

Seth Blum
Washington University in St. Louis
seth.blum@wustl.edu

APA agenda item 4 (adaptation communication)

Second informal consultation, May 2, 17:00-18:00 in room Santiago de Chile

Notation

LMDC\China denotes a party negotiating on behalf of a group.

CBDR = common but differentiated responsibility

... means that the note-taker missed a comment

Session notes

Co-facilitator: Notes happiness about COP23 progress. Asks those present (does not explicitly exclude Observers) to sign up for the email list for documents by emailing klucas@unfccc.int with the subject “APA4 email list”. They sent out a table last night, purely noting duplications, and open the floor for comments on decision structure and annex

EU: Table is a tool, we haven’t agreed on headings. These are purely clusters of ideas; the decision text might not even have headings. He recognizes things will be moved around. Requests elaboration on what should go where, as well as on Annex 2: what type of information will go in there? Decision text? Is it a full duplicate of the decision or purely elements?

Co-facilitator: Allow others to ask questions before giving floor to G77.

Japan: First impression was uneasy, because at COP23 we had no headings in the informal note. The inclusion of headings is an issue for them. If we go with the G77 proposal, we need to remove headings. Otherwise, we’ll have to start from scratch.

USA: Want to talk about substance, not structure, particularly in the Annex. Appreciate G77 proposal, but it’s difficult to understand the thinking that went into this. We don’t understand the need for principles here and enumeration numerous modalities. We see the same words repeated across multiple headings. It would be good to hear more about why that’s the case. Looking at Co-facilitators note, it was simply “approach”, points out that maybe the group could revert to that going forward. Goal was not to lose anything from informal note, welcomes ideas from Japan. Separating operational decisions from the elements is a good step forward, would like to focus time on that. View on Annex 2: missing element in note how parties using 4.7 will be reflected in the text. Open to placing that in annex or in text. They see the structure as being driven by the content, hope for flow without headings.

Mexico: Asks the group to elaborate on the intentions of the headings because they’re not always clear. Asks Co-facilitators to clean informal note in view of G77 proposal. On Annex 2: don’t think it should be present for the time being.

Australia: G77 proposal is a good basis, but we want to understand thinking behind it. We should retain the option of having no headings. Re: Annex 2, not sure if it's appropriate to consider at this time. They would like to focus on substance and elaborating elements to clarify preambular and decision sections. We'll have to have further discussion about sequencing.

Canada: Want to see retention of all options in restricting. Sees decision/annex split as way to consider substantive elements. Re: Annex 2, does "guidance for NDCs" mean guidance for adaptation communications or what exactly is meant?

New Zealand: With or without headings, this is useful, especially the decision/annex split.

G77/Argentina: Thanks colleagues for the good spirit in considering the proposal. Headings are a way to restructure conversation, with assurance that informal note text needs a tool to make ideas there more visible, and that headings could be a way to do that. Notes that all Parties agreed on textual narratives. To make that transition, we need to make our own document more navigable. This is our attempt, but G77 welcomes other attempts. Conscious of possible technical work to add to different clusters/titles. We need to use this session to provide ideas from all parties. Emphasizes they are not prejudging final outcome of the package—this is just to restructure the informal note. Annexes are proposals from people at this table, this allows them to keep all options open until Poland. Question to Co-facilitator, can this be a structure to guide the process to revise the informal note? Need to check how ideas can fit these clusters, which could be valuable since we can see tomorrow if the ideas are properly reflected under the different titles.

Co-facilitator: Note no other flags, so will start working within structure of G77 proposal with all caveats, so not eliminating any options, some headings may change/go away, but they consider that a mandate. Thank parties for agreeing to work with the proposal. Heard request to move informal note content into G77 structure. We're happy to do that, and we can do it this evening. Next meeting tomorrow at noon, would reviewing then be an acceptable way forward for everybody?

G77/Argentina: If the co-facilitators will use the structure and content of the informal note, and the exercise will be to populate the structure with existing information, if so, we are agreed. They do not accept a streamlined version or merging of ideas, they consider that the task for tomorrow and the continuation of work.

USA: Asks Co-facilitators to indicate if they were unsure or had difficulty placing things to indicate ambiguity. Maintaining everything is critical, but we would ask to present views on where it was difficult to map things in and next steps might be present.

Co-facilitator: If anything's unclear, we'll come back to you. We'll also provide something for tracking where material from the informal note went.

EU: We agree with the proposed way forward. We might have to come back to some questions for G77 tomorrow, but that might be a better time.

Switzerland: We are happy to be patient, but we have difficulty in understanding the meaning of some headings, we wonder if it might not be beneficial for all if we could have more information, and it would also help Co-facilitators especially with items that seem to address the same issues. Especially three modalities

Japan: Notes the three modality headings, but they can't find the same phrasing in the COP23 informal note. Asks Co-facilitators what they have in mind? If it's clear; he's happy.

Co-facilitator: I'll give the floor to G77/Argentina to clear this up.

G77/Argentina: Modality is just a word, the message is that we identified content in the Cop23 text related communication and submission, and on those provisions that are pre-existing, you can use modalities or any other word to cluster. Another point is on the guidance, the updating of which is a different process, hence the different modalities sections. The important thing is the meaning. lie. under support, implementation and updating is in the informal note.

Co-facilitator: I never use the word modalities except in the UNFCCC. Asks G77, the third modality bullet is for the support material?

G77/Argentina: Confirms, support is scattered and hopefully Co-facilitators will concentrate it.

China: Heard from EU that we should focus on elements, but they note structure will be the basis for the discussion on the details. Since the informal note is messy, it's hard to continue our discussion. China's view to first focus on the structure, see it as beneficial.

G77/Argentina: Support is an element – a list of elements is one thing, we have another concept that is support. We have time to make changes to the structure. Re: China: their point is important but we need to move to substance. Question to co-facilitator: Please let me know if you have an idea of when you can deliver this input/tool in order to prepare for tomorrow.

Co-facilitator: Confident that we could get it out by 10pm tonight if not sooner; will need to go through some clearance but confident that you will have it by 10pm if not sooner

G77/Argentina: Thanks co-facilitators, asks time of session next day, Co-facilitator responds noon.

Switzerland: To co-facilitator: you won't remove duplication?

Co-facilitator: No, we will not touch the duplications until tomorrow so we can all collaborate.

G77/Argentina: Requests to move meeting later for time to coordinate.

Co-facilitator: We will ask. [Note: meeting was later moved to 5pm]