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

APA agenda item 4

Informal consultation, 3 May 2018 17:00-18:00, Tokio

… indicates where the note-taker missed something.

Session notes

Co-facilitator: Notes topic was mentioned in APA Heads of Delegation meeting, gives the floor for comments to confirm that this is something acceptable to parties.

Japan: Need to consider how we allocate part of the contents in the decision and in the annex. We should consider this to move forward.

Co-facilitator: We really try to cut and paste, how it's a real basis for the job we are trying to achieve here. Of course, there were challenges in transferring since some of the titles did not exactly match the old titles. One thing a few Parties raised in the last meeting was a challenge we faced: in last iteration, we had support, this reflects varied understanding of where support could go. In order to discuss this topic, in section 7, "Option 1: Modalities for the preparation, submission, updating and implementation of the adaptation communication", we would add the word support. From informal conversations, but would like to present formally. Asks for objections.

<No flags raised>

This is for easing the discussion further, to understand where the discussion will take place. Thanks Parties. Opens floor for general comments on the tool.

G77/Argentina: Thank secretariat for tool, we wanted to provide narrative, she has general thoughts. Asks to add asterisk or footnote to position—that this is not prejudging the final outcome. Convo with other groups on use of the word options—wonder if the option "no headings" is applicable, since everything is between headings. Notes linkages section as example of where no heading isn't a good option. Want to hear from colleagues in the room of how we want to deal with the options. How could we erase headings/subheadings? Notes we can call 'headings' whatever we want (clusters', etc.) Context from last informal note at COP23 (disclaimer of how to read) was a good way to understand how to read the informal note information, suggests the repetition of that information. Asks how we can continue working with the narrative today and next sessions, think the structure there is opportunity to see we need more and in other cases we have a lot and it's repetitive, how to manage that and if we can provide more information to add.

EU: New tool confirmed that this is a good structure and a structure that will help us in our work moving forward. Provides a better overview of linkages, etc. we're confirming we would like to work on this basis. Similar thought to G77 on 'no heading' options: what does this actually mean? Japan didn't want titles yesterday, but they mean 'no cluster' now, so it would be a good idea to get rid of them and

instead have a note by all heading that the final outcome may not have a heading or content, or this content may be moved to another section. We hope to move into substantial discussion on some of the issues. One area he would like to highlight: Annex I/elements, which is the heart of the guidance. It's important to have time to work on that part. See a lot of opportunities for streamline, there's a lot of duplication and copy/past into different options that make it difficult to read and understand. Illegible especially to people ein other rooms, useful to have that part streamlined. Want simple streamlining done by Co-facilitators.

Norway: Helpful start, responding G/77 and EU regarding options, gave input, want ?? [principles, support] in the preamble so the cluster won't be necessary, since quite a few are related to what's already in the PA, put in your hands about how to proceed see the merit of including no text option to possibly have fewer clusters so we can compromise/make it more condensed. …

USA: Appreciate the co-facilitators moving intentionally, the 'no heading' part is in reference to the whole section, and now we're moving to the content underneath and discussion about merits of inclusion, (Norway), a bit more of a discussion that needs to be had re: no heading, no heading was a more rich question, wants to have those discussions. Not insisting on keeping no heading, just don't want to lose the intention.

Co-facilitators: …

New Zealand: Agree on streamlining elements, some things in the decision part that should still be associated with the elements, i.e. purpose of the guidance, that should be with the guidance than being in the decision. We'd be happy to entertain a reference in the decision about purpose. For the streamlining in the decision, linkages could take the form of referencing parts of the PA. Look forward getting into substance.

Co-facilitator: Thanks for constructive nature [of comments], they're ready to start working on substance. Have structure and need to agree on a method of work, they will treat the text in a way that is fair and doesn't take any options out. Wants Japan's views on no heading debate, but also wants to see whether Parties would have a preference on how to treat the text, as well as how could text be managed to make it evolve. Reminds parties that the co-facilitators are willing to do any task requested, including streamlining, depending on Party comfort.

African Group/South Africa: (align G77). Notes text is not agreed upon, principle of leaving all information, notes omission of important information, wants re-inclusion, last paragraph on relevant context of previous informal note, irrespective of where information will go.

Co-facilitator: Easy task, we'll do it. Floor is open, requests feedback on mode of work

Canada: South Africa made reference to May 1 document to ID areas of overlap and duplication, that was helpful, is it an exercise we can revisit? Not to do again, but it might help further our discussions.

China: There are some options close to the structure, including the guidance. Structure is useful for us to develop detail in the information, as Japan mentioned about the no headings, that wouldn't be helpful to further understand each other re: details of the information. More detail on no heading parts would help us understand each other for different views.

Japan: Suggest focusing on first the purpose, then preamble, etc. we can see preamble and purpose could be a combined paragraph, … could discuss one by one and people can share common understanding …

USA: Want to ensure we have a way forward. Narrative might help consolidate or conceive of common thinking.

EU: On moving forward: Annex I is the most important part, it's substantive guidance, and it's also not fully navigable – has two options that are very similar. Would welcome streamlining the annex without removing any options, but while trying to organize without repetition. It would be a good first step for that section. Let's move into substance, work on some sections! Don't know how many sections per session, but we should try to get through some of sections that need discussion, not sure starting from the beginning, maybe support is a place to discuss, EU wants to discuss elements since they see it as the meat of the substance. Coming closer on options will help us move forward in general.

Co-facilitator: Give me 30 seconds.

Argentina/G77: Want to allow Co-facilitator to prepare first informal note which would take onboard the different comments/suggestions from the floor today, including caveats. We support EU on streamlining options, start narrative, can take two every day (know in advance) which topics are being discussed. Can provide ideas or further work. This includes Annex I and support. Reluctant to take elements tomorrow, our group needs more time, tomorrow support and asks for suggestions on another topic.

Kuwait: (aligns Argentina/G77) asking for streamlining, but maybe now isn't the time, put all the thoughts on paper first, to not leave anybody behind, maybe we need that step. Agree with G77 that we need coordination time on elements.

China: (aligns Argentina/G77) Reminds that we took this approach in 2016, listing lots of key words, but that didn't work so far, so key problem is that the structure has a lot of different views, so for saving time and more useful guidance development, we should be conscious of structure, reminds of importance of APA4 for developing countries. Annex I is not just the guidance, it should be all of the parties' thoughts. It shouldn't give priority in ordering which one should be first.

Co-facilitator: Will have a first iteration of a new document, first can invite parties to review table of elements co-facilitators thought were repetitive. They note they sent out table with lack of context, and an explanation may have been useful. A few parties have raised the issue of whether to go in order – suggest starting in support section. Have 2 hours tomorrow 4-6p room Bangkok. Work on 5, 6, 7 of document. Will go into substance in those sessions. Will adjust as necessary.