

**Round table under agenda item 7 of the
Ad-hoc Working Group on the Paris Agreement (APA)
“Modalities and procedures for the effective operation of
the committee to facilitate implementation and promote compliance
referred to in Article 15, paragraph 2, of the Paris Agreement”¹**

Monday, 6 November; room Rakiraki

Draft agenda

Version of 26 October 2017

Morning: 8:00 – 10:00

1. Opening by APA Co-Chairs (8:00–8:15)
2. Discussion in plenary (8:15–8:45):
 - Introduction/framing by co-facilitators
 - Scenarios and guiding questions for the breakout groups (see Annex)
3. Work in breakout groups on the basis of scenarios 1 - 3 (see Annex) (8:45–10:00)

10:00 – 13:00: Break for COP opening

Afternoon: 13:00 – 15:00

4. Discussion in plenary (13:00–13:30):
 - Reporting back from breakout groups on their discussions on scenarios 1-3
5. Work in breakout groups on the basis of the scenarios 4 - 6 (see Annex) (13:30–14:15)
6. Discussion in plenary (14:15–14:45):
 - Reporting back from breakout groups on their discussions on scenarios 4-6
 - Discussion
7. Closing by the APA Co-Chairs (14:45–15:00)²

Logistical note: While no registration is required for attendance, interested Parties are kindly invited to inform the secretariat of the names of the delegates who will attend this event.³ This would help the secretariat in the preparations and planning for the round table. Parties are invited to send such information by email to APA-item-7@unfccc.int, if possible by 1 November 2017.

¹ Information relating to APA agenda item 7 is available here: <http://unfccc.int/bodies/apa/items/10167.php>.

² According to the conclusions from the APA session in May 2017 (see paragraph 22(b) in FCCC/APA/2017/2), “If Parties agree, the co-facilitators designated for each relevant agenda item at APA 1.4 will prepare, under their own responsibility and the guidance of the APA Co-Chairs, an informal note reflecting the views expressed at the relevant round table and make that note available to Parties as soon as possible thereafter”.

³ In addition to the delegates following negotiations under APA agenda item 7, and in the context of possible interlinkages identified by Parties in their interventions and submissions, attendance by delegates following discussions on other arrangements under the Agreement is encouraged (e.g. the Transparency Framework, the Financial Mechanism, the Technology Mechanism, the Paris Committee on Capacity-Building and/or the Capacity-Building initiative for Transparency).

ANNEX

ROUND TABLE ON APA AGENDA ITEM 7

A. SCENARIOS

The scenarios below are suggested as explorative examples only, with the aim of stimulating discussions. They are without prejudice to the role, functions and any other aspect of the modalities and procedures for the Committee that Parties may consider and eventually agree upon in the course of future negotiations.

SCENARIOS FOR THE FIRST BREAKOUT SESSION:

Scenario no. 1

Party X has not submitted its nationally determined contribution (NDC) for the past 11 years since the original NDC was submitted in 2016 at the time when the Party submitted its document of ratification of the Paris Agreement to the depositary (relevant provision: Article 4, paragraph 2).⁴

Scenario no. 2

Party Y submitted its intended nationally determined contribution (INDC) in 2015 and subsequently submitted an NDC in 2024. The information in the new NDC is limited to the indication of the emission reduction target of the Party; that target is the same as the one in the Party's INDC of 2015. The NDC does not provide any further information (relevant provisions: Article 4, paragraphs 4, 8 and 13).

Scenario no. 3

Party Z has not submitted its national inventory report for more than 3 years beyond the deadline specified in the relevant modalities, procedures and guidelines (MPGs) (relevant provision: Article 13, paragraph 7).

SCENARIOS FOR THE SECOND BREAKOUT SESSION:

Scenario no. 4

Party A has not been able to submit its Adaptation Communication under Article 7, paragraph 10, in the past 10 years since ratifying the Paris Agreement. The Party asserts that this is due to capacity constraints.

In considering the situation, the Committee, based on the information in the registry under Article 7, paragraph 12, becomes aware that one quarter of the Parties have not as yet submitted their Adaptation Communications (relevant provisions: Article 7, paragraphs 9, 10, 11 and 12).

Scenario no. 5

A developed country Party B makes its submissions under Article 13 generally within the periodicity set out in the applicable MPGs, but with an average delay of 6 to 8 months. In its latest submission, the Party provides, among other things, certain information on the projected levels of financial resources to be provided to developing country Parties which it intends to mobilize from the private sector sources. The submissions do not contain information on the financial resources already provided (relevant provisions: Article 9, paragraphs 5 and 7, Article 13, paragraph 9).

⁴ Unless otherwise indicated provisions in the present scenarios refer to those of the Paris Agreement. They are indicative only and added to complement the illustrative example, without prejudice to any views and interpretations Parties may have.

Scenario no. 6

Party C made its last submission under Article 13 one year after the deadline specified in applicable MPG. The report on the review of that submission conducted pursuant to Article 13, paragraph 12, indicates that, while the submission contains national inventory, the information provided is only partial and is not consistent with the relevant methodology. The Party asserts that it lacks the technical capacity to apply the methodology consistently (relevant provisions: Article 13, paragraphs 7, 12, 13).

B. GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR ALL SCENARIOS

The below questions are suggested to guide the discussions of the scenarios illustrated in part A. They are not intended to constrain participants in any way, but rather to stimulate discussions. The groups may also wish to explore any other questions that the participants put forward in the course of the discussions.

1. In the light of their discussions on the following questions, participants are invited to reflect on whether issues described in the scenarios are best addressed by the Committee or would be better considered and dealt with through other means.
2. What information would the Committee need in order to consider the matter and arrive at any conclusions or propose any steps/measures? How would it get this information?
3. What specific engagement with the Party concerned could be most useful and effective? How would the Committee go about it?
4. What would be the appropriate ways for the Committee to consider the national capabilities and circumstances affecting the implementation/compliance issue of the Party/Parties concerned and what would be the measures or outputs the Committee could elaborate/put forward?
5. Which other arrangements/bodies under the Paris Agreement may be concerned with the issue? How does the Committee interact with these bodies?
6. What appropriate measures or steps could the Committee take to address the issue in question? Is there any particular sequence to such measures and if so, what would be most useful and practical?
7. How could the Committee follow up on the issue and measures/steps taken?
8. What would be effective and appropriate ways to bring the issue to the attention of the Committee?