

Caroline Hobbs

Yale University, School of Forestry and Environmental Studies

APA Agenda Item 5: informal consultations on modalities procedures and guidelines for the transparency framework for action and support referred to in Article 13 of the PA

11.13.17

17:00 (started 10 minutes late at 17:10)

The outcome of deliberations on this item will form part of the overall outcome under the Paris Agreement Work Programme

Co-Facilitators: Xiang Gao (China) Andrew Rakestraw (USA)

Andrew Rakestraw

- APA co-chairs provided parties with a common template for comments
- Co-chairs have received 1041 written comments in total
- Priority in incorporating comments: ensuring substance rather than language was maintained
- we included insertions that did not duplicate
- right now we want to focus more on the concepts
- upon the guidance of APA co-chairs (focused on content and not headings)
- useful comments on how to streamline this content- proposals were in direct conflict with each other
- emphasize paragraphs in section 2: content not exhaustive
- articles 13.7-13.12 vary in their legal nature (the shalls and the shoulds) further discussion is needed on this issue
- MPGs will provide flexibility as needed by countries
- Received useful comments on how to streamline this document, but many were in conflict with each other
- Reiterated the importance of Section 2
- Co-chairs are not seeking input on individual items but rather on process

Indonesia:

- Technical issue with submission
- Wants to add new bullet under 8.4
- Add: interlinkage under articles 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 11, and 14 of Paris agreement

Co-facilitator:

- Clarify that it was a technical error

Singapore:

- On behalf of G-77 and China:
 - Would like to see language in notation key in same style - italics
 - Wants to see caveat in notation key to remain

Ecuador:

- On behalf of LMDC's:
 - Support G77 and China coordinator
 - Might not want to create new version of the text given that this is the last informal
 - At this stage, issuing a formal note does NOT mean parties are negotiating, and this practice has become popular since Paris
 - Element presented by Ecuador in previous notes not represented here
 - Differentiation between support provided and support mobilized - section e4
 - Create different headings and sections for that distinction
 - Look forward to negotiating and not just having an informal working document turn into a more formal one
 - In objectives or overarching comments there is sometimes the issue of commensurability

- Call for commensurability between what's reported from one side and what's reported from another
- Add consideration on the expected impacts of the results

Costa Rica:

- On behalf of AILEC
 - Concerned about how notation keys should be referenced in each element
 - Notation keys are confusing
 - Better to specifically reference them in each element
 - Further conversations needed on this issue

Bhutan:

- On behalf of LDC's:
 - Not happy with the document itself
 - This document provides a good basis for us to engage in constructive negotiation in upcoming sessions

US :

- Contains **a lot** that we don't like
- However it's a good way to capture the progress we've made here
- Uncomfortable with notation key - only see LDC and developed countries listed in article 2 and article 9
- Don't see reference to developed countries or developing countries
- Include phrases as a super script
- A lot of room still to streamline the document
 - Lots of redundancies in the text
- In a few places it seems like provisions were in the wrong sections
- Notation key is a good place to focus now

South Africa:

- Good basis to move forward on
- Support proposal made by Singapore on G77
- Phrases are quite long and having them in super script would be quite strange
- 2 things that we think are being overlooked
 - First that we were keen on having a separate sub heading under item B 4, information provided in terms of item 9.5
 - Grateful that you've included a reference to information about 9.5
 - This is very important to our group
 - Alternative would be to put a placeholder round 9.5
 - Some parties believe that due to the importance of this item it should have a separate heading
 - Reference specifically to support provided in terms of 13.14 and 13.15, technology transfer and capacity building
 - In favor of heaving a separate sub heading for that as well
 - Feel that this is currently captured in the document

Maldives:

- Speaking on behalf of AOSIS
 - Echoes Singapore's statement
 - Wanted to see standalone section on loss and damage, but realizes that a working document is important, so they want to move forward with the working document this session
- Good attempt to capture concerns of all parties
- Doesn't balloon the text too much
 - We've come out with a workable document
- Concerns are present though

- Stand alone section on damage - although we know this isn't meant to be exhaustive
- Do not wish to reopen the document at this stage
- The informal note could also serve as a useful reference document for work going on under other APA items
- Express our intent to engage constructively moving forward with this

Switzerland:

-On behalf of Environmental integrity group:

- Echoes G77 proposal and also acknowledges US proposal as a potential way forward
- Important not to lose any substance
 - good, comprehensive, paper
 - Reflects the views of all parties
 - Will engage on this in May
 - Proposal made by G77 on keys - unhappy about it, will make the paper less readable
 - Proposal made by the US, like this, think this could be a way forward
 - Streamlining could be useful
 - Important not to lose any substance

Australia

- Things missing, haven't been articulated in a way that we'd prefer
- Don't want to open the text at this stage
- Don't want to further balloon the text too much
- Understand the concerns that the notation could be hard to read
- Current font is 9.5
 - Maybe we move the font up to 10 or 11 (simple solution)
- If we cannot have the notation key in the current form
 - We suggest they be abbreviated in super script

EU

- Not everything we submitted is reflected
- Basis for our discussion
- Uncomfortable in the way the document shows how many difficult issues we have on our table in this room
 - We will need much time to come to final MPGs and how many difficult areas we have to tackle
 - Our task next year will still be so difficult
- Article 9 paragraph 5 (to what South Africa said) - we have another discussion going on-- whether this discussion is part of the MPGs or not
 - It's not appropriate for this to be about headings
 - We'd be happier if we had (in relation to discussion on item 8)
 - We need to come back to this at the next session
- To replace the subscripts with clear reference to the parties
- In some places we think sub scripts may not be correct
 - Having it closer to the text makes this inaccuracy clearer
 - Although also concerned about readability of the text
- We don't want to create a much longer or an unreadable text
 - All the subscripts in creates very long complicated lines
- Done a really good job to make it readable and clear

Brazil

- On behalf of Argentina, Uruguay and Brazil
 - All parties will have to decide at the end what will be included in the final document
 - For the time being, this document is satisfactory
 - Reminder to colleagues outside this room: APA does not need to resolve all the placeholders

- Don't need to negotiate font size - just want to see the notation key be readable
 - How we like to read is a matter of taste
 - We leave the font size and italicization to the discretion of the co-chairs

China

- LMDCs
 - Would like to associate with G77 document
 - We don't need to agree on everything to make progress on this document
 - Agrees with Brazil on giving discretion on formatting, but requests larger font
 - Objective is to capture clear information submitted by the parties
 - Want to capture party submissions more accurately since there is already incorrect text in the notation key

Saudi Arabia

- Arab Group
 - Not everyone loves but everyone can live with
 - Looking forward to working with others moving forward

Co-facilitator

- A4.1 - interlinkages with all relevant issues in
 - Would like to include this
 - On the understanding that this was a technical error
- On the notation box
 - We would like to remove this box, and add notations onto the end of each section
- Parties interests are to ensure readability on this
- We will ensure that this is readable
- Creating a superscript
 - Seemed to be a strong view, we'd like to take this on board as well
- We would like to keep but amend language around what are no longer notations
 - Replaced with: in order to accurately capture parties views Following each provision to indicate to which party provisions apply ... under article 13 This approach in no way prejudices parties views with regard to MPGs
- Take note of concerns raised around content and headings and subheadings
 - Nothing is agreed in this text
 - There's still a lot of work to do ahead of us
- Make these amendments to the co-facilitators note as soon as possible and post something no later than tomorrow morning
- Forward this document to the APA co-chairs

South Africa

- We accept your proposal we just want a clarification
 - In terms of the addition issues that were raised
 - Want to be clear that the two points we raised regarding headings and emphasizing the report provided
 - Given the broad nature of 4.5 we'd have to live with that, with a reference to 7.13, we'd consider that a cover up of concerns

Co-facilitator:

- Add in a reference to 7.13 in this paragraph

Over all this discussion was free of major conflict, suggestions were made about how to move forward on the draft document made over the weekend which will be revised and resubmitted tomorrow. Readability was emphasized by the majority of the parties.