

Seth Blum

seth.blum@wustl.edu

Washington University in St. Louis

APA agenda item 4 notes

May 5, 2018, Starts late at 4:10 pm, Santiago de Chile

Note: This session was originally scheduled for 4-5pm, but ran 4-6pm.

... denotes somewhere where the notetaker missed something.

Session notes

Co-facilitator: Notes meeting focus on elements, notes we only have two hours left, will produce a second iteration [of informal note] tonight, have ideas and want to test them with you, need to accelerate ideas on the text because we have only one more meeting left. The next meeting we will see whether Parties are comfortable with the iteration and see if parties want changes on the text which will be the final outcome of the session in Bonn. Important that changes are reflected in the iteration tonight, in order to contribute to navigability.

Re: structure, options, opt in/opt out, or same text without the distinction between common set and opt in/opt out, we could try to reflect in the text that the option is the actual division of opt in/opt out vs common elements, or could proceed, in Option 1 and Option 2, where each has a number of elements from party submissions, or says placeholder for further information on the bullet. Thought we could just eliminate the option reference and list the elements that are between brackets. We can then spot if there are clear duplications or opportunities for streamlining. Opens the floor for comments on these ideas or substance. About Annex 2, will see that there is two sets of text, two Options 1 and 2, one thing that we might try to achieve is to merge these two sets of options, because second set is the first elements in ????

Argentina/G77: Question on the first proposal, while noting group is prepared to engage on the narrative of the elements, want time to provide specific ideas for second iteration. Q: How that could be reflected (the common and opt in/out), would it be in brackets? It's not enough to have a general comment in the preamble, we need that very clear in the actual list of elements. How are planning to do this?

Co-facilitator: We will do this in the text itself, could read in the Annex, could explain with a footnote underneath, no need for a title.

Argentina/G77: Build on the basis of your proposal, Option 1 is common/additional, Option 2 is more narrow, there could be the footnote, we need to include in footnote which are particular elements. Importance of reflecting with clarity which are the common and which are the additional elements.

Co-facilitator: That can be reflected in the text.

Switzerland/EIG: Annex I is a useful basis to build on, bearing in mind that the level of detail is nationally determined, Option 1 Annex I, don't see the necessity of common and opt-in/out division, since some issues in Section B have an equal standing with items listed in Section A, ... could be contrary to Art 10, re: subheading A of Option 1 all of the elements listing on the subheading are important with the exception of the last item, which is indicative levels of public finance sources, clearly outside the scope of mandate, and should be in SBI agenda item 15 on climate finance. Option 2 of Annex I, do see a lot of overlap with Option 1, agree to deal with merging the two options, good progress we could achieve. Some items i.e. synergies and practices learned only in Option 2 and would have to be added to Option 1 list. Re: adding bullet points, we're fine looking at your proposal. Re: Annex II, earlier have clearly expressed that parties are free to choose submission and that guidance adopted by COP should serve different context in which adaptation communication may be prepared. Don't see the need in giving NDCs privileged status, choice is importance, we should focus on common guidance in Annex I and encourage parties to use it irrespective of the vehicle. Understanding co-facilitator's comment, I think we're on the same page, outcome of last meeting isn't well reflected, want to see option of no vehicle specific guidance restored.

New Zealand: Supports iteration that reduces duplication, merging Annex I into common elements would be very helpful, we don't see the need for a section that would be additional opt in/out provision because of way guidance will be used and because it will be used through reporting in a number of different vehicles and national circumstances. Don't see any part as necessarily mandatory, so when developing different bullet points certainly Annex into guidance for parties, that we're providing in the guidance is simply there. But on national circumstances could have text like "parties could provide information such as a, b, c" but it wouldn't be a closed list. Parties could provide other national circumstances information. Don't need to be defining too closely what the content will be. We think some merging is possible, and bulletizing the different sub-elements would make it easier to understand where the guidance is headed. In terms of duplication, looking at Annex II vs. options under Annex I, there's a lot of overlap, not convinced that we need Annex II, could be merged into Annex I, there should be enough in there for parties that wish to communicate adaptation as part of NDC. Willing to discuss vehicle specific guidance, but the case has not been made as far as we can see.

Co-facilitator: Optional title in one list of elements, not all common elements, but list would be only one but separated at beginning with title "common set..." a list of bullets associated, an option for no title, and then additional opt in opt out, will do the same.

EU: Notes that the Annex with elements is very important, it's the substantial guidance for adaptation communication, we've worked a lot on the elements, all of the key ideas that we need to capture are already captured somehow, what we have is a bit more than we need but we have what we need. Proposal seems like a good one, close to the idea we had ourselves. Nothing else but agreeing to let them do it would be a huge step forward, would make it easier to understand and reflect that we've done a lot of work and are much closer to an agreement than what a current version seems like. ...Subheading on opt in opt out. NZ proposal sounds like good alternative to opt in opt out, headings that give main content, then provide optional additional elements, to give parties additional guidance. If that's moving too fast, perhaps to do as co-facilitators are suggesting.

Uruguay/UR,AR,BR: Hesitant on merging approach, understand on proposal for G77 on common opt in opt out, in this case these are operational headings, what's the nature of Option 2? Common? In/out?

Any attempt of merging those without clearly understanding, we're building options on a mechanism, so much more complex question, ... if we do that without being clear, we'll get comments back, in any case, second proposal will need to have further information on ... of the elements, but need some space for inputs that more come up on a more detail in the next days. Clear message that any new tool or paper should have an inclusive and reassuring approach with the issue of the no headings.

Co-facilitator: On placeholder for further information, notes that the text is open so we don't need a placeholder for more elements. Any party can provide more sub-bullets, there's even an indication at the end of the lists.

Argentina/G77: Concerned about the time, and we thought today was about substance. I spent a lot of time working on substance, really appreciate proposals, we need to do substance. Don't understand well the proposals, see potential issues w understanding of the text, so not in a position to accept. Give us time to go to substance.

Co-facilitator: Please, go ahead G77.

Argentina/G77: Not clear on reference to sectors [in elements], have to flag that, added bullet points to Option 1, will give ideas on the first bullet. Add: importance of information on impacts, risk, vulnerability, information on reduction of vulnerabilities, information on nationally determined priority of adaptation/vulnerability reduction, can provide language. [to co-facilitator]

On adaptation priorities... nationally determined priority, national update on??? Under Option 1.

Adaptation support needs: Opposed to word "invested" in resources for adaptation, should be based on grants, it's important to flag that. Info on projected cost of priorities should be added as a bullet point as well as support, technology, capacity needed should be added.

Under recognition, we don't feel that specific timeframes are agreeable at this stage, include info on .. adaptation programs/actions estimated needs and costs. Last point, under B, elaborated economic diversification plans and national development plans that result in mitigation co-benefits. [added from just economic diversification].

Hard to follow, but will provide language to include in the second iteration, expect the same from ideas from last informal.

Co-facilitator: We're doing this tonight, so send language before 6PM? Proposal to eliminate repetition is precisely because many elements are common in Option 1 and Option 2, want to see those inclusions reflected in Option 1 or both?

Argentina/G77: Both.

Malawi: (obo LDC?) Echoes request from Uruguay on status of Option 2 elements, that would help for LDCs to know about flexibility, very important on common opt in/opt out.

Uruguay: coming back to co-facilitator question, Option 2 is placeholder for further information, approach is that these are not options because they're related, word "further", so could accept deleting these referenced two optioned but def placeholder for each element at this stage.

Co-facilitator: Is the ellipsis at the end of the list an appropriate place to reflect this?

Uruguay: Could we keep the language for now since the document is complex?

Co-facilitator: to be clear, could have national circumstances, elements separated, last bullet would say 'placeholder for further information on national circumstances'

Uruguay: That's fine.

South Africa/African Group: Wanted more clarity but it's better, we want a very clear delineation of the two, no conflation, but now it will be very clear. Emphasize delineation.

Point of Order (Argentina): Almost sure we're mixing two proposals. Close first proposal and then go to second one. Proposal 1: merge elements. Signal from group, we don't feel comfortable. Proposal 2: on bullet points. Maybe the groups can intervene to give signals on these but need to be clear on what we're talking about.

Co-facilitator: There are different views on #1, so can we park that for now? Leave suggestions there, proceed as indicated by Uruguay, follow suggestion by Argentina in terms of going to substance. We have the room for the hour after this as well if parties would like to stay.

Canada: Emphasize the importance of communication as way to assist planning, coordinate support, share best practices. This should be useful and helpful in preparing communication (as outlined in submission) in alignment with no additional burden, this communication in Canada's view, all elements are at parties' discretion, including opt in opt out parties may not use all elements so reiterate NZ/Switzerland and to respond to colleague from Malawi.

Norway: Can we refer to option in italic and options in bold? We're merging the options in italics?

Co-facilitator: Yes, because they're not options, they're placeholders.

NZ: Not sure we're heading in a direction that will help you make elements easier to follow, understand. Heading towards something that still has duplication. Reiterate from Canada this is all discretionary, national circumstances dictate taking from guidance what is useful. There shouldn't be a concern that the common set of elements is somehow something all parties shall do. There's no shall. [something about placeholder]. Re: additional time, I have to go, I'm not saying that the rest of the group can't stay, I hope that parties that if they do stay are able to have a continuing productive discussion.

Ecuador/LMDC: (align with Argentina/G77), Options 1 and 2 have different information and we don't want to lose the work we've done, in that regard I would wait, re: headings, ok with proposal including Options 1 and 2 in the headings. Re: annexes, all of agenda items are taking different views, we can't leave anybody behind, so eager to discuss about annex 2, this is the place to discuss adaptation communication as part of NDC since that's part of the mandate. Thank you for giving the place to discuss the NDCs even in there as the common guidance. ... would like to continue discussions, want further clarification on the informal note that is proposed.

Saudi Arabia/Arab Group: (align with G77 and LMDC), Worry that different comments by parties have been misunderstood as it relates to which of three co-fac suggestions they refer to. Ex: national circumstances, within each element, suggestion to put all of these under national circumstances, last one as placeholder, all other suggestions we're clear enough to have an opinion on. Also, how many more iterations of informal note? Re: common vs. opt in opt out, put a lot of time into separating

elements, would be good to continue with that work, not remove differentiation done by G77. Re: Annex II, our position as Arab Group that we need Annex II as a separate annex per the G77 proposal. Notes the “inter alia, as a component of NDCs” Other ways of communicating adaptation have guidance, but not NDCs as a component of the PA. Filling a gap, as Ecuador mentioned, linked to info needed for other items, and the vehicle under PA is NDCs.

Co-facilitator: Re: iterations, have one tonight, don’t see much opportunity to have another iteration (but we’re in your hands), will bring this to Monday, in that meeting will discuss second iteration. “Probably Parties will have observations on the text” since we don’t have time to discuss a third iteration, could be minor edits but nothing of too much substance. That’s our limitation, hope that’s clear.

EU: Perhaps Saudi Arabia is right that there was confusion, repeats EU response, taking into consideration additional ideas since the original proposal. One idea about specific elements, reorganizing elements, last bullet placeholder. NZ/UR proposal is agreeable. Would remove one area of complexity in the current text. Other one, merge Option 1 and 2 overall in Annex I, that would be very good idea and hope it would be possible to agree to that, should be possible to do that without losing options and ideas that are already there. Question from Malawi, you should take them and look and some elements are very clearly the same, some we don’t know what they are, maybe put them in between and call them something “elements from Option 2 that are different” or something like that, but possible to merge without difference, but I might be wrong.

Co-facilitator: Thanks.

EU: G77 had textual suggestions, and we would be fine to have those in the new version of the text, could they be highlighted, they don’t have status but would be fine if they were included in new version.

Co-facilitator: Clarifies EU proposal, eliminate all duplication, but then add new title of Option 2 almost like an indication of better reading, more like an explanation.

Uruguay: Not accepting first proposal, options by parties should be standing to allow for negotiations, accept the proposal on placeholders. Won’t accept other language, we have specific language. Re: last informal note, note views on no headings as clearly indicated.

Co-facilitator: Would you accept EU proposal?

Argentina: Not in a position to give a common response, could we have 5 min to meet?

<90% of the room goes outside>

<EU, CH, JP, US, etc. huddle inside>

<Resumes ca. 20 minutes later>

Co-facilitator asks **Switzerland** if he still wants the floor. No.

Argentina/G77: First proposal, cannot accept it at any point to merge the two options. Need to see from Uruguay that this session should be to have clarity on the options. Want option just as it is. Their flexibility is to take the second proposal that information in italics could appear as bullet points including placeholder.

Co-facilitator: So will remain as is. Wonder if we could try to reflect that Option 2, trying to avoid the problems in readability and duplication in Option 2, at the same time our goal is to make text more navigable. For that, in order to reflect the two options as optional ways of expressing the content of Annex I, could say that in Option 2 that all elements of Option 1 are optional plus some extra elements listed under Option 2. Would that make sense?

US: Been very interested in hearing other countries views, not worth the ink and paper to do streamlining efforts in Option 2, I agree with views that all of this guidance is not burdensome, prescriptive, ... in their view, some common or not elements, but there's also inherent flexibility in article 7, any structure or flow doesn't change that fundamental reality, this is sending an important signal, so important to capture the approaches that may be taken to reflect on adaptation communication moving forward. Would appreciate keeping Option 2 as it is, to reflect longer on new arrangement of placement in annexes. Later, we can see intact views and not a pointer to another section.

Co-facilitator: Still have 20 minutes if other comments, but we will keep the language as it is. Will present it in a different way, as was proposed, but the language will remain as is.

Invite parties to take the floor if they want to continue discussing.

Argentina/G77: Want to come back to informal note iterations, from [elements] 1-4, didn't have time for further ideas, and allocation of time for each of the topics, we have a mandate and maybe we want more time, heard from Heads of Delegation meeting, maybe we have 1-2 more hours. Now speaking on personal/national perspective on this, not sure about the final iteration today since we need to have conversation on the other points, be fair on whole list and structure. Want another iteration considering the whole discussion.

Co-facilitators: Every item has lack of time, limited capacity of venue, situation is that we're approaching the end of the session by Wed, 6p on Tuesday deadline, difficult to have an extra hour, also, this was a two hour session, we've been going over at other meetings. I know adaptation is very important, but we have limitations. Notes Heads of Delegation desire for joint APA4/5 informal that has been planned for close to the end of the session, Secretariat is looking at scheduling possibility, might not be possible to avoid further clashes at that session. There will likely be scheduling conflicts with another related item.

Saudi Arabia: Very important for final informal note to reflect all parties positions, and you [the co-facilitators] mentioned yesterday it will reflect the progress achieved. Lots of progress here, good atmosphere, would be a shame to cut that in the middle so we won't complete the work we've started, support Argentina's suggestion, any possibility of having extra time, it will be very important to the outcome of this session.

Ecuador: ...

Co-facilitator: We're trying our best. Will convey more time request to the co-chairs.