

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 policymakers 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 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-September 4.

Emphasizing 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 feel 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_update9.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 exists 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, 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)**, **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 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 need to ensure implementation actually happens pre-2020 because in the post-2020 time-frame, 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,” said Mali.

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 per cent 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 Organization). “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.