BANGKOK CLIMATE TALKS HIGHLIGHTS:
SATURDAY, 1 SEPTEMBER 2012

On Saturday, the ADP met throughout the day to consider ambition and vision for the ADP. In the morning and afternoon, a number of contact groups and informal consultations under the AWG-KP and AWG-LCA convened.

**ADP ROUNDTABLE: Ambition:** Discussions on ambition continued from Friday. Many developing countries highlighted that ambition must address adaptation, mitigation and means of implementation. Many stressed the need for parties that have not done so to present their pledges.

The REPUBLIC OF KOREA underscored the need for: a holistic approach to strengthen both domestic actions and international cooperation; and a balance between mitigation and adaptation. He suggested that parties that have presented pledges should remove conditionalities and move to the higher range of their pledges.

SAUDI ARABIA stressed the need to address ambition on adaptation, including through pledges by parties, a registry and a workshop to discuss these matters. BARBADOS said increasing participation through increased pledges is vital, stressing that the issue is not about a participation gap but an ambition gap.

SWITZERLAND, supported by NORWAY, said the workstream should not be seen as competitive but rather as complementary. BARBADOS emphasized that the ambition workstream should be approached with a sense of urgency.

SWITZERLAND highlighted aspects hindering progress on raising ambition, namely: a technical understanding of the potential for joint and individual actions; and political will. He called for technical discussions on ambition, focusing on exchanging experiences and analyzing the potential for raising ambition in different sectors. The SOLOMON ISLANDS said exchanging experiences would not be useful if means of implementation to enhance NAMAs are not ensured. The MARSHALL ISLANDS said engagement with non-state actors should be enhanced, focused and interactive.

JAPAN called for enhanced transparency over mitigation actions, and improved cooperation, including outside the UNFCCC. NORWAY said raising ambition requires clarity on emission reduction accounting to understand what and how much countries are doing, noting that it is easy to do this for parties with commitments under the Kyoto Protocol.

SINGAPORE highlighted three aspects for raising ambition: deepening the range of actions, particularly ambition in the context of the Kyoto Protocol, and the range of pledges; broadening the range of actions, saying complementary initiatives are relevant but should strengthen the multilateral system and respect the different competencies of multilateral organizations; and broadening the range of actors.

BOLIVIA highlighted the reluctance of some parties to join a second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol, and questioned why parties want to “kill” a system that works for many. He highlighted the need for a system providing clear accounting rules, a high level of ambition and commitments.

ECUADOR proposed a compliance regime linked to the International Court of Justice.

CHINA highlighted implementation, commitment and equity gaps. He emphasized: a holistic and balanced approach to raising the ambition level of all the BAP pillars; that ambition is not a matter of potential but of responsibility; the importance of briefings or reports from other relevant processes, including on long-term finance and the workshop on equitable access to sustainable development; and that any reference to supplementary actions should not be an excuse for undertaking unilateral measures.

AUSTRALIA emphasized: building understanding on issues, such as what drives and what can incentivize ambition, through sharing experiences, best practices and success stories; the important catalytic and demonstration effect of complementary activities taking place outside the UNFCCC; hearing from parties on what they require to ramp up ambition; and the development of credible carbon markets. The EU proposed further discussion on: how the UNFCCC can provide transparency; and catalyzing action in other multilateral bodies. He suggested the Secretariat prepare a technical paper with structured and quantified options on complementary initiatives.

BRAZIL stressed: equity and ambition as mutually supportive; the importance of attractive agreements, pointing to possible examples to look towards, such as the WTO and the Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (disarmament treaty); that “no party exits the Kyoto Protocol to
do more”; and the importance of recognizing ambition, pointing to
developing countries that have put forward NAMAs as an example. He highlighted the paradox of having to produce
NAMAs to get support, and suggested developed countries are
reluctant to provide support that could create competition from the
developing world. The US noted the lack of differentiation
among parties in the disarmament treaty referred to by Brazil.

SWITZERLAND said that ministerial meetings should not
be overused and should be timely and well organized to ensure
productivity. The PHILIPPINES reiterated that developing
country ambition is linked to support from developed countries,
and that developed country mitigation ambition relates to
discussions in the AWGs.

COLOMBIA suggested that climate change discussions be
framed in a broader context, advocating that climate change is a
global security issue and that it should be placed on the Security Council’s agenda. She stressed that adaptation should be the
centerpiece and said there is a “no going back option” of climate
change in relation to climate refugees. The US recalled climate
discussions in the Security Council. MICRONESIA, supported
by the US, highlighted the value of outside initiatives, such as
those focused on HFCs, black carbon, methane and ground-level
ozone. She underscored that, in order to close the ambition gap,
outside actions must be additional to current pledges. Nauru,
for AOSIS, said next week’s discussions should focus on, inter
alia: the outcome of Doha; the 2013 workplan; and closing the
ambition gap in 2013.

ROUNDTABLE: Vision for the ADP: Discussions continued
from Friday. Reiterating that the ADP must be negotiated under
the Convention, BRAZIL affirmed that the negotiation of a
new legal instrument for 2020 is the main focus of the Durban Platform. Warning against starting to negotiate the instrument too early, he said this would contaminate the “real” deliverables
for Doha, which should be the AWG-KP and the AWG-LCA.
BARBADOS said, inter alia, that the new legally-binding
agreement must be: comprehensive in scope; and address
adaptation, mitigation, finance and technology.

Venezuela, for ALBA, expressed concern with some parties
questioning the validity of the Convention after 20 years, and
reinterpreting certain terms. He underlined that a flexible system
of bilateral and plurilateral agreements might undermine the
multilateral rule-based system.

The EU stressed the need to set out a work plan aimed at
adopting a legally-binding agreement in 2015, applicable to all,
and invited parties to make submissions and begin discussing
informally what this means in practical terms.

NEW ZEALAND said universal participation would deliver
an enhanced level of ambition and would be the best platform on
which to build. TANZANIA emphasized that support to countries
suffering the impacts of climate change is an equity issue.

The REPUBLIC OF KOREA recommended flexibility in a post-2020 agreement, with incentives for developing-
country participation, which should take into account national
circumstances, such as population growth rate and density,
energy mix, renewable energy endowment, and the extent of
coastline.

Nauru, on behalf of AOSIS, called for the workstream on
ambition to be prioritized in order to reach agreement on a new
protocol, and opposed a separate roundtable on principles, saying
these should not be discussed in isolation.

MEXICO proposed that a post-2020 outcome with legal
force could work together with a cluster of related instruments
that have separate contractual, prescriptive and facilitative
dimensions. He expressed disappointment at the “deafening
silence” on mid-term finance. The MARSHALL ISLANDS
suggested that the “binary division” between countries under
the AWG-KP could be replaced by a number of lists with a
more differentiated middle ground, from which countries could
“graduate” to more stringent requirements.

The UNITED ARAB EMIRATES said that the CBDR
principle could be reinforced, while enabling a wider group of
countries to play “a fair role” in reducing emissions, considering
countries’ demographics, resource endowments and other
factors. SAUDI ARABIA highlighted the need for greater mutual
understanding in negotiations.

AWG-KP

INFORMAL CONSULTATIONS: Second Commitment
Period: Parties continued to discuss options for ensuring
continuity between the first and second commitment periods.
Several parties reiterated concerns that provisional application of
an amendment to the Kyoto Protocol may not be operationalized
quickly enough to address the gap and therefore give the
Protocol “a solid legal footing.”

IN THE CORRIDORS

On Saturday, the ADP roundtables on the workstreams concluded. Meanwhile, in the AWG-LCA contact group and
informal groups, delegates continued to “hit walls.” The aim
of the AWG-LCA here in Bangkok was to put “text on pieces
of paper for Doha” as one delegate put it. But even getting text
on pieces of paper seems to be a difficult task. “Durban clearly
only mandated further work on specific issues, and we cannot
accept text or decisions in Doha on any other issues,” said one
developed country representative. “The other issues were already
allocated for consideration by the Subsidiary Bodies or the
institutions created in Cancun and Durban,” he added.

On the other hand, developing countries have identified
numerous unresolved issues under the Bali Action Plan that must
be addressed in the AWG-LCA. “Decisions on these issues are
necessary for the AWG-LCA to successfully terminate in Doha.
Otherwise, what becomes of them? We can’t just leave them
hanging and right now the ADP is a vacuum so we can’t assume
they will be picked up there,” one delegate stated.

With these two divergent views, some were hoping a
middle ground could be found. We can’t have a “dictionary of
outstanding issues,” but we also “can’t have nothing at all,”
expressed one who was sitting in the AWG-LCA discussions.