

Durban Platform: Developing countries call for contact group to advance work

Bonn, 11 March (Meena Raman) – Several developing country groupings called for the establishment of a contact group to advance work on the elements for a draft negotiating text for the 2015 agreed outcome under Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP).

The ADP is convened under United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and is meeting in Bonn, Germany on 10-14 March 2014. It resumed its work following its last session held in Warsaw, Poland in November 2013. The Bonn session is the fourth part of its second session.

The call for a contact group to advance work was made by the Like-minded developing countries (LMDC), the African Group, the BASIC countries (Brazil, South Africa, India and China), the Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our Americas (ALBA) and the Arab Group.

The developing countries wanted the contact group for Workstream 1 (on the 2015 agreement) to focus on the six core elements referred to in the Durban and Doha mandates, i.e. mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology development and transfer, capacity building, and transparency of action and support. They said that for any agreed outcome to be credible and legitimate, it must be the product of a formal, transparent and participatory negotiating process driven by the Parties in which the Parties negotiate with each other, implying that this was not a negotiation with the Co-chairs on texts produced by the latter.

The G77 and China wanted Parties to move beyond an exchange of ideas and engage in substantive negotiation on the elements for a draft negotiating text for the 2015 agreement (for the post-2020 timeframe) based on inputs and submissions by Parties.

The call for the contact group and engagement in substantive negotiations on the elements of the draft negotiating text was made in response to a proposal by the Co-chairs of the ADP, Artur Runge-Metzger (the European Union) and Kishan Kumarsingh (Trinidad and Tobago) to hold open-ended consultations on the 2015 agreement.

Metzger, in opening the ADP session, said that 'open-ended consultations' are commonly used to describe negotiations. It means that it is open to all Parties and are not consultations with the Co-chairs but is open to all and is fully inclusive and transparent. He said that Parties were in a formal session of the ADP and the principles of work are that this process is party-driven; builds on Parties' inputs, and any outputs must reflect inputs from Parties. He added further that shaping the content of the 2015 agreement needs to encompass all the elements of mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology, capacity building, and transparency of action and support.

He added further that the Warsaw decision invited Parties to prepare for nationally determined contributions (NDCs) to achieve the objective of the Convention and to communicate this in advance. An in-session workshop will be held on Tuesday, 11 March in this regard on the domestic preparations being undertaken.

In relation to workstream 2 on the pre-2020 ambition, Metzger said that technical expert workshops will be held on actions with high mitigation potential on scaling up renewable energy and energy efficiency in the March session.

Following the interventions by the Parties, the Co-chairs proceeded with the open-ended consultations as they had proposed initially and no contact group was formed.

Ambassador Rene Orellana of Bolivia, speaking for the G77 and China, said Parties needed to move beyond an exchange of ideas and engage in substantive negotiation and trusted the Co-chairs to facilitate the work, based on the decisions adopted in Durban, Doha and Warsaw, towards elements for a draft negotiating text for the 2015 agreement based on inputs and submissions by Parties; and toward enhanced ambition pre-2020 in accordance with the Durban Mandate.

He added that the successful accomplishment of work will require Parties to consider the elements and contributions in a comprehensive manner. The G77 stressed the importance of giving balanced consideration to how all elements, not only mitigation, has a role to play in reaching a successful outcome. The consideration of the element of “support” is essential, particularly in the context of an “ex-ante” discussion on the elements and contributions of Parties and to understand how the said support will be delivered in a predictable and accessible manner, to assist developing country Parties in accordance with principles and provisions of the Convention. The elements of support, in terms of finance, technology and capacity-building, are issues of ongoing discussions under the Convention, and the work must build upon these.

Orellana said a comprehensive consideration of the elements and contributions requires the consideration of adaptation actions and measures. The G77 and China signalled concern over the absence of adaptation in the discussions, and urged Parties to give it due consideration.

The Group said that the role of Parties cannot be replaced, as it is Parties that will have to reach an agreement. Therefore, Parties must avoid any mode of work that could go down the path of having to take important decisions in a manner that does not allow careful reflection and equal opportunity for all delegations, large or small (in an apparent reference to the resort to ‘huddles’ in small groups in arriving at decisions in Warsaw).

The G77 and China reiterated the following: (a) the work under the Ad Hoc Working Group must be under the Convention and should be based on its principles and provisions related to commitments and responsibilities with regard to mitigation, adaptation and means of implementation; (b) the process under the ADP must not lead to a reinterpretation or a rewriting of the Convention; (c) the outcome must be in accordance with the objective, principles and provisions stipulated in the

Convention, including the principles of equity and common but differentiated responsibility and respective capabilities (CBDRRC); (d) the negotiations under the ADP must be a party-driven process, and must be fully inclusive and transparent; (e) the work should lead to a balanced, ambitious, fair and equitable outcome under the Convention; and (f) progress depends on following a balanced approach that will include mitigation, adaptation and means of implementation, in accordance with the spirit of the Convention.

Orellana added further that under Workstream 2, developed countries must demonstrate clear and unconditional leadership in mitigation, adaptation, finance and technology development and transfer. The G77 and China expects that the amendments adopted in Doha in relation to the second commitment period (2CP) of the Kyoto Protocol (KP) enter into force as soon as possible. It is paramount that the ambition mechanism launched in Doha effectively results in the increase of the ambition of Annex I Parties’ quantified emissions reduction and limitation commitments for the 2CP. He urged all Annex I Parties to the KP to go through the relevant legal procedures necessary to bring the amendments into force as soon as possible, and to revisit and significantly increase their quantified emissions reduction and limitation commitments by 2014. It is crucial to ensure the operationalization and implementation of the 2014 Revisit Mechanism under the KP (agreed to) in Warsaw.

The G77 and China also urged non-KP Annex I Parties to increase their mitigation ambition in a comparable manner within the same timeframe. All Annex I Parties must undertake additional verifiable actions under the KP, as well as under the Convention with a view to close the ambition gap by 2020. The enhanced commitments from the Annex I Parties in 2014 for the post-2020 period should be the first step, since this would directly impact the level of ambition in Workstream 1 for the post-2020 period.

Orellana stressed that the members of G77 and China have made greater contributions on combating climate change than those of developed countries during the pre-2020 period and urged developed country Parties to fulfil and enhance their commitments on the provision of finance, technology and capacity building support to developing countries, which is fundamental for developing countries to implement their actions on adaptation and mitigation.

Sudan for the African Group said there is need for a clear workplan for both workstreams. At this session, it wanted a contact group to be established in relation to the 2015 agreement so that Parties views could be formally recorded and the emerging consensus captured. It said that the elements of the draft negotiating text are defined in the Durban decision (decision 1/CP.17). The architecture of the 2015 agreement should cover general commitments, specific commitments, operational mechanisms and institutions under Convention, including transparency, accountability, and compliance, building on the Bali Action Plan (BAP) and the KP.

On Workstream 2, it was important to accelerate all the BAP actions. It was also ready to engage on work related to renewable energy and energy efficiency. It called for a technical paper on the full range of incentive types (on mitigation) which are thematic based, taking into account geographical distribution.

Nauru for the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS) welcomed the opening of the technical expert meetings under Workstream 2 and was eager to translate the lessons learnt into concrete progress for real mitigation action on the ground. The focus here on renewable energy and energy efficiency provided an opportunity to focus on an area of high mitigation potential and to highlight areas where intensive there is cooperation among governments, international organizations and financial institutions. It added that it is also important to be mindful that these efforts have significant co-benefits for sustainable development and adaptation. It also encouraged Parties to raise the ambition of their 2020 pledges, or to come forward with new pledges for those who have not yet done so.

On the 2015 agreement, Nauru called for clear progress and to continue to build on the foundation of the Convention, including all of its principles and provisions. The fact that Parties are now negotiating a new protocol applicable to all does not relieve developed countries of their responsibility to take the lead in addressing climate change. It could not afford any backsliding in the type, nature, or ambition of their mitigation commitments under the 2015 agreement. The outcome of the 2015 agreement should be a legally binding Protocol under the Convention that is applicable to all Parties, which will require universal participation and contributions from all Parties. The safety, viability and survival of its members demands that the agreement be based on science and include a global goal of limiting global warming to well below 1.5 degrees.

In this context, the level of ambition of the 2015 Agreement is critical to the survival of SIDS. It proposed that this session focus on the following, inter alia: the identification of the elements that would be included in the final 2015 agreement; focus on identifying the information needed to allow Parties to present their information in a manner that facilitates the clarity, transparency, and understanding of nationally determined contributions; this will inform a process that would lead to an urgent submission of Parties' proposed national contributions in a transparent and verifiable manner that enables quantification and assessment against the long-term global goal of holding warming below 1.5C; and move toward a process to review proposed national contributions. Furthermore it must articulate: a balanced treatment of mitigation and adaptation, including a clearly defined relationship between mitigation ambition and adaptation costs as well as loss and damage, particularly when adaptation measures are not sufficient to address climate impacts; and a provision for long term, scaled up, predictable, new and additional finance, technology and capacity building to cover the costs of adaptation and loss and damage.

Unfortunately, Nauru added, severe climate impacts are already occurring and that much worse still lies ahead. The establishment of an international mechanism to address loss and damage in Warsaw represented an important step and addressing loss and damage must be part of the 2015 agreement.

Nepal for the Least Developed Countries (LDCs) said that the task in Bonn is to ensure high emission reduction commitments upfront and looked forward to the preparations for the nationally determined contributions of Parties. LDCs needed support in this regard. As regards the 2015 agreement, it stressed the importance of the adequacy of the individual and aggregate targets on mitigation to ensure the limiting of temperature to below 1.5 degree C. It welcomed the efforts under Workstream 2 on actions with high mitigation potential in which renewable energy and energy efficiency are relevant as there is need for significant emission reductions.

The Philippines speaking for the LMDC said that in the past two years, Parties have had informal consultations that gave a better understanding of each other's views, ideas, starting points, and objectives for this process. Divergences and convergences have emerged. The challenge clearly is on expanding convergence and narrowing divergence on the basis of consensus by shifting from an informal mode of work to a formal, transparent and participatory negotiating process of the Parties and

by the Parties, as quickly as possible. The time to start this process is now.

The common objective must be to arrive at an agreed outcome in Paris that is balanced, comprehensive, credible, legitimate, and acceptable to all, so that all will implement it. The outcome must be consistent with the Convention, enhances its full, effective and sustained implementation, and avoids re-writing or re-interpreting any of its provisions or principles. Most importantly, the principles of equity and CBDR must remain the bedrock of the 2015 agreed outcome.

The Philippines said that despite the long-standing commitments of developed country Parties under the Convention since 1992, the consequences of their historical responsibility for emissions coupled by the lack or inadequacy of their efforts on climate change are now making themselves deeply felt through the acceleration and widening of the adverse effects of climate change on our peoples. Many developing countries of the LMDC and of our broader family, the G77, are suffering massively from these adverse effects. This highlights the urgency that we must all feel in carrying out our work under the ADP.

The Philippines stressed that this also underlines the need for developed country Parties to finally take up the mantle of leadership that they have long been called to take up under the Convention, rather than seeking to escape from it or transferring the responsibility to those who still face major sustainable development and poverty eradication challenges. This includes, in particular, ratifying by Annex I Parties no later than the end of 2014 the Doha amendment to the KP with respect to its 2CP so that it can enter into force as soon as possible before 2020.

For any agreed outcome to be credible and legitimate, it must be the product of a formal, transparent and participatory negotiating process driven by the Parties in which the Parties negotiate with each other on the basis of good faith and in the spirit of mutual understanding.

At this session of the ADP, formal and structured intergovernmental negotiations on the elements for a draft negotiating text of the 2015 agreed outcome must start through the establishment by the ADP of a contact group for Workstream 1 focusing on the six core elements referred to in the Durban and Doha mandate, i.e. mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology development and transfer, capacity building, and transparency of action and support. The proceedings of this contact group must be open to observers. They, too, have a stake in this process.

Through such formal negotiations, a negotiating text should be developed from a compilation transparently drawn from and attributed to Parties' textual submissions. It emphasized that only formal negotiations in a contact group can ensure that our substantive discussions under the ADP are proceeding in the right direction to Paris so that we can adopt a balanced text by the end of COP21 in 2015.

The negotiations in the contact group under the ADP must follow a logical sequence as stated in paragraph 2(a) of decision 1/CP.19 (Warsaw decision). It must start with further elaborating, beginning at its first session in 2014, the elements identified in paragraph 5 of decision 1/CP.17 for a draft negotiating text, followed by negotiations on contributions, and then on information. In this context, the provision of support by developed countries to developing countries for their domestic preparations with respect to information on their contributions is necessary and must be done in a timely and adequate manner. The provision of support is a concrete commitment by developed country Parties rather than those of international organizations.

It added further that any guidance from the Co-chairs, such as questions that are put to Parties as contained in the scenario note, should be balanced. The questions to be discussed in the negotiations are directly related to the substance. Such questions should follow the mandate from Durban and Doha and be determined by all Parties in a Party-driven and consensus-building manner, in order to reflect different concerns and views of all Parties in a balanced manner. It also stressed that procedures or processes that are non-participatory or non-transparent, or which limit effective involvement to only a few Parties rather than all the Parties, must be avoided.

The Philippines said the LMDC has made a submission on the elements for the 2015 agreed outcome; it outlined the way in which the elements of the 2015 agreed outcome could be fleshed out in a manner that is fully consistent with the principles, provisions, structure and annexes of the Convention, builds on previous COP decisions, and leads to enhanced action by all Parties to achieve the objective of the Convention.

In mitigation, there should be CBDR-based differentiation between developed and developing countries, measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) of support, and response measures. Under adaptation, Annex II Parties should fulfil their

commitments to support developing countries to address the adverse effects of climate change, including loss and damage as well as economic diversification. The other elements under finance, technology development and transfer, capacity building, and transparency of action and support, should also be enhanced consistent with the Convention.

It said the submission points the way by which an equitable, ambitious, and effective outcome can be achieved in Paris (at the 21st meeting of the Conference of Parties in 2015) in a manner that respects the mandate of the ADP, enhances implementation of the Convention, and enhances international cooperation and domestic contributions by all Parties fully in accordance with the provisions and principles of the Convention, in particular equity and CBDR. The way suggested will allow Parties to reach a balanced, comprehensive, and satisfactory agreement within the timeline to Paris that remains to us under the ADP.

However, proposals that are not consistent with the Convention, or which seek to rewrite or re-interpret it, are not helpful to the process that we are in. They only cause delay and confusion, and will drastically reduce the possibility of reaching a credible, legitimate, and acceptable outcome in Paris.

With regards to Workstream 2, enhancing pre-2020 ambition holistically includes mitigation, adaptation, finance and technology transfer. It should be achieved through the implementation of the Bali outcomes. The pre-2020 mitigation gap would be closed if developed country Parties committed to an aggregate emission reduction of more than 40% below their 1990 levels by 2020, even as developing countries are already contributing more to global mitigation efforts than developed countries. All developed country Parties should revisit and increase their pre-2020 mitigation ambition in order to set a high starting point and reference level for determining their post-2020 mitigation commitments.

While technical expert meetings help implement paragraph 5 of decision 1/CP.19, we would like to emphasize that paragraphs 3, 4, and 5 of this COP decision should be addressed in a balanced manner. Enough space and time slots in the ADP process should be secured to discuss the issue of the implementation of paragraphs 3 and 4 of decision 1/CP.19 in 2014. International cooperative initiatives may facilitate the implementation by developing countries of their presented actions but should not

transfer to developing countries the commitments and obligations of developed countries.

Saudi Arabia speaking for the Arab Group said that the work of the ADP must take into account the principles of the Convention which is based on the principle of equity and CBDR. It stressed that the process of negotiations in the ADP must be party-driven and avoid over-burdening the Co-chairs. It must be based on proposals submitted by Parties and not the fruits of the Co-chairs. It called for an open-ended contact group that was open to observers and must avoid consultations with Co-chairs. It underscored the need for a logical sequence to the negotiations with the need to agree first on the key elements of the 2015 agreement, followed by discussions on the contributions and the information. It stressed the importance of finance and technology transfer to developing countries for their contributions.

On Workstream 2, it stressed the importance of the ratification of the 2KP and for developed countries should take measures to ensure the closure of the gap to reduce emissions and provide mechanisms for implementation and support to developing countries for adaptation and mitigation.

India speaking for BASIC (Brazil, China, South Africa and India) expressed concerns with the effective implementation of the Bali outcomes in Warsaw as well as the period from now to 2020. The effective implementation of the Bali, Cancun, Durban and Doha outcomes will be paramount for trust building amongst Parties in order to create the necessary conditions and an international enabling environment for a successful conclusion of the work on the Durban Platform.

It said the ADP Warsaw decision reiterated that the Durban Platform is under the Convention and shall be guided by the principles of the Convention, in particular, equity and CBDR. This has been emphasized in Durban and Doha decisions. It is important to once again remind ourselves that the Durban Platform is to further enhance the full, effective and sustained implementation of the Convention. This means that the 2015 agreement must strengthen the multilateral, rule-based system under the Convention. It is by no means to renegotiate, rewrite, restructure, or reinterpret the Convention or its principles, provisions and Annexes. It shall be based on science and the principles of equity and CBDR, as well as the promotion of sustainable development. In order for the Durban Platform process to raise the level of ambition, the 2015 agreement must adhere to the

principles, provisions and structure of the Convention, in particular the provisions of Articles 4 and 12 as per the Annexes, which fully reflect the common but differentiated responsibilities of developed and developing countries.

In Warsaw, Parties decided to elaborate, beginning at the first session of ADP in 2014, the elements for a draft negotiating text. It stressed that the 2015 agreement should address all elements referred to in paragraph 5 of Decision 1/CP.17, i.e. mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology development and transfer, capacity-building and transparency of action and support, in a balanced and comprehensive manner, and should not just be confined to mitigation.

India added that the Warsaw decision also invited all Parties to initiate and intensify domestic preparations for their intended nationally determined contributions and to identify the information that Parties will provide when putting forward their contributions. However, with regard to the intended nationally determined contributions, it is important to understand that contributions should cover all the pillars of the Convention, i.e. mitigation, adaptation and the provision of finance and technology to developing countries, and be in full accordance with the principles and provisions of the Convention, in particular the Article 4 of the Convention.

It called on developed countries to make their preparations and include in their submissions information particular on the provision of finance, technology and capacity building support to developing countries in addition to their mitigation commitments. Developing country Parties' contributions will be in the context of sustainable development, and dependent on the financial and technological support provided by developed country Parties. It also believed that information to facilitate the understanding and transparency of the contributions shall be differentiated between developed and developing countries.

India said it is important to switch-over from the mode of open-ended consultations to a contact group format focusing on the six core elements mandated by decision 1/CP.17. The outcomes in a textual or written form should come from Parties in a Party-driven and consensus-building manner.

The pre-2020 ambition must cover mitigation, adaptation and provision of finance and technology support to developing countries. It urged developed country Parties participating in the 2CP of the KP to revisit and significantly increase their emission reduction targets in 2014, and urged developed

countries that are not part of the 2CP to also revisit and raise the ambition of their commitments under the Convention within the same timeframe and in a comparable manner. If the developed countries had committed to an emission reduction of 40% below their 1990 levels by 2020, the pre-2020 mitigation gap would not even have existed. The 2014 Revisit (of mitigation ambition) should be fully and effectively implemented as soon as possible. Developed countries should also honour and fulfil their commitments on providing finance, technology and capacity-building support to developing countries during the pre-2020 period. It also urged those Annex I Parties that have not put forward a pre-2020 quantified economy-wide emission reduction target to do so.

It noted with concern that the mitigation contribution by developing country Parties is much greater than that by developed country Parties. The concern is not that developing countries are doing more than the developed countries but on the rather low ambition levels of developed countries. It is simply not acceptable that the commitments of developed countries should be transferred to developing countries and more so through initiatives outside the Convention. While we recognise the potential of international cooperative initiatives to advance our efforts to combat climate change, these initiatives must be treated in full accordance with the principles and provisions of the Convention.

Nicaragua speaking for the ALBA countries emphasized the need for the ADP process to fully be in accordance with the principles and provisions of the Convention. It is crucial to guide the work on the basis of the application of the principle of CBDR, with developed countries taking the lead in reducing emissions and in meeting commitments under the Convention because of their debt and historical responsibility. The leadership must be expressed in the form of quantified, concrete and ambitious commitments, to be announced as soon as possible to provide impetus to this process. It noted that so far these commitments are not being met, which sets an inappropriate precedent for the negotiations. The ADP work is intrinsically determined and linked to the outcome of the ministerial meeting in June this year on the level of ambition of the Parties Annex I of the KP.

It emphasized that any action in developing countries, according to the Convention, is subject to the provision of means of implementation (transfer of finance, technology and capacity building), from developed countries to developing countries, for which there must be defined a roadmap for effective

financing and technological support for mitigation and adaptation. It is important to remember that the Warsaw decision states that the preparation of the "nationally determined actions" are subject to the financial support from developed countries. For ALBA, nationally determined contributions are related to all elements of the new agreement and therefore not limited to mitigation. They should also envisage contributions in adaptation, losses and damages, funding, financing and technology transfer and capacity building. In particular, developed countries must report their financial contributions. It also said that response measures to climate change must be effectively considered and incorporated into the new agreement, understanding the integrated vision which correlates the tackling climate change with the right to comprehensive and sustainable development and the eradication of extreme poverty and its consequences.

It is essential to ensure that the process is actually and effectively led by the Parties. Any document must conform to occur only from the positions presented by the Parties. To take this forward, we need to take from this meeting, a more structured way of working, a formal transparent and inclusive process that produces a real negotiation, under the absolute rule of the Parties. Therefore, a contact group for the Workstream 1 is required.

The legal nature of this 2015 agreement should not be prejudged as form follows content stressed ALBA. The substantive outcome of the negotiation will define the shape of the agreement. These substantive outcomes should encompass in a balanced way, all the elements agreed in Durban so that outcome of the negotiations successfully strengthen the implementation of the Convention.

Colombia for the Independent Alliance of Latin America and the Caribbean (AILAC) said that at this meeting, there needs to be progress to identify all the elements of the draft negotiating text of the 2015 agreement latest by June. It wanted to avoid a debate on the process and to get down to substantive discussions on both workstreams. On Workstream 1, it stressed the need for a single negotiating body to ensure the in-depth understanding of all the issues. The general structure of the new agreement has to be legally binding.

The preamble must reflect the overall objective, the science, the principles of the Convention including CBDR and equity and recognition for all Parties to undertake mitigation and adaptation. For mitigation, there has to be a global goal for emission reductions undertaken by all in accordance with CBDRRC;

mechanisms to determine nationally determined contributions; information on commitments which are comparable; support for finance and technology transfer; market and non-market mechanisms; reducing emissions from forests (REDD-plus) and review mechanisms for contributions and support. Under mitigation, applicable to all does not mean uniformity of application. There should be equity and fair differentiation, where there is capacity and political will to act, with highest political will and leadership from those who have historical responsibility.

On adaptation, it should address needs of both LDCs and non-LDC developing countries. The nationally determined contributions must also address adaptation, finance and technology transfer. There is need to look at loss and damage, as well as means of implementation and transparency of action and support. There needs to be ex-ante clarity and rules and a mechanism for periodic review of actions based on respective capabilities as well as robust compliance mechanisms.

Greece for the European Union also saw the need for a draft negotiating text to emerge by December 2014 for the COP in Lima, Peru. It saw priority for this March session to make progress on agreeing to the requirements for upfront information for nationally determined contributions so that they are transparent, quantifiable, comparable, verifiable and ambitious. It also wanted progress on for rules for the 2015 agreement for MRV and accounting taking into account a variety of possible mitigation types. Means of implementation also need to be addressed. It also welcomed the initiatives on energy efficiency and renewable energy. It looked forward to technical expert meetings in future sessions on REDD-plus and the phasing down of hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs).

Australia for the Umbrella Group said it was ready to get to work to identify the elements for the 2015 agreement, which should be ambitious, durable and fair. It supported the nationally determined contributions which are fair and with upfront information to ensure transparency and are quantifiable. It wanted a better understanding of assumptions behind the contributions. The elements of the text need to be given form and substance. There needs to be agreement on what are the core elements and what can be developed in parallel decisions. On how to give effect to the principles of the Convention appropriate for a 2020 agreement, it said there is need to operate beyond a binary approach (referring to developed and developing countries) which could not serve the purpose. The approach has to fit the economic advancement and

evolution of countries and to improve as circumstances and capacities evolve. In relation to the pre 2020 work, it said deeper technical exchanges are needed and to close the gap in mitigation ambition. It also called on countries that have not made pledges to do so in relation to their mitigation actions.

Switzerland for the Environmental Integrity Group said discussions should focus on Workstream 1 in identifying the elements of the draft negotiating text. It wanted the advancing of common understanding of the core elements of the 2015 agreement and may include legally binding elements, COP decisions, and nationally determined contributions.

On the central elements of the 2015 agreement, it wanted to see a robust and credible framework post-

2020 which must ensure all Parties formulate commitments, including targets and actions based on the same legal form and same intentional legal rules, differentiated according to CBDRRC, that reflect a dynamic regime and reflects the changing economic realities, national circumstances and capabilities.

Adaptation under 2015 agreement should promote and increase the adaptive capacity and resilience in the context of sustainable development; must be under-pinned by adequate and transparent means of implementation based on a clear global vision of financial support. There should be an effective financial mechanism, which duly reflects and is operated by all developed country Parties and those who are able to do so with capacities.