



## SUMMARY OF THE WARSAW CLIMATE CHANGE CONFERENCE: 11-23 NOVEMBER 2013

The Warsaw Climate Change Conference took place from 11-23 November 2013 in Poland. It included the 19th session of the Conference of the Parties (COP 19) to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the ninth session of the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP 9). The conference also included meetings of three subsidiary bodies: the 39th sessions of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA 39) and the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI 39), and the third part of the second session of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP 2).

Marking the second time that UN climate change negotiations have taken place in Poland, the conference drew over 8,300 participants, including 4,022 government officials, 3,695 representatives of UN bodies and agencies, intergovernmental organizations and civil society organizations, and 658 members of the media.

Negotiations in Warsaw focused on the implementation of agreements reached at previous meetings, including pursuing the work of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action. Concluding 27 hours after its scheduled closing time, the meeting adopted an ADP decision that invites parties to initiate or intensify domestic preparations for their intended nationally-determined contributions, and resolves to accelerate the full implementation of the Bali Action Plan and pre-2020 ambition. Parties also adopted a decision establishing the Warsaw international mechanism on loss and damage, and the “Warsaw REDD+ framework,” a series of seven decisions on REDD+ finance, institutional arrangements and methodological issues.

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

The international political response to climate change began with the adoption of the UNFCCC in 1992, 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 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 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, in 2005, 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 mandated 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

### IN THIS ISSUE

A Brief History of the UNFCCC and the Kyoto Protocol. . .	1
Report of the Warsaw Climate Change Conference . . . . .	3
Conference of the Parties . . . . .	3
Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol . . . . .	7
COP 19 and CMP 9 Joint High-Level Segment . . . . .	9
<i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action . . . . .	10
Subsidiary Body for Implementation . . . . .	15
Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice . . . . .	22
Joint COP/CMP Closing Plenary . . . . .	27
A Brief Analysis of the Warsaw Climate Change Conference . . . . .	27
Upcoming Meetings . . . . .	30
Glossary . . . . .	32



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 Copenhagen in 2009.

**COPENHAGEN:** The UN Climate Change Conference in Copenhagen, Denmark, took place in December 2009. The high-profile event was marked by disputes over transparency and process. During the high-level segment, informal negotiations took place in a group consisting of major economies and representatives of regional and other negotiating groups. Late in the evening of 18 December these talks resulted in a political agreement, the “Copenhagen Accord,” which was then presented to the COP plenary for adoption. 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 above pre-industrial levels. Parties agreed to consider strengthening the global long-term goal 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. Decision 1/CP.16 also addressed other aspects of mitigation, such as: measuring, reporting and verification (MRV); and reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries; and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests, and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries (REDD+).

The Cancun Agreements also established several new institutions and processes, including the Cancun Adaptation Framework, Adaptation Committee, and the Technology Mechanism, which includes the Technology Executive Committee (TEC) and the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN). The Green Climate Fund (GCF) was created and designated as an 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 (AR4) 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 covered 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.

**DOHA:** The UN Climate Change Conference in Doha, Qatar, 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 to 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 (NAPs); 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:** ADP 2 met in Bonn, Germany, from 29 April to 3 May 2013. The session was structured around workshops and roundtable discussions, covering the ADP’s two workstreams. 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.

**BONN:** The Bonn Climate Change Conference took place from 3-14 June 2013. SBI 38 was characterized by an agenda dispute concerning a proposal by the Russian Federation, Belarus and Ukraine to introduce a new item on legal and procedural issues related to decision-making under the COP and CMP. As no solution to the dispute was found, the SBI was unable to launch substantive work. SBSTA 38 achieved what many saw as good progress, *inter alia*, on REDD+ and several methodological issues. The resumed ADP 2 was structured around workshops and roundtables. No agreement was reached on establishing one or more contact groups to move part of the work to a more formal setting. Many, however, felt that switching to a

negotiating mode will be important to ensure that the ADP makes progress in future sessions.

## REPORT OF THE WARSAW CLIMATE CHANGE CONFERENCE

COP 19 and CMP 9 opened on Monday morning, 11 November 2013. COP 18/CMP 8 President Abdullah bin Hamad Al-Attiyah, Qatar, highlighted the Doha Climate Gateway and progress made in Doha. Marcin Korolec, Minister of the Environment, Poland, called on “each party to contribute an ingredient to help cure the planet,” expressing hope that COP 19 will build a solid foundation for addressing climate change. Reminding delegates of the Olympic motto “faster, higher, stronger,” UNFCCC Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres underscored that what happens at the National Stadium in Warsaw “is not a game: we either all win or lose.”

Welcoming delegates, Hanna Gronkiewicz-Waltz, Mayor of Warsaw, highlighted her city’s sustainable activities in water management, transportation and energy. Reporting on unprecedented changes in the climate system and their consequences, IPCC Chair Rajendra Pachauri stressed the need for greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions to peak by 2015 and increasing the share of renewable energy.

This report summarizes the discussions by the COP, CMP, ADP, SBI and SBSTA based on their respective agendas. Negotiations and outcomes under the COP and CMP on issues forwarded to the SBI, SBSTA and ADP are summarized in the context of negotiations under the relevant subsidiary body.

### CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES

On Monday, 11 November, Marcin Korolec, Minister of the Environment, Poland, was elected COP 19/CMP 9 President by acclamation.

**ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS:** Parties agreed to apply the draft rules of procedure (FCCC/CP/1996/2) with the exception of draft rule 42 on voting. The COP then adopted the agenda (FCCC/CP/2013/1), with the agenda item on the second review of the adequacy of Convention Articles 4.2(a) and (b) held in abeyance. Parties also agreed to the accreditation of observer organizations (FCCC/CP/2013/2).

**Election of officers other than the President:** COP President Korolec indicated that consultations will be conducted on the election of officers. On 23 November, the COP closing plenary elected members of the COP Bureau: SBSTA Chair Emmanuel Dumisani Dlamini (Swaziland); SBI Chair Amena Yauvoli (Fiji); Cheik Ndiaye Sylla (Senegal); Ravi Shanker Prasad (India); Su Wei (China); Jaime Hermida Castillo (Nicaragua); Jorge Voto-Bernales (Peru); Nicole Wilke (Germany); Jo Tyndall (New Zealand); and Marina Shvangiradze (Georgia) as Rapporteur.

The COP also elected: the SBI Bureau, with Ilhomjon Rajabov (Tajikistan) as Vice-Chair and Mabafokeng F. Mahahabisa (Lesotho) as Rapporteur; and the ADP Bureau, with Anna Serzysko (Poland) as Rapporteur.

The COP also elected officers to the Technology Executive Committee (TEC) and the Consultative Group of Experts (CGE) on National Communications from non-Annex I parties. Consultations will continue on the outstanding nominations. The list of nominees is available on the UNFCCC website.

**Dates and venues of future sessions:** In plenary on 22 November, the COP adopted a decision on future sessions (FCCC/CP/2013/L.2), accepting the offer by Peru to host COP 20 and CMP 10 in Lima from 1-12 December 2013; by France to host COP 21 and CMP 11 in Paris from 30 November to 11 December 2015; and by Senegal to host COP 22 and CMP 12 in Dakar. Minister Manuel Pulgar-Vidal Otálora (Peru) said that Peru would lead negotiations actively, inclusively and transparently, emphasizing that progress at COP 20 will depend on, *inter alia*, dialogue between developed and developing countries, and mobilization of all actors, including civil society and the private sector, and inviting parties to confront climate change with solidarity and effectiveness. Reminding delegates of the challenge ahead of COP 21, Minister Laurent Fabius (France) called upon delegates “to go from chaos to cosmos,” adding that the 2015 agreement will have to promote a new economic model and more solidarity. Minister Mor Ngom (Senegal) announced Senegal’s bid to host COP 22 in Dakar in 2016, encouraging parties to go beyond “narrow considerations to be together and act together.”

**Adoption of the report on credentials:** On 22 November, the COP adopted the report on credentials (FCCC/CP/2013/9).

**REPORTS OF THE SUBSIDIARY BODIES:** On Friday 22 November, the COP adopted the reports of SBSTA 38 and SBSTA 39 (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/3 and Add.1&2; and FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.21), as well as the report of SBI 39 (FCCC/SBI/2013/L.1).

**Report of the ADP:** On Saturday, 23 November, the COP adopted the Report of the ADP and the decision on further advancing the Durban Platform (see page 10).

**CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSALS BY PARTIES UNDER ARTICLE 17 OF THE CONVENTION:** This item (FCCC/CP/2009/3-7 and FCCC/CP/2010/3) was first taken up by the COP on Monday, 11 November. The COP noted proposals by Japan (FCCC/CP/2009/3), Tuvalu (FCCC/CP/2009/4), Australia (FCCC/CP/2009/5), Costa Rica (FCCC/CP/2009/6), the US (FCCC/CP/2009/7) and Grenada (FCCC/CP/2010/3). During the COP closing plenary on Friday, 22 November, the COP agreed to include this item in the provisional agenda for COP 20.

**CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSALS BY PARTIES FOR AMENDMENTS TO THE CONVENTION UNDER ARTICLE 15: Proposal from the Russian Federation:** This issue (FCCC/CP/2011/5) was first taken up by the COP on 13 November. It was subsequently taken up in informal consultations facilitated by Iwona Rummel-Bulska (Poland) but no agreement was reached. On 22 November, the COP agreed to include this item on the agenda for COP 20.

**Proposal from Papua New Guinea and Mexico:** This issue (FCCC/CP/2011/4/Rev.1) was first taken up by the COP on 13 November. It was subsequently taken up in informal consultations facilitated by Iwona Rummel-Bulska but no agreement was reached. On 22 November, the COP agreed to include this item on the agenda for COP 20.

**REPORT OF THE ADAPTATION COMMITTEE:** These discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item on the report of the Adaptation Committee (see page 17).

**DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGIES AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE TECHNOLOGY MECHANISM: Joint annual report of the TEC and CTCN:** These discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item on the joint annual report of the TEC and CTCN (see page 19).

**Report on modalities and procedures of the CTCN and its Advisory Board:** These discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item on the report on modalities and procedures of the CTCN and its Advisory Board (see page 19).

**2013-2015 REVIEW:** These discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item on the 2013-2015 review (see page 20).

**MATTERS RELATING TO FINANCE: Work Programme on Long-term Finance:** This issue (FCCC/CP/2013/7) was taken up by the COP on Wednesday, 13 November. Long-term Finance (LTF) Work Programme Co-Chair Mark Storey (Sweden) reported on the extended work programme on LTF, highlighting the need for transparency in the definition and tracking of LTF, and calling for identifying ways of scaling up private finance for adaptation.

The Philippines, for the Group of 77 and China (G-77/China), said a successful outcome in 2015 depends on progress on predictability, accountability and sustainability of LTF. Egypt, for the African Group, underlined that the level of action on climate change is related to the level of support provided to developing countries. Maldives encouraged developed countries to reach a burden-sharing agreement to reach the US\$100 billion annual goal. Colombia, for the Association of Independent Latin American and Caribbean states (AILAC), urged: clarity and predictability in the provision of finance; clarity in the scale of resources to be mobilized; and sufficient funding for the Adaptation Fund. The European Union (EU) indicated that it has fulfilled and reported on LTF obligations. The Republic of Korea suggested setting up a working group on LTF to start a political dialogue on this issue.

This issue was further discussed in a contact group co-chaired by Kamel Djemouai (Algeria) and Herman Sips (the Netherlands), together with all other COP finance sub-items except REDD+ (namely: report of the Standing Committee on Finance (SCF), report of the Green Climate Fund (GCF) and guidance, arrangement between the COP and the GCF, report of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and guidance, and fifth review of the financial mechanism), which convened throughout the meeting.

In the contact group on Wednesday, 13 November, parties exchanged views on prioritization and sequencing of sub-items. The Philippines, for the G-77/China, suggested sequencing from easier to more difficult. The EU proposed having “a clear starting and landing point,” and the US stated it looks forward to the high-level ministerial dialogue on finance. Many parties agreed that the sub-item on arrangements between the GCF and the COP is the least contentious one, while LTF is the most difficult one. Many developing countries, including Colombia, for AILAC, and Saudi Arabia, stressed LTF as a priority.

Discussions on the sub-items, based on their alphabetical order on the COP agenda, continued, starting with LTF, on

Thursday, 14 November. Most developing countries stressed a COP decision on LTF as one of the most important ones. Some urged implementation of Convention Article 4.7 (finance and technology transfer), stressing that the provision of resources is an obligation for governments, and noting that financial resources contributing towards the US\$100 billion target will not be “new,” but constitute delivery of a commitment already taken. A number of developing countries called for, *inter alia*, more concrete outcomes, and clarity and predictability in the form of mid-term targets or quantified pathways to the US\$100 billion target. Many developed countries underscored the need for effectiveness and enabling environments. Some developed countries indicated that no financing commitments would be made in Warsaw and rejected quantified pathways, emphasizing work undertaken towards achieving the 2020 goal. Most concurred on the importance of efforts to achieve the 2°C target; as well as transparency and trust-building.

In the COP/CMP President’s informal stocktaking plenary on Thursday, 21 November, the COP President reported he had requested Ministers Maria Kiwanuka (Uganda) and Martin Lidegaard (Denmark) to hold consultations aimed at resolving outstanding issues. On 22 November, Minister Ephraim Kamuntu (Uganda) replaced Minister Kiwanuka.

After extensive consultations, on Saturday, 23 November, the COP adopted the decision.

**Final Outcome:** In its decision (FCCC/CP/2013/L.13), the COP, *inter alia*:

- takes notes of the LTF Co-Chairs’ report on the LTF work programme;
- underlines the urgency of implementing commitments related to finance and technology transfer under the Convention;
- recognizes the commitment by developed countries to jointly mobilize US\$100 billion annually by 2020 in the context of meaningful mitigation actions and transparency of implementation, and the importance of providing clarity on the level of financial support;
- acknowledges the pledges and announcements by developed countries since COP 18;
- requests parties to enhance their enabling environments and policy frameworks;
- urges developed countries to maintain continuity of mobilization of public climate finance at increasing levels from the fast-start finance period from a wide variety of sources, including public, private and alternative;
- calls on developed countries to channel a substantial share of public funds to adaptation and recalls that a significant share of new multilateral funding for adaptation should flow through the GCF;
- requests developed countries to prepare biennial submissions on their strategies and approaches for scaling up climate finance from 2014-2020, including information on quantitative and qualitative elements of a pathway;
- requests the SCF to consider ongoing technical work on operational definitions of climate finance; and
- decides to continue deliberations on LTF, including in in-session workshops, and convene a biennial high-level ministerial dialogue on climate finance from 2014-2020.

**Report of the Standing Committee on Finance:** This issue (FCCC/CP/2013/8) was taken up by the COP on Wednesday, 13 November. SCF Co-Chairs Diann Black-Layne (Antigua and Barbuda) and Stefan Schwager (Switzerland) introduced the report. The Philippines, for the G-77/China, and Egypt, for the African Group, called for work on the MRV of support. The issue was further discussed in the contact group co-chaired by Djemouai and Sips. The discussions in that contact group are summarized under the sub-item on LTF above. On Saturday, 23 November, the COP adopted the decision.

**Final Outcome:** In its decision (FCCC/CP/2013/L.8), the COP, *inter alia*:

- notes the report of the SCF and welcomes the transparency and openness of its work;
- takes note of the initial forum of the SCF and invites the SCF to consider focusing its second forum in 2014 on mobilizing finance for adaptation from public and private sectors;
- endorses the workplan of the SCF for 2014-2015 and takes note of information on the biennial assessment and overview of climate finance flows, to be conducted in 2014;
- invites the SCF to consider ways to increase work on MRV of support; and
- calls on the SCF to enhance its linkages with the SBI and thematic bodies of the Convention.

**Report of the GCF to the COP and guidance to the GCF:** This issue (FCCC/CP/2013/6, 8 and MISC.3) was taken up by the COP on Wednesday, 13 November. Former GCF Co-Chair Zaheer Fakir (South Africa) presented the report, and informed that Manfred Konukiewitz (Germany) and Jose Maria Clemente Sarte Salceda (Philippines) had been elected as the new GCF Co-Chairs. The Philippines, for the G-77/China, Maldives, for the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS), and others called for a rapid and substantial operationalization and capitalization of the GCF. The G-77/China underscored that the Fund's Private Sector Facility will be country-driven and will pursue sustainable development. The African Group called for an initial mobilization, a replenishment process, and a focus on adaptation finance. India called for balancing mitigation and adaptation funding. The issue was further discussed in the contact group co-chaired by Djemouai and Sips. On Saturday, 23 November, the COP adopted the decision.

**Final Outcome:** In its decision (FCCC/CP/2013/L.12), the COP, *inter alia*:

- takes note of the second annual report of the GCF Board and welcomes the establishment of the GCF's independent secretariat and selection of its Executive Director, and the entry into force of the headquarters agreement;
- notes the progress made by the Board to ensure the operationalization of the GCF;
- decides to adopt initial guidance to the GCF on policies, programme priorities and eligibility criteria, requesting the Fund to: balance the allocation of resources between adaptation and mitigation; pursue a country-driven approach; and take into account the immediate needs of vulnerable developing countries in allocating resources for adaptation, and confirm the eligibility of all developing countries.

In its additional guidance to the GCF, the COP:

- stresses the need for full operationalization of the GCF;
- urges the Board to finalize the essential requirements relating to managing financial resources, and calls for ambitious and timely contributions by developed countries to enable the GCF to prepare the initial resource mobilization by COP 20;
- underlines that initial resource mobilization should reach a very significant scale; and
- invites financial inputs from a variety of other sources.

**Arrangements between the COP and the GCF:** This issue (FCCC/CP/2013/6 and 8) was taken up by the COP on Wednesday, 13 November. COP President Korolec noted that the COP had requested the SCF and GCF Board to develop arrangements between the COP and the GCF. The Philippines, for the G-77/China, emphasized: that the GCF must be guided by the COP and be accountable to it; and the need to provide guidance on issues, such as eligibility criteria, as soon as possible. The issue was further discussed in the contact group co-chaired by Djemouai and Sips. The discussions in that contact group are summarized under the sub-item on LTF (see page 4). On Saturday, 23 November, the COP adopted the decision.

**Final Outcome:** In its decision (FCCC/CP/2013/L.10), the COP, *inter alia*:

- takes note on the report of the SCF containing the draft arrangements presented to the GCF Board, noting that the Board has approved them;
- agrees to the arrangements between the COP and the GCF contained in the annex to the decision, thereby bringing the arrangements into force; and
- requests the GCF Board to report on the implementation of the arrangements in its annual reports to the COP, starting at COP 20.

**Report of the GEF to the COP and Guidance to the GEF:** This issue (FCCC/CP/2013/3 & Add.1, 8 and MISC.4, and FCCC/SBI/2013/INF.9) was taken up by the COP on Wednesday, 13 November. The GEF presented its annual report and an update on the status of resources. On views and recommendations from parties on elements to be taken into account in developing guidance to the GEF, the Philippines, for the G-77/China, expressed support for the GEF's work and requested that the GEF develop a strategy for its replenishment, considering its role in the evolving financial architecture, including the GCF. Highlighting support to technology development and transfer, Uganda indicated that more resources need to be raised to address developing countries' adaptation and mitigation needs. The issue was further discussed in the contact group co-chaired by Djemouai and Sips. The discussions in that contact group are summarized under the sub-item on LTF (see page 4). On Saturday, 23 November, the COP adopted the decision.

**Final Outcome:** In its decision (FCCC/CP/2013/L.11), the COP, *inter alia*:

- takes note of the GEF annual report and notes the SCF's recommendations regarding draft guidance to the GEF;
- welcomes ongoing work of the GEF on the sixth replenishment period and the draft GEF 2020 strategy;
- calls upon developed countries and invites other parties that make voluntary contributions to the GEF to ensure a robust sixth replenishment;

- encourages the GEF to finalize the accreditation of new project agencies and assess the possibilities for expanding the direct access modality; and
- encourages the GEF to strengthen collaboration with the SCF.

**Fifth Review of the financial mechanism:** This issue (FCCC/CP/2013/8 and INF.2) was taken up by the COP on Wednesday, 13 November. The Philippines, for the G-77/China, emphasized that the Convention's financial mechanism should remain in place for any new agreement, stressing the need to ensure predictability and accessibility, as well as balance in the use of financial resources. The issue was further discussed in the contact group co-chaired by Djemouai and Sips. On Saturday, 23 November, the COP adopted the decision.

**Final Outcome:** In its decision (FCCC/CP/2013/L.9), the COP, *inter alia*:

- welcomes the draft updated guidelines provided by the SCF;
- decides to adopt the updated guidelines annexed to the decision; and
- requests the SCF to continue to provide expert input to the fifth review of the financial mechanism, with a view to the review being finalized by COP 20.

**Results-based finance for the full implementation of activities in Decision 1/CP.16, Paragraph 70 (REDD+):** This issue (FCCC/CP/2013/5) was first addressed by the COP on Monday, 11 November, and subsequently in a contact-group co-chaired Agus Sari (Indonesia) and Christina Voigt (Norway). On Friday, 22 November, the COP adopted the decision.

**Final Outcome:** In its decision (FCCC/CP/2013/L.5) the COP, *inter alia*:

- reaffirms that results-based finance provided to developing country parties for the full implementation of REDD+ activities may come from a variety of sources, public and private, bilateral and multilateral, including alternative sources;
- agrees that developing countries seeking to obtain and receive results-based payments should provide the most recent summary of information on how all safeguards have been addressed and respected before they can receive results-based payments;
- encourages entities financing REDD+ activities, including the GCF in a key role, to collectively channel adequate and predictable results-based finance in a fair and balanced manner, taking into account different policy approaches; and
- decides to establish an information hub on the web platform on the UNFCCC website as a means to publish information on the results of REDD+ activities and corresponding results-based payments.

**NATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS: National communications from Annex I Parties:** These discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item on the national communications from Annex I parties (see page 15).

**National communications from non-Annex I Parties:** These discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item on the national communications from non-Annex I parties (see page 15).

**CAPACITY-BUILDING UNDER THE CONVENTION:** These discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item on capacity-building under the Convention (see page 20).

**IMPLEMENTATION OF ARTICLE 4, PARAGRAPHS 8 AND 9, OF THE CONVENTION: Implementation of the Buenos Aires programme of work on adaptation and response measures (Decision 1/CP.10):** These discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item on Decision 1/CP.10 (see page 20).

**LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES (LDCs):** These discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item on Least Developed Countries (see page 18).

**GENDER AND CLIMATE CHANGE:** These discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item other matters (see page 21).

**ADMINISTRATIVE, FINANCIAL AND INSTITUTIONAL MATTERS: Budget performance for the biennium 2012–2013:** These discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item on budget performance for the biennium 2012-13 (see page 20).

**Programme budget for the biennium 2014–2015:** These discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item on the programme budget for the biennium 2014–2015 (see page 21).

**Privileges and immunities for individuals serving on constituted bodies established under the Convention:** These discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item on privileges and immunities for individuals serving on constituted bodies established under the Convention (see page 21).

**Decision-making in the UNFCCC process:** This issue was taken up by the COP on Monday, 11 November. COP President Korolec underlined that the proposed new item on decision-making in the UNFCCC process is distinct from the item on the rules of procedure, and the proposal by Papua New Guinea and Mexico to amend Convention Articles 7 and 18. He also assured parties that discussions on this new item will be forward-looking and that its inclusion will not prejudice outcomes.

On Wednesday, 13 November, during the COP plenary, Fiji, for the G-77/China, requested that the informal consultations be open-ended and cautioned against duplication, prejudice and overlap. Informal consultations facilitated by Vice Minister Gabriel Quijandria Acosta (Peru) and Vice Minister Beata Jaczewska (Poland) were held throughout the meeting. Some parties sought reassurance that this issue would not be conflated with, or prejudice the outcome of, discussions on the rules of procedure; and the proposal from Papua New Guinea and Mexico to amend Convention Articles 7 and 18. Some parties emphasized the need to understand the meaning of “consensus,” and to clarify the role of the presiding officer and the Secretariat. One party stressed the need for “a clear legal environment, where we do not deviate from procedures that are not in force but yet applied.” Others highlighted that the rules of procedure have not been adopted because of lack of agreement on voting rules, and called for a forward-looking process, without re-opening past decisions.

There was convergence on a party-driven process and the need to: respect the sovereignty of all parties; recognize that all have an opportunity to be heard; and ensure inclusiveness,

legitimacy and transparency. Some parties emphasized the need to avoid taking decisions “in the corridors or backrooms,” citing COP 15 as an example. While there was some convergence on the timeliness of discussions to increase the effectiveness of negotiations, some expressed concern over “sacrificing inclusiveness for effectiveness.” Others called for revisiting recent practices that favored the adoption of decisions as “a package.” Many questioned the way small negotiating groups are constituted, stressing that some parties with an interest in the issue may not get invited. On Saturday, 23 November, the COP adopted conclusions.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/CP/2013/L.3), the COP:

- notes the initial exchange of views on this agenda item and decides to continue discussions on decision-making in the UNFCCC process;
- requests the President, in collaboration with Peru as the host of COP 20, to undertake forward-looking, open-ended informal consultations on decision-making in the UNFCCC process in conjunction with the 40th session of the SBs;
- agrees that items 2(b) and 6(b) of the COP 19 agenda on rules of procedure and on the proposal from Papua New Guinea and Mexico, would continue to be considered under distinct and separate processes from this item; and
- agrees to continue its consideration of this item at COP 20.

**HIGH-LEVEL MINISTERIAL DIALOGUE ON CLIMATE FINANCE:** On Wednesday, 20 November, a two-part ministerial dialogue mandated by COP 18 considered progress in mobilizing long-term climate finance, including efforts by developed countries to scale up finance after 2012.

The keynote speakers were UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, President Jakaya Mrisho Kikwete (United Republic of Tanzania), GEF CEO and Chairperson Naoko Ishii, GCF Executive Director Hela Cheikhrouhou, and Nicholas Stern, London School of Economics. The dialogue was co-chaired by Ministers Maria Kiwanuka (Uganda) and Martin Lidegaard (Denmark).

During the first part of the dialogue, participants were invited to consider the “state of play” and progress in scaling up climate finance, including: gaps after the fast-start finance period; ways to build momentum for public finance, especially for adaptation; and challenges in mobilizing climate finance. Opening “icebreaker” statements were given by Minister Lisel Alamilla (Belize), Minister Dalila Boudjemaa (Algeria), Minister Peter Altmeier (Germany), and Todd Stern, Special Envoy for Climate Change (US).

During the second part, participants were asked to explore efforts being undertaken to scale up the mobilization of climate finance, *inter alia*: collective policy and regulatory actions to redirect private finance flows; facilitative actions for effective deployment of climate finance; and strategies by individual developed countries. “Icebreaker” statements were delivered by Minister Tine Sundtoft (Norway), Secretary of State Edward Davey (UK), and Secretary of Environment and Natural Resources Juan José Guerra Abud (Mexico).

A summary of the ministerial dialogue is available at: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12592e.html>

**CLOSING PLENARY:** The COP closing plenary first convened Friday evening, 22 November, to consider agreed items. The plenary was suspended at 9:00 pm, pending consultations on outstanding issues. The COP closing plenary resumed at 5:00 pm on Saturday, when President Korolec invited delegates to consider outstanding issues on the COP agenda, stressing that these were not a “package” and that each item would be addressed individually, including: the report of the ADP; matters related to finance; and adoption of the programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015. The plenary was again suspended at 5:50 pm pending consultations on remaining issues. The plenary resumed at 7:04 pm, when delegates considered: loss and damage; forum and work programme on the impact of the implementation of response measures; the Buenos Aires programme of work on adaptation and response measures; and rules of procedure. The plenary was again suspended from 7:30 to 8:43 pm, when it resumed to consider all remaining items, including election of officers, and adoption of the report. The COP adopted the meeting’s report (FCCC/CP/2013/L.4) and a decision expressing gratitude to Poland and the people of the city of Warsaw (FCCC/CP/2013/L.1) for hosting the conference. COP 19 President gavelled the meeting to a close at 8:52 pm on Saturday, 23 November 2013.

#### **CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES SERVING AS THE MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE KYOTO PROTOCOL**

The CMP opened on Monday, 11 November and adopted the agenda and organization of work (FCCC/KP/CMP/2013/1). Fiji, for the G-77/China, proposed a new item on modalities and arrangements for the high-level ministerial roundtable to revisit the quantified emission limitation and reduction commitments for the second commitment period. Supported by Australia, the EU objected, stressing that the relevant decision from Doha on the ambition mechanism provides sufficient guidance on this matter. Noting the lack of consensus on its proposal, the G-77/China underlined that the issue could be raised under other matters. Parties adopted the agenda as originally proposed and agreed to the organization of work without amendment. For a summary of opening statements, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12584e.html>

**ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS: Election of replacement officers:** On Saturday, 23 November, the CMP elected officers to the Adaptation Fund Board; the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) Executive Board; the Compliance Committee; and the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee (JISC). Consultations will continue on outstanding nominations.

**Approval of the report on credentials:** On Saturday, 23 November, the CMP approved the credentials of representatives (FCCC/KP/CMP/2013/8).

**Status of ratification of the Doha Amendment to the Kyoto Protocol:** On Wednesday, 13 November, the Secretariat explained that the Doha Amendment requires 144 ratifications to enter into force and that the depositary has received instruments of acceptance from Barbados, Mauritius and the United Arab Emirates. The EU stressed its intention to ratify the Doha Amendment as soon as possible and noted that over 110 other parties will also need to ratify. Norway informed its parliament will soon consider a ratification proposal. Expressing

disappointment with the status of ratification, China announced its intention to ratify the Doha Amendment by the end of 2014. On Friday, 22 November, the Secretariat reported that it had received the instrument of acceptance of the Doha Amendment from Bangladesh. Switzerland asked for a correction to footnote 11 of the French translation of the Doha Amendment concerning Switzerland.

**REPORTS OF THE SUBSIDIARY BODIES:** On Friday, 22 November, the CMP adopted the reports of SBSTA 38 and SBSTA 39 (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/3 and Add.1&2; and FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.21), and of SBI 39 (FCCC/SBI/2013/L.1).

**ISSUES RELATING TO THE CDM: Guidance relating to the CDM:** This issue (FCCC/KP/CMP/2013/5 (Parts I & II)) was first taken up by the CMP on Monday, 11 November, and subsequently in a contact group co-chaired by Giza Gaspar Martins (Angola) and Marco Berglund (Finland). During the CMP closing plenary on Saturday, 23 November, Ecuador called for political discussion on the issue of lack of demand for certified emission reductions (CERs). The CMP adopted a decision.

**Final Outcome:** In its decision (FCCC/KP/CMP/2013/L.10), the CMP, *inter alia*:

- expresses concern regarding the difficult market situation currently faced by CDM participants and the consequent loss of institutional capacity threatening the value of the CDM;
- encourages parties to make greater use of the CDM;
- designates as operational entities those entities that have been accredited, and provisionally designated, as operational entities by the Executive Board to carry out sector-specific validation and/or sector-specific verification functions;
- urges the Executive Board to expedite evaluating the use of the voluntary sustainable development tool and to report on its findings to CMP 10; and
- requests the Executive Board to develop guiding tools to assist designated national authorities in monitoring the sustainable development benefits in its territory of CDM activities, and simplify the validation process for activities that are deemed to be automatically additional.

**Review of the modalities and procedures for the CDM:**

These discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item on review of CDM modalities and procedures (see page 17).

**ISSUES RELATING TO JOINT IMPLEMENTATION (JI): Guidance relating to JI:** This item (FCCC/KP/CMP/2013/4) was first taken up by the CMP on Monday, 11 November, and subsequently in a contact group co-chaired by Dimitar Nikov (France) and Yaw Osafo (Ghana). On 22 November, the CMP adopted a decision.

**Final Outcome:** In its decision (FCCC/KP/CMP/2013/L.3) the CMP, *inter alia*:

- expresses concern regarding the difficult market situation currently faced by JI participants and the consequent loss of institutional capacity threatening the value of JI as a tool for parties;
- stresses the need to improve JI in the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol;
- takes note of the annual report for 2012–2013 of the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee (JISC); and

- requests the JISC to submit recommendations on the accreditation system for JI aligned with that of the CDM, to be considered by SBI 40.

**Review of the JI guidelines:** These discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item on review of the JI guidelines review (see page 17).

**Report of the Compliance Committee:** This issue (FCCC/KP/CMP/2013/3) was taken up by the CMP plenary on Wednesday, 13 November. Compliance Committee Co-Chair Khalid Abuleif (Saudi Arabia) presented the Committee's annual report. Ilhomjon Rajabov (Tajikistan) and Ida Kärnström (Sweden) co-chaired informal consultations. On 22 November, the COP adopted a decision.

**Final Outcome:** In its decision (FCCC/KP/CMP/2013/L.2), the CMP, *inter alia*:

- notes the work of the Compliance Committee during the reporting period; and
- adopts the amendments to the rules of procedure of the Compliance Committee annexed to the decision.

**ADAPTATION FUND: Report of the Adaptation Fund Board:** This issue (FCCC/KP/CMP/2013/2 and FCCC/SBI/2013/INF.2) was taken up in the CMP plenary on Wednesday, 13 November. Adaptation Fund Board (AFB) Chair Hans Olav Ibrekke introduced the report. Many parties underscored the need for predictable, adequate and sustainable funding. Benin described the gap between funds raised and the fundraising target as “a major blow” to the LDCs. Egypt highlighted the Fund as the main source of adaptation support with direct access and called for a focus on replenishment options. Civil society constituencies: emphasized NAPs as an investment, not as cost; said underfunding is the result of unreliability of the market; and lamented that rich countries have avoided their moral obligation to provide funding. The issue was subsequently considered in a contact group co-chaired by Suzanty Sitorus (Indonesia) and Ana Fornells de Frutos (Spain). On Friday, 22 November, the CMP adopted a decision.

**Final Outcome:** In its decision (FCCC/KP/CMP/2013/L.6), the CMP, *inter alia*:

- takes note of the Adaptation Fund Board (AFB) report and information on the status of resources of the Fund;
- adopts the amendment to the terms and conditions of services to be provided by the World Bank as an interim trustee for the Fund;
- notes with concern issues related to the sustainability, adequacy and predictability of funding from the Fund, given the current prices of CERs;
- takes note with appreciation the efforts of the AFB to promote the accreditation of national implementing entities and direct access to the resources of the Fund;
- invites the AFB to provide to CMP 10 its views on the matters included in the terms of reference for the second review of the Adaptation Fund, annexed to the CMP 9 Decision (FCCC/KP/CMP/2013/L.7), taking into account the deliberations and conclusions of SBI 40;
- decides that an account held in the CDM registry for the Fund shall receive 2% of proceeds levied in accordance with Decision 1/CMP.8, paragraph 21;

- requests the AFB to consider the arrangements for the monetization of this share and forward its recommendations to CMP 10;
- requests the AFB to develop and approve the legal arrangements with the trustee regarding the 2% share for approval by the CMP;
- takes note of the AFB's fundraising strategy for 2013, and continues to encourage Annex I parties and international organizations to provide funding to support this strategy, and welcomes financial contributions and pledges made to the Fund in 2013.

**Second Review of the Adaptation Fund:** These discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item on the Adaptation Fund (see page 19).

**NATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS FROM ANNEX I PARTIES THAT ARE ALSO PARTIES TO THE KYOTO PROTOCOL:** These discussions are summarized in the section on SBI item on Annex I national communications and GHG inventory data (see page 15).

**DATE OF THE COMPLETION OF THE EXPERT REVIEW PROCESS UNDER ARTICLE 8 OF THE KYOTO PROTOCOL FOR THE FIRST COMMITMENT PERIOD:** These discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item "Other matters": expert review process under Article 8 of the protocol for the first commitment period (see page 21).

**ANNUAL COMPILATION AND ACCOUNTING REPORT FOR ANNEX B PARTIES UNDER THE KYOTO PROTOCOL:** These discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item on Annex B parties' annual compilation and accounting report (see page 15).

**CLARIFICATION OF THE TEXT IN SECTION G (ARTICLE 3, PARAGRAPH 7 TER) OF THE DOHA AMENDMENT TO THE KYOTO PROTOCOL:** This item (FCCC/KP/CMP/2013/7) was first taken up during the CMP and SBSTA opening plenaries on Monday, 11 November. The issue was subsequently addressed as a SBSTA agenda item in an informal group facilitated by Nagmeldin Elhassan (Sudan). During the SBSTA closing plenary on Sunday, 17 November, Elhassan reported that the informal group was unable to complete work on this issue, and SBSTA adopted conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.31) inviting the CMP to consider the issue further. On Wednesday, 20 November, COP President Korolec informed during an informal stocktaking plenary that he had requested Iwona Rummel-Bulska (Poland) and Marzena Anna Chodor (Poland) to facilitate further consultations. During CMP plenary on Friday, 22 November, the CMP adopted conclusions.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/KP/CMP/2013/L.5), the CMP: notes it was unable to conclude work with regard to the request by Kazakhstan for clarification of the text in section G (Article 3, paragraph 7 *ter*) of the Doha Amendment to the Kyoto Protocol, in particular the information to be used to determine the "average annual emissions for the first three years of the preceding commitment period;" and requests SBSTA to continue its consideration at SBSTA 40.

**CAPACITY-BUILDING UNDER THE KYOTO PROTOCOL:** Discussions under this item are summarized under the SBI agenda item on capacity-building under the Protocol (see page 20).

**MATTERS RELATING TO ARTICLE 2.3 OF THE KYOTO PROTOCOL:** Discussions under this item are summarized under the SBI agenda item on Protocol Article 3.14 (see page 20).

**MATTERS RELATING TO ARTICLE 3.14 OF THE KYOTO PROTOCOL:** Discussions under this item are summarized under the SBI agenda item on Protocol Article 3.14 (see page 20).

**ADMINISTRATIVE FINANCIAL AND INSTITUTIONAL MATTERS: Budget performance for the biennium 2012-2013:** Discussions under this item are summarized under the SBI agenda item on budget performance for the biennium 2012-2013 (see page 20).

**Programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015:** Discussions under this item are summarized under the SBI agenda item on the programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015 (see page 21).

**CLOSING PLENARY:** On Saturday, 23 November, the CMP adopted the meeting's report (FCCC/KP/CMP/2013/L.4) and a decision expressing gratitude to Poland and the people of the city of Warsaw (FCCC/KP/CMP/2013/L.1) for hosting the conference. The CMP 9 President closed the meeting at 9:00 pm.

#### **COP 19 AND CMP 9 JOINT HIGH-LEVEL SEGMENT**

The joint COP/CMP high-level segment was held on 19, 21 and 22 November. Donald Tusk, Prime Minister of Poland, opened the high-level segment and welcomed participants. Noting that Poland is hosting the COP/CMP for the second time, he outlined emerging challenges since Poznan: the financial crisis; failure to achieve a global agreement in Copenhagen; shifts in the world energy market; and recent IPCC findings. Emphasizing that "we cannot afford a failure; and cannot play with the climate," he said the key goal for Warsaw is to produce a "sober assessment" of what is necessary to achieve a global agreement.

Calling Warsaw an important stepping stone, UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon signaled a "steep climb" ahead. Among areas for action, he highlighted: ratifying the Kyoto Protocol's second commitment period; increasing ambition on mitigation, adaptation and finance for a large-scale transformation; sending the right policy signals to investors; and constructing an action agenda to meet the climate challenge by laying a firm foundation for the 2015 agreement

UN General Assembly President John Ashe stated that, although he understands the challenges of negotiations, "the picture outside this room is bleak." He said parties must reach a deal in 2015, which should include pre-2020 ambition, a compliance mechanism, and applicability to all.

UNFCCC Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres said COP 19 is held in the context of "a clarion call from science, and a compelling call from the Philippines." She stressed the need for Warsaw to pave the way to Lima and Paris, and called for

ministers' active involvement on core deliverables: finance; "a cornerstone for" the loss and damage mechanism; increased pre-2020 ambition; and elements of the new agreement.

The high-level segment continued with statements from heads of state and government, deputy heads of state and government, ministers, and other heads of delegations. A webcast of the statements is available at: <http://bit.ly/HX8VgK>

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

The opening plenary of the third part of the second session of the ADP (ADP 2-3), co-chaired by Kishan Kumarsingh (Trinidad and Tobago) and Artur Runge-Metzger (EU), took place on Tuesday, 12 November. The ADP's work was based on: the agenda (ADP/2013/AGENDA) adopted at the first part of ADP 2; and the Co-Chairs' scenario note (ADP.2013.16. InformalNote). For a summary of the opening statements, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12585e.html>

**ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS: Election of Officers:** At the ADP closing plenary on Saturday, 23 November, Co-Chair Kumarsingh announced that Anna Serzysko (Poland) would be the new ADP Rapporteur commencing after ADP 2-3.

**IMPLEMENTATION OF ALL THE ELEMENTS OF DECISION 1/CP.17:** On Tuesday, 12 November, the ADP began with a briefing and discussion on the overview of mandates and progress of work by institutions, mechanisms and arrangements under the Convention (FCCC/ADP/2013/INF.2). Guided by questions from the Co-Chairs, subsequent work during the first week took place under the two workstreams. Workstream 1 (2015 agreement) was discussed in open-ended consultations on content and elements of the 2015 agreement, including adaptation, mitigation, technology, finance, capacity-building, and transparency. Workstream 2 (pre-2020 ambition) was discussed in open-ended consultations on the way forward, as well as workshops on lessons learned from relevant experience of other multilateral environmental agreements, and on pre-2020 ambition, urbanization and the role of governments in facilitating climate action in cities.

During the second week, the ADP's work consisted of: negotiations based on a Co-Chairs' draft decision and conclusions in open-ended informal consultations on implementation of all the elements of Decision 1/CP.17; a Co-Chairs' special event; and a high-level ministerial dialogue on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action. The ADP decision and conclusions were adopted during the closing plenary on Saturday, 23 November.

**OVERVIEW OF INSTITUTIONS, MECHANISMS AND ARRANGEMENTS UNDER THE CONVENTION:** On Tuesday, 12 November, Co-Chair Runge-Metzger identified the state of play under the Convention as "a natural entry point" into discussions under both ADP workstreams. The Secretariat presented the overview (FCCC/ADP/2013/INF.2), noting an online interface for future reference.

**WORKSTREAM 1: Adaptation:** Co-Chair Kumarsingh drew attention to the technical paper on adaptation (FCCC/TP/2013/10) during the ADP opening plenary on Tuesday, 12 November. Many parties appreciated the signal sent by holding the first ADP open-ended consultations on adaptation. During

informal consultations on Wednesday, 13 November, the Secretariat introduced the synthesis of submissions on the costs, benefits and opportunities for adaptation (FCCC/TP/2013/10).

Many parties indicated that the 2015 agreement should: reflect the urgency of adaptation to signal to international institutions, donor countries and the private sector the need for partnerships; recognize parties' ongoing adaptation efforts; contain a holistic review component assessing national and global actions and needs; and strengthen the financial mechanism. Stressing transparency as key to building confidence, one party urged finalizing MRV arrangements and clarifying further pledges in Warsaw.

During open-ended consultations on Friday, 15 November, parties examined: strengthening the current adaptation framework; and adaptation in the 2015 agreement, including a proposed global goal. Many countries recognized the central role of NAPs, and underlined the global, regional, national and local dimensions of adaptation. Peru reiterated the proposal by AILAC to use national communications to reinforce NAPs and identify gaps. Saudi Arabia said NAPs should be a requirement for all countries. Indonesia, China and the Republic of Korea stressed the link between adaptation and sustainable development.

On finance, Malaysia, for the G-77/China, with India, China, Kenya and Egypt, expressed concern over lack of funding for adaptation. Mali called for funding for NAPs. India highlighted financing for technology transfer. The US indicated its commitment to support adaptation.

On institutional arrangements, many called for strengthening the existing institutions addressing adaptation under the Convention.

The G-77/China, Bangladesh, Kenya and others called for a global adaptation goal based on the proposal made by the African Group, determined by estimating adaptation needs according to emission scenarios. Australia, Norway, the Republic of Korea and the US stressed the technical difficulty of aggregating adaptation to a quantified global goal, with the US adding that setting such a goal could be counter-productive. ADP Co-Chair Kumarsingh invited the African Group, Australia, the US and others to consult on the proposed global goal on adaptation. Nepal, the Philippines and Nauru, for AOSIS, stressed the link between mitigation and adaptation. AOSIS stressed that small island developing states (SIDS) will be unable to adapt to some climate change impacts, and underscored that only ambitious and timely mitigation can reduce loss and damage.

**Mitigation:** During informal consultations on Wednesday, 13 November, a number of parties agreed on the importance to ensure broad participation in the 2015 agreement. Some stressed that mitigation commitments must be differentiated in accordance with the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities (CBDR), and that enhanced mitigation by developing countries depends on the provision of means of implementation.

Calls were made for agreement in Warsaw on launching national consultations on mitigation pledges. Parties also discussed the process for defining mitigation commitments. Some identified the need to balance the flexibility of nationally determined commitments and the rigidity of commonly agreed

rules. Suggestions were made to create “an upward spiral of ambition” with facilitative engagement to compare commitments among countries. It was also proposed that the 2015 agreement be flexible and adjustable to developments in science and capabilities. One party stressed that commitments must be fulfilled by domestic means, without relying on offsets. Parties discussed historical responsibilities, with some proposing to mandate the IPCC to develop a methodology, while others indicated that a focus on historical responsibilities will not ensure achievement of the 2°C goal.

**Technology:** On Thursday, 14 November, parties agreed to open all open-ended consultations to observers. Co-Chair Kumarsingh invited parties to focus their discussions on how technology development and transfer could be reflected in the 2015 agreement and institutional arrangements for the post-2020 period.

Malaysia, for the G-77/China, stressed that technology development and transfer are key to enable low-emission trajectories in developing countries, and called for identification of specific amounts, timelines and sources of finance to strengthen the current reporting system. Venezuela lamented the lack of financial support.

Egypt, for the Like Minded Developing Countries (LMDCs), China and others called for a dedicated window for technology transfer in the GCF. The LMDCs, with Pakistan, called for a work programme on MRV of technological support, and, with China, Ecuador and others, the removal of barriers, including in relation to intellectual property rights (IPRs). India and Pakistan emphasized finance for IPRs. The LMDCs, China, Kuwait and others said the GCF could provide a dedicated window for IPR issues. Japan opposed taking up IPRs, while Bolivia, with Cuba, called for a workshop on this issue.

On the 2015 agreement, Nauru, for AOSIS, emphasized linking technology development and transfer to the financial mechanism. AOSIS, the LMDCs, Nepal, for the LDCs, and others urged technology development and transfer for mitigation and adaptation. Bolivia called for: strengthening the role of the TEC; a workshop to explore its mandate to guide the CTCN; and a repository of reliable technologies accessible to developing countries.

On institutional arrangements for the post-2020 period, AOSIS emphasized linking technology transfer and development to existing institutions under the financial mechanism. The LDCs said a technology mechanism should be integrated into the new agreement.

Consultations continued on Friday, 15 November. The US, with Canada, highlighted IPRs as critical for innovation. Canada emphasized that IPRs are sufficiently addressed in other fora. The US, the EU and Switzerland stated that IPRs are not the main barrier to technology transfer. Together with South Africa and Swaziland, for the African Group, the Philippines called for a built-in review mechanism for addressing the adequacy of support.

The African Group also called for Annex I countries to leverage private-sector support and for learning from other multilateral agreements. The EU suggested the 2015 agreement promote international technology cooperation, and emphasized

the role of the CTCN and the public and private sectors. He added that the Technology Mechanism should be the technology component for the post-2020 period and stressed the importance of enabling environments. Parties also called for: mapping technology needs through technology needs assessments; supporting traditional and indigenous knowledge transfer; engaging with other intergovernmental institutions to avoid duplication; and promoting synergies between the Technology Mechanism bodies.

**Finance:** During open-ended consultations on Thursday, 14 November, delegates considered climate finance in the 2015 agreement for the implementation of post-2020 commitments and post-2020 institutional arrangements.

Bolivia, China, Cuba, Ecuador, Kuwait, Iran, Nicaragua, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone and Venezuela questioned the proposed focus, stressing that developing countries are uncomfortable with concentrating on post-2020 issues without first discussing pre-2020 finance. Switzerland supported the Co-Chairs’ proposed approach, saying that focused discussions will enable real progress. Most parties agreed that the 2015 agreement should build on existing institutions, noting the need for their enhancement. Many developing countries called for: new, additional and scaled up finance; public finance to be the main source of climate finance; MRV of support; a finance chapter in the 2015 agreement with the same legal force as the agreement’s other elements; aggregate and individual targets for developed countries’ financial commitments; and a finance roadmap. Concerned about suggestions implying financial commitments to be taken on by developing countries, some delegates also emphasized that South-South cooperation should be regarded as “voluntary efforts.”

Several developed countries emphasized the role of enabling environments in encouraging financial flows. Japan and the US underscored the need to incentivize both public and private investment, with the US identifying public finance as key for the LDCs, and highlighting the role of private finance in middle- and high-income economies. The US also observed that legally-binding elements of the 2015 agreement are yet to be determined. Canada said public finance alone will not suffice to address the needs of the poorest.

Switzerland highlighted the role of biennial reviews by the SCF, and the need to strengthen MRV of both public and private finance. He called for strengthened commitment with respect to the overall amount and donor base. Norway underlined the need for public finance for adaptation, and called for parties to use carbon-pricing and cost-effective market mechanisms to ensure compliance with the polluter-pays principle. Bangladesh stressed predictable adaptation finance.

**Capacity-building:** During open-ended consultations on Friday, 15 November, parties recognized that capacity-building is a cross-cutting issue, should figure prominently in the 2015 agreement and should be country-driven. Many developing countries said capacity-building should focus on both mitigation and adaptation.

Pakistan, for the LMDCs, the Dominican Republic, and Nepal, for the LDCs, stressed the need for support for capacity-building. St. Kitts and Nevis, for AOSIS, China and the Republic

of Korea called for a capacity-building window under the Convention's financial mechanism. The EU emphasized the role of the private sector, especially in terms of technology.

On institutional arrangements, the EU and Japan suggested strengthening the Durban Forum on Capacity-building. South Africa said the Durban Forum has not had the opportunity "to prove itself." Indonesia stressed the role of the Forum's national focal points. The US called for encouraging existing bodies under the Convention that carry out capacity-building. Algeria stressed that these bodies should be provided with adequate support. The Republic of Korea and Japan proposed mainstreaming capacity-building in all aspects of the 2015 agreement.

Saudi Arabia, supported by China and Swaziland, for the African Group, urged building countries' capacity to identify their capacity-building needs, and called for a working group on capacity-building. AOSIS stressed the need for a stand-alone body. The LDCs, AOSIS, South Africa, Cuba and others called for MRV of the delivery of capacity-building. The EU and the US highlighted their reporting on capacity-building activities. Colombia called for "an innovative look" to identify the recipients and multipliers of capacity-building. The US underscored the need for developing countries to build enabling environments.

**Transparency:** During open-ended consultations on Friday, 15 November, many parties highlighted transparency of actions and support, emphasizing the need for more work on MRV of support. Swaziland, for the African Group, stressed the need for improved transparency in finance, technology and capacity-building commitments through clarifying specific amounts, timelines and sources. Saint Lucia called for: a robust and transparent MRV system built on lessons learned from fast-start finance; indicators to assess the impact of support; standardized format for reporting by developed countries; and simplification of reporting by developing countries. The US highlighted that transparency can enhance the provision of support, and emphasized the need for equal transparency rules for providers and receivers.

The LMDCs highlighted developed and developing countries' differentiated responsibilities with respect to commitments and reporting, warning that attempts to develop common accounting rules applicable to all would delay action and progress. The African Group, supported by Algeria, cautioned against overburdening developing countries, and against equal obligations for Annex I and non-Annex I parties.

Calling for a common transparency and accountability framework for both up-front information on commitments and *ex post* MRV, Australia clarified that the intention is not to have the same rules apply to all parties under all circumstances or create unreasonable burdens.

On transparency of mitigation commitments, the US proposed a staged approach to maximize participation, with: all parties submitting nationally determined mitigation commitments under a single but flexible set of rules applicable to all; a global consultation process; and regular reviews at the implementation stage.

Regarding up-front information requirements when establishing mitigation commitments, the EU recognized the need for flexibility, while calling for information on: targets and target periods; sectors and GHGs covered; methodologies used; approaches to market mechanisms; and the accounting system for the land-use sector.

Regarding MRV for developed country mitigation, Nepal, for the LDCs, supported by China, called for accurate, complete and regular reviews, and stressed the need to avoid lowering the standards of the MRV and compliance system of the Kyoto Protocol.

**WORKSTREAM 2: The Way Forward:** During open-ended consultations on Wednesday, 13 November, parties were invited to focus on a workstream 2 outcome and concrete actions to raise ambition. The Secretariat presented a technical paper on mitigation benefits of actions, initiatives and options to enhance ambition (FCCC/TP/2013/8 and Add.1&2).

Nauru, for AOSIS, proposed a process focused on renewable energy and energy efficiency involving submissions, technical papers and expert workshops. Nepal, for the LDCs, called for implementation of pledges, expanding their scope and tightening the rules, and stressed means of implementation as essential to workstream 2.

Malaysia, for the G-77/China, said enhanced Annex I commitments should be the first step and called for, *inter alia*, ratifying the Doha Amendment, and establishing a mechanism matching mitigation and adaptation proposals with finance and technology. China called for: an outcome that recognizes elements beyond mitigation; and work programmes on the adequacy of financial support and IPRs.

The EU suggested: further technical work to draw on the experience of other bodies and further workshops; opportunities for ministers to show leadership; and promoting the UNFCCC's catalytic role.

On hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), India and Saudi Arabia underlined they "belong" under the UNFCCC. The EU emphasized shared responsibility with the Montreal Protocol. China said the UNFCCC principles should apply to the phase-out of HFCs. Mexico underscored the health co-benefits of addressing short-lived climate pollutants.

Colombia, for AILAC, noted the need for emissions to peak in 2015, calling for, *inter alia*, increased ambition on REDD+ and a ministerial session in June 2014.

Ecuador stressed that progressing to close the pre-2020 ambition gap is a starting point for moving forward under workstream 1.

Venezuela, for LMDCs, supported by Kuwait and Algeria, called for, *inter alia*: clarity on finance and support for identifying developing countries' needs; addressing economic and social consequences from the implementation of response measures; and rapid capitalization and operationalization of the GCF.

South Africa, the Federated States of Micronesia and Bolivia underlined the mitigation, implementation, finance and technology gap. Cameroon, for the Central African Forest Commission (COMIFAC), highlighted the role of reducing, halting and reversing deforestation in closing the mitigation

gap. South Africa stressed the need for increased means of implementation for non-Annex I countries. Mali called for building on the US\$100 billion goal, with South Africa proposing a portal to match funding with required support.

The US, supported by Canada and Australia, called for harnessing the mitigation potential of sub-national actors. China said these local efforts fall under national action.

**Workshop on Lessons Learned from Relevant Experience of Other Multilateral Environmental Agreements:** This workshop took place on Wednesday, 13 November. Delegates were invited to identify concrete arrangements to enhance pre-2020 ambition under workstream 2. Parties addressed:

- enabling parties to opt out of new obligations;
- relationship between UNEP and the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) Secretariat;
- application of the precautionary principle under the Montreal Protocol;
- differentiation between developed and developing countries' obligations;
- addressing GHGs under the Montreal Protocol;
- provisions concerning participation, especially of non-parties; and
- the impact of obligations on non-parties.

For a complete summary of the workshop, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12586e.html>

**Workshop on Urbanization and the Role of Governments in Facilitating Climate Action in Cities:** This workshop took place on Thursday, 14 November. Delegates were invited to chart concrete options for the ADP's work. Participants addressed: successful policies promoting energy efficiency and renewable energy in transport and buildings; the financing gap in infrastructure needs of developing countries; and the role of non-state actors in the ADP process. For a complete summary of the workshop, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12587e.html>

**IMPLEMENTATION OF ALL THE ELEMENTS UNDER BOTH WORKSTREAMS:** During the second week, the ADP's work continued, based on the Co-Chairs' draft decision and conclusions, in open-ended informal consultations on implementation of all the elements of Decision 1/CP.17, in a Co-Chairs' special event, and during a high-level ministerial dialogue.

**ADP Co-Chairs' Special Event:** Participants at the ADP Co-Chairs' special event on Tuesday, 19 November, focused on: how the 2015 agreement could foster enhanced collaboration between non-state actors and governments; and the role the UNFCCC could play in recognizing and strengthening non-state actors' initiatives and actions. For more details, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12591e.html>

**High-level Ministerial Dialogue on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action:** On Thursday, 21 November, COP 19 President Korolec invited Ministers and other heads of delegations to discuss their views on pre-2020 actions for transitioning to a post-2020 world; and elements required for a successful, meaningful, durable 2015 agreement. For more details, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12593e.html>

**Negotiations on progress on the implementation of all elements under both workstreams:** On Monday, 18 November, the ADP Co-Chairs presented draft text on the implementation of all the elements of Decision 1/CP.17, consisting of: draft Co-Chairs' conclusions; and a draft decision on pre-2020 ambition and post-2020 action, including an annex with indicative elements of the 2015 agreement. Parties discussed several revised versions throughout the week. The closing ADP plenary, which was originally scheduled for Thursday afternoon, was continually postponed as negotiations continued in the open-ended consultations, as well as informally all day and night on Friday, and on Saturday morning.

Areas of disagreement included: incorporating "indicative elements of the 2015 agreement" or a "non-exhaustive list of areas for further reflection" as an annex to the decision or conclusions, respectively, which were rejected by many for lack of negotiation time; and the issue of "nature and extent of differentiation." Discussions were polarized between various developing countries, which stressed continued application of the principles, provisions and annex-based differentiation arrangement under the Convention; and developed countries, which emphasized the need to continue but also update the application of the CBDR principle to reflect evolving circumstances. In addition, delegates differed on, *inter alia*: a clear roadmap for finance and technology transfer; loss and damage; MRV for support; a timeline to submit intended nationally determined commitments, and accompanying information for assessment against adequacy and fairness; a compliance mechanism; accounting rules; and IPRs.

India expressed concern that the text "presumes" that in the 2015 agreement each party will have commitments on mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology development and transfer, and capacity-building.

China emphasized the need to enhance implementation up to 2020 and the Bali Action Plan (BAP). The LDCs called for reference to the principles of equity and fairness, and confidence building through full implementation of the BAP.

On a roadmap for finance, the US stressed that the US\$100 billion target was made in the context of a wide package of decisions and that new commitments "cannot be made along the way." The LMDCs opposed proposals related to harnessing private investment for mitigation.

On increasing ambition, the EU called for a workplan with deadlines, up-front transparency and an assessment phase under workstream 1, and concrete actions under workstream 2. He also stressed inclusion of the 2°C goal. India underscored the need to: increase developed countries' mitigation ambition to at least 40% below 1990 levels; enhance technology transfer; and address IPRs. Australia, Japan and Canada opposed reference to IPRs.

Singapore said collaborative work at the sub-national level should be in the context of sharing and learning. The US, Japan and Canada supported facilitating collaborative work on mitigation and adaptation at the sub-national level. The LMDCs cautioned against referring to actions outside the Convention.

**CLOSING PLENARY:** ADP Co-Chair Kumarsingh opened the closing ADP plenary Saturday afternoon, 23 November at 12:12 pm, two days later than originally scheduled. Reflecting on

inclusive, transparent, interactive and candid ADP consultations, he invited parties to consider for adoption draft conclusions containing a non-exhaustive list of areas for further reflection, and a draft decision on further advancing the Durban Platform (FCCC/ADP/2013/L.4 & Add.1). He stressed the text as party driven and sensitive to a diversity of views, noting that it does not prejudice the content for the 2015 agreement.

India, for Brazil, South Africa, India and China (BASIC), supported by China, Saudi Arabia, and Singapore, lamented that the text lacks urgency, ambition and a clear roadmap on finance. He stressed balance in the decision requires that a reference to “all parties” with the term “commitments” requires adding the context “in accordance with the provisions of the Convention.” He opposed the annex in the conclusions for lack of proper discussion of its listed areas.

Stressing differentiation should remain valid and calling for referring to “enhanced actions” when speaking of developing countries and “commitments” when referring to developed countries, China, with the Philippines, called for a reference to Article 4 of the Convention (differentiation of commitments). He stressed that the purpose of the ADP is not to create a new climate regime, but to enhance the full and effective implementation of the Convention, requiring means of implementation and transparency of actions and support. He described the annex as “unbalanced, very selective and misleading.”

Singapore suggested moving the annex into a Co-Chairs’ reflection note and stressed that past commitments have not been fulfilled. The US, with the EU, supported the draft decision and conclusions with the annex, and opposed a reference to Article 4 of the Convention, noting diverging views on how differentiation should be captured in the new agreement.

Noting it “has been a very long week and night” and that it “is becoming a long day,” Fiji, for the G-77/China, thanked all parties for their involvement in discussions on the ADP in 2013 and expressed desire to see agreement in 2015. Nauru, for AOSIS, said the decision provides an opportunity to unlock mitigation potential to limit global warming below 1.5°C, and stressed parties should “go home, do their homework, and bring options for decisive action” at key events next year. The Gambia, for the LDCs, emphasized that it views the text in the “spirit of compromise” and had not raised issues “dear” to the Group despite concerns on: adequacy, science and NAPAs; lack of reflection of different capabilities; and insufficient reference to finance and implementation.

Expressing preparedness to accept the text, Colombia, for AILAC, called for acting within the framework of respective capacities and taking into account priorities of all parties. She said success in Lima and Paris requires more balanced discussions and thinking about “how we are working.”

Bolivia noted it had originally proposed adding reference to Article 4 of the Convention (commitments), and stressed that text referring to commitments from developing countries by 2015 implies a challenge that can only be met through compliance with Article 4 of the Convention, including clarity on provision of finance.

Proposing submitting the text for adoption to the COP, the Russian Federation said other COP/CMP decisions should not be held “hostage” because of the lack of agreement on the ADP draft text.

Noting physical strain from lack of sleep and the urgency to reach agreement, Venezuela, Swaziland, for the African Group, and Switzerland asked the ADP Co-Chairs to inform delegates of the timeline of the meeting.

Co-Chair Kumarsingh suspended the ADP closing plenary at 2:16 pm for parties to seek an agreement and resumed the closing plenary at 3:40 pm. India read out the proposed amendments resulting from “the informal huddle.” In the draft decision, the proposal was to replace the term “commitments” with “contributions, without prejudice to the legal nature of the contributions,” and substituting the wording “parties in a position to do so” with “parties ready to do so.” In the draft conclusions, the proposal was to delete the non-exhaustive list of areas for further reflection contained in the annex, as well as reference to the annex contained in the draft conclusions. Prior to the ADP’s adoption of the conclusions and draft decision on further advancing the Durban Platform (FCCC/ADP/2013/L.4 & Add.1), as orally amended, Bolivia and Cuba stated their understanding that the amended paragraph in the decision should be applied in strict conformity to Article 4 and, in particular Article 4.7, of the Convention.

The ADP adopted its report (FCCC/ADP/2013/L.3). Co-Chair Kumarsingh acknowledged delegates’ diligent work to arrive at a substantive outcome, and Co-Chair Runge-Metzger, also referring to delegates, said “what would we be without them – and what would they be without us?” Co-Chair Kumarsingh suspended ADP 2-3 at 4:08 pm. The COP later adopted the ADP conclusions and decision, and took note of the ADP report.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/ADP/2013/L.4), the ADP invites parties and admitted observer organizations to submit information on opportunities for actions with high mitigation potential, including their mitigation benefits, costs, co-benefits and barriers to their implementation, and strategies to overcome those barriers, including finance, technology and capacity-building support for mitigation action in developing countries. The ADP also requests the Secretariat to, *inter alia*:

- organize in-session workshops;
- enhance the visibility on the UNFCCC website of quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets, quantified emission limitation and reduction commitments and nationally appropriate mitigation actions, as well as of actions with high mitigation potential, including actions of public and private entities with adaptation and sustainable development co-benefits;
- organize technical expert meetings in 2014 to share policies, practices and technologies and address the necessary finance, technology and capacity-building, with a special focus on actions with high mitigation potential with the participation of parties, civil society, the private sector and cities and other subnational authorities;
- prepare regular updates on actions with high mitigation potential; and

- convene a forum to share experiences and best practices of cities and subnational authorities in relation to adaptation and mitigation.  
In its decision (FCCC/ADP/2013/L.4/Add.1), the COP:
- warns that climate change represents an urgent and potentially irreversible threat to human societies, future generations and the planet;
- underlines the significant gap between the aggregate effect of parties' mitigation pledges and aggregate emission pathways consistent with having a likely chance of holding the increase in global average temperature below 2°C or 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels;
- affirms that fulfilling the ultimate objective of the Convention will require strengthening the multilateral, rules-based regime and the urgent and sustained implementation of existing commitments under the Convention;
- urges all parties to the Kyoto Protocol to ratify and implement the Doha Amendment;
- emphasizes that enhanced action and international cooperation on adaptation are urgently required to enable and support the implementation of adaptation actions aimed at reducing vulnerability and building resilience in developing countries;
- requests the ADP to further elaborate elements for a draft negotiating text, taking into consideration its work, including, *inter alia*, on mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology development and transfer, capacity-building, and transparency of action and support;
- invites all parties to initiate or intensify domestic preparations for their intended nationally determined contributions, without prejudice to the legal nature of the contributions, in the context of adopting a protocol, another legal instrument or an agreed outcome with legal force under the Convention applicable to all parties towards achieving the objective of the Convention and to communicate them well in advance of COP 21 (by the first quarter of 2015 by those parties ready to do so), without prejudging the legal nature of the contributions;
- requests the ADP to identify, by COP 20, the information that parties will provide when putting forward their contributions, without prejudice to the legal nature of the contributions;
- urges and requests developed country parties, the operating entities of the financial mechanism and any other organizations in a position to do so to provide support for the related activities as early as possible in 2014;
- resolves to accelerate the full implementation of the BAP, in particular in relation to the provision of means of implementation, recognizing that such implementation will enhance ambition in the pre-2020 period;
- resolves to enhance ambition in the pre-2020 period in order to ensure the highest possible mitigation efforts under the Convention by all parties; and
- decides to accelerate activities under the workplan on enhancing mitigation ambition.

#### **SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR IMPLEMENTATION**

SBI 39 opened on Monday, 11 November, with Tomasz Chruszczow (Poland) continuing as the SBI Chair. The SBI closing plenary, originally scheduled to take place on Saturday, 16 November, opened and adopted conclusions early on

Sunday morning, 17 November. As some SBI agenda items remained unresolved on Sunday morning without a quorum, the SBI closing plenary was suspended and resumed on Monday morning, 18 November. This section summarizes COP/CMP negotiations and outcomes on issues referred to the SBI.

**ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS:** On 11 November, parties adopted the agenda (FCCC/SBI/2013/11) with the item on information in non-Annex I national communications held in abeyance.

**ANNEX I NATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS AND GHG INVENTORY DATA: Sixth national communications:** This issue was taken up by the SBI on 11 November, and subsequently in informal consultations facilitated by Fatuma Mohamed Hussein (Kenya) and Kiyoto Tanabe (Japan). The SBI adopted conclusions and two draft COP/CMP decisions (FCCC/SBI/2013/L.7 & Add.1 & 2) on Annex I countries' national communications. On Friday, 22 November, the COP and the CMP plenaries adopted their respective decisions.

**Final Outcome:** In its decision (FCCC/SBI/2013/L.7/Add.1), the COP, *inter alia*:

- emphasizes that the national communications and annual GHG inventories are the main source of information for reviewing the implementation of the Convention by Annex I parties;
- recalls a COP 17 request to the Secretariat to prepare a compilation and synthesis report on developed country parties' biennial reports for consideration by COP 20 and subsequent sessions;
- recalls that the due date of the first biennial reports and the sixth national communications from developed country parties is 1 January 2014; and
- requests the Secretariat to prepare a compilation and synthesis report on the communications for COP 20.

In its decision, (FCCC/SBI/2013/L.7/Add.2), the CMP, *inter alia*:

- emphasizes the communications and data as the main source of information for reviewing the implementation of the Convention and its Kyoto Protocol by Annex I parties that are also parties to the Protocol;
- recalls a COP 17 request to the Secretariat to prepare a compilation and synthesis report on developed country parties' biennial reports for consideration by COP 20 and subsequent sessions;
- requests the Secretariat to prepare a compilation and synthesis report on the supplementary information in the sixth national communications for CMP 10; and
- requests the Secretariat to organize centralized reviews of sixth national communications for parties with total GHG emissions of less than 50 million tons of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent, with the exception of Annex II parties.

**Report on national GHG inventory data from Annex I Parties for the period 1990-2011:** This issue was addressed in plenary on 11 November. SBI took note of the report (FCCC/SBI/2013/19).

**Annex B parties' annual compilation and accounting report:** This issue (FCCC/KP/CMP/2013/6 and Add.1) was briefly considered by the SBI in plenary on 11 November.

**Final Outcome:** The SBI adopted its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2013/L.3). On Friday, 22 November, the CMP took note of the report.

**NON-ANNEX I NATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS:**

**Consultative Group of Experts (CGE):** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2013/7, 17 and 18) was first taken up in plenary on 11 November, and subsequently in informal consultations co-facilitated by Fatuma Mohamed Hussein (Kenya) and Kiyoto Tanabe (Japan). In plenary early on Sunday morning, 17 November, SBI Chair Chruszczow reported that the composition of the CGE had been agreed.

On Friday, 22 November, the COP plenary adopted conclusions and a decision and took note of the nominations to the CGE.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2013/L.24 & Add.2), the SBI notes, *inter alia*: the recommendation to develop a long-term work programme to efficiently respond to the needs for technical assistance of non-Annex I parties for meeting their reporting requirements; that the CGE's training materials should be periodically updated; invites a representative of non-Annex I parties to participate in the work of the CGE in an observer capacity, pending the consideration at COP 20 of the specific matter of the membership of such parties on the CGE.

In its decision (FCCC/SBI/2013/L.24/Add.1), the COP:

- decides to continue the CGE for a period of five years from 2014-2018;
- decides that the CGE shall function in accordance with the revised terms of reference contained in the annex to the decision and that the CGE membership shall be the same as set out in decision 3/CP.8, annex, paragraphs 3-8;
- decides that the CGE shall be composed of experts drawn from the UNFCCC roster of experts with expertise in at least one of the sections of national communications or biennial update reports; and
- requests the Secretariat, subject to available financial resources, to facilitate the work of the CGE by organizing CGE meetings and workshops, and providing technical support to the CGE and liaising with other relevant multilateral programmes and organizations for additional financial and technical support.

**Financial and technical support:** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2013/INF.7&8 and FCCC/CP/2013/3/Add.2) was first taken up by the SBI on 11 November in plenary, and subsequently considered in informal consultations co-facilitated by Fatuma Mohamed Hussein and Kiyoto Tanabe.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.5), the SBI *inter alia*:

- invites the GEF to continue providing information on its activities relating to the preparation of biennial update reports (BURs) as well as of national communications by non-Annex I parties, including dates of the approval of funding and the disbursement of funds;
- encourages the GEF to make support available to non-Annex I parties for preparing their subsequent BURs in a timely manner;
- notes progress made by the GEF in the finalization of its Global Support Programme; and

- welcomes the release by the Secretariat of an upgraded version of the national GHG inventory software for non-Annex I parties.

**NAMAS BY DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: Team of technical experts under international consultations and analysis:**

This item was first taken up briefly in plenary by the SBI on 11 November, and subsequently in informal consultations co-facilitated by Ann Gann (Singapore) and Helmut Hojesky (Austria). In plenary on 18 November, the SBI adopted conclusions containing a draft COP decision. In plenary on Friday, 22 November, the COP adopted the decision.

**Final Outcome:** In its decision (FCCC/SBI/2013/L.23) the COP, *inter alia*:

- notes that international consultation and analysis is non-intrusive, non-punitive and respectful of national sovereignty;
- recognizes the need to have an efficient, cost-effective and practical international consultation and analysis process; and to build capacity and provide financial support in a timely manner to non-Annex I parties to facilitate the timely preparation of their biennial update reports;
- adopts the composition, modalities and procedures of the team of technical experts contained in the annex; and
- requests the Secretariat to maintain and update the UNFCCC roster of experts, and the CGE to develop and organize appropriate training programmes for nominated technical experts.

**Work programme to further the understanding of the diversity of NAMAs:**

This issue (FCCC/SBI/2013/INF.12/Rev.2) was taken up by the SBI on 11 November, and subsequently in informal consultations facilitated by Ann Gann and Helmut Hojesky. The SBI adopted conclusions. On 22 November, the COP took note of the conclusions.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2013/L.8), the SBI, *inter alia*: takes note of the compilation on NAMAs and information on the in-session workshop on the diversity of NAMAs; invites Annex II countries to scale up support for the preparation and implementation of NAMAs; and requests the Secretariat to organize technical discussions, including workshops, in 2014, and report on the extent of matching of actions and support under the registry to SBI 40 and 41.

**COORDINATION OF SUPPORT FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTIVITIES IN RELATION TO MITIGATION ACTIONS IN THE FOREST SECTOR BY DEVELOPING COUNTRIES, INCLUDING INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS:**

This issue (FCCC/SB/2013/INF.6, FCCC/SB/2013/MISC.3 and Add.1) was first addressed in the SBI and SBSTA plenaries on 11 November, and subsequently by a contact group co-chaired by Madeleine Diouf (Senegal) and Keith Anderson (Switzerland).

During the SBSTA and SBI closing plenaries, SBSTA Chair Richard Muyungi (Tanzania) and SBI Chair Chruszczow reported that no agreement had been reached on this agenda item, and that draft SBI and SBSTA conclusions (FCCC/SB/2013/L.5) had been prepared, including elements of a draft COP decision. Consultations on this item continued during the second week under the authority of the COP/CMP President. On Friday, 22 November, SBSTA Chair Muyungi and SBI Chair

Chruszczow informed delegates that a new draft decision text had been agreed upon. The COP adopted the decision.

**Final Outcome:** In its decision (FCCC/CP/2013/L.6), the COP, *inter alia*:

- invites interested parties to designate a national entity or focal point; and
- encourages national entities or focal points, parties and relevant entities financing REDD+ activities to meet on a voluntary basis, in conjunction with the first sessional period meetings of the subsidiary bodies (SBs), starting with the second sessional period meetings of the SBs in 2014.

**MATTERS RELATING TO THE PROTOCOL'S MECHANISMS: Review of Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) modalities and procedures:** This item (FCCC/SBI/2013/MISC.1 & Add.1; and FCCC/SBI/2013/INF.1 & INF.6) was taken up briefly in plenary on 11 November, and subsequently in informal consultations co-facilitated by Giza Martins (Angola) and Marko Berglund (Finland). In plenary on Saturday, 16 November, the SBI adopted conclusions and elements of a CMP decision in an annex. On 22 November, the CMP adopted the decision.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2013/L.9), the SBI, *inter alia*, identifies a consolidated but non-exhaustive list of suggested changes to the modalities and procedures for the CDM and the need to continue work on this matter at SBI 40.

In its decision (FCCC/KP/CMP/2013/L.8), the CMP invites submissions from parties and admitted observer organizations to the Secretariat by 30 April 2014, and requests the Secretariat, subject to available funding, to prepare a technical paper by 19 March 2014, on the:

- membership and composition of the Executive Board of the CDM;
- liability of designated operational entities to compensate for the issuance of certified emission reductions (CERs) resulting from significant deficiencies in validation, verification and certification reports;
- provisions for programmes of activities;
- length of the crediting period;
- requirements for the demonstration of additionality;
- role of designated national authorities of Annex I and non-Annex I parties; and
- simplification and streamlining of the project cycle for certain project categories.

**Review of the joint implementation (JI) guidelines:** This item (FCCC/SBI/2013/MISC.3 & Add.1; and FCCC/SBI/2013/INF.3) was first taken up briefly by the SBI in plenary on 11 November, and subsequently in informal consultations co-facilitated by Yaw Osafo (Ghana) and Dimitar Nikov (France). In plenary on Saturday, 16 November, the SBI adopted conclusions. On 22 November, the CMP took note of the conclusions.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2013/L.11), the SBI, *inter alia*: takes note of the relevant views submitted by parties and admitted observer organizations, as well as document FCCC/SBI/2013/INF.3; and agrees to continue consideration of this agenda sub-item at SBI 40.

**Modalities for expediting the continued issuance, transfer and acquisition of JI emission reduction units:** This item was first taken up briefly by the SBI in plenary on 11 November, and subsequently in informal consultations co-facilitated by Yaw Osafo and Dimitar Nikov. On Saturday, 16 November, the SBI adopted conclusions.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2013/L.12), the SBI agreed to continue consideration of this agenda sub-item, on the basis of the draft text proposed by the Co-Chairs of the relevant informal consultations, at SBI 40.

**Modalities for expediting the establishment of eligibility of Annex I parties with commitments during the second commitment period:** This issue was taken up by the SBI opening plenary on 11 November, and subsequently in informal consultations facilitated by Yaw Osafo and Dimitar Nikov. On Sunday, 17 November, the SBI adopted conclusions recommending the adoption of a CMP decision (FCCC/SBI/2013/L.14). On Friday, 22 November, the CMP adopted the decision.

**Final Outcome:** In its decision (FCCC/SBI/2013/L.14/Add.1), the CMP, decides, *inter alia*:

- to create a process for the second commitment of the Kyoto Protocol to expedite the establishment of the eligibility of Annex I parties with commitments inscribed in the third column of Annex B in the Doha Amendment, under certain criteria;
- these parties may submit a report on the establishment of its national registry by 30 June 2015;
- for these parties who have submitted this report, a review will be initiated by an expert review team;
- the report of this review shall be forwarded to the Compliance Committee; and
- of these parties, those whose report has been reviewed shall be eligible to acquire CERs issued for emission reductions occurring after 31 December 2012 four months from the date of the submission of the report.

**Procedures, mechanisms and institutional arrangements for appeals against decisions of the Executive Board of the CDM:** This issue was taken up by the SBI on 11 November. The SBI agreed to defer further consideration of this sub-item to SBI 40.

**Report of the administrator of the international transaction log under the Kyoto Protocol:** The SBI took up this issue on 11 November. The SBI took note of the report (FCCC/SBI/2013/INF.16), and agreed to continue consideration of matters referred to in paragraphs 58(b) and (c) of the 2012 Report at SBI 40.

**ADAPTATION COMMITTEE'S REPORT:** This issue was first considered jointly by the SBI and SBSTA in plenary on 11 November (FCCC/SB/2013/2), and subsequently in informal consultations facilitated by Helen Plume (New Zealand). In informal consultations on Friday, 15 November, parties considered the Chair's revised draft COP decision text. Discussions focused on: changes in the rules of procedure; shortfall in resources; and encouraging parties to make available sufficient resources for the successful and timely implementation of the Committee's three-year workplan. One party stressed

the need to strengthen the Adaptation Committee in order for the Cancun Adaptation Framework to have a solid foundation. On Sunday, 17 November, the SBI and SBSTA adopted a draft COP decision. On Friday, 22 November, the COP adopted the decision.

**Final Outcome:** In its decision (FCCC/SB/2013/L.2), the COP, *inter alia*:

- notes with concern the shortfall in resources referred to in the Committee's report;
- notes progress made by the Committee in the implementation of its three-year workplan;
- encourages the Committee to continue supporting NAPs;
- requests the Committee to consider further focusing its 2014 thematic report and organize a special event during SB 40;
- decides to replace the positions of Chair and Vice-Chair of the Committee by those of Co-Chairs;
- expresses its appreciation for financial and in-kind contributions in support of the work of the Committee; and
- reiterates its encouragement to parties to make available sufficient resources for implementation of the Committee's three-year workplan.

**Least Developed Countries (LDCs):** This item (FCCC/SBI/2013/8, 15 and 16) was first taken up by the SBI on 11 November, and subsequently in informal consultations facilitated by Collin Beck (Solomon Islands). In plenary on Saturday, 16 November, the SBI adopted conclusions.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2013/L.2), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- acknowledges the progress made by the Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG);
- welcomes the technical guidelines for the NAP process, the work on gender and other considerations regarding vulnerable communities within the LDCs, the work on promoting regional synergy and synergy among multilateral environmental agreements in addressing adaptation in the LDCs, and the mobilization of organizations, regional centers and networks, and experts;
- notes NAPAs by all 50 LDC parties that embarked on NAPA preparation; and
- welcomes the LEG's engagement with the Adaptation Committee and other relevant bodies under the Convention.

**National Adaptation Plans (NAPs):** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2013/8, 9, 15 and MISC.2 & Add.1; FCCC/CP/2013/3) was taken up by the SBI on 11 November, and subsequently in informal consultations facilitated by Frank McGovern (Ireland) and Amjad Abdulla (Maldives). In informal consultations, on Thursday, 14 November, many parties supported working on the basis of the Co-Chairs' draft conclusions. Several developing countries supported also having a COP decision to highlight the importance of NAPs to the broader adaptation and development communities. Some developed countries expressed support for a COP 19 decision on the importance of NAPs, while others preferred a more substantive COP decision at a later stage. In informal consultations on Friday, 15 November, parties considered a draft COP decision. Discussions focused on text regarding parties and relevant organizations submitting

information on their experience with the initial guidelines for the NAPs process.

On Sunday, 17 November, the SBI adopted conclusions and a draft COP decision. On Friday, 22 November, the COP adopted the decision.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2013/L.10), the SBI, *inter alia*: welcomes the technical guidelines for the NAP process, the NAP expo held in June 2013, progress made by the GEF in responding to guidance from the COP, and establishment of the NAP global support programme for the LDCs; notes that the LDCs can start to access resources from the Least Developed Countries Fund and developing countries from the Special Climate Change Fund; requests the LEG to continue providing technical guidance to the LDCs on the NAP process; and invites the task force on NAPs under the Adaptation Committee to report on its work to SBI and SBSTA 41.

In its decision (FCCC/SBI/2013/L.10/Add.1), the COP, *inter alia*:

- recalls that planning for adaptation should be based on nationally-identified priorities;
- welcomes the technical guidelines for the NAP process and the establishment of the NAP global support programme for the LDCs;
- invites developed country parties, UN organizations, specialized agencies and others to enhance financial and technical support to the NAP process;
- invites UN organizations, specialized agencies and others to consider establishing or enhancing support programmes for the NAP process and to submit to the Secretariat, by 26 March 2014, information on how they have responded to this invitation;
- invites parties and relevant organizations to submit, by 26 March 2014, information on their experience with the application of the initial guidelines of the NAPs for compilation into a document for SBI 40; and
- decides to continue to take stock of and, if necessary, revise the initial guidelines of the NAPs at COP 20.

**LOSS AND DAMAGE:** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2013/INF.14, FCCC/SBI/2013/CRP.1 and FCCC/TP/2013/2 & 12) was first taken up by the SBI on 11 November. A contact group and informal consultations were facilitated by Anna Lindstedt (Sweden) and Robert Van Lierop (St. Kitts and Nevis). The issue proved controversial and was forwarded for ministerial consultations facilitated by Bomo Edna Molewa (South Africa) and Lena Ek (Sweden) on 19 November. They relayed that consensus had to be reached on the organization of aspects of institutional arrangements and supporting their operationalization. Several developed countries stated that loss and damage is part of the mitigation and adaptation continuum, whereas developing countries identified loss and damage as a separate issue, distinct from adaptation. The closing plenary on Saturday, 23 November, was adjourned to allow further informal consultations on the draft decision. Following this "huddle," developing countries introduced, and parties accepted, textual amendments relating to, *inter alia*, the review of the international mechanism. The COP decision was adopted as orally amended on 23 November.

**Final Outcome:** In its decision (FCCC/CP/2013/L.15), the COP, *inter alia*:

- establishes the Warsaw international mechanism for loss and damage under the Cancun Adaptation Framework, subject to review by COP 22, including on “its structure, mandate and effectiveness,” to address loss and damage associated with extreme weather and slow onset events in developing countries that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change;
- establishes an executive committee of the Warsaw international mechanism, which shall function, and be accountable to, the COP;
- requests the executive committee to report annually to the COP through the SBs;
- the Warsaw international mechanism is tasked to, *inter alia*: enhancing knowledge and understanding of comprehensive risk management approaches; strengthening dialogue, coordination, coherence and synergies among relevant stakeholders; and enhancing action and support, including finance, technology and capacity-building;
- decides that, in exercising its functions, the international mechanism will, *inter alia*: facilitate support of actions to address loss and damage; improve coordination of the relevant work under existing Convention bodies; convene meetings of relevant experts and stakeholders; promote the development of, and compile, analyze, synthesize and review information; provide technical guidance and support; and make recommendations on how to enhance engagement, actions and coherence under and outside the Convention;
- invites the Secretariat, in consultation with the COP President, to convene the initial meeting of the executive committee by March 2014, which will be open to observers;
- requests the executive committee to develop its initial two-year workplan for the implementation of the mechanism’s functions, including scheduling of meetings, for consideration by SB 41;
- requests the SBs to consider the composition of, and procedures for, the executive committee, and make recommendations for adoption by COP 20, with a view to finalizing its organization and governance;
- requests developed countries to provide developing countries with finance, technology and capacity-building in accordance with decision 1/CP.16 and other relevant decisions; and
- decides to review the Warsaw international mechanism, including its structure, mandate and effectiveness, at COP 22.

**MATTERS RELATING TO FINANCE: Adaptation Fund:** The issue (FCCC/KP/CMP/2013/2 and FCCC/SBI/2013/INF.2) was referred by the CMP to the SBI, which took it up on 11 November (FCCC/TP/2013/1). It was subsequently considered in informal consultations facilitated by Suzanty Sitorus (Indonesia) and Ana Fornells de Frutos (Spain).

In its closing plenary on Sunday, 17 November, the SBI adopted conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2013/L.6 & Add.1), which include a draft CMP decision. Consultations on the issue continued under the CMP, in a contact group.

**Final Outcome:** In its decision (FCCC/KP/CMP/2013/L.7), the CMP, *inter alia*:

- decides the second review of the Adaptation Fund will be undertaken in accordance with the terms of reference contained in the annex to the decision;
- requests the Adaptation Fund Board (AFB) to make available in its report to CMP 10 information on the financial status of the Adaptation Fund, with a view to finalizing the review at the same session;
- invites views from parties and observer organizations, among others, on the review, by March 2014;
- requests SBI 40 to consider the review with a view to recommending a draft decision for CMP 10; and
- requests a technical paper from the Secretariat and the AFB, based on the terms of reference and taking into account the deliberations and conclusions of SBI 40, for SBI 41.

**Other Matters:** The SBI took up this issue on 11 November, and took note of a periodic update by the SCF on its work relating to the fifth review of the financial mechanism (FCCC/CP/2013/8).

**TECHNOLOGY: Joint annual report of the Technology Executive Committee (TEC) and the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN):** This issue (FCCC/SB/2013/1) was taken up jointly by the SBI and SBSTA on 11 November, and subsequently in informal consultations facilitated by Majid Al Suwaidi (United Arab Emirates) and Stig Svenningsen (Norway). Parties did not reach consensus in informal discussions.

During the SBI closing plenary on Monday, 18 November, Australia, for Canada, the US, New Zealand and Japan, called for reflecting in the report that no consensus had been reached, and that this item should be considered at SBI 40. Bangladesh cautioned against forwarding this item to SBI 40, and, with Cuba, called on parties to devote time to concluding the issue in Warsaw.

On 18 November, the SBI Chair informed the COP/ CMP President the SBI was unable to reach agreement on its consideration of the report. In the COP plenary on Friday, 22 November, President Korolec reported that no agreement had been reached on this item. He proposed, and parties agreed, that SBSTA and SBI will continue discussions on this issue at their 40th session with a view to forwarding a draft decision to COP 20.

**Final Outcome:** The SBI and SBSTA will consider this issue at SBI and SBSTA 40.

**Modalities and procedures of the CTCN and its Advisory Board:** This issue (FCCC/SB/2013/INF.7) was jointly considered by the SBI and SBSTA on 11 November, and subsequently in informal consultations facilitated by Carlos Fuller (Belize) and Kunihiko Shimada (Japan). The SBI and SBSTA adopted conclusions (FCCC/SB/2013/L.3), noting the work of the CTCN in finalizing in a timely manner the modalities and procedures of the CTCN for consideration by COP 19 and forwarded a COP decision (FCCC/SB/2013/L.3/Add.1), which the COP adopted on Friday, 22 November.

**Final Outcome:** In its decision (FCCC/SB/2013/L.3/Add.1), the COP:

- welcomes the report on modalities and procedures of the CTCN;

- adopts the modalities and procedures of the CTCN, contained in Annex I of the decision;
- adopts the rules of procedure of the CTCN's Advisory Board contained in Annex II of the decision;
- requests the CTCN to work in conjunction with the TEC to ensure coherence and synergy within the Technology Mechanism; and
- requests the CTCN Advisory Board and the Climate Technology Centre to engage with institutions from developing and developed country parties to become part of the Network.

**Poznan strategic programme on technology transfer:**

This agenda item (FCCC/CP/2013/3 and Add.1) was first taken up in plenary on 11 November, and subsequently in informal consultations facilitated by Carlos Fuller and Kunihiko Shimada.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2013/L.4), the SBI:

- notes the report of the GEF on the progress made in carrying out the Poznan strategic programme on technology transfer;
- acknowledges the GEF's support to assist 36 non-Annex I parties to the Convention in conducting their technology needs assessments and its future support on this matter;
- notes the GEF report on its consultations with the CTCN, through its Advisory Board, and invites further consultations on future GEF support to the CTCN and to report at SBI 40; and
- reiterates the need to align the further implementation of the Poznan strategic programme on support for climate technology centers and a climate technology network with the operationalization and activities of the CTCN.

**CAPACITY-BUILDING: Capacity-building under the**

**Convention:** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2013/12; FCCC/SBI/2013/2 and Add.1, FCCC/SBI/2013/3, FCCC/SBI/2013/MISC.4, and FCCC/SBI/2012/20) was first addressed on 11 November, and subsequently in informal consultations facilitated by Amanda Katili Niode (Indonesia). The SBI adopted conclusions.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2013/L.19), the SBI agrees to continue consideration of this issue at SBSTA 40, with a view to the adoption of a decision at COP 20.

**Capacity-building under the Protocol:** This issue was first addressed on 11 November, and subsequently in informal consultations facilitated by Amanda Katili Niode.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2013/L.18/Rev.1), the SBI agrees to continue consideration of this issue at SBSTA 40, with a view to the adoption of a decision at COP 20.

**RESPONSE MEASURES: Forum and work programme:**

This issue (FCCC/SB/2013/INF.2-4, FCCC/SB/2013/INF.8-12 and FCCC/SB/2013/MISC.2 and 4) was first taken up by the SBI and SBSTA on 11 November. It was subsequently considered in a contact group facilitated by SBSTA Vice-Chair Narcis Paulin Jeler (Romania), and consulted upon informally by SBI Chair Chruszczow and SBSTA Chair Muyungi. The issue proved controversial and, on 18 November, was forwarded to the COP President who consulted with Diann Black Lane (Antigua and Barbuda) on the next steps. Following intense consultations, President Korolec proposed a draft decision for adoption by

the COP (FCCC/CP/2013/L.14). At the developing countries' request, this issue was left for further consideration by SB 40.

The forum on response measures in-forum workshop on cooperation on response strategies, co-facilitated by SBSTA Chair Muyungi and SBI Chair Chruszczow, took place on Tuesday, 12 November. For more details, see <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12585e.html>.

The COP took note of the conclusions on 22 November.

**Final Outcome:** In their joint conclusions (FCCC/SB/2013/L.4), the SBI and SBSTA note with appreciation the meeting of the forum on the impact of the implementation of response measures, and the presentations and exchanges made during the in-forum workshops on areas: (b) (cooperation on response strategies) held during COP 19; (c) (assessment and analysis of impacts of response measures); (d) (exchanging experience and discussion of opportunities for economic diversification and transformation); and (g) (just transition of the workforce, and the creation of decent work and quality jobs), as well as the in-forum expert meeting on area (e) of the work programme (economic modeling and socio-economic trends). They also: request their Chairs to prepare the report on the in-forum workshop on area (b) before SB 40. SB 39 decides to submit the proposals by the EU, the G-77/China, and the US contained in the annex for consideration by COP 19. The issue will be further considered by SB 40.

**Protocol Article 3.14:** This issue was taken up jointly with the SBSTA agenda item on Protocol Article 2.3. It was first briefly addressed in plenary on 11 November, and subsequently taken up in informal consultations facilitated by SBI Chair Chruszczow and SBSTA Chair Muyungi. Substantive discussions were taken up under sub-item 15(a) (forum and work programme).

**Final Outcome:** In their closing plenaries, the SBI, on 17 November, and SBSTA agreed to continue consultations on how to take up this issue at SBI 40 and SBSTA 40.

**Implementation of Decision 1/CP.10:** This issue was taken up by the SBI plenary on 11 November. Substantive discussions were taken up under sub-item 15(a) (forum and work programme).

**Final Outcome:** In its closing plenary on Sunday, 17 November, the SBI agreed to continue consultations on how to take up this issue at SBI 40.

**2013-2015 REVIEW:** This issue was considered jointly in plenary by the SBI and SBSTA (FCCC/SB/2013/INF.12) on 11 November, and subsequently in a contact group co-chaired by Gertraude Wollansky (Austria) and Leon Charles (Vanuatu). The SBI and SBSTA adopted conclusions.

**Final Outcome:** In their conclusions (FCCC/SB/2013/L.1), the SBI and SBSTA, *inter alia*: take note of report by the structured expert dialogue (SED); note the contributions made by the IPCC and others, and agree to consider AR5 reports; request meetings of the SED in conjunction with SB 40 and 41; and invite views from parties on how the Review will inform the work of the ADP.

**ANNEX I PARTIES WHOSE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES ARE RECOGNIZED BY THE COP:**

This item (FCCC/TP/2013/3) was first taken up by the SBI on 11 November. On 16 November, SBI adopted conclusions.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2013/L.17), the SBI decides to continue its consideration of this matter at SBI 40.

**ADMINISTRATIVE, FINANCIAL AND INSTITUTIONAL MATTERS: Budget performance for the biennium 2012-2013:** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2013/14, INF.4 and INF.15) was referred to the SBI by the COP and CMP, and taken up by the SBI on 11 November. It was decided that the SBI Chair would prepare draft conclusions. In the SBI plenary on 17 November, SBI Chair Chruszczow informed that during the consultations, the G-77/China had suggested inserting a paragraph making reference to the COP decision on the programme budget for the biennium 2014-15. The US said the proposed paragraph by the G-77/China would prejudice the outcome of a decision yet to be reached. In the SBI closing plenary, SBI Chair Chruszczow informed that parties were unable to reach consensus, and the SBI adopted conclusions including a draft COP/CMP decision (FCCC/SBI/2013/L.20).

The COP adopted the decision in its closing plenary on Friday, 22 November. In the COP plenary on Saturday, 23 November, Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres notified of an adjusted policy on developing country participation, namely that representatives from developing countries designated by their regional groups to participate in meetings of bodies under the Convention, and elected, will be eligible for funding under the Trust Fund, the UNFCCC core budget, and the Trust Fund for Supplementary Activities. The CMP adopted the decision in its closing plenary on Saturday, 23 November.

**Final Outcome:** In their decision (FCCC/SBI/2013/L.20), the COP and CMP: take note of the information contained in the documents provided; express appreciation to parties that made contributions to the core budget, and contributions received to the Trust Fund for Participation in the UNFCCC Process and to the Trust Fund for Supplementary Activities, and call upon parties that have not made contributions to do so; and reiterates its appreciation to the Government of Germany for its contributions.

**Programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015:** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2013/6 & Corr.1 & Add. 1, 2 and 3) was referred to the SBI by the COP and CMP, and first taken up by the SBI on Monday, 11 November, and subsequently in a contact group chaired by SBI Vice-Chair Robert van Lierop (St. Kitts and Nevis), and bilateral consultations. In its closing plenary on Sunday, 17 November, the SBI agreed to recommend that COP 19 and CMP 9 further consider this matter and forward the draft decision as an annex to the SBI conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2013/L.22). Many developed countries stressed that the draft decision did not reflect the full range of proposals. In the COP/CMP informal stocktaking plenary on Wednesday, 20 November, COP President Korolec reported that consultations had not yielded results and that Tosi Mpanu Mpanu (Democratic Republic of the Congo) and van Lierop would undertake further consultations. In the COP and CMP plenaries on Saturday, 23 November, the COP and the CMP adopted the decisions.

**Final Outcome:** In its decision (FCCC/CP/2013/L.7), the COP, *inter alia*:

- approves the programme budget for the biennium 2014-15;

- notes that the approved programme budget includes additional provisions for undertaking activities to enhance the implementation of existing and new mandates;
- emphasizes the need to further save costs by using Bonn as the principal venue for meetings;
- urges parties to make voluntary contributions; and
- requests the Executive Secretary to report to COP 20 on income and budget performance.

In its decision (FCCC/KP/CMP/2013/L.9), the CMP, *inter alia*:

- endorses the COP 19 decision (FCCC/CP/2013/L.7) on the programme budget for 2014-15;
- takes note of the financing requirements for the CDM and JI proposed by the CDM Executive Board and JI Supervisory Committee; and
- approves the budget for the international transaction log for 2014-15.

**Privileges and immunities for individuals serving on constituted bodies established under the Kyoto Protocol:** This issue was taken up by the SBI in plenary on 11 November, and delegates decided to defer it to SB 40.

**OTHER MATTERS: Expert Review Process under Article 8 of the Protocol for the First Commitment Period:** The issue was taken up by the SBI on 11 November, and subsequently in a contact group facilitated by Gerhard Loibl (Austria) and Thelma Krug (Brazil). In plenary on 17 November, the G-77/China stressed the information is relevant for the ADP negotiations, calling for a date for the completion of the review. The EU, supported by the Russian Federation, Australia and others, described this as a technical matter and said information will be available by mid-2014. SBI Chair Chruszczow noted that he will report to the COP President and ask him to decide whether to further consult parties on this issue. The SBI adopted conclusions, including an annex containing a draft CMP decision.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2013/L.13), the SBI agrees to continue its consideration of the issue at SBI 40, with a view to preparing a draft decision for consideration and adoption at CMP 10, taking into account draft text contained in the annex to the conclusions.

**Gender and Climate Change:** This item (FCCC/KP/2013/4 and MISC.2) was taken up by the SBI on 11 November, and subsequently in a contact group and bilateral consultations facilitated by Lilian Portillo (Paraguay) and Georg Borsting (Norway). The SBI adopted conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2013/L.16), which contain an annex with proposals by parties on ways to enhance gender balance in the UNFCCC process.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2013/L.16), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- agrees to consider ways that gender balance, gender-sensitive climate policy and the effective participation of women in the work of bodies under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol could be strengthened;
- agrees to continue to work under this agenda item at SBI 41;
- encourages parties that are eligible for funding from the Trust Fund for Participation in the UNFCCC Process to nominate delegates of both genders for such funding;

- encourages international and regional organizations to further develop additional tools, knowledge, research and strategies for implementing gender-sensitive and responsive climate policy at the international, regional and country-driven approach at the national level; and
- encourages international and regional organizations, when conducting capacity-building activities, to consider gender balance and encourage the participation of female delegates who are participating in the UNFCCC process.

**Article 6 of the Convention:** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2013/13) was taken up briefly by the SBI on 11 November. Interested parties consulted informally, and it was agreed the SBI Chair would draft conclusions on the report. In its closing plenary on 17 November, the SBI adopted conclusions. On 22 November, the COP took note of the conclusions.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2013/L.21), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- welcomes progress made in implementation of the article through the adoption of the Doha work programme and establishment of the Dialogue on Article 6 of the Convention;
- recalls COP 18 Decision 15 (on gender);
- invites other intergovernmental organizations to enhance their efforts to support parties and stakeholders in implementing the Doha work programme;
- concludes that the second dialogue will be convened during SBI 40, which will also consider subsequent meetings;
- recalls the request contained in COP 18 Decision 15 for parties to report on activities and policies implementing Article 6 in their national communications and other reports; and
- requests the Secretariat to prepare summary reports of the Dialogue, and a report on good practices of stakeholder participation in implementing Article 6.

**CLOSING PLENARY:** Parties delivered their closing statements on Saturday, 16 November. For more details, see <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12589e.html>. SBI 39 adopted its report on Monday, 18 November (FCCC/SBI/2013/L.1). Chair Chruszczow closed the meeting at 12:19 pm.

### **SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE**

SBSTA 37 opened on Monday, 11 November, with Richard Muyungi (Tanzania) as Chair. The SBSTA plenary adopted conclusions on Sunday, 17 November. This section summarizes COP/CMP negotiations and outcomes on issues referred to the SBSTA.

**ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS:** On the agenda (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/4), SBSTA Chair Muyungi proposed including a new sub-item on clarification of the text in section G, Article 3.7 *ter* of the Doha Amendment under the item on methodological issues under the Protocol. Parties agreed, adopting the agenda and agreeing to the organization of work. The SBSTA also agreed that parties submit their opening statements to the Secretariat for posting online.

**NAIROBI WORK PROGRAMME:** This item (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/INF.6 and FCCC/TP/2013/11) was first considered by the SBSTA on 11 November, and subsequently in informal consultations, co-facilitated by Don Lemmen (Canada) and Juan

Hoffmaister (Bolivia). In plenary on 16 November, the SBSTA adopted conclusions and a draft COP decision. The COP adopted the decision on 22 November.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.34) the SBSTA:

- welcomes submissions from parties and relevant organizations on ways to enhance the relevance of, and support the objective of, the Nairobi Work Programme (NWP); and
- recalls its request for the Secretariat to organize a technical expert meeting on best practices and available tools for the use of indigenous and traditional knowledge and practices for adaptation, and the application of gender-sensitive approaches and tools for understanding and assessing impacts, vulnerability and adaptation to climate change, to be carried out in conjunction with the Adaptation Committee's workshop on best practices and needs of local and indigenous communities;
- invites parties and NWP partner organizations to submit to the Secretariat by 20 August 2014, information on good practices in, and lessons learned from, national adaptation planning; and
- requests the Secretariat to compile these submissions for SBSTA 41.

In its decision (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.34/Add.1), the COP *inter alia*:

- decides to continue the NWP, addressing the knowledge needs arising from, *inter alia*, the Cancun Adaptation Framework and other relevant workstreams and bodies under the Convention and the knowledge needs identified by parties;
- decides that the relevance of the NWP should be enhanced on the basis of, *inter alia*: activities that build upon each other and are linked to issues that are practical and engage adaptation practitioners; development of linkages with other relevant workstreams, including the NAPs process, research and systematic observation, and with bodies under the Conventions, including the Adaptation Committee, the LEG and the Technology Mechanism; development of knowledge products to improve the understanding and assessment of impacts, vulnerability and adaptation in response to needs identified by parties; and support for the effective dissemination of knowledge products at all levels through, *inter alia*, knowledge networks and national focal points, particularly in developing countries;
- recognizes that the effectiveness of the modalities of the NWP should be enhanced, including through: the improvement of the relevance and dissemination of knowledge products; improved approaches to engage and collaborate with NWP partner organizations, adaptation practitioners and experts, including regional centers and networks; and further development of the NWP Focal Point Forum;
- requests SBSTA to consider ways to enhance the effectiveness of these modalities at SBSTA 40;
- requests SBSTA to consider, *inter alia*, ecosystems, human settlements, water resources and health;
- requests SBSTA 41 to discuss issues under the NWP;
- decides that activities under the NWP should integrate gender issues, indigenous and traditional knowledge and the role of and impacts on ecosystems;

- invites the Adaptation Committee, in accordance with its mandate and functions, to provide further recommendations for activities to be undertaken by the NWP; and
- requests the SBSTA: to consider and further elaborate additional activities at SBSTA 40; take stock of progress on the implementation at SBSTA 44; and review the NWP with a view to further improve its relevance and effectiveness at SBSTA 48.

**ADAPTATION COMMITTEE'S REPORT:** These joint SBI/SBSTA discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item on the Adaptation Committee's report (see page 17).

**METHODOLOGICAL GUIDANCE FOR REDD+:** This issue was first addressed in the SBSTA plenary on 11 November. Chair Muyungi recalled that SBSTA 38 had recommended the adoption of three draft COP decisions (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.12/Add.1, 2 & 3) on: the timing and the frequency of presentations of the summary of information on how all safeguards are being addressed and respected; modalities for national forest monitoring systems; and the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation. SBSTA 38 had also prepared elements of two draft COP decisions (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.12) on MRV modalities; and guidelines and procedures for the technical assessment of submissions from parties on proposed forest reference emission levels and/or forest reference levels. These issues were further discussed in a contact group co-chaired by Peter Graham (Canada) and Robert Kofi Bamfo (Ghana).

On Saturday, 16 November, the SBSTA adopted conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.33); and two draft COP decisions (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.33/Add.1 & Add.2) on MRV modalities; and guidelines and procedures for the technical assessment of submissions from parties on proposed forest reference emission levels and/or forest reference levels.

On 22 November the COP plenary adopted all decisions. The Philippines, supported by Australia, for the Umbrella Group, Bolivia, Brazil, Mexico, for Environmental Integrity Group, and the EU, highlighted: that the reference to "livelihoods" in the decision on the drivers of deforestation should not be interpreted so as to mean that indigenous peoples are the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation; and that when addressing the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation traditional livelihoods of indigenous peoples should not be negatively affected. President Korolec invited delegates to adopt the decision with the understanding suggested by the Philippines and supported by others. He said all decisions on REDD+ adopted at COP 19, including those on finance and institutional arrangements, will be called the "Warsaw REDD+ Framework."

**Final Outcome:** On modalities for national forest monitoring systems (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.12/Add.1) the COP, *inter alia*, decides that:

- the development of parties' national forest monitoring systems for the monitoring and reporting of REDD+ activities should take into account the guidance in decision 4/CP.15 and be guided by the most recent IPCC guidance and guidelines; and
- robust national forest monitoring systems should provide data and information that are transparent, consistent over time, and suitable for MRV anthropogenic forest-related emissions by sources and removals by sinks, forest carbon stocks, and

forest carbon stock and forest-area changes resulting from the implementation of REDD+ activities.

On the timing and the frequency of presentations of the summary of information on how safeguards are addressed and respected (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.12/Add.2), the COP, *inter alia*, decides that:

- developing country parties should start providing the summary of information in their national communication or communication channel, including via the web platform of the UNFCCC, after the start of the implementation of REDD+ activities; and
- the frequency of subsequent presentations of the summary of information should be consistent with the provisions for submissions of national communications from non-Annex I parties.

On the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.12/Add.3), the COP, *inter alia*, encourages parties, organizations and the private sector to take action to reduce the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, and to continue their work to address the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation and share the results of their work.

On MRV modalities (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.33/Add.2), the COP, *inter alia*, decides that:

- MRV is to be consistent with guidance provided in decision 4/CP.15;
- the data and information used by parties in the estimation of anthropogenic forest-related emissions should be transparent, and consistent over time and with the established forest reference emission levels and/or forest reference levels; and
- data and information should be provided through the biennial update reports by parties.

On forest reference emission levels and/or forest reference levels (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.33/Add.1), the COP, *inter alia*:

- adopts the guidelines and procedures for the technical assessment of submissions from parties on proposed forest reference emission levels and/or forest reference levels; and
- requests the Secretariat to prepare a synthesis report on the technical assessment process, for consideration by the SBSTA.

**COORDINATION OF SUPPORT FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTIVITIES IN RELATION TO MITIGATION ACTIONS IN THE FOREST SECTOR BY DEVELOPING COUNTRIES:** These joint SBI/SBSTA discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item on coordination of support for the implementation of activities in relation to mitigation actions in the forest sector by developing countries (see page 16).

**TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER AND TECHNOLOGY MECHANISM: Joint annual report of the TEC and CTCN:** These joint SBI/SBSTA discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item on the joint annual report of the TEC and CTCN (see page 19).

**Modalities and procedures of the CTCN and its Advisory Board:** These joint SBI/SBSTA discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item on the modalities and procedures of the CTCN and its Advisory Board (see page 19).

**Third synthesis report on technology needs identified by Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention:** This item (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/INF.7) was first taken up by the SBSTA on 11 November. A contact group, held with the SBI, co-chaired by Majid Al Suwaidi (United Arab Emirates) and Stig Svenningsen (Norway), considered this item throughout the week. On 16 November, the SBSTA adopted its conclusions.

**Final Outcome:** In its final conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.27), the SBSTA welcomes the information provided in the third synthesis report on technology needs identified by non-Annex I parties and agrees to continue its consideration of the report at SBSTA 40.

**RESEARCH AND SYSTEMATIC OBSERVATION:** This agenda item was addressed in plenary on 11 November.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.25) the SBSTA:

- notes the statements delivered by the representatives of the IPCC, the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) and the Global Climate Observing System (GCOS), and the WMO information on the developments regarding the implementation of the Global Framework for Climate Services (GFCS) and the first session of the Intergovernmental Board on Climate Services (IBCS);
- invites WMO to provide, at SBSTA 41, information on the second session of the IBCS;
- notes the information by GCOS on its recent and planned activities and the role of GCOS;
- emphasizes the continued need to secure funding to meet the needs for global climate observations under the Convention on a long-term basis;
- welcomes the contribution of Working Group (WG) I to the IPCC's Fifth Assessment Report (AR5) and noted the future release of the contributions of WG II and III to the AR5, and the AR5;
- emphasizes the importance of systematic observation for the UNFCCC process, including for decision making on adaptation;
- notes that there are still gaps in critical observational data, and urges parties and relevant organizations to enhance capacity, collaboration and coordination in this area; and
- notes that a workshop on systematic observation, organized in collaboration with GCOS and its sponsors, could help to identify ways to strengthen systematic observation.

**RESPONSE MEASURES: Forum and work programme:** These joint SBI/SBSTA discussions are summarized under the SBI item on forum and work programme (see page 20).

**Protocol Article 2.3:** These joint SBI/SBSTA discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item on Protocol Article 3.14 (see page 20).

**ISSUES RELATED TO AGRICULTURE:** This issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/MISC.17, Add.1 and 2) was first discussed on 11 and 13 November in plenary. A workshop on the current state of scientific knowledge on how to enhance the adaptation of agriculture to climate change impacts was held on 12 November, co-facilitated by Hans Åke Nilsagård (Sweden) and Selam Kidane Abebe (Ethiopia). For more details, see <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12585e.html>.

During the SBSTA opening plenary, SBSTA Chair Muyungi proposed establishing a contact group. Several developing countries opposed this, explaining that parties only agreed to hold a workshop while several developed country parties supported a contact group. On Wednesday, 13 November, Chair Muyungi reported that his informal consultations on whether or not to convene a contact group yielded agreement to consider at SBSTA 40 the Secretariat's report on the workshop, as well as submissions by parties and observer organizations, and not to convene a contact group. The SBSTA agreed to these conclusions.

On 16 November, the SBSTA adopted conclusions. A group of developed countries expressed concern over the lack of discussions on agriculture and with the way the conclusions were adopted. They called for SBSTA 40 to build on areas of commonality. Other developed countries also expressed regret that no contact group was established and the submissions were not considered at SBSTA 39. Many developing countries supported the way the conclusions were adopted, noting the procedures were correctly applied, and emphasized the role of agriculture in adaptation.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.35) the SBSTA acknowledges parties exchange of views during the in-session workshop and agrees to consider at SBSTA 40 the report of the in-session workshop and the views submitted by parties and observer organizations.

**METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES UNDER THE CONVENTION: Work programme on the revision of guidelines for the review of biennial reports and national communications, including inventory reviews, for developed countries:** This issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/INF.5 and FCCC/SBSTA/2013/INF.14) was first addressed on 11 November, where Chair Muyungi reminded delegates of progress made at SBSTA 38 and established a contact group co-chaired by Rittaa Pipatti (Finland) and Qiang Liu (China). Delegates completed the revision of the review guidelines for biennial reports and national communications, and agreed to complete the work on the revision of the review guidelines for GHG inventories by COP 20. This work programme will continue in 2014. The SBSTA adopted conclusions and a draft COP decision. On 22 November, the COP plenary adopted the decision.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.32) the SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- invites parties to submit by 19 February 2014, detailed views on the structure, outline, key elements, including the purpose and scope of the review, timing and reporting, and content of the review guidelines for GHG inventories for Annex I parties;
- requests the Secretariat to prepare, by 26 March 2014, a synthesis report on those views and a draft of the revised review guidelines for GHGs as inputs for the second technical workshop to be held in April 2014;
- agrees that parties should take into account the need to have a cost-effective, efficient and practical review process that does not impose an excessive burden on parties, experts or the Secretariat;
- agrees that the work programme should be adjusted; and

- requests the Secretariat to organize an additional technical workshop in the second half of 2014.
- In its decision (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.32/Add.1), the COP:
- adopts guidelines for the technical review of information reported under the Convention related to GHG inventories, biennial reports and national communications by Annex I parties; and
  - decides to use the guidelines for the review of the first biennial reports and of the sixth national communications starting in 2014.

**General guidelines for domestic MRV of domestically supported NAMAs by developing countries:** This issue was first addressed on 11 November, and subsequently in a contact group co-chaired by Sarah Kuen (Belgium) and Qiang Liu (China). The SBSTA adopted conclusions and a draft COP decision. On 22 November, the COP adopted the decision.

**Final Outcome:** In its decision (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.28), the COP:

- adopts the general guidelines for domestic MRV of domestically supported NAMAs by developing countries;
- invites developing country parties to use the guidelines on a voluntary basis; and
- encourages developed country parties to support interested developing country parties.

**Revision of UNFCCC reporting guidelines on Annex I annual inventories:** This issue was first addressed on 11 November, and subsequently in a contact group co-chaired by Rittaa Pipatti (Finland) and George Wamukoya (Swaziland). The SBSTA adopted conclusions and a draft COP decision. On, 22 November, the COP adopted the decision.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.29) the SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- welcomes the timely completion of the work of the IPCC on the supplementary guidance on wetlands, and takes note of views submitted by parties on how to reflect the guidance;
  - agrees that Annex I parties need more time to consider the full scope of the guidance and to continue discussions at SBSTA 46 to further explore the use of the guidance, and invites parties to submit to the Secretariat, by March 2017, information on their experience in the use of the guidance; and
  - agrees to further discuss the reporting of carbon dioxide emissions/removals relating to harvested wood products, and to continue such discussions at SBSTA 46.
- In its decision (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.29/Add.1), the COP:
- adopts revised guidelines for the preparation of national communications by Annex I parties, Part I, including: UNFCCC reporting guidelines on annual GHG inventories; revised common reporting format tables; and global warming potential values;
  - decides that the guidelines have to be used for the preparation of Annex I parties' inventories beginning in 2015, provided the Secretariat makes the CRF Reporter available by June 2014; and
  - encourages Annex I parties to use the IPCC 2013 Supplement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National GHG Inventories: Wetlands.

**GHG data interface:** This item was first considered on 11 November and taken up in informal consultations, facilitated by Diana Harutyunyan (Armenia) throughout the week. On 16 November, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.23) the SBSTA: recalls its request to the Secretariat at SBSTA 38 to implement any technical changes to the interface should the revised "Guidelines for the preparation of national communications by Parties included in Annex I to the Convention, Part I: UNFCCC reporting guidelines on annual greenhouse gas inventories" be adopted at COP 19; and agreed to consider matters relating to the further development of the interface at SBSTA 43.

**Annual report on the technical review of GHG inventories from Annex I Parties:** This issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/INF.8) was first addressed in on 11 November. The SBSTA took note of the report.

**Bunker fuels:** The issue was taken up briefly in plenary on 11 November, with the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) and the International Maritime Organization (IMO) reporting on relevant work (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/MISC.20). Cuba, on behalf of a number of developing countries, said measures taken to combat climate change, including unilateral ones, should not constitute a means of arbitrary or unjustifiable discrimination or a disguised restriction on international trade. China welcomed ICAO's "reaffirmation" of CBDR and stated that IMO recognizes the principles of the UNFCCC, including CBDR. The Republic of Korea expressed concern over unilateral approaches to aviation and stated that emissions from shipping should be considered under the IMO.

Japan underlined that the principle of non-discrimination in the Chicago Convention on International Civil Aviation conflicts with CBDR, and said the former should guide the aviation sector. She said CBDR is not appropriate for the shipping industry because of the complex registration of vessels. Singapore, supported by Panama, called ICAO and IMO the "most competent" bodies to address emissions in their respective sectors.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.22) the SBSTA takes note of the report, notes views expressed by parties on this information, and invites the ICAO and IMO Secretariats to continue to report at future SBSTA sessions.

**METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES UNDER THE PROTOCOL: Implications of the implementation of decisions 2/CMP.7 to 4/CMP.7 and 1/CMP.8:** This issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/INF.3, FCCC/SBSTA/2013/INF.15 and FCCC/TP/2013/9) was first addressed on 11 November, and subsequently in a contact group co-chaired by Nagmeldin Elhassan (Sudan) and Anke Herold (Germany). The SBSTA was not able to conclude its work on this issue and agreed to invite the CMP to consider a draft text containing elements of a draft decision (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.31). For the final outcome and discussion on this item, please see the CMP section on Clarification of the text in section G (Article 3 Paragraph 7 *ter*) of the Doha Amendment to the Kyoto Protocol (see page 9).

**LULUCF under Protocol Articles 3.3 and 3.4, and under the CDM:** The issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/MISC.18 and 19) was briefly taken up by the SBSTA in plenary on 11 November, and in informal consultations co-chaired by Marcelo Rocha (Brazil) and Lucia Perugini (Italy). On Sunday, 17 November, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.26) the SBSTA, *inter alia*: takes note of the views submitted by parties and observer organizations (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/MISC.18 & 19); agrees to continue in SBSTA 40 consideration of modalities and procedures for possible additional LULUCF activities under the CDM; requests the Secretariat to prepare a technical paper and organize a workshop; and agrees to continue, at SBSTA 40, consideration of issues under the work programmes on more comprehensive accounting and additionality.

**HCFC-22 and HFC-23:** The SBSTA first took up this issue on 11 November in plenary, and subsequently in informal consultations facilitated by Jeffery Spooner (Jamaica) and Ulrika Raab (Sweden). In plenary on 16 November, the SBSTA adopted conclusions and a draft CMP decision. On Friday, 22 November, the CMP adopted the decision.

**Final Outcomes:** In the conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.24), the SBSTA concludes its consideration of these issues.

In its decision (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.24/Add.1), the CMP:

- recognizes the work of the SBSTA, the information collected through submissions by parties and document FCCC/TP/2011/2;
- notes that the SBSTA has deliberated on the implications of the establishment of new hydrochlorofluorocarbon-22 (HCFC-22) facilities seeking to obtain CERs for the destruction of hydrofluorocarbon-23 (HFC-23) and the means to address such implications; and
- completes its consideration of this agenda item.

**ANNUAL REPORT ON TECHNICAL REVIEW OF ANNEX I GHG INVENTORIES AND OTHER INFORMATION UNDER PROTOCOL ARTICLE 7.1:**

**Clarification of text in section G, Protocol Article 3.7 *ter* of the Doha Amendment to the Protocol:** Discussions under this item are summarized under CMP agenda item on clarification of the text in section G, Protocol Article 3.7 *ter* of the Doha Amendment to the Kyoto Protocol (see page 9).

**MARKET AND NON-MARKET MECHANISMS UNDER THE CONVENTION: Framework for various approaches:** This item (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/INF.11 & FCCC/TP/2013/5) was considered on Monday, 11 November. SBSTA agreed to continue consideration of this issue at SBSTA 40.

**Non-market-based approaches:** This item (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/INF.12) was considered on Monday, 11 November. SBSTA agreed to continue consideration of this issue at SBSTA 40.

**New market-based mechanism:** This item (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/INF.13 & FCCC/TP/2013/6) was considered on Monday, 11 November. SBSTA agreed to continue consideration of this issue at SBSTA 40.

**2013-2015 REVIEW:** These joint SBI/SBSTA discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item on the 2013-2015 Review (see page 20).

**WORK PROGRAMME ON CLARIFICATION OF DEVELOPED COUNTRY QUANTIFIED ECONOMY-WIDE EMISSION REDUCTION TARGETS:** This issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/INF.10 and FCCC/TP/2013/7) was first addressed on 11 November, and subsequently in a contact group co-chaired by Karine Hertzberg (Norway) and Brian Matlana (South Africa). SBSTA adopted conclusions that indicate that this work programme will continue in 2014, and a draft COP decision. The COP adopted the decision on 22 November.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.30) the SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- acknowledges a convergence in the coverage of sectors and gases and use of global warming potential values among developed countries regarding the identification of common elements for measuring progress as per Decision 2/CP.17, paragraph 5, and acknowledges that the identification of common elements will contribute to measuring comparability of efforts among developed countries; and
- agrees to undertake further work in 2014 on identifying common elements, referred to in Decision 2/CP.17, paragraph 5, including under the work programme on clarification of quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets of developed country parties, requesting: in-session expert meetings and technical briefings, and an update on document FCCC/TP/2013/7.

In the addendum to its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.30/Add.1), the SBSTA: takes note of: a SBSTA event and report on quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets; the technical briefing on LULUCF reporting; and a technical paper on quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets by developed country parties.

**OTHER MATTERS: Brazilian proposal:** This issue was first taken up on Monday, 11 November, and considered in informal consultations facilitated by SBSTA Chair Muyungi.

During the SBSTA's consideration of the Brazilian proposal to address the development by the IPCC of a reference methodology on historical responsibilities to guide domestic consultations for the 2015 agreement, the US, supported by the EU, Australia, Switzerland, Canada, New Zealand, Norway and Israel, opposed consideration of this issue, whereas Venezuela, India, Cuba, China, Bolivia and Saudi Arabia supported it. BASIC welcomed the Brazilian proposal.

During the SBSTA plenary on 13 November, the G-77/China endorsed the Brazilian proposal and requested that it be considered in a contact group. Parties continued to consult informally but were unable to reach consensus. The G-77/China, supported by Venezuela, Bolivia, India, Nicaragua, Argentina, Malaysia and the Philippines, lamented that no strong signal will be sent from Warsaw on objective and science-based information on historical responsibilities. Brazil regretted that the IPCC has not been requested to provide this information.

Switzerland highlighted scientific information that includes not only historical contributions, but capacity, as well as current and future emissions. The EU identified the need for domestic consultations on commitments in the 2015 agreement based on a broad range of indicators, including past, current and future emissions, and different capabilities.

**CLOSING PLENARY:** SBSTA 39 adopted its report (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.21) on Sunday, 17 November. Parties made closing statements and asked for them to be made available on the UNFCCC website. Australia, for Japan, Canada, Australia and the US, noted that SBSTA's consideration of the joint annual report of the TEC and CTCN was not completed at this session and should be considered at SBSTA 40. Chair Muyungi thanked delegates and closed the meeting at 2:56 am.

### JOINT COP/CMP CLOSING PLENARY

The joint COP/CMP closing plenary took place in the evening of Saturday, 23 November. Referring to running a marathon, COP19 President Korolec expressed satisfaction with having reached the finish line with results "one can be proud of."

Australia, for the Umbrella Group, thanked the presidency for conducting a party-driven process leading to agreement among all groups building on Durban and Doha.

India highlighted equity as an absolute and inalienable right that "cannot be equated with, and is far beyond, fairness."

Fiji, for the G-77/China, thanked the COP President for delivering transparency, inclusiveness, solidarity and efficiency, as promised.

Highlighting "good overall progress" in Warsaw, the EU hailed COP 19 as the biggest advance on REDD+ since Cancun, expressing, however, disappointment that outstanding technical questions concerning the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol could not be solved.

Expressing satisfaction with the establishment of the Warsaw international mechanism on loss and damage, Nauru, for AOSIS, lamented that a "catastrophic ambition gap" remains, emphasizing the need to raise the level of finance and calling on the world's leading experts to join efforts with the AOSIS workstream 2 plan launched under the ADP in Warsaw.

Thanking the President for "maintaining" transparency and welcoming the establishment of the Warsaw international mechanism on loss and damage, Nepal, for the LDCs, lamented lack of progress on, *inter alia*, LTF and IPRs, and called for an acceleration in negotiations under the ADP.

Swaziland, for the African Group, called on Annex I parties to ratify the Doha Amendment, expressing: disappointment with lack of progress under CMP agenda items 5, 7 and 8, and failure to improve the CDM; and concern over proposal to include the CDM in a new market mechanism.

Expressing satisfaction with the establishment of the Warsaw international mechanism on loss and damage, Panama, for the Central American Integration System (SICA), called for: strengthening developed country parties' commitments; bridging the gap and increasing ambitions before 2020; and replenishing the GCF.

Lamenting lack of ambition, Mexico emphasized its national efforts irrespective of an international agreement, and the need to take action "without bargaining with the future of our planet."

Australia informed that its participation in the COP 19 decisions does not indicate acceptance of provisions in paragraph 7 (urging developed countries to maintain and increase public climate finance) in the decision on LTF (FCCC/CP/2013/L.13) and in paragraphs 13-14 (ambitious and timely contributions to enable the operationalization of the GCF, including initial

resource mobilization) in the decision on the report of and guidance to the GCF (FCCC/CP/2013/L.12). Canada clarified it understands paragraph 13 of this same decision refers to a collective contribution by developed countries and that countries may also provide finance through other channels. He expressed commitment to the goal of jointly mobilizing, from a wide variety of finance sources, US\$100 billion annually by 2020.

Environmental NGOs lamented a weak outcome, insufficient to close the emissions gap and lacking clear agreement on the roadmap to the 2015 agreement. YOUNGOs urged applying the principle of intergenerational equity in the 2015 agreement.

### A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF THE WARSAW CLIMATE CHANGE CONFERENCE

*"We're on a road to nowhere*

*Come on inside"*

- Talking Heads

Last year, Typhoon Bopha ravaged the Philippines during the Doha Climate Change Conference, prompting the Philippines' Naderev Saño to ask "If not us, then who? If not now, then when? If not here, then where?" A year later, the Warsaw Climate Change Conference opened as Supertyphoon Haiyan, the strongest storm to ever make landfall, ravaged the Philippines yet again and Saño chose actions over words, undertaking a voluntary fast, joined by over 200 supporters, until a meaningful outcome was reached in Warsaw. The fast, the supertyphoon, and the many marches and protests, became touchstones of the urgency of climate action, backed by alarms sounded by the scientific community leading up to COP 19.

Heading into Warsaw, the scientific community issued a "clarion call" that climate change is unequivocal and its effects are evident in many parts of the world, including flooding in the Middle East and Europe, and prolonged droughts in the US and Australia. Two months before the COP, IPCC Working Group I concluded that human influence on the climate system is clear and limiting climate change will require substantial and sustained reductions of GHG emissions. The World Meteorological Organization confirmed that 2013 has been among the top ten warmest years on record and that melting ice caps and glaciers, in part, brought global sea level to a new record high.

While these reports outlined the already-evident effects of climate change, others showed how paltry the international response currently is. The UNEP Emissions Gap Report showed an increase in emissions in 2013, noting that the opportunities for reaching the 2°C goal are closing and warning against the costs of inaction.

Against this backdrop of urgency—for ambitious mitigation, earnest adaptation, and resolute efforts on loss and damage—COP 19 convened in Warsaw. In striking contrast to reality on the ground and in the atmosphere, a sense of resolve was notably absent at the Warsaw National Stadium, the venue for the conference. Halfway along the road between Durban and Paris, this brief analysis takes stock of the COP's ability to fulfill expectations, the ADP's progress towards a 2015 agreement and enhancing pre-2020 ambition, and the UNFCCC's ability as a process to respond to the grave challenge posed by the changing climate.

## MODEST EXPECTATIONS FOR A STOP ALONG THE ROAD

Before the opening of the conference, many expected Warsaw to be a “Finance COP,” or an “Implementation COP.” Yet, by the end of the meeting, those wondering if COP 19 could be a “REDD+ COP” were ultimately proven correct. Parties approved a package of decisions, heralded by many as an overdue success, creating the Warsaw Framework for REDD+ that addresses a series of methodological questions, institutional arrangements and results-based finance. COP 19 also reached relatively timid decisions on some issues, such as long-term finance, and loss and damage.

At COP 19, financial issues proved thorny, ultimately tied to diminishing trust among parties in the climate process. Pledges made in Warsaw, including US\$40 million by the Republic of Korea to the Green Climate Fund (GCF) and US\$72.5 million by seven European governments to the Adaptation Fund, were insufficient to build confidence among developing countries that the 2009 promise of US\$100 billion per year by 2020 would be realized. Developing countries point to the fact that climate finance pledged through multilateral funds decreased by 71% in the last year, and the GCF contains only US\$6.9 million donated by only ten countries. With the GCF in large part still an “empty shell,” many developing countries worried that pledges would not materialize into actual deposits to realize the 2020 goal. Thus far, developed countries have explained that their finance ministers are leery of sending funds to an institution lacking finalized operating procedures. In Warsaw, with the operationalization of the GCF, several developed countries expressed willingness to pledge, yet the pledges did not necessarily raise developing countries’ confidence that the funds will actually materialize.

Another key COP 19 agenda item, loss and damage, was also unable to restore developing countries’ confidence that the UNFCCC process can meet their expectations. Last year in Doha, it was agreed that COP 19 would establish “institutional arrangements, such as an international mechanism,” to address loss and damage in countries that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change, and elaborate its functions and modalities in accordance with the role of the Convention. This issue proved to be one of the most contentious of the conference.

Loss and damage results from slow onset or extreme weather events that cannot be prevented by even the most ambitious mitigation action. Due to the extreme, and sometimes permanent, nature of the damage and losses involved, loss and damage cannot be adequately addressed through adaptation either. For developing countries, particularly members of AOSIS and the African Group, it was therefore crucial that the mechanism’s specific functions and modalities include provision of support and that funding for actions on loss and damage come from a dedicated source separate from adaptation finance. Conversely, developed countries repeatedly emphasized that, as part of the Cancun Adaptation Framework, arrangements on loss and damage should not duplicate or add layers to the existing institutional framework.

In the end, agreement was only reached during the closing plenary, with the G-77/China squeezing in last-minute amendments in a final attempt to distinguish loss and damage from adaptation, even if only in the preamble. Building to a large extent on the Doha decision, the new Warsaw international mechanism provides for enhancing knowledge, action and support for loss and damage, as well as strengthening dialogue among relevant stakeholders. Yet it merely “requests” developed countries to provide developing countries with financial support. Provisions on the 2016 review of the mechanism’s structure, mandate and effectiveness came as a last-ditch effort by developing countries to get a better deal; however, with three more years to go before the review could potentially strengthen the mechanism, it could be a case of too little, too late for those already suffering from climate change-related loss and damage.

While parties found minimal agreement on finance and loss and damage, they were unable to achieve consensus on other key issues, including markets, agriculture, response measures, and Articles 5, 7 and 8 (methodological issues under Protocol). A standout among these issues was work related to non-market-based approaches, the new market mechanism and the framework for various approaches, which seek to elaborate common rules for all mitigation efforts, market and non-market based, to ensure environmental integrity. COP 19 inherited the politically difficult issues of markets from the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action. Developed countries point to the need for a variety of tools, such as market mechanisms, to “stretch” their ambition. Developing countries, however, have a fundamentally different view, pointing to sputtering carbon markets and low prices for carbon credits as proof of the need for greater mitigation ambition. Despite the COP President’s attempt to intercede during the second week and find a way forward on the issue, parties could not reach agreement, finally forwarding this highly political issue to its technical body to address next year.

Amid what many called “mixed” or “disappointing” results, REDD+ stood out as perhaps a singular achievement. After eight years of negotiations, and extra time allotted to negotiate technical REDD+ issues in June, parties finally completed a package agreement. Still, institutional arrangements and finance proved difficult. Both institutional and financial issues had to contend with the myriad of REDD+ initiatives and projects currently underway outside the UNFCCC process. While negotiators worked for years to secure common MRV guidance and financial arrangements, a multitude of bilateral and multilateral, public and private initiatives sprung up. Various parties and other stakeholders were already invested with a particular set of arrangements and unwilling to shift midway through their REDD+ process, which weakened the decisions on REDD+ institutional arrangements and finance. The institutional arrangements decision amounts to annual meetings between national focal points and funding agencies. The decision on finance creates yet another REDD+ information hub. It falls short of establishing the market mechanism envisioned by those who brought deforestation back to the UNFCCC agenda in 2005. Instead, it leans toward a fund-based approach, which could, by some estimates, require US\$30 billion annually.

Aside from the relative success of the REDD+ package, COP 19 really did not even meet its modest expectations. For some, solely meeting the bare minimum was a further sign of increasingly diminishing confidence in the process, as issues of trust among parties led to sober reflections on the process itself.

### **CONDUCTING A PROCEDURAL DIAGNOSTIC: GREASING A SQUEAKING WHEEL**

Since Copenhagen, concerns over transparency and process have cast a shadow over the UNFCCC. The need to rebuild both trust among parties and legitimacy of the process is dire. To some extent, more transparent and inclusive talks in Cancun and the Durban “indabas” did manage to restore a certain degree of confidence. Yet, acrimonious discussions returned again in Warsaw as the fragile feeling of trust dissipated. Developing countries complained of “broken promises” and made desperate calls for implementing agreed commitments on finance, while mutual accusations of backtracking were thrown around. Some controversial statements made during a press conference sparked a finger-pointing session between the Like-Minded Developing Countries (LMDCs) and the EU, which some even described as “negotiating through the media.” With trust issues like these, the road to Paris is likely to be a bumpy one.

Procedural trepidations, too, never truly left the process. In Cancun, COP President Patricia Espinosa gavelled through the adoption of the Cancun Agreements despite Bolivia’s opposition, leaving many to ponder the meaning of consensus. Just two years later, COP President Abdullah bin Hamad Al-Attiyah gavelled through the adoption of the Doha Amendment notwithstanding Russia’s raised flag. This caused Russia to demand that decision-making be put on the SBI agenda, which resulted in a procedural impasse last June when the SBI was unable to begin its work for two weeks. Following protracted consultations immediately prior to the Warsaw conference, a new agenda item on decision-making in the UNFCCC was introduced under the COP, and informal open-ended consultations were launched. In these informal consultations, parties considered procedural issues that will shape their future discussions.

Although no formal outcome in the form of a COP decision was reached, the creation of a designated window for procedural discussions is significant. Parties appeared to be on the same wavelength on the timeliness of addressing the decision-making process perceived as flawed by many, and “cleaning house” before Paris. The task seems daunting, however, as numerous issues have been added to a laundry list dominated by an overarching concern over legitimacy of the process.

Anxieties surrounding transparency and inclusiveness versus efficiency and effectiveness; the roles of the COP President, the Secretariat and presiding officers; organization of high-level engagement as well as the process for achieving outcomes—all harking back to Copenhagen—have been haunting the UNFCCC process for years. And although COP President Marcin Korolec was hailed for conducting the process in a transparent and party-driven manner, many developing countries’ delegations were spread too thinly to be able to effectively follow the packed agenda. Late nights, too, continued to compromise transparency, efficiency and inclusiveness, which led some to wonder if all-

night negotiations could be some parties’ tactic, and to question their good faith.

The avoidance of package deals, too, engendered discussions. With the adoption of the rules of procedure nowhere in sight, package deals have, in the past, been the means to reach consensus. Yet, package deals often mean that parties are forced to accept compromises on issues that, if taken on their own, they would not agree to. During the informal stocktaking plenary on Saturday morning, COP President Korolec slipped up to mention “a package,” an eyebrow-raising comment he later retracted after the G-77/China and others sought reassurance that each decision would be considered on its face value. Other parties, however, seemed more comfortable with package-deal language. The outcomes of several COPs leading up to Warsaw have been the result of take-it-or-leave-it, not give-and-take, deals. Warsaw prudently showed caution on that front.

### **ADP: HALFWAY STOP ON THE ROAD TO NOWHERE?**

The main expectation for the ADP at COP 19 was to intensify work on the content of the 2015 agreement and on concrete outcomes on pre-2020 ambition, thereby instilling confidence that this process can deliver on both fronts. Despite the best efforts of the Co-Chairs, results were sparse.

The task to “develop a protocol, another legal instrument or an agreed outcome with legal force under the Convention applicable to all parties” by 2015 to enter into force by 2020, agreed in Durban, has become a touchstone of the UNFCCC’s ability to respond to the urgency of climate change. Progress toward a new agreement is one indication of whether the UNFCCC is still relevant and able to take the necessary action to combat climate change.

At the halfway mark to 2015, with just two years to go, parties seem far from delivering on their goal to complete a negotiating text at COP 20 in Lima.

It appears that the 2015 agreement is developing into a purely “bottom-up” arrangement, meaning that states delineate the extent and nature of their contributions. What seems to be lacking is top-down commitments and a pledge-and-review mechanism to assess the patchwork of national contributions to determine if they represent emission reductions substantial enough to stay within the 2°C target. The controversial reference to “intended nationally determined contributions” that would not prejudge their legal nature was introduced as an oral amendment in the final minutes of the ADP closing plenary. The term “contributions,” as opposed to “commitments,” represented a divide between developed countries and some developing countries, particularly the LMDCs. This effectively left fundamental issues, such as the legal nature of the 2015 agreement and the means to differentiate commitments in an agreement “applicable to all,” unresolved.

Differentiation is also side-stepped in the decision. Many developed and several developing countries supported a discussion on how differentiation could be reflected in the 2015 agreement, which, according to the Durban mandate, should be “applicable to all.” However, LMDCs are hesitant to revisit this issue and argue instead for any future agreement to reflect the Annex I/non-Annex I distinction. Developing countries supporting discussions on differentiation, such as AILAC, felt

their voices were drowned out by the rising visibility of the LMDCs as well as the acrimony between the EU and Venezuela, which became a distraction during the final days.

Revising differentiation in the 2015 agreement is a key demand of developed countries. Given fundamental changes in the global economy since 1992, some non-Annex I countries, such as the Republic of Korea, China, Brazil and India, are now economic powerhouses with associated increases in GHG emissions. For a long time, their argument for retaining Annex I/non-Annex I differentiation was rooted in their per capita emissions being much lower than those in developed countries and their right to sustainable development. Today, China, the world's largest emitter in absolute terms, also ranks on par with the EU in per capita terms, prompting those open to differentiation to note the need for the 2015 agreement to look at current and future emissions as those will amount to tomorrow's historical responsibilities.

Furthermore, several developed countries, currently holding the historical responsibilities for atmospheric concentrations of GHGs, have yet to embrace their leadership role, as evidenced by the gap between the slim pledges and implementation of commitments, and the cuts needed to keep global temperature rise below 2°C.

Meanwhile, pre-2020 mitigation ambition has been slow to emerge. Only four countries—Bangladesh, Barbados, Mauritius and the United Arab Emirates—have ratified the Doha Amendment, which needs 144 ratifications to enter into force. China and the EU did announce their intentions to ratify; however, even with all of the EU member states on board, a further 110 ratifications are needed. Thus, until the Doha Amendment enters into force, parties with quantified emissions limitation or reduction commitments (QELRCs), are not legally bound to fulfill them. Furthermore, the second commitment period covers only about 15% of global emissions, which makes it imperative that other countries contribute to the global mitigation effort if the global temperature goal of 2°C is to be achieved. The COP decision on “Further advancing the Durban Platform” contains no targets for 2020, merely urging states that have not communicated their quantified economy-wide emission reduction target, or nationally appropriate mitigation action, to do so. It further urges developed countries “to implement without delay” their quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets under the Convention, and QELRCs for the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol, if applicable.

If anything, the Warsaw COP saw pre-2020 mitigation ambition wane. For example, Japan, one of the few Annex I countries without a QELRC for the second commitment period, announced its new GHG emission reduction target during the first week of the COP. It has pledged to reduce its emissions by 3.8% compared to 2005 by 2020, which, if using 1990 as the base year, results in an increase of 3.1%, whereas under the Kyoto Protocol first commitment period, Japan was supposed to reduce its GHG emissions by 6% compared to 1990 levels.

The COP also decided to intensify the technical examination of opportunities with high mitigation potential next year, building on a technical paper briefly considered at COP 19. This, however, is less specific than the AOSIS proposal for a technical

process focused initially on renewable energy and energy efficiency, coupled with submissions and high-level engagement on those issues. The decision offers little to developing countries on the enhancement of pre-2020 ambition on provision of support other than to urge developed countries to increase technology, finance and capacity-building support to enable increased mitigation ambition by developing countries.

Under the ADP, the task of COP 19 was to show progress toward a 2015 agreement and enhancing pre-2020 ambition, and provide confidence that the UNFCCC can deliver on a substantial mandate in a very short time. On both these fronts, results appeared inadequate. In the absence of delineated potential elements of the 2015 agreement, one wonders if at this stage, the ADP is any closer to a 2015 agreement. Progress toward increasing pre-2020 ambition seems stunted despite the growing evidence and calls for urgent action. On the road to Lima, and only two years from the deadline for an agreement in Paris, the Warsaw outcomes provide little reason for high hopes.

### ON THE ROAD TO NOWHERE?

Announcing his voluntary fast, Naderev Saño reminded participants of the many criticisms of the UNFCCC process as a “farce [and] an annual carbon-intensive gathering of useless frequent fliers.” But he also tried to instill hope that the process can fulfill its potential to be “the project to save the planet, saving tomorrow, today.” What he did not characterize, and what is increasingly gaining relevance, are the growing number of initiatives, policies and programmes outside the UNFCCC actively addressing climate change. Often, these are borne out of the frustration of subnational jurisdictions and non-state actors with the lack of progress in the UNFCCC. In some cases, governments eager for progress have turned to other international institutions, such as the Montreal Protocol, or taking unilateral measures. Several hundred civil society representatives, even those usually engaged constructively in the negotiations, walked out of COP 19, demonstrating their deep reservations—also felt by others—on the ability of the UNFCCC to deliver.

The problem, however, may not be only the flawed process, but also the absent political will. Even a preeminent functioning process will fail when facing a lack of political will to move forward and find a solution. The UN Secretary-General's upcoming 2014 UN Climate Summit may be able to inject high-level engagement in the climate change arena lacking since Copenhagen. This engagement may entrench positions, but could also find common ground that is currently elusive, but will be necessary if the UNFCCC is to retain any relevance. Ultimately, the question is if climate change will wait for the UNFCCC. Thus far, the evidence shows the UNFCCC is being left behind.

### UPCOMING MEETINGS

**International Conference on Climate Change, Water and Disaster in Mountainous Areas:** This conference is organized by the Society of Hydrologists and Meteorologists (SOHAM-Nepal). **dates:** 27-29 November 2013 **location:** Kathmandu, Nepal **contact:** Deepak Paudel, SOHAM Nepal **phone:** +977-9841647398 **email:** sohamconference2013@gmail.com **www:** <http://www.soham.org.np/pdf/international-conference.pdf>

**Third Meeting of the Sixth Replenishment of the GEF:**

The Third Meeting of the Sixth Replenishment of the Global Environment Facility (GEF-6) is scheduled to take place in December 2013. Representatives from donor countries, non-donor recipient countries, civil society, GEF agencies, the Trustee, the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP), and the Evaluation Office are set to attend. **dates:** 10-12 December 2013 **location:** Paris, France **contact:** GEF Secretariat **phone:** +1-202-473-0508 **fax:** +1-202-522-3240 **email:** secretariat@thegef.org **www:** <http://www.thegef.org/gef/events/third-replenishment-meeting>

**Seventh Session of the UN General Assembly's Open Working Group (OWG) on Sustainable Development Goals:**

OWG-7 is expected to discuss: sustainable cities and human settlements, sustainable transport; sustainable consumption and production (including chemicals and waste); and climate change and disaster risk reduction. **dates:** 6-10 January 2014 **location:** UN Headquarters, New York **contact:** UN Division for Sustainable Development **phone:** +1-212-963-8102 **fax:** +1-212-963-4260 **email:** dsd@un.org **www:** <http://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/index.php?menu=1549>

**GEO (Group on Earth Observations) Ministerial**

**Summit:** The GEO-X Plenary Session and the GEO Geneva Ministerial Summit will take place in Geneva. Membership in GEO is open to all UN member states and to the European Commission. Membership in GEO is contingent upon formal endorsement of the GEOSS 10-Year Implementation Plan, and all members belong to a regional caucus. **dates:** 12-17 January 2014 **location:** Geneva, Switzerland **contact:** GEO Secretariat **phone:** +41-22-730-8505 **fax:** +41-22-730-8520 **email:** secretariat@geosec.org **www:** <http://www.earthobservations.org/>

**Fourth Session of the IRENA Assembly:** The fourth session of the International Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA) Assembly, IRENA's supreme governing body, will immediately precede the World Future Energy Summit (WFES), the International Water Summit (IWS) 2014, and EcoWASTE 2014, which together form Abu Dhabi Sustainability Week (ADSW 2014). **dates:** 18-19 January 2014 **location:** Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates **contact:** IRENA Secretariat **phone:** +971-2-417-9000 **email:** secretariat@irena.org **www:** <http://www.irena.org/>

**World Future Energy Summit 2014:** The World Future Energy Summit (WFES) 2014 will offer a number of renewable energy-related events, including a conference, exhibition, "Project and Finance Village," and "Young Future Energy Leaders program." Hosted by Masdar, Abu Dhabi's renewable energy company, the event will be attended by international policy makers, industry experts, investors and media, who will discuss practical and sustainable solutions to future energy challenges. **dates:** 20-22 January 2014 **location:** Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates **contact:** Sheila Baranda **phone:** +971-2-409-0302 **email:** sheila.baranda@reedexpo.ae **www:** <http://www.worldfutureenergysummit.com/>

**International Renewable Energy Jobs Conference:** The International Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA) is organizing this event alongside the World Future Energy Summit. The conference will discuss how the renewables sector has become

a significant employer with potential for creating millions more jobs worldwide in the coming years. It will provide an opportunity for experts and policy makers to share knowledge, experience and best practices on renewable energy job creation. It will also look at trends and dynamics in renewable energy job creation and the policy and economic environment needed to maximize potential for job creation. **date:** 21 January 2014 **location:** Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates **contact:** IRENA Secretariat **email:** ireValue@irena.org **www:** [http://irevalue.irena.org/event\\_detail.aspx?id=2](http://irevalue.irena.org/event_detail.aspx?id=2)

**5th Biennial C40 Mayors Summit:** The C40 Cities Climate Leadership Group (C40) is hosting this three-day summit to convene mayors from the world's largest cities with hundreds of urban and climate change leaders for a series of roundtable discussions and working sessions focused on greenhouse gas measurements and climate adaptation. Inaugurated in 2005, C40 is a network of cities around the world looking to take local actions for climate change adaptation and mitigation. **dates:** 4-6 February 2014 **location:** Johannesburg, South Africa **contact:** Linda Phalatse **phone:** +27-11-587-4251 or +27-83-544-0998 **email:** contact@c40.org **www:** <http://c40summitjohannesburg.org/>

**Sixth Meeting of the Green Climate Fund Board:** The sixth meeting of the Green Climate Fund (GCF) Board of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) will take place in Indonesia. **dates:** 19-21 February 2014 **location:** Indonesia **contact:** Secretariat of the Green Climate Fund **phone:** +49 228 815-1371 **fax:** +49-228-815-0349 **email:** isecretariat@gcfund.net **www:** <http://gcfund.net/>

**Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action:** The ADP will convene for the fourth part of its second session in March 2014. **dates:** 10-14 March 2014 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** <http://unfccc.int>

**Forests Asia Conference: Sustainable Landscapes for Green Growth in ASEAN:** This conference, organized by the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) as part of global celebration on the International Day of Forests, will discuss sustainable forest landscapes within the Association of Southeast Asian Nations' post-2015 sustainable development efforts. The conference will focus on governance, trade and investment in order to manage forests for green returns, climate change mitigation and adaptation, energy and low-carbon development, food security and nutrition. **dates:** 20-21 March 2014 **location:** Jakarta, Indonesia **contact:** Adinda Hasan, Regional Communications Officer, CIFOR **phone:** +62-(0)-811-860-9338 **email:** a.hasan@cgiar.org **www:** <http://www.cifor.org/forestsasia>

**IPCC WGII 10th Session and IPCC-38:** IPCC WGII will meet for approval and acceptance of the WGII contribution to AR5. WGII assesses the vulnerability of socio-economic and natural systems to climate change, negative and positive consequences of climate change, and options for adapting to it. Subsequently, IPCC-38 will convene to endorse the WGII contribution to AR5. **dates:** 25-29 March 2014 **location:**

Yokohama, Japan **contact:** IPCC Secretariat **phone:** +41-22-730-8208 **fax:** +41-22-730-8025 **email:** IPCC-Sec@wmo.int **www:** <http://www.ipcc.ch/>

**IPCC WGIII 12th Session and IPCC-39:** IPCC WGIII will meet for approval and acceptance of the WGIII contribution to AR5. WGIII focuses on mitigation of climate change. Subsequently, IPCC-39 will convene to endorse the WGIII report. **dates:** 7-13 April 2014 **location:** Berlin, Germany **contact:** IPCC Secretariat **phone:** +41-22-730-8208 **fax:** +41-22-730-8025 **email:** IPCC-Sec@wmo.int **www:** <http://www.ipcc.ch/>

**Third International Climate Change Adaptation**

**Conference:** The Conference titled “Adaptation Futures 2014” will connect the research community and users of climate change adaptation information at regional and global scales. **dates:** 12-16 May 2014 **location:** Fortaleza, Brazil **contact:** UNEP Secretariat **email:** adaptationfutures2014@inpe.br **www:** <http://adaptationfutures2014.ccst.inpe.br/>

**46th GEF Council Meeting and GEF Assembly:** The Global Environment Facility (GEF) Assembly will be held back-to-back with the 46th GEF Council meeting in Mexico. The CSO Consultation, GEF Council and LDCF/SCCF Council Meetings will convene from 25-27 May, with the Council meeting beginning on 25 May and overlapping for half a day, on 27 May, with the CSO Consultation. The Assembly will convene from 28-30 May. All 183 member nations, including South Sudan—the GEF’s newest member—will gather for the Assembly. **dates:** 25-30 May 2014 **location:** Cancun, Mexico **contact:** GEF Secretariat **phone:** +1-202-473-0508 **fax:** +1-202-522-3240 **email:** secretariat@thegef.org **www:** [http://www.thegef.org/gef/5th\\_assembly](http://www.thegef.org/gef/5th_assembly)

**UNFCCC 40th Sessions of the Subsidiary Bodies:** SBI 40 and SBSTA 40 will convene in June 2014. **dates:** 4-15 June 2014 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** <http://unfccc.int>

**2014 Climate Summit:** This event is being organized by UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon with the aim to mobilize political will for an ambitious legal agreement through the UNFCCC process. **date:** 23 September 2014 **location:** UN Headquarters, New York, US **www:** <http://www.un.org/climatechange/summit2014/>

**CBD COP 12:** The Convention on Biological Diversity’s COP 12 will engage in a mid-term review of the implementation of the Strategic Plan and the Aichi targets. The theme of the meeting will be “Biodiversity for Sustainable Development.” The Meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety will take place immediately before COP 12. **dates:** 6-17 October 2014 **location:** Pyeongchang, Republic of Korea **contact:** CBD Secretariat **phone:** +1-514-288-2220 **fax:** +1-514-288-6588 **email:** secretariat@cbd.int **www:** <http://www.cbd.int/meetings/>

**IPCC-40:** This IPCC meeting will be held to adopt the AR5 SYR and approve its SPM. **dates:** 27-31 October 2014 **location:** Copenhagen, Denmark **contact:** IPCC Secretariat **phone:** +41-22-730-8208 **fax:** +41-22-730-8025 **email:** IPCC-Sec@wmo.int **www:** <http://www.ipcc.ch/>

**UNFCCC COP 20 and CMP 10:** The 20th session of the Conference of the Parties (COP 20) to the UNFCCC and the 10th session of the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol will take place in Lima, Peru. **dates:** 1-12 December 2014 **location:** Lima, Peru **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** <http://unfccc.int>

For additional meetings and updates, go to <http://climate-l.iisd.org/>

**GLOSSARY**

ADP	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action
AILAC	Association of Independent Latin American and Caribbean States
AOSIS	Alliance of Small Island States
BAP	Bali Action Plan
BASIC	Brazil, South Africa, India and China
CBDR	Common but differentiated responsibilities
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CERs	Certified Emission Reductions
CGE	Consultative Group of Experts
CMP	Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties of the Kyoto Protocol
COP	Conference of the Parties
CTC	Climate Technology Centre
CTCN	Climate Technology Centre and Network
GCF	Green Climate Fund
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GHG	Greenhouse gas
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IPRs	Intellectual property rights
JI	Joint Implementation
LDCs	Least Developed Countries
LEG	LDC Expert Group
LMDCs	Like Minded Developing Countries
LTF	Long-Term Finance
LULUCF	Land use, land-use change, and forestry
MRV	Measuring, reporting and verification
NAMAs	Nationally appropriate mitigation actions
NAPs	National adaptation plans
QELRCs	Quantified emissions limitation or reduction commitments
REDD+	Reducing emissions from deforestation and degradation in developing countries, including conservation
SB	Subsidiary Body
SBI	Subsidiary Body for Implementation
SBSTA	Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice
SCF	Standing Committee on Finance
TEC	Technology Executive Committee
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change