

Notes for APA Agenda Item 8B – Further Matters Related to Implementation of the PA
Friday 16:00-17:00, Bula Zone, Rakiraki
Reed Kurtz, American Association of Geographers

- Context/Description Meeting starting a few minutes late, co-facilitators coming from APA meeting immediately prior; appears that same negotiators remaining in room (along with many observers from prior session); Large square table at center where party delegates are sitting, with remainder of party delegates and observer organizations in chairs around against the back; room is close to capacity; monitors at each long end where negotiated text is displayed; currently sitting behind Honduras delegation
- Co-facilitator: Welcome and thank you; considering procedural items and steps for implementation of PA; plan has been announced earlier, halfway through consultation; we will continue addressing 5 remaining matters and whether, how, and which body they will be taken up; my co-chair and I updated the session yesterday, reiterated desire to update and assist; at second informal session, informed about [...]; first did recap of this session, some parties back in May noted there were issues about communication of finance that weren't being addressing, including in particular modalities of communication; noted that APA or SBI could undertake preparatory work; other parties under view that COP is forum to advance and work on all agenda items under (issue 9?); to continue discussion from 2 days ago, some parties said work should progress steadily under this item; other felt should follow from Marrakech; thus no agreement; should continue regarding article 9.5 as per previous session
- Co-Chairs Questions (displayed on projector screens):
 - Is prep work on this matter currently being undertaken? If so where?
 - If not, is prep work required, and if so, by which body?
 - What should be timeframe for completion?
 - Modalities for biennially communicating finance information on the provision of public financial resources to developing countries in accordance with Article 9, Paragraph 5, of PA. Additional questions:
 - What are those specific procedural matters concerning Article 9.5 that are not currently being addressed by the COP under its agenda item 10(f)?
 - What is the appropriate forum for considering these additional procedural matters?
- Floor open for interventions
- Philippines: we're proud to pick up where we left off on last statement; COP was asked to initiate process to consider Article 9.5, and then said COP would send whatever results we have w/o specifications of considerations of CMA at first

session; the COP initiated, then what happened? What happened was that we were unclear as to what form we could present these results; if you look at mandate to SBSTA it doesn't coincide with APA transparency framework; in fact two other aspects of 9.7 that need to be taken up with APA; how we will do this to have progress?; we feel the mandate the COP gave to APA shall [] the entry into force of the Agreement; who should then give this work to APA on 9.5? Because we're doing precisely that; won't go into substance on 9.5, just will say that in current discussion on Article 13 it becomes essential that we do same kind of work for article 9.5 that we are doing for other articles; believe this is mandate given to APA by PA; need balance on items; we feel if COP has to give this mandate, it must be given to APA; the COP started and then what? We have a roundtable? There is no clear process within the COP to then know how to take it as a decision; at the same time, you are undertaking a different process (Article 13); We feel that the COP would have to [...] in order for honest treatment we feel it's necessary to have a balanced treatment of all items; this evening we'll have a discussion with transparency framework, and clearly article 9.5 is way we're going to do it; enhanced action requires advanced support; there should be a decision regarding your last Q, the time frame should be brought forward

- Co-chairs: We'll take this into consideration; anybody care to add or provide a different view?
- South Africa: thank you for restarting discussion from where we left off yesterday; for the record the African Group wants to highlight that what we feel we should progress on differs from issues you raised; there are several issues that have been raised that are quite material to way forward, and the suggestion that continuing with way provided in Marrakech we don't agree with, we believe there is a different basis for moving forward; would further like to raise substantive issues w/r/t Article 9.5: we see these communications as having a number of critical dependencies on various agenda items and articles; a few we want to identify is 9.7 on transparency; 13.11 on provisional finance info; and others; as a group we find it difficult to find progress on 5.7(?) b/c if there's not basis for agreement there's no way to move forward; specific issues Africa Group wants to see considered: COP agenda item 10F; narrative we hear from partners is that they're negotiating process to launch process, but this puts us in the coalition that feels this is not acceptable because it's not following the mandate; we see in context of modalities being new vehicle for negotiations; second issue ... quite important b/c all communications find home in the process registry; third point on modalities is template: our understanding is [...]; lastly concerning information contained, this should be an agreement to adopt a guideline [having difficulty hearing] we are talking in terms of article 9.5 communications, but we believe that having a format would help us; we will be

submitting [...]

- Thank you for providing us assistance in seeing linkages and how from your perspective you see this missing piece affecting other areas, it helps group overall with understanding and can help put us on right path
- China: from our perspective why people are adding new items is 1) to get progress, as there isn't much progress; 2) b/c the mandate is not so comprehensive; article 4 is quite comprehensive on guidance on NDCs, for example, but there we are seeking more on finance for NDCs, but our partners are telling us that NDCs are limited for mitigation, which means that there is no space for finance, this is why there are calls for missing mandates related to finance; I think the request by Africa Group is legitimate and reasonable and I support their ideas and welcome full discussion on their proposal, and that they could communicate their proposal to all of us so we can have a look
 - To SA: can you confirm that you will be making submission? (Yes)
- New Zealand: we're continually hearing calls for balance, across work program and agenda, and that is consistent with Paris, it's no new mandate to fill a gap; for us to proceed, we don't support actioning a new item, we need to respect the mandate, which is not to start a discussion on such modalities
- Ecuador: speaking for LDCs: support points raised by China; regarding Question A, there is no prep work being undertaking, b/c 9.10F(?) ... there's no work being undertaken there; it is important to undertake action there b/c w/o it there's lack of coherence; on second question, prep work is needed, by APA, this agenda item is one of places where work could be needed; 10F is only addressed once and year, which could be moved forward in May, and another session in 2018 could help this too; 10F completion has to happen by end of 2018 to incorporate as part of transparency framework
- Canada – to echo NZ colleague, we're always talking about balance of treatment of issues, and that's an important point; balance achieved was in Paris; and current agenda item respects mandate given at that time; at same time we see trend towards, when in specific agenda items aren't being appropriately discussed or covered, there's a tendency to sub-divide or insert agenda items in new places or move in other arrangements to air and discuss issues; at some point important to note that all parties made compromises in Paris, and everybody can be unhappy with certain parts, Paris is based on compromise; given we have very full agendas, I think it's a fairness aspect, and looking at possible additional matters, seeing 4 of 5 is finance, again it's about balance and that's one issue receiving more attention than others
- Philippines: Thank you and I'll try not to use word "balance" b/c there seems to misunderstanding of the meaning of word; remember that this was discussed, not negotiated; you say "to initiate a process to identify the information" with

the roundtable, but it's not very clear; so is the COP preparing decisions to be adopted by the CMA – I thought they were put out by APA? Like South Africa group we would like to get into substance of discussions, but we need to have a space to discuss the substance of discussion, and this particular item is part and parcel of ongoing discussions of transparency framework; and therefore we need to have the negotiating space in which we can discuss the real substance and come to a decision w/r/t to the CMA; after you initiate the process, then what? You say to bring it to CMA, but how? It's a procedural matter, we stand ready to engage in substance, we only note that APA has been established by COP to prepare entry into force of PA

- Egypt – Support developing countries' views; we don't believe means we should talk file by file, we believe balance means we need to talk about 9.5; there is no work being done on 10F; we believe [...] I believe in Morocco we had 9 now we have 5; but Q is how with discussion we're having is ... important element regarding fairness, we are overloading ourselves with other issues; it is about political commitment, this issue is a reflection of the commitment of developing countries are being asked for; if this isn't the case on finance, although they've been reporting on methods.... [difficult hearing/understanding]
 - 10 minutes remaining; we don't want it to appear to give all time to 9.5 matter; next point is really about us getting to... ; suggestion: can we hear from colleagues on 10F? just to give us an idea on how issues are being addressed?
- India: [loud noise next door]; we share views of (developing countries); we agree on need to discuss 9.5; COP is not comprehensive, just to identify ... in addition to transparency we expect [...]; want to raise point to confirm: want to know whether observers are allowed out in these discussions;
 - We in contact group agreed that observer groups would be allowed; observers should be allowed according to tickets, the mechanism; this is what manages the specific numbers of observers and negotiators [Did India want to ensure adequate number of seats in room for party delegates? Or are there other considerations as to why India wants to know about observer group participations? Honestly wasn't clear to me from India's question why the question was raised, I didn't intuit it was about space until co-facilitator's response, but to be fair I had difficulty hearing right prior to India's asking of the Q]
- Japan: want to respond to Egypt: what we are doing in this room is a procedural matter, we are trying to deal with those issues in the work program to be adopted in 2018, those include 9.5 and the other 4 items have not been resolved, just want to be clear on this point
- United States: Japanese colleague made same point I was going to make; list has

no particular status, as noted by co-chairs, these were possible additional matters

- EU: since we're still on 9.5; this is a procedural matter on how to proceed, not discuss substance; that's still our view
- Norway: we agree w/ G77 that matter is not being currently considered and is indeed a new item, and that the work program is being taken up in 10F, which would make it something new; acknowledge this is highly controversial and not something we would recommend; on transparency, the system will reflect action on Article 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, but the recording is distinct from NDCs; these things are being worked out in order to capture those distinctions
- Ecuador: sorry to take floor again; note we might continue discussing this issue when we come back; we invite parties to address these Qs, b/c we haven't heard from parties; we've heard that Paris is a very weak and fragile balance, and need to discuss how to discuss this and how 9.5 doesn't have a common [...], important to discuss how to aggregate and compare with one another
- Georgia: We are confused by suggestion that slow progress is best addressed by creating new items; fact is there are lots of items, we cannot afford to lose time especially since some parties are under stress to make all the meetings; best way to make progress on current agenda items is to make progress on current agenda; ask to move on and discuss other items
- Kuwait: Arab Group firmly supports statements of developing countries on 9.5, it is critical
 - Want to continue process of sharing informal notes; want to also make sure we progress through other matters as well; want to request that next item be on GCF and GEF while acknowledging that Africa Group and colleagues want to come back to this issue; will have opportunity at end to look at proposal by Africa Group; hopefully by end of time tomorrow we'll be able to reflect
- Philippines: are you taking up now the issue you called Initial Guidance
 - No, tomorrow
- Egypt: I don't think you're taking this as a package, each is an item as its own, we won't move until items are addressed; on informal note want to see paper on way forward