

Sixth 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

Monday, 7 May 2018, 3-6pm, Room Bangkok, SB48

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

APA Informal Informals took place on 7 May 2018 AM, United States reported back:

- Good discussions
- Language, vocabulary, better understanding of terms – indicators, accounting for vs. accounting, how people saw tracking progress process working, APA 3 inputs on ICTU and accounting
- Not the intention to have formal outcome
- Useful in creating understanding about what people meant when talking about certain terms

Speaker list for **E&F**:

Egypt, Bhutan, S Africa, Chile, Brazil, Saudi Arabia, Australia, Norway, Canada, Mexico, Singapore

Procedural points -

Singapore

- G77 & China
- Expressed displeasure on timing cut to 3 hours – 2 hours today and 1 hour tomorrow
- Not what we agreed (5 hours)
- With all the things we need to cover
- Strongly urge, on behalf of the group, to find the timing to discuss remaining issues

Co-Facilitators took note of the concern and said to see what can be discussed in this session and how we can move forward.

China

- LMDC, associate with G77 & China
- Want more clarification on time, didn't have time to discuss adaptation and structuring issue that is important for developing country Parties
- Additional time for adaptation not accepted by other Co-Facilitators
- Deep regret that no balance in issues
- Balanced time allocated to each important Agenda Items

Chile

- AILAC
- Change of time plan is surprising
- The main concern is that we might not have enough time to cover all of the informal note we had planned to in Bonn

Maldives

- AOSIS
- Voice concern with remaining time allocated to go through issues

For Section E&F:

Egypt

- Align with Ecuador
- Qn 1: Can continue deliberation on info to be reported in APA5 and SBSTA agenda item 13
- Qn 2: Focus on original mandate but should be possible option for developing countries; Approach 1, caveat that “shall” must be clear for developed countries and for developing countries should have option to report whatever they want to report
- Qn 3: kept separate; Approach 2
- Qn 4: Support Approach 2 because we currently do not have guidelines for quantitative and qualitative information for TT and CB. Request for mandatory guidelines for developed countries
- Can provide written inputs for what we would like to see for quantitative and qualitative info
- Section F: Qn 1 needs more enhancement, support Approach 2, and new approach to maintain existing guidelines or to use it as starting point and start discussing approach at a later point in time

Bhutan

- LDC Group
- Qn 1: note difference in content discussed in SBSTA and what is discussed here; but support maintaining placeholder
- Qn 3: important to maintain linkage between MPG and Art 11.4 of PA, support Approach 1
- In relation to TT and CB, the approach described in Approach 2 is our preference (tabular formats)
- Section F: difficult for us to see which approach to support, aware of needs and priorities for submission / reporting format but wanted to underline we need to take into account capacity and circumstances of LDCs to avoid undue additional burden for reporting additional information
- On Qn 2: we think that Approach 1 between B7 and C12 is our preference

South Africa

- On behalf of African Group
- Qn 1: work is currently being done in Art 9.7 SBSTA and will directly flow into our work, no need to duplicated but there are elements to consider e.g. process, no underlying set of methodologies for review process and for reporting under this item
- Qn 2: MPGs for developed and other Parties – we don’t need any specific flexibility, we should use the term “should” for developing Parties
- Qn 3: mandate / requirement to report under Art. 11 has no corresponding mandate under PAWP, basically fulfilled under APA 5 – see a reference, most efficient way, note that transparency arrangements – difference in reporting by developed countries and voluntary reporting by developing countries should be mirrored
- On Qn 4: TT and CB – necessary to have qualitative and quantitative information

- On Section F: Qn 1: facilitative, see merit in developing current guidelines, reporting tables will be useful, see merit in developing CGE tables; taking into account experiences by developing countries
- Qn 2: suggest different approach – captured in Section F.10 in the informal note – support for CB for reporting, specific ref to Art. 13 in continuing support.... Important to report specifically and in detail in MPGs. This may require additional CRF tables in addition to Art 9.7 discussions.

Chile

- AILAC
- Qn 1: Agree with approach proposed, key to avoid duplication of discussions between APA 5 and SBSTA on this issue
- Discussions on financial requirements for CB and TT are demanding but work is in SBSTA and just a link and transfer would be sufficient; but need to translate that work into reporting guidelines
- Account for resources for CB support; if needed, group should identify any additional issues
- Qn 2: we think that we should be guided by principle of consistency to have a clear idea of global financial flows and ensure consistency; structure and content of MPG for support should mirror structure of MPGs we design for developed country Parties however given the different circumstances and capacities , see need for flexibility regarding those guidelines
- Qn 3: need more discussion
- Qn 4: we prefer working around Approach 2 because on TT and CB, there's still a lot of work to do to improve info and guidelines of support
- Really addressing needs of countries, collective long-term goal
- For qualitative information, could include link to the stage of policies and measures rolled out, for quantitative, can explore investments and timelines
- Section F, Qn 1: experience is to work with CTF; Approach 3 would work but can have discussion around what kind of info can be reported under that
- Qn 2: Approach 2, info into F.8 – to ensure coherence within components of ETF

Brazil

- Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay
- Qn 1: avoid undue duplication and prejudgment of outcomes, keep position that placeholder should be kept here and E.5 has 2 key elements 1) voluntary request 2) flexibility provision
- Qn 2: support Approach 2, built in flexibility
- Qn 3: support Approach 2, MPGs do not reference Art 11.4, do not have mandate to elaborate MPGs on this issue
- Qn 4: support Approach 2, necessary to have quantitative and qualitative information; being negotiated under Agenda 14a under SBI so support placeholder to be kept here
- Section F: support no tables; Voluntary nature, avoid additional burden, should keep parameters as they are
- Qn 2: more clarity needed on CB elements, placeholder needed here

Saudi Arabia

- Arab Group
- Section E, Q1: different content being discussed and our agenda; important we don't half discussions
- Q2: other Parties info is voluntary and not comparable to developed countries; could have additional Approach here
- Qn 3: Approach 2
- Qn 4: Approach 2, mindful that we need to capture "shalls" and "should"
- Section F, supportive of Approach 2, using tables already developed will be useful
- Qn 2: Approach 1
- Overarching approaches – useful to capture here as well

Australia

- Section E, Qn 1: agree to maintain placeholder here for work underway in SBSTA 13, can incorporate work here by reference
- Qn 2: useful to have some guidance here, but to include only E4, E6 and E8
- Qn 3: capacity building support provided, additional specific guidance not provided
- Difficult to separate; include check-box in table developed
- Lack of guidance in his section
- Qn 2: retain B7, C12 for now

Norway

- Agree with those who have asked for more time
- ...
- Qn 3: Approach 1
- Qn 4: TT and CB, Approach 1
- Section F: CTF

Canada provided clarification for Section E. New approach.

Mexico

- Section E, Qn 4: support Approach 2

Section B: National Inventory report on anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks of greenhouse gases

Egypt

- Sectors and Gases: support Approach 4
- Time Series: no backsliding, developed vs. developing countries, X-4 for inventory year but should not be obliged to provide full time series
- For Frequency, no backsliding so Approach 1, and Approach 3 – biennial with condition of provision of support
- For NIR submission vehicle

- Approach i, Approach ii, Approach iii

Australia

- On IPCC guidelines, support 2006 guidelines including supplements and further ones adopted by CMA
- On sectors and gases, prefer Approach 1 but see merits in Approach 2; don't see Approach 3 as standalone, but can sit under Approach 2; Approach 4 not seen as applicable
- For time series, don't see Approaches as mutually exclusive; for countries already provided time series continue to do so e.g. from 1990
- For end of time series, we really only see Approach 1 since 4 year old data is not useful for Parties to track progress
- ..
- Submission format, value in standalone report. Own experience, information quite distinct. Useful to have sector expert dedicated team to pull info together. Information from inventory feeds into other areas. Merit in separating timeframe of those 2 sections.

Brazil

- Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay
- General comments that have been sent via email
- On methodologies (B.4.a), all can be merged, keep existing arrangements; many developing countries are already combining 1996 and 2006 guidelines and we have to recognize we don't have this binary approach you have listed; more complex or combination approaches used by Parties
- Flexibility – for us not about the tiers the IPCC guidelines have embedded; we foresee more than just choosing the different tiers
- Barriers and constraints in the full use of IPCC guidelines – don't see this as a mandatory reporting requirement for developing country Parties; these may be some elements Parties will discuss with TER team
- Needs to be discussed with CB needs
- On sectors and gases, flexibility aspect – don't see it as a pick-and-choose approach, we need to make sure that when we write MPG for this section, flexibility provision is there
- Parties may “downgrade” to Tier 1 and in future come back to Tier 2 depending on CB
- On time series, flexibility provision – consistent with national capacities and data availability. Difficulties is in finding activity data consistent with IPCC 2006 guidelines. Even where there are tools available and guidance to overcome gaps in time series, sometimes there are still big gaps and we need to think about giving flexibility to developing countries
- CRF developed by Secretariat
- Difficult learning process in some cases (developing country Parties) – see difficulties in using electronic / CRF by Secretariat

China

- On behalf of LMDC

- On Section B approaches – challenging to comment on them as they are not what we should be discussing but rather who and legal status
- Need general approach at beginning such as using current guidelines as starting point to cover following sub-sections
- On sub-titles, on methodologies, developing countries can use 2001 or 2006 and Approach 2 for developing country Parties as a mandatory; not both IPCC guidelines are already being used by some developing country Parties
- On Sectors and Gases, Approach 1. Approach 2 (3 gases at minimum but still need wording like “as appropriate” or “to the extent possible” as in NC guidelines), Approach 4 (B6, B11) don’t see this applicable to developing country Parties as mandatory – could be encouragement but not mandatory. Some merits in Approach 3 but B6 and B8, we don’t think that specific reference can be supported as it may mean once it is included it has to be continued, as this needs to respect the dynamic nature of NDCs
- On Time Series, ... want to add new approach on self-determined, as appropriate as some Parties may not like to start in 1990 or 2010, some Parties may want to start in their own base year selection; differentiation in Approaches for developed and developing countries; no backsliding
- We don’t think time series shall be mandatory but developing country Parties shall report if you report in previous years
- On Frequency B9 and B16 – like to see reference to B16 as well. For developed, Approach 1; developing Approach 3 biennially but add “as appropriate” like in para 90 in Decision 1/CP.21 and include contingency on support provided.
- On NIR, developed countries should continue to submit stand-alone report. Concerns on B.9.6 – don’t want this reference; level of detail of reporting should be accorded flexibility in para 89 of Decision 1/CP.21 for developing country Parties
- Confused on mode of work – not helpful in achieving what we need to.

Maldives

- On use of IPCC guidelines, combination of Approach 1 and 3; mentioned developing countries can strive... mention CBIT
- Approach 2, 3 and 4 not mutually exclusive from Approach 1; distinction between national circumstances and constraints
- On start year, should be combination of Approach 1 and 2. For those who started in 1990, no backsliding; for the rest, base year of NDC

Canada

- Parties could use 2006 IPCC software, requires limited country data
- Prioritizing improvements, important to increase coverage than to insist use of Tier 2 methodologies
- Key category analysis
- Regarding time series, support Approach 1. Flexibility for developing country Parties in light of national capacities - no later than base year
- ...

- On frequency, combination of Approach 1 and 2, Parties encouraged to report annually over time, biennial reporting could be one of flexibility parameters
- NIR vehicle or format, support Approach 1
- Value of improvement plans/planned improvements, demonstrates progress is planned. Ok to not have perfect coverage at start as long as country can show progress or improvements.

United States

- Also see need to begin by reporting data that is as good as we have and improve over time
- Speak to general approaches on screen and not specific numbers
- 2006 IPCC guidelines and CMA adopted ones – 13.7.a good practice methodologies
- Recognize 2006 guidelines accommodate different capacities
- On sectors and gases, see Approach 1 being relevant. Note to think in terms of key categories and possibility to discuss lower thresholders; not same burden on all sectors that were not key categories
- Flexibility e.g. later start year, or if data didn't exist. No later than previously reported data or reference / base year
- End year of time series – x-2 for effective tracking and feed into GST
- Submission process and reporting formats – biennial can be least frequent time, Parties should be encouraged to move to annual over time
- Part 1 and Part 2 of biennial reports – discussion we can have later

Saudi Arabia

- Arab Group
- More helpful to structure approaches based on identifying who would apply MPGs and legal language
- Useful to have overarching approach rather than this structure
- Bullets 3 and 4 under Section B – extremely helpful to identify what applies to developed and developing countries
- B.4.a – all the approaches may be relevant depending on who is applying them e.g. Approach 1 – developed and Approach 2 – developing, etc.

Marshall Islands

- Only on IPCC Guidelines
- Want to move towards latest guidelines, and to facilitate that, would make it easier domestically to have the expectation that that is what's needed – useful for all Parties

Turkey

- IPCC: Approach 1, flexibilities already defined in guidelines
- Sectors and gases: Approach 1 more useful, recognize possible need for transition period, planned improvement
- Time Series: acknowledge transition period, Approach 1 suitable for start and end years

Norway

- Flexibility will need to be addressed
- Norway's preferences: IPCC: Approach 1, Sectors and Gases: Approach 1, Start and end year: Approach 1, on frequency, Approach 1 & 3 combination and NIR also Approach 1 & 3 combination

Switzerland

- EIG
- Aim of this session is to look at aim of approaches and see if they capture element in the informal note well
- Will not repeat preference, suggest reason the submission
- IPCC: Approach 1; Approach 3 is part of Approach 2 and can be merged
- Start and end years: depending on the IPCC guidelines used; many years have gaps in time series and difficult for them to retrieve this data and will need to come back on this issue

Chile

- AILAC
- Developing country Parties will need flexibility to implement MPGs
- Like to see one set of MPGs for this Section
- Sectors and gases: Approach 1
- Start year for time series: if possible move towards 1990
- End year: Approach 3
- Coverage: Approach 1
- On submission process, combination of Approach 2 and 3 but want to move towards annual frequency over time
- On vehicle/format, see value in countries moving to stand-alone reports over time

European Union

- 2006 IPCC Guidelines and more recent guidelines adopted by CMA, and flexibility for developing country Parties in light of their capacities + 2006 IPCC wetlands guidelines
- Gases in all NDCs – Approach 3, flexibilities for those developing countries that need it in light of their capacities e.g. if gases have already been reported in previous reports.
- Wrt to time series, support 1990 but see flexibility through Approach 4 but that would not be the only flexibility approach necessarily; see missing: start year of NDC being important for time series and not reflected in any approach here
- Similar situation that Approaches not mutually exclusive – useful to structure the informal note here
- X-2 approach and apply Approach 3 (X-4) in applying flexibility. Mindful of data availability.
- On submission process and reporting format – support Approach 3 biennially with understanding of no backsliding and that developed countries will continue annual inventory reporting. Not clear on what biennial/annual is referring to in terms of reporting.
- Part of Biennial Transparency Report (BTR) and Where there is no BTR, a stand-alone report
- Only address format but not timing of submission but that comes in next Section but that maybe somehow linked

Bhutan

- LDCs
- IPCC Guidelines – support Approach 1, but B.4.a.2 is captured as Approach 2 but ok to be captured in Approach 1
- Frequency, combination of Approach 1 and 2, should not be less than biennially
- Light revised document – in original B.7.6. CBIT and other relevant agencies to provide CB support for continuity of inventory data – now being moved to A.9.1 – like to request to bring back to original place

Japan

- Common MPGs
- GHG inventory in some developing country Parties have already used 2006 IPCC guidelines
- All gases to be covered – some countries find it difficult but all should be required to support improvement
- Common MPGs – all from 1990 but difficult to go back to 1990 depending on data availability
- End year of time series: support X-2, unless constraints experiences. If so, explanation required and how to improve.
- On process: Approach 1 continual annual reporting, useful and helpful for GST

South Africa

- General remarks on the incorporation of flexibility in the GHGI – we see MPGs as being a single set of MPGs
- Range of flexibility span current set of guidelines, need to fully implement current arrangements ... improvements
- Use of flexibility selected as appropriate, should be provided in table and provided to TER
- Provision of flexibility to be provided to TER process
- Role of CGE
- On relationship, NDC & GHGI tracking of progress – occurs at different points
- IPCC guidelines: combination of Approaches 1 & 3
- CBIT, CGE in transitioning to newer guidelines
- S. Africa using 2006 guidelines – important to recognize that combination of guidelines are already being used by developing country Parties; important to accommodate that moving forward
- All 7 gases, with flexibility according to availability of data
- For time series, start year current practice of 1990 should be maintained; flexibility – full time series from 2020 and report back as much as national circumstances and capacities allow.
- X-2 for developed, X-4 for developing, encouraged to report more recent data
- Current practice – encouraged to produce annual
- Depending on APA 3, Section C of informal note outcomes
- Current practice of BTRs annually by developed country Parties
- Vehicle: continued practice of stand-alone inventory reports, for developing country BTR plus standalone if it is their preference

Indonesia

- On methodologies, Approach 1 2006; wetlands should also be mentioned here
- Sector and Gases: Approach 2; 3 gases minimum and others subject to capacity building and tech transfer and finance
- Time Series start year: Combination of Approach 2 and 1; consistency – sectors already provided in 1990 but those with limitations on data availability they can use whatever is available for time being
- Time Series end year: Approach 3, direction of X-2 but transition time period has to be considered to achieve X-2
- Coverage of time series: Approach 3: base year and NDC reference year
- Submission process and reporting format, in terms of Frequency: Approach 2 but those who have done annually can continue
- For NIR, biennial but those who have annual can continue to submit annually
- More direct and ambition situation. Flexibility would be our concern as well. Transition period may be necessary.

India

- As mentioned by China and Saudi Arabia, would like to discuss “who” and which provisions apply to developed and developing country Parties
- Methodologies: Approach 1 and wetlands; Approach 2 for developing countries and support of CBIT
- Sectors and gases: Approach 1 for developed and combination with Approach 3 including precursors in NDCs, for developing countries Approach 4 because of lack of capacities
- Time Series: Approach 1 for developed, 1990; Approach 4 for developing
- End year of Time Series: Approach 1 for developed and Approach 2 for developing
- Frequency, Approach 1 for developed and Approach 3 for developing
- NIR submission vehicle/format, Approach 1 for developed and Approach 3 for developing

New Zealand

- Step back
- GHGI not to create problems and burdens for Parties
- Important component of Parties’ understanding of their own domestic emissions to formulate policies and measures and look at what next NDC could consist of – vital domestically and internationally so we can all understand how we are doing

Israel

- Best we can do, with understanding that flexibility is available
- Desirability for best, moving towards Approach 1/improvements
- Reporting requirements that of Annex I Parties. Set expectations.
- Overriding aim to set the expectations.
- All Approach 1 except for availability of data

Brazil

- 3 quick comments
- Lack of understanding when people say developed countries should continue to report annually – clear under Convention that doesn't matter what we decide under PA, under the Convention, developed countries already expected to report NIR annually
- On IPCC Guidelines, the world is not as binary as described as many developing countries already using both guidelines in combination
- Preferred approaches? Rational behind preferences
- How to move forward?

Egypt

- Not question on which preference but need to understand different starting points

Section A: Overarching considerations and guiding principles

Co-Facilitator invited comments on visual tool prepared for Section A.

For APA agenda item 5 – section **A** visual tool, please click [here](#)

Brazil

- We foresee role of CGE under the PA – would like to see mention for CMA adoption
- On CMA or COP decision on BR/BURs – not sure if we can include, depends on pre-2020 for developed countries.
- For final BUR, difficult to say when would be the last one since we all started at different times; some of us still preparing our first BUR and depends on finance and support. Sometimes tricky.
- On FMCP, process and steps will be decided based on the last BUR – as a consequence of what is inside the MPGs
- “superseded” – not elements, but all (existing UNFCCC MRV system) – clarification on why “elements” used
- NIR – clarification needed – what happens in terms of the review process needed?
- Procedural linkage between Art. 13 and UNFCCC reporting and review

Egypt

- A most problematic, need to be addressed
- Need to look at last two bullets for COP/CMA decision

New Zealand

- On elements on COP/CMA decision – comprehensive list of what should be there
- What's missing is what would go in a preamble, because it sets the context of what we are agreeing e.g. first Biennial Transparency Report
- May want to call to attention flexibility
- Continuous improvement

European Union

- Elements of the COP and/or CMA decisions adopting the MPGs – missing: don't have section on COP/CMA decision – hope to see in next iteration of informal note
- Already pretty comprehensive list of elements
- Have not thought of preambular language – every decisions has it – something we need to think about
- Need to think about final submission of BRs and BURs and the procedural linkage between Art 13 and UNFCCC reporting and review
- Link to CBIT, CB – some missing elements
- Element we would not see in cover decision – mandate for TER report; in the past was dealt with the UNFCCC Secretariat and discussed in lead reviewers meeting and that way of developing report and outline of key elements were in MPGs or review guidelines already...
- Section A on flexibility, not necessary to have separate heading in MPGs but should be implemented to individual provisions to MPGs, would be ok with New Zealand's suggestion

Bhutan

- On behalf of LDCs
- In terms of Q1, in previous sections in past few days of engagement, provided description and how it can be operationalized but looking at this tool, may need further work to tease out line-by-line. Not quite convinced on what is being proposed here.
- On Qn 2, couple of things that need to be added on the list: 1) reference to principles agreed under PA and Decision 1/CP.21, 2) flexibilities

United States

- A1,A6, A7 important to capture in MPGs, not necessarily as headings and also used differently as headings
- Do agree that some of the items in A9 most relevant to COP/CMA decisions
- A2-6 useful elements as we develop MPGs but not entirely clear all needs to be reflected as text language
- A lot of items would go into decisions – note that COP and CMA had different mandates so have to be careful which would go into COP and which into CMA decisions
- Call to Parties to nominate experts to Roster of Experts – as Parties have noted that there would be a need for more reviewers
- Clarity on last BR/BURs, NC updated guidelines – need more thought for guidelines to supersede
- Procedural issue: currently a REDD+ technical annex to BR/BURs – if UNFCCC MRV arrangements were to be superseded, the technical annex would have to be attached
- Clarity on last BR/BUR and start of BTRs
- Avoid duplication and undue burden important to keep
- Important to capture flexibility here – in light of capacities, apply to relevant provisions, note limitations to timing on those provisions, to whom (categories or criteria) these flexibility provisions should apply
- Updated training materials
- Mandate to Secretariat to publish reports received from Parties and TER reports

Co-Facilitator closed the speaker list to share plan for tomorrow.

Speakers list: Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Australia, China, Egypt, Chile, S. Africa, Canada, Switzerland, Japan

- Informal consultation tomorrow from 3-4pm and will take up Item D: Adaptation.
- Joint informal consultation with APA Agenda Items 4 and 5 tomorrow at 10-11am.
- Tomorrow night Co-Facilitators intend to publish a new iteration of Co-Facilitators' informal note.
- Will work with APA Co-Chairs to accommodate Parties' request to engage on the republished Co-Facilitators' informal note.

Egypt sought clarification on Section C's deadline for written inputs. Co-Facilitator said midnight today would be OK.

Brazil sought clarification on the mode of work. Noted that Section C is a different animal, keen to work with colleagues to send something for Co-Facilitators to capture, like an additional approach. Pointed out that Parties didn't really engage on the elements as most of it was on picking-and-choosing the preferred approaches.

Co-Facilitator said that informal note will be in two documents 1) light revision and 2) capturing changes like an Appendix.

China sought clarification on joint session with APA Agenda Item 4, and the remaining hour on Section D. Asked if we might continue after Section A speaker list, before proceeding to D. Inf-inf – didn't have chance to talk about way forward and capturing each other's' opinions. Asked Co-Facilitators if there was space and opportunity for inf-inf tomorrow.

Saudi Arabia thanked Co-Facilitator for the way forward. Said that once light revision was published, had sent in some notes. Would like to see reference to that notes being captured. On Section C – informal-informals were helpful but didn't get to talk about approaches – want to understand how that would be reflected, don't want to have a tool that we weren't a part of.

Co-Facilitator said that they would have to consult with APA Co-Chairs, could find some time enough time and space to complete the work.. in terms of Saudi Arabia's points, take note of them in terms of how we are thinking about it. Note that we don't have to resolve everything today, can take it up tomorrow.

The informal consultation ended at 6.15pm.