

APA Agenda Item 8: Informal Consultations on Issues other than Adaptation Fund

May 08, 2018 – 10:00-11:00, Room Santiago

Informal Session Summary:

This agenda item under the APA is focused primarily on five issues: 1) the guidance of the CMA to the entities of the financial mechanism, or the GEF and GCF, 2) the guidance of the CMA to the Least Developed Countries Fund and the Special Climate Change Fund, 3) the guidance of the CMA regarding the adjustment of NDCs, 4) modalities for biennially communicating finance information, particularly related to Article 9.5 of the PA, and 5) the setting of a new monetary goal to follow the current 100B USD goal per year through 2025.

In this context, the goal of this session, which is the last of SB48 for this agenda item, was to discuss with Parties the preparation of the final version of the informal note, which summarizes the conversations of the last several days. While it does not appear that the second and final version of the informal note has been circulated to the Parties, the co-facilitator sought approval for the process of preparing an informal note where different options were identified that captured the spirit of recent conversations.

A significant portion of the discussion focused on the annexation of CRPs (Conference Room Papers) to the informal note. South Africa, on behalf of the African Group, requested that their CRP submission be included as an annex, while others argued that the legal status of CRPs was significantly different than informal notes (which have no status) and therefore they should not be combined. There were suggestions to perhaps include links to the CRPs, but in the end, Parties decided to keep trend with previous informal notes under this agenda item and include the CRP as an annex.

In terms of other content, both discussions of Article 9.5 were recurring, as was the initial hope of the secretariat, as were conversations regarding the financial target. Conversations focused on actions that need or do not need to be taken by the CMA. For both cases, some countries suggested that the CMA did not need guidance to initiate a process, either for Article 9.5 or the new financial goal, while others argued that it would be wise to initiate some sort of a negotiation process to assure that these issues are handled with due diligence.

- *Kevin M. Adams, Stockholm Environment Institute*

Relevant Documents:

[First Iteration of Informal Note](#)

Open – 10:07

Co-Facilitator

- Would like to recap discussion of last consultation (last Saturday)
- Discussed a new quantified finance goal
 - Parties acknowledge the importance of this matter, but there remain different views about when the CMA should initiate work on this mandate
 - Could benefit from lessons learned under the UNFCCC process
 - Options

- APA could recommend to CMA to initiate work as soon as possible, at CMA 2 – would also need to suggest possible scope of technical work
 - Could be initiated at a future time to be determined by the CMA
- Discussed subitem 8b relating taking stock of progress
- Last scheduled meeting
- Would like to go back to Article 9.5 discussions regarding modalities for the accounting of finance
 - Can we identify options for a possible way forward?

China

- Still waiting for the informal note to be issued – cannot seem to find it on the website.

Co-Facilitator

- We wanted to issue the informal note after we have received your guidance.

South Africa

- On behalf of African Group
- We would like to have the CRP Annexed to the Informal Note.

Co-Facilitator

- We can confirm that it will be Annexed to the Informal Note.

United States

- On the topic of the post-2025 collective goal, it sounded like all of the options you described involve the CMA initiating a process
- We would like an option to be that nothing further is needed for CMA 1
- On 9.5, similar argument can be made

Switzerland

- The US said one part of what we wanted to say.
- On the attachment of the CRP, we do not understand the benefit of that. This CRP we find helpful, but we are not sure why it needs to be attached to the informal note, as it remains with us until we have concluded our session. If this is the case there is no need to attach it.

EU

- We have a similar question about the CRPs.
- The EU has made a submission on 9.5, explaining why we feel there is no need for additional work.
- We would like to note that further work is based on the informal notes from the co-facilitators.
- On the 2025 goal, we were hoping to see the note to be able to react from it, but we too felt that the suggestions made based on our statements last time were not reflected
 - We would like to see an option that says no further action is needed by the CMA

Ecuador

- On behalf of LMDCs

- I would also like to address the CRP issue – in other agenda items during this session the approach we have taken is to include them.
- This is a useful approach we think, and we would encourage you to discuss the matter with the other co-facilitators for other items.
- On the goal, our point of view has been that the discussion now should not be about the goal we should have, but the process behind getting to that goal. We would not like it to be an arbitrary process at the last moment. This is something that all the parties around the table would like to avoid.

Co-Facilitator

- We do cover some of these issues in the coordination meetings, but it is primarily up to the negotiators in this room.

Timor Leste

- Would like CRP to be included.
- 9.5 is important to us.
- We need to address footnote one, regarding the Loss and Damage issue, and progress needs to be made there.

China

- The CRP document should enjoy the same status as other submissions or be incorporated into the main text.
- How to implement 9.5 is very critical – how we could see the first round of submissions should be included in the informal note.
- Setting a new goal is likely to be a very long process, including many consultations.

Egypt

- The informal notes are informal notes – useful to inform discussion, but not basis for negotiation.
- Big distinction between CRPs and informal notes, including a different legal status.

Co-Facilitator

- Can we agree that in this room, what we are doing by having the informal note by having the CRPs is helpful? Can help assure parties their views have been considered.

Russian Federation

- Agree and we have raised this elsewhere that it is not wise to include these as Annexes.

Canada

- Including these would not be useful for the clarity of the note.
- On the collective goal, the discussion about the term process that we had last session, this was meant broadly, as in the process now regarding these conversations, not a specific formal process.

Switzerland

- Our understanding was that CRPs do not disappear, regardless of whether or not they are attached.

- We need to take a way forward that is useful, and we are not convinced that it is useful to rush toward an avalanche of CRP submissions on this issue when the views are reflected already in the informal note.

Japan

- We are comfortable moving forward so long as the views of the discussions are all captured in the informal notes.
- We find our views well captured in the notes as they are currently.

New Zealand

- We do not take issue with attaching the CRPs.

India

- Agree with G77 and China.

Malawi

- On behalf of the LDCs.
- What we want to see from our group is for us to have a full package the contains all the elements that we agreed to be discussing under this agenda item.
- Would like have a broad view on process. If we could agree on the next goal, 1 trillion, 2 trillion, in an hour on the day of, that would be a great outcome.

Australia

- Agree with process comments.
- Believe that discussion on modalities of 9.5 is beyond the mandate of this session.

Honduras

- On behalf of ILAC.
- We consider it essential that the informal note captures as well as possible the exchanges we've had during these days.
- Look forward to upcoming iterations.

Norway

- Agree that it is important to capture the discussions we have had.
- We suggest having an option to link to the website where the submissions are available in a footnote on the informal notes.

Co-Facilitator

- Clarification on the status of CRPs
 - CRPs and all written submissions from parties are published on the website
 - CRPs are just one form Parties may use to capture their views and submit them to one another
 - The remain available to be referenced by Parties at later dates.
- For the moment, we will continue with attaching the in-session submissions of CRPs, and will continue to attach them in a similar fashion to the way this has been done in the past, in a way to assist parties and reflect further for further discussions.

*** Close, 11:14 ***