

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

Tuesday, 8 May 2018, 3-5pm, Chamber Hall, SB48

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

Materials for discussion for joint informal consultations on APA items 4 and 5 are available [here](#)

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

Section D: Information related to climate change impacts and adaptation under Article 7 of the Paris Agreement

Ecuador

- LMDC
- Need space and room, and time
- Sought clarification on how/when to revisit this issue in Bangkok or COP24

Co-Facilitator clarified that Parties will decide at a later stage.

New Zealand

- This morning's joint informal consultation valuable
- Approach 1: Article 13.8 MPGs and adaptation communication guidance are related, such that high-level, non-prescriptive guidance should be developed by APA Item 4 that can then be incorporated into the MPGs.
- Don't see a line drawn between what has happened in the past and what will happen in the future
- Whichever vehicle (NCs, AC...) would be able to tell a complete story
- Development of guidance should be entrusted to Agenda Item 4
- On loss and damage, don't think that having MPGs would be in the scope quite clearly

Uruguay

- On behalf of Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay
- Our views this morning not quite reflected in updated Section D visual tool
- Progress in APA 4 in terms of suggested elements, and specific structure of elements
- Work in APA 5 are related to that progress; what we need to have is placeholders for bringing this information and structure to APA 5
- Not just needing to park discussion but relationship between progress noted
- List of elements from Art 13 transparency perspective – might find some specific guidance
- Need to have space in APA 5 to deal with guidance and progress made in APA 4

Saudi Arabia

- Arab Group
- Joint session earlier extremely useful, hope to see more of that in future

- Approach 4: resulting in mitigation co-benefits which can be reported under 13.7.b

Egypt

- Expressed views in morning session but will repeat again
- APA 4 – ex ante information related to NDCs and APA 5 focus on reporting on implementation
- Align with LMDC statement, Approach 3 is appropriate and Approach 4 suggested by Saudi Arabia for Arab Group acceptable as well
- On information relation to loss and damage, Approach 1

United States

- Useful morning session
- In one place, prefer the APA 4 experts develop one set of adaptation communication guidance
- China's interesting suggestion this morning, however it is done/work divided up, don't need to prejudge outcomes of each room, so can proceed that way as suggested
- On 13.7, loss and damage, think this is outside the scope of 13.8 – carefully negotiated in Paris, note that Art 8 is not referenced anywhere in Art 13, don't see it bringing it in MPGs, but recognize Parties might feel it is relevant in reporting adaptation and vulnerabilities

China

- Helpful discussion morning, look forward to having more discussions like that in future
- Question here is whether we develop guidance in two rooms or in one room
- Agree with New Zealand on difficulty to draw line between ex ante and ex post – whichever way they are reported it to be done in a comprehensive way
- But still helpful to divide the work between APA 4 and 5 – perhaps ex ante and ex post is a helpful way, and maybe we can do so with adaptation experts since they may have a different understanding with people here and APA 4
- Important not to prejudge outcomes, when we have negotiated, we can come together and decide what to do with each set out outcomes/guidance
- Already have good foundations on guidelines in regard to adaptation e.g. NCs – can already start work

European Union

- EU prefers that adaptation experts look at entire part of adaptation information in one context and in conjunction with all the elements; that would present a more comprehensive outcome at the end
- We think we need to have a pragmatic way forward in this discussion, cannot come back to this conversation again and again without going into content of these sections at all
- Does not produce much progress in either section
- Question is can we resolve what is discussed in each room without preempting the outcomes on where the info goes in the end
- Approach 3 not yet the approach that expresses that point, we need to have an option/approach that makes clear the discussion decoupled in different rooms that it does not preempt Parties' views on whether the information is distinct or not

- Expressed as ex post reporting, but what would be the exact sections discussed in each room (same sections in relation to the questions)
- Still a bit concerned that discussion in two rooms may need more time but we need to find a pragmatic approach on how we move forward
- Support Saudi Arabia's point on mitigation co-benefits reported in 13.7.b – important to capture this
- On loss and damage, EU supports Approach 2

Indonesia

- In view of Section D and linkage between MPGs and AC, we think that Approach 1 is ok for the time being; we cannot move forward without a sequence on how to move forward
- In terms of Approach 2, since we are talking about linkage, we can see how we can connect it between those two
- On loss and damage, we prefer Approach 1. L&D important but not included in AC, somehow we have to have it in MPG in order to accommodate info with regard to L&D

Costa Rica

- AILAC
- Clear division of labor
- Recognition of efforts, effectiveness of action, support
- Global goal on adaptation
- L&D – important that it is an integral part just as adaptation is, important to have Parties to have space to report

South Africa

- African Group, joint statement with AILAC by Costa Rica
- Two process developing in parallel
- Different communication process – AC and reporting under TF having different functions
- On L&D, add that the way this is formulated in Art 14 – we consider it is an important element of climate impact within the TF

Bhutan

- LDCs
- Morning session very helpful
- Clear linkage between APA 4 and 5, need to work in parallel as proposed by other colleagues here
- Most pragmatic way is to start with discussion on ex post then revisit in light of discussion... by COP24
- On L&D, support to include info on L&D, essential component of PA

Mexico

- EIG
- Support Approach 1

- Outside scope of Art 13
- In light version of informal note by Co-Facilitators, some elements missing – would like to discuss in APA 4, D7, 8, 9 and D12.

Maldives

- AOSIS
- On Section D linkages, discussion this morning quite useful
- Recognize linkages happening between APA 4 and 5
- Specificities of substance appears to be distinct and should continue parallel process
- Close collaboration among Agenda Items to avoid duplication work
- Can explore Approach 2 and 3
- On L&D, strongly Approach 1
- Procedural point: no deletion at this point from informal note.

Timor Leste

- Support LDC, AOSIS views that Approach 3
- On Approach 1, not sure why “high-level” is there
- Wrt L&D, Art 13 says action and support framework. Art 13.5 like my colleague from Maldives expressed – something we need to think about. Art 13.8 impacts of climate science linked to Art 8 of PA. Art 8.3 is action and support wrt to impact.
- Art 8.4 is also action and support with specific links with APA 4
- Useful for partners around the room to include action and support on L&D, and at least reduce vulnerabilities for my country otherwise I will be left behind
- PA is clear for all of us – how to implement and operationalize this good Agreement, not to renegotiate what we have agreed in Paris

India

- Joint session in morning was helpful in understanding views of the Parties
- Both APA 4 and 5 have clear linkages, work should be done in parallel – support Approach 3 as said by Ecuador on behalf of LMDC
- Uniform treatment to adaptation
- On L&D, support many developing countries on Approach 1. Especially for mega-biodiverse countries and island countries.

Japan

- Approach 1 – elements developed under APA 4 then incorporated to APA 5
- L&D outside of scope of Art 13, support Approach 2

Canada

- Thank you for joint session this morning
- Holistic discussion by adaptation experts – Approach 1
- On L&D, support Approach 2 for reasons that have been said including NZ and EU
- Not prejudging what Parties want to report

Costa Rica

- AILAC

Australia

- See adaptation as part of a comprehensive whole
- Have heard interest from Parties in ex ante reporting, see value in developing guidance – how to do it and how to do it well – we think the right expertise sits with APA 4
- Not prejudging vehicle where Parties might report it
- Don't see Art 8 as part of the framework but Parties may wish to report if they want
- Separate questions to the MPGs work we are doing here

European Union

- Trying to understand AILAC and African Group – D.10? Where would that go?
- D.2 and D.3 as part of sections to be discussed under MPGs, but when looked at D.3, many future elements... not so clear how that divide on ex ante and ex post would work

Co-Facilitator noted that if there were no further requests for the floor for Section D, suggest to move to Section A. Reminded Parties to submit written input by 7pm.

Section A: Overarching considerations and guiding principles

Saudi Arabia

- Tools have been constructive way to understand one another
- Wrt Section A, would benefit from more substantial discussion
- Opportunity to address key issues and understand we as Parties view elements captured in document
- Should not be limited to movement (Qn 1)
- Useful to clarify key elements in Section A
- Helpful to develop other Sections going forward if we address Section A
- Recognizing different starting points of developing countries in Section A
- Multiple structures
- Recalled Egypt's suggestion on different structures 1) use existing UNFCCC reporting guidance, 2) builds on existing system for developed and developing country Parties and 3) common MPGs as appropriate with two separate parts for developed and developing countries – useful but haven't even engaged on this at all
- On Qn 1: difficult for us to identify with either Approach. A1, A2, A5 and A6 useful plus others – hard to give black-and-white answer to this question
- Wrt Qn 2: found it confusing, as it didn't really provide Approaches the way other sections did – there are/in informal notes, find different views and useful to capture them in that format
- Extremely premature, contingent on what we design
- Final BR/BUR – don't see a "one-date-fit-all", transition period
- Give parties time to transition for the ETF to work

Turkey

- Elements as Headings – propose another approach / heading
- Flexibilities should be integrated; A6 no need to be a separate heading
- Option in Approach 1 enough (A9)
- No need to list certain elements, details will be in MPGs already

Australia

- Add EU, NZ, Brazil to additions to preamble – due date, CB, CBIT, include IPCC guidelines, metrics and request to Secretariat to make ready MRV process – tabular formats, portals, publish party reports, TER reports on website, potentially publish synthesis report, outline of reports.
- Procedural linkages wrt question raised yesterday on inventory reporting under Convention and PA – practical way under both without duplicating reporting requirements

China

- Echo concerns by Saudi Arabia
- Slightly different approach on how we would like to discuss this section
- Still look forward to more substantive discussions after this
- Qn 1: Approach 2 acceptable
- ...
- Interlinkage not needed in MPG cause only guidance for the way forward
- Building on existing arrangement is key – want that concept or principles to be reflected in principles part of MPGs, and throughout MPGs as we have already mentioned in previous sections
- Clarification on tools for this section

Egypt

- Highlight support with Saudi Arabia on behalf of Arab Group and China
- Qn 2 is premature at this stage, hold on until we have output from Qn 1

Chile

- AILAC
- Elements under headlines might not fit very well
- Could reflect more on what the Decision text could look like, so as to guide us on what to include in the MPGs

S. Africa

- On Qn 2, include specific reference to 13, 14, 15
- Concur with Brazil's previous suggestion on CB, CBIT, CGE's role
- Reference to the way flexibility is operationalized in the TF, layout principles for the provision of flexibility
- BR/BUR, logically last report for 2020, different for different Parties – need some flexibility for those Parties that would have at that point started reporting their BURs – would related to transition period

- Process would be more suited in the Decision part of overall structure of TF/MPGs
- First BTR...
- Superseded elements, applied to BR/BURs reporting requirements – not affected by that process
- Agree with Australia to add info on synthesis information wrt GST; good to consider what kind of synthesis to have and value to draw from that

Canada

- Agree with NZ
- Adding CB, CBIT, CGE, etc. look forward to see what goes in to COP decision later
- Support Chile to consider date for using MPGs and submitting first BTR

Switzerland

- On Qn 1, have different view on Approaches outlined
- NIR, TER, FMCP guidelines
- A3 – dealt with under each of sub-sections under format
- A5-8 – guide our work but some elements might be useful to be reflected in MPGs itself e.g. agree with China that headings might not be reflected in MPGs.
- A9 ...
- Generally OK on the elements in Qn 2
- Specifying date of start of MPGs may not necessarily be needed, can combine with date of first report
- No need for outline of TER report
- Biennial assessment of SEF be part of ...

Japan

- Element to request Secretariat... BTR integral to GST

Indonesia

- Difficult for us to choose which approach but prefer A1,6,7 considering that Approach1 is more appropriate for the time being
- Improve reporting on transparency
- Additional for this one, see that the element of A3 is really important, should be mentioned at beginning of MPGs itself – need clarity on how MPGs will be used by others.
- MPGs should be communicative and people outside of TF should be easy to read
- Qn2, we see that this is helpful to see the points here

Ecuador

- Heart of the matter of transparency
- Ideas in Section A is important for the work going forward
- On behalf of LMDC, echoing comments already made by China, Egypt, Saudi Arabia and other colleagues
- ...

Maldives

- Approach 1 and 2 do not reflect fully, don't agree on all of them
- A1,A2 ok but wouldn't see A6 or A7 as separate headings, should be operationalized by incorporation into specific elements of MPGs
- A4,A5
- On right side of tool, support the list of elements as a way to proceed into decision text
- Could include procedural elements – NCs, existing processes could possibly be aligned
- Clarity on how new transparency system will supersede the old system, including sequencing, timeline and all aspects. Date for BR/BURs, first BTRs...
- Importance of CB for developing countries; the decision can also address the role of CBIT has been providing for this

Co-Facilitator asked for any more flags for the floor on Section A, stopped to consult with Co-Facilitator on responding to requests by Saudi Arabia and China.

- Noted Section A was one of the difficult issues to start discussion on, emphasized that this is just the beginning.
- Responding to China's specific question on written input. Not intending to re-organizing Section. Trying to get parties to engage.
- Heard from many Parties that their preferred approaches not captured, will go back to capture them.
- Whole lot of things to discuss. Not closed list at all.
- Starting where we were a year ago to develop headings/sub-headings of MPGs...
- Heard clearly that discussion on this point is premature
- In terms of next steps, we would like to receive any additional written input on D and A by 7pm tonight to allow us to produce an informal note for consideration
- 12-1pm informal consideration to consider that informal note...
- Interest in Co-Facilitators for further clarification on TER – have secured a space in room Nairobi 5-7pm. To discuss TER in whichever way they want.

Brazil sought clarification on

EU sought clarification on tool, revised version of note. Would like to understand how Co-Facilitators intend to represent views by Parties, especially ones they have not seen, or had a chance to discuss in this room. Curious how it would look like and how we can recognize views, and if there was an additional input.

Co-Facilitator responded that for those written input/submissions on issues that were identified, those will be pretty clear within the note/tool which those are because they will not contain specific reference to the light revision – mapped the specific revisions to the light revision. Those new elements that don't map back to light revision, will reflect oral or written submissions.

To Brazil's point, light revision and compilation of various tools A-H. In terms of additional question on information that Parties have submitted on those issues that have not been identified by Co-Facilitators, not very much, so could put on APA 5 page somewhere a compilation of proposals with a foreword in the interest of transparency available to all.

Co-Facilitator said the will get the informal note out by late tonight, ahead of the 12-1pm informal consultation for this Agenda Item tomorrow.

The informal consultation ended at 5pm.