



SUMMARY OF THE BONN CLIMATE CHANGE CONFERENCE: 29 APRIL – 3 MAY 2013

The second session of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP 2) met in Bonn, Germany, from 29 April to 3 May 2013. Approximately 600 government delegates and 200 observers participated in the session. ADP 2 was structured around workshops and roundtable discussions, covering the ADP’s two workstreams on the 2015 agreement (Workstream 1) and pre-2020 ambition (Workstream 2). Many felt this format was helpful in moving the ADP discussions forward. Several delegates noted, however, that the ADP needs to become more focused and interactive in future sessions. At the end of the week, ADP 2 suspended its session with a view to resuming it in the context of the next Bonn Climate Change Conference from 3-14 June 2013.

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, which sets out a framework for action aimed at stabilizing atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases (GHGs) to avoid “dangerous anthropogenic interference” with the climate system. The Convention, which entered into force on 21 March 1994, now has 195 parties.

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

LONG-TERM NEGOTIATIONS IN 2005-2009:

Convening in Montreal, Canada, at the end of 2005, the first session of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP 1) decided

to establish the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Annex I Parties’ Further Commitments under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP) in accordance with Protocol Article 3.9, which mandates consideration of Annex I parties’ further commitments at least seven years before the end of the first commitment period. COP 11 created a process to consider long-term cooperation under the Convention through a series of four workshops known as “the Convention Dialogue.”

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

COPENHAGEN: The UN Climate Change Conference in Copenhagen, Denmark, took place in December 2009. The high-profile event was marked by disputes over transparency and process. During the high-level segment, informal negotiations took place in a group consisting of major economies and representatives of regional and other negotiating groups. Late in the evening of 18 December these talks resulted in a political

IN THIS ISSUE

A Brief History of the UNFCCC and the Kyoto Protocol.	1
ADP 2 Report.	3
Agenda and Organization of Work	4
Implementation of all the Elements of Decision 1/CP.17	4
Closing Plenary	15
A Brief Analysis of ADP 2.	15
Upcoming Meetings.	17
Glossary	19



agreement: the “Copenhagen Accord,” which was then presented to the COP plenary for adoption. After 13 hours of debate, delegates ultimately agreed to “take note” of the Copenhagen Accord. In 2010, over 140 countries indicated support for the Accord. More than 80 countries also provided information on their national mitigation targets or actions. Parties also agreed to extend the mandates of the AWG-LCA and AWG-KP until COP 16 and CMP 6 in 2010.

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

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

Under the Protocol track, the CMP urged Annex I parties to raise the level of ambition towards achieving aggregate emission reductions consistent with the range identified in the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), and adopted Decision 2/CMP.6 on land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF). The mandates of the two AWGs were extended for another year.

DURBAN: The UN Climate Change Conference in Durban, South Africa, took place from 28 November to 11 December 2011. The Durban outcomes cover a wide range of topics, notably the establishment of a second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol, a decision on long-term cooperative action under the Convention and agreement on the operationalization of the GCF. Parties also agreed to launch the new ADP with a mandate “to develop a protocol, another legal instrument or an agreed outcome with legal force under the Convention applicable to all Parties.” The ADP is scheduled to complete these negotiations by 2015. The new instrument should enter

into effect from 2020 onwards. In addition, the ADP was also mandated to explore actions to close the pre-2020 ambition gap in relation to the 2°C target.

BONN: This meeting took place from 14-25 May 2012 in Bonn, Germany. The conference comprised the 36th sessions of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) and Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA). It also included AWG-LCA 15, AWG-KP 17 and the first session of the ADP. Under the AWG-KP, the focus was on issues to be finalized for adopting a second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol and for the AWG-KP to conclude its work at CMP 8. Many outstanding questions remained, including the length of the second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol and carry-over of surplus units.

Under the AWG-LCA, debates continued on which issues require consideration so that the AWG-LCA can finalize its work at COP 18. Developed countries stressed “significant progress” and the various new institutions established in Cancun and Durban. Some developing countries identified the need to continue discussing issues required to fulfill the Bali Action Plan mandate.

Under the ADP, discussions centered on the agenda and the election of officers. After nearly two weeks of discussions, the ADP plenary agreed on the Bureau arrangements and adopted the agenda, initiating two work streams: one addressing matters related to paragraphs 2-6 of Decision 1/CP.17 (2015 agreement) and the other addressing paragraphs 7-8 (enhancing the level of ambition during the pre-2020 period), and agreed on the election of officers.

BANGKOK: This informal session took place from 30 August - 5 September 2012 in Bangkok, Thailand. Under the ADP, parties convened in roundtable sessions to discuss their vision and aspirations for the ADP, the desired results and how these results can be achieved. Parties also discussed how to enhance ambition, the role of means of implementation and how to strengthen international cooperative initiatives, as well as the elements that could frame the ADP’s work.

The AWG-KP focused on resolving outstanding issues to ensure successful completion of the group’s work in Doha by recommending an amendment to the CMP for adoption. This would allow a second commitment period under the Protocol to start immediately from 1 January 2013.

The AWG-LCA continued working on practical solutions to fulfill specific mandates from COP 17. The focus was on outcomes needed to conclude the group’s work in Doha, how to reflect the elements in the final outcome of the AWG-LCA and whether additional work might be required beyond COP 18.

DOHA: The UN Climate Change Conference in Doha took place from 26 November to 8 December 2012. The conference resulted in a package of decisions, referred to as the “Doha Climate Gateway.” These include amendments to the Kyoto Protocol to establish its second commitment period and agreement to terminate the AWG-KP’s work in Doha. The parties also agreed to terminate the AWG-LCA and negotiations under the Bali Action Plan. A number of issues requiring further consideration were transferred under the SBI and SBSTA, such as: the 2013-15 review of the global goal; developed and developing country mitigation; the Kyoto Protocol’s flexibility

mechanisms; national adaptation plans; MRV; market and non-market mechanisms; and REDD+. Key elements of the Doha outcome also included agreement to consider loss and damage, “such as” an institutional mechanism to address loss and damage in developing countries that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change.

ADP 2 REPORT

The second session of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP 2) opened on Monday, 29 April 2013, in Bonn, Germany. Welcoming delegates to ADP 2, Co-Chair Jayant Moreshver Mauskar (India), recalled agreement at COP 18 in Doha that the ADP move to more focused mode of work in 2013.

UNFCCC Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres underscored a heightened sense of urgency, noting that atmospheric greenhouse gas (GHG) concentrations are close to surpassing the 400 parts per million (ppm) of carbon dioxide (CO₂) threshold. She called for substantive progress, noting that only two-thirds of the time allocated for the ADP at COP 17 in Durban remain.

Qatar, for the COP 18 Presidency, thanked participants for a successful Doha outcome and stressed ongoing support for the ADP Co-Chairs.

Fiji, for the Group of 77 and China (G-77/China), highlighted that work under the ADP must not lead to the re-interpretation or rewriting of the Convention. He called for an outcome that is in line with the Convention’s principles; is balanced, ambitious and fair; and includes adaptation, mitigation and means of implementation. He stressed the need to bring the amendment to the Kyoto Protocol adopted in Doha into force as soon as possible, and noted that enhanced pre-2020 action should address gaps in finance, technology and means of implementation.

The European Union (EU) identified the need to agree on a single, fair and comprehensive legal framework under the ADP, and close the pre-2020 ambition gap. He called for considering a spectrum of mitigation commitments under Workstream 1 (the 2015 agreement) that is fair and reflects evolving economic realities, and identifying concrete actions to close the ambition gap under Workstream 2 (pre-2020 ambition), including through enhanced pledges and international cooperative actions. The EU highlighted mitigation potential of hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), fossil fuel subsidies, renewable energy and energy efficiency.

Australia, for the Umbrella Group, emphasized the importance of a global regime that helps to foster national action, stressing that it is national action that will ultimately reduce emissions and prepare countries for climate impacts. He called for a climate-effective new agreement that includes participation of all parties, with a spectrum of contributions that enables all parties act in a way that reflects their national circumstances, and allows for flexibility, while accommodating concerns related to transparency and environmental integrity.

Switzerland, for the Environmental Integrity Group (EIG), expressed willingness to work in a focused manner towards the adoption of a legally-binding instrument in 2015. He identified the need for all parties to take appropriate mitigation commitments of the same legal form, including targets or actions, under the same rules. The EIG explained that

the instrument must also address adaptation and means of implementation. On pre-2020 ambition, he identified the need to increase action within and outside the Convention, underlining the importance of other processes for the success of the ADP.

Swaziland, for the African Group, welcomed the workshop-roundtables format. He expressed concern over the lack of adequate mitigation finance, as well as lack of action on adaptation. He emphasized that the ADP is not a forum for the renegotiation of the Convention, and identified the need to define an adaptation goal.

Nauru, for the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS), emphasized the need for an agreement that ultimately brings CO₂ concentrations to a level consistent with 1.5°C. She stated that work under both workstreams must be driven by a sense of urgency, with Workstream 2 focusing on policies that can be deployed immediately. She indicated that the outcome under Workstream 1 should be a protocol under the Convention, applicable to all parties, and suggested convening a ministerial meeting to raise ambition at COP 19, in Warsaw.

Nepal, for the Least Developed Countries (LDCs), urged allocating sufficient time for workshops and roundtables, and supported the establishment of two contact groups for the two workstreams. On Workstream 1, he stressed the need to: define the structure of the future agreement; address thematic areas to make the ADP’s work manageable; address countries’ evolving capabilities in a constructive manner; and articulate the elements of the 2015 regime. On Workstream 2, he called for: progress on pre-2020 mitigation ambition; urgent win-win mitigation options; enhanced action on adaptation; and scientifically-informed political will.

Chile, for the Independent Alliance of Latin America and the Caribbean (AILAC), which includes Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Panama and Peru, emphasized the Convention as a “living instrument” and the need to be dynamic in its interpretation. On common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities (CBDR), he indicated that common responsibilities should be reflected by the adoption of commitments by each party; and differentiation in a fair contribution by each party; and that respective capabilities be reflected in defining the nature and scale of each party’s contribution to mitigation and means of implementation. He stressed the principle as a tool for action, and not an excuse for inaction.

Nicaragua, for Like-minded Developing Countries, stressed that developed countries’ efforts in combating climate change have been inadequate, and called for global cooperation on technology transfer and capacity building. On Workstream 1, he stressed that mitigation, adaptation, means of implementation, forests, compliance, and loss and damage, among other issues, need to be addressed in an effective manner. On Workstream 2, he emphasized the need: to ratify the amendment to the Kyoto Protocol in 2013 and increase mitigation ambition in 2014; for developed countries to provide means of implementation to developing countries without looking to receive emission credits in return; and for an inclusive and transparent process.

Reminding delegates that creating new institutions is not enough, Egypt, for the Arab Group, called for: time-bound deliverables; for the ADP to be informed by progress under

the Subsidiary Bodies (SBs); and to build on progress made under the UNFCCC since 2005. He emphasized that the Arab Group would not agree to side-step the founding principles of international cooperation on climate change and shift the burden to closing the ambition gap to developing countries.

India, for BASIC, which includes Brazil, China, India and South Africa, stressed that ADP negotiations are aimed at strengthening the multilateral climate regime, and not at negotiating a new regime or rewriting, restructuring or reinventing the Convention's principles and provisions. He called for a comprehensive and coordinated ADP process, and for early and meaningful operationalization of the GCF, Technology Mechanism and Adaptation Committee.

The Philippines cautioned against pursuing the ADP's work in a vacuum, highlighting that it should be carried out in the context of previous work and processes under the Convention, including the Doha package. He emphasized Workstream 2 as the last opportunity for developed countries to take responsibility and demonstrate climate change leadership.

Business and Industry expressed willingness to assist the ADP in coming to a better understanding of enabling conditions required to mobilize and leverage private sector investments. He noted that voluntary action plans and commitments to a low-carbon society are making steady progress in some countries.

Environmental NGOs (ENGOs) called for a fair, just and equitable agreement to address climate debt and ambition, expressing regret that developed countries are looking to deregulate the current legally-binding climate regime and lock in a pledge-and-review system.

Climate Action Network (CAN) proposed developing an equity spectrum based on the Convention's principles as one method to bring forward action towards a 2015 agreement.

The Farmers Constituency underscored that the ADP is an opportunity to involve farmers in mitigating climate change, while also contributing to food security and resilience.

The Gender Constituency urged delegates, especially those from developed countries, to "break the spell" that is holding the negotiation process behind.

AGENDA AND ORGANIZATION OF WORK

On Monday morning, the ADP adopted the agenda (FCCC/ADP/2013/1) and agreed to the organization of work (ADP.2013.1.InformalNote). Co-Chair Mauskar informed delegates that the ADP would decide on Friday whether to establish a contact group co-chaired by the ADP Co-Chairs, as proposed in the Co-Chairs' informal note. Parties agreed that ADP 2 would suspend its session on Friday and resume it in June. Co-Chair Mauskar informed delegates that the election of officers would be addressed in the June session. During the closing plenary on Friday, Co-Chair Harald Dovland (Norway) indicated that "the time is not ripe" to take up the issue of contact groups yet and said the issue will be considered in June.

Concerning an intersessional ADP meeting in September, the Secretariat informed delegates that no funding pledges had been received by the deadline of 30 April 2013.

IMPLEMENTATION OF ALL THE ELEMENTS OF DECISION 1/CP.17

The agenda item on the implementation of all the elements of Decision 1/CP.17 (Durban Platform for Enhanced Action) includes Workstreams 1 (the 2015 agreement) and 2 (pre-2020 ambition). It was first taken up on Monday morning by the ADP plenary. SBI Chair Tomasz Chruszczow (Poland) and SBSTA Chair Richard Muyungi (Tanzania) reported on relevant work under the SBs. Co-Chair Dovland highlighted "numerous" submissions since Doha. He recalled that the ADP requested the Secretariat to prepare a technical paper compiling information on the mitigation benefits of actions, initiatives and options to enhance mitigation ambition, indicating that the paper will be made available before the ADP session in June.

During the week, the following workshops were held:

- scope, structure and design of the 2015 agreement (Workstream 1);
- low-emission development opportunities (Workstream 2); and
- land-based mitigation opportunities (Workstream 2).

In addition, roundtables took place on:

- catalyzing action (Workstream 2);
- setting the scene (Workstream 1);
- adaptation (Workstream 1);
- means of implementation (workstream 1);
- mitigation (workstream 1);
- transparency of action and support (Workstream 1);
- building a practical and results-oriented approach to increasing pre-2020 ambition (Workstream 2); and
- wrap up and close (Workstreams 1 and 2).

WORKSHOP ON THE SCOPE, STRUCTURE AND DESIGN OF THE 2015 AGREEMENT: This workshop was facilitated by Kishan Kumarsingh (Trinidad and Tobago). The first part of the Monday afternoon workshop on the scope, structure and design of the 2015 agreement focused on design aspects for an ambitious, durable and effective 2015 agreement that mobilizes national action.

Expert Presentations: Ross Garnaut, Australian National University, observed that, since the UN Climate Change Conference in Copenhagen in 2009, the international climate regime had been based on "concerted domestic actions," with increasing recognition that an enforceable international agreement is not feasible and that mitigation has focused on domestic action based on international peer pressure and domestic political pressure. Stressing that domestic political commitments can provide a firm basis for mitigation, he noted that many of the pledges put forward represent ambitious changes in emission trends and are more consequential than the Kyoto Protocol, pointing, however, towards a global average temperature increase of 4°C instead of the 2°C target. He suggested recognizing the need to scale up mitigation and guiding national targets with independent expert assessment on allocating a global carbon budget for 2020-2050. He also called for giving substance to commitments on climate finance, and identified the need to adopt domestic 2020-2050 targets at COP 21 in 2015 that are consistent with the 2°C goal.

Adam Matthews, Global Legislators Organization (GLOBE), UK, presented a study on national climate change legislation covering 33 countries. He highlighted: legislative progress in 18

countries in 2012; that 31 out of 33 countries have a flagship law on climate change; and that the UNFCCC process is a positive driver for national climate legislation. Among lessons learned he underscored that: most countries taking climate action are often motivated by national interest; legislators can learn from the experience of other countries; domestic action and international commitments complement each other, but domestic actions are not yet sufficient to meet international climate objectives; and an ambitious international agreement will help to promote stronger national action.

Panel: Switzerland underscored key elements of the 2015 agreement, including:

- predictability through a common rules-based system, containing a common accounting framework;
- fair sharing of efforts and broad participation;
- predictable support for adaptation and mitigation;
- a dynamic mechanism that considers evolving responsibilities and capabilities;
- flexibility for addressing national circumstances; and
- a long-term perspective to enable transformational effect.

She also stressed the need for: providing certainty through, for example, a compliance mechanism that includes supportive and sanctioning elements; and drawing lessons from the Kyoto Protocol on institutional arrangements.

Marshall Islands remarked that domestic approaches have moved ahead of international action and that “nothing at the UNFCCC stage is enforceable without political trust, confidence and momentum.” He called upon delegates not be afraid to set long-term political aspiration, and urged them to secure that there is enough political momentum behind the ADP process.

The US suggested that to broaden participation, countries should be allowed to define their own mitigation contributions according to national circumstances. He said that such an approach would not necessarily result in a lower level of ambition, as parties are in a unique position to assess their own needs and circumstances. The US proposed two devices: a “clarity component” whereby each party provides information regarding their contributions; to be coupled with a “consultative period” of three to six months, during which parties have an opportunity to analyze each other’s measures. He suggested that such consultations could lead to more ambitious contributions as a result of reactions from the international community.

South Africa commented on how concerted domestic action has enabled wider participation but failed to translate into mitigation ambition by Annex I parties. He emphasized that mitigation is ahead of adaptation, and highlighted adaptation as an essential element of the 2015 agreement. He suggested considering technical work to reflect adaptation costs under the SBSTA or the IPCC.

The International Chamber of Commerce welcomed the deep and far-reaching architecture for the international climate regime already developed and said the 2015 agreement should be flexible and incorporate scientific, economic and technological evolution. He emphasized the need to promote cost-effective ways to enable an ambitious and a reliable long-term investment framework, noting that offset credits and carbon pricing could provide pathways to low-carbon economies. He further

stressed: the need to align climate policies with other policies; and durability and flexibility of the new agreement, saying the agreement should also be simple and clear.

Noting the need for an independent expert assessment of the remaining emissions budget for 2015-2020, CAN urged for an equity review of the mitigation pledges in parallel to a science review. He emphasized that the “elements of equity,” namely ambition, responsibility, capacity and development needs, have already been agreed and should not be changed. He called for a dynamic equity spectrum approach as opposed to a generic spectrum approach, to give life and meaning to the principles of the Convention.

General Discussion: The Gambia, for the LDCs, emphasized the need for: a party-oriented approach that accommodates national circumstances; scientific evaluation of the adequacy of commitments; sufficient flexibility; and periodic review of commitments.

The Russian Federation indicated that the focus should not be on the agreement’s design but on the level of participation, observing that the principles of the Convention are subsidiary issues.

The EU noted that national climate legislation is not sufficient to ensure the adequacy of collective ambition. She indicated that a focus on fairness rather than equity would be more useful, noting disagreement on the interpretation of the latter. On transparency, she observed that the biennial reports by developed and developing countries will show whether transparency policies implemented thus far have delivered.

Switzerland stressed the need to explore sources of inspiration and noted that when we talk about monitoring, reporting and verification (MRV) and transparency, we talk about emission reductions and overarching objectives.

New Zealand observed that a top-down approach would be difficult for galvanizing participation, while a bottom-up approach would not be effective in enhancing ambition. Calling for a hybrid approach, New Zealand proposed a rules-based approach whereby all countries undertake diverse commitments within the same legal framework. She proposed commitments that: are quantifiable and transparent; allow for variance depending on national circumstances; and are subject to regular review.

Jamaica called for taking into consideration the Kyoto Protocol’s shortcomings, including lack of full participation, in the new agreement’s design. He observed that the compliance aspects of the Protocol were deficient and parties were allowed to “jump off,” and called for a linkage to science.

Singapore highlighted the importance of each party having a sense that the agreement is fair for them, as opposed to an imposed top-down framework.

Swaziland called for setting an adaptation goal. Tuvalu noted the need for “a massive scaling up” of action and “a global Marshall Plan” for climate change.

Expert Presentations: The second part of the workshop focused on applying the Convention’s principles in the 2015 agreement.

Lavanya Rajamani, Centre for Policy Research, New Delhi, India, discussed design options for differentiation. She outlined the rationale for differentiating between countries, and illustrated

possible forms of differentiation. She summarized constituting elements of differentiation, distinguishing between categories of commitments and categories of parties. She reminded delegates that “differentiation is not an end in itself, but a means to an end,” saying it should be ceased when it begins to detract from the object and purpose of a treaty. She emphasized, however, that identifying “relevant differences” and determining that they have ceased to exist is a value-laden and subjective exercise.

Tara Shine, Mary Robinson Foundation, Ireland, identified equity and ambition as two sides of the same coin and emphasized that differentiation and equity in the UNFCCC are necessary to facilitate maximum collaboration. She suggested that parties could contribute to the achievement of the Convention’s objective, taking action tailored to their circumstances, priorities and resources, not only with regard to mitigation but also adaptation, finance and technology. She suggested that making every country’s efforts count under all these different categories of action would ensure a fairer level of contribution. Shine concluded that variable geometries and flexibility are fundamental prerequisites for a just transition to a low-carbon economy.

Panel: The Russian Federation warned that differentiation can hamper universal participation and said the new agreement should not focus on protecting only the most vulnerable but the entire planet.

Noting that differentiation is considered in the Convention’s principles, Peru suggested examining existing approaches to differentiation in other agreements and instruments to draw lessons. He proposed a fairness scheme as a possible first approach to graduating countries’ responsibilities both in terms of time and intensity. In that regard, he supported further exploring the *per capita* emission criterion.

Third World Network, for ENGOs, highlighted that the Convention bases differentiation on historical responsibilities and countries’ different capabilities. On the proposal by developed countries to recognize changes since 1992, she highlighted that “a huge gap” in historical responsibilities between developed and developing countries remains unchanged.

The EU said that differentiation should apply not only to mitigation but also to adaptation. He supported legally-binding commitments for all parties reflecting evolving realities in a dynamic manner, and called for discussing how to structure these commitments. He pointed to interlinkages and tensions between commitments’ effectiveness, on one side; and fairness and equity, on the other, stressing the need to ensure that commitments are delivered and fairness is not used as a means to avoid action.

India stressed that the Convention’s principles must form an integral part of the 2015 agreement, and that the Convention’s implementation is key to ensuring ambition and enhanced action. She emphasized that any approach to defining commitments must be anchored in the CBDR and equity principles.

Trade Unions identified the need for: a long-term regime; building trust between governments as well as people; and aligning climate policies with economic, social and employment policies, so that national circumstances are not considered as static.

General Discussion: Ecuador underscored the need for predictable support, which is currently lacking, and noted that any acceptable definition of equity needs to reflect historical responsibilities and national capabilities.

Bolivia emphasized: historical responsibility; social and poverty dimensions; and adaptation and mitigation capacity. He further stressed poverty eradication and equitable access to sustainable development, enabled by financial support and technology transfer.

The Philippines called for urgent implementation of developed country parties’ obligations under the Convention; lamenting the lack of common understanding on finance twenty years after the Convention was negotiated, and that developing countries’ access to financial resources remains subject to conditionalities. China emphasized historical responsibility and that the Convention’s principles apply to the scope, structure and design of the 2015 agreement.

Chile said CBDR should be seen as dynamic, and not construed as an excuse for not responding to climate change. He said the Convention’s principles should promote sustainable development and climate resilient growth and that there would be no progress unless there is an increase, in a differentiated way, of the capacity to act.

Kazakhstan observed that not all Annex I parties have a historical responsibility for climate change. Australia proposed annexing national schedules in the 2015 agreement, saying these would give countries flexibility in tailoring actions according to national circumstances.

Costa Rica said that differentiation between developed and developing countries is required but a new agreement would benefit from broader foundation for differentiation among developing countries. Swaziland emphasized that equity should be reflected in a general commitment to a global temperature goal, emission reductions and finance.

WORKSHOP ON LOW-EMISSION DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES:

The workshop on low-emission development opportunities took place on Tuesday morning, facilitated by Alexa Kleysteuber (Chile). Highlighting that emission reductions corresponding to 8-13 billion tonnes of CO₂ equivalent are needed by 2020, as identified in the UN Environment Programme (UNEP) Emissions Gap Report, and that 20% of parties are without a pledge, she urged for a discussion on best practices, success stories, barriers and solutions.

Expert Presentations: Ron Benioff, Low Emissions Development Strategies (LEDS) Global Partnership, identified a wealth of programmes advancing low-emission development at the national and local levels and significant opportunities for low-emission development as key messages. Highlighting the opportunity for the international community to increase donor coordination, he noted the need for, *inter alia*: investments in knowledge-sharing; building political support; outreach to stakeholders; and enhanced integration between national, state and local efforts.

Highlighting the capacity of energy policy to create benefits while reducing emissions, Dolf Gielen, International Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA), emphasized opportunities for renewable energy deployment. He stressed the growing

renewable capacity addition in the energy sector, including solar, wind and hydro energy. He identified universal access, doubling the rate of efficiency gains, and the share of renewables as the objectives of the Sustainable Energy for All (SE4ALL) public-private partnership. He said that end-use sectors, as well as the energy sector, require changes for those objectives to be reached.

Responding to questions, Benioff highlighted efforts to develop tools aimed at establishing and communicating benefits of LEDS. He emphasized that LEDS is about developing a transformational vision, noting the need for hard-hitting analysis, stakeholder consultation and concerted efforts over multiple years. He said that developed countries are engaged in the LEDS Global Partnership and that the dynamic within the donor community regarding LEDS is changing.

Gielen observed that the renewable energy sector represents 1% of the global economic activity and about three million jobs worldwide. He noted that in developing countries renewables are significantly more expensive, with the cost of finance tending to be about 15-20% higher in Africa. He also observed that development projects tend to cost more than commercial projects because they have broader objectives and parameters, but that costs tend to decrease as markets mature.

Panel: The UK highlighted its energy efficiency strategy, saying that it will reduce the amount of imported gas and create jobs. He noted efforts to connect finance with demand by offering finance to households and increase the availability of energy-use information. The UK also outlined its efforts to upscale international action through, *inter alia*, climate finance and action on REDD+.

Kenya highlighted a comprehensive national climate action plan for 2013-17 with specific actions. She explained that the plan includes adaptation, mitigation and enabling conditions and estimated that US\$12 billion would be needed for implementation. She underscored an inclusive process, also noting that the plan has been mainstreamed in the national development planning process.

UNEP presented on the Climate and Clean Air Coalition, which includes 60 partners and focuses on short-lived climate pollutants. She explained that the key activities include: reducing black carbon emissions from heavy-duty diesel fuels and reducing methane from gas and oil production. She highlighted benefits for human health and agricultural yields.

China drew attention to Confucius's idea of harmony between people and nature, the concept of ecological civilization and need for low-carbon development as an innovative development pathway. He identified main drivers, namely energy efficiency, energy mix, income sources and population, and highlighted national targets, including: reducing carbon intensity by 40-45% from 2005 levels by 2020; reducing carbon intensity by 17% below 2010 levels by 2020; a 4 billion CO₂ equivalent target for total energy use by 2015; and additional targets for non-fossil energy use, electricity mix and carbon sinks. China underscored public financial support for low-carbon development, and highlighted local action, such as a low-carbon province, a city pilot project and a carbon market pilot scheme. He also highlighted awareness of the importance of climate change legislation, and phasing out low-efficiency production capacity

in recent years. On challenges, he noted intensive urbanization and industrialization in the coming decades, and the challenge of changing China's 70% reliance on coal in primary energy use.

Norway highlighted the importance of supporting developing countries to explore cost-effective mitigation actions. He underscored the importance of establishing a price for carbon, which should be: the same for all sectors and complemented by technology, research development and adequate emission policies.

C40 Cities: Climate Leadership Group highlighted the potential of the 63 cities in the network to combat climate change. She highlighted that the involvement of cities' mayors in the network facilitates the sharing of experiences and lessons learned.

General Discussion: Switzerland underscored the need for quantified international objectives and identified potential areas for increasing ambition, including REDD+, agriculture, promotion of renewable energy, phasing out fossil fuel subsidies and eco-labeling.

Senegal lamented that after his country developed a low-carbon development strategy, the only energy-related proposal attracting interest from investors related to fossil fuel technologies. He emphasized the lack of coherence between the aid provided for developing country strategies that focus on energy efficiency and renewable energy, and investments financed by the private sector.

Nauru proposed focusing on barriers to energy efficiency and renewable energy, and means of mobilizing implementation.

The International Energy Agency (IEA) drew attention to the Tracking Clean Energy Progress report of 2013, which shows that the world is not on the right path to promote energy efficiency and renewable energies. He asked guidance from the ADP on how the IEA could better support its work.

Marshall Islands underscored benefits for the Pacific Islands from switching to renewable energy and the need for financial tools to make such a switch easier and more affordable.

Australia highlighted impacts of its national climate policy, adopted in 2012, particularly with regard to decreased emissions in the energy sector, as well as increased investments in renewable energy. He identified rooftop solar as an example of how the private sector has started investing in renewable energy in Australia, regardless of the phasing out of state subsidies.

On closing the ambition gap, the EU suggested increasing energy efficiency and renewable energy; and phasing out fossil fuel subsidies and HFCs. He suggested that HFCs should be addressed at COP 19, as well as under the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer. He identified the need to address bunker fuels also through the International Civil Aviation Organization and International Maritime Organization.

Brazil questioned Norway's assertion that mitigation is cheaper in developing countries. He further emphasized that it is not through pilot projects in developing counties that parties are going to fix the matter of climate change. He concluded that each state has to address its problems through structural changes.

South Africa emphasized the need to consider not only the costs of climate action, but also its benefits. She drew attention to the NAMAs announced by South Africa in 2010, which have failed to attract the necessary financial support.

Indonesia said that mitigation, adaptation and economic considerations should be integrated into low-emission development strategies. Stressing the importance of means of implementation, Samoa said that it is important to contextualize support on the basis of regional needs, and highlighted renewable energy, energy efficiency, LULUCF and forestry as main focal areas of its NAMAs. Canada said greening the energy production is a long-term process and highlighted its economic, environmental and social aspects.

ROUNDTABLE ON CATALYZING ACTION: The roundtable on catalyzing action (Workstream 2) took place on Tuesday afternoon, chaired by Co-Chair Dovland.

Japan highlighted his country's Top Runner programme, initiated in 1998, which sets efficiency standards for various consumer products, thereby encouraging manufacturers to achieve the baseline within a certain time period in order to receive a Top Runner label.

The Republic of Korea highlighted the Global Green Growth Institute established in 2010 to provide green growth strategies and mitigation and adaptation capacity building, noting that membership would increase to 30 countries in a couple of years.

Ethiopia explained that an inter-ministerial steering committee is looking at economy-wide emission reductions with the aim of making Ethiopia carbon neutral by 2025.

The EU called for capturing mitigation options with the highest potential in a technical paper and addressing conditions for increasing pledges.

Bolivia highlighted efforts in the forest and agricultural sectors in the context of its proposed joint mitigation and adaptation mechanism.

ROUNDTABLE ON SETTING THE SCENE: The roundtable on setting the scene (Workstream 1) took place on Tuesday afternoon, as a follow-up to the workshop on the scope, structure and design of the 2015 agreement. Co-Chair Mauskar invited delegates to focus on the contours and central elements of the 2015 agreement.

Ecuador, for the Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America (ALBA), underscored the importance of the Convention's principles. He maintained that the only possible criterion for differentiation is the one established in Annex I of the Convention, stressing that any other formula for differentiation would be unlikely to lead to any agreement.

The EU suggested a step-wise approach to couple nationally-driven action with international coordination, allowing parties to identify different typologies of commitments and declare what kind of commitment they are willing to undertake. The system would then provide the means to assess the overall adequacy of commitments to achieve the 2°C target. He argued that this approach would reconcile bottom-up and top-down approaches.

Bangladesh said the 2015 agreement should be bold, clear and enforceable, and strike a balance between mitigation and adaptation.

Ethiopia indicated that Annex I parties should be subject to a top-down system to reduce their emissions, whereas a bottom-up approach should apply to all others. He suggested that historical emissions levels should form the basis for defining the top-down commitments for Annex I parties. He further suggested that

transfer of finance and technology should be made based upon per capita gross domestic product.

Tuvalu, for the LDCs, said that the ADP should work towards a new protocol applicable to all, based on the latest science, be inclusive and contain strong commitments and deadlines.

Singapore identified principles, actions, rules and ambition as the key elements when considering the 2015 agreement. He argued that the Convention's principles should set the context, and suggested a system based on nationally-determined actions, taking into account national circumstances. He elaborated that nationally determined actions need to be supplemented by top-down internationally-agreed rules to promote certainty of action and reciprocal honoring of obligations. He added that commitments must have the same legally-binding character, and that transparency in implementation should be ensured by means of a set of rules applicable to all parties. He concluded that to ensure an adequate level of ambition nationally determined actions have to be linked to a periodic review process to raise the level of ambition.

The Philippines said "the scene" is already set by the Convention, which provides clear provisions and universal participation, and underscored that implementation remains the main problem rather than the contents of the Convention's provisions.

The Russian Federation suggested that the 2015 agreement needs to be: forward looking; based on science; universal; with "legally-locked" commitments by all, even if different in format; and with mitigation at its core.

Chile, for AILAC, underscored among key elements: a structure for differentiation to operationalize the CBDR; a mechanism that allows countries to become more ambitious when their circumstances evolve; a periodic scientific review; and a common-rules framework that could be implemented with differentiation over time and include incentives.

South Africa highlighted, *inter alia*, a global goal, absolute emission reduction targets for developed countries and relative targets for developing countries with deviation from business-as-usual emissions; a robust review; and a compliance system based on internationally-agreed rules.

New Zealand called for a hybrid structure of bottom-up and top-down approaches, with party-determined commitments that comprise a variety of forms, backed by a full system of MRV.

Norway agreed that the Convention's principles should guide the new agreement but underscored that they are not static. He supported: differentiation to take CBDR into account; clarity on parties' actions; the same legal nature for all commitments; and mitigation at the center.

Japan said the new agreement should: be applicable to all; be transparent through robust MRV; have a peer-review system to decide whether parties' contributions are fair; and include a mechanism to scale up emission reductions. The US highlighted the need for broad participation and ambitious contributions by parties.

Nauru, for AOSIS, urged for a legally-binding protocol under the Convention based on science and applicable to all. She stressed that the new agreement should: be based on the CBDR and equity principles; take into account historical responsibilities and regional priorities; and give full consideration to the special

circumstances of small island developing states. Marshall Islands underscored the need for political engagement before and after the moment of commitment so that inadequate commitments are not made legally binding. Uganda called for a top-down approach and stressed the need for political vision to move forward.

Saudi Arabia said the ADP should focus on: actions that fulfill sustainable development needs, including elimination of poverty and job creation; and rationalization of climate change action.

ROUNDTABLE ON ADAPTATION: The roundtable on adaptation (Workstream 1) took place on Wednesday morning, chaired by Co-Chair Dovland. He invited parties to share concrete proposals and ideas on how to enhance and complement action on adaptation in the 2015 agreement.

Many parties, including AOSIS, Australia, Norway, Japan, AILAC, the EU, Singapore and Mexico, identified the need to build on existing institutions. AOSIS, LDCs, AILAC, EU, Switzerland, Timor-Leste, Norway, China and others recognized the need for adaptation support in particularly vulnerable countries.

Nauru, for AOSIS, stressed the need to channel the means of implementation into the institutional framework created at COP 16 in Cancun, highlighting provision of finance as a priority and observing that attracting private sector funding for adaptation has been difficult. The Gambia, for the LDCs, regretted that only 25% of the LDCs' needs identified in national adaptation programmes of action (NAPAs) have received support.

India called for measurable, reportable and verifiable provision of resources to developing countries, adding that no new commitments for non-Annex I parties should be introduced.

Australia suggested focusing on adding value to the existing adaptation architecture and emphasized mainstreaming adaptation into national decision-making. The EU supported drawing on the work of the SBs and the new bodies, including the Adaptation Committee, and said that a transformation in growth, development and investment needs to be facilitated.

Nepal cautioned that if the global temperature rise is not limited to 1.5°C, adaptation requirements will exceed adaptation capacity, even with support provided. Swaziland, for the African Group, emphasized that the Group will not accept the 2015 agreement if adaptation and enhanced adaptation support are not central to it. He proposed a technical paper on adaptation strategies associated with different temperature increase scenarios. Peru, for AILAC, urged moving forward on the practical implementation and operationalization of the Cancun adaptation framework.

Norway identified the need for monitoring and evaluation of adaptation processes under the Convention. Switzerland stressed the need to mainstream adaptation strategies, including by fostering the engagement of private actors.

China called for: mainstreaming adaptation in climate strategies; identifying the most vulnerable sectors and regions; and strengthening the financial support mechanisms, such as the GCF and the Adaptation Fund.

South Africa said that transition to sustainable development at the national level requires support, adding that a separation between adaptation and means of implementation would make this transition difficult.

Jamaica and Timor-Leste emphasized the need to adequately address loss and damage. Kyrgyzstan, for the Mountainous Landlocked Developing Countries, called for an ecosystems approach in the 2015 agreement.

Timor-Leste urged for financial commitments with respect to national adaptation plans (NAPs), as opposed to voluntary support. Venezuela, for ALBA, called for systematic support for NAPs in developing countries. Marshall Islands urged domestic legally-binding commitments on adaptation for all nations.

Singapore cautioned against institutionalizing “a disconnect” between mitigation and adaptation and said that the adaptation framework should feed into a review process for scaling up mitigation ambition. Saudi Arabia suggested a comprehensive framework on adaptation that would account for economic resilience, economic diversification and means of implementation.

Bangladesh stressed that adaptation issues must be urgently brought to the implementation phase. He also highlighted the need to agree on a loss and damage mechanism at COP 19.

Co-Chair Dovland identified areas of convergence, including: the need to include adaptation in the 2015 agreement; the need for balance between mitigation and adaptation; using existing institutions; means of implementation; and mainstreaming adaptation at the national level.

ROUNDTABLE ON MEANS OF IMPLEMENTATION: The roundtable on means of implementation (Workstream 1) took place on Wednesday morning, chaired by Co-Chair Mauskar. He requested focusing on what is needed for the 2015 agreement in terms of means of implementation.

Iran stated that the Convention's existing provisions constitute a sound framework for means of implementation. China indicated that the notion of “means of implementation” is too general. He highlighted Annex I parties' commitments on finance, technology and capacity building, noting a close link between the implementation of these commitments and developing country commitments. He underscored the need for clarity on how much financial support developed countries will be providing to developing countries, saying the amount must exceed US\$100 billion in 2020.

The Philippines identified the need to harmonize the work of bodies currently dealing with adaptation, technology, finance and capacity building. Swaziland, for the African Group, underscored adaptation and mitigation in line with the 1.5°C target as the context for the means of implementation. The Republic of Korea emphasized the importance of MRV of climate finance. He identified the GCF as the key mechanism for ensuring transparency of financial support and enhancing trust between developed and developing countries.

Nauru, for AOSIS, called for robust provisions in the 2015 agreement on developed country support, and periodic review of these commitments. She stressed that grant-based funding for adaptation should be a priority. Nepal identified the need for financial targets for developed countries. Kenya called for finance, technology and capacity-building commitments in the 2015 agreement and identified the need to strengthen and review the institutions created.

Ecuador, for Like-minded Developing Countries, called for: a review of adequacy of developed country commitments on means of implementation, integrated in the ADP's work; evaluation of the implementation of these commitments; and exploring new ways to enhance implementation. He also highlighted the "current collapse" of the carbon market as a lesson to be taken into account.

New Zealand highlighted the importance of market mechanisms in helping countries to address climate change and expressed confidence that these will form a part of the post-2020 world.

India identified the need to address finance, technology and capacity building in a distinct manner, and proposed a roundtable on finance, technology and capacity building during the June session.

Colombia, for AILAC, expressed support for universal contributions, provided that there are net benefits for developing countries and developed countries continue to lead the efforts. She also identified the need to review the means of implementation in the post-2020 period. Switzerland highlighted the need to consider lessons learned and create a framework for means of implementation that is fair, with contributions coming from all parties in a position to do so. Australia identified the need to direct means of implementation to measures that lead to demonstrable results. He called for a dynamic approach that reflects changing capacities, noting "interesting" submissions on the capacity to provide support.

The EU indicated that stable and transformative environments include not only support but also, for example, creating policy frameworks and tackling subsidies. He underscored the need to make the existing institutions deliver and for addressing transparency of support. The US indicated that efforts to push capital to developing countries will not be useful without appropriate policies and regulatory frameworks. Japan acknowledged that means of implementation will remain important but reserved its position on whether they should form an integral part of the 2015 agreement.

Timor-Leste underscored the need for developed country commitments on finance and technology, and stressed transparency and enhancing existing institutions as key issues. South Africa called for addressing the financing gap, capitalizing and operationalizing the GCF and reviewing the financing goal on a regular basis.

Norway identified the need for finance to be results-based and for priority to be given to the poorest. He highlighted private finance, market-based mechanisms and funding potential through addressing emissions from international aviation and maritime transport.

Indonesia called for taking stock of what has been achieved and evaluating what mistakes have been made in the past. Nicaragua questioned the delivery status of financing pledges made by developed countries in Doha.

WORKSHOP ON LAND-BASED MITIGATION

OPPORTUNITIES: The workshop on land-based mitigation opportunities took place on Wednesday afternoon, facilitated by Gary Cowan (Australia). He recalled estimates in the Stern Review that emissions from deforestation and agriculture

amount to about a third of global emissions, and asked delegates to consider how to get more from land, not only in terms of mitigation, but also adaptation.

Expert Presentations: Riccardo Valentini, University of Tuscia, Italy, presented on managing land-use and forests, providing a scientific perspective on carbon conservation and sequestration. He explained that this sector provides an important opportunity for mitigation. He underscored the need to enhance forests' role as carbon sinks in the tropics and in the boreal regions, warning against replacing tropical forests with plantations. He identified untapped potential in the land sector, and drew attention to climate-related threats to forests, such as pests, disease and fire, which are likely to manifest in the long term, beyond 2050.

Maria Sanchez Sanz, UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), emphasized the need to take food security and people into account. She called for improving data collection and tapping mitigation potential in the land and forest sectors at all levels, including the global, national and local ones. She emphasized that at the ground level, it is relatively easy to adopt an integrated approach, but the challenge is how to scale up this approach.

Panel: Brazil underscored national policies and initiatives resulting in a significant reduction of deforestation between 2004-2012, noting that 2012 saw the lowest rate of deforestation since the 1980s. He stressed that most of the funding for these policies comes from the national budget. He said the great challenge is to maintain, once achieved, low rates of deforestation. He noted that the cost of mitigation in the sector is higher because of continuing investment in capacity building and infrastructure are needed to create an enabling environment and maintain the results achieved.

Indonesia said that the consideration of forests under the Kyoto Protocol, both in the context of rules on LULUCF and the Clean Development Mechanism, presented challenges for implementation by forested countries. She identified the lack of understanding of how to count carbon under REDD+ and how this differs from the way in which forests are considered under the Kyoto Protocol as a barrier for progress.

New Zealand drew attention to their national emissions trading scheme that includes forestry, resulting in incentivizing the reversal of deforestation. She pointed to challenges in addressing mitigation in the agriculture sector, underscoring national efforts to enhance productivity and land efficiency. Based on lessons learned, she suggested, *inter alia*: integrating approaches across sectors; partnerships with the private sector to provide long-term viability; and focusing on co-benefits of mitigation, such as erosion control, water quality improvement, as well as increased productivity and profitability.

Tanzania highlighted national challenges for land-based mitigation opportunities, including dependence on biomass for energy and dependence on local revenue from forests. He underscored national initiatives that are community-based and include the development of plans and policies for decreasing deforestation.

Bolivia proposed a joint mitigation and adaptation mechanism as an alternative to REDD+, saying it is based on non-market approaches and already reflected in decisions under the

UNFCCC and the Convention on Biological Diversity. He described elements of the mechanism already being implemented in his country, including *ex ante* public funding and performance indicators that focus both on mitigation and adaptation aspects.

FAO, for the UN-REDD Programme, highlighted the relevance of lessons learned from the early stages of the REDD-readiness phase. She stressed the need for: an enabling environment, policies and legal frameworks for REDD+ activities, and ensuring country ownership and leadership.

General Discussion: The Farmers Constituency highlighted farmers' role in mitigation and underscored the relevance of capacity building. India underscored the role of agriculture for livelihoods and supported work on adaptation in the agriculture sector. Saudi Arabia welcomed the approach to land-based opportunities as a whole and supported addressing, *inter alia*: carbon storage, "yellow carbon," mitigation co-benefits, and non-market instruments.

Norway stated that more developing countries should be encouraged to present targets relating to avoiding deforestation. Noting that many developing countries are reluctant to invest national resources in avoiding deforestation before an international structure for incentives is in place, he said the only way to scale up forest emission reductions is to increase verified emission reductions before 2020. He added that a mechanism for this purpose could have different forms and funding could be provided through the GCF. He supported: including land use and land-use change in the new agreement; finalizing technical rules for REDD+; and including a potential REDD+ pilot phase in the New Market Mechanism (NMM).

Tuvalu drew attention to findings in the UNEP Emissions Gap Report that highlight barriers to mitigation, including lenient LULUCF accounting rules and double counting of offsets. He highlighted problems with avoiding deforestation, including permanence and leakage. He called for addressing the drivers of deforestation, such as palm oil and timber, and for addressing forests accounting with a more holistic approach than in the Kyoto Protocol.

Papua New Guinea said more ambition to mobilize finance is required to move faster on REDD+, and supported a REDD+ governance structure to provide guidance and standards. Switzerland said it is not opportune to have a governing body on REDD+ at this stage under the ADP.

Brazil emphasized that, for his country, REDD+ has "nothing to do with carbon markets." He said that, despite forests being an important part of the solution, this should by no means decrease the urgency of mitigation efforts by other countries in other sectors.

ROUNDTABLE ON CATALYZING ACTION: The roundtable on catalyzing action continued on Thursday morning. Co-Chair Mauskar invited delegates to discuss how to catalyze action at the national and international levels to bridge the ambition gap between now and 2020.

Nauru, for AOSIS, announced plans to make a submission on upscaling action on renewable energy and energy efficiency in developed and developing countries.

Underscoring developed country leadership as key to enhancing ambition, China lamented that some developed countries have withdrawn from the Kyoto Protocol. He proposed

a second set of amendments to the Kyoto Protocol as a way to enhance ambition. China also underscored that enhanced developing country action requires finance and other forms of support, calling for the immediate operationalization of the GCF.

Chile, for AILAC, indicated that developed countries need to do more to support extant arrangements. Swaziland, for the African Group, expressed support for national initiatives, but cautioned that they cannot replace international cooperation.

Switzerland suggested institutionalizing roundtables to share information. The Philippines expressed frustration that the ADP process has yet to deliver, calling for action instead of more roundtables.

Norway proposed: involving the finance community; sharing experiences; and better interaction with other international initiatives. Supported by the Marshall Islands and Singapore, he suggested political and technical dialogues, with Singapore indicating that these discussions need to interact and reinforce each other.

The EU identified factors hindering action, including that 20% of the cost of switching to renewable energy is associated with investment costs. She identified the need to discuss ways to reduce these costs, including by engaging the private sector. She supported further addressing HFCs and, with Nauru and others, fossil fuel subsidies. Norway, supported by Nauru, suggested addressing barriers to renewable energy and energy efficiency.

Many developing countries identified the need to focus on the means of implementation, and stressed the need for developed country leadership. Uganda highlighted the need for a strengthened institutional framework to mobilize adequate financial and human resources. Indonesia underscored the need for: a combination of "push and pull factors" to introduce and implement national policies; and systematizing best practices and lessons learned. Mali called for, *inter alia*, a platform through which feasibility studies on mitigation actions could be prepared *pro bono* or at low cost, so as to channel the available finance for implementation.

A number of developing countries stressed the importance of providing access to energy. New Zealand called for, *inter alia*: progress on the Framework for Various Approaches and the NMM; and strengthening complementary initiatives, such as the Global Research Alliance on Agricultural Greenhouse Gases. The Marshall Islands suggested: focusing on low-hanging mitigation potential opportunities, such as energy efficiency and renewable energy, HFCs and fossil fuel subsidies. Mexico suggested addressing: renewable energy, REDD+, bunker fuels and ecolabeling. He emphasized the need to enhance stakeholder involvement and ownership of the relevant initiatives.

ROUNDTABLE ON MITIGATION: The roundtable on mitigation (Workstream 1) took place on Thursday morning. Co-Chair Dovland invited delegates to discuss what is needed to enhance action on mitigation.

Australia stressed the importance of identifying a spectrum of mitigation commitments by all countries. He supported allowing each country to identify the type and level of effort within the spectrum and ensuring all countries continue taking more ambitious actions. He elaborated that commitments should be: nationally determined; respect CBDR; subject to *ex-ante* review; subject to a rules-based system; and kept under regular

review. He suggested: a roundtable in June to discuss efforts countries see themselves taking from 2020 in the context of national circumstances; and, supported by the EU and Norway, a roundtable on a potential consultation process to compare efforts proposed by countries and the level of mitigation ambition required by science

Switzerland, for EIG, said that all parties should adopt nationally-determined commitments and targets, featuring highest possible contributions from all, coupled with internationally determined MRV rules. Supported by Norway, the EU reiterated a step-wise approach that couples nationally-driven approaches with international coordination. She emphasized the need to consider what kind of information and indicators to choose to enable the international community to scrutinize mitigation commitments.

China emphasized equity as a primary concern, saying that historical responsibilities should form the basis of the architecture for all parties to protect the climate. Iran reiterated that the principles and obligations in the Convention and Kyoto Protocol should be upheld and the ADP should not shift the burden of mitigation to developing countries. Ecuador emphasized the importance of financial targets for both adaptation and mitigation support, which should also be subjected to MRV.

Tuvalu, for the LDCs, called for multilateral oversight of commitments, questioning the suitability of a bottom-up approach to deliver the required level of ambition. Chile, for AILAC, asserted that all parties should take a commitment proportional to their capacity and support should be provided to those lacking capacity. He added that the provision of finance must have “a legal character.”

Swaziland, for the African Group, stressed the need for general aggregate commitments, as well as specific commitments by individual parties, also calling for: accountability rules; a compliance system; and a review mechanism for commitments. Noting proposals for nationally-determined contributions to meet an international goal, she suggested reflecting on how national efforts could become part of the international agreement.

The US supported a “spectrum approach” whereby each country presenting its nationally-determined contribution as reflected in national schedules. He said each party should accompany its contribution with information that enables understanding the proposed level of ambition, and reiterated the proposal for a consultative period. He indicated that mitigation contributions should not be conditioned on finance.

The Philippines stressed that developed countries must take the lead under Workstream 2, including through the ratification of the second commitment period amendment to the Kyoto Protocol.

Brazil observed general agreement on proposals that are compatible with CBDR; called for coherence in countries’ climate and non-climate related actions; and said only structural changes will lead to addressing the climate challenge, provided that developed countries assume the leadership role.

The Gambia said that the bottom-up approach to mitigation has not worked effectively and supported a top-down approach

Co-Chair Dovland concluded by noting “numerous references” to nationally determined commitments, and suggested further discussions on these, including possible timeframes.

ROUNDTABLE ON TRANSPARENCY OF ACTION AND SUPPORT: The roundtable on transparency of action and support (Workstream 1) was held on Thursday afternoon.

India stressed that the level of confidence would rise if developed countries increased their commitments in accordance with science. Stressing the need for an MRV framework on finance, she expressed concern over the lack of fast-track finance and discouraged the use of unilateral trade measures. The Philippines lamented the lack of transparency on developed countries’ commitments on finance. South Africa called for review of outcomes rather than actions, and said that this would require a science-based compliance procedure.

Japan highlighted the need for a spectrum of efforts based on nationally determined commitments, durability, and a review system based on science. Supporting the US proposal, he urged for a consultative process to consider parties’ contributions.

Stressing the need for strong commitments by developed countries, Bolivia indicated that the legal nature, accounting rules and a compliance system of the Kyoto Protocol should serve as the basis for the new agreement.

Saudi Arabia indicated that action on transparency should be advanced under sustainable development imperatives and requested a technical paper on this. He further called for a workshop and a technical paper on finance for climate change action.

Singapore said that the notion of a spectrum of commitments is not consistent with the Convention’s principles and, supported by Brazil, proposed a workshop on the leadership of developed countries at the June session. On transparency, he urged for a framework of multilateral rules applicable to all parties and said that it would need to build on the rules established in Cancun.

The Dominican Republic said that, in accordance with CBDR, all countries need to commit to measurable, reportable and verifiable action in line with their different emission levels and capacities. He said that while countries’ efforts should differ in proportion to their capacity, their nature should be legally-binding.

Bangladesh urged for transparency in terms of delivery of pledges and said that any future financial support must be brought under MRV.

On transparency, China identified technology, finance and capacity building as priorities, noting the need to: identify key issues and develop indicators to organize work; create a database to cover information on transparency; establish an inspection and review procedure; and establish a mechanism to inform stakeholders.

The EU urged building on the already developed MRV system, noting that a system to provide a good understanding of success stories to help close the mitigation gap has not yet been created. On transparency of support, she stressed the need to improve efficiency of delivery, and enhance comparability of information provided on mitigation and adaptation.

Indonesia called for a robust MRV system that would reflect common interests and different capacities.

Observing that transparency promotes accountability, the United States said that transparency of implementation needs to take into account nationally determined contexts and that reporting should be in line with capabilities and based on the existing reporting commitments, including GHG inventories and biennial reports. He added that MRV of support is a two-way street and that developing countries need to be able to demonstrate progress.

Norway highlighted reporting and review as elements of transparency of mitigation commitments, adding that measuring and reporting on national progress should be an obligation for all.

Swaziland, for the African Group, called for integration of agreed reporting processes into the future agreement and said that “transparency builds trust.”

Kenya said that nationally defined mitigation commitments should be reviewed against science.

Botswana cautioned that implementation of transparency should not translate into a burden and said that capacity building needs to be part of the package on transparency.

Mali said that although national circumstances need to play a role in determining commitments, transparency should be top-down and build on the MRV regime agreed in Cancun.

Noting the common desire of all parties to do their best, Co-Chair Mauskar identified the need to find convergence on how to achieve it and noted that any MRV system should be easy to understand and implement.

ROUNDTABLE ON BUILDING A PRACTICAL AND RESULTS-ORIENTED APPROACH TO INCREASING PRE-2020 AMBITION: The roundtable on building a practical and results-oriented approach to increasing pre-2020 ambition (Workstream 2) took place on Thursday afternoon.

Viet Nam noted that his country is using its own resources for mitigation, adaptation, and loss and damage, which is hindering progress towards sustainable development. He called for an effective management instrument for climate finance. Thailand identified the need to respect multilateral rules and remove unilateral measures.

Saudi Arabia highlighted that fossil fuel subsidies serve to advance sustainable development needs, expressing concern that proposals to address these subsidies are used as an excuse to shift the burden from developed to developing countries. He stressed the need to consider response measures, and to immediately ratify the Kyoto Protocol amendment, increase its ambition and broaden participation in the second commitment period.

Senegal complemented the process of technology needs assessments, lamenting however, that when it comes to project implementation, the necessary funds are not in place. Indonesia stressed that low-carbon development strategies must be fully supported by means of implementation.

Papua New Guinea called for a COP 19 decision recognizing REDD+ as a key measure to close the pre-2020 gap and proposed a workshop in June on the forest sector. Brazil indicated that REDD+ is already being discussed under the SBI, SBSTA and COP, saying REDD+ discussions under the ADP are unnecessary.

Nauru, for AOSIS, called for focusing on renewable energy and energy efficiency AT the June session, with the compilation of a list of successful and innovative policies, followed by submissions and a technical paper. He suggested technical working groups on these issues at COP 19 and called for a ministerial meeting on renewable energy and energy efficiency.

The EU identified the need for the ADP to move to a more concrete working mode, and called for discussions on incentives to come forward with new pledges. Australia highlighted that all countries should make a pledge, and countries with pledges should consider doing more. He supported ministerial engagement at COP 19 to increase ambition, and identified work to clarify MRV as critical.

India identified review of the adequacy of Annex I parties’ commitments as a key to closing the pre-2020 gap. He stressed the need to avoid unilateral measures, including on aviation emissions, and opposed addressing HFCs under the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer.

The Philippines lamented the uncertain future of the Protocol’s Adaptation Fund and called for a “needs-based approach,” underscoring that a results-based approach cannot be applied to adaptation, questioning whether 1000 bodies instead of 2000 after a typhoon would be a good result.

Switzerland called for exchanging information on, *inter alia*, experiences with climate policies, how to improve nationally enabling conditions, and mobilizing finance and technology. He underscored the importance of stakeholder involvement, and identified fossil fuel subsidies, bunker fuels, REDD+, agriculture and ecolabels as interesting areas to explore.

ROUNDTABLE ON CLOSING AND WRAPPING UP WORKSTREAM 1: The roundtable on closing and wrapping up Workstream 1 took place on Friday morning.

Co-Chair Mauskar highlighted common ground on the 2015 agreement, including: application of the Convention’s principles; adaptation as an integral part; enabling enhanced action on adaptation and mitigation by finance, technology and capacity building; and that all parties need to contribute, taking into account national circumstances. He also indicated, *inter alia*, that parties agree on the need for enhanced national action and international cooperation, guided by international rules and based on the Convention’s principles, combined with: a process for consulting, adjusting and assessing action; ensuring transparency and accountability; provision of incentives and support; and regular review of overall results based on science. He said the list of common ground will be annexed to the Co-Chairs’ informal note, which they will prepare under their authority for the resumed ADP 2 in June. He reminded delegates of the need to start preparing for deliverables for COP 19, indicating that the Co-Chairs will include a proposal in their note as to how to proceed. Nauru, for AOSIS, said that discussions under the two workstreams should remain separate and that adequate time needs to be dedicated to each. Timor-Leste supported the AOSIS proposal that two contact groups are necessary. Saudi Arabia said that there should be only one contact group for all ADP sessions. Timor Leste identified the need to discuss the linkage between the new agreement and the new mechanism on loss and damage.

Supported by the Philippines, Uganda recalled the 1997 Brazilian proposal on burden-sharing, asked the Secretariat to trace the proposal and invited delegates to consider how elements of the Brazilian proposal could fit into the 2015 agreement. Brazil highlighted that they are working closely with the expert who helped them develop the proposal, noted a recent paper on the proposal in the context of BASIC and asked the Secretariat to make the paper available. New Zealand noted that the Brazilian proposal had been considered under a SBSTA work programme and that its conclusions should be included in the information circulated by the Secretariat.

Norway proposed consideration of additional questions, including: how mitigation commitments should be reflected in the new agreement; what is the best way to achieve implementation; how the agreement should be adjusted in order to consider new scientific knowledge; and how the new agreement should reflect enhanced transparency of action.

The Gambia stressed that another ADP session in September is essential, together with a ministerial segment in Warsaw, to raise mitigation ambition and secure the provision of adequate means of implementation.

South Africa supported: addressing issues where common ground is identified; enhancing understanding of the type of commitments proposed; and ensuring that mitigation, adaptation and means of implementation are all considered. Tanzania supported a “needs-based approach” regarding means of implementation provided to developing countries.

India underscored: lack of clarity on how developed countries’ contributions to mitigation defined according to national circumstances, as proposed by the US, would address the closure of the pre-2020 ambition gap; and the need for clear milestones for provision of finance and technology.

The EU described ongoing efforts to expedite the ratification of the Kyoto Protocol amendment, stressing that it has been implementing its commitments under the second commitment period since 1 January 2013.

Singapore suggested organizing work in June around clusters addressing, *inter alia*: enhancing nationally-determined actions and modalities; strengthening internationally-agreed rules and modalities; and means of implementation. China said balance should be ensured in June with respect to the experts and panelists, as well as the topics addressed, suggesting consideration of technology transfer, finance and capacity building. He supported a workshop on equity, including consideration of the Brazilian proposal. Swaziland, for the African Group, called for a workshop in June on adaptation commitments. Nepal, for the LDCs, said nationally-determined commitments could lead to an insufficient level of action to protect the climate system, and called for separate contact groups for the two workstreams.

ROUNDTABLE ON CLOSING AND WRAPPING UP WORKSTREAM 2: The roundtable on closing and wrapping up Workstream 2 took place on Friday morning.

Co-Chair Dovland recalled ideas expressed, including ratification of the Kyoto Protocol amendment, removing conditionalities from the existing pledges, and encouraging market and non-market approaches. On increasing the number of countries submitting pledges, he mentioned requesting

developing countries that had not submitted NAMAs to do so with the understanding that NAMAs could receive international support. He also mentioned the interest of parties to address: short-lived pollutants and new technologies; energy efficiency; renewable energy; and implementing low-emission development strategies. He recognized calls for: enabling environments; providing access to means of implementation; making technology affordable for developing countries; and recognizing co-benefits. On barriers to implementation, he highlighted: insufficient means of implementation; high capital costs; insufficient anchoring of climate change strategies in domestic policies; and lack of political engagement. On suggestions for areas to discuss at the June meeting he noted: renewable energy and energy efficiency; land-use opportunities; climate financing and promotion of climate-friendly investment; the role of international cooperative initiatives in enhancing national action; and enhancement of access to means of implementation.

Malaysia, for the Like-minded Developing Countries, said: work must be under the Convention’s principles; the Kyoto Protocol amendment should be ratified by developed countries no later than April 2014; and developed countries not included in the Kyoto Protocol should present their comparable efforts by the same date. Nicaragua, for ALBA, supported: an informative session on the status of the Kyoto Protocol amendment every time the ADP meets; establishment of MRV for means of implementation, and a contact group on finance.

Saudi Arabia highlighted a results-oriented approach and the need to be comprehensive and adopt an economy-wide approach across sectors without singling out particular sectors. He proposed a workshop on the sustainable development impacts of mitigation. Iran supported a workshop on technology transfer, including those related to fossil fuels. Nigeria suggested REDD+ be considered under Workstream 2 as a means for increasing ambition.

China emphasized that discussions in June need to focus on the question of removal of conditions that developed countries have attached to moving to the high end of their commitments during the second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol.

Nauru, for AOSIS, identified the need for more focused discussion, with developed countries taking the lead and upscaling finance. He suggested focusing on low-hanging mitigation potential, singling out opportunities from renewable energy and energy efficiency. Supported by the Philippines, South Africa opposed taking a sectoral approach, emphasizing instead the need for taking a holistic approach and to understand how the outcome of Workstream 2 relates to Workstream 1.

Indonesia emphasized the need for focused discussion and remarked that energy efficiency and renewable energy are key to increasing the level of ambition. Switzerland, for the EIG, welcomed the convergence emerging at ADP 2, and invited delegates to work on specific thematic areas, including climate finance, renewable energy and energy efficiency.

Brazil indicated that the institutions created since Bali and under the Kyoto Protocol need to show that they work, indicating that Workstream 2 should build upon these institutions and engage other stakeholders.

Norway emphasized that the EU and Norway have been implementing the amendment to the Kyoto Protocol since

1 January 2013, and invited other countries to proceed to ratification. He emphasized the need for action on REDD+, HFCs, energy efficiency and renewable energy. He also expressed support for a ministerial discussion on enhancing ambition at COP 19 in Warsaw. The EU emphasized the need to make progress on upfront costs of capital investment, agriculture, forestry and other land uses.

Papua New Guinea emphasized that REDD+ is more mature than other elements under discussion, and identified the need to quantify its potential in helping filling the pre-2020 gap.

Timor-Leste underscored the need to link ADP discussions with work under the SBI and SBSTA on finance, as well as the need to enhance operationalization of the institutions already established. Swaziland underscored the need to raise Annex I parties' ambition under the Kyoto Protocol, and to enable developing countries to access funding.

CLOSING PLENARY

The ADP closing plenary took place on Friday afternoon. Co-Chair Dovland noted "intensive work" on the two workstreams throughout the week. He said the Co-Chairs will prepare informal notes on the April part of the session and on the plan of work in June, and the facilitators will prepare reports on their respective workshops. Dovland noted that these documents will be available on the UNFCCC website. He also drew attention to the special event for stakeholders during the meeting, noting concrete proposals on, *inter alia*: an equity reference framework; involvement of ministers; local government action plans; gender-responsive policies; and recognition of indigenous people's rights. He added that another special event for stakeholders will be held in June to improve stakeholders' participation.

On issues to be discussed at the resumed ADP 2 in June, Co-Chair Dovland outlined ideas for Workstream 1, including: a variety of enhanced actions and types of commitments; how to combine top-down and bottom-up elements in an effective way; and how to strengthen the multilateral rules-based regime to ensure ambition. He also noted the need to go further on: enhanced action and support for adaptation; how mitigation efforts can have an impact on adaptation needs; and how the 2015 agreement can add value to existing institutional arrangements.

On Workstream 2, Co-Chair Mauskar identified the following ideas for discussion in June: the role of renewable energy and energy efficiency in moving to low-emission development; climate financing and attracting climate investment; scaling up mitigation and adaptation opportunities in land use; international cooperative initiatives; how relevant institutions under the Convention can increase access to means of implementation; and how political engagement can facilitate work on enhancing mitigation ambition.

China emphasized the April and June sessions as an integral whole, and Saudi Arabia identified the need to discuss sectors other than the specific energy sectors addressed under Workstream 2.

Co-Chair Mauskar thanked parties for their valuable contributions and declared ADP 2 suspended at 3:42 pm.

A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF ADP 2

"Let your dreams be bigger than your fear and your actions speak louder than words"

Katarzyna Snyder, Poland, Incoming COP 19 Presidency

SO MUCH TO DO, SO LITTLE TIME

At the last CMP meeting in Doha, Qatar, in 2012, an amendment was adopted to the Kyoto Protocol creating a second commitment period that commits Annex I parties to an average 18% reduction in emissions from 1990 levels by 2020. However, today, the second commitment period only covers 15% of global emissions. It is now apparent that Annex I parties' Kyoto targets, combined with the bottom-up pledges by developed and developing countries under the Convention, are not sufficient to keep the global temperature rise below 2°C. According to the UNEP Emissions Gap Report 2012, the 2°C target will slip out of reach unless more ambitious action is taken before 2020.

With the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention and the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Annex I Parties' Further Commitments under the Kyoto Protocol having completed their work in Doha, all eyes are now on the remaining *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action. The ADP has a tremendous task ahead to complete its two objectives—to develop a new legal instrument under the Convention applicable to all parties by 2015 to come into effect in 2020, and close the pre-2020 ambition gap. This brief analysis focuses on expectations for, and developments during, the Bonn session, and looks into how this meeting played out in the context of the overall UNFCCC process.

POURING WATER ON A SPONGE

The ADP already had an extensive general exchange on issues covered by its mandate in Bangkok and Doha in 2012, so the goal for ADP 2 was for parties to "intensify their engagement with each other and seek to ensure that they take the work of the ADP to the next stage." In other words, parties were expected to move to more focused discussions on substantive elements of the 2015 agreement and adopt a practical approach to enhancing pre-2020 mitigation ambition. As agreed in Doha, this conceptual work should feed into a draft ADP negotiating text to be considered by COP 20 in 2014.

The first part of ADP 2 was structured around a series of roundtables and workshops, which also aimed to attract participation of experts and stakeholders to assist parties in their deliberations. Whereas the Doha discussions on the 2015 agreement and pre-2020 ambition often overlapped, in Bonn the two workstreams were clearly separated. While the interlinkages between the two workstreams are undoubtedly strong and many recognize that a successful 2015 agreement will depend on an ambitious delivery on bridging the pre-2020 ambition gap, many parties see the need to keep the two workstreams separate to allow for more focused discussions.

Thus, the Bonn meeting was aimed at preparing the basis for future discussions by gathering concrete proposals on, for example, key elements that the 2015 agreement could contain and sectors where further mitigation action could take place before 2020. This general feeling was reflected by UNFCCC Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres, who called 2013

“the year of the sponge,” where parties and the Co-Chairs are gathering views and ideas. She invited stakeholders to be “the water on that sponge,” but warned, however, that this is “not the time for philosophy but for concrete proposals,” noting that the ADP had already used one-third of its allocated time for completing its tasks.

ADP 2: EXPECTATIONS AND “DESIGN” OF THE SESSION

The mood of the April session was largely positive. Discussions were described by many as “constructive” and “rich,” which kept the upbeat spirit alive. On the 2015 agreement, the Co-Chairs sought parties’ views on its main elements, including its scope, structure and design. Discussions covered a range of issues from mitigation and adaptation to transparency and means of implementation. One of the key discussions concerned ways to design mitigation commitments. The session saw some attempts to start bridging the gap that divided parties during the AWG-LCA negotiations, where the Umbrella Group, in particular, advocated a bottom-up approach, and developing countries with the EU and some other developed countries insisted on a top-down approach.

Ideas put forward by developed countries at ADP 2 included a spectrum of commitments for countries to choose from and a mechanism to ensure that the overall ambition is in line with climate science. Some developing countries, in turn, expressed support for reconsideration of the Brazilian proposal, originally made in 1997, seeking to allocate mitigation action based on negative historical contributions to temperature increases rather than on emission flows. While they remain at early stages, many felt that these discussions are fundamental, since the top-down Kyoto Protocol has not been able to attract universal participation, while the bottom-up approach dominating since Copenhagen has resulted in an inadequate level of ambition. In her press conference on Friday, Figueres pointed to emerging convergence, not on the detailed design of mitigation commitments, but on the need to link action at the international, domestic and subnational levels together, and to use different commitment types depending on national circumstances.

The Convention’s principles, particularly equity and common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, are not explicitly referenced in the ADP’s mandate. However, many parties consider these principles to be at the core of the ADP’s work. However, when a number of developing countries stressed that the ADP’s work takes place under the Convention and its principles therefore apply and should not be reinterpreted, developed countries and some developing countries, including AILAC, called for dynamic interpretation of the Convention and for considering how common but differentiated responsibilities should apply to commitments by all parties under the 2015 agreement.

It was apparent at ADP 2 that the task under Workstream 2 is urgent if parties want to stay on track to meet the 2°C target that they set for themselves in both Copenhagen and Cancun. Recent data shows that atmospheric concentrations of GHGs continue to rise, and are currently at 399.72 ppm, close to crossing the 400 ppm threshold. According to the IPCC, achieving the 2°C target implies stabilizing GHG concentrations in the atmosphere at

445-490 ppm. Some non-governmental organizations complained that discussions under Workstream 2 failed to respond to this alarming information, focusing instead on countries showcasing their “shining examples” of existing policies and activities rather than discussing new ones.

Still, several proposals were put forward by delegates on how to bridge the pre-2020 gap. One of the key concerns for developing countries is the slow progress of bringing into force the Doha Amendment to the Kyoto Protocol, which is yet to receive its first instrument of ratification. The EU and other countries participating in the second commitment period insisted, however, that they have been implementing their commitments since January 2013, even if the formal ratification process is still ongoing.

Concerning additional climate policies that could help to bridge the ambition gap, proposals included increased attention to renewable energy, energy efficiency, fossil fuel subsidies and hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs). REDD+ and other land-related activities were signaled as areas that could potentially contribute to bridging the gap. This was the first time the ADP addressed land use-based mitigation opportunities. While this sector represents one-third of GHG emissions, the debate showed that there are different views on how to address mitigation. It is not yet clear how REDD+ will perform internationally, since its costs are much higher than initially expected, and some developing countries oppose consideration of agriculture from a mitigation perspective. Moreover, as the exchanges between Brazil and Norway demonstrated, some fear that developed countries’ support for actions in third countries may lead to avoidance of national mitigation efforts in other sectors.

Finally, a topic that played an important role under both workstreams was that of means of implementation: finance, technology transfer and capacity building. Many developing countries expressed frustration, arguing that developed countries are not adequately implementing their commitments on finance and technology transfer under the Convention, and that the Green Climate Fund remains an empty shell without adequate resources. Under Workstream 1, calls were made for targets on finance and adaptation to be included in the 2015 agreement. Developed countries, in turn, confined themselves to emphasizing that the institutional machinery created in Cancun should be built upon and that appropriate regulatory and policy frameworks are needed in developing countries.

BACK IN A MONTH

So, did the April session meet expectations? Although, admittedly, more concrete steps are needed on both the 2015 agreement and pre-2020 ambition, there was a shared feeling that the discussions in Bonn were positive and constructive. With the June session only a month away, many were optimistic that the April session would put the wind in the sails of the ADP.

With the format of roundtables and in-session workshops boding well for an open and frank exchange of views, some parties were willing to move to a more structured mode of discussions and supported the Co-Chairs’ proposal to establish a contact group under the ADP. Reportedly, others seemed to be reluctant to set up contact groups at this stage, which, in effect, would imply that the ADP has moved into negotiating mode.

Some parties also expressed views on whether one contact group or more would be necessary to address issues under the two workstreams. The Co-Chairs prudently deferred the decision on whether to establish a contact group or several contact groups to the June session, with some fearing this might become a contentious issue.

As the plenary drew to an unusually early close, many felt that the task for the June session will be to continue advancing towards more focused work, which, for some, implies moving to concrete textual proposals on the 2015 agreement and pre-2020 ambition as soon as possible. As far as pre-2020 ambition is concerned, the results-oriented approach envisioned by the Co-Chairs will need to be maintained as numerous issues—including the role of renewable energy in low-emission development, mitigation and adaptation opportunities in land use, and international cooperative initiatives—merit further consideration.

Despite a perceived convergence of views on some issues, the April session left some with a lingering feeling that much work remains to be done in a very limited amount of time. With only 19 months to go, the pressure is on for the ADP to show that it is not a recycled AWG-LCA and is capable of delivering on its ambitious, albeit vague, mandate.

UPCOMING MEETINGS

First meeting of the Advisory Board of the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN): The agenda for this meeting will include the election of a Chair and Vice-Chair, adoption of operational modalities and rules of procedure, and the setting of the agenda for the second Advisory Board meeting. The meeting will be open to observers. **dates:** 14-15 May 2013 **location:** Copenhagen, Denmark **contact:** UNEP Secretariat **email:** Myriam.Arras-Nobecourt@unep.org **www:** <http://www.unep.org/climatechange/ctcn/>

ICAO Symposium on Aviation and Climate Change: The symposium aims to foster dialogue on environment and aviation among member states and other key stakeholders, leading to the 38th Session of the ICAO Assembly in September 2013. **dates:** 14-16 May 2013 **location:** Montreal, Canada **contact:** Vanessa Muraca **phone:** +1-514-954-8219, ext. 8243 **fax:** +1-514-954-6744 **email:** green@icao.int **www:** <http://www.icao.int/Meetings/Green/Pages/default.aspx>

UNGA Thematic Debate: Climate Change, Green Energy and Water Sustainability: The 67th Session of the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) will host a thematic debate on Climate Change, Green Energy and Water Sustainability. **date:** 16 May 2013 **location:** UN Headquarters, New York **www:** <http://www.un.org/en/ga/president/67/>

Fourth Session of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction: The aim of the Fourth Session is to continue the momentum into a durable and sustained effort from all actors to take shared responsibility in reducing risks and reinforcing resilience. The session will include an event focused on small island developing states. **dates:** 19-23 May 2013 **location:** Geneva, Switzerland **phone:** +41-22-91-78861 **fax:** +41-22-91-78964 **email:** globalplatform@un.org **www:** <http://www.preventionweb.net/globalplatform/2013/>

Forest Products and Technologies for the Future: This seminar will examine forests in the Russian Federation and the technologies required for the modernization of the country's forestry sector. The seminar will also explore the potential of the Russian Federation's forests with regard to climate change mitigation and the sustainable supply of timber and bio-energy. **dates:** 22-24 May 2013 **location:** Saint Petersburg, Russian Federation **contact:** Tatyana Yakusheva **phone:** +7-499-615-99-25 **email:** tmanaeva@gmail.com **www:** <http://www.unece.org/index.php?id=32202>

Soil Carbon Sequestration: A Solution for Climate, Food Security and Ecosystem Services: This conference aims to highlight the growing importance of conserving and restoring soil organic carbon for multiple win-win benefits within various land type and land use settings. **dates:** 26-29 May 2013 **location:** Iceland **contact:** Andres Arnalds, Organizing Committee **email:** arna@land.is **www:** <http://scs2013.land.is/>

73rd Meeting of the CDM Executive Board: The Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) Executive Board will convene its 73rd meeting to consider matters relating to the operation of the CDM. **dates:** 27-31 May 2013 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** <http://cdm.unfccc.int/Meetings/MeetingInfo/DB/GYXC7S6BWTQRDE/view>

Fifth Scaling Up Renewable Energy Program (SREP) Pilot Country Meeting: The meeting will provide a platform for pilot and reserve countries to share updates on the status of their projects, and focus on the areas of monitoring and reporting on energy access results, project delivery and private sector engagement. **dates:** 28-30 May 2013 **location:** Bandos Island, Maldives **phone:** +1 202 458-1801 **email:** cifadminunit@worldbank.org **www:** <https://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/content/srep-pilot-country-meetings>

Carbon Expo: Global Carbon Market Fair and Conference: This meeting is sponsored by Fira Barcelona, the International Emissions Trading Association and the World Bank. **dates:** 29-31 May 2013 **location:** Barcelona, Spain **contact:** Lisa Spafford, IETA **phone:** +41-22-737-0502 **email:** spafford@ieta.org **www:** <http://www.carbonexpo.com/>

Fifth Tokyo International Conference for African Development (TICAD V): The conference is being convened under the theme "Hand in Hand for a More Dynamic Africa" and will focus on: economic growth; achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs); consolidation of peace and good governance; and climate change. **dates:** 1-3 June 2013 **location:** Yokohama, Japan **contact:** Shigeki Komatsubara **phone:** +1-212-906-5926 **email:** shigeki.komatsubara@undp.org **www:** <http://www.ticad.net/ticadv/index.html>

UNFCCC Subsidiary Bodies: The next session of the UNFCCC subsidiary bodies will take place in June 2013. **dates:** 3-14 June 2013 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/meetings/upcoming_sessions/items/6239.php

UNFCCC Workshop on the Review of the CDM Modalities and Procedures: The workshop aims to facilitate parties' review of the CDM modalities and procedures during

the Subsidiary Bodies session and is organized upon a request by CMP 8. **dates:** 8-9 June 2013 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php

32nd Meeting of the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee: The Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee will convene its 32nd meeting to consider matters relating to Joint Implementation. **dates:** 17-18 June 2013 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://ji.unfccc.int/Sup_Committee/Meetings/index.html

GEF 44th Council Meeting: The Global Environment Facility's Council meets twice a year to approve new projects with global environmental benefits in the GEF's focal areas, and provide guidance to the GEF Secretariat and agencies. **dates:** 18-20 June 2013 **location:** Washington, DC, USA **contact:** GEF Secretariat **phone:** +1-202-473-0508 **fax:** +1-202-522-3240 **email:** secretariat@thegef.org **www:** <http://www.thegef.org/gef/content/gef-44th-council-meeting>

Global Symposium on REDD+ in a Green Economy: The symposium, convened by the UN Collaborative Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries (UN-REDD), will examine lessons learned from pilot activities linking REDD+ to sustainable development and the green economy. **dates:** 19-21 June 2013 **location:** Jakarta, Indonesia **contact:** John Prydz **email:** John.Prydz@unep.org **www:** http://www.un-redd.org/REDD_in_Green_Economy_Global_Symposium/tabid/105931/Default.aspx

33rd Meeting of the Open-Ended Working Group of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol: This meeting will consider issues related to the implementation of the Montreal Protocol in preparation for the 25th Meeting of the Parties (MOP25). **dates:** 24-28 June 2013 **location:** Bangkok, Thailand **contact:** Ozone Secretariat **phone:** +254-20-762-3851 **fax:** +254-20-762-0335 **email:** ozoneinfo@unep.org **www:** <http://conf.montreal-protocol.org/meeting/oewg/oewg-33/presession/default.aspx>

Sixth meeting of the Technology Executive Committee: The sixth meeting of the UNFCCC TEC will: discuss progress made on producing new technology briefs, enabling further engagement with arrangements under and outside of the Convention; present modalities for increasing engagement with stakeholders; and continue the Committee's other work. **dates:** 26-28 June 2013 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/ttclear/pages/tec_home.html

Fifth Africa Carbon Forum: The Africa Carbon Forum is a trade fair and knowledge sharing platform for carbon investments in Africa, and will consider ways to promote access to low-carbon development in Africa. **dates:** 3-5 July 2013 **location:** Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire **contact:** Emilie Wieben **email:** acf@risoe.dtu.dk **www:** <http://africacarbonforum.com/2013/english/>

Joint Assembly of International Association of Hydrological Sciences (IAHS), the International Association for the Physical Sciences of the Oceans (IAPSO), and the International Association of Seismology and Physics of the Earth's Interior (IASPEI): This scientific conference

will include symposia on: ocean mixing; regional seas; ocean observations and climate change; climate and land surface changes in hydrology; cold and mountain region hydrological systems under climate change; characterizing water quantity and quality; understanding freshwater quality problems in a changing world; interactions between sediment and aquatic ecology; adaptive water resources management; and hydrology education and capacity building in developing countries. **dates:** 22-26 July 2013 **location:** Gothenburg, Sweden **contact:** Congress Secretariat **phone:** +46-31-708-60-00 **fax:** +46-31-708-60-25 **email:** iaHS.iapso.iaspei2013@congrex.com **www:** <http://iahs-iapso-iaspei2013.com/iahs---iapso---iaspei/5866/Page.aspx>

74th Meeting of the CDM Executive Board: The Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) Executive Board will convene its 74th meeting to consider matters relating to the operation of the CDM. **dates:** 22-26 July 2013 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** <http://cdm.unfccc.int/calendar/index.html>

30th Meeting of the Joint Implementation Accreditation Panel: The Joint Implementation Accreditation Panel will meet to consider matters relating to the accreditation of independent entities. **dates:** 22-23 August 2013 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** <http://ji.unfccc.int/index.html>

75th Meeting of the CDM Executive Board: The CDM Executive Board will convene its 75th meeting to consider matters relating to the operation of the CDM. **dates:** 23-27 September 2013 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** <http://cdm.unfccc.int/calendar/index.html>

IPCC Working Group I Session and IPCC-36: The IPCC Working Group I plenary session for endorsement of the Fifth Assessment Report (AR5) will be held in September 2013. Subsequently, IPCC-36 will convene to endorse the WGI contribution to the AR5. **dates:** 23-26 September 2013 **location:** Stockholm, Sweden **contact:** IPCC Secretariat **phone:** +41-22-730-8208 **fax:** +41-22-730-8025 **email:** IPCC-Sec@wmo.int **www:** http://www.ipcc.ch/scripts/_calendar_template.php?wg=8#.UYPBCBxBgrI

33rd Meeting of the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee: The Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee will convene its 33rd meeting to consider matters relating to the operation of Joint Implementation. **dates:** 3-4 October 2013 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php

CBD SBSTTA 17: The meeting is expected to address, among others, issues related to marine and coastal biodiversity, biodiversity and climate change, and collaboration with IPBES. **dates:** 14-18 October 2013 **location:** Montreal, Canada **contact:** CBD Secretariat **phone:** +1-514-288-2220 **fax:** +1-514-288-6588 **email:** secretariat@cbd.int **www:** <http://www.cbd.int/doc/?meeting=SBSTTA-17>

IPCC-37: The 37th session of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC 37) will consider two methodology reports: the “2013 Supplement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: Wetlands”; and the good practice guidance on estimating GHG emissions and removals from LULUCF under the Kyoto Protocol. **dates:** 14-18 October 2013 **location:** Georgia **contact:** IPCC Secretariat **phone:** +41-22-730-8208 **fax:** +41-22-730-8025 **email:** IPCC-Sec@wmo.int **www:** http://www.ipcc.ch/scripts/_calendar_template.php?wg=8#.UYPBCBxBgrI

Third International Marine Protected Area Congress: The third International Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) Congress aims to define actions to promote cooperation through different initiatives, and to inspire a new way of thinking to face global challenges, such as climate change, poverty reduction, and resource sharing. **dates:** 21-27 October 2013 **location:** Marseille and Corsica, France **contact:** IUCN **email:** info@impac3.org **www:** <http://www.impac3.org/en/>

25th Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol: MOP 25 is scheduled to consider a number of issues, including nominations for critical- and essential-use exemptions. **dates:** 21-25 October 2013 **location:** Bangkok, Thailand **contact:** Ozone Secretariat **phone:** +254-20-762-3851 **fax:** +254-20-762-4691 **email:** ozoneinfo@unep.org **www:** <http://ozone.unep.org>

76th Meeting of the CDM Executive Board: The Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) Executive Board will convene its 76th meeting to consider matters relating to the operation of the CDM. EB76 will be held in conjunction with the 19th session of the Conference of the Parties (COP 19) to the UNFCCC. **dates:** 4-8 November 2013 **location:** Warsaw, Poland **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** <http://cdm.unfccc.int/calendar/index.html>

19th Session of the Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC: COP 19, CMP 9, ADP and the SBs will convene in Warsaw, Poland. **dates:** 11-22 November 2013 **location:** Warsaw, Poland **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** <http://www.unfccc.int>

GLOSSARY

ADP	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action
AILAC	Independent Association of Latin America and the Caribbean
ALBA	Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America
AOSIS	Alliance of Small Island States
BASIC	Brazil, South Africa, India and China
CBDR	Common but differentiated responsibilities
CMP	Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol
CO2	Carbon dioxide
COP	Conference of the Parties
EIG	Environmental Integrity Group
GCF	Green Climate Fund
GHGs	Greenhouse gases
HFCs	Hydrofluorocarbons
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
LDCs	Least Developed Countries
LEDS	Low Emissions Development Strategies
LULUCF	Land use, land-use change and forestry
MRV	Measuring, Reporting and Verification
NAMAs	Nationally appropriate mitigation actions
NMM	New Market Mechanism
REDD+	Reducing emissions from deforestation and degradation in developing countries, including conservation and enhancement of carbon stocks
SBs	Subsidiary Bodies
SBI	Subsidiary Body for Implementation
SBSTA	Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change