

APA meeting, agenda item 4
Fri., 11/10/17, 12 noon (ran from ~12:15 – 1:30 pm)

Prepared by:

James L. Stillwell

Manager, Sustainability Engagement and Outreach
Center for Global Sustainability
University of Maryland School of Public Policy

Co-facilitator: As you know, we already have a first proposal of a common skeleton based on submissions received from parties. Thanks for the positive response overall. Only meant as a base to continue our work. That is our suggestion for this session, along with ideas for how we can start populating this list of headings and subheadings, starting with the headings.

You might notice that there's a section 1 overarching and 2 guidance for further comms – those are not headings at all... they have no status. Please just attend to numerals 1-12.

We ask parties to go through the document with your proposals, not one-by-one for each item. After that, if parties agree, we'll generate a new iteration of the note to share in advance of tomorrow's two sessions.

Argentina: on behalf of G77 and China: My understanding is that the headings overarching and guidance will not appear, correct?

Co-facilitator: We can work with those headings if parties like, but only for ordering our conversation – have no status. If parties agree, we can drop them altogether.

[No objections.]

Now, any comments on the headings?

Argentina: We are happy to hear those headings will be deleted in your first iteration. Headings proposed by our group need revision.

“Support” is not just “support,” but important to say it's “support for developing countries.”

Our party will make updates and then share back.

Under 1.8, we have different issues – should be separated. [Didn't understand this part.]

Under preamble and intro remarks: adaptation communication is a tool to improve adaptation.

Same comment applies to principles. CBDRC, different national circumstances, not creating additional burden. Maybe we should discuss difference between subheadings and content. We are happy to share our complete version.

Co-facilitator: We would like to hear as many suggestions on headings and subheadings during this meeting as parties like. But we urge you to include textual proposals so we can iterate this evening. We therefore would prefer to hear your inputs in the room here, rather than electronically.

EU: The way we see this is a tool for continuing our work, as you've said, rather than a fixed list that can be revised. We agree that it's good to get rid of overarching, and guidance... maybe break this down into 2 pieces: guidance ... and [...?]. At this stage, we suggest waiting for subheadings until after we populate the list. Re: 7, should not keep as a heading, but as a subheading under IP 6.

Re: content: Preamble = recalls article 7 of PA. Open to keeping or dropping guiding principles and overarching. Under purpose – we feel this captures stuff well, and would like to see submissions in order to further populate the section. This is good because we've seen a lot of convergence on this rather than a long list of what parties request.

Ecuador: Argentina and G-77; LMDCS: Thanks very much for preliminary material and time to go through it. As proposed, it's important to leave behind the categorization of headings and subheadings (as Parties have said). Also, on paper = some info that's easy to understand and identify, e.g., support needs for developing countries -- more clearly state this part. Something could be provided in the preamble.

Re: Headings – should keep [...] as a heading.

Some of the principles important to us are CDR, not keeping an additional organ, this is a country-driven process.

US: Now that we have a clear way forward and encouragement to exchange views, I echo EU on deleting Overarching and Guiding principles. Re: what purpose would Principles serve? We see no separate need for principles at all – already included in article 2 of PA, as negotiated by lawyers in Paris. What does this mean to include, which does not include different provisions for developed and developing country parties, which there shouldn't be? Adaptation applies equally to both developed and developing countries.

If arts 9, 10, and 11 do have explicit subheadings or language, [lost this]. Already support provided for adaptation communication (e.g., CBIT)... will continue to be achieved through existing channels.

Re: 5 (approach) and 2 (communicating) = US provided these as possible headings. Guiding principles and vehicles are not used as headings. But approach and communicating are – recommend to replace colloquial language we've used in this room.

Re: 6, opt-in/ opt-out: don't want to create too rigid a structure – increased burden and reduced flexibility for parties. Better to have list of elements that a party can choose from based on their national circumstances. Re: 7, whether meant to be under 6 – goes beyond the mandate of this

session. Vehicle should not determine the purpose of the communication itself. [Lost last point.] Adaptation communication applies to both developed and developing countries.

Co-facilitator: Thanks very much for speaking to the text and providing clear reference to it.

New Zealand: I know you're planning on removing overarching and guidance sections, but is actually a useful way of organizing: decision first, then guidance on how to execute. E.g., 8, 2, c – this goes into a decision, not guidance, because parties have to reduce guidance if timing/frequency compels parties to modify the guidance.

New Zealand was one of the parties that proposed a section-titled approach, to guide parties on what they do: to incorporate guidance into standalone adaptation communication, or as part of another communication.

We wonder whether the section on support is necessary, esp because the MPGs being developed under section 15 already address this = burdensome for parties to include this info in two separate sections.

We also have further content to include under elements of section 6 = reflects core parts of the adaptation communications. Recommended subheadings: Risks and vulnerability, info on action taken to adapt to and prepare for climate change, guidance on adaptation communication. Also have another heading on updating the guidance, since we use and learn from this document and as base for future revision.

Japan: will there be another paper for us to comment on? #9 linkage heading could be incorporated into preamble/ intro. Flexibility also could be incorporated elsewhere.

Co-facilitator: To reiterate, we encourage parties to focus on headings, but free to incorporate all you like as appropriate

Please be brief with remaining interventions.

Saudi Arabia: Echo Argentina on behalf of G77 and Ecuador on behalf of LDCs: Suggestion to move item to item 6 was not made by SA yesterday but by colleague from Kuwait – prefer to keep as-is.

Re: CBDR – [couldn't catch]

Recommend removing overarching guidance for adaptation communication. [Also recommend removing {something else.}]

Additional content required under #5 (approach)?

Seems to be confusion/ divergence on vehicles/ communications. Not sure what “communication” would imply if it has a further reach other than vehicles. Look forward to further discussing areas of convergence and divergence.

Argentina: Happy to see parties are sharing their different points of view. Our [?] made major effort in order to have a common position.

Reading from the floor, can be difficult to follow and engage, so we invite parties to submit (include all options available) to have fuller discussion.

RE: Preamble: Principles enlighten the work we are in doing in process of prep we are doing in adaptation communication.

{didn't capture}

Common elements helps eliminate doubt among parties on what they're working on. National circumstances, impact assessment, priorities are all squarely relevant for countries. We are already engaging in possible list.

Happy to see further elaboration for tomorrow's conversation.

Article 7.13 is important. Since we are implementing, we propose 2 main subheadings: [...?]

Very positive to have this in tomorrow's document to have position discussion. Since China says they welcome electronic submission, we welcome submissions from others – but not that this will likely affect timing. Hopefully tonight, but depends on when submissions arrive.

Mexico: On behalf of UNG group: glad to continue the work and populate contents... we support the way you propose continuing. Re: section 2, no need to include guiding principles... we support flexible approach to vehicles. [Did not capture.] We will elaborate more in our written submission.

China: Thank you. This whole structure and how to structure adaptation comms is basis of how to structure adaptation guidance. What is guidance for including all future work? Future users are not negotiators. If no CBDR principles, then should be included. [Totally lost...]

New Zealand: Do I now need to write down my verbal intervention and send it in, since you're now accepting written submissions?

Co-facilitator: No – we've been taking careful notes, but want to be fair since G-77 asked to submit written. Thanks to you, we have done very well with objective of today's session. We'd like to focus on headings – parties please use that as guidance in what you submit. You're welcome to submit more, but will focus on headings. We may make adjustments to subheadings if it needs to happen, but headings is the focus.

We are struggling to promise a time to produce an iteration – hopefully tonight, if not then early tomorrow morning, at latest tomorrow at session but want to do tonight based on yesterday's experience.

Norway: Based on previous days' conversations, I think we should include a few key words of what headings should continue – we hope you look at. Some parties will see things as headings, others as subheadings.

Co-facilitator: Correct, and we'll need flexibility in order for us to get the work done. Re: overarching and guidance – not totally getting rid of for now, but will park it, as it may be useful later on.

EU: What type of new document should we expect? New skeleton only, or start populating?

Co-facilitator: We will incorporate submissions from parties.. whether “enhanced skeleton” or just skeleton. If EU or any party feels it would help to send further info, they are welcome to do so, but parties may evaluate on their own.

Argentina: Our group supports your proposal, and we can deliver our coordination at 7:30 tonight.

Co-facilitator: I suggest to parties that this is the deadline for submitting if parties decide to submit.

Switz: That was our question – thanks.