

Fifth Informal Consultation on APA Agenda Item 5 on modalities, procedures and guidelines for the transparency framework for action and support referred to in Art. 13 of the Paris Agreement

Saturday, 5 May 2018, 12-1pm, Chamber Hall, SB48

Note taker: Melissa Low, Research Fellow, Energy Studies Institute, National University of Singapore (esimlyx@nus.edu.sg)

The meeting began at 12.06pm.

Number of tools available on the UNFCCC Website:

- For APA agenda item 5 – section **B** visual tool, please click [here](#)
- For APA agenda item 5 – sections **E** and **F** visual tool, please click [here](#)
- Tool prepared by the co-facilitators on section **G** issues for discussion (revised), please click [here](#)
- Tool prepared by the co-facilitators on section **H** issues for discussion, please click [here](#)

Sections E & F for this session.

Co-Facilitator shared the mode of work for this agenda item. This afternoon's 2 hour session will focus on Section C. If complete, then start on Section B.

- May 5 – E & F
- May 5 (4-6pm) – C & B
- May 7 (3-6pm) – E & F, B, A
- May 8 (3-5pm) – D

Brazil

- Thanked Co-Facilitator for the update and for agreement with Co-Chairs on additional time to cover in a balanced manner all the sections
- From the tool, you have taken note that Parties may wish to raise other issues but you have decided not to put what we have sent outside your list in the tool – in the spirit of flexibility, we could agree with your approach but make sure that your list starts the discussion but there are other things that can be discussed – when can we cover other issues?

Co-Facilitators said they will take this up.

Co-Facilitator shared the tool with questions for discussion. Tool can be found [here](#).

Ecuador asked if the Co-Facilitators wanted Parties to respond to all 6 questions at once. To which, the Co-Facilitators said yes.

- Speaking on behalf of LMDC
- On linkage between development of MPGs under APA 5 and SBSTA agenda item 13 [E.3, E.4, E.5, E.10, noted importance for linkage with finance issues – request Co-Facilitators to push the SBSTA discussion to conclude on time, at least by first week of COP24 so we can go through that, have a placeholder for those issues

- On question 2, to make a distinction, if any, between MPGs for “developed” and “other” Parties that provide support – made reference to Art 9.2 – provision of information is voluntary and that would have to adjust to capacity to calculate, provide and report that information from “other Parties that provide support” – distinction is not consistent with the PA. Should be voluntary. There could be a third option, to get rid of reference to “other Parties that provide support” so as to help streamline and improve understanding in that section.
- On question 3 on linkage, if any, between Article 11.4 and MPGs for capacity-building support provided – more lenient towards Approach 1.
- On question 4, TT and CB, what specific qualitative and quantitative information should the MPGs request from developed country Parties and other Parties that provide support – the encouragement of other Parties that provide support is done in reference explicitly in financial support in Art 9. Not necessarily on TT and CB support.
- On section F, reporting format – not addressed under any agenda item and intend to get through; if we get to discussion on modalities on formats we can discuss it then and move that under this section but it depends also on what happens under SBSTA agenda items
- On formats for financial support received, had this discussion in Paris...this could be a place to start discussing that

Switzerland

- Avoid as much duplication of work as possible, work should be done in SBSTA room
- If text included here, ask to include underlying assumptions etc. that is currently missing
- No difference between MPGs, because “shall” report and others is voluntary; other Parties should be guided by MPGs
- Essential that guidance is the same and not different
- One set of MPGs provided and mobilized, others invited to do so
- Quantitative aspects of CB should be captured in box, avoids double counting
- Concrete proposals for TT
- On Section F, introduce standard tabular format for all finance and narrative format for case studies for CB and TT support received

Maldives

- Ensure consistency and coherence with SBSTA items
- For , between MPGs for “developed” and “other” Parties that provide support? [E.4, E.5, E.6, E.7, E.8, E.9], prefer Approach 1: Combine E.4 and E.5, E.6 and E.7, E.8 and E.9 but note that “other” Parties would be voluntary
- Wrt question 4 on TT and CB, prefer Approach 2 Detailed MPGs for qualitative and quantitative information, requiring information and presented in tabular formats.
- For Section F, question 2 on the relationship between sections B.7, C.12 and F.8? Should CB needs be requested in one or multiple areas of the MPGs? We prefer Approach 1: Retain B.7, C.12 and F.8 and F.12.4.
- All elements captured, not deleted, affect the way we have it now.

Co-Facilitators assured the Maldives that nothing will be deleted.

European Union

- Qn 1 on linkages: SBSTA has clear mandate for developing accounting... deliver results to APA 5 for integration so support Approach 1 so as to avoid duplication of work; should have clear placeholder for that work
- For APA 5 work, should focus on TT and CB support provided and mobilized and another one that needs to be looked at includes development of MPGs in areas of support needed and received.
- On Qn 2: Structure of information should be the same but this is a “should” requirement – can reflect different starting point, different flexibilities, national circumstances etc.
- MPGs are the adequate vehicle to report support provided and mobilized for CB – integral part of climate finance
- On Section F, support Approach 3 development of CTF for MPGs but want to underline that there is an inherent difference in information for support needed vs. support received. Here it is merged.
 - On Approach 2, refer to CGE tables – do not have any formal status and never been adopted; do not correctly interpret the current guidance under the Convention, other tables currently used by developing countries in BURs are much for useful than those developed by CGE – would like to build tables based on those used by developing countries already
- On Section F, question 2: ... C12 and B7 may not be in MPGs

USA

- Qn 1: clear mandate in SBSTA room, maintaining placeholder in our room – Approach 1
- Qn 2: Approach 1, recognize it is a “should” provision for other Parties and need to be reflected in MPGs
- Qn 3: linkages between Art 11.4 and MPGs – see this slightly differently than views already expressed; reporting in Art 11.4 does not provide a vehicle – concerned about this
- Qn 4: see reporting in an iterative manner. What remains to be captured – qualitative and textual information – open to discussion on how best to capture that. We haven’t had that discussion in detail yet.
- On Section F, support needed and received – whatever format we choose, important to have same expectation on clarity on information provided so we have a full set of information
- On Section F, qn 2: few more references to include there – see as a bit different, should capture CB needs related to inventories, adaptation, capturing progress; CB need to correspond to flexibility. Capture support aspect related to CB needs.

Ecuador

- Wanted to clarify what position was on Qn2 for combining the sections

New Zealand

- Placeholder approach is a way forward, can incorporate work of SBSTA

- Agree with others that have spoken on Qn 2: one set of guidance being developed and “other Parties..” would be using same set of guidelines on a voluntary basis
- On Qn 3 on guidance for TT and CB want to avoid additional burden on developing country Parties so we should have a simpler approach
- On Qn 4, there is likely to be needed both quantitative and qualitative although not always possible to provide quantitative information in some areas. Narrative may be more appropriate. “flexibility” could well be extended here because of the nature of this issue
- On standardized reporting formats, helps countries focus. Should not be spending time to develop these formats, not by end of this year and can put a place for future work – simply don’t have time to develop tables between now and end of COP24
- On relationship in Qn 2 in Section F, quite relaxed about how this is done; can see benefits of doing it either way. As long as guidance is provided by Parties.

Canada

- Section E, Qn 1, support Approach 1
- Section E, Qn 2, agree with Ecuador on “shall” and “should” apply to within; headers can be merged but bullets may not be able to be merged e.g. those with additional flexibility
- On Section F, confused and made suggestion
- On Section F, Q2, support Approach 2 but to build additional elements to F8; on improvement plan – like to explore that and capacity building needs for implementation and tracking progress and results based...

China

- Affiliate intervention with points made by Ecuador on behalf of LMDC
- Section E, Qn 1, support Approach 1 but interested in hearing a report from SBSTA group to ensure timely input for our work here
- Different legal status on how we should report information. Important to keep mandate here and whether 11.4 needs to be kept is up to the discussions in that room.
- On TT and CB support, agree with previous speakers we need further guidance, so we support Approach 2
- Need to elaborate on other elements e.g. support fulfil developing country needs, best practices, in-kind support above and beyond ODA while avoiding double counting
- Not clear on approaches in the slides on Section F, Qn 1, Approach 1-3.
- CGE’s work is valuable – good to look into the work of the CGE and develop tables at the later stage
- See great differences in content covered by these sections B7, C12 – perceive as CB related to preparing NIR or NDC for implementation or reporting. Very different from what we want to report under F8 on domestic actions addressing climate change. Go for Approach 1 to retain them as they are before we have better understanding of these sub-sections
- On combining sections here, not clear on how to do that as we didn’t have this exercise for previous discussions – combine titles or sections? Better to retain if we didn’t do it for other sections

Japan

- SBSTA inputs
- Obligation difference between “shall” and “should” but all Parties should provide information under the TF, combine headings
- On Qn 4, support Approach 1 on TT and CB.

List of speakers: Egypt, Bhutan...

Co-Facilitator thanked everybody for their inputs and encouraged Parties to send their comments by 4pm today to the email APA-item-7@unfccc.int, and in advance of Monday’s session that will continue looking at Sections E & F.

The informal consultation ended at 1.07pm.