

15:00-16:00 in the Nairobi Room

**APA agenda item 5: informal consultations on modalities, procedures and guidelines for the transparency framework for action and support referred to in Art. 13 of the PA
November 10, 2017**

Note taker: Florencia Sanchez Zunino, University of Maryland (sanchezf@umd.edu)

Co-Facilitators: Preliminary material released on Monday, the material has no formal status. This session today intends to take up technical expert review. The co-facilitators encouraged parties to send proposal by today at 9 pm.

Singapore

- Will do their best to share comments by Saturday at 3pm
- Raise point that finance people should join the discussion for transparency purposes

Brazil (Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay)

- Full support to concern of Singapore
- Proposal on how to streamline the text in G1, G3 and G4. We cannot redo what we did in Paris. The document can be shortened.
- Concern on how one of the proposal has been expressed
- Surprised to see a special treat to one proposal
- Comments in detail will be send by tomorrow

Costa Rica (AILAC)

- General remarks: we should take the best practices and lessons learned from the implementation of the ICA/IAR
- On Section G3 we would like you to add consistency of information on accounting guidance for NDCs and assessment of consistency with provisions of accounting in relation to implementation of Article 6
- Section G8 Adding a section called recurrent issues
- Flexibility on the technical review should be implemented through a "transition process action plan". Based on the gaps of information of barriers. Plan should be presented by a developing country just once through first BUR

European Union

- Technical expert reviews: no general or major concerns
- Few in detail issues. Submission may not be completely represented
- G4 Issues of confidentiality
- G5 formats of reviews and centralized peer review. we had a bit more detail in each of the review format and it would be useful to capture that
- Options of flexibility in relation to the role of the secretariat in section G5. Corrective responsibility of the secretariat. Role in assessing the expert's qualification.
- Frequency and timing of the review that the party can request
- Will do their best to submit something today at 6 PM
- On FMCP, only some comments that don't want to raise from the floor

Bhutan (LDC)

- Agree with views expressed by Singapore
- Major significant issues missing from TER and FMCP:

- Scope of review should focus on all areas of implementation, including mitigation, adaptation, loss and damage and support
- Composition of Technical expert review member should ensure balance
- Input by Parties or non-Party stakeholder in TER should form basis for FMCP

New Zealand

- Small comment on FMCP
- Roles of parties and the secretariat should be expanded
- While the role of secretariat is nebulous now, we can lift some language to put in for the TER G5, 3

China

- Missing issues:
 - Emphasize the TER and FMCP process based on current IAR/ICA guidelines. Emplacement of these tools
- There is space for streamline: info to be reviewed, frequency and timing issues could be compared to each other
- G2 10 misplaced, should be in G3
- Other comments will be sent via email

United States

- Only a few comments here, more comments will be shared by email
- Missing in G3 in scope defined in Paris agreement itself. Consideration of parties considered as relevant
- G2 10 misplaced, agree with China
- Agree with Brazil on replication

Norway

- Section G 5 1 format. Proposed a simplified review
- G 6 2 composition balance of geographical representation
- Expert report should not exceed a certain number of pages

Japan

- Simplify review format. should have standardized checklist and based on recommendations from last TER

Georgia (Environmental Integrity Group)

- General comments, written submission tonight
- Clear identification of the information to be provided, missed in this material
- Format: clear defined format cannot be to discretion of the parties
- Composition: geographical balance. Experts from developed and developing countries
- Scope is not fully reflected. It should cover technical reports as well as the information to be included

Australia

- Support suggestions of Japan and New Zealand
- Under format G5, 1.3 we would also include the in-country reviews to Parties that require flexibility in light of their capacities
- G5, 4.2 should also include account areas for improvement. Include capacity by building needs, taking into account improvement and account recommendations from TER

The informal consultation ended at approximately 3:40 PM

Co-Facilitator: Since there were no further requests from the floor, they suggested that Parties use the extra time to prepare comments to be submitted for tonight discussion.