

## BONN CLIMATE CHANGE CONFERENCE: 14 - 25 MAY 2012

Opening today, negotiations under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the Kyoto Protocol are scheduled to continue in Bonn, Germany, until 25 May 2012. The conference comprises the 36th sessions of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) and the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA). It also includes the 15th session of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention (AWG-LCA), the 17th session of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP) and the first session of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP).

The ADP will meet from 17 to 24 May. Drawing, *inter alia*, on party submissions (FCCC/ADP/2012/MISC.3), the new body is expected to start planning its work, including on mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology development and transfer, transparency of action and support, and capacity building. The ADP is also expected to consider a workplan on enhancing mitigation ambition and elect its Chair, Vice-Chair and Rapporteur.

Meeting from 15-24 May, the AWG-LCA is expected to focus on preparation of an agreed comprehensive and balanced outcome for adoption at the 18th session of the Conference of the Parties (COP 18). It will also organize five in-session workshops on: equitable access to sustainable development; clarification of developed country emission reduction targets; further understanding the diversity of developing countries' nationally appropriate mitigation actions (NAMAs); various approaches; and a new market-based mechanism.

Meeting from 15-24 May, the AWG-KP is expected to focus on Annex I parties' further commitments, including quantified emission limitation or reduction objectives (QELROs), carry-over of assigned amount units (AAUs) and proposed amendments to the Protocol and its annexes.

The SBI and SBSTA will both meet from 14 to 25 May. The SBI provisional agenda (FCCC/SBI/2012/1) includes items, *inter alia*, on: national communications; NAMAs; finance; national adaptation plan; loss and damage; response measures; technology; appeals against the decisions of the Executive Board of the Clean Development Mechanism; arrangements for intergovernmental meetings; and administrative, financial and institutional matters.

The SBSTA provisional agenda (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/1) contains items, *inter alia*, on: the Nairobi Work Programme on impacts, vulnerability and adaptation; technology; research and systematic observation; response measures; agriculture; various methodological issues; as well as scientific, technical and socio-economic aspects of mitigation.

## A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE UNFCCC AND THE KYOTO PROTOCOL

The international political response to climate change began with the adoption of the UNFCCC in 1992. The UNFCCC sets out a framework for action aimed at stabilizing atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases to avoid "dangerous anthropogenic interference" with the climate system. The Convention, which entered into force on 21 March 1994, now has 195 parties.

In December 1997, delegates to COP 3 in Kyoto, Japan, agreed to a Protocol to the UNFCCC that commits industrialized countries and countries in transition to a market economy to achieve emission reduction targets. These countries, known as Annex I parties under the UNFCCC, agreed to reduce their overall emissions of six greenhouse gases by an average of 5% below 1990 levels between 2008-2012 (the first commitment period), with specific targets varying from country to country. The Kyoto Protocol entered into force on 16 February 2005 and now has 192 parties.

### LONG-TERM NEGOTIATIONS IN 2005-2009:

Convening in Montreal, Canada, at the end of 2005, the first session of the Conference of the Parties serving as meeting of the Parties (CMP) decided to establish the AWG-KP under Protocol Article 3.9, which mandates consideration of Annex I parties' further commitments at least seven years before the end of the first commitment period. COP 11 created a process to consider long-term cooperation under the Convention through a series of four workshops known as "the Convention Dialogue."

In December 2007, COP 13 and CMP 3 in Bali, Indonesia resulted in agreement on the Bali Roadmap on long-term issues. COP 13 adopted the Bali Action Plan and established the AWG-LCA with a mandate to focus on mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology and a shared vision for long-term cooperative action. Negotiations on Annex I parties' further commitments continued under the AWG-KP. The deadline for concluding the two-track negotiations was in Copenhagen in December 2009. In preparation, both AWGs held several negotiating sessions in 2008-2009.

**COPENHAGEN:** The UN Climate Change Conference in Copenhagen, Denmark, took place in December 2009. The high-profile event was marked by disputes over transparency and



process. During the high-level segment, informal negotiations took place in a group consisting of major economies and representatives of regional and other negotiating groups. Late in the evening of 18 December, these talks resulted in a political agreement: the “Copenhagen Accord,” which was then presented to the COP plenary for adoption. Over the next 13 hours, delegates debated the Accord. Ultimately, the COP agreed to “take note” of the Copenhagen Accord. In 2010 over 140 countries indicated support for the Accord. More than 80 countries also provided information on their national mitigation targets or actions. Parties also agreed to extend the mandates of the AWG-LCA and AWG-KP until COP 16 and CMP 6.

**CANCUN:** Following four preparatory meetings in 2010, the UN Climate Change Conference in Cancun, Mexico, took place in December 2010. By the end of the conference, parties had finalized the Cancun Agreements, which include decisions under both negotiating tracks. Under the Convention track, Decision 1/CP.16 recognized the need for deep cuts in global emissions in order to limit global average temperature rise to 2°C. Parties also agreed to keep the global long-term goal under regular review and consider strengthening it during a review by 2015, including in relation to a proposed 1.5°C target. They took note of emission reduction targets and NAMAs communicated by developed and developing countries, respectively (FCCC/SB/2011/INF.1/Rev.1 and FCCC/AWGLCA/2011/INF.1, both issued after Cancun). Decision 1/CP.16 also addressed other aspects of mitigation, such as measuring, reporting and verification (MRV); reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries; and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries (REDD+).

The Cancun Agreements also established several new institutions and processes, such as the Cancun Adaptation Framework and the Adaptation Committee, as well as the Technology Mechanism, which includes the Technology Executive Committee (TEC) and the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN). They also created the Green Climate Fund (GCF), designated to be a new operating entity of the Convention’s financial mechanism and governed by a Board of 24 members. Parties agreed to set up a Transitional Committee tasked with the Fund’s detailed design. Parties also established a Standing Committee to assist the COP with respect to the financial mechanism. They also recognized the commitment by developed countries to provide US\$30 billion of fast-start finance in 2010-2012, and to jointly mobilize US\$100 billion per year by 2020.

Under the Protocol track, the CMP urged Annex I parties to raise the level of ambition of their emission reduction targets with a view to achieving aggregate emission reductions consistent with the range identified in the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). Parties also adopted Decision 2/CMP.6 on land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF).

The mandates of the two AWGs were extended to the UN Climate Change Conference in Durban.

**DURBAN:** Following three negotiating sessions in 2011, the UN Climate Change Conference in Durban, South Africa, took place from 28 November to 11 December 2011. The Durban outcomes cover a wide range of topics, notably the establishment of a second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol, a decision on long-term cooperative action under the Convention, and agreement on the operationalization of the GCF. After extensive negotiations, parties also reached agreement to launch the new ADP with a mandate “to develop a protocol, another legal instrument or an agreed outcome with legal force under the Convention applicable to all Parties.” The new negotiating

process, which begins in May 2012, is scheduled to end by 2015. The outcome is mandated for adoption at COP 21 and it should come into effect and be implemented from 2020 onwards.

### **INTERSESSIONAL HIGHLIGHTS**

**CARTAGENA DIALOGUE FOR PROGRESSIVE ACTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE:** The Cartagena Dialogue for Progressive Action on Climate Change met from 3-4 April 2012 in Nairobi, Kenya. The meeting brought together over 80 representatives from 38 countries committed to progressive international collaborative action to address the climate change crisis. UNFCCC Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres also attended the meeting. Discussions on the Durban Platform focused on the need to build on the political momentum of COP 17, to think creatively about the governance and organization of work of the ADP, and strategies for delivering a new legally-binding agreement by 2015. The Dialogue recognized the need to finalize details for the second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol, enhance mitigation ambition in the period leading up to 2020, operationalize the institutions and mechanisms agreed at previous COPs and the critical role of adaptation and finance.

**MAJOR ECONOMIES’ FORUM ON ENERGY AND CLIMATE:** The 13th meeting of the Leaders’ Representatives under the Major Economies’ Forum on Energy and Climate took place in Rome, Italy, on 17 April 2012. The Forum, launched by President Obama in 2009, facilitates a candid dialogue among 17 developed and developing economies to support progress in meeting the climate change and clean energy challenge globally. The United Nations, with Colombia, New Zealand, Qatar, and Singapore also participated in the session, with Algeria, Bangladesh, and Barbados also invited.

Participants welcomed the package of agreements reached in Durban, which they agreed represents significant progress. The importance of implementing the Durban outcomes in a balanced fashion was emphasized, as well as the importance of upholding and moving forward with the Durban outcome. In anticipation of adopting a Kyoto Protocol amendment this year, it was noted that Annex I Kyoto Protocol parties need to convert their targets to QELROs, and agree on rules for the second commitment period and on how to treat the carryover of AAUs. While recognizing that the AWG-LCA and the AWG-KP will conclude their work in Doha, participants expressed different views on priorities for this year and whether/how issues that could not be resolved this year would be treated.

**INFORMAL MINISTERIAL MEETING ON THE DURBAN PLATFORM:** An Informal Ministerial Meeting on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action was held from 4-5 May 2012 in Bonn, Germany, at the invitation of COP 17 President Maite Nkoana-Mashabane, South African Minister of International Relations and Cooperation. The meeting brought together ministers and high-level officials from 32 countries, representing all UNFCCC negotiating groups. Discussions focused on what needs to be done over the next four years to ensure implementation of the ADP’s mandate. Participants also discussed options to bridge the gap between what governments have committed to up to now and what action is required to make the world climate-resilient. The meeting expressed determination to build on the momentum of the Durban Conference and achieve a strong outcome at COP 18 in Doha, Qatar.

## SB 36 AND AWG HIGHLIGHTS: MONDAY, 14 MAY 2012

The Bonn Climate Change Conference opened on Monday. In the morning and afternoon, opening plenaries of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) and the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) took place.

### SBI

**ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS:** On the agenda (FCCC/SBI/2012/1), MALAYSIA, supported by CHINA, BRAZIL, EGYPT, INDIA and others, highlighted the sensitivity of the agenda sub-item on information contained in non-Annex I national communications. BRAZIL, INDIA, SAUDI ARABIA, SWAZILAND, SUDAN and others emphasized that retaining the item in abeyance would constitute the most efficient use of time. Nauru, for the ALLIANCE OF SMALL ISLAND STATES (AOSIS), stressed the need for full substantive discussion on the item and the EUROPEAN UNION (EU) called for compilation and synthesis of information contained in non-Annex I national communications.

SBI Chair Tomasz Chruszczow (Poland) noted that reaching consensus on this issue appeared impossible. He proposed, and parties agreed, to adopt the agenda with the sub-item on information contained in non-Annex I national communications held in abeyance.

**OPENING STATEMENTS:** Algeria, for the G-77/CHINA, stressed the importance of funding for non-Annex I national communications and continuing the Consultative Group of Experts on Non-Annex I National Communications (CGE). He said international consultation and analysis (ICA) should be operationalized in a non-intrusive manner and that the registry for nationally appropriate mitigation actions (NAMAs) must take into account the diversity of developing country actions. The G-77/CHINA called for progress on the review of the Adaptation Fund and development of national adaptation plans, and identified intellectual property rights and the host of the Technology Mechanism as “serious hurdles.”

Nauru, for AOSIS, called for: a compilation and synthesis report on non-Annex I national communications; further elaboration of the NAMA process, including a simplified procedure for least developed countries (LDCs) and small island developing States (SIDS); establishing an international mechanism to address loss and damage at COP 18; and a new programme on Convention Article 6 (education, training and public awareness).

Swaziland, for the AFRICAN GROUP, stressed the importance of: national adaptation plans; loss and damage; and further work on Convention Article 6. He emphasized

the need to avoid focusing on developing country voluntary mitigation actions, and said ICA for developing countries must be kept distinct from international analysis and review (IAR) for developed countries. He also called for equal balance of adaptation projects and removal of the co-financing requirements.

Australia, for the UMBRELLA GROUP, highlighted the importance of measuring, reporting and verification (MRV) and the SBI's role in implementing related decisions. He called for progress on adaptation, and identified the need for a decision on the host of the Technology Mechanism and the creation of an advisory body for the Climate Technology Center and Network (CTCN).

The Republic of Korea, for the ENVIRONMENTAL INTEGRITY GROUP (EIG), called for progress on: the MRV package, ICA technical expert teams; NAMA registry prototype; work programme on loss and damage; candidates to host the Climate Technology Centre (CTC); Adaptation Fund; and review of the design of the commitment period reserve. He urged grouping all matters on response measures under a single agenda item.

The EU called for progress on: national adaptation plans, in particular with relation to LDCs; host of the CTC; capacity-building; NAMA registry; and modalities for the ICA. He highlighted that all issues related to response measures have found “their new home” in the forum on response measures.

Dominican Republic, for the COALITION OF RAINFOREST NATIONS, urged for continued discussion on NAMAs, in particular composition, modalities and procedures of technical experts under ICA, and highlighted the need for full support for developing country national communications. He called for addressing the implementation of REDD+ activities by developing countries and emphasized the lack of funding to operationalize them.

The Gambia, for the LDCs, identified the need for guidance to the Global Environment Facility (GEF) from COP 18 on national adaptation plan formulation in LDCs. He stressed the importance of all parties being able to access information on available NAMA support in the NAMA registry.

Honduras, for the CENTRAL AMERICAN INTEGRATION SYSTEM (SICA), called for progress on: adaptation in regions of high vulnerability enabled by adequate, predictable, sustained and additional financial resources; and the work programme on loss and damage that should focus on harm prevention and reduction rather than risk assessment. IRAN supported the candidacy of the Research Institute for Petroleum Industries (Iran) to host the CTC.

YOUTH suggested a permanent programme on Convention Article 6 with robust performance indicators and urged for action to address loss and damage.



**CONVENTION ARTICLES 4.8 AND 4.9: Matters related to LDCs:** SBI Chair Chruszczow introduced the item (FCCC/SBI/2012/7). Least Developed Country Expert Group (LEG) Chair Pepetua Latasi reported on the LEG's work. The Gambia, for the LDCs, and Bangladesh, for the G-77/CHINA, called for support for the full implementation of national adaptation programmes of action (NAPAs).

Colin Beck (Solomon Islands) will facilitate informal consultations.

**CONVENTION ARTICLE 6 (education, training and public awareness):** On this item (FCCC/SBI/2012/3-5, FCCC/SBI/2012/Misc.4 and FCCC/CP/2011/7/Add.2), Tony Carret (EU) will consult informally.

**ANNEX I NATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS:** The Secretariat introduced the report on the status of Annex I fifth national communications (FCCC/SBI/2012/INF.6), compilation and synthesis of the fifth national communications (FCCC/SBI/2011/INF.1 and Add. 1-2) and compilation and synthesis of supplementary information from Protocol parties (FCCC/SBI/2001/INF.2).

BOLIVIA stressed that Annex I national communications must contain more detail and expressed concern that some non-EIT countries' emissions were "camouflaged" by EIT emissions.

Julia Martinez (Mexico) and Kiyoto Tanabe (Japan) will consult informally.

**Further implementation of Convention Article 12.5 (frequency of national communications):** SBI 36 agreed to conclude consideration of the matter.

**NON-ANNEX I NATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS: Consultative Group of Experts on Non-Annex I National Communications (CGE):** On this item (FCCC/SBI/2012/2, FCCC/SBI/2012/12-14 and FCCC/SBI/2012/MISC.6), CGE Chair Ruleta Camacho (Antigua and Barbuda) reported on progress in implementing the CGE's work programme. Nauru, for AOSIS, supported by Tanzania, for the AFRICAN GROUP, highlighted the need to extend the CGE's term at least until 2016 and said its mandate should encompass a number of roles.

**Financial and technical support:** On this issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/INF.7 and FCCC/SBI/2012/MISC.7), the GEF reported on funding available for non-Annex I national communications and biennial update reports. The PHILIPPINES raised concerns over agreed full cost funding. She also emphasized that COP 17 did not give the SBI a mandate to start work on biennial update reports.

Julia Martinez (Mexico) and Kiyoto Tanabe (Japan) will consult informally on the CGE and financial and technical support.

**Further implementation of Convention Article 12.5 (frequency of national communications):** SBI 36 agreed to conclude consideration of the matter.

**NATIONALLY APPROPRIATE MITIGATION ACTIONS BY DEVELOPING COUNTRY PARTIES: Prototype of the Registry:** The Secretariat introduced the item, inviting parties to a demonstration of the prototype registry on Tuesday afternoon.

Elina Bardram (the EU) and Wondwossen Sintayehu (Ethiopia) will co-chair a contact group.

**Composition, modalities and procedures of the team of technical experts under ICA:** On this issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/MISC.8) the PHILIPPINES stressed the need to link it to the provision of resources.

Elina Bardram (the EU) and Wondwossen Sintayehu (Ethiopia) will co-chair a contact group.

**NATIONAL ADAPTATION PLANS:** On this issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/8 and MISCs.1-2, and Add.1 and MISC. 3), Richard Merzian (Australia) and Amjad Addulla (Maldives) will co-facilitate informal consultations.

**MATTERS RELATING TO FINANCE: Initial review of the Adaptation Fund:** The Secretariat introduced the item (FCCC/SBI/2012/INF.2, FCCC/KP/CMP/2011/MISC.1, FCCC/KP/CMP/2011/6 and FCCC/KP/CMP/2011/6/Add.1). The PHILIPPINES encouraged review of the Adaptation Fund, interim institutional arrangements and all related matters under the Convention and the Protocol. Bangladesh, for the G-77/CHINA, and Malawi, for the LDCs, welcomed a full initial review.

Ruleta Camacho (Antigua and Barbuda) and Diane Barclay (Australia) will co-chair a contact group on this issue and other matters relating to finance.

**TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER: Report of the Technology Executive Committee (TEC):** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/1) will be considered in a joint SBI/SBSTA contact group co-chaired by Carlos Fuller (Belize) and Zitouni Ould-Dada (United Kingdom).

**Matters Relating to the Climate Technology Center and Network:** On this issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/INF.4), the Secretariat announced three shortlisted candidates to host the CTC: a UNEP-led consortium, the GEF and Det Norske Veritas AS. IRAN asked how the CTCN will address regional technology issues.

Carlos Fuller (Belize) and Zitouni Ould-Dada (United Kingdom) will co-chair a contact group.

**Poznan Strategic Programme on Technology Transfer:** The item (FCCC/SBI/2012/9) will be considered in a contact group co-chaired by Carlos Fuller (Belize) and Zitouni Ould-Dada (United Kingdom).

**LOSS AND DAMAGE:** On this issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/INF.3 and FCCC/TP/2012/1), NAURU stressed the importance of the item for AOSIS and said discussions on an international mechanism on loss and damage should start already at the current session. TIMOR LESTE stressed the importance of addressing risk assessment and key methodologies in particularly vulnerable LDCs. He identified the need for financial support for expert meetings on loss and damage preceding COP18.

Don Lemmen (Canada) and Lucas Di Pietro (Argentina) will consult informally.

**FORUM AND WORK PROGRAMME ON RESPONSE MEASURES, PROTOCOL ARTICLE 3.14 (adverse effects) and PROGRESS ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF DECISION 1/CP.10:** These issues will be considered in a joint SBI/SBSTA forum operating as a contact group on all issues related to response measures.

**CAPACITY BUILDING (CONVENTION):** SBI Chair Chruszczow introduced the item (FCCC/SBI/2012/10, FCCC/SBI/2012/MISC.5).

UKRAINE expressed concern that all issues had not been adequately reflected and called for further work.

Kunihiko Shimada (Japan) will facilitate informal consultations.

**CAPACITY BUILDING (PROTOCOL):** On this issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/10, FCCC/SBI/2012/MISC.5), Kunihiko Shimada (Japan) will facilitate informal consultations.

**COMPLIANCE:** SBI Chair Chruszczow will consult interested parties on this issue (FCCC/KP/CMP/2005/2).

**APPEALS AGAINST CDM EXECUTIVE BOARD DECISIONS:** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2011/17, Annex 1, FCCC/SBI/2011/MISC.2, FCCC/TP/2011/3 and FCCC/KP/CMP/2011/3) will be considered in a contact group co-chaired by Kunihiko Shimada (Japan) and Yaw Osafo-Osafo (Ghana).

**REVIEW OF THE COMMITMENT PERIOD RESERVE:** On this issue, Nauru, for AOSIS, expressed doubt as to whether a redesign is needed and stressed that discussions on this issue should not prejudice AWG-KP outcomes.

SBI Chair Chruszczow will prepare draft conclusions and a draft CMP decision.

**ARRANGEMENTS FOR INTERGOVERNMENTAL MEETINGS:** QATAR reported on the status of arrangements for COP 18 and CMP 8. A contact group chaired by SBI Chair Chruszczow will prepare draft conclusions.

**ADMINISTRATIVE, FINANCIAL AND INSTITUTIONAL MATTERS: Budget performance for the biennium 2012-2013.** On this issue (FCCC/SBI/INF.5), UNFCCC Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres emphasized that timely contributions are crucial. The SBI took note of the status of contributions and requested that parties make their outstanding contributions.

**Continuing review of the Secretariat's functions:** The SBI took note of the available information.

**Implementation of the Headquarters Agreement:** On the Secretariat's office facilities, Germany reported that the new premises would be handed over on the UN Day on 24 October 2012. She noted that the second office premises would be ready for occupation in 2017 and that the World Conference Center was scheduled for completion in 2013.

The SBI Chair will draft conclusions and decisions.

**Transaction log fees:** This issue (FCCC/TP/2010/1, FCCC/SBI/2009/MISC.3 and Add.1, FCCC/SBI/2010/MISC.4, FCCC/KP/CMP/2011/7 and Corr.1, FCCC/KP/CMP/2010/8 and FCCC/KP/CMP/2009/19) will be considered during informal consultations facilitated by Toshiyuki Nagata (Japan).

**Privileges and Immunities:** Kunihiko Shimada (Japan) will facilitate informal consultations.

**Policy and budgetary implications of funding travel and participation in meetings of the constituted bodies of all members and alternate members:** Informal consultations will be held on this issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/INF.1).

**OTHER MATTERS:** The RUSSIAN FEDERATION, supported by the US, proposed a contact group to consider procedural issues related to the Standing Committee and other institutions, as well as nominations to those institutions. He stressed the need to resolve systemic legal issues in a transparent consultative process. The EU opposed the proposal, stating that the issue should be taken up in informal consultations within regional groups. The SBI Chair will consult informally.

The interim Secretariat of the Green Climate Fund (GCF) reported that the UNFCCC and the GEF had provided technical, administrative and logistical support for the GCF Board and the GCF. He noted that all arrangements were provisional to allow the Board to exercise authority over the interim Secretariat. On the host country for the GCF, he observed that Germany, Mexico, Namibia, Poland, the Republic of Korea and Switzerland had expressed an interest in hosting the GCF. Delegates were also briefed on the status of nominations for the GCF Board membership and plans for its first meeting from 31 May to 2 June in Geneva, Switzerland.

### SBSTA

**ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS:** Parties adopted the agenda and organization of work (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/1) with minor amendments.

**OPENING STATEMENTS:** Algeria, for the G-77/CHINA, called for, *inter alia*: further discussion on agriculture and adaptation; and identification of potential areas of future work under the the Nairobi Work Programme on Impacts, Vulnerability and Adaptation (NWP). She called for balanced discussions on implementation of market- and non-market approaches regarding the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation.

Highlighting methodological issues, the EU called for ensuring the continuity of rules, institutions and mechanisms under the Kyoto Protocol during the interim period between the first commitment period and the entry into force of the second commitment period.

Swaziland, for the AFRICAN GROUP, called for a decision on the host of the CTC based on, *inter alia*, capacity to respond to developing country needs.

Australia, for the UMBRELLA GROUP, supported discussions on agriculture and adaptation, and welcomed the enhancement of environmental integrity and transparency on REDD+ and market- and non-market approaches.

The Gambia, for the LDCs, underscored the need for a three-year work programme on agriculture to include international cooperation on research and development of climate resilient agricultural systems and disseminate research outcomes and technology outputs. He urged the TEC to build on previous work to achieve action-oriented outputs that address barriers and scale up technology transfer to developing countries.

Nauru, for AOSIS, underscored the need for data to ascertain loss and damage in SIDS due to climate change and sea-level rise.

Papua New Guinea, for the COALITION OF RAINFOREST NATIONS, called for the implementation of REDD+ activities and cautioned against reopening discussion on agreed issues concerning REDD+ and NAMAs.

Mexico, for the EIG, called for progress on: MRV, especially regarding guidelines for the reporting of domestically supported NAMAs; methodological guidance on REDD+; methodological work on good practice guidance on land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF); and grouping all matters related to response measures under a single agenda item.

Bolivia opposed the abuse of the flexibility mechanisms under the Protocol.

The Climate Action Network (CAN), for ENGOs, suggested that information on fossil fuels be included in national communications and underscored the relevance of climate change resilient agriculture, in particular for developing countries.

The FARMERS' CONSTITUENCY supported the adoption of an agriculture work programme under the SBSTA, informed by science and local farmers' knowledge and with participation of, *inter alia*, farmers' organizations.

**NAIROBI WORK PROGRAMME (NWP):** SBSTA Chair Muyungi reported on progress under the NWP (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/INF.1). The EU welcomed significant progress since the last report. The SBSTA Chair will consult interested parties.

**METHODOLOGICAL GUIDANCE FOR REDD+:** SBSTA Chair Muyungi introduced the item (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/MISC.1 and ADD.1, and FCCC/SBSTA/2012/MISC.9). The Democratic Republic of the Congo, for CENTRAL AFRICA FORESTS COMMISSION (COMIFAC), said MRV modalities should ensure coherence, transparency and comparability of information, as well as consider national capacities and circumstances. INDONESIA called for equal progress on REDD+ issues under both the SBSTA and AWG-LCA, and suggested considering countries' existing forest monitoring systems.

Peter Graham (Canada) and Victoria Tauli-Corpuz (the Philippines) will co-chair a contact group.

**TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER AND REPORT OF THE TECHNOLOGY EXECUTIVE BOARD (TEC):** On this issue (FCCC/SB/2012/1), Carlos Fuller (Belize) and Zitouni Ould-Dada (UK) will co-chair a joint SBI and SBSTA contact group.

**METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES (CONVENTION):** Helen Plume (New Zealand) and Quiang Liu (China) will co-chair a contact group on the work programme on developed country biennial reporting guidelines and work programme on the revision of guidelines for the review of biennial communications and national communications, including national inventory reviews. They will also co-chair a contact group on general

guidelines for domestic MRV of domestically supported NAMAs. Michael Gytarsky (the Russian Federation) will conduct informal consultations on the common metrics.

**Emissions from international aviation and maritime transport:** On this issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/MISC.7), the International Maritime Organization (IMO) reported on its work to improve energy efficiency in international maritime transport.

BRAZIL expressed concern regarding the unilateral treatment of emissions in specific regional systems and identified the need to further consider the economic impacts of market-based measures. CHINA noted that the IMO's ship energy efficiency regulations do not reflect the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities in a full and objective manner, and requested that the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) consider countries' differentiated responsibilities. SINGAPORE, supported by PANAMA, welcomed progress made by the IMO and ICAO in addressing climate change in their respective sectors.

JAPAN acknowledged the series of guidelines adopted by the IMO Marine Environment Protection Committee as helpful. The EU welcomed ICAO's effort to accelerate work towards a global market-based mechanism and encouraged parties to support IMO's efforts to assess options for such a mechanism. CUBA, on behalf of several countries, expressed concern with respect to unilateral measures in relation to aviation emissions, such as under the EU Emissions Trading Scheme. AUSTRALIA welcomed ICAO's shift towards a more action-oriented "implementation mode" and underscored the need for the universal application of market-based measures.

SBSTA Chair Muyungi will consult with interested parties and prepare SBSTA conclusions.

**RESEARCH AND SYSTEMATIC OBSERVATION:** On this issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/MISC.2 and Add.1-2, FCCC/SBSTA/2012/MISCs.3-4), the World Meteorological Organization reported on the Draft Implementation Plan and Governance Structure of the Global Framework for Climate Service. The Global Climate Observing Services described elements of the Satellite Supplement. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) highlighted elements of the paper on the framework for a new generation of socioeconomic scenarios for climate change impact, adaptation, vulnerability and mitigation research.

Stefan Rosner (Germany) and David Lesolle (Botswana) will facilitate informal consultations.

**METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES (PROTOCOL): Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) under the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM):** On this issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/MISC.8 and Add. 1-2), Peer Stiansen (Norway) and a co-facilitator to be announced will draft conclusions.

**Forests in Exhaustion under the CDM:** On this issue, BRAZIL reiterated the importance of the CDM in promoting sustainable development and proposed that definition of forests in exhaustion included in Annex 3 of the CDM Executive Board 50's proposed agenda should be used as a basis of discussion.

Eduardo Sanhueza (Chile) will facilitate informal consultations.

**LULUCF under the CDM:** The IPCC reported on supplementary methodologies and a scoping meeting held by the IPCC Task Force on Greenhouse Gas Inventories, which adopted a proposal to produce the 2014 revised supplementary methods and good practice guidance arising from the Kyoto Protocol.

Peter Iversen (Denmark) and Marcelo Rocha (Brazil) will co-chair a contact group.

**Implications of the Implementation of Decision 2/CMP.7 (LULUCF) and Decision 5/CMP.7 (information on potential environmental, economic and social consequences, including spillover effects, of tools, policies, measures and**

**methodologies available to Annex I parties):** Nagmeldin Elhassan (Sudan) and Anke Herold (Germany) will co-chair a contact group.

**FORUM AND WORK PROGRAMME ON RESPONSE MEASURES:** The SBI and SBSTA Chairs will consult on this issue.

**PROTOCOL ARTICLE 2.3 (adverse impacts of policies and measures):** SBSTA Chair Muyungi proposed that discussions on this issue move forward under the forum on response measures. SAUDI ARABIA opposed, stressing the need for the adverse impacts of policies and measures to be treated as a separate item.

The SBI and SBSTA Chairs will continue consultations on how to address this issue in the future, while the issue will also be taken up in a joint SBI/SBSTA forum operating as a contact group where all issues related to response measures will be addressed.

**AGRICULTURE:** The Secretariat introduced the item (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/MISC.6 and Add. 1-2). The GAMBIA proposed considering agriculture through workshops and expert meetings. URUGUAY stressed the need for measures that reduce intensity of emissions from the sector.

SBSTA Chair Richard Muyungi will chair a contact group.

**SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND SOCIOECONOMIC ASPECTS OF MITIGATION:** The SBSTA agreed to consider this issue at SBSTA 38.

**COOPERATION WITH RELEVANT INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS:** On this issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/INF.3), the IPCC, UN Convention to Combat Desertification and the Convention on Biological Diversity reported on collaboration with the UNFCCC, and identified potential areas for future work and synergies.

The SBSTA Chair will prepare conclusions.

### IN THE CORRIDORS

The Bonn Climate Change Conference opened on a sunny Monday morning. The mood of delegates gathering in the familiar surroundings of the Maritim Hotel was positive, although many joked that they now know the city and conference venue by heart. "We've had nearly a 6-month break in the formal negotiations, but many of us have already been spending quite a bit of time in Bonn recently for workshops and the informal meeting in early May."

While the surroundings were well-known, there was also a feeling of anticipation regarding the post-Durban process, including the newly established ADP. Many commented that they were looking forward to commencing work under the new ADP on Wednesday; however, few seemed to have a clear sense of the timeline and substance. Meanwhile, the various new bodies were generating new dynamics in the process, ripe with rumors that nominations were proving difficult. This was confirmed in the evening, with the SBI plenary finishing business for the day without having resolved the process of how nominations for the various bodies should be considered.

As the SBs opened, technology was very much on the agenda. Along with the ubiquitous iPads and iPhones sported by delegates, technology permeated conversation in the corridors with delegates expressing different views on the host of the CTC. The importance of resolving the issue came up in the SBSTA, SBI and a press conference with UNFCCC Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres. Some delegates favored the Caribbean as host, others emphasized the need for the CTC to be in a developing country, while one recommendation noted the Republic of Korea as an option due to their technological advancements. Whatever the case, technology will remain a key part of the climate conversation in Bonn.

## SB 36 AND AWG HIGHLIGHTS: TUESDAY, 15 MAY 2012

In the morning, the opening plenary of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP) took place. In the morning and afternoon, the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention (AWG-LCA) convened. In the morning and afternoon, various contact groups and informal consultations were held under the AWG-KP, the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) and the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA).

### AWG-KP

**ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS:** AWG-KP Chair Madeleine Diouf (Senegal) highlighted important outcomes from CMP 7 and called on parties to build on the momentum to finalize the AWG-KP's work for adoption by CMP 8 in Doha. Parties adopted the agenda and agreed to the organization of work (FCCC/KP/AWG/2012/1 and 2).

**ANNEX I FURTHER COMMITMENTS:** AWG-KP Chair Diouf recalled the AWG-KP's mandate to conclude its work by CMP 8 and identified issues for consideration to fulfill its mandate. These include quantified emission limitation or reduction objectives (QELROs) (FCCC/KP/AWG/2012/MISC.1 and Add.1), carry-over of assigned amount units (AAUs) and proposed amendments to the Protocol, including the length of the second commitment period.

Parties agreed to establish a contact group on Annex I further commitments, co-chaired by AWG-KP Chair Diouf and AWG-KP Vice-Chair Jukka Uosukainen (Finland). AWG-KP Chair Diouf also identified the need to discuss legal aspects of the entry into force of the second commitment period and noted the possibility of establishing spin-off groups.

**OPENING STATEMENTS:** Algeria, for the G-77/CHINA, expressed concern that some Annex I parties have not submitted information on their QELROs for the second commitment period, highlighting the need to avoid a gap between commitment periods in order to preserve the Protocol and its flexibility mechanisms.

Australia, for the UMBRELLA GROUP, highlighted the need for the AWG-KP to fulfill its mandate in Qatar by adopting amendments concerning the second commitment period of the Protocol. Switzerland, for the ENVIRONMENTAL INTEGRITY GROUP (EIG), highlighted the need for clarity on legal issues in order to have a "seamless continuation" of the Kyoto Protocol beyond 2012. The EIG, supported by the EU, stated that the duration of the second commitment period should be eight years. The EU emphasized the need to resolve issues related to the

carry-over of AAUs and the length of the second commitment period. He also proposed a simplified process for parties wishing to increase their level of ambition during the second commitment period.

Nauru, for AOSIS, Swaziland, for the AFRICAN GROUP, and the Gambia, for LDCs, supported a five-year second commitment period from 2013-2017 to avoid locking in the level of ambition and to be able to respond to the findings of the Fifth Assessment Report by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). They also called for adopting the necessary amendments at CMP 8 to ensure the entry into force of the Protocol's second commitment period and its provisional application from January 2013. The Gambia, for LDCs, indicated that Annex I parties who have not confirmed their participation in the second commitment period should not continue participating in the Protocol's flexibility mechanisms.

Saudi Arabia, for the ARAB GROUP, urged for ambitious emission reduction commitments from Annex I parties and called for avoiding a gap between the first and second commitment periods. SOUTH AFRICA reported on informal meetings held after Durban, highlighting outstanding issues such as the carry-over of surplus AAUs and the length of the second commitment period. She urged delegates to work constructively so that "the Durban legacy will not be undone."

Bolivia, for ALBA, stressed that Durban had not affected the lack of political will by developed countries regarding mitigation commitments, but rather showed a trend to move away from those commitments that are unfulfilled. Papua New Guinea, for the COALITION OF RAINFOREST NATIONS, highlighted the need to improve developed countries' level of ambition, and suggested that both private and public finance be deployed for operationalizing REDD+.

### AWG-LCA

Opening the session, AWG-LCA Chair Aysar Tayeb (Saudi Arabia) recalled the mandate to finish the AWG-LCA's work at COP 18.

Reporting on relevant initiatives, SOUTH AFRICA highlighted an informal ministerial meeting in Bonn, Germany, in May 2012. She stressed the need to ensure the implementation of the Durban package and move the process forward through constructive engagement. JAPAN reported on the Tenth Informal Meeting on Further Actions against Climate Change, co-chaired by Brazil and Japan in Tokyo, Japan, in March 2012, where expected outcomes from Doha were among the issues discussed. Stressing the central role of equity in the negotiations, INDIA reported on a workshop on climate change and equity in April 2012 in New Delhi, India. KENYA reported on the Cartagena Dialogue on Progressive Action on Climate Change, which took



place in Nairobi, Kenya, in April 2012, and addressed, *inter alia*, the Durban Platform, second commitment period under the Protocol and a new legally-binding instrument.

**OPENING STATEMENTS:** Algeria, for the G-77/CHINA, urged parties to address outstanding issues under the AWG-LCA, taking into account equity, common but differentiated responsibilities and historical responsibility. She said that commitments by developed states under the Protocol second commitment period should be matched by comparable reduction commitments by developed countries that are not parties to the Protocol.

Switzerland, for the EIG, said that work on issues needing further consideration should start immediately. Australia, for the UMBRELLA GROUP, called on parties to avoid duplication of efforts and focus on a streamlined, targeted agenda.

Nauru, for AOSIS, called for the AWG-LCA's work to be guided by a greater sense of urgency and ambition. She highlighted priority tasks, including: supporting the new bodies and processes to enable them to deliver on their mandates; identification of the long-term global goal for emission reductions and global peaking of emissions; and confirming the scope of the Review.

Swaziland, for the AFRICAN GROUP, stressed that the outcome of the AWG-LCA should be inclusive, fair and effective, covering all elements of the Bali Action Plan and recognizing the urgent needs of Africa, especially on adaptation.

The Gambia, for the LDCs, expressed concern with unresolved issues, emphasizing the need to address the mitigation ambition gap. He also called for opportunities to enable LDCs and SIDS to embark on sustainable development pathways, and for "frank discussions" on medium- and long-term finance.

The EU emphasized the need to make progress on all elements of the Durban package and cautioned against reopening decisions from Cancun and Durban. He also highlighted the need for a structured approach to address the 2020 pledges and for clarity on remaining uncertainties. He observed that a new market mechanism should be a catalyst for ambition from all countries.

PERU, speaking for a number of countries, called for focused discussion on outstanding issues.

Venezuela, for ALBA, identified difficulties with working on the basis of the AWG-LCA's text, saying its development has been disproportionate and unbalanced. Egypt, for the ARAB GROUP, expressed support for the AWG-LCA Chair's work plan, called for identifying what has been agreed at previous COPs and stated that discussions on all topics must be completed and not simply transferred to different bodies.

Papua New Guinea, for COALITION OF RAINFOREST NATIONS, stressed the importance of agreement on: a REDD+ mechanism by COP 18; finance for its implementation, including a dedicated REDD+ funding window in the Green Climate Fund; and a new market-based mechanism. Tajikistan, for MOUNTAINOUS LANDLOCKED DEVELOPING COUNTRIES, stressed the importance of financial support and capacity building for all developing countries, and called for attention to water resources and ecosystem services.

Honduras, for SICA, stressed the need to complete the AWG-LCA's mandate under the Bali Action Plan and evaluate which of its elements have not been completed by COP 18. India, for BASIC, highlighted the need to maintain the delicate balance under the two-track approach and emphasized the importance of equitable access to sustainable development. Belarus, for EITs, stressed the particular circumstances of EITs and called for finalizing the decision text on their needs in Doha.

**ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS:** On the agenda and organization of work (FCCC/AWG-LCA/2012/1 and 2), AWG-LCA Chair Tayeb outlined intentions to establish a single contact

group, chaired by the AWG-LCA Chair. He also noted that five in-session workshops will take place, as mandated by Decision 2/CP.17 (Outcome of the work of the AWG-LCA).

A discussion ensued on the AWG-LCA's proposed agenda and organization of work. The EU stressed that the proposed agenda did not recognize issues that the AWG-LCA was tasked by COP 17 to take forward in 2012. He emphasized that listing the elements of the Bali Action Plan in the agenda implied that no progress had been made since COP 13, and specified that the agenda did not take into account the various new institutions created or that some of the issues had been moved from the AWG-LCA to the Subsidiary Bodies. Switzerland, for the EIG, called for clarity on how work in the group would be conducted in 2012, noting that many of the items on the proposed agenda had already been addressed.

CHINA, BOLIVIA, VENEZUELA and NICARAGUA expressed support for adopting the agenda as proposed.

The US, supported by CANADA and others, expressed concern with reopening of issues and proposed establishing spin-off groups to consider issues specifically mandated by COP 17. He said other issues could then be discussed in a single contact group. NEW ZEALAND said that only those issues where there was a clear mandate to report back to COP 18 should be discussed.

AWG-LCA Chair Tayeb noted that the agenda was not "his" and its elements reflected the agreement of parties. He also said issues on the proposed agenda have enjoyed different levels of progress and listing them on the agenda did not imply that they were going to be reopened. He proposed adopting the agenda and then organizing the work of the AWG-LCA through a single contact group. He also proposed to conduct informal consultations between now and the first meeting of the contact group to reach a common understanding on the organization of work.

MEXICO, supported by the US and opposed by CHINA, proposed beginning work in a single contact group without adopting the agenda.

SINGAPORE, supported by many countries, suggested: convening spin-off groups for those issues whose consideration was explicitly mandated by COP 17; considering the other issues in a single AWG-LCA contact group where parties could decide on further work, including by establishing spin-off groups if necessary; and adopting the agenda provisionally.

The AWG-LCA Chair will consult informally on the agenda and organization of work.

### **CONTACT GROUPS AND INFORMAL CONSULTATIONS**

**NATIONAL ADAPTATION PLANS (SBI):** The informal group on national adaptation plans (NAPs) met in the morning. The group opened its meeting to observer organizations.

Co-Chair Richard Merzian (Australia) identified the synthesis report on support for the NAP process in LDCs (FCCC/SBI/2012/8) as a starting point for the group's discussions.

Bangladesh, for the G-77/CHINA, informed delegates that they are working on a submission on NAPs. Ghana, for the AFRICAN GROUP, reiterated the need to take all submissions into consideration. Bhutan, for LDCs, supported by MEXICO, SUDAN, Ghana, for the AFRICAN GROUP, and Vanuatu, for AOSIS, identified priorities, including: the need for NAPs to be driven by country needs and priorities; natural transition from short-term to long-term adaptation; and a separate institutional set-up for LDCs.

The PHILLIPINES, the EU and BOLIVIA highlighted, *inter alia*: accessibility and scaling up of financial assistance for NAPs. AUSTRALIA highlighted support measures for LDCs and the US emphasized the need for knowledge-sharing on best practices in adaptation.

The co-chairs will prepare a draft text.

**REDD+ (SBSTA):** After a morning contact group, parties convened informally in the afternoon and exchanged views on guidance for national forest monitoring systems and measuring, reporting and verification (MRV). On national forest monitoring systems, some parties indicated that the information monitored should be selected by each country implementing REDD+. Some parties also underscored that information requirements should be coherent with those applicable to nationally appropriate mitigation actions (NAMAs). One party stressed that the monitoring system should be a process established in a gradual manner. Another party highlighted that non-market approaches should also be considered and that data on other issues, such as ecosystem services, should be included. A number of parties emphasized that the system should be built on existing national monitoring systems. While some parties supported inviting the IPCC to provide further information on methodological issues, others opposed, with one party suggesting that this could be useful at a later stage. Many underscored the relevance of capacity building for the preparation of a robust and transparent monitoring system.

On MRV for REDD+, delegates focused on possible interlinkages between MRV for NAMAs and for REDD+.

The co-chairs will prepare a non-paper reflecting parties' views.

**LOSS AND DAMAGE (SBI):** During afternoon informal consultations on loss and damage, parties considered ways to move forward and exchanged views on assessing the risk of loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change. The informal consultations were open to observer organizations.

The G-77/CHINA said the outcome from SBI 36 should include conclusions on the work programme and further guidance for regional meetings, as well as an annex to the conclusions that would expedite discussions in Doha. He said that an international mechanism for loss and damage should include elements on assessing and addressing loss and damage, and on the leadership role of the Convention. He cautioned against a unified approach to loss and damage and emphasized regional variability of impacts.

Timor Leste, for LDCs, welcomed the technical paper on assessing the risk of loss and damage (FCCC/TP/2012/1) and report on the expert meeting held in Tokyo, Japan, from 26-28 March 2012 (FCCC/SBI/2012/INF.3) as a good basis for substantive discussions. He also expressed concern over a capacity gap.

AOSIS identified areas in need of support for SIDS. The US identified the need for data on physical determinants and socio-economic drivers of risk as well as on human vulnerability. She cautioned against conflating assessment of risk, and assessment of loss and damage.

Informal consultations will continue.

**TECHNOLOGY (SBI/SBSTA):** The contact group met in the afternoon, followed by informal consultations chaired by Zitouni Ould-Dada (UK) and Carlos Fuller (Belize).

During the informal consultations, parties discussed elements of the Technology Executive Committee (TEC) Report (FCCC/SB/2012/1) and the GEF Report on the Implementation of the Poznan Strategic Programme on Technology Transfer (FCCC/SBI/2012/9).

On the TEC Report, some parties noted that modalities on linkages with other relevant institutional arrangements under and outside the Convention were "too general" and called for more specific references to interlinkages.

On the GEF Report, parties addressed progress on implementation, including: the imbalance between adaptation and mitigation in Technology Transfer Pilot Projects; the need

for the GEF to carry out Technology Needs Assessment in regions not already covered; and constraints faced by the GEF in long-term implementation of the Poznan Strategic Programme.

The co-chairs will prepare draft conclusions by Friday.

**ANNEX I FURTHER COMMITMENTS (AWG-KP):** In the afternoon contact group, parties addressed the way forward.

AUSTRALIA reported on domestic developments, including recent work towards carbon pricing. The EU underscored the need for transparency on QELROs and, supported by St. Lucia, for AOSIS, proposed that countries make presentations on their QELROs submissions. SWITZERLAND noted the need to address technicalities for a seamless 2012-2013 transition.

BOLIVIA emphasized that the ambition of developed country commitments and the adoption of a second commitment period are not just technical matters, but are dependent on political will. Supported by SAUDI ARABIA, he called for discussions on consequences for countries that are not agreeing to take on commitments for the second commitment period. BOLIVIA also suggested addressing in the presentations how to increase the level of ambition.

Parties agreed to create a spin-off group co-facilitated by Sandea De Wet (South Africa) and Jürgen Lefevere (EU) to discuss, *inter alia*, QELROs for the second commitment period, carry-over of AAUs, and proposed Protocol amendments, including the length of the second commitment period. AWG-KP Vice-Chair Uosukainen will also facilitate informal consultations.

### IN THE CORRIDORS

On the second day, the opening plenaries of the AWG-KP and AWG-LCA were the focus of the negotiations in the Maritim. Both AWGs are scheduled to terminate their work in Doha, and face considerable pressure to "finally" fulfill their mandates. The delegates' challenge is therefore to ensure that they "die respectfully and with dignity," as the Chinese delegate phrased it in the AWG-LCA opening plenary.

While the AWG-KP swiftly began its work, the AWG-LCA was bogged down with discussions on the agenda, as parties' views diverged on the way forward. While some non-Annex I countries believe that the elements of the Bali Action Plan should provide the foundation for the AWG-LCA's work, some of the other non-Annex I countries and Annex I countries supported the view that "evolution since Bali," including outcomes from Cancun and Durban, should form the basis of the AWG-LCA's work in 2012. "The agenda is not static," said one developed country delegate. "If we treat it as such, it's like taking three steps back and ignoring all the hard work we've done since Bali in 2007."

Some delegates in the corridors suspected that bringing back elements from the Bali Action Plan could be a strategy from those reluctant to let the AWG-LCA "die in Doha." But delegates did concede that many have different interpretations of what has been agreed since the creation of the AWG-LCA at COP 13 in Bali, and feel that issues could be discussed but that conclusions do not need to be reached on all issues.

When the AWG-LCA opening plenary was suspended at 7:00 pm, the agenda had still not been adopted. Informal consultations will follow. Exiting the plenary hall, some feared that the "Bangkok ghost" would rear its head in Bonn, recalling the AWG-LCA meeting in April 2011 when the agenda was not agreed until the last day.

Meanwhile, nominations for posts in the ADP, the Green Climate Fund Board and other bodies were also a hot topic in the corridors. Rumor has it that there were still many positions left to fill, with some proving to be highly controversial within regional groups and potentially delaying meetings already scheduled.



# Climate Change Policy & Practice

<http://climate-l.iisd.org/>

Climate Change Policy & Practice (formerly called Climate-L.org) is a knowledge management project carried out by the International Institute for Sustainable Development Reporting Services (IISD RS) in collaboration with the UN System Chief Executives Board for Coordination.

This knowledgebase of UN and intergovernmental activities addressing the challenge of global climate change features:

- news on UN and intergovernmental activities related to international climate change policy, updated on a daily basis;
- an iCal of upcoming climate change events;
- guest articles by key figures of the climate community and UN leaders; and
- policy updates.

New posts to the knowledgebase are distributed through the Climate Change Daily Feed, which is distributed exclusively through our community listserve, CLIMATE-L.

---

Climate Change Policy & Practice: <http://climate-l.iisd.org/>

To receive the Climate Change Daily Feed and to subscribe to the CLIMATE-L community listserve: <http://climate-l.iisd.org/about-the-climate-l-mailing-list/>

To subscribe to our iCal of climate change events:  
<webcal://climate-l.iisd.org/subscribe/icalendar/>

Climate Change Policy & Practice is supported by the  
Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, Global Program Climate Change



Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft  
Confédération suisse  
Confederazione Svizzera  
Confederaziun svizra

Swiss Agency for Development  
and Cooperation SDC

## SB 36 AND AWG HIGHLIGHTS: WEDNESDAY, 16 MAY 2012

In the morning and afternoon, a number of contact groups and informal consultations took place under the AWG-KP, SBI and SBSTA. Under the AWG-LCA, an in-session workshop on equitable access to sustainable development was held.

### AWG-LCA

The AWG-LCA in-session workshop on equitable access to sustainable development took place in the morning and afternoon.

UNFCCC Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres invited parties to consider three aspects of equity in relation to the global goal for emission reductions: country circumstances; historical and future contributions to overall emissions; and capacity to address climate change.

Sivan Kartha, Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI), highlighted three requirements for ensuring equitable access to sustainable development in the context of global and national peaking of emissions, namely that: global peaking of emissions and their subsequent rate of decline is consistent with limiting temperature increase to below 2°C; each country has a sufficient share of the limited greenhouse gas (GHG) budget and; each country has adequate financial and technical resources to stay within the available GHG budget without compromising development.

Prodipto Ghosh, The Energy and Resources Institute (TERI), presented an approach to equity in climate change, highlighting the requirement of formal justification of any equity principle and saying that it should be subjected to validation.

Nauru, for AOSIS, discussed elements of equity, science, sustainable development and survival. Underscoring equity in adaptation, he emphasized that small island developing States (SIDS) have high adaptation needs for which private sources of financing are not generally available. He noted the need for finance, technology transfer and capacity building to be scaled up, adding that the mechanism to address loss and damage should consist of a risk management facility, an insurance component and provide for slow-onset impacts.

BOLIVIA observed that equity is a key principle to solving the climate change crisis by linking rights and obligations. He proposed establishing a long-term work programme on equity with a concrete roadmap.

INDIA elaborated on notions of equitable access to sustainable development. He rejected the perception that a focus on equity reflects a “hesitation to act,” saying that equity is rather a key enabler for action. He called for a full discussion on this issue under the AWG-LCA and ADP.

SWITZERLAND explained that equity in the negotiations will emerge through differentiated forms of mitigation, adaptation and support; and elaborated on various equity principles including, *inter alia*, a focus on the ability to pay and the polluter-pays principle.

The SOUTH CENTRE emphasized the importance of negotiations on finance and technology, adding: “If equity is a gateway to ambition, then finance and technology are the gateways to equity.”

Bangladesh, for LDCs, indicated that countries that have developed unsustainably in the past have a primary responsibility to develop a global low-carbon economy and society.

CHINA explained that developed countries have “over-occupied” most of the existing atmospheric space through their cumulative emissions, transferring responsibility onto developing countries and creating a new form of inequality. He requested the establishment of a work programme on equity to further define equitable access to sustainable development in the context of a shared vision and broader negotiations.

SINGAPORE identified challenges to defining equity given different national circumstances, defining his country as one that is “disadvantaged” in terms of alternative energy sources. He said that his country does not support a formulaic equity approach based on criteria, such as *per capita* indicators.

The CLIMATE ACTION NETWORK (CAN) suggested a “three-phase process” to building a rough consensus on equity, including an “equity corridor,” comprising a dialogue to understand positions and agreement on key principles, followed by the application of these principles to key issues.

PAKISTAN requested clarification on how to proceed with different national definitions of equity that reflect domestic circumstances and SINGAPORE clarified that the goal is a definition of equity that reflects different national circumstances. The UNITED ARAB EMIRATES called for considering views on how national circumstances could be more systematically included in assessing equity.

EGYPT called for a discussion on the different facets of vulnerability as a cornerstone of future actions. In response, SINGAPORE noted that consideration of national circumstances



would take into account high vulnerability, assets, capacity and constraints that may impact what a country can contribute to global mitigation efforts.

CAN emphasized the need for a shared understanding of equity, noting that: some countries have not made pledges; developed countries need to move to the top end of their emission reduction ranges; and emissions from bunker fuels need to be addressed.

The EU identified the goal of a future regime as enabling all parties to achieve sustainable development, poverty eradication and climate-resilient growth. He explained that the UNFCCC's principles form a good basis but need to be interpreted in a way that reflects countries' evolving common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities.

The US said that equitable access to sustainable development should focus on development opportunities and that a formulaic approach results in conclusions that are "not tenable in the real world."

BRAZIL stressed that historical responsibility lends itself to a quantifiable translation, and elaborated on equitable access to sustainable development as reflected in the shared vision and review.

AUSTRALIA emphasized that questions concerning equity cannot be answered with one dimensional formulae or "snapshots in time."

EGYPT observed that climate change mitigation efforts are costly and entail severe constraints, primarily on developing country fiscal budgets, and questioned the extent to which it is fair and equitable to impose strong mitigation demands on developing countries. He called for transmitting the outcomes of the workshop to the other Convention bodies and establishing a work programme on equity.

In the ensuing discussion, NEW ZEALAND noted that equity is applied continuously under the UNFCCC, including: in the decision-making process; the establishment of institutions; and actions taken, in the absence of definition. Acknowledging differences in national circumstances, she emphasized the need to ensure that all countries participate in mitigation efforts according to their capabilities. SOUTH AFRICA called for further work to understand the operational aspects of the Convention's principles. The PHILIPPINES inquired into strategies to decouple emissions from development, with AUSTRALIA pointing to a carbon price and the EU urging global action to avoid carbon leakage.

On the way forward, the EU indicated that a stand-alone debate on equity would not be productive and called for focusing on mitigation and adaptation.

A summary report of the proceedings will be prepared.

#### **CONTACT GROUPS AND INFORMAL CONSULTATIONS**

**TECHNOLOGY (SBI/SBSTA):** In the morning informal consultations, parties discussed the report on the evaluation of proposals for hosting the Climate Technology Centre (CTC) (FCCC/SBI/2012/INF.4) and issues relating to the Advisory Board.

It was noted that the host of the CTC will be selected from three short-listed candidates, namely the United Nations Environment Programme, the Global Environment Facility and Det Norske Veritas AS. The three candidates will speak to the group on Thursday morning.

Parties also heard an explanation of proposed elements of the host agreement, including: status given to the CTC within the host country; financial and staffing arrangements; relationship to the Technology Executive Committee (TEC); and cooperation with other UNFCCC bodies.

Some parties requested a more specific timeframe on the selection process, while others reiterated the need for the host to be selected by 2013. Parties also requested details on alternative approaches if the proponent with the highest ranking does not match the criteria during the negotiations, with some stressing the need for transparency in the negotiation process.

Parties also briefly discussed issues relating to the Advisory Board, including composition, responsibilities and inclusiveness in regards to gender, regions and stakeholder representation.

**APPEALS AGAINST CDM EXECUTIVE BOARD'S DECISIONS (SBI):** In the morning contact group, parties considered a Co-Chairs' draft text on appeals against decisions of the CDM Executive Board.

On eligibility criteria for members of the appeals body, BOLIVIA highlighted that they should have expertise on environmental and socio-economic issues. GRENADA noted that appeals could be made on technical grounds and proposed either listing an extensive skillset or only mentioning that members should have "ten years of relevant experience." AUSTRALIA stressed the link between functions of the appeals body and the skillset required of its members. He emphasized the need for impartiality and highlighted the possibility for judicial experts to seek outside technical assistance.

GRENADA, supported by THAILAND, suggested deleting the requirement that members must be unaffiliated with any government. AUSTRALIA preferred retaining it, highlighting a situation where an appeals body member was involved in CDM negotiations. The EU proposed that the appeals body develop a code of conduct on impartiality and independence.

Parties also addressed internal management of the appeals body, including its composition and the quorum required for decision-making.

Highlighting the importance of accountability and access to justice, the CDM WATCH stressed the need for a broad legal standing and legitimate process that enables all those affected by the the CDM to raise their concerns.

Negotiations will continue.

**NATIONAL ADAPTATION PLANS (SBI):** In the morning informal consultations, parties discussed issues relating to both financial and non-financial arrangements for the formulation and implementation of national adaptation plans (NAPs) for LDCs (FCCC/CP/2011/9/Add.1). The meeting was open to observers.

Parties highlighted the importance of institutional issues in facilitating financial and technical support for the NAP process in LDCs. Various LDC parties outlined areas where support is required, noting the need for strengthening national capacity to ensure integration of adaptation into national development.

Parties will submit inputs for a draft text to be presented at the next meeting.

**ARRANGEMENTS FOR INTERGOVERNMENTAL MEETINGS:** In the morning contact group, parties considered the organization of COP 18 and CMP 8, future sessional periods and participation of observers (FCCC/SBI/2012/11).

The G-77/CHINA and the RUSSIAN FEDERATION highlighted the need for additional negotiating time between Bonn and Doha while acknowledging financial constraints. The US, supported by CANADA and AUSTRALIA, proposed organizing workshops instead of a negotiating session. INDIA and SOUTH AFRICA said workshops could be integrated into

the negotiating process. The Secretariat confirmed that the deadline for raising funds for the proposed intersessional meeting in Bangkok is Friday next week.

SBI Chair Chruszczow encouraged Eastern European states to present an offer to host COP 19 and CMP 9 as soon as possible.

The Chair will prepare text for draft conclusions and negotiations will continue.

**LULUCF (SBSTA):** In the afternoon contact group, Co-Chair Peter Iversen (Denmark) underscored that Decision 2/CMP.7 (LULUCF) requires the SBSTA to address: more comprehensive accounting; possible additional LULUCF activities under the CDM; alternative approaches to addressing the risk of non-permanence under the CDM; and modalities and procedures for applying the concept of additionality.

Parties agreed to prioritize work and submit text, including on the first three areas of work with a focus on technical aspects and experiences.

BRAZIL drew attention to non-permanence under the CDM, in particular to issues such as liability for reversibility, consideration of buffers and insurance and its implications. BELARUS elaborated on time necessary to consider that “permanence” is achieved. The EU suggested parties also consider how the issue of addressing non-permanence would work, *inter alia*, between different commitment periods.

The Co-Chairs will prepare draft conclusions.

**PROTOTYPE OF THE REGISTRY (SBI):** The contact group considering the prototype of the NAMA Registry met in the afternoon, co-chaired by Elina Bardram (EU) and Wondwossen Sintayehu (Ethiopia).

The Secretariat briefed parties on functions of the NAMA Registry. The EU, supported by KENYA, noted the value of the Registry in matching projects with funding sources, indicating that it should not substitute other MRV requirements.

BRAZIL, supported by CHILE, SINGAPORE, CANADA, the REPUBLIC OF KOREA and SOUTH AFRICA, said access rights to the Registry should be reserved for the national UNFCCC focal points. JAPAN cautioned against overburdening the prototype as it could complicate the technical capacity of the Registry.

Mali, for the AFRICAN GROUP, supported by the US, the PHILIPPINES and ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA, requested a manual on the Registry for distribution to other NAMA stakeholders in their home countries.

The Co-Chairs will compile draft conclusions to be discussed during informal consultations on Monday.

**ANNEX I FURTHER EMISSION REDUCTIONS (AWG-KP):** During the meeting of the AWG-KP spin-off group in the morning and afternoon, Annex I parties made presentations on their submissions on QELROs (FCCC/KP/AWG/2012/MISC.1 and Add.1).

SWITZERLAND explained his country’s pledge to reduce emissions by at least 20% between the years 2013-2020 compared to 1990 levels and the possibility of increasing the target to 30% if other developed countries commit to comparable emissions reductions and economically more advanced developing countries contribute adequately according to their differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities.

NORWAY elaborated on his country’s emission reduction target of 30% by 2020, which could be increased to 40% as part of a global and comprehensive agreement beyond 2012 where major emitting parties agree on emission reductions in line with the 2°C target.

The EU discussed their 20% emission reduction target from 1990 levels by 2020, and reiterated willingness to undertake a 30% reduction target as part of a global and comprehensive agreement, provided that other developed countries commit themselves to comparable reductions and developing countries contribute adequately according to their differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities.

NEW ZEALAND explained his country’s pledge to reduce emissions by 10-20% below 1990 levels provided that: the global agreement limits temperature rise to 2°C; developed countries make comparable efforts; advanced and major-emitting developing countries take action commensurate with their capabilities; there is an effective set of rules for LULUCF; and there is recourse to international carbon market.

LICHTENSTEIN presented a reduction of at least 20% between 2013 and 2020 compared to 1990 levels, saying the level of ambition could rise to 30% if other developed countries make comparable commitments and economically more advanced developing countries also take appropriate mitigation action.

KAZAKHSTAN pledged a 15% reduction by 2020 and requested that the base year for her country be updated from 1992 to 1990. ICELAND pledged a 30% reduction in a joint effort with the EU, and emphasized its participation in the EU Emissions Trading Scheme.

During discussions delegates addressed, *inter alia*: the formula for defining QELROs for the 2013-2020 period; use of LULUCF; ways to raise the level of ambition; conditions to move to the top range of the pledges; implications for the Protocol’s environmental integrity; ways to calculate the carryover of AAUs; implications of using offsets from market-mechanisms; and existing domestic legislation.

Negotiations will continue.

### IN THE CORRIDORS

On the third day in Bonn, many delegates spent the day on substantive discussions on equity and a broad range of topics taken up in the various contact groups and informal consultations under the SBI and SBSTA.

Delegates also worked to clarify the way forward under the AWG-LCA in order to avoid stalling work. “We are working to resolve the issue as fast as possible,” one delegate said on his way to evening informal consultations on the AWG-LCA agenda. “We have too much work before Doha to get gridlocked on the agenda.” Later in the evening agreement was reported on the AWG-LCA’s agenda. A delegate found in the corridors expressing relief and delight explained that the outcome includes a footnote indicating that the “consideration of some issues may already have been concluded.”

Looking further ahead, however, some worried about financial constraints surrounding the proposed Bangkok meeting and what they alluded to as “lack of enthusiasm” from some countries to have an extra session before Doha.

With the opening plenary of the ADP scheduled for Thursday, interest is brewing on who will be chairing the new body. With three nominations, and two of them from the G-77/China, delegates speculated on how the issue will be resolved in under 24 hours. The possibility of a late night meeting in order to reach agreement in time for the opening session were among the rumored strategies.



## Sustainable Development Policy & Practice

<http://uncsd.iisd.org/>

A knowledge management project carried out by the International Institute for Sustainable Development Reporting Services (IISD RS) in collaboration with the UN System Chief Executives Board for Coordination (CEB)

This knowledgebase tracks international activities preparing for the UN Conference on Sustainable Development (UNCSD, or Rio+20).

It features:

- News on UN and intergovernmental activities (publications, meetings, statements, projects) related to the UNCSD. The posts are researched and produced by IISD's team of thematic experts, resulting in all original content, and they are searchable by several categories.
- A clickable world map, enabling searches of the latest sustainable development news by region.
- A calendar of upcoming UNCSD-related events, along with an automatically updating iCal application, through which the event data can be downloaded to your own calendar.

New posts to the knowledgebase are circulated via the *UNCSD Update*, which is distributed exclusively through the UNCSD-L listserv. UNCSD-L is a companion project managed by IISD RS. This community listserv offers participants an opportunity to post announcements regarding publications and meetings.

---

To receive the *UNCSD Update* and to subscribe to the UNCSD-L community listserv:  
<http://uncsd.iisd.org/about-the-uncsd-l-mailing-list/>

To subscribe to the iCal of UNCSD-related events:  
<http://uncsd.iisd.org/icalendar/>

Sustainable Development Policy & Practice is supported by Germany's Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU) and the European Union (EU)



Federal Ministry for the  
Environment, Nature Conservation  
and Nuclear Safety



## SB 36 AND AWG HIGHLIGHTS: THURSDAY, 17 MAY 2012

In the morning and afternoon, the opening plenary of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP) was held. The AWG-LCA opening plenary also convened in the evening, followed by the AWG-LCA contact group. In the afternoon, an in-session workshop took place under the AWG-LCA on developed countries' quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets and related assumptions and conditions. In the morning and afternoon, a number of contact groups and informal consultations took place under the SBI and SBSTA.

### ADP

**OPENING STATEMENTS:** Opening the first session of the ADP, COP 17 President Maite Nkoana-Mashabane identified the new body as an opportunity to consider what needs to be done beyond 2020. She urged parties to engage constructively and create a credible workplan, prioritizing work in such a manner that the ADP can finalize its work by 2015. She stated that "the time is now to be leaders and take decisive action to save our future."

Highlighting the ADP as an opportunity to demonstrate that multilateralism does work, UNFCCC Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres emphasized that the world made history twenty years ago by adopting the three Rio Conventions and is now in a position to write history again. She indicated that the ADP's work should be guided by both a short-term view that considers implementation and a long-term perspective that rises to the challenge of the post-2020 world.

Algeria, for the G-77/CHINA, stated that the ADP's outcome must be in line with the objective, principles and provisions of the Convention and emphasized the importance of progress under the AWG-KP and AWG-LCA. She said the ADP's work plan must be based on Decision 1/CP.17 (Establishment of an *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action), equity, common but differentiated responsibilities and the relevant provisions of the Convention.

Switzerland, for the ENVIRONMENTAL INTEGRITY GROUP (EIG), highlighted the ADP as a turning point in the UNFCCC negotiations. He identified mitigation as the core task, involving all countries in accordance with their common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, while also addressing adaptation, finance, technology and capacity

building. The EIG called for a solid work plan, agreed in Bonn, that includes milestones and a timetable, and leads to a smooth adoption of the future regime in 2015.

The EU emphasized that their decision to participate in a second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol was taken in the context of the wider package in Durban that leads to transition toward a single global agreement. He said a new protocol would be the most effective form of such an agreement, and identified the need to discuss how the new protocol can allow sustainable development at the same time as delivering the necessary emission reductions by all parties. On the mitigation workplan, the EU identified the process of closing the mitigation gap as an iterative one whereby the gap is assessed, options to increase ambition are identified and the appropriate decisions are taken.

Australia, for the UMBRELLA GROUP, underscored the Durban Platform as a universal platform to take international efforts on climate change forward by providing a "common ground" for all countries. He suggested focusing the work in Bonn on defining the ADP's work plan and added that the establishment of low-carbon development pathways is key to addressing climate change without sacrificing economic growth or development.

The Gambia, for LDCs, highlighted that the ADP's mandate provides an opportunity to enhance the mitigation ambition and adopt a new protocol under the Convention applicable to all, taking into consideration equity and common but differentiated responsibilities. He suggested identifying deliverables for each COP in the context of a three-year programme that would allow incorporating inputs from, *inter alia*, the IPCC Fifth Assessment Report. He underscored that the work of the ADP must not be seen as an opportunity to postpone action, and stressed the importance of the second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol.

Nauru, for AOSIS, expressed hope that the ADP would demonstrate a "sober, serious and determined sense of urgency and ambition." She called for a mitigation work programme that makes strides in closing the recognized mitigation ambition gap.

Swaziland, for the AFRICAN GROUP, said the establishment of the ADP should result in a strengthened multilateral, rule-based climate change regime, emphasizing the need for significant scaling up of developed country mitigation ambition.



Egypt, for the ARAB GROUP, stressed that negotiations under the ADP must seek to ensure the full and effective implementation of the Convention. He also emphasized the need to respect, and not renegotiate, the principles that govern international action.

Papua New Guinea, for the COALITION OF RAINFOREST NATIONS, stated that an international legal instrument is needed now, as 2020 is too late. She underscored the important role of REDD+ in the new regime. India, for BASIC, said that the full elaboration of the ADP's work plan will be possible only after the AWG-LCA and AWG-KP have concluded their work and that an outcome should reflect the historical responsibility of developed countries.

Tajikistan, for MOUNTAINOUS LANDLOCKED DEVELOPING COUNTRIES, said a new legally-binding agreement must build upon the Convention's principles and suggested that a contact group be formed to get work underway. CHILE, for several Latin American countries, said the results of the ADP should take the form of a protocol or some other legally-binding instrument under the Convention, and underscored the importance of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities. The Democratic Republic of Congo, for COMIFAC, said the new working group should lead to the adoption of a new binding accord and that the ADP should treat adaptation and mitigation "on equal footing."

Honduras, for SICA, said: adaptation is the priority for the majority of developing countries, in particular for the most vulnerable ones; the ADP outcome must be based on the Convention's provisions and principles, including equity and common but differentiated responsibilities. Argentina, for a number of countries, emphasized that an ADP outcome should be in accordance with the Convention's principles, recognizing the different nature of developing and developed countries' obligations. He added that developing countries' voluntary NAMAs are related to the provision of finance, technology and capacity building, and suggested that the ADP's work plan first focus on the scope of the work, including on guiding principles.

BINGOs suggested strengthening the avenues for the business and private sector to contribute to the ADP's work in areas such as finance, innovation, MRV, and new market mechanisms.

Climate Action Network, for ENGOs, urged increasing mitigation ambition through, *inter alia*, closing loopholes, eliminating fossil subsidies, and adopting an ADP work plan with milestones.

ICLEI, for LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND MUNICIPAL AUTHORITIES, underscored that there is a "dangerous gap" between now and 2020 that needs to be addressed by increasing mitigation ambition. He highlighted the key role of local governments in successfully implementing climate change policies.

WOMEN AND GENDER CONSTITUENCY cautioned against exacerbating gender inequalities and identified the need to integrate human and social dimensions into the climate change negotiations. She suggested a workshop on gender equality.

YOUNGOs said: the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities is not negotiable; the integrity of the Convention should not be undermined; and closing the ambition gap should be a priority for the ADP.

**ELECTION OF OFFICERS:** Reconvening the ADP plenary in the afternoon, COP Vice-President Robert Van Lierop (Suriname) explained that intensive consultations have taken place before and during the Bonn meeting concerning the Chairs of the ADP. He noted, however, that the issue remains unresolved and urged parties to be flexible and agree on nominees for the Chair and Vice-Chair so that the ADP can begin its work as soon

as possible. He also explained that a proposal has been made to elect the Chair at this session and continue consultations on the election of other officers until Doha. Groups have until noon on Friday, 18 May, to consult on this proposal.

#### AWG-LCA

**PLENARY:** In the evening, the AWG-LCA plenary convened. AWG-LCA Chair Tayeb reported that agreement on the agenda and the way forward had been reached during informal consultations. He highlighted the Bali Action Plan as the original mandate of the AWG-LCA and parties' appreciation of the significant work done since its adoption. He stressed that there was no desire to renegotiate what has already been agreed and noted that there are clearly mandated tasks from COP 17 for the AWG-LCA to complete this year.

AWG-LCA Chair Tayeb reported that the specific elements of the agreement that has been reached were to: adopt the agenda with a footnote stating that items on the agenda enjoy different levels of progress through decisions adopted by COP 16 and 17, and some items may not need further work under the AWG-LCA taking into account the progress made; proceed in the single contact group and rapidly launch spin-off groups to consider tasks mandated in Durban; and evaluate progress through the single contact group to decide where additional spin-off groups are needed. AWG-LCA Chair Tayeb also said he will consult informally on Annex I parties whose special circumstances have been recognized by the COP.

Parties then adopted the agenda with a footnote (FCCC/AWG/LCA/2012/L.1) and agreed to establish a single AWG-LCA contact group.

**CONTACT GROUP:** In the evening, the AWG-LCA contact group convened, chaired by AWG-LCA Chair Tayeb. Parties debated whether spin-off groups would only focus on the implementation of tasks mandated by COP 17 or if they should adopt a broad-based approach and also consider related issues under a particular agenda item. Agreement was finally reached to launch spin-off groups on tasks mandated by COP 17, including on: shared vision; developed country mitigation; developing country mitigation; REDD+; sectoral approaches; various approaches, including markets; and Review. Progress made and the need for spin-off groups on other issues will be discussed in the contact group.

**IN-SESSION WORKSHOP:** In the afternoon, the AWG-LCA in-session workshop on clarification of developed country parties' quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets and related assumptions and conditions took place, facilitated by Andrej Kranjc (Slovenia).

The Secretariat introduced the updated technical paper (FCCC/TP/2012/2) on assumptions, conditions, commonalities and differences in approaches concerning developed country quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets, and comparison of the level of emission reduction efforts.

The EU provided an overview of their emission reduction pledge, highlighting that mitigation by developed and developing countries forms the cornerstone of 2020 reductions to limit global temperature increase to below 2°C.

The US clarified their pledge of reducing emissions by 17% below 2005 levels by 2020 and provided an overview of domestic emission reduction initiatives, highlighting the transport sector.

NEW ZEALAND explained that his country is prepared to take on an emission reduction target of 10-20% below 1990 levels by 2020, if there is a global comprehensive agreement that would have to meet a number of conditions.

AUSTRALIA presented on their 2020 pledges and low-carbon emissions strategy. He said a 5% reduction below 2000 levels is

unconditional, a reduction of 15% is subject to strict conditions and a reduction of 25% is contingent on comprehensive global action.

CANADA discussed an emissions reduction target of 17% from 2005 levels by 2020 highlighting a domestic sector-by-sector emissions reduction plan.

SWITZERLAND provided an overview of their unconditional reduction target of 20% below 1990 levels by 2020 and highlighted that the commitment could be increased to 30% subject to comparable commitments by developed countries and adequate contributions from economically more advanced developing countries in accordance with common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities.

NORWAY encouraged countries that have not yet communicated their pledges to do so and explained their 30% target relative to 1990 levels by 2020, which can be increased to 40% if major emitting countries agree to commitments that would limit global warming to 2°C, focusing on manufacturing, transport and petroleum sectors.

AOSIS presented on assessing the scale of the ambition gap through common accounting rules and expressed concern that more effort is needed for a number of countries to meet their current pledges.

Following the presentations, parties discussed, *inter alia*: regional cap-and-trade initiatives, supplementarity of market-based mechanisms, level of ambition, conditionalities on moving to the upper range of the pledges, accounting for LULUCF and the ability of parties to meet their targets.

#### **SBI AND SBSTA CONTACT GROUPS AND INFORMAL CONSULTATIONS**

**LOSS AND DAMAGE (SBI):** Informal consultations on loss and damage continued in the morning and were open to observers.

The G-77/CHINA, the AFRICAN GROUP, LDCs, AOSIS and the US said that cross-cutting issues under the three thematic areas of the work programme need to be addressed in a holistic manner.

The G-77/CHINA suggested that a draft decision text should be annexed to the SBI conclusions. AOSIS called for discussion on risk management and the impacts of slow-onset events. The US said it is important to consider biophysical risks together with socio-economic vulnerability and proposed using a combination of bottom-up and top-down approaches. She stressed the need to bridge the gap between data users and data providers. The EU highlighted that inaccurate communication of risks can lead to inadequate responses.

AUSTRALIA stressed the link between discussions on loss and damage and national adaptation plans (NAPs) and, supported by the US, proposed that regional meetings focus on risk reduction, retention and transfer.

Draft conclusions will be prepared and the negotiations will continue.

**NATIONAL ADAPTATION PLANS (SBI):** Informal consultations on NAPs took place in the afternoon and the meeting was open to observers.

Co-Chair Addulla introduced the draft text, prepared based on parties' submissions and interventions. He summarized the draft text, which includes, *inter alia*: facilitation of country-driven NAPs; streamlining the LDC Fund to support the NAP process; the use of national and regional centers and networks; and sharing of best practices in adaptation.

Parties then proposed additions to the text which included implementation, support programmes and guidance on finance.

Some parties requested streamlining the text, the consideration

of which will continue at the next meeting.

**FORUM ON RESPONSE MEASURES (SBI/SBSTA):** In the afternoon, SBI Chair Chruszczow and SBSTA Chair Muyungi opened the joint SBI and SBSTA forum on the impact of the implementation of response measures.

Parties shared views on how to organize the work of the forum. Argentina, for the G77/CHINA, called for a clear set of modalities for the operationalization of the forum and work programme, including, *inter alia*: assigning specific tasks and activities for the rest of the year and creating an outline schedule for 2013 to address the specific needs and concerns of developing country parties. South Africa, for the AFRICAN GROUP, stressed economic and social impacts of trade and trade-related measures adopted by developed countries.

The US, supported by AUSTRALIA, suggested that parties focus discussions on how to undertake the consolidation of response measures issues. The EU suggested that a forum take place in an open context to include non-parties, such as civil society and experts. AUSTRALIA said work should focus on substantial points of convergence on issues to be addressed in the work programme.

CHINA stressed the importance of the forum to minimize or prevent the negative impacts of response measures, and expressed concern with the inclusion of aviation in the EU Emissions Trading Scheme. SAUDI ARABIA suggested exchanging information through, *inter alia*, workshops. Parties agreed to share further views on the way forward and submit information to the Secretariat for further guidance.

#### **IN THE CORRIDORS**

The corridors were once again buzzing with speculations and murmurs of anticipation about the Chairs of the ADP and other outstanding nominations.

After enthusiastic opening statements under the ADP in the morning, work under the new body in the afternoon was confined to a brief announcement that consultations on its Chairs remain inconclusive. By the end of the day, parties had not made significant progress on the selection of the Chairs and rumors circulated on the reasons for the deadlock and the possible ways forward. Some speculated that one of the candidates was only willing to accept the position of Chair and not Vice-Chair, while others mentioned that the idea of having two Co-Chairs had also been raised.

"To be honest it's unlikely that a decision will be made in Bonn," predicted one delegate, who expressed disappointment at the delay. Those eager to start working stressed that the selection process does not necessarily need to delay negotiations as substantive work could be launched regardless. One delegate even suggested that the COP President provisionally chair the body until a decision has been reached. Others, however, felt that at least one Chair must be appointed before work of the ADP begins.

On the Green Climate Fund Board, things were apparently not looking so green as the announcement was made that the Board's first meeting, scheduled for the end of May, was postponed pending the process of nominations. According to one delegate, although most groups have nominated their proposed Board members, others have chosen to go way beyond the call of duty and nominate more than their share of the composition. "There will be trouble, but I guess we will just have to see until all have submitted nominations," said one high-level delegate.

As the AWG-LCA contact group closed its meeting late in the evening, the fate of the leadership of the ADP hung in the air, like the GHG emissions that continue to fuel the climate process.



iisd | Reporting  
Services

## International Institute for Sustainable Development Reporting Services (IISD RS) Knowledge Management Resources

IISD RS, publisher of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin*, also maintains online knowledgebases that are updated daily with information regarding meetings, publications and other activities related to international sustainable development policy and its implementation.

Each knowledgebase project consists of several integrated resources, to help the sustainable development policy and practice communities assess trends and activities at the international level. These resources are:

- Daily news reports researched and written by our own experts and organized in a **freely accessible, searchable on-line knowledgebase**;
- A **comprehensive calendar of upcoming events** related to international sustainable development policy, which can be downloaded to your own online calendar;
- And a **community listserve**, which exclusively delivers email updates of the most recent additions to our knowledgebases, as well as announcements by listserve members regarding their organizations' sustainable development activities.

Each knowledgebase focuses on a specific environmental challenge or region, as noted below:



**Sustainable Development Policy & Practice**  
<http://uncsd.iisd.org/>



**Climate Change Policy & Practice**  
<http://climate-l.iisd.org/>



**SIDS Policy & Practice**  
<http://sids-l.iisd.org/>



**Biodiversity Policy & Practice**  
<http://biodiversity-l.iisd.org/>



**Sustainable Energy Policy & Practice**  
<http://energy-l.iisd.org/>



**Latin America & Caribbean Regional Coverage**  
<http://larc.iisd.org/>



**African Regional Coverage**  
<http://africasd.iisd.org/>

## SB 36 AND AWG HIGHLIGHTS: FRIDAY, 18 MAY 2012

In the afternoon, the opening plenary of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP) reconvened. In the afternoon, an in-session workshop took place under the AWG-LCA to further the understanding of the diversity of NAMAs by developing countries. In the morning and afternoon, a number of contact groups and informal consultations took place under the SBI, SBSTA, AWG-KP and AWG-LCA.

### ADP

In the evening, the ADP opening plenary reconvened, presided by COP Vice-President Robert Van Lierop (Suriname).

CHINA, supported by SAUDI ARABIA, EGYPT, INDIA and KUWAIT, made a point of order, emphasizing a potential conflict of interest given that COP Vice-President Van Lierop was nominated to the COP Bureau by the Latin American and Caribbean Group (GRULAC). He stressed that the COP Vice-President represents the same regional group as one of the three candidates for the ADP Chair and should therefore refrain from taking part in the proceedings concerning the election of the ADP Bureau.

BARBADOS, supported by the US, the EU, GRENADA, AUSTRALIA and others, said that the COP Vice-President has been elected to serve by the COP and calls for his removal are “unjustified” and “unfortunate.”

The Secretariat clarified that members of the COP Bureau do not represent party or regional interests and there is an assumption of impartiality. He also pointed out that the COP President, in her absence, can designate a COP Vice-President to preside at a meeting and that in doing so, the COP Vice-President would not represent the interests of GRULAC.

COP Vice-President Lierop declined to recuse himself, undertaking to conduct himself impartially. He explained that consultations on the election of the ADP Bureau by Ambassador Noziphoy Joyce Mxakato-Diseko, South Africa, had been inconclusive.

Reporting on the consultations, Ambassador Diseko raised the possibility of the ADP Bureau being elected by a vote in accordance with the COP draft rules of procedure.

Expressing regret for the situation, the Gambia, for LDCs, supported by Guyana, for GRULAC, the EU, the US, AUSTRALIA, AOSIS and the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, proposed that the COP Presidency preside over the ADP until matters concerning the election of its Bureau are resolved. Swaziland, for the AFRICAN GROUP, called for consultations to be concluded during the current session in Bonn.

After further discussion, including a request for clarification from China on what the “COP Presidency” refers to and who the COP President could designate to chair on her behalf, parties agreed that the COP Presidency would preside over the ADP during the Bonn session, while consultations continue on the election of officers.

### AWG-LCA

In the afternoon, the AWG-LCA in-session workshop to further the understanding of the diversity of NAMAs by developing country parties, underlying assumptions, and any support needed for implementation of these actions took place.

BRAZIL observed that his country’s mitigation actions are expected to result in a reduction of 36.1-38.9% below projected emissions in 2020 and highlighted reductions in deforestation and emission reductions in agriculture and energy sectors.

AOSIS called for common accounting rules for non-Annex I parties and cautioned that even if indicators presented by China, Brazil and India are achieved, their emissions will increase. She also elaborated on innovative mitigation initiatives in SIDS.

The GAMBIA presented on his country’s NAMAs, focusing on the energy and transport sectors. He emphasized the need for financial, technological and capacity-building assistance.

The REPUBLIC OF KOREA presented on his country’s low-carbon green growth strategy of reducing emissions by 30% compared to business as usual. He also emphasized that legislation on a national emissions trading scheme has been adopted.

BANGLADESH said his country is in the initial stages of developing NAMAs and that mitigation action will be focused on energy transformation and consumption, LULUCF and industry.

GEORGIA said his country pursues the goal of becoming a major regional exporter of “green power,” and elaborated on a potential NAMA in the energy sector on renewable energy.



CHINA highlighted that his country has submitted a pledge to lower emissions by 40-45% per unit of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) by 2020 compared with the 2005 level. He underscored his country's work programme for national economic and social development aimed at emission reductions and said mitigation actions are implemented through, *inter alia*: promoting energy conservation, developing low-carbon energy and increasing carbon sinks.

CHILE said a national low-emissions development strategy is being developed through a government-led, multistakeholder, participative process and presented a list of NAMAs under development, including in the transport, forestry, transportation and waste sectors.

MALAWI underscored his country's intention to prepare more detailed concept notes for NAMAs to be implemented as pilot projects in the energy, agriculture, forestry and waste sectors, saying criteria for NAMA selection includes, *inter alia*: high level of replicability and potential entry points for business investments.

MEXICO highlighted his country's Special Programme on Climate Change (PECC) and elaborated on a recently passed law on climate change. He highlighted that the pledge to reduce emissions by 30% compared to business as usual scenario by 2020 is unconditional and will be implemented through the national budget.

The EU underscored uncertainties around assumptions and conditions attached to NAMAs. He emphasized that these can have a substantial impact on expected global emissions, highlighting uncertainties relating to the definition of "business as usual." He supported requesting that the Secretariat develop a technical paper to drive the discussion forward and organizing another workshop, focusing on capturing the diversity of NAMAs in a structured manner, including information on the implementation of pledges and low-emissions development strategies.

The CLIMATE ACTION NETWORK (CAN) elaborated on the role of low-carbon development strategies in enabling equitable access to sustainable development and said credited NAMAs should avoid undermining the environmental integrity of global mitigation action and double counting.

Following the presentations, parties discussed, *inter alia*: intensity targets by some countries; inclusion of CDM in NAMAs; reporting and accounting rules for non-Annex I parties; greenhouse gases and sectors covered; avoiding double counting; national monitoring systems; and institutional arrangements.

#### **CONTACT GROUPS AND INFORMAL CONSULTATIONS**

**AGRICULTURE (SBSTA):** During morning informal consultations, parties exchanged views on how issues relating to agriculture should be taken up under the SBSTA. Many parties referred to their submissions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/MISC.6 and Add. 1-2), highlighting the need to, *inter alia*: ensure that work on agriculture is consistent with the SBSTA mandate in Convention Article 9 (the scope of technical, scientific and methodological work); assess existing scientific and technological knowledge on agriculture and climate change; increase knowledge sharing; enhance information on "knowledge gaps;" improve agricultural productivity and resilience in the context of climate change; and improve capacity building in developing countries.

Many developing countries underscored the importance

of adaptation and its relative priority compared to mitigation. They also highlighted the need to achieve food security and the importance of technology transfer. Some countries called for a dialogue on how to facilitate, *inter alia*, technology transfer and innovation. Others called for a work programme to move the process forward. A developing country suggested workshops as a useful way forward. A developed country noted the need to learn more from external bodies and organizations, such as the IPCC. Another developed country highlighted the need to recognize the site-specific nature of agriculture. A representative from the IPCC provided an overview of how agriculture is being treated in the Fifth Assessment Report.

Informal consultations will continue.

**LOSS AND DAMAGE (SBI):** During the morning informal consultations that were open to observers, parties exchanged views on the Co-Chairs' draft text and proposal by the G-77/China to annex a draft decision text to the conclusions.

LDCs, the AFRICAN GROUP and AOSIS expressed readiness to work on framing the decision. Stressing the importance of staying within the group's mandate, several developed countries said it is premature to annex decision text before considering a technical paper on slow-onset events and the outcomes of the four upcoming workshops. As a way forward, Co-Chair Lemmen proposed an informal meeting to be held immediately before Doha to consider inputs from the workshops and the technical paper. Several parties indicated the need to consider the Co-Chairs' proposal within negotiating groups.

On the text, parties flagged some points that have not been reflected and the US pointed to convergence on key messages.

The Co-Chairs will consult informally and a drafting group will convene.

**AWG-LCA CONTACT GROUP:** In the morning contact group, parties focused on identifying elements that require further consideration and have not been assigned to spin-off groups.

On response measures, SAUDI ARABIA proposed considering intellectual property rights (IPRs). With CHINA, KUWAIT, VENEZUELA, ARGENTINA, INDIA and others, opposed by the EU, SINGAPORE, MEXICO, AUSTRALIA and the US, he also suggested considering trade measures.

Algeria, for the AFRICAN GROUP, the PHILIPPINES, ARGENTINA, NICARAGUA and other developing countries called for establishing a spin-off group on adaptation, noting the need to further consider national adaptation plans for developing countries that are not LDCs. On adaptation, Bangladesh, for LDCs, also drew attention to gaps in terms of scaling up support, transparency, accounting, risk management and risk reduction strategies. SAUDI ARABIA called for addressing economic diversification to build resilience and EGYPT highlighted vulnerability assessments and developing countries' urgent needs.

The Philippines, for the G-77/CHINA, highlighted that some areas of the Bali Action Plan have not been thoroughly addressed and that the mechanisms established for adaptation and other issues are not yet operational.

Opposing the establishment of a spin-off group on adaptation, SWITZERLAND, NORWAY, the EU and other developed countries pointed to progress and current work under other bodies on, *inter alia*, the Adaptation Committee, and loss and damage.

On technology, many developing countries supported establishing a spin-off group. The G-77/CHINA underscored the issue as one of the four pillars of the Bali Action Plan and called

for further discussions, in particular on IPRs. Algeria, for the AFRICAN GROUP, called for a clear distinction between issues to be addressed under the ADP for the post-2020 regime and issues to be finished by the AWG-LCA.

Many developed countries drew attention to progress on technology and its consideration under other UNFCCC bodies. The US and SINGAPORE indicated that there are other avenues to discuss IPRs. JAPAN, the EU and other developed countries opposed a spin-off group on technology. BOLIVIA suggested further discussion on, *inter alia*, barriers to development and transfer of technologies and IPRs that are in the public domain.

On capacity building, China, for the G-77/CHINA, supported further discussion on, *inter alia*: institutions, financial mechanisms, monitoring and performance tools. The PHILIPPINES highlighted means of implementation. Drawing attention to the recently established Durban Forum for in-depth discussion on capacity building, the US, the EU and other developed countries opposed having a spin-off group.

On other matters and countries with economies in transition to a market economy, BELARUS, for Kazakhstan, Ukraine and the Russian Federation, supported a spin-off group on the issue to complete work.

Discussions on items such as finance will continue at the next contact group meeting.

**CONVENTION ARTICLE 6 (education, training and public awareness) (SBI):** In the afternoon informal consultations that were open to observers, parties focused on a draft proposal by the G-77/China on the Doha Work Programme on Convention Article 6.

YOUNGOS, CAN and LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND MUNICIPAL AUTHORITIES identified issues that should be emphasized in the text, including: gender; local communities; and specific reporting requirements.

Dominica, for the G-77/CHINA, introduced their draft text which is divided into a preamble, recommendations to be considered for the Doha Work Programme, the role of the Secretariat and intergovernmental organizations. The EU suggested the inclusion of a section on the role of parties in the work programme. AUSTRALIA and the US discussed the proposed eight-year work programme with a mid-term review in 2016.

Parties will submit proposals and a draft text will be prepared. Informal consultations will continue.

**SHARED VISION (AWG-LCA):** The spin-off group met in the afternoon to discuss the way forward.

Facilitator Zou Ji (China) asked parties to consider the following three options on how to move forward: numbers and context; range of numbers and context; or process and mechanism to identify and elaborate on numbers, range and context.

Many parties highlighted the importance of discussing the issues simultaneously, but views were divergent on the starting point of discussions.

BRAZIL, NORWAY, SWITZERLAND and the EU suggested that the group first address ways to move forward before deciding on substance of discussion.

Discussion on context was supported by AUSTRALIA, MEXICO, the EU, SOUTH AFRICA, Antigua and Barbuda, for AOSIS, India, for the G-77/CHINA, the US, BOLIVIA, SINGAPORE and CHILE. The US, BOLIVIA, JAPAN, CHILE, MEXICO and COLOMBIA highlighted global goal and peaking

of emissions as the focus of the group.

Botswana, for the AFRICAN GROUP, Uganda, for LDCs, and the PHILIPPINES highlighted means of implementation and support as a possible way forward.

Parties will submit text for a summary to be discussed at the next informal consultation.

#### **ANNEX I FURTHER COMMITMENTS (AWG-KP):**

In the afternoon, the AWG-KP contact group convened to hear progress reports from the spin-off group on numbers and text, and from the informal consultations on legal and procedural issues.

On numbers and text, Co-Facilitator Lefevere reported that parties had made presentations on their QELRO submissions and highlighted issues discussed, including: clarification of QELRO submissions and associated conditions; views on market mechanisms; national policies implemented to support QELROs; and preferences for the length of the second commitment period.

In the ensuing discussion, parties considered several issues, including: concerns regarding the length of the second commitment period; ways to structure Annex B; and rules to translate pledges into QELROs. Parties agreed to focus the next spin-off group on carry-over of AAUs, drawing on proposals from Durban and new ideas that parties have put forward in Bonn.

On legal and procedural issues, AWG-KP Vice-Chair Uosukainen reported on informal consultations, which focused on: how to secure continuity between the first and second commitment periods; the application of accounting rules in the second commitment period; different ideas on provisional application to secure continuity; and ways to raise the ambition levels during the second commitment period. Parties agreed to address some of these issues in the spin-off group, and an additional informal consultation may be convened.

#### **IN THE CORRIDORS**

Friday night brought the ADP to the fore once again, and the corridors were filled with both excitement and discontent over the opening plenary of the new body. "This was quite something," commented one delegate exiting the plenary tent. "I have never seen anything like this," declared another.

As the ADP plenary convened just before 6 pm, "intense moments" followed.

Points of orders were the flavor of the night as the session progressed. However, delegates' reaction to the first point of order by China was unexpected and raised a few laughs, as half the room stood up and rushed to the door as soon as the delegate started speaking. Luckily, it had nothing to do with his intervention, but rather the need for headsets and translation to understand the point of order made in Chinese.

The mood quickly turned serious again. After legal advice from the Secretariat that COP Bureau members do not represent parties or regional interests, COP Vice-President Van Lierop's passionate assurances that he was acting in the interest of all parties when presiding over the ADP was met by thundering applause.

Because of the unresolved issue of the ADP Bureau members, the prospect of the ballot box was mooted in plenary just in case the controversy over the Chair of the ADP was not finally resolved through "less radical" means. Exiting the plenary, one relieved delegate sighed, "That was a lucky escape, I thought I was going to have to cast my vote tonight."



## Sustainable Development Policy & Practice

<http://uncsd.iisd.org/>

A knowledge management project carried out by the International Institute for Sustainable Development Reporting Services (IISD RS) in collaboration with the UN System Chief Executives Board for Coordination (CEB)

This knowledgebase tracks international activities preparing for the UN Conference on Sustainable Development (UNCSD, or Rio+20).

It features:

- News on UN and intergovernmental activities (publications, meetings, statements, projects) related to the UNCSD. The posts are researched and produced by IISD's team of thematic experts, resulting in all original content, and they are searchable by several categories.
- A clickable world map, enabling searches of the latest sustainable development news by region.
- A calendar of upcoming UNCSD-related events, along with an automatically updating iCal application, through which the event data can be downloaded to your own calendar.

New posts to the knowledgebase are circulated via the *UNCSD Update*, which is distributed exclusively through the UNCSD-L listserve. UNCSD-L is a companion project managed by IISD RS. This community listserve offers participants an opportunity to post announcements regarding publications and meetings.

---

To receive the *UNCSD Update* and to subscribe to the UNCSD-L community listserve:  
<http://uncsd.iisd.org/about-the-uncsd-l-mailing-list/>

To subscribe to the iCal of UNCSD-related events:  
<http://uncsd.iisd.org/icalendar/>

Sustainable Development Policy & Practice is supported by Germany's Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU) and the European Union (EU)



Federal Ministry for the  
Environment, Nature Conservation  
and Nuclear Safety



## SB 36 AND AWG HIGHLIGHTS: SATURDAY, 19 MAY 2012

In the morning, the plenary of the ADP took place, and an in-session workshop was held under the AWG-LCA on a framework for various approaches. In the afternoon, an AWG-LCA in-session workshop took place on the new market-based mechanism.

In the morning and afternoon, a number of contact groups and informal consultations took place under the SBI, SBSTA, AWG-KP and AWG-LCA.

### ADP

Reconvening the ADP plenary in the morning, COP Vice-President Van Lierop informed parties that the COP 17 President had designated Sandea de Wet (South Africa) to preside over the ADP on her behalf and urged parties to intensify their efforts in informal consultations facilitated by Ambassador Diseko so that the ADP Bureau can be elected by the end of the Bonn session.

Chair de Wet encouraged parties to work hard with Ambassador Diseko to reach agreement on the election of officers. She also congratulated parties for allowing the ADP's work to proceed pending these consultations. Chair de Wet then proposed that parties adopt the agenda (FCCC/ADP/2012/1).

SAUDI ARABIA argued that the agenda can only be adopted by an elected officer and questioned how the ADP can begin work when it does not have an elected Chair. He expressed willingness to work on the provisional agenda and organization of work in an informal setting. Many parties recalled the agreement from Friday that the COP Presidency guide discussions under the ADP pending agreement on its Chairs, and affirmed the legitimacy of the proceedings. The Secretariat clarified that according to the draft rules of procedure, it is the ADP that adopts its agenda and the Chair simply facilitates the process. He noted that there is no legal impediment to the ADP adopting its agenda.

CHINA requested the Secretariat to explain the rationale of the items on the ADP's provisional agenda. The Secretariat responded that item 3 (planning of work in accordance with Decision 1/CP.17) and item 4 (workplan on enhancing mitigation ambition) were placed on the provisional agenda on the basis of Decision 1/CP.17 (Establishment of an *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Durban Platform on Enhanced Action).

CHINA urged careful consideration of the structure of Decision 1/CP.17. He questioned whether item 4 should be placed on the ADP's agenda and noted that Decision 1/CP.17 does not specify that the work plan on enhancing mitigation ambition should be under the ADP. He emphasized a post-2020 outlook as the ADP's core task, and also noted that raising the level of ambition does not refer only to mitigation but also to means of implementation in terms of technology, finance and capacity building.

Nauru, for AOSIS, the Gambia, for LDCs, BARBADOS, GRENADA, SWITZERLAND, the EU, the US, MEXICO, SINGAPORE, AUSTRALIA, JAPAN and COSTA RICA urged the adoption of the agenda as proposed. GRENADA suggested that work be prioritized once the agenda has been adopted.

The EU stressed that the work plan on enhancing mitigation ambition was a core element of the Durban package. BARBADOS explained that a draft decision had been proposed in Durban that included only a post-2020 outlook but the most vulnerable countries had rejected this proposal. He suggested modifying item 4 by adding a reference to "pre-2020 mitigation ambition."

CHINA suggested amending agenda item 3 to "planning of the work on mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology development and transfer, transparency of action and support, and capacity building." He also called for deleting item 4. SINGAPORE cautioned against listing specific issues to avoid a potential exclusion of those not listed.

BRAZIL recognized that the work plan on enhancing mitigation ambition is part of the agreement on the ADP, highlighting that discussions around this issue will be broader than a simple reference to mitigation. He stressed that the main focus of the ADP's work will be on negotiations for the new instrument and that the two elements of its work will be separate.

VENEZUELA noted her country's formal reservation to Decision 1/CP.17 in Durban and highlighted that developed countries had already "violated" the Durban package by not putting on the table their QELROs for the second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol. Supported by BOLIVIA, she requested adding a footnote to the agenda to indicate that: "the implementation of Decision 1/CP.17 should be examined on the basis of its compliance with international law, in accordance with the principle of *pacta sunt servanda* and, in particular, with

the exception on non-performance related to the full respect and compliance with the UNFCCC and its Kyoto Protocol, for the parties that are parties of those instruments.”

VENEZUELA stressed that the footnote is “indispensable” for her country’s support for the adoption of the agenda. The US, SINGAPORE and SWITZERLAND expressed preference for not including a footnote.

SINGAPORE suggested that agenda item 3 be adopted as proposed, while item 4 on the work plan on mitigation ambition be amended by adding “in accordance with Decision 1/CP.17.”

The PHILIPPINES, supported by EGYPT, cautioned against “cherry-picking” from Decision 1/CP.17. He proposed deleting item 4 and amending item 3 to “planning of work in accordance with all the elements of Decision 1/CP.17.”

JAPAN stressed the need to start substantive work as soon as possible and said the current provisional agenda is general enough to accommodate parties’ concerns.

Chair de Wet stressed that the Durban outcome was “a very balanced one,” saying it will be difficult to delete agenda items. She urged parties to adopt the agenda as originally proposed, thereby sending “a tremendous” message to the international community that parties are ready to begin work under the ADP.

The PHILIPPINES, supported by ECUADOR, BOLIVIA, MALAYSIA, ARGENTINA, IRAN and others, opposed adopting the agenda and stressed his earlier proposal to delete item 4 and amend item 3 to include “all elements of” Decision 1/CP.17. GRENADA, the EU, BARBADOS and others opposed this proposal. With SWITZERLAND and others, they reiterated their support for adopting the agenda as originally proposed by the Chair.

Stressing the need to reflect all parties’ views, CHINA highlighted the “constructive proposal” by the Philippines and said discussions on how to organize work in more concrete terms can take place once the agenda has been adopted.

SINGAPORE, supported by CHILE, the US, the REPUBLIC OF KOREA, COSTA RICA, COLOMBIA and the GAMBIA, reiterated his proposal, clarifying that it aims to maintain a distinction between the two agenda items and retains item 4, while adding the words “in accordance with Decision 1/CP.17.”

After further discussion, SINGAPORE proposed combining item 3 as amended by the Philippines and item 4 as amended by himself. No agreement was reached.

Lamenting that his suggestion to hold item 4 in abeyance had not been proposed to parties, CHINA sought clarification on the definition of the “Presidency” and whether the COP President has unlimited power to designate anyone to preside over the ADP. Chair de Wet stressed that no country has intervened in support of China’s proposal. She proposed launching substantive work provisionally on the basis of the proposed agenda while conducting informal consultations on the agenda.

The meeting was adjourned shortly after 3:00 pm, following a point of order from China concerning the lack of interpretation. Chair de Wet informed delegates that the ADP plenary is likely to reconvene on Tuesday.

#### AWG-LCA

**WORKSHOP ON A FRAMEWORK FOR VARIOUS APPROACHES:** In the morning, an in-session workshop took place under the AWG-LCA.

**General considerations for a framework for various approaches:** The first session focused on general considerations for different approaches outside the UNFCCC that could be included under a framework, including market-based mechanisms and non-market-based mechanisms.

The Secretariat reported on submissions from parties and observers (FCCC/AWGLCA/2012/MISC.4 and Add.1), outlining commonalities and differences, and highlighting references to governance structure, purpose and relationship with the new market-based mechanism.

JAPAN highlighted his country’s views on various approaches, including opportunities for using markets. He noted that the existing market mechanisms and party-driven approaches should complement each other.

The UNITED ARAB EMIRATES presented on the role of the frameworks in providing a platform for transparency.

BOLIVIA introduced the Climate Justice mechanism, a proposal that operates on the principle of equity.

**Designing and implementing a credible system:** The second session addressed requirements to ensure the environmental integrity and credibility of market-based and non-market-based mechanisms.

The CENTRE FOR EUROPEAN POLICY STUDIES highlighted issues to consider, including: the relationship between UNFCCC and non-UNFCCC mechanisms; views on what constitutes a standard for the new market-based mechanisms; and the scope of a standard’s application.

The ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE FUND presented information on a credible system for enhancing the effectiveness of new market-based mechanisms and reducing risk, noting a “continuum of possibilities” for UNFCCC involvement.

The INSTITUTE FOR POLICY STUDIES elaborated on “lessons learned” from the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM), including the need to define minimum standards and enhance the appeals process.

The COALITION FOR RAINFOREST NATIONS explored the role of REDD+ in a new market-based mechanism.

In the ensuing discussions, BOLIVIA expressed “deep concern” over a REDD+ market mechanism, noting the lack of measures for transparency and integrity. The COALITION FOR RAINFOREST NATIONS underscored the need for national monitoring systems. SIERRA LEONE asked if bilateral or domestic markets will undermine the environmental integrity of market mechanisms, and the ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE FUND underscored the importance of standards for transparency and environmental integrity.

**Managing possible risks:** The third session focused on risks posed by counting identical mitigation efforts across more than one mechanism.

NEW ZEALAND reiterated her country’s proposal for the use of a Declaration Model, in the interim, which gives parties the platform to publically declare what units they are using, produce the methodology for their generation and show how these units represent genuine, verifiable emission reductions.

AOSIS elaborated on their submission, stressing that the work programme on standards and approaches must ensure verified mitigation outcomes and avoid double counting.

The CLIMATE ACTION NETWORK (CAN) discussed types of double counting and said the best way to avoid this is to ensure transparency by clear accounting and specific rules regarding the complementary relationship between the CDM, new market mechanisms and regional trading mechanisms.

Parties discussed aspects of the presentations, including clarification of the Declaration Model, voluntary arrangements and the promotion of access to new market mechanisms.

#### **WORKSHOP ON THE NEW MARKET MECHANISM:**

The AWG-LCA in-session workshop on the new market-based mechanism was held in the afternoon.

The Secretariat presented an overview of submissions by parties and observer organizations (FCCC/AWGLCA/2012/MISC.6 and Add. 1 & 2; FCCC/AWGLCA/2012/MISC.7).

**Conceptual models:** The first part of the workshop focused on conceptual models.

The EU elaborated on modalities and procedures for a new market-based mechanism, saying that its implementation would rest with the host country and that the mechanism would: be subject to a common set of rules under the UNFCCC; avoid double counting; promote environmental integrity; and provide a new source of finance.

CHINA proposed a project-based mechanism comparable to the CDM that would: promote cost-effectiveness in emission reductions; be subject to participation eligibility requirements for developed countries; be supplementary to domestic efforts; avoid double counting; and not introduce emission reduction commitments for developing countries.

ECUADOR proposed a “net avoided emissions” mechanism (NAE), designed to provide incentives to avoid emissions in the first place, achieve cost-effective emission reductions, increase country participation and enhance equity.

INTERNATIONAL EMISSIONS TRADING ASSOCIATION (IETA) elaborated on a sectoral crediting mechanism that would account for, *inter alia*, continuity and fungibility of credits.

**Technical elements:** The second part of the workshop focused on technical elements of the new market-based mechanism.

The ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT (OECD) elaborated on setting and using crediting baselines.

AOSIS said that the new market-based mechanism should focus on sectors where substantial emission reductions are needed, such as industry, energy and transport, and emphasized the need to open opportunities for developing country participation.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, speaking for Costa Rica, Panama, Peru and Mexico, presented on a strategic programme on market-based approaches, which is a domestically-driven, self-funded action through programmes and measures, encompassing different sectors and large segments of local economies.

The CENTRE FOR CLEAN AIR POLICY highlighted elements of their submission, which notes that supported NAMAs are designed to improve the economic feasibility of underlying green investments. He said that the private sector in developing countries may stand to gain more from investing in the underlying projects, such as wind farms, than they would from the carbon credit transactions.

Parties discussed technical aspects of the presentations, including the varied definitions of the sectoral approach.

**Challenges associated with implementation:** The third part of the workshop dealt with challenges associated with implementation.

JAPAN said his country supports the continuation of the CDM provided it is improved, noting that new market-based mechanisms should allow a wide spectrum of approaches, including projects and sector-based approaches.

BOLIVIA highlighted that carbon markets trigger environmental problems, further noting that market-based approaches are economically, environmentally and socially inefficient.

CARBON MARKETS AND INVESTORS ASSOCIATION stressed the need to strengthen institutional capacity at the domestic level, noting that the implementation of a new market mechanism will rely on carbon asset management at the national level, which includes data collection, scope and sector definition, and MRV arrangements.

KfW discussed triggers for mitigation actions within developing country economies, such as the implementation of indirect carbon-related policies, which include the introduction of standards and regulations, taxes and charges, subsidies and other market- and non-market incentives.

Following the presentations, parties discussed, *inter alia*: project-by-project and sectoral approaches, participation of developing countries in the new mechanism, the role of the private sector, ways to address leakage, equity and private sector incentives.

#### **CONTACT GROUPS AND INFORMAL CONSULTATIONS**

**AWG-LCA CONTACT GROUP:** The third meeting of the AWG-LCA contact group convened in the morning. Discussions focused on enhanced action on the provision of finance.

The Philippines, for the G-77/CHINA, Algeria, for the AFRICAN GROUP, CUBA, EGYPT, INDONESIA, VENEZUELA, SAUDI ARABIA, INDIA and others, opposed by the US and the EU, called for establishing a spin-off group on finance.

The G-77/CHINA stressed finance as one of the most important pillars of the Bali Action Plan. With many others, she emphasized the need to consider transparency of fast-start finance and the lack of agreement on long-term finance. She stressed the need to discuss financial support for: national adaptation plans in developing states other than LDCs; biennial update reports; and reporting and verification.

The G-77/CHINA also stressed that financial institutions that “we have now” are “empty shells” and, with the AFRICAN GROUP and many developing countries, expressed concern over the finance gap between 2012 and 2020.

EGYPT, PAKISTAN and others called for the consideration of how to conclude institutional arrangements between the Green Climate Fund (GCF) and the COP. The EU indicated that the AWG-LCA is not the proper forum to discuss arrangements between the COP and the GCF.

CHINA called for capitalizing the GCF and for the Standing Committee to start its work as soon as possible. SAUDI ARABIA stated that special attention is needed for the public and private sourcing of finance. PAKISTAN stressed that closing the finance gap is just as important as closing the mitigation gap. Supported by the EU and BRAZIL, he indicated that it is important to learn lessons from fast-start finance.

The US and the EU emphasized that: developed countries have provided assurance that there will be no gap; a work programme on long-term finance has been established; and developed countries are fully committed to providing fast-start finance. The EU also indicated that decisions on provision of finance have been taken in Durban and Cancun.

The AWG-LCA contact group will reconvene on Monday.

**SPIN-OFF GROUP ON REVIEW (AWG-LCA):** Opening the session, Facilitator Gertraud Wollansky (Austria) introduced an information paper highlighting the mandate of the group from Decisions 1/CP.16 and 2/CP.17 (Outcome of the work of the AWG-LCA). She explained that she had undertaken informal consultations to get a sense of elements requiring further clarification. She reported divergent views on the scope of the Review and also the expert consideration of inputs.

Botswana, for the AFRICAN GROUP, supported by CHINA and BRAZIL, observed that the Durban decision defines the scope and modalities of the Review, and that the scope includes not just the temperature goal but also the adequacy of means of implementation for developing countries.

Calling for a prompt start to the Review, Trinidad and Tobago, for AOSIS, with SINGAPORE, the EU and others, emphasized the need for a narrow focus on scope in the context of what was agreed in Cancun. She said the group should focus on exactly “when and what will take place.” She also noted that tasking the Subsidiary Bodies to assist with the Review does not preclude the establishment of an expert body.

**SPIN-OFF GROUP ON REDD+ (AWG-LCA):** The spin-off group on REDD+ met in the afternoon, facilitated by Yaw Osafo (Ghana).

Delegates exchanged views on modalities and procedures for financing results-based actions, as mandated by Decision 2/CP.17 (Outcome of the work of the AWG-LCA). Some parties also identified potential elements for a COP decision in Doha.

GUYANA, supported by the PHILIPPINES, highlighted that the 2°C target can only be achieved if REDD+ is part of the solution. With many others, he underscored that a variety of sources will be required to achieve the necessary scale of financing. Many parties supported a REDD+ funding window in the GCF. CHINA expressed preference for public sources of financing but said he is open to exploring other sources.

MEXICO elaborated on their proposal that parties participating in REDD+ establish a national registry to account for verified emission reductions and carbon stock units, and inform a UNFCCC REDD+ registry to prevent double counting. BOLIVIA called for further work on non-market approaches. BRAZIL supported further work on new ideas on appropriate market-based mechanisms, which would not be based on the generation of offsets.

The EU said REDD+ emission reductions results should be assessed through an independent review. With SWITZERLAND and INDIA, he suggested further work on definitions.

INDIA said countries should use their own methodologies to measure emissions from forest degradation until agreement on a common methodology is reached.

Facilitator Osafo noted that the Secretariat will prepare a technical paper, as requested by Decision 2/CP.17, and that consultations on the date of a REDD+ workshop are taking place.

**SPIN-OFF GROUP ON NUMBERS AND TEXT (AWG-KP):** In the afternoon, informal spin-off group on item 3 (numbers/text), parties focused discussions on the level of ambition of parties’ commitments and carry-over of surplus assigned amount units (AAUs).

On ambition, a group of developed countries introduced two proposals. The first one would establish a review of the level of ambition of parties’ QELROs, coinciding with the 2013-2015 Review under the Convention, to address the concern raised by some parties that an 8-year commitment period would lock in a low level of ambition. The second one includes a simplified procedure to amend Protocol Annex B to facilitate an increase in the level of ambition by a party.

A developing country introduced a proposal on revising QELROs with a view to strengthening commitments under the Protocol. The proposal indicates that Annex I parties may, at any time, strengthen their QELROs and ensure the immediate effect of such revision by: forfeiting a part of their AAUs; transferring these units to a cancellation account established for this purpose in the national registry; and communicating such transfer to the Secretariat.

Parties then reviewed options for addressing the carry-over of surplus AAUs from the first to the second commitment period. They agreed to focus discussions at their next meeting on options for “middle ground” proposals, clarify concepts, and further assess the implications of proposals with a view to creating a single document to work on.

### IN THE CORRIDORS

As delegates prepared to unwind at the traditional NGO party on Saturday night and enjoy a well-deserved day off on Sunday after a rather frenetic week, many reflected on the “drama” that had unfolded in the ADP and AWG-LCA over the past few days, in particular regarding agendas and the organization of work.

Many were speculating on whether procedural issues would continue to take center stage during the final week of discussions. “The worst case scenario is that we leave Bonn without even adopting the ADP agenda if things continue at this rate,” said one seemingly frustrated delegate, who went as far as to argue that a diverse coalition of “anti-ADP parties” were intent on obstructing proceedings. Another one remarked, however, that progress under the ADP is unlikely until more progress is achieved under the AWG-KP and AWG-LCA, especially on developed country QELROs.

Enjoying a light moment, some delegates joked that the provisional ADP Chair [woman’s] ample multitasking skills perhaps might be severely stretched in attempting to overcome the agenda impasse. “Well, I’ve heard that the plan is just to get the process up and running by trying to resolve the organizational issues in Bonn and then hopefully adopt a programme of work in Doha before beginning work in earnest in 2013. If we don’t, it’s not going to be good for the process.”

Whether the Bangkok session will actually be held is another area of uncertainty, with indications that the Bureau has yet to make a decision on this. “We really will need an additional meeting before Doha if progress continues at this languid pace,” said a weary negotiator heading out of the Maritim.

## SB 36 AND AWG HIGHLIGHTS: MONDAY, 21 MAY 2012

In the morning and afternoon, the ADP in-session workshop took place. A number of contact groups and informal consultations were held under the SBI, SBSTA and AWG-LCA throughout the day.

### ADP

Opening the workshop in the morning, María del Socorro Flores (Mexico) explained that she had been asked to facilitate the ADP in-session workshop on enhancing mitigation ambition on behalf of the COP 17 Presidency. She recalled the mandate in Decision 1/CP.17 (Establishment of an *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Durban Platform on Enhanced Action) to organize the workshop and highlighted relevant submissions (FCCC/ADP/2012/Misc.1 & Add.1; and FCCC/ADP/2012/Misc.2). She also noted that the current mitigation pledges account for approximately 60% of the emission reductions needed to hold temperature increase to below 2°C, and identified the workshop as an opportunity to explore options for closing the gap.

CHINA, supported by INDIA, SAUDI ARABIA and NICARAGUA, expressed concern with the title of the workshop on “enhancing mitigation ambition,” stressing the need for a careful reading of Decision 1/CP.17. He indicated that the relevant paragraph 8 refers to ambition more broadly than just in terms of mitigation. He requested that the correction be registered in the report of the workshop. Facilitator Flores indicated that China’s comments will be reflected.

The PHILIPPINES, supported by SAUDI ARABIA, highlighted the importance of discussing ambition with respect to the means of implementation. EGYPT, supported by SAUDI ARABIA, stressed the importance of the workshop’s scope and identified the possible need for another workshop on the means of implementation. INDIA, supported by SAUDI ARABIA, called for an integrated summary of the work done on ambition under the ADP, AWG-LCA and AWG-KP. Raising concerns over LULUCF and “hot air” credits, BOLIVIA requested that their concerns be reflected in the workshop report.

Parties also heard reports on the AWG-LCA in-session workshops on developed and developing country mitigation, held during the previous week.

**Understanding the gap and potential solutions to address it:** UNEP emphasized that if the gap between the 2°C target and current country pledges is not closed, the temperature increase will be substantially higher. He highlighted three possible emission pathways, noting the need for global emissions to peak before 2020. He explained that the pathway to 1.5°C is similar in the near-term but that longer-term decline in emissions must be sharper. On closing the gap, he stressed: energy efficiency; a lower-emissions energy mix; and the need to reduce non-CO2 emissions. He underscored the urgency of acting before 2020, saying that the technical potential exists to reduce emissions by 2020 in line with the 2°C target at a reasonable cost.

IPCC Working Group III presented on low stabilization and new long-term scenarios from the IPCC special report on renewable energy. Noting that more than one transformation pathways are possible, he indicated that more stringent mitigation action is related to increasing the role of renewable energy.

The INTERNATIONAL ENERGY AGENCY presented a report on 2012 Energy Technology Perspectives and recommended: leveling the playing field for energy technologies; unlocking the potential of energy efficiency; and accelerating efforts in energy innovation.

CHINA, supported by INDIA, indicated that the workshop must be based on language in Decision 1/CP.17 and not on the provisional agenda, stressing the need for a broader discussion on the ambition issue. He requested that the Secretariat prepare a document on the title and issues to be covered during the third part of the workshop.

**Working together to close the gap:** Nauru, for AOSIS, stressed the need for a workplan that would include in-session workshops, submissions and negotiations.

AUSTRALIA elaborated on his country’s clean energy future package and stressed the need to reinforce the link between domestic and international action. He called for, *inter alia*: an

annual COP decision on ambition; showcasing domestic action; transparency; defining a new market-based mechanism and learning from each other.

The MARSHALL ISLANDS emphasized that climate change and rising sea levels affect his country's security, statehood and survival. He said that transformational global effort is needed and elaborated on his country's Ocean Thermal Energy Conversion project.

NEW ZEALAND highlighted the need for: exchanging information; developing the carbon market; engaging in specific sectors and/or regional initiatives; enabling new mitigation technologies through cooperation and partnerships; and ensuring mutual support.

JAPAN stressed, *inter alia*, the need to: set a long-term goal by 2050; increase transparency; review and update targets or actions for 2020; explore various approaches towards a post-2020 climate regime; and engage in international cooperation for low-carbon development.

CHINA underscored Annex I parties' unsatisfactory performance in achieving their targets under the Kyoto Protocol, stating that the reduction in their emissions has been caused by the economic recession rather than innovations in sectors, such as transport and building. He emphasized that 12 out of the 22 Annex I parties complying with their targets under the Protocol are countries with economies in transition. He concluded that: developed countries should lead in emission reductions and cut down emissions from consumption; and technology, finance and capacity building are key to low-carbon development in developing countries.

NORWAY, AUSTRALIA and JAPAN stated that China's allegation of their non-compliance with the Kyoto targets is inaccurate. NORWAY and JAPAN highlighted that their participation in the flexibility mechanisms must also be considered.

BRAZIL presented on equity and ambition, emphasizing the need to consider linkages between equity, ambition and the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities within and outside the UNFCCC. He said: the Kyoto Protocol is key for enhancing mitigation by, *inter alia*, enhancing possibilities for the participation of developing countries in the CDM through deforestation and afforestation activities; and mitigation actions in non-Annex I parties will depend on the level of support received from developed countries.

COSTA RICA asked how equity among developing countries will be addressed in the future, underscoring that she would like to see countries like China, Brazil and India making more efforts to combat climate change.

BRAZIL emphasized the need to differentiate between historical responsibilities that actually happened and future responsibility based on projections. He cautioned against selecting specific countries by looking at "big" developing countries rather than focusing on other socio-economic indicators.

The EU elaborated on a continuous process to scale up ambition, including through: understanding of the gap; implementation and enhancement of mitigation pledges; and

identifying and launching complementary initiatives. He identified areas where ambition could be increased, including aviation, maritime transport, renewable energy and REDD+.

The US described efforts to enhance domestic mitigation ambition, including through renewable energies. He suggested that efforts outside the Convention can also make a difference through, *inter alia*: further work under the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) and International Maritime Organization (IMO) to develop a global framework to address emissions; phasing out fossil fuel subsidies by broadening the agreement by G-20 to phase out inefficient subsidies; and support efforts to develop low-emission development strategies.

The Gambia, for LDCs, called for including short-term activities in the workplan, and for more in-session workshops. He urged Annex I parties to remove conditionalities, encouraged more ambitious NAMAs and called for low-emission development strategies by all countries.

On opportunities for international cooperation, RESPONDING TO CLIMATE CHANGE (RTCC) called for a focus on capital mobilization, national and subnational efforts, and adaptation.

ICLEI – LOCAL GOVERNMENTS FOR SUSTAINABILITY emphasized the need to "urbanize" the climate agenda as most energy consumption as well as smart technologies are concentrated in cities.

The CLIMATE GROUP emphasized best practices and leadership examples emanating from subnational governments.

The FOREST CARBON PARTNERSHIP FACILITY focused on lessons from REDD+ countries on, *inter alia*: the need to build capacity before talking about finance; the importance of private sector involvement; scaling up result-based payments; and enhancing regulatory frameworks.

CLIMATE ACTION NETWORK urged parties to, *inter alia*: deliver on technology and finance as promised by developed countries; put forward more NAMAs; raise the level of ambition; and take concrete steps on emissions from international transport.

**Next steps and action under the workplan:** Facilitator Flores proposed changing the workshop title to "workshop to increase the level of ambition on paragraph 8 of Decision 1/CP.17" to reflect that not only mitigation is captured. CHINA agreed and requested that the change be reflected, *inter alia*, in the workshop report. Several parties welcomed the more holistic approach to ambition and requested that the Secretariat prepare a technical paper.

AOSIS stressed the need for an early and robust ADP process. The EU called for, *inter alia*, launching a continuous process to enhance ambition and address the gap. SINGAPORE cautioned parties against transforming the workshop into a "proxy for negotiating issues." COSTA RICA called for updates on the size of the gap and studies on mitigation potential. CHINA stressed the importance of both quality and speed of the process under the Durban Platform and said that a lot of work remains under AWG-LCA. NORWAY urged initiatives on REDD+ and short-lived climate forcers.

**CONTACT GROUPS AND INFORMAL CONSULTATIONS**

**REDD+ (SBSTA):** During the morning informal consultations, parties considered draft SBSTA conclusions.

Some parties highlighted that while forest monitoring systems and MRV have been broadly discussed, the consideration of drivers of deforestation and degradation is at an initial stage and requested reflecting this in a balanced way. Some parties said it is premature to include a list of issues discussed on drivers.

Parties also received a report on discussions in a drafting group on an annex on national forest monitoring systems and MRV. It was highlighted that progress has been achieved, while a number of outstanding issues remain and some party proposals are yet to be discussed.

Revised draft SBSTA conclusions will be prepared and the drafting group on MRV and forest monitoring systems will meet again and report to the informal group.

Parties then addressed guidance on safeguards and information systems. Some underscored the need for further guidance. One party suggested a technical assessment of reference levels based on experiences and lessons learned from LULUCF. Some parties suggested that information on REDD+ be included in national communications and in the biennial update reports.

Informal consultations will continue.

**AWG-LCA CONTACT GROUP:** In the morning AWG-LCA contact group, parties continued discussions on enhanced action on the provision of finance. Developing countries continued to express support for the establishment of a spin-off group to consider the issue, which developed countries generally opposed.

AWG-LCA Chair Tayeb summarized overall discussions. He noted that concerning response measures, unilateral trade measures had been identified as requiring further consideration.

AWG-LCA Chair Tayeb also invited parties to consider the outcome under the item on the catalytic role of the Convention since no specific proposals had been made.

On adaptation, he observed that issues raised requiring additional consideration include: adequacy, predictability and transparency of adaptation finance; interlinkages between adaptation and the means of implementation; potential need for additional institutional arrangements; a national adaptation plans (NAP) process for developing countries that are not LDCs; regional centers; and risk assessment, reduction and vulnerability.

On technology development and transfer, AWG-LCA Chair Tayeb highlighted: IPRs; interlinkages with other arrangements, especially the financial mechanism; clarifying the relationship between the Technology Executive Committee (TEC) and the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN); additional functions of the TEC; evaluation of the environmental aspects of technology before and after transfer; and improving South-South cooperation.

On finance, AWG-LCA Chair Tayeb observed that parties had raised issues concerning: the funding gap between 2012 and 2020; links between the finance gap to discussions relating to the mitigation and ambition gaps; clarity on access and sources of long-term finance; transparency of fast-start finance; lessons learned from fast-start finance and links to medium-term finance; relationship between the Green Climate Fund (GCF) and the COP; capitalization of the GCF; fulfillment of the mandate in

the Bali Action Plan on MRV of support; funding for biennial update reports; MRV of support for biennial update reports; and financing of NAPs.

On capacity building, AWG-LCA Chair Tayeb said the gaps identified included monitoring and performance indicator tools, and institutional and financial arrangements. He invited parties to focus on what a decision on Annex I parties undergoing transition to a market economy might entail.

AWG-LCA Chair Tayeb observed that parties had not objected to addressing the issues outlined but expressed divergent views on how to take discussions forward. He undertook to consult the Chairs of the relevant bodies to ensure that duplication is avoided.

**NATIONAL ADAPTATION PLANS (SBI):** During the morning informal consultations that were open to observers, parties discussed draft text on NAP.

Parties highlighted areas to be strengthened in the text, which included information on activities and programmes to support the NAP process and the role of the LDC Expert Group.

Some parties recommended that the text reflect the operationalization of support from the LDC Fund for the NAP process by COP 18.

Parties discussed strengthening references to support the NAP process for LDC parties through bilateral and multilateral channels, including the LDC Fund.

Informal consultations continued in the afternoon.

**AGRICULTURE (SBSTA):** In the morning contact group on agriculture, parties reflected on draft SBSTA conclusions.

Parties views diverged on, *inter alia*, language regarding the aim of the assessment of the current state of scientific knowledge and whether to reference a workshop (FCCC/AWG/LCA/2009/CRP.2) and a technical paper (FCCC/TP/2008/8) on opportunities and challenges from mitigation in the agricultural sector.

Bolivia, for the G-77/CHINA, objected to the absence of language on adaptation, with the PHILIPPINES adding that the word was "profusely used" in previous discussions. The US expressed support for addressing adaptation concerns, but objected to limiting the focus of work on this issue.

Some developing countries, opposed by the US, proposed removing language regarding efficiency and productivity of agricultural systems.

A revised text will be produced.

**INITIAL REVIEW OF THE ADAPTATION FUND (SBI):** The contact group on the initial review of the Adaptation Fund met in the afternoon.

Discussions focused on draft text on matters relating to finance which notes: views of parties and written submissions on the initial review of the Adaptation Fund; issues raised by parties, including those related to the interim institutional arrangements; and funding availability.

Parties also highlighted issues, including defining the type of financial information to be requested from the Adaptation Fund Board, GEF and CDM Executive Board, and the mandate for the provision of this information.

Two paragraphs remain outstanding on information and on the timing of a draft decision on the outcome of the initial review. Negotiations will continue.

**VARIOUS APPROACHES (AWG-LCA)** In the afternoon, the AWG-LCA spin-off group on various approaches convened its first meeting, open to observers.

Parties considered developing a work programme on a framework to consider various approaches, including opportunities for using markets; and conducting a work programme to elaborate modalities and procedures for the new market-based mechanism.

Parties were invited to consider, *inter alia*, core elements and what needs to be done before Doha. Some parties raised issues concerning the organization of work, including how to reflect output from the relevant in-session workshops.

Pointing to various approaches being implemented at the national level, the US, supported by JAPAN and NEW ZEALAND, but opposed by GRENADA and CHINA, noted that carbon units should be tracked as they move between countries. GRENADA said parties should first consider what needs to be tracked, followed by what would be eligible for use towards meeting emission reductions targets.

Negotiations will continue.

**TECHNOLOGY (SBI/SBSTA):** During closed informal consultations throughout the day, parties considered three draft texts on: the CTCN; report of the TEC; and the Poznan Strategic Programme on Technology Transfer.

On matters relating to the CTCN, parties discussed details of the negotiation process with the shortlisted host proponent and elements of the host agreement, with parties underscoring the need for transparency in the process.

On the TEC's report, parties discussed contents of the TEC's work plan and linkages with other relevant institutional arrangements under and outside the Convention.

On the Poznan Strategic Programme, parties reiterated the need to ensure a balance between adaptation and mitigation projects in the long-term implementation of the Poznan Strategic Programme and discussed methodologies to encourage more adaptation projects.

Informal consultations continued into the evening.

**SECTORAL APPROACHES (AWG-LCA):** In the afternoon, the AWG-LCA spin-off group on sectoral approaches and sector-specific actions held its first meeting.

Parties reflected on the way forward in light of Decision 2/CP.17 (Outcome of the work of the AWG-LCA), which agrees to continue work towards a general framework and issues related to addressing emissions from international aviation and maritime transport. Parties also reflected on how to finish or transition work in light of the AWG-LCA's mandate to terminate work in Doha.

The EU stated its willingness to discuss the general framework and bunker fuels and, supported by CHINA, opposed moving this area of work under the SBSTA. Burkina Faso, for the AFRICAN GROUP, supported by CHINA, JAPAN and ARGENTINA, underscored that any action should be in line with the principles of the Convention and the Protocol.

SOUTH AFRICA identified the need for the IMO, ICAO and UNFCCC to enhance common understanding on their respective work. INDIA stressed the need for a multilateral approach to work on sectoral approaches. JAPAN emphasized that the ICAO and IMO are the most appropriate bodies to consider international transport emissions. The US, supported by CANADA, noted that the IMO and ICAO are specialized independent agencies with their own guiding principles, which limits the application of the Convention's principles. ARGENTINA stressed that work on sectoral approaches must not lead to new commitments for developing countries.

Informal consultations will continue.

**RESPONSE MEASURES (SBI/SBSTA):** In the afternoon joint SBI/SBSTA forum on response measures, parties considered a table containing an initial proposal on how to operationalize the work programme, which outlined: the area of the work programme; the session and year during which the area will be addressed; and the actions and deliverables for each area. A revised version of the table will be prepared taking into account parties' views.

### IN THE CORRIDORS

After enjoying a sunny and warm Sunday in Bonn, delegates returned reinvigorated on Monday, ready for negotiations. Their adaptive nature was truly tested during some well-attended informal consultations. "There's only so much adapting one can do," joked one delegate on the lack of space in the negotiating room on adaptation and NAPs.

Indeed, the space issue extended to other areas of the meeting, including thought-space, once again preoccupied by the crucial question of ambition. This time, the focus of attention was on the day-long ADP workshop, which was initially entitled "enhancing mitigation ambition" until some developing countries insisted on a broader focus, so that it would also cover means of implementation. Several delegates explained that the "somewhat surprising" significance given to the workshop's title illustrates the sensitivity concerning the scope of the ADP's work.

Ambition prevailed as the overall theme during the event, evident from the scientific presentations, a further reminder that parties will have to start working to achieve more ambitious results well before 2020. As many developing countries continuously reiterated, the pre-2020 mitigation ambition gap is highly relevant under both the AWG-LCA and AWG-KP. It remains, however, highly contentious under the ADP, where the agenda discussions reportedly continued during the day. According to delegates, some developing countries continue to insist on the deletion of the item on workplan on mitigation ambition, while others argue for it to remain, stressing its key role in the Durban package. One insider explained: "The difference is that the AWG-LCA and AWG-KP place the pre-2020 emphasis on developed countries, whereas the ADP is mandated to look at all parties."

Thankfully, in other quarters, the atmosphere was less somber than under the ADP, described by some as "tense." During informal consultations on sectoral approaches congeniality prevailed and butter cookies were even offered to sweeten discussions.

## **SB 36 AND AWG HIGHLIGHTS: TUESDAY, 22 MAY 2012**

In the morning, the ADP plenary convened. A number of contact groups and informal consultations were held under the SBI, SBSTA, AWG-KP and AWG-LCA throughout the day.

### **ADP**

During the ADP plenary on Tuesday morning, Ambassador Diseko reported on consultations on the election of ADP officers. She informed parties that a new approach based on equity and fairness was being considered for the ADP Bureau from now up to 2015. She invited groups to continue consulting and expressed hope that an agreement could be reached by Tuesday evening, observing that the situation was affecting the spirit of trust. Ambassador Diseko also expressed doubt on an additional negotiating session being held before Doha.

Interim ADP Chair de Wet invited parties to share their views on how they see work proceeding under the ADP during the rest of the week.

VENEZUELA, speaking on behalf of Argentina, Algeria, Bahrain, Bolivia, China, Comoros, Cuba, Democratic Republic of Congo, Djibouti, Ecuador, El Salvador, Egypt, India, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Nicaragua, Oman, Paraguay, Palestine, the Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Syria, Sudan, Thailand, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates and Yemen, called for open-ended, transparent and inclusive consultations. He expressed willingness to discuss a post-2020 mitigation framework, while recognizing the need to enhance mitigation actions in 2012-2020. He also pointed out that a separate agenda item on enhancing mitigation ambition under the ADP would “render meaningless” the ongoing discussions under the AWG-KP and AWG-LCA. He expressed support for an inclusive agenda that captures, in a non-selective manner, all the elements of Decision 1/CP.17 (Establishment of an *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Durban Platform on Enhanced Action).

Proposing the adoption of the ADP agenda based on what was agreed to in Durban, Nauru, for AOSIS, called for a detailed schedule of work with timetables and milestones for making progress on all items in a balanced manner. He emphasized the need for a work programme on enhancing mitigation ambition.

CHILE, COSTA RICA and PERU supported beginning work immediately on all elements of the Durban Platform. COLOMBIA proposed establishing two contact groups on agenda item 3 (planning of work in accordance with Decision 1/CP.17) and item 4 (work plan on enhancing mitigation ambition). The GAMBIA proposed establishing a contact group to address issues relating to a legally-binding agreement.

AUSTRALIA highlighted two distinct work streams under the ADP on: the development of a protocol or legally-binding agreement; and enhancing mitigation ambition. He suggested using 2012 as a “conceptual year” aimed at sharing ideas on the work of the ADP. Regarding the Bonn session, he supported adopting the agenda, finalizing the election of officers and establishing a contact group on the agenda items.

Cautioning against polarizing the process, SAUDI ARABIA supported open-ended informal consultations to identify areas of convergence and divergence.

Switzerland, for the ENVIRONMENTAL INTEGRITY GROUP, warned that attempting to change the balanced Durban package will put Doha at risk. He urged agreement on the ADP Chairs and agenda.

The EU outlined elements of the “fine and balanced” Durban compromise, consisting of: a second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol; a pre-2020 mitigation work plan; agreement by 2015 applicable to all; concluding the AWG-LCA; and operationalizing the institutions created in Cancun and Durban. He expressed concern that procedural arguments risk unraveling the Durban package. He underscored that ministers noted the ambition gap in Durban “with great concern” and that it is not for the negotiators to change the agreement. The EU also expressed concern over attempts to change the ADP’s mandate to negotiate a new, legally-binding instrument applicable to all by introducing the Bali Action Plan into the new mandate. He urged agreement on the ADP agenda and Chair, and said work should be launched under two contact groups.

The US identified “critically important” features in the Durban Platform, highlighting an instrument with legal force for all parties and a path leading further into the future than before. He underscored two work streams with a clear mandate from the COP: developing a post-2020 regime and working on pre-2020 mitigation. Emphasizing the need to implement rather than renegotiate Decision 1/CP.17, he called for planning the ADP’s work at this meeting, including input and interactions over the coming months.

The RUSSIAN FEDERATION highlighted a new, comprehensive agreement as the main objective of the ADP’s work and warned against using the agenda as a tool to review the “fragile and multifaceted” balance of interests agreed in Durban. Stressing urgency, JAPAN warned against wasting time on agenda discussions and called for starting substantive work under contact groups. NEW ZEALAND expressed concern over “difficult atmosphere” and attempts to renegotiate ministerial agreements. She stressed that the agenda must be compatible with the Durban outcome, and proposed establishing two contact groups. She also indicated that election of officers for the ADP should comply with the normal UNFCCC practice.

INDONESIA stressed the importance of trust and good-faith negotiations, calling for the adoption of the agenda. Supported by CHINA and MALAYSIA, the PHILIPPINES reiterated his country’s proposal to delete agenda item 4 and reformulate item 3 to “planning of work in accordance with all the elements of Decision 1/CP.17.” He expressed concern over lack of progress under the AWG-KP and AWG-LCA, and attempts to limit the question of ambition to the ADP. EGYPT welcomed the agenda proposal by the Philippines as “balanced and inclusive,” and underscored equity and common but differentiated responsibilities.

NORWAY urged agreement on the agenda and Chairs, and called for discussions on the ADP work programme and milestones. He underscored that work must start under both work streams, including on mitigation ambition.

INDIA underscored the importance of working on, *inter alia*, mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology development and transfer, and to ensure that the principles of equity and common but differentiated responsibilities are “fully suffused” in each item. He also recalled that ambition relates to all elements of work.

CANADA supported working through two groups, which would make progress possible in the discussions to raise the level of ambition and arrive at a “single, global and comprehensive agreement” for all parties.

CHINA restated support for the “balanced package” reached at Durban, and emphasized the need to continue work under the AWG-LCA according to the Bali Action Plan. He urged continued work on mitigation ambition under the AWG-KP and AWG-LCA. PAKISTAN said: the agenda should be comprehensive enough to allow all parties to remain engaged and retain trust; and that work must focus on, *inter alia*, on the post-2020 architecture.

The MARSHALL ISLANDS highlighted the decision by ministers in Durban to launch the mitigation work plan.

The UNITED ARAB EMIRATES underscored, *inter alia*: adaptation and further operationalizing the Green Climate Fund (GCF).

BRAZIL emphasized the importance of advancing all aspects of the Durban outcome and highlighted the main focus of the Durban Platform to create a new legal instrument under the UNFCCC as “an important opportunity that must not be lost.” SOUTH AFRICA underscored the importance of trust and mutual reassurance, upon which the Durban Package was based, which included an agreement to look at the level of ambition.

#### **CONTACT GROUPS AND INFORMAL CONSULTATIONS APPEALS AGAINST CDM EXECUTIVE BOARD**

**DECISIONS (SBI):** A contact group on appeals against decisions of the CDM Executive Board convened in the morning.

Parties continued considering bracketed parts of the Co-Chairs’ draft text on procedures, mechanisms and institutional arrangements for appeals. They considered paragraphs relating to internal management of the appeals body, collegiality and commencement of an appeal, and discussed, *inter alia*, chairing arrangements, the format and frequency of meetings of the appeals body, and the timeframe for filing a petition for appeal. Diverging views remain, *inter alia*, on the issue of scope.

Parties agreed to continue considering the Co-Chairs’ draft text at SBI 37 with a view to forwarding a draft decision to CMP 8. Draft conclusions will be forwarded to the SBI for adoption.

**NUMBERS/TEXT (AWG-KP):** In the morning AWG-KP contact group, AWG-KP Chair Diouf introduced Harald Winkler (South Africa) as the new Co-Chair of the spin-off group on numbers and text because Sandea de Wet (South Africa) is acting as the Interim ADP Chair.

In the ensuing informal spin-off group, parties considered surplus AAUs and carry-over, focusing on two proposals. Several countries expressed the need to better understand the implication of the proposals, with some developed countries requesting knowledge on their “quantifiable impacts.” Other countries underscored their adaptation priorities, and expressed support for a proposal to transfer units to the Adaptation Fund in the form of AAUs. One party noted that proposals make “heavy intervention into the market space,” therefore requiring time to reflect on the implications. Parties will continue to consult on the proposals, and will review the third proposal in the next meeting.

**MITIGATION BY DEVELOPING COUNTRY PARTIES (AWG-LCA):** The AWG-LCA spin-off group held its first meeting in the morning, which was open to observers.

Facilitator Gary Theseira (Malaysia) introduced an information paper on nationally appropriate mitigation actions (NAMAs) by developing country parties, which contains: matters relating to paragraphs 48-51 of Decision 1/CP.16 (Outcome of the work of the AWG-LCA); non-Annex I biennial update reporting guidelines; modalities and guidelines for international consultation and analysis (ICA); NAMA registry; and other issues.

Parties' views diverged on the group's mandate. The PHILIPPINES, BOLIVIA, INDIA and SAUDI ARABIA reiterated the mandate in the Bali Action Plan, which highlights NAMAs by developing country parties in the context of sustainable development, supported and enabled by technology, financing and capacity-building, in a measurable, reportable and verifiable manner.

The US indicated that Decision 2/CP.17 (Outcome of the work of the AWG-LCA) gives the group a mandate for focused discussions on mitigation. NEW ZEALAND, NORWAY, CANADA, SINGAPORE, the MARSHALL ISLANDS and AUSTRALIA supported the development of a technical paper on progress made since COP 16 in Cancun, considering actions taken and actions that need to be taken. SOUTH AFRICA called for a redraft of the information paper to provide a clear understanding on the way forward.

A revised information paper will be produced based on the discussions.

#### **DEVELOPED COUNTRY MITIGATION (AWG-LCA):**

In the morning, the spin-off group held its first meeting, facilitated by Andrej Kranjc (Slovenia). The meeting was open to observers.

Delegates considered how to organize the group's work. The Marshall Islands, for AOSIS, said progress on developed country mitigation has not been comparable to progress on developing country mitigation actions. He highlighted, *inter alia*, that many Annex I parties had failed to present QELROs for the second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol. He suggested focusing on increasing developed countries' emission reduction targets and enhancing the transparency and comparability of pledges. AOSIS also suggested discussing QELROs to close the mitigation ambition gap in the Bangkok session. Many developing countries supported working on enhancing mitigation ambition.

The EU, NORWAY, the US, JAPAN and other developed countries indicated that the appropriate place for discussing mitigation ambition is under the ADP. INDIA highlighted that discussions should also be based on the Bali Action Plan, which mandates ensuring comparable efforts among developed countries. CHINA indicated that progress on comparability is required, otherwise the Bali Action Plan mandate will not be accomplished and the AWG-LCA will not be able to terminate its work in Doha. ECUADOR underscored that the AWG-LCA should not conclude its work before the Bali Action Plan mandate on developed country mitigation has been fulfilled. Many developed parties highlighted agreement in Durban that the AWG-LCA would terminate its work in Doha.

Many parties suggested that the group focus on further clarifying assumptions underlying developed country pledges. MEXICO expressed concern on the degree of subjectivity of conditions in developed country pledges and called for analyzing ways to remove them. Many developing countries supported further work on common accounting rules, with SOUTH AFRICA calling for considering comparability and compliance. INDIA suggested the group elaborate a robust set of rules on accountability and enhancement of mitigation ambition.

Many developed countries supported an updated technical paper and further workshops on understanding underlying assumptions. NORWAY suggested that the workshop focus on issues, such as rule-based approaches, greenhouse gases and sectors; and LULUCF.

Facilitator Kranjc said he would report to the AWG-LCA Chair to seek guidance on the way forward.

**AWG-LCA CONTACT GROUP:** In the afternoon, the AWG-LCA contact group convened. Parties heard progress reports.

On shared vision, Facilitator Ji highlighted three options, including: a specific number on the global peaking of emissions; a numeric range for global peaking, or a process or mechanism to identify goals for global emissions and a peaking timeframe.

On developed country mitigation, Facilitator Kranjc noted, *inter alia*: encouraging progress on MRV issues; uncertainties regarding LULUCF carbon credits; and that work should continue in Doha.

On developing country mitigation, Facilitator Theseira reported, *inter alia*, on "unfinished business" related to reporting.

On REDD+, Facilitator Osafo reported, *inter alia*, that parties restated the importance of new and predictable funding, and a specialized REDD+ funding window in the GCF.

On sectoral approaches, AWG-LCA Chair Tayeb noted that the informal group facilitated by Wamukoya emphasized linkages between the UNFCCC, ICAO and IMO in addressing emissions from the international aviation and maritime sectors.

On various approaches, Facilitator Kleysteuber reported on the two workshops and highlighted that parties had identified possible elements for a work programme.

On Review, Facilitator Wollansky reported on the need to further identify its scope and noted initial discussions on the need for an expert body.

On response measures, AWG-LCA Chair Tayeb identified unilateral trade measures as the main element.

On the Convention's catalytic role, AWG-LCA Chair Tayeb said that no specific issues have been identified and invited parties to consider the relationship between the UNFCCC, Convention on Biological Diversity and the UN Convention to Combat Desertification.

On adaptation, AWG-LCA Chair Tayeb noted, *inter alia*, linkages between adaptation and means of implementation.

On technology, AWG-LCA Chair Tayeb highlighted, *inter alia*: linkages with the financial mechanism; and relationship between the Technology Executive Committee (TEC) and the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN).

On finance, AWG-LCA Chair Tayeb stressed, *inter alia*: the funding gap between 2012 and 2020; the link between the funding and mitigation gaps; transparency; MRV of financial support; and funding for national adaptation plans in LDCs and other developing countries.

On capacity building, AWG-LCA Chair Tayeb stressed finance as one of the means of implementation.

AWG-LCA Chair Tayeb also reported on other matters related to EITs and Annex I parties whose special circumstances are recognized by the COP.

Algeria, for the AFRICAN GROUP, requested clarification on whether the contact group would produce a decision. He supported having spin-off groups on adaptation, response measures, finance, technology transfer and capacity building.

AUSTRALIA called for a clear understanding of the objectives of the contact group discussions and suggested focusing on making the agreed mechanisms and bodies fully operational.

The EU, supported by SWITZERLAND, suggested mapping issues being addressed under other bodies to avoid duplication.

INDIA highlighted that progress should be measured against the Bali Action Plan.

The Philippines, for the G-77/CHINA, called for a focused group to address finance. COLOMBIA, supported by BRAZIL, suggested a spin-off group to address scaling up of climate finance and avoiding a financial gap between 2012 and 2020. THAILAND, Malawi, for LDCs, and ARGENTINA, opposed by AUSTRALIA, supported establishing a spin-off group on finance. JAPAN called for the avoidance of duplication of work on finance.

CHINA supported spin-off groups on finance and response measures. SINGAPORE reiterated that the UNFCCC is not the appropriate forum for addressing trade issues. The US opposed the establishment of new spin-off groups on any issues, including finance.

AWG-LCA Chair Tayeb, supported by ALGERIA, the PHILIPPINES, INDONESIA, SAUDI ARABIA, VENEZUELA and EGYPT, proposed continuing discussions in an informal group and invited parties to address issues in a more focused manner during the next meeting. The EU reiterated that there was no need for additional spin-off groups and, with the US, AUSTRALIA, CANADA and JAPAN, sought clarification on whether the AWG-LCA Chair proposed establishing an informal meeting of the contact group. AWG-LCA Chair Tayeb clarified that discussions could benefit from a more informal setting. The US proposed that parties continue to meet as a contact group but in a smaller room and requested that observers be allowed to attend.

AWG-LCA Chair Tayeb observed that he was not proposing to establish “a subset of the contact group,” adding that he would make a judgment on whether the proposed group would be open or closed, formal or informal.

#### **DURBAN FORUM ON CAPACITY BUILDING**

**(SBI):** The first meeting of the Durban Forum took place in the afternoon.

UNFCCC Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres highlighted the Forum as the institutional arrangement created by COP 17 to facilitate the enhancement of monitoring and review of the effectiveness of capacity building.

SBI Chair Chruszczow emphasized the cross-cutting nature of capacity building in the climate change process.

The Secretariat elaborated on objectives and referred delegates to a compilation and synthesis report on capacity-building work undertaken by the Convention bodies.

The LDC Expert Group highlighted its training and support programmes for LDCs in the preparation and implementation of national adaptation programmes of action (NAPAs).

Uganda, for LDCs, presented on NAPA experiences, reflecting on good practices and gaps, noting the value of capacity building in enhancing knowledge and skills in the NAPA process.

The INSTITUTE OF DEVELOPMENT STUDIES presented on mobilizing knowledge and strengthening capacity under the Nairobi Work Programme, highlighting his organization’s work, including the development of online and offline knowledge products for community radio on adaptation.

The UN FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION (FAO) presented on capacity building in adaptation practices, highlighting the FAO’s support for technical assistance in strengthening need-based climate information services and the development of tools and methodologies to assess climate impacts.

YOUNGOs presented on leadership, participation and support in capacity building for adaptation, highlighting their work in mobilizing young advocates in the climate movement. He emphasized the role of youth in capacity building through non-formal education in raising awareness and promoting sustainability.

The Forum continued into the early evening.

#### **IN THE CORRIDORS**

On Tuesday, delegates’ views on progress diverged. As some groups under the Subsidiary Bodies concluded their work, the ADP continued to struggle to get substantive work started.

After “yet another round” of procedural plenary discussions in the morning, the ADP moved into a smaller informal setting for the evening. Initial discussions during the informal meeting focused on areas where assurances on the agenda discussion are needed, including the ADP’s role in enhancing ambition. Parties also reflected on ways to find a balance between the three working groups. Five proposals to move out of the procedural deadlock were also reportedly being considered into the evening, no doubt adding to the complexity of the task at hand.

Reflecting on the negotiating dynamics, many delegates commented on the relationship between the three *Ad Hoc* Working Groups. Some noted that a “nautical theme” seemed to be emerging as some developing countries expressed concern over developed countries attempting to “jump ship” from the AWG-KP and AWG-LCA to the ADP when it comes to mitigation ambition. One delegate lamented: “Developed countries seem eager to lay the AWG-LCA to rest and place the emphasis on the ADP; where is the equity in that.”

Like any effort to navigate deep seas, a sense of direction and timing is key. With the morning report that an intersessional in Bangkok before Doha is now appearing “unlikely,” many delegates expressed an added sense of urgency for clarity on the way forward: “These are indeed stormy waters for the ADP; it is difficult at this stage to see the horizon in the distance,” opined one negotiator.

## **SB 36 AND AWG HIGHLIGHTS: WEDNESDAY, 23 MAY 2012**

A number of contact groups and informal consultations were held under the SBI, SBSTA, AWG-KP, AWG-LCA and ADP throughout the day.

### **CONTACT GROUPS AND INFORMAL CONSULTATIONS**

**SHARED VISION (AWG-LCA):** The spin-off group on shared vision convened in the morning, open to observers.

Parties focused on identifying possible areas of convergence. Facilitator Ji said that the in-session workshop on equitable access to sustainable development could serve as a catalyst.

Botswana, for the AFRICAN GROUP, Uganda, for LDCs, CHINA, BRAZIL and others stressed the importance of the means of implementation. Some developing countries urged for a discussion on the context, whereas several developed countries said the focus should be on the global goal and peaking timeframe.

CHINA, supported by BRAZIL, requested that the importance of context be included in the Facilitator's report. JAPAN cautioned against duplication of work. MEXICO, the PHILIPPINES and others said that relevant contextual elements need to be defined. Trinidad and Tobago, for AOSIS, said that burden-sharing cannot be discussed without identifying the burden first.

**REVIEW (AWG-LCA):** In the spin-off group on Review, which was open to observers, parties addressed the expert consideration of inputs, and made proposals on the way forward.

JAPAN proposed an open-ended expert meeting format and called for avoiding duplicating the work of the IPCC. Trinidad and Tobago, for AOSIS, opposed by Botswana, for the AFRICAN GROUP, CHINA, BRAZIL and the PHILIPPINES, reiterated support for establishing an expert group, highlighting the guiding role that such a body could play. NORWAY said an expert body should support and inspire the review process.

CANADA, supported by the US and AUSTRALIA, proposed establishing a joint SBSTA/SBI contact group to allow for full deliberation of the Review.

On scope, SAUDI ARABIA, CHINA, the PHILIPPINES and the AFRICAN GROUP drew attention to Decision 2/CP.17 (Outcome of the work of the AWG-LCA), which stipulates that parties will continue working on the scope of the Review and consider its further definition. AOSIS and others questioned the value of expanding the scope of the Review.

**NUMBERS/TEXT (AWG-KP):** In the morning informal meeting of the spin-off group on numbers/text, a presentation was made regarding a third proposal on surplus units.

The presentation elaborated on aspects of the proposal, which, *inter alia*: addresses all banked units (Certified Emission Reductions, Emission Reduction Units and Assigned Amount Units); eliminates surplus for parties that have submitted second commitment period QELROs above their current emission levels; states that previous period surplus reserve units may only be used toward domestic compliance assessment; incentivizes QELROs that are below current emissions; and provides clear measurement points.

In the afternoon spin-off group, parties requested additional information on QELROs expressed in tons of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent, in addition to QELROs expressed as a percentage of emissions during a base year or period. A group of developing countries called for parallel treatment of QELROs under five- and eight-year commitment periods. Informal consultations continued.

**REDD+ (SBSTA):** In the morning contact group, Co-Chair Graham explained that agreement has been reached on SBSTA conclusions, including forwarding an annex with outstanding text for consideration in Doha that includes views by parties on MRV and national monitoring systems. He explained that parties consider drivers of deforestation and forest degradation as critical and that further discussion is needed. He highlighted issues that could not be properly addressed due to lack of time, including guidance and safeguards and guidance for forest reference levels and/or forest emission reference levels.

**REDD+ (AWG-LCA):** The spin-off group met in the morning and was open to observers.

AWG-LCA Chair Aysar Tayeb highlighted the importance of making progress under this issue. He said that the Secretariat will prepare a technical paper and efforts will be made to organize the REDD+ workshop before Doha, despite financing difficulties.

Parties then exchanged views on what they want to achieve in Doha, in particular what conditions are necessary for the financing of REDD+ results-based actions. Some countries preferred broader discussions, with some cautioning against the use of the word “conditions.” Key issues discussed included, *inter alia*: adaptation and other co-benefits of REDD+; availability of post-2012 finance for countries to implement REDD+; a new market mechanism for REDD+ third phase; fixing the gaps for supporting REDD+ during preparatory phases one and two; the configuration of a forest governance framework and its linkages with finance; whether to forward the work on finance to the SBI and the scope of that work; MRV of support; support of non-carbon activities; enhancing understanding of “results-based performance;” and interlinkages with discussions held in other groups, such as finance and various approaches.

**AWG-LCA CONTACT GROUP:** In the afternoon contact group, parties first addressed finance.

Many developing countries drew attention to the funding gap from 2013 to 2020, underscoring the need for scaling up finance and for ensuring new, additional and predictable funding. BANGLADESH proposed an incremental increase from 2013 to 2020. He also called for a balanced allocation between mitigation and adaptation. COLOMBIA suggested considering an intermediate funding target for the mid-term period. BARBADOS proposed an additional mid-term period of fast-start finance like commitments. He also indicated that the US\$100 billion per year of long-term finance would be “grossly inadequate” for assisting countries in adaptation.

The US noted that the 2020 finance goal was made in the context of meaningful mitigation action for 2020, questioning whether those parties calling for mid-term finance commitments would also take on mid-term mitigation commitments.

On technology, AWG-LCA Chair Tayeb outlined issues for discussion, including: IPRs; linkages between the technology and financial mechanisms; possible additional functions for the Technology Executive Committee (TEC) in evaluating environmental aspects of technology; and the relationship between the TEC and the Climate Technology Centre (CTC).

On response measures, AWG-LCA Chair Tayeb highlighted that further work is needed on “unilateral measures with global implications.” INDIA called for a spin-off group to address unresolved issues on response measures with clear timelines. He elaborated on discussions needed under the AWG-LCA and indicated that the statement, supported by several developing countries, would be delivered to the AWG-LCA Chair.

AUSTRALIA opposed a spin-off group, pointing to Decision 2/CP.17, which “consolidates all progressive discussions related to response measures under the Convention.” SAUDI ARABIA stressed that parties are working to complete and not consolidate work, and that he does not see a mandate for consolidation. The US explained that work in Durban was “painstakingly negotiated” and, supported by AUSTRALIA, the EU, NEW ZEALAND, MEXICO and AOSIS, opposed the proposal to establish a spin-off group.

### **IN THE CORRIDORS**

As the Bonn session began to draw to a close, several AWG-LCA and SBs groups started to wrap up as focus began to shift towards the way forward after Bonn.

Expectations for Doha seemed to be mixed as revealed in the afternoon open-ended informal consultations by the COP 18 and CMP 8 Presidency. Many interventions reflected the fear that the lack of progress and “procedural wrangling” in Bonn had put the Doha outcome in jeopardy. Some also questioned what the ADP would be able to report to the COP as even the seat reserved for the ADP Chair on the podium remained empty and agreement on an agenda was still pending as of Wednesday evening.

On the election of officers, an online announcement was made late in the afternoon that the COP 17 Presidency had informed regional group coordinators that the emerging consensus had fallen apart and in view of the “impasse, the only avenue left is an election of the officers of the ADP Bureau.” It was also initially announced that the ADP plenary would convene in the evening. The news caused excitement in the Maritim: “If a vote actually takes place, this will be the first time since the adoption of the Convention that such an event takes place.” Many began preparing for a long night, while hoping that a solution could be reached without resorting to a vote. Eventually, the ADP plenary was postponed until Thursday and uncertainty prevailed as to what the next day would bring.

Informal consultations on the ADP agenda were also held throughout the day and continued late into the evening based on a new proposal from the interim ADP Chair. “Thursday will be an interesting day,” speculated one delegate, adding: “My impression from the ADP discussions is that the dynamics of this process is changing and the majority of parties, both developed and developing, are gearing towards a new approach under the ADP that is no longer strictly based on the traditional distinctions between developed and developing countries, where common but differentiated responsibilities is at the core, as it has been in the past.”

## SB 36 AND AWG HIGHLIGHTS: THURSDAY, 24 MAY 2012

In the afternoon, the AWG-KP closing plenary convened. The AWG-LCA closing plenary took place in the evening.

### AWG-KP

In the AWG-KP closing plenary, AWG-KP Chair Diouf indicated that discussions in the AWG-KP contact group have advanced understanding of substantive issues. She identified issues for further consideration, including information on QELROs; carry-over of AAUs; and proposed amendments to the Kyoto Protocol, including the length of the second commitment period. On informal consultations on legal and procedural issues related to the second commitment period, she highlighted enhanced clarity on parties' positions and on the options to facilitate a successful outcome in Doha, noting that "a large amount" of work remains.

AWG-KP Chair Diouf suggested suspending AWG-KP 17 and resuming work at the next meeting, saying this will allow the AWG-KP to proceed promptly with the current organization of work. She noted wide support for an additional session before Doha, explaining that this depends on funding.

**CLOSING STATEMENTS:** Swaziland, for the AFRICAN GROUP, highlighted, *inter alia*, that: the legal status of the second commitment period is not negotiable; a five-year commitment period is needed to avoid locking in low levels of ambition; and that not all Annex I parties have submitted adequate, or any, information on QELROs. He highlighted the African Group proposal on carry-over of units, saying it gives "fair reward" to over-achievement, maintains environmental integrity and is flexible enough to cater for countries with special needs. He also noted monetization of AAUs to capitalize the Adaptation Fund.

The Republic of Korea, for the ENVIRONMENTAL INTEGRITY GROUP (EIG), emphasized commitment to adopting amendments to the Protocol in Doha with a view to operationalize the second commitment period. He highlighted, *inter alia* that: the length of the second commitment period should be eight years; the mid-term review to enhance the level of ambition has to be conducted in the context of the scientific recommendations of the IPCC; and agreement is needed on an environmentally integral treatment of carry-over.

Nauru, for AOSIS, identified the need to address surplus Kyoto units, highlighting the proposals by AOSIS and others to move this issue forward. He called for clear, unconditional, single-number QELROs for a five-year commitment period and for clarifying that units from any new market mechanism under the Convention may only be used within the Kyoto accounting

framework if they have been scrutinized for environmental integrity. He stressed that Protocol amendments adopted in Doha must be legally-binding on parties from 1 January 2013 onwards through the provisional application of these amendments pending their entry into force.

The EU highlighted the importance of a transition and continuity of rules, institutions and mechanisms. He lamented the lack of agreement on the length of the second commitment period, and reiterated support for an eight-year period. He urged other Annex B parties that have not done so to provide information on their QELROs. He called for "the Durban constructive spirit" to take the final steps for a second commitment period in Doha as part of progress across all tracks on the road to a single global and comprehensive legally-binding agreement.

The Gambia, for LDCs, urged those Annex I parties that have not done so to submit their QELROs. He supported: a five-year commitment period to avoid locking the current low ambition for eight years; having a cap on carry-over of AAUs; and the provisional application of the proposed Protocol amendments for the second commitment period. He called for: avoiding the "distractions" by parties wanting to "jump ship"; clearing away the conditionalities; and striving for continuity.

Australia, for the UMBRELLA GROUP, called for ensuring the smooth operation of the second commitment period, to commence on 1 January 2013, as well as securing a smooth post-2012 transition for the flexibility mechanisms. He welcomed the "breakthrough" in Durban to negotiate a new, comprehensive agreement by 2015 covering all parties, recognizing the Kyoto Protocol's role in securing the Durban outcome. He emphasized that alone, a second commitment period "cannot help us avoid dangerous climate change" and that "it will be only one part of the bigger picture."

Saudi Arabia, for the ARAB GROUP, expressed disappointment with the slow pace of negotiations on key issues, in particular on the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol. Underscoring historical responsibility, he said, *inter alia*, that: emission reductions are the primary responsibility of developed countries; negotiations under the AWG-KP should be separated from other negotiations; and the flexibility mechanisms should only benefit parties undertaking commitments during the second Protocol commitment period.

Ecuador, for the ALBA, expressed concern with the lack of fulfillment of the legal mandate to achieve ambitious emission reductions. He said the level of ambition by developed countries is insufficient. He maintained that a central element of the Doha package must be a legal procedure for countries that did not

comply with their obligations under the Kyoto Protocol. He underscored that the ADP should not jeopardize progress under the AWG-KP.

Sierra Leone, for a number of members of the COALITION FOR RAINFOREST NATIONS, expressed preference for a five-year commitment period that would better enable considering new scientific results, and highlighted the need for clear rules to ensure environmental integrity. He emphasized a link between the AWG-KP and AWG-LCA concerning units from the new market mechanism. He stressed the role of REDD+ in the new market mechanism, highlighting public and private capital, and ambitious Annex I commitments.

Honduras, for SICA, expressed “deep concern” over delays concerning the second commitment period under the Protocol, stressing the need for urgent progress. He expressed support for a five-year commitment period.

Thanking delegates, AWG-KP Chair Diouf suspended AWG-KP 17 at 5:58 pm.

### AWG-LCA

The AWG-LCA closing plenary took place late on Thursday evening. On item 3 (preparation of an agreed, comprehensive and balanced outcome to COP 18), item 4 (review) and item 5 (other matters), AWG-LCA Chair Tayeb reported that five workshops took place during the AWG-LCA session. He outlined discussions in the AWG-LCA contact group, saying these have been helpful in furthering parties’ understanding of each others’ views. AWG-LCA Chair Tayeb explained that the oral reports and summaries of the issues discussed under the contact group will be made available online and can be used in future discussions, but they have no formal status. Parties agreed to suspend the session to allow the AWG-LCA to resume work at its next meeting.

Algeria, for the G-77/CHINA, stressed the need for an AWG-LCA outcome in Doha to be in line with the Bali Action Plan and decisions taken in Cancun and Durban. She called for further progress, *inter alia*, on adaptation and technology, and for an additional negotiating session in Bangkok to allow the AWG-LCA to fulfill its mandate.

Australia, for the UMBRELLA GROUP, underscored efforts undertaken since 2007 to fulfill the AWG-LCA’s mandate and build confidence among parties, including the establishment of transparency requirements for all parties, the Adaptation Framework and the Green Climate Fund (GCF). He said the AWG-LCA was mandated by COP 17 to complete specific activities and suggested that issues requiring more technical consideration after Doha be taken up in the permanent Subsidiary Bodies.

The EU highlighted the task in Bonn to take forward what was mandated in Durban and lamented lack of sufficient progress in this regard. She indicated that some items from the Bali Action Plan may not need further work, saying this does not imply that they are less important. She expressed concern over attempts to reopen issues as this could jeopardize the goal of successfully terminating the AWG-LCA. She cautioned against “automatically” transferring issues from the AWG-LCA to the ADP, and supported working in a more effective way, taking into consideration decisions taken in Durban and Cancun.

Switzerland, for the EIG, highlighted that the AWG-LCA is close to fulfilling the Bali Action Plan mandate after the decisions taken in Cancun and Durban. He called for the successful conclusion of the AWG-LCA in Doha and suggested taking forward specific tasks to the Subsidiary Bodies and relevant institutions. He indicated that the AWG-LCA must deliver its part of the Durban package, including on the clarification of pledges, understanding the diversity of NAMAs, Review and REDD+.

Swaziland, for the AFRICAN GROUP, urged the AWG-LCA to give full consideration to adaptation, finance, response measures, and technology transfer and shared vision. On adaptation, he highlighted the need to scale up financial and technology support, and to include NAPs for both LDCs and vulnerable developing countries.

Nauru, for AOSIS, proposed a workshop on common accounting rules to be held in Bangkok and indicated that it should be a full negotiation session. He also proposed a workshop on the diversity of NAMAs for developing countries, highlighting the need for the AWG-LCA to start discussion on the post-2012 financing.

Gambia, for LDCs, called for a spin-off group on the scale of funding, based on the needs of developing countries.

Egypt, for the ARAB GROUP, identified the need for an additional negotiating session before Doha to allow more time for the AWG-LCA to reach clear agreements, underlining the need for specific results. He proposed a workshop on threats of climate change to developing countries.

Cuba, for ALBA, urged for adequate completion of the work of the AWG-LCA and highlighted support for the Bali Roadmap.

Sierra Leone, for a number of members of the COALITION FOR THE RAINFOREST NATIONS, stressed the need for an implementable REDD+ mechanism by Doha and called for discussions on REDD+ financing, including a dedicated window in the GCF.

Tajikistan, for MOUNTAINOUS LANDLOCKED DEVELOPING COUNTRIES, stressed the importance of long-term finance and the provision of assistance to all developing countries, saying exclusive language will not be acceptable to the group.

The PHILIPPINES, for 36 developing countries, highlighted the Convention’s principles, including common but differentiated responsibilities and equity. He underscored unresolved issues under the AWG-LCA and warned against prematurely agreeing on the conclusion of the AWG-LCA in Doha without ensuring an agreed outcome on all elements of the Bali Action Plan mandate.

The AWG-LCA adopted the report of the session (FCCC/AWG/LCA/2012/L.2). AWG-LCA Chair Tayeb underscored the need to start thinking about the agreed outcome to be reached at COP 18. He suspended AWG-LCA 15 at 11:59 pm.

### IN THE CORRIDORS

Efforts continued on Thursday to bring the ADP out of the “deadlock.” With parties reluctant to set a precedent of voting, the COP 17 Presidency resumed consultations on the ADP chairing arrangements. Last ditch efforts were also made to reach agreement on the ADP agenda. The ADP plenary, originally scheduled for the evening, eventually disappeared from the meeting schedule as informal consultations around the ADP continued into the evening.

After 9 pm, a group of relieved delegates emerged and reported that agreement on the ADP agenda had been reached. Moments later, rumors began to circulate that agreement had also been reached on the ADP’s chairing arrangements.

Meanwhile, the AWG-LCA closing plenary was delayed until past 10:30 pm pending “brief” informal consultations inside the plenary hall on mitigation workshops.

While many apparently tired delegates welcomed the opportunity to get some rest before the ADP, SBI and SBSTA closing plenaries on Friday, some expressed hope that the delay would not “unravel” the “hard-won” agreement reached under the ADP.

**ENB SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS:** The *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* summary and analysis of the Bonn Climate Change Conference will be available on Monday, 28 May 2012 online at: <http://www.iisd.ca/climate/sb36/>

## SUMMARY OF THE BONN CLIMATE CHANGE CONFERENCE: 14-25 MAY 2012

The Bonn Climate Change Conference took place from 14 to 25 May 2012 in Bonn, Germany. The conference comprised the 36th sessions of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) and the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA). It also included the 15th session of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (AWG-LCA), the 17th session of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP) and the first session of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP).

Under the SBI, key issues discussed included loss and damage, national adaptation plans (NAPs), and reporting by Annex I and non-Annex I parties. The SBSTA focused on agriculture, research and systematic observation, and methodological guidance on REDD+ (reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries, and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries). Technology and response measures were considered under both the SBI and SBSTA.

Under the AWG-KP, the focus was on issues that need to be finalized to adopt a second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol and for the AWG-KP to conclude its work at the eighth session of the Conference of the Parties (COP) serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP 8). These include: matters relating to quantified emission limitation or reduction objectives (QELROs) with a view to adopting these as amendments to Annex B to the Kyoto Protocol and carry-over of assigned amount units (AAUs). While discussions under the AWG-KP advanced understanding of these issues, many outstanding questions remain, including the length of the second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol and carry-over of surplus units.

Under the AWG-LCA, parties initially debated the agenda and whether it adequately reflected progress since the adoption of the Bali Action Plan at COP 13 in 2007. After agreement on the agenda, debates continued on which issues require consideration so that the AWG-LCA can finalize its work at COP 18 in Doha.

Developed countries stressed “significant progress” and the various new institutions established in Cancun and Durban. They called for a focus on specific tasks mandated by Decision 2/CP.17 (Outcome of the work of the AWG-LCA). Developing countries identified the need to continue discussing issues, such as finance, technology, adaptation, capacity building and response measures in order to fulfill the mandate in the Bali Action Plan.

Under the ADP, discussions centered on the agenda and election of officers. After nearly two weeks of discussions, the ADP plenary adopted the agenda and agreed on the election of officers during the final day of the conference.

At the close of the Bonn Conference, many felt that the atmosphere had been “tense,” especially under the ADP. They expressed hope that this would not have a lasting impact, putting at risk efforts to rebuild trust in the process over the past two years since Copenhagen and the “delicate balance” of interests reflected in the Durban Package.

### IN THIS ISSUE

A Brief History of the UNFCCC and the Kyoto Protocol	2
Report of the Meeting	2
<i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action	3
<i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol	7
<i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group on Long-Term Cooperative Action under the Convention	9
Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice	14
Subsidiary Body for Implementation	18
A Brief Analysis of the Bonn Climate Change Conference	24
Upcoming Meetings	26
Glossary	30

This issue of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* © <enb@iisd.org> is written and edited by Asheline Appleton, Joanna Dafeo, Lagipoiva Cherele Jackson, Elena Kosolapova, Kati Kulovesi, Ph.D., and Eugenia Recio. The Digital Editor is Leila Mead. The Editor is Pamela S. Chasek, Ph.D. <pam@iisd.org>. The Director of IISD Reporting Services is Langston James “Kimo” Goree VI <kimo@iisd.org>. The Sustaining Donors of the *Bulletin* are the European Commission (DG-ENV), the Government of the United States of America (through the Department of State Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs), the Government of Canada (through CIDA), the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ), and the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU). General Support for the *Bulletin* during 2012 is provided by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Government of Australia, the Ministry of Environment of Sweden, the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, SWAN International, the Swiss Federal Office for the Environment (FOEN), the Finnish Ministry for Foreign Affairs, the Japanese Ministry of Environment (through the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies - IGES), the Japanese Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (through the Global Industrial and Social Progress Research Institute – GISPRI), and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). Funding for translation of the *Bulletin* into French has been provided by the Government of France, the Belgium Walloon Region, the Province of Québec, and the International Organization of the Francophone (OIF and IEPF). The opinions expressed in the *Bulletin* are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of IISD or other donors. Excerpts from the *Bulletin* may be used in non-commercial publications with appropriate academic citation. For information on the *Bulletin*, including requests to provide reporting services, contact the Director of IISD Reporting Services at <kimo@iisd.org>, +1-646-536-7556 or 300 East 56th St., 11D, New York, NY 10022, USA.

## A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE UNFCCC AND THE KYOTO PROTOCOL

The international political response to climate change began with the adoption of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in 1992. The UNFCCC sets out a framework for action aimed at stabilizing atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases to avoid “dangerous anthropogenic interference” with the climate system. The Convention, which entered into force on 21 March 1994, now has 195 parties.

In December 1997, delegates to COP 3 in Kyoto, Japan, agreed to a Protocol to the UNFCCC that commits industrialized countries and countries in transition to a market economy (EITs) to achieve emission reduction targets. These countries, known as Annex I parties under the UNFCCC, agreed to reduce their overall emissions of six greenhouse gases by an average of 5% below 1990 levels between 2008-2012 (the first commitment period), with specific targets varying from country to country. The Kyoto Protocol entered into force on 16 February 2005 and now has 192 parties.

**LONG-TERM NEGOTIATIONS IN 2005-2009:** Convening in Montreal, Canada, at the end of 2005, the first session of the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties (CMP) decided to establish the AWG-KP under Protocol Article 3.9, which mandates consideration of Annex I parties’ further commitments at least seven years before the end of the first commitment period. COP 11 created a process to consider long-term cooperation under the Convention through a series of four workshops known as “the Convention Dialogue.”

In December 2007, COP 13 and CMP 3 in Bali, Indonesia, resulted in agreement on the Bali Roadmap on long-term issues. COP 13 adopted the Bali Action Plan and established the AWG-LCA with a mandate to focus on mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology and a shared vision for long-term cooperative action. Negotiations on Annex I parties’ further commitments continued under the AWG-KP. The deadline for concluding the two-track negotiations was Copenhagen in December 2009. In preparation, both AWGs held several negotiating sessions in 2008-2009.

**COPENHAGEN:** The UN Climate Change Conference in Copenhagen, Denmark, took place in December 2009. The high-profile event was marked by disputes over transparency and process. During the high-level segment, informal negotiations took place in a group consisting of major economies and representatives of regional and other negotiating groups. Late in the evening of 18 December, these talks resulted in a political agreement: the “Copenhagen Accord,” which was then presented to the COP plenary for adoption. Over the next 13 hours, delegates debated the Accord. Ultimately, the COP agreed to “take note” of the Copenhagen Accord. In 2010 over 140 countries indicated support for the Accord. More than 80 countries also provided information on their national mitigation targets or actions. Parties also agreed to extend the mandates of the AWG-LCA and AWG-KP until COP 16 and CMP 6 in 2010.

**CANCUN:** Following four preparatory meetings in 2010, the UN Climate Change Conference in Cancun, Mexico, took place in December 2010. By the end of the conference, parties had finalized the Cancun Agreements, which include decisions under both negotiating tracks. Under the Convention track, Decision 1/

CP.16 recognized the need for deep cuts in global emissions in order to limit global average temperature rise to 2°C. Parties also agreed to keep the global long-term goal under regular review and consider strengthening it during a review by 2015, including in relation to a proposed 1.5°C target. They took note of emission reduction targets and nationally appropriate mitigation actions (NAMAs) communicated by developed and developing countries, respectively (FCCC/SB/2011/INF.1/Rev.1 and FCCC/AWGLCA/2011/INF.1, both issued after Cancun). Decision 1/CP.16 also addressed other aspects of mitigation, such as measuring, reporting and verification (MRV); reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries; and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries (REDD+).

The Cancun Agreements also established several new institutions and processes, such as the Cancun Adaptation Framework and the Adaptation Committee, as well as the Technology Mechanism, which includes the Technology Executive Committee (TEC) and the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN). They also created the Green Climate Fund (GCF), designated to be a new operating entity of the Convention’s financial mechanism and governed by a Board of 24 members. Parties agreed to set up a Transitional Committee tasked with the Fund’s detailed design. Parties also established a Standing Committee to assist the COP with respect to the financial mechanism. They also recognized the commitment by developed countries to provide US\$30 billion of fast-start finance in 2010-2012, and to jointly mobilize US\$100 billion per year by 2020.

Under the Protocol track, the CMP urged Annex I parties to raise the level of ambition of their emission reduction targets with a view to achieving aggregate emission reductions consistent with the range identified in the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). Parties also adopted Decision 2/CMP.6 on land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF).

The mandates of the two AWGs were extended to the UN Climate Change Conference in Durban.

**DURBAN:** Following three negotiating sessions in 2011, the UN Climate Change Conference in Durban, South Africa, took place from 28 November to 11 December 2011. The Durban outcomes cover a wide range of topics, notably the establishment of a second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol, a decision on long-term cooperative action under the Convention, and agreement on the operationalization of the GCF. After extensive negotiations, parties also reached agreement to launch the new ADP with a mandate “to develop a protocol, another legal instrument or an agreed outcome with legal force under the Convention applicable to all Parties.” The new negotiating process is scheduled to end by 2015. The outcome is mandated for adoption at COP 21 and should come into effect and be implemented from 2020 onwards.

## REPORT OF THE MEETING

The UN Climate Change Conference in Bonn opened on Monday morning, 14 May 2012. This report summarizes the discussions of the five bodies, based on their respective agendas:

- First session of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP);
- 17th session of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP);
- 15th session of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention (AWG-LCA).
- 36th session of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA); and
- 36th session of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI).

### **AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON THE DURBAN PLATFORM FOR ENHANCED ACTION**

Opening the first session of the ADP, COP 17 President Maite Nkoana-Mashabane (South Africa) identified the new body as an opportunity to consider what needs to be done beyond 2020. She urged parties to engage constructively and create a credible work plan, prioritizing work in such a manner that the ADP can finalize its work by 2015.

Highlighting the ADP as an opportunity to demonstrate that multilateralism works, UNFCCC Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres indicated that the ADP's work should be guided by both a short-term view that considers implementation and a long-term perspective that rises to the challenge of the post-2020 world.

Algeria, for the Group of 77 and China (G-77/China), stated that the ADP's outcome must be in line with the objective, principles and provisions of the Convention and emphasized the importance of progress under the AWG-KP and AWG-LCA. She said the ADP's work plan must be based on Decision 1/CP.17 (Establishment of an *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action), equity, common but differentiated responsibilities and the relevant provisions of the Convention.

Switzerland, for the Environmental Integrity Group (EIG), highlighted the ADP as a turning point in the UNFCCC negotiations. He identified mitigation as the core task, involving all countries in accordance with their common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, while also addressing adaptation, finance, technology and capacity-building. The EIG called for a solid work plan, agreed in Bonn, that includes milestones and a timetable, leading to a smooth adoption of the future regime in 2015.

The European Union (EU) emphasized that their decision to participate in a second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol was taken in the context of the wider package in Durban that leads to transition toward a single global agreement. He said a new protocol would be the most effective form of such an agreement, and identified the need to discuss how the new protocol can allow sustainable development as well as delivering the necessary emission reductions by all parties. On the mitigation work plan, the EU identified the process of closing the mitigation gap as an iterative one whereby the gap is assessed, options to increase ambition are identified and the appropriate decisions are taken.

Australia, for the Umbrella Group, underscored the Durban Platform as a universal platform to take international efforts on climate change forward by providing a "common ground" for all countries. He suggested focusing the work in Bonn on defining

the ADP's work plan and added that the establishment of low-carbon development pathways is key to addressing climate change without sacrificing economic growth or development.

The Gambia, for Least Developed Countries (LDCs), highlighted that the ADP's mandate provides an opportunity to enhance the mitigation ambition and adopt a new protocol under the Convention applicable to all, taking into consideration equity and common but differentiated responsibilities. He suggested identifying deliverables for each COP in the context of a three-year programme that would allow incorporating inputs from, *inter alia*, the IPCC's Fifth Assessment Report. He underscored that the work of the ADP must not be seen as an opportunity to postpone action, and stressed the importance of the second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol.

Nauru, for the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS), expressed hope that the ADP would demonstrate a "sober, serious and determined sense of urgency and ambition." She called for a mitigation work plan that makes strides in closing the recognized mitigation ambition gap.

Swaziland, for the African Group, said the ADP should result in a strengthened multilateral, rule-based climate change regime, emphasizing the need for significant scaling up of developed country mitigation ambition.

Egypt, for the Arab Group, stressed that negotiations under the ADP must ensure full and effective implementation of the Convention. He also emphasized the need to respect, and not renegotiate, the principles that govern international action.

Papua New Guinea, for the Coalition for Rainforest Nations, stated that an international legal instrument is needed now as 2020 is too late. She underscored the important role of REDD+ in the new regime.

India, for Brazil, South Africa, India and China (BASIC), said that the full elaboration of the ADP's work plan will only be possible after the AWG-LCA and AWG-KP have concluded their work and that an outcome should reflect the historical responsibility of developed countries and view the Durban Platform as a historic opportunity to ensure that international climate regime evolves according to the realities of a changing world.

Tajikistan, for Mountainous Landlocked Developing Countries, said a new legally-binding agreement must build upon the Convention's principles and suggested that a contact group be formed to get work underway.

Chile, for Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Peru, Panama and Dominica, said the results of the ADP should take the form of a protocol or some other legally-binding instrument under the Convention.

The Democratic Republic of Congo, for the Central Africa Forests Commission (COMIFAC), said the working group should lead to the adoption of a new binding accord and that the ADP should treat adaptation and mitigation "on equal footing."

Honduras, for the Central American Integration System (SICA), said: adaptation is the priority for the majority of developing countries, in particular for the most vulnerable ones.

Argentina, for a number of countries, emphasized that an ADP outcome should be in accordance with the Convention's principles, recognizing the different nature of developing and developed countries' obligations. He added that developing countries' voluntary NAMAs are related to the provision of

finance, technology and capacity building, and suggested that the ADP's work plan first focus on the scope of the work, including on guiding principles.

Business and Industry NGOs suggested strengthening the avenues for the business and private sector to contribute to the ADP's work in areas such as finance, innovation, MRV, and new market mechanisms.

Climate Action Network (CAN), for Environmental NGOs, urged: increasing mitigation ambition through, *inter alia*, closing loopholes, eliminating fossil fuel subsidies and adopting an ADP work plan with milestones.

ICLEI, for Local Government and Municipal Authorities, underscored that there is a "dangerous gap" between now and 2020 that needs to be addressed by increasing mitigation ambition. He highlighted the key role of local governments in successfully implementing climate change policies.

Women and Gender Constituency cautioned against exacerbating gender inequalities and identified the need to integrate human and social dimensions into the climate change negotiations. She suggested a workshop on gender equality.

Youth NGOs (YOUNGOs) said: the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities is not negotiable; the integrity of the Convention should not be undermined; and closing the ambition gap should be a priority for the ADP.

**ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS:** Discussions during ADP 1 focused on the election of officers and the agenda. Agreement on these two issues took time and was only reached during the ADP closing plenary on 25 May.

**Election of Officers:** In the ADP plenary on Thursday, 17 May, COP Vice-President Robert Van Lierop (Suriname) explained that intensive consultations have taken place before and during the Bonn meeting concerning the ADP Bureau. He noted that it remains unresolved and urged parties to agree on nominees for the Chair and Vice-Chair so that the ADP can begin its work. The three candidates for ADP Chair were Harald Dovland (Norway), nominated by the Western Europe and Others Group, Kishan Kumarsingh (Trinidad and Tobago), nominated by the Latin American and Caribbean Group (GRULAC) and Jayant Moreshwar Mauskar (India), nominated by the Asia-Pacific Group. A proposal was made to elect the Chair at this session and continue consultations on the election of other officers until Doha. Delegates were given until Friday, 18 May to consult on this proposal.

On 18 May, the ADP reconvened. COP Vice-President Van Lierop explained that consultations on the election of the ADP Bureau by Amb. Nozipho Joyce Mxakato-Diseko (South Africa) had been inconclusive. Amb. Diseko raised the possibility of the ADP Bureau being elected by a vote in accordance with the draft rules of procedure.

Expressing regret for the situation, The Gambia, for LDCs, supported by Guyana, for GRULAC, the EU, the US, Australia, AOSIS and the Russian Federation, proposed that the COP Presidency preside over the ADP until matters concerning the election of its Bureau are resolved. Parties agreed that the COP President would preside during the Bonn session, while consultations continued on the election of officers.

On Saturday, 19 May, COP Vice-President Van Lierop informed the ADP plenary that the COP 17 President had designated Sandea de Wet (South Africa) to preside over the

ADP on her behalf and urged parties to intensify their efforts in informal consultations facilitated by Amb. Diseko so that the ADP Bureau can be elected by the end of the Bonn session.

Informal consultations on the ADP Bureau continued throughout the meeting. On the morning of Friday, 25 May, Amb. Diseko reported that the consultations had been "intensive" and that they revealed parties strong interest and commitment to the work of the ADP. She explained there was agreement on the principles of equitable and geographical balance, rotation between Annex I and non-Annex I parties and regional rotation in 2012-2015. She noted that despite all efforts there was no successful outcome and described this as a "sad state of affairs." She requested parties to prepare for elections in accordance with the draft rules of procedure. The EU, supported by Saudi Arabia, requested an adjournment to allow for further consultations among the regional groups. The ADP plenary was suspended for further informal consultations.

In the evening, Amb. Diseko reported that agreement had been reached. She outlined an interim arrangement, which will be applied pending its endorsement by COP 18. The arrangement consists of a multi-year approach for the Bureau, with two Co-Chairs, one from a non-Annex I country and one from an Annex I country. In 2012-2013, the ADP will be co-chaired by Mauskar and Dovland. Oleg Shamanov (Russian Federation) will be the Rapporteur. In 2013, Kumarsingh will co-chair the ADP with a Co-Chair from an Annex I country, and the Rapporteur will come from a non-Annex I party. In 2015, the non-Annex I party Co-Chair will be from the African Group and the Rapporteur from a non-Annex I country. Amb. Diseko commended the ADP's achievement, underscoring the need for "the spirit of unity" and called for keeping transparency and mutual trust among parties.

UNFCCC Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres welcomed the new Bureau members and commended de Wet and the COP presidency for having "unequivocal perseverance" in taking forward the negotiations on the agenda and the Bureau officers. She highlighted the need to keep working in a spirit of mutual respect and congratulated parties for "having taken the first of many footsteps of this journey."

ADP Co-Chair Mauskar highlighted that the Durban package of decisions is a landmark and, in that context, the ADP is significant, in establishing a new process. He acknowledged that taking the process forward to achieve meaningful results at Doha and beyond will be complex and challenging. He said that the ADP Co-Chairs will undertake intersessional consultations on how parties intend to progress on the two work streams under the ADP agenda.

**Agenda and organization of work:** The ADP agenda was first considered on Saturday, 19 May when interim Chair de Wet proposed that the ADP plenary adopts the agenda (FCCC/ADP/2012/1).

China requested the Secretariat to explain the rationale of the items on the ADP's provisional agenda. The Secretariat responded that items 3 (planning of work in accordance with Decision 1/CP.17) and 4 (work plan on enhancing mitigation ambition) were placed on the provisional agenda on the basis of Decision 1/CP.17.

China stated that Decision 1/CP.17 does not specify that the work plan on enhancing mitigation ambition should be under

the ADP. He emphasized a post-2020 outlook as the ADP's core task, and also noted that raising the level of ambition does not only refer to mitigation but also to means of implementation in technology, finance and capacity building. China suggested deleting item 4 and amending item 3 to "planning of the work on mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology development and transfer, transparency of action and support, and capacity building." Singapore cautioned against listing specific issues to avoid potential exclusion of those not listed. He suggested that item 3 be adopted as proposed, while item 4 on the work plan on mitigation ambition be amended by adding "in accordance with Decision 1/CP.17."

Nauru, for AOSIS, The Gambia, for LDCs, Barbados, Grenada, Switzerland, the EU, the US, Mexico, Singapore, Australia, Japan and Costa Rica urged the adoption of the agenda as originally proposed. The EU stressed that the work plan on enhancing mitigation ambition was a core element of the Durban package. Barbados explained that a draft decision had been proposed in Durban that included only a post-2020 outlook but the most vulnerable countries had rejected this proposal. He suggested modifying item 4 by adding a reference to "pre-2020 mitigation ambition." Many parties emphasized the need to adopt the agenda and begin substantive work as soon as possible, including on pre-2020 mitigation ambition.

Brazil recognized that the work plan on enhancing mitigation ambition is part of the agreement on the ADP, highlighting that discussions around this issue will be broader than a simple reference to mitigation. He stressed that the main focus of the ADP's work will be on negotiations for the new instrument and that the two elements of its work will be separate.

The Philippines, supported by several parties, proposed deleting item 4 and amending item 3 to "planning of work in accordance with all the elements of Decision 1/CP.17." Grenada, the EU, Barbados and others opposed this proposal. With Switzerland and others, they reiterated their support for adopting the agenda as originally proposed by the Chair.

Venezuela noted her country's formal reservation to Decision 1/CP.17 in Durban and highlighted that developed countries had already "violated" the Durban package by not putting on the table their QELROs for the second commitment period under the Protocol. Supported by Bolivia, she requested adding a footnote to the agenda to indicate that: "the implementation of Decision 1/CP.17 should be examined on the basis of its compliance with international law, in accordance with the principle of *pacta sunt servanda* and, in particular, with the exception on non-performance related to the full respect and compliance with the UNFCCC and its Kyoto Protocol, for the parties that are parties of those instruments." Venezuela stressed that the footnote is "indispensable" for her country's support for the adoption of the agenda. The US, Singapore and Switzerland preferred not including a footnote.

Interim Chair de Wet stressed that the Durban outcome was "a very balanced one," saying it will be difficult to delete agenda items. She urged parties to adopt the agenda as originally proposed, thereby sending "a tremendous" message to the international community that parties are ready to begin work under the ADP.

The Philippines, supported by Ecuador, Bolivia, Malaysia, Argentina, Iran, China and others, opposed this. After further

discussion, interim Chair de Wet proposed launching substantive work provisionally on the basis of the proposed agenda while conducting informal consultations on the agenda.

Reconvening the ADP plenary on Tuesday, 22 May, interim Chair de Wet invited parties to share their views on how they see work proceeding under the ADP.

Venezuela, speaking on behalf of Argentina, Algeria, Bahrain, Bolivia, China, Comoros, Cuba, Democratic Republic of Congo, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, India, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Nicaragua, Oman, Palestine, Paraguay, the Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates and Yemen, expressed willingness to discuss a post-2020 mitigation framework, while recognizing the need to enhance mitigation actions in 2012-2020. He also pointed out that a separate agenda item on enhancing mitigation ambition under the ADP would "render meaningless" the ongoing discussions under the AWGs. He expressed support for an inclusive agenda that captures, in a non-selective manner, all the elements of Decision 1/CP.17.

A number of parties highlighted the key elements of the Durban package and called for launching the ADP's work as agreed in Durban. They expressed concern over efforts to "undo" the Durban package and delay progress. The EU, supported by Norway, highlighted the "fine and balanced" Durban compromise, consisting of: a second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol; a pre-2020 mitigation work plan; agreement by 2015 applicable to all; concluding the AWG-LCA; and operationalizing the institutions created in Cancun and Durban. He underscored that ministers noted the ambition gap in Durban "with great concern" but it is not for negotiators to change the agreement. The EU also expressed concern over attempts to change the ADP's mandate to negotiate a new, legally-binding instrument applicable to all by introducing the Bali Action Plan into the new mandate. He urged agreement on the ADP agenda and said work should be launched under two contact groups.

Switzerland, for the EIG, warned that attempting to change the balanced Durban package will put Doha at risk. Chile highlighted that the Durban Platform has "transformative potential, and presents opportunities to increase the ambition that must be seized." With many others, he listed key elements of the Durban package, including: a second Protocol commitment period to commence in January 2013; a new legally binding agreement, concluded as early as possible but no later than 2015, in order to take effect no later than 2020; a work plan on enhancing mitigation ambition with a view to closing the ambition gap and reach an emissions trajectory consistent with the goal of limiting temperature increase to below 2°C; and the successful completion of the AWG-LCA's work at COP 18. Chile elaborated that the new agreement should include mitigation commitments by all parties, finance commitments, adaptation, technology development and transfer, transparency of action, and support and capacity building.

Australia highlighted two distinct work streams under the ADP on: the development of a protocol or legally-binding agreement; and enhancing mitigation ambition. He suggested using 2012 as a "conceptual year" aimed at sharing ideas on the work of the ADP. Proposing the adoption of the ADP agenda based on what was agreed to in Durban, Nauru, for

AOSIS, called for a detailed schedule of work with timetables and milestones. He underscored the need for a work plan for enhancing mitigation ambition. Colombia proposed establishing two contact groups on agenda items 3 and 4. The Marshall Islands emphasized the decision by ministers in Durban to launch the mitigation work plan.

The US identified “critically important” features in the Durban Platform, highlighting an instrument with legal force for all parties and a path leading further into the future than before. He underscored two work streams with a clear mandate from the COP: developing a post-2020 regime and working on pre-2020 mitigation. Emphasizing the need to implement rather than renegotiate Decision 1/CP.17, he called for planning the ADP’s work at this meeting, including input and interactions over the coming months.

Brazil emphasized the importance of advancing all aspects of the Durban outcome and highlighted the main focus of the Durban Platform to create a new legal instrument under the UNFCCC as “an important opportunity that must not be lost.” South Africa underscored the importance of trust and mutual reassurance, upon which the Durban Package was based, including agreement to look at the level of ambition.

The Russian Federation highlighted a new, comprehensive agreement as the main objective of the ADP’s work and warned against using the agenda as a tool to review the “fragile and multifaceted” balance of interests agreed in Durban. Stressing urgency, Japan warned against wasting time on agenda discussions and called for starting substantive work in contact groups. New Zealand expressed concern over the “difficult atmosphere” and attempts to renegotiate ministerial agreements. She stressed that the agenda must be compatible with the Durban outcome, and proposed establishing two contact groups. Norway urged agreement on the agenda and Chairs, calling for discussions on the ADP work programme and milestones. He underscored that work must start under both work streams. Canada supported working through two groups, which would make progress possible in the discussions to raise the level of ambition and arrive at a “single, global and comprehensive agreement” for all parties.

India underscored the importance of working on, *inter alia*, mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology development and transfer, and ensuring that the principles of equity and common but differentiated responsibilities are “fully suffused” in each item. He also recalled that ambition relates to all elements of work. China emphasized the need to continue work under the AWG-LCA, according to the Bali Action Plan. He urged continued work on mitigation ambition under the AWG-KP and AWG-LCA.

The ADP plenary reconvened on Friday, 25 May. Interim Chair de Wet explained that she had undertaken extensive consultations on the agenda. She said the discussions had provided clarity on the future and for the organization of work. She thanked parties for their hard work, active participation, flexibility and understanding and invited them to adopt the agenda.

Venezuela noted that the footnote requested by his country regarding reassurances had not been reflected in the revised agenda. He asked for the footnote to be reflected either in a miscellaneous document or in the agenda. Interim Chair de

Wet responded that her understanding was that Venezuela’s concerns had been addressed during informal discussions and that Venezuela’s request would be reflected in the report of the session. Parties agreed to reflect the footnote in a miscellaneous document and in the meeting’s report.

Parties then adopted the agenda as revised during informal consultations (FCCC/ADP/2012/L.1). The revised agenda contains item 3 (implementation of all the elements of Decision 1/CP.17), with paragraph (a) on “matters related to paragraphs 2 to 6” and paragraph (b) on “matters related to paragraphs 7 and 8.” Item 3 also includes a footnote explaining that the item “will be considered within the context of Decision 1/CP.17 and under the Convention, without prejudice to the position of any Party or to the work of the other Subsidiary Bodies.” The footnote also indicates that two work streams are initiated under paragraphs (a) and (b), and further work streams may be considered as the need arises.

**ADP WORKSHOP:** On Friday, 18 May, an ADP workshop took place under the title “Workshop to increase the level of ambition on paragraph 8 of Decision 1/CP.17.” For detailed coverage of the workshop, see <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12542e.html>.

**CLOSING PLENARY:** The ADP closing plenary took place on Friday, 25 May. Parties adopted the meeting’s report (FCCC/ADP/2012/L.2).

Saudi Arabia, for the Asia-Pacific Group, said that electing the ADP Bureau by a vote would have had serious consequences for the UNFCCC process and highlighted the importance of preserving consensus.

The Gambia, for LDCs, called for a meeting before Doha to advance the ADP’s work and avoiding lengthy discussion on the organization of work.

Nauru, for AOSIS, highlighted that policy decisions should be guided by science, and success will only be reached by working together. On the post-2020 period, he supported milestones and deadlines for smooth and steady progress by 2015. He supported submissions on the planning of work and on identifying ways to close the ambition gap. He said a work plan should focus on, *inter alia*: developed countries’ information on policies to increase the level of ambition; developing countries’ analysis of their mitigation potential and means of implementation needed; and developed countries’ information on potential scale up of support for enabling ambitious NAMAs.

Australia, for the Umbrella Group, said the ADP should intensify global cooperation on climate change to meet the below 2°C goal. He called for progress on the two tasks: enhancing pre-2020 mitigation ambition and negotiating a new legal agreement applicable to all.

Swaziland, for the African Group, expressed hope for work under the ADP to provide an opportunity for a fair, multilateral, rules-based system in the context and principles of the Convention. He expressed disappointment that some parties have “pushed back” on assurances given in Durban with regard to the second commitment period under the Protocol, and also that the comparability assurance from developed countries had not been realized. He called for an increase in the level of ambition on all fronts, including through the scale-up of finance, technology transfer, and focused capacity building towards developing countries for mitigation and adaptation.

The EU expressed support for adopting a ratifiable second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol in Doha as part of a transition to a single, comprehensive and global legally binding climate agreement by 2020. He also stated the need to take forward the pre-2020 mitigation work plan as agreed to in Durban. He proposed that workshops be held to take forward the two substantive work streams covered by the agenda in the ADP: one on a work plan taking parties towards the 2015 agreement, and the other on ways to enhance pre-2020 mitigation ambition.

Algeria, for the G-77/China, expressed hope that the work under the ADP will lead to concrete and positive outcomes for all parties, in accordance with the principles and provisions of the Convention.

Mexico, for the EIG, described the Durban package as a turning point in the climate negotiations, noting that substantive work must start in the next session on both work streams to increase mitigation ambition and adopt a legal instrument under the Convention that is applicable to all parties.

Guyana, for GRULAC, congratulated the Chairs and Rapporteur of the ADP on their election, adding that they were “pleased” to be part of the leadership of the ADP, and offered the support and cooperation of GRULAC.

Venezuela, for the Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America (ALBA), reiterated the need for developed countries to fulfill their ambitions in reducing emissions, highlighting the efforts of developing countries in reducing emissions. He said that parties need to avoid artificial splits between working groups as this threatens the principle of equity based on common but differentiated responsibilities. He referred to the ADP as the “new ship of hope.”

Slovenia, for Central and Eastern European countries, congratulated the new leadership and expressed hope on the success of the work of the ADP.

Egypt, for the Arab Group, noted that the ADP work programme must be based on clear agreement and understanding on guidelines in accordance with all the articles and principles of the Convention.

The Philippines, on behalf of a group of 38 countries, indicated that all elements of Decision1/CP.17 form part of the ADP’s work, noting that the organization of the work must reflect this as well as the principles and provisions of the Convention. She observed that the legal form of the outcome should not be decided up-front, nor should discussions on this be an immediate priority.

Honduras, for SICA, reaffirmed adaptation as the main priority, requesting serious advancement during the next negotiating session to ensure actions and results that favor reduction of vulnerability in their region.

Sierra Leone, for the Coalition for Rainforest Nations, stated that a new, international agreement is needed before 2020. He underscored the need for REDD+ mechanisms to be part of the new regime, and for private and public capital to make REDD+ phases effective.

Tajikistan, for Mountainous Landlocked Developing Countries, called for, *inter alia*: a work plan with “uncomplicated and inclusive institutional arrangements,” with clear milestones. He underscored the need for a new legal agreement

to acknowledge the wide range of climate vulnerabilities developing countries face and to provide long-term financial support to vulnerable developing countries.

ADP Co-Chair Mauskar suspended the ADP at 8:21 pm.

### **AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON FURTHER COMMITMENTS FOR ANNEX I PARTIES UNDER THE KYOTO PROTOCOL**

The AWG-KP opening plenary took place on Monday, 15 May, with Madeleine Diouf (Senegal) as the AWG-KP Chair and Jukka Uosukainen (Finland) as the AWG-KP Vice-Chair.

Chair Diouf highlighted important outcomes from CMP 7 and called on parties to build on the momentum to finalize the AWG-KP’s work for adoption by CMP 8 in Doha. Parties adopted the agenda and agreed to the organization of work (FCCC/KP/AWG/2012/1 and 2).

**ANNEX I FURTHER COMMITMENTS:** Chair Diouf recalled the AWG-KP’s mandate to conclude its work by CMP 8 and identified issues for consideration to fulfill its mandate. These include QELROs (FCCC/KP/AWG/2012/MISC.1 and Add.1), carry-over of AAUs and proposed amendments to the Protocol, including the length of the second commitment period.

Parties agreed to establish a contact group on Annex I further commitments, co-chaired by Chair Diouf and Vice-Chair Uosukainen. A spin-off group was subsequently created, focusing on numbers and text. It was co-facilitated by Jürgen Lefevere (EU) and Sandea de Wet (South Africa), later replaced by Harald Winkler (South Africa), following de Wet’s appointment as the interim ADP Chair. Legal and procedural issues were considered in informal consultations facilitated by Vice-Chair Uosukainen.

**Numbers/Text:** On this issue (FCCC/KP/AWG/2012/MISC.1 and Add.1), parties considered a number of proposals, and *inter alia*: heard presentations on the parties’ QELROs submissions; discussed the level of ambition of parties’ commitments and carry-over of surplus AAUs; and reviewed options for addressing the carry-over of surplus AAUs from the first to the second commitment period.

On **QELROs**, parties received information from Switzerland, Norway, Kazakhstan, the EU, AOSIS, Belarus, Australia, and Croatia regarding, *inter alia*: clarifications on QELROs submissions and associated conditions; views on market mechanisms; national policies implemented to support QELROs; and preferences for the length of the second commitment period.

On **ambition**, the EU introduced two proposals. The first one would establish a review of the level of ambition of parties’ QELROs, coinciding with the 2013-2015 Review under the Convention, to address the concern raised by some parties that an eight-year commitment period would lock in a low level of ambition. The second one includes a simplified procedure to amend Protocol Annex B to facilitate an increase in the level of ambition by parties.

Brazil introduced a proposal on revising QELROs with a view to strengthening commitments under the Protocol. The proposal indicates that Annex I parties may, at any time, strengthen their QELROs and ensure the immediate effect of such revision by: forfeiting a part of their AAUs; transferring these units to a cancellation account established for this purpose in the national registry; and communicating such transfer to the Secretariat.

On *carry-over of surplus AAUs*, the African Group, AOSIS, and Brazil offered proposals and presentations. The African Group proposal states, *inter alia*, that surplus AAUs can be carried over but placed in a special reserve, provided that the party is participating in the second commitment period and the party's QELRO is lower than its 2008 greenhouse gas inventory. In addition, the proposal permits parties to trade 2% of the reserve per year with 1% of the revenue to be spent on domestic mitigation and 1% of AAUs to be transferred to the Adaptation Fund.

The AOSIS proposal states that, *inter alia*, the total quantity of AAUs, Certified Emission Reductions and Emission Reduction Units approved for carry-over, and carried over from the previous commitment period, shall be deemed a party's previous period surplus reserve. It also states that after the end of the subsequent commitment period, a party may use any carried over units up to a specified quantity.

The Brazilian proposal contains various paragraphs, which state that, *inter alia*, if the emissions of an Annex I party in a commitment period are less than its assigned amount under this article, the difference shall, on request of that party, be carried over to the subsequent commitment period. It alternatively states that if the assigned amount of an Annex I party included for the first commitment period is less than that party's emissions in 2007 multiplied by five, the difference between the assigned amount for that party for the first commitment period and its emissions in 2012 multiplied by five shall be deemed the previous period surplus reserve.

**Legal issues:** During informal consultations facilitated by Vice-Chair Uosukainen, parties considered legal aspects of the entry into force of the second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol. Issues discussed included: how to secure continuity between the first and second commitment periods; the application of accounting rules in the second commitment period; options for provisional application of Protocol amendments to secure continuity pending their entry into force; and ways to raise ambition levels during the second commitment period.

Parties also considered an AOSIS proposal relating to provisional application of the Protocol amendment, an AOSIS proposal for amendments and an African Groups proposal on legal issues. Many parties stressed the need for clarity on legal issues to ensure a "seamless continuation" of the Protocol beyond 2012. Enhanced clarity on parties' positions was noted, as well as "a large amount" of work remaining before a successful outcome in Doha can be reached.

**CLOSING PLENARY:** The AWG-KP closing plenary convened on Thursday, 24 May. Chair Diouf indicated that discussions in the AWG-KP contact group have advanced understanding of substantive issues. She identified issues for further consideration, including information on QELROs; carry-over of AAUs; and proposed amendments to the Kyoto Protocol, including the length of the second commitment period. On informal consultations on legal and procedural issues related to the second commitment period, she highlighted enhanced clarity on parties' positions and on the options to facilitate a successful outcome in Doha, noting that "a large amount" of work remains.

Chair Diouf suggested suspending AWG-KP 17 and resuming work at the next meeting, saying this will allow the AWG-KP to proceed promptly with the current organization of work. Parties

agreed to the proposal. Chair Diouf also noted wide support for an additional session before Doha, explaining that this depends on funding.

Swaziland, for the African Group, highlighted, *inter alia*, that: the legal status of the second commitment period is not negotiable; a five-year commitment period is needed to avoid locking in low levels of ambition; and that not all Annex I parties have submitted adequate, or any, information on QELROs. He highlighted the African Group's proposal on carry-over of units, saying it gives "fair reward" to over-achievement, maintains environmental integrity and is flexible enough to cater for countries with special needs. He also noted monetization of AAUs to capitalize the Adaptation Fund.

The Republic of Korea, for the EIG, emphasized commitment to adopting amendments to the Protocol in Doha with a view to operationalize the second commitment period. He highlighted, *inter alia*, that: the length of the second commitment period should be eight years; the mid-term review to enhance the level of ambition has to be conducted in the context of the scientific recommendations of the IPCC; and agreement is needed on an environmentally integral treatment of carry-over.

Nauru, for AOSIS, identified the need to address surplus Kyoto units, highlighting the proposals by AOSIS and others to move this issue forward. He called for clear, unconditional, single-number QELROs for a five-year commitment period and clarifying that units from any new market mechanism under the Convention may only be used within the Kyoto accounting framework if they have been scrutinized for environmental integrity. He stressed that Protocol amendments adopted in Doha must be legally-binding on parties from 1 January 2013 onwards through the provisional application of these amendments pending their entry into force.

The EU highlighted the importance of transition and continuity of rules, institutions and mechanisms. He lamented the lack of agreement on the length of the second commitment period, and reiterated support for an eight-year period. He urged other Annex B parties that have not done so to provide information on their QELROs. He called for "the Durban constructive spirit" to take the final steps for a second commitment period in Doha as part of progress across all tracks on the road to a single global and comprehensive legally-binding agreement.

The Gambia, for LDCs, urged those Annex I parties that have not done so to submit their QELROs. He supported: a five-year commitment period to avoid locking in the current low level of ambition for eight years; having a cap on carry-over of AAUs; and the provisional application of the proposed Protocol amendments for the second commitment period. He called for: avoiding the "distractions" by parties wanting to "jump ship"; clearing away the conditionalities; and striving for continuity.

Australia, for the Umbrella Group, called for ensuring the smooth operation of the second commitment period, to commence on 1 January 2013, as well as securing a smooth post-2012 transition for the flexibility mechanisms. He welcomed the "breakthrough" in Durban to negotiate a new, comprehensive agreement by 2015 covering all parties, recognizing the Kyoto Protocol's role in securing the Durban outcome. He emphasized

that alone, a second commitment period “cannot help us avoid dangerous climate change” and that “it will be only one part of the bigger picture.”

Saudi Arabia, for the Arab Group, expressed disappointment with the slow pace of negotiations on key issues, in particular on the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol. Underscoring historical responsibility, he said, *inter alia*, that: emission reductions are the primary responsibility of developed countries; negotiations under the AWG-KP should be separated from other negotiations; and the flexibility mechanisms should only benefit parties undertaking commitments during the second commitment period.

Ecuador, for ALBA, expressed concern with the lack of fulfillment of the legal mandate to achieve ambitious emission reductions. He said the level of ambition by developed countries is insufficient. He maintained that a central element of the Doha package must be a legal procedure for countries who did not comply with their obligations under the Kyoto Protocol. He underscored that the ADP should not jeopardize progress under the AWG-KP.

Sierra Leone, for a number of members of the Coalition for Rainforest Nations, expressed preference for a five-year commitment period that would better enable considering new scientific results, and highlighted the need for clear rules to ensure environmental integrity. He emphasized a link between the AWG-KP and AWG-LCA concerning units from the new market mechanism. He stressed the role of REDD+ in the new market mechanism, highlighting public and private capital, and ambitious Annex I commitments.

Honduras, for SICA, expressed deep concern over delays concerning the second commitment period under the Protocol, stressing the need for urgent progress. He expressed support for a five-year commitment period.

Thanking delegates, AWG-KP Chair Diouf suspended AWG-KP 17 at 5:58 pm.

#### **AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON LONG-TERM COOPERATIVE ACTION UNDER THE CONVENTION**

Opening the session on Tuesday, 15 May, AWG-LCA Chair Aysar Tayeb (Saudi Arabia) recalled the mandate to finish the AWG-LCA’s work at COP 18. On the agenda and organization of work (FCCC/AWGLCA/2012/1), he outlined intentions to establish a single contact group. He also noted that five in-session workshops will take place, as mandated by Decision 2/CP.17 (Outcome of the work of the AWG-LCA).

Discussions ensued on the AWG-LCA’s proposed agenda and organization of work. China, Bolivia, Venezuela and Nicaragua expressed support for adopting the agenda as proposed. The EU lamented that the proposed agenda did not recognize specific issues that the AWG-LCA was tasked by COP 17 to take forward in 2012. He emphasized that listing the elements of the Bali Action Plan in the agenda implied that no progress had been made since COP 13. He specified that the agenda did not take into account the various new institutions created or that some of the issues had been transferred from the AWG-LCA to the SBI and SBSTA. Switzerland, for the EIG, called for clarity on the organization of work, noting that many of the items on the proposed agenda had already been addressed. The US, supported by Canada and others, expressed concern with reopening of

issues and proposed establishing spin-off groups to consider issues specifically mandated by COP 17. Chair Tayeb noted that issues on the proposed agenda have enjoyed different levels of progress and listing them on the agenda did not imply that they were going to be reopened.

Informal consultations on the agenda followed. On Thursday, 17 May, Chair Tayeb reported to the plenary that agreement had been reached on the agenda, with a footnote stating that items on the agenda enjoy different levels of progress through decisions adopted by COP 16 and COP 17, and some items may not need further work under the AWG-LCA taking into account the progress made. He also noted agreement to proceed in the single contact group; rapidly launch spin-off groups to consider tasks mandated in Durban; and evaluate progress through the single contact group to decide where additional spin-off groups are needed. Chair Tayeb also said he will consult informally on Annex I parties whose special circumstances have been recognized by the COP.

Parties then adopted the revised agenda (FCCC/AWGLCA/2012/L.1) and agreed to establish a single AWG-LCA contact group, chaired by Tayeb.

**AGENDA ITEMS 3, 4 AND 5:** Discussions in the AWG-LCA contact group focused on agenda items 3 (preparation of an agreed, comprehensive and balanced outcome to COP 18), 4 (review) and 5 (other matters).

At the first contact group meeting on Friday, 18 May, parties debated whether spin-off groups would only focus on the implementation of tasks mandated by COP 17. Agreement was reached to launch spin-off groups on tasks mandated by COP 17, including on: shared vision; developed country mitigation; developing country mitigation; REDD+; sectoral approaches; various approaches, including markets; and Review.

Progress made under the AWG-LCA since the adoption of the Bali Action Plan and the need for additional spin-off groups was debated during subsequent contact group meetings. Many developing countries called for spin-off groups on adaptation, finance, technology and response measures, underscoring outstanding issues. Developed countries opposed, highlighting progress made under the AWG-LCA and establishment of various new institutions and processes. Belarus, for Kazakhstan, Ukraine and the Russian Federation, supported a spin-off group on other matters and EITs.

At the AWG-LCA closing plenary on Thursday, 24 May, Chair Tayeb said discussions in the AWG-LCA contact group had been helpful in furthering parties’ understanding of each other’s views. Parties agreed that the oral reports and summaries of the issues discussed under the contact group will be made available online and can be used in future discussions, but they have no formal status. The reports can be accessed at: [http://unfccc.int/meetings/bonn\\_may\\_2012/session/6646.php](http://unfccc.int/meetings/bonn_may_2012/session/6646.php).

Discussions on issues under the AWG-LCA contact group are summarized below under the respective agenda items and sub-items.

#### **PREPARATION OF AN AGREED COMPREHENSIVE AND BALANCED OUTCOME FOR COP 18: Shared**

**Vision:** Discussions in the informal group on shared vision, facilitated by Zou Ji (China), focused on identifying possible areas of convergence.

Botswana, for the African Group, Uganda, for LDCs, China, Brazil and others stressed the importance of the means of implementation. Some developing countries urged for a discussion on the context, whereas several developed countries said the focus should be on the global goal for emission reductions and timeframe for peaking. China, supported by Brazil, requested that the importance of context be included in the Facilitator's report. Mexico, the Philippines and others said that relevant contextual elements need to be defined. Trinidad and Tobago, for AOSIS, said that burden-sharing cannot be discussed without identifying the burden first. While many parties supported discussion of the context for identifying the goals, their views differed on the context. Some parties suggested the principle of equity is key for considering, *inter alia*: contributions, capabilities and circumstances. Some developing countries drew attention to trade, response measures and intellectual property rights (IPRs) as potential elements within the context.

In the final AWG-LCA contact group meeting, three options were identified for consideration: specific numbers for goals with context; range of numbers for goals with context; or process or mechanism with which to work on a specific number or range of numbers for goals. Facilitator Ji underscored the AWG-LCA workshop on equitable access to sustainable development as a good opportunity to exchange views. Among key issues, he highlighted discussions on context for equity and equitable access to sustainable development; definition of equity; and application of the equity principle. For more details on the workshop, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12538e.html>.

**Mitigation: Developed country mitigation:** Developed country mitigation was considered in a spin-off group and an in-session workshop.

The workshop on clarification of developed country parties' quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets and related assumptions and conditions took place on Thursday, 17 May. For more details on the workshop, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12539e.html>.

On Tuesday, 22 May, the spin-off group on mitigation by developed country parties convened for the first time, facilitated by Andrej Kranjc (Slovenia).

The EU, Norway, the US, Japan and other developed countries identified the ADP as the appropriate place for discussing mitigation ambition. India highlighted that discussions should be based on the Bali Action Plan, which mandates comparable efforts among developed countries. Ecuador underscored that the AWG-LCA should not conclude its work before the Bali Action Plan mandate on developed country mitigation has been fulfilled.

A number of developed countries highlighted the agreement to terminate the work of the AWG-LCA in Doha. Many developing countries supported further work on common accounting rules, with South Africa calling for considering comparability and compliance. Parties also suggested that the group focus on further clarifying assumptions underlying developed country pledges. China indicated that progress on comparability of developed countries' mitigation efforts is required, otherwise the Bali Action Plan mandate will not be accomplished and the AWG-LCA will not be able to terminate its work at Doha. India suggested the group elaborate a robust set of rules on

accountability and enhancement of mitigation ambition. Many developed countries supported an updated technical paper and further workshops on understanding underlying assumptions.

In the final AWG-LCA contact group meeting on 24 May, Facilitator Kranjc reported on substantive issues and suggestions for the way forward. On substantive issues, he noted, *inter alia*: that all parties agreed to the continuation of the process to clarify developed country parties' quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets is essential to enable the understanding of various issues, such as assumptions and conditions associated with the targets. He also noted a number of divergent views around issues related to, *inter alia*: the comparability of efforts by all developed country parties as outlined in the Bali Action Plan and whether the ambition gap should be addressed in the AWG-LCA, ADP, or other bodies under the Convention.

On the way forward, the group agreed, *inter alia*: to continue working on the clarification of targets in workshops, but in a more rigorous way and on the usefulness of updating the technical paper (FCCC/TP/2012/2) to incorporate additional information provided by parties. Divergent views were reported on the following: whether the update of the technical paper should be preceded by further submissions from developed country parties in the form of an agreed and updated common template; and on the next steps in and after Doha, including if the process of clarifying targets should continue, and if specific work should be carried out under the subsidiary bodies (SBs).

**Developing country mitigation:** Developing country mitigation was considered in a spin-off group and an in-session workshop.

The workshop to further the understanding of the diversity of NAMAs by developing country parties, underlying assumptions, and any support needed for implementation of these actions took place on Friday, 18 May. For more details on the workshop, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12540e.html>.

The spin-off group was facilitated by Gary Theseira (Malaysia). It discussed the tasks mandated by Decision 2/CP.17. There were divergent views on how to take the work forward and three options were considered, namely:

- the organization of a workshop to further the understanding of the diversity of NAMAs, structured around the elements identified in Decision 2/CP.17, paragraph 34, including assumptions and methodologies, sectors and greenhouse gases, support needs and others;
- that the Secretariat prepare a synthesis report or compilation paper gathering the information provided by developing country parties on their NAMAs through submissions or workshops; and
- any future workshop should not focus on understanding the diversity of NAMAs or the elements of Decision 2/CP.17, paragraph 34, but on other issues.

Parties agreed to have a focused workshop on specific NAMAs, structured in accordance with Decision 2/CP.17, that pays particular attention to support needs, but not limited to this.

Other issues discussed include: considering the diversity of NAMAs under the Subsidiary Bodies after the AWG-LCA finishes its work; developing guidelines for MRV of support; work on the understanding of means of implementation; and developing a common template for pledges from non-Annex I Parties listed in FCCC/AWGLCA/2011/INF.1.

**REDD+:** REDD+ was considered in a spin-off group, facilitated by Yaw Osafo (Ghana). Issues discussed included: parties' submissions on REDD+ financing related issues; what parties want to achieve in Doha; and the way forward.

On party submissions on REDD+ finance, Guyana, supported by the Philippines, highlighted that the 2°C target can only be achieved if REDD+ is part of the solution. With many others, he underscored that the required scale of financing can only be provided through a variety of sources. Many parties also supported a REDD+ window in the Green Climate Fund. China and others expressed a preference for public sources of financing, with China saying he is open to explore other sources.

Mexico elaborated on a proposal that parties participating in REDD+ establish a national registry to account for the verified emission reductions and carbon stock units and inform a UNFCCC REDD+ registry to prevent double counting.

Brazil supported further work on new ideas on appropriate market-based mechanisms excluding generation of offsets. Bolivia suggested further work on non-market approaches.

The EU said REDD+ emission reductions results should be assessed against independent review. With Switzerland and India, he suggested further work on definitions. Some parties highlighted the relevance of enhancing understanding of "results based performance."

On what parties want to achieve in Doha, in particular on conditions necessary for financing REDD+ results-based actions, some countries preferred broader discussions, with some cautioning on the use of the word "conditions." Key issues discussed included, *inter alia*: how the finance landscape for the post-2012 period will allow countries to implement REDD+; a new market mechanism for REDD+ phase 3; "fixing the gap" for supporting REDD+ preparatory phases; whether to forward the work on finance to the SBI and the scope of this work; MRV of support; support for related activities that do not deliver carbon sequestration, such as adaptation; and interlinkages with discussions held in other groups, such as finance and various approaches.

On the way forward, Chair Tayeb highlighted that the Secretariat will prepare a technical paper, as well as efforts to organize the REDD+ workshop before Doha, despite financing difficulties. Many parties expressed support for organizing the workshop, with some suggesting potential areas to focus on.

**Sectoral approaches:** The AWG-LCA spin-off group on sectoral approaches and sector-specific actions convened twice, facilitated by George Wamukaya (Kenya).

Parties reflected on the way forward in light of Decision 2/CP.17, which agrees to continue work towards a general framework (paragraph 74) and issues related to addressing emissions from international aviation and maritime transport (paragraph 78).

During the spin-off groups, parties expressed a willingness to move this item forward within a multilateral setting; reiterated the importance of sectoral approaches and sector-specific actions; and reflected on how to finish or transition work in light of the AWG-LCA's mandate to terminate work in Doha.

Views varied on the framing of a general framework that would apply to all sectors as set out in Convention Article 4.1(c) (reducing emissions on relevant sectors). Parties emphasized that

such a framework should not inhibit investment and growth in these sectors.

On emissions from international transport, parties recognized the roles of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) and International Maritime Organization (IMO) and emphasized the importance of the UNFCCC to send a "signal" to these bodies for reducing emissions. Party views varied, however, on how to package the "signal" to these bodies.

On the way forward, many parties expressed that more time is needed before submitting proposals for text that could form the basis of negotiations in the coming sessions. Parties also welcomed the opportunity to make submissions on paragraphs 74 and 78, which will be made available on the UNFCCC website to form the basis of future work at the next session.

**Various approaches:** Various approaches, including markets, were considered in a spin-off group, facilitated by Alexa Kleysteuber (Chile), and two in-session workshops. For more details on the workshops, held on Saturday, 19 May, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/download/pdf/enb12541e.pdf>.

In the spin-off group, parties were invited to consider various approaches, including opportunities for using markets, to enhance the cost-effectiveness of, and to promote, mitigation actions, bearing in mind different circumstances of developed and developing countries.

On a framework for various approaches, parties focused discussions on paragraph 79 of Decision 2/CP.17 concerning the need for robust standards that deliver real, permanent, additional and verified mitigation outcomes, avoidance of double counting, and achievement of a net decrease and/or avoidance of greenhouse gas emissions.

On the new market-based mechanism, parties discussed the need to elaborate modalities and procedures for, as well as specific elements of, such a mechanism.

Parties requested that the Secretariat prepare a technical paper, and agreed to focus further discussions through workshops.

**Response measures:** Response measures were discussed in the AWG-LCA contact group. India called for a spin-off group to address unresolved issues on response measures with clear timelines. He elaborated on discussions needed under the AWG-LCA and indicated that the statement, supported by several developing countries, would be delivered to the AWG-LCA Chair. Australia opposed a spin-off group, pointing to Decision 2/CP.17, which "consolidates all progressive discussions related to response measures under the Convention." Saudi Arabia stressed that parties are working to complete and not consolidate work, and that he does not see a mandate for consolidation. The US explained that work in Durban was "painstakingly negotiated."

Saudi Arabia, China, Kuwait, Venezuela, Argentina, India and others, opposed by the EU, Singapore, Mexico, Australia and the US, suggested considering trade measures. Some parties highlighted the World Trade Organization as the appropriate forum to consider trade measures.

Summarizing discussions in the final AWG-LCA contact group, Chair Tayeb explained that a number of parties had expressed the view that response measures have not yet been fully addressed by the AWG-LCA, while others argue that the consideration of the issue has been completed.

**Adaptation:** Adaptation was discussed in the AWG-LCA contact group. Algeria, for the African Group, the Philippines, Argentina, Nicaragua and other developing countries called for establishing a spin-off group on adaptation, noting the need to further consider NAPs for developing countries that are not LDCs. Bangladesh, for LDCs, also drew attention to gaps in terms of scaling up support, transparency, accounting, risk management and risk reduction strategies.

Saudi Arabia called for addressing economic diversification to build resilience and Egypt highlighted vulnerability assessments and developing countries' urgent needs. The Philippines, for the G-77/China, highlighted that some areas of the Bali Action Plan have not been thoroughly addressed and that the mechanisms established for adaptation and other issues are not yet operational. Opposing the establishment of a spin-off group on adaptation, Switzerland, Norway, the EU and other developed countries pointed to progress and current work under other bodies on, *inter alia*, the Adaptation Committee, and loss and damage.

Chair Tayeb noted in the final contact group that a number of issues were identified during the discussion under adaptation, but there were divergent views about the issues raised and how they are to be addressed.

**Finance:** Issues related to finance were discussed in the AWG-LCA contact group. The Philippines, for the G-77/China, Algeria, for the African Group, Cuba, Egypt, Indonesia, Venezuela, Saudi Arabia, India and others, opposed by the US and the EU, called for establishing a spin-off group on finance.

The G-77/China stressed finance as one of the most important pillars of the Bali Action Plan. With many others, she emphasized the need to consider transparency of fast-start finance and the lack of agreement on long-term finance. She stressed the need to discuss financial support for: NAPs in developing countries other than LDCs; biennial update reports; and reporting and verification. The G-77/China also stressed that the financial institutions that "we have now" are "empty shells" and, with the African Group and many developing countries, expressed concern over the finance gap between 2012 and 2020.

Egypt, Pakistan and others called for the consideration of how to conclude institutional arrangements between the Green Climate Fund (GCF) and the COP. The EU indicated that the AWG-LCA is not the proper forum to discuss arrangements between the COP and the GCF. China called for capitalizing the GCF and for the Standing Committee to start its work as soon as possible. Saudi Arabia stated that special attention is needed for the public and private sourcing of finance. Pakistan stressed that closing the finance gap is just as important as closing the mitigation gap.

Many developing countries drew attention to the funding gap from 2013 to 2020, underscoring the need for scaling up finance and for ensuring new, additional and predictable funding. Bangladesh proposed an incremental increase from 2013 to 2020. He also called for a balanced allocation between mitigation and adaptation. Colombia suggested considering an intermediate funding target for the mid-term period. Barbados proposed an additional mid-term period of commitments like fast-start finance. He also indicated that the US\$100 billion per year of long-term finance would be "grossly inadequate" for assisting countries in adaptation. The US noted that the 2020 finance

goal was made in the context of meaningful mitigation action for 2020, questioning whether those parties calling for mid-term finance commitments would also take on mid-term mitigation commitments.

The US and the EU emphasized that: developed countries have provided assurance that there will be no financing gap in 2012-20; a work programme on long-term finance has been established; and developed countries are fully committed to providing fast-start finance. The EU also indicated that decisions on provision of finance have been taken in Durban and Cancun.

Chair Tayeb reported to the final AWG-LCA contact group that a number of issues were identified during the discussion on finance and that there were divergent views about the issues raised and how they are to be addressed.

**Technology:** On technology, many developing countries supported establishing a spin-off group. Japan, the EU and other developed countries opposed a spin-off group on technology.

The G-77/China underscored the issue as one of the four pillars of the Bali Action Plan and called for further discussions, in particular on IPRs. Algeria, for the African Group, called for a clear distinction between issues to be addressed under the ADP for the post-2020 regime and issues to be finished by the AWG-LCA.

Many developed countries drew attention to progress on technology and its consideration under other UNFCCC bodies. The US and Singapore indicated that there are other avenues to discuss IPRs. Bolivia suggested further discussion on, *inter alia*, barriers to development and transfer of technologies and IPRs that are in the public domain.

Developing countries listed issues for further consideration, including: IPRs; linkages between the technology and financial mechanisms; possible additional functions for the Technology Executive Committee (TEC) in evaluating environmental aspects of technology; and the relationship between the TEC and the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN).

During the final AWG-LCA contact group, Chair Tayeb, assisted by Kunihiko Shimada (Japan), reported that parties had an opportunity to have a focused discussion on issues relating to IPRs, the linkage between the Technology Mechanism and the financial mechanism, and additional functions of the TEC and the CTCN. The report also reflected the diversity of parties' views on these issues.

**Capacity Building:** On capacity building, China, for the G-77/China, supported further discussion on, *inter alia*: institutions, financial mechanisms, monitoring and performance tools. The Philippines highlighted means of implementation. Drawing attention to the recently established Durban Forum for in-depth discussion on capacity building, the US, the EU and other developed countries opposed having a spin-off group.

During the final AWG-LCA contact group, Chair Tayeb noted that although confirming the richness of information that emerged during the first meeting of the Durban Forum on Capacity Building, some parties expressed the view that it does not enable a valid assessment of the delivery of capacity building; and the identification of performance indicators to monitor and assess capacity building is an issue that still needs to be addressed by the AWG-LCA. He also noted that other parties expressed the view that the AWG-LCA does not need

to re-consider capacity-building, as the agreement reached in Durban on the establishment of the Durban Forum addresses substantive issues previously raised by parties.

**REVIEW:** The spin-off group on Review, facilitated Gertraud Wollansky (Austria), met twice. Parties considered an information paper highlighting the mandate of the group from Decisions 1/CP.16 and 2/CP.17. The main issues discussed were the scope of the Review and the expert consideration of inputs.

On scope, Botswana, for the African Group, supported by China and Brazil, observed that the Durban decision defines the scope and modalities of the Review, and that the scope includes not just the temperature goal but also the adequacy of means of implementation for developing countries. Calling for a prompt start to the Review, Trinidad and Tobago, for AOSIS, with Singapore, the EU and others, emphasized the need for a narrow focus on scope in the context of what was agreed in Cancun.

Saudi Arabia, China, the Philippines and the African Group drew attention to Decision 2/CP.17, which stipulates that parties will continue working on the scope of the Review and consider its further definition. AOSIS and others questioned the value of expanding the scope of the Review.

On the expert consideration of inputs, Japan proposed an open-ended expert meeting format and called for avoiding duplicating the work of the IPCC. Trinidad and Tobago, for AOSIS, opposed by Botswana, for the African Group, China, Brazil and the Philippines, reiterated support for establishing an expert group, highlighting the guiding role that such a body could play. She also noted that tasking the SBs to assist with the Review does not preclude the establishment of an expert body. Norway said an expert body should support and inspire the review process. Canada, supported by the US and Australia, proposed establishing a joint SBSTA/SBI contact group to allow for full deliberation of the Review.

Reporting on progress to the final AWG-LCA, Facilitator Wollansky said that there was a general understanding among parties that the work this year is to further consider the definition of the scope of the review and the expert consideration of the inputs. She highlighted two options for consideration: limiting the scope of the Review; or extending the Review. She also noted another view that there is no need to discuss scope as defined by inputs. She also noted that parties had discussed expert consideration of inputs and various options had been considered, including establishing a new body to provide guidance to review, in addition to the SBs; and that a joint SB contact group should be used because such a group would have party ownership and incur no additional cost. She noted general guidance for expert consideration including: holding meetings with sessions parallel to the SBs; calls for meetings to be open-ended; and to avoid duplication of work. She noted that beginning in 2014 intersessional activities might be required.

**OTHER MATTERS: Countries with economies in transition and countries whose special circumstances have been recognized by the COP:** Chair Tayeb conducted bilateral meetings with relevant parties. Consultations were also held with Turkey, an Annex I country seeking to benefit from financial, capacity-building and technological support due to special circumstances recognized by the COP. A group of EITs presented a draft decision text for consideration in Doha.

**CLOSING PLENARY:** The AWG-LCA closing plenary took place late in the evening on Thursday, 24 May. Parties agreed to suspend the session to allow the AWG-LCA to resume work at its next meeting.

Algeria, for the G-77/China, stressed the need for an AWG-LCA outcome in Doha to be in line with the Bali Action Plan and decisions taken in Cancun and Durban. She called for further progress, *inter alia*, on adaptation and technology, and an additional negotiating session in Bangkok to allow the AWG-LCA to fulfill its mandate.

Australia, for the Umbrella Group, underscored efforts undertaken since 2007 to fulfill the AWG-LCA's mandate and build confidence among parties, including the establishment of transparency requirements for all parties, the Adaptation Framework and the GCF. He said the AWG-LCA was mandated by COP 17 to complete selected activities and suggested that issues requiring more technical consideration after Doha be taken up in the permanent SBs.

The EU highlighted the task in Bonn was to take forward what was mandated in Durban and lamented lack of sufficient progress. She indicated that some items from the Bali Action Plan may not need further work, saying this does not imply that they are less important. She expressed concern over attempts to reopen issues as this could jeopardize the goal of successfully terminating the AWG-LCA. She cautioned against "automatically" transferring issues from the AWG-LCA to the ADP, and supported working in a more effective way, taking into consideration decisions taken in Durban and Cancun.

Switzerland, for the EIG, highlighted that the AWG-LCA is close to fulfilling the Bali Action Plan mandate after the decisions taken in Cancun and Durban. He called for the successful conclusion of the AWG-LCA in Doha and suggested taking forward specific tasks to the SBs and relevant institutions. He indicated that Doha must deliver on the Durban package, including on the clarification of pledges, understanding the diversity of NAMAs, Review and REDD+.

Swaziland, for the African Group, urged the AWG-LCA to give full consideration to adaptation, finance, response measures, and technology transfer and shared vision. On adaptation, he highlighted the need to scale up financial and technology support, and to include NAPs for both LDCs and vulnerable developing countries.

Nauru, for AOSIS, proposed a workshop on common accounting rules to be held in Bangkok and indicated that it should be a full negotiating session. He also proposed a workshop on the diversity of NAMAs for developing countries, highlighting the need for the AWG-LCA to start discussion on the post-2012 financing.

The Gambia, for LDCs, called for a spin-off group on the scale of funding, based on the needs of developing countries.

Egypt, for the Arab Group, identified the need for an additional negotiating session before Doha to allow more time for the AWG-LCA to reach clear agreements, underlining the need for specific results. He proposed a workshop on threats of climate change to developing countries.

Cuba, for ALBA, urged for adequate completion of the work of the AWG-LCA and highlighted support for the Bali Roadmap.

Sierra Leone, for a number of members of the Coalition for Rainforest Nations, stressed the need for an implementable REDD+ mechanism by Doha and called for discussions on REDD+ financing, including a dedicated window in the GCF.

Tajikistan, for Mountainous Landlocked Developing Countries, stressed the importance of long-term finance and the provision of assistance to all developing countries, saying exclusive language will not be acceptable to the group.

The Philippines, for 36 developing countries, underscored the Convention's principles, including common but differentiated responsibilities and equity. He underscored unresolved issues under the AWG-LCA and warned against prematurely agreeing on the conclusion of the AWG-LCA in Doha without ensuring an agreed outcome on all elements of the Bali Action Plan mandate.

The AWG-LCA adopted the report of the session (FCCC/AWG-LCA/2012/L.2). Chair Tayeb underscored the need to start thinking about the agreed outcome to be reached at COP 18. He suspended AWG-LCA 15 at 11:59 pm.

### **SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE**

SBSTA 36 opened on Monday, 14 May, with Richard Muyungi (Tanzania) as Chair. Parties adopted the agenda and organization of work (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/1) with minor amendments. The SBSTA plenary adopted conclusions on Friday, 25 May.

**NAIROBI WORK PROGRAMME ON IMPACTS, ADAPTATION AND VULNERABILITY (NWP):** During the SBSTA opening plenary, SBSTA Chair Muyungi reported on progress under the NWP (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/INF.1). The EU welcomed significant progress since the last report. The SBSTA conclusions were prepared by the SBSTA Chair in consultation with interested parties.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In the conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.4), the SBSTA welcomes the report on progress on implementation of the NWP and notes the Secretariat's efforts on further enhancing its outreach. The SBSTA invites parties and relevant organizations to submit their views by 17 September 2012 on future areas of work.

**METHODOLOGICAL GUIDANCE FOR REDD+:** This issue was first addressed in the SBSTA plenary on Thursday, 17 May. It was further addressed in a contact group and informal consultations co-chaired by Peter Graham (Canada) and Victoria Tauli-Corpuz (the Philippines). Main issues discussed included: MRV, forest monitoring systems and drivers of deforestation and forest degradation.

On *national forest monitoring systems*, parties discussed at length the potential features of the system, with many saying it should be built on a phased approach. Parties' views differed on whether activities "shall" or "should" take into account the most recent IPCC guidance. Parties discussed a robust national forest monitoring system, with some underscoring it should provide data and information that is complete, meaning that the information provided should allow the technical analysis of the results of the activities implemented.

On the *type of information to be collected*, Bolivia highlighted that non-market approaches and information on the multiple functions of forests and adaptation should be considered. Some parties underscored that the information

monitored should be selected by each country implementing REDD+. Many developing countries highlighted the need to build capacity and provide adequate support and finance. Some developed countries emphasized the need to include consideration of social and environmental safeguards within the monitoring system and stressed the need for robust information.

On *MRV*, parties discussed possible interlinkages between MRV for NAMAs and for REDD+, with many developing countries highlighting the need to look for synergies. Some emphasized the need to find a balance between the quality and type of information required, while ensuring simplicity and avoiding overburdening developing countries. Many developing countries suggested reference to the need for MRV support. A number of parties emphasized that the system should be built on existing national monitoring systems. Many highlighted linkages with discussions in other groups, such as REDD+ financing under the AWG-LCA. Some underscored that access to technology and information should be facilitated by developed countries, but others also emphasized the role of South-South cooperation. Some parties suggested the information be included in the national communications and biennial update reports.

On *information systems*, a party suggested a technical assessment for the reference levels based on experiences and lessons learned from LULUCF. One party highlighted the need to consider lessons learned from the first report submitted. Norway suggested a "step-wise approach" to MRV.

On *drivers of deforestation and forest degradation*, parties exchanged initial views. Some highlighted that drivers are different in each country and should be addressed at the domestic level. Some parties, opposed by Brazil and Argentina, suggested addressing international drivers in the draft text. Parties did not reflect discussions on drivers in the SBSTA conclusions, as some parties indicated that it was premature to reflect initial discussions.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.9/Rev.1), the SBSTA takes note of the parties' submissions, in particular on drivers of deforestation and forest degradation and on robust and transparent national forest monitoring systems. SBSTA agrees to:

- continue its work on MRV on the basis of an annex containing elements for a possible draft decision; to complete this work at SBSTA 37; and prepare recommendations for a draft decision for consideration by COP 18;
- continue its work on issues identified in Decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 72 and Appendix II, in particular on how to address drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, including consideration of social and economic aspects in developing countries at the national level, at SBSTA 37;
- continue consideration of the timing and the frequency of the presentations of the summary of information on how all of the safeguards referred to in Decision 1/CP.16, Appendix I, are being addressed and respected, and the need for further guidance at SBSTA 37, with a view to conclude its consideration at SBSTA 39; and
- initiate work on the technical assessment of the proposed forest reference emission levels and/or forest reference levels at SBSTA 37, to report to the COP 18 and 19 on progress made, including any recommendations for a draft decision on this matter.

The SBSTA recognizes that:

- further work on methodological guidance may be needed pending the outcome of the work of the AWG-LCA;
- parties aiming to undertake the activities referred to in Decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 70, could consider the adaptation needs of the country concerned; and
- the annex on elements for a possible draft decision contains bracketed text structured under two subheadings: modalities for national forest monitoring systems and MRV.

#### TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER AND THE TEC'S

**REPORT:** The discussions and conclusions on technology have been summarized under the SBI on page 21.

#### RESEARCH AND SYSTEMATIC OBSERVATION:

This issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/MISC.2 and Add.1-2, FCCC/SBSTA/2012/MISCs.3-4), was first taken up by the SBSTA plenary on 14 May.

The World Meteorological Organization reported on the Draft Implementation Plan and Governance Structure of the Global Framework for Climate Service. The Global Climate Observing System described elements of the Satellite Supplement. The IPCC highlighted elements of the paper on the framework for a new generation of socio-economic scenarios for climate change impacts, adaptation, vulnerability, and mitigation research. On Saturday, 19 May, SBSTA 36 held a research dialogue.

The issue was subsequently taken up in informal consultations facilitated by Stefan Rosner (Germany) and David Lesolle (Botswana). Parties were unable to reach agreement

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.17), the SBSTA takes note of the parties' views and agrees to continue its consideration of this item at SBSTA 37 on the basis on the draft text contained in the annex to the conclusions.

#### FORUM AND WORK PROGRAMME ON RESPONSE MEASURES:

This issue was taken up by the SBI and SBSTA plenaries on 14 May. It was subsequently addressed in a joint SBI/SBSTA forum operating as a contact group on all issues related to response measures, and was co-chaired by SBSTA Chair Muyungi and SBI Chair Tomasz Chruszczow (Poland). On 17 May, parties shared views on how to organize the work of the forum. Argentina, for the G-77/China, called for a clear set of modalities for the operationalization of the forum and work programme, including *inter alia*: assigning specific tasks and activities for the rest of the year and creating an outline schedule for 2013 to address the specific needs and concerns of developing country parties. South Africa, for the African Group, stressed economic and social impacts of trade and trade-related measures adopted by developed countries.

The US, supported by Australia, suggested that parties focus discussions on how to undertake the consolidation of response measures issues. The EU suggested that a forum take place in an open context to include non-parties, such as civil society and experts. Australia said work should focus on substantial points of convergence on issues to be addressed in the work programme.

China stressed the importance of the forum to minimize or prevent the negative impacts of response measures, and expressed concern with the inclusion of aviation in the EU Emissions Trading Scheme. Saudi Arabia suggested exchanging information through, *inter alia*, workshops.

In their closing plenaries, the SBI and SBSTA Chairs reported on positive results achieved in the first meeting of the forum, and that review of the work of the programme will take place with a view to providing recommendations at COP 19. They highlighted that the plan of work is structured along the eight areas identified in Decision 8/CP.17 (Forum and work programme on the impact of the implementation of response measures), using modalities adopted by the same decision and taking into account that modalities considered are subject to financial resources.

**SBI/SBSTA Conclusions:** In the conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.18 and FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.25), the SBI and SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- agree to implement the work programme on the impact of the implementation of response measures as contained in the annex;
- request the Secretariat to support, under the guidance of the SBI and SBSTA Chairs, the implementation of the work programme; and
- invite relevant organizations and other stakeholders to participate in the activities of the work programme contained in the annex.

**PROTOCOL ARTICLE 2.3 (ADVERSE IMPACTS OF POLICIES AND MEASURES):** This matter was considered jointly with other related issues in the response measures forum.

**AGRICULTURE:** Decision (2/CP.17) requested the SBSTA to consider issues related to agriculture with the aim of adopting a decision at COP 18. This issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/MISC.6 and Add.1-2) was first considered by the SBSTA on 14 May. Chair Muyungi subsequently facilitated informal consultations.

Throughout the informal consultations, many parties referred to their submissions, highlighting the need to, *inter alia*: ensure that work on agriculture is consistent with the SBSTA mandate in Convention Article 9 (the scope of technical, scientific and methodological work); assess existing scientific and technological knowledge on agriculture and climate change; increase knowledge sharing; enhance information on "knowledge gaps;" improve agricultural productivity and resilience in the context of climate change; and improve capacity building in developing countries.

Many developing countries underscored the importance of adaptation and its relative priority compared to mitigation. They also highlighted the need to achieve food security and the importance of technology transfer. Some countries called for a dialogue on how to facilitate, *inter alia*, technology transfer and innovation. Others called for a work programme to move the process forward. A developing country suggested workshops as a useful way forward. A developed country noted the need to learn more from external bodies and organizations, such as the IPCC. Another developed country highlighted the need to recognize the site-specific nature of agriculture.

On the draft conclusions, parties' views diverged on, *inter alia*: language regarding the aim of the assessment of the current state of scientific knowledge and whether to reference a workshop (FCCC/AWGLCA/2009/CRP.2) and a technical paper (FCCC/TP/2008/8) on opportunities and challenges from mitigation in the agricultural sector. Bolivia, for the G-77/China, objected to the absence of language on adaptation, with the Philippines adding that the word was "profusely used" in

previous discussions. The US expressed support for addressing adaptation concerns, but objected to limiting the focus of work on this issue. No agreement was reached.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its draft conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.19), the SBSTA agrees to continue consideration of this agenda item at its 37th session.

**METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES (CONVENTION):**

**Work programme on developed country biennial reporting guidelines:** This issue was first taken up by the SBSTA plenary on Monday, 14 May. It was subsequently taken up in a contact group and informal consultations co-chaired by Helen Plume (New Zealand) and Qiang Liu (China). The group considered the scope of the common tabular format and activities that will be undertaken before Doha.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.11), SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- initiates its consideration of the work programme on a common tabular format;
- acknowledges that, in accordance with Decision 2/CP.17, developed country parties shall use the reporting guidelines for the preparation of the first biennial reports;
- agrees that the work programme on a common tabular format should include the submission of views from parties;
- invites parties to submit their views;
- requests the Secretariat to organize a workshop on common tabular format in October 2012; and
- agrees to continue its consideration of the common tabular format at SBSTA 37.

**Work programme on the revision of the guidelines for the review of biennial reports and national communications, including national inventory reviews:** This issue was first taken up by the SBSTA plenary on 14 May. It was subsequently taken up in a contact group and informal consultations co-chaired by Helen Plume and Qiang Liu. During the meetings, parties considered, *inter alia*, national inventory reviews for developed country parties with a view to conclude work by COP 19.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.13), the SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- initiates its consideration of the work programme on the revision on the guidelines for the review of biennial reports and national communications, including national inventory reviews, for developed countries;
- acknowledges that, in accordance with Decision 2/CP.17, biennial reports are due on 1 January 2014 and that Annex I parties are requested to submit their sixth national inventories by the same date;
- requestes the Secretariat to prepare a technical paper summarizing the current review process under the Convention;
- invites parties to submit their views on the elements of the work programme; and
- given the need to complete the work by COP 19, agrees to further consider the work programme on the revision of review guidelines at SBSTA 37.

**General guidelines for domestic MRV of domestically supported NAMAs by developing countries:** This issue was first taken up by the SBSTA plenary on Monday, 14 May. It was subsequently taken up in a contact group and informal consultations co-chaired by Helen Plume and Qiang Liu.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.15), the SBSTA initiates its consideration of the development of general guidelines for domestic measurement, reporting and verification of domestically supported NAMAs by developing countries and agrees to continue the interactive exchange of views on the guidelines with a view to agreeing on the next steps at SBSTA 37.

**Bunker fuels:** This issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/MISC.7) was first taken up by the SBSTA on 14 May. SBSTA Chair Muyungi consulted with interested parties and SBSTA conclusions. During the opening SBSTA plenary, the IMO reported on its work to improve energy efficiency in international maritime transport.

Brazil expressed concern regarding the unilateral treatment of emissions in specific regional systems and identified the need to further consider the economic impacts of market-based measures. China noted that the IMO's ship energy efficiency regulations do not reflect the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities in a full and objective manner, and requested that ICAO consider countries' differentiated responsibilities.

Singapore, supported by Panama, welcomed progress made by the IMO and ICAO in addressing climate change in their respective sectors. Japan acknowledged the series of guidelines adopted by the IMO Marine Environment Protection Committee as helpful. The EU welcomed ICAO's efforts to accelerate work towards a global market-based mechanism and encouraged parties to support the IMO's efforts to assess options for such a mechanism. Cuba, on behalf of several countries, expressed concern with respect to unilateral measures in relation to aviation emissions, such as under the EU Emissions Trading Scheme. Australia welcomed ICAO's shift towards a more action-oriented "implementation mode" and underscored the need for the universal application of market-based measures.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.14), the SBSTA takes note of the information received from, and the progress reported by the secretariats of ICAO and IMO regarding their ongoing work to address emissions from fuel used for international aviation and maritime transport, and notes the views expressed by parties on this information. The SBSTA invites the secretariats of ICAO and IMO to continue to report, at future sessions of the SBSTA, on relevant work on this issue.

**Common metrics:** This issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/INF.2) was first taken up by the SBSTA plenary on Monday, 14 May. It was subsequently taken up in informal consultations facilitated by Michael Gytarsky (Russian Federation).

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.5), the SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- welcomes the report on the workshop on common metrics, which focused on uncertainties, new and refined areas or metrics, policy goals, and the relationship between policy frameworks and metrics;
- notes that common metrics are being assessed by the IPCC in the context of its work on the Fifth Assessment Report;
- invites the IPCC to present its findings at SBSTA 40; and
- agrees to continue its consideration of the item at SBSTA 40.

**Greenhouse gas data interface:** During the closing plenary on 25 May, SBSTA Chair Muyungi reported on the issue.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.7), the SBSTA, *inter alia*: welcomes the further improvements made by the Secretariat to the greenhouse gas data interface;

and agrees to consider at SBSTA 38 matters relating to further development of the interface in order to accommodate relevant changes relating to the forthcoming use of the revised reporting guidelines by Annex I parties.

**METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES (PROTOCOL): Carbon capture and storage (CCS) under the CDM:** This issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/MISC.8 and Add.1-2), was first addressed by the SBSTA on 14 May. Peer Stiansen (Norway) facilitated informal consultations.

Facilitator Stiansen reported that parties made progress on the establishment of global reserve of Certified Emission Reductions for CCS project activities under the CDM. Discussion focused on, *inter alia*: the eligibility of CCS project activities that involve the transport of carbon dioxide from one country to another, or that involve geological storage sites that are located in more than one country; and the establishment of a global reserve of CER units for CCS project activities.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L. 8), the SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- agrees to continue consideration of this matter at SBSTA 37;
- invites parties, intergovernmental organizations and admitted observer organizations, by 13 August 2012, to submit their views on the eligibility of certain CCS project activities; and
- requests the Secretariat to prepare a technical paper on the issue of transboundary effects of project activities for its consideration at SBSTA 37.

**Forests in exhaustion under the CDM:** This issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/MISC.10) was addressed in the SBSTA plenary on 14 May with informal consultations facilitated by Eduardo Sanhueza (Chile).

Brazil reiterated the importance of the CDM in promoting sustainable development and proposed that definition of forests in exhaustion included in Annex 3 of the proposed agenda for the 50th meeting of the CDM Executive Board. Parties' views on the issue diverged and some supported having further discussions.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.10), the SBSTA takes note of the summary report in document FCCC/SBSTA/2012/MISC.10 and agrees to continue consideration of this agenda item at SBSTA 38.

**LULUCF under the CDM:** This issue was first addressed in the SBSTA plenary on Thursday, 17 May. It was further addressed in a contact group co-chaired by Marcelo Rocha (Brazil) and Peter Iversen (Denmark).

Parties had an initial exchange of views on issues requested by Decision 2/CMP.7 (LULUCF), in particular on: accounting of emissions by sources and removals by sinks from LULUCF, including through an activity- or land-based approach; modalities and procedures for possible additional LULUCF activities under the CDM; and alternative approaches to addressing the risk of non-permanence under the CDM.

Parties agreed to prioritize work and submit text, with a focus on technical aspects and experiences.

Brazil drew attention to non-permanence under the CDM, in particular to issues such as liability for reversibility, consideration of buffers, and insurance and its implications. Belarus elaborated on time necessary to consider that "permanence" is achieved. The EU suggested that parties also consider how the issue of addressing non-permanence would work, *inter alia*, between different commitment periods.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.3), SBSTA initiates its consideration of the issues related to LULUCF as referred to in Decision 2/CMP.7 (LULUCF), paragraphs 5, 6, 7 and 10 for reporting on progress to COP/MOP 8. The SBSTA also invites parties and observers to submit their views for compilation by SBSTA 37 on:

- issues related to modalities and procedures for alternative approaches to addressing the risk of non-permanence under the CDM, in accordance with Decision 2/CMP.7, paragraph 7;
- modalities and procedures for possible additional LULUCF activities under the CDM in accordance with Decision 2/CMP.7, paragraph 6; and
- issues related to a more comprehensive accounting of anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks from LULUCF, including through a more inclusive activity-based approach or a land-based approach, as referred to in Decision 2/CMP.7, paragraph 5.

**Implications of the implementation of Decisions 2/CMP.7 to 5/CMP.7:** This issue was first addressed in the SBSTA plenary on 14 May. It was further addressed in a contact group co-chaired by Nagmeldin Elhassan (Sudan) and Anke Herold (Germany).

Co-Chair Herold reported that parties agreed to organize work before Doha in the following way: request that the Secretariat prepare a technical paper; invite parties to submit their views on the technical paper; and discuss those inputs in a technical workshop, subject to the availability of financial resources.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.16), the SBSTA acknowledges the importance of the technical work under this agenda sub-item for the implementation of the second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol. The SBSTA also requests the Secretariat to prepare a technical paper, including options to address the relevant methodological decisions. It invites parties to submit, by 21 September 2012, their views on the implications of the implementation of Decisions 2/CMP.7 to 5/CMP.7 on the previous CMP decisions on methodological issues related to the Kyoto Protocol.

The SBSTA further requests the Secretariat to make these submissions available on the UNFCCC website and to compile them into a miscellaneous document; and organize a technical workshop before SBSTA 37. The SBSTA agreed to continue consideration of this issue at SBSTA 37 and invited the IPCC to consider the possibility of completing the work on the methodological guidance by October 2013 to allow for adoption of a decision on this matter at CMP 9.

**SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF MITIGATION:** This issue was first taken up 14 May in the SBSTA opening plenary.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.2), the SBSTA agrees to continue its consideration of the scientific, technical and socio-economic aspects of mitigation at SBSTA 38, taking into account the best available scientific information on mitigation, in particular information from the IPCC and the ongoing work of other bodies under the Convention on related matters.

**COOPERATION WITH RELEVANT INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS:** This issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/INF.3) was first addressed on 14 May. The IPCC, UN Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) and the Convention on

Biological Diversity (CBD) reported on collaboration with the UNFCCC, and identified potential areas for future work and synergies.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.6), the SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- notes the information paper prepared by the Secretariat on relevant activities in which the Secretariat has been involved with other intergovernmental organizations;
- takes note of the statements made by representatives of the IPCC, and the secretariats of the CBD and UNCCD;
- reaffirms the importance of the Secretariat engaging with other intergovernmental organizations; and
- recognizes the resources and expertise of other intergovernmental and international organizations that are relevant to the UNFCCC process.

**CLOSING PLENARY:** The SBSTA closing plenary convened on 25 May and adopted the meeting's report (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.1).

Algeria, for the G-77/China, expressed concern regarding, *inter alia*: slow progress on Annex I review guidelines for biennial reports, national communications and annual inventories; and that no conclusion was reached on research and systematic observation. She also highlighted that the ability of developing countries to undertake MRV depends on the extent to which they receive support from developed country parties. She noted that work on agriculture is related to the SBSTA's mandate in Convention Article 9 (establishing the scope of technical, scientific and methodological work by SBSTA) and is to be done on the basis of the principles and provisions of the Convention.

The EU, *inter alia*: recognized that further work remains to be done on drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, safeguards and guidance for the assessment of proposed forest reference levels. He welcomed the constructive atmosphere of the initial exchange of views on issues related to agriculture and expressed disappointment that parties have not been able to conclude work under the agenda item on research and systematic observations. The EU also expressed concern about the difficulties in developing general guidelines on domestic MRV; and welcomed the operationalization of the work programme under the forum on the impact of the implementation of response measures.

Australia, for the Umbrella Group, welcomed the progress on CCS and agriculture. He expressed anticipation for outcomes in Doha on national forest monitoring systems, MRV and safeguards to ensure environmental integrity on REDD+.

Swaziland, for the African Group, stated that, *inter alia*: adaptation remains the highest priority for Africa; work on agriculture must be consistent with the desire to improve food security and the livelihood of local communities; a financing barrier exists for REDD+ implementation in Africa; and that parties should be commended for constructive discussions on response measures.

Nauru, for AOSIS stated that: the long-term global goal should be a key research area discussed during the SBSTA research dialogue and that the focus should be on vulnerable developing countries. She expressed disappointed with the deliberations under the agenda item on research and systematic observations, and expressed hope that the long-term goal will be addressed at each SBSTA session under this agenda item.

Honduras, for the Dominican Republic, Guatemala and El Salvador, stated that the NWP must continue to develop and evolve, and that its reform should involve work with indigenous peoples, local communities and lead to gender mainstreaming. He also expressed his countries support for an approach on food security in agriculture.

Costa Rica, for the Coalition for Rainforest Nations, welcomed the progress on methodological guidelines on REDD+ activities but said that progress has been limited. He stressed that parties cannot be allowed to reopen issues that have already been agreed upon and expressed concern about lack of progress on research and systematic observation, and marine ecosystems.

Republic of Korea, for EIG, welcomed progress on, *inter alia*: MRV of systems for Annex I and non-Annex I countries; adaptation; technology transfer; and REDD+. She said the group is looking forward to progress on agriculture.

Bolivia, for ALBA, supported the G-77/CHINA and *inter alia*, lamented lack of progress on drivers of deforestation, research and systematic observation, adaptation, agriculture, and water. He also expressed concern that equity and national circumstances are not taken into account in MRV by developing countries.

The Gambia, for LDCs, welcomed progress on procedural issues under the NWP. He said better understanding is needed on the impacts of climate change on agriculture and lamented lack of progress on research and systematic observation.

Business and Industry NGOs pledged to work actively with the TEC and CTCN. She highlighted the need to continue to harness the expertise of the private sector and for strong protection of IPRs.

The International Indigenous People's Forum on Climate Change said that drivers of deforestation pose a threat to indigenous peoples' survival and that MRV systems must capture forest and agricultural values.

YOUNGOs expressed disappointment at the lack of progress on: drivers of deforestation and safeguards to protect biodiversity and indigenous people's rights.

Chair Muyungi declared SBSTA 36 closed at 1:43 pm

### **SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR IMPLEMENTATION**

SBI 36 opened on 14 May, with Tomasz Chruszczow (Poland) as Chair. On the agenda (FCCC/SBI/2012/1), Malaysia, supported by China, Brazil, Egypt, India and others, highlighted the sensitivity of the agenda sub-item on information contained in non-Annex I national communications. Brazil, India, Saudi Arabia, Swaziland, Sudan and others emphasized that retaining the item in abeyance would constitute the most efficient use of time. Nauru, for AOSIS, stressed the need for full substantive discussion on the item and the EU called for compilation and synthesis of information contained in non-Annex I national communications. Chair Chruszczow noted that reaching consensus on this issue appeared impossible. He proposed, and parties agreed, to adopt the agenda with the sub-item on information contained in non-Annex I national communications held in abeyance. The SBI closing plenary adopted conclusion on Friday, 25 May.

**ANNEX I NATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS: Fifth national communications:** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/INF.6, FCCC/SBI/2011/INF.1 & Add. 1-2, and FCCC/SBI/2011/INF.2) was first considered by the SBI plenary on 14 May. It was

subsequently taken up in informal consultations co-chaired by Julia Martinez (Mexico) and Kiyoto Tanabe (Japan).

Parties considered the status of submissions and review, and compilation and synthesis, of Annex I fifth national communications. Parties also considered compilation and synthesis of supplementary information incorporated in the fifth national communications. Bolivia stressed that Annex I parties' national communications must contain more detail and expressed concern that the some non-EIT countries' emissions was "camouflaged" by the drop in emissions in EITs.

**SBI Conclusions:** On the status of submissions and review, and compilation and synthesis, of fifth national communications (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.16), the SBI:

- urges Annex I parties to submit their national communications by the relevant date in the future;
- calls on Annex I parties to enhance further the completeness, comparability and level of detail;
- notes that over the period 1990-2008 the total aggregate emissions for all Annex I parties decreased by 6% and by 10.7% when including LULUCF; for EITs, GHG emissions excluding and including LULUCF decreased by 36.7 and 49.7%, respectively; and for non-EITs, GHG emissions excluding and including LULUCF increased by 8 and 8.4%, respectively; and
- decides to recommend a draft decision for adoption by CMP 8 (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.16/Add.1).

In its conclusions on compilation and synthesis of supplementary information incorporated in Annex I fifth national communications (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.15), the SBI:

- urges Annex I parties to enhance further the completeness, comparability and level of detail of the reported information;
- notes that the total aggregate emissions of Annex I parties, excluding emissions from LULUCF, decreased by 16.2%; emissions from EITs decreased by 36.4%; and emissions from non-EITs increased by 0.1% from the base year to 2008, and for several parties the increase was higher; and
- decides to recommend a draft decision for adoption by CMP 8 (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.15/Add.1).

**Convention Article 12.5:** On 14 May, the SBI plenary agreed to complete the consideration of this issue.

#### NON-ANNEX I NATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS:

**Consultative Group of Experts on Non-Annex I National Communications (CGE):** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/2, FCCC/SBI/2012/12-14 and FCCC/SBI/2012/MISC.6) was first considered by the SBI plenary on 14 May.

CGE Chair Ruleta Camacho (Antigua and Barbuda) reported on progress in implementing the CGE's work programme. AOSIS and the African Group highlighted the need to extend the CGE's term at least until 2016 and said its mandate should encompass a number of roles. The issue was then taken up in consultations co-facilitated by Julia Martinez and Kiyoto Tanabe.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.22), the SBI welcomes the CGE's progress report. The SBI also:

- urges Annex II parties and other Annex I parties in a position to do so to provide financial resources to enable the CGE to implement planned activities;
- reiterates the invitation to the CGE, in implementing its work programme, to take into account the current and future needs of non-Annex I parties; and

- initiates, but did not conclude, consideration of the term and mandate of the CGE.

The SBI conclusions include an annex and two appendices to facilitate work in Doha.

**Convention Article 12.5:** On 14 May, the SBI opening plenary agreed to complete the consideration of this issue.

**Financial and technical support:** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/INF.7 and FCCC/SBI/2012/MISC.7) was first taken up by the SBI plenary on 14 May. The Global Environmental Facility (GEF) reported on funding available for non-Annex I national communications and biennial update reports (BURs). The Philippines raised concerns over agreed full-cost funding. The issue was subsequently taken up in informal consultations co-facilitated by Julia Martinez and Kiyoto Tanabe.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.23), the SBI takes note of: the information provided by the GEF on the financial support provided and the GEF policy guidelines for the financing of BURs by non-Annex I countries. The SBI also, *inter alia*: recommends that COP 18 request the GEF to make available support to non-Annex I parties for preparing their BURs; and encourages the GEF to continue ensuring that sufficient financial resources are provided to meet the agreed full costs incurred by developing countries in complying with their reporting obligations.

**NAMAs: Prototype registry:** This issue was first considered by the SBI plenary on 14 May and referred to a contact group co-chaired by Elina Bardram (EU) and Wondwossen Sintayehu (Ethiopia).

The Secretariat briefed parties on the functions of the NAMA Registry, which is a dynamic, web-based platform that facilitates the matching of finance, technology and capacity-building support with developing country mitigation actions. A demonstration of the prototype NAMA registry took place on 15 May. Parties noted the value of the Registry in matching projects with funding sources, indicating that it should not substitute other MRV requirements.

**SBI Conclusions:** In the conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.10), the SBI invites further views on the prototype registry; notes the value of testing the functionalities of the prototype; requests a user manual for the prototype; and takes note of the estimated budgetary implications in the development of the prototype.

**Technical experts for international consultations and analysis (ICA):** This matter (FCCC/SBI/2012/MISC.8) was first introduced in the SBI plenary on 14 May. Elina Bardram and Wondwossen Sintayehu co-chaired a contact group. The Philippines stressed the need to link this issue to the provision of resources.

Co-Chair Bardram reported to the SBI closing plenary that while the draft conclusions require fine-tuning, the text fully reflects the views of the parties. She said it may be useful to continue exploring how to bridge gaps between different proposals and to provide additional input to the Secretariat informally.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.21), the SBI decides to continue consideration of this matter at its next session on the basis of draft text annexed to the conclusions. The SBI also recognizes the need to have an efficient, cost-

efficient and practical international consultation and analysis (ICA) process, which does not impose an excessive burden on parties and the Secretariat.

**MATTERS RELATING TO FINANCE: Initial review of the Adaptation Fund:** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/INF.2, FCCC/KP/CMP/2011/MISC.1, FCCC/KP/CMP/2011/6 and FCCC/KP/CMP/2011/6/Add.1) was first considered by the SBI plenary on 14 May. It was subsequently taken up in a contact group co-chaired by Ruleta Camacho (Antigua and Barbuda) and Diane Barclay (Australia).

Discussions focused on a draft text that notes: views of parties and written submissions on initial review of the Adaptation Fund; and issues raised by parties, including those related to the interim institutional arrangements and funding availability. Items highlighted by parties include defining the type of financial information requested from the Adaptation Fund Board, GEF and CDM Executive Board and the mandate for the provision of this information.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.13), the SBI notes:

- some parties have raised issues related to sustainability, predictability and adequacy of the resources for the Adaptation Fund;
- efforts of the Adaptation Fund Board to promote the accreditation of national implementing entities and direct access, and initiatives by the Board to explore options for raising additional resources; and
- further information is required to conduct the initial review of the Adaptation Fund.

The SBI also:

- invites the Adaptation Fund Board to provide additional, disaggregated information on its administrative costs;
- invites parties and relevant organizations to submit to the Secretariat, by 17 September 2012, further views on the review of the Adaptation Fund; and
- agrees to continue its consideration of the initial review of the Adaptation Fund in accordance with the annex to Decision 6/CP.6 (Report of the Adaptation Fund Board) at SBI 37.

**Other Matters:** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/7 and FCCC/CP/2011/7) was first considered by the SBI plenary on 14 May. It was taken up in a contact group co-chaired by Ruleta Camacho and Diane Barclay.

The Philippines, for the G-77/China, supported by Bangladesh, noted the need for predictability and sustainability of financing for the implementation of adaptation projects.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.14), the SBI:

- encourages donor countries to continue providing funding for country-driven activities;
- notes that existing modalities for implementing NAPA priorities are partially addressing the other elements of the LDC work programme and encouraged the LDC Fund to support technology elements of the work programme; and
- encourages LDC parties to consider the options highlighted in the report of the LDC Expert Group (LEG), which identify various ways to further address the other elements of the LDC work programme.

**CONVENTION ARTICLES 4.8 AND 4.9: Progress on the implementation of Decision 1/CP.10 (Buenos Aires Programme of Work):** This issue was first taken up in the SBI plenary on 15 May. It was subsequently considered in a joint SBI/SBSTA forum operating as a contact group on issues related to response measures, (see page 15).

**Matters related to LDCs:** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/7) was first considered by the SBI plenary on 14 May. LEG Chair Pepetua Latasi (Tuvalu) reported on the LEG's work. The issue was subsequently considered in informal consultations facilitated by Colin Beck (Solomon Islands). He reported that the group met twice and discussed the LEG work programme for 2011-2012. Bangladesh, for the G-77/China, stressed that additional resources should be mobilized for the implementation of NAPAs in LDCs.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.2), the SBI, *inter alia*, invites the LEG to continue to assist the LDCs that have not yet completed their NAPAs to complete and submit these as soon as possible, in collaboration with the GEF and its agencies.

**NAPs:** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/8 and MISC.1, 2, and Add.1 and MISC.3) was first considered by the SBI on 14 May. The contact group was co-chaired by Richard Merzian (Australia) and Amjad Abdulla (Maldives). The SBI adopted conclusions on 25 May.

Discussions focused on the facilitation of country-driven NAPAs; streamlining the LDC Fund to support the NAP process; the use of national and regional centers and networks; and sharing of best practices in adaptation. Parties also discussed implementation, support programmes and guidance on finance. Several LDCs highlighted the need for strengthening national capacity to ensure integration of adaptation into national development.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.7), the SBI:

- urges developed country parties to mobilize financial support for the NAP process;
- reiterates the request to developed country parties to continue to provide LDC parties with finance, technology and capacity building;
- looks forward to the analysis and compilation of support needed for the NAP process; and
- looks forward to continuing consideration at SBI 37 of guidance on policies and programmes to enable the above.

**LOSS AND DAMAGE:** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/INF.3 and FCCC/TP/2012/1) was first considered by the SBI plenary on 14 May. It was subsequently taken up in informal consultations co-facilitated by Don Lemmen (Canada) and Lucas Di Pietro (Argentina). Parties considered activities to be undertaken under the work programme on loss and damage. Discussions focused, *inter alia*, on: ways to move forward; thematic area 1 under the work programme on loss and damage (assessing the risk of loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change and the current knowledge on the same); links between loss and damage, and NAPs; and cross-cutting issues.

AOSIS called for establishing an international mechanism to address loss and damage at COP 18. LDCs called for further

elaboration on predictability and adequacy of financial assistance to enhance adaptive capacity.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.12), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- notes the remaining work under the work programme as well as a number of points relevant to assessing the risk of loss and damage, including: a range of approaches to assess the risk; gaps in the assessment of risk; access to, sharing and the use of data; and that enhanced technical and institutional capacities will help developing countries in assessing the risks of loss and damage;
- notes the importance of adopting a holistic approach;
- recalls that COP 17 requested the Secretariat to organize four expert meetings; and
- requests the SBI Chair to convene an informal pre-session meeting to facilitate completion of its work

#### **PROTOCOL ARTICLE 3.14 (ADVERSE EFFECTS):**

This matter was considered jointly with other related issues in the response measures forum (see page 15). On 25 May, the SBI Chair reported that consultations were held but this issue could not be completed. The SBI agreed to continue consideration of the issue at SBI 37.

**FORUM AND WORK PROGRAMME ON RESPONSE MEASURES:** The joint SBI/SBSTA discussions and conclusions have been summarized under the SBSTA (see page 15).

**TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER: Report of the TEC:** This issue (FCCC/SB/2012/1) was first considered by the SBI on 14 May. It was subsequently considered in a joint SBI/SBSTA contact group, co-chaired by Carlos Fuller (Belize) and Zitouni Ould-Dada (United Kingdom).

Parties noted that modalities on linkages with other relevant institutional arrangements under and outside the Convention were “too general” and called for more specific references to interlinkages.

**SBI/SBSTA Conclusions:** In the conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.12) and (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.20), the SBI and SBSTA:

- welcome the rolling work plan of the TEC for 2012-2013;
- note the structured work plan of the TEC on activities mandated by Durban: short-term activities to begin in 2012 and medium-term activities to begin in 2013;
- note the initial ideas of the TEC on its modalities on linkages with other relevant institutional arrangements under and outside the Convention;
- invite TEC to further elaborate its initial ideas on modalities on linkages; and
- note that the TEC will consult with relevant institutional arrangements once they become operational, and report on the results of these consultations at the next session.

**Matters relating to the CTCN:** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/INF.4) was first considered by the SBI plenary on 14 May. It was subsequently considered in a joint SBI/SBSTA contact group, co-chaired by Carlos Fuller and Zitouni Ould-Dada.

Discussions focused on the host of the CTCN. Parties discussed details of the negotiation process with the shortlisted host proponents and elements of the host agreement, with parties underscoring the need for transparency in the process.

**SBI/SBSTA Conclusions:** In the conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.18), the SBI and SBSTA:

- agree on a ranked list of proponents, with the consortium led by the United Nations Environment Programme ranked first, the GEF ranked second and Det Norske Veritas AS ranked third for hosting the CTCN;
- request the Secretariat to promptly initiate a discussion on the key elements of the potential host agreement with the proponent ranked first and, if needed, with the proponents ranked second and third, in parallel; and
- agree to recommend the host of the CTC at SB 37 to COP 18, requesting the GEF to support the operationalization and activities of the CTCN.

#### **Poznan Strategic Programme on Technology Transfer:**

This issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/9) was first considered by the SBI plenary on 14 May. It was subsequently considered in a contact group, co-chaired by Carlos Fuller and Zitouni Ould-Dada.

During discussions, parties reiterated the need to ensure a balance between adaptation and mitigation projects in the long-term implementation of the Poznan Strategic Programme and discussed methodologies to encourage more adaptation projects.

**SBI Conclusions:** In the conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.19), parties agree to invite the GEF to enhance balance between adaptation and mitigation projects; for the GEF and implementing agencies to expedite the completion of remaining pilot projects; and for the GEF to align the implementation of its climate technology centers and network with the CTCN operationalization activities.

**CONVENTION ARTICLE 6 (education, training and awareness-raising):** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/3-5, FCCC/SBI/2012/Misc.4 and FCCC/CP/2011/7/Add.2), was considered by the SBI plenary on 14 May and in informal consultations, facilitated by Tony Carritt (EU). Parties discussed a draft text submitted by the G-77/China on recommendations to be considered for the Doha Work Programme, and the role of the Secretariat and intergovernmental organizations. They also heard recommendations from YOUNGOs, the Climate Action Network and Local Government and Municipal Authorities on issues to be strengthened in the text, including gender, local communities, and specific reporting requirements.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.26), the SBI agree to continue consideration of this item at SBI 37 on the basis of the draft text contained in the annex, in which parties:

- decide to adopt the eight-year Doha Work Programme on Convention Article 6, as contained in the appendix to this decision;
- decide to review the work programme in 2020, with an intermediate review of progress in 2016; and
- request the SBI to enhance the work on Convention Article 6 by organizing an annual in-session dialogue.

**CAPACITY BUILDING (CONVENTION):** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/10 and FCCC/SBI/2012/MISC.5) was first considered by the SBI plenary on 14 May. Kunihiko Shimada (Japan) facilitated informal consultations.

Parties considered issues regarding capacity building for EITs. They noted that most issues facing EITs are reflected in synthesis report (FCCC/SBI/2012/MISC.5) and that further work to build capacity is needed.

The first meeting of the Durban Forum took place on 22 May. For more details, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12543e.html>.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.4), the SBI notes that capacity building for EITs is essential in enabling their commitments under the Convention and the decision to conclude the third review of the implementation of the framework for capacity building in EITs at SBI 46. It invites parties and relevant organizations to submit to the Secretariat, by February 2016, information on how they have implemented capacity-building activities. The SBI requests the Secretariat to prepare a synthesis report based on these submissions.

**CAPACITY BUILDING (PROTOCOL):** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/10, FCCC/SBI/2012/MISC.5), was first considered by the SBI plenary on 14 May. Kunihiko Shimada facilitated informal consultations.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.5), the SBI notes capacity building for EITs is essential in enabling their commitments under the Convention and the decision to conclude the third review of the implementation of the framework for capacity building in EITs at SBI 46. It invites parties and relevant organizations to submit to the Secretariat, by February 2016, information on how they have implemented capacity-building activities. The SBI requests the Secretariat to prepare a synthesis report based on these submissions.

**COMPLIANCE:** This issue (FCCC/KP/CMP/2005/2) was taken up by the SBI plenary on Monday, 14 May. Chair Chruszczow consulted interested parties. The item was deferred to SBI 37.

#### APPEALS AGAINST CDM EXECUTIVE BOARD

**DECISIONS:** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2011/17, Annex 1, FCCC/SBI/2011/MISC.2, FCCC/TP/2011/3 and FCCC/KP/CMP/2011/3) was first taken up by the SBI plenary on 14 May. It was subsequently taken up in a contact group co-chaired by Kunihiko Shimada and Yaw Osafo (Ghana).

Parties considered procedures, mechanisms and institutional arrangements for appeals against the decisions of the CDM Executive Board. Co-Chair Shimada reported some progress on modalities and geographic distribution of nominees. Divergent views remained on the issue of quorum, scope and standing before the appeals body.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.8), the SBI notes progress in setting out some of the features of the possible appeals body and that different views remain on, *inter alia*, the issue of scope. The SBI agrees to continue its consideration of the matter at SBI 37 on the basis of, *inter alia*, the draft text contained in the annex with a view to forwarding a draft decision for consideration by CMP 8.

#### REVIEW OF THE COMMITMENT PERIOD RESERVE:

This issue was first taken up by the SBI plenary on 14 May. It was subsequently taken up in a contact group chaired by Chair Chruszczow.

AOSIS expressed doubt as to whether a redesign is needed and stressed that discussions on this issue should not prejudice AWG-KP outcomes.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.11), the SBI states that it: initiated its consideration of the review and revision, as appropriate, of the design of the commitment period reserve for the subsequent commitment period; and agrees to continue consideration of this item at SBI 37.

**ARRANGEMENTS FOR INTERGOVERNMENTAL MEETINGS:** This matter was first considered in the SBI plenary on 14 May. A contact group was chaired by Chair Chruszczow. The SBI adopted conclusions on 25 May.

Parties considered the organization of COP 18 and CMP 8, future sessional periods and participation of observers (FCCC/SBI/2012/11). Chair Chruszczow encouraged Eastern European states to present an offer to host COP 19 and CMP 9 as soon as possible.

The G-77/China and the Russian Federation highlighted the need for additional negotiating time between Bonn and Doha, while acknowledging financial constraints. The US, supported by Canada and Australia, proposed organizing workshops instead of a negotiating session. India and South Africa said workshops could be integrated into the negotiating process.

During the SBI closing plenary on 25 May, Chair Chruszczow reported that sufficient funds for an additional intersessional meeting have not yet been pledged. Bangladesh, for the G-77/China, said the situation was regrettable and urged parties in the position to offer resources to do so. Saudi Arabia proposed an amendment to the conclusions text reflecting the importance of a meeting in Bangkok. Parties agreed to amend the text to reflect that resources have not yet been pledged and the deadline for making pledges is Tuesday, 29 May.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.24), which were revised in plenary, the SBI invites the Bureau of COP 17 and CMP 7 to finalize the details of the arrangements for COP 18 and CMP 8, including arrangements for the high-level segment, in consultation with the President Designate of COP 18 and CMP 8 and the Secretariat. The SBI also stresses the importance of the principles of transparency and inclusiveness in the lead-up to and during COP 18 and CMP 8.

The SBI notes the agreement of parties on the importance of additional intersessional resumed sessions of the *ad hoc* working groups before the Doha Conference. The SBI takes note of the information provided by the Executive Secretary on the provisional preparations for additional intersessional resumed sessions of the *ad hoc* working groups and noted the critical and urgent need for financial contributions in order for the Secretariat to make the necessary arrangements. The SBI invites the UNFCCC Executive Secretary to explore cost-saving measures to facilitate these additional intersessional resumed sessions of the *ad hoc* working groups to be held from Thursday, 30 August, to Wednesday, 5 September 2012, in Bangkok, Thailand. The SBI invites all presiding officers, in consultation with the Bureau, to give serious consideration to streamlining the work of the *ad hoc* working groups while ensuring that all bodies can complete their mandated tasks.

The SBI also notes that sufficient voluntary contributions have not been confirmed and that in the absence of such contributions or pledges by 29 May 2012 it would not be possible for the Secretariat to make the necessary arrangements.

The SBI also notes that, in keeping with the principle of rotation among regional groups, the President of COP 19 and CMP 9 would come from Eastern Europe and the President of COP 20 and CMP 10 would come from GRULAC. The SBI also notes the ongoing consultations with regard to hosting COP 19 and CMP 9 and urges parties to come to a conclusion on this

issue so that a decision could be taken at COP 18. The SBI also invites parties to come forward with offers to host future sessions of the COP and CMP, including COP 20 and CMP 10.

**ADMINISTRATIVE, FINANCIAL AND INSTITUTIONAL MATTERS: Budget performance for the biennium 2012-2013.** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/INF.5) was first introduced in the SBI plenary on 14 May. UNFCCC Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres emphasized that timely contributions are crucial. The SBI took note of the status of contributions and requested that parties make their outstanding contributions.

**Continuing review of the Secretariat's functions:** The SBI took note of the available information.

**Implementation of the Headquarters Agreement:** On the Secretariat's office facilities, Germany reported that the new premises would be handed over on United Nations Day on 24 October 2012. She noted that the second office premises would be ready for occupation in 2017 and that the World Conference Center was scheduled for completion in 2013.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.17), the SBI takes note of the information provided by the representative of the Host Government of the Secretariat that construction work on the new conference facilities in Bonn resumed and that some of the components of SBI 38 could be held there. The SBI encourages the Host Government to ensure that the conference facilities are fully completed as soon as possible in 2013. The SBI also notes the reports made by the Host Government and the Executive Secretary of the progress made in the completion of the new office premises for the Secretariat.

**Transaction log fees:** This issue (FCCC/TP/2010/1, FCCC/SBI/2009/MISC.3 and Add.1, FCCC/SBI/2010/MISC.4, FCCC/KP/CMP/2011/7 and Corr.1, FCCC/KP/CMP/2010/8 and FCCC/KP/CMP/2009/19) was first taken up by the SBI plenary on 14 May. It was subsequently taken up in informal consultations facilitated by Toshiyuki Nagata (Japan). Parties considered methodology for the collection of international transaction log fees in the biennium 2014-2015.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.6), the SBI recommends a draft decision for adoption by CMP 8.

**Privileges and Immunities:** This issue was first introduced in the SBI plenary on 14 May. Kunihiko Shimada facilitated informal consultations. During the SBI closing plenary Shimada reported that parties had further refined draft treaty agreements and had removed some aspects.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusion (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.9), the SBI agrees to conclude its consideration of this issue and forward the draft text contained the annex for consideration to CMP 8. The SBI recommends that CMP 8 consider the way forward, in particular the form of the forum for, and the scope of, the discussions.

**CLOSING PLENARY:** The SBI closing plenary took place on 25 May and parties adopted the report of SBI 36 (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.1).

Australia, for the Umbrella Group, highlighted progress on adaptation and integration of capacity-building priorities across the Convention. He said that NAPs and the loss and damage work programme can generate tangible benefits for developing countries. He welcomed the commencement of the Durban

Forum on Capacity Building and said his country was keen to conclude the review of the Adaptation Fund in Doha. He said more work needs to be done on MRV, including on the adoption of modalities and procedures for the ICA technical team of experts.

Swaziland, for the African Group, highlighted the importance of technology transfer, capacity building and financial support to developing countries. He stressed adaptation as the key priority for his region and welcomed progress on loss and damage saying that more work needs to be done on various approaches and the role of the Convention. Welcoming progress on finance, he described as crucial predictable, sustainable and adequate financial support for national adaptation plans as well as adequate and predictable funding of the Adaptation Fund.

Nauru, for AOSIS, said her group looks forward to the review of the Adaptation Fund and acknowledges its critical role for implementing adaptation projects. She highlighted capacity building as a cross-cutting issue and welcomed the work programme on response measures, expressing concern that response measures were also being addressed under other bodies. She said MRV is crucial for building trust among parties and noted the need for a permanent space for exchange of information on education, training and public awareness. She expressed disappointment that the agenda item on information contained in non-Annex I national communications was held in abeyance.

The Gambia, for LDCs, welcomed conclusions related to the Adaptation Fund. He said that predictability and adequacy of technical and financial assistance to developing countries is not fully reflected in the conclusions on loss and damage. He urged developed countries, the GEF and its implementing entities to continue financial support of NAPs. He said his group would like to have a strong body to conduct ICA with respect to biennial update reports. He expressed concern about the lack of financial resources for finalizing the prototype of the Registry.

Algeria, for the G-77/China, *inter alia*: recalled the need to operationalize ICA in a non-intrusive and non-punitive manner that respects sovereignty; welcomed the constructive work under the forum on response measures; expressed support for progress on the work programme on loss and damage; and expressed concern over the diminishing resources for the Adaptation Fund due to the low market prices of Certified Emission Reductions, affecting the balance of adaptation and mitigation.

The EU welcomed, *inter alia*: progress towards the implementation of the work programme on loss and damage; the first session of the Durban Forum on Capacity Building; the operationalization of the work programme under the forum on the implementation of response measures; and conclusions and a draft CMP decision on the methodology for calculating the International Transaction Log fees for the 2014-2015 biennium.

Mexico, for the EIG, recalled the need to finish work under the AWG-LCA and AWG-KP in order to move towards a "technical or implementation phase," and underscored the relevance of the SBI towards operationalizing the Bali Action Plan. Progress was highlighted on, *inter alia*: the national adaptation plans process; the work programme on loss and damage; and prototype of the NAMA registry.

Ecuador, for the Coalition for Rainforest Nations, highlighted, *inter alia*: the need for adequate, predictable and scaled-up

support for developing countries with regard to all elements under the Convention, especially REDD+; and the need for MRV measures to be consistent between NAMAs and REDD+.

Honduras, for SICA, welcomed progress on loss and damage and highlighted the need for: further progress on NAPs; full and timely support for adaptation measures from developed countries; and financial resources to compensate loss and damage, noting that COP 18 should work towards prevention and the reduction of damages as a main priority.

The Climate Action Network welcomed progress made on the first Durban Forum on Capacity Building and the SBI conclusions on loss and damage. Local Governments and Municipal Authorities welcomed efforts to continue integrating work of governments at all levels in relation to adaptation, and loss and damage. YOUNGOs stressed the importance of education for young people in the context of Article 6, and requested sufficient time to discuss this issue in Doha.

SBI 36 closed at 9:26 pm.

## A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF THE BONN CLIMATE CHANGE CONFERENCE

Six months ago, many delegates left the UN Climate Change Conference in Durban basking in the warm glow of success, imbued with the infectious spirit of “Ubuntu,” or unity and interconnectedness. The conference had agreed on several landmark decisions including: the establishment a new *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP) and “a process to develop a protocol, another legal instrument or an agreed outcome with legal force applicable to all parties” to come into effect from 2020 onwards; a second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol; and agreement to terminate the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention (AWG-LCA) and *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Annex I Parties’ Further Commitments under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP) in Doha. Many saw these decisions as heralding a new era of multilateralism and turned to 2012 with anticipation, vigor and purpose.

Six months later, the pressure was on delegates in Bonn to live up to the promise of Durban. Delegates faced a heavy workload, including the tasks needed to operationalize the institutions and mechanisms established in Cancun and Durban. Parties also had to try to demystify what it was they had actually agreed to during the waning hours of the frenzied COP 17. However, negotiations in 2012 got off to an inauspicious start and the Bonn Climate Change Conference was marred by mistrust and unabashed posturing. The meeting was almost paralyzed by prolonged procedural wrangling, which many described as “unprecedented.” This analysis will discuss the underlying reasons for the disputes in Bonn and examine the implications for COP 18 in Doha, Qatar, in another six months.

### UNRAVELING DURBAN’S CONSTRUCTIVE AMBIGUITY

Many could not begin to imagine how difficult it would be to begin implementing the Durban decisions. The new platform established in Durban introduced the notions of a “post-2012 or pre-2020” landscape; and a “post-2020” period, that will be covered by the new “protocol, another legal instrument or an

agreed outcome with legal force under the Convention applicable to all parties” to be developed by the ADP.

The Durban Package, which had been negotiated sensitively to accommodate the myriad of parties’ interests, presented challenges and complexities in Bonn, when parties began the business of interpreting its ambiguous language. For example, while many parties see mitigation as the core of the ADP, some developing countries insisted that all elements, including financing, adaptation, capacity building and technology transfer, should also be central to the ADP’s mandate.

For many, enhancing ambition to close the “mitigation gap” was a crucial part of Decision 1/CP.17. The decision establishes that the ADP process for the post-2020 regime shall raise the level of ambition and also launches a post-2012 work plan on enhancing mitigation ambition for all parties. However, the decision does not stipulate when and which body will implement the work plan. While some developing parties supported addressing pre-2020 mitigation ambition under the AWG-LCA, many others insisted on addressing it under the ADP.

The reason why some preferred to address enhancing mitigation ambition under the AWG-LCA is that the Bali Action Plan affirms the Convention’s core principles, including common but differentiated responsibilities. This implies that developed countries have commitments, while developing countries only take nationally appropriate mitigation actions contingent on support from developed countries. This level of comfort is missing under the ADP for developing countries. Indeed, the decision adopting the ADP does not include references to the Convention’s principles nor does it make a distinction between developed and developing countries. As one insider highlighted, “some parties have started to panic about the ADP; they feel as if they are walking into a dark room and don’t know if there is anything there or where anything is.” This uncertainty manifested in disagreements over both the AWG-LCA and the ADP agendas. On the ADP agenda, parties ultimately agreed to address two work streams, one on the post-2020 regime and the other on the post-2012 work plan on enhancing the level of ambition.

Uncertainties also arose when considering the termination of the AWG-LCA in Doha. Decision 1/CP.17 extends the AWG-LCA’s “mandate for one year in order for it to continue its work and reach the agreed outcome pursuant to decision 1/CP.13 (Bali Action Plan)”, until COP 18 at which it “shall be terminated.” However, Durban left room for different interpretations on how to proceed with the inconclusive work beyond Doha. The lack of clarity on the AWG-LCA termination provided room for discussions on whether the AWG-LCA should finish after the Bali Action Plan was accomplished or if the Bali Action Plan was accomplished by the termination of the AWG-LCA. Some parties, particularly a group of developing countries, wanted to assess the progress achieved toward fulfilling the Bali Action Plan, including some elements that were not agreed upon in Durban but were reflected in a compilation document referred to as “CRP.39,” such as intellectual property issues in relation to technology, rights of Mother Earth, trade, and response measures. Meanwhile, many developed countries wanted to focus on specific issues mandated by COP 17. They highlighted that many issues mandated by the Bali Action Plan had already been properly addressed and forwarded to the permanent subsidiary

bodies or other relevant institutions created for that purpose, such as the Technology Executive Committee, the Green Climate Fund, the Adaptation Committee and the Durban Forum on Capacity Building.

Nevertheless, the extent to which the permanent subsidiary bodies and the new bodies can address these issues is limited to their technical nature or their particular mandate. Moreover, many of the established bodies still need to be operationalized, as many highlighted. The fact that progress towards their operationalization was not achieved in Bonn did not help to enhance the environment of cooperation. On finance, the Philippines provided examples of this phenomenon, underscoring that the GCF is still “an empty shell, and the Standing Committee is not standing.”

In Durban, under the AWG-KP track, parties agreed to “decide that the second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol shall begin on 1 January 2013.” However, it is clear to everybody that to “really adopt” the second commitment period parties will have to agree on its length, put forward QELROs and adopt the necessary amendments to the Kyoto Protocol in Doha. Some questions remain on key issues such as how to ensure a smooth transition to the second commitment period, how to deal with excess units from the first commitment period, how rules can be continued and, in particular, how to continue with the flexibility mechanisms, including who will be able to participate, given that some countries indicated they would not be part of a second commitment period. In Bonn, developing countries reiterated that parties intending to participate in the second commitment period should submit ambitious QELROs in line with the goal of limiting temperature increase to below 2°C. Venezuela vociferously demanded that Annex I parties “show their QELROs” as opposed to pledges. The EU highlighted their submission of QELROs and also called upon his Annex B colleagues to follow suit.

Moreover, in order to finish shaping the second commitment period and properly adopt it in Doha, parties have to agree on its length and on the text of the Kyoto Protocol amendment, but negotiations in Bonn did not lead to any further progress in this regard. With so many relevant details to be defined before Doha, developing countries expressed fear that parties are “jumping from the Kyoto Protocol ship” by shifting the focus on the ADP. The EU and other developed countries argued, in turn, that their agreement on a second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol was based on a transition to a global and comprehensive post-2020 climate treaty to be negotiated under the ADP.

### **EVOLVING DYNAMICS IN A CHANGING WORLD**

If anything, the Bonn session brought to the fore the universally acknowledged fact that the UNFCCC, drafted in 1992, reflects a reality light years away from the 2012 global landscape. Since the negotiation of the Convention, the outlook for many G-77/China members has changed dramatically and resulting tensions from these divergences are increasingly playing out in the negotiating rooms. For several years now, many have been wagering bets on how long the G-77/China tinderbox diplomacy can prevail, when it is evident that many of the members appear to sit uncomfortably around the same table. A discernible chasm was evident in Bonn. As one delegate said, “Members of the group are now washing their dirty linen

very publically.” The group did not have a common negotiating position on the ADP and many other issues. Moreover, they had trouble agreeing on fielding one non-Annex I candidate for the position of ADP Chair. As one practitioner explained, the UNFCCC governance structure assumed certain things, including that parties fall neatly into two groups: Annex I and non-Annex I countries. This “binary” dynamic has changed. As one delegate noted: “GRULAC and the Asian Group are the dominant forces but they do not represent the interests of the entire group.” This means that, in addition to the traditional distinction between developed and developing countries, a third category of “emerging developing countries” or “advanced developing countries” may need to be factored into the mix.

Ultimately, the specter of having to vote for the ADP officers and the resulting damage to the process proved too much for parties to stomach, and they eventually agreed to a “delicate arrangement,” where the candidate from the Asia-Pacific Group will serve an initial one year term from 2012-2013, with his counterpart from an Annex I party, and the subsequent Co-Chair from GRULAC will serve for a term of 18 months. Many said that creating a voting precedent under the UNFCCC would be difficult, almost unfathomable but, at times during the meeting it appeared as if the taboo would be broken.

Other dynamics also played out within the G-77/China, which caught many practitioners by surprise. Bonn witnessed the emergence of a group of approximately 40 countries primarily comprised of the Arab Group, Latin American countries, including Argentina, Venezuela, Bolivia and Ecuador, as well as India and China, who, on the face of things, appear to have forged an alliance to uphold the Convention’s principles of common but differentiated responsibilities and equity, as well as developed countries’ historical responsibility for climate change. They maintain that any outcome under the ADP must be equitable so that “universality of application” does not become “uniformity of application.”

In contrast, another group of developing countries, including members from AOSIS, LDCs, and some Latin American countries, such as Chile, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Peru and Panama, are looking for such action on mitigation from developed and developing countries and for action to be “incentivized for all countries,” which they describe as the “beginning of a new paradigm for responding to climate change.”

Reflecting on the developments within the G-77/China, one insider said “history is being made and the wedge within the group is helping to bring about an exciting geo-political shift, which is about how countries deal with each other politically and economically and also a reflection of where they are and where they will be.”

### **LOOKING AHEAD**

Bonn demonstrated that, as many have said, Durban was a carefully negotiated package contingent on all elements of the outcome moving forward in tandem. However, what is clear is that parties have a very different perspective of what the future looks like in terms of, *inter alia*, the ADP’s mandate, how to terminate the AWGs and what to focus on for effectively addressing climate change. As evidenced in Bonn, constructive ambiguity results in uncertainty that can sometimes breed

mistrust. This mistrust is often manifested through disputes over procedure and consequently hampers progress. Looking ahead, parties have their work cut out to accomplish tasks they agreed to in Durban. They will need to exercise goodwill, integrity and congeniality in order to deliver on the ultimate objective of meaningful mitigation action for the post-2012 era.

## UPCOMING MEETINGS

### Third meeting of the Technology Executive Committee:

The third meeting of the Technology Executive Committee (TEC) will be convened in May 2012. **dates:** 28-29 May 2012 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** <http://unfccc.int/ttclear/jsp/TECMeeting.jsp>

### 29th Meeting of the Joint Implementation Supervisory

**Committee:** The Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee (JISC) holds its regular meeting to consider matters relating to the operation of Joint Implementation (JI). **dates:** 28-30 May 2012 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** [http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc\\_calendar/items/2655.php](http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php)

**Climate Adaptation Futures: Second International Climate Change Adaptation Conference 2012:** Co-hosted and convened by the University of Arizona (US) and the Programme of Research on Climate Change Vulnerability, Impacts and Adaptation (PROVIA) of the UN Environment Programme (UNEP), this conference will focus on adaptation to climate variability and change. **dates:** 29-31 May 2012 **location:** Tucson, Arizona, USA **contact:** University of Arizona Institute of the Environment **phone:** +1-520-626-9987 **email:** [adaptationfutures2012@gmail.com](mailto:adaptationfutures2012@gmail.com) **www:** <http://www.adaptation.arizona.edu/adaptation2012>

**Seventh ITU Symposium on ICTs, the Environment and Climate Change:** This symposium, organized by the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) and the Government of Canada, aims to raise awareness of the role of information and communication technologies (ICTs) in climate change mitigation and adaptation, thereby advancing the "green ICT" agenda. **dates:** 29-31 May 2012 **location:** Montreal, Canada **contact:** Louise Roderick **phone:** +1-613-998-9489 **fax:** +1-613-998-4530 **email:** [Louise.Roderick@ic.gc.ca](mailto:Louise.Roderick@ic.gc.ca) **www:** <http://www.itu.int/ITU-T/worksem/climatechange/201205/index.html>

**Second meeting of the CDM Policy Dialogue:** The second meeting of the CDM Policy Dialogue will take place in May 2012. **dates:** 30-31 May 2012 **location:** Frankfurt, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** [http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc\\_calendar/items/2655.php](http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php)

**Carbon Expo 2012:** The international trade fair and conference for emissions trading, carbon abatement solutions and clean technologies is sponsored by the World Bank. **dates:** 30 May - 1 June 2012 **location:** Cologne, Germany **contact:** Guido Hentschke **phone:** +49-221-821-3097 **fax:** +49-221-821-99-1060 **email:** [g.hentschke@koelnmesse.de](mailto:g.hentschke@koelnmesse.de) **www:** [http://www.carbonexpo.com/en/carbon\\_expo/home/index.php](http://www.carbonexpo.com/en/carbon_expo/home/index.php)

**Africa Policy Dialogue stakeholder consultations:** Africa Policy Dialogue stakeholder consultations will take place in June 2012. **dates:** 4 June 2012 **location:** Johannesburg, South Africa **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** [http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc\\_calendar/items/2655.php](http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php)

**GEF 42nd Council Meeting:** The Global Environment Facility (GEF) Council meets for three days, twice each year. **dates:** 4-7 June 2012 **location:** Washington DC, USA **contact:** GEF Secretariat **phone:** +1-202 473-0508 **fax:** +1-202 522-3240 **email:** secretariat@thegef.org **www:** <http://www.thegef.org/gef/meetingdocs/97/452>

### 37th Meeting of the CDM Small Scale Working Group:

The Small Scale Working Group of the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) will hold its 37th meeting to consider matters relating to small scale CDM project activities, including proposals for new baseline and monitoring methodologies for small scale project activities. **dates:** 5-8 June 2012 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** [http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc\\_calendar/items/2655.php](http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php)

**IPCC 35:** Agenda items for the 35th session of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change will include the future work programme of the task force on national greenhouse gas inventories (TFI), progress in the preparation of the Fifth Assessment Report (AR5) and the communications strategy and outreach. **dates:** 6-9 June 2012 **location:** Geneva, Switzerland **contact:** IPCC Secretariat **phone:** +41-22-730-8208/54/84 **fax:** +41-22-730-8025/13 **email:** [ipcc-sec@wmo.int](mailto:ipcc-sec@wmo.int) **www:** <http://ipcc.ch>

**4th CDM Roundtable:** The 4th CDM Roundtable will be held in June 2012. **dates:** 8 June 2012 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** [http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc\\_calendar/items/2655.php](http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php)

**56th Meeting of the CDM Methodology Panel:** The CDM Methodology Panel will hold its 56th meeting to consider matters relating to CDM baseline and monitoring plans and methodologies. **dates:** 11-15 June 2012 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** [http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc\\_calendar/items/2655.php](http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php)

**UNFCCC regional expert meeting on loss and damage:** The UNFCCC regional expert meeting on a range of approaches to address loss and damage associated with adverse effects of climate change will be held in June 2012. **dates:** 13-15 June 2012 **location:** Addis Ababa, Ethiopia **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** [http://unfccc.int/adaptation/cancun\\_adaptation\\_framework/loss\\_and\\_damage/items/6872.php](http://unfccc.int/adaptation/cancun_adaptation_framework/loss_and_damage/items/6872.php)

**Rio Conventions Pavilion at Rio+20:** The Rio Conventions Pavilion at Rio+20 is a collaborative outreach activity of the Secretariats of the Rio Conventions (UNFCCC, UNCCD and CBD), the Global Environment Facility (GEF), and 25 other international, national and local partners. It aims to promote and strengthen synergies between the Rio Conventions at implementation levels by providing a coordinated platform for awareness raising and information sharing about the linkages

in science, policy and practice between biodiversity, climate change and combating desertification/land degradation. **dates:** 13-22 June 2012 **location:** Rio de Janeiro, Brazil **contact:** Rio Conventions Pavilion **phone:** +1-514-288-6588 **fax:** +1-514-288-6588 **email:** info@riopavilion.org **www:** http://www.riopavilion.org/

**Latin America Policy Dialogue stakeholder consultations:** Latin America Policy Dialogue stakeholder consultations will be held in June 2012. **dates:** 15 June 2012 **location:** Rio de Janeiro, Brazil **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc\_calendar/items/2655.php

**Dakar: Managing the Regional Risks of Climate Extremes and Disasters – Learning from the IPCC Special Report:** This event is part of a series of briefings to publicize the findings of the IPCC Special Report titled “Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters for Advancing Climate Change Adaptation” to policy makers, practitioners and private sector audiences. This event is by invitation only. **dates:** 18-19 June 2012 **location:** Dakar, Senegal **contact:** Climate and Development Knowledge Network **phone:** +44-207-212-4111 **email:** cdknetwork.enquiries@uk.pwc.com **www:** http://cdkn.org/

**60th Meeting of the CDM Accreditation Panel:** The Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) Accreditation Panel will hold its 60th meeting to consider matters relating to the accreditation of operational entities. **dates:** 18-21 June 2012 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc\_calendar/items/2655.php

**European Union Sustainable Energy Week:** European Union Sustainable Energy Week events will take place across Europe. Events in Brussels will center around a high-level conference on the sustainable energy sector, which is expected to draw 4,000 participants from over 50 countries. Throughout the week other events will take place in parallel to draw attention to energy efficiency and sustainable energy themes. **dates:** 18-22 June 2012 **location:** Brussels, Belgium **email:** brussels@eusew.eu **www:** http://www.eusew.eu

**IDB Climate Change and Sustainability Day:** The Inter-American Development Bank is organizing an event on Climate Change and Sustainability on the sidelines of the UN Conference on Sustainable Development (UNCSD, or Rio+20). Discussions will address, among other topics: mitigation and adaptation to climate change, resilient low carbon development, biodiversity, sustainable energy and the challenges of a local level sustainability agenda. **date:** 20 June 2012 **location:** Rio de Janeiro, Brazil **www:** http://events.iadb.org/calendar/eventDetail.aspx?lang=en&id=3475

**UN Conference on Sustainable Development (UNCSD or Rio+20):** The UN General Assembly, in December 2009, adopted a resolution calling for a UNCSD to be convened in Brazil in 2012. This meeting will mark the 20th anniversary of the UN Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), which convened in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, in 1992. **dates:** 20-22 June 2012 **location:** Rio de Janeiro, Brazil **contact:** UNCSD Secretariat **email:** uncsc2012@un.org **www:** http://www.uncsc2012.org/

**36th Meeting of the CDM Afforestation and Reforestation Working Group:** The Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) Afforestation and Reforestation (A/R) Working Group holds regular meetings to consider matters relating to CDM A/R project activities, including preparing recommendations on submitted proposals for new baseline and monitoring methodologies. **dates:** 20-22 June 2012 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc\_calendar/items/2655.php

**28th Meeting of the Joint Implementation Accreditation Panel:** The 28th Meeting of the Joint Implementation Accreditation Panel will take place in June 2012. **dates:** 21-22 June 2012 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc\_calendar/items/2655.php

**The Mediterranean City: A Conference on Climate Change Adaptation:** This conference will initiate an ongoing collaboration of cities working together to share ideas, needs and strategies to adapt to the current and future impacts of climate change as they similarly affect the five Mediterranean-climate regions of the world. **dates:** 25-27 June 2012 **location:** Los Angeles, California, USA **www:** http://www.cvent.com/events/the-mediterranean-city-conference/event-summary-608171ff129f41ca824e89f112c41848.aspx

**First IUFRO-FORNESSA Regional Congress:** The Congress will provide a platform for African forest scientists, forest managers and policy makers and their colleagues from other parts of the world to share and exchange information and experiences on critical issues affecting forest and wildlife resources in Africa. The Congress will highlight research that puts relevant information in the hands of forest communities, forest managers, policy makers, the private sector and civil society. Specific themes to be covered include: forests and climate change; forests and water; forest policy, governance and trade; forest biodiversity and conservation; and agroforestry, energy and food security. IUFRO is the International Union of Forestry Research Organizations. **dates:** 25-29 June 2012 **location:** Nairobi, Kenya **contact:** Joe Cobbinah **phone:** +233-244-405-601 **fax:** +233-03220-60121 **email:** iufrofor\_2012@yahoo.com **www:** http://www.fornis.net/congress/en/homepage

**18th Meeting of the Adaptation Fund Board:** The Adaptation Fund Board supervises and manages the Adaptation Fund under the authority and guidance of parties to the Kyoto Protocol. **dates:** 28-29 June 2012 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** Marcia Levaggi **phone:** +1-202-473-6390 **email:** mlevaggi@thegef.org **www:** http://www.adaptation-fund.org/page/calendar

**Second International 100% Renewable Energy Conference and Exhibition:** IRENEC 2012 is organized by EUROSOLAR Turkey, the Turkish section of the European Association for Renewable Energies, and will serve as an international platform to discuss technical, economic and political aspects of a transition to 100% renewable energy. **dates:** 28-30 June 2012 **location:** Istanbul, Turkey **contact:** EUROSOLAR Turkey **phone:** +90-533-395-5839 **fax:** +90-216-589-1616 **email:** info@irenec2012.com **www:** http://www.irenec2012.com

**Policy Dialogue Asia Stakeholder Consultation:** Policy Dialogue Asia stakeholder consultation will be held in July 2012. **dates:** 7-8 July 2012 **location:** Bangkok, Thailand **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** [http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc\\_calendar/items/2655.php](http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php)

**19th Session of the Commission for Environmental Cooperation (CEC) Council:** The US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) will host the 19th Regular Session of the Commission for Environmental Cooperation (CEC) Council. The Council will examine project and issues in three thematic clusters: healthy communities and ecosystems; climate change - low-carbon economy; and greening the economy in North America. **dates:** 10-11 July 2012 **location:** New Orleans, Louisiana, USA **contact:** Nathalie Daoust, Council Secretary **phone:** +514-350-4310 **fax:** +514-350-4314 **email:** ndaoust@cec.org **www:** <http://www.cec.org/council2012>

**68th Meeting of the CDM Executive Board:** The CDM Executive Board holds regular its meeting to consider matters relating to the operation of the CDM. **dates:** 16-20 July 2012 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** 49-228-815-1000 **fax:** 49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** [http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc\\_calendar/items/2655.php](http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php)

**Third Workshop on Enhancing the Regional Distribution of CDM Projects in Asia and the Pacific:** This workshop is organized by the Asian Development Bank (ADB), the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES) and the UNFCCC Secretariat, in collaboration with the UNEP Risoe Centre. The aim of the workshop is to provide a platform for participants to share best practices and key lessons, enhance their knowledge on the CDM and discuss technical, financial and policy issues specific to their projects. **dates:** 18-20 July 2012 **location:** Manila, Philippines **contact:** Alma Cañarejo **email:** acanarejo@cmp-adb.org **www:** [http://mailman.ngocentre.org.vn/webfm\\_send/3358](http://mailman.ngocentre.org.vn/webfm_send/3358)

**Third meeting of the High-Level Panel on the CDM Policy Dialogue:** The third meeting of the High-Level Panel on the CDM Policy Dialogue will be held at the end of July. **dates:** 25-26 July 2012 **location:** Johannesburg, South Africa **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** [http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc\\_calendar/items/2655.php](http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php)

**38th Meeting of the CDM Small Scale Working Group:** The thirty-eighth meeting of the CDM Small Scale Working Group will be held in August. **dates:** 7-10 August 2012 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** [http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc\\_calendar/items/2655.php](http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php)

**57th Meeting of the CDM Methodology Panel:** The fifty-seventh meeting of the CDM Methodology Panel will take place in August. **dates:** 13-17 August 2012 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** [http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc\\_calendar/items/2655.php](http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php)

**61st meeting of the CDM Accreditation Panel:** The sixty-first meeting of the CDM Accreditation Panel will be held in late August. **dates:** 21-24 August 2012 **location:** Bonn, Germany

**contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** [http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc\\_calendar/items/2655.php](http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php)

**Additional Session of the UNFCCC Ad Hoc Working Groups:** This tentatively scheduled meeting will include sessions of the AWG-LCA, the AWG-KP and the ADP. Due to space limitations, it will not be possible to hold side events and exhibits on this occasion. **dates:** 30 August - 5 September 2012 (tentative) **location:** Bangkok, Thailand **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** <http://www.unfccc.int/>

**Second Global Conference on Agriculture, Food Security and Climate Change:** The second Global Conference on Agriculture, Food Security and Climate Change is co-organized by the Governments of Viet Nam and the Netherlands, in collaboration with other partners, including the World Bank and the FAO. The meeting will take stock of the implementation of the Roadmap for Action established at the 2010 conference in The Hague, the Netherlands, and set new and more concrete priorities for action while demonstrating early action on climate-smart agriculture as a driver for green growth. **dates:** 3-7 September 2012 **location:** Hanoi, Viet Nam **contact:** Tran Kim Long, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development **phone:** +84-4-38434682 **fax:** +84-4-37330752 **email:** longtk.htqt@mard.gov.vn **www:** <http://www.afconference.com/>

**14th Regular Session of the African Ministerial Conference on the Environment:** The 14th Regular Session of the African Ministerial Conference on the Environment (AMCEN-14) will provide a platform for African Ministers to debate the key outcomes of the UNCSD (Rio+20), and address other emerging issues. The meeting will also provide an opportunity to the Ministers to refine their strategies in preparation for UNFCCC COP 18. **dates:** 10-14 September 2012 **location:** Arusha, Tanzania **contact:** Angele Luh Sy **phone:** +254-20-762-4292 **email:** Angele.Luh@unep.org **www:** <http://www.unep.org/roa/InformationMaterial/PressReleases/tabid/51641/Default.aspx>

**Oceans of Potential Conference:** The "Oceans of Potential" conference is an initiative of Plymouth's marine science organizations and coordinated by Plymouth Marine Laboratory. It will bring together stakeholders from a broad range of disciplines to discuss the opportunities offered by oceans, including renewable energy, carbon sequestration, human health, bioengineering and new approaches to food production. **dates:** 11-12 September 2012 **location:** Plymouth, United Kingdom **contact:** Conference Secretariat **email:** [pde@plymouth.ac.uk](mailto:pde@plymouth.ac.uk) **www:** [www.oceansofpotential.org](http://www.oceansofpotential.org)

**CTI-CFF Regional Exchange:** Climate Change Adaptation Experiences in the Coral Triangle: The Coral Triangle Initiative on Coral Reefs, Fisheries and Food Security (CTI-CFF) is a multilateral partnership of six countries working together to sustain extraordinary marine and coastal resources by addressing crucial issues such as food security, climate change and marine biodiversity. This regional exchange aims to review and share the recent activities in the Coral Triangle countries related to vulnerability assessments and early actions towards resiliency and climate change adaptation learning networks. **date:** 12 September 2012 **location:** TBA **contact:** CTI-CFF Secretariat **phone:** +62-21-386-0623 **fax:** +62-21-386-0623

**email:** secretariat@cti-secretariat.net **www:** <http://www.coraltriangleinitiative.org/events/cti-cff-regional-exchange-cca-experiences-coral-triangle>

**Nigeria Alternative Energy Expo:** The Nigeria Alternative Energy Expo will bring together renewable energy and power professionals, government and civil society representatives, as well as over 200 exhibiting companies from all over the world. It aims to: create a platform for all stakeholders to network and transfer knowledge and skills; raise awareness and educate the public about climate change; and showcase both local and international initiatives and technologies that are at the forefront of renewable energy and climate change resilience. **dates:** 17-19 September 2012 **location:** Abuja, Nigeria **contact:** Conference Organizers **phone:** +234-9-480-6271 **email:** [info@nigeriaalternativeenergyexpo.org](mailto:info@nigeriaalternativeenergyexpo.org) **www:** <http://www.nigeriaalternativeenergyexpo.org/>

**69th Meeting of the CDM Executive Board:** The Executive Board of the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) will hold its 69th meeting to consider matters relating to the operation of the CDM. **dates:** 17-21 September 2012 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** [secretariat@unfccc.int](mailto:secretariat@unfccc.int) **www:** [http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc\\_calendar/items/2655.php](http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php)

**Third International Conference on De-growth for Ecological Sustainability and Social Equity:** This conference will cover three topics—commons, work and democracy—and address the sources of de-growth, subjects of change and scenarios. **dates:** 19-23 September 2012 **location:** Venice, Italy **contact:** Conference Secretariat **email:** [venezia2012decrecita.it](mailto:venezia2012decrecita.it) **www:** <http://www.venezia2012.it/chi-siamo/promotori/?lang=en>

**Third Symposium on the Ocean in a High-CO2 World:** This symposium is sponsored by the Scientific Committee on Oceanographic Research (SCOR), the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) of UNESCO, and the International Geosphere-Biosphere Programme. The symposium aims to attract over 300 of the world's leading scientists to discuss the impacts of ocean acidification on marine organisms, ecosystems and biogeochemical cycles. It will also cover socioeconomic consequences of ocean acidification, including policy and management implications. **dates:** 24-27 September 2012 **location:** Monterey, California, USA **email:** [secretariat@scor-int.org](mailto:secretariat@scor-int.org) **www:** <http://www.highco2-iii.org>

**30th Meeting of the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee:** The Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee will meet in September. **dates:** 26-28 September 2012 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** [secretariat@unfccc.int](mailto:secretariat@unfccc.int) **www:** [http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc\\_calendar/items/2655.php](http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php)

**22nd LEG meeting:** The Least Developed Countries Expert Group will meet in late September 2012. **dates:** 26-29 September 2012 **location:** Funafuti, Tuvalu **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** [secretariat@unfccc.int](mailto:secretariat@unfccc.int) **www:** [http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc\\_calendar/items/2655.php](http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php)

**UNU-WIDER Conference on Climate Change and Development Policy:** The UN University (UNU)-World Institute for Development Economics Research (WIDER) conference on "Climate Change and Development Policy" aims to reflect

the diverse range of perspectives on how to balance climate and development objectives. The conference will evaluate how research can inform development policy and identify existing knowledge gaps, focusing on both low-carbon development (mitigation) and climate-resilient strategies (adaptation). **dates:** 28-29 September 2012 **location:** Helsinki, Finland **contact:** Anne Ruohonen **email:** [climate2012@wider.unu.edu](mailto:climate2012@wider.unu.edu) **www:** [http://www.wider.unu.edu/home/news/en\\_GB/call-28-09-2012/](http://www.wider.unu.edu/home/news/en_GB/call-28-09-2012/)

**LEG workshop for Pacific LDCs:** The LEG workshop for Pacific LDCs will be held in Tuvalu. **dates:** 28 September - 3 October 2012 **location:** Funafuti, Tuvalu **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** [secretariat@unfccc.int](mailto:secretariat@unfccc.int) **www:** [http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc\\_calendar/items/2655.php](http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php)

**October CDM Meetings:** The 8th CDM Assessment team workshop will be held from 1-2 October, the 39th meeting of the CDM small-scale working group will be held from 9-12 October, the 5th CDM roundtable will be held on 12 October, the 58th meeting of the CDM Methodology Panel will be held from 15-19 October, and the 62nd meeting of the CDM Accreditation Panel will be held from 22-25 October 2012. **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** [secretariat@unfccc.int](mailto:secretariat@unfccc.int) **www:** [http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc\\_calendar/items/2655.php](http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php)

**African Sustainable Energy Finance Summer Academy:** The Sustainable Energy Finance Academy, held within the new framework of the Frankfurt School – UNEP Collaborating Centre for Climate and Sustainable Energy Finance, will provide a comprehensive framework on renewable energy and energy efficiency financing in Nairobi, Kenya, with a special emphasis on renewable energy in Africa. **dates:** 21-26 October 2012 **location:** Nairobi, Kenya **contact:** Summer Academy Team **phone:** +49-069-154008-692 **fax:** +49-069-154008-4692 **email:** [summeracademy@fs.de](mailto:summeracademy@fs.de) **www:** [http://www.frankfurt-school.de/content/en/consulting/ias/regional\\_summer\\_academies/sustainable\\_energy\\_finance\\_nairobi.html](http://www.frankfurt-school.de/content/en/consulting/ias/regional_summer_academies/sustainable_energy_finance_nairobi.html)

**Eighth African Development Forum:** The eighth African Development Forum (ADF) is being held under the theme "Governing and Harnessing Natural Resources for Africa's Development." The ADF will focus on the following six areas: knowledge base, human and institutional capacities; policy, legal and regulatory issues; economic issues; governance, human rights and social issues; participation and ownership of natural resources; and environmental, material stewardship and climate change. **dates:** 23-25 October 2012 **location:** Addis Ababa, Ethiopia (tentative) **contact:** Isatou Gaye **phone:** +251-11-544-5098 **fax:** +251-11-551-0365 **email:** [igaye@uneca.org](mailto:igaye@uneca.org) **www:** [http://www.uneca.org/eca\\_resources/news/2012/120309adf.html](http://www.uneca.org/eca_resources/news/2012/120309adf.html)

**29th Meeting of the Joint Implementation Accreditation Panel:** The Joint Implementation Accreditation Panel will meet in October 2012. **dates:** 24-25 October 2012 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** [secretariat@unfccc.int](mailto:secretariat@unfccc.int) **www:** [http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc\\_calendar/items/2655.php](http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php)

**19th Meeting of the Adaptation Fund Board:** The Adaptation Fund Board will meet in October. **dates:** 25-26 October 2012 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** Marcia Levaggi **phone:** +1-202-473-6390 **email:** [mlevaggi@thegef.org](mailto:mlevaggi@thegef.org) **www:** <http://www.adaptation-fund.org/page/calendar>

**37th Meeting of the CDM Afforestation and Reforestation**

**Working Group:** The 37th Meeting of the CDM Afforestation and Reforestation Working Group will be held in late October.  
**dates:** 29-31 October 2012 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** [http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc\\_calendar/items/2655.php](http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php)

**CIF Partnership Forum 2012 and Associated Events:**

The Climate Investment Funds Partnership Forum is an annual gathering of all stakeholders interested in the development of the CIF, to review work done and discuss further areas for action.  
**dates:** 31 October - 8 November 2012 **location:** Istanbul, Turkey **contact:** Climate Investment Funds **phone:** +1-202-458-1801 **email:** CIFAdminUnit@worldbank.org **www:** <http://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/>

**World Energy Outlook 2012 Launch:** The International Energy Agency (IEA) will launch its flagship publication, the World Energy Outlook (WEO) 2012. The WEO-2012 will include analysis and insights into global energy market trends and their meaning for energy security, environmental protection and economic development. It will also contain updated forecasts to 2035 of energy production and demand, investment, trade and emissions, broken down by country, fuel and sector. The WEO-2012 will also investigate specific strategic energy issues, including: “golden rules” for the coming “Golden Age of Gas,” an in-depth examination of the value of improving energy efficiency; the increasing importance of the water-energy nexus; climate feedbacks on energy trends; and the International Year of Sustainable Energy for All. **date:** 12 November 2012 **location:** Paris, France **contact:** Pawel Olejarnik, IEA **phone:** +33-1-40-57-67-57 **email:** pawel.olejarnik@iea.org **www:** <http://www.worldenergyoutlook.org/publications/weo-2012/>

**6th CDM Roundtable and 70th Meeting of the CDM**

**Executive Board:** The 6th CDM Roundtable will be held on 18 November, followed by the 70th meeting of the CDM Executive Board. The meeting precedes UNFCCC COP 18/CMP 8. **dates:** 18-23 November 2012 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** [http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc\\_calendar/items/2655.php](http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php)

**14th meeting of the CDM DNA Forum:** The 14th meeting of the CDM Designated National Authorities (DNA) Forum will be held in late November. **dates:** 24 -25 November 2012 **location:** Doha, Qatar **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** [http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc\\_calendar/items/2655.php](http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php)

**UNFCCC COP 18:** The 18th session of the Conference of the Parties (COP 18) to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the eighth session of the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP 8), among other associated meetings, are scheduled to take place in Doha, Qatar. **dates:** 26 November - 7 December 2012 **location:** Doha, Qatar **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** [http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc\\_calendar/items/2655.php](http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php)

**GLOSSARY**

ADP	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action
AAU	Assigned Amount Unit
ALBA	Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America
AOSIS	Alliance of Small Island States
AWG-KP	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol
AWG-LCA	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention
BASIC	Brazil, South Africa, India and China
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
COP	Conference of the Parties
CMP	Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol
CTCN	Climate Technology Centre and Network
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GCF	Green Climate Fund
GRULAC	Group of Latin American and Caribbean States
EIG	Environmental Integrity Group
EITs	Economies in Transition
ICA	International Consultation and Analysis
ICAO	International Civil Aviation Organization
IMO	International Maritime Organization
IPRs	Intellectual Property Rights
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
LDCs	Least Developed Countries
LEG	Least Developed Countries Expert Group
LULUCF	Land use, land-use change and forestry
MRV	Measuring, reporting and verification
NWP	Nairobi Work Programme on impacts, vulnerability and adaptation
NAMA	Nationally appropriate mitigation actions
NAPs	National adaptation plans
NAPA	National adaptation programme of action
QELROS	Quantified Emissions Limitation and Reduction Commitments
REDD+	Reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries, and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries
SBs	Subsidiary Bodies
SBI	Subsidiary Body for Implementation
SBSTA	Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice
SICA	Central American Integration System
TEC	Technology Executive Committee
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
YOUNGOs	Youth NGOs