

7 May 2018

SB 48, APA agenda item 5 (transparency)

15:00-17:00

Jennifer Huang, C2ES

Next steps: Tuesday, 08 May, 15:00 – 16:00: § Section D (Adaptation)

My shorthand/acronyms:

GROUP/Country intervening on behalf of group: (other group/party statements supported by group/country)

ABU = Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay

CF = co-facilitator

ID = identify

MPGs = modalities, procedures, and guidelines

PA = Paris Agreement

PAWP = Paris Agreement Work Program

§ = section

¶ = paragraph

Art = article

Re = regarding

ETF = enhanced transparency framework

ICA = international consultation and analysis

IAR = international assessment and review

NC = National Communication

BR = biennial report (developed countries)

BUR = biennial update report (developing countries)

A1 = annex 1 (developed countries)

NA1 = non-annex 1 (developing countries)

CTF = common tabular format

GLs = guidelines

CGE = Consultative Group of Experts

ROE = Roster of Experts

PaMs = policies and measures

CBDR = common but differentiated responsibilities

MOI = means of implementation

CB = capacity building

NIR = national inventory report

TACCC = transparency, accuracy, completeness, comparability, consistency

BTR = biennial transparency report

TER = technical expert review

ERT = expert review teams

FMCP = facilitative multilateral consideration of progress

CBIT = Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency

... = missed intervention (sorry)

CF Gao: Start with read out from informal informal, then continuing to speakers list on Sections E and F (support). Joint consultation for item 4 and 5 tomorrow; will load material tonight.

US:

- Rich discussion from Saturday
- Better understanding of terminology around indicators, “accounting for” versus “accounting,” tracking progress process and how it related to input from agenda item 3

Singapore (G77&China): Unhappy with time for informal consultations; left thinking we’d have 5 hours but now it’s 3 hours. Strongly urge to find the additional two hours so we can go through all aspects.

CF Gao: Let’s see how far we can get with the time we have for now.

China (LMDCs):

- More clarification on org of work going forward.
- Requests for more time for other agenda items have not been granted; not balanced

Chile (AILAC): Change in time allocated took us by surprise; we might not have enough time to cover all the items of the informal note

Maldives (AOSIS): Limited time and amount of material; ensure enough time to go through agenda items.

Moving to support discussion.

Tool:

https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/APA%20item%205%20Approaches_Sections%20E_F_04052018%200945.pdf

Egypt (aligned with LMDCs):

Section E

- Q1: Agree info from SBSTA item 9.7 should be reflected in reporting requirements of MPGs.
- Q2: Focus on original mandate to focus on developed countries, but also optional for developing countries.
- Q3: Approach 2; mandate clear that for developing countries, it’s a “shall” and “should for developing countries
- Q4: Support approach 2 because we don’t have detailed guidelines on FTCTB and developing countries should provide qualitative information

Section F: should be enhanced

- Q1: Approach 2
- Q2: Approach 1. Would like approach maintaining existing guidelines. Another approach is to maintain existing and then move to something else later.

Bhutan (LDCS):

Section E

- Q1: Different in content of discussion between SBSTA and here; linkage; maintain placeholder for outcome of discussion.
- Q3: Maintain linkage between MPGs and art 13; approach 1
- Q4: Approach 2, CTF

Section F

- Q1: Still thinking through but needs to take into account capacities and special circumstances of LDCs to avoid undue reporting burden
- Q2: Approach 1

South Africa (AGN):

Section E

- Work being done under Art 9.7 will flow into our work, but elements we need to consider, e.g. guidance on review process needed by ERTs
- May need additional specific information on support provided
- Q2: MPGs for developed and other parties – use term “should,” don’t need specific guidelines; should accommodate flexibility within provisions
- Q3: Mandate/requirement to report under Art 11 fulfilled by discussions under APA agenda item 5; reference in APA item 5. In terms of transparency arrangements, difference between developed and developing countries should be mirrored.
- Qualitative and quantitative info on tech transfer and CB

Section F

- Q1: Purpose to facilitate in as much detail as possible reporting by developed countries; merit in developing current guidelines and more detail. Build on current CGE tables, taking into account experience of developing countries
- Q2: Suggest different approach currently captured in Sec F.10.

Chile (AILAC):

Section E

- Q1: Agree with approach proposed to avoid duplication of issue
- Q2: ... Ensuring flexibility in obligations via guidelines.
- Q3: Not sure about right approach; discussing internally.
- Q4: Working around approach 2 because on technology transfer and CB there is still a lot of work to do to improve GLs and info available on this type of support. First understand needs of countries

Section F

- Q1: ...
- Q2: Approach 2 more appropriate to organize info. Helps ensure coherence between components of ETF.

Brazil (ABU):

Section E

- Q1: Approach 1. Avoid duplication of efforts and prejudgment; placeholder should be kept here. Flexibility provision; parties should be encouraged to apply common modalities as applicable and as appropriate. Those parties not obliged to report continuously.
- Q2: Support approach 2. MPGs common but with built-in flexibility.

- Q3: Support approach 2. MPGs do not reference art 11.4 because provisions of this art have a broader scope and don't have mandate to elaborate MPGs on this issue.
- Q4: Support approach 2. Necessary to have quantitative and qualitative info in tabular format. Support keeping placeholder here.

Section F

- Q1: Approach 1; keep current reporting requirements for BURs; voluntary request. Encourage learn by doing approach.
- Q2: Approach 2. Place holder here too.

KSA (Arab Group):

Section E

- Q1: Difference between content discussed between SBSTA and APA. Don't half discussions here. Support approach 2 capturing that point.
- Q2: Agree that info voluntary and not comparable with developed country parties. Helpful to add additional approach to capture that.
- Q3: Approach 2; separate mandate.
- Q4: Approach 2, we have to capture distinction between "shalls" and "should"

Section F

- Q1: Approach 2; use tables already developed
- Q2: Approach 1, retains current separation

Australia:

Section E

- Q1: Agree to maintain placeholder for ongoing work going on in SBSTA; incorporate work by reference
- Q2: Single set of guidance for use by any party reporting on support provided. Second proposal for third approach that applies to all parties provided reporting on support provided.
- Q3: Parties reporting under art 13 on CB would be considered to meet req under art 11
- Q4: Difficult to separate out TT and CB component from financial support provided; include checkbox in tables being developed and open text column for CB support projects

Section F

- Q1: priority area; focus on this section
- Q2: Maintain placeholders

Norway: Agree with lack of time.

Section E

Q1: Keep placeholder

Q2: Approach 1

Q3: Approach 1

Section F

- Support approach with CTF

Canada: When we talked about Approach 3, it was about both developed countries and developing countries providing support.

Mexico:

Section E, Q4: Approach 2

(turning to section B, on inventories)

Egypt:

- Methodologies and parameters: Approach 1 for developed countries. Approach 5 for developing countries. Three gases as appropriate for developing countries.
- Sectors and gases: No backsliding. Approach 1 for developed countries. Retain what we have for developing countries.
- Frequency: Approach 3 with caveat continent on provision of support.
- NIR submission: standalone report for developed countries, approach 1. Also approach 5.
- Approach I. Approach 2.I on existing GLs.

Australia:

- Use of 2006 GLs, including summaries.
- Time series: Approaches not necessarily mutually exclusive.
- Standalone inventory report helpful.

Brazil:

- Methodologies, parameters and data: Can all be merged that says developed countries continue to apply and developing encouraged to apply methodologies parameters, data
- Flexibility not about the tiers and choosing between them.
- Sectors and gases: Flexibility not picking and choosing approach.
- Times series: capturing clearly .
- ...

China (LMDCs):

- Need very general approach at beginning, e.g. using existing GLs as a starting party.
- ...
- Gases: Some merit to approach 3.
- Time series: Should not be mandatory for all developing countries. Support no backsliding for developed countries.
- Frequency: Placeholder
- Developed countries continue to submit standalone report
- This is not most efficient way to address inventories; real debate is on their applicability and legal status.

Maldives (AOSIS):

- Approach 1 and 3 combination; can be way to operationalize flexibility
- Sectors and gases: approach 1 (covers all gases); approaches 2-4 not mutually exclusive and can be combined to reflect flexibility
- Time series: start – combination of approach 1 and 2. End – approach 1 with flexibility for developing countries that need it.

- Frequency: ...

Canada

- Approach 1, on methodology, parameters and data.
- Sectors and gases: Approach 1
- Biennial reporting part of flexibility.
- NIR format: Approach 1. Can explore web-based tables.
- Value of improvement plans: goes with flexibility.

US

- Need to begin by reporting data the best we have and improve over time
- Methodologies, parameters, and data: Approach 1
- Important that 2006 GLs accommodate different range of capacities
- Lower threshold for key categories part of flexibility
- Time series: Approach 1 most relevant (1990).
- Coverage: Approach 2 using start year
- Frequency: Approach 3 biennial at least; encourage parties to move to reporting annually
- See standalone NIRs are very important

KSA (Arab Group):

- Helpful to structure approaches on who will apply MPGs as well as legal language
- Add overarching approach
- Informal note should include where sections don't apply to MPGs for developing countries.
- Sectors and gases: Approach 1 for A1 and approach 2 for NA1, three gases at min
- ... NIR submission: Approach 5 and Approach 1 for NA1 parties

RMI: ...

Turkey:

- Methodologies, parameters, data: approach 1
- Sectors and gases: Approach 1, but transition period
- Time series: Common system applies to all parties.
- ... Constructing coherent reporting vehicle is important

Norway:

- Approach 1: use of IPCC GLs
- Gases: Approach 1, comprehensive
- Start year of time series: Approach 1
- Approach 1: end year
- Approach 1: coverage of time series
- Approaches 1 and 3 for NIR submission

Switzerland (EIG):

- Agree aim of session is looking at approaches
- ...

- Coverage and gaps: gaps in time series; challenge for these countries to retrieve this data; take into account as we discuss

Chile (AILAC):

- One set of MPGs
- Approach 1 re IPCC GLs
- Sectors and gases: approach 1
- Time series: combining approaches 1 and 4. Moving towards 1990.
- End year of time series: Approach 3 useful
- Coverage: approach 1
- Submission process: combination of approach 2 and 3; move to annual frequency
- NIR submission format: combination of approaches

EU:

- IPCC GLs: 2006 GLs with flexibility for developing countries. Either combination of approaches or refer as separate approach
- Gases: Approach 1, including all gases covered (approach 3) with flexibility for developing countries
- ... Time series: start 1990 with flexibility through approach 4
- End of time series: Approach 1 and approach 3 (to apply flexibility). Most imp element is whether data available for a certain reporting year.
- Frequency: Approach 3 (biennial); no backsliding.

Bhutan (LDCs): Most items parties have different starting points and capacities.

- Methodologies, parameters, data: approach 1.
- Sectors and gases: coverage of 7 gases, approach 1.
- Submission process, frequency: combination of approach 1 and 2, noting reporting should not be less than biennially.
- [Request to move piece of text to original place]

Japan:

- Common MPGs and GHG inventories in some developing countries have already used 2006 GLs
- Gases: all covered; common MPG should be comprehensive
- Submit from 1990 with flexibility for base year of NDC to be included in alternative
- Approach 1: end year of time series

South Africa:

- Importance of flexibility
- IPCC GLs accommodation of approaches 1 and 3
- Sectors and gases: combo of approaches 1 and 4
- Time series: start year from 1990 and provision of flex to developing countries – full time series from 2020 and report back as far as national circumstances allows
- X-2 for developed; x-4 for developing countries for reporting
- Coverage: biennial time series and encouragement for developing countries
- NIRs: biennially with encouragement to submit NIR with BTRs

Indonesia:

- Approach 2, three gases
- Time series: combo of approach 2 and 1
- Transition period for moving to biennial time series
- Coverage: Approach 3
- Frequency: approach 2
- Nir submission format: approach 3 (alongside BTR)

India:

- Would also like to address 'who' these options apply to
- Methodologies: Approach 1
- Sectors and gases: approach 1 for developed countries and approach 3 for developing countries
- Time series: Support approach 1 for developed countries and earliest year approach 4 for developing countries
- End year time series: approach 1 for developed countries and approach 2 for developing countries
- Frequency: developed countries approach 1 and developing countries approach 3
- Vehicle: Approach 1 for developed and approach 3 for developing

NZ:

- Let's not so much concentrate where we are today with reporting requirements, but where do we want to be under the PA. Even if we can meet standard immediately, idea of IPCC GLs is to enable any party no matter what capacity and data, to apply GLs. Good starting point.

Israel:

- Aim: Clear expectations will help us domestically
- Methodologies: Approach 1
- Sectors and gases: Approach 1
- Start year of time series: Approach 1 desirable but approach 2 if reason is written in approach 4; combination
- End year: approach 1
- Coverage of time series: Approach 1
- Frequency: approach 2 moving towards approach 1
- Vehicle: Approach 1 desirable but probably in conjunction with one of the other approaches, maybe 3

Brazil:

- Under convention, already decisions that it doesn't matter what we decide under PA, A1 parties will continue to report annually on inventory report under the Convention
- To change any aspects related to land sector will be difficult for developing countries; not opposing use of 2006 GLs because we see it happening with appropriate support and CB
- We've made interventions in things not on the screen and we've been promised our views will be taken up in the future. Now that we are almost at the end, important to know what about how we'll move forward. Helpful to discuss and share proposals.

CF: Can continue with section A

Brazil: CCTV says ends at 17:00, but we can continue to 18:00? We'll still need an indication of next steps at the end of that hour. We don't want last minute proposal on how to move forward.

Egypt: Comment re section B; issue isn't about which methodology to use. We're not understanding each other in terms of existing capacity in developing countries and we all have to come to agreements that we're at different starting points. It's a matter of MRV systems: many of us don't even have one.

CF Andrew: Hoping to get clear sense from parties where they are in their various approaches and encourage you to work bilaterally to better understand issues. Re Brazil, we could come back to process after we give ourselves 5-10 minutes before concluding. We'll consult and have clear next steps.

(moving to section A)

Tool:

https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/APA_agenda%20item%205%20section%20A%20tool_05052018%201846.pdf

Brazil:

- Q1: once we decide elements of NDCs, then this is decided.
- We'll address 'Elements of the COP and/or CMA decisions adopting the MPGs.'
 - Missing CB
 - Guidance for CBIT necessary under decision adopting MPGs
 - CGE: foresee role under PA
 - Submission of final BRs/BURs: not sure necessary to take decision; depends on when developing countries will have information to present on pre-2020 targets/pledges. Different for different parties. Depends also on finance and support. BTR depends on NDCs and when they're triggered. No need to be prescriptive about date of first BTR.
 - FMCP depends on when you submit first BTR and flexibility embedded in MPGs, process, and steps.
- Questions for clarification:
 - "Elements of existing UNFCCC MRV system that are superseded" – it's eventually and it's not elements. If you're superseding, you're superseding all things, and not just certain elements.
 - "Procedural linkage between art 13 and UNFCCC reporting and review" – will we have two reviews, one under the Convention and one under PA?

CF Andrew: I'll turn questions back to the floor.

Egypt:

- I'll start with elements of section A. Most problematic section. It's not getting attention it deserves. Request giving sufficient attention to section A and structure of MPGs. Need answer or approaches. Start with section A.3 outlining approaches. If we solve it our lives will be easier.
- Two sets of MPGs; common with flex; two separate tracks; one set of MPGs with flex for each element.
- Section A.2: elements 1-4, 6 to be guiding principles.
- Objectives: 17 elements. Are you planning to merge/group them?
- Classification: Approach 2 (A.1) but need to discuss A.3 first
- Like Brazil, also not clear on the last two elements.

NZ:

- Q1: Would be useful for MPGs to be divided into chapters reflecting different parts of Art 13 (7(a), 7(b), 9, 10) and define chapters of MPGs. Don't use "headings."
- Decisions adopting MPGs: comprehensive list of what should be there. Perhaps we need to look at last two bullets; combining that with third bullet to bring issues together; related.
- What's missing is what would go in preamble. Sets context for what we're agreeing. Recall relevant provisions of PA and flexibility provision in art 13.2. Note ongoing process of learning by doing and continuous improvement.

EU:

- Q2 elements of COP and/or CMA decision: missing from informal note is that we don't have separate sector dedicated to COP and/or CMA decision. Iteration would benefit from inclusion. Elements are pretty comprehensive.
- Link between submission of final BR/BURs and supersession
- Exact submission date, including month because makes big difference re inventories.
- Support for developing countries: address support for reporting, CBIT, CB
- Mandate for TER report; in past dealt with by UNFCCC secretariat and then lead reviewers developed more detailed format and helped with continuous improvement. We wouldn't like to go through a formal CMA process for each improvement of review report template.
- Separate bullet in elements relating to revisions/update of MPGs
- Need further discussion on principles; those reflected are those already in the PA and in decision text; don't see in Sec A further elaboration of principles. Can be outlined in preambular text.
- Sec A on flexibility; not necessary as separate heading for MPGs. Implemented related to individual provisions of MPGs.

Bhutan (LDCs):

- Q1: Not quite convinced of what was proposed here
- Q2: Several items that should be added to list.
 - Making references to principles of PA and Paris decision.
 - Flexibility

US:

- Q1, neither approach quite fit
- People use headings differently; value to capture some items, but carefully consider in introductory section of MPGs
- Not sure all items need to be reflected in text language; orienting language
- A lot of items things that will go into decisions; COP and CMA have different potential mandates and would need to be careful about which items go to which
- Items for one or the other:
 - Call to parties to nominate experts to ROE
 - Clear on superseding of MRV system and how that would work, including BR/BURs, IAR/ICA and updating NC guidance, etc. Different ways to do this, e.g. have inventory MPGs and relevant provisions replace the current A1 reporting GLs. Clear that any superseding language would apply to PA parties only
- Procedure: REDD+ technical annex attached to BURs; if they're superseded, then attached to BTRs
- Decision to note parties should be using MPGs once adopted
- Clear on timing of last reports of current system and first reports under new systems; clarity on expectations and no processes running in parallel

- Capture flexibility and recall that it shall be provided that developing countries who need it in light of capacity; note any provisions related to timing of that flexibility and any further guidance re to whom it would apply
- Mandate to develop training materials that will go with MPGs
- Mandate to secretariat to publish reports once received from parties once TER completed

CF Andrew:

- Tomorrow will continue with speakers list on sec A: KSA, Turkey, Australia, China, Egypt, Chile, South Africa, Canada, Switzerland, Japan
- 10:00-11:00 (TBC), Joint informal with items 4 and 5
- 15:00-16:00, informal consultation (sec D)
- CF informal note that compiles tools issued tomorrow after informal consultation

Brazil:

- Sec C different animal; hopefully clarified after our session.
- We didn't touch on all the elements in all the sections. We've proposed and made submissions on some of these other elements. Expect to see reflected in your informal note these views, but how are you planning to do so?
- Biggest challenge is we have short notice to review informal note and a meeting on Wed to give feedback that will probably be yes/no because I doubt opportunity for further changes.

CF Andrew: We had hoped to get to all the elements; we didn't have time. Informal note can't be much more than capturing discussion around tools; two documents light revision plus notes/tools as an appendix.

China: We must complete speaker list during our one-hour informal tomorrow. We haven't touched on approaches and potential ways forward; are we still scheduling informal informals tomorrow?

KSA: Our expectation is that as we progress we'll address subsections we haven't addressed and have conversations in the manner we've already done. Important that references to notes somehow captured. Clarity on expectations: we didn't address potential approaches in informal informals. How will that be reflected?

CF Andrew: Re more time, we'd have to consult with co-chairs and could probably find the time and space to complete speakers list. Don't need to resolve everything right now, can take up tomorrow.