

APA agenda item 4: informal consultations on further guidance in relation to the adaptation communication, including, inter alia, as a component of nationally determined contributions, referred to in Article 7, paragraphs 10 and 11, of the PA .

Second informal session - Wednesday, May 2, 2018, 16-17pm, Santiago de Chile

RINGO notes taken by Hélène Le Brun, Baptiste Andrieu and Juan Avella

Synthesis of the session:

- Parties analyzed the document between the first and the second session.
- G77 insisted on the fact that it is the structure which is discussed here and not the content.
- Most parties agreed with the new structure provided by Argentina on behalf of the G77.
- They demanded clarification on some specific points such as headlines and annex 2.
- The co-facilitators approved to work on the new text and will provide new inputs by this evening to finish working on the structure and start working on the content tomorrow.
The main point during session 3 will be to avoid duplications in the new document, which were criticized in the Informal Note.
- G77 has asked to postpone session 3 later thursday in order to have time to work on the new document provided by co-facilitators.

Co Facilitator:

Three speakers remained from the last session. They do not wish to speak. Opens floor.

EU:

Thanks G77 for the proposal.

It looks like a constructive and better structure for the information product. It is a good basis for restructuring the work.

It is a tool too similar to the previous one.

It is not necessary to agree on the headings for now.

Cluster of ideas.

There are some issues that they would like to elaborate: differences between the old structure and the new one? What links can be made between these 2 documents ?

Annex 2: what kind of info should go there? Experts recommendations? Needs clarification.

UE doesn't understand the meaning of this Annex.

Japan:

Understands the heading proposal, especially the annex part.

One big concern: at COP23 there were no headings.

If we go ahead with the G77 proposal no headings are needed.

US:

US prefers to advance into the contents instead of wasting time talking and correcting the structure. In the same line, the delegate remarks that the use of headings is confusing. Coming back to the first assertion, the US asks what information should be incorporated in these documents. Finally, annex 2 was not clear enough for the delegate. A discussion on this should be taken.

México:

Elaborates on the intentions of the headings that aren't clear.
Annex 2 should not be present in the structure.

Australia:

Looks forward to hearing explanations on the headings.
If headings are kept, their phrasing must be considered.
It is not a proper time to consider annex 2.
It makes sense to complete the technical undermining before going into content.

Canada:

What is helpful is the distinction of annex text and substance text and to start avoiding repetitions.
Annex 2: "guidance for NDC", meaning? Adaptation as part of NDCs ? It is not clear.

New Zealand:

Separation of decision and annex makes sense.

Argentina for G77:

Appreciate the efforts made by Parties and Groups to engage with the proposal, it is a "good spirit" to be continued in Poland.

On the structure: **these are not negotiating language**, it was just a way to restructure the conversation. The informal text is not clear; the new text is simpler.
It was necessary to make a new document by our own; it was just a first attempt.
Some technical work should be done before the content.
Theses sessions aim to leave Bonn with a comprehensive document.

About headings: this work is just about restructuring the note. They want to keep all the ideas. That's the reason of the structure of the annexes. Necessary before Poland. They want to organize the structure; these are not final words.

Co-Facilitator:

The co-facilitator accepted the new text proposed by Argentina on behalf of G77. A new input will be provided to the parties in the evening, and the next discussion based on this will be held tomorrow at noon.

Argentina G77:

Asked clarification on the fact that only the structure will change and not the information for now.

Ok.

G77 is waiting for this proposal in order to keep working.

US:

The US delegate encouraged, one more time, to go forward on the discussion of the contents. The delegate demanded Argentina and G77 to show the difficulties on the structure; to present a map to advance the conversations.

Co-Facilitator:

Some areas are not clear, co-facilitators will provide some insights on the discussion tomorrow.

Confirms that they will not remove duplicates for the moment.

EU:

EU agreed with US to move forward the negotiations. The delegation would like to work tomorrow on the text provided by the facilitators.

Switzerland:

Trust the ability of G77 to do a good job and the relevance of the note. Nevertheless they have difficulties understanding the meaning behind certain headings.

For the general interest, G77 should provide more information on some headlines, especially for items that seem to address same issues. That would help the work.

Japan:

They consider that the proposal of COP 23 is logical and that the G77 one is unclear.

Argentina G77:

Again, Argentina on behalf of G77 repeated that the words and terms used in the new text aren't definitive; the parties are invited to work on them. With this in mind, the delegate was not negotiating the word "modalities" in the text (this was a direct answer to Japan); it was only a suggestion. This new text does not have anything new. It is just a restructuration that attempts to provide more clarity before discussing the contents.

China:

They want to focus on the details, but recognize that the structure is really important.

The old text is very messed, so it is difficult to focus on the content.

They asked to have different sources for structure.

Argentina G77: Support from something else? It's just a term. They cannot lose time. They need to go to substance. For this is needed a well developed structure. When can the text be delivered in order to prepare the coordination for tomorrow?

Co-Facilitator: by 22.00 they can send the text if not sooner.

Argentina: when is the next informal? (12.00)

Switzerland:

Question just to clarify : co-facilitators won't remove any duplication?

Co-Facilitator:

No. Won't handle the duplications. Tomorrow they'll reduce the duplications

Argentina:

Can the informal session be postponed?

Co-Facilitator:

They'll try to postpone it.