

SUMMARY OF THE FIFTH SESSION OF THE AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON LONG-TERM COOPERATIVE ACTION AND THE SEVENTH SESSION OF THE AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON FURTHER COMMITMENTS FOR ANNEX I PARTIES UNDER THE KYOTO PROTOCOL: 29 MARCH - 8 APRIL 2009

The fifth session of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (AWG-LCA 5) and the seventh session of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP 7) took place from 29 March to 8 April 2009 in Bonn, Germany. Approximately 2600 participants attended the meeting, representing governments, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, academia, the private sector and the media.

The main objective of the session was to work towards negotiating text under both AWGs. AWG-LCA 5 concentrated on the key elements of the Bali Action Plan (decision 1/CP.13), namely mitigation, adaptation, finance and technology, as well as on a shared vision for long-term cooperative action under the Convention. Chair Michael Zammit Cutajar (Malta) had prepared a note to focus negotiations on the fulfillment of the Bali Action Plan and on the components of the agreed outcome (FCCC/AWG/LCA/2009/4, Parts I and II), which he first presented during a pre-session event on Friday, 27 March. Discussions at AWG-LCA 5 focused on further elaborating elements for a draft negotiating text to be prepared by the Chair for the next AWG-LCA session in June 2009. After the meeting, many felt that the AWG-LCA process was on track and that it has completed the final stage of clarifying ideas and options to be included in a negotiating text for the June session. While the content is still somewhat abstract and general, the form of some issues, such as those related to nationally appropriate mitigation actions (NAMAs) and a framework for adaptation, has begun to take shape.

The focus in the AWG-KP 7 was on emission reductions by Annex I parties under the Kyoto Protocol beyond 2012, and on legal issues, including possible amendments to the Protocol.

The AWG-KP also considered the flexibility mechanisms, land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF), and potential consequences of response measures. Its discussions were structured around four notes (FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/3 and 4; FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/INF.1 and 2) prepared by Chair Harald Dovland (Norway) and presented during a pre-session event on Friday, 27 March. The AWG-KP reached agreement on a request to its Chair to prepare two documents for the June session: a proposal for Protocol amendments under Article 3.9 (Annex I parties' further commitments) and a text on other issues, such as LULUCF and the flexibility mechanisms. Many felt that this will signify a shift to a full negotiating mode. There were, however, some protracted discussions on the AWG-KP's mandate and many developing countries expressed disappointment at the lack of agreement on the aggregate range of emissions reductions for Annex I parties in the post-2012 period.

The AWG-LCA and AWG-KP are scheduled to conclude their work by the fifteenth Conference of the Parties (COP 15) to be held in Copenhagen, Denmark, in December 2009.

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

IN THIS ISSUE

A Brief History of the UNFCCC and the Kyoto Protocol . . .	1
Report of AWG-LCA 5 and AWG-KP 7	2
<i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group on Long-Term Cooperative Action	2
<i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties	7
A Brief Analysis of AWG-LCA 5 and AWG-KP 7	12
Upcoming Meetings	14
Glossary	15

This issue of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* © <enb@iisd.org> is written and edited by María Gutiérrez, Ph.D., Kati Kulovesi, Ph.D., Kelly Levin, Miquel Muñoz, Ph.D., and Yulia Yamineva. 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 United Kingdom (through the Department for International Development – DFID), 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), the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU), the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the European Commission (DG-ENV), and the Italian Ministry for the Environment, Land and Sea. General Support for the *Bulletin* during 2009 is provided by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Government of Australia, the Austrian Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management, the Ministry of Environment of Sweden, the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, SWAN International, 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), the Government of Iceland, and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). Funding for translation of the *Bulletin* into French has been provided by the International Organization of the Francophonie (IOF). Funding for the translation of the *Bulletin* into Spanish has been provided by the Ministry of Environment of Spain. 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., 11A, New York, New York 10022, United States of America.

out a framework for action aimed at stabilizing atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases to avoid “dangerous anthropogenic interference” with the climate system. The UNFCCC entered into force on 21 March 1994, and now has 192 parties. In December 1997, delegates at the third Conference of the Parties (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 under the UNFCCC as Annex I parties, agreed to reduce their overall emissions of six greenhouse gases by an average of 5.2% 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 184 parties.

In 2005, the first Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties (COP/MOP 1) in Montreal, Canada established the AWG-KP on the basis of Protocol Article 3.9, which mandates the consideration of Annex I parties’ further commitments at least seven years before the end of the first commitment period. In addition, COP 11 agreed in Montreal to consider long-term cooperation under the Convention through a series of four workshops known as “the Convention Dialogue,” which continued until COP 13.

BALI ROADMAP: COP 13 and COP/MOP 3 took place in December 2007, in Bali, Indonesia. The focus of the Bali conference was on long-term issues. These negotiations resulted in the adoption of the Bali Action Plan, which established the AWG-LCA to focus on four key elements of long-term cooperation identified during the Convention Dialogue: mitigation, adaptation, finance and technology. The Bali Action Plan contains a non-exhaustive list of issues to be considered under each of these areas and calls for articulating a “shared vision for long-term cooperative action.”

The Bali conference also resulted in an agreement on a two-year process, the Bali Roadmap, which covers negotiation “tracks” under the Convention and the Protocol and sets a deadline for concluding the negotiations at COP 15 and COP/MOP5, to be held in Copenhagen in December 2009. The two key bodies under the Bali Roadmap are the AWG-LCA and the AWG-KP, which held four negotiation sessions in 2008: in April in Bangkok, Thailand; in June in Bonn, Germany; in August in Accra, Ghana; and in December in Poznan, Poland.

During COP 14 in Poznan, AWG-LCA 4 continued discussing all the key elements of the Bali Action Plan and held an in-session workshop and ministerial roundtable on “a shared vision.” It mandated the AWG-LCA Chair to prepare a document for consideration by AWG-LCA 5 that would focus negotiations on the fulfillment of the Bali Action Plan, and a negotiating text for AWG-LCA 6 in June 2009.

AWG-KP 6 held a strategic discussion of all elements of its work programme and decided that in order to finalize agreement on Annex I parties further commitments at COP/MOP 5, the AWG-KP needs to consider in 2009 the aggregate scale of emission reductions by Annex I parties, the contribution by parties individually or jointly to the aggregate scale, as well as other issues identified in what is known as paragraph 49. These issues include: the flexibility mechanisms; LULUCF; greenhouse gases, sectors and sources; potential consequences of tools,

policies, measures and methodologies; aviation and maritime bunker fuels; and legal matters. AWG-KP 6 also requested the AWG-KP Chair to prepare four notes for consideration at AWG-KP 7 on the flexibility mechanisms, LULUCF, amendments pursuant to Protocol Article 3.9, and elements of text related to issues in paragraph 49.

REPORT OF AWG-LCA 5 AND AWG-KP 7

The fifth session of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention (AWG-LCA 5) and the seventh session of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Protocol (AWG-KP 7) opened on Sunday, 29 March 2009.

Matthias Machnig, State Secretary, Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety of Germany, highlighted the need to switch to a “full negotiating mode” in Bonn and stressed that the agreement in Copenhagen should be guided not only by what is possible but also by what is necessary to address climate change. He welcomed the US delegation and stated that the US is now “back in the game.”

UNFCCC Executive Secretary Yvo de Boer noted that only eight months, constituting six weeks of real negotiating time, remain before COP 15 in Copenhagen. He highlighted the documents prepared for the session to focus discussions under both AWGs. De Boer thanked Germany for its financial support for the session and underscored the need for further funding to organize the meeting in Bangkok in September and any additional sessions deemed necessary.

AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON LONG-TERM COOPERATIVE ACTION

The fifth session of the AWG-LCA opened on Sunday afternoon, chaired by Michael Zammit Cutajar (Malta), with Luiz Figueiredo Machado (Brazil) as the Vice-Chair. Delegates adopted the agenda and organization of work (FCCC/AWGLCA/2009/1 and 2) and then delivered opening statements.

Sudan, on behalf of the Group of 77 and China (G-77/China), called for an open, party-driven, transparent, and inclusive process that focuses on implementing the Bali Action Plan. He lamented that many submissions by members of the G-77/China had been omitted or were not properly reflected in the Chair’s note (FCCC/AWGLCA/2009/4, Parts I and II), such as specific proposals on adaptation, finance and technology.

Algeria, for the African Group, underscored the need for adaptation and massively scaled-up and predictable funding. He stressed that “a shared vision” should not be focused only on mitigating climate change but also on contending with its impacts.

Australia, for the Umbrella Group, highlighted the role of major economies and identified the need for a global agreement that is informed by science, achievable, comprehensive, and able to reflect the full spectrum of mitigation and adaptation options. She called for consistency between the AWG-LCA and AWG-KP.

Grenada, for the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS), and Lesotho, for the Least Developed Countries (LDCs), called for stabilizing concentrations below 350 parts per million (ppm) and limiting temperature increases to below 1.5°C.

The Czech Republic, for the European Union (EU), identified the need for low carbon development strategies, and said developing countries should reduce emissions by 15-30% below business as usual projections by 2020.

The Republic of Korea, for the Environmental Integrity Group, highlighted Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) and supported the creation of a NAMA registry. Argentina expressed hope for an agreement on long-term global objectives, including medium- and long-term commitments, and technological and economic assistance that contributes to the eradication of poverty in developing countries. Indonesia stressed the need to consider development needs.

India, with Saudi Arabia, cautioned against revising the principles of the Convention. India called for deep, mid-term emission reductions from Annex I countries and the fulfillment of commitments related to finance and technology transfer

The US recognized its unique position as the largest historical emitter of greenhouse gases and as a country with important capabilities, but underscored that the US alone cannot provide the solution to the climate change problem. Calling for significant action by major economies, he highlighted measures by the US and China in their economic stimulus packages to promote clean energy. He underscored President Obama's plans for a federal cap-and-trade system that will set the US pathway to cutting emissions by 15% from current levels by 2020 and 80% by 2050, and highlighted technological leap-frogging by developing countries. The US identified the need to establish a structure for significant financial support for developing countries, and for an effective use of adaptation resources with the focus on the most vulnerable countries.

The LDCs underscored the need for adaptation technologies, urged the AWG-LCA to establish concrete mechanisms for their deployment, and stressed that financing mechanisms should be fully accountable to the UNFCCC. Bangladesh called for a mechanism for prompt financial support to respond to localized extreme events and highlighted the proposal for an international air travel levy to raise additional funding for adaptation. The Gambia called for a comprehensive approach, including financial and technological capacity building and institutional support.

Tuvalu urged a substantial outcome at Copenhagen, and called for accelerated actions by all countries to reduce emissions drastically and urgently. He highlighted the need for substantial outcomes on adaptation and for new and additional financial resources. Saudi Arabia opposed proposals to reduce fossil fuels imports, given impacts to those economies that depend on such commodities.

LONG-TERM COOPERATIVE ACTION: This agenda item was first considered by the AWG-LCA plenary on 29 March. Chair Zammit Cutajar presented the Chair's note (FCCC/AWGLCA/2009/4, Parts I and II) intended to focus negotiations on the fulfillment of the Bali Action Plan and components of the agreed outcome. He also introduced other relevant documents (FCCC/AWGLCA/2009/Misc.1 and Add.1-3; and FCCC/AWGLCA/2009/Misc.2). Discussions focused on the key elements outlined in the Bali Action Plan (decision 1/CP.13), namely a shared vision for long-term cooperative action, mitigation, adaptation, technology and financing.

Parties agreed to establish contact groups on a shared vision, mitigation, adaptation, and delivering on technology and financing. The main objective of the contact group discussions was to elaborate on ideas for the negotiating text to be prepared for the June 2009 session. This mandate was based on the decision by AWG-LCA 4 in December 2008 (FCCC/AWGLCA/2008/L.10), which requests the AWG-LCA Chair to prepare a negotiating text for consideration at AWG-LCA 6, taking into account the proceedings of AWG-LCA 5 and further submissions received from parties by 24 April 2009. No conclusions were adopted under this agenda item. The contact group discussions on the key elements are summarized below.

Shared Vision: A shared vision of long-term cooperative action was discussed in a contact group chaired by Zammit Cutajar. Discussions focused on the scope of a shared vision and, in particular, its nature and relationship with the four building blocks of mitigation, adaptation, technology and finance, its underlying principles and a long-term global goal for emission reductions.

Parties agreed that a shared vision should encompass the four building blocks of the Bali Action Plan and their interconnectedness, with South Africa highlighting the need for a balance between adaptation and mitigation. They also agreed that a shared vision should be based on the implementation of the Convention, its objective and principles, such as common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, and sustainable development. Some parties noted that a shared vision should be a short, simple and profound political statement that is understandable to the public.

Parties suggested several principles for a shared vision in addition to those reflected in the Convention. AOSIS, with Bangladesh, highlighted the right to survival. New Zealand, with Australia, noted changing national circumstances. China stressed historical responsibility. The EU underlined the transition to a low-carbon society. Iceland, with Norway and the EU, stressed a forward-looking perspective and gender balance. Micronesia, with the Bahamas, highlighted urgency.

Various opinions were expressed on the long-term global goal for emission reductions as an element of a shared vision. Developing countries emphasized that developed countries should take the lead and establish ambitious mid-term and long-term goals, and China lamented that developed country emissions have not even peaked yet. China, Brazil and several other developing countries also highlighted historical responsibility, while several developed countries referred to changing economic circumstances and increases in developing countries' emissions. They argued that mitigation by developed countries alone is not sufficient to address climate change. Australia proposed a mid-term global goal. The US highlighted the importance of considering longer-term emission pathways and several countries highlighted there are multiple pathways to achieve given stabilization levels. Several countries from the Umbrella Group underlined links between the AWG-LCA and the AWG-KP. Some developing countries noted the link between a long-term goal with sustainable development, and identified the need to increase resilience of ecosystems and economies, and poverty eradication.

Several countries suggested the long-term goal should be quantified. The EU and Japan proposed global emission reductions of 50% by 2050. Some developing countries noted that quantification of the goal could also be done in relation to other elements such as finance. Pakistan proposed quantifying the measurable, reportable and verifiable (MRV) support by developed countries to developing countries, leading to the same level of emission reductions, and Bolivia suggested quantification in relation to changes in developed countries' consumption patterns and compensation to developing countries for lost development opportunities. Many countries said that a long-term goal should be based on sound science. However, Brazil and India called for careful consideration of assumptions underlying scientific arguments.

Mitigation: Mitigation and its associated means of implementation were discussed in a contact group chaired by Zammit Cutajar. Discussions covered all subparagraphs of paragraph 1(b) of the Bali Action Plan, namely:

- 1(b)(i) on mitigation by developed countries;
- 1(b)(ii) on mitigation by developing countries;
- 1(b)(iii) on reducing deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries, plus conservation (REDD+);
- 1(b)(iv) on sectoral approaches;
- 1(b)(v) on market-based approaches;
- 1(b)(vi) on consequences of response measures; and
- 1(b)(vii) on the catalytic role of the Convention.

Three in-session workshops were held on: economic and social consequences of response measures (FCCC/AWGLCA/2009/CRP.1); mitigation by developed and developing countries respectively (FCCC/AWGLCA/2009/CRP. 3); and opportunities and challenges for mitigation in the agricultural sector (FCCC/AWGLCA/2009/CRP.2). For more details of these workshops, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12400e.html>, <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12401e.html> and <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12404e.html>.

On *mitigation by developed countries*, parties discussed the nature of commitments and ways to define them. South Africa, China and several others highlighted the need for comparable efforts, and underlined that all developed countries should set legally binding, quantitative and economy-wide emission reduction targets. Brazil, Bolivia and several others highlighted historical responsibility and the polluter pays principle. The EU called for developed country leadership and ambitious targets. New Zealand noted that the discussion was about “developed countries,” not Annex I countries. The Republic of Korea highlighted that mitigation can be an economic opportunity. Some countries called for nationally appropriate commitments. The US urged further discussion of long-term emission pathways and noted plans for a federal cap-and-trade system with interim annual goals, guided by a long-term goal up to 2050.

Japan and others stressed the need for a legal framework for commitments by Protocol non-parties, including the US. India proposed that the AWG-LCA determines the collective emission reduction range for all Annex I countries and individual targets for Protocol non-parties. Japan and others urged cooperation with the AWG-KP to achieve a comprehensive outcome in Copenhagen.

On *mitigation by developing countries*, discussions focused on NAMAs. The Republic of Korea noted that NAMAs can be voluntary, based on support or on carbon credits. China said developing countries are interested in NAMAs but they are facing financial and technological barriers. The EU proposed considering how to incorporate NAMAs into low-carbon development strategies, and suggested such strategies as a way of communicating needs for support.

Japan, the EU and others suggested “advanced developing countries” should do more on mitigation, while Saudi Arabia, South Africa and others opposed differentiation among developing countries. Japan supported halving global emissions by 2050 and said that a Copenhagen agreement should be comprehensive and involve major developing countries, or otherwise Japan will not be able to join it. China, India, Saudi Arabia and others stressed the voluntary nature of developing country mitigation, stating that commitments would be against the Convention's principles.

The US and several developing countries highlighted mitigation actions already implemented by developing countries, and Mexico and others identified the need for their recognition. Several parties supported registering NAMAs. Parties discussed the nature and functions of a NAMA registry, and, in particular, ways of matching actions with support. South Africa discussed specific steps for establishing a NAMA registry, including the registration of developing country actions enabled through their own resources and verification at the national level. Saudi Arabia described an integrated support and accreditation mechanism (SAM). India highlighted the role of support and suggested a registry can be “a NAMA window” of the financial mechanism. Argentina, the Philippines and Saudi Arabia expressed concern with the concept of a registry, and Algeria said the idea of matching actions with support connotes uncertainty or delay.

On MRV, several developing countries highlighted that the MRV requirement applies to financial, technical and capacity building support by developed countries for NAMAs. Several developed countries highlighted the need for MRV of NAMAs. The US said MRV should not be confined to NAMAs themselves, but should also take into account their context to understand the net results and the direction of global emissions. New Zealand identified an “information deficit” due to the lack of recent developing country inventories and identified the need to verify that the information is correct. India and others stressed that verification is inconsistent with the Convention's provisions, and China said MRV only applies to supported action, which would be verified by national entities under UNFCCC guidance.

On *REDD+*, parties highlighted access to financial, technological and capacity-building support. Several countries highlighted the link with NAMAs. Many also identified the need for performance-based and robust methodologies and monitoring systems. Among other issues, parties noted national-level implementation, co-benefits and a phased approach.

Parties also addressed cooperative *sectoral approaches*. Developing countries supported consideration of such approaches only in the context of Convention Article 4.1(c) on the transfer of technologies. Several developing countries noted that sectoral approaches should take place at the national level and opposed global and regional sectoral approaches. On emissions from international aviation and maritime transportation, Norway

supported a global target for international shipping emissions, while Pakistan and Singapore supported consideration of the issue by specialized agencies such as the International Civil Aviation Organization and the International Maritime Organization.

On the *role of markets*, discussions focused on their purposes and limitations. Several developing countries highlighted that markets should not substitute mitigation activities in developed countries or public funding. The EU proposed complementing NAMAs with market mechanisms, and elaborated on sectoral crediting and trading for developing countries with no-lose targets below business-as-usual baselines. Developing countries stressed the role of governments and the public sector in enhancing mitigation, with the LDCs highlighting barriers to market participation. Developed countries underlined the need to engage the private sector.

On *consequences of response measures*, parties noted both positive and negative consequences for different economic and social sectors and countries. Several parties supported establishing a forum to exchange views and experiences and develop recommendations.

On the *catalytic role of the Convention*, it was agreed that this is a crosscutting element. Developing countries highlighted the central role of the UNFCCC.

Adaptation: Adaptation was discussed in a contact group, co-chaired by Thomas Kolly (Switzerland) and William Agyemang-Bonsu (Ghana), focusing on the following issues: underlying principles of adaptation; possible elements for an adaptation framework; institutional arrangements; means of implementation; implementation; and risk and insurance.

On *principles*, parties discussed, *inter alia*: the need for country-driven and pragmatic approaches; consideration of adaptation at the same level as mitigation; differences between adaptation and sustainable development; and the catalytic vs. direct role of the Convention. Mexico highlighted the needs of vulnerable countries, sectors and groups, and, with the Gambia and others, underscored needs of women, children, the poor and indigenous peoples. Bangladesh called for legally binding provisions on adaptation.

On *institutional arrangements*, discussions centered on possible elements for a framework for adaptation action. The US noted that “one size does not fit all,” and stressed the need for a clearly defined role for the Convention. The African Group said that actions should be country-driven. Turkey and Mexico suggested a framework should support implementation at the national and regional levels and allow for coordination at the different levels of government. Panama and Colombia proposed that the framework adopt a flexible approach.

On *means of implementation*, the G-77/China underscored the need for new, scaled-up, predictable, additional and continued financial resources to finance incremental costs, as well as for direct and non-conditional access to those resources by developing countries. China underscored adaptation technologies, including ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ technologies. Many parties highlighted the need for capacity building, long-term adaptation, addressing immediate adaptation needs, and risk reduction strategies. They also discussed: full versus incremental funding of adaptation activities; mutual accountability; matching adaptation activities with support; assessment of vulnerabilities;

funds outside the Convention and whether adaptation support outside the Convention can be counted towards support commitments; and the diversion of resources allocated for poverty reduction and sustainable development towards adaptation, as well as differentiation of official development assistance (ODA) from adaptation funding.

On *implementation*, parties discussed implementation of adaptation action and implementation of enabling activities and environments. Among other issues, parties noted the need for: contemplating both short- and long-term adaptation needs; compensation for climate-related losses and damages; an ecosystem approach; and actions other than those related to infrastructure. The EU said adaptation measures should be integrated into national, regional and local planning. Japan underscored information sharing. The Gambia called for immediate implementation of National Adaptation Programmes of Action and stressed the need to avoid maladaptation. The African Group underscored a network of regional adaptation and research centers, and consideration of indigenous knowledge.

On *risk reduction*, parties underscored, *inter alia*: access to weather and climate information; community-level capacity building; special needs of small island developing states (SIDS) and LDCs; unequal distribution of losses among and within countries; and integration of disaster relief and resilience strategies. Bangladesh proposed the development of a vulnerability index. Uganda called for strengthening national early warning systems.

Parties also considered the use of *insurance* as an adaptation strategy. AOSIS proposed a multi-window mechanism including three elements; insurance, compensation and risk reduction. Parties discussed, *inter alia*: whether insurance should be considered under adaptation or on its own, and the difference between risk transfer and risk reduction. Australia noted possible perverse incentives of insurance mechanisms.

Finance and technology: This issue was first addressed in the opening plenary on 29 March. Arthur Rolle, Chair of the Expert Group on Technology Transfer (EGTT), presented three reports on: the long-term perspective beyond 2012; sectoral approaches; and future financing options and performance indicators (FCCC/SB/2009/Inf.1-3). Issues related to delivering on finance and technology were then discussed in a contact group chaired by Vice-Chair Machado.

The contact group focused its discussions on generation of and access to financing, development and transfer of technology, institutional arrangements and REDD+. Developing countries underscored finance and technology as “make or break” components of an agreement in Copenhagen.

On *financial resources*, the G-77/China underscored the need for new and additional, appropriate, predictable, sufficient, and in addition to ODA financial resources, as well as for funding of incremental costs. India noted lack of metrics for measuring incremental costs. Mexico reiterated its proposal for a Green Fund financed by assessed contributions by developed countries. Norway highlighted its suggestion for financing using revenues from the auctioning of carbon credits, and the Republic of Korea proposed crediting of NAMAs. Switzerland noted its proposal for a carbon tax of US\$2 per tonne of carbon dioxide. Some parties suggested considering how the proposed financing options address issues of historical responsibility

and the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities. India highlighted problems with harmonizing a global carbon tax. Canada pointed to EGTT's proposals on financing, and Tanzania underscored compliance with financing commitments. Parties also noted the need for public financing for adaptation and made comparisons between the scale of climate financing with that in economic stimulus packages.

On *technology*, China underscored the need for a technology roadmap. The EU said the UNFCCC should play a catalytic role. China preferred an action-based mechanism. Many developing countries said the further elaboration of technology needs assessments should not detract from their implementation.

On intellectual property right (IPRs) in developing countries, Bolivia suggested compulsory licensing, voluntary licenses, patent pooling, and/or extension of exemptions. Japan said IPRs should be protected and highlighted them as fundamental for technology development. Pakistan suggested national incentives in developed countries to engage private IPR holders with developing countries.

Parties discussed a balanced approach to mitigation and adaptation technologies, the use of leveraging or clearing house institutions to link technology needs with resources from the private sector, and assessment of the scale and speed of technology transfer. Parties also addressed issues related to research and development (R&D), including the need for joint R&D activities, scaling up public funding on climate technology R&D and regional R&D centers.

On *institutional arrangements*, many developed countries suggested strengthening existing mechanisms, while many developing countries proposed the establishment of new ones. Parties discussed: the need for efficient, effective and transparent mechanisms; the G-77/China's proposed multilateral technology fund; Mexico's proposed Green Fund; and the use of an integrated financial architecture vs. the use of a sector- or area-specific approach. Parties further discussed the need for an assessment mechanism and whether mechanisms should be under the COP. The African Group supported innovation centers. AOSIS noted the need for region-specific and special mechanisms for LDCs and SIDS. Brazil underscored the need to ensure that assessment mechanisms do not themselves become a barrier to technology transfer, and Norway underscored the issue of financing cannot be solved until leakages are addressed. Parties also addressed the governance of institutions, and the effects of institution multiplicity in access to funds.

On *REDD+*, parties discussed financing options. Norway and many others stressed a multi-phase results-based approach. Panama proposed a technical paper on options for financing a potential REDD+ fund. Papua New Guinea, supported by many parties, emphasized the need to integrate multiple revenue streams and organize them to facilitate a step-wise process. He also underscored the need to ensure stability of carbon markets and suggested possibly setting aside Assigned Amount Units. Thailand highlighted the cross-cutting nature of REDD. The EU highlighted co-benefits and synergies with adaptation financing. The Environmental Integrity Group stressed governance and recognition of indigenous peoples' rights. Saudi Arabia underscored comparability of REDD to other mitigation activities such as carbon capture and storage (CCS).

OTHER MATTERS: This issue was first considered by the plenary on Sunday, 29 March, when Chair Zammit Cutajar identified the need to consider whether, where and when to hold additional meetings in 2009, as reflected in the Chair's scenario note (FCCC/AWGLCA/2009/2). Parties met informally several times for consultations chaired by Zammit Cutajar that lasted until the afternoon of the last day of the session. The AWG-LCA plenary adopted conclusions (FCCC/AWGLCA/2009/L.2) on Wednesday, 8 April.

Discussions focused on the following issues: the value of holding additional sessions; the burden imposed on small delegations and developing countries; and the proximity of the proposed meetings to COP 15 and difficulties for national and group coordination. Parties also considered: possible venues; financial support for the organization of the meeting and for participation of developing country parties; and the implications, particularly for observer organizations, of the informal nature of one of the proposed sessions. In the final agreement, the proposed second additional meeting was reduced from two weeks to one week, and parties decided to allow participation of observers in the informal session.

AWG-LCA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/AWGLCA/2009/L.2), the AWG-LCA requests the Secretariat to organize, subject to availability of funds, an informal meeting from 10-14 August 2009 in Bonn, Germany, and a resumed seventh session from 2-6 November at a location to be announced. The AWG-LCA notes that the organization of work for each meeting will be decided at the previous session, respectively, and that observer and media organizations will be able to register and attend the meeting in accordance with the current practice. The AWG-LCA also notes that the informal session cannot produce decisions or conclusions affecting the organization of work of, or preparatory work for, AWG-LCA 6.

CLOSING PLENARY: In the closing plenary on Wednesday, 8 April, Chair Zammit Cutajar highlighted the 24 April 2009 deadline for further submissions and outlined the organization of work for AWG-LCA 6, proposing to start as a single convened group and read the draft negotiating text from top to bottom.

In their closing statements, the Gender Constituency noted that the transition to a low-carbon society should be socially just and that the needs of the most vulnerable should be recognized. Indigenous Peoples stressed that REDD must ensure prior informed consent of local indigenous communities and include their participation in all steps of governance. Sudan, for the G-77/China, expressed concern with very little engagement from developed countries and a serious Convention implementation deficit. Mexico, for the Environmental Integrity Group, stressed that the work of AWG-LCA has important intergenerational implications in the context of sustainable development. Grenada, for AOSIS, expressed extreme disappointment with the lack of progress. He also noted some disturbing trends in doubting scientific findings and called for clear milestones for each of the future meetings. Lesotho, for LDCs, highlighted that the key guiding principle should be avoiding adverse impacts on the most vulnerable countries and called on developed countries to provide adequate financial support for adaptation actions.

The EU noted progress in gaining a better understanding of some ideas such as REDD, a NAMA registry and technology transfer. Canada underlined progress made at this session

in relation to a shared vision, including possible long-term pathways, as well as on realizing the full mitigation potential of REDD, and on adaptation and technology transfer.

Argentina, for fourteen Latin American and Caribbean countries, called for very ambitious emission reductions. He also highlighted that adaptation is a necessity in developing countries. Mauritania stressed the right to aspire to equitable development and called on developed countries to live up to their current commitments.

India stated that negotiating text should be based on the Bali Action Plan and that new issues outside its mandate, including concepts such as “advanced developing countries” and “low-carbon development strategies,” should not be introduced in that text. Bolivia stressed that developed countries should pay their climatic debt.

The US called for a pragmatic approach and noted convergence on many issues such as adaptation and financial architecture. Japan highlighted the need for coherence with the work under the AWG-KP. The Marshall Islands called for immediate and credible mitigation targets and for an action-oriented legally binding agreement. Algeria stressed that attempts to link the two tracks and to differentiate among developing countries could slow down progress in AWG-LCA and make it difficult to reach agreement in Copenhagen.

Rapporteur Lilian Portillo (Paraguay) presented the meeting’s draft report (FCCC/AWG-LCA/2009/L.1) and parties adopted it. Chair Cutajar asked parties to consider when, in their view, it is appropriate to begin deliberations on the form of the agreed outcome at Copenhagen. In closing, he highlighted eight ingredients for success in AWG-LCA: vision, science, urgency, principles, commitments, pragmatism, ambition and innovation. AWG-LCA 5 concluded at 7:28 pm.

AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON FURTHER COMMITMENTS FOR ANNEX I PARTIES

AWG-KP 7 opened on Sunday, 29 March, with Harald Dovland (Norway) continuing as the Chair, and Mama Konate (Mali) as the Vice-Chair.

Chair Dovland opened the session and parties adopted the agenda (FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/1). Chair Dovland noted that COP/MOP 4 had agreed to elect a new Chair and Vice-Chair, and reported that consultations by Eric Mugurusi (Tanzania) had not been completed. Mugurusi noted nominations from both the Group of Latin American and Caribbean countries and the African Group and said he would continue the consultations. Chair Dovland noted that according to the draft rules of procedure, current officers will continue until the election of new ones.

Sudan, for the G-77/China, expressed concern with slow progress in fulfilling the group’s mandate under Protocol Article 3.9 (Annex I further commitments). He stressed the need to focus at this session on the aggregate scale of Annex I parties’ emission reductions and adopt conclusions on a draft legal amendment text. He called for an organization of the agenda that reflects this dual objective.

Australia, for the Umbrella Group, highlighted the complexity of assessing the comparability of Annex I countries’ mitigation efforts. Noting co-dependence with the AWG-LCA, he emphasized the need for consistency and coherence between the two groups.

Grenada, for AOSIS, stressed the need to incorporate scientific information released since the IPCC AR4, which points to climate change effects occurring much faster than projected and previous research greatly underestimating costs of inaction. He called for stabilization at well below 350 ppm with emissions peaking by 2015. Nigeria, for the African Group, highlighted the importance of discussing potential consequences of response measures.

The EU stressed the need to limit global warming to below 2°C and to avoid the possible crossing of critical thresholds. He highlighted synergies with the AWG-LCA and called for a comprehensive and meaningful conclusion to be reached in Copenhagen.

Switzerland, for the Environmental Integrity Group, supported the inclusion of new documented greenhouse gases and the improvement of the flexibility mechanisms. He urged information exchange between the two AWGs.

Lesotho, for the LDCs, called for deep and ambitious emission reduction commitments by Annex I countries, and for ensuring that efforts under the Protocol do not impose constraints on the most vulnerable countries.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK: Chair Dovland presented the organization of work (FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/1 and 2; FCCC/KP/AWG/2008/8). South Africa, for the G-77/China, opposed contact groups on the flexibility mechanisms and LULUCF, preferring informal consultations. He urged focusing on Annex I emission reductions and draft Protocol amendment text. The EU, Australia, Japan and Canada stressed the need to retain the contact groups on the flexibility mechanisms and LULUCF. Parties agreed to establish contact groups on potential consequences, emission reductions, legal matters, flexibility mechanisms, and LULUCF. They also agreed to consult informally on “other issues,” including: greenhouse gases, sectors and sources; common metrics; and possible approaches to sectoral emissions.

ANNEX I EMISSION REDUCTIONS: Discussions covered the agenda items on Annex I countries’ aggregate and individual emission reductions. They were taken up by the AWG-KP plenary on Monday, 30 March, and considered in a contact group and informal consultations chaired by Chair Dovland. The AWG-KP closing plenary adopted the conclusions (FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/L.6) on Wednesday, 8 April.

Chair Dovland reported on the informal pre-session workshop on the scale of emission reductions to be achieved by Annex I parties, held on Saturday, 27 March (FCCC/AWG/KP/2009/CRP.1), highlighting productive discussions.

The AWG-KP’s work plan for 2009 (FCCC/KP/AWG/2008/8) mandates AWG-KP 7 to adopt conclusions on the aggregate range of Annex I emission reductions. Micronesia, speaking for AOSIS and also speaking for Argentina, Benin, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Gambia, Guatemala, Ecuador, El Salvador, Kenya, Mozambique, Panama, Peru, Senegal, Togo and Uganda, highlighted scientific findings since the Fourth Assessment Report (AR4) by the Intergovernmental Panel on

Climate Change (IPCC), and urged stabilization at below 350 ppm. She called for Annex I countries, whether or not they are Protocol parties, to collectively reduce their emissions by at least 45% from 1990 levels by 2020, and by more than 95% by 2050. Later in the session, the LDCs and the African Group expressed support for this position, while some non-Annex I countries expressed other views. India, for example, called for an overall emission reduction target for all Annex I countries of 40% from 1990 levels.

The EU proposed an Annex I aggregate emission reduction range of 30% by 2020. He reiterated the EU's commitment to reduce emissions unilaterally by 20% from 1990 levels by 2020, and increase reductions to 30% in the context of global efforts. Norway reiterated the goal of becoming carbon neutral by 2030. Australia and New Zealand supported stabilization at 450 ppm. Australia highlighted its unconditional commitment to reduce emissions by 5% below 2000 levels by 2020, and by 15% in the context of global efforts. Canada noted that its emissions are currently at 2000 levels, but highlighted progress in decoupling them from economic growth. Belarus stressed the need to include his country in Annex B and ratify the Belarus amendment for it to enter into force.

Japan and the Russian Federation highlighted their ongoing domestic processes on further emission reductions. Japan said his country would announce a mid-term target in June and supported halving global emissions by 2050. Questioning the 25-40% aggregate range for Annex I countries from the IPCC AR4, Japan stressed several possible emission pathways to achieve a given stabilization level and the need to consider political and economic factors. China and Japan emphasized that the AR4 is not a negotiated outcome.

Expressing disappointment at the failure of many Annex I parties to present concrete numbers, Tuvalu drew attention to the AWG-KP as a "faith-building exercise," which would allow action under the AWG-LCA. New Zealand called for agreement on "a shared vision" and a global goal under the AWG-LCA before finalizing commitments under the AWG-KP. India proposed that the AWG-LCA should agree on the collective emission reductions range for all Annex I parties and decide on individual targets for Protocol non-parties, while the AWG-KP should focus on targets for Protocol parties. Japan and the Russian Federation, opposed by several developing countries, urged inserting a reference to cooperation with the AWG-LCA in the conclusions. Parties agreed to reiterate language on the need to "maintain a coherent approach between the Convention and Protocol." In the closing plenary, Japan requested reflecting their position regarding cooperation with the AWG-LCA in the meeting's report.

The last issue to be resolved under AWG-KP 7 concerned whether and how to reflect proposed numbers and new scientific findings in the conclusions. South Africa reminded parties that the AWG-KP has already twice before agreed to reach agreement on the aggregate scale and cautioned that "this issue will be with us until Copenhagen." South Africa and several other developing countries urged a clear and strong signal concerning the AWG-KP's work on Annex I countries' further emission reductions. After informal consultations conducted by Ian Fry (Tuvalu), parties reached agreement on Wednesday evening on the need to add text, which, *inter alia*, notes information provided by some

parties on scientific findings since AR4, and indicates that the scale of emission reductions will be the "key focus" of AWG-KP 8.

On the possible ways forward to determine the aggregate emission reduction range, parties agreed to the EU's proposal to compile the existing pledges by Annex I parties, which were incorporated in an informal table compiled by the Secretariat. Many proposals on the aggregate range were reiterated in the contact group on legal matters and included as bracketed options in the Chair's non-paper on possible Protocol amendments under Article 3.9, which many expect will evolve into a negotiating text at the June session. South Africa (FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/CRP.3) and another non-Annex I country tabled proposals for Annex I countries' individual targets for commitment periods in 2013-17 and 2018-22, which were also reflected in the non-paper.

In the closing plenary, the Climate Justice Network stated that northern governments are putting unjustified pressure on those in the South while refusing to live up to their legal and moral obligations. He urged those in the North, as well as Southern elites, to change their lifestyles and called for a full "repayment of the climate debt." Kiko Network of Japan said the 450 ppm scenario is "dangerously high" and Annex I countries' emissions must be reduced by more than 40% by 2020.

AWG-KP Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/AWG/KP/2009/L.6), the AWG-KP, *inter alia*, reaffirms that it will coordinate its work with other bodies and processes under the Convention, especially under the Protocol, and recalls that it will maintain a coherent approach between the Convention and the Protocol. The AWG-KP takes note of the information on possible quantified emission reduction and limitation commitments by some Annex I parties and invites Annex I parties in a position to do so to submit further information before AWG-KP 8. It also takes note of information provided at AWG-KP 7 on recent scientific analysis on stabilization below the levels assessed in the AR4, "hence the greater urgency to address climate change." It agrees to continue considering the scale of Annex I parties' aggregate emission reductions "as a key focus" of AWG-KP 8.

OTHER ISSUES IN THE AWG-KP'S WORK

PROGRAMME: Legal Matters: This issue (FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/3 and 4; FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/Misc.6 and Add.1-2) was considered by the AWG-KP plenary on 1 April, and in a contact group and informal consultations chaired by Dovland. The AWG-KP adopted conclusions on 8 April (FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/L.5).

The focus of discussions was on documents to be developed by the AWG-KP Chair for AWG-KP 8. Some parties expressed general views on the post-2012 legal framework. Parties also considered a Chair's non-paper with options for possible Protocol amendments strictly related to Protocol Article 3.9 (Annex I further commitments).

On the legal framework, Japan stressed that a "narrow amendment" to the Protocol is not an adequate basis for the post-2012 climate regime and said his country can only join a broader legal framework, which includes commitments by the US and major developing countries. Japan, Australia, Canada and several other developed countries emphasized the need for a coherent and comprehensive outcome in Copenhagen, and proposed coordination with the AWG-LCA. Tuvalu urged building on

the Protocol's architecture, and said the Copenhagen outcome should consist of two separate instruments. Australia outlined its submission (FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/MISC.6/Add.2) with two options for the post-2012 legal framework: a new protocol or a combination of a new protocol and amended Kyoto Protocol. He said the latter option could necessitate complex entry into force provisions to link the amended Kyoto Protocol to the outcome from the AWG-LCA.

On the development of text, Protocol Articles 20 and 21 provide that proposals to amend the Protocol or its annexes must be communicated to parties six months before the meeting at which they are proposed for adoption. Having to regard this "six-month rule," delegates discussed the scope and nature of the documents to be developed for the AWG-KP's June session, which is the last one before the deadline.

Several developing countries highlighted the AWG-KP's mandate based on Protocol Article 3.9 and stressed the need to focus on Annex I parties' further commitments. China and others emphasized the limited and technical nature of the amendments required for the second commitment period. The EU and other developed countries highlighted the AWG-KP's work programme, which also includes other issues such as the flexibility mechanisms and LULUCF. The EU, New Zealand and others stressed the need to agree on LULUCF rules before finalizing commitments. Switzerland supported the establishment of a "Committee of the Whole" to consider all issues in the work programme. Tuvalu and others supported the consideration of other issues, including extending the share of proceeds to joint implementation and emissions trading.

Parties agreed to request the AWG-KP Chair to prepare two documents for the June session: a proposal for Protocol amendments under Article 3.9, and a text on other issues in paragraph 49 of the AWG-KP 6 conclusions (FCCC/KP/AWG/2008/8). In the closing plenary, Bolivia made a statement to be reflected in the meeting's report, highlighting the AWG-KP's "clear and unambiguous" mandate to adopt an amendment to Annex B at COP/MOP 5, and stressing this as the AWG-KP's only mandate. She said any document on "other issues" must be clearly separate from amendment text related to Protocol Article 3.9.

Parties also considered a non-paper by Chair Dovland on amendments strictly related to Protocol Article 3.9, focusing on Annex B and consequential textual amendments. The non-paper contains, *inter alia*, several options on annexes. Many parties proposed adding new columns to Annex B, e.g., to refer to per capita emissions or express targets in relation to different base years. New Zealand proposed adding an Annex C, which would not change the nature of Annex I commitments, but provide choice in how parties express them. Tuvalu proposed an Annex C on voluntary commitments. The non-paper also contains options on possible additions or changes to the Protocol's relevant articles. Parties suggested text on issues including Annex I countries' collective emission reduction range and the length of the commitment period(s). While no formal decision was taken on the non-paper, Chair Dovland said he would be "surprised if the text was not there in the June session."

In the closing plenary, Chair Dovland highlighted the outcome as a "breakthrough" since the AWG-KP is now considering negotiating text.

AWG-KP Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/L.5), the AWG-KP, *inter alia*:

- recalls the six-month rule;
- reiterates that it will forward to COP/MOP 5 the results of its work for their adoption;
- requests the Chair to prepare a proposal for amendments under Protocol Article 3.9, as well as a text on issues outlined in paragraph 49 of AWG-KP 6's report (FCCC/KP/AWG/2008/8);
- invites parties to submit further views on matters related to the two documents and requests the Chair consider these submissions as well as other submissions invited by AWG-KP 7; and
- reiterates that it will coordinate its work with other bodies and processes under the Convention, especially its Protocol, with a view to avoiding duplication and maintain a coherent approach between the Convention and Protocol with respect to Annex I parties' commitments.

Flexibility Mechanisms: This issue (FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/4; FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/INF.1; FCCC/AWG/2009/MISC.3 and Add.1-2; FCCC/KP/AWG/2008/5; and FCCC/KP/AWG/2008/8) was first taken up by the plenary on Monday, 30 March, and considered in contact groups and informal consultations co-chaired by Christiana Figueres Olsen (Costa Rica) and Gertraud Wollansky (Austria). The AWG-KP plenary adopted conclusions (FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/L.2) on Wednesday, 8 April.

Discussion largely focused on a Co-Chairs' non-paper, which is based on the Chair's note on possible improvements to the flexibility mechanisms (FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/INF.2). Parties dedicated most of the session to working through the text by merging some options, deleting others, and retaining several others. Few deletions were made.

Kuwait opposed the inclusion of air and ground transportation and highlighted CCS as a possible improvement to the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM), and, with Saudi Arabia, opposed sectoral crediting. Australia called for more effective treatment of LULUCF and CCS. Panama, on behalf of Central American countries and the Dominican Republic, stressed environmental integrity. The Business and Industry organizations stressed the need for consultation with financial experts.

Parties also discussed ways to refer in the conclusions to Annex I (possible improvements with potentially significant implications) and Annex II (other possible improvements) of the Chair's note. Switzerland called for including Annex II in the document rather than as a footnote. The Russian Federation stressed recognition of the different statuses of work on Annex I and Annex II and opposed consolidation of the two annexes. A new compromise text, referring to both annexes and their statuses of work, was included.

As in other contact groups under the AWG-KP, one of the final issues to be resolved concerned submissions. South Africa, supported by China, India and Brazil, suggested inviting party submissions on technical aspects of possible improvements to the flexibility mechanisms. Delegates debated whether and how to link the outcome to the conclusions on legal matters and whether the AWG-KP Chair should reflect the new submissions in the text to be prepared by AWG-KP 8. Consistently with other groups, parties agreed that the AWG-KP Chair should also consider the new submissions.

AWG-KP Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/KP/ AWG/2009/L.2), the AWG-KP, *inter alia*, notes its continued deliberations on possible improvements identified in Annex I and Annex II (FCCC/KP/ AWG/2008/5), and that the progress during the deliberations is reflected in Annex I while Annex II remains under consideration. It invites parties to submit by 24 April 2009 views on Annex I and Annex II for consideration at AWG-KP 8 and agrees to continue deliberations, in the context of the conclusions on legal matters, and previous and future party submissions.

Land Use, Land-use Change and Forestry: This issue (FCCC/KP/ AWG/2009/4; FCCC/ AWG/ KP/2009/ INF.1; FCCC/ AWG/ KP/2009/ MISC.5 and Corr.1 & Add.1; FCCC/ AWG/ KP/2008/3; FCCC/ AWG/ KP/2008/5; and FCCC/ AWG/ KP/2008/8) was taken up by the plenary on Tuesday, 31 March, and in contact groups and informal consultations co-chaired by Marcelo Rocha (Brazil) and Bryan Smith (New Zealand). The AWG-KP plenary adopted conclusions (FCCC/KP/ AWG/2009/ L.3) on Wednesday, 8 April.

Parties agreed to focus on clarifying some concepts proposed by parties and reflected in the AWG-KP Chair's document on LULUCF (FCCC/KP/ AWG/2009/ INF.1). Based on these discussions, parties agreed to have the Co-Chairs prepare a non-paper to facilitate negotiations in June using decision 16/ CMP.1 on LULUCF as the basis.

Parties discussed the EU's proposal for a "bar approach" to account for forest management. The EU described it as an agreed level above which removals would be credited and below which they would be debited. Brazil, Tuvalu and others expressed concern with the concept, in particular with how the bars for individual countries would be set. Tuvalu elaborated on his proposal for compulsory accounting for forest biomass decline as a means to ensure that carbon stock losses do not go unaccounted for as a result of the forest definition.

Other proposals addressed included: Tuvalu's and others' proposal to include revegetation to balance out accounting for re-vegetation; Canada's proposal for assuming zero emissions or removals for cases of carbon saturation in cropland management; Iceland's proposal to include wetland restoration and degradation as an optional activity under Article 3.4 (additional LULUCF activities); and two different proposals by New Zealand and Tuvalu for accounting for harvested wood products. Parties also briefly referred to the land-based approach (as opposed to activity-based approaches), which some supported as a long-term goal but felt it was premature to adopt now, while others favored retaining it as an option.

For the draft conclusions, parties agreed to request submissions before AWG-KP 8. There was some disagreement on whether the AWG-KP Chair should take into account only previous submissions and the Co-Chairs' non-paper, or whether he should also consider the new submissions when preparing his document. Parties preferring the latter option felt that the Co-Chairs' non-paper did not properly elaborate on land-based accounting, while others argued that the new submissions should first be discussed by parties. After extended discussions, parties agreed to note in the annex that land-based accounting could be further elaborated based on submissions and views expressed at this session, and to include consideration of all submissions in the AWG-KP Chair's text.

AWG-KP Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/KP/ AWG/2009/L.3), the AWG-KP, among other things:

- notes that progress made at AWG-KP 7, as reflected in the annex, could facilitate deliberations at AWG-KP 8; notes that the annex does not capture all of the proposals and options put forward by parties in their submissions and during the discussions at this session;
- invites submissions from parties by 24 April 2009;
- agrees to continue its deliberations taking into account the annex to the conclusions, as well as previous and new submissions, "in the context of the AWG-KP Chair's text,";
- requests that the AWG-KP Chair's text be based on the annex; and
- encourages parties to share information, particularly data, before AWG-KP 8.

The conclusions include an annex with two options: one for an activity-based approach to accounting for LULUCF on the basis of decision 16/ CMP.1; and one for a land-based approach. A note in the chapeau of the annex explains that the latter option (land-based approach) remains an explicit option and could be further elaborated based on the submissions by parties and the views expressed at AWG-KP 7.

Potential Consequences of Response Measures: This issue (FCCC/KP/ AWG/2009/ INF.3; FCCC/ KP/ AWG/2009/ MISC.4; and FCCC/ KP/ AWG/2008/8) was taken up by the AWG-KP plenary on Tuesday, 31 March, and in contact groups and informal consultations co-chaired by Mama Konaté (Mali) and Paul Watkinson (France). The AWG-KP plenary adopted conclusions (FCCC/KP/ AWG/2009/ L.4) on Wednesday, 8 April. On Monday, 30 March, the AWG-KP convened an in-session workshop on potential consequences (FCCC/ AWG/ KP/ CRP.2). For more details on the workshop, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12399e.html>.

The key issues discussed included: which countries to focus on; whether more scientific evidence of negative consequences of response measures was needed; the need for assessment of consequences versus implementation of remedies; whether positive and negative consequences should be balanced; and ways to report potential consequences. The different views were compiled in a bracketed text that was annexed to the conclusions and forwarded to AWG-KP 8 for further consideration.

With regard to which countries to focus on, parties were divided on the need to focus on the most vulnerable countries or on all developing countries at large. China, with Saudi Arabia, Indonesia and others, said that reference to consequences should be with regard to all developing countries. Australia and others opposed this and called for focus on the most vulnerable.

With regard to evidence of consequences, Australia, the EU and Japan highlighted the need for evidence of negative consequences, while the G-77/China and others voiced concern with this proposal. Senegal highlighted difficulties in providing evidence of even positive consequences. The G-77/China, opposed by the EU and New Zealand, also called for reference to remedies in the text.

Parties were divided on balancing positive and negative consequences, with several developed countries supporting recognition of both positive and negative impacts. Many

developing countries expressed concern with the consideration of positive impacts, and Saudi Arabia cautioned against a reference to maximizing positive consequences.

On reporting efforts to address potential consequences, the EU, with Canada, noted that reporting requirements already exist. New Zealand and others, opposed by Algeria and others, proposed that non-Annex I countries could use their national communications to identify consequences of response measures. Brazil stated that the national communications process was too slow and dependent upon support by the Global Environment Facility, and called for continuous reporting of consequences. Senegal highlighted limited capacity to prepare national communications. Jamaica said other relevant documents should also be used. Nigeria supported an independent assessment of consequences and highlighted difficulties in quantifying consequences. Argentina argued for the consideration of regional consequences. Qatar suggested a transparent reporting obligation that could identify impacts of response measures.

AWG-KP Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/KP/ AWG/2009/L.4), the AWG-KP, *inter alia*: notes the text for further consideration at AWG-KP included in the annex; invites parties to submit by 4 May 2009 views on the annex, and agrees to resume consideration of potential consequences at AWG-KP 8, based on the annex and party submissions, with a view to forwarding the results of its work for consideration to COP/MOP 5.

Other Issues: This issue (FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/4 and 5) included: the coverage of greenhouse gases, sectors and sources; common metrics; and possible approaches targeting sectoral emissions. It was taken up by the plenary on Tuesday, 31 March, and in informal consultations chaired by Chair Dovland. The AWG-KP plenary adopted conclusions (FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/L.7/Rev.1) on Wednesday, 8 April.

Discussions focused, *inter alia*, on whether to include new greenhouse gases for the second commitment period and on common metrics to calculate carbon dioxide equivalence of emissions. The IPCC noted the completion of the report of the expert meeting on alternative common metrics, to be considered by IPCC-30. He noted that global temperature potential (GTP) values have not been assessed or approved by the IPCC, and that GTP and other common metrics will be considered in the context of the Fifth Assessment Report. Parties agreed to continue discussing the matter at AWG-KP 8.

AWG-KP Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/KP/ AWG/2009/L.7/Rev.1), the AWG-KP, *inter alia*: acknowledges its consideration of the coverage of greenhouse gases, sectors and source categories, common metrics, possible approaches for targeting sectoral emissions and other issues; requests the Secretariat to update the technical information on the gases as appropriate, taking into account party submissions; notes the IPCC's technical assessment of alternative common metrics; and invites party submissions by 24 April 2009 for consideration at AWG-KP 8.

Additional Meeting Time: Informal consultations took place throughout the session on the need to hold additional meetings in 2009. These discussions were held in conjunction with the AWG-LCA's consultations on the same topic.

AWG-KP Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/KP/ AWG/2009/L.8), the AWG-KP agrees to meet informally

from 10-14 August 2009 in Bonn, Germany and to resume its ninth session from 2-6 November; and agrees to consider the organization of work for this additional meeting and the session at AWG-KP 8.

CLOSING PLENARY: The AWG-KP closing plenary convened at 8:20 pm on Wednesday, 8 April. Eric Mugurusi (Tanzania) reported on consultations concerning the election of officers. He noted that the African Group had withdrawn their candidate and only the candidate nominated by GRULAC remained. Parties elected John Ashe (Antigua and Barbuda) as the new Chair, Harald Dovland (Norway) as the Vice-Chair, and Miroslav Spasojevic (Serbia) as the rapporteur. Incoming AWG-KP Chair Ashe stressed time constraints and emphasized the need for leadership for Copenhagen to succeed.

Parties then adopted the meeting's report (FCCC/AWG/ KP/2009/L.1). Japan, supported by Turkey, the Russian Federation, Ukraine, Croatia, Belarus, Australia and others, expressed concern over the scope of the AWG-KP's work and urged close cooperation between the two AWGs. Japan highlighted that cooperation between the AWGs is necessary for a fair, comprehensive and effective post-2012 framework and requested that these concerns be reflected in the meeting's report.

Canada stressed that an environmentally-effective agreement in Copenhagen requires very close coordination by the AWGs. Croatia highlighted that the world is very different from 20 years ago when the distinction between Annex I and non-Annex I countries was established. New Zealand said the AWG-KP's work is challenged in the absence of a shared vision and global long-term goal. The Russian Federation lamented that progress achieved so far does not point towards a global and comprehensive agreement in Copenhagen. Australia urged every effort be made to ensure coherence and consistency between the AWGs, while South Africa noted that the two groups meet at the same time and place at every session, meaning that parties have an understanding of what is going on in each group and a formal link is therefore unnecessary.

The Republic of Korea, for the Environmental Integrity Group, noted some positive steps forward. The EU stressed that the incoming Chair had been given a clear mandate to prepare text on amendments and decisions to be adopted in Copenhagen. He emphasized the AWG-KP's mandate covers the broad range of issues in the work plan and New Zealand said these issues are really "aspects of the same issue," namely Annex I further emission reductions, and emphasized the need for finalizing LULUCF rules before the targets.

Sudan, for the G-77/China, highlighted the AWG-KP's "very clear and definite" mandate to reach conclusions on Annex I parties' emission reductions. He expressed "extreme disappointment" over the lack of substantive discussion on Annex I parties' emission reductions, noting that the AWG-KP is now behind schedule. He said that while the other issues are important, they must not distract from the AWG-KP's focus, and welcomed discussion on potential consequences of response measures. He emphasized the necessity of reaching agreement in Copenhagen "to save the planet."

A number of developing countries expressed disappointment at the conclusions on Annex I emission reductions. Botswana said that historical responsibility seemed to be turning into historical and current irresponsibility. China said the atmosphere

was “excessively occupied” by Annex I emissions, denying developing countries space for sustainable development. She urged Annex I parties to show responsibility and move forward with concrete steps. Lesotho expressed disappointment that even the science had been doubted in the negotiations.

The US emphasized that “the times have changed” and that the US anticipates being more active, expressing interest in various issues under the AWG-KP, including the flexibility mechanisms and LULUCF.

Chair Dovland stressed that parties should not underestimate what had been achieved at AWG-KP 7, underscoring that agreement was reached on text to be prepared for AWG-KP 8 and emphasized that the discussions will shift gears in June. He thanked everyone, including Vice-Chair Konate and the Secretariat staff, for working with him and said it had been a privilege to serve as the AWG-KP Chair. He closed the meeting at 10:46 pm.

A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF AWG-LCA 5 AND AWG-KP 7

A glacier is “a large, slow-moving mass of ice, formed from compacted layers of snow that slowly deforms and flows in response to gravity and high pressure.”

Negotiations under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) have sometimes been said to proceed at a “glacial speed.” The problem is that with human-induced climate change, glaciers have begun to move more quickly. During the fifth session of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action (AWG-LCA 5) and the seventh session of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP 5), delegates heard news of the shattering of the last ice bridge connecting Antarctica’s Wilkins Ice Shelf to the coast. This caused the skeptical ones to wonder whether climate change and the movement of ice would soon be outpacing progress in the negotiations. Less than eight months remain before the critical conference in Copenhagen, where negotiators are supposed to reach agreement on the post-2012 climate change regime and deliver an ambitious political response to the growing concern about climate change.

While the main objective of the Bonn meeting was still somewhat unglamorous – to work towards negotiating texts under both AWGs – everybody agrees that time is running out and that the “serious work” must kick off in June. As the UNFCCC Executive Secretary Yvo de Boer reminded delegates, in terms of negotiating time, Copenhagen is only several weeks away. The sense of urgency is also growing outside the process: the International Scientific Congress on Climate Change, held in Copenhagen just a few weeks before the Bonn talks, sent a chilling message that the worst-case IPCC scenario trajectories (or even worse) are being realized. And the process is taking place in the midst of a major global economic crisis. On the more positive side, the new US administration finally arrived to the negotiating table with clear signs of wanting to engage, but with little time to prepare concrete proposals that would gain the required backing at home. Many familiar with the process remain confident that an agreement in Copenhagen will be possible,

noting that it is too early in the process to see major movement and things will only get serious once parties have a negotiating text before them. However, some delegates were increasingly worried about the amount of work ahead of them and expressed disappointment with the pace of the negotiations in Bonn.

This brief analysis takes stock of progress made at AWG-LCA 5 and AWG-KP 7 and analyzes key remaining issues for the eight critical months ahead, with particular emphasis on the interrelatedness of various negotiation forums and issues – where if one part moved, the other might follow, and, on the other hand, lack of progress on one issue could hold back others. In this sense, it might be more the dynamics of glacier movement than glaciers’ pace which serves as an analogy to the process as it unfolded in Bonn.

CHARACTERIZING THE PACE IN BONN

For most delegates, the main objective of the first negotiating session in 2009 was to ensure that both AWGs have negotiating texts on the table at their June sessions and that these texts contain a balanced mix of concrete ideas so that parties can start to add in the details and bracket those ideas that they are not comfortable with. In other words, many saw the meeting as a key step in identifying and elaborating on the elements that could be included in a Copenhagen agreement. Lawyers also highlighted the “six-month rule,” which means that any Protocol amendments or other legal instruments proposed for adoption in Copenhagen must be communicated to parties by June 2009. As it happened in 1997 when the Kyoto Protocol was adopted, negotiations are certain to continue until the very end of the Copenhagen conference (and there can be such last-minute surprises like the Clean Development Mechanism was), but the interpretation is that the main ideas should be included in the proposals in order to comply with the six-month rule.

AWG-LCA: Although at first the AWG-LCA seemed to simply replay well-known positions and general statements, to many participants the session’s discussions gradually became more practical and slightly more detailed. Submissions made prior to the meeting – constituting the basis of the Chair’s note – could be characterized as containing a high level of abstraction. As this session progressed, however, more clarity emerged in certain contexts. This was particularly so in discussions on adaptation and the concept of nationally appropriate mitigation actions (NAMAs) by developing countries. Some also observed more convergence in discussions on reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries (REDD) with regard to the inclusion of conservation (albeit in a differentiated manner) in “REDD+,” and more detail in the proposals.

After the meeting, many veterans felt that the formal process of the AWG-LCA had moved forward, constituting a useful step towards consolidating ideas to be included in a negotiating text. However, all delegates were quick to point out that not only is there a surplus of issues on the table, but also substantive disagreement on many critical issues, especially with regard to specifying targets in a shared vision and whether the role of the Convention in finance and technology transfer should be more action-based or advisory. To be sure, discussions on governance challenges, especially with regard to finance and technology transfer, have just begun.

AWG-KP: In the AWG-KP process, parties were a step closer than the AWG-LCA to entering the negotiation phase, taking up issues such as Annex I emission reductions, flexibility mechanisms, potential consequences, land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF), and legal matters. AWG-KP delegates, however, faced at least two critical challenges. The first challenge related to the scope of the negotiating text to be developed for the June session and whether it should be based on the stricter or broader interpretation of the AWG-KP's mandate. Most developing countries stressed the need to focus on inserting new quantified targets into Annex B and making related textual amendments to the Protocol, while developed countries were looking for a broader negotiating text that also covers issues such as the flexibility mechanisms and rules on how to account for sinks. Many felt that the outcome was still relatively obscure and meant that many of the same "battle lines" would re-emerge in June.

The second significant challenge revolved around the aggregate scale of emissions to be achieved by Annex I parties. According to the AWG-KP's work programme for 2009, AWG-KP 7 was supposed to adopt conclusions on the aggregate range. As there were no clear numbers in the final outcome, many developing countries were left frustrated, noting that the AWG-KP had dedicated the last three years to exploring the means available for Annex I countries to achieve their commitments and that focus on the actual numbers was overdue. Some developing countries had come to the table with detailed calculations of ranges and targets for Annex I parties. Many Umbrella Group countries, however, were once more reluctant to advance independently of the AWG-LCA: while some of them have placed unilateral offers on the table, Japan and the Russian Federation made it clear that they were not willing to negotiate numbers for Annex I Protocol parties under the AWG-KP without knowledge of commitments from the US and advanced developing countries. So while some considered the discussion on the ranges and targets tabled by some developing countries at this meeting as an important step in the right direction, given that they will be reflected in the June negotiating text, everyone acknowledges that the AWG-KP is in for some rough times.

INTERCONNECTIONS

INSIDE THE PROCESS: Those familiar with the dynamics of glacier and ice movement know that, as with other natural systems, changes in some parts – even small changes – can lead to a sequence of events that results in significant consequences. In the case of the Wilkins Ice Shelf, for example, it was the snap of an ice bridge that is leading to the wider break-up of the Ice Shelf. In the post-2012 negotiations, it may also be that if one aspect of the negotiations were to advance, other pieces might also start falling into place.

If there is one thing that characterizes the Bali Roadmap negotiations, it is the amount of interconnections. Indeed, procedural interlinkages and the ensuing challenges are increasingly evident. Developing countries stress that serious progress on numbers for developed countries and financial support is required before they are willing to discuss mitigation action. But some developed countries were also in their own waiting game – arguing for consistency between the two AWGs and waiting for major developing countries and the US

to express their commitments. Intimately related to mitigation commitments are new and existing market mechanisms and rules for accounting for LULUCF. Many were waiting for these rules to be resolved before targets are set, and are speculating about the implications for the US – a Protocol non-party who cannot fully participate in the formulation of rules on LULUCF and flexibility mechanisms. As most expected, substantive progress with respect to these issues remained slow and, in fact, hardly moved at all.

OUTSIDE THE PROCESS: It is also important to note the interconnectedness of progress under the UNFCCC with that achieved in processes outside of the Convention. Many have noted that the major deals requiring agreement by Copenhagen will likely be done outside of the UNFCCC meetings, perhaps in the form of bilateral negotiations, such as the dialogue between the US and China, or in smaller multilateral meetings, including the G8 discussions, the UN Secretary-General's climate summit of world leaders in September, and the upcoming Danish meeting of finance ministers. There is also a series of meetings under the Major Economies Forum, announced by US President Obama, with the first of multiple meetings to take place at the end of April. Many delegates have expressed high hopes for the Forum to make progress on elucidating what major economies are able to do with regard to both mitigation and technological and financial support.

In addition, progress on mitigation is heavily dependent on progress made on domestic programmes. With regard to developing country action, China and India have committed to substantial programmes for advancing energy efficiency and renewable energy. Mexico and South Africa have already established targets, and the Republic of Korea has committed to developing a 2020 goal. Japan will release its mid-term emission reduction target in June. And all eyes are on legislative developments within the US, especially regarding the details of its planned economy-wide cap-and-trade programme. The programme will be market-based, and will most likely contain offset features similar to the mechanisms under the Kyoto Protocol, necessitating compatibility and fungibility between the US and international trading schemes. Indeed, many believe that for the Copenhagen agreement to be acceptable in the US Congress, and to not repeat another Kyoto failure, it will have to be heavily informed by US domestic-level climate legislation. However, during the Bonn meetings, President Obama's push to "fast-track" a cap-and-trade programme was rejected in Congress, which means that climate legislation will now require more votes and likely take more time. This was considered a setback by many, especially in light of the schedule of submissions and meetings in the lead up to Copenhagen. But even if the US is successful in passing domestic legislation on a timescale relevant to the international process, many note that Obama's proposed reduction target of reaching 1990 emissions levels by 2020 – considered weak by many – would require an incredibly hard push domestically, leaving hopes low for an even more ambitious goal in the context of the UNFCCC process.

LOOKING AHEAD

The Bonn climate talks are part of the long (and now even longer, as parties have agreed to add two more sessions) series of meetings in the final run up to Copenhagen and, starting with

the June session, delegates are going to pick up the pace. Yet, few expected to see big concessions or advances so early in the game, and, as many expressed in the closing plenary, the real work is yet to come.

With regard to situating the Bonn talks on “the road to Copenhagen,” the UNFCCC Executive Secretary de Boer identified four minimum requirements for a successful Copenhagen agreement: targets for Annex I parties; meaningful efforts by major developing countries to limit emissions growth; financial and technological support for mitigation and adaptation; and clarity on governance. On most of these issues, this Bonn session brought some clarity on these topics, albeit slowly and only in form rather than in substance. Given that COP 15 is rapidly approaching, some are saying that it may be better to start downplaying expectations that Copenhagen will result in a detailed and comprehensive agreement and prepare to accept that it will be instead a key stepping stone where, like in the Kyoto Protocol, delegates reach agreement on the general framework but the details are defined at a later stage. Yet, recent science suggests that global emissions will have to peak well before 2020 in order to avoid the most dangerous climate scenarios. While there is no clarity in the negotiations as to which emission pathway to follow, climate change seems to be leaving precious little time for agreement, elaboration and implementation for this later stage.

UPCOMING MEETINGS

SECOND MEETING OF THE CBD AHTEG ON BIODIVERSITY AND CLIMATE CHANGE: The second meeting of the *Ad hoc* Technical Expert Group (AHTEG) on Biodiversity and Climate Change, organized by the Secretariat of the Convention for Biological Diversity, will be held from 18-22 April 2009 in Helsinki, Finland. For more information, contact: CBD Secretariat; tel: +1-514-288-2220; fax: +1-514-288-6588; e-mail: secretariat@cbd.int; internet: <http://www.cbd.int/doc/?meeting=AHTEG-BDCC-02-02>

INDIGENOUS PEOPLES' GLOBAL SUMMIT ON CLIMATE CHANGE: This conference will take place from 20-24 April 2009 in Anchorage, Alaska, US. The aims of the conference include bringing indigenous peoples together to talk about common issues and raising the visibility and participation of indigenous peoples in local, national and international processes. For more information, contact: Inuit Circumpolar Council; tel: +1-907-274-9058; fax: +1-907-274-3861; e-mail: info@indigenoussummit.com; internet: http://www.iccalaska.org/Media/Flyer_Summit.pdf

THIRTIETH SESSION OF THE IPCC: The 30th session of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) will take place from 21-23 April 2009 in Antalya, Turkey. The 39th session of the IPCC Bureau will convene in the same location, on 20 April 2009. For more information, contact: IPCC Secretariat; tel: +41-22-730-8208; fax: +41-22-730-8025; e-mail: IPCC-Sec@wmo.int; internet: <http://www.ipcc.ch/meetings/session30.htm>

G8 ENVIRONMENT MINISTERS MEETING: The meeting of environment ministers of the group of most industrialized nations (G8) will take place from 22-24 April 2009 in Siracusa, Italy. This preparatory meeting will feed its results

into the G8 annual summit, which will deal with the traditional issues relating to financial stability and macro-economic coordination, with the newer agenda items on development in Africa and in the environment. For more information, visit: <http://www.g8italia2009.it/>

UNCTAD EXPERT MEETING ON TRADE AND CLIMATE CHANGE: TRADE AND INVESTMENT OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES UNDER THE CDM: The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) expert meeting on trade and climate change will take place from 27-29 April 2009 in Geneva, Switzerland. At its fifty-fifth session, UNCTAD's Trade and Development Board approved terms of reference for a single-year expert meeting on trade and climate change. Accordingly, this expert meeting will focus on the trade and investment opportunities and challenges under the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM). For more information, contact: Lucas Assunção; fax: +41-22-917-0247; e-mail: lucas.assuncao@unctad.org; internet: <http://www.unctad.org/Templates/meeting.aspx?intItemID=4714&lang=1&m=15861&info=not>

MAJOR ECONOMIES FORUM ON ENERGY AND CLIMATE: The Major Economies Forum will take place from 27-28 April 2009 in Washington, DC, US. The Forum will seek to facilitate a dialogue among key developed and developing countries in an effort to generate the political leadership necessary to achieve a successful outcome at the UN climate change negotiations in December 2009. This meeting will serve as a preparatory session for a Major Economies Forum Leaders' meeting that Prime Minister Berlusconi has agreed to host in La Maddalena, Italy, in July 2009. The 17 major economies invited to attend are: Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, the European Union, France, Germany, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Republic of Korea, Russia, South Africa, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Denmark, in its capacity as the President of the December 2009 Conference of the Parties to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, and the UN have also been invited. For more information, visit: <http://www.state.gov/g/oes/rls/other/2009/120980.htm>

UNFCCC TECHNICAL WORKSHOP ON INCREASING ECONOMIC RESILIENCE TO CLIMATE CHANGE AND REDUCING RELIANCE ON VULNERABLE ECONOMIC SECTORS THROUGH ECONOMIC DIVERSIFICATION: This workshop, which is held under the Nairobi work programme on impacts and vulnerability and adaptation to climate change, will take place from 28-30 April 2009 in Cairo, Egypt. For more information, contact: UNFCCC Secretariat; tel: +49-228-815-1000; fax: +49-228-815-1999; e-mail: secretariat@unfccc.int; internet: http://unfccc.int/adaptation/adverse_effects/items/4781.php

C40 LARGE CITIES CLIMATE SUMMIT – SEOUL 2009: The C40 Large Cities Climate Summit will be held from 18-21 May 2009 in Seoul, Republic of Korea. The C40 Large Cities Climate Leadership Group was established in 2005 by London's then mayor Ken Livingstone and comprises the world's largest cities committed to taking action on climate change. C40 previously met in London in 2005, New York in 2007, and will meet in Seoul in 2009 for its third Summit. The theme of the Seoul Summit is “Cities' Achievements and Challenges in the Fight against Climate Change.” The Summit is expected to

attract the mayors from the C40 Group to share their policies and experiences on this issue through plenaries and sessions. For more information, contact Mr. Chul-wong CHOI; tel: +82-2-2115-7796; fax: +82-2-2115-7799; e-mail: c40seoul@seoul.go.kr; internet: <http://www.c40seoulsummit.com/>

G8 DEVELOPMENT MINISTERS MEETING: The meeting of G8 development ministers will take place from 21-23 May 2009 in Pecara, Italy. For more information, visit: <http://www.g8italia2009.it>

G8 ENERGY MINISTERS MEETING: The meeting of G8 energy ministers will take place from 24-25 May 2009 in Rome, Italy. For more information, visit: <http://www.g8italia2009.it/>

WORLD BUSINESS SUMMIT ON CLIMATE CHANGE: The World Business Summit on Climate Change will be held from 24-26 May 2009 in Copenhagen, Denmark. The Summit will bring together representatives from business, science, economics, civil society, media and government to put forward recommendations for the next international framework on climate change. For more information, contact: Copenhagen Climate Council; tel: +45-3393-9323; e-mail: jc@mm.dk; internet: <http://www.copenhagenclimatecouncil.com/world-business-summit.html>

30TH SESSIONS OF THE UNFCCC SUBSIDIARY BODIES, AWG-LCA 6, AND AWG-KP 8: The 30th sessions of the Subsidiary Bodies of the UNFCCC – the Subsidiary Body for Implementation and the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice – are scheduled to take place from 1-12 June 2009 in Bonn, Germany. At the same time, AWG-LCA 6 and AWG-KP 8 will also take place. For more information, contact: UNFCCC Secretariat; tel: +49-228-815-1000; fax: +49-228-815-1999; e-mail: secretariat@unfccc.int; internet: <http://unfccc.int/meetings/items/2654.php>

INFORMAL MEETINGS OF THE AWG-LCA and AWG-KP: Informal meetings of the AWG-LCA and the AWG-KP are scheduled to take place from 10-14 August 2009 in Bonn, Germany. Observers will be allowed. For more information, contact: UNFCCC Secretariat; tel: +49-228-815-1000; fax: +49-228-815-1999; e-mail: secretariat@unfccc.int; internet: <http://unfccc.int/>

AWG-LCA 7 AND AWG-KP 9: The seventh meeting of the AWG-LCA and the ninth session of the AWG-KP are scheduled to take place from 28 September - 9 October 2009 in Bangkok, Thailand. For more information, contact: UNFCCC Secretariat; tel: +49-228-815-1000; fax: +49-228-815-1999; e-mail: secretariat@unfccc.int; internet: <http://unfccc.int/meetings/items/2654.php>

RESUMED AWG-LCA 7 AND AWG-KP 9: A resumed seventh session of the AWG-LCA and the ninth session of the AWG-KP are scheduled to take place from 2-6 November 2009 at a location to be announced. For more information contact: UNFCCC Secretariat; tel: +49-228-815-1000; fax: +49-228-815-1999; e-mail: secretariat@unfccc.int; internet: <http://unfccc.int/>

UNFCCC COP 15 AND KYOTO PROTOCOL COP/MOP 5: The fifteenth Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC and fifth meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol are scheduled to take place from 7-18 December 2009 in Copenhagen, Denmark. These meetings will coincide with the 31st meetings of

the UNFCCC's subsidiary bodies. Under the "roadmap" agreed at the UN Climate Change Conference in Bali in December 2007, COP 15 and COP/MOP 5 are expected to finalize an agreement on a framework for combating climate change post-2012 (when the Kyoto Protocol's first commitment period ends). For more information, contact: UNFCCC Secretariat; tel: +49-228-815-1000; fax: +49-228-815-1999; e-mail: secretariat@unfccc.int; internet: <http://unfccc.int/>

GLOSSARY

AOSIS	Alliance of Small Island States
AR4	Fourth Assessment Report by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
AWG-KP	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group on Further Commitments by Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol
AWG-LCA	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention
CCS	Carbon Capture and Storage
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
COP	Conference of the Parties
COP/MOP	Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol
EGTT	Expert Group on Technology Transfer
GRULAC	Group of Latin American and Caribbean Countries
GTP	Global temperature potential
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IPR	Intellectual property right
LDCs	Least Developed Countries
LULUCF	Land use, land-use change and forestry
MRV	Measurable, reportable and verifiable
NAMA	Nationally appropriate mitigation action
ODA	Official development assistance
ppm	Parts per million of carbon dioxide equivalent
REDD	Reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries
REDD+	Reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries, including conservation
SIDS	Small Island Developing States
TNAs	Technology Needs Assessments
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change