

Third World Network Bonn Climate News Updates

(June 2015)



TWN
Third World Network

Third World Network
BONN CLIMATE NEWS UPDATES
(June 2015)

TWN
Third World Network

BONN CLIMATE NEWS UPDATES (JUNE 2015)

is published by
Third World Network
131 Jalan Macalister
10400 Penang, Malaysia
Website: www.twn.my

© Third World Network 2015

Cover design: Lim Jee Yuan

Printed by Jutaprint
2 Solok Sungei Pinang 3, Sg. Pinang
11600 Penang, Malaysia

ISBN: 978-967-0747-09-5

CONTENTS

NOTE

Update No.	Title of Paper	Page
1.	Paris Agreement Will Not be Pulled Out from a Hat, Assures French Foreign Minister	1
2.	ADP Resumes Work in Bonn	3
3.	ADP: Streamlining of ‘Geneva Text’ Begins	7
4.	Subsidiary Bodies Begin Work on Key Issues	9
5.	ADP: Progress Made on Streamlining Geneva Text; Differentiation Issue Also Raised	15
6.	ADP: Heed Ground Rules in Streamlining Negotiating Text – Say Developing Countries	19
7.	ADP: Next Steps Identified on Way Forward on Negotiating Text	24
8.	Differences Re-emerge on the Rocky Road to Paris	29
9.	ADP: Conditions for Increasing pre-2020 Emissions Target Not Met – Says EU	31
10.	Developing Countries Call for a New Institution Dedicated to Capacity Building	34
11.	2013-2015 Review: Differences over Use of Structured Expert Dialogue Report	37
12.	Parties Unable to Agree on Response Measures	40
13.	Parties Call for ADP Co-chairs to Produce Streamlined Text for Substantive Negotiations to Begin	45
14.	ADP: Compiled Text on pre-2020 Action to be Tabled	49
15.	Orderly and Timely Outcome with No Surprises, Says COP 21 Presidency	54
16.	ADP Co-chairs to Produce Concise Text 24 July for Substantive Negotiations	56
17.	SBSTA: Agreement on ‘REDD-plus’ but Other Key Issues to be Resolved in Paris	60
18.	SBI: Financial Shortfall Confronts Secretariat-mandated Activities, Key Issues Deferred to Paris	64
19.	ADP: North-South Divide over Mandate for pre-2020 Climate Action	70
20.	ADP: Strong Disagreement over Elements for Decision on pre-2020 Climate Action	74

21. SBI/SBSTA: Draft Decision on Impact of Implementation of Response Measures Sent to Paris	79
22. 2013-2015 Review: Work to Continue in Paris, Differences Remain on SED Report	81

NOTE

This is a collection of 22 News Updates prepared by the Third World Network for and during the recent United Nations Climate Change Talks – the forty-second sessions of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI 42) and the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA 42), as well as the ninth part of the second session of the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP 2-9) – in Bonn, Germany from 1 to 11 June 2015.

Paris Agreement Will Not be Pulled Out from a Hat, Assures French Foreign Minister

Bonn, 2 June (Meena Raman*) –The text of the new climate agreement to be concluded in Paris at the end of this year, will not be pulled out of a hat, assured Laurent Fabius, the Foreign Minister of France, at the welcoming ceremony of the climate talks which kicked off on 1 June in Bonn, Germany. Fabius is the incoming President of the 21st meeting of the Conference of Parties (COP 21) to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

Stressing the need for Parties to make progress in the negotiations for the Paris agreement, he said that he did ‘not want to pull a text out of a hat’. ‘The objective is to have a pre-agreement in October,’ said Fabius, so that at the COP in December, it will be ‘possible to have final outcomes and a solid agreement’.

The sentiment of the incoming Presidency was further explained by Laurence Tubiana, the Special Representative of the French Minister of Foreign Affairs, who spoke later at the opening plenary session of the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP), which followed the welcoming ceremony.

Tubiana said that by October, ‘we need to have a sense of the agreement on the main political points that have to be agreed in Paris.’ Referring to the French Presidency, she said ‘we are not working on a text’ and ‘we do not want to produce a text’, saying further that ‘we are supportive of a transparent and inclusive process,’ in an apparent reference to a Party-driven process.

(The ADP, which was launched in 2011, is expected to finally commence substantive negotiations on the Paris agreement at the Bonn session which ends on 11 June. The negotiations are based on a 90-page negotiating text called the ‘Geneva text’, which was the result of work done in Geneva in February this year. The task in Bonn is to

produce a more streamlined, concise and manageable negotiating text). (See separate article on this.)

At the welcoming ceremony, Peruvian Environment Minister and COP 20 President Manuel Pulgar-Vidal addressed Parties via a video message. Both he and Fabius outlined their views on the Paris agreement.

Pulgar-Vidal said that the Paris agreement could have a set of key components such as the following: a core instrument that is universal, legally binding and durable, and provides flexibility for different national circumstances; provides for some form of long-term goal which confirms that 1.5°C-2°C of temperature limit is established with a global objective of carbon neutrality and encourages national pathways for low carbon development.

He added further that the agreement could provide for mitigation commitments to be prepared, communicated, implemented and reported periodically with nationally determined contributions which are based on the principle of progression with flexible and evolving rules for review and accounting, in a facilitative process for the fulfilment of national objectives.

Pulgar-Vidal also said that there could be acknowledgement of the intended nationally determined contributions (INDCs) in the decision to register them in a multilateral framework as Parties move forward towards the ratification of the agreement. He added further that the agreement could have a long-term and qualitative goal for adaptation to give vision and purpose to climate-resilient development around the world; a commitment to prepare and implement national adaptation plans (NAPs) to establish a global process of cooperation to feed the institutional knowledge and financial and technical gaps for adaptation action.

He added further that the agreement could provide substantial progress on climate finance to improve methodologies and definition for accounting to reinforce the existing monitoring and review mechanisms on support; ensure the efficient disbursement of resources by the Green Climate Fund (GCF); explore in the future, a new possible aggregate financial target at the global, sectoral or regional level and to promote in the corporate banking and insurance sector climate-sensitive portfolios.

He also said that the Paris outcome could have institutional arrangements and international cooperation to deal with the issues of loss and damage, in particular risk management, insurance schemes, rehabilitation measures and humanitarian issues; and launch a global effort to scale up technology and capacity building support to developing countries.

Pulgar-Vidal also stressed the acceleration of pre-2020 climate action through the fulfilment of existing obligations and engagement of subnational actors, the private sector and civil society around the world, as well as a decision to pursue the treatment of workstream 2 issues of the ADP both before and after 2020. (Workstream 2 relates to pre-2020 ambition while workstream 1 deals with the post-2020 agreement).

He added that these are just examples of what could be in the outcomes and do not cover the whole range of matters, saying further that 'convergence on these issues are necessary and possible'.

The COP 20 President said further that 'under the banner of the "Lima Paris Action Agenda", we want to carry the cause of climate action all the way to Paris. We have seen the commitment of stakeholders who are acting and to increase engagement beyond Paris. To support national governments, Paris needs to embed this action into the paradigm of progress in the UNFCCC.' He said that the Paris outcome needs to formally recognise action by all actors across levels, catalyse further action and cooperation initiatives.

In his remarks, Fabius said that 'we will not win the battle for development and elimination of poverty if we do not win the fight against climate change'. On what is wanted in Paris, he said 'we want to limit global mean temperature rise to 2°C or 1.5°C compared to pre-industrial levels. This can give a clear signal to the world, to local government, to businesses that we are moving into transition

towards low carbon economy and granting equitable access to sustainable development.'

He identified four pillars for the climate agreement as follows: (i) This is a universal legally binding agreement according to a legal formula that will be decided on the basis of the Durban mandate; it must cover mitigation and adaptation; it must take into account the responsibility and capacities of all and these are evolving; it must be sustainable and help progressively attain the long-term objective; (ii) On the INDCs, it is important for each country to present its national contribution with commitments on mitigation and also adaptation projects; (iii) On finance, technology and capacity building support, trust must be built that the commitment made in Copenhagen will be kept, i.e. to raise US\$100 billion per year from public and private sources, with part of it going to the GCF. Rules and incentives must be established to ensure reorientation of public and private flows to low carbon economy; (iv) The 'Lima to Paris Action Plan' seeks to bring in non-state actors, local authorities and businesses so that they also make commitments and this is to support not replace commitments, and strengthen collective efforts, even before 2020.

Fabius stressed that Parties at the Bonn session must make progress on three areas: what matters come under the legal instrument and what come under COP decisions; simplify and shorten the negotiating text, promptly drafting the provisions that have consensus and isolating the major rather political options that ministers must decide on; and finally prepare a decision on pre-2020.

He added that climate change negotiations are complicated in getting a balanced agreement, saying that he did not want 'to pull a text out of my hat'. He said that it is therefore important to reach a pre-agreement in the ADP in October and on that basis, there is a text that is clear to everybody as Parties go to Paris.

The COP 21 President also said there are plans to involve heads of states and governments to give political guidance and strong mandates to negotiators, with a meeting planned in New York in September, as well as to have them be present at the opening of the COP in Paris if they wish. Fabius added that the ministers will be involved from the second week of the Paris COP and stressed that the failure of COP 21 would be a terrible thing and a fatal blow to the negotiating process. He said that 'we have to absolutely succeed'.

(* With inputs from Indrajit Bose)

ADP Resumes Work in Bonn

Bonn, 2 June (Indrajit Bose) – The Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP) resumed its work at the ninth part of its second session in Bonn on 1 June. The June session offers Parties to the UNFCCC the first opportunity to begin negotiating on the basis of their positions contained in the negotiations text. Parties had finalised the [negotiations text](#) earlier in February 2015 in Geneva, and referred to as the ‘Geneva text’.

At the opening plenary, Co-chair of the ADP, Daniel Reifsnyder (USA), said that the task of the June session (which meets from 1-11 June) is to consolidate and streamline the negotiating text. ‘It will not remove any views from the table,’ said Reifsnyder and added that the idea is for the views to be coherently presented.

Charting out the work for the first week in Bonn, he said that the contact group would meet in two negotiating groups and to complement support to the negotiating groups, facilitators had been appointed who have been tasked with time-bound consultations twice every day. The mandate of each facilitated group would be established in each negotiating group and the facilitators would report back on progress. When Parties in the negotiating groups consider the text is better reflected, it would be included in a ‘working document’, said Reifsnyder. ‘This does not mean it will be reflected in the Paris agreement. It merely means it is an enhanced presentation of the ideas. No issues in the Geneva text will be left behind until 11 December (the last day of COP21),’ clarified Reifsnyder.

The opening plenary was brief, with statements by the Group of 77 and China and other groupings. Developing country groups such as the African Group, the Least Developed Countries (LDCs), the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS), the Like Minded Developing Countries (LMDC), South Africa, Brazil, China and India (BASIC) supported the statement by the G77 and China and refrained from reading out their statements in the interest of

time. Their statements were instead posted on the UNFCCC website.

While the Umbrella Group of countries made a brief intervention, the other groups such as the European Union and the Environmental Integrity Group took the floor to say that their statements were posted online.

South Africa, on behalf of the G77 and China, said that the 2015 agreement must be comprehensive in dealing with all the agreed elements, inter alia mitigation, adaptation, loss and damage, finance, technology development and transfer, capacity building and transparency of action and support. To achieve this, Parties need the commitment for a rules-based agreement that is under the Convention and based on its principles and provisions. There should be no backsliding, including by using processes outside of the Convention, it stressed. Any attempt to redefine, rewrite, renegotiate or water down the Convention will not be acceptable, it warned. It added that progress on Loss and Damage should be secured, response measures and specific institutions should be addressed in the agreement. ‘If these issues are not accommodated there can be no agreement in Paris,’ it stressed.

The LDCs referred to the report of the 2013-2015 Review and said that warming needs to be kept to below 1.5°C as the report clearly says that a 2°C world is an unsafe world.

The BASIC group underlined that the so-called ‘self differentiation’ approach is not consistent with the principles and provisions of the Convention, as well as the Durban or Lima mandates. ‘While Parties may nationally determine their own contributions in the context of the current intended nationally determined contribution (INDC) process, they cannot unilaterally determine or rewrite their commitments or obligations under the legal framework of the Convention,’ read the statement posted on the UNFCCC website.

The LMDC articulated that concepts or approaches such as evolving common but differentiated responsibilities (CBDR) or ‘Parties in a position to do so’ are not consistent with the principles of the Convention and are not acceptable. ‘Concepts such as these and issues that did not obtain consensus among the Parties through the COP in Lima such as an ex ante review (whether or not in the guise of an INDC workshop) may not be made part of the work of the ADP in the run-up to Paris as they only make it more difficult to achieve trust and build confidence in this process.’ (The LMDC was referring to an un-mandated side-event which has been planned on INDCs, organised by the UNFCCC secretariat to be held on 2 and 9 June.)

The Africa Group proposed concrete suggestions on streamlining the negotiations text. It said that the overlaps and duplications ‘within’ paragraphs could serve as a good starting point. It also requested space to be allocated to understanding the structure and the form of the agreement. The group has also expressed its concern on the working document proposed by the Co-chairs where the reflections of the consolidated text would figure. It also highlighted the key asks of the African ministers of the Paris agreement.

A clear divergence area is workstream 2 dealing with the pre-2020 ambition. While the developed countries are focused on technical expert meetings (TEMs) under workstream 2, the developing countries are clear that the scope of the work goes beyond the TEMs.

‘We are looking forward to the adoption and the launching of initiatives that will effectively result in enhancing mitigation by 2020 with the view to close the mitigation gap,’ said the LDCs in their statement posted online.

Highlights of interventions/statements at the opening plenary

Speaking for **the G77 and China, South Africa** underscored the importance of addressing cross-cutting issues such as the structure, the legal form and differentiation, which would catalyse progress. It also requested for adequate time to discuss pre-2020 actions and reiterated the importance of openness and for the process to be Party-driven and transparent.

It said that there are multiple challenges involved in climate change and gave the example of developing countries having to mitigate without adequate finance and technology support from the developed countries. Under such circumstances, indicating developing countries’ commitment is hard

work. ‘We are embarking on INDCs despite the fact that developed countries are not putting forward commitments on finance or technology in their INDCs,’ said South Africa, adding that the developed countries have not honoured their obligations under the Convention.

South Africa also said that the fact that the Doha Amendment to the Kyoto Protocol (KP) has been accepted by 29 developing countries and by only three developed countries is indicative of that. It called on developed countries to ensure that they honour and implement their existing commitments under the Convention and the KP. Developed countries need to honour the principles of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities (CBDRRC) and equity, which have been reaffirmed in Lima, it said.

On the work of the ADP, South Africa said that workstream 2 is an integral part of the ADP and that it would be critical for an agreement in Paris. It stressed that developed countries should fulfil their commitment to provide and mobilise US\$100 billion and provide a clear pathway to achieve this.

It added that the 2015 agreement must be comprehensive in dealing with all the agreed elements, inter alia mitigation, adaptation, loss and damage, finance, technology development and transfer, capacity building and transparency of action and support. To achieve this, Parties need the commitment for a rules-based agreement that is under the Convention and based on its principles and provisions. There should be no backsliding, including by using processes outside of the Convention, it stressed. Any attempt to redefine, rewrite, renegotiate or water down the Convention will not be acceptable, it warned. It added that progress on Loss and Damage should be secured, response measures and specific institutions should be addressed in the agreement. ‘If these issues are not accommodated there can be no agreement in Paris,’ said South Africa while adding that a divided G77 is to no one’s interest.

The statement posted online by the **Least Developed Countries (LDCs)** underscored the importance of process. ‘There is a need for careful balance between the progress needed to achieve an agreement in Paris and the treatment of the process that will be driving this ahead. Here, your role as the co-chairs and the role of the current and incoming COP Presidents are really fundamental,’ the statement reads.

Reflecting on the final report of the 2013-2015 Review, the LDCs said that the report had arrived at the conclusion that ‘the “guardrail” concept, in which up to 2°C of warming is considered safe, is not

adequate'. The report clearly states that less warming would be preferable. Warming needs to be kept to below 1.5°C, it said. 'The Structured Expert Dialogue thus directly lends stringent, scientific support to our position on 1.5°C as a scientifically defensible global goal. It is critical that these strong conclusions and insights be translated into decisions and fostered actions: all Parties to urgently raise ambition, to commit toward an ambitious outcome in Paris under the ADP, outcome that address adaptation, mitigation, finance, technology, capacity building, loss and damage and transparency at the scale required by the challenge at hand,' the statement reads.

On workstream 2, it said that their expectations go beyond a renewed work programme on enhancing mitigation ambition in the pre-2020 period and the continuation of the technical examination meetings and processes. 'We are looking forward to the adoption and the launching of initiatives that will effectively result in enhancing mitigation by 2020 with the view to close the mitigation gap.'

The BASIC (Brazil, South Africa, India, China) group of countries said that achieving consensus requires the strengthening of the multilateral rules-based regime under the Convention, in full accordance with its principles and provisions. The Paris agreement should enhance the full, effective and sustained implementation of the Convention, not create a new regime or restructure, reinterpret or rewrite the Convention, it said. Stressing that Parties must advance on all the six elements mandated in Durban, in a balanced manner and coherent structure, the group said that coherence is also fundamental to address cross-cutting issues in all sections of the negotiating text, in particular differentiation between developed and developing countries and the application of the principles of equity and CBDRRC. The group underscored the need for the provisions of the agreement to fully reflect different responsibilities and development stages of developed and developing countries.

In the statement issued, the group underlined that the so-called 'self differentiation' approach was not consistent with the principles and provisions of the Convention, nor with the Durban mandate or the Lima Call for Climate Action. 'While Parties may nationally determine their own contributions in the context of the current Intended Nationally Determined Contribution (INDC) process, they cannot unilaterally determine or rewrite their commitments or obligations under the legal framework of the Convention. BASIC countries also do not support efforts by some Parties to take key

issues, such as climate finance, outside the scope of the Convention in an effort to bypass its unique legal character,' the statement reads.

The 2015 agreement is a vehicle to enhance the implementation of commitments in accordance with Article 4 of the Convention. This requires honouring and implementing existing commitments and responsibilities by developed countries. Enhanced action will not be achieved by shifting these burdens to developing countries, who have already taken on the largest and disproportionate share of the burden on a voluntary basis and often without support, even though they are not the ones with primary responsibility for causing climate change. It is also important to take into account that adaptation needs are driven by the extent of adverse effects of climate change experienced and the challenges faced by developing countries both now and in the future and hence adaptation is an issue which requires a global response, in accordance with the principles and provisions of the Convention. The group also said that in their INDCs, they would reflect the results of their current ambitious national initiatives. The group also called for more time to be dedicated to discussing other aspects of workstream 2 issues and ways to ensure that enhanced actions are agreed to in a draft decision text on pre-2020 ambition.

The LMDC in its statement said that the Paris outcome must address all the six core elements from the Durban mandate in a balanced manner and will result in enhanced action in implementing the UNFCCC both before and after 2020. 'We have continually stressed that this outcome must be achieved through an open, transparent, inclusive, Party-driven and consensus-building process, marked by direct negotiations among the Parties on the basis of texts that they have produced themselves. These are the benchmarks by which we will assess both the success and the legitimacy of the outcome in Paris,' the LMDC said in their statement.

It reiterated that what Parties will achieve in Paris must be under the Convention, guided by the principles, provisions and structure of the Convention. The result must be to enhance the implementation of the Convention in order to achieve the objective of the Convention as set out in its Article 2, and not to renegotiate, rewrite, restructure or replace the Convention or reinterpret its provisions. The concepts or approaches such as 'evolving CBDR' or 'Parties in a position to do so' are not consistent with the principles of the Convention and are not acceptable.

Concepts such as these and issues that did not obtain consensus among the Parties through the COP

in Lima such as an ex ante review (whether or not in the guise of an INDC workshop) may not be made part of the work of the ADP in the run-up to Paris as they only make it more difficult to achieve trust and build confidence in this process.

The LMDC stressed Parties' INDCs towards achieving the objective of the Convention as set out in its Article 2 must be consistent with the Parties' respective obligations and commitments under Article 4 of the Convention. 'In this context, we expect developed country Parties to communicate well in advance of Paris their INDCs not only on post-2020 emission reduction targets but also on post-2020 targets, policies and measures for the provision of finance, technology development and transfer and capacity building support to developing countries,' it said. On workstream 2, it said that pre-2020 ambition should be primarily achieved through the implementation of the outcomes of the Bali Roadmap.

In their statement posted online the **African Group** reaffirmed its call for a multilateral rules-based system that enhances the implementation of the Convention, recognises the enormous contribution by developing countries going to 2020, and as such, calls on developed countries to scale up their support action in developing countries. The group outlined the vision of the African ministers for the Paris agreement to be under the Convention, and in accordance with its principles and provisions, in particular the principles of CBDRRC and equity; provide parity between mitigation and adaptation; operationalise the global responsibility for adaptation, through a global goal for adaptation that enhances the implementation of adaptation commitments under the Convention; and the agreement should reaffirm the international obligation for all developed country Parties and other Parties included in Annex II to provide climate finance to developing countries as a means to enhance action towards achieving the objectives of the Convention.

It also called for more space to comprehensively work towards a pre-2020 decision, 'which we see as a necessary step to build the trust and assurance on the implementation of existing agreements going to 2020'. The group also pointed to the lack of access to reliable and affordable clean energy and reflected on its call for an ambitious global partnership and support programme for the acceleration of renewable energy access and deployment in all countries. For this, 'the missing piece is enhanced public finance to catalyze new

projects, guarantee safe investment conditions for both the private and public sectors over several decades to provide concessional credits for upfront investment, and support fixed costs associated with capacity-building, training and smart grid upgrades,' it said.

Speaking for the **Umbrella Group** of countries, **Australia** said it sees the main objective under workstream 1 as delivering a concise, durable and operational legal agreement. As part of the streamlining and consolidation of the text exercise, it said Parties should identify content that is more appropriate for a decision text, as distinct from provisions that are suitable for a durable legal agreement and consider what work could be done after Paris and when this should be done. The exercise should focus on areas of the text where there is opportunity to build better conceptual understanding, as the basis for building convergence. These could include the nature of adaptation commitments, process for finalisation and update of mitigation contributions, aggregate review, transparency and the global goal. The exercise should also continue to keep in mind matters relating to the structure of the agreement. On workstream 2, it said that it was looking forward to working on a decision in Paris and enhancing the technical expert meetings beyond 2015.

In its statement posted online, **the European Union (EU)** stressed that the objective is to work towards adopting a legally binding agreement that is capable of keeping the world collectively on track to achieve the below 2°C objective. It outlined several areas for progress: how the agreement would deliver transparency and accountability of Parties against their mitigation commitments; how dynamism would be ensured in the 2015 agreement; in relation to mitigation, it called for securing a process to regularly revisit and, if necessary, raise ambition over time to achieve an agreed long-term goal. It called for achieving climate-resilient sustainable development through effective adaptation. On finance, Parties must address how the post-2020 regime would provide climate finance to those countries in need. It also called for progress on workstream 2, including work on a decision to be adopted in Paris. It said that it is also looking forward to the INDCs of Parties, in particular of all the major economies.

Following the conclusion of the opening plenary, Parties met in negotiating groups to consider sections of the Geneva text. (See separate article in this regard.)

ADP: Streamlining of 'Geneva Text' Begins

Bonn, 2 June (Meena Raman and Indrajit Bose) – After a rather unclear start on how to embark on the streamlining of the 'Geneva text' for the Paris agreement, Parties in the negotiating groups of the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP) began to make some progress in advancing the work.

The negotiations are based on a 90-page negotiating text called the 'Geneva text', which was the result of work done in Geneva in February this year.

The negotiating groups were launched on Monday, 1 June, to consider sections of the Geneva text and to embark on a 'first reading', which according to the ADP Co-chairs, Daniel Reifsnyder (US) and Ahmed Djoghlaif (Algeria), is to 'consolidate and streamline the text with a view to reducing duplication, overlap and repetition'.

At the opening plenary of the ADP held on the morning of 1 June, Reifsnyder said that there were 20 negotiating days left for Parties. He also outlined that two negotiating groups will meet in parallel every day, and will be supported and complemented by work in facilitated groups in between the negotiating groups. The work of the negotiating groups will be captured in a 'working document'. In the second reading, there will be substantive negotiations. A contact group will be convened on 2 June to take stock of progress and make the necessary adjustments for the second reading, added the Co-chair.

The Geneva text is organised into the following sections: preamble (section A); definitions (section B); general and objective (section C); mitigation (section D); adaptation/loss and damage (section E); finance (section F); technology transfer (section G); capacitybuilding (section H); transparency of action and support (section I); timeframes and process related to commitments/contributions/other matters related to implementation and ambition (section J);

facilitating implementation and compliance (section K); and procedural and institutional provisions (section L).

The first negotiating group was convened in the morning after the ADP plenary and focused discussions on the section on 'general and objective' and was chaired by Reifsnyder. The afternoon negotiating group discussed the 'mitigation' section and another negotiating group met in parallel on 'adaptation and loss and damage'.

Before starting the streamlining exercise, in the first negotiating group on the 'general and objective' section, considerable time was spent discussing the modalities of the streamlining process.

Reifsnyder proposed that simple paragraphs with similar options should be tackled first and showed an example of how a paragraph might be streamlined. Parties sought clarity on how concepts would be streamlined across sections, who would be the custodian of the streamlining exercise and how to ensure proposals of Parties are not lost. Some Parties such as Norway and Sudan (for the African Group) agreed with the Co-chair that they should begin with the less complicated paragraphs.

During the negotiating group sessions on general/objective and adaptation and loss and damage, Reifsnyder asked of the Parties which paragraphs they would like to begin the streamlining exercise with. Upon consensus on the paragraphs to be streamlined, Parties went into an informal facilitation setting in a smaller room to begin the exercise, which met from 1-3 pm.

During the informal focused group, the Secretariat projected a proposal for a 'consolidated text' on the screen and Parties looked at it to see if they were comfortable with the text. Parties spent time going over the consolidated proposals and if they agreed on the proposals, the paragraph would be considered streamlined.

The Secretariat prepared the consolidated paragraphs which were essentially paragraphs with similar options. For example, under paragraph 54.2 of the negotiations text, there are two options. One, 'The governing body **shall adopt** further guidance on reporting on adaptation and further facilitating/ may facilitate the sharing of information on progress in and experiences with preparing and implementing adaptation actions.' Two, 'The governing body **may facilitate** the sharing of information on progress in and experiences with preparing and implementing adaptation actions.' The consolidated text proposed by the Secretariat read: 'The governing body [shall adopt further guidance on reporting on adaptation/] and may facilitate the sharing of information on progress in and experiences with preparing and implementing adaptation actions.'

Parties were not sure how to go about the streamlining process initially but it seemed there was more clarity on the process as, by the end of the day, Parties had approved a few 'consolidated paragraphs' from the adaptation section of the negotiations text. For those paragraphs that the Secretariat did not have consolidated options, Parties asked for the consolidated paragraphs before undertaking the streamlining. In some cases, such as in adaptation, some Parties said they would send their suggestions to the Secretariat on where the overlaps might be which could facilitate streamlining.

During the negotiating group discussion on mitigation which was chaired by Djoghlaif, the Secretariat initially proposed some paragraphs for consolidation with text on the screen. In certain cases, some Parties expressed their discomfort at the proposed consolidation, preferring to retain the original texts as they were in the Geneva text. Proposals also came from some Parties for streamlining, such as from Malaysia (speaking for the Like-minded Developing Countries), India, China, and Norway.

When concerns were expressed by some Parties such as Tuvalu for the LDCs and Sudan for the African Group that they were worried about their positions being compromised, Malaysia intervened to clarify that the object of the streamlining was not

to remove the options of any Party but to preserve them. Some progress was made in relation to a few paragraphs, with further work conducted at the focused group discussion later at night from 7-9 pm.

On another matter, when the daily programme was first seen on Monday morning, it was noted that the meetings of the facilitated groups were closed to observers.

Malaysia (speaking for the LMDC) raised its flag during the negotiating group session on the general/objective section and sought assurance for the meetings to be opened to observers 'because they are as much invested in the process'. To this Reifsnnyder responded that the usual practice is that facilitated forums are limited to Parties only. Malaysia requested the Co-chair to reconsider his proposal and to allow the observers into the focused group meetings.

Reifsnnyder repeated that the practice is closed to the observers and that 'we may have problems' because of space and that 'we want to afford priority to Parties' and sought Parties' views on allowing observers into the focused group meetings. Saudi Arabia supported the LMDC proposal and said observers should be allowed. Nicaragua also said that for the sake of transparency, the process must be open to everyone. Besides, 'the decision belongs to Parties. It is not a decision that the Secretariat can take for us,' said Nicaragua. The exchange led to observers being allowed into the meetings.

Three focused group meetings were held on 1 June on general/objective, on mitigation and on adaptation and loss and damage. The session on general/objective was held from 1.30pm to 3pm and was co-facilitated by Diann Black-Layne of Antigua and Barbuda and Artur Runge-Metzger from the European Union. The mitigation focused group, scheduled from 7pm to 9pm, was co-facilitated by Franz Perrez of Switzerland and Fook Seng Kwok of Singapore. There were two rounds of focused group meeting on adaptation, for about an hour around 5pm and then again from 7pm to 8pm. The sessions were co-facilitated by Andrea Guerrero of Colombia and Georg Borsting of Norway.

Subsidiary Bodies Begin Work on Key Issues

Bonn, 2 June (Hilary Chiew) – The 42nd session of the UNFCCC’s Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA42) launched its work in contact groups and informal consultations upon opening on 1 June.

The groups are to conclude their respective work and submit draft decisions and draft conclusions for adoption at the closing plenary scheduled for the morning of 11 June.

The new Chair Lidia Wojtal (Poland) said 2015 will be another challenging year for the whole UNFCCC process given the scarcity of time and workload that needs to be carefully managed towards concluding the Paris agreement. She said SBSTA42 would need to complete as much work as possible and every effort should be made to find and build consensus to achieve that.

She assured Parties that she considered all agenda items as equally important and as such will give equal attention to all items. ‘All items will receive balanced treatment and I will instruct co-facilitators along the same line,’ she stressed. (Lidia Wojtal replaced Tomasz Chruszczow [also of Poland].)

Wojtal had issued an information note on 8 May outlining her ‘approach and vision for the forthcoming two SBSTA sessions in the run-up to the 21st session of the Conference of the Parties (COP) in Paris, France, and to highlight a few issues of particular interest to the SBSTA’.

She also said that as time in Paris will be very short and space must be made for governments to complete their negotiations on the Paris agreement, an intense effort will be required at SBSTA42 so that work on as many items as possible can be completed. She further noted that she intended for SBSTA43 (to be held alongside the Paris COP) to exclusively focus on key issues that are directly related to the Paris outcome, and for any other unresolved issues to be addressed at SBSTA44. Her

particular focus for SBSTA42 will include key issues on which SBSTA41 was not able to conclude work last December.

Referring to the SBSTA Chair’s approach, **South Africa for the G77 and China** said that ‘it regards all issues on the SBSTA agenda with the same priority and not only those items that have been prioritised in your information note. All these issues need to be concluded as soon as possible.’

Meanwhile, the 42nd Session of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI42) also launched its work in contact groups and informal consultations. A major agenda of SBI42 is the second multilateral assessment (MA) working group session under the international assessment and review process on 4 and 5 June. A total of 24 developed countries will be assessed on their progress towards the achievement of emission reductions and removals related to their quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets. Countries to be assessed include Canada, Japan, the Russian Federation, Australia and Germany.

Besides the MA and agenda items, several workshops and events will take place during this session of SBI: a joint technical workshop with SBSTA and the Standing Committee on Finance (SCF) on methodologies for the reporting of financial information by developed country Parties will also be held on 6 June; the fourth meeting of the Durban Forum on Capacity building (3 and 8 June); and the third Dialogue on Article 6 of the Convention (2 and 3 June).

The SBI is presided over by Amena Yauvoli (Fiji) and is expected to conclude its work before the closing plenary in the afternoon of 11 June.

Following are the interventions of groups of Parties at the SBSTA opening.

South Africa speaking for the G77 and China said the work of SBSTA plays an important role in our understanding of the science of climate change, is aimed at strengthening the implementation

of the Convention and therefore has a direct bearing on the negotiations under the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP).

The G77 reiterated the importance of the achievement reached at COP19 with the Warsaw Framework for REDD-plus, which has concluded most of the negotiations under this agenda item. It looked forward to concluding the consideration of pending matters in this session and is ready and willing to move REDD-plus further into implementation, provided that adequate and predictable support is made available from developed countries.

It also called for the recognition that alternative policy approaches, such as joint mitigation and adaptation approaches, need differentiated methodological guidance, in accordance with national circumstances and national policies, in the context of sustainable development supported by financial, technical and capacity building within the context of the Convention.

In relation to agriculture, the G77 and China said it attaches great importance to the SBSTA discussions. It engages actively in the two in-session workshops on early warning systems, risks assessments and vulnerability of agricultural systems affected by climate change. Agriculture is considered to be the backbone of developing countries, economic systems and has a special role for the livelihood of millions, food security and poverty eradication.

The Group also appreciated the work of the Structured Expert Dialogue (SED) under the 2013-2015 Review of the adequacy of the long-term global goal and the overall progress towards achieving it and welcomed the SED final report. It expected that a thorough consideration will be made of the report in order for COP21 to take forward the work of the SED, as well as on linkages with work under the ADP.

The G77-China said that research dialogue is a fundamental part of our common efforts to communicate emerging scientific findings; research planning activities; research priorities and gaps; research capacity building activities particularly in developing countries, as well as regional climate change research networks. It therefore sees the seventh research dialogue taking place on Thursday (4 June) as an important forum to facilitate discussions with the scientific community on scientific issues related to meeting the needs of the Convention. The Group seeks to help address the data and information gaps, including from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCCC)'s

Fifth Assessment Report, and to advance the discussions on lessons learned.

On Response Measures, the G77-China reaffirmed the importance of giving full consideration to what actions are necessary to meet the specific needs and concerns of developing country Parties arising from the impact of the implementation of response measures, in accordance with the principles and provisions of the Convention.

'In this regard, we look forward to engage constructively on the text of the draft decision forwarded from Lima in order to adopt a decision in COP21 for the establishment of a mechanism on enhanced action on the impact of the implementation of response measures. The G77-China position remains firm that the negative economic and social consequences of response measures taken by developed country Parties on developing country Parties must be avoided and minimised. Policy issues, such as unilateral measures, must be addressed.

'As for agenda item 8(a) on methodologies for reporting of financial information by Parties included in Annex 1 to the Convention, the actions taken to comply with obligations on the provision of financial resources, access and transfer of technology – and more especially on meeting costs of adaptation – have to be reported by developed country Parties in a manner that is comparable and verifiable. This has not been the case in the 20 years since the entry into force of the Convention. Such lack of reporting is one of the most serious gaps in our implementation of the Convention.' It is of utmost importance that progress be made on this item to ensure that the SBSTA fulfils its mandate set out in decision 2/CP17 and that COP21 takes a decision in this regard, it said further.

In Lima, it said the Group worked very hard to bring the item on methodological issues under the Kyoto Protocol to a conclusion. Any further obstacles to finalising the Kyoto Protocol's second commitment period must be dealt with during this session. If progress is not made on this agenda item, it would not bode well for the 2015 agreement in Paris.

It also looked forward to continuing to engage constructively at this session in the discussions related to the framework for various approaches, new market mechanism and non-market-based approaches in a balanced manner thereafter, noting the importance of this discussion for the 2015 agreement. Also, the Group recognises that non-market-based approaches are important to ensure the implementation of the objective of the Convention, according to its principles and provisions.

Representing the African Group, Sudan drew attention to key elements and areas of work that require considerable advancement in this session. On REDD-plus, the Group intends to continue to positively engage on the issues of non-market-based approaches and additional guidance for safeguards. It believed that more time should be devoted to the yet-to-be-discussed issue of non-carbon benefits, which has interesting and complementary overlaps between itself, the issue of safeguards and non-market-based approaches (NCBs). NCBs within the African context are essential for the long-term viability and success of REDD-plus implementation. In the particular case of African countries whose interest is in the 'plus' part of REDD, success in generating and maintaining the NCBs is the main bulwark against emissions from deforestation and degradation. The Group intends to table a proposal on the consideration of NCBs that would direct sufficient support towards their implementation in REDD-plus countries for whom the implementation of NCBs is critical. Progress on this issue here in Bonn, we believe, would bode well for a positive outcome in Paris.

The African Group appreciated the work of the SED and its final report. It was concerned about the mandate of special event of 2013-2015 Review and how to take forward the work of SED.

On the impacts of implementation of Response Measures, the African Group would like to highlight the crucial need to strengthen and enhance areas of cooperation and collaboration among Parties. It would also like to highlight the urgency to give full consideration to the necessary action required to meet the needs arising from the impacts of the implementation of response measures, particularly the specific needs and concerns of developing country Parties.

'We were disappointed when the negotiations on the impacts of the implementation of response measures could not reach a successful conclusion in Lima, after a lot of work and cooperation from our Group. We see this as an important issue for sustainable development for Africa and look forward to constructive discussions and successful conclusions at this session,' it lamented.

On methodological issues under the Kyoto Protocol, the Group said it did its utmost to bring this item to a conclusion in Lima, and hoped that any further obstacles to finalising the Kyoto Protocol's second commitment period can be overcome during this session for a decision to be reached in Paris and called for the rapid ratification of the Doha Amendment by all.

It said the Framework for Various Approaches, New Market Mechanisms and Non-market Approaches are very important issues for the African Group. However, the Group believes that it is important to consider the relationship with the 2015 agreement and previous decisions prior to taking decisions on these matters, including the amendment to the Kyoto Protocol. The Group reiterates its position that market discussion should take into account issues of poverty eradication and sustainable development.

The Maldives representing the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS) warned that the guardrail of up to 2°C of warming being considered safe is inadequate. It said Parties should aim to push the defence line as low as possible. It said limiting temperature rise to 1.5°C is still feasible and brings many benefits but the window is closing rapidly. It called upon the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN) to explore climate technologies to address the ambition gap as the IPCC has confirmed that sea level rise will worsen and this would threaten infrastructure and settlements that support the livelihood of island communities.

It said it is essential that actions are informed by latest science findings particularly the conclusion of the 2013-2015 Review and therefore the joint contact group of SBSTA and the SBI to deliberate on the SED final report must lead to immediate implementation of climate actions.

Representing the Least Developed Countries (LDCs), Angola expressed solidarity with Bangladesh, Nepal and Vanuatu that were hit by deadly earthquakes or cyclones recently.

It too found that keeping temperature rise below 2°C cannot be considered safe as climate change impacts are already costing lives and warned that increased warming will cause irreversible damage. It said the SED final report directly lent support to the Group's position of 1.5°C as a defensible global goal. Towards this end, it said the agenda item on research dialogue is of vital importance to the LDCs.

It also said it is of critical importance that SBSTA develops a methodology for reporting on finance especially with experience gained by Annex 1 Parties from their first Biennial Report, adding that it is crucial for methodologies on reporting to be enhanced to gain more clarity and transparency of finance available for the needs of developing countries.

On agriculture, it said the assessment of risks and vulnerabilities of the agriculture system to different warming scenarios revealed a knowledge gap that needs to be addressed. It is critical to support

the most vulnerable countries with contingency plans that hold great potential of reducing the impacts. On loss and damage, it said the composition of the Executive Committee of the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage needs to be completed as soon as possible so that the ExCom can get into full operationalisation of its two-year workplan.

Guatemala representing the Independent Alliance of Latin America and the Caribbean (AILAC) announced its new member the Republic of Paraguay. It reckoned that the contribution of REDD-plus to the global effort of mitigating climate change is of substantial importance and therefore it is important to conclude outstanding issues and focus on the implementation.

It looked forward to a constructive and productive workshop on methodologies to provide financial information by Annex I countries to developing countries. It was alarmed by the final report of the SED which tells us to avoid a 2°C temperature rise and said that governments should work to limit the rise to 1.5°C. It also underscored the importance of resolving all the methodological issues related to the KP and the urgent need for developed country Parties to ratify the second commitment period of the KP.

The European Union welcomed the final SED factual technical report and looked forward to discussing scientific findings related to the adequacy of the long-term goal and its further operationalisation. It was keen on finalising meaningful conclusions, with a view to informing the ADP process in due time.

Highlighting the issues that the EU considered as central for this SBSTA session, it said the first and the utmost important item is the methodological issues relating to Articles 5, 7 and 8 of the KP. It urged Parties to work towards a constructive outcome and resolve outstanding issues during the June session so that the CP2 can become effective with legal certainty.

It highlighted the importance of finalisation of the methodological issues under the KP on determining the ‘average annual emissions for the first three years of the preceding commitment period’. It suggested keeping this item separate from SBSTA items 9a and 9b.

It reiterated the importance of the methodologies for reporting of financial information by Annex I Parties since it has linkages to the discussions on transparency of support under ADP. On market mechanisms and non-market approaches under the Convention, the EU is awaiting the

technical exchange of views and a close cooperation of the SBSTA Chair and ADP Co-chairs on these mechanisms.

It also welcomed efforts made by the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO) and the International Maritime Organisation (IMO) in addressing international transport greenhouse gas emissions and encouraged them to step up their related work and activities, including an agreement on a global market-based mechanism for aviation in 2016.

Mexico speaking for the Environmental Integrity Group (EIG) said the Nairobi Work Programme which has been established as the technical and knowledge platform under the Cancun Adaptation Framework has enormous potential to liaise with other organisations doing valuable work in adaptation. On REDD-plus, it said following the Warsaw Framework for REDD+, it is now crucial to advance its implementation. It looked forward to the two in-session workshops related to agriculture and considered the work as fundamental in the field of adaptation. It welcomed the joint workshop on reporting methodologies of financial information which would add to understanding of different financing approaches. It looked forward to the completion of the 2013-2015 Review at this session in Bonn.

Representing the Umbrella Group, Australia said as Parties work to conclude the Paris agreement, the 2013-2015 Review and the SED final report would help Parties to better understand the adequacy of the long-term global goal. It welcomed the continued efforts by forest countries and donors to implement the Warsaw Framework for REDD-plus and hoped to conclude all outstanding issues including safeguards under the REDD+ agenda item. While it welcomed the two in-session workshops of early warning system and risk and vulnerability assessments of the agriculture agenda item, it is disappointed that there was no agreement on the item related to market mechanism (at SBSTA41).

The meeting was reconvened after lunch as several Parties had indicated their intention to address the agenda item 8(c) on emissions from fuel used for international aviation and maritime transport. This agenda item will not be deliberated at this session.

Argentina speaking for the African Group, the League of Arab States, Bolivia, Brazil, China, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, India, Iran, Malaysia, Nicaragua, Uruguay, Venezuela, and Vietnam welcomed the reports presented by ICAO and IMO on their work.

As expressed previously, they reaffirmed that the following elements should be duly considered by the ICAO and IMO when addressing climate change:

- Article 2.2 of the KP, by which Annex I Parties shall pursue limitation or reduction of emissions of greenhouse gases of international maritime and aviation working through the ICAO and IMO, and by which both organizations are mandated by the UNFCCC - as primary fora on climate change – to address the issue;
- Full respect for the principles and provisions of the Convention and of its Kyoto Protocol, in particular the principles of common but differentiated responsibilities (CBDR), as well as that measures should not constitute disguised restrictions on international trade;
- Comprehensive assessment of the possible social, economic, technical and environmental implications of the measures under discussion for developing countries, taking into account that international aviation and maritime transport play a vital role in the facilitation of world trade, and therefore on the social and economic development in developing countries;
- Respect for the consensus rule, and for the promotion of an inclusive and transparent process and a multilateral approach consistent with the principles and provisions of the UNFCCC, in opposition to unilateral measures;
- Promotion of transfer of financial resources and technologies from developed countries to developing countries, in accordance with the developed countries' obligations under the Convention.

Argentina said in relation to the IMO work, the group of countries reaffirmed the importance of the progress made in the IMO's Marine Environment Protection Committee with the recognition of its Resolution on Promotion of Technical Co-operation and Transfer of Technology relating to the Improvement of Energy Efficiency of Ships to the UNFCCC principles, in particular the principle of CBDR and equity. In particular, they acknowledged the work of the Ad Hoc Expert Working Group on Facilitation of Transfer of Technology for Ships (AHEWG-TT). With respect to the proposals for additional IMO measures, this should be consistent with the principles and provisions of the Convention and Argentina expressed support for multilateral discussions, in opposition to unilateral measures. In

this sense, they are deeply concerned about the recent approval by the EU of a unilateral measure on measuring, reporting and verification of shipping emissions that undermines the spirit of multilateral cooperation and that is inconsistent with the principles and provisions of the Convention.

It also reiterated its acknowledgement of the approval of the Third IMO GHG Study 2014, which highlights, in reference to the average of the period from 2007 to 2012, that 'international shipping accounts for approximately 2.6% and 2.4% of CO₂ and GHGs on a CO₂e basis, respectively', while in 2012 it only accounted for 2.2% of global emissions. This shows that international maritime transport is only a modest contributor to climate change, while it is fundamental for trade and economic and social development, as recognised in the IMO communication.

With respect to the ICAO report and communication, and in relation to the work of the Environmental Advisory Group (EAG), the group would like to recall the mandate coming from Resolution A38-18, in the sense that ICAO State Members should work on the technical aspects, environmental and economic impacts and modalities of the different possible options for a global market-based measure for international aviation, including its feasibility and practicability. In this respect, it is worth noting the recent presentation in the EAG of some alternative proposals to the Strawman document by different ICAO Members, proposals that should be further analysed, studied and elaborated by the ICAO, in particular in terms of how they take into account the special circumstances of developing States and address all of the concerns presented by Parties before taking further steps forward, following Resolution A38-18. In this sense, the work in the ICAO should remain Party-driven, transparent and inclusive.

[The Strawman document is the report of the Meteorological Aeronautical Requirements and Information Exchange Project Team (MARIE-PT-Action Report No. 2A dated 20 March 2012). This paper presents a 'strawman', in other words a proposal, outline or framework, for functional requirements for meteorological information to support ICAO's global concept of air traffic management and performance-based navigation.]

The group of countries also wish to reaffirm the importance of the recognition in Resolution A3818 that market-based measures (MBM) should be implemented only after bilateral and/or multilateral agreement and on the basis of mutual consent. Therefore, they call on countries to respect ICAO decisions and not resort to unilateral action.

In addition, it is worth noting the acknowledgement in the ICAO resolution of the principle of CBDR in any possible design of market-based measures. The ICAO discussions should not prejudice or duplicate possible results of the UNFCCC work or its principles and provisions.

With regard to ICAO's work referred to in States' action plans, in the case of developing countries, these plans must be understood as voluntary actions that take into account the specific national contexts, and not as part of a global goal in the international aviation transport. In this context, there is a need to ensure the transfer of financial resources, technology transfer and capacity building support to developing countries for them to be able to voluntarily undertake specific action plans.

The group also wanted to reiterate their deep concern at the proposals for the use of international aviation and maritime transport as a potential source for the mobilisation of revenue for climate finance, echoing the views included in Resolution A38-18 and in the submissions made by ICAO that international aviation should not be disproportionately targeted as a source of revenue.

Argentina requested for the statement to be included in the records of the session and trusts that the ICAO and IMO will take these matters under

consideration in their work and in their reports and communications in future SBSTA sessions.

China emphasised that MBM should accommodate the principle of CBDR and that economic impact analysis of different options of MBM should be carried out especially on developing countries. On IMO's plan, it concurred with the warning by the IMO general secretary who had cautioned that such regulation could undermine international shipping.

Singapore commended the progress made by ICAO and IMO and believed that with their expertise, measures such as the global MBM should continue to be developed.

Japan welcomed the significant progress made by the ICAO in terms of the global MBM and by the IMO in terms of discussion of a data collection system for fuel consumption. It noted that the mention of CBDR in the IMO preamble is not an acknowledgment of the principle but merely cognizant (of its presence). It further said the principle of non-discrimination should be the basis for international cooperation but CBDR is not consistent with this principle. Therefore, differentiation of developed and developing countries is not compatible.

It was supported by the **Republic of Korea and the United States**.

ADP: Progress Made on Streamlining Geneva Text; Differentiation Issue Also Raised

Bonn, 3 June (Meena Raman and Indrajit Bose) – Progress on the streamlining of the negotiations text for the Paris agreement under the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP) varied as regards the various elements, depending on the approach taken by Parties and the complexity of the issues.

A conceptual discussion on the various options on differentiation also took place, in the focused group meeting on ‘transparency of action and support’ late evening on Tuesday, 2 June. The different notions of differentiation were identified by some Parties such as **Brazil, the European Union and Norway**. It was also stressed that this was a cross-cutting issue that needed to be addressed not only in the ‘transparency’ section but across all the elements.

[The UNFCCC currently provides for differentiated responsibilities between developed and developing countries, under the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities (CBDRRC) under Article 3.1. The Geneva text contains proposals which are viewed by many developing countries as departing from this principle, such as a proposal by the United States for new annexes that differentiates countries according to new criteria related to ‘evolving emissions and economic trends’.]

Parties are still engaged in the ‘first-reading’ of the ‘Geneva text’ under the ADP and have been tasked to consolidate and streamline the text, with a view to reducing duplication, overlaps and repetition.

Parties progressed with streamlining four different sections of the Geneva text. The ADP convened the negotiating group of the contact group on ‘technology development and transfer’ and ‘finance’ in the morning and ‘capacity building’ and ‘transparency of action and support’ in the afternoon. The ADP also convened facilitated groups of the

contact group on the same themes from the Geneva text on 2 June in the afternoon and evening.

Following the practice of the first day of streamlining, the negotiating groups discussed which paragraphs should go to the facilitated groups and once in the facilitated groups, Parties discussed those paragraphs at length. Some of the consolidated paragraphs were put forth by the secretariat and some proposals came from the Parties themselves.

Co-chair Daniel Reifsnyder (USA) chaired the sessions on ‘technology’ and ‘transparency’ while Co-chair Ahmed Djoghlafl (Algeria) chaired ‘finance’ and ‘capacity building sessions’. The facilitated group on ‘finance’ was co-facilitated by Georg Borsting (Norway) and Diann Black-Layne (Antigua and Barbuda); ‘technology development and transfer’ was co-facilitated by Tosi Mpanu Mpanu (Democratic Republic of Congo) and Artur Runge-Metzger (European Union); ‘capacity building’ was co-facilitated by Artur Runge-Metzger and Tosi Mpanu Mpanu; and ‘transparency of action and support’ was co-facilitated by Fook Seng Kwok (Singapore) and Franz Perrez (Switzerland).

Transparency of action and support

At the negotiating group to consider this element, **Brazil** expressed doubts as to whether Parties could achieve any streamlining without an open and honest discussion on differentiation. It said that there are different kinds of proposals relating to differentiation in the Geneva text in the transparency section as well as throughout the whole text. Saying that there were too many details in the section, it questioned the need for streamlining when the details could be in a decision (and not the core agreement).

In response to Brazil, Reifsnyder said that what goes where – whether into an agreement or a decision – needs to be decided. The section deals with the

land-use sector, market mechanisms, accounting rules etc. and whether there should be interim arrangements or elements for a work plan will need to be agreed to and this will be decided in Paris.

The European Union said that the task is to unpack the text according to headers. On differentiation, there is a need to group all the different proposals and identify the political issues that will need to be decided later. **The US** suggested that in addition to streamlining, Parties could have conceptual discussions in the facilitated group session to unpack the issues more.

Tuvalu said that the discussion about differentiation relates to the 'who' question (who do the provisions apply to) and there needs to be a discussion on the 'what', i.e. on what the transparency section covers in relation to all aspects of the agreement.

Argentina also agreed that there is a need to talk about differentiation, which is not just linked to the transparency section but to all other sections too. It added that there are other issues too like the use of markets, which are also in other sections.

India said that while it appreciated the concerns of Parties, questions about concepts will continue but the rules of the exercise could not be changed every day. The suggestion was to try to overcome the redundancies and duplications. At the appropriate time, Parties can discuss differentiation but there is a need to have similar progress in all the sections of the elements (of the Paris agreement).

Colombia agreed that the issue of differentiation will not be solved here (in Bonn) and there is a need to streamline texts. **Canada, China** and **Iran** also agreed with India. Mexico called for a sense of urgency, saying that the issue of differentiation will not be resolved here but there is a need for the conversation to take place.

The meeting was adjourned after Parties agreed to work in the facilitated group to focus on possible paragraphs for consolidation, which began soon after and ended at 1 pm, and reconvened at 7pm and went on till 9 pm.

During the facilitated group meeting, Parties made progress in streamlining the paragraphs that were assigned to be addressed. After completing this task, the co-facilitator, Fook Seng Kwok (Singapore), proposed that Parties use the time to discuss the 'differentiation' concept.

Brazil identified several proposals, which were in the text which included options for no differentiation; differentiation according to the category of commitments; self-differentiation and maintaining the current differentiation as per the Convention. There were proposals for a common or

single framework of reporting. It said that it was very difficult for developing countries to be brought to that level of stringency of the developed countries with no support on the means of implementation.

The EU said that the issue was not about solving the matter but about teasing out what is in the text and said it had identified similar ideas as what Brazil had done. There are several options in the text it said, where one option is to maintain the bifurcated old system; an option that applied to only developed countries; an option for a common framework with a strong focus on flexibility that would accommodate countries' circumstances and self-differentiation. It added that if these categories are clearer, it would help the process.

In response, Fook said that the message seems that there may be a need to cluster the different categories.

Norway said that differentiation could be seen in the light of the specific issue. In relation to transparency in mitigation, there could be different types of targets (for emission reductions), and there will be different rules and this is not according to the category of a country. There could also be a common system as well as self-differentiation with flexibilities. It said that there could be self-differentiated commitments structured by the Convention. It added that even if commitments are differentiated, it understands that countries with high capacities for transparency should continue this in the new agreement. There could also be flexibility within a tiered approach. There could be a common system with a multifaceted approach to differentiation where countries can contribute according to different capacities.

Bolivia, speaking for **the G77** and **China**, explained the CBDR principle as exists under the Convention. It added that there is differentiation within the Convention, which must apply to the post-2020 agreement.

Tuvalu explained how the **LDCs** viewed the matter. They recognised that commitments are nationally determined and there are certain standards from existing commitments. Developed countries have an obligation to do no less than what they are doing now with quantified economy-wide targets for mitigation. There are opportunities for others who may want to do the same – hence the notion of 'countries in a position to do so'. The latter is a self-selection by countries who will then be in an annex A which is for those who do quantified economy-wide targets. Then there are other countries who are mostly developing countries who will have more flexibility which are conditioned on support and are in annex B. Different standard of tiers – whether one

is in annex A or B would be used. On the issue of transparency of support, a similar sort of approach is envisaged.

The US said that it did not hear anyone saying that there should be no reporting requirements. The disagreement is about the what, the why and the when. It is useful to tease out issues like the frequency of reporting, the stringency and depth of review etc. There are different ways of differentiating this and there is a need for clustering. On the issue of self-differentiation, countries can select their level of stringency and choose their flexibility, so long as there is no backsliding.

Mexico said that what differentiation means depends on the nature of the contribution that determines the rigour of reporting. Once there is a level of rigour, then the challenge is to determine what the depth of the reporting is. It added that self-differentiation can work but with no backsliding.

Kenya said that in relation to the discussion, what it feared is the loss of balance on how all the elements would be treated. Addressing transparency would also mean addressing the means of implementation. It said that on differentiation, it was not about having differentiated systems but that transparency rules have to be multilaterally agreed, with the frequency question and capacity issue taken care of. So far, what Parties have is a parallel system and Parties have not reached the point to move from that to reach a stage for a unified system. It said that there should be provisions in the agreement with the details to be developed later.

Japan said that the level of reporting or frequency could have flexibility, with different tiers within each category.

Other Parties also indicated their desire to address the issue of differentiation, which was noted by the co-facilitator.

Technology transfer

The matter of observers being allowed to observe the work of the negotiating group on 'technology transfer' became an issue, when several observers were turned away by security officials at the door of the meeting room, despite the daily programme indicating that the session was open to observers. On Monday, Nicaragua, Malaysia and Saudi Arabia had asked the ADP Co-chairs to open all sessions to the observers, including the facilitated group meetings and this had been agreed to. Following the intervention of Nicaragua at the technology negotiating group to allow observers in, the observers were allowed in.

Several observers along the corridors were exasperated and expressed concerns that attempts were being made to keep observers out of the process, when much rhetoric was being made about the need for non-state actors to be actively engaged in climate actions all the way to Paris and beyond.

On substance, **India** stressed the need for a coherent approach as regards the streamlining process, calling for an exercise, which was purely mechanical in merging options without altering the content of the proposals of Parties. When the facilitated group met soon after the negotiating group discussion ended, progress was made in the consolidation of some paragraphs.

Finance

The finance session started with queries from the United States and Bolivia on behalf of the Group of 77 and China. The US said that in the consolidated text proposed by the secretariat, there were no overarching brackets. It stressed that nothing in the working document should be considered agreed and wondered how that would be characterised universally in the document.

In response to the US, Djoghlaif said that there is only one official document, referring to the Geneva negotiations text. 'We are assisting Parties to prepare the final document, which will be adopted on 11 December and which will replace the Geneva text. Nothing is agreed; everything is in brackets,' said Djoghlaif. 'This is an effort to streamline the text and this is a non-document. The hope is we will be able to have an evolving document. We are working to facilitate a text through which you can work in a more manageable manner,' said the Co-chair further.

Bolivia on behalf of the G77 and China then sought further clarification on the process and said that the group had worked on streamlining the Geneva text by trying to compress the duplications and thus narrowed down options. It said that it had not worked as per the informal note on duplications in the Geneva text, which the secretariat had issued prior to the Bonn session. 'We did not look through the duplications. We looked through the Geneva text. We looked at all the options put forth by G77 and tried to consolidate the options and shorten the text,' it said.

By way of example, **Ecuador for the Like Minded Developing Countries (LMDC)** said that in the spirit of streamlining and getting rid of as much text as they could, the group had aligned with the G77 and China's proposals in the negotiations text and deleted some of their proposals.

Following considerable exchange on process, Djoghlafl encouraged the G77 and China to go over its streamlined proposals, which the group presented to the Parties. Djoghlafl, with the Parties, zeroed in on certain paragraphs to be taken to the facilitated group for discussions.

However, due to disagreements in the facilitated group, Parties could not approve any of the consolidated paragraphs proposed by the G77 and China. The disagreements arose out of certain Parties objecting to the G77 and China's proposals. Bolivia clarified to the Parties that streamlining is not verbatim moving of text but that it is condensing

and consolidating text. The co-facilitators proposed an additional facilitated session at 7pm, which was later cancelled.

Capacity-building

The sessions on capacity building, both negotiating group and facilitated group, saw a mix of paragraphs consolidated proposed by the secretariat or by the Parties. In the negotiating group, Parties decided on which paragraphs to work on during the focused group. In the facilitated group session, Parties agreed on some of the consolidated paragraphs.

ADP: Heed Ground Rules in Streamlining Negotiating Text – Say Developing Countries

Bonn, 4 June (Meena Raman and Indrajit Bose) – Developing countries urged Parties to heed the ‘ground rules’ when streamlining the negotiating text for the Paris agreement.

This call was heard in several groups meeting under the UNFCCC’s Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP).

The ‘ground rules’ emerged during the course of the streamlining exercise, with developing country Parties and the secretariat making efforts at consolidating texts where options were repetitive and clearer and focused alternatives could be presented for ease of negotiations, without the addition or subtraction of words so as to retain the positions of all Parties.

Strong disagreements also arose between developed and developing countries especially in the finance discussions.

When considering the preamble section of the text, **the United States (US)** said that ‘merging options for the sake of merging’ is not the purpose of the streamlining process.

Malaysia, speaking for **the Like-minded Developing Countries (LMDC)**, in response said that Parties must follow some fundamental ground rules and that the exercise is to streamline and present clear alternatives to focus negotiations.

In the finance discussions, **Canada** presented a ‘streamlining proposal’ which was viewed by several developing countries as a ‘cherry picking’ exercise that did not follow the ‘ground rules’. (See further exchanges below.)

In the adaptation and loss and damage discussion, developed countries did not want the merger of texts that touched on concepts dealing with ‘bifurcation’ and ‘universal commitments’. This approach of the developed countries also appeared to prevail in the other sections of the text dealing with mitigation.

There were calls also for greater clarity on the use of brackets or slashes in the negotiating text, as Parties continued to engage in the ‘first reading’ of the ‘Geneva text’ on 3 June in Bonn.

Parties worked on streamlining of six sections of the Geneva text. The ADP convened the negotiating group of the contact group on ‘facilitating implementation and compliance’ and ‘time frames and process related to commitments/contributions/ other matters related to implementation and ambition’ in the morning and ‘preamble’ and ‘procedural and institutional provisions’ in the afternoon. The ADP also convened facilitated groups on these issues along with additional facilitated groups on adaptation and loss and damage, finance and mitigation.

The session on facilitating implementation and compliance was co-facilitated by Sarah N Baashan (Saudi Arabia) and Aya Yoshida (Japan); time frames and process related to commitments/contributions/ other matters related to implementation and ambition was co-facilitated by Roberto Dondisch (Mexico) and George Wamukoya (Kenya); preamble was co-facilitated by George Wamukoya and Aya Yoshida; procedural and institutional provisions was co-facilitated by Sarah N Baashan and Roberto Dondisch; adaptation and loss and damage was co-facilitated by Andrea Guerrero (Colombia) and Georg Borsting (Norway); finance was co-facilitated by Georg Borsting and Diann Black-Layne (Antigua and Barbuda); mitigation was co-facilitated by Franz Perrez (Switzerland) and Fook Seng Kwok (Singapore).

Finance

The facilitated session on finance was an intense session with differing views. Two streamlining proposals were on the table: one from

the G77 and China and one from Canada pertaining to paragraph 82 of the finance section in the negotiations text.

After the G77 and China tabled its proposal, the developed countries raised issues. ‘We are taking a technical approach here. Certain options were consolidated but for the sake of clarity and transparency, it would be much appreciated if the G77 could provide the exact reference points,’ said **the US**. Following this, **Bolivia** on behalf of the Group walked the Parties through the references. After Bolivia’s explanation, the US said that they had found new words added or deleted in the G77 and China’s proposal. ‘From what we understand we are not in the mode of deletion or insertion,’ said the US.

Zambia then asked the secretariat to help mark the references to sources in the G77’s proposal. As the secretariat was attributing the G77 and China’s proposal, **Switzerland** said it was not in a position to accept two of the paragraphs as they were not a ‘copy-paste’ job.

‘We need to be quite clear of what we are doing here. It is cherry picking. When we are looking at consolidation, we are looking at redundancies. We do not know how we can consolidate paragraph 82 but we cannot cherry-pick,’ said **Switzerland**.

Bolivia urged Parties to get on with the exercise of streamlining. ‘We tried to follow rules. It was a milkshake text. When we negotiate, we will negotiate. We wanted to bring out what this option was,’ said Bolivia.

Switzerland responded saying that it was not willing to go beyond the mandate. ‘We will do the same for the Canadian proposal and scrutinise it the same way,’ said Switzerland and asked Parties to move to the Canadian proposal.

Explaining their proposal, **Canada** said they adopted a different approach to streamline the text. ‘The document in front of us is very dense. There is a lot but it boils down to clear concepts. The concept is that of Parties mobilising finance. We are in a conundrum. It is very hard to work with the text that has no real duplication by words. So, you cannot really use the same words. So, I have tried to streamline concepts which are in there, but I did not create new language. I sometimes changed the grammar,’ said Canada. The second rationale for the proposal, it added, was ‘there is a lot in paragraph 82 that is covered in other paragraphs. We have in paragraph 79 what Parties will do. We tried to capture from there so we some guiding principles. It is a messy text to work with or without streamlining. Our proposal is about concepts only.’

Developing countries responded sharply to the proposal by Canada. **Zambia for the LDCs** said that the proposal did not amount to ‘cutting and pasting’ and called for clarity on what it is that Parties were doing there.

To this, the co-facilitator responded that there were various types of challenges around the text. ‘As Parties you will have to consider what to do in terms of consolidating, collapsing and streamlining. You will have to show what is a useful way forward to arrive at an easier text to work on,’ said Borsting (Norway), and asked Canada to clarify where the ‘pasting’ came from.

Zambia intervened again to say that it had understood what Canada had said but ‘from what I understand we are having a second modality of work and do we agree on this new basis?’ it asked. It added that Parties cannot have it both ways, to cut paste from the Geneva text and not cut paste from the text.

Speaking for the **Arab Group, Saudi Arabia** also wanted clarity on the mode of work. ‘Are we choosing some words from the Geneva text? I could pick and choose too. What our colleagues were doing earlier to the G77 proposal were they were checking word to word. Three words were missing and the proposal was harshly criticised. And we see here that it is okay for Canada to choose just half a sentence. We need to be on the same page. If we decide on cherry-picking from each option, we can also cherry pick,’ said Saudi Arabia.

To this **Switzerland** suggested that Canada should take the entire sentence instead of half a sentence in its proposal. It was willing to work on Canada’s proposal by taking concepts in brackets and said it would add some of its proposals too. **The EU** said it wanted nine additions to Canada’s proposal. **Australia** said it could offer some text clarification to Canada’s proposal.

At this point, **India** said that Parties were getting into the second step of the exercise without getting into step one.

Bolivia in its national capacity urged Parties not to lose time and asked of Parties to look at the G77 and China proposal. **China** too expressed concern about the way of working. ‘Our mandate is to remove the duplications. We cannot continue to work this way,’ said China and asked the co-facilitator to move directly to negotiations. Expressing doubts on how much progress Parties could make this way, **Brazil** said there is no point redrafting Canada’s proposal and the risk of picking and choosing words remained.

Zambia said that the G77 had done a lot of work already and had submitted a text to the secretariat.

Ecuador spoke for the **LMDC** and encouraged Parties to put their proposals in writing and to circulate them. ‘We circulated our proposal and received several questions of where which part came from.’

The co-facilitator concluded the session saying the matter would be taken up at the stocktaking, scheduled for 4 June. ‘The G77 has received questions on their proposal but there are also comments on Canada’s proposal. We will bring that back to the next meeting of the group if that is what the co-chairs decide to do. Parties can give their feedback to the co-chairs and decide on the next steps forward,’ said Borsting.

He added that Canada should keep working on its proposal and everyone should send suggestions to Canada. He also encouraged other Parties to come forth with proposals on streamlining and asked of the Parties to be ‘better prepared’ next time if the Co-chairs decided not to change anything in the stocktaking session.

Adaptation and Loss and Damage

The facilitated group on adaptation and loss and damage began with observers not being allowed into the room despite vacant chairs in the room. Following Saudi Arabia’s intervention to let observers into the room to maintain transparency, observers were allowed. This has been a sticky issue since day one when the facilitated groups were closed to the observers. It was only after Malaysia, Saudi Arabia and Nicaragua intervened that the sessions were opened to the observers.

In relation to a paragraph which was being considered, Japan suggested that paragraphs that carried the idea of ‘bifurcation’ should be kept separate and not streamlined. On the option concerned, Japan said, ‘The option has a bifurcated approach.’ Japan received support from **Switzerland**, which said that while it is okay to merge content, it is not okay to merge options with different content.

The US concurred, saying that the concepts of universal commitment and bifurcation might ‘muddle’ things and added that ‘there are a bundle of options that speaks of universality and a bundle that speaks to bifurcation’.

Argentina intervened to say that ‘this mechanical exercise’ to merge texts is to make the text more workable. ‘While some Parties are saying it is okay to merge options, some are saying that I don’t want to see my option touched.’

The adaptation session also took an interesting turn when the co-facilitator sought Parties’ view on

whether they should have a conceptual discussion on the adaptation goal. **Chile** was in favour of the discussion, but **Australia** wanted to know if the group had finished with all the proposals to streamline as contained in the informal note issued by the secretariat.

To the query, the co-facilitator said that some paragraphs were still left to be discussed. At this point the US intervened to say that it was ready to engage at a conceptual level and ‘I am going to be very American here and point to the elephant in the room. There are groups that want to discuss loss and damage. That must also be part of the conceptual discussion. We want to put the elephant in the room. Are Parties ready to engage at a conceptual level discussion on that?’ the US asked.

The co-facilitator responded that the ‘elephant in the room’ needed to go to the Co-chairs and not to the co-facilitators, thus concluding the session.

Preamble

In the negotiating group on preamble chaired by Daniel Reifsynder (US), Parties were asked to consider a proposal for streamlining from the secretariat.

Canada said that it was premature to go into discussion on the preamble. **India** responded that Parties could not change the rules every day and should concentrate on streamlining. Parties can decide on how to move further after guidance comes from the ADP stocktake and India proposed that the streamlining exercise continue.

China concurred with the Co-chairs’ approach and suggested that at the next session, there is a need to consider what matters are premature and what are not. In response, the Co-chair said that this was an important observation.

(The ADP will hold a stocktaking exercise on 4 June and decide on the next steps.)

Argentina sought clarification on the use of brackets in the text, given varying views among Parties and that had also cropped up in other groups.

In response, the Co-chair said that Parties had also raised the issue of the use of slashes and brackets in the text. (As an example, the Geneva text uses the phrase ‘commitments/contributions/actions’). He explained that slashes were used instead of brackets in the text from Lima (where the previous COP was held), to indicate alternatives. In Geneva this year, Parties put in proposals which were then bracketed. What was not done, said Reifsynder, was to come back to the issue of slashes and he said that this would be addressed at the stocktaking session. On the use

of brackets, he said that it had two purposes – one is to indicate no agreement on the text as formulated and the other is to indicate that there are alternative ideas.

The Co-chair also proposed several paragraphs for streamlining from the secretariat to be sent to the facilitated group for discussion, and this group met soon after.

When some text was put on the screen for consideration, some Parties including **Colombia** and **the US** expressed concerns, preferring to keep the original text.

Malaysia, speaking for the **LMDC**, said that the secretariat had done a ‘brilliant job’ in removing the repetitions and in providing alternatives in a clear way. **Sudan for the African Group, Pakistan** and **Iran** agreed with the secretariat’s proposals.

The US could not agree, and said that ‘merging options for the sake of merging’ is not the purpose but what is important is for clarity of the options and insisted that they be kept separate.

In response, **Malaysia** said that Parties must follow some fundamental ground rules and that Parties are not ‘merging for the sake of merging’. It said that the exercise is to streamline and present clear alternatives to focus negotiations.

Timeframes and process related to contributions

At the negotiating group on ‘timeframes and process related to contributions’ chaired by ADP Co-chair Ahmed Djoglaf (Algeria), **Malaysia** speaking for **the LMDC** provided proposals for streamlining on several paragraphs. Malaysia explained the approach and rationale taken in the LMDC’s efforts to streamline, pointing out that where there were duplications in the options, texts were merged without adding or subtracting any words, so that the positions of Parties were preserved.

Given that Parties were seeing the LMDC proposals for the first time, there was agreement to consider some of the proposals at the facilitated group meeting held soon after. **New Zealand** also had proposals, which were transmitted to the facilitated group meeting, including that of the secretariat.

During the facilitated group meeting, in considering one of the LMDC proposals, **Tuvalu for the LDCs** raised the point that Parties need to decide what are complementary decisions for the Conference of Parties (COP) and for work to be done on those paragraphs which are needed for the agreement. Canada also said that the para under consideration looked like a COP decision and that

what was missing is a sense of urgency in the process.

The European Union (EU) agreed with these views.

In response, **India** said that Parties had not made a decision on what goes into a COP decision and what is in the core agreement. At this stage of the debate, a technical merger of texts is done and Parties can indicate that this text is then relevant for a COP decision.

The US agreed that at this stage, the co-facilitators could note what Parties think but it is difficult at this stage to decide what goes as Parties had different views.

Dondisch, the co-facilitator, said that at this point Parties are not making a distinction on substance but to treat all the paragraphs in the same way, but Parties’ views could be noted.

The EU said that the task is not only to streamline but to also clarify options and divergence.

Malaysia said that there are duplications and repetitions which have to be streamlined so that Parties could focus on the alternative options.

Mitigation facilitation group

In the mitigation facilitation group, progress was slow in considering proposals for streamlining that came from the secretariat and Parties. This prompted the co-facilitator Perrez (Switzerland) to comment that it ‘did not make sense to merge (options) if people do not want to merge’.

The Marshall Islands said it was not comfortable with a proposal for merger as it ‘affected the legal form’. This prompted **China** to state that any technical streamlining at this stage would not prejudice the structure or the legal form of the agreement. With the addition of the word ‘shall’ in brackets from one of the options, agreement was reached.

Facilitating implementation and compliance

Co-chaired by Reifsnnyder, the negotiating group began with a proposal from the Co-chair on a multilateral consultative process.

‘I have been in the process even before the process began,’ said Reifsnnyder and informed Parties about the draft text produced on a multilateral consultative process, which could not be adopted at the fifth Conference of Parties (COP5). ‘Several legal experts were involved. It was a one-page decision and a five-page elaboration of consultative mechanism. COP5 could not take action because of the differences in opinion on composition of the consultative process and it was never adopted. It

might be useful for Parties to consider the document,' he said.

Following the proposal, Parties entered into considering which of the paragraphs from the section should go to the facilitated group for further discussion. During the facilitated group, Parties looked at consolidated proposals from the European Union and the secretariat and made progress on streamlining.

Procedural and Institutional Provisions

Chaired by Co-chair Ahmed Djoghlaf, the session saw consolidated texts being tabled for approval in the negotiating group as opposed to those proposals being sent to the facilitated groups. The session was to also discuss definitions and Kuwait asked for a clarification on that. 'We have to agree on words and then look at the definition,' said Djoghlaf.

ADP: Next Steps Identified on Way Forward on Negotiating Text

Bonn, 5 June (Meena Raman and Indrajit Bose) – The UNFCCC’s Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP) met in a contact group on 4 June, where the Co-chairs took stock of the progress of work and identified the next steps in the process.

The Bonn session of climate talks is taking place from 1 to 11 June.

Chairing the contact group, ADP Co-chair Ahmed Djoghlaif (Algeria) said that there had been teething problems in the process of streamlining the Geneva negotiating text, but Parties had worked hard to help. He added that while negotiating groups had expressed satisfaction in the way they had operated thus far, they had also expressed concerns about the pace of the deliberations. He hoped things would get expedited. ‘We have reduced the size of the Geneva text by 5 per cent,’ he said, which was the result of the first three days of the consolidation or streamlining exercise here at Bonn. He also said that some more paragraphs remained to be streamlined.

He said further that the Co-chairs had been informed that it would be easy to proceed if paragraphs were grouped within the same section. ‘In some circumstances, clarifying concepts or discussions would also help,’ said Djoghlaif. He also suggested to Parties to discuss paragraphs that can be moved to the accompanying decision. What will be adopted in Paris will be a package, he stressed.

Djoghlaif added that the results (of the streamlining process) are captured in a working document and clarified that it is not an official document but is a ‘non-paper’ and is a tool to help Parties. He also referred to another document, which is a ‘streamlined and consolidated text’. Djoghlaif reiterated that the Geneva text is the only official document.

[Both the working document and the ‘streamlined and consolidated text’ are on the

UNFCCC website. The latter is comprised of 86 pages (from the original 90 pages of the Geneva text) and includes the work done thus far in Bonn as well as the work from Geneva that has not been streamlined.]

On the next steps, Djoghlaif outlined that another stocktaking session would take place on 8 June and if needed earlier too. Since facilitated meetings have been helpful, they would continue. He said that over the next two-and-a-half days, there will be meetings on mitigation, adaptation and loss and damage, capacity building, timeframes, transparency of action and support, finance, technology development and transfer and workstream 2 (dealing with the pre-2020 ambition). The sections on the preamble, definitions and final clauses would be looked at later, he added. For now, the task is to continue with streamlining and unpacking and making the options clear. If required concepts could be clarified within the section, he said, and added that Parties could also notify what paragraphs they want moved to the accompanying decision.

‘So, you go from easier to most difficult steps and under no circumstances should any Party be left behind. Any agreement should have the full backing of all the Parties,’ said Djoghlaif.

At this point Co-chair Daniel Reifsnyder (the United States) intervened to explain two outstanding issues that had emerged during the facilitated group discussions. One was on use of slashes in the text. He said that there had been a number of Parties that had asked about the meaning of ‘slashes’ in the Geneva text. He explained that the text from Lima used slashes instead of brackets. They should mostly be replaced by brackets but that may signal that it is an alternative to something else. He said the Co-chairs do not have a quick solution and will probably come back to this with a proposal the next time Parties meet.

Following the remarks by the Co-chairs, speaking for **the G77 and China**, **South Africa** said the process of streamlining is an arduous, but necessary, process. The pace had been slow but it felt encouraged that progress had been made, notably on workstream 2. ‘We should approach our negotiations in a step-by-step manner starting from the technical and editorial level that will give Parties the reassurances they need at each stage of the process, towards a shorter and a more manageable text. Streamlining and consolidating should, however, not prejudice Parties’ views on specific issues and the structure and content of the Paris outcome,’ said South Africa.

South Africa also said that more clarity and direction provided by the Co-chairs could accelerate progress, expressing concern that the continuing ADP sessions had eaten into the Group’s coordination time. ‘The Group needs adequate time to coordinate, especially since the majority of the proposals in the text come from members and sub-groups of the G77. It is in our collective interest to have a balance between coordination time for groups and facilitation time and this will be to the benefit of the streamlining exercise,’ it said.

On the way ahead, South Africa sought clarity on the outcome of the work in the Bonn session and how progress on the negotiating text could be best captured. ‘It has been our experience that ground rules for the streamlining process thus far have not been applied consistently in the different facilitation groups. This has created unease for the Parties,’ it said. It added that the working tool is to assist Parties to streamline in a practical manner. It envisioned an updated Geneva text capturing the progress made in Bonn as the basis of the work.

‘It is important to keep in mind that the streamlining process is not advancing at the same pace on the different chapters. If the working document only captures progress on some issues and does not maintain Parties’ proposals on others, we run the risk of moving forward in a very unbalanced manner. There is a need for greater consistency in approach to streamlining across thematic areas. This can be achieved by a clearer understanding of what streamlining duplications and overlaps entails,’ it said further.

South Africa also expressed concern that some Parties were engaging with different approaches to different sections of the text, raising procedural debates in some, which resulted in differences in the pace of progress along with procedural difficulties. It sought guidance on how the many cross-cutting issues, in particular the similar issues emerging from

different sections in the text, would be addressed. ‘There is a need to discuss, not in a theoretical manner, but based on the textual proposals, cross-cutting issues such as differentiation, structure, and legal form,’ it said.

Highlighting the importance of workstream 2, South Africa said: ‘We expect to leave this Bonn session with text on the table for workstream 2 and to do so we will need to be provided with dedicated time and space for textual discussion under this workstream.’

Speaking for **the Like Minded Developing Countries (LMDC)**, **Malaysia** said Parties need to accelerate the streamlining work. It said that the LMDC and the G77 and China had participated very proactively in the streamlining exercise and the LMDC went beyond their own proposals for the streamlining.

On how to accelerate the pace of work, it called for ground rules and a detailed mode of work, with permanent drafting groups for critical areas such as mitigation, adaptation and means of implementation. It also called for priority to be accorded to identification of key issues within each section and stressed that once the key issues were resolved, other issues will sort themselves out. There is a need to prioritise and sequence the key elements so that Parties could get to the heart of the matter, it added.

Malaysia said that issues and concepts across sections should also be identified where they are repeated, sometimes in exact language without prejudice to the placement. On the outcome of the Bonn session, it said that the streamlined text should be included in the Geneva text so that it evolves. ‘That way we can see the progress towards Paris.’ Malaysia also called for ground rules to be established for brackets and slashes and said that these issues occupied a large space of time during the first reading of the Geneva text. It also supported the G77 and China on the importance of workstream 2.

To the question of what goes into the accompanying draft decision, Malaysia said this issue should be addressed last. ‘We can identify it but it would be premature to concretise what will be in the draft decision without seeing the content and form of the Paris agreement,’ it said.

Speaking for **the Least Developed Countries (LDCs)**, **Angola** said the process had not been as helpful and that it should be clear to reflect on the divergences. It also called for discussions to better understand what issues are more relevant for the agreement and which ones are better suited for decisions. It stressed on workstream 2 saying it is

important to close the pre-2020 mitigation gap. Angola also emphasised that loss and damage should be reflected in the agreement.

Speaking for **the African Group, Sudan** expressed concern about the pace of work and sought clarity on how to unpack the text in the second week so that they are easier to streamline. It added that the Group is not in a position to deal with cross-cutting issues without knowing the form, structure and legal character of the agreement.

Speaking for **the Umbrella Group, Australia** said that Parties had captured only low hanging fruit and it was important to take broader structural and conceptual questions during the second reading of the text. ‘This means more than a mechanical exercise. We should have time to unpack these key issues,’ it said. In the second reading, it said, there should be space for Parties to better understand proposals within key paragraphs, and better clustering to happen. It was in favour of discussing what content is more suited to decisions. It called for clarifying options as well as reflection of compromise ideas and the option of ‘no text’ to be presented. On workstream 2, Australia said Parties could start building on the decision based on the Lima decision and enhance and support the technical expert meetings.

The European Union said that progress had been slow with the process to mechanically streamline text, which had its limitations and Parties had sometimes ended up joining options that made political choices less clear. On the next steps, it called for accelerating work and supported the move for the unpacking and regrouping of issues across and within sections. It said strategic discussions on substantive issues are needed as well as clarity of the product from Bonn. It wanted a consolidated text from Bonn which had clear political choices. It also agreed on the need to address matters in workstream 2. It said that it is against the delivery of these outcomes that Parties will be judged.

Speaking for **the Environment Integrity Group, Switzerland** said that an editing exercise would not take Parties to an agreement in Paris. It said that much of the work Parties had done in the first three days could have been done by the ‘able secretariat’. It added that Parties would not be able to advance without engaging in conceptual text-based discussions. For next steps, Switzerland said that facilitated groups should have the opportunity to cluster paragraphs that deal with the same issues. Parties need to discuss what belongs to decisions, it said. ‘Balance is important. Balance means some issues take longer than the others. In Paris, we need

to achieve balance in the agreement,’ it said. Switzerland also said that it would be useful to maintain the Geneva text till Paris and called for an additional tool to be used in Bonn. In the second week, Parties should prepare a working basis for December, it said.

India said that as a Bonn outcome, it was looking at a 60-page document coming out of 90 pages from the Geneva text, with the latter staying as a reference document. What comes from Bonn would be a next step document that contains the consolidated text along with the unconsolidated text. The Bonn document would be the basis for the next ADP meeting. It called for more time to discuss workstream 2 issues.

Brazil said the second reading should not produce a mechanical exercise of identifying duplications. It called for the unpacking of issues in certain paragraphs in the text. It asked of the secretariat if it could provide Parties with inputs on each issue that a paragraph addresses. ‘Clustering is a matter of indicating where the issues are and what each paragraph addresses,’ said Brazil. It added that there is a need to consider placement for the agreement and for COP decisions without prejudice to the legal outcome. It said that ‘it would be good to consider to continue to identify cross-cutting issues and allocate treatment for them,’ adding that no option should be excluded. Brazil said it preferred to keep the Geneva text and in the working document incorporate all the portions of the Geneva text and continue to update it.

Egypt said that the road to Paris did not start in Bonn; it had started years before that and added that the road to Paris must ensure balance between the different elements, which had become vague with only some sections having advanced. It underscored the importance of discussing the legal form at an early stage and said that legal value of an agreement is different from a decision.

At the beginning of the contact group session, Co-chair Djoghlaif invited the Chairs of the Subsidiary Bodies to present updates of their work that is relevant to the ADP. The SBI Chair was not present and the rapporteur presented on his behalf.

The SBSTA Chair Lidia Wojtal (Poland) focused on three issues: market and new market mechanisms and the 2013-2015 Review. She spoke of the report of the Structured Expert Dialogue, which was made available to Parties on 4 May. She said the report includes 10 messages, which may inform the ADP and added that Parties are working towards the conclusion of the Review and on how to capture it in a decision. Work on markets and new

market mechanisms to elaborate the Framework of Various Approaches is also under way, she said.

The rapporteur of the SBI said that the body is working towards an agreement on a draft decision for COP21 on response measures. He pointed out that the SBI was also working on the programme budget and for successful completion of the multilateral assessment (of developed country mitigation). He also appraised the contact group that Parties are working on a support package for capacity building and the Poznan programme on technology transfer. For capacity building, the rapporteur said Parties are working on a terms of reference for review of the capacity building mechanism in developing countries. On the multilateral assessment, he said that all but two Parties had been multilaterally assessed.

Facilitated meetings

Following the stocktaking session, facilitated meetings on mitigation, adaptation and workstream 2 were convened.

Mitigation

In the facilitated meeting on mitigation, much time was focused on paragraph 39 of the Geneva text which relates to market mechanisms, accounting rules and the land-use sector. **Australia** presented its proposal on a way to cluster and unpack the various issues in the paragraph. This led to a long and intense exchange among Parties, with a clear divergence between those who are proponents of the various options who wanted to advance further discussion on this paragraph, and those who did not think that this was the right time to discuss these issues, as they stressed the need to discuss other more important issues in the mitigation section.

Saudi Arabia said that there was a need to identify areas of convergence and divergence on the issues in the mitigation section (as a whole) and areas of priority. It said that markets are merely a tool and what was more important is to see what kind of commitments Parties are undertaking on mitigation before looking at whether markets can be a tool.

India said that in the previous session, Parties did not agree to a mechanical merger of simple paragraphs but were now transitioning to discussing a very complex and difficult issue. It proposed the identification of the core issues in the mitigation section for discussion.

China said that one issue that needed to be considered in the unpacking of paragraph 39 is

whether markets are ‘to be or not to be’. **Bolivia** and **Venezuela** also raised similar concerns.

Malaysia, for the LMDC, in response to these interventions, said that it wanted the identification of key issues and to prioritise elements in the text. The issues in paragraph 39 are being imposed upon Parties who see it as being a peripheral issue. It said that when the LMDC put proposals on the table, some Parties wanted more time to reflect when these proposals were fairly easy to streamline. It said that it was time to reflect on the approach. ‘What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander,’ said Malaysia, saying that paragraph 39 had a large number of paragraphs. It further said that if Parties wanted to categorise the issues within the paragraph, then it was okay to identify them and move on to identifying the key issues within the mitigation section and to sequence the discussion.

Australia, in response to Malaysia, said that it saw paragraph 39 as a key issue and was prompted to forward its proposal as it saw interest from other Parties who also had similar ideas. It said that there is confusion in the working modality, whether to cluster and unpack or actually merge and provide debate on substance. **The EU** supported Australia and said that this was a simple exercise of clustering the issues.

Following these exchanges, the co-facilitators proposed a break, and came back shortly with a table that had issues under accounting rules and markets. Whether there will be markets at all is a decision to be taken, said the co-facilitator. Several Parties raised concerns over the table and there was agreement not to circulate the table on the UNFCCC website.

Adaptation

Parties resumed the exercise of streamlining the list of paragraphs which were still pending from the previous session. Some Parties wanted to move to step two of streamlining and the co-facilitator **Andrea Guerrero (Colombia)** said that she would propose a far more interesting dynamic to Parties.

She presented a table with three columns; the columns titled ‘cluster’, ‘paragraph’ and ‘text’. The idea was that the broader themes within the adaptation section would be identified, and next to it the paragraphs corresponding to those themes would be listed, with the text from these paragraphs pasted.

While some Parties expressed support for the format while suggesting changes to it, others thought it would be more meaningful to have a conceptual discussion on key issues first. Some Parties said they

had proposals around clustering and others were of the view that it was too early to begin identifying paragraphs.

Saudi Arabia wanted to ensure consistency in approach across sections (the mitigation section was happening in parallel to the adaptation section). After further deliberations on the format, Guerrero went over to the mitigation session to confirm whether they were on the same page. She returned to the adaptation group and reported that they were following the same approach of clustering and even identifying paragraphs. Eventually Parties agreed to work on the format put forth by the co-facilitator with the understanding that it was an evolving table and would merely serve as a tool.

As the format was being discussed, **Timor Leste** pointed out that as in adaptation, there should be a separate format to discuss loss and damage. The US did not agree with the proposal. ‘At this stage we are not taking any Parties’ position off the table. There are Parties that see the Warsaw Mechanism on Loss and Damage as clearly being under the

Cancun Adaptation Framework. Our position has not changed. We cannot have a conversation around that if we separate the issues,’ the US said.

The adaptation group will meet next on 6 June with further submissions and proposals by Parties on the format and the way ahead.

Workstream 2

The ADP convened the first facilitated group on workstream 2 on 4 June. The session was co-facilitated by Aya Yoshida (Japan) and George Wamukoya (Kenya).

Yoshida presented a few guiding questions to Parties for discussion and the differences between developed and developing countries on the scope and mandate of workstream 2 were clear. **The G77 and China** said it is working on elaborating a decision text, which it should be able to finalise soon. **The EU** also said that it had a proposal which it would submit before the next session on workstream 2, which is scheduled to meet on 5 June.

Differences Re-emerge on the Rocky Road to Paris

A new climate change agreement is to be adopted in Paris in December, but there are big differences on how to reach a fair deal, and the negotiations are tough.

Bonn, 8 June (Martin Khor) – The UN Climate Conference in Paris in December may become a Climate Summit if many top political leaders accept an invitation to attend. What role they are to play is not yet known, or even the dates they are requested to come.

A new agreement to tackle climate change is expected to be adopted. But there are many hurdles to overcome before a deal is reached.

At negotiations now taking place in Bonn to draw up the Paris agreement, old unresolved issues have resurfaced, with sharp divisions between developed countries (the North) and developing countries (the South).

It is hard to see how they can be settled in the remaining week in Bonn plus the three more meetings including the Paris conference. But a deal in Paris is a political necessity, so somehow the differences have to be bridged, or else papered over.

There are two requisites for a good climate deal in Paris. First, it has to be environmentally ambitious, meaning that it leads the world to reduce emissions so that the average global temperature does not increase by more than 2°C (or 1.5°, according to some) above the pre-industrial period.

That global average temperature rise has now exceeded by 0.8° since pre-industrial level. With global emissions increasing by about 50 billion tonnes a year, the remaining ‘space’ in the atmosphere to absorb more emissions (before the 2° limit is reached) will be exhausted in three decades or so.

Second, the deal also has to be fair and equitable. This means that the North, having been mainly responsible for the historical emissions and being more economically advanced, has to take the lead in cutting emissions as well as transferring funds

and technology to the South to help it switch to low-carbon sustainable development pathways.

This equity principle is indeed embedded in the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, which will house the new Paris agreement, and which is now conducting the negotiations.

The South countries insist that this principle be at the centre of the new agreement, and that indeed it has to be since it comes under the Convention and thus it must be in accordance with the Convention’s principles and provisions.

But the North countries are most reluctant to accept this argument. They claim the world has changed, and all countries (except the least developed) should be treated the same way.

By this they mean that a new regime should be created in which all countries should undertake the same emission reduction obligations, if not now, then in the near future.

In the interim, all countries should contribute in various ways to cut their present and future emissions. And they should do this, even if they do not get enough funds and the technology they ask for.

The developing countries argue that this kind of attitude is tantamount to the North escaping from their legal obligations under the present Convention, and that the rich countries are in effect subverting the Convention’s principles and provisions and rewriting the rules.

They are concerned that this ‘great escape’ is aimed at shifting the burden of change away from the North to the South. Moving from the present cheap oil-based energy system to one based on renewable energy, and other transformations, requires a social, economic and technological revolution that is costly.

Will it affect development goals? Who will pay for this cost? How to obtain the technologies cheaply enough to implement the revolution? What obligations should the South take on under the Paris agreement if the North does not meet its obligation to help out?

These questions and the differences in approach are at the core of the many problematic issues being negotiated.

The current Bonn session is grappling with a draft that contains the different views that countries have on the Paris agreement. Among the key issues to be resolved are the following:

- **SAME OR DIFFERENT TREATMENT:** Should countries have the same obligations to address emissions and to provide financing (a position favoured by the North) or have different obligations, according to their historical responsibilities and current level of development (the South's view)?
- **BALANCE ON MITIGATION, ADAPTATION, LOSS and DAMAGE:** Generally, the North is more interested in focusing the agreement on having obligations on mitigation (reducing emissions), whilst the South is equally or even more concerned about actions on adaptation (measures to reduce the effects of climate change) and loss and damage (coping with the damage caused by climate change, such as storms, heavy rain, floods, drought, etc.). The North is especially resisting loss and damage.
- **FUNDING:** The North pledged to mobilise US\$100 billion a year for climate actions for the South by 2020, but only a small fraction is available so far. The South wants a firm commitment on finance in the Paris agreement, and a roadmap on how the money will increase to US\$100 billion between now and 2020, but this is resisted by the North.

- **TECHNOLOGY:** The South wants concrete commitments from the North to transfer technologies needed for mitigation and adaptation actions, including removing barriers such as lack of funds and know-how, and intellectual property which may raise the cost. The North wants the South to obtain technology on commercial terms, and does not want the agreement to mention the intellectual property issue or address know-how.

- **COUNTRIES' 'CONTRIBUTIONS':** Countries are expected to submit the 'contributions' they intend to make to global climate action. The North wants developing countries to submit figures on their maximum mitigation obligations.

The developing countries are upset that the North is refusing to commit any figures on funding, and many want to also include their actions on adaptation to show the range of their contribution to global actions. Meanwhile the mitigation commitments submitted by several developed countries show a low level of ambition.

- **LEGALLY BINDING?:** The Paris outcome could be a protocol or another legally binding agreement or an outcome with legal force. What exact shape or form it will take is still to be discussed. How binding it will be on countries, and what happens if they do not comply, will be one of the final issues to be resolved.

The above is a rough account of the differences, which are mainly on North-South lines. But there are also various shades of views among the developed countries and among the developing countries.

Whether they can be bridged before or at Paris remains to be seen. The fate of our climate, and humanity's future, depends quite a lot on it.

ADP: Conditions for Increasing pre-2020 Emissions Target Not Met – Says EU

Bonn, 6 June (Indrajit Bose) – The European Union said that its conditions for moving beyond its 20% emissions reduction target by 2020 below 1990 levels had not been met and anything more would come only post-2020. This was in response to calls by developing countries to developed countries to raise their pre-2020 mitigation ambition.

The Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP) convened a facilitated group meeting on pre-2020 climate action, also called workstream 2, on 5 June. There was a clear divide on the way ahead on the issue.

While the call from developing countries was for the developed countries to raise ambition, the proposals of developed countries largely focused on technical expert processes and high-level engagement.

[The *quid pro quo* in Durban in 2011 that launched the ADP process to develop a protocol, legal instrument or outcome with legal force ‘applicable to all Parties’ was for developed countries to commit to the Kyoto Protocol (KP)’s second commitment period (CP2). Parties agreed that there will be a CP2, but what was not decided then was its length (whether a five or eight-year period) and what the actual numbers for the emission reduction targets by the Annex 1 Parties will be, both individually and in aggregate. In Doha in 2012, they agreed to revisit their CP2 commitment at the latest by 2014, to raise it from 18% to at least 25-40% below 1990 levels by 2020.]

At the 5 June discussion, Parties could not agree on the way forward in terms of a product on workstream 2 from the Bonn session as several Parties provided their views on what should be the elements of a draft decision on pre-2020 action.

India called for a compilation text, comprising Parties’ views on the elements of a draft decision text for workstream 2. ‘In this session we can have

at least a draft text comprising views of all Parties, just like the Geneva text has the views of all the Parties. We should leave Bonn with that. If we don’t demonstrate our collaboration pre-2020, it will be very difficult to collaborate on post-2020,’ said India.

The EU disagreed and said Parties must focus on only the areas where there was convergence. It added that it did not want to move to any compilation text and said that any next steps should lie in pulling together a ‘sweet spot’ of consensus. It was supported by **New Zealand**.

In response to the EU, **India** said Parties could use the compiled text to identify commonalities and see ‘what we concur with’. ‘The ADP process comprises two workstreams – 1 (post-2020) and 2 (pre-2020). Just as in workstream 1, we are trying to conclude with a draft negotiating text with the cooperation and views of all the Parties, similarly for workstream 2, we have to have a parallel process because everyone wants to know what will happen pre-2020 before they commit for post-2020,’ it said.

‘We need a clear cut decision text on workstream 2. Our suggestion would be let us capture all of the opinions shared here. We should have a draft negotiating text. It should include the EU, the Umbrella Group, the G77 and China’s proposals as well as proposals of individual Parties,’ said India.

As Parties move forward in workstream 1, they should work parallelly on workstream 2 as well, added India. Calling for more sessions on workstream 2 at the ongoing Bonn session, India said there is time to decide on the modalities post-2020, whereas there is no time for pre-2020. **China** and **Saudi Arabia** supported India’s call for a compilation text.

Responding to India, **the EU** said that workstream 1 had not provided a good model of how things could be done very fast. (On 4 June, Parties had indicated that the pace of the streamlining

process of the negotiations text had been rather slow. Please see TWN Update #7: [Next steps identified on way forward on negotiating text.](#)) The EU said it needs to wait and see what the proposals on workstream 2 look like and reiterated that Parties should not move to a compilation text.

In a further response, **India** agreed that the Geneva text is unwieldy but clarified that it is not the fault of the Parties. ‘The Geneva text is unwieldy because the previous ADP Co-chairs did not take Parties’ views on board, which was the result of what happened in Lima. It is not the fault of the Parties that we have such a text. If we capture the opinions of all Parties on workstream 2, it won’t exceed five to seven pages,’ said India.

Besides the compilation text, Parties also had divergences over the revisit mechanism of the KP. India recalled the decision on the revisit mechanism and said that it has to be considered how the current 2013-2015 Review would inform pre-2020 ambition and how willing countries are to close the mitigation gap.

In response, **the EU** said it had gone through a revisit mechanism exercise and added that its conditions of moving beyond the 20% target had not been met. The EU added that anything more would come only post-2020. It said it is concerned with repeated questions on the revisit mechanism. ‘If there are issues that are beyond what is possible to reach consensus on, for instance revisit mechanism, that will not happen,’ the EU said.

While the call from developing countries was for the developed countries to raise ambition, the proposals of developed countries largely focused on technical expert processes and high-level engagement.

Responding to such proposals, **Mexico** questioned the effectiveness of the technical expert meetings (TEM) under workstream 2. ‘TEMs have not produced actions we seek. Presentations by experts for two days do not trigger the action we need,’ said Mexico.

India said Mexico’s intervention was very pertinent. ‘Until and unless we see addition from the initiatives being talked of, it does not help us. The proposal from Mexico is very welcome and we must look at the utility of these processes,’ said India. It also called for evaluating the effectiveness of high-level events and asked, ‘By convening high-level events, have we galvanised action?’

The co-facilitators for workstream 2, Aya Yoshida (Japan) and George Wamukoya (Kenya), encouraged Parties to submit their proposals online and would get back to Parties on the next steps after consulting with the ADP Co-chairs.

Highlights of the interventions

Speaking for **the G77 and China, Mali** said the Group is working to present a text to Parties and took Parties over the major elements of its proposal. It said that in its proposal the preamble would contain the provisions of the Convention to enhance ambition pre-2020 and would recall earlier decisions from Durban through Lima. The preamble would also mention the ambition gap pre-2020. Besides the preamble, the Group’s proposal would comprise the following elements: a work programme, accelerated implementation modalities pre-2020, multilateral cooperation support, call for enhancing mitigation action through concrete actions, technical expert process on adaptation and high-level engagement.

Speaking for **the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS), the Maldives** said that they had been pushing for workstream 2, not just for the technical process but for greater action in the short term. It said the COP decision should focus on enhancing implementation so that new voluntary mitigation cooperation initiatives emerge, and recognise that considerable work had been done on workstream 2. It said that the preamble should recognise the pre-2020 gap, and that it would submit its proposal.

India said that it views pre-2020 as an issue of enhancement of ambition and better implementation of the existing provisions of the Convention, stressing that pre-2020 action would build trust. It said that there should be a specific mechanism in the draft decision on pre-2020, which defines the modalities as has been agreed to earlier. It recalled the decision on the revisit mechanism and said that it has to be considered how the current 2013-2015 Review would inform pre-2020 ambition and how willing countries are to close the mitigation gap. It called for the pre-2020 decision to have an evaluation mechanism of the quantified emission reduction targets.

India said along with the gap in mitigation, there exist a lot of gaps in adaptation, finance, technology and capacity building. There has to be a clear component (in the decision) of how support on these elements should be provided. India said that the Executive Director of the Green Climate Fund met with the G77 earlier in the day and India was dismayed to hear that only US\$2.5 billion per year is available for 2015-2018. It wondered how the varied requirements would be met through this. India also called for a collaborative mechanism to ensure barriers such as intellectual property rights are removed, stressing that ‘we need to look beyond

technical expert meetings and look at the actual grounding of technology’.

It said that a draft text for pre-2020 should comprise all the elements it had pointed out to. ‘In this session we can have at least a draft comprising views of all Parties, just like the Geneva text has the views of all the Parties. We should leave Bonn with that. If we don’t demonstrate our collaboration pre-2020, it will be very difficult to collaborate post-2020,’ said India.

China said there are substantial issues to be addressed in the pre-2020 period in a holistic and balanced manner. It said that a lot of the developing countries had done their best to take climate action, even without finance, technology or capacity building support from the developed countries whereas the developed countries’ actions remained far from satisfactory. It brought to the attention of Parties that as of 20 May 2015, of the 32 countries that had ratified the Doha Amendment to the KP, there were only three Parties from Annex 1. It said that developed countries had committed to reduce emissions to 18% below 1990 levels by 2020, which is far from the scientific need of 40% reductions below 1990 levels. It urged the developed countries to remove conditionalities and called for a clear roadmap on finance and for barriers to be removed for technology transfer to developing countries.

Argentina underscored that pre- and post-2020 are related and it is important to close the ambition gap. Pre-2020 cannot be closed to adaptation, it said, adding that the Doha Amendment to the Kyoto Protocol is critical. It expects to leave the Bonn session with a clear image about workstream 2 that would be adopted in Paris.

Calling for a comprehensive and substantive outcome pre-2020 to facilitate the post-2020

outcome, **Iran** said there needs to be a clear roadmap. TEMs should be extended to adaptation and workstream 2 should address means of implementation, said Iran.

The EU outlined the elements of a draft decision on workstream 2 and presented an overview of the elements. These include a high-level segment, technical expert processes, Convention bodies and outside actors and a review component which would evaluate the effectiveness of processes within the 2016-2020 period. Its proposal was reflected on the screen and it said that the proposal had been posted on the UNFCCC [website](#).

Speaking for **the Umbrella Group of countries**, **Australia** went through its pre-2020 [proposal](#), which also focuses largely on advancing the technical examination process and high-level engagement.

Supporting the EU proposal, **Norway** said TEMs are useful to get different stakeholders on one platform and discuss issues.

Switzerland said that all countries should think of what mitigation actions should be taken up and said it is ready to engage in a discussion on how workstream 2 would continue after 2020. It recognised the importance of high-level meetings but did not want to decide if such high-level events should continue. Referring to non-state actors as ‘key’, Switzerland said it was ready to engage in a discussion on how they could be strengthened without creating burdensome structures.

The EU took the floor again and reassured Parties that the ratification of the Doha Amendment is well underway and the fact that targets are binding makes it a more complex process. It said the EU is well underway on the task of reducing emissions by 20% by 2020.

Developing Countries Call for a New Institution Dedicated to Capacity Building

Bonn, 8 June (Indrajit Bose) – A rich exchange of views on the need for a separate institutional mechanism on capacity building in the Paris agreement took place on 5 June.

This was at a facilitated session on capacity building under the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP). While developed countries wanted to explore the need for a new institution on capacity building, developing countries were convinced that it was high time there was an institution dedicated to capacity building.

The co-facilitators were Artur Runge-Metzger (the European Union) and Tosi Mpanu Mpanu (Democratic Republic of Congo).

Saudi Arabia opened the discussions when it said that Parties should work in ‘collaborative and cooperative approach’ rather than seeing the creation of a specialised institution as a ‘liability’. ‘You say the world has changed and we are having a new agreement that is applicable to all. That means we all need to be in this agreement. However, we are different from you. We are at different levels of capacity. The question that needs to be asked is, how do I figure out I have the potential to deliver? How do I assess my technology and financial needs? There are those that are not even in a position to assess and say this is what I need to address a certain project,’ said Saudi Arabia.

South Africa said that the CTCN providing capacity has not been done in a coherent manner. A lot of capacity is done by consultants. How do you say a certain thing has been implemented? it asked. **India** added that the CTCN had not been able to ensure access to climate-friendly technologies.

Jamaica responded that for the CTCN, the capacity is only to participate. ‘What do you do when you implement technology projects? Sometimes, a country is not able to use the tools and the methodology that are needed to use the technology.

So this is the missing part – a centralised body,’ it said.

Burundi said that Parties need to sit and reflect on the issue and that lack of coordination among the Convention’s mechanisms did not help matters. **Senegal** said, ‘We want to remind that developing countries are tired to be called developing countries. What we want is to become developed countries.’

The United States wanted to know why a new institution is required when existing institutions such as the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN) were already in place and how a new institution would do things differently from the CTCN. **The European Union (EU)** agreed that capacity building is a crucial issue and wanted to know whether the adaptation committee was speaking to the technology institutions on gaps.

Highlights of interventions

Saudi Arabia said that Parties need to be frank and candid. ‘If I have to establish an institution, is it a liability on developed countries to have it established? Do they see it as an undue commitment they have to fulfil?’ it asked.

Referring to the developed countries, Saudi Arabia said, ‘You say the world has changed and we are having a new agreement that is applicable to all. That means we all need to be in this agreement. However, we are different from you. We are at different levels of capacity. The question that needs to be asked is, how do I figure out I have the potential to deliver? How do I assess my technology and financial needs? There are those that are not even in a position to assess and say this is what I need to address a certain project,’ said Saudi Arabia.

Saudi Arabia added that it must not be seen as a liability for developed countries but a ‘collaborative and cooperative approach’. ‘Let’s have that kind of

mindset and work accordingly,' it said, adding that developing countries are not saying they won't do, the reality being they don't know how to do.

'The lack of understanding, knowledge, capacities such as in technology and education need to be really addressed. You have got through your learning curve already. If you wait for our learning curve, it will take several years. We could start from where you ended,' said Saudi Arabia, suggesting that Parties maintain a collegial cooperative forum.

'Let us see how much we can do as adaptation and how much we can do as mitigation. Establishing an institution that will be in the agreement will put us in comfort. It does not end there if you say "I have an institution established for you. Now go and increase your capacity."' We cannot be in an argumentative mode,' said Saudi Arabia, reminding Parties that this should not be considered a liability because 'you are sharing your experience, knowledge, state of the art technology' and added, 'we hope you can help us with your technology transfer as well'.

South Africa said that the CTCN providing capacity has not been done in a coherent manner. 'If it is cooperative action why is there no body that can govern it, and that is why the call for a mechanism. And often we don't get to know the results. A lot of capacity is done by consultants. How do you say a certain thing has been implemented? It is difficult to measure results. It is for these reasons we need an institution,' said South Africa.

India added that the ownership of most climate-friendly technologies has been skewed in that 'we don't have access to those technologies'. CTCN has not been able to do that. 'We hope to see an enhanced role of the institution in the agreement. When I say access is barrier I mean to run a super efficient power plant for instance, there has to be a pool of technologies that need to be made available so that they are indigenously manufactured. The cost of IPR is a huge barrier. We see the role of the financial mechanism of the Convention to provide financial support to meet the cost of IPR,' said India.

Malaysia recalled its experience of attending a CTCN workshop and referred to it as a mixed experience. No one can say capacity has not been enhanced but there is a capacity need to meet the reporting requirements. 'We need to see our first and second NATCOMs (national communications) to see the issue of capacity. Many of us are doing our biennial update reports. Things have come a long way. There are many lessons we can take from these,' said Malaysia, adding that capacity has to be localised. 'If you look at financial, mitigation aspects,

they all have links to capacity,' said Malaysia, adding that Parties need to make an honest effort to fill the gaps.

Referring to the Synthesis report on the implementation of the framework for capacity-building in developing countries, an agenda item under the Subsidiary Body for Implementation, **Jamaica** said it is an issue that is very much related to the ADP. 'There is no central and focused unit addressing the review. Several countries have not been addressed. The paper looks at 50 national communications. They are using just 1 per cent of the developing countries to inform the process. We look at what has been happening and those countries that were able to implement projects. It is true that 99 per cent of the countries were not part of the assessment. So there are gaps already. We don't have an institutional body to play this role. This is an example of why we need an institutional body dedicated to capacity building,' said Jamaica.

Further reflecting on what the US had said, Jamaica responded that for the CTCN, the capacity is only to participate. 'What do you do when you implement technology projects?' said Jamaica. Sometimes, a country is not able to use the tools and the methodology that are needed to use the technology. So this is the missing part – a centralised body. Supporting Saudi Arabia, it said implementation drives capacity. 'We are looking for tools. There are many countries that do not have the capacity,' said Jamaica.

Burundi said that there are bodies in the Convention but there is very little coordination among the bodies. It stressed on the gap on implementation. It said an institution is needed which could coordinate and help countries with capacity building. 'Otherwise we lose our efforts. I invite my colleagues to sit and to see how we can put a body to coordinate everything on capacity building and to see how we can reach the goal on capacity building,' said Burundi.

Senegal said capacity building is the only element under the Convention that does not have dedicated institutional arrangement. It's true that the Durban Forum on capacity building is there and it serves as a platform of discussion where people from a UN body, private sector and other agencies come in to share what has been done in developing countries. 'We want to remind that developing countries are tired to be called developing countries. What we want is to become developed countries,' stressed Senegal, calling for institutional arrangements for capacity building in the ADP. 'It is time to be treated as a stand-alone issue and not a

cross-cutting issue. Saudi Arabia is right when he talks of cooperation. We are here to talk with each other and hopefully understand each other,' said Senegal.

The US said that capacity is the end point but capacity building is a process, which is a collaborative approach. The question is how to get there, it said, adding that there exists a range of institutions such as the Climate Technology Centre and Network, the Green Climate Fund, the Adaptation Committee and others through which different kinds of work are continuing which will only grow in future. 'The question is what is it out there, what are the gaps. We heard calls for institutional arrangements. It is important to focus on the end point of institutional arrangements, before we talk about how to structure something,' the US said. It said that a number of the proposals appeared close to the CTCN and sought information on how some of the proposals differ from what the CTCN does.

The EU said nobody is denying that capacity building is a serious concern and asked of the Parties how to do it most efficiently. It said that there is a need to understand the concerns raised. 'We need to make links between various areas. Is the adaptation committee speaking to the technology institutions on gaps? It would be interesting to know if there is a demand to continue this if we meet in Bonn or is it useful to carry it the next time we meet in Bonn.'

Summarising the discussions, **Runge-Metzger** said that he had heard from Parties that there is a need for capacity building and country-specific provisions for capacity building. He also said that there are gaps within capacity building and these gaps are not picked up by those who should pick these up. To resolve this, a mechanism as a way forward is what he had heard from Parties. He also asked Parties to consider how to sequence capacity building because the need to deliver on capacity could not wait until after the (Paris) agreement. 'Starting capacity building in 2025 would be too late,' he said.

2013-2015 Review: Differences over Use of Structured Expert Dialogue Report

Bonn, 8 June (Hilary Chiew) – There are divergent views over the use of the report of the Structured Expert Dialogue (SED) in the review of the long-term global goal and the progress made towards achieving it (the 2013-2015 Review).

Some countries cautioned against picking and choosing from the SED findings as discussion continues on the joint agenda item on the 2013-2015 Review of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) and Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA). The two subsidiary bodies are meeting from 1 to 11 June.

The 18th meeting of the Conference of the Parties decided to periodically review the adequacy of the long-term global goal and the progress made towards achieving it. The Structured Expert Dialogue (SED) was mandated to assist the SBI and SBSTA to do so. It is to ensure the scientific integrity of the review through a focused exchange of views, information and ideas. The SED concluded its work following the second meeting of the fourth session in February 2015 in Geneva.

The other joint agenda item of the SBI and SBSTA that also drew much attention at the beginning of the 42nd session is the impact of the implementation of response measures (see TWN Bonn Update #12). The first contact group meeting for both items was held on 2 June, followed by an informal consultation on 3 June.

The contact group meeting on 2 June was preceded by a special event on the presentation of the factual report of the SED that includes a compilation of the summary report of the four sessions of the SED and a technical summary which synthesises the work that includes 10 messages capturing the key findings emerging from its sessions.

At SBSTA 41 and SBI 41 in Lima Parties were further invited to submit their views on any other

information or gaps in information relevant to the 2013-2015 Review as well as their views in light of the ultimate objective of the Convention and the overall progress made towards achieving the long-term global goal, including consideration of the implementation of the commitments under the Convention.

SBSTA 42 and SBI 42 currently meeting in Bonn are considering the SED factual report and the submissions from Parties with a view to report to the 21st Conference of the Parties (COP 21) in Paris which shall take appropriate action on the basis of the 2013-2015 Review. The two subsidiary bodies are also invited to consider this matter and to take further steps, including preparing a draft decision for consideration and adoption at COP 21.

Following are the highlights from the first week of the Bonn session.

On 2 June, the contact group Co-chair Gertraude Wollansky (Austria) informed Parties that five submissions were received so far with the latest just a few minutes earlier from the Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and she hoped to get more in the next few days.

To take the work further, she asked Parties to consider two questions: what type of outcome they expect of the conclusion of the review, and how to work towards achieving it including a timeline of whether to finish the work in this Bonn session or continue negotiation at SBSTA 43 and SBI 43 in Paris at the end of the year.

The United States said any decision text must draw closely from the SED technical summary and Parties should work as hard as they can to close the review in Bonn.

Switzerland said it is time to focus on the content based on the result of the SED's report which Parties will draw heavily upon and it would like to have a draft decision in Bonn to be ready for Paris.

Representing the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS), Trinidad and Tobago said after a two-year process, it is time to agree on substance and that is why we have the joint contact group and not just end with the conclusion of the SED. In an ideal world, the contact group will wrap up work at this June session with a draft decision text to be firmly based on the SED's findings.

It wanted a recommendation to strengthen the long-term global goal as it is clear from the SED's findings that limiting temperature rise to 2°C is inadequate as it will not prevent irreversible consequences to many threatened ecosystems and a high number of small island states. AOSIS also wanted the sixth assessment review of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) to ensure that its lowest marker scenario is consistent with limiting warming below 1.5°C by 2100 as an appropriate recommendation by the contact group.

AOSIS also said that the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP) should be informed by the outcome of the Review and include the 1.5°C target as a benchmark for the overall level of ambition of the ADP on mitigation.

It called on the strengthening of the long-term global goal of below 1.5°C as a benchmark for the Secretariat's synthesis report on the aggregate effect of the intended nationally determined contributions (INDCs) that are coming.

(At the informal consultation on 3 June, AOSIS reiterated that the 1.5°C target should be included in the content of the draft decision text and said that it was making a submission to be turned into a CRP document.)

Saudi Arabia in expressing concerns over the IPCC criteria and procedure (the Fifth Assessment Report was heavily relied on by the SED's work) said the science of climate change should be looked at and reviewed by developing countries and scientists. It is not enough to have the IPCC authors give their value judgment, said Saudi Arabia, referring to its experience with the IPCC process. It also acknowledged the SED's final report as a judgment of the two co-facilitators (of the SED) and cautioned against picking and choosing the findings.

It said what is clear is that the long-term goal must meet the objective of the Convention and that would mean achieving sustainable development, securing food production and doing so while respecting the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities (CBDR). Towards that end, Saudi Arabia said, who are we to just look at 2°C or 1.5°C without considering those elements. It was against

having such skewed findings to be inserted as content of the draft decision to inform the ADP and prejudice the negotiations there.

China said it would like to see a draft decision from this session and did not want to delay the work to the 43rd session of the Subsidiary Bodies in Paris which would not provide time to discuss in-depth. On the content of the draft decision, it wanted it to be a procedural one that can comprise a summary of the procedural processes over the past years, the information gaps that were identified and how do to address issues identified during the past two years of discussion.

Noting Saudi Arabia's warning against picking and choosing the findings of the SED's report, it also cautioned Parties against such practice.

India supported having a draft decision in Bonn that acknowledges the knowledge gained and the gaps in information identified.

Brazil said its understanding is that we should be working on a substantive draft decision but it would also support no picking and choosing, particularly the reference of the means to achieve the goal. It said the draft decision should highlight key messages and with respect to the long-term goal of limiting warming to 1.5°C, the difficulties of achieving it.

The European Union (EU) said the SED's report was useful in helping policy makers digest the IPCC report which is relevant to our work here. It said the priority is to work on a substantive decision, adding that so far Parties have been discussing procedural matters but the real mandate of the Review is to prepare for the action to be taken by the COP. It said we should try to advance work as much as possible.

The Solomon Islands speaking for the Least Developed Countries (LDCs) in associating with AOSIS' intervention wanted the pre-2020 ambition to be reflected in the content and said we certainly need to report the findings to the ADP.

Japan also wanted the ADP to be informed of the final report of the SED and view the draft decision as an important outcome of the Bonn session.

The Philippines said as president of the Climate Vulnerable Forum, the country has made a submission on 1 May that would give substantial advice to the COP and the ADP. It requested the Co-chairs to allow for a short interactive session next week for the Philippines to explain its submission.

Norway said the SED report is a balanced presentation which fulfilled the mandate. It is ready to take the next step and prepare an outcome with procedural and substantial recommendations to the

COP, and preferred to come out with a possible draft decision text in Bonn.

Botswana said strengthening the global goal to limit temperature rise below 1.5°C is central in addition to having a draft decision but the gaps of means of implementation need to be addressed as well.

Speaking for the Independent Alliance of Latin America and the Caribbean (AILAC), Colombia said despite the fact that limiting temperature rise to 2°C or 1.5°C remains challenging, the group believed that we should strengthen the global goal to 1.5°C to avoid risks to vulnerable countries and ecosystems.

Bhutan in supporting the Solomon Islands said it would be appropriate if the draft decision addressed the need for limiting warming to 1.5°C.

Co-chair Wollansky then announced that the Co-chairs will prepare a draft decision text based on

what they have heard from Parties in the last one hour.

China said it had a concrete proposal for the draft decision and can send it to the Secretariat to be turned into a CRP document.

Saudi Arabia said there is no consensus on how to proceed yet as there is disagreement on the draft decision being one with substantial content instead of being a procedural one.

Wollansky conceded, saying that she would not produce a draft text but a paper reflecting different options.

The CRPs of China and AOSIS were subsequently posted on the UNFCCC website.

Parties will continue to meet in informal consultation in the second week and are supposed to deliver a draft decision by 11 June. Meanwhile, it is learnt that bilateral talks were taking place in the corridor between country groupings and individual countries and country groupings.

Parties Unable to Agree on Response Measures

Bonn, 8 June (Hilary Chiew) – Parties continue to be unable to reach consensus on work on impact of implementation of response measures, a joint agenda item of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) and Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA).

This has been the situation since COP 19 in Warsaw (2013) on the future of the work programme and forum launched by COP 17, following the conclusion of the review of these two processes at the 39th meeting of the subsidiary bodies in November 2013. The forum was established to implement the work programme by providing a platform that allows Parties to share information, experiences, case studies, best practices and views.

The other joint agenda item of the SBI and SBSTA that also drew much attention at the beginning of the 42nd session is the 2013-2015 Review (see TWN Bonn Update #11). The first contact group meeting for both items was held on 2 June, followed by an informal consultation on 3 June.

The draft decision text contained in the annex to decision 20/CP.20 (adopted at COP 20 in Lima) was forwarded for consideration at the ongoing SBSTA 42 and SBI 42 with a view to the subsidiary bodies recommending a draft decision for adoption at COP 21 in Paris at year end.

SBI Chair Amena Yauvoli (Fiji) opened the contact group meeting on 2 June and reminded Parties that in order to make progress, discussions will be convened to have a draft conclusion ready for the Paris COP.

He also proposed to Parties that their discussion will be facilitated by three persons. Eduardo Calvo (Peru) and Delano Ruben Verwey (the Netherlands) will preside over the meetings in the first week while Verwey will co-facilitate with Crispin D’Auvergne (Saint Lucia) in the second week.

Kick-starting the meeting, Calvo said many issues in this agenda item that were discussed at the old venue at the Maritim Hotel remain although the subsidiary bodies’ sessions are now held in the new facilities of the World Conference Centre.

Verwey said despite the cooperative spirit, Parties have diverging views but it seems there is willingness to cooperate and engage and that is how we will continue the discussion. He asked Parties to express their views on how to proceed here in Bonn with a view to agreeing to a draft decision and a draft conclusion to be forwarded to the Paris COP.

Argentina speaking for the G77 and China said the Group would like to reaffirm that all developing country Parties face economic and social consequences of response measures. The issue of response measures is recognised in the Convention and in this sense, the Group reiterates the importance of giving full consideration to what actions are necessary, including actions related to funding, insurance and the transfer of technology, to meet the specific needs and concerns of developing country Parties arising from the impact of the implementation of response measures, in accordance with the principles and provisions of the Convention, as well as relevant COP decisions.

The issue of the impact of the implementation of response measures has to be seen in the broader objective of the achievement of sustainable development in its economic, social and environmental dimensions and the first and overriding priorities of developing countries, which are poverty eradication and economic and social development.

In this regard, we regret that no decision could be taken in Lima on the matter, even if we were very near from an agreement at that time, showing the G77-China its utmost flexibility towards a progress

on the issue. Nevertheless, we believe this session gives us another opportunity and welcome the consideration during the 42nd sessions of the draft decision brought forward from Lima to these SBS, with a view to adopting a decision in Paris on the matter.

In this sense, the Group reaffirms the contents of the G77 and China submissions, in particular the June and October 2014 submissions, for the continuation of the forum and the establishment of a mechanism to avoid and minimise the negative economic and social consequences of response measures taken by developed country Parties on developing country Parties, and in particular to address policy issues of concern, such as unilateral measures. We believe the Group has put forward key substantive elements towards the achievement of progress in this session, elements that do not seek to reinvent the wheel, but to work to enhance the implementation of the principles and provisions of the Convention, building on the work already done by the forum. Thus, we trust Parties will engage constructively in these discussions towards the adoption of a decision on the issue in Paris.

Towards this end, a decision on the matter at COP 21, we believe Parties must make the best use of the available time and enter into drafting mode as soon as possible. While we enter into drafting mode, we would be encouraged to advance at the same time further technical substantive work that would help us to feed our discussions and enhance the understanding of the issue towards a decision in Paris.

In this respect, in advancing our discussions on the draft decision and the substantive technical work, the G77 and China wants to reiterate some of the key elements of the issue:

- from the results of the review of the work of the forum on the impact of the implementation of response measures finalised in COP19 in Warsaw, there are still gaps of implementation of the relevant principles and provisions of the Convention and its Kyoto Protocol to address the specific needs and concerns of developing countries arising from the impact of the implementation of response measures. This signifies that there is a need for further detailed substantive work and specific action on the matter.
- even if the forum on the impact of the implementation of response measures has proved useful for exchange of experiences and information, it has been incapable of taking

specific actions to address implementation gaps to avoid and minimise negative economic and social consequences of response measures. Thus, any work on the matter must be focused on the specific needs and concerns of developing countries arising from the impact of the implementation of response measures. Some of the areas where collaboration and cooperation could be enhanced and where there are still gaps of implementation are:

- Exchange of views, sharing information and expertise to inform policy choices of response measures taken by developed country Parties
- Facilitation of technical collaboration among Parties and experts on tools, including studies, modelling and methodologies, to assist developing country Parties in addressing negative economic and social consequences of response measures, in particular in relation to specific action for economic transformation and diversification
- Cooperation of modelling teams among Parties, to seek consensus on methodology development and scenarios setting and for models to take into account the specific national economic and social conditions and needs of developing countries
- Partnership with organisations in the research and assessment of developing countries' concerns and needs rising from the impacts of the implementation of response measures
- Cooperation under the Convention to enhance the reporting of Annex I Parties of the impacts of their response measures on developing countries, and how they are minimising the adverse effects on developing countries
- Promotion of cooperation for the fulfilment of developed countries' obligations in terms of support of financial resources, transfer of technology and capacity building to developing countries, in order for the latter to be able to deal with the negative impacts of the implementation of response measures
- Support of multilateral solutions, in opposition to unilateral measures and those that, as agreed in decision 1.CP.18, are policy issues of concern, such as for example, the recent approval by the EU of a measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) of shipping emissions
- Cooperation to ensure that 'measures taken to combat climate change, including unilateral ones, should not constitute a means of arbitrary

or unjustifiable discrimination or a disguised restriction on international trade' (Article 3.5 of the UNFCCC)

- Cooperation for response measures taken by developed countries not to undermine the development nor constitute a means of transferring the burden of climate change mitigation obligations of developed countries to developing country Parties
- Collaboration for the development of mechanisms for a just transition of the workforce and the creation of decent work, in accordance with nationally defined priorities
- Cooperation on the assessment of response measures taken by developed country Parties.

Therefore, the Group is prepared to continue engaging in a transparent and open manner, between Parties, and with a broad participation of civil society, organisations and experts, for the discussion of the draft decision for the establishment of a Mechanism for Enhanced Action on the impact of the implementation of Response Measures under the COP, and to take forward our technical work towards the 43rd session of the Subsidiary Bodies.

The Group also asked for clarification of slots availability in order to allocate sufficient time to make progress at the ongoing Bonn session.

To this, the Secretariat informed that four informal consultations are scheduled for this session on 3, 6, 9 and 10 June.

The European Union (EU) noted that Parties were close to a deal in Lima but unfortunately it did not happen. It outlined four points to reach agreement – process must add value to the overall UNFCCC process; it must be inclusive by adding interests and concerns of everyone; discussions have to be comprehensive and balanced, stressing that they must include both positive and negative impacts so as to have a complete picture; and that the forum can be a successful basis for moving forward.

To take the work forward, the EU said the text (annex to decision 20/CP20) would need substantial revision and a fresh look as the text before us does not help us to explore the way forward.

The United States said it looked forward to a productive and constructive session with an improvement of understanding of positive and negative impacts. It is fine with having the text as a basis to reflect progress made but does not want to restrict ourselves to achieve progress. It would like to have the opportunity to express areas that Parties can come to an agreement and to make progress.

Saudi Arabia representing the Like Minded Developing Countries (LMDC) and the Arab

Group endorsed the G77 and China statement. It lamented that the work is way overdue and reminded Parties that this work should have concluded at COP 19 in Warsaw. It supported using the draft text before us and get into drafting mode in a manner that will help us reach agreement in Paris.

It said clarity and timeframe are missing from the method of work on this agenda item. We need clarity on how to proceed with the options and we need a timeframe on delivering results that will provide comfort to Parties and build confidence.

(There are two options related to the future of the forum and two options on the establishment of a mechanism in the heavily bracketed draft decision text.)

Ghana speaking for the African Group said the Group has repeatedly discussed the experiences of impacts faced and has shown its willingness to engage. It urged Parties to put a human face to the issue and to ensure the people who brought us here that progress is being made and it would be a shame to spend another six months doing nothing.

Singapore said it is incumbent on Parties to make progress and we need a decision by, of and for the Parties.

It said fundamentally if we clear the weeds and under bushes, the aim is to attain sustainable development and therefore we should frame the issue in sustainable development. It took the point of some Parties about including positive impacts but argued that Parties are here to address adverse impacts. It also noted that the question is not about having a process but is about the structure and modalities that govern the process whereby we should not be reinventing the wheel and that includes the work of the forum. Therefore, the logical reboot is to address the gaps, adding that the process must be founded on the UNFCCC's multilateral rules-based system.

It further said Singapore tried to conceptualise the views in a diagram and would be happy to share the diagram with Parties as a point of reference to focus discussion in June. It also clarified that the proposed diagram is a G77 and China proposal which was conceptualised by Singapore.

China said some countries like island states face aviation taxes that would have negative impacts on their tourism development and Middle Eastern countries face the issue of economic diversification while manufacturing countries like China and other emerging economies face unilateral measures related to climate change which could have been better dealt with through international cooperation. We need to find solutions to those negative impacts and the text from Lima is a very good basis for negotiation and there is no need for duplication of work.

The Maldives speaking for the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS) said the impact of the implementation of response measures is not just an issue for oil-producing countries and it sees implications for small island states. We need this process in place and to reach a decision in Bonn.

Australia said we should not focus too heavily on a decision and should take time to consider the technical and not just the political issues.

Verwey concluded that there is common agreement that we use the text transmitted from Lima as the starting point for further discussion as the text had captured a lot of the elements although there are still some gaps to be addressed to make it more robust and meaningful. He said that as discussion on the elements matured then they can be inserted into the text.

He said Parties have taken the time to outline their reflections. He urged them to look at the underlying elements and encouraged Parties to engage with each other to get further understanding of the key issues.

Informal consultation on 3 June

At the start of the meeting, **the G77 and China** suggested putting the draft decision text on the screen and get into drafting mode, cautioned against regressing to pre-Lima positions and pleaded for engagement.

The EU said it is encouraged by the range of views expressed and would like to engage with some proposals made such as the one by Singapore. It would like to make progress with technical work.

The United States reinforced that it wanted all ideas that Parties think are most important to be prioritised in the drafting exercise.

Saudi Arabia speaking for the Arab Group and the LMDC was of the opinion that there was not much difference in Parties' views and supported the G77 and China proposal on getting on with a drafting mode and that Parties' ideas can be inserted as we work on the text itself.

Responding to the EU, **Singapore** said it has handed over the presentation of the diagram to the Secretariat and it is also available on a request basis. To this, co-facilitator Verwey said the document can be distributed if everyone agreed. He also requested for a mandate from the Parties for the Secretariat to prepare a draft conclusion which was agreed by Parties.

Parties then discussed the operational paragraphs of 1 to 7 of the draft decision text. The G77 and China, however, clarified that the Group wanted to look at the whole decision and not just

paragraphs 1 to 7 but is happy to start from paragraph 1 as the natural order.

It also requested for informal, informal consultation in light of the momentum in the negotiation but the informal consultation was only on Saturday, 6 June.

Verwey then informed that Parties could have informal, informal consultations over the next two days of 4 and 5 June.

After two informal, informal consultations on 4 and 5 June and an informal consultation on 6 June, the spirit of constructive cooperation deteriorated and divergence deepened.

Parties tried to engage on the operational paragraphs on inserting the elements of positive impacts and need for economic modelling as a tool for assessment and analysis of impacts. The G77 and China sought to add value to the technical work but was met with resistance from the US and the EU who expressed concerns that the G77 and China was taking the discussion in a regressive direction by reflecting the former's proposal of including positive impacts as 'not having the capacity to benefit from positive impacts'.

The US said it would not support the proposals of the G77 and China that are difficult for them in reference to the issue of addressing unilateral measures.

The G77 and China asked the US to clarify why it finds the Group's proposals difficult when they are Convention provisions and COP decisions and wondered why Parties are having difficulties with their commitments. It questioned that if Parties are not going to fulfil commitments agreed by all Parties then why are we here. It further urged Parties to reflect on the good faith of the G77 and China which was introducing new text to find solutions while their counterparts are not offering any textual changes to move discussion on difficult areas.

New Zealand reacted strongly to the statement, saying that accusing Parties of going back on their commitment is not constructive.

The US reiterated that it is not going to change its position and is not able to make any concession.

Saudi Arabia and India said addressing unilateral measures is part of the agreed language in decision 1/CP.18 and a major concern for developing countries while **Australia** noted that the issue is under the jurisdiction of the World Trade Organisation.

At the informal consultation on 6 June, the Secretariat presented an eight-paragraph draft conclusion.

Both **the US and the EU** noted that the text must focus on areas of convergence and not

distraction with elements that do not belong and pre-empt or prejudge the work on the draft decision. The EU asked for the Secretariat to revise the text accordingly while the US wanted the draft conclusion text to be put aside until Parties managed to produce the draft decision.

The G77 and China disagreed and said that the draft conclusion does not pre-empt the draft decision but it is to assist Parties to move forward.

When the Group proposed for informals to be conducted in the afternoon, **the US** said it had made other arrangements as there was not supposed to be

an official meeting in the afternoon but noted that it can support having bilaterals on Tuesday (9 June).

Verwey noted that the EU was nodding in agreement with the US.

Expressing disappointment, the G77 and China said the Group was willing to engage despite the respective small delegation of its members. It proposed that bilateral and offline discussion should not be left till Tuesday as realistically Parties needed more time.

Verwey said the Secretariat will assist in getting a room if Parties so desired and he would leave it to Parties to decide as this is a Party-driven process.

TWN

Bonn News Update **13**

www.twnmy

Published by
Third World Network

9 June 2015

Parties Call for ADP Co-chairs to Produce Streamlined Text for Substantive Negotiations to Begin

Bonn, 9 June (Indrajit Bose and Meena Raman) – At the stock-take meeting of the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP) held on 8 June, Parties called on the Co-chairs to produce a streamlined and consolidated text to accelerate the pace of work, so as to enable substantive negotiations to begin as soon as possible.

The G77 and China said that ‘we are of the view that the success of this process now hinges on Parties demonstrating their trust in your leadership. It is our view that your leadership and further guidance during this week will help Parties to expedite our work and to leave Bonn with a solid basis for our next session.’

South Africa, speaking for **the G77**, proposed that ‘the Co-Chairs identify within and across sections (of the Geneva text), similar paragraphs and cluster those paragraphs dealing with the same issues and or themes in the streamlined consolidated text. We must agree that the result of your work would be without prejudice to the existing proposals and without prejudging the priority and sequencing of issues. The same approach should be followed across the different sections of the entire Geneva text.’

It also requested that the Co-chairs ‘give clear guidance to the co-facilitators on how to move forward in the next round of textual negotiations in order for us to work through the text with clarity and in a consistent manner so as to enable Parties to start substantive negotiations’.

The G77 and China also stressed the ‘need to create opportunities for Parties to reflect on cross-cutting issues, such as scope (of the agreement), support, thematic parity, equity, differentiation, structure, legal form, at an appropriate time. This would not be a theoretical exercise, but rather take place in the context of specific text that Parties are working on. The views expressed would be captured in your working document. Such an approach would

be an important output (of the current ADP session), as it will help in facilitating negotiations in the forthcoming sessions.’

The G77 said further that ‘the Paris outcome must address all the elements as agreed to in the Durban Platform in a balanced manner. In this regard we emphasise the urgency and importance of advancing textual negotiations on a decision for workstream 2 (on pre-2020 ambition).’ It added that ‘it will be submitting a text on elements for a decision on pre-2020 ambition today. Given our submission and those of other Parties, we see great value in holding additional facilitations this week to further advance our work on the pre-2020 decision.’

The Group also stressed the importance of clarifying ‘the nature and status of the document that will reflect the progress made here in Bonn and especially its relationship to the Geneva text’.

The call to accelerate the pace of work and for the Co-chairs to lead in producing the text was echoed by all Parties, both developing and developed countries. Over the past week since the Bonn meetings started on 1 June, Parties have been engaging in a first and second reading of the Geneva negotiating text, working through facilitated meetings to help streamline and consolidate the text. Despite the intense engagement of some Parties, including in providing proposals for streamlining, the Parties were of the view that the progress has been slow.

ADP Co-chair Ahmed Djoghlaif (Algeria) in his opening remarks at the stock-take meeting said that Parties had shared concerns on the slow pace of work to deliver ‘a more readable, concise, and manageable negotiating text without duplication or repetition and with clear options’.

Speaking for the ADP Co-chairs, he clarified the following points: ‘(i) The only official document that will remain with us until withdrawn in Paris is

the Geneva negotiating text. The products of this session in Bonn are tools and non-papers aimed at facilitating the adoption at the 21st meeting of the UNFCCC's Conference of Parties (COP 21) of the Paris agreement; (ii) The expected outcome of this session is the first streamlined and consolidated text; streamlined paragraphs agreed in the facilitated groups have been made available through our daily updates on the ADP website. These streamlined paragraphs will be included in the new version of the working document to be published in the course of today (8 June); (iii) The co-facilitators will continue to respond expeditiously to any request for further consolidation and streamlining, without leaving out any position and without sacrificing any option, so as to achieve a full re-aggregation of the text. To this end, the co-facilitators have been encouraged to convene bilateral meetings between their facilitation sessions. We, the Co-Chairs, also intend to convene bilateral meetings to prepare for the next stocktaking meeting, if convened, on Wednesday (10 June); (iv) The consistency of the method of work across the facilitation groups will depend on the consistency of the requests of Parties addressed to the co-facilitators; (v) The further clarification of concepts and better understanding of positions are being addressed within the facilitation groups in relation to the text. If needed, a stocktaking meeting will be convened on Wednesday to provide an opportunity for further clarification of concepts at the ADP level. However, we believe that such a discussion should be linked to the text; it should not be used to restate well-known positions or be a broad philosophical discussion.'

Co-chair Daniel Reifsnyder (the United States) added that Parties would get the opportunity to discuss the way forward on the concluding day of the Bonn session (which will be on 11 June). They would discuss what is to be done in the forthcoming ADP sessions planned from 31 August-4 September and 19-23 October.

After the interventions, Djoghlafl said it was clear from Parties' interventions that they wanted to expedite and to arrive at a negotiating text that is clear, concise, manageable and workable, and one that did not sacrifice any options. 'Some want the negotiating text earlier. I doubt something can be done unless you give us the assurance that you will take it and not throw it in the bin, and we can agree on how to do it. But this will not work.' He added that there would be two more sessions on workstream 2 and if Parties felt they might need more time, they would get more time to discuss workstream 2. He said that another stock-take would be scheduled for 10 June.

On the next steps, Djoghlafl said that the Co-chairs would meet with the co-facilitators and with the Secretariat's help, reflect on the proposals of Parties and try to come up with a document. 'The mandate is very clear. Facilitation meetings should continue to streamline the text ... You are the best placed to know where you stand with a clear understanding on paragraphs that can be identified as potential paragraphs, which we can always put for consolidation,' said Djoghlafl.

Several developing country Parties also stressed on the need for additional sessions on workstream 2 (pre-2020 action).

France, as the incoming COP 21 Presidency, welcomed the positive spirit of Parties and 'did not want a last minute scenario' (for the Paris outcome). It stressed the need for a transparent process that delivers. It said that Parties had given strong support for a new document by the end of session and to accelerate the process, stressing that 'the only way for the inclusive process is here'.

During the stock-take session, the ADP Co-chairs also asked of Parties to reflect on the suggested structure for a decision at COP 21 and what elements of the Geneva text should be part of an accompanying COP decision and what should be part of an agreement. Reifsnyder said that there was no clarity on this and that the UNFCCC was only 22 pages with very short articles. He said there is a need to discuss this, as it would help the Co-chairs.

Clear differences emerged on the issue between the developing and the developed countries on this.

Speaking for **the Like-Minded Developing Countries (LMDC)**, **Malaysia** said that it is premature to discuss the issue because 'we have not agreed on what the core elements of the agreement will be'. 'We can agree on a general principle such as guidance and timing. We feel requiring Parties to identify at this early stage is premature. We request consideration with that aspect of the work in subsequent sessions,' said Malaysia.

China said it is more important to focus on streamlining the Geneva text rather than discuss what elements should go to the decision and what should be in the core agreement. It added that as a general principle, the agreement should be comprehensive and cover in a balanced manner all the elements and should not be only about mitigation. It said that at this stage there needs to be guidance or principles on what is in the core agreement and what is not. The general or big issues should be part of the core agreement while leaving detailed rules for operation and further guidelines elaborated through COP decisions for Paris and beyond. Priority should be on streamlining and consolidating and next time, we

can decide on the matter. That is the right approach, said China.

In response to Co-chair Reifsnyder who said that there is no hierarchy between what goes in the agreement and what goes in a decision, **Tuvalu**, for the **Least Developed Countries (LDCs)**, said, ‘We don’t agree there is no hierarchy. There is a hierarchy of decisions. We heard from Parties to move whole sections to the Geneva text. We need clear discussion on what is in the Geneva text and what could be seen as downgrading of work in the decisions.’

The developed countries, on the other hand, presented their views on what they saw as issues belonging to a COP decision and what should be part of the agreement. They said that the agreement should be concise and that detailed rules and anything that is time-bound should be part of the decisions.

Highlights of other interventions

Speaking for **the African Group, Sudan** called for increasing the pace of negotiations and clarity in the mode of work in facilitated sessions. It said that the secretariat should identify themes and concepts of the streamlined consolidated text, while ensuring that the integrity of Parties’ options remains intact. The Group also called for discussion on differentiation, structure, scope and legal form and said that it would help streamline across sections. Stressing that all options remain on the table, the Group said it is important to capture the status of the documents.

Speaking for **the LMDC, Malaysia** said the group had provided texts, paragraphs and participated in the consolidation exercise but that the pace needs to be accelerated. Calling for a change in gear, Malaysia said that it is time now for the Co-chairs to produce a document that would be streamlined and consolidated and which would help negotiations to begin. It said that all options could be retained and language could be tweaked provided it was done in a balanced way.

Speaking for **the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS), the Maldives** hoped that all the co-facilitators continue to work on clustering tables and said the Co-chairs should produce a consolidated version of the Geneva text where all the options remain as is. Calling for a co-facilitated dialogue on workstream 2, it asked of the Co-chairs to develop indicative milestones to be achieved by the next two ADP sessions.

Speaking for **the LDCs, Angola** stressed on the need to begin negotiations based on the working document which the Co-chairs produce. It said on

workstream 2, Parties need to move beyond the technical examination processes and complement and strengthen National Adaptation Plans.

Speaking for **the Arab Group, Saudi Arabia** said it is important that the streamlined working document comes early in the process, which would help move to the real negotiations mode at the next ADP session.

India said that the Durban mandate related to two workstreams. It highlighted that workstream 2 was not getting the balanced time allocation. ‘Workstream 2 is quite important from the developing countries’ point of view. All submissions made today flag the importance of workstream 2. We need to evolve clear elements of the workstream 2 document by the end of this session. You will receive proposals from G77 and China, AOSIS and the EU. It is enough to give you an idea how to proceed. But we need allocation of time to workstream 2 so that some kind of preliminary negotiations are held and a document on workstream 2 is arrived at,’ said India.

‘We are working diligently till late. We are being efficient but this is time to take stock and pause and think whether we are being effective. Why should we wait till the end of the session for the streamlined and condensed document? Why not tomorrow? Different sections are moving at a different pace. We urge the Co-chairs that with the benefit of inputs and the combined wisdom of the co-facilitators, to produce a condensed and streamlined text by tomorrow so that from tomorrow till the end, we can indulge in negotiations,’ said India. It also said that cross-cutting issues are welcome and that equity must be included in that discussion. On sequencing, India said Parties should first decide about what would be the parts of the agreement. Only then should we look at the COP decisions, it added.

China said there is a need for more clear and consistent guidelines to the co-facilitators to follow the same process. It said since the pace of work was not the same across different sections, there is a need for guidance on how to approach and cluster paragraphs. China further said there is a need to make options clearer and that streamlining is a priority to further focus on textual negotiations in the forthcoming ADP sessions. It also said that workstream 2 is part of the Paris package. ‘It is not part of the Geneva text, so there is a lot more work that is to be done to speed up workstream 2. We need to take a balanced approach to both the workstreams. Pre-2020 implementation is a very important factor to build trust and confidence,’ said China.

Peru said streamlining of every section should be done before the work of every session. It called for the consistent use of editorial tools, while keeping all the positions on the table. It also said that the next session of the ADP should begin with a concise document to finally negotiate and called for the first draft decision on workstream 2 issues to be produced by the end of the ongoing session at Bonn.

The European Union was concerned that Parties had spent a week engaging in an exercise that should have been done by the secretariat. ‘We are negotiating a legally binding agreement and we need to familiarise ourselves with the ideas in the text. We need a negotiating text that is structured coherently,’ the EU said.

Speaking for **the Environment Integrity Group (EIG), the Republic of Korea** also said Parties need to speed up the process and called for a working document as a starting point for negotiations in September.

The United States called for a shorter document with clearer options. It stressed the need to see the landing zones on the content of the agreement, the legal character of the agreement, to reduce the number of options in a logical order. ‘This means we need to engage in negotiations,’ the US said. It added that Parties could discuss cross-cutting issues if the discussions were aimed at shortening the text. It also called for ‘adding a couple of extra days’ for the August session of the ADP.

TWN

Bonn News Update 14

www.twn.my

Published by
Third World Network

10 June 2015

ADP: Compiled Text on pre-2020 Action to be Tabled

Bonn, 10 June (Indrajit Bose) – A compiled text on what Parties must do in the pre-2020 climate action (called workstream 2), with inputs and reflections of Parties, will be made available on 10 June.

This is in response to a call made by **India, China and Brazil** at the third facilitated session on workstream 2, under the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP) that convened on 9 June. **Aya Yoshida (Japan)** and **George Wamukoya (Kenya)** were the co-facilitators for the session.

Developing countries have been stressing the importance of pre-2020 action under the ADP as a strong foundation for the post-2020 Paris agreement.

India sought the co-facilitators' guidance on the way forward. 'In the spirit of being Party-driven we respect the views and ideas of various Parties. How does this process move forward? We have to take action now and in the spirit of urgency, we should develop a compilation text, which takes the inputs of all the Parties, and which can be the draft negotiating text for the pre-2020 workstream. That can help us conclude our plan of action at the earliest possible and not leave it to the last minute in Paris. The Co-chairs should give us more time to develop a draft text so that we move forward in the two planned ADP sessions,' said India.

China supported India in the call for a compilation text and **Brazil** said that Parties should engage in the preparation of a decision on workstream 2 in Bonn. **The United States (US)** disagreed, saying that a compilation text would not make sense. 'What would be more helpful would be to discuss Parties' preferences and for the Co-chairs to produce a reflections note on convergences and divergences in the way forward,' said the US.

However, **Yoshida** said that the co-facilitators would compile Parties' inputs on workstream 2, and 'take into account the inputs and reflections, which

would have a flexible structure and which would reflect the discussions and the inputs received so far'. Yoshida added that they would make the document available to Parties several hours before the next facilitated session planned for 10 June from 7 to 9 pm.

Various groups of Parties such as **the G77 and China, the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS), the European Union (EU), the Environment Integrity Group (EIG) and the Umbrella Group** have posted their proposals on what they see as the elements of a workstream 2 decision, which are available at the UNFCCC website (<http://unfccc.int/bodies/awg/items/9036.php>).

The G77 and China's proposal, posted online on 9 June, contains the elements for the decision text. It outlines the preamble, the objectives of the pre-2020 work programme, the accelerated implementation process pre-2020; details out enhancing the technical examination process (TEP); and calls for launching TEP on adaptation. The proposal also provides provisions for multilateral cooperation and support for initiatives and enhancing high-level engagement, besides a placeholder for institutional arrangements. (http://unfccc.int/files/bodies/awg/application/pdf/g77_possible_elements_-_8_june_2015_710pm.pdf)

The facilitated group saw a rich exchange of views as well as divergences. During the discussion, Parties responded to questions posed by the co-facilitators around two themes: the TEP and advancing implementation under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol.

Speaking for the G77 and China, Mali said it is critical how the findings of the TEP could be most effectively translated into concrete actions on the ground because 'unless we translate we are not fulfilling our mandate'. It welcomed TEMS

(technical experts meetings) on mitigation and said that TEMs provide a ‘non-political facilitative space’ and called for a parallel process on adaptation.

Mali added that the topics of TEMs should be Party-driven and determined by Parties. It said further that the areas do not need to be sectoral always and there might be a need to look at broader, cross-cutting issues.

Mali also said that there is a need to improve access to the TEP. It recalled the experience of including participation by a manager of a medium enterprise which belongs to Mali and who had come to Bonn to participate in the TEM organised during the first week of the Bonn session. Mali said the manager used the space to demonstrate a lot of what was happening on the ground with respect to a hybrid decentralised solar system. ‘The question is how do we ensure that our experts from our regions are able to come here and give us not only policy recommendations but also the reality from the ground,’ said Mali.

Mali added that in such meetings the ‘usual suspects’ such as IRENA (International Renewable Energy Agency), IEA (International Energy Agency) and OECD (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development) are to be found. ‘We need to invite those who don’t need foreign exchange swap instruments because they deal with local currency. We need to continue engaging in meaningful opportunities for such people,’ said Mali.

Mali appraised Parties that it had not had the chance to interact with the Executive Director of the Green Climate Fund (GCF) in Bonn on what are the instruments that the GCF might use or mobilise in terms of accelerated implementation. ‘We need a mode of work that is more structured and focused, also which should be linked to the financial and technology mechanism of the Convention,’ said Mali.

It stressed that drive on means of implementation is missing and referred to driving concrete action on means of implementation as absolutely necessary. ‘We have to start ensuring that institutions respond,’ said Mali, adding that it had called for a technical paper to support TEMs and which would focus on analysing gaps, not just of means of implementation but that of delivery. The idea is to find out how we make the process less cumbersome and more readily available, it said.

Mali also said the G77 and China supports high-level events under the COP Presidency. It said that summary for policy-makers of each of the TEMs should cater to both adaptation and mitigation. Referring to the Group’s proposal, Mali said they

have submitted ideas for deepened engagement with both mitigation and adaptation and for scaling up of initiatives.

On what should be the appropriate home for the TEP, Mali said the G77 and China has a placeholder for institutional arrangements and added that the Group was actively discussing the issue. ‘At this stage, all options are on the table,’ it said.

On strengthening collaboration, there is a need to convene representatives of the Convention’s bodies and the G77 and China had outlined activities in its proposals on the issue of adding value and synergy between the existing processes.

Under advancing implementation of the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol, Mali said that sharing experiences on accelerated implementation as per the Warsaw and the Lima decisions would be useful.

Further adding on the issue of advancing implementation of the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol, Mali urged Parties to see climate action as an opportunity. It said that all Parties should advance the implementation of the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol without duplicating efforts and reiterated that the Group is very serious about adaptation, mitigation and means of implementation and added that sustained focus on means of implementation was critical to advance the implementation. It stressed that existing action is not enough. ‘If it was, we would not be here in the first place,’ said Mali.

On finance, Mali said the discussion is riddled with definition and methodological issues over which Parties should have a serious conversation. It called on Parties to take stock and define a trajectory for adequacy but also said that a trajectory would not get Parties there. What is important is the assessment of the adequacy of finance to developing countries in a holistic manner. ‘We are aware of the work of the Standing Committee on Finance (SCF) on MRV (measuring, reporting and verification) of finance and to ensure transparency in the delivery of finance. We want to avoid duplication and ensure it is adding value. It will not be enough to say there is a long-term finance process. It has been there for some time but the question is whether there is transparency. The discussion is happening, which is relevant here but over there, that discussion is not happening,’ said Mali.

On the role of non-state actors, Mali said that it is the Parties that have obligations and the actors are the ones implementing it. It said the issue is how a space should be articulated to link the two elements and what should be the incentives for further action. ‘They have a role to play that is clear. But they don’t

have any obligation. So there is no need for any normative guidance coming from this body or the Convention. The idea is how we make the space relevant for them,' said Mali.

It added that the UNFCCC has yet to deliver as one. It said there are Chairs of the Climate Technology and Centre Network (CTCN) and there is the GCF and Parties will have to define how the institutions would work together.

India asked if all the existing institutions were working well, why did Parties have to create the Durban Platform for workstreams 1 and 2. 'Gaps existed then and gaps exist now,' said India, adding that the question is how the gap in adaptation, capacity building and means of implementation should be closed for the effective implementation of the Convention. It said it got the impression that Parties should close shop for the next five years and only talk about post-2020 and the TEP. It disagreed with this view and reiterated that workstream 2 related to the Durban mandate, which was arrived at in Warsaw and Lima. It stressed that workstream 2 was 'inextricably linked' to the success of workstream 1. 'We have to demonstrate political will through enhanced action and not action already completed. Enhanced pre-2020 ambition will not only provide a strong basis for post-2020 cooperation, it will also avoid higher costs of mitigation and adaptation. Such high costs will jeopardise developing countries' future contribution to climate change,' said India.

The Kyoto Protocol and the Convention are the main enablers of action under workstream 2 and it is in this light that the G77 and China has highlighted the actions that can be taken to close the ambition gap and for it to be ratcheted up, said India. It also said there exist suggestions on the revisit mechanism and on a 2015-2020 work programme to review the adequacy on provision of finance, technology and capacity building support in the pre-2020 period.

India highlighted that apart from a clear roadmap on finance, there was also a need for a clear roadmap for technology development and transfer, which would enable them to look at greener technologies, the climate proprietary know-how and the prohibitive costs of intellectual property rights.

On technical expert meetings (TEMs), India said that apart from the reports generated by these processes, there is a need to be clear that these are translated to action and accelerated implementation. There needs to be some cost-benefit analysis towards this and to ascertain the constraints in using the outcomes of the TEP.

'Is it a constraint of information or finance and technology? Without understanding real constraints,

it is difficult to see how scaling up will help. We also need to see if they have led to additional actions. Unless these are demonstrated, we feel the high-level events are only talks,' said India. It suggested exploring adaptation topics and to see adaptation gaps. There is also a need to look at sustainable consumption and focus on luxury emissions and compare it to emissions of necessary consumption in developing countries.

On the call for inclusion of non-state actors, India made it clear that Parties and national governments have the primary responsibility for climate change. 'The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), which deals with countries, should not try to bypass the sovereign authorities and should work through Parties,' said India, adding that undoubtedly non-state actors have a role to play but whatever action has to be taken must be through national entities.

On multilateral cooperation initiatives, India said that these do not adhere to the principles and provisions of the Convention. 'We would like to see the UNFCCC as the primary vehicle for action. Multilateral vehicles cannot be a substitute for action,' said India.

(India was referring to voluntary initiatives undertaken outside the ambit of the Convention.)

On advancing implementation, **the European Union** was of the view that MRV was a key way of accelerating implementation for now and the International Consultation and Analysis (ICA) and the International Assessment and Review (IAR) processes would need to promote action. **Japan** seconded the EU about the MRV arrangements to enhance action in the pre-2020 period.

In response, **Mali speaking for the G77 and China** said, 'Transparency is important. We are going through our first cycle of biennial update reports and each cycle will have revision guidelines. When it comes to transparency of finance, the SCF is working on a full plan on transparency of support. We are curious as to how transparency in and itself can be a foundation for ambition,' said Mali, adding that the TEM and the work under the TEP was the primary space to unlock ambition.

Mali added that in Paris, Parties would have to reflect the full Durban mandate, which is workstream 1 and workstream 2. 'We do not foresee a situation where there is no decision. We need an ambitious decision that can close the gap,' it said. Mali reflected on the EU's statement at an earlier session on workstream 2 in Bonn wherein it had said that it would not revisit its emissions reduction target pre-2020 (see TWN Bonn Update No. 9: 'Conditions for increasing pre-2020 emissions target not met –

says EU'). 'There have been constraints in increasing the targets. EU indicated it would not. There is this issue of providing signals. We are trying to picture here that in Paris, we will have an agreement on pre-2020 that is ambitious. It has to be an ambitious decision,' Mali stressed.

Highlights of other interventions

Speaking for the **Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS)**, the **Maldives** stressed that workstream 2 should drive action and that none of the elements in themselves, whether it is technical papers or outputs or high-level events, drive action. It added that existing multilateral and cooperative initiatives could use the TEMs to get new institutions on board and for new resources to be scaled up. It said that the Convention's bodies should modify their work plans to take into account results of the TEMs. It called for a direction from the Conference of Parties to the Convention bodies in this regard and said the idea is to work collectively. The Maldives added that new and reformed voluntary cooperative and multi-stakeholders are two ways in which workstream 2 could drive action. It called for institutional support for high-level events and detailed out a proposal of having a high-level Chair, Co-chair and staff to assist with such events.

China said the implementation issues are explicitly listed in paragraph 4 of the Warsaw decision and added that a lot of the issues remained to be addressed. As examples, China mentioned immediate ratification of the Doha amendment to the Kyoto Protocol, evaluating the conditionality of commitments and assessing adequacy of finance in a holistic manner. It said that by accelerating the implementation process under the UNFCCC, a space to enhance ambition could be established. Accelerated implementation should be in the centre of pre-2020 action, which is to be informed by the TEP and linked to high-level engagement. To advance further work and a draft decision on workstream 2, China called for a compilation of all of the Parties' views and concerns in a comprehensive and balanced way 'without introducing new text'.

Bolivia called for additional TEMs on adaptation, sustainable development and poverty eradication. It said it is not ethical to address climate change through businesses and profits. It called for a new TEM on the technical know-how and practices from indigenous and local communities.

Argentina underscored the importance of having TEMs on both mitigation and adaptation and

added that limiting the TEP to just experiences and lessons learnt would not be enough to close the ambition gap.

Saudi Arabia said not addressing pre-2020 would result in a bigger gap in the post-2020 period. It called for adaptation to be addressed in a bottom-up approach and called for TEMs to be a result of a Party-driven process.

Brazil underscored the importance of means of implementation if the objective is to translate to actions on the ground. High-level engagement should be meaningful and should provide the opportunity to translate the identified policies and actions at a larger scale. The question is how to provide the channel, it said.

Bangladesh said an enhanced pre-2020 climate action is essential for the post-2020 climate regime and called for a clearer implementation element in the TEP.

The EU said that advancing a decision on the TEP was a mandate from Lima adding that TEP had provided a great 'learning experience' for all the Parties. Referring to the UNFCCC as 'not intended to be an implementing institution', which would connect different actors, it said that the TEP was meant to play a catalytic and connecting role for outcomes. It called for the TEP to be linked to a clear political space and gave the example of the Lima Paris Action Agenda (for the engagement of non-state actors).

The TEP can be improved for these high-level dialogues and for involving a larger number of non-state actors, financial advisers that would be so important to achieve the low carbon transition and for broader participation beyond the governments, according to the EU.

In response to the proposal by AOSIS, the EU said that it was concerned about the 'long list' of actions that may be needed to support the work intersessionally and its budget implications would have to be considered. The EU recommended a step-by-step approach instead. To proposals that the choice of TEMs should be Party-driven, the EU expressed concern about overly politicising the TEP process, which has been rather 'organic' thus far. The EU added that the TEMs should sit under the COP rather than the subsidiary bodies.

On advancing implementation, **the EU** said that Parties must not take the pressure of what they should be doing in the pre-2020 period. 'Paris is about collective commitments,' it said. The EU added that the GCF would be the key space to watch in the pre-2020 period and could receive 'high quality' funding proposals and institutions such as the TEC

(Technology Executive Committee) and the CTCN could take up policy recommendations. It said that MRV was a key way of accelerating implementation for now and the ICA and the IAR processes would need to promote action. ‘These will be the key tools to understanding the potential and reducing emissions before Paris comes into force,’ said the EU, adding that the Secretariat should focus on the mandate from Lima.

Japan called for strengthening linkages between TEP and institutional mechanisms such as the TEC and the CTCN and said it is important that the outcome of TEMs is recognised by Parties. It added that there should be an efficient way of conducting high-level engagement vis-à-vis appropriate policies. Regarding transparency in flow of finance, Japan added that the SCF was engaged in tracking overall finance and that developed countries were providing detailed biennial reports. Japan seconded the EU about the MRV arrangements to enhance action in the pre-2020 period. It said it was important to continue with the multilateral assessment process. It also called for work to be advanced under the Lima Paris Action Agenda through either a COP decision or political declaration

and added that existing institutions were effectively supporting to advance implementation.

New Zealand said that the mandate from Lima was clear. It added that the expertise of TEC and CTCN could be made use of and added that it had been comfortable with the selection of topics for the TEMs. The future COP presidencies could assume the role and given the implementation focus, the TEP could be housed ‘probably’ in the SBI. It said it would like to hear from the adaptation committee whether there was a vacuum in the technical expert process.

Australia said the COP should not be too prescriptive on how the TEMs work. On high-level engagement, Australia said it is not convinced that they would always be useful. It was in favour of the TEP to be housed in the SBI and was open to ideas around this.

The US referred to the Lima decision as guidance to proceed for further discussions and said that TEP are tools for Parties to catalyse ambition and Parties could use TEMs for voluntary initiatives. It said that the Adaptation Committee, not the TEMs, should promote coherence on adaptation gaps and said that the TEC and the CTCN should be the guiding bodies.

TWN

Bonn News Update **15**

www.twn.my

Published by
Third World Network

10 June 2015

Orderly and Timely Outcome with No Surprises, Says COP 21 Presidency

Bonn, 10 June (Hilary Chiew) – The in-coming French presidency of the 21st Conference of the Parties (COP) of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) stressed that it does not want surprises in Paris but an ‘orderly and timely’ delivery of an agreement that lasts.

At the open-ended informal consultation to solicit views on the expectation of the Paris COP from Parties and observers held on 9 June, the Special Representative of the French Minister of Foreign Affairs, Ambassador Laurence Tubiana, apologised (to Parties) if the in-coming presidency was ‘pressing too much’ and sought Parties’ understanding to put themselves in the shoes of the French.

Emphasising on inclusiveness, she explained that timely processing and preparing of what is needed for the core agreement and COP decisions are very important to ensure that all small and big countries’ voices are listened to and no one is left behind.

Explaining the sentiment of the incoming COP President Laurent Fabius, the Foreign Minister of France, about an ‘agreement text’ by October, she said it would be very important to have by then the main elements of the global deal that everybody wanted.

At the opening of the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP) on 1 June, Tubiana assured that the French Presidency is not working on a text and does not want to produce a text.

On inclusiveness, she said the duty of the COP Presidency is to listen to every voice and the responsibility for an agreement lies on all Parties.

‘We cannot put the responsibility on the Co-chairs. We have to deliver it ourselves. We have to mobilise at all levels ... negotiators, ministers and heads of government. It is not easy to explain to the outside world what we are doing here but we must

work on the message that we are working hard to deliver and we have to make it work together,’ she added.

She said she is hopeful as she saw immense mobilisation and willingness to act. She said for the first time since her involvement in this process in 1997, she saw that each country wanted to bring home the result of the international discussion and make the change at home.

Tubiana said the agreement will deal with mitigation and adaptation, the latter a priority for many countries that are suffering from the impacts of climate change. She also said a balanced agreement must taken into account each country’s responsibility and having the six elements (mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology development and transfer, capacity building and transparency of action and support) of the Durban mandate.

She said to mobilise the US\$100 billion a year by 2020 from both public and private sources, the role of non-state actors is needed. It is not to replace the governments’ efforts but it is about cooperation that is really needed for the climate regime.

She further said that the in-coming Presidency will continue to convene consultations to explore ideas for common ground to ensure success in Paris with two more informal meetings for ministers scheduled for 20 and 21 July. The French are also working closely with the UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon as well as the option of inviting heads of states to the first day of the COP.

Argentina said it hoped to sign a good deal in Paris that includes mitigation, adaptation and means of implementation as well as differentiation.

Concurring with Tubiana that the secret of the success of the Paris COP will be an agreement with means of implementation that Parties are waiting for, Argentina stressed that the agreement will be under

the Convention. It said the Convention is 'wise' and Parties had tried to implement it through the Kyoto Protocol (KP) which is a top-down approach and which is good but Parties were not ambitious enough.

Although Argentina approved of the second commitment period (of the KP), it is disappointed that the obligation of developed countries are not very high. And as a result of this lack of ambition, we now try to go for a bottom-up approach and it hoped this will work.

Argentina will do its part but emphasised that it will be under the Convention and with differentiation.

The European Union expressed full confidence in the in-coming Presidency team and it shared the French vision of a Paris COP that is transparent and inclusive. It said the group is concerned over the gap between the negotiation and a political decision at the ADP discussion, noting that it is important to get a 'text' out soon so decision-makers can engage going forward. An early text will also contribute to the media narrative that the international community is taking climate action seriously and everyone is on board to make the goal a reality.

Australia speaking for the Umbrella Group wanted the Paris COP to represent a significant collective effort and put us on the path of global warming below 2°C. It said an important part of Paris will be the Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDCs) that Parties will bring forward this year, particularly from the advanced economies, noting that many Umbrella Group members had submitted theirs.

It also would like to see broad participation by including non-state actors and welcomed the incoming Presidency support on this issue. It said our job is to deliver to our ministers a draft agreement as close as possible to the final deal in Paris and there is less than six months to set up a concise, durable agreement and accompanying decisions to operationalise the agreement.

The Maldives speaking for the Alliance of Small Island States said one part of the 'Paris Package' should consist of an ambitious, legally

binding Protocol, under the Convention, capable of limiting warming to below 1.5°.

It said in addition to addressing mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology development and transfer, transparency of action and support, and capacity building in a balanced manner, the 2015 agreement must also anchor and give permanence to Loss and Damage.

The Maldives said AOSIS also sees a series of supporting decisions as a part of the 'Paris Package'. We have had some very good discussions here in Bonn on the workstream 2 (pre-2020) decision and are optimistic that we will continue to work constructively to achieve a strong decision on workstream 2, which we also see as a critical component of the Paris Package. We believe that the workstream 2 decision should be separate from the covering decision for the 2015 agreement and consistent with the mandate of the ADP for workstream 2.

It welcomed the vision of achieving an outcome in an orderly and timely manner, noting that many AOSIS members' delegations are small and the practice of previous COPs of late nights and sessions running dozens of hours beyond the scheduled closing time often resulted in those delegations being left out of the final decision-making process. It therefore welcomes efforts to limit long days and last-minute scrambling to reach a transparent and inclusive outcome.

Singapore adding its voice to AOSIS said it would like to commend France for the inclusiveness and assurance to work together in a transparent manner to make COP21 a success.

The Trade Union constituency said the agreement must commit to ensure just transition of the workforce. Recalling the walk-out protest by civil society groups at the Warsaw COP (in December 2013) as they witnessed clear backtracking by Parties and the call by the in-coming Presidency for inclusiveness, it highlighted the discussion in the programme budget of the UNFCCC where support for civil society involvement could be limited and urged for assurance of the participation of civil society.

TWN

Bonn News Update 16

www.twn.my

Published by
Third World Network

15 June 2015

ADP Co-chairs to Produce Concise Text 24 July for Substantive Negotiations

Bonn, 12 June (Indrajit Bose and Meena Raman) – On the last day of the climate change talks held in Bonn from 1 to 11 June, developing countries reflected that modest progress had been made under the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP) and welcomed the proposal by the Co-chairs to produce on 24 July, a more streamlined, concise and consolidated text to allow for substantive negotiations which will begin late August.

The ADP convened in the afternoon of 11 June a contact group that was followed by a short closing plenary. In a note prepared for the information of Parties (posted on the UNFCCC website and referred to in the final session of the ADP), the Co-chairs Ahmed Djoghlaif (Algeria) and Daniel Reifsnyder (USA) made known their suggestions on the way forward for the preparations of the next ADP session to be held end of August in Bonn. Parties reflected on the Co-chairs' note and made their views known.

The Co-chairs informed Parties that the Geneva Negotiating Text (GNT) is the only official document before the ADP until it is withdrawn by Parties at the 21st meeting of the Conference of Parties in Paris in December (COP 21). 'All the documents issued during ADP 2.9 (the recent Bonn session), as well as during future ADP sessions, will continue to be non-papers and will hold no status, as they are simply tools to assist Parties to fulfil the ADP mandate successfully.'

They stated further that the outputs of the Bonn session are the following non-papers:

(i) a revised streamlined and consolidated text (dated 11 June 2015), and (ii) a working document (also dated 11 June 2015).

(The revised consolidated text is 85 pages long, containing both the streamlined paragraphs and the non-streamlined paragraphs of the GNT. The working document contains the streamlined

paragraphs of the Geneva text as well as the observations of Parties.)

Responding to the call by Parties for the Co-chairs to produce a streamlined and consolidated text to accelerate the pace of work, (see TWN Bonn Update 13: *Parties call for ADP Co-chairs to produce streamlined text for substantive negotiations to begin*), the ADP Co-chairs stated that with the support of the Secretariat and the co-facilitators, they will make available 'a single document based on the structure of Annex II to the scenario note of 5 May 2015, and guided by the views expressed by Parties during the 8 June stocktaking meeting, taking fully into account the discussions on this issue during the 75 meetings of the ADP negotiating groups as well as the meetings of the facilitation groups. It will include a fully streamlined, consolidated, clear and concise version of the GNT that will present clear options and will not omit or delete any option or position of Parties.'

The Co-chairs stated further that the document 'will separate paragraphs of the GNT that are, by their nature, obviously appropriate for inclusion in a draft COP decision from paragraphs that are, by their nature, obviously appropriate for inclusion in the Paris Agreement. Issues clearly requiring further substantive negotiation among Parties to determine their placement will remain in the streamlined, consolidated, clear and concise GNT without inclusion in either category and will be clearly identified.'

'This suggested tool ... will be made available as an annex to the Co-chairs' scenario note to be issued on 24 July 2015,' they added further.

(Annex II of the Co-chairs' scenario note refers to a draft outline decision for COP 21 that presents all matters related to the ADP in a single decision. The first part of the decision focuses on the adoption of the Paris Agreement which is to be reflected in an

annex to the decision; the second part relates to ‘decision elements’ which are not in the Paris Agreement; the third part deals with ‘decision elements on the pre-2020 ambition’; the fourth part addresses ‘interim arrangements’, while the fifth part relates to ‘administrative and budgetary matters’.)

Responding to the Co-chairs’ suggestions, on the issue of what matters of the GNT are contained in the Paris Agreement and what goes into the decisions, **South Africa, speaking for the G77 and China**, stressed ‘the importance of addressing all the elements in the Durban Platform in both places in a comprehensive and balanced manner, preserving the structure of the Geneva text and taking into account that there are many issues that Parties believe should be addressed in the agreement, as well as in decisions. We also believe that you should keep in mind that there are certain issues for which it may be too early to make determination regarding their proper placement. It is therefore important that we leave here with a clear understanding that your document will be without prejudice to Parties’ right at our next sessions to propose that options, paragraphs, elements, etc. be moved’.

Saying that the progress in Bonn had been modest, the G77 and China also emphasised the importance of an open and transparent process that is Party-driven and builds consensus to provide all Parties with the assurances needed to secure an equitable and ambitious agreement in Paris. Stressing on increasing the pace of work in the subsequent session, South Africa called for clarity on the way forward, including the work the Co-chairs intended to undertake in the intersessional period. ‘The Group feels that it is important to enter into substantive negotiations without any further delay,’ it added.

Supporting the Co-chairs’ proposal on the way ahead, South Africa said the documents that have been produced in Bonn as well as the document the Co-chairs had indicated they would present would have the status ‘only of non-papers’. ‘It is important that your document address the six core elements mandated by the Durban Platform decision in a comprehensive and balanced manner both in the agreement text and decision text, without prejudice to the Parties’ proposals and would not prejudice the priority, sequencing and final placement of issues,’ it said.

The Group also asked of the Co-chairs to create appropriate opportunities for Parties to reflect on the cross-cutting issues, such as scope, support, thematic parity, equity, differentiation, structure and legal form, at an appropriate time. ‘This should not be a theoretical exercise, but rather take place in the

context of specific text that Parties are working on,’ it said.

On workstream 2, South Africa said that the Group regards it as an integral part of the ADP that has a direct bearing on the successful outcome of the Paris COP. ‘We reiterate that workstream 2 shall be treated in a balanced manner with workstream 1. The Group shares its concern on unbalanced progress between workstreams 1 and 2 in this session,’ it said. It requested the Co-chairs, with the co-facilitators and Secretariat to draft an inclusive paper based on Parties’ submissions, interventions and presentations of their proposals made in Bonn, facilitators’ outputs and further submissions by Parties intersessionally.

(Workstream 1 of the ADP refers to work on the post-2020 Paris Agreement, while workstream 2 refers to pre-2020 ambition.)

Speaking for **the Like Minded Developing Countries (LMDC)**, **Malaysia** said the workstream 2 mandate of the ADP is an integral pillar of the work in the ADP. ‘Pre-2020 enhanced ambition through workstream 2 is the foundation and springboard for enhancing action after 2020. The LMDC stands firmly with the G77 and China in stressing the need for our work at this session, with all the various perspectives expressed and submissions made, to be fairly and fully reflected through a document so that we do not start anew when we meet again this year. We have continually stressed the need for balance in progress between workstreams 1 and 2. This balance can only be achieved if work done under workstream 2 continues to progress,’ it said.

On the proposal of the Co-chairs on the single document to be produced, the LMDC called for greater clarity, including how it would be structured, how many parts it would have, and what the content would be of those parts. ‘What will be the criteria for determining or differentiating which particular paragraphs drawn from the Geneva text should go into text relating to a core agreement and into text relating to an accompanying COP decision?’ it asked.

It suggested that in terms of the structure, text relating to the core agreement should come first, followed by text relating to an accompanying decision. ‘Additionally, for both texts on the core agreement and accompanying decision, they should follow the structure of the Geneva text in which the six core elements are reflected. This will allow us to focus on these core elements as the priority areas that we will negotiate on substantively at the next session,’ it said.

The LMDC also said that substantive negotiations in the August session should begin based on the streamlined and consolidated text.

The LMDC further stressed on the need for clear and explicit terms of reference (TOR) to provide guidance to the Co-chairs and the co-facilitators. It outlined the TOR ‘on the modalities for facilitation (which) must be applied by all the facilitators in order to avoid any confusion over how texts are being negotiated from one section of the negotiating text to another’. It suggested the following:

- ‘Maintain the integrity of Party views and proposals in terms of their options and positions;
- The structure of the Geneva text must be maintained, that it remains intact, and continues to serve as the reference point;
- Transparency, inclusiveness, and direct Party-driven negotiations, are key principles that must always be reflected in our process, so that Parties themselves draft and own the negotiating text. A “no textual surprises” policy should be in place such that you or the facilitators may change existing negotiating text through removing brackets, merging language, or providing drafts of compromise texts “on your own responsibility” only on the basis of a consensus by the Parties providing you with the mandate to do so;
- Consideration of elements for the agreement and accompanying decisions should not prejudice the legal nature of the agreement;
- Documents that you produce for the consideration of the Parties should be circulated to the Parties at least 3 weeks before the start of the ADP session in which they would be considered;
- Textual drafting should be annotated in order to identify the source of the proposal and assist in providing further clarity on the concepts contained in the text;
- There must be balanced progress between workstreams 1 and 2, and between the sections of the workstream 1 negotiating text. In this regard, cross-cutting issues that may affect the consideration of different sections should be substantively addressed first;
- The practice of keeping no more than two negotiating sessions or facilitation meetings running in parallel at the same time should be maintained, in order to ensure that Parties with small delegations are able to participate effectively, while keeping in mind that overlapping meetings for issues or sections that have close linkages to each other should be avoided;

- The single package approach we have been taking in the ADP will be maintained, such that all texts remain bracketed until the final consensus decision is made by the Parties to adopt such texts, and that nothing is agreed until everything is agreed.’

The LMDC added that these would also ensure that the negotiations remain Party-driven, transparent and inclusive, attributes which are the prerequisites for the final negotiated outcome to be considered legitimate.

Speaking for **the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS), the Maldives** stressed on accelerating work and gave a ‘clarion call’ for limiting global warming to 1.5°C. It stressed that none of the options in the GNT should be left behind in the streamlined document that the Co-chairs will present. It called for indicative milestones, including inputs and outputs, to be set on the road to Paris.

Sudan, for the African Group, said that in relation to the placement of issues, it was concerned on how it would be determined, when the issues require substantive negotiations. It called for streamlining and simplifying so that the document could be taken on board for negotiations, with the assurance that none of the ideas would be taken off. It expressed caution on whether it was the appropriate time to apportion parts of the GNT to decisions.

Speaking for **the Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America (ALBA), Cuba** wanted the Co-chairs to produce a text that would allow Parties to arrive at the forthcoming session with a less extensive document and clearer options to progress in negotiations. It said that while developing the new document, the following elements need to be kept in mind: ‘to provide a balanced and equal development of all elements of the Durban Platform; the work with the different elements of the text take the same methodological assumptions, so that the end result is balanced and consistent; the structure of the document agreed in Geneva is respected; the consolidation of the text does not involve the loss or dilution of any of the items under negotiation and that each party should be able to find in the consolidated document, the elements and positions of the Geneva text; and to work on the basis of the consolidated text of 11 June, in order to capture the work done in this session’.

ALBA also expressed its concern about the lack of progress in workstream 2. ‘It is important to remember that when we agreed in 2011 to work under these two workstreams, we adopt it as a “package” where progress in one area is closely related to the overall progress in all the work under

the Durban Platform,' the Group said. 'It will not be possible to reach a substantive agreement beyond 2020 without a clear roadmap, about the way in which the commitments under the Convention will be fulfilled in the rest of this decade,' it added.

Speaking for **the Independent Alliance of Latin America and the Caribbean (AILAC)**, **Colombia** called for the new negotiating document ahead of the July informal ministerial meeting in Paris (to be held on 23 July) and added that the document should not be used to make political decisions.

Angola for the Least Developed Countries (LDCs) called for the document to be shared at the earliest, preferably in the beginning of July so that it can receive ministerial guidance for the process and help Parties undertake some analytical work. It also said that Parties reserve the right to amend the document as the basis for negotiations in August and the tools would be non-papers.

The European Union called for substantive negotiations to happen and called for the Co-chairs' document to be published in July for conversation among the ministers. It said that it is not suggesting that the ministers negotiate the text but added that 'many of the key issues that we must resolve in order to reach agreement in Paris relate to matters that can only be resolved by ministers'. It also called on all Parties, especially the 'major economies', to come forth with their intended nationally determined contributions (INDCs).

Speaking for **the Environment Integrity Group (EIG)**, **the Republic of Korea** said in the document proposed by the Co-chairs, all ideas of the Parties must be taken forward. It gave the mandate to the Co-chairs to separate what elements they see as being part of the agreement and what goes into the decisions.

Speaking for **the Umbrella Group**, **Australia** stressed the need for changing gear and called for a substantially shorter and more coherent text. On workstream 2, it said the Durban mandate on enhancing mitigation ambition should be respected

and that work on enhancing the Convention could be done through the COP and its subsidiary bodies.

Peru, which holds the current COP presidency, added that there is strong expectation to begin the next ADP session with a substantial working document on workstream 2 that took stock of proposals from all the Parties.

France, as the incoming presidency, said there are three conditions necessary for success at COP 21: trust, trust and additional trust among Parties. France also added that through the Lima Paris Action Agenda, ambition, solidarity and cooperation could be shown among all the actors.

Responding to the interventions of some Parties that they wanted the text out in early July, Co-chair Reifsnnyder said, 'It is not an easy thing to prepare' and that developing the text would take some 'careful work on our part, the Secretariat's part and the co-facilitators' part to understand what are the sensitivities. It is a very risky assignment because if we get it wrong, we go backwards to where we started but if we get it right it helps us propel forward'. He said that Parties have the right to amend the produced document and could 'do what you wish with it' and added that the Co-chairs would focus on the convergences and take into account requests made on workstream 2.

On the issue of milestones, between now and December, Reifsnnyder said, it is fair that Parties begin to have clear ideas about where they need to be in August and October. On the issue of apportioning text to the decision or agreement, Reifsnnyder said that some issues are clearly going to be in the agreement, while the final clauses are in a decision text. He indicated that the Co-chairs will take a cautious approach and would pay careful attention to this matter.

Reifsnnyder added that the documents produced in Bonn would be the basis to prepare the additional tool with the benefit of observations from facilitated discussions. 'In these documents (from Bonn) we will know where we left and where we begin,' he said, adding that the LMDC TOR was helpful for the Co-chairs.

TWN

Bonn News Update 17

www.twn.my

Published by
Third World Network

15 June 2015

SBSTA: Agreement on 'REDD-plus' but Other Key Issues to be Resolved in Paris

Bonn, 12 June (Hilary Chiew) – The 42nd session of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA 42) closed on 11 June in an upbeat mood with the closing of the agenda item on tackling emission from forestry activities.

Agenda item number 4 is on the 'Methodological guidance for activities relating to reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries' or REDD-plus as commonly referred to.

After intense negotiations during the first week of SBSTA 42 (1-11 June), Parties reached agreement on 9 June on the matter and adopted the draft conclusion covering three areas of discussion: safeguards, non-market-based approaches and non-carbon benefits.

The document will now move to the 21st meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP) in Paris at the end of the year for consideration and formal adoption.

On safeguards, the SBSTA completed its consideration of the need for further guidance on ensuring transparency, consistency, comprehensiveness and effectiveness when informing on how all the safeguards referred to in decision 1/CP.16 (December 2010), appendix I, are being addressed and respected. It agreed to recommend a draft decision on this matter for consideration and adoption at COP21.

On non-market-based approaches, the SBSTA completed its consideration of the development of methodological guidance on non-market-based approaches such as joint mitigation and adaptation (JMA) approaches for the integral and sustainable management of forests. It agreed to recommend a draft decision on alternative policy approaches, such as JMA approaches for the integral and sustainable

management of forests, for consideration and adoption at COP21.

On non-carbon benefits, the SBSTA completed its consideration of methodological issues related to non-carbon benefits resulting from the implementation of the activities referred to in decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 70.

Announcing the closure of the agenda item, SBSTA Chair Lidia Wojtal (Poland) said the matter was deliberated for 10 years and the result would enable the full implementation of REDD-plus on the ground. Country groupings' interventions also welcomed the conclusion of the agenda item with the Group of 77 and China stressing the need for developed countries to scale up support for effective implementation.

Upon the declaration by Wojtal that the agenda item 'can now be considered closed', Parties applauded before Wojtal gavelled the adoption of the documents.

The other key agenda items of SBSTA 42 were issues relating to agriculture; the 2013-2015 Review; impacts of the implementation of response measures; market and non-market mechanisms under the Convention; and methodological issues under the Kyoto Protocol.

South Africa speaking for the Group of 77 and China (G77 and China) welcomed the progress made during this session on a number of agenda items but at the same time registered its concern that no progress, or very little progress, had been made on others. This will unfortunately place us all under more pressure to finalise these matters in Paris at a time when we have to conclude intense negotiations under the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP), said South Africa.

The Group wished to reflect that on issues related to agriculture, the engagement was

constructive in the two in-session workshops during SBSTA 42. The reports that will be considered in SBSTA 43 on these workshops should be comprehensive and capture the views of developing country Parties, taking into consideration the urgent need to increase the adaptive capacity of agriculture to deal with the adverse effects of climate change. This, the G77 and China said, would continue to be the key priority for developing countries in light of the particular vulnerabilities of the agricultural sector and its relationship with the livelihood of millions, food security and poverty eradication.

On (the forum and work programme on impact of the implementation of) response measures, the Group reaffirmed the importance to give full consideration on what actions are necessary to meet the specific needs and concerns of developing country Parties arising from the impact of the implementation of response measures, in accordance with the principles and provisions of the Convention. We need to continue the consideration of the issue at our next session in Paris, in order to adopt a decision on this agenda item in Paris. We are prepared to continue to engage constructively towards a resolution of the matter.

Regarding REDD-plus, the Group welcomed the work concluded in this session, forwarding three draft decisions to the COP, marking the end of a 10-year negotiation process. With the conclusion of negotiations on methodological guidance for REDD-plus, it is now up to developed countries to scale up and enhance support to all phases of REDD-plus activities, in order to move us effectively into the implementation of the Warsaw Framework for REDD-plus. In this context, the Group also welcomed the decision in alternative policy approaches, such as JMA for the integral and sustainable management of forests.

On the agenda items 9(a) and (c) that relate to Articles 5, 7 and 8 of the Kyoto Protocol (KP) and Section G (related to Article 3 paragraph 7 *ter* of the KP) of the Doha Amendment (on the second commitment period for emissions reduction), South Africa said the G77 and China has worked constructively to generate the necessary clarifications on the rules. These rules are necessary to achieve a sustained and effective implementation of the second commitment period (CP2) of the KP in a manner that maintains the environmental integrity of the commitments agreed in Doha (COP18 in 2012), and the G77 and China has shown extraordinary flexibility in the interests of implementation.

The Group hoped to work constructively with partners in Paris to resolve outstanding issues while

preserving the integrity of the KP rules, and without weakening further the commitments of Annex I Parties for the CP2. The G77 and China welcomed the special event that presented the report of the Structured Expert Dialogue under the agenda item 2013-2015 Review and looked forward to continue working on the issue in Paris.

[COP 18 in 2012 decided to periodically review the adequacy of the long-term global goal and the progress made towards achieving it. The 2013-2015 Review is the first review, and is a joint agenda item of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) and SBSTA. The Structured Expert Dialogue (SED) was mandated to assist the SBI and SBSTA to do so. It is to ensure the scientific integrity of the review through a focused exchange of views, information and ideas. The SED concluded its work following the second meeting of the fourth session in February 2015 in Geneva. There was a difference of opinion over the use of the SED report: see TWN Bonn Update #11: *2013-2015 review: Differences over use of Structured Expert Dialogue report.*]

On item 8 (c) that relates to emissions from fuel use for international aviation and maritime transport, the Group took note of the report by the secretariats of the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO) and the International Maritime Organisation (IMO). South Africa said the G77 and China holds a strong position that this agenda item should continue to be dealt with through a multilateral process, in a manner that is open and transparent, inclusive and Party-driven. The Group is strongly against the imposition of unilateral measures in addressing emissions, which would be contrary to the principles of common but differentiated responsibility (CBDR) and respective capabilities and equity.

The Group also welcomed the research dialogue that took place on 4 June where the scientific community made presentations on data and information gaps regarding research and systematic observation.

The Maldives representing the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS) said the output of the 2013-2015 Review presented to all of us the cause for alarm that global warming up to 2°C exposed us to impacts that are not aligned with the ultimate objective of the Convention. It was disappointed that Parties were not able to reach an agreement. AOSIS remained convinced that the SED report is factual and balanced in its presentation that the long-term global goal is inadequate and should be strengthened to 1.5°C to fulfil the ultimate objective (of the Convention). It said the work will be continued at

the next session with the expectation that the outcome from the Review will be an important input for the ADP process in line with the Durban Mandate.

(The ultimate objective of the Convention expressed in Article 3 is the ‘stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system’.)

On item 9 (a) (related to Articles 5, 7 and 8 of the KP), AOSIS said Annex I Parties without a CP2 commitment cannot carry forward their assigned amount unit, noting that ‘it is not possible to have your cake and eat it as well’.

On market and non-market mechanisms under the Convention, the Group appreciated the opportunity to discuss the matter to ensure that market mechanisms deliver net benefit i.e environmental integrity and avoid double-counting (of generated carbon credits).

Sudan speaking for the Africa Group expressed appreciation for the successful conclusion of the discussion on non-carbon benefit. It said the draft decision is more important than it is perceived. It is a holistic approach towards achieving the ultimate objective of REDD-plus.

On the two in-session workshops on agriculture, it said the Group engaged constructively and looked forward to the report that will be considered at SBSTA 43 (at Paris in December) to be comprehensive and capturing the views of developing countries. It is however disappointed that again the matter on the methodological issues under the KP (items 9 a, b and c) remained to be resolved but it looked forward to swift resolution in the work in Paris (at SBSTA 43).

The Africa Group also expressed disappointment on the lack of progress over the deliberation of the long-term global goal (under the item 2013-2015 Review). It said over the last two years, Parties invested so much time on the Structured Expert Dialogue and the Group’s expectation was to leave Bonn with a draft decision for consideration in Paris. It looked forward to an open discussion in Paris and to reach an outcome to inform the work of the ADP.

On the impacts of implementation of response measures, it welcomed the progress but noted that Parties were not able to finalise their work. The Africa Group looked forward to further deliberation and adoption of a decision that would put in place an appropriate arrangement for this important issue in Paris.

Angola representing the Least Developed Countries (LDCs) welcomed the SED report. It

pointed out that under the current global warming increase of 0.8°C which is already causing widespread impacts to over 860 million people in the LDCs, the risks of a 2°C increase are too high and it runs counter to the ultimate objective of the Convention. It would like to see the long-term global goal to be set below 1.5°C and anchored in the new climate agreement. It urged the ADP to take into account the outcome of the 2013-2015 Review and increase its ambition to adopt the 1.5°C warming pathway for the sake of humanity. It regretted that Parties were not able to conclude on this matter but recognised the valuable discussion in this June session, which forms a good basis for conclusion of this item at the next SBSTA session (in December in Paris).

On agriculture, Angola said the emphasis on adaptation is very important for the LDCs. It said the two in-session workshops were extremely valuable by showing and closing the knowledge gaps and resilience of smallholder farmers to the impacts of climate change, stressing that access to information on a timely fashion (via early warning systems) is critical. It also welcomed the conclusion of REDD-plus and looked forward to the full implementation on the ground of the activities.

Representing the Coalition for Rainforest Nations, Panama welcomed the compromise reached on further guidance for (REDD-plus) safeguards, which marked the end of the 10-year negotiation. It never thought the process would take so long but is happy that with the conclusion, Parties are now able to implement the mechanism provided support is fulfilled, coordinated properly and made available to Parties.

On the market and non-market mechanism discussion, although it is pleased with the exchange of views, it is nevertheless disappointed that Parties were not able to reach a conclusion.

The European Union (EU) thanked the SBSTA Chair for an effective time management and flexibility in providing slots for additional meetings in order to find compromises in as many items as possible so that the SBSTA agenda can be streamlined for Paris. It said Parties had worked hard during these 10 days and we now welcomed the progress achieved on a number of issues, which are of central importance to the EU.

Despite lengthy discussions up to late evenings, the EU was glad that Parties found common grounds and came to a compromise on all three sub-items under REDD-plus namely, safeguards, non-carbon benefits and JMA approaches. It was also pleased to see progress on the issues relating to agriculture and

would like to congratulate the successful completion of the two in-session workshops.

On the reporting methodologies of financial information by Annex I Parties, the EU was pleased to have seen a constructive participation in the joint SBSTA-SBI-Standing Committee on Finance workshop and looked forward to the summary by the Secretariat.

Though discussions were not easy, the EU believed that we have made good progress with regard to the response measures and this session has provided the necessary platform for Parties to build bridges in order to finalise this discussion in Paris.

The EU then mentioned SBSTA agenda items where it had expected more progress during this session. Firstly, as for the methodological issues under the KP relating to Articles 5, 7 and 8 and associated issues, the EU was of the opinion that the outcomes are regrettably poor. We avoided application of 'rule 16' only at the very last minute. In this context, to enable the full implementation of the CP2 of the KP, the EU now urges all Parties to work effectively and constructively for an agreement to ensure closing this agenda item in Paris

It regretted the lack of progress on the 2013-2015 Review and expected that the SBSTA 43 will continue the consideration of the SED report and submissions of Parties with a view of informing the COP that shall take appropriate action. The EU expressed an urgent need to find a way to finalise the 2013-2015 Review and have a substantive outcome in Paris along with the long-term goal under the ADP.

It was also disappointed with the inability of Parties to find a consensus on how to proceed with agenda items on the market mechanisms and non-market approaches that forced the 'rule 16'. As a result, unfortunately, in Paris we will have to start from the same place where we were after Lima. (Rule 16 is a rule of procedure that places an issue in the agenda of the next session.)

Representing the Environmental Integrity Group, Mexico welcomed the conclusion of REDD-plus, which is an important tool to deliver mitigation outcomes. It expressed concern on the discussion on market and non-market mechanisms, which did not achieve an agreement. On the 2013-2015 Review, it deplored the fact that Parties could not reach meaningful conclusion and it called on Parties to come back and work decisively to demonstrate clearly how this process should be guided by science.

Australia, speaking for the Umbrella Group, warmly welcomed the conclusion of REDD-plus and looked forward to working with all countries to enhance implementation of the mechanism to reduce emissions from the forestry sector. It further welcomed the workshops on agriculture but was disappointed that Parties were not able to come to an agreement on the 2013-2015 Review discussion and hoped that the matter can be successfully closed at the next session in Paris.

On market and non-market mechanisms, it said some technical work that emerged in this session could lay the foundation for continued work at SBSTA 43 although it was disappointed that Parties could not reach a conclusion. On response measures, it welcomed the work and trusted Parties to continue to work constructively towards a conclusion in Paris.

TWN

Bonn News Update 18

www.twn.my

Published by
Third World Network

7 December 2013

SBI: Financial Shortfall Confronts Secretariat-mandated Activities, Key Issues Deferred to Paris

Kuala Lumpur, 16 June (Hilary Chiew) – The 42nd session of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) closed on 11 June with mixed results and the warning of a deficit in the programme budget for the current year and the biennium 2016-2017.

In its address to the plenary of the SBI, a subsidiary body of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the Secretariat outlined the administrative and budgetary implications of a number of decisions arising from the session that requested the Secretariat to organise workshops, stating these cannot be met with the existing resources within the core budget. A draft decision from the SBI to the Conference of Parties (COP) for adoption in Paris in December approves a core programme budget of Euro 54,648,484 for the biennium 2016-2017.

The funding shortfall is expected to affect the organisation of side events and exhibits in 2016; cutting additional meetings of constituted bodies from three to two over the 2016-2017 biennium; the review of greenhouse gas inventory and review of a higher number of biennial update reports from developing countries; funding to strengthen adaptation programme in the area of loss and damage, the Adaptation Committee and the National Adaptation Plan processes.

Presiding over the closing session, SBI Chair Amena Yauvoli (Fiji) cautioned that in the absence of adequate funding, the Secretariat will not be in a position to undertake the required activities.

(In one of the budget contact group meetings in Bonn, developed countries including the European Union and the United States made it clear that they were under strict constraints from capital regarding increase in the core programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017. The Secretariat also informed Parties that most of the funds were voluntary and earmarked by donors rather than contribute to the core budget.)

Another key issue of concern to many developing countries at the SBI 42 was the outcome of the first round of the international assessment and review (IAR) of Annex I developed countries (2014-2015). They expressed disappointment that Parties could not reach agreement on this, warning that this could undermine the transparency framework meant to build trust and confidence among Parties. China and Brazil questioned the obstruction by some Parties against the call for submissions for Parties' views on the issue which they said would be important for improving the IAR.

[The Conference of Parties (COP), by Decision 1/CP.16, decided that developed country Parties should enhance reporting in national communications (NC) and submit biennial reports which outline progress in achieving emission reductions and the provision of financial, technology and capacity-building support to non-Annex I Parties, building on existing reporting and review guidelines, processes and experiences. ..It also established a new process, international assessment and review under the SBI for developed country Parties that aims to promote the comparability of efforts among all developed country Parties with regard to their quantified economy-wide emission limitation and reduction targets.

The IAR has two parts: (i) a technical review of the biennial reports, where relevant, in conjunction with the review of annual greenhouse gas (GHG) inventories, and national communications of developed country Parties, which will result in an individual review report for each developed country Party; and (ii) a multilateral assessment of developed country Parties' progress in implementation towards the achievement of emission reductions and removals related to their quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets. The multilateral assessment will be conducted on the basis of biennial reports, the national GHG inventory (including the national

inventory report) and the NC, the technical review report of biennial reports, as well as supplementary information on the achievement of the Party's quantified economy-wide emission reduction target.]

In contrast, developed country Parties are satisfied with the IAR process which comprised the multilateral assessment in a working group session setting during SBI 41 in Lima in December 2013 and the recent session of the SBI (1 to 11 June) in Bonn. They are of the view that the process would contribute towards the international consultation and analysis (ICA) process for developing country Parties and urged developing countries to submit their biennial update reports (BURs) in a timely manner to facilitate the ICA process.

[The process of international consultation and analysis applies to non-Annex I Parties and consists of two steps: (i) the technical analysis of BURs, and (ii) a facilitative sharing of views among Parties. The process aims to enhance the transparency and accountability of information reported in BURs by non-Annex I Parties. A team of technical experts will conduct the technical analysis of BURs.]

A significant development at SBI 42 was the completion of nominations for the Executive Committee of the Warsaw Mechanism on Loss and Damage, meaning that it is now able to start its work.

Speaking for the Group of 77 and China, South Africa pointed out that while progress was made at this session of the SBI, a number of key areas had little or no progress and warned that this will add to the work pressure in Paris (at year end) at a time when Parties are engaged in intense negotiations.

[The Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP) is negotiating 'a protocol, another legal instrument or an agreed outcome with legal force under the Convention applicable to all Parties' commonly referred to as the 'Paris agreement'. This is expected to be concluded in December 2015.]

On the impact of implementation of response measures, the Group reaffirmed the importance to give full consideration on what actions are necessary to meet the specific needs and concerns of developing country Parties arising from the implementation of response measures, in accordance with the principles and provisions of the Convention.

In this regard, it welcomed progress made and remained committed to engage constructively in this issue as well as other matters of concern including unilateral measures during the next session in order to forward the draft decision for consideration by the 21st Conference of the Parties (COP21).

The G77 and China reiterated that adaptation is of urgent priority for developing country Parties and called for urgent and immediate implementation of the National Adaptation Plan (NAP) process. It welcomed the draft decision and the extension of the mandate of the Least Developed Countries Expert Group for consideration at COP 21.

On capacity-building, the Group was disappointed with the lack of progress as in its current form, the Durban Forum for Capacity-building is inadequate to enhance capacity-building support, adding that it will continue to call for the establishment of a permanent institutional arrangement for effective implementation and monitoring of capacity-building.

[In the draft conclusion proposed by the SBI Chair and adopted by Parties at the closing session on 11 June, it was agreed that Parties would continue consideration of the terms of reference for the third comprehensive review of the implementation of the framework for capacity-building in developing countries at SBI 43 at year end on the basis of the draft text contained in Annex I. Parties also agreed to continue consideration of the matter at SBI 43 on the basis of the draft decision text contained in Annex II with a view to recommend a draft decision for COP21.]

The text for a permanent institutional arrangement is bracketed in paragraph 9 of Annex II which reads: [*Decides* to establish a Capacity-building Committee under the Convention to utilize the Durban Forum and the Capacity-building Portal and facilitate effective capacity-building implementation at the international, regional and national levels in accordance with the capacity-building framework ...].]

On the revision of the 'guidelines for the preparation of national communication by Parties included in Annex I to the Convention, Part II: UNFCCC reporting guidelines on national communications', the G77 and China said it looked forward to adopting the comprehensive guidelines to be used for the seventh national communication by Annex I Parties.

On the international assessment and review (IAR) for Annex I Parties, South Africa said the Group actively participated in the first round of the IAR process as it is an important component of the transparency arrangement under the Convention. It stressed the need for Annex I Parties to enhance information on provision of support for developing countries. The Group was disappointed with the lack of progress on substantive issues with the outcome of the first round of the IAR and called on developed

countries to show leadership by engaging constructively on this issue.

It welcomed the in-session workshop on gender responsive climate policy which focused on mitigation action and technology development and transfer. It highlighted the need for a glossary on gender-related terms for that could enhance Parties' understanding of the interface between gender and climate policies.

On the 2013-2015 Review, the Group welcomed the special event which presented the report of the Structured Expert Dialogue and looked forward to continue working on the item in Paris.

(The 2013-2015 Review is a joint agenda item of SBI and the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice.)

It noted with concern the serious lack of contribution for funding for participation of developing countries' representatives in UNFCCC meetings in particular the forthcoming ADP and COP meetings. It urged Parties, in particular Annex I Parties, to enable the full and effective participation of developing countries in these meetings.

Sudan speaking for the African Group said it looked forward to the result of the Poznan Strategic Programme on technology transfer to further enhance the programme. It highlighted challenges to formulate and implement national adaptation plans (NAPs) due to inadequate funding. Therefore, it said, there is a need for clear guidance on how developing countries can access finance to implement their NAPs.

On intergovernmental meeting, the Group said there is the need for the COP and Meeting of Parties (of the Kyoto Protocol) to be held annually and it looked forward to constructive discussion at SBI 44 on the timing and frequency of the organisation of the meeting sessions.

Noting that the IAR is an important component of the transparency framework, the African Group stressed the need for Annex I Parties to enhance provision of support for developing countries. The Group was disappointed with the lack of progress on substantive issues related to the IAR outcome and called upon developed countries to show leadership to build trust and confidence.

On capacity-building, it said the Group engaged constructively as it is of utmost importance for Africa but was disappointed that no progress was made. The Durban Forum for capacity-building is inadequate in its current form to enhance capacity-building support and needs to establish a permanent institutional arrangement for effective implementation and monitoring of capacity-building including

linkages for adaptation, mitigation, technology and financial system.

It appreciated the successful organisation of the in-session workshop of gender, noting that it provided a platform for good practices and the Group looks forward to the report which would form the basis for further discussion of gender in the next SBI session.

The Maldives representing the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS) stressed that it had emphasised throughout the session the science output of the 2013-2015 Review 'which presented to all of us the cause for alarm'. It said global warming of up to 2°C presents a risk for impacts that would not keep with the ultimate objective of the Convention.

The Group was disappointed that Parties could not agree with proposed language that recognised the importance of the content of the Structured Expert Dialogue (SED) report. 'Our conviction remained that the SED report is in line with its mandate of being factual and balanced, and support the recommendation that the present long-term global goal is inadequate and should be strengthened to 1.5°C to fulfil the ultimate objective of the Convention,' said the Maldives. It added that the work will continue at the next session in Paris with the expectation for an outcome that will be an important input for the work of the ADP which is in line with the Durban mandate.

AOSIS also expressed disappointment that the capacity-building item was not satisfactorily concluded but acknowledged that there is now better understanding of each other's position which would hopefully assist the process when Parties meet again in Paris.

On the flexible mechanism of the Kyoto Protocol, AOSIS was disappointed that Parties were not able to make greater headway on necessary improvement of the environmental integrity of the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) through the agreement on crediting period, scrutiny of some project risks, improved additionality requirements and addressing double counting of emission reduction between host Parties and acquiring Parties. It sees the review of the CDM modalities and procedure as the ideal opportunity to redesign the CDM to deliver substantial net emission reduction so that it is not functioning purely as an offsetting tool.

On the review of the Joint Implementation (JI) guidelines, it said progress was made at this session and looked forward to further engagement to ensure that JI delivers net atmospheric benefits.

Speaking for the Least Developed Countries (LDCs), Angola welcomed the SED report but noted that Parties could not reach agreement. It said current global warming of 0.8°C above pre-industrial level is already causing widespread impacts on the 850 million people of the LDCs and that a 2°C temperature rise runs counter to the objective of the Convention. It would like to see the long-term global goal be set at below 1.5°C and anchored in the new climate agreement, adding that it would like to see the ADP take into consideration the outcome of the SED and increase its ambition and put us on the 1.5°C pathway in the name of humanity. Although it was disappointed that Parties were not able to conclude the deliberation at this session, it nonetheless recognised progress made and believed that is a good basis for continuation of discussion at Paris.

Angola lamented that even as impacts of climate change are already affecting the most vulnerable countries with the present 0.8°C rise in temperature, we see only marginal progress in the process to support adaptation for those with little to do with causing climate change. It said the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of the process of formulating and implementing NAPs had shown that developing countries only managed to initiate their activities and in particular LDCs have not been able to start formulation of NAPs towards medium and long-term adaptation. The M&E process at this session only revealed the many gaps and challenges faced by developing countries in the process and it looked forward to Parties recommending a decision in Paris that will address these gaps and needs.

It further expressed disappointment over the unwillingness of certain Parties to recognise special circumstances of LDCs and Small Island Developing States (SIDS), noting that the LDC category was established in recognition of unique structural handicaps including low income, high vulnerability and weak human institutional capacity.

Angola said the special circumstances of LDCs are equally relevant in the context of adaptation and access to finance, noting that the key reason causing lack of progress to formulate NAPs by LDCs is the critical lack of resources in the LDC Fund. Many proposals for NAPs are in limbo as for the first time in the history, the LDC Fund is empty and there is a shortfall of US\$1 billion for full implementation of the National Adaptation Programme of Actions (NAPAs) to address the most urgent and immediate needs for the most vulnerable group of countries.

It, however, welcomed the agreement to forward the decision to COP 21 to extend the

mandate of the Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG) for the next five years and expansion of the mandate to include technical guidance for medium and long-term adaptation.

On capacity-building, the Group was disappointed that no progress was made in this session, reiterating the need for establishment of institutional arrangements which will focus on the monitoring and reviewing of efforts and supports including providing advice and support for mitigation and adaptation-related activities.

The Group appreciated the in-session workshop on gender responsive climate policy which provided a platform for sharing views on how to impart gender-related climate technologies. It was pleased that delegates shared views on a possible recommendation to move forward to attain gender responsiveness on climate change policies.

Expressing its disappointment over the IAR discussion, **China** recalled that the IAR is a new transparent framework established by the Cancun Agreement (COP 16) with the aim to improve transparency and compatibility among countries and to build confidence. It underscored that the agenda item on the outcome of the first round of the IAR (2014-2015) is crucial in two aspects.

First, to provide guidance to the preparation of the conclusion on IAR because it is not clear in decision 2/CP.17 the format, scope and procedure for inclusion. Otherwise, China said, without a common understanding of Parties, we cannot finish the first round of the IAR and it would result in the delay of the revision of the modalities of procedure of the IAR.

Secondly, said China, the SBI provided the right place for Parties to discuss the multilateral issue of IAR instead of any informal bilateral discussion. However, due to time limitation and technical complexity, China believed it is best to call for submission from Parties about their views on this issue to provide clear understanding of each other and to accelerate the negotiation with regard to the IAR process.

It said that, unfortunately, it seemed that some Parties do not want to make a conclusion of the IAR or make a hasty conclusion without pointing out the lessons learnt and the direction of future enhancement. This, it said, would sacrifice the importance and effectiveness of the IAR and would damage mutual trust. It does not believe this is in line with the spirit of transparency and improvement over time. It urged all Parties to engage actively in this important item when they meet again in Paris to have fruitful discussion on inter alia the nature,

format, scope, procedure and conclusion of the first IAR.

Similarly, **Brazil** conveyed its disappointment with the lack of willingness of some Parties to arrive at a conclusion on this agenda item. It said more than 60% of questions submitted during the written questions and answers phase came from developing countries and they again participated actively during the working group session (conducted on 4 and 5 June during the Bonn SBI session). It noted that developing countries showed their commitment and engaged constructively.

Echoing China, Brazil said it was extremely disappointed over not having a substantive conclusion to the discussion and achieving consensus on forwarding the conclusion in reference to paragraph 12 of Annex II of decision 2/CP.17.

(Paragraph 12 said the SBI will forward conclusions based on the record referred to in paragraph 11 to relevant bodies under the COP as appropriate; Paragraph 11 noted that *'the outputs of the international assessment for each Party will include the following: a record prepared by the Secretariat which includes in-depth review report, the summary report of the SBI, questions submitted by Parties and responses provided, and any other observations by the Party under review that are submitted within two months of the working group session of the SBI.'*)

Not doing so, said Brazil, is sending out signals of the lack of transparency. Saying that the IAR framework is robust and promotes transparency Brazil acknowledged its potential contribution to building trust among Parties.

'The procedural conclusion is the exact opposite of what we need now,' Brazil said, adding that Parties must set the tone and raise the bar, recognising the existing gaps and bridge the gaps.

'We must acknowledge our weaknesses if we want to be stronger. This is a learning by doing process and the second working group session is more efficient and had improved on the first session (in Lima last December),' it stressed, adding that there is a need to improve the information provided by developed country Parties.

Brazil said it was baffled by the obstruction of some Parties against the call for submissions. It also called out to civil society and observer organisations to engage themselves more in the IAR process; keeping track of the Biennial Report (of Annex I Parties) as well as the output from the IAR contained in the record made available on the UNFCCC's website; questioning the information provided by Parties and keeping up with the multilateral assessment working group session.

Bolivia expressed concern on the serious gap in the funding for the participation of developing countries in the process leading to COP 21 in Paris. It said it is very important to have an effective and inclusive participation of all developing countries in adopting an outcome that will determine how we will address climate change.

It also raised the visa problem faced by some delegations to attend the COP meetings and more recently, the limited visa from 1 to 10 June (for Bonn) which made attending pre-session meetings impossible. It called on the host countries to consider this matter.

Representing the Environmental Integrity Group (EIG), Switzerland expressed concern of the lack of progress on the adoption of the draft decision for the 2013-2015 Review, noting that the Group had been actively involved in the proceedings of the Review since its inception and the five substantive sessions of the SED over the span of two years. The SED had been exemplary and demonstrated an effective and efficient science-policy interface, said Switzerland. It noted that the science is clear and 'deplored' the inability of the joint contact group of the SBI and the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) to reach a meaningful conclusion. It called on all Parties to come back to the negotiation table in Paris to work decisively and clearly demonstrating how this whole process is guided by science and good will.

It considered the second round of the working group of the multilateral assessment to be helpful in enhancing understanding of the implementation of each Party commitment. This positive experience, it said, would contribute to enhance the biennial update report (BUR) and the international consultation and analysis (ICA) process for non-Annex I Parties.

Switzerland further said the EIG regretted that there was no progress on the review of the modalities and procedure of the CDM. It looked forward to engaging other Parties to develop common stable ground for a mechanism that is important for many governments to announce even more ambitious Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDCs).

On the 2016-2017 biennium programme budget, the EIG commended the SBI Chair on the realistic decision with new elements that allowed Parties to even better assess the needs and priorities in the budget. 'It allowed us to make choices when it comes to allocating the fund that we all contributed to allow the Secretariat to accomplish its tasks,' said Switzerland. But it also said it is aware that more work needs to be done in Paris which will be

important not only for the ADP and new agreement but also the programmes and institutions under the SBI.

Australia speaking for the Umbrella Group welcomed the cooperative spirit that allowed progress for implementation of the agenda items which helped clear the way for Paris. It was pleased with the constructive atmosphere in the multilateral assessment working group session which demonstrated the robustness of the transparency framework in continuing to build trust and at the same time facilitate the sharing of views for the ICA beginning in Paris for Parties ready to do so. It further encouraged (developing country) Parties that had not yet submitted their BUR to complete and submit their BUR in a timely manner.

On the review of the guidelines for reporting national communications of Annex I Parties, it looked forward to completing the revision.

The Umbrella Group was disappointed that Parties were not able to come to a substantive decision text on the 2013-2015 Review. Nevertheless, it welcomed the efforts and looked forward to substantive discussion and closing of the agenda item in Paris. On response measures, it would continue to work constructively towards a suitable outcome in Paris.

On capacity-building, it said Parties came a long way to have a draft terms of reference for the third review and a draft discussion for Parties to discuss and finalise in Paris.

It also welcomed the in-session workshop for gender responsive climate policy to increase awareness of gender equality and participation in responding to climate change.

The European Union (EU) said the two-week discussion was substantive and constructive. It said the multilateral assessment process is an important

part of the overall transparency framework of pre-2020 particularly understanding the progress made to build trust among all Parties, noting that the process has demonstrated the value of discussion and the need to have clear understanding of the rules applied.

It also urged developing country Parties to submit their BUR in order to continue the process and follow standards set by the multilateral assessment.

The EU stressed that it has strong interest in a functioning Secretariat that works under professional circumstances. It therefore appreciated having achieved agreement on the programme budget for the 2016-2017 biennium. Responding to the report of the Secretariat on this matter, it regretted that some important information was not mentioned by the Secretariat. One is the fact that Parties' contributions increased by 5.5% and no cut was introduced in order to allow the Secretariat to continue its business-as-usual.

(In a 'zero percent' increase scenario discussed in the budget contact group, Parties were informed that there would be no 'carry-over' of any funds to the financial year 2016 – in the past this carry-over comprised outstanding contributions from Parties to the budget. The EU then said that without any carry-over, a 2016 budget of the same amount as that of 2015 would require increased contributions of 5-6% to maintain the same level of expenditure.)

It too welcomed the extension of the mandate of the LEG as an important step forward in terms of addressing specific challenges of the LDC in the context of adaptation and believed the progress made would allow for further reporting to enhance formulation and implementation of NAPs at the next session.

(With inputs from Chee Yoke Ling.)

ADP: North-South Divide over Mandate for pre-2020 Climate Action

Delhi, 18 June (Indrajit Bose) – During the facilitated session on workstream 2 of the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP) on 10 June, Parties were divided over the mandate and scope of workstream 2 (pre-2020 action).

The Bonn climate talks convened on 1-11 June.

Developing country Parties were clear that the scope of the workstream 2 extended to all the elements of the Durban Platform mandate, including mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology transfer and capacity building. They referred to decisions taken in the UNFCCC's meetings of Conference of Parties (COP) held in Durban, Warsaw and Lima in 2011, 2013 and 2014 respectively. The developed country Parties, on the other hand, referred to the same decisions to say that workstream 2 is limited in scope to only address the mitigation ambition and nothing more.

Speaking for **the G77 and China, Mali** said the Group's approach is to have a comprehensive pre-2020 ambition and it is not just to address the mitigation failure. 'The implementation gap has to cover all the elements and has to cover the full outcomes of the Bali Roadmap. The Warsaw decision states how we must advance work concretely. Years are passing and implementation needs to be assessed and reviewed through which we can enhance our work,' said Mali.

(The Bali Roadmap refers to decisions taken under the Bali Action Plan adopted in 2007 and matters relating to the Kyoto Protocol's second commitment period.)

China said it was surprised to hear that there is no agreement on the mandate of workstream 2. It called on Parties to revisit the Durban decision (paragraphs 7 and 8). China said that in Durban, Parties agreed that work would be divided into two streams: 1 and 2.

(Paragraphs 7 and 8 of the Durban decision read as follows:

7. Decides to launch a workplan on enhancing mitigation ambition to identify and to explore options for a range of actions that can close the ambition gap with a view to ensuring the highest possible mitigation efforts by all Parties;

8. Requests Parties and observer organizations to submit by 28 February 2012 their views on options and ways for further increasing the level of ambition and decides to hold an in-session workshop at the first negotiating session in 2012 to consider options and ways for increasing ambition and possible further actions.)

'Paragraph 8 speaks to enhancing the level of ambition. The ambition should be comprehensive, not just mitigation but also adaptation, technology transfer and capacity building,' said China. Parties should be consistent with the context of the Durban platform, it stressed.

China also recalled paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 from the Warsaw decision and paragraphs 17, 18 and 19 from the Lima decision.

(Paragraphs 3, 4, 5 of the Warsaw decision read as follows:

3. Resolves to accelerate the full implementation of the decisions constituting the agreed outcome pursuant to decision 1/CP.13 (Bali Action Plan), in particular in relation to the provision of means of implementation, including technology, finance and capacity building support for developing country Parties, recognizing that such implementation will enhance ambition in the pre-2020 period

4. Also resolves to enhance ambition in the pre-2020 period in order to ensure the highest possible mitigation efforts under the Convention by all Parties by:

(a) Urging each Party that has not yet communicated a quantified economy-wide emission

reduction target or nationally appropriate mitigation action, as applicable, to do so;

(b) Urging each developed country Party to implement without delay its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target under the Convention and, if it is also a Party to the Kyoto Protocol, its quantified emission limitation or reduction commitment for the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol, if applicable;

(c) Urging each developed country Party to revisit its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target under the Convention and, if it is also a Party to the Kyoto Protocol, its quantified emission limitation or reduction commitment for the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol, if applicable, in accordance with decision 1/CMP.8, paragraphs 7-11;

(d) Urging each developed country Party to periodically evaluate the continuing application of any conditions associated with its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target, with a view to adjusting, resolving or removing such conditions;

(e) Urging developed country Parties to increase technology, finance and capacity-building support to enable increased mitigation ambition by developing country Parties;

(f) Urging each developing country Party that has communicated its nationally appropriate mitigation action to implement it and, where appropriate, consider further action, recognizing that nationally appropriate mitigation actions will be taken in the context of sustainable development, supported and enabled by technology, finance and capacity-building;

5. Decides to accelerate activities under the workplan on enhancing mitigation ambition in accordance with decision 1/CP.17, paragraphs 7 and 8, by:

(a) Intensifying, as from 2014, the technical examination of opportunities for actions with high mitigation potential, including those with adaptation and sustainable development co-benefits, with a focus on the implementation of policies, practices and technologies that are substantial, scalable and replicable, with a view to promoting voluntary cooperation on concrete actions in relation to identified mitigation opportunities in accordance with nationally defined development priorities;

(b) Facilitating the sharing among Parties of experiences and best practices of cities and subnational authorities, where appropriate, in identifying and implementing opportunities to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the adverse impacts of climate change, with a view to

promoting the exchange of information and voluntary cooperation;

(c) Inviting Parties to promote the voluntary cancellation of certified emission reductions, without double counting, as a means of closing the pre-2020 ambition gap;

(d) Considering further activities to be undertaken under that workplan at the twentieth session of the Conference of the Parties.

Paragraphs 17, 18, 19 of the Lima decision read as follows:

17. Encourages all Parties to the Kyoto Protocol to ratify and implement the Doha Amendment to the Kyoto Protocol;

18. Reiterates its resolve as set out in decision 1/CP.19, paragraphs 3 and 4, to accelerate the full implementation of the decisions constituting the agreed outcome pursuant to decision 1/CP.13 and enhance ambition in the pre-2020 period in order to ensure the highest possible mitigation efforts under the Convention by all Parties;

19. Decides to continue the technical examination of opportunities with high mitigation potential, including those with adaptation, health and sustainable development co-benefits, in the period 2015-2020, by requesting the secretariat to:

(a) Organize a series of in-session technical expert meetings which:

(i) Facilitate Parties in the identification of policy options, practices and technologies and in planning for their implementation in accordance with nationally defined development priorities;

(ii) Build on and utilize the related activities of, and further enhance collaboration and synergies among, the Technology Executive Committee, the Climate Technology Centre and Network, the Durban Forum on capacity-building, the Executive Board of the clean development mechanism and the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism;

(iii) Build on previous technical expert meetings¹ in order to hone and focus on actionable policy options;

(iv) Provide meaningful and regular opportunities for the effective engagement of experts from Parties, relevant international organizations, civil society, indigenous peoples, women, youth, academic institutions, the private sector, and subnational authorities nominated by their respective countries;

(v) Support the accelerated implementation of policy options and enhanced mitigation action, including through international cooperation;

(vi) Facilitate the enhanced engagement of all Parties through the announcement of topics to be addressed, agendas and related materials at least two months in advance of technical expert meetings;

(b) Update, following the technical expert meetings referred to in paragraph 19(a) above, the technical paper on the mitigation benefits of actions, and on initiatives and options to enhance mitigation ambition, compiling information provided in submissions from Parties and observer organizations and the discussions held at the technical expert meetings and drawing on other relevant information on the implementation of policy options at all levels, including through multilateral cooperation;

(c) Disseminate the information referred to in paragraph 19(b) above, including by publishing a summary for policymakers.)

‘It is very clear that these (paragraphs) talk of finance, adaptation, capacity building and technology development and transfer, so it should address all the elements. The only difference is in the timeframe. We do pre-2020 in workstream 2 and post-2020 in workstream 1. We are surprised to see the level of understanding on the mandate,’ said China adding that with such understanding it would become very difficult to achieve the task at hand. ‘We are talking energy mix by the end of the century, but we have no idea about the next five years. This is not helpful for building trust,’ said China.

India also expressed surprise with Parties’ questioning the scope and mandate of workstream 2. ‘We know we are working under the ADP for enhanced action. We are looking at closing the ambition gap. For this, all the possible actions that can be taken up must be taken up. Therefore, limiting the scope of discussion here is very surprising,’ said India.

‘We need to go back to the Lima decision where paragraphs 17 and 18 relate to implementation issues. There are very clear mentions of paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Warsaw decision. Paragraph 3 talks of accelerated implementation pursuant to the Bali Action Plan. Paragraph 4 resolves to enhance ambition in the pre-2020 period and for that Parties have to communicate their QELROs (Quantified Emission Limitation and Reduction Objective) or Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) at an early date, and other segments reflect what kind of action is envisaged. We should not get into a debate on what kind of action,’ said India.

(QELROs apply to developed countries and NAMAs to developing countries.)

The United States (US) stressed that a number of discussions were outside of the scope of

workstream 2. Presenting its interpretation of previous decisions, the US said, ‘We heard ambition reflects on all the elements. Paragraph 7 of the Durban decision launches the work plan on mitigation and the next paragraph calls out for ambition. While the next paragraph does not spell out mitigation, it is in relation to the paragraph above which is focused on mitigation. Therefore, it should not be about all the elements. Our interpretation is it is just mitigation. Then, paragraph 5 of the Warsaw decision focuses on mitigation efforts. That is our view on the scope and we have discussed this through last year,’ said the US.

The European Union said it agreed with much of what the US said on the mandate. ‘The focus of the work should be drawing on mandates from Durban and Lima. The time is best spent not focusing on the mandate,’ it said and added that it ‘appreciates China’s passion in promoting UNFCCC and Kyoto Protocol to enhance ambition’.

Canada expressed ‘strong concerns’ to responding to what they felt was beyond the Durban and Lima mandates. **Japan** too was hesitant about revisiting the scope and mandate of workstream 2 since it had already been decided upon in Lima.

Following these interventions, **China** raised its flag again expressing deep concern about the conversation that was going on. ‘We need to reach a common mandate and scope and how we go to more details of thematic areas. The key work for workstream 2 is action, implementation and enhanced action. Yes, existing institutions are operating but they are not enough to close the gap that exists. The core spirit of Durban Platform is let us speed up, accelerate and fill in the gap,’ it said.

China added that the gap is not just there in mitigation. ‘It is a systematic gap. The question is why do we have a gap in mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology transfer and capacity building. Different Parties have expressed through different submissions and the way to enhance the ambition level to close the gap. Remember, many Parties have expressed the understanding that the ambition has to be comprehensive and include all the elements. Many Parties mentioned mitigation, adaptation, technology, finance, capacity building. There are a lot of views and options, but some Parties said that they don’t share these views. No matter what options you share or not, all these issues are on the table. These issues are unresolved and we need to continue to work on these,’ said China.

Emphasising on the adaptation aspect, China said the Warsaw decision talks of linkages in terms of co-benefits. Paragraphs 4(e) and 4(f) are also related to adaptation, it said.

‘Let us take paragraph 4(f), which refers to NAMAs. In developing countries when we do NAMAs, it is a systematic strategy. It is hard for us to focus on just mitigation. So we come up with a strategy to balance the costs. In the more profound understanding, you cannot separate adaptation from mitigation. If we cannot show we did a good job before 2020 to develop a systematic and efficient programme and strategy, how are we to believe that we can do a good job post-2020?’ asked China.

Malaysia added that there is a need to convert conversations on the ground to actions. ‘What we don’t want is between now and 2020 we know everything but have nothing to build on. We need actions. We need implementation. Workstream 2 should be inclusive. Do we have enough information to dismiss any concepts? If we truly address the spirit, we cannot narrowly interpret the mandate because doing so would be denying the obvious links,’ said Malaysia.

In response, **Switzerland** said that the mandate of workstream 2 is about mitigation. It added that if Parties came to Switzerland, they would see several summits in the country (referring to the Swiss mountains). ‘It would be good to focus on one to hike,’ it said.

In response to Switzerland, **Mali** said many from the G77 and China come from different geographies, two-thirds of which is desert. ‘You could focus on one point and still get lost,’ said Mali and added, ‘We are not talking adaptation just to get a kick on adaptation. The fact is to go for mitigation you have to go through adaptation. We looked at mitigation and we could look at adaptation with mitigation co-benefits. We have to broaden the discussion to reflect the reality,’ said Mali.

The North-South divide and intense debate over the mandate and scope of work under workstream 2 is expected to continue well into the Paris COP later this year.

TWN

Bonn News Update 20

www.twn.my

Published by
Third World Network

18 June 2015

ADP: Strong Disagreement over Elements for Decision on pre-2020 Climate Action

Delhi, 18 June (Indrajit Bose) – Strong disagreement between developing and developed countries emerged on what elements should be contained in the draft decision text on pre-2020 action on climate change under workstream 2 of the UNFCCC's Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP).

A key disagreement between developed and developing countries is on the issue of accelerating implementation of decisions taken under the Bali Action Plan (2007) and the Kyoto Protocol, as part of the work under the pre-2020 timeframe in the ADP. Developed countries are of the view that the existing Convention bodies and institutions are already acting on implementation issues and there is no need for further decisions under the ADP in this regard. Developing countries, on the other hand, led by the G77 and China insisted that the pre-2020 decision must address the implementation gap.

Two facilitated meetings were held morning and evening of 10 June on workstream 2, which saw a divergence of views among Parties.

During the morning session, co-facilitators **Aya Yoshida (Japan)** and **George Wamukoya (Kenya)** put forth a document compiling the views of Parties from the previous session on workstream 2 held on 5 June, and sought reactions to the document. (http://unfccc.int/files/bodies/awg/application/pdf/ws2_facilitators_input_2015-06-10.pdf)

The document divided the elements into the following parts: a preamble, technical examination process (TEP) and accelerated implementation process (AIP). The TEP had sub-bullets on enhanced high-level engagement: it called for a technical paper, summary for policy-makers and other activities; had provisions for Convention bodies, international institutions and non-state actors; and a periodic review of effectiveness.

The AIP comprised sub-bullets on increased mitigation commitments/pledges by developed countries; enhanced delivery of support from developed country Parties to developing country Parties; and undertaking additional activities such as sharing of experiences, facilitation of further measures to prepare and implement nationally appropriate mitigation actions by developing country Parties, supported by developed country Parties, assessment of the adequacy of financial, technology, and capacity-building support from developed country Parties to developing country Parties etc.

Developing countries said that the document could be the basis for a draft decision text, subject to certain revisions, which they specified in their interventions and asked for the revised document to be produced before the evening session.

Developed countries, however, refused to engage with it and said that the document could not be the basis for a draft decision text on workstream 2 and called for a 'convergences' document. As the interventions continued it became clear that Parties were not on the same page with respect to the elements of the document presented by the co-facilitators.

Speaking for the Group of 77 and China (**G77 and China**), **Mali** said while the co-facilitators' paper provided a rough outline, it would need further work. The storylines need to be based on driving action and not on specific areas, it said. The mandate is to explore a range of actions. 'We have done quite a bit of identification and exploration. For the next phase, it will be important to move into implementation of action rather than the general objective being identification of areas,' said Mali.

Mali suggested the elements of the paper be reordered. Based on the last two decisions from Warsaw and Lima, the AIP preceded the TEP. On

technical expert meetings (TEMs), Mali suggested fleshing out the bullet-point on mitigation and adding another one on adaptation. It said the enhanced high-level engagement should build on the last two decisions Parties had taken in Warsaw and Lima and said that the point on review should be a separate section in itself. Following that should be the sections of workstream 2: preamble, accelerated implementation and review, which should speak to both accelerated implementation and TEMs, said Mali.

On content, Mali said the document is missing critical elements such as elements of indigenous knowledge and practices, response measures and economic diversification. It added that the structure of the document provides for insertion of specific bullets at this stage.

On the timeline, Mali stressed that it is very important for Parties to leave Bonn with a revised input on workstream 2. It asked of the co-facilitators to revise the input based on Parties' comments and to issue it ahead of the second session on workstream 2 planned for the day. It added that if that was not possible, to revise the document inter-sessionally and Parties could consider it during their preparatory meeting in August prior to the next ADP session planned from 31 August-4 September.

Emphasising the importance of workstream 2, **China** said there is a strong and clear mandate for the workstream for the 2015 agreement and added that it is a matter of political trust, urgency and starting point for post-2020. It said workstream 2 is the first step to ensure Parties can achieve any post-2020 goal. It said that the basic tone of any document on workstream 2 should be focused on action and enhancing the implementation of the Convention. The principles and provisions of the Convention should guide the basic tone, China said.

'This is the storyline and nothing else. We do not want to repeat the exercise to assess means or identify areas. The assessment and identification has continued for two decades now. It is high time to see substantial results of the implementation of the Convention. We have to show to the world that the Convention process makes sense,' stressed China.

Reflecting on the storyline further, China added that the structure should begin with a preamble and the paragraphs following it should tell the storyline through the objective, the principle and the approaches to see how Parties can achieve the goal and how the ambition gap is to be filled up before 2020. It added that the structure should first talk about accelerated implementation and then move to the TEP since it is important to talk substance first.

Elaborating on the relationship between the TEP and the AIP, China said the AIP addresses mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology transfer, capacity building and transparency of action and support to achieve the targets by 2020. It added that TEMs serve as the supportive means to ensure that Parties achieve what they design in the accelerated implementation section.

'When we request the secretariat to issue a paper, what is the purpose of the paper? What is the storyline? The paper is a tool to support achieving the objectives in the AIP,' said China, adding that that was the logical way to elaborate what Parties want to do pre-2020. To the co-facilitators, China said there is a need to further complement their paper and added that by making full use of the material of Parties' submissions the paper could be developed further after the restructuring.

India called for a more detailed document, which should capture the views of all the Parties. 'As we move to the closure of the ADP, we need to have clear and actionable decision on workstream 2, just like we have on workstream 1. We do not intend to start negotiating here (in Bonn) what would be the ultimate decision. We will begin negotiating at a later date. It is in this context we asked for the text to be compiled,' said India. 'Just as the views of the Geneva text, like everyone felt they owned it, we should come out with text on workstream 2 where every Party feels they own the text,' it said, emphasising that the storyline's focus should be implementation.

(In the workstream 2 facilitated group discussion on 5 June, India had stressed on the need for a compilation text, comprising Parties' views on the elements of a draft decision text for workstream 2. See TWN Bonn Update #9: '*Conditions for increasing pre-2020 emissions target not met, says EU*' – www.twn.my/title2/climate/news/Bonn15/TWN_up_date9.pdf)

On structure, India called for a separate section on review and supported the G77 and China's proposal on structure. On non-state actors, India said their interface should be routed through the Convention.

It also said it did not see a TEP for adaptation in the co-facilitators' paper. 'There is no doubt that it is the AIP which will form the core of pre-2020 actions. There should be a review mechanism. We cannot keep lingering on the action that needs to be taken now. We should have a clear timeline of financial delivery and clear mapping of sources of finance. There needs to be more detailed input in technology transfer and some kind of global

technology pulls in accessing technology in enhancing mitigation action,' it said.

India also said that it was hearing from Parties that existing mechanisms or institutions were taking care of all that was required, whether in finance or technology development and transfer. 'If we were addressing all our requirements, why did we need the ADP platform? The fact is they have not delivered as per the expectation of Parties and there is a gap. There are actions that can be triggered and there exist barriers. Developing countries require finance, technology and capacity building support and these must be undertaken immediately. We cannot keep this workstream hanging for long. We need to have evolution here. Just as we came up with a compilation in Geneva for workstream 1, we should do the same for workstream 2,' said India.

Commenting on the co-facilitators' paper, **Bolivia** agreed with China and said that action pre-2020 is important to enhance implementation, which must be addressed as a priority. On the content, Bolivia said it is missing important things such as recognition and support to indigenous peoples' knowledge systems and practices. 'Maybe this is an issue that has not been addressed because your understanding is that indigenous people are included as non-state actors, but we cannot support that. Indigenous systems are articulated in a very coherent and comprehensive manner, including a holistic perspective of the world. You cannot compare this to the practices of businesses. We cannot include specific topics in the general context of non-state actions,' said Bolivia. 'Our specific recommendation is to add a new bullet-point that recognizes and supports indigenous knowledge and systems in adaptation and mitigation,' it added.

Saudi Arabia said adaptation needs to be highlighted without taking anything away from mitigation. It said that issues such as response measures, economic diversification and indigenous communities were missing from the co-facilitators' paper.

Venezuela said for trust to be built, Parties need to meet their existing commitments and provide means of implementation, including on adaptation. 'Sometimes we have the idea that technology would give us the solutions. TEMs are a useful platform for us to discuss issues that could really come to bear their fruits after 2020. But we have to resolve a number of issues before 2020. Engagement of private sector and non-state actors are okay, but we must remember that this is a multilateral platform,' it stressed.

Speaking for **the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS), the Maldives** said they were willing

to move forward with the co-facilitators' input as the basis of discussions in August. It sought clarification on the reporting obligation of the non-state actors. (One of the bullets in the co-facilitators' paper reads: '*Encouragement to Convention bodies, international institutions, and non-State actors to cooperate in facilitating the implementation of policy options and to report on their efforts in their annual report to the COP*').

Brazil stressed that it understood the reference to the participation and invitation to non-state actors as respecting official channels of communication. It was concerned about creating an official channel of reporting for non-state actors. It also sought further clarification on the purpose of the work to convene annual meetings as part of high-level engagement. (One of the bullet-points in the co-facilitators' compiled document reads: '*Convening of annual meetings to provide a space for announcing actions, voluntary initiatives, and coalitions*'.)

Lending support to Bolivia, it said that non-state actors and indigenous peoples could not be put under the same bracket. 'We have a lot to learn from the practices of indigenous communities, to deal with nature and modern civilization,' it said. It supported Mali's proposal on a separate section for review. 'We believe we are advancing work and we will be glad to further engage on specific issues once we are able to consider the revision of this paper along the lines presented,' said Brazil.

South Africa said it was willing to move forward with the co-facilitators' document as the base document. It supported Mali, China, Brazil and India on focusing on workstream 2 on accelerating implementation and enhancing ambition. It supported a roadmap for the delivery of US\$100 billion climate finance (per year by 2020). It said it needs a very clear outcome on negotiations on workstream 2.

Colombia said that the co-facilitators' document, with some restructuring as elaborated by Mali, provides a good basis for a decision on workstream 2 in Paris.

The European Union (EU) said it did not see the co-facilitators' input as the basis of the work being taken forward. It said that it may be a little early to keep the process under review and a bit too early to assess impacts on the ground. On accelerating implementation, the EU said, 'Our colleagues have been diligent about it. Everything in the Convention is about accelerating implementation. Most bullet-points are being handled by different procedures and committees. We do not see great benefit on taking a decision on these under this workstream,' it said. 'Rest assured we are not convinced that all of the

Convention's bodies are working well, but the point is not all the issues are meant to be dealt with in workstream 2,' said the EU.

The United States (US) expressed concern on the lack of clarity on what was intended with the document presented by the co-facilitators. It said there is confusion over the mandate and added that any document should focus on convergences. It said it would not be helpful to produce another version of the paper. 'We asked for convergences and divergences and there is no point in going back and forth on this paper,' it said, calling for substantive discussions on workstream 2.

The US also said that a number of the proposals duplicate existing work under the Convention. 'On finance, there are a number of expert bodies including the Green Climate Fund (GCF) and the Standing Committee on Finance. Adaptation is supported through financial mechanisms such as National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPAs), National Adaptation Plans (NAPs), the Adaptation Fund, the Global Environment Facility (GEF), the GCF and the Adaptation Committee. There is need for a conversation around experiences, lessons, gaps and needs,' said the US.

New Zealand said that it is open to discussing implementation but 'we do not need to do it here. We are doing it elsewhere. We do not need to bring other issues into workstream 2,' it said. 'The main point is we do not see the paper as the basis for our discussion. We cannot proceed to a text this way. We could work on the convergences,' said New Zealand.

Norway said it would not help to discuss issues that are important but which do not belong to workstream 2.

Australia said all the discussion was not proving helpful and called for a more converging document. 'We cannot use this paper so there is no point in engaging on this or adding bullets. We need to engage in substantial discussions,' said Australia.

Following the interventions, **co-facilitator Yoshida** responded that the co-facilitators would revise the document with the inputs of Parties from the floor as well as through submissions. They would identify areas of convergence and divergence and present it to the contact group.

To this, **the EU** said that the document needs substantial revision. 'When you revise, we would not like to see a document that looks like what you did before,' said the EU. **The US** said it would not be okay with a compilation text.

China stressed that their proposal for a compilation text is for substantive negotiations.

Responding to the US, **co-facilitator Wamukoya** said it is for Parties to negotiate based on inputs. 'We will look at inputs. We will look at reflections. You can use or reject what we present. Do not throw everything to us. It is you who will solve the problem. It is your responsibility,' he said.

On 11 June, the last day of the Bonn climate talks, the co-facilitators posted a revised iteration of their document titled 'Facilitators' output, Workstream 2' on the UNFCCC website. There was no opportunity for Parties to discuss the document and it is expected that this would be taken up at the forthcoming session of the ADP late August.

http://unfccc.int/files/bodies/awg/application/pdf/adp2_9_output_ws2_20150611_1400.pdf

During the evening facilitated session, **the G77 and China and the Environment Integrity Group (EIG)** had an opportunity to explain their submissions on the key elements for the draft decision to be adopted in Paris on workstream 2. There was also a discussion on the mandate of workstream 2 where there was considerable divergence (see separate TWN Bonn Update # 19 on this).

Explaining its submission, **Mali, for the G77 and China**, said there are challenges that Parties must address in 2015. 'How do we strengthen our work to ensure we have an impact on the ground?' questioned Mali. To do that, Parties need to set the parameters of the discussion under workstream 2 as well as ensure that as we build on post-2020, there is a need to ensure implementation actually happens pre-2020 because in the post-2020 timeframe, the idea is to enhance the implementation, stressed Mali further. http://unfccc.int/files/bodies/awg/application/pdf/g77_wsii_possible_elements_9_june_2015_final.pdf

(The post-2020 timeframe refers to the Paris Agreement currently being negotiated under workstream 1 of the ADP's work and which is to be concluded in 2015 and to come into effect post-2020.)

Explaining the G77 and China proposal, Mali said that its preamble sets out specific principles, relevant COP decisions in the context that action is enabled by finance, technology transfer and capacity building, which is the cornerstone of their submission. Its submission also outlines the full set of objectives of work from now till 2020, by considering and strengthening the mechanisms of the Convention itself. It also spoke of enhancing high-level engagement and strengthening multilateral cooperation. It is important to define key objectives and based on that, different elements proceed further, explained Mali.

‘The key areas through which you address those specific objectives would be through the accelerated implementation, enhancing of TEP for mitigation and adaptation and enhancing high-level engagement. In Warsaw and Lima we took up accelerating implementation. The question is what difference are we making on the ground. Do we need to be more concrete? It is very important that we apply ourselves to achieve the goal. The reason for the 20 bullets, which speak to specific proposals, when put together would advance and accelerate the implementation. Finance is a key ingredient. Is climate finance really transparent? Those are some of the specific questions we are asking when we are talking finance here. We are not duplicating what is happening elsewhere. There is no way to enhance ambition in developing countries without finance. We cannot be content with business as usual. The different bullet points should be seen as ways to enhance action. Then we can have a discussion on each of the points,’ said Mali.

On the AIP, Mali said the Group has defined a number of modalities through which Parties could consider the actions proposed. ‘We need to strengthen the process. Are we really extracting mitigation opportunities by having meetings here and there? How is it making a difference on the ground?’ it asked. Mali also said that the policy recommendations emerging from the TEMs are well known. The stress should be to accelerate implementation, it added.

On its proposal to launch a TEP on adaptation, Mali said, ‘We need to enhance those adaptation actions and implement those opportunities and see what is going on. We have not heard anyone question the usefulness of TEMs on mitigation, but when it comes to adaptation, suddenly everything has been tried and done. At least that is not our view.’

On its proposal for multilateral cooperation and support initiatives, it said that this is the space for facilitation, which must be strengthened. The GCF should be involved to ensure more ownership to scale

up initiatives. Adaptation and financing need high-level attention, stated Mali further.

Speaking for the **EIG, Mexico** said that existing technologies allow for 80% of emission reductions. For the past two-and-half-years, TEMs had been successful and amount to a good number of projects. It feared that these will be put away and the wealth of information from these projects will not be used. It said its submission answers the question on what should be done to trigger action based on this information. (http://unfccc.int/files/bodies/awg/application/pdf/ws2-eig_proposal-8jun2015.pdf)

‘The idea is to remind ourselves and identify potential projects in our countries. So first, we identified on the need and then what the COP could decide on. These paragraphs follow the logic of whether it is for the UNFCCC to play a role to translate them into action. The hope is we can have a conversation around this. It is up to the body or the COP to decide to request the secretariat to see if TEMs have produced actions. The second is to understand action from the TEMs, maybe in getting a better idea on whether it adds value from the existing cooperation going on. We do not intend to initiate complex processes with very in-depth kind of survey or investigation and it can be done in a relatively easy way,’ said Mexico and added that it is up to the Parties to take advantage of the TEMs.

It said the idea behind its submission is to trigger project proposals. ‘Once we have identified that projects have been replicated or identified, both within and outside of the Convention, how do you get actors to work on actual projects with interested Parties?’ asked Mexico. It said Parties should look beyond the UNFCCC institutions and gave the example of UNIDO (United Nations Industrial Development Organisation). ‘Rather than one or two TEMs per year, we should have focused preparations and hold TEMs on issues that are of interest to Parties for practical replication,’ it said. It also spoke about the importance of non-state actors highlighted in its submission.

TWN

Bonn News Update 21

www.twn.my

Published by
Third World Network

18 June 2015

SBI/SBSTA: Draft Decision on Impact of Implementation of Response Measures Sent to Paris

Kuala Lumpur, 18 June (Hilary Chiew) – After much wrangling, Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) agreed to consider a draft decision on the impact of implementation of response measures at the end of the year in Paris.

The UNFCCC's Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) and the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) met for their 42nd session on 1-11 June in Bonn.

'Response measures' is a joint agenda item of the two bodies and after considerable exchange in the first week, Parties agreed to consider a draft decision contained in the annex (to the draft conclusion) at the 43rd session of the Subsidiary Bodies with a view to recommending a draft decision on this matter for consideration and adoption by the 21st meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP 21). All three meetings will take place in Paris from 30 November to 11 December.

The Parties also agreed to defer the technical discussion on improving the work programme on the impact of implementation of response measures to the 43rd session of the SBI and SBSTA.

The agreement on the draft decision came after the co-facilitators proposed a way out of the impasse in negotiation by introducing a co-facilitators' text which did away with thorny language proposed by Annex I Parties (developed countries) that wanted both 'positive and negative impacts' to be assessed and a proposal by developing countries under the Group of 77 and China for the 'establishment of a mechanism' on enhanced action on response measures.

During the first week of the 42nd session of the SBI and SBSTA, Parties tried to 'improve' on the heavily bracketed draft decision text forwarded by COP 20 (2014) but to no avail. (Please see TWN Bonn News Update No. 12: *Parties unable to agree*

on response measures' – http://www.twn.my/title2/climate/news/Bonn15/T_WN_update12.pdf)

The SBI and SBSTA have so far been unable to conclude work on this joint agenda item since the 39th session of the two subsidiary bodies held alongside COP 19 in Warsaw in 2013.

On 8 June, co-facilitators Eduardo Calvo (Peru) and Delano Ruben Verwey (the Netherlands) sought a mandate from Parties to enable them to prepare a text as a way forward to address all the concerns of Parties.

Calvo said the proposed text will focus on the function of the work without sticking to names which has made it difficult to move forward so far.

Verwey said all the options in the annex attached to decision 20/CP.20 will be left aside and the functions and modalities of the mechanism (a Group of 77 and China proposal) will become part of the new arrangement. He said the co-facilitators' text, which is a clean text with no brackets, has no official standing until Parties decide what they want to do.

(The most contentious options are establishment of a mechanism for enhanced action on response measures proposed by the Group of 77 and China, and the counter option of 'no text' which is supported by Annex I Parties.)

Calvo said he and Verwey will try to reflect the sensitivities but acknowledged that to put all sensitivities in the text is not the way forward. He said if Parties could accept the co-facilitators' text, then it will be the Parties' draft decision forwarded for adoption by the Subsidiary Bodies.

Argentina speaking for the G77 and China thanked the co-facilitators for their creative thinking and would like to see the proposal on paper. It could support the idea on the condition that the text will take Parties forward.

The European Union, the United States and New Zealand also voiced their support.

On 9 June, the co-facilitators presented their draft decision text and walked Parties through each of the 10 paragraphs.

Argentina speaking for the G77 and China said it appreciated the co-facilitators' effort which brought something creative and innovative. It noted that there are many elements of the Group's proposal that are missing such as the wordings of 'the specific needs and concerns of developing countries' but the Group can consider taking the text forward in the spirit of showing flexibilities, adding that it reserves the right to deliberate on it further after the regional groupings' consultations.

Verwey said it is not just the G77 and China's proposals that are missing but other Parties' too and that is part of the compromise.

The EU said it too had some issues with the text but it is prepared to forward the text to the contact group meeting the following day (10 June). It said it would like to hit the ground running in Paris and appreciated the co-facilitators' text that is helpful.

Ghana representing the African Group said it was willing to use the text as the basis for further negotiation but reserved the right to discuss the elements further in Paris.

On 10 June, Parties accepted the co-facilitators' draft conclusion and the 10-paragraph draft decision which is in brackets is to be forwarded as Parties' draft decision.

The key paragraphs are:

'Paragraph 2 – *Decides* to continue and improve the forum on the impact of the implementation of response measures, which shall provide a platform allowing Parties to share, in an interactive manner, information, experiences, case studies, best practices and views, and to facilitate assessment and analysis of the impact of the implementation of response measures, with a view to recommending specific actions;

Paragraph 3 – *Requests* the Chairs of the subsidiary bodies to convene the improved forum, to implement the work programme on the impact of the implementation of response measures referred to in paragraph 5, which will continue to be convened under a joint agenda item of the subsidiary bodies,

and operate in accordance with the procedures applicable to contact groups.

The improved forum shall meet twice a year in conjunction with the sessions of the subsidiary bodies, with its first meeting taking place at the forty-fourth sessions (May 2016) of the subsidiary bodies;

Paragraph 4 – *Also requests* the subsidiary bodies, in order to advance the work of the improved forum, to constitute ad-hoc technical expert groups, as appropriate, to elaborate on the technical work under the improved forum. The technical ad-hoc expert groups shall consist of balanced regional representation of Parties;

Paragraph 5 – *Adopts* the work programme comprising the following areas:

(a) Economic diversification and transformation;

(b) Just transition of the work force, and the creation of decent work and quality jobs;

Paragraph 6 – *Decides* that the implementation of the work programme shall address the needs of all Parties, in particular, the developing country Parties, and shall be informed, inter alia, by the assessment and analysis of impacts, including the use and development of economic modelling, and taking into account all relevant policy issues of concern;

Paragraph 7 – *Requests* the subsidiary bodies to review every three years, beginning at their forty-ninth session (November 2018), the work programme of the improved forum, including the modalities for its operation;

Paragraph 8 – *Decides* that the improved forum shall provide recommendations to the subsidiary bodies on the actions referred to in paragraph 1 for their consideration, with a view to recommending those actions, as appropriate, to the Conference of the Parties, beginning at its twenty-third session (November 2017); ...'

To deal with the technical aspect of the work programme, the draft conclusion noted that the Subsidiary Bodies would invite Parties to submit by 21 September 2015, 'their views on the further elaboration of the work programme on the impact of the implementation of response measures and the modalities for its implementation as detailed in the draft decision text contained in the annex'.

2013-2015 Review: Work to Continue in Paris, Differences Remain on SED Report

Kuala Lumpur, 18 June (Hilary Chiew) – Parties to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change agreed to continue work on the 2013-2015 Review of the adequacy of the long-term global goal and the progress made towards achieving it, at the climate talks in Paris at the end of the year.

This was the conclusion after a total of four informal consultations held on 3, 8, 9 and 10 June, including a six-hour-long ‘Friends of the Chair’ session on 9 June. Difficulties arose because Parties could not reach agreement on how to deal with the report of the Structured Expert Dialogue (SED) and had different interpretations of the mandate for the review.

The tension in the discussions over two weeks on this agenda item revolved around how to reflect the SED summary report in the draft conclusion and whether there should be a draft decision for the Conference of the Parties (COP) that will meet in Paris from 30 November to 11 December.

After the 9 June morning’s informal consultation ended in a deadlock, co-facilitator Leon Charles (Grenada) proposed the convening of the Friends of the Chair and this met from 3:30 pm to 9:30 pm. The other co-facilitator was Gertraude Wollansky (Austria). Both were also Co-chairs of the joint contact group set up after the opening of the 42nd session of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) and the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) on 1 June. The Subsidiary Bodies met on 1-11 June and the 2013-2015 Review is a joint agenda item of the two bodies.

(The 18th meeting of the COP in 2012 had decided to periodically review the adequacy of the long-term global goal and the progress made towards achieving it. The SED was mandated to assist the SBI and SBSTA to do so through a focused exchange

of views, information and ideas on the science of climate change. The SED concluded its work in February 2015 in Geneva. However, some developing country Parties at the Bonn meeting cautioned against picking and choosing from the SED findings which themselves appeared to be selective of the outcome of the Fifth Assessment of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.)

Following are the highlights of the Bonn meetings:

Informal consultation on 8 June

After the first informal consultation on 3 June, Parties met in the second informal consultation on 8 June. Co-facilitator Wollansky circulated an ‘elements paper’ which was based on Parties’ submissions after the 41st session of the Subsidiary Bodies in Lima last year.

She informed that the ‘elements paper’ has been updated with newly received inputs from the United States for the Umbrella Group.

Wollansky explained that it contained headings in bullet-point form after the co-facilitators had gone through the inputs and tried to put them into language that might go into the draft conclusion and draft decision, noting that under most headings in the ‘elements paper’ are options of dealing with the subject. She also said if Parties are able to condense those options which are saying more or less the same thing then they can be amended further.

She went on to propose putting up the ‘elements paper’ on the screen for Parties to go through it to see if there is agreement to use some text for the draft conclusion and draft decision. She further reminded Parties about delivering the drafts to the Subsidiary Bodies’ Chairs by Wednesday (10 June) and that the time had come to work on the text.

Saudi Arabia asked what was the basis to put the ‘elements paper’ on the screen and if there is a mandate for Parties to discuss the contents to produce a specific outcome.

Supporting Saudi Arabia, **China** pointed out that the ‘elements paper’ is a mix of elements for a draft conclusion and a draft decision which are different in nature. Before going into substantive discussion, it said there are different views on whether to come to a draft decision or just draft conclusion or even finish the discussion in this session, hence there is no basis to go sentence by sentence and line by line.

(During the first week of the Bonn session, China and Saudi Arabia had questioned the push by other Parties to have a substantive content for the draft decision instead of a procedural one. Please see TWN Bonn Update No. 11: ‘2013-2015 review: Differences over use of Structured Expert Dialogue report’ – http://www.twn.my/title2/climate/news/Bonn15/T_WN_update11.pdf).

In response, Wollansky said the paper was not invented by the co-facilitators and they did not add or change the meaning, but one that captured the different expressions of views of the same topic. She said perhaps Parties can start by putting together the elements for a draft conclusion, adding that there are no papers with any status except the CRPs (conference room papers) submitted by Parties (Trinidad and Tobago, and China submitted their respective CRP in the first week).

Wollansky also said Parties should at least come up with a draft conclusion text if nothing else as many Parties wanted a draft conclusion.

Noting that there is no consensus to put the ‘elements paper’ on the screen, she asked Parties to give their views, nevertheless.

Saudi Arabia said the work is governed by the COP mandate and nothing else. It failed to see the need to have elements in the draft conclusion, adding that it will simply acknowledge that work was done and attach the (SED) report and leave it to the COP. It asked the co-facilitator to point out where the mandate is for citing elements, insisting that Parties should just engage in a procedural conclusion and nothing else.

Trinidad and Tobago representing the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS) said it wanted to make it abundantly clear that for the sake of progress, the discussion (on the elements paper) is step one in the process for a substantive draft decision for the COP.

Japan wanted substantive discussion on a draft decision text in light of limited time in Paris (venue

of next session of the Subsidiary Bodies and the COP), adding that it did not hear anyone opposing having a draft decision but what goes into the draft.

Wollansky then informed the meeting that Switzerland had asked for a chance to introduce its submission and that the Umbrella Group and African Group should be allowed to present their submissions as well.

Saudi Arabia asked if this is in line with the mandate which it insisted is a waste of time as entertaining Parties’ views in their respective submissions is not part of the mandate and cannot be included in the draft conclusion.

Wollansky replied that other Parties (referring to China and Trinidad and Tobago) were allowed to introduce their CRPs last week and therefore the same chance should be given to everybody and that inviting Parties to introduce their views is not outside the mandate of this group (that is discussing the 2013-2015 Review).

The United States suggested a six-paragraph draft conclusion on procedural matters which can be drawn from China’s CRP and a placeholder for any draft decision.

To this, **Saudi Arabia** said there is no agreement and this is not taking us anywhere and again requested for Parties to adhere to the mandate.

When asked by Wollansky what will be the output of the discussion as the group needs to have something to forward to the Chairs of the Subsidiary Bodies, **Saudi Arabia** said the co-facilitators could produce a proposed conclusion made on the basis of the mandate for Parties to engage in a discussion.

Wollansky said if that is the will of the group, then it can be done at the meeting on the next day (9 June) but that the co-facilitators so far had not had a mandate from the Parties to do so.

Brazil said a procedural conclusion does not mean that it need not be substantive and that the US’ suggestion presented some merits and can be considered as a starting point for discussion.

South Africa said it would like for a draft decision to come out of this process. **India** said it supported the position of Saudi Arabia and China.

The Solomon Islands speaking for the Least Developed Countries (LDCs) said it would like to see something substantive coming out in the Bonn session. It would not stand in the way of a draft conclusion but it would remain firm that a substantive decision on this issue is needed at Paris.

Trinidad and Tobago for AOSIS said the Group cannot support the approach of having a few lines in a draft conclusion. Our mandate is to come out with findings of the report, noting that it was

this Group that had put forward a proposal to have a technical body (referring to the SED) to enable a science-policy interface to guide the discussion on the review on the long-term global goal and the overall progress made towards achieving it. It also said the Group expects both procedural and substantive content in the drafts that reflect Parties' views as it gave the mandate to the co-facilitators to produce them.

Australia, Canada, the European Union and Switzerland wanted the co-facilitators to come back with a draft conclusion and draft decision that Parties can discuss at the next meeting.

China, in supporting Saudi Arabia, said it was open to discussing a draft conclusion that Parties mandate the co-facilitators to produce but it will not support the production of a draft decision.

The United States said it would also support AOSIS in that any text must be largely drawn from Parties' submissions.

Wollansky said she would consult the Subsidiary Bodies' Chairs on the situation and would bring the draft back to Parties the next day and she encouraged Parties to continue discussion among themselves.

Informal consultation on 9 June

The meeting started with the SBSTA Chair Lidia Wojtal urging Parties to wrap up their work to make a step forward in bringing science into the decision-making process.

Chairing the informal consultation, co-facilitator Leon Charles asked the UNFCCC Secretariat's legal department representative to provide Parties with a quick interpretation on the mandate and guidelines.

The legal representative presented on four relevant COP decisions (1/CP16; 1/CP.17; 2/CP.17 and 1/CP.18) and the respective mandates to both the Subsidiary Bodies and the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP). She noted that the only paragraph that speaks to the form of inputs is paragraph 166 of Decision 2/CP.17 which reads: *'Also requests the subsidiary bodies to report on their considerations and findings to the Conference of the Parties, which should address those considerations and provide any further guidance, as appropriate; ...'*

She said there is nothing else that predetermined what the Subsidiary Bodies can do which leaves the two bodies a whole range of possibilities, including covering the considerations of the findings and propose actions to the COP, while

it is not for the Subsidiary Bodies to decide how the COP will work. The COP basically will consider whether a goal can be strengthened or if it is adequate.

Brazil sought clarification on the mandatory nature of paragraph 6 Decision 1/CP.17 in relation to informing the ADP which reads:

'Further decides that the process shall raise the level of ambition and shall be informed, inter alia, by the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the outcomes of the 2013-2015 review and the work of the subsidiary bodies; ...'

The legal representative noted that the word 'shall' is a strong mandate i.e. the input has to be taken into account by the ADP process.

Saudi Arabia recalled that the previous day's informal consultation (8 June) ended with the understanding for the co-facilitators to produce a draft conclusion so that Parties could deliberate on it.

Co-facilitator Charles then requested the Secretariat to circulate the document noted as 'of 9 June at 09:08 am' which contained three options in the draft conclusion, and an annex containing the draft decision with two options with an appendix listing the 10 key messages of the SED report which are up to the Parties to pick, delete or propose new inputs.

Option 1 of the draft conclusion is a paragraph containing a procedural conclusion noting that the Subsidiary Bodies had completed their work in pursuant to the four COP decisions. Option 2 has 11 paragraphs of procedural conclusion in which the last paragraph said the Subsidiary Bodies would refer the report on the SED to the COP which shall take appropriate action. Option 3 comprises the first 10 paragraph of Option 2 and an additional paragraph which said the Subsidiary Bodies agreed to consider at their 43rd session (in Paris later this year) the draft decision text contained in the annex, with a view to recommending a draft decision for consideration and adoption by COP 21.

Saudi Arabia expressed disappointment that the co-facilitators did not produce a draft conclusion on the basis of the mandate and not one with options that captured different views.

Charles pointed out that it is not up to the co-facilitators to choose Parties' views; hence they provided the three options.

Saudi Arabia then asked the Secretariat's legal representative if the three options are in line with the mandate or there can be misinterpretation of the mandate that led to these options.

The legal representative said the COP decisions do not talk about the form of the considerations. In her view, it is up to Parties to decide the form which could be a conclusion or proposal for actions, thus reckoning that the options (presented by the co-facilitators) met the mandate.

Trinidad and Tobago for AOSIS said the options presented are fully in line with the mandate of providing considerations and findings while acknowledging that there is flexibility in the form. However, it could not understand and could not support unsubstantive considerations and findings.

The United States said it would be useful to having at least a procedural conclusion with the view to having a conceptual discussion of the decision text at this session.

China said it is clear from the explanation of the legal representative that the mandate is just to report the considerations and findings with no specific mention of the form to forward findings to the COP. It does not want to prejudge the form to forward the considerations. It said the draft prepared by the co-facilitators somewhat prejudged that Parties will have a draft decision coming out of this process (in Bonn). It could not support Option 3.

Charles proposed to bracket the entire text until Parties decide on the way forward but urged them to go through each of the options and see if they are comfortable with the wordings.

The European Union was of the view that a substantive outcome is necessary and has strong preference for Option 3 as it understood that one of the results of this whole process is for the COP to take action which to its understanding, the usual way is through a draft decision.

Brazil said it is flexible on the options as they reflect the different views and positions of Parties, noting that its preference is for Option 2 that reflected the language used in past conclusions and decisions and supported the co-facilitators' proposal.

Switzerland said it interpreted paragraph 166 of decision 2/CP.17 as a mandate to provide a substantial decision and is ready to work on the proposal of the co-facilitators, noting that its preference is for Option 3.

Saudi Arabia regretted that the exercise so far has achieved nothing since the co-facilitators were asked yesterday to prepare a draft conclusion in accordance with the mandate. It maintained its position and urged the co-facilitators to consult the legal representative again on the mandate.

Charles replied that Parties had heard clearly from the legal representative that the decision is in the hands of Parties and as such they cannot follow

the request of Saudi Arabia as there are other Parties that are willing to move forward.

Norway said the mandate is to provide substantive recommendations and it supported the co-facilitators to start the discussion. It was happy that many countries have come to take part. Its preference is for Option 3 but is willing to discuss the other options.

Australia welcomed the document prepared by the co-facilitators which presented the views expressed by Parties. Its preference is Option 3.

As it was approaching the end of the scheduled one-hour meeting, Charles proposed extending the meeting.

Saudi Arabia said it was not prepared to attend another meeting and asked to keep to the schedule. 'I ask you not to do this because Saudi Arabia will not be there,' it added.

China said we should accommodate different delegations' schedule and that it too was not able to participate in the proposed extended meeting.

When Charles asked Saudi Arabia what time it would be available, Saudi Arabia said by all means other Parties can participate but it held the right to denounce the unscheduled meeting and nothing that happened in those meetings is of its concern.

The meeting ended with Charles informing Parties that a 'Friends of the Chair' will be convened later and the co-facilitators would keep Parties informed (of the time and venue).

Informal consultation on 10 June

At the start of the meeting, co-facilitator Wollansky informed Parties that it would be the last informal consultation for the Bonn session. She said the two-hour informal consultation session would be followed by another 30 minutes of meeting in a contact group setting.

A draft text noted as 'Version x 9 June at 22:06 pm' was circulated to Parties. This retained the three options in the draft conclusion, and an annex with two options for the draft decision with an appendix consisting of the 10 key messages from the SED report similar to the 9 June morning version, but this time with some brackets and new inputs which Parties had inserted during the six-hour Friends of the Chair meeting.

Wollansky said the group is expected to deliver the final product to the Subsidiary Bodies Chairs by lunch time and urged Parties to engage in the draft text and provide their views on the understanding that there is no agreement yet on which option to bring forward to the Chairs. (The SBI and SBSTA

closing plenaries were scheduled to close the next day on 11 June.)

Saudi Arabia said it would like to work from where Parties ended yesterday (referring to the 9 June informal consultation) and need not go through the draft text that was just circulated in the room. It said while it welcomed and appreciated the efforts, ‘not all Parties were there’ and it would like to put the document aside.

Saudi Arabia sought clarification from Wollansky to show the range of options for reporting to the COP but it insisted that it is not able to identify the range of options except to ‘just report to the COP’. It said a report does not include summarising, synthesising or drawing conclusions.

Wollansky replied that the range of options was according to the legal advice from the Secretariat based on paragraph 166 of decision 2/CP.17 which requests the Subsidiary Bodies to report on their considerations and findings and it could take any form that is known to the UNFCCC process.

Saudi Arabia insisted that the option of reporting is not to make conclusions or concrete suggestions that are not within the mandate of reporting and it is not ready to engage in negotiation that does not reflect the mandate.

Wollansky said there is clearly a different interpretation of the scope of the mandate but what the co-facilitators did was reflect Parties’ interpretations in the draft.

Saudi Arabia said it did not want to leave it to the Parties to make their own interpretation (of the mandate), suggesting a recess so that Parties could consult their lawyers on the technical aspect of the word ‘report’.

Wollansky said she was sure a lot of Parties had consulted their legal advisers and she saw some of them in the room and she would say that the view of which option to choose had been checked by Parties with their lawyers.

SBSTA Chair Lidia Wojtal, who dropped in at the meeting, addressed Parties and said she saw all SBSTA items are progressing well and hoped there is still room for compromise to reach a good solution for this item. She said the Subsidiary Bodies need time to prepare the documents for the closing plenary tomorrow (11 June) and urged Parties to show flexibility as it is the only way to move forward to a conclusion.

After an hour had passed, Saudi Arabia repeated its proposal to consult lawyers on the interpretation of the word ‘report’. It said it is not in a position to accept the assumption of Wollansky that Parties had consulted their lawyers. It said we

are not here to entertain Parties’ views but to fulfil the mandate to report.

Wollansky responded that she was not sure if the Secretariat’s legal representative was still in the room but opined that while the legal consultation can go on, it should not interrupt the work of Parties that want to engage on the draft text before we go to the contact group to present the results of the work.

China said it had listened to all the views expressed and noted that Parties are facing a very complicated situation. It said the main issue is the different options in the draft conclusion text which represent the different interpretations of Parties. It proposed that Parties set the text aside and start by drafting on the screen with one simple paragraph as a starting point.

Trinidad and Tobago raised a point-of-order for clarity from China, and said there are three options and that the only legitimate one to begin with is Option 3.

Saudi Arabia took the floor to say that there is also an option to close the door on the misinterpretation of ‘report’ and it did not hear any reaction to its proposal, insisting that only by solving the interpretation can Parties deal with the options. It requested for a five-minute huddle with legal advisers in the room.

To this, Wollansky said the legal representative from the Secretariat had just left the room.

Trinidad and Tobago again raised a point-of-order. It said it appeared that there is an overwhelming majority in the room that understood what is ‘report’ and are prepared to proceed on substantial discussion and suggested that Parties which do not have clear understanding seek clarification.

Wollansky explained that China’s proposal is to put aside the three options and to work on one paragraph without prejudging what character it may have.

Saudi Arabia retorted that there is a procedural issue in the process. It said point-of-order is only raised if there is a procedural objection or observation, and not to react to an intervention. It stressed that all Parties are equal and if a Party wants to react to another, it should take its turn to speak and adhere to the rules of procedure.

Brazil said given the time constraint, it sees the merit of China’s proposal. To accommodate Option 3, it suggested for the Subsidiary Bodies to continue considering the nature of the recommendation at SB 43 for COP 21 in Paris.

The United States said while there may be merit in China’s proposal, it is reinventing the wheel.

It proposed starting with Option 2 and bracketing paragraph 13 (which is Option 3 that contained the proposal for a draft decision).

Trinidad and Tobago said the options are somehow not mutually exclusive and Parties could amend or add to what is on the screen. While it would like to see Brazil's proposal, it was also agreeable with the United States' proposal, noting that there is an abundance of flexibilities.

The European Union said the proposal by the United States would save time and would be a good way to move forward.

Switzerland felt that China's proposal would take a lot of time so it would support the US proposal to start with Option 2 although it is in favour of Option 3.

India said in light of the divergence of views, it strongly felt that the proposal by China could be a good starting point but it was also open to the proposal by Brazil.

Saudi Arabia said while Parties are starting with a paragraph that quite reflects the mandate, the exercise had also opened up to reconstructing the paragraph with ideas that are not aligned to the mandate. It said that text inserted into the paragraph without Parties having a chance to react to them is inappropriate.

As time ran out, Wollansky said the understanding in the room was that everything on the screen was in brackets and Parties will have the chance to look at them again in the contact group after a short break.

Contact group on 10 June

The meeting which was scheduled to start at 12 noon began 30 minutes later.

Presiding over the meeting, Co-chair Leon Charles (Grenada) urged Parties to focus on deciding what they would forward to the Subsidiary Bodies, noting that Parties had run out of time for a text with substantive matters.

He said there are four possible things that can be reported to the Subsidiary Bodies' Chairs and would like to get Parties' views on which of the four that they were most comfortable with.

The four options are: the draft proposal noted as Version 1 of 9 June at 09:08 am; the newly circulated document which was based on the drafting on the screen at the just concluded informal consultation; that the work has been initiated and will be continued at SB 43 with no document to be forwarded to the COP; and that the Parties were not able to come to any conclusion.

To a question from **Canada** on the fourth option, he clarified that no conclusion means Parties would leave it to the Subsidiary Bodies' Chairs on what to do.

Trinidad and Tobago for AOSIS said option four seems to apply to all the options on the table. Ideally, it would want to be able not to begin at the next Subsidiary Bodies' session on a clean slate and it would like to work on the proposal brought forward by the co-facilitators of the informal consultations (referring to the document in Option 1).

Charles clarified that option four would not have any document attached to it (to be forwarded to the Subsidiary Bodies' Chairs).

To a question from Switzerland on what is the difference between option three and option four, Charles said option three implied that Parties agreed to continue work at SB 43 while option four implied that the Subsidiary Bodies' Chairs will most likely apply Rule 16. He went on to read out Rule 16 – 'any item of the agenda of an ordinary session where consideration is not completed shall be included on the agenda item of next session'.

The Solomon Islands for LDCs said it preferred option three which it understood the work initiated to mean all the three documents – Version 1 of 9 June, the text drafted (and circulated) at the last informal consultation and Version x of 9 June (version coming out from the Friends of the Chair deliberation).

Charles clarified that option three does not imply any document. Only options one and two have reference to the document that Parties want to carry forward.

He then asked Parties if they could live with option one. The EU, the United States, Canada, Japan, Trinidad and Tobago, and the Solomon Islands preferred option one. Saudi Arabia, China and Qatar said they could not live with option one, and Saudi Arabia and China also could not support option two.

Canada explained that it supported option one as it is similar to what was happening in the ADP discussion where many Parties had expressed concerns that their options were taken off the table and that could prejudice the Paris outcome. Parties are saying that the only text with status is the Geneva text (the text where Parties inserted their views in the Geneva session of the ADP negotiation in February) where all the options are on the table. It said option one contained the views of all Parties and urged Parties that do not support it to reconsider.

Charles then requested option three to be projected on the screen which referred to paragraph 166 of decision 2/CP.17 and that Parties had begun

consideration of the final and factual report of the SED referred in the Subsidiary Bodies' conclusions.

Saudi Arabia said it want to make clear that the SED report is not final or factual and to stick to just saying the SED report.

Charles replied that that was the official reference. The Subsidiary Bodies' report on their respective 41st session in Lima last year said:

'In fulfilment of the mandate given in decision 1/CP.18, paragraph 86(b), the SBSTA and the SBI requested the co-facilitators of the SED to prepare, with the assistance of the secretariat, a final factual report that includes a compilation and a technical summary of the summary reports on the meetings of the SED and to make it available no later than 3 April 2015.'

Saudi Arabia agreed that such was the mandate but Parties did not conclude that it is final and factual.

China concurred with Saudi Arabia, saying that Parties are not in a position to make judgment whether the SED report is final or factual. The mandate intended it to be so but whether it is so will depend on the individual judgment of Parties.

Charles then asked for the contested words to be bracketed.

Trinidad and Tobago supported by Palau said it regarded the SED report as final and factual but is open to dropping the words if that will make Parties more comfortable.

The US welcomed the signs of engaging with text now after 10 days of meeting. While it is far from its desired outcome, it would, nevertheless, reluctantly go with the suggestion to just say 'the SED report'.

The meeting concluded with draft conclusions which read:

1. The Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) and the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI), in accordance with decision 2/CP.17, paragraph 166, and in response to the mandate given at SBSTA 41 and SBI 41 began their consideration of the report of the structured expert dialogue (SED), referred to in SBSTA 41 and SBI 41 conclusions, which includes a compilation and a technical summary of the summary reports on the meetings of the SED and the submissions from Parties on the 2013-2015 review.

2. The SBSTA and the SBI agreed to continue their consideration of this matter at SBSTA 43 and SBI 43 (November-December 2015).

(Edited by Chee Yoke Ling)

Previous compilations of the News Updates and Briefing Papers prepared by the Third World Network for and during the United Nations Climate Change Talks are:

1. Bali News Updates and Climate Briefings
2. Bangkok News Updates and Climate Briefings
3. Bonn News Updates and Climate Briefings
4. Accra News Updates and Climate Briefings
5. Poznan News Updates
6. Bonn News Updates and Climate Briefings (March/April 2009)
7. Bonn News Updates and Climate Briefings (June 2009)
8. Bonn News Updates and Climate Briefings (August 2009)
9. Bangkok News Updates and Climate Briefings (September/October 2009)
10. Barcelona News Updates and Climate Briefings (November 2009)
11. Copenhagen News Updates and Climate Briefings (December 2009)
12. Bonn Climate News Updates (April 2010)
13. Bonn Climate News Updates (May/June 2010)
14. Bonn News Updates and Climate Briefings (August 2010)
15. Tianjin Climate News Updates (October 2010)
16. Cancun News Updates and Climate Briefings (November/December 2010)
17. Bangkok Climate News Updates (April 2011)
18. Bonn Climate News Updates (June 2011)
19. Panama Climate News Updates (October 2011)
20. Durban News Updates and Climate Briefings (November/December 2011)
21. Bonn Climate News Updates (May 2012)
22. Bangkok News Updates and Climate Briefings (August/September 2012)
23. Doha News Updates and Climate Briefings (November/December 2012)
24. Bonn News Updates and Climate Briefings (June 2013)
25. Warsaw News Updates and Climate Briefings (November 2013)
26. Bonn Climate News Updates (March 2014)
27. Bonn News Updates and Climate Briefings (June 2014)
28. Lima Climate News Updates (December 2014)

TWN
Third World Network

ISBN-978-967-0747-09-5



9 789670 747095