

Fourth Informal Consultation of the APA Agenda Item 5 Modalities, Procedures and Guidance for the Transparency Framework for Action and Support referred to in Article 13 of the Paris Agreement

Friday, 10 November 2017, 3-4pm, Nairobi 1/2/3, COP23

Note taker: Melissa Low, Research Fellow, Energy Studies Institute, National University of Singapore (esimlyx@nus.edu.sg)

To be discussed: TEC, FMCP

The Co-Facilitators noted that upon request of Parties at the first informal consultation on 7 November 2017. It has been prepared under the Co-facilitators' own responsibility and thus has no formal status. The content is not exhaustive. It does not represent agreed views, ideas or text and nor does it attempt to draw any conclusions on possible areas of convergence or divergence. The Co-facilitators' also recognize that nothing is final until all the MPGs are final. The Co-facilitators further recognize that there are varying views on the structure of the MPGs, including differentiation, the operationalization of the provisions in Article 13.3, and consideration of developing country Parties' transition to the enhanced transparency framework. There is no intention to prejudge or prejudice the position of Parties on these issues, their views regarding the outcome of related agenda items or regarding the content of MPGs.

At this session, intend to take up technical expert review and facilitative multilateral consideration of progress. This evening's session will take up support needed and received.

Ask that parties focus intervention on the following:

- Are there any fundamental issues missing from the Preliminary material document? Focus on issues of significance
- Are proposals captured accurately? Are they in the right place? Is there a way to streamline this material?

Singapore (G77 & China)

- Group is still consulting with members, require more time to look through 25 pages of material
- Will try our best to provide inputs by Saturday, 3pm
- Raise organization of work issue – recognize secretariat has tried its best to ensure finance discussion does not coincide but like to express our hope that finance people can join us for transparency

Co-Facilitator said they have taken note on the clashes with finance and secretariat will continue to ensure that does not happen. Preference to receive inputs as soon as possible, by 9pm tonight if OK. Will take those received at 3pm on board as well. A lot of work needed, and have to send them to APA Co-Chairs as well, encourage Parties to send submissions in as soon as possible.

Brazil (Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay)

- Full support for concerns raised by Singapore for G77 & China
- For TER, Section G, we have some proposals on how to streamline the text:
 - G1, G3, G4 – can be shortened, since we have defined in the PA what are the objectives, functions of TER and scope of work to be reviewed

- Can repeat what we have in Paris but we just have to copy and paste exact wordings that we agreed in Paris, no expanding or rewriting
- Minor comments will be submitted in writing tomorrow
- On FMCP, streamlining should also be applied:
 - Defined scope, functions in Paris so can be very straight forward
 - Express some concern over the way our submission has been expressed – steps of FMCP, online platform – surprised to hear under H4, 3 the phrase is completely out of place and there are challenges to be aware of
 - Do not understand why qualitative assessment placed on our submissions – we have to talk about everything here and everything here has challenges to be aware of
 - One proposal from us received this special treatment and we would not like to see this happening again and cannot receive or deserve this special treatment – ask that Co-Facilitators recall or re-read our submission to capture our proposal more accurately
- Will do our best to send our comments in written form

Costa Rica (AILAC)

- Associate with Singapore (G77 & China)
- On TER, should take best practice and lessons learned from ICA and IAR
- New technical review should allow capacities to enhance reporting – clear processes and guidelines should be formulated
- No undue burden for Parties and Secretariat
- On section G, G3 – scope in item 7, like you to add consistency of information on accounting guidance for NDCs as specified in 1/CP.21 para 31 and assessment of consistency with provisions of accounting in relation to implementation of Article 6
- To add previous TERs to the text
- Like to make a point around some rationality to address issue of one of the proposals we have made – flexibility on TER has to be ensured for developing countries through implementation of a transition process
- “transition process action plan” should contain capacity building needs in short and medium term that Party could implement to identify gaps of information; to be given just once through first BUR
- “transition process action plan” should not be the focus of the process, but should be taken into account by the TTE to review

European Union

- Detailed issues where we found that our submission may not be completely represented
- G4, confidentiality in review process
- G5 in relation to review – we had a bit more detail in each of the review format and useful to capture that, although we recognize you cannot capture all in full details – hope you can try to condense our inputs
- Some options of flexibility that could not directly find and in relation to role of Secretariat in G5,3 to compile final review reports and role in assessing experts’ qualification

- Some element where we thought it would be important in future to implement review and to request certain types of reviews – that was an element we could not see, but will reflect again in our written input, hope we can respond today due to the EU procedures but we are trying to keep to the 6pm deadline
- On FMCP, we only have some ways more that don't want to raise from the floor

Bhutan (LDCs)

- Join views expressed by Singapore (G77) in allowing more time to work on this and allow us to work until 3pm tomorrow to come up with written inputs
- With regard to inputs, 3 major significant issues missing from our submissions on TER and FMCP:
 1. On TER, scope of the review should focus on thematic areas of implementation including mitigation, adaptation, loss and damage and support
 2. Composition of TER members, captured but we would like to consider to ensure balance and geographical and regional representation on TER
 3. On the item of structure and element of the report, we believe there is space to allow recommendations of sources of support to overcome barriers of implementation of this framework in general
 4. On FMCP, on objective, function and purpose, like to see that one of the reason is to facilitate improved reporting over time and needs to be reflected
 5. Under scope, need to capture the FMCP is for all thematic areas as reflected under TER
 6. In the area of info to be considered, we believe input by Parties or non-Party stakeholder in TER should form basis for FMCP
- Will be providing detailed comments by 3pm tomorrow

New Zealand

- One small comment on the FMCP: heading H4 format and steps... there should be a little more in that on the role of the Secretariat, because there is nothing there that covers the role of the Secretariat
- While we understand the role is rather nebulous now and while we cannot foresee, we can lift some language to put in for the TER G5, 3
- Did provide some detail in submission on role of the Secretariat

China

- Missing ones:
 - TER, FMCP process could be based on current IAR/ICA guidelines – want to see it reflected in this tool
 - Some of the expressions here replicate the current provisions so important in have that reflected in the document
 - See some replacement of the tool e.g. in G2, 10 GHG inventory report should be reviewed separately should belong in reporting format and NDCs is not within scope of review but should be in G3
- Other comments will be sent via email
- Space for streamline: info to be reviewed, scope and frequency and timing issues could be comparable to each other

- Options to be developed for current tools:
 - Different opinions e.g. FMCP whether should be every party to undergo or by region or groups
 - Options or approaches or clusters could guide our work forward more easily

United States

- Few comments to highlight here, detailed comments to be sent via email
- Missing:
 - G3 in scope, missing scope defined from the PA – consideration of Parties... like to see that added back in
 - Appreciate China G2,10 in wrong place
 - Agree with Brazil on replication
 - Principles section already been captured – opportunity to streamline
- H4 inputs – missed a little bit of what should have been captured : reporting through BTR and efforts under Article 9 and achievement of NDC under Article 4
- Will send language and detailed comments via email

Norway

- G5,1 on format, suggested a simplified review
- G6,3 composition, suggested balanced geographical representation
- Should not exceed certain number of pages
- Will send comments in via email

Japan

- As Norway said, on format, should have standardized checklist and based on recommendations from last TER

Georgia (EIG)

- Will send written submission by tonight
- Major comments:
 - Clear identification of info to be provided missing from this material
 - Goes beyond Art 13.11, 13.12
 - Reporting format need clearly defined format and cannot be left to discretion of Parties being reviewed
 - Geographical balance and from developed and developing countries
 - On FMCP, we believe that scope is also not fully reflected as it should cover review reports and biennial reports and regarding info to be provided under Art 9
- Will provide all info in writing

Australia

- There's been a lot of comments that have been constructive but lend support on China, New Zealand on simplified review and NZ's FMCP need more info on role of the Secretariat, China/US on combination of sections on info to be reviewed, scope and frequency and timing
- Under format G5, 1.3 in county reviews could be made available to Parties that require flexibility in light of their capacities
- All formats increase use of standardized format and CTF
- G5, 4.2 review report to include capacity by building needs, taking into account improvement from improvement plans, taking into account recommendations from TER team

Since there were no further requests from the floor, Co-Facilitators suggested that Parties use the remaining time to work on their written submissions and adjourned the informal consultation.

The next informal consultation happening today at 6pm will focus on transparency of support needed and received.

The informal consultation ended at 3.34pm.