

APA agenda item 4: informal consultations on further guidance in relation to the adaptation communication, including, inter alia, as a component of nationally determined contributions, referred to in Article 7, paragraphs 10 and 11, of the PA – 11/11/2017 – Andrea Fontana

Chair

- Open the floor for first reactions
- Focus if something has been left out
- Reactions to the skeleton as it is now

Saudi Arabia – Arab league of States

- Surprised publishing on website
- Not acceptable and must be removed – facilitators do not have mandate for publishing on APA website
- Must capture diversion in the room in clear manner
- NDCs not captured
- Paper need three options
 - Common adaptation communication guidance
 - Common adaptation communication guidance + vehicle specific guidance
 - Vehicle specific guidance
- Opening
 - Offered as basis for work – we do not agree
- Explain note please
 - Disagree on inputs because our not
- Recommend that we list three options mentioned

EU

- Presented as without status – clear disclaimers – we think that this could be a good starting point for further discussion – can find our ideas somewhere in there – we think most ideas are in here – still need a discussion on structure
- Structure
 - Specific headings – we see them as headings that cluster some ideas we need to discuss for final outcome – not very detailed discussion on wording of heading as it might disappear in final version
 - Preamble – issue
 - No need for guiding principles but helpful – allows for discussion on what the guidance is like
 - Purposes – three options: wondering if we need option 2 and 3 or if we can rid them straight away: we think 2 is talking about an a) and b) of purpose of guidance – can be captured under 5-approach – similar idea on 4.3 objective

US

- Understood that we gave facilitators mandate for producing this
- This is going to take us much further away for how many options there are
- It would be a shame to go in 2018 w/o way forward

Canada

- Given you mandate to draft this – in your opening you mentioned you would update this – as the document indicates this is just a tool to move discussion forward – would be unfortunate to backtrack – there has been a lot of good will

- High level comments – EU: preamble: often you come back and overarching, you want to have the comment rather than prejudging with preambular
- 4/5 can go together? – 5 could be embedded somewhere else – if we can try to merge points together

Argentina – G77

- comments on different options
 - we need to have a common understanding of the options – there are different ideas coming at the same time – in certain cases opinions are options and others are not – in certain you have options w/ headings and certain w/o
- understood the place of operation paragraph under 3) understand why it is there – at the same time the nature of it is different – we can try to see how we can reflect conversation that didn't take place here on the flow – no issue with operational paragraph
 - not sure option 3 is very productive
 - EU on 1 and 2 → not sure about merging – we did not have that conversation
- On the approach – options 2 on hearing 2 and then appears in heading 5 – kind of repetition we try to avoid and express we have flexibility on placement – not sure approach should be repeated in too many places – maybe have it as heading – we are still looking for the place for it
- Heading 6 on elements - difference in options – make sure you capture all options proposed SA – option 1 and option 2: there is a substantial difference between our understanding → could be an opt-in/opt-out

Ecuador - LMDC

- Align with Argentina
- Be clear on sub-comments raised – differentiation is embedded in the all process of the PA and we are not renegotiating any article of the PA
- Demanding clearly – guidance on adaptation communication (NDCs)
- Captured difference in a non-productive way
- High level commentary – need of conversation on which of the headings will go to another document – at this stage it is good – until the proposal we have – maybe there are repetitions in approach) and in 8) → language we have been discussing on differences – we would like to keep it that way

Japan

- Share view on good starting point – common understandings are there – 4) 6)
- We still have contents under the headings
- My delegation did not send any content – should we submit content?

Chair

- Not content it's just points to give an idea of what's going to be like

Saudi Arabia

- Serious concern without mandate or agreement in the room – we will not accept it – needs structure issue – concerns with facilitators acting without encapsulating party's views – we request removal of informal note

South Africa – African Group

- Associate with G77
- Understanding that this note iteration should build on APA 1.3 informal note and consider submissions made

- Elements we want to engage with
 - Number of headings that do not have title – conceptual info on there – what are we trying to put there?
 - Operation – support remains very crucial for developing countries
 - Understand what would be the conceptual different for objectives?
 - Importance of support is crucial for us

Norway

- This perfectly in line with how we left room yesterday
- Grows larger and larger and cannot identify anything missing
- Paper might need some sorting
- We can do a bit of sorting and merging some heading
- Preamble
 - Relevant references to PA would be good here
- Guiding principles
 - Exact references to PA – we could do some work on that and put it under one heading
 - Useful as SA said what 2.2 of approach means and what is expected
- 6) – lots of useful elements there
 - option 1 – opt-out option would be useful to know criteria to be under a) or b)

Malawi

- support G77, South Africa
- 3) – allowed to have one of the bullet around support – has not been reflected – add that
- seek clarity from you on how operational paragraph will be different than rest – more work on operational paragraph
- 7) concerned about it – why specific elements for NDCs → common elements; why NDCs are having their own elements here?

Chair

- trying to capture views to have a conversation – just trying to include in a balanced way the views of parties

Malawi

- can we get comments on proponent of 3) to have more clarity?

Colombia - ILAC

- associate with Argentina
- technical and conceptual questions
 - approach
 - purpose and objective difference?
 - Operational paragraph
- We need to ensure nobody is left behind
- We believe that this exercise of populating points is the way forward
- Opt-in opt-out adds flexibility
- For us this guidance is subject to evolution and adjustment over time

Jamaica -

- SIDS
- G77 and China

- We would have been presented with document highlighting headings and while I am happy to see the further elaboration it would be to see headings only

Chair

- Procedural issue to deal with

US

- Reaction
 - Other Parties see this as the basis for more work
- Comment on Saudi Arabia – this agenda item – developing guidance for adaptation communication **only** – no mandate to shape adaptation in others

Uruguay

- Approach – section 2) and then option 2) approach and then again as a different section in 5) – some explanations from the proponents – sections that have no headings provisions – highlight importance
- Other elements to reflect specific circumstances and priorities
- Support option 1
- Support to developing country parties to indicate what we need by support

Secretariat – the note will be removed from website

Saudi Arabia

- Initially raised from specific question on item 7)
 - Apologize from not engaging in discussion and hope we can engage from now

Argentina

- Group is first of all to thank you for the removal of the note and happy to see the first iteration of the note and views of from the Parties – can agree on an iteration of your note – if it's possible to have it for the afternoon session

Chair → won't be able to produce other iteration – other iteration by Monday – meeting adjourned

Afternoon session

Ecuador – LMDC

- At the beginning of the skeleton: general guidance for adaptation comm and NDC
 - Important to have guidance for NDC given the lack of guidance already there
 - We understand that different country parties will submit info on adaptation it is necessary to have further guidance on NDC specific to adaptation communication
- Clarification from facilitator: one general guidance for adaptation communication and one specific guidance for NDC specific guidance? Yes, that is correct. We want that on top. Facilitator: do you have specific content – both titles will coexist, they are mutually exclusive

US

- More and more difficult to progress on this issue item
- Clear divergence in the room
- Room does not have legal specific guidance mandate – no guidance for NDC possible here – adaptation communication guidelines here only

Co facilitator

- No consensus in the room
- Text would remain would reflect the request and we would reflect also parties' opinion that do not want to include it

US

- Thank you for looking for compromise
- What do we mean by title
- Where is this going to know? Concerned about putting it above, do not want to give it uncomfortable status

Co facilitators

- Ecuador wants two titles
 - Indulgence from proponent: can we add both but work on one only → my understanding of US
 - There will be another set of guidelines for NDC but we will keep working on other guidelines
 - Ecuador?

Ecuador

- That is the correct interpretation

Canada

- Quite an interesting topic – to discuss NDC guidance in adaptation room? Important to keep NDC in NDC room and adaptation in adaptation room – rather than having two points at the top – use already used language “including *inter alia* NDC”

Co facilitators

- Instead of what Ecuador proposes one single title that would replicate title of agenda

New Zealand

- Could not be there in the morning
- Thank you for incorporating our vision in the document
- How to take this forward? Language used as we flash language out, should be as open as possible – non mandatory communication – approach each country takes to adapt to climate change will be country driven – therefore language we use should not be suggesting there is something we need to do – more like “were they to choose to”
 - Single set of guidance coming from these countries can use no matter what vehicle – if party chooses to put adaptation communication under transparency of 13 – no need separate guidance – options are in the document that would go in the direction of LMDC – can we have a common set of guidelines?

Saudi Arabia – league of Arab states

- Agree with Ecuador
- Few issues raised
 - We shouldn't link adaptation communication to NDCs – many linkages in PA between different items – it would be incorrect and incomplete to deny linkage – currently exist no guidance for adaptation communication for NDC → there is a gap in the guidance and we need to address this gap and this is the right platform
- More appropriate to use PA language
 - Skeleton of adaptation communication
 - Skeleton on adaptation communication as a component of or in conjunction with adaptation communication

Canada

- For my own understanding – concerns of component of NDC → asking Saudi Arabia why? First we had specific and additional guidance for adaptation communication for NDC → would be burden for parties that use it as vehicle – provision that use NDCs

Co facilitators

- What we are doing here is to reflect parties' opinions – let's not forget that we have the task in this section and COP to complete our work and advance as much as possible to reflect parties views
- Needs to be coherent – we would like to see exchange – we will have time for that negotiation once we have document with all opinions expressed

US

- Eager to engage more with how headings stand
- As NZ said → more explicit input on outline – agree with NZ that one set of guidelines should allow parties to include adaptation communication in whatever vehicle of choice
- What could turn into very comprehensive guidance? Why would it not be sufficient?

Saudi Arabia

- In no way opposed to have specific guidelines for every vehicle as well
 - What's worrying is that at the moment there's no guidance at all

Co facilitator

- Let move on

Norway

- This is not necessarily a point of divergence
- It changes the scope of our discussion
 - Changing the heading means a lot
- Need linkage to transparency framework that is still lacking – linkage to the registry – does not mean that we should discuss those directly in these group – agree with way forward

Comments on the text

Argentina

- G77 and China
- This is time for adaptation
- Can reiterate some issues from the morning
 - Approach → appears under multiple headings – how are parties understanding to read the guidance? Is this part of the guidance or how to read the guidance?
 - Would like to hear from parties – process of updates →
 - How they are understanding to accommodate difference under article 7.11?
 - Can we engage more with the idea of common elements?

EU

- Steering away from Argentina
- Reflecting on some issues
 - Approach → 5) useful idea – for elements to report on heading n6 → guiding elements that parties are encouraged to use – could contain more than that – one or two paragraphs that introduce what is coming after
 - Updates → haven't thought about it yet

- Vehicles → updates will depend on vehicle of choice
- Elements themselves → similarity between elements in item 2 and option 1
- Given non mandatory requirement – what is difference between elements and opt-in and opt-out → seems sub issues that could fit into common elements because more qualifying → could it be to have a common set of elements – category with any other elements – maybe additional category of reporting to include these elements?

NZ

- Approach → this was our submission – there is some confusion now in the doc you prepared – it appears in 5) and option 2) of section 2)
 - In our proposal approach follows purpose
 - To be applied to any vehicle but similar structure welcome
 - Not meant to be an additional reporting burden
 - The approach and structure could equally serve the decision
 - Would not need to be in both places
 - If we were to reorganize I would encourage moving 8/9 into first part of document → issues of vehicles communicating are not something that would go into the guidance
- No agreement on the content of the document – we are not that sure if we need anything on support – in the guidelines of the transparency framework there is parts dedicated to support provided and support needed and received – maybe just cross reference in adaptation communication guidance

Co facilitator

- Are parties comfortable with concept note that would work for the preparation of next session on Monday?

Saudi Arabia

- As long as all parties inputs are included

Dialogue to be picked back up on Monday

- Conversation on approach
- On purpose
- On elements

Kuwait

- Informal note → is it going to be posted or handed out? We will email it and post it