

Article 4 APA Negotiation

1. Note From Yesterday Updated:

- a. Secretariat: The new note aims to capture the ideas from yesterday's session and new ideas brought by parties to the session. It only focused on elements under #6 of the skeleton, didn't go further. The secretariat merely collating information.
- b. Decided to use italics to delineate where new text was added

2. Floor Open For Comment:

a. Main Comment 1: Argentina/G77+ China Proposal

- i. There should be a new paragraph in the informal note providing relevant context to the third bullet. Full text to be sent to secretariat for consideration of inclusion.
 - 1. Very important to Argentina's continued participation
- ii. Under the 6th heading, the options should read as "option 1: Vehicle-specific guidance for an adaptation communication" with additional relevant info and "option 2: No vehicle-specific guidance for an adaptation communication".
- iii. Secretariat: Can you read the paragraph you propose?
- iv. *Pgh to be submitted to secretariat for consideration*
- v. Secretariat: Language within the text shouldn't hint at outcomes, it should only try to explicate criteria/guidelines/clarifications. (They go on to say they essentially agree w/ the G77's proposal but believe it should go elsewhere in the document).
- vi. Argentina: Thank you for that effort, but G77 needs this to ensure they will have many options
- vii. Secretariat: Yes, this motion is noted and will be considered for acceptance
- viii. Switzerland: We have many concerns. First, why is NDC specific guidance being singled out? Next, why was our proposal not adopted in the new informal note? Third, we want specific guidance for adaptation/other things.
- ix. Secretariat: Currently it's a yes/no NDC specific guidance, are you proposing an 'option 3'?
- x. Switzerland: We want to see Opt. 1 changed to "vehicle specific guidance" and have vehicles added.
- xi. Secretariat: Shouldn't this go under Option 2?
- xii. Switzerland: *Debates in-group, will come back to them*
- xiii. *Japan and S. Africa Comments*

- xiv. Saudi Arabia: We on behalf of the Arab Group want to align with Argentina on the option 1/option 2 approach with some clarifications. Under #6, b, bullet 1, change language to “Info on adaptive action that results in mitigation benefits”. Under #5, approach, clarify to say that it provides guiding communication - include under guiding principles?
- xv. At the top, with the option 1/option 2 pathways, we agree with Ecuador (believe they mean Argentina)
- xvi. Jamaica: On Behalf of the Alliance of developing states we agree with Argentina, and express hope that comments made will be taken with reflections going forward; need flexibility.
- xvii. [Back to Africa Prop.]
- xviii. Colombia: We align with the G77 with the addition of three minor inclusions; make option for 1st bullet GSD adaptation, transparency framework language, 3rd bullet under purpose should discuss G77 changes as originally proposed.
- xix. Secretariat: Please send the intended text
- xx. [Back to Africa Prop.]

b. Main Comment 2: Japan’s Comment

- i. Japan: - - -
- ii. Secretariat: You want option one to say specific guidance for specific vehicles w/ option 2 delineating vehicles?...That is the proposal from the Swiss.
- iii. New Zealand: We agree, option 2 should the say “no vehicle specific guidance:
- iv. Secretariat: Yes
- v. Japan: We need to have consistent language, and add something to the preamble to better delineate the status of the note, need to discuss details/bullets, did I understand you?
- vi. Secretariat: Thank you, yes we are working out how to best streamline info given to us from all different parties in different formats. Status of subheadings reflect interests of parties, text is in no way precluding parties from reflecting on subheadings.
- vii. Japan: Have identified options on subheadings, please keep bullets
- viii. Secretariat: This text is not part of the skeleton, all subheadings are in-text, there is not equivalent level of discussion at subheadings, would like to remind parties that we are still reflecting and discussion is still open. As Japan says, subheadings need attention, not all parties have done this yet.
- ix. [Back to A.G. Prop]

- x. Saudi Arabia: We are okay with G77 proposal as long as original footnote from informal note remains
- xi. China: We support G77 and Saudi view. Guiding Principles are integral as well (in response to US).
- xii. Saudi Arabia: Please add our items to informal note/ treat our position seriously.

c. Main Comment 3: South Africa/Africa Group Proposal

- i. Secretariat: There are no more requests
- ii. South Africa: We align w/ G77+China on behalf of the African Group on inputs already made issue. In addition, African Group requests that relevant methodologies/guidelines on adaptation and communication should be produced by the IPCC in a report to nations on how to properly implement adaptation strategies, to be completed before COP 25. African Group will write a formal proposal.
- iii. Secretariat: We are happy to receive this, need to consult w/ APA co-chairs.
- iv. EU: Our ideas are reflected in new informal note. We believe that Purpose: Sections 1 and 2b can be merged and Elements: Option 1 to be followed by Option 2 list.
- v. US: Our ideas are reflected in new informal note. We would not support the African Group requiring anything of the IPCC.
- vi. Japan: Need to clarify text in italics. Also, we agree w/ the US that South Africa's proposal is not feasible in terms of timeline, capacity, and budget. It is out of scope, not appropriate. IPCC is not present which is also an issue.
- vii. Malawi: We support the proposal brought forth by South Africa, could be really helpful to support our nation, just because we haven't discussed it doesn't mean we shouldn't air our views.
- viii. [Back to G77 Prop.]
- ix. Liberia: We align with South Africa on IPCC proposal, we do not believe the proposal is unreasonable.
- x. NZ: There should be a section within the note on approach, must remain since adaptation communication isn't mandatory. Also, on the IPCC Proposition, IPCC has neither the funding nor the resources to conduct such a comprehensive endeavor. Working groups are already at capacity.
- xi. Secretariat: Other groups need this room, will take final requests for the floor very quickly
- xii. [Back to G77 Prop]

- xiii. US: We are uncomfortable/don't support guiding principles, and room does not have mandate to request anything of the IPCC.
 - xiv. Uruguay: We align with Argentina, and also need clarification on African Group proposal, will comment on it tomorrow.
 - xv. Secretariat: It will need to be brought to the APA co-chairs, that is our mandate at the moment, we will consult parties in contact groups
 - xvi. [Back to G77 Prop.]
3. Secretariat: Thank you, this was a productive session, new informal note will be up by 1pm.