

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

Wednesday 5th December 2018, 11:00-13:00, Meeting room 20

Notes taken by Edward Morgan – Griffith University

<<Session began 11:12>>

Facilitator: had good first meeting. Like to pick up from where left it yesterday, Recognise good work that has been done Monday (informal, informal consultations). Suggest continue work on text. Aiming for an iteration today. Hope to get it out asap today. Suggests look at principles, purpose and support. Start with discussing purpose – important element, want to continue cleaning.

First idea: consider the possibility of looking at section on purpose. There are 2 items that differentiate 2 elements of purpose.

Suggest number 1 could be transferred to Annex - moves purpose of the guidance to Annex. Leave this section solely for purpose of communication.

EU: On purpose: first paragraph agree with suggestion to move to Annex. Perhaps we can shorten a bit. Keep only literal b. Then on paragraph 2 suggest to shorten and simplify to only contain essential elements. Contain only chapeau and part a “communicate adaptation plans and priorities” change assessment to review for consistency. Removing all other elements.

Facilitator: is it opposition to review, or about consistency.

EU: consistency but also preference (maybe – needs to think about it)

Argentina – speaks on behalf G77 and China. This suggestion is new, group need consider it. First view is that it can change decisions. Could have implications. Has concerns about placeholders and change of language. In spirit of collaboration – possible to merge some of the ideas for paragraph 1. Suggests merging a and b to streamline and make it more consistent. In terms of paragraph 2: b needs to be included: 5 ideas:

Priorities, implementation and support, plans, and action

Raise visibility

Enhance support for developing countries

Economic diversity

Transformation.

<they gave some concrete text I didn't get>

They want to keep these ideas in there.

Norway: Pleased to hear straight into work, many good ideas in room, pleased to see effort to make more concise. Agree to move purpose to Annex (they suggested this twice at Bangkok!). Believes paragraph A captures most important part. B belongs elsewhere. Want to put enhance it. Suggest “Improve understanding

Australia: we agree to moving to Annexe if that is what we want. With addition of implementing, find difficult – don't see NCs as plan so don't like implementation. Implicit instruction to remove facilitate learning, support but Australia think this is valuable, like to see this retained (1c and also i in paragraph 2).

Facilitator: not sure G77 asked to remove i. Ask them to think about it

US: agree on moving purpose of guidance to Annexe. Not strong feeling on 1c. Also don't support implementation, don't see it as an implementation vehicle. Paragraph 2: Looking for clarity from G77 – nine points reduced to five? But which 5? Also put it after guidance of adoption. Concern over defining set list of purpose... wants to soften the language so less defining. Makes a suggestion for the chapeau “underscores the importance of an adaptation communication as a vehicle to, inter alia, :”

Facilitator: might be more flexible.

Argentina: clarifications – no opposition to 1c (no preference), difference over implementation. G77 feel it is about implementation and this should be included – critical for us. Mentioned ones they support. Slight changes in a for consistency; b little bit repetitive so flexible on this; c retain; d important retain; e is critical but letting it go as a gesture; f not provided new not support f; g and h keep; i is not part of purpose.

Canada: supports moving purpose of guidance to Annexe. 1c not needed, happy to merge a and b. Liked US suggestion on how to frame the nature of those discussions. G77 five points – wants to pick up d and e. Struggle with language around parity. Can be sensitive. On e, would be a means to support developing countries... <not sure what the point was here>

EU: Assessment vs. review = matter of preference but flexible. On paragraph 1: happy to merge a and b, don't mind about c. On paragraph 2 – long listing makes it not a purpose statement, language proposed by US is way to get around it.

US: to repeat chapeau: “underscores the importance of an adaptation communication as a vehicle to, inter alia, :”

Argentina: question about suggestion – we still need a list, need to define aspects. Critical aspect is inter alia. What are critical issues US want to see?

US: Inter alia means a Party don't have to fit to the list if they have a different view. AC is something new, there may be other roles of the AC, so don't want fixed list and there may be other roles

Ecuador: Speaks on behalf of like-minded developing nations; supports G77 and China. Would changing the chapeau change the role of the list, would no longer be the 'purpose'

Facilitator: US suggestion provides flexibility, but keeps the idea of what it should be for. It would mean that parties don't need to comply with strict list

Argentina: Share question about Ecuador about the content. Not the same to say importance of vs. purpose of. It changes the idea of the list is for.

US: There is no reason to be suspicious of the change, the list wouldn't change. Some of the things in the list are not purposes so changing chapeau allows list to be flexible. The change is only about flexibility.

Facilitator: there are questions over the change – are we still talking about purposes or something else.

Uruguay: Supports the G77 and China. We endorse exercise to streamline. They don't want to minimise important of things that get lost. Uruguay don't want to see reference to review. Implementation is important, this is about operationalisation of Paris agreement, so not just about documents but actually doing what is said in document. Do not support suggestion of moving things to Annexe –trying to understand difference, changing it might be good. Changing purpose section is new. The nature of purpose is very important. This is an essential part of guidance, so a bit surprised at the changes.

Facilitator: The idea of change is about flexibility. By removing word purpose you might change meaning but you get flexibility.

South Africa: On behalf of AGN; aligns with G77 and China. Does want to move to Annexe. Trying to build guidance. Don't like inter alia – makes it open ended and doesn't help. Supports G77 streamlined version.

Colombia: speaks on behalf of ALEC. Supports Argentina and G77 and China. Want to retain purpose. Should enhance adaptation action, removing it weakens this. On issue of assessment vs. review – no need for this reference here

Switzerland: support streamlining. Prompted by Uruguay's expression of surprise. This is the first time we have a text that does not have a no text format – great progress.

US: Paragraph 2: (a) delete brackets in order to make it the primary purpose – too prescriptive. (b) to provide to global stocktake. (c) raise the visibility of profile, but don't want parity with mitigation. Happy to delete some others.

Facilitator: Move to principle section – paragraph 4. Already gone through, discussions in Bangkok. This is shortened list. Explore possibilities of simplifying/refine elements in list

Argentina: on behalf of G77 and China; tried to make effort on streamlining. Looked at how to merge some ideas. Important for group to see: convention and Paris, especially equity; national country-driven approach not a basis for comparison or review; streamline sections (b), (c) and e.

Facilitator: to clarify: merging (b),(c) & (e)? Check and come back

Japan: lots of duplication with pre-ambule part. Wording 'should' is not appropriate – this should be changed.

Facilitator: note that section is in brackets. Notes what G77 took out takes into account duplication.

EU: Most of the issues captured here. We don't need section on principles. Recognise that some it is important, but think it is better in the preamble. (a) don't think there is need for that, understand it is important but should be reflected at a higher level; (b), (c), e –

understand ideas important to parties but want to put this into preamble; would like to see ideas put in preamble. (f) is unclear – what is the principle/idea in this

US: Echo points made by Japan and EU. Strange to have a list of principles, put it in the preamble. Not sure how useful it would be to person having to use it, won't contribute will make it more complicated. As long as it stays bracketed we are OK with it.

Argentina: Chapeau: make more direct; (a) improve it to make more clear, in particular equity, merge (b),(c),(e) shall not impose additional parties on developing countries. Keep (d) and (f) as they are.

Australia: align with other parties – can't accept elevation of some principles of Paris Agreement over others; want more explanation around (d) mentions 'full consideration' but who is considering and why, what is purpose of consideration? If already stated this is not about comparing and evaluating then why have 'consideration'

New Zealand: Like others, position is that principles section is unnecessary. Hard to apply practically, many already covered. But not too problematic. Principles need to stick to Paris Agreement, so uncomfortable with some, don't like reference to Convention and don't like (d). Word flexibility can be confusing, suggest discretion or something similar.

Facilitator: G77 has made effort to streamline. Does NZ want to keep language as it is? Opposed to rearrange

China: China supports Argentina. (a) Key Issue: How developed country will take lead <<didn't quite understand this point>>. Principles are very crucial for how to revise in future, so important to include here.

Norway: Don't see need for this part. See it as undermining flexibility that is given to AC in Paris Agreement. Think AC is already framed in PA. Items listed don't give much guidance. What guidance does (a) give? Doesn't add anything when making a plan. (b) already specified in preamble and Article 5, same for (c) already in Article 6; basis for comparison does not give any guidance. Nobody wants comparison or basis for review, so don't bring it up.

Ecuador: Paris is part of convention, so how can Paris not be part of convention (why separate them? Why not refer to convention?). Something about support needs <<not sure what the point was>>, asked for developed countries to come up with some language.

Saudi Arabia: Speaking on behalf of Arab Group, align with G77 and China. Believes principles are important. They aren't new, enshrined in Paris, really important to group. Point (f) links directly to objective of PA, does not think this should be sidelined or belittled; important to group.

Argentina: 3 comments. (1) believe that Article 2 of PA is agreement it enhances Convention; framework is not open to change/interpretation. In response to NZ = (2) the newly merged (b),(c),(e) not referring to convention. Convention mentioned in (b). Special needs come from Convention or Paris Agreement. We would like to have a conversation on support, particularly important to developing countries.

Facilitator: the intention to have discussion on support.

South Africa: African Group want to emphasise to importance of having principles. Don't understand distinguishing between Paris and convention.

Canada: How to reflect support needs – Indigenous knowledge is key, so including support needs for them. Don't need to separate it. <<not sure what the point was here, it was related to support – I think it was that support isn't only important to developing countries but also relevant to developed countries as in the example given around First Nations people in Canada>>

US: Set of principles included in Article 2 of PA, AC is part of PA, so don't need principles here, some of which are not accurately reflected here.

EU: We agreed to PA as package with all articles. Same comment as Canada about support needs – something that is also relevant for developed countries. Don't need bifurcated view. Relevant for all countries.

China: Question to EU – haven't discussed how to formulate package of PAWP so important to keep CBCDD<<not sure on this acronym??>> principles here. Made a suggestion <<didn't quite catch it>>

Facilitator: proposes move on to support. Refer to section on support.

Argentina: G77+China – paragraph 20, mention of NDC is not necessary; para 21&22 before word support to include 'also' to make it 'also support'

EU: Didn't understand first proposal.

Argentina: Paragraph 20 delete bracketed 'in NDCs' and say 'as referred to in para 7.10 and 7.11'.

Japan: asks for Argentina to repeat change

Facilitator: notes the change is to add the word also.

Switzerland: Might make it easier if we separate modalities of support of preparing AC and support for implementation; para 19, 21, 22, 23 about implementation; 20 and 24 about preparation of updating. Welcomes suggestion of G77. Wants to delete mention of GEF (as they not mandated to fund adaptation). Suggests saying 'in line with mandates'

Facilitator: agreement on support for preparing AC, maybe less consensus on what happens in future (implementation)

EU: already had inf, inf session on this. Wants to know how to bring this into the discussion. EU has been working on text for 20, 21.

Facilitator: Please bring proposal forward

EU: For p.20; want to turn it around. Support for these mechanisms work on a demand basis. So "Encourage developing countries to use the provisions for support for NDCs and NAPs in preparation of AC and invite GEF and GCF to take into account within respective mandates"

USA: Wondering how to bring suggestions in? Also have new suggestions for text. Para 19: invites <list of relevant agencies> to continue to mobilise support for adaptation actions in

developing countries; para 20 encourages operating of ... to continue to provide support for...;

Argentina: Asks for room to provide another session on support. Don't like separating implementation out from preparation of AC. To say we already have support for NAPs etc. is not enough, this is new mechanism so need to have that.

Facilitator: Narrative is emerging. Some divergence on implementation.

Belarus: Supports US proposal – much broader formulation, i.e. not just about financial but also technological and expertise which mid-developing countries would like. Suggests saying 'developing countries and others in need of support'.

Saudi Arabia: question about 1st iteration.

<<Session ended 13:07>>