

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 .

Fourth informal session - Friday, May 4, 2018, 16-17pm, Bangkok

RINGO notes taken by Hélène Le Brun and Baptiste Andrieu

Summary of the session:

We struggled understanding the details of this session. Parties also had difficulties understanding each other.

The goal was to focus on sections 5, 6 and 7 and especially on duplications and on the flow of bullets. No conclusions were reached concerning these sections as most parties debated about whether or not to keep the option “no headings”. They did not conclude on this point either. The goal is to work on annexes tomorrow. There are only two sessions left.

Meeting started at 16:09

Co facilitator:

- After this session, only two more : 04/05 and 07/05
- Would like to start with sections 5,6,7 today and on annexes tomorrow
- Today let's focus on :
 - duplications (can refer to the revised table sent yesterday)
 - logical flow of bullets

Argentina:

- Would like to focus on modalities 5, 6 and 7 today
- Would like to provide ideas on 6 and 7, and then engage with questions from colleagues
- For section 6: section not very populated so add issues that are necessary. Can send you the language
- Suggest to take stock and if necessary to revise further guidance content on specific decisions
- Important to provide dates here
- Main idea : submit, see the report and see if guidance is working well
- For section 7: we chatted about titles. Word “reduction” is redundant, wanted to flag that
- Importance to request specific bodies on funding (GCF, GEF, Adaptation fund...) and support need to be provided on adaptation communication
- Can we delete the “no heading?”

Co-Facilitator:

- Deleting the option “no heading” is interesting

Ecuador, on behalf of developing countries:

- Article 6: important to have a space for the date
- Article 7: there are specific bodies that can support the work of developing countries on adaptation communication

EU:

- Section 7 first bullets similar to 5 and could be in annex. Opportunity to simplify

- Several bullets in section 5 that talk about same thing : on how to apply guide, some seem redundant
- Section 6: things that should be there. Not sure understood proposal from G77 but good place to explain further what revising the revue of the guidance would be
- Section 7: first bullet similar to one in section 5. Could be merged to this or use it as a heading or an entry paragraph to annex that provides detail guidance
- same for next paragraph
- with regards to 3 last paragraph. One on support, probably belongs here. The way we would detail depends on vehicle specific support
- same for next together, so can be one bullet
- next one on implementation of needs. We think it's out of the scope of guidance. Must be discussed in a part about finance
- same for next one about finance, should be discussed in finance

New Zealand:

- Would not see headings included => option "no headings" must be kept
- Article 5: some of the bullets might belong elsewhere, some modalities are already in the Paris Agreement
- Article 6: we made a submission for inspiration to give example language that could go in the decision
- Article 7: agree with EU. Some of the content is out of scope. It belongs in provision of info on the support provided under discussions on APA agenda item 5. Not appropriate here
- Requesting parties to provide information again
- We all agree that all parties need the support for adaptation

Japan:

- We can proceed on this informal note
- On articles 5 and 6: agree with New Zealand

We did not catch what was said about article 7

US

- Question on section 6 for G77, on dates, are you thinking on signing for non mandatory?
- Agreed with many of the points just made

Co-Facilitator:

- Dates just for submission and not for communication itself

Argentina:

- Sometimes difficult to navigate different interventions, ask colleagues to repeat
- On section 6 : dates refer to that cycle of guidance, date for revision of guidance, +2 *other dates we missed*
- Support is very important for us.
Not sure understood what was said.

Kuwait:

- As she understood colleague from New Zealand and Japan, as said, it is already mentioned in the PA

South Africa, on behalf of the African group:

- Input is in relation to support
- I wanted to understand if from our partners there is a discussion on implementation?

Uruguay:

- No headings: discomfort from our group about this
- Have different options, no content in option “no heading”, it’s not about content here
- Or if colleagues prefer we could provide examples
- We are just talking about headings and not content

Co-f

- Ask Parties to think about option of no headings

Not sure about this

US:

- About heading/content : don’t see the suggestion we made yesterday reflected on the note
- At the moment, headings help know where things go in the text
- Could have footnotes here that refers to what “no headings” mean
- It’s important to discuss the content now

NZ:

- We would be happy to work on this basis and understand that the headings are only to guide, we don’t want the headings to appear in the final document
- We also note that there is international support already available for developing countries through the GEF
- Because of the way the PA is reformulated, it’s quite a frustration on adaptation communication

Japan:

Said things about Paris Agreement paragraph 7 “action not adaptation”

- No headings: nothing to add to NZ and US but when we move to duplication, one heading could be moved to subheadings

Kuwait:

- About support, here were not renegotiating the PA, all understand 7.13
- Only trying to make the guidance
- Providing support for developing countries

Argentina:

Talked about articles 7.10 and 7.13

- Doesn’t understand Japan’s reading
- Would love to avoid this kind of conversation about the word of Paris Agreement and now implement

EU

- Recap on the first intervention about section 5
- The way we see it, it doesn’t have to be long section just a few ideas on :

US

- On no headings : necessary on some sections
- Take the decision later

Switzerland :

- Flexibility on heading/no heading options

Australia :

- There might be some misunderstanding about what NZ and Japan said
- Have to be constructive to move forward

Argentina :

- This structure is just a way to address different issues
- I really cannot support to choose some sections to maintain no headings, it is not clear at all on the approach
- Begs to agree on this, trying to make it more navigable here

US :

- Our primary concern is about the principale section

Uruguay:

- Inconfortable with this discussion
- Issue was : headings or not
- Use them to advance in our work, and delete it from the final document
- Now discussing content

EU:

- Following along the lines of Uruguay
- Common footnotes
- Headings are not meant to be headings in the final text

Norway

- We should not discuss the headings in the structure
- This whole session has been about headings
- We should start talking about content

Cof :

- Tomorrow we will be talking about annexes
- No new version tonight but will make one tomorrow
- We'll try to find a solution on heading/no heading