

APA Informal Consultation Agenda Item 5 on the Modalities, Procedures, and Guidelines for the Transparency Framework under Article 13 of the Paris Agreement

November 9, 2017, Nairobi, Main Plenary Building

NOTE TAKER: Renee Valerie Fajardo, Vermont Law School
reneevaleriefajardo@vermonlaw.edu

CO-FACILITATORS: Preliminary Material has no status. No MPG

- Informal 15:00 – 16:00 – technical expert review; 18:00 – 19:00 – transparency in support received

FOCUS:

1. Are there any fundamental ideas missing in the preliminary material document?
2. Are proposals captured accurately?
3. Are there ways to streamline proposals?

PHILIPPINES (G77):

- There are very big gaps concerning Art. 4.5, Art. 10.6, and Art. 11 (Capacity-building)
- The purpose of transparency of support framework is to provide clarity in all the articles mentioned above. There is a big gap in capturing all the ongoing processes that, in themselves, contain MPGs. Before we get a full picture, we have to take all of these articles in. Will go in greater detail on capacity-building and CBIT
- Second gap: Measurement and verification – we have started work on common tabular format on financial support received. The only way to know how much finance is provided is to measure the support received. (e.g. biennial assessment)
 - Support provided came mainly from Art. 11.5 institutions, all of which are outside the financial mechanisms
 - Institutions within the financial mechanisms of the convention: GEF, LDCF, SCCF, AF
 - Must consider all of these
- The whole tool must be rationalized with the
 - Biennial assessments already provide ways to evaluate support
 - But we need to scale up support – this has to be captured. Not only Art. 9, but also Art. 9.5 – need qualitative and quantitative information
 - Art. 9.5 refers to Art. 9.1 (obligation), (9.3 (mobilization) – very important aspects that also need to be captured (taking into account country-driven structure and needs of developing countries)
 - Art. 9.4 looks into balance of provision of resources between mitig'n and adapt'n and needs and priorities of developing countries
 - AF financed through grant-based and public financing
- Art. 10.6 – provision on need and received – there's a long way to go from discussing needs and received. And the figures do not necessarily coincide. We want to find out if we want to be totally transparent, where the discrepancies lie
- Mobilized – are these predictable and accessible resources?

Australia:

- Document good place to start.
- KEY ITEMS that need to included:
 - Title: insertion of "Provided and mobilized"
 - A lot of duplication (A.4.), add "other parties who provide support"

- Technology transfer and _____ can be wrapped up in one section
- Detail comments to be sent in written form

Switzerland:

- Missing elements:
 - E.2. include option that it is not necessary. Objectives, principles and nat'l circumstances will be captured in annex that will include BAR and BURs.
 - "Qualitative is missing in several places
 - Streamline: Section E.1 and E.2. Not necessary since captured in beginning. E.3. ok to have placeholders, except for underlying assumptions which do not belong under the placeholder (table it in this discussion)
 - E.4. and E.5/ can be placeholder
 - E.6 and E.7 can be taken together. One paragraph for both
 - Coordinated and received – to be discussed tomorrow

EU:

- Clarify preliminary material. We can clarify approaches used in relation to the placeholder for the outputs of the SBSTA agenda item. We see a placeholder and then a txt, which is confusing. We can say "approach 1" and placeholder for SBSTA outputs on financing. Also useful to describe what the expectations are "the outputs of these SBSTA agenda item will be integrated into this section". We can say "approach 2" compilation of text proposed from party submissions – placeholder is a different approach from having text from submissions.
- We are missing a section on issues and elements related to potential of the cover decision that will go together with MPGs. Will summarize elements that are important to MPGs but not included to MPGs (like relations to CBIT, and support for reporting). These do not have a place inside the MPGs, but they should be compiled and discussed.
- Other elements missing
 - E.1. – options not reflected
 - E.2. – additional aspects in EU not reflected
 - E.5. and E.7. – support proposal made by Australia to streamline
 - E.8 – elements missing proposed to be in textual and tabular format
- In relation to E.2 (national circumstances and arrangement) – Switzerland proposed should be captured in one section v. this element is unnecessary. Favors to be captured in one section. REFRAME.

BRAZIL (Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay): Aligned with G77

- What is now Section E:
 - Subsection on objectives and principles – do not need to have headings one after and other. Sufficient to have objectives and principles in the very beginning as opposed to having it in every subsection
 - Nat'l circumstances – same rationale applied. If we're reporting nat'l circumstances, we don't have to be too specific. Those are given
 - Institutional Arrangements – will differ for every country – open to discuss if should be part of every section
- E.3., E.4. – Use of placeholder is questionable. If there is a placeholder but there are elements, this is confusing. Placeholder is here because they refer to a specific agenda item that will be discussed later. Putting long list of elements that we are not sure needs to be here is confusing.
- E.5 – placeholder also – but this is a section about support provided by other parties – we may consider use of same methodology for SBSTA agenda item on financial info from other parties –

but we need to highlight flexibility (one thing to report the Information and then to choose to follow guidance/methodology – may need flexibility on the requirements to the methodology) – flexibility as iterated in E.5. Is not the only way flexibility should be applied?

- E.6. and E.7. – technology – also has elements –
- Missing section on interlinkages

CHINA (G77):

- Confusing distinction between developed country parties and developing country parties. E.4. info for developed countries and developing countries that provided support have the same obligations – should not be the same
- Provide same info or voluntarily provide same info (?)
- Should we wait for the work of SBSTA? Should we start work on our list here? What are our expectations?
- Missing points from submissions
 - BR deadline should continue to apply to developed country parties when they provide information. This is a ceiling, not a floor
 - Capacity-building support provided
 - E.4. 2(b) – new and additional
 - Parties should report enabling policies to promote transparency and capacity building

SAUDI ARABIA (Arab League)

- Aligned with G77
- Cannot accept different groups, specifically CME (?)
 - Paris negotiated very delicately.
 - We've achieved balance and this doc loses it: "shall"- "should" distinction is completely lost in this document

US:

- Streamlining:
 - Not sure we need objectives and principles section – already captured in PA
 - Placeholders for SBSTA info are key, but they need to clarify that those are alternatives. Bullet points should be removed because they are being discussed in SBSTA
 - MPGs for developed and developing country parties who provide support should be the same because there has been discretion provided
 - Tech transfer should not be included
- Missing:
 - In capacity-building, development, and tech transfer – we suggested "a description and approach that a party has undertaken to support"
 - Headings "support and mobilized" is missing

INDIA:

- Associates with G77, support Saudi Arabia and China
- Needs more clarification articles 10.6. Need to capture the work on ongoing process to have full picture.
- M and V important to provide clarity
- What are the flows in the financial mechanism of UNFCCC? Outside UNFCCC?
- Art. 9.5. (linkages with 9.1 and (2) – important info); Art. 9.7 – accounting of modalities – need to have internationally agreed methods for reconciling internationally recognized support provided and received
 - Reporting provided and received cannot be based on the same report

- String and common definitions that build trust among parties

SOUTH AFRICA:

- There should be a specific heading for support provided by developed countries (4.5,) specifically for producing NDCs, reports, capacity-building
- Separate section on indicative support to be provided by developing party countries under Art. 9.5

ECUADOR (LMDC):

- Context in which provision is presented: info needs to cover support provided by developed countries to developing countries – no distinction among 9, 10, 11, 17
- Support reported in the context of PA
- Country-driven strategies – should reflect needs and priorities of developing countries and how they have been addressed. Clarify support needed
- Differentiating support provided and support mobilized should still be reflected. These are very important
- Support continuation support between finance and support for tech, capacity-building
- Look at objective for mobilization make sure the support mobilized is commensurate and responsive to needs

CANADA:

- Missing: “support provided and mobilized”
- Streamlining: Supports others suggestion to remove objectives and principles. They are to be applied in MPGs
- Agree with Australia that E.4., E.6., and #.7
- How to clarify placeholder and language in it

COSTA RICA (AILAC): Associate with G77

- Agrees with others on placeholders – these are on finance
- Missing:
 - Try to understand the discussions on other agendas are covering – transparency
 - Important for transparency group to address guidelines on reporting of information, quantitative elements
- Developed and developing countries MPG support should be the same, but ensure flexibility
- Tech and CB – a lot of elements still need to be developed. Parties need to identify what is required to achieve the objectives of the agreement
- Support of tech and CB – Art. 10.6 link with Art. 14 (tech mech and tech framework can inform TF) 0 what kind of info and report useful in TF; categories of ... new methodologies

EGYPT:

- Align with G77
- E1 is missing ambition. Under objectives, missing element of “progression”
- E2 agrees with South Africa separating sections...
- E3, E4 – starting point in tabular format, not clear
- E4 is missing linkage to Agenda Item 8 – link to Art. 9.5
- Issue of mobilization should be separated

PHILIPPINES:

- Forgetting important process on results under Par. 45 – work done by adaptation committee and LEG in collaboration with standing committee – related to mobilization of support to developing country parties

- We don't have review of effectiveness of support – related to Art. 7.14(c) of the Agreement (review of adequacy and effectiveness of adaptation and support provided for adaptation)
- Missing balance between mitigation and adaptation, also in technology – balance in technology for mitigation and adaptation
- Streamlining – take into account what is being done elsewhere. Until that is all done, streamlining should not undermine clarity
- Until we have agreed on the objectives and principles, they should stay in different sections

EU: We cannot accept heading Art. 9.5 – this is a separate provision. We come into dangerous fields when we start conflating obligations – Art. 9.5 is only referenced in party submissions. Support provided by developed countries in preparing reports should not be in a separate heading (sub-element of support provided in general)

IRAQ: shares concern Saudi Arabia and Egypt

- Support G77
- Intervention about Par. 9, under B4 – capacity building- capacity building is critical for LDCs to improve their GHG inventories with increasing accuracy. We have a lot of developing parties that are still in conflict. It is important to find suitable data to produce data. We lost data from most important sectors through burning and losing in wars. We need to consider concerns of developing countries passing through conflict. Special circumstances

EGYPT:

- Transparency framework covers all of Art. 9. Prepared to show flexibility
- Some elements are crucial for other countries. Without them, developing country parties will not get the TF they are looking for.