

APA Agenda Item 8A: informal consultations on issues related to Adaptation Fund
Tuesday December 4, 2018, 3:00-3:45PM
Tatry Meeting Room 3

Notes taken by Anna McGinn, University of Maine, U.S. (badges through Dickinson College
and University Corporation for Atmospheric Research)

***Please note that these notes are an attempt to capture what took place during the meeting, but they are not comprehensive and could have errors.**

Key:

...means that there were comments that I missed

AF: Adaptation Fund

AFB: Adaptation Fund Board

[]: my comments

PA: Paris Agreement

KP: Kyoto Protocol

Co-F: Co-Facilitator

[Start meeting]

Co-F: Building on the progress made in Bangkok. We are limited in time. We have 45 minutes. We need to have focused discussions for possible landing zones. In this regard, we would like to seek your agreement that we can start our work today on the basis of this joint reflection note addendum 4 section 3. Can we start with this document?

Hearing no objections, we move now to discussions on this reflection note and this addendum.

We heard yesterday from the party lead meetings, particularly in terms of governance, happy with the atmosphere. We will move forward with this, with informal informals, and whatever else we need to move things forward.

Begin work with paragraph 19 of the addendum. We know this paragraph is critical. We propose you take a look at this section. We have a lot of brackets and a lot of questions. We have a lot of activities and who can deliver those. There are three options.

[no interventions]

Co-F: We are requesting the Board to consider the issues of serving the Agreement and to forward the recommendation to the CMA and CMP. Can we hear from you on if it should say 'invite' or 'request' and to who? On the activities we have from A-G, if you have an indications of the possible activities that you would like to be delivered and who?

EU: On para 19, we should all agree that it is the Board that knows best and is best placed to know what is needed. Give the Board a mandate to assess this. Would be odd to not let the Board do this. We should not get stuck negotiating a group of issues...

US: Comfortable with the AFB performing the review and if necessary the updates of these policies. I think what is important, and it is difficult and I don't want to prejudge how the board will be under the PA, but if there is going to be a new board, I would want the new board to make the decisions. It doesn't make sense for the KP board to make changes for it to be brought under the PA.

Co-F: Can I ask you, does that mean we do not need a list so explicit of activities? Maybe we don't need a list in terms of that.

US: I would prefer a list, comfortable with a list that say 'to review *and as necessary to update* as needed to bring under the PA.' List of what we would expect the new report to review.

Switzerland: With regard to first question, our position is also what we want it to be parties to the PA. we proposed the other... We have heard that there are parties that are not parties to the PA and depending on the governance conversation and they want to be part of these conversations and if they can't be part of the board, they want a way to have a voice.

If the CMA can identify issues as important to look at, we would be happy to have those in the text, if that is too hard to come to agreement, then we can be more general about it.

EU: Touching now on participation, we still have the AF next year under the KP, we will believe that all parties should participate in this exercise and we think arrangement can be made with the board. All parties should be involved before we review the board composition.

Co-F: Can I ask how to do that? How do you complete the exercise before you have the new board?

Thanks Switzerland for the bridging proposal.

Argentina on behalf of Uruguay and Brazil: Thank you for the addendum. We think the board is the best suited body to undertake this task and we are happy with keeping only this option. Our preferred option for the governance is option2, in our view there will be a transition period where the Fund will be under the CMP and the CMA at the same time so the board would be a board that allows parties to both treaties to sit on it. That should not exclude anyone. Since our preferred option is that the board start serving the PA at this COP, the election of this year's board should allow parties to the PA to be elected to the board. Regarding the list. We acknowledge there are some topics that could be contentious there. There are some elements we need to identify and these are, so we could leave an open Monday for some other topics, but the very first three are essential because the fund under the PA needs new institutional arrangements for secretariat and trustee relationships. The relationships were conferred under the KP, so is that necessary as well—our German colleagues can clarify that.

Co-F: Can we streamline the activities? I heard that we could make something broader, others want to be more specific.

Argentina: The fourth- the sources of finance are important as well.

South Africa on behalf of the Africa Group: We are not happy with the text of this discussion. We think the Bangkok text was better. A lot was deleted, and we want to bring them back. But we are not going to prevent progress. In relation to the issue of 19, until we clarify serving two body exclusively, we shouldn't complicate. We understand the CMA will take a decisions on this paragraph...in our view this language can be a direct message to the board. We could clarify the text to request the board to do certain things. We are not interested in a list. We are going to get into everyone's pet issues. We need to trust the board. The first things we need which is not there is to have the board come back to the parties and say how they are going to best serve the Paris Agreement- how does it support developing countries? For the legal arrangements, we think those are a lot simpler. We give a broad invitation to the board to come back to us and show relationship with us. We want to see how the board will support developing countries under the Paris Agreement.

EU: We are trying to find compromise, we are happy to agree with South Africa and support them. The CMA should simply invite the board to do the work and then come back to the CMA with the results.

Co-F: Can we explore the groups that haven't spoken or the delegations that have provided other options. Do you see this as a bridging proposal? US, Switzerland, Argentina- is this a landing zone?

Switzerland- We are in line with Argentina. We think the three first ones and the fourth one are crucial. We don't need to see a list. We can go on to task the body, whoever it is, to carry out the work. We think we have agreement on the first three issues, can we give those as our priorities? If we all agree on it.

We want the board in the transition period that is available to everyone. We don't necessarily want our bridging proposals, we are putting it forward as a bridge....

We are fulling in line with Argentina, as the group EIG, that would be our preferred option.

South Africa on behalf of Africa group: Just because we don't speak on something doesn't mean we are in agreement. Our issues with A and B are with exclusivity. Our priorities are not listed there. Maybe we could put them under governance arrangement more broadly. I don't know what we have C listed there. Again, we would think that would be opened under a general heading of how the AF is going to support developing country parties. But I look at the text today, and it looks like what we are doing today is different from yesterday. One issue with the board coming back to us on mobilization of funding...we heard again today that moving the fund closer to the PA, we hear that is to be closer to Article 6, but we don't know where that is going. We want to know how they will serve developing counties with resource mobilization.

US: I think the solution of having the text say "to review, and as necessary update" could resolve issues with A and B to deal with the exclusivity issue. As the fund comes under the PA, it would be what you would expect, the suite of review of priorities, we aren't saying that they need to change anything, but it should happen as a review process. I am fine with a report back....

Co-F: It is important to consider the options- is it possible at this moment to review, delete or merge any of the three options?

- no changes...
- consider need for possible changes
- review/consider possible changes

We don't have much time, we have 7 minutes to go, we need to focus our conversation in terms of how we can improve or streamline this paragraph 19. Do you have any ideas in terms of the options? Can we streamline any of them?

Argentina: We can consider this fine because the board will consider that they are in a position to – and they will do it and it is up to the parties to approve them or not. This is what the board did when the fund was established. I think this gives enough room to the board to undertake the work they need to take. Whatever the outcome of their deliberation and their work with the parties.

EU: To summarize, we see convergence on the fact- we should invite the board to do the work, review what needs to be changes, and then report back to the board. We prefer option 2.

Belize: On 19, we consider the request of the board would be sufficient in that paragraph with forwarding recommendations to the CMA, we do not see the need for separate elements under 19 include C,D,F and consideration of the need for possible changes would be sufficient.

Switzerland: Our preferred option is option 2, if there are still proponents for 3, we could combine and say review and consider, but we would dropped the detailed list. We would leave it up to the board if there needs to be changes.

Co-F: Any other comments- level of comfort with merging 2 and 3. At least we can delete 1? [gets signal] okay we can't delete 1.

Switzerland: We don't want to merge. We want to drop 3 and we want to add to two- review and consider changes

US: Concern with that is obviously the board could always review. My concern is that we want to give the board priority areas that they would review. We aren't asking them to change anything. We just want to give priorities of what they should review. They can always generally review anything, so I'm not sure asking them to just generally review is specific enough.

Co-F: Time is up. We don't have much time. This is not as complicated an issue as others that we need to solve in this agenda item. We have booked room 9 for you until 1800 for you to do what you can have progress on this. Think about 19 specifically. And then come back tomorrow to have our section informal from 3-4pm in room 23.

South Africa: Question- are the co-f going to provide a revised text based on what happened in this session? What is the status of what has changed during this meeting?

Co-F: We were mandated by APA co-chairs to produce first iteration by Thursday, so the time for you to give input on any part of the agenda item is until tomorrow. We really need you to engage because after that we are mandated to produce a text and we want the information to come from the commons. Help us to come up with the solutions and help provide the bridging solutions. Any bookings we can do for you to have a safe space for dialogue, please let us know.

Meeting adjourned.

[Note G77 didn't have any interventions in this whole meeting- very unusual for this Agenda Item]