

Third 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

Thursday, 9 November 2017, 12-1 pm, Nairobi 1/2 Room, COP23

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

Co-Facilitators recalled that the Preliminary material was prepared and uploaded to the APA Agenda Item 5 website.

Intend to take up support provided, and if there is time, support received

Informal consultation timeslots:

- Friday, 3-4pm: TEC, FMCP
- Friday, 6-7pm: transparency of support received and needed

Co-Facilitator noted 2 questions to guide discussions:

- 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?

Philippines (G77 & China)

- Finance group of G77 and China helping transparency coordinator
- Thanked Co-Facilitator for the tool, taking careful look at it
- First remark: big gap concerns Articles 4, 4.5, 10, 10.6, 11 (capacity building support) – the purpose of transparency of support is to provide clarity in all the Articles I have mentioned. There is a big gap in capturing all the ongoing processes that in themselves contain modalities and procedures that might be there before we can get a full picture of MPGs of transparency of support
- I will go into detail later on what is happening on the capacity building side, PCCB, CBIT and how funding is being provided for that.
- Second missing gap in this useful tool - streamlining and rationalization needed – but M and V side is missing. Measurement and verification mechanisms need to be in place; have started to work on common tabular format on received from developed countries to developing countries. We do have to look at how much and what is being provided – it is going to be measured. This is the work of the SCF on the biennial assessment of climate finance flows. This work is very detailed on biennial assessment and what we are finding out is methodologies. Support provided mainly from institutions outside of the framework of the financial mechanism – referred to Art 11.5 institutions – bilateral channels, regional development banks, multilateral financial institutions. All of these found outside.

- Inside operating entities – GEF and GCF and funds under the Convention e.g. LDCF, SCCF – work need to be taken into account and the Adaptation Fund.
- Will try to work out this and give you the details
- The whole tool will have to be rationalized in that manner, in my mind
- Information in paragraph 2b, all of that we are looking at biennial assessments and we are now in preparation of 3rd iteration, no need to reinvent the wheel since we will have that information but how is it going to be scaled up because what we are taking about is enhanced actions enabled by enhanced support.
- Art. 9.7, Art. 9.5 of PA – need quantitative and qualitative information of what is being done
- Art 9.5, 9.1, 9.3 – obligation and mobilization – important components that need to be captured and taken in to account, country-driven strategies and taking into account needs and priorities of developing countries
- Art. 9.4 - balance of provision of resources between mitigation and adaptation
- In process of identification of needs by countries themselves – undertaking in long-term finance
- Adaptation finance will be on a grant, public based financing – all of which we wish to capture and will provide details
- Art 10.6 – a lot going on, but provision to a need – perhaps we'll have time later for support received – there is a long way to go from here to there and unfortunately the figures do not always coincide i.e. what is said to be provided is not received necessarily.
- If we are going to be totally transparency, where does provided go to receive? Mobilized is something else.
- Two things needed: predictable and accessible resources

Australia

- Pleased to see Parties engaged in the compilation tool
- Acknowledge it is not a perfect tool but can use as a starting point
- Intend to give input
- Key items that can be included for compilation
 - Title: insert “ and mobilize”
 - Notice duplication e.g. A4, add “and other Parties” and on capacity building and technology transfer – can be wrapped up into one paragraph
- Detailed comments will be sent in written form

Switzerland

- Elements missing from our submission
 - E2: see option not necessary
 - “Qualitative” missing in several places
- Streamlining
 - E1, E2
 - E3 – can just have a placeholder and not have elements except for underlying assumptions for capacity building and technology transfer that is for a different conversation to be held in this room

- o E4, E5 can be placeholders
 - o E6, E7 – agree with proposal from Australia that this can be taken together and make one para for both
- Support needed and received comment but will do it tomorrow

European Union

- Ways to streamline and clarify preliminary material
 - o Approaches used in this section in relation to placeholder for SBSTA Agenda Items
 - o We see placeholders and texts following as confusing – thinking how we can clarify further; approach one then placeholder and text that follows
 - o It would be useful to describe a little more here expectations, i.e. outputs here will be expected to be added Where
- Heading of remaining texts that come in
- Placeholder is a different approach than text from submissions – trying to find different working to make factual distinction
- In Preliminary material, missing section on “issues or elements related to potential elements of a cover decision to go together with MPGs” – summarize elements important for this whole area but not MPGs e.g. linkages to CBIT (cited Philippines’ intervention)
- Missing
 - o E1 – our objectives not captured here
 - o E2 – some additional aspects in EU submission not reflected
 - o E5, E7 – also raised by Australia in relation to countries that support on voluntary basis
 - o E8 – some elements missing we propose to have info in textual and tabular format
 - o Details will be submitted in writing to Secretariat
- Proposals from Switzerland:
 - o E2 – national circumstances – Switzerland believes should be captured in one, but there was a proposal that this element is not necessary and this is not the same thing. We believe this should be captured together, not that it is not necessary.

Brazil (Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay)

- Align with statement made by Philippines for G77 & China
- Section E:
 - o On sub-section on objectives and principles, don’t foresee seeing each of these for each sub-section because it is covered elsewhere. No need specific ones for each.
 - o On national circumstances, same rationality applied – once because only one country’s national circumstances. Don’t foresee having to go into this in other areas e.g. NIR...
 - o On institutional arrangements, it depends on country. Some countries have for NIR, info related to finance, technology and capacity building – don’t see text below this
 - o Substantive part of the section E3, E4 – we see you use placeholders but again we think we need to think about why we put the placeholders here – list of several elements with the placeholders is confusing; some elements not necessary and creates confused message to use placeholder and long list of elements when we are not sure it needs to be here anyway

- o Need to make better use of placeholders to better understand what we hope to achieve with the placeholders
- o E5 support by other Parties, which is a “should” under the PA, we may consider this but here I want to highlight flexibility; one thing is to choose to report and to choose to follow methodology that is being developed for developed countries, etc. See no. 2 below E5 – choose whether to report info, once I choose to use this guidance, therefore I want to also have flexibility on how to apply that one
- o E6, E7 on technology – here we see list of elements, other agenda items that are not yet identified with interlinkages with the PA but we foresee Agenda Item SBSTA 6b (technological framework) may produce interesting results and may wish to take into account. No placeholder for this Agenda Item, appreciate if you can take this into consideration for next iteration.
- o Will submit more detailed comments over email.

China

- Affiliated with statement made by G77 & China
- Current tool is a little confusing e.g. E4 – support provided and mobilized by developed country Parties but the same bullet identified it together
- We should make a clear distinctions between developed county and other Parties because distinction between C and E.
- Keep some options under E5 for flexibility, E4 provide info under same requires referred to in E1, E4, voluntary basis or have further flexibilities – will be easier to read and constructive to further work
- On placeholders, do we work on the issues or wait?
 - o Expectations, if not provided to us the transparency group should continue to work on this
- China’s submission elements missing:
 - o On support provided, don’t see this as ceiling but a floor or starting point, don’t see this here in the Preliminary material/tool
 - o E4, 2b – there is a determination of resources, new and additional but our submission asked for proof.
 - o Enabling policies to promote finance, technology for technology transfer and training
- Will provide further details of missing elements

Saudi Arabia (Arab Group)

- Align with Philippines for G77 & China and China’s very valuable comments
- Cannot accept different groups in E:
 - o Paris negotiated very delicately as seen in Art. 9, 13.9 and while we achieved a balance, some of it was lost i.e. “shall”, “should” etc. that is lost here.

United States

- Happy to keep working on this text but concerns mentioned yesterday still hold

- Opportunities for streamlining:
 - Not sure we need objectives and principles section, as captured in PA
 - Placeholders to take account for SBSTA Agenda Items key – make clear that these are alternatives, helpful to clarify language for E2,E5 and E10
 - Resources mobilized E5, E7, E9
- Missing from what was proposed in Roundtable:
 - Capacity building and support provided under Art. 10, E6
 - Description of technology...
 - E8 for capacity building
 - Support mobilized to be added back in
 - Will send along in email to Secretariat

India

- Associate with intervention made by Philippines for G77 and China, Saudi Arabia and China
- Important for clarity
- Art 4.5, 10.6 very important and we need to capture the work we have here in the ongoing processes so we get a full picture of all ongoing processes; that way we can address the gaps we have
- M & V of support provided needed for clarity
- What are the flows within the financial mechanism of the Convention and flows outside financial mechanism (Art 11.5 channels)
- The whole tool – Art 9.5 which has linkages to 9.1 and 9.2 on mobilization – this information is extremely important
- We have ongoing processes of Art. 9.7, modalities for accounting for financial resources; we need to have internationally agreed methods for reconciling for support provided per year and support received per year. Need to be reconciled or get close to it. Several implications to follow strict and common definitions and to the satisfaction to build trust among Parties.

South Africa

- Should be a specific heading “Support provided by developed countries in terms of 4.5, 13.14, 13.15 for adaptation communications and implementation of transparency framework” basically support for producing reports and capacity building and review process; given importance we attach to this we would like to have a specific section
- Separate E section on indicative support to be provided by relevant countries under Art. 9.5

Ecuador (Like Minded Developing Countries)

- Context that this information is provided in:
 - Headings of E, support provided, needs not to be differentiation between 9.4, 9.7
 - Under the Paris Agreement
 - Support will be provided for climate actions understood in very different ways but in the context of the Paris Agreement

- Reflecting all of the references to support provided to developing country Parties from developed country Parties
- E2 on country driven strategies – needs and priorities need to be reflected in terms of how they have been addressed and considered so they can look at appropriateness of support provided and mobilized
- Supporting issue of differentiating support provided and mobilized – important to continue to reflect because two definitions are very different altogether e.g. GCF and mobilization content very different
- Art 9.3, 9.5 support provided and mobilize reflect commensurability and responsiveness – that needs of developing countries in reports are taken into account and not just left in the report

Canada

- Happy to be working on Preliminary material despite concerns regarding bifurcation
- “support provided and mobilized” in E and following sub-titles missing
- Streamlining, we can support proposals by others that “objectives and principles” section not needed
- Share views by Australia and others that E4, E6, E8 talk about developed Parties and “other Parties that provide support”, help us not to have E5, E7 and E9
- Happy with EU’s suggestion on clarification of placeholders

Costa Rica (AILAC)

- Associate ourselves with Philippines for G77 & China
- Thank Co-Facilitator for valuable work
- Placeholders – for clarity, big concern that placeholders are around finance but we should also concern with technology transfer and capacity building
- Some concrete elements for section E – we have to try to understand what the discussions around other Agenda Items are covering e.g. SBSTA accounting; important for transparency group to be considering this
- In order to ensure consistency and comparable information got GST and reporting of support provided and mobilized, structure of MPGs would be helpful
- Necessary to ensure flexibility
- For technology and capacity building, a lot of work needed to develop transparency elements – in both cases Parties will need to identify gaps to what is needed to achieve the Paris Agreement; planning work needed for both
- Useful info and sources available in relation to technology and capacity
- Art 10.6 – technology mechanism under technology framework can give inputs; info should be complementary to Parties’ reported info – what kinds of info and reports will be important in the technology framework
- Will be sending specific items via email

Egypt

- Aligned with elements put forward by Philippines, South Africa etc.

- On A1, missing para 4.5 of PA on ambition – important for transparency framework for forward looking approach
- On A4, missing linkage to Agenda Item 8 of APA, 9.5
- On specific Agenda Items in E, E1 – capturing of progression missing; financial and technology measures
- E2, support South Africa (African Group) on importance of including Art. 9.5 in separate section E.X
- E4 – mentioned in Roundtable already
- E3, E4
- On Ecuador's point on mobilization, this should be totally provided on definition of support provided and mobilized
- Will be sending details via email through G77 and African Group

Philippines

- We are forgetting a very important ongoing process: para 45 of the 1/CP.4, work done by the Adaptation Fund, LEG in collaboration with SCF that we have already reported work; related to work and support for adaptation; reviewing not here in terms of the adequacy of support (Art 10.14, 7.14c of the PA – perhaps missing here is the balance of mitigation and adaptation
- Technology... at different stages of technology for mitigation and adaptation
- Getting necessary information from our colleagues involved in technology to provide you with details
- On streamlining we need to take into account what is happening elsewhere, but until such is captured, streamlining should not undermine clarity; hear my colleague from Brazil

European Union

- Cannot accept heading Art. 9.5
- No link at all with Article 13 made in relation to that particular Article, only 9.7
- If we start adding headings, 9.5 only captured in Parties' submissions; something we accept because it is captured from Parties' submissions but adding additional headings now is unacceptable.
- On producing reports, not that we do not want to discuss or have in MPGs, but rather we do not think it warrants a separate heading as it is captured in some sub-sections.

Iraq

- Same concerns with Saudi Arabia, Egypt regarding the text and support intervention made by Philippines on behalf of G77 & China
- On para 9, b4 on capacity building, here we would like to say capacity building is critical for LDCs & SIDS to improve GHG inventory with increasing accuracy. Passing through concentrated situation because they are lying in conflict zones e.g. lost important and valuable data due to burning and losing through wars and ISIS attacks for first NC preparations

Egypt

- As mentioned by colleagues from G77 and others, we try to approach this with an open mind
- Article 9 covered – all Articles, if we start picking and choosing... we cannot deal with the issue
- For the sake of moving forward we are showing flexibility; but some Parties suggest including things in or out we do not agree
- Parties can provide their views and at the end of the day, Co-Facilitators can capture all the views and not put limitations
- Some elements are crucial for Parties and if excluded then this transparency process cannot move forward
- There are existing arrangements with differentiation to work with

Co-Facilitators said plan is to issue informal note this weekend. There will be two sessions tomorrow 3-4pm (TEC, FMCP) and 6-7pm (transparency support needed and received). No sessions on Saturday, so submissions by 9pm tomorrow evening. One deadline instead of original 2 deadlines.

Brazil

- Since you have changed the game plan, we reserve the right to change the time to respond to you.

Co-Facilitator accepted this.

The informal consultation ended at 1.15pm.