

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

APA agenda item 4

Informal consultation

May 7, 2018 12:00-13:00 room Bangkok

... denotes where the notetaker missed something.

Session notes

At 12:10, Pilar (Argentina) calls for a G77 huddle outside. Umbrella huddles/consults inside.

At 12:24, delegates return.

Co-facilitator: Last informal, but we have informal time for this evening. We'll discuss at the end of the session. When we left Sat, went through modalities and produced another iteration of the text...

Saudi Arabia: Like to clarify, this is our final informal consultation of the session? We made a G77 decision based on that.

Co-facilitator: Sorry, misspoke. We have more informal time. Want to get through 1-4 in the remainder of session. Asking two things: more things to input, as well as please remove duplication. Begin with Preamble, ask if we could combine first two bullets. The floor is open.

Argentina/G77: Happy for more time. Appreciate hard work of facilitators, think more time is crucial. If it's possible to have a slot tomorrow, that would be quite appreciated. G77 submit many ideas we would like to engage with colleagues, and everybody can see them on second iteration of informal note, expecting partners, please engage with ideas. Don't need to wait for another text to engage. Second point: we discussed item 1 further, as well as item 3, adoption of the guidance, we have more language, but consider it important for consistency. Will take from the floor but then submit through you. Under Preamble, "importance of flexibility", add additional language "provided to developing countries in the submission and updating of adaptation communication in 7.10, 7.11 of PA". For further clarification. On idea of additional burden, want shall, not should, "recognize the role of adaptation and the role it plays in ensuring the right of sustainable development" under #3, "including inter alia as a component of NDCs, [including ...]" as to not prejudge the final structure. Important for us for those ideas to be there.

Co-facilitator: Thanks, but want reflections on combining the first two bullets of the Preamble.

Norway: Agree about duplications, thanks for providing additional time. For Preamble, think that there more possibilities of avoiding duplication, think that "not mandatory", "additional burden", "not mandatory", can recall 7.10 PA [reads 7.10 aloud]. Re: Importance of "global goal" and "PA" propose to move under Purpose of the communication. Re: fifth bullet in Preamble "linkages" could refer to 11 [??] ... perhaps could also do noting, wait nevermind that's fine. On "additional burden" [second to last] better referred to under the purpose, under preambulars could also give reference to and recall 7.12,

about public registry and have placeholder for specifics, ... have stuff for purpose and adoption but will come back.

New Zealand: Thanks for revised note. On preamble, like Norway but taking it further, bullet point 2 can be combined with 1, but recalling those articles covers almost everything else but 'comparisons between parties' can refer to paragraph numbers but by recalling those we've covered everything we don't need to restate, this part of the preamble can be very short.

EU: Go into text very specifically, starting on combining 1 and 2, yes. Simplifying is good, but want to specify 4.7, 4.13b and a link to existing guidance to NCs, BURs, and NAPs, other docs used for submission but fine to combine it into one para that notes specific areas that need to be recalled. Agree Norway that "global goal" and "PA" belong more in purpose. The last three can be combined into one para capturing that idea. Add, but could also be recalled as part of PA recollection, important to note the language of 7.5 as an inclusive, country specific process. Want to recall, similar to G77?, note linkages between adaptation and sustainable development, incl SDG and ?? framework.

Saudi Arabia: Clarify regarding organization of work. Another informal session, but when and where? Based on input from this and next informal, will there be another iteration of informal note?

Co-facilitator: Have Genf from 6-10pm, will not be time between now and then to do an iteration of informal note. Cannot do another iteration before 6p. Will produce another iteration after the session at 6pm this evening. Talking with co-chairs about how to ensure Party comfort with the informal note. Told tomorrow is almost impossible because of clashes. Still working on how to resolve final iteration of the note.

Saudi Arabia: Sorry still confused, will there be another iteration?

Co-facilitator: Not before 6pm, but after tonight.

Saudi Arabia: Re preamble, bullets one and two important to maintain references to both groups of provisions so prefer to see them separated.

Ecuador: On the time of work, we need more time and even the constraint have referred will need time to review the final informal note before it is completely acceptable for us, so given that we encourage you to work ... ? as well, given the preamble, there is the whole framework we have to include in the work in developing adaptation communication, that will be all at the moment? [unclear]

China: For this part, also include heading preamble, in my memory, this is the first time to discuss, from the EU and Norway and NZ intervention, there is a lot of divergence on the boundary for each subheading, what's the differentiation between preamble and propose, what's the basic defn included, some views on this point will be needed to fully discuss in another consultation, so for this we also ask the co-facilitator to arrange another informal consultation to discuss this issue.

Uruguay: (support G77), support another iteration, ... , issues of clarity that we need to have further discussion on the form of the informal note, but re: preamble, support Arab Group in differentiation of UNFCCC and PA bullet points. Support the G77 and the additions, [refers to above], supports mentioning "adoption of further guidance ... inter alia as a component of NDCs"

South Africa/African Group: (aligns G77), see good progress but we need more time. Support G77 on issue of flexibility, provided in 7.10, 7.11, emph adaptation communication not adding addnl burden.

Kuwait: (aligns G77, KSA/Arab Group, Ecuador/LMDC), see divergence between dev and developed countries, see first two bullets and the articles mentioned, looking forward for the next session.

Colombia/ALIAC: (support G77) Asks partners for clarity on how to address linkages, prioritize some linkages over others, i.e. Norway highlighting the registry, but Argentina/G77 highlighted others before, especially PA linkage to the GST on 7.14b, so it's not limited to the registry. Would like other views on this topic.

Norway: Thanks for China asking what the difference between the preamble and the purpose is. We think the purpose could be covered under the preambular. In our submission last year, we proposed a preambular that says "Recognizes that the purpose of the adaptation communication is" and then listed three purposes. Perhaps could eliminate heading on purpose. Regarding Colombia's question, sorry if I gave the impression that there's only a linkage to the registry, tried to address linkage to the other communications, don't mean registry is the only linkage. If we can address those linkages by using decided language from PA if we define those in the preambulars using language from the PA. If we use that perhaps we've covered all of it already.

USA: Looking forward to engaging on colleagues in the room. Agree with Norway/EU, strikes at heart of concerns coming later in the decision text, be clear that we're not walking back from PA provisions, be ready to clearly highlight the importance of flexibility and vehicle choice not only for dev countries but for all parties, want to make sure 7.13 is reflected exactly how it is phrased, important provision that gives comfort to many parties. Do think these are non-mandatory so inherently flexible so non-mandatory and do not cause burden. That this flexibility is important to keeping the burden, that there will be no additional burden that this is a common view of all parties and a clear reading of the PA language. In adpt comm, it's clear there is no differentiation and we wouldn't want implication of that in the preambular language.

Co-facilitators: Six minutes, four speakers. Closing the list now.

China: Sorry to take the floor again, support G77, mention about preamble, additional burden should be especially for the developing country parties according to PA Art7, add ... ?? Want to raise clarification to Norway, does she want to change structure of decision, but purpose under preamble, this will change the whole decision structure, and will have impact on the preamble and each point for further development. Important for us to further understand. Structure or detailed information first? Important for strategy.

Mexico: Thanks for additional time. Mention fully subscribes to 7.10, 7/13 incl support and additional burden (G77 suggestion)

Ecuador/LMDC: We are all part of UNFCCC so that's part of our work here. Will they have an explanation on why it is not a good approach to include them as part of the preamble and part of adaptation work in this room?

New Zealand: Wanted to respond to a couple of points. Linkages, this could be done in two ways, in which we can find every subparagraph and list them all, or take a comprehensive approach, and in case

we missed something, we can recall relevant articles. If parties want to go find every subarticle, that's fine, it just leads to a longer preamble. We see everything that comes before the operational part of the decision, that adopts guidance, where parties will use it, the review, where parties will submit, all of that is preambular, where we're just noting and recalling, that's just part of a preamble. You don't ever see a COP decision that starts with preamble, it just launches into the preamble, this is understood, maybe as homework before this evening to look at what a COP decision can look like to help our thinking here and find a way through.

China: Re: NZ saying there doesn't need to be a preamble recalling PA, this is important to us... in the future this will be used by individual countries, how to consider the principles, this will be important sources for that, important to connect PA and technical issues raised by the guidance, so think PA provisions should be resolved.

Kuwait: Echo China, if we need to put all bullets and sub-bullets back to a preamble, what's the point of the meeting here? We're here to set the guidance for adaptation communication. Can't go home and say oh we can do whatever I want. We are not renegotiating the PA. Sitting here to set the guidance for adpt comm. If we need to put all the linkages back in the preamble, GST, support, if we refer back to the preamble, so everybody can describe whatever depending on the understanding of adaptation communication, we have GST and ... We need to set the GUIDANCE for adaptation communications.

Co-facilitator: We've been working to do just that and making progress. Interpretation that we've finished the conversation on preamble and can work through 2,3,4,8.

Genf 6-10pm today, 10am in Chamber Hall joint with APA5. About to meet with co-facilitators about how to run the meeting and might send material before.

Ecuador: Had comments on general structure of informal note but can discuss this afternoon before you issue informal note

?: Would like to have time to revise before it's finalized.

Adjourned.