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, 4-6pm, Chamber Hall, SB48

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

The meeting began at 4pm.

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

Australia

… (sorry arrived slightly late and didn't catch what was said)

European Union

- NDC based on specific guidance
- Do not see description of NDCs as we see this in MPGs identical to document online. Parts of the *ex-ante* information in the planning process in the NDC – fair & ambition, contributing to objective of PA but not for tracking of progress; here we see only info relevant for tracking of progress
- In MPGs, indicate several targets in NDCs e.g. quantified economy-wide target and policies & measures supporting that target – this section is where Parties clarify status of elements
- Support Approaches 3,4 and 5 – approaches may not be covering all that we need; e.g. self-defined indicator would not work for certain targets
- Most important indicator for tracking progress would be total emissions and removals – deleted from revised streamline note; or at least it is now shortened in a way I consider unrecognizable, hope to have it back
- Section C.4 is now with heading "Specific guidance", perhaps can have sub-headings to structure content in those parts
- Section 4 heading information "Tracking of progress …"

- Wrt Qn 3 on projects, would support Approach 2 but recognize different capacities of Parties, maybe an Approach 4 missing here (Approach 2 plus flexibility for developing countries in light of their capacities)
- On Information on accounting and Article 6 (C.4, C.5, C.9 and C.10) – need cross-reference from APA Agenda item 3 and Article 6
- Need to look back at a later stage

Brazil

- Speaking on behalf of Brazil, Argentina and Uruguay
- Don't see this mode of work as picking and choosing approaches. By no means we agree with approach you have described; we have a different way to organize but not saying you have to change the way you're doing things but make sure people understand that the way they engage with this exercise, by no means we agree this is the approach we will use to develop the MPGs
- There is at least in this session an important omission; for us C.3 and C.4, one of the approaches needs to capture the notion of the placeholders for Article 6
- Explained the position on this
- Art 4.13 – at least 3 layers of reporting requirements: 1) Account for NDC (set of information including indicators), 2) Account for emissions and removals in relation to NDC i.e. GHG inventory or sector related inventory, 3) Article 6 approaches but applies only to those of us who choose to engage with Art 6.2 (particularly on what we call corresponding adjustment)
- Not possible to have any meaningful discussion without having connection with Art 4.13
- Projections are not applicable to all Parties – here can say developed countries should continue to provide projections (since already included in Biennial Reports) and developing countries can choose if they want to provide projections

Egypt

- Associate statement with Brazil
- Linked to Art 6 SBSTA discussions
- Should wait for output from other agenda items; not sure why we have different treatment compared to Section E (this morning)
- If we are to provide comments on specific issues starting with description of Parties' NDC, a general description is enough – support Approach 1 or 2
- Need another Approach to be waiting for outcome of Agenda item 3 – see this as Approach 5
- Should discuss what to do when Parties decide not to use guidance
- Confused between Sections C4 and C5 – titles were different; merged in discussion? Asked for clarity from Co-Facilitators
- Add Approach 4 for using existing guidelines for accounting

Co-Facilitator noted that for this issue, approaches were difficult compared to FMCP issue but useful discussion thus far.

China

- Echo position presented by Brazil
- Need to wait for output for Agenda Item 3 and request to have a placeholder there

- Some approaches are not exclusive to each other while some do not capture original intention, request for you to make them more clearly presented
- Do not want to prejudge any outcome from APA 3 especially the scope of NDC
- Don't want to stop our work here and so maybe we can talk about describing Parties' NDC
- C3 and C4 – recognize that some NDCs do not have targets
- We don't think Approach 3 is workable and cannot develop specific guidance to accommodate all different types of NDC and have to respect dynamic nature of NDCs and different types of NDCs may be submitted
- Confusing for title of C4 and its relationship with C5
- New approach to be added: have to be coordinated and consistent with APA 3
- Share concerns raised by Egypt for no backsliding, so add approach to use UNFCCC existing guidelines
- Need inputs from SBSTA on ITMOs then we can work on reporting format
- Like to send further written inputs on how to revise approaches at later stage

Saudi Arabia

- On behalf of Arab Group
- Agree with other that some approaches are missing, will try to be specific
- Wrt description of a Party's NDC (C.3), likewise can work with Approach 1 but see that 3.3 may not be consistent or if its referencing C3.1;
- Wrt to Approach 2, we can work with that but don't want to prejudge scope of NDC being decided at APA3 but we think that approach can be further elaborated by linking it to C3.4
- Don't think we can work with Approach 3 – agree with others on if it would be applicable to all NDCs
- Wrt to progress made, for us Approach 2 may be a way forward but want further clarity by adding qualitative and or quantitative information, as appropriate & maintain differentiation
- Can add Approach 6, consistent with APA 3 outputs
- Comments on sub-category in C.4 – not of view that we can use current specific clustering that talks about indicators to track progress – indicative of all types of NDCs and specific guidance – all bullets under that can go above
- Wrt C.8, like to add Approach here on using existing guidance… not applicable to developing country Parties, not mandatory
- Wrt to Art 6 linkages, useful to separate them; can clarify Approach 1 to say "incorporate outputs"
- Because C.9 is included, can say this section is not relevant to MPGs

Republic of Korea

- C.3 – approaches are not mutually exclusive but can support Approach 3
- C.3.5 Adaptation etc. can be moved to other
- C.3.1 not enough, reports need to be readable and more info than link is needed
- Public registry must be further elaborated
- C.3.2 how much Parties should report and what need to be elaborated
- C.3.11

- C.3.4 guidance not information should be moved to general principles
- C.4 difference between approaches not mutually exclusive – Approach 3 acceptable for EIG but stress that things are mutually exclusive here; qualitative and quantitative are important here
- C.4.15 should be moved to C.6 – propose to move to columns if using box
- C.4.16 – not clear if this is related to just land or general projection/reporting and if latter, moved to C.8; report core number under C.3
- C.4.22 according to current methodologies, concern with what can be reported under C.9 – like to remove C.9 from MPG
- C.4.6 – flexible base year – concern – need to be elaborated
- Approach 1 and 4 want to avoid using "general" and "comprehensive" in Approach 4
- C.8 projections useful, contextual for developing understanding over time support Approach 2
- Info from accounting in Art 6 – propose that we should not make any kind of pre-judgement of name and content of guidance under APA 3
- We do not believe people here copy and paste, more elaboration needed on items

United States

- General caveat – making effort to talk to general concept but doesn't mean we agree with every word and point in informal note
- Approaches not mutually exclusive, some combination of Approach 1, 2 and 3 – we think you would have just a few pieces of info 1) economy-wide or not 2) sectors, gases, definitions 3) baseline, reference, parameters, assumptions, 4) target type, policies and measures, or other as self-defined by Party and other info as necessary and 5) date of end of NDC, 6) quantified achievement of NDC e.g. %, or completion achievement if policy & measure, 7) expected use of ITMOs
- Additional info: 1) Accounting approach, 2) baselines, and 3) how double counting was avoided
- If good info provided upfront of NDC that would be easier
- Combination of Approaches 1, 2, 4 and 5; 3 not necessarily well defined here – could be the way we are speaking differently about indicators e.g. on basis of MW or GHG reductions or Hectares etc. all indicators to track progress. Don't think very feasible to negotiate a menu of indicators, because it would also apply to first NDCs and they have already been applied.
- ITMOs guidance would have to be consistent with outcomes from SBSTA discussions
- On projections: Caveats – imagine to be general provision, not specific on methodology as it should be able to capture different ways to do projections and not what you use to measure/not held accountable to specific sets of projections
- Work from APA 3 will be relevant in allowing Parties to show how they have followed guidance from SBSTA on NDCs, ITMOs – placeholder or copy & paste fine but have to have reference there

Chile

- On behalf of AILAC
- Approach 3 – like the idea of self-contained tracking of NDC but other elements from other approaches can also be included

- Wrt progress made for achieving NDC – rather than focusing on better and best info, … link and reference to link and reference can be put under Approach 3 in order to be consistent with the agenda
- Projections are useful and in tracking progress of NDC – don't see that as separate
- Yes projections can be modelled in different way but taking effort to model is not only important for transparency but also planning of proper policies – looking backwards and also how are we doing
- Regarding last point on Accounting in Art 6 – we do know interlinkages here; Approach 2 looks a good fit but probably the elements here from APA3 or SBSTA – need to elaborate and clarify and info may not necessarily come from APA3 and SBSTA so combination of Approaches 2 and 3 could be best way forward
- General comment: preference for trying to get best info for report but in looking for transparency as the main goal, and from our own experience producing and publishing that information will help domestic policies and help advance climate action

Bhutan

- On behalf of LDCs
- Projections – useful for understanding NDCs of Parties, many LDCs try to provide projections in current NDCs but for many of us we have flexibility and submission of projections could be additional burden to us; special situation of LDCs should be taken into account
- Art 6 – some combination of Approaches 1 & 2 but think there is space in this room to have some discussion on accounting

Maldives

- On behalf of AOSIS
- On description of Parties NDCs, prefer Approach 3 – consistency, adjustment or changes relevant should also be clearly identified
- On progress made, we favor Approach 3 with quantitative and qualitative and info in MPGs; track progress toward quantitative and qualitative goals including mitigation actions where relevant
- Don't believe Approaches 4 and 5 could be used as tools under Approach 3
- On projections, favor Approach 2 but wish to highlight same point by Bhutan for LDCs on projected end points – useful for tracking progress, Global Stocktake etc. should not include LULUCF
- Info should identify and confirm that in Art 4.13,14 – no preference but can be confirmation between Approach 1 and 2

New Zealand

- Description of NDC – like other groups, we think Approach 3 is useful – for TER to have info all in one place than seeking it elsewhere
- …

- Flexibility in light of capacities can be extended but important to recall what the US said that these are projections and no predications of the future, but tools to see how you're doing and prepare the next NDC – useful regardless of any NDC type
- On Art 6 and accounting issue, we would see an approach along lines of Approach 2 but wouldn't see this as a placeholder/ incorporation by reference; may need to have some specific guidance but given the way we are working and given the late stage of the way we are working, incorporating guidance by reference for APA3 and SBSTA will allow those rooms to know that work here depends on theirs
- Agree that necessary for Parties to provide info for accounting approach for first NDC – Approach 3 under description of NDC comes into play

Norway

- CTU important to track progress – Approach 2 and 3 useful, including some content of C.3.5 and C.3.10
- Some indicators may not be relevant for all NDCs
- Wrt projections, important part of reporting
- Accounting in Art 6, need to see outcomes of APA 3 and SBSTA

Japan

- Description of NDC – most recent NDC including info to facilitate CTU; future NDC to be consistent with ICTU guidance
- Wrt tracking progress of NDC, important for Parties to provide information to track progress/achievement of NDC; info reported should be as quantifiable as possible based on type of NDC chosen
- Projections – essential, Approach 2 seems useful
- Accounting in Art 6, avoid duplication of work, consistent with SBSTA output

Costa Rica

- Associate with Chile for AILAC
- …
- Projections applicable, important

Indonesia

- Combination of Approach 1 and 2 but if Approach 2, clear that needs to be included in summary
- Art 4 – prefer Approach 3 without C.4.16 (to be excluded)
- On projections, prefer Approach 2
- Accounting in Art 6, Approach 3 appropriate

South Africa

- On behalf of African Group
- Agree with what others have said on the linkages with other groups
- Description of NDC, information included in MPGs, we think that the only 2 sets of info are necessary 1) clarity on NDC target(s), 2) information necessary to track progress

- Approach 3 – diversity of NDCs involves whole range of indicators difficult to define
- …

Brazil

- Divergence of views
- Need to clarify way forward

Saudi Arabia

- Want clarity on what submissions would look like – specific or with respect what we discussed today to help guide discussions going forward
- Ideas going around the room:
    - Having space to discuss implementation – tracking progress
    - Projections – important issues to stress here is to not infringe on self-determined nature of NDCs; need to design for everyone and not for some types of NDCs only

European Union

- Mandate in Art 13, para 7b clear that MPGs should include info necessary…
    - If we should only made reference to accounting guidance… then that para would be written differently
    - Clear mandate it would need to provide these types of requirements
- From conversation we have had, some of the language on self-defined indicators is not very precise and leads to misunderstandings… self-defined in NDCs or in progress – good to think about improved language that avoids that this can be interpreted in different ways

United States

- Point similar to what EU mentioned
- We are talking about different language, may make it seem we are further apart than we are
- Common language or agreement on approaches
- Informal discussions or in any different settings would be helpful before we come back again

Brazil

- We should start discussion on the mandate – it is clear
- Trying to identify what we have to have in the whole MPG, taking into account all of Art 13, the "shalls" and "should" but need to take into account we are not working in isolation to other discussions

China

- Regret that NDC colleagues are having informal informals now and cannot be a part of this discussion

Co-Facilitators said that this discussion was very useful, heard more clarifying questions than any other discussions. There is clearly a need for Parties to seek clarification from each other. Have heard request for possible joint sessions or additional coordination with APA 3, will pass on request to APA Co-Chairs and see how they respond to that. In terms of kinds of specific next steps coming out of this evening's session, a bit more time for Parties to confer with each other would be useful before re-issuing any notes. Inputs by midnight tomorrow. Revised note by Monday.

Co-Facilitator addressed Saudi Arabia's point, to get more granularity in discussion and input. Seek to characterize input to how they view the approaches. Encouraged to add additional approaches if current approaches are inadequate. Re-characterize approaches or put new ones – C3 and C5.

European Union

- Additional rooms for Monday to have discussions?

Brazil also sought clarification on mode of work. Chile sought clarification on next steps.

Co-Facilitators mentioned next steps:

- Monday, 7 May – 3 hours from 3-6pm (E & F then B, A)
- Tuesday, 8 May – 3-5pm (A,D, other items)

Saudi Arabia asked for clarification on work on Section C, and if we expect to see tool for entire Section C or just those sub-sections captured on the slide. Get clarity on potential output of informal informals as suggested.

Co-Facilitator noted that informal informals would first be reported to informal consultation before capturing any progress. Normal reporting channels.

Co-Facilitator thanked everybody for their inputs and encouraged Parties to continue consulting with each other before Monday

The informal consultation ended at 6.06pm.