



## SUMMARY OF THE BONN CLIMATE CHANGE CONFERENCE: 4-15 JUNE 2014

The Bonn Climate Change Conference took place in Bonn, Germany, from 4-15 June 2014, and included the 40th sessions of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) and the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA). The fifth meeting of the second session of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP 2-5) also took place. The meeting brought together approximately 2790 participants, 1689 representing parties and observer states, 1068 from observer organizations, including non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and 37 media.

The Bonn Climate Change Conference marked the first time in UNFCCC history that high-level ministerial events convened outside of the Conference of the Parties (COP) and the COP serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP). Ministerials convened during the first two days of the session, including the High-Level Ministerial Roundtable under the Kyoto Protocol, which aimed to assess implementation of the Protocol and provide ministers with an opportunity to increase their quantified emission limitation and reduction commitments (QELRCs). The High-Level Ministerial Dialogue on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action aimed to raise pre-2020 ambition and provide momentum for negotiations on the 2015 agreement.

During the session, SBI 40 and SBSTA 40 began quickly moving through the items, with many considered in informal consultations rather than contact groups. SBI 40 made good progress, according to many, on issues including Convention Article 6 (education, training and public awareness). SBSTA 40 achieved progress as characterized by many on agriculture, and research and systematic observation.

ADP 2-5 convened in a contact group at this session, as decided at ADP 2-4 in March 2014, structured around workstream 1 (2015 agreement) and workstream 2 (pre-2020 ambition). Under workstream 1, the ADP discussed: mitigation; adaptation; finance; technology and capacity building (means of implementation); transparency; intended nationally determined contributions (INDCs); and other issues related to elements. Under workstream 2, Thematic Expert Meetings (TEMs) on the urban environment and land use were organized, and a forum on the role of cities and subnational authorities in mitigation and adaptation also convened.

## A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE UNFCCC AND KYOTO PROTOCOL

The international political response to climate change began with the adoption of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in 1992, which sets out a framework for action aimed at stabilizing atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases (GHGs) to avoid “dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system.” The Convention, which entered into force on 21 March 1994, now has 196 parties.

In December 1997, delegates to the third Conference of the Parties (COP) 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, the first Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto

### IN THIS ISSUE

A Brief History of the UNFCCC and Kyoto Protocol . . . . .	1
Report of the Bonn Climate Change Conference . . . . .	3
High-level Ministerial Roundtable under the Kyoto Protocol . . . . .	3
High-level Ministerial Dialogue on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action . . . . .	4
Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI 40). . . . .	5
Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA 40). . . . .	13
<i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP 2-5) . . . . .	19
A Brief Analysis of the Meeting . . . . .	33
Upcoming Meetings. . . . .	35
Glossary . . . . .	36

This issue of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* © <enb@iisd.org> is written and edited by Jennifer Allan, Beate Antonich, Elena Kosolapova, Ph.D., Mari Luomi, Ph.D., and Anna Schulz. The Digital Editor is Leila Mead. The Editor is Pamela Chasek, Ph.D. <pam@iisd.org>. The Director of IISD Reporting Services is Langston James “Kimo” Goree VI <kimo@iisd.org>. The Sustaining Donor of the *Bulletin* is the European Commission (DG-ENV). General Support for the *Bulletin* during 2014 is provided by the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety (BMUB), the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, SWAN International, the Swiss Federal Office for the Environment (FOEN), the Finnish Ministry for Foreign Affairs, the Japanese Ministry of Environment (through the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies - IGES), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), and the International Development Research Centre (IDRC). Funding for translation of the *Bulletin* into French has been provided by the Government of France, the Wallonia, Québec, and the International Organization of La Francophonie/Institute for Sustainable Development of La Francophonie (IOF/IFDD). The opinions expressed in the *Bulletin* are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of IISD or other donors. Excerpts from the *Bulletin* may be used in non-commercial publications with appropriate academic citation. For information on the *Bulletin*, including requests to provide reporting services, contact the Director of IISD Reporting Services at <kimo@iisd.org>, +1-646-536-7556 or 300 East 56th St., 11D, New York, NY 10022 USA.



<http://enb.iisd.mobi/>

Protocol (CMP 1) decided to establish the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Annex I Parties' Further Commitments under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP) in accordance with Protocol Article 3.9, which 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 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 (BAP) 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 extended 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. 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 (REDD+).

The Cancun Agreements also established several new institutions and processes, including the Cancun Adaptation Framework, the Adaptation Committee, and the Technology Mechanism, which includes the Technology Executive Committee and the Climate Technology Centre and Network. The Green Climate Fund (GCF) was created and designated as an operating entity of the Convention's financial mechanism.

Under the Protocol track, the CMP urged Annex I parties to raise the level of ambition towards achieving aggregate emission reductions, and adopted Decision 2/CMP.6 on land use, land-

use change and forestry. 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 operationalization of the GCF. Parties also agreed to launch the new *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (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, with the new instrument entering into force in 2020. In addition, the ADP was 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 in November and 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 BAP. A number of issues requiring further consideration were transferred to the Subsidiary Body for Implementation and the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice, such as: the 2013-2015 Review of the global goal; developed and developing country mitigation; the Kyoto Protocol's flexibility mechanisms; national adaptation plans; MRV; market and non-market mechanisms; and REDD+.

**WARSAW:** The Warsaw Climate Change Conference took place from 11-23 November 2013, in Warsaw, Poland. Negotiations focused on the implementation of agreements reached at previous meetings, including pursuing the work of the ADP. The meeting adopted an ADP decision that invites parties to initiate or intensify domestic preparations for their intended nationally determined contributions (INDCs), and resolves to accelerate the full implementation of the BAP 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.

**ADP 2-4:** The fourth meeting of ADP 2 (ADP 2-4) took place from 10-14 March in Bonn, Germany. Under workstream 1 (2015 agreement) the meeting convened in open-ended consultations on agenda item 3, which addressed: adaptation; INDCs; finance, technology and capacity building (means of implementation); ambition and equity; mitigation; transparency of action and support; and other issues related to elements. An in-session workshop addressed domestic preparations for INDCs. Under workstream 2 (pre-2020 ambition), technical expert meetings on renewable energy and energy efficiency convened.

## REPORT OF THE BONN CLIMATE CHANGE CONFERENCE

SBI 40, SBSTA 40 and ADP 2-5 opened on Wednesday, 4 June. Two high-level ministerial events convened on Thursday, 5 June, and Friday, 6 June, respectively. This report summarizes discussions by the three bodies and the ministerials based on their agendas.

### HIGH-LEVEL MINISTERIAL ROUNDTABLE UNDER THE KYOTO PROTOCOL

On 5 June, COP 19/CMP 9 President Marcin Korolec (Poland) and COP 20/CMP 10 President-designate Manuel Pulgar-Vidal (Peru) welcomed participants and emphasized the need to seek consensus. Noting this is the first time ministers are present at a June session, Rita Schwarzelühr-Sutter, Parliamentary State Secretary, Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety, Germany, looked forward to a vivid dialogue.

UNFCCC Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres hoped that the clarity and starkness of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) 5th Assessment Report (AR5) findings would “jolt parties into action,” and reported that only 10 out of the required 144 ratifications of the Doha Amendment had been received.

Halldór Thorgeirsson, UNFCCC Secretariat, said that overall emissions by Annex B parties to the Kyoto Protocol with commitments under the first commitment period were 22.6% below the 1990 base year in 2012.

On the *Doha Amendment*, Greece, for the European Union (EU), emphasized the importance of both ratifying and implementing the Doha Amendment. Noting they had overachieved on their first period commitment target, Norway underscored that “too few” countries took new commitments.

Bolivia, for the Group of 77 and China (G-77/China), stressed ratification of the Doha Amendment by all Annex I parties as crucial for building trust in the ADP negotiations. Ethiopia urged those without commitments to reconsider.

Tanzania, for the African Group, lamented that some developed countries had withdrawn from the Protocol altogether. China highlighted proposals by others for “outright emission increases.”

On *EU emission reductions*, the EU announced the overachievement of its target under the first commitment period and that the EU is projected to overachieve its target of 20% below 1990 levels in the 2013-2020 period. He reiterated the conditional offer to increase the commitment to 30%. Slovenia praised the EU’s Emission Trading Scheme (ETS) for enabling the overachievement.

On *increasing ambition*, Grenada underscored that it is premature to call some results an “overachievement,” and called for developed countries to unlock their full mitigation potential.

Liberia, for the Least Developed Countries (LDCs), expressed concern that countries with initial targets under the second commitment period have not put forward new targets with increased ambition, and called for removing conditionalities.

The Marshall Islands called on states undertaking more ambitious action than they are formally committed to account for

these actions under the UNFCCC. Expressing disappointment that no developed countries have moved towards the upper end of their pledge ranges, the Maldives invited parties to note the urgency of action as stated by the IPCC. Bangladesh observed IPCC AR5 reveals that it is still technologically and economically feasible to limit warming to 1.5°C, but only with meaningful efforts, particularly by Annex I parties.

China stressed enhanced ambition by developed countries should not be used as bargaining chip. Tanzania called for “limited” use of offset mechanisms when increasing ambition.

Citing the UN Environment Programme (UNEP) Gap Report, Egypt underscored that Annex I commitments are insufficient. He described the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) as an “effort by developing countries,” that “cannot be discarded.”

Stressing the Protocol’s weakness is lack of political will, not its architecture, Bolivia queried the ethical grounds on which developed countries ask developing countries to undertake commitments.

Iran emphasized that work on pre-2020 ambition includes means of implementation (MOI) and called for developed countries’ unconditional leadership, cautioning against introducing commitments for developing countries.

Uganda called for clear accounting rules, buy-in by all parties, and linking market mechanisms to ambition, demand and carbon prices.

Slovenia underscored the need for all parties to reduce emissions in the pre-2020 period according to common but differentiated responsibilities (CBDR), and reminded this requires that developed countries support mitigation and adaptation in developing countries.

Sweden and Luxembourg emphasized the importance of decoupling emissions from economic growth. The Netherlands emphasized acknowledging that enhanced ambition under the Kyoto Protocol alone will not be effective, as it only covers a small percentage of global emissions.

On *lessons learned from the Kyoto Protocol*, Germany stressed that: a legally-binding form is crucial; rules on accounting and transparency create clarity; and market mechanisms can play a role in achieving reduction targets and environmental integrity. Switzerland highlighted that the Kyoto Protocol demonstrates that a system of absolute economy-wide emission reduction targets that ensures predictability through common rules can work without sacrificing economic growth. Gabon highlighted the need to: step up commitments and ambition; build trust; secure pragmatic cooperation; and continue to pay attention to science. Zambia called for strengthening political will, accounting rules and compliance.

On the *global agreement*, Norway, Switzerland and Luxembourg underlined that the participation of all heavily emitting countries is important for a successful global agreement. Australia said universal applicability of the 2015 agreement will provide a level playing field and increase overall ambition.

Nicaragua called for a new agreement that recognizes different levels of development and responsibility. Nigeria noted new market-based mechanisms (NMMs), the framework for various approaches (FVA) 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 (REDD+) as important issues to be considered in Lima.

Presenting *country experiences and achievements*, Morocco, Azerbaijan, Malta, Hungary, Estonia, France, Finland, the UK, Australia and many others presented domestic emission reduction activities.

During civil society interventions, Business and Industry NGOs (BINGOs) called for establishing early climate targets, taking action on short-lived climate pollutants (SLCPs), and reforming the CDM.

Observing that no country has indicated its intention to increase its target, Climate Action Network (CAN), for Environmental NGOs (ENGOS), said the ministerial discussions presented a “spectrum of known commitments.” Climate Justice Now! (CJN!), for ENGOS, reminded Annex I parties of the “broken promise” of the Durban mandate to have a “full, legal second commitment period.”

Indigenous Peoples called for an overarching human rights-based approach and recognition of the rights and knowledge of indigenous peoples.

Local Government and Municipal Authorities urged Ministers to discuss with their national colleagues and channel bank bailout money to local climate action.

Farmers called for more transparent talks and warned that climate change threatens to reduce agricultural yields and push more people into poverty.

Youth demanded fossil fuel divestment and cited community renewable energy (RE) systems as being at the forefront of providing energy for all and reducing emissions.

COP 19 President Korolec and COP 20 President Pulgar-Vidal observed agreement by many that there is need to ratify the second commitment period while raising ambition in commitments and actions.

### **HIGH-LEVEL MINISTERIAL DIALOGUE ON THE DURBAN PLATFORM FOR ENHANCED ACTION**

On Friday, 6 June, incoming COP 20 President Pulgar-Vidal welcomed delegates, called for political guidance on the ADP process, and underlined the need for a COP 20 decision on workstream 2 (pre-2020 ambition).

ADP Co-Chair Kishan Kumarsingh (Trinidad and Tobago) highlighted issues to be resolved, including: required information for, and the process to consider: INDCs; application of CBDR and respective capabilities (CBDRRC) in the 2015 agreement; the legal form of the new agreement and the character of obligations within it; means of capturing progress on pre-2020 ambition; and implementation of existing commitments, including finance.

On *level of ambition*, the Marshall Islands stressed bold action by all to close the ambition gap. Lesotho said it expects robust decisions on GHG emission reductions, and to maintain the safety of vulnerable countries, he called for developed countries to take the lead and heavily emitting countries to further increase ambition through 2020. The Maldives and Zambia called on developed countries to increase their pre-2020 commitments.

The EU announced anticipated adoption, in October 2014, of the Union’s 2030 target to reduce GHG emissions 40% below

1990 levels through domestic efforts, but stressed efforts by all parties are needed. The US inquired what is deterring countries from submitting pledges when they say they are taking action at home.

Norway outlined three ways for approaching global zero net emissions by mid-century: implementing what has already been decided; increasing action in the near term; and delivering an ambitious agreement in Paris. Canada urged, *inter alia*: an approach balanced with economic prosperity; maintenance of long-term commitments through low-carbon development strategies; and deployment of clean technologies. Denmark said forward movement by the US and China would encourage increased ambition.

Brazil stressed that developing countries cannot be expected to do more when developed countries backtrack from their commitments on emission reductions and MOI. Zambia, Bhutan and Senegal emphasized the scaling up of MOI to ensure developing country participation, especially by the LDCs.

Indonesia, with the G-77/China, Thailand and Bolivia, called for the capitalization of the GCF.

Mexico highlighted transitioning to a low-carbon economy through sustainable production and consumption. The Republic of Korea highlighted availability of technology and resources.

On *Convention principles*, the G-77/China, with Iran, China and Algeria, warned that negotiations should not result in rewriting or reinterpreting the Convention.

Australia said splitting countries into outdated categories does not encourage them to join the global effort. The US suggested applying CBDRRC in a way to achieve the Convention’s objective, not on the basis of categorizations and encouraged finding other ways to provide developing countries with the “differentiation they need.” Kuwait and Argentina said universal application does not mean uniform application, allowing for differentiated implementation.

Malta said the 2015 agreement must ensure broad participation and include a dynamic spectrum of commitments reflecting the evolving responsibilities and capabilities of countries. The EU, with the Czech Republic, explained INDCs can operationalize CBDR and ensure fairness, but called for reflecting evolving realities.

Grenada said the agreement must be sufficiently flexible to allow differentiated commitments and contain a mechanism to increase commitments.

On *the road to COP 20*, Japan emphasized the need to deliver political guidance for success in Paris and Lima. The G-77/China stressed working in a more formal and urgent manner to elaborate elements for a draft negotiating text before Lima.

Colombia, for the Independent Alliance for Latin America and the Caribbean (AILAC), emphasized a negotiating draft by Lima is “absolutely crucial,” including elaboration of the scope and nature of INDCs. Egypt stated that areas of convergence in the ADP should be expanded so that a credible and legitimate outcome acceptable to all could be reached. Algeria called for efforts under the ADP to focus on the definition of the elements of the post-2020 regime and pre-2020 work plan.

On *INDCs*, Grenada, with Switzerland, said adaptation must be addressed separately from INDCs, with Grenada clarifying

that adaptation efforts are contingent on the level of global ambition.

AILAC suggested INDCs include mitigation, adaptation and MOI, and reflect national circumstances. He said the 2015 agreement is an opportunity to flesh out adaptation issues, identifying the regional and global co-benefits of adaptation as the reason AILAC supports adaptation within the scope of INDCs.

The G-77/China reminded that the Warsaw outcome requires support for developing country INDCs, calling for finance, technology transfer and technical support for their preparation.

On **legal form**, China urged focus on the agreement's substantive content before legal form. Germany called for a new protocol in Paris, applicable to all parties and taking into account past, present and future emissions to move towards global decarbonization. Malta said the 2015 agreement should contain legally-binding commitments that are quantifiable, transparent, comparable and verifiable.

Indonesia said that a successful and meaningful agreement should: be legally-binding and a continuation of the existing regime; contain a global target based on science; allow for adjustment of ambition; and ensure transparency.

Bangladesh called for a comprehensive, legally-binding agreement maintaining a critical balance between all elements of Decision 1/CP.17 (establishing the ADP).

On **content of the 2015 agreement**, the Marshall Islands called for a new agreement with commitments to fully decarbonize the global economy by 2050. He also underlined the importance of including adaptation, and loss and damage in the new agreement.

The G-77/China and Uganda, for the LDCs, urged balanced inclusion of mitigation, adaptation and MOI. Saudi Arabia called for a balanced agreement in line with the Sustainable Development Goals. The LDCs emphasized that the 2015 agreement should contain loss and damage, including a risk transfer mechanism.

Tanzania, for the African Group, said the agreement should define the level of adaptation finance, and base access to adaptation funds on vulnerability, with National Adaptation Plans (NAPs) serving as the "entry to support." Guyana and Papua New Guinea called for anchoring the Warsaw Framework for REDD+ in the 2015 agreement.

Venezuela questioned the use of market mechanisms, and called for the new agreement to be based on justice, equity science and the principles of the Convention. Bolivia cautioned against: using a bottom-up approach; commercializing the environment; and asking developing countries to open doors for corporate investments. New Zealand stressed international carbon markets as essential to sending predictable price signals. Australia suggested the new agreement foster policies that promote investment and innovation.

Nicaragua said the 2015 agreement must maximize the use of financial mechanisms.

The Netherlands called for a dynamic, inclusive agreement that accounts for changing circumstances. Canada said the 2015 agreement should: be fair, ambitious, durable and inclusive; encourage action; and allow for effective action by all major

economies and emitters. France stressed the agreement needs to: be dynamic, strengthened over time, and for "all of us," including civil society; maintain a balance between different elements; and include short-term solutions and long-term mechanisms.

Turkey said the agreement must be applicable to all, leaving the types and timing of commitments to parties' discretion.

During statements by civil society, BINGOs urged that recent progress on the GCF be matched with a successful funding round, and supported market frameworks and partnerships. Local Government and Municipal Authorities called for anchoring the potential of cities and subnational authorities in the new agreement, and proposed a 10-year action plan for a Decade of Urban Low-Emission Development. Youth and ENGO representatives called for, *inter alia*: a global temperature goal of 1.5°C; a swift transition away from fossil fuels; setting emission targets for 2020-2025; and concrete targets on finance and technology transfer.

Trade Unions emphasized the need to sensitize, train and mobilize workers around climate measures and stressed transition to a green economy must take into account social impacts and workers interest.

Women and Gender opposed high-risk technologies as unacceptable and that they should stay out of the new agreement. Farmers advocated open and transparent talks.

In closing, COP 19 President Korolec noted that developing an ambitious agreement and increasing pre-2020 ambition are crucial tasks, calling on parties to use events, such as the UN Secretary-General's Climate Summit and the pre-COP ministerials, to advance negotiations.

#### **SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR IMPLEMENTATION (SBI 40)**

Opening the session, on Wednesday, 4 June, SBI Chair Amena Yauvoli (Fiji) stated that it is time to understand, take stock, and rally around key issues and move forward, stressing that the SBI will be "at the heart of Convention implementation" in Lima. Parties agreed to the organization of work and adopted the agenda (FCCC/SBI/2014/1), agreeing to hold the agenda item on information contained in non-Annex I national communications in abeyance.

**OPENING STATEMENTS:** The Republic of Korea, for the Environmental Integrity Group (EIG), identified the need for concrete outcomes of the work programme to further the understanding of the diversity of Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs).

Nepal, for the LDCs, called for the inclusion of LDCs and small island developing states (SIDS) on the Executive Committee of the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage, and the G-77/China called for majority membership for developing countries on the Executive Committee. Australia, for the Umbrella Group, called for focusing on mandate and procedures for the Executive Committee.

Sudan, for the African Group, suggested that experts on various issues be incorporated into the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage. Nicaragua, for the Like-Minded Developing Countries (LMDCs), stressed that the basic rules for non-market-based approaches, NMMs and the FVA need to be approved by the COP.

The LMDCs called for a new mechanism on response measures to review negative impacts of measures taken by developed countries.

The LDCs, Colombia, for AILAC, and Nauru, for the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS), called for progress on the second review of the Adaptation Fund and ensuring sustained funding for it.

The LDCs called for a decision enabling the full implementation of all elements of the LDC work programme.

AILAC stressed, *inter alia*, the need to: support developing countries' national communications and biennial update reports (BURs); identify lessons learned from the NAMA work programme for INDCs on mitigation; and strengthen the NAP process. The Dominican Republic, for the Central American Integration System (SICA), stressed the need to ensure progress on adaptation and MOI; and urged tangible outcomes on NAPs.

On the 2013-2015 Review, AOSIS stressed ensuring that decisions are based on the latest science and said the process should deliver conclusions that lead to "immediate implementation" of the 1.5°C goal.

SICA supported basing SBI outcomes on recent scientific findings so that they are accounted for in the ADP and during the 2013-2015 Review. The Umbrella Group urged consideration of the IPCC findings on adaptation and mitigation in the Review, and stressed mitigation and transparency should be prioritized to build collective confidence and action.

The EU, *inter alia*, emphasized the review of existing mechanisms under the Kyoto Protocol should be compatible with greater ambition, promote scaled-up mitigation actions and enable net contributions to global mitigation efforts, and suggested guidance on how the outcomes of the Structured Expert Dialogue (SED) under the 2013-2015 Review might inform the work of the ADP.

The African Group expressed concern over the lack of progress on: implementation of the Kyoto Protocol second commitment period; response measures; and technology transfer.

The G-77/China stressed the Technology Executive Committee (TEC) should structure its work plan for the short- and medium-term.

BINGOs appreciated the opportunity to nominate business experts as advisors and observers to the GCF, TEC and the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN).

CAN, for ENGOs, highlighted that the MRV regime should not be limited to mitigation but also address MOI, especially finance.

CJN!, for ENGOs, called on developed countries to "pay their climate debt."

Indigenous Peoples called for an integrated and holistic approach in the implementation of adaptation and mitigation work plans that respects indigenous peoples' rights, institutions and traditional knowledge systems.

Youth highlighted the need to focus on Convention Article 6 (education, training and public awareness), in particular public participation, and called for enhancing the participation of observers.

**ANNEX I NATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS: Sixth National Communications and First Biennial Reports:** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.5) was first considered by the SBI on 4 June. The SBI took note of the information presented in the document. SBI Chair Yauvoli noted that the technical review, the first step of the international assessment and review process for developed countries, will be completed by September 2014.

**Revision of the "Guidelines for the Preparation of National Communications by Parties Included in Annex I to the Convention, Part II: UNFCCC Reporting Guidelines on National Communications":** This item was first considered by the SBI on 4 June. It was subsequently taken up in informal consultations facilitated by Fatuma Mohamed Hussein (Kenya) and Helen Plume (New Zealand). Parties initiated consideration of the revision of the guidelines for the preparation of national communications by Annex I parties.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.15) the SBI, *inter alia*:

- takes note of the views submitted by Annex I parties on their experience with preparing their first biennial reports, recognizing that inconsistencies have been identified between the reporting guidelines on national communications and the UNFCCC biennial reporting guidelines for developed country parties;
- invites parties to submit their views on the reporting guidelines on national communications to the Secretariat by 20 August 2014; and
- requests the Secretariat to include a synthesis of views of parties submitted by 20 August 2014 in a technical paper to facilitate consideration of the revision of the reporting guidelines at SBI 41.

**Date of the Completion of the Expert Review Process under Article 8 (Expert Review) of the Kyoto Protocol for the First Commitment Period:** This item was first considered by the SBI on 4 June. It was subsequently taken up in informal consultations facilitated by Gerhard Loibl (Austria) and Thelma Krug (Brazil).

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.23), the SBI recommends a draft decision on the date of the completion of the expert review process for adoption by CMP 10.

**REPORTING FROM PARTIES NOT INCLUDED IN ANNEX I TO THE CONVENTION: Information Contained in National Communications from Parties not Included in Annex I to the Convention:** This item was held in abeyance.

**Provision of Financial and Technical Support:** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.7) was first considered by the SBI on 4 June. Robert Dixon, Global Environment Facility (GEF), informed delegates of the completion of the GEF's sixth replenishment process, with 30 donor countries pledging US\$4.43 billion over the next four years, and GEF support of 31 countries to prepare their BURs. This issue was further considered in informal consultations co-facilitated by Fatuma Mohamed Hussein and Helen Plume.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.8), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- takes note of and invites the GEF to continue providing information on financial support for the preparation of BURs;
- urges non-Annex I parties that have yet to submit their requests to the GEF for support, and encourages the GEF implementing agencies to continue facilitating the preparation and submission of project proposals by non-Annex I parties;
- recommends that COP 20 request the GEF to continue to work with its implementing agencies to further simplify its procedures and improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the process through which non-Annex I parties receive funding; and
- requests the Secretariat to make updated versions of the national GHG inventory software for non-Annex I parties available in other UN languages by June 2015.

**WORK PROGRAMME TO FURTHER THE UNDERSTANDING OF THE DIVERSITY OF NAMAS:**

This item (FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.1 and 10) was introduced in plenary on 4 June. SBI Chair reported the first successful “match” between a NAMA from Georgia and support from Austria. Informal consultations were co-facilitated by Ann Gann (Singapore) and Dimitar Nikov (France).

During informal consultations, parties addressed, *inter alia*, reporting by the Secretariat on the NAMA registry, and the report of the work programme to further the understanding of the diversity of NAMAs for COP 20.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.18), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- welcomes the information provided during the in-session workshop;
- takes note of the information provided by the Secretariat on the extent of the matching of actions with support under the NAMA Registry;
- requests the Secretariat to arrange annual technical briefings in conjunction with the meetings of the SBs and prepare written information to allow for an exchange of views on updated information on NAMAs and support for NAMAs under the Registry, including the extent of matching between them; and
- agrees to prepare conclusions at SBI 41 on the process of furthering the understanding of the diversity of NAMAs, describing, *inter alia*, activities conducted under the work programme, submissions from parties, reports by the Secretariat, and information on issues addressed and experiences shared under the work programme in relation to the preparation and implementation of, and support for, NAMAs.

**Workshop on the NAMA Work Programme:** A technical workshop on NAMAs convened on 5 June, co-chaired by Ann Gann and Dimitar Nikov and structured around the three focal areas of the work programme: information on assumptions, methodologies, GHGs and other technical issues; support for preparing and implementing NAMAs; and the extent of matching NAMAs with support.

On challenges to generating information relating to NAMAs, parties mentioned, *inter alia*: collecting data and developing baselines; developing MRV processes; and understanding and measuring co-benefits.

On support for NAMAs, Sudhir Sharma, UNEP Risø Centre, reported that of 41 NAMAs, 28 are seeking implementation support totaling around US\$5 billion.

A panel on experiences with obtaining support for NAMAs highlighted the importance of engaging key stakeholder institutions and actors, including the private sector, and demonstrating government commitment and NAMA feasibility to donors.

The UNFCCC Secretariat presented on the UNFCCC NAMA Registry, noting that so far only 44 of approximately 150 NAMAs identified have been submitted into the Registry, and only two matches recorded.

**MATTERS RELATING TO THE MECHANISMS UNDER THE KYOTO PROTOCOL: Review of the Modalities and Procedures of the CDM:** This issue (FCCC/TP/2014/1) was first considered by the SBI on 4 June, and subsequently in informal consultations co-facilitated by Marko Berglund (Finland) and Philip Gwage (Uganda).

During consultations, parties disagreed on, *inter alia*, the need for a technical paper focusing on net mitigation, and the CDM Executive Board to identify options for the evolution of the CDM to generate substantial net emission reductions. During plenary on 14 June, SBI Chair Yauvoli reported that no agreement could be reached. The SBI will continue considering this issue at SBI 41.

**Review of the Joint Implementation (JI) Guidelines:** This issue was first considered in SBI plenary on 4 June, and subsequently in informal consultations co-facilitated by Dimitar Nikov (France) and Yaw Osafo (Ghana). Parties worked on a draft decision with an annex on modalities and procedures for JI, including sections on: the JI Supervisory Committee; host countries; eligibility to transfer and acquire credits; and project cycle.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.11), the SBI agrees to continue its consideration of this matter at SBI 41 on the basis of a draft decision text by the co-facilitators contained in the annex.

**Synergy Relating to Accreditation under the Mechanisms of the Kyoto Protocol:** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2014/5) was first considered in SBI plenary on 4 June, and subsequently in informal consultations co-facilitated by Martin Hession (EU) and Jeffery Spooner (Jamaica).

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.4) the SBI takes note of the JI Supervisory Committee recommendation on the accreditation system for JI aligned with that of the CDM, and recommends a draft decision (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.4/Add.1) for consideration and adoption by CMP 10.

**Modalities for Expediting the Continued Issuance, Transfer and Acquisition of JI Emission Reduction Units:** This issue was first considered in SBI plenary on 4 June, and subsequently in informal consultations co-facilitated by Dimitar Nikov and Yaw Osafo.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.9), the SBI agrees to continue consideration of this matter at SBI 41 on the basis of draft decision text contained in the annex, and requests a technical paper from the Secretariat on, *inter alia*, any technical implications for the processes and systems under the

Kyoto Protocol, the current status of ratification or provisional application of the Doha Amendment, and the status of the JI projects.

**Procedures, Mechanisms and Institutional Arrangements for Appeals against Decisions of the CDM Executive Board:**

This item was introduced during the SBI on 4 June, and subsequently considered in informal consultations co-facilitated by Yaw Osafo and Kunihiko Shimada (Japan).

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.5), the SBI states that parties continued to maintain different views on the scope of appeals, and agrees to continue its consideration of the matter on the basis of, *inter alia*, the co-facilitators' draft text (FCCC/SBI/2012/33/Add.1), with a view to preparing a draft decision for consideration and adoption by CMP 10.

**Matters relating to the International Transaction**

**Log (ITL) Under the Kyoto Protocol:** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.6) was first considered in the SBI on 4 June, and subsequently in informal consultations facilitated by Yuji Mizuno (Japan).

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.2), the SBI, *inter alia*: requests the ITL administrator and the Security Working Group to:

- execute further implementation options by extending the current information security control implementation on the basis of a registry-specific and quantitative risk assessment, followed by an in-depth control implementation analysis; and
- prepare a document containing a final implementation option for information security management, including the related resource requirements for registry systems and budget requirements for the ITL, for consideration at SBI 42.

**LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES:** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2014/4) was first considered in the SBI on 4 June, and subsequently in informal consultations facilitated by Patience Dampety (Ghana).

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.3), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- takes note of the report on the implementation of the LDC Expert Group (LEG) work programme for 2013-2014;
- notes contributions made by parties to the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF), and the importance of continuing to support the full implementation of National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPAs) to address urgent and immediate adaptation needs, and to build capacity for medium- and long-term adaptation planning and implementation; and
- welcomes the submission of proposals for the funding of the implementation of NAPA projects to the LDCF, approval of US\$6.73 million for the National Adaptation Plan Global Support Programme for LDCs and for a project to build the capacity of LDCs, materials prepared as supplements to the LEG Technical Guidelines for the NAP process, and engagement and collaboration of the LEG with other constituted bodies and programmes under the Convention.

**NAPs:** This item (FCCC/SBI/2014/4 and MISC.1) was introduced during SBI plenary on 4 June. Nauru, for AOSIS, called for predictable and sustainable support, and for finance to

come from the GCF. Bhutan, for the LDCs, lamented inadequate financing, and called for expanding the guidelines for the formulation of NAPs before COP 20.

Ghana, for the G-77/China, underscored the need to link NAPs to the GCF, and said funding for NAPs should be simple, expedited and sustainable. The item was subsequently discussed in informal consultations co-facilitated by Margaret Mukahanana-Sangarwe (Zimbabwe) and Tomasz Chruszczow (Poland).

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.19), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- invites the Adaptation Committee to urge its task force on NAPs to expedite its work;
- invites the LEG and the Adaptation Committee to explore ways in which developing country parties that are not LDCs can be accommodated in the NAP Expo;
- invites the Adaptation Committee, in collaboration with the LEG, to organize a workshop, to be held prior to SBI 42;
- invites the LEG and the Adaptation Committee to prepare an information paper on experiences, good practices, lessons learned, gaps and needs in the process to formulate and implement NAPs, based on the NAP Expo and relevant documents for consideration by SBI 41, as well as to serve as an input to the workshop;
- invites the Adaptation Committee, in collaboration with the LEG, to prepare a report on the workshop for consideration by SBI 42 with a view to making recommendations to the COP, as appropriate; and
- decides to continue its consideration of the matter at SBI 41, on the basis of, *inter alia*, the Co-Chairs' notes contained in the annex to the conclusions.

**WARSAW INTERNATIONAL MECHANISM FOR LOSS AND DAMAGE ASSOCIATED WITH CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACTS:**

This issue was first taken up in SBI and SBSTA plenaries on 4 June. Nauru, for AOSIS, supported by Timor Leste, for the LDCs, Tuvalu and the Maldives recalled the findings of IPCC WGII on irreversible impacts of climate change and called for making the mechanism functional. Lamenting the lack of AOSIS membership in the interim Executive Committee, he proposed a special seat for SIDS and, with Bangladesh, majority membership of developing countries in the Committee. The LDCs called for seats for both SIDS and LDCs in the Executive Committee and stressed the need for MOI for the two-year work plan. AOSIS also proposed a technical and financial facility within the Mechanism and requested a space for consultations with the interim Executive Committee.

The issue was addressed in SBI/SBSTA joint informal consultations facilitated by Beth Lavender (Canada) and Alf Wills (South Africa). Parties considered, *inter alia*: membership and composition of the Executive Committee; terms of its members; and its subsidiary structures.

**SBI/SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SB/2014/L.4), the SBI and SBSTA, *inter alia*: note they initiated consideration of the composition of, and procedures for, the Executive Committee of the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage, with a view to finalizing its organization; and conclude that they will continue their consideration of this

matter at SB 41, taking into account the elements reflected in the bracketed draft decision text contained in the annex to the conclusions, with a view to making recommendations for consideration and adoption by COP 20.

**SECOND REVIEW OF THE ADAPTATION FUND:** The issue was first considered by the SBI on 4 June. The issue was then taken up in informal consultations facilitated by Suztanty Sitorus (Indonesia) and Ana Fornells de Frutos (Spain).

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.17), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- welcomes the financial contributions and pledges made to the Adaptation Fund by parties, and expresses hope that more funds could be generated to meet the current needs of the Fund;
- takes note of the oral report of the Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat on the Board's new fundraising target of US\$80 million per calendar year for 2014 and 2015;
- continues to note with concern the lack of sustainable, predictable and adequate financial resources for the Adaptation Fund;
- invites parties, observer organizations, stakeholders and implementing entities to submit to the Secretariat, by 22 September 2014, further views on the second review of the Adaptation Fund; and
- agrees to complete its consideration of the second review of the Adaptation Fund at SBI 41 with a view to recommending a draft decision to CMP 10.

**DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGIES AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE TECHNOLOGY MECHANISM: Joint Annual Report of the TEC and CTCN for 2013:**

This item was first taken up by the SBI on 4 June. Lamenting the parties' inability to conclude this matter, Uganda, supported by Malawi, for the LDCs, inquired on the conclusion of the report, given the "red lines" set by developed countries, and where issues related to technology development and transfer would be discussed. The issue was then taken up in informal consultations co-facilitated by Carlos Fuller (Belize) and Elfriede More (Austria).

During informal consultations, participants discussed the TEC seeking observer status in other international organizations.

**SBI/SBSTA Conclusions:** In their conclusions (FCCC/SB/2014/L.1), the SBI and SBSTA invite the TEC to further strengthen the linkages with organizations inside and outside the Convention, which undertake work relating to enabling environments for, and barriers to, the development and transfer of technology, and recommended a draft decision (FCCC/SB/2014/L.1/Add.1) on the joint annual report of the TEC and CTCN for 2013 for consideration and adoption at COP 20.

**Poznan Strategic Programme on Technology Transfer:** The issue (FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.3) was first taken up in SBI plenary on 4 June. Uganda noted that many countries, in particular LDCs, have not completed their technology needs assessments (TNAs), and requested further support for these and for ensuring that identified priorities are implemented.

The issue was subsequently taken up in informal consultations facilitated by Carlos Fuller and Elfriede More.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.12), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- notes the GEF report on the progress made in carrying out the Poznan strategic programme, including the findings arising from the consultations between the GEF and CTCN Advisory Board;
- invites the GEF to continue to consult with the CTCN Advisory Board on the support the GEF will provide for the implementation of the CTCN five-year work programme and to report on its findings to SBI 41;
- invites the CTCN to include information on the support it has received from the GEF and other relevant organizations in the 2014 TEC and CTCN joint annual report for consideration by COP 20;
- invites the TEC to evaluate the Poznan strategic programme with the aim of enhancing the effectiveness of the Technology Mechanism and to report back to COP 20 through SBI 41;
- notes the need for parties to enhance and follow up on the TNA process by further promoting the development and implementation of economically, environmentally and socially sound project proposals; and
- invites the GEF to further support the implementation of the results of TNAs, including technology action plans and project ideas prepared by non-Annex I parties.

**CAPACITY BUILDING: Capacity Building Under the Convention:** The issue (FCCC/SBI/2014/2 and Add.1 and 7, and MISC.2) was first taken up by the SBI on 4 June. Burundi, for the African Group, said capacity building requires a standing institutional arrangement and, with Malawi, for the LDCs, called for a formal work programme under the Durban Forum on Capacity Building. Informal back-to-back consultations on both sub-items under this agenda item were facilitated by Tosi Mpanu-Mpanu (Democratic Republic of Congo) and subsequently by Philip Gwage.

Among other issues, parties considered capacity building for developing countries under the Convention on the basis of a "Chair's text" and submissions by parties, but were unable to agree on draft decision text to be forwarded to COP 20.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.13), the SBI welcomes the success of the meetings of the Durban Forum on Capacity Building, held during SBI 38 and 40. The SBI also welcomes the launch of the UNFCCC Capacity Building Portal, and agrees to continue its consideration of the matter at SBI 41 on the basis of the draft decision text contained in the annex to the conclusions.

**Capacity Building under the Kyoto Protocol:** The issue was first considered in SBI plenary on 4 June, and subsequently in back-to-back informal consultations with the agenda item on capacity building under the Convention.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.14), the SBI welcomes the success of the 2nd and 3rd meetings of the Durban Forum on Capacity Building, held during SBI 38 and 40, and expresses its appreciation to participants for their active participation. The SBI also welcomes the launch of the UNFCCC Capacity-Building Portal, and agrees to continue its

consideration of the matter at SBI 41 on the basis of the draft decision text contained in the annex to FCCC/SBI/2013/L.18/Rev.1.

### 3rd Meeting of the Durban Forum on Capacity Building:

The Durban Forum took place on 12 and 14 June, focusing on enabling environments, and capacity building for mitigation and adaptation. The Forum was chaired by SBI Chair Yauvoli and co-facilitated by Ian Fry (Tuvalu) and Angela Kallhauge (Sweden). Opening the meeting, SBI Chair Yauvoli described the Forum as an excellent opportunity to share quality information on enhancing capacity on climate change issues.

During the sessions, participants discussed experiences, best practices and lessons learned regarding the implementation of capacity-building activities in developing countries.

Co-facilitator Fry noted that the outcomes of the meeting would be used to support the SBI in enhancing the effectiveness of capacity building.

### PARTIES INCLUDED IN ANNEX I TO THE CONVENTION WHOSE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES ARE RECOGNIZED BY THE COP:

This issue (FCCC/TP/2013/3) was first considered by the SBI on 4 June, and was subsequently taken up in informal consultations facilitated by Marzena Chodor (Poland).

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.22), the SBI: takes note of information contained in the technical paper prepared by the Secretariat; takes note of the submission from Turkey dated 14 February 2014; and concludes that no further discussion is required under this agenda item, deems its consideration of this agenda item completed, and recommends a draft decision (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.22/Add.1) for consideration and adoption by COP 20.

**ARTICLE 6 (EDUCATION, TRAINING AND PUBLIC AWARENESS) OF THE CONVENTION:** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2014/3) was first taken up by the SBI on 4 June, and subsequently in informal consultations facilitated by Anne Rasmussen (Samoa).

Parties considered: subsequent meetings of the Dialogue on Article 6 of the Convention; a report by the Secretariat on good practices of stakeholder participation in implementing Article 6 of the Convention; and development of terms of reference for an intermediate review of the implementation of the Doha work programme on Article 6.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.20), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- concludes that the 3rd and 4th Dialogues on Article 6 of the Convention will be convened during SBI 42 and SBI 44, respectively, in Bonn;
- invites parties, observer organizations and other stakeholders to submit to the Secretariat, by 18 February 2015, their feedback on the organization of the 2nd Dialogue and their views on the agenda for the 3rd Dialogue;
- agrees to develop terms of reference for the intermediate review of the implementation of the Doha work programme for consideration at SBI 42, with a view to launching the review at SBI 44; and
- decides to take into account the proposals contained in an annex to the conclusions, titled "Elements as input to the

intermediate review of the implementation of the Doha work programme on Article 6 of the Convention," as input to the review in 2016, and invites submissions of further ideas to the Secretariat by 18 February 2015.

**2nd Dialogue on Article 6 of the Convention:** The Dialogue convened in three sessions, beginning on 5 June, focusing on public participation, public awareness and public access to information, with international cooperation as a cross-cutting theme. The Dialogue was chaired by SBI Chair Yauvoli, and co-facilitated by Renilde Ndayishimiye (Burundi) and Paul Watkinson (France).

Opening the dialogue, incoming COP President Pulgar-Vidal stressed the importance of connecting citizens' expectations to the formal negotiating process, and retaining the confidence of civil society through openness and transparency. Former SBI Chair Tomasz Chruszczow described the exchange of messages between policymakers and civil society as the only way to start changing human behavior.

Sessions focused on good practices and lessons learned. Themes included: public participation in climate change policy decision-making and action; raising public awareness and mobilizing climate action; and public access to information as a means for enhancing public input to informed decision-making and effectiveness of climate action.

### IMPACT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF RESPONSE MEASURES: Forum and Work Programme:

This issue (FCCC/SB/2014/INF.1) was first considered in SBI plenary on 4 June, and subsequently addressed in a contact group co-chaired by SBI Chair Yauvoli and SBSTA Chair Emmanuel Dumisani Dlamini (Swaziland) and during informal consultations co-facilitated by the SBI and SBSTA Chairs, with the help of Eduardo Calvo Buendia (Peru).

During discussions, developing countries maintained that the review has been completed, while some developed countries felt that in the absence of a decision signaling the issue's completion it had not been completed.

**SBI/SBSTA Conclusions:** In their conclusions (FCCC/SB/2014/L.2), the SBI and SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- welcome the report on the in-forum workshop on area (b) (cooperation on response strategies) of the work programme on the impact of the implementation of response measures;
- note submissions from parties on the review of the work of the forum on the impact of the implementation of response measures, and that the compilation of those submissions attached to the conclusion as Annex II concludes the review;
- invite parties, experts, practitioners and relevant organizations to submit to the Secretariat, by 22 September 2014, their views on options to strengthen opportunities for cooperation and collaboration, and request the Secretariat to prepare a technical paper on areas of convergence related to areas of cooperation, as well as a synthesis paper, based on the reports on the work of the forum, submissions, presentations and statements made and the review of the work of the forum; and
- take note of parties' submissions regarding a draft decision to take the work forward, and agree to forward them for consideration at SB 41, with a view to providing recommendations for consideration at COP 20.

**Matters Relating to Article 3.14 (Adverse Effects) of the Kyoto Protocol:** The matter was first taken up by the SBI on 4 June. SBI Chair Yauvoli noted that substantive decisions on this item would be made jointly during the forum on response measures. SBI Chair Yauvoli consulted informally with interested parties. Consideration of this issue will resume at SBI 41.

**Progress on the Implementation of Decision 1/CP.10 (Buenos Aires programme of work on adaptation and response measures):** This issue was considered in the SBI on 4 June. During the SBI on 14 June, SBI Chair Yauvoli reported on consultations he had with interested parties. The SBI decided to continue consideration of this issue at SBI 41.

**2013-2015 REVIEW:** This issue (FCCC/SB/2014/MISC.1 and Add.1, and MISC.2) was first considered by the SBI on 4 June. Malawi stressed the centrality of science for the review and the importance of having additional SED meetings in 2014 and 2015. A contact group was co-facilitated by Gertraud Wollansky (Austria) and Leon Charles (Grenada).

In the contact group, participants discussed the need for additional SED meetings, the need for additional information, and when to conclude the SED. Trinidad and Tobago, for AOSIS, and other developing countries urged an October meeting of the SED, held during ADP 2-6. Australia, the US and other developed countries said the next meeting should take place during COP 20.

AOSIS, supported by Bhutan, called for additional information, such as national communications and peer-reviewed literature published after the IPCC's cut-off date. Switzerland, for the EIG, suggested including information from the Convention's implementation bodies, and Brazil suggested information from the GCF and NAMA registry. China called for information on the implementation of all the commitments under the Convention, particularly finance and technology transfer.

The EU said that the focus of the SEDs should be the IPCC reports. The US suggested IPCC experts involved in the SED help assess any additional peer-reviewed information.

**SBI/SBSTA Conclusions:** In their conclusions (FCCC/SB/2014/L.3), the SBI and SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- request the SED co-facilitators, with the support of the Secretariat, to convene an additional meeting of the SED after SB 41 and before SB 42 in conjunction with a meeting of the ADP, to consider inputs identified in Decision 1/CP.17, paragraph 161 (*inter alia*: submissions from parties; first BURs and biennial reports from developed country parties; national inventories; reports from UN agencies and international organizations; scientific information on the observed impacts, including from regional and sub-regional agencies), with a view to closing the SED prior to SB 42;
- request the Secretariat to prepare an indicative, descriptive identification of what information will be available to the SED and make it available to parties by 1 October 2014;
- request the SED co-facilitators to consult with recognized experts, as needed, to identify potential additional inputs to the SED; and
- invite parties to submit to the Secretariat, by 1 November 2014, their views on: additional inputs to the SED, how to

conclude the 2013-2015 Review, and on the final reporting of the SBs to COP 21.

**SED:** From Friday through Sunday, 6-8 June, the SED convened to hear and discuss information from IPCC WGII and WGIII reports relevant to the adequacy of the long-term global goal, including consideration of commitments under the Convention (Review theme 1), and overall progress made toward achieving the long-term global goal, including consideration of commitments under the Convention (Review theme 2).

**ARRANGEMENTS FOR INTERGOVERNMENTAL MEETINGS:** The item (FCCC/SBI/2014/6) was first taken up by the SBI on 4 June. A contact group was chaired by SBI Chair Yauvoli.

During the opening plenary, the Russian Federation underscored the need to ensure the negotiating process during the drafting of the new agreement will follow international legal norms and UN practice, saying he "counts on" the functions of the COP President and the SB Chairs "being appropriately carried out."

During the closing plenary, the Russian Federation emphasized that how chosen officials act and how Secretariat officials carry out their functions is important for ensuring effectiveness of the process, and transparently and viably adopted decisions.

Brazil requested that the agenda item on arrangements for intergovernmental meetings be taken up in Lima.

On the cost recovery proposal for side-events and exhibits, Tuvalu highlighted that the conclusion text that "encourages alternatives to be proposed" is unclear. The Philippines reaffirmed the value of observers' participation and civil society input.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.21), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- notes that the President of COP 22/CMP 12 will come from Africa, recalling the offer of Senegal to host COP 22/CMP 12, and notes that the President of COP 23/CMP 13 will come from the Asia-Pacific;
- requests the Secretariat to prepare: a document outlining various options relating to the frequency and organization of the sessions of the COP, CMP and SBs; and a document on adjusting the timing of the election of the President;
- urges current and future presiding officers to ensure the observance of the draft rules of procedure, and to enforce clear and effective time management practices;
- reaffirms the fundamental value of effective participation by observers; and
- states that parties express concern about the side-events and exhibits cost recovery proposal, and encourage alternatives to be proposed.

**ADMINISTRATIVE, FINANCIAL AND**

**INSTITUTIONAL MATTERS: Financial Matters:**

UNFCCC Executive Secretary Figueres reported on the issue (FCCC/SBI/2014/INFs. 8 and 9) on 4 June. She announced a cost-recovery procedure for side-events and exhibits being implemented by the Secretariat. Figueres subsequently consulted informally with interested parties.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.16 and Add.1), the SBI takes note of the information relating to the status of contributions as at 15 May 2014. The SBI also notes with concern the insufficient level of funds to cover the costs for participation of representatives of eligible parties in ADP 2-6 and COP 20, and urges parties to further contribute to the Trust Fund for participation in the UNFCCC process. The SBI also considers and recommends a draft decision for COP 20 on revisions to the financial procedures required for the adoption of the International Public Sector Accounting Standards.

**Continuing Review of the Functions and Operations of the Secretariat:** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.4) was first considered by the SBI on 4 June. Parties agreed to continue consideration of the issue.

**Implementation of the Headquarters Agreement:** The issue was taken up by the SBI on 4 June. UNFCCC Executive Secretary Figueres consulted informally with interested parties.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.10), the SBI, *inter alia*, takes note of the information provided by the representative of the host government of the Secretariat that the City of Bonn expects to complete construction of new conference center facilities in time for SB 42.

**Privileges and Immunities for Individuals Serving on Constituted Bodies Established under the Kyoto Protocol:** This item was first considered by the SBI on 4 June. Informal consultations were facilitated by Kunihiko Shimada.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.6), the SBI takes note of parties' views, and agrees to continue its consideration of this matter at SBI 44 on the basis of the draft treaty arrangements on the issue.

**Privileges and Immunities for Individuals Serving on Constituted Bodies Established under the Convention:** This item was first considered by the SBI on 4 June. Informal consultations were facilitated by Kunihiko Shimada.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.7), the SBI takes note of the parties' views and of the draft treaty arrangements on privileges and immunities for individuals serving on constituted bodies established under the Kyoto Protocol, and agrees to continue its consideration of this matter at SBI 44.

**OTHER MATTERS:** Suzanty Sitorus (Indonesia) reported on, and the SBI took note of, a periodic update on the work of the Standing Committee on Finance (SCF).

**CLOSING SBI PLENARY:** SBI Chair Yauvoli informed parties on the multilateral assessment working group session, to be held for the first time in Lima, and sought assurances from parties that all other issues on the SBI 41 agenda be closed by 5 December, to allow for the first round of the multilateral assessment working group to be launched on 6 December.

The Secretariat reported on administrative and budgetary implications of conclusions adopted by the SBI at this session.

SBI Rapporteur Mabafokeng Mahabisa (Lesotho) presented the draft report of the session (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.1), which was adopted.

Bolivia, for the G-77/China, expressed concern over, *inter alia*: the lack of funding for the NAP process; the lack of sustainable, predictable and adequate funds through the

Adaptation Fund; and the inadequacy of the Durban Forum on Capacity Building in addressing developing countries' needs.

Nepal, for the LDCs, underscored adaptation is critical and the provision of adequate and predictable support to formulate and implement NAPs is "key to protect lives and livelihoods." Bangladesh said: "US\$100 million in pledges by Annex II countries are not enough to make the Adaptation Fund sustainable."

Sudan, for the African Group, suggested: completing the second review of the Adaptation Fund in Lima; considering potential diversification of revenue streams; and enhancing direct access modalities and institutional linkages between the Fund and other institutions.

The EU stressed the need to deliver on the Cancun Adaptation Framework, and expressed disappointment with the lack of progress on CDM reform, underlining necessary technical work on net mitigation. Nauru, for AOSIS, with the LDCs, stressed "needed" CDM reform to generate real and measureable emission reductions

The African Group lamented lack of progress on the review of the modalities and procedures for the CDM, noting "CDM has not seen its way to Africa."

The EU noted progress made on next steps for concluding the 2013-2015 review and on transparency and reporting. AOSIS also called for information in the 2013-2015 Review to address the 1.5°C temperature goal. Australia, for the Umbrella Group, welcomed: steady progress made in Bonn; the consideration of the IPCC AR5 findings by the SED; agreement on the Kyoto Protocol Expert Review date; and technology.

The EU and the Philippines noted the need to operationalize the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage.

The LDCs welcomed conclusions under the Poznan Strategic Programme on technology transfer and the joint annual report of the TEC and CTNC, suggesting COP 20 help developing countries to resolve access barriers to technology.

The African Group emphasized the value of the Poznan Strategic Programme on technology transfer, "especially when it involves TNA and piloting of both mitigation and adaptation technologies."

Bangladesh lamented that adaptation technologies are still not adequately addressed, and called for removing barriers, such as intellectual property rights (IPRs).

CJN!, for ENGOs, stressed the importance of operationalizing the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage to provide technical and financial support to developing countries, and said the UNFCCC should avoid the privatization of side event spaces.

CAN, for ENGOs, expressed alarm over the proposed side-event cost recovery system, and called for allocating adequate resources to observer participation.

Noting under-representation of the Youth from the Global South at this meeting, Youth called for continued discussion on Convention Article 6 (education, training and public awareness).

Woman and Gender explained more women with access to capacity building, information and finance will provide "tools to face climate change and solutions to create resilience."

Indigenous Peoples recommended, *inter alia*, adopting an integral approach to NAPs that respects indigenous peoples' rights, knowledge systems and governance, and recognizing at all levels of decision-making free, prior and informed consent.

SBI Chair Yauvoli expressed confidence on progress in Lima and closed the meeting at 12:19 pm, on Sunday, 15 June.

#### **SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE (SBSTA 40)**

Opening the session on 4 June, SBSTA Chair Emmanuel Dumisani Dlamini (Swaziland) welcomed participants, highlighting that 2014 is a challenging year and emphasizing the importance of expediting work with the objective of adopting decisions in Lima.

Renate Christ, IPCC Secretary, reported on the work of the IPCC, including approval and adoption of contributions by WGII on impacts, adaptation and vulnerability, and WGIII on mitigation of climate change. She called for the SBs to use the rich knowledge contained in the reports to inform their work.

SBSTA Chair Dlamini introduced the agenda (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/1) and proposed an additional sub-item under agenda item 11(d) "methodologies for financial reporting by Annex I Parties to the Convention," suggesting that work on this issue be undertaken primarily in Lima while undertaking preliminary work at this session. The agenda was adopted as amended, and parties agreed to the organization of work.

**Election of Officers:** On 15 June, SBSTA Chair Dlamini reported that Jurga Rabazauskaitė-Survilė (Lithuania) was elected rapporteur. No nomination for Vice-Chair was received, and SBSTA Chair Dlamini reported that the current Vice-Chair would remain in office.

**OPENING STATEMENTS:** On 6 June, Bolivia, for the G-77/China, expressed hope for progress on: response measures; the Technology Mechanism; and the Nairobi Work Programme on impacts, vulnerability and adaptation to climate change (NWP). Sudan, for the African Group, lamented the lack of progress on the Kyoto Protocol's second commitment period, response measures, and the Technology Mechanism.

Mexico, for the EIG, expressed hope that the NWP could inform how to measure progress on adaptation. Costa Rica, for AILAC, stressed the NWP as a key area of work, including elaboration of additional activities and timing of their implementation.

On agriculture, the G-77/China, India, for Brazil, South Africa, India and China (BASIC), and Nepal, for the LDCs, said discussions should focus on adaptation. The EU called for a work programme on agriculture that addresses mitigation, adaptation and MOI. The LDCs called for the Adaptation Committee and ADP to incorporate agriculture in their work.

AILAC said discussions on agriculture should focus on: identifying the potential of adaptation efforts and associated co-benefits; promoting an integrated-landscape level approach to climate change and food security; and supporting implementation through access to MOI. Papua New Guinea, for the Coalition for Rainforest Nations, stressed that agriculture is a source of food security and livelihoods.

Citing an "unprecedented lack of transparency," the G-77/China, with the African Group, called for input to the work of the interim Executive Committee of the Warsaw International Mechanism on Loss and Damage. The LDCs cited the importance of engaging insurance experts to make sure the Executive Committee is not a "talk shop."

Australia, for the Umbrella Group, observed that nearly all Annex I countries had submitted their biennial reports and looked forward to continuing clarification of 2020 pledges. The EU highlighted, *inter alia*, finalizing and operationalizing the accounting and reporting framework under the Kyoto Protocol, and reviewing guidelines for annual GHG inventories.

Nauru, for AOSIS, described the 2013-2015 Review as a priority, saying the SED should consider national and regional reports that are not included in peer reviewed journals.

Expressing disappointment with progress on market- and non-market-based mechanisms, the EIG stated that understanding minimal standards and a common accounting framework are crucial. BASIC called for equal importance to be given to non-market-based approaches and NMMs, saying flexibility should be given to parties wishing to use the FVA, which requires establishment of basic rules.

On REDD+, the Coalition for Rainforest Nations described the Warsaw REDD+ Framework as the end of a long journey, saying REDD+ implementation can finally start.

The African Group urged identifying non-carbon benefits and considering how they could be incentivized. Nepal, for the LDCs, welcomed progress and looked forward to methodological guidance for non-market and non-carbon benefits. Bolivia, for Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America (ALBA), underscored that non-market-based approaches should be on "equal footing" with results-based payments for REDD+. Ecuador, for the LMDCs, supported the elaboration of non-market-based approaches in discussions on forests.

AILAC called for a "technology integration approach" and elaboration of technology roadmaps linked to the NAP process.

On response measures, the LMDCs called for establishment of a new mechanism, other than the forum on response measures, to serve as an implementation platform.

BINGOs expressed hope SBSTA could endorse the joint annual report of the TEC and CTCN and continue discussions under FVA and market mechanisms.

CAN, for ENGOS, highlighted that new areas of the NWP are "crucially important" for those most vulnerable, and called for discussions on a biodiverse, climate-resistant agriculture sector. CJN!, for ENGOS, said the "Warsaw walk-out" was due to rapidly growing corporate influence in the negotiations, and called for a holistic, rights-based approach focused on non-market-based mechanisms.

Farmers lamented limited progress on a work programme on agriculture promoting food security, adaptation and mitigation. Indigenous Peoples underscored that many of the world's remaining forests are on customary or traditional lands.

Youth called for 75% of fossil fuels to stay in the ground, and bottom-up behavioral change coupled with top-down institutional change. Women and Gender called for gender to be considered in all land-based agenda items as a cross-cutting issue.

**NWP:** This item (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/INFs. 7 and 11) was first considered by the SBSTA on 4 June. Nauru, for AOSIS, expressed concern that, despite recent efforts, the NWP remains ineffective in supporting the needs of SIDS. She suggested greater collaboration between the NWP and the Adaptation Committee, ultimately leading to the NWP becoming the “research arm” of the Adaptation Committee.

Beth Lavendar (Canada) and Juan Hoffmaister (Bolivia) co-facilitated informal consultations, during which participants identified potential issues for the NWP to consider and ways to enhance the modalities of the NWP, including by strengthening linkages between the NWP and Cancun Adaptation Framework.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/L.13), the SBSTA concludes that the following actions, *inter alia*, would be carried out to enhance the effectiveness of the NWP modalities:

- enhancing collaboration with global and regional knowledge networks and NWP partner organizations;
- inviting regional centers and networks to serve as regional knowledge platforms for the implementation of activities under the NWP;
- considering web-based activities; and
- further considering improved approaches to engaging with NWP partner organizations when SBSTA takes stock of progress at SBSTA 44.

SBSTA invites parties and NWP partner organizations to include in its submissions requested by SBSTA 39: available and implemented tools and methods for human adaptation planning processes, and good practices and lessons learned addressing ecosystems, human settlements, health and water resources; and good practices and lessons learned related to processes and structures linking national and local adaptation planning.

SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- invites the LEG and Adaptation Committee to consider a synthesis report of the submissions; and
- requests the Secretariat, in collaboration with relevant stakeholders including those from the Adaptation Committee, to produce information on available and implemented tools and methods for human adaptation planning processes and good practices and lessons learned addressing ecosystems, human settlements, health and water resources, and good practices and lessons learned related to processes and structures linking national and local adaptation planning by SBSTA 43, and to prepare and communicate knowledge products by SBSTA 45.

**DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGIES AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE TECHNOLOGY MECHANISM: Joint Annual Report of the TEC and CTCN for 2013:** This item was first taken up by the SBSTA and SBI on 4 June. Carlos Fuller (Belize) and Elfriede More (Austria) co-facilitated joint SBI/SBSTA informal consultations. (See summary on page 9.)

**Third Synthesis Report on Technology Needs Identified by Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention:** This item was first taken up by the SBSTA plenary on 4 June, and was subsequently addressed in informal consultations co-facilitated by Carlos Fuller and Elfriede More.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/L.5), the SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- welcomes the completion of TNAs by 31 countries, acknowledging financial support provided by the GEF under the Poznan Strategic Programme on technology transfer and technical support provided by UNEP and regional organizations;
- recognizes that TNAs provide a wide range of information, and that this information could provide insight on the types of support needed;
- invites parties, relevant international organizations, the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism and other relevant financial institutions to provide technical and financial support to non-Annex I parties for the implementation of the results of their TNAs;
- notes that the TNA process is meant to enhance action on mitigation and adaptation, and recognizes that project implementation benefits from a range of relevant elements;
- encourages non-Annex I parties to take the outcomes of their TNAs into account when preparing their requests for support from the CTCN; and
- acknowledges possible interlinkages between TNAs and other climate- and development-related domestic processes, such as NAMAs and NAPs.

**METHODOLOGICAL GUIDANCE FOR REDD+:** This item (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/MISC.3 & Add.1-3, and MISC.4 & Add.1) was first taken up by the SBSTA on 4 June. A contact group was co-chaired by Peter Graham (Canada) and Robert Bamfo (Ghana).

On 6 June, an in-session expert meeting on non-market-based approaches for REDD+ was held. During the discussion, Brazil stated that the Warsaw Framework for REDD+ supersedes the mandate of SBSTA 38. Malaysia, Colombia, Mexico, the US and Norway said that no additional methodologies are needed and that the Warsaw Framework provides sufficient methodological guidance at present.

Tanzania, for the LDCs, underscored that non-market-based approaches are very important for REDD+, and Bolivia underlined that joint mitigation and adaptation approaches involve long-term finance, not markets.

Norway and the EU said this is not the appropriate forum to discuss non-market-based approaches, given discussions on this issue under the FVA and SCF. The Global Forest Coalition observed that many countries do not see a role for REDD+ in the NMM.

Co-Chair Graham stated that a workshop report would be prepared for SBSTA 41.

During the contact group, participants discussed non-carbon benefits. Noting the diversity of non-carbon benefits across countries, several developed and developing countries stated it would be difficult to develop international guidance relevant to all.

Tanzania, for the LDCs, Cameroon, for the Central African Forest Commission (COMIFAC), and Ghana, for the African Group, emphasized international guidance is central to reducing deforestation and emissions, and promoting sustainable forest management.

During informal consultations, parties continued to discuss the need for methodological guidance on non-market-based approaches, and the difference between non-carbon benefits and safeguards.

During the closing plenary, Brazil, Australia, for the Umbrella Group, and Mexico, for the EIG, stated that there is no further need for additional methodological guidance and suggested closing this agenda item.

Bolivia, with Venezuela and Saudi Arabia, underlined that joint mitigation and adaptation, as a non-market-based approach, is within the mandate of this agenda item. Some suggested establishing new agenda items to clarify joint mitigation and adaptation approaches, or financial support for REDD+.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/L.8), the SBSTA agrees to continue its consideration of non-market-based approaches at SBSTA 41 and its consideration of non-carbon benefits at SBSTA 42.

**RESEARCH AND SYSTEMATIC OBSERVATION:** This item (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/INFs. 1 and 5) was first addressed by the SBSTA on 4 June. The World Meteorological Organization (WMO) reported on interim progress in the implementation of the Global Framework for Climate Services (GFCS). She explained the potential synergies between the GFCS and the UNFCCC, particularly with regard to NAP processes.

The issue was subsequently addressed in informal consultations co-facilitated by David Lesolle (Botswana) and Christiane Textor (Germany), during which participants discussed ecosystems with high-carbon reservoirs. Some parties underlined that the scientific knowledge on these ecosystems warrants consideration by other bodies of the Convention. Other parties observed that the discussion in the research dialogue and the IPCC show that uncertainties remain.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/L.6), the SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- invites parties and research programmes and organizations to provide information by 25 March 2015, on lessons learned and good practices for knowledge and research capacity building, considering information presented at past research dialogues and workshops, and IPCC AR5;
- invites parties to submit to the Secretariat by 25 March 2015, views on various topics for consideration as part of the Research Dialogue during SBSTA 42;
- notes that the outcomes of the workshop on the technical and scientific aspects of ecosystems with high-carbon reservoirs not covered by other agenda items under the Convention, such as coastal marine ecosystems, may be relevant to other processes under the Convention, such as the NWP and CTCN;
- encourages research programmes and organizations to continue sharing experiences, knowledge and views, *inter alia*, on ecosystems with high-carbon reservoirs, including capacity-building elements; and
- invites the IPCC to take note, in its consideration of future work, of the SBSTA's work on research and systematic observation in matters related to ecosystems with high-carbon reservoirs.

**2013-2015 REVIEW:** This item (FCCC/SB/2014/MISC.1 & Add.1 and MISC.2 & Add.1) was first considered by the

SBSTA on 4 June. Calling the flow of information from the SED to the ADP “essential,” Nauru, for AOSIS, called for the SED Co-Chairs to present a progress report to the ADP. A joint contact group was co-chaired by Gertraud Wollansky (Austria) and Leon Charles (Grenada). The SED and joint contact group discussions are summarized on page 11.

**ISSUES RELATING TO AGRICULTURE:** This item (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/INF.2) was first considered by the SBSTA on 4 June, and was subsequently taken-up in a contact group co-chaired by Selam Kidane Abebe (Ethiopia) and Peter Iversen (Denmark).

During the contact group, participants expressed support for the report of the workshop and discussed possible future work on agriculture under the UNFCCC. Egypt, for the G-77/China, supported further work on exchanging scientific information on adaptation policies and approaches.

Malawi, for the African Group, underscored the need to address issues related to small-scale and subsistence farming. Costa Rica, for AILAC, called for a framework for agriculture. New Zealand suggested seeking scientific advice on reducing emissions, while Argentina stressed the need to stay within the adaptation mandate provided by SBSTA 38. Switzerland suggested addressing livestock-related issues.

During subsequent informal consultations, parties continued to discuss possible issues for future consideration. In particular, parties debated whether or not to address mitigation issues in future actions under this agenda item. During the closing plenary on 15 June, Egypt, for the G-77/China, congratulated all parties on their efforts in working toward a “roadmap” on agriculture for COP 22.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/L.14), the SBSTA agrees to consider: development of early warning systems and contingency plans in relation to extreme weather events; assessment of vulnerability and risk of agricultural systems in relation to different climate change scenarios; identification of adaptation measures; and identification and assessment of agricultural practices and technologies to enhance productivity in a sustainable manner, food security and resilience. The SBSTA further agrees to welcome submissions and hold in-session workshops on the first two issues at SBSTA 42 and the second two issues at SBSTA 44.

**WARSAW INTERNATIONAL MECHANISM FOR LOSS AND DAMAGE ASSOCIATED WITH CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACTS:** This item was first addressed in the SBSTA on June 4. SBI/SBSTA joint informal consultations were co-facilitated by Beth Lavendar (Canada) and Alf Wills (South Africa). This issue is summarized on page 8.

**IMPACTS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF RESPONSE MEASURES: Forum and Work Programme:** This item (FCCC/SB/2014/INF.1) was first considered by the SBSTA on 4 June. The SBI and SBSTA Chairs convened a joint contact group on this item. These discussions are summarized on page 10.

**Matters Relating to Article 2.3 (Response Measures) of the Kyoto Protocol:** This item was first considered by the SBSTA on 4 June. The SBI and SBSTA considered this item under the Forum and Work Programme. Informal consultations were

convened by the SBSTA and SBI Chairs. These discussions are summarized on page 10.

**METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES UNDER THE CONVENTION: Work Programme on the Revision of the Guidelines for the Review of Biennial Reports and National Communications, including National Inventory Reviews, for Developed Country Parties:** This item (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/INF.3, 4, 9, 10 & 12) was first considered by the SBSTA on 4 June, and later taken up in a contact group co-chaired by Riitta Pipatti (Finland) and Samuel Adeoye Adejuwon (Nigeria).

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/L.17), the SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- agrees to continue discussions at SBSTA 41, with a view to considering a draft decision at COP 20;
- invites parties to submit views and suggestions for textual modifications on specific paragraphs of the revised UNFCCC Annex I inventory review guidelines to the Secretariat by 15 July 2014;
- requests the Secretariat to prepare an updated draft of the revised UNFCCC Annex I inventory review guidelines to serve as the basis for a workshop;
- agrees to continue consideration of the training programme for review experts based on the annexed draft decision text; and
- recognizes the need to update, revise and complete the materials for a training programme for the review of GHG inventories from Annex I parties due to the adoption by the COP of the revised “Guidelines for the Preparation of National Communications by Parties included in Annex I to the Convention, Part 1: UNFCCC reporting guidelines on annual GHG inventories,” and requests the Secretariat to develop a formal training programme for the review of GHG inventories from Annex I parties for consideration at SBSTA 41.

**Common Metrics to Calculate the CO<sub>2</sub> equivalence of GHGs:** This item was first taken up by the SBSTA on 4 June. A special event was held by the IPCC on common metrics at this session. Mikhail Ginarsky (Russian Federation) facilitated informal consultations on this issue. In the consultations no conclusions could be reached, and this item will be taken up at SBSTA 41.

Brazil regretted the lack of conclusions, saying it is of utmost importance to continue discussion on common metrics, recalling that the IPCC AR5 says the choice between common metrics is a policy choice and stressed that the SBSTA is the appropriate place to take such a decision, which is a critical input to the ADP. India urged the SBSTA Chair to encourage a productive discussion on this matter at the next session.

**Bunker Fuels:** This issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/MISC.5/Rev.1) was introduced on 4 June. The International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) highlighted the implementation of a capacity-building strategy for the development of member state action plans for CO<sub>2</sub> emission reductions, while noting efforts to create a global market-based measures scheme using a “strawman” approach.

The International Maritime Organization (IMO) highlighted the entry into force of mandatory energy efficiency measures, adopted by the IMO under Annex VI of the International

Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (MARPOL), saying they represent the first ever mandatory global CO<sub>2</sub> emission reduction regime for an entire industry sector.

Cuba, for the LMDCs, called for the IMO and ICAO to consider the Convention and Kyoto Protocol when addressing climate change in the maritime and aviation sectors. With the United Arab Emirates, he emphasized CBDR and noted deep concern over using the aviation and maritime sectors as a source for revenue for long-term climate finance, due to possible trade impacts and transfer of costs to developing countries.

The United Arab Emirates, Singapore, the Republic of Korea, Japan and the US welcomed actions by the ICAO and IMO, including elaboration of a global market-based mechanism scheme under the ICAO. Panama said technology transfer and support is necessary to build the technical experience and capacity of developing countries to reduce emissions in these sectors.

SBSTA Chair Dlamini conducted informal consultations on this issue.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/L.1), the SBSTA takes note of the information and progress reports from the IMO and ICAO, and invites them to continue reporting on relevant work at future sessions.

**Methodologies for Financial Reporting by Developed Country Parties:** This item was introduced on 4 June. Bolivia, for the G-77/China, underlined that a contact group should address the issue in order to provide a clear way forward to Lima. China, supported by India, South Africa and others, said there has been a clear mandate to do this since COP 17, and called for launching substantive discussions.

A contact group was co-chaired by Fatuma Mohamed Hussein (Kenya) and Helen Plume (New Zealand). Brazil and China expressed concern over the lack of substantive progress on this item and urged all parties to engage actively and constructively on this issue.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/L.16), the SBSTA: takes note of relevant SBI work; welcomes the information provided by the SCF related to the preparation of the first biennial assessment and overview of climate flows; requests the Secretariat to summarize information of relevant ongoing work; and agrees to discuss the matter further at SBSTA 41 with a view to recommending a decision to COP 20.

**METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES UNDER THE KYOTO PROTOCOL: Implications of the Implementation of Decisions 2/CMP.7 to 4/CMP.7 and 1/CMP.8:** This item was first considered in the SBSTA on 4 June. A contact group was established, co-chaired by Maesela Kekana (South Africa) and Anke Herold (Germany).

During the contact group, the Co-Chairs introduced a “co-facilitators” note, which parties examined and that outlined elements of text relating to review and adjustments and an in-session discussion text relating to reporting and accounting.

A drafting group met to resolve bracketed areas in the text, but a number of issues remained, *inter alia*, on: how to reference Decision 13/CMP.1 (modalities for the accounting of assigned

amounts under Article 7, paragraph 4, of the Kyoto Protocol); how to reference Annex I parties with commitments inscribed under the Doha Amendment; and an option to allow Annex I parties to request the expert review team to review their annual inventory for the first year of the second commitment period.

Bolivia, for the G-77/China, noted not all parties have worked constructively, worrying this would undermine the second commitment period.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/L.15), the SBSTA notes that progress needs to be made on two sets of issues, those set out in Annex I (in-session discussion text relating to reporting and accounting) and in Annex II (note by the co-facilitators on elements of text relating to review and adjustments of the conclusions), and facilitate finalization of work for consideration at CMP 10, the SBSTA:

- requests the Secretariat to update and extend the technical paper (FCCC/TP/2013/9) for consideration at SBSTA 41 and reflect the status of work as of June 2014, address the update of conservativeness factors contained in Appendix III to Decision 20/CMP.1, including consideration of the default uncertainties in the IPCC's 2006 Guidelines for National GHG Inventories, and reflect any party submissions on this issue;
- invites submissions by parties by 20 August 2014; and
- requests the Secretariat to explore ways to facilitate a technical discussion among experts from interested parties prior to SBSTA 41.

The SBSTA agrees to continue consideration of this item at SBSTA 41.

**Clarification of the Text in Section G (Article 3, paragraph 7ter) of the Doha Amendment to the Kyoto Protocol:** This issue (FCCC/KP/CMP/2013/7) was first addressed by the SBSTA on 4 June. Nauru, for AOSIS, stressed that work on agenda items on implications of implementation of Decisions 2/CMP.7 to 4/CMP.7 and 1/CMP.8, and clarification of the text will be expedited if parties agree that the text of Section G not be re-written or creatively interpreted. A contact group was co-chaired by Maesela Kekana and Anke Herold.

During the contact group and informal consultations, parties discussed five options for clarifying the text in Section G (Article 3, paragraph 7ter) of the Doha Amendment, which include that: the paragraph not apply to parties without QELRCs during the first commitment period; the paragraph refers to parties with QELRCs inscribed in the third column of Annex B to the Kyoto Protocol, and clarifies the term "average annual emissions" for parties without QELRCs in the first commitment period; and the paragraph refers to the parties' "preceding commitment period."

Text in several options remained bracketed and no agreement on which option to use could be reached.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/L.18), the SBSTA agrees to continue consideration of the issue at SBSTA 41, taking into account the options for the text of a bracketed draft decision contained in an annex.

**Land Use, Land-use Change and Forestry (LULUCF) Under Protocol Articles 3.3 and 3.4, and Under the CDM:** This item (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/MISC.2 and FCCC/TP/2014/2)

was first considered by the SBSTA on 4 June, and was subsequently addressed in informal consultations co-facilitated by Lucia Perugini (Italy) and Marcelo Rocha (Brazil).

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/L.7), the SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- notes the possible additional LULUCF activities defined in the technical paper prepared by the Secretariat and agrees to prioritize its decision of the following groups of possible additional LULUCF activities in the context of mitigation practices limited to changes in carbon stocks, including revegetation, cropland management and grazing land management, and wetland drainage and rewetting;
- agrees to continue consideration of issues relating to more comprehensive accounting of anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks from LULUCF at SBSTA 42; and
- agrees to continue consideration of issues relating to modalities and procedures for applying the concept of additionality at SBSTA 42.

**Implications of the Inclusion of Reforestation of Lands with Forest in Exhaustion as Afforestation and Reforestation CDM Project Activities:** This item (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/MISC.1) was first considered by the SBSTA on 4 June. Informal consultations were facilitated by Eduardo Sanhueza (Chile). No agreement could be reached on the issue, which will be taken up at SBSTA 41.

**MARKET AND NON-MARKET MECHANISMS UNDER THE CONVENTION: FVA:** This issue was first considered in the SBSTA on 4 June, and in subsequent informal consultations co-facilitated by Peer Stiansen (Norway) and Mandy Rambharos (South Africa).

Discussions focused on, *inter alia*: relevance of the FVA to the ADP; the need to share experiences on all approaches, and for more focused submissions on approaches to be considered in the design of the framework, without prejudging the use of such approaches; long-term functions; how to address whether and how approaches are comparable to UNFCCC standards; and avenues for international participation of subnational entities.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/L.10), the SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- encourages parties to draw on submissions, the technical synthesis and the report on the workshop;
- notes its work on this matter is being conducted without prejudice to the work of the ADP on the 2015 agreement and pre-2020 ambition;
- notes the willingness of parties to share information relevant to the design and operation of market-based approaches and non-market-based approaches, and invites further submissions, by 22 September 2014, without prejudging the use or recognition of these approaches under the Convention and its instruments;
- suggests that these submissions address, *inter alia*, whether and how approaches meet standards that are comparable to standards under the UNFCCC, enable the accounting, at the international level, of mitigation outcomes, allow for participation, including through possible eligibility criteria, provide co-benefits, including their contribution to sustainable

development, poverty eradication and adaptation, have effective institutional arrangements and governance, and relate to international agreements; and

- requests a technical paper from the Secretariat for consideration at SBSTA 41 on how approaches may address these issues.

**Non-Market-Based Approaches:** This issue was considered in the SBSTA on 4 June, and in subsequent informal consultations co-facilitated by Peer Stiansen (Norway) and Mandy Rambharos (South Africa).

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/L.11), the SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- encourages parties to draw on submissions and the report on the workshop on non-market-based approaches;
- notes its work in this matter is being conducted without prejudice to the work of the ADP on the 2015 agreement and pre-2020 ambition;
- notes the willingness of parties to share information relevant to the design and operation of non-market-based approaches;
- invites further submissions by 22 September 2014, including on lessons learned from developing and implementing non-market-based approaches, options for international cooperation, and co-benefits of such approaches; and
- requests a technical paper on these matters from the Secretariat for consideration at SBSTA 41.

**New Market-Based Mechanisms:** This issue was considered in the SBSTA on 4 June and in subsequent informal consultations co-facilitated by Peer Stiansen and Mandy Rambharos.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/L.12), the SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- encourages parties to draw on submissions, the technical synthesis and the report on the workshop on the mechanism;
- notes its work on this matter is being conducted without prejudice to the work of the ADP on the 2015 agreement and pre-2020 ambition;
- invites further submissions on the mechanism by 22 September 2014, including on its design and governance, possible elements of its modalities, meaning of “a net decrease and/or avoidance of global GHG emissions,” lessons learned from Kyoto Protocol mechanisms, relationship with the FVA and Kyoto Protocol mechanisms, and relationship with enhanced mitigation ambition; and
- requests a technical paper on these matters from the Secretariat for consideration at SBSTA 41.

#### WORK PROGRAMME ON CLARIFICATION OF QUANTIFIED ECONOMY-WIDE EMISSION REDUCTION TARGETS OF DEVELOPED COUNTRY PARTIES:

This issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/INF.6) was first considered by the SBSTA on 4 June. Informal consultations were co-facilitated by Karine Hertzberg (Norway) and Brian Mantlana (South Africa).

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/L.4), the SBSTA:

- welcomes information from the in-session event on quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets of developed country parties regarding the use of LULUCF and market-

based mechanisms by developed country parties in achieving their targets;

- takes note of the information provided by Annex I parties on quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/INF.6); and
- requests the Secretariat to update the document on quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets (FCCC/TP/2013/7).

The SBSTA also agrees to prepare conclusions at SBSTA 41 describing activities under the work programme since SBSTA 38, and issues addressed and shared understanding during the work programme with a view to identifying common elements for measuring progress towards the achievements of targets and on ensuring comparability of efforts.

#### SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF MITIGATION OF CLIMATE CHANGE:

This item was first considered by the SBSTA on 4 June. Informal consultations convened on this issue, and parties agreed to take up this item again at SBSTA 42.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/L.2), the SBSTA agrees to continue its consideration of this agenda item at SBSTA 42, taking into account the best available scientific information on mitigation of climate change and the ongoing work of other bodies under the Convention on related matters.

**COOPERATION WITH OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS:** This item (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/INF.8) was introduced in the SBSTA on Wednesday. The Secretariat reported that it has engaged in cooperative and enhanced activities, which promise to further the implementation of parties’ decisions under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol. The SBSTA Chair consulted with interested parties.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/L.9), the SBSTA, *inter alia*: reaffirms the importance of the Secretariat’s engagement with other international organizations, in particular with UN entities; recognizes that the resources and expertise of other intergovernmental and international organizations are relevant to the UNFCCC process, and encourages the Secretariat to work in partnership with them; and requests the Secretariat to strengthen its collaboration with international organizations in implementing activities referred to in Decision 1/CP.19 (enhancing the ADP) paragraph 2(d), which requests organizations in a position to do so to provide support to parties in their domestic preparations for their INDCs.

**CLOSING SBSTA PLENARY:** On 15 June, the UNFCCC Secretariat reported on the budgetary implications of SBSTA conclusions.

SBSTA Chair Dlamini, on behalf of SBSTA Rapporteur Diana Harutyunyan (Armenia), presented the draft report of the session (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/L.3), which parties adopted.

Bolivia, for the G-77/China, *inter alia*, emphasized the importance of structuring the work of the TEC and that lack of progress on clarification of the rules for the effective implementation of the Doha Amendment should not be used as an excuse not to ratify the second commitment period.

The EU flagged his disappointment that the rules to implement the Doha Amendment are not finalized, stating that, without these rules, the EU cannot fulfill its obligations and ratify the Doha Amendment.

Australia, for the Umbrella Group, stated that “more work needs to be done” on loss and damage, and looked forward to finalizing the organization and governance of the Executive Committee in Lima.

Sudan, for the African Group, underlined the need to work on non-carbon benefits of REDD+. He stressed that methodological discussions should not be used to renegotiate the Doha Amendment.

Nauru, for AOSIS, stated outcomes on loss and damage in Lima should include: ensuring SIDS representation on the Executive Committee; creating an organization and governance structure; and establishing systems to address the needs of SIDS and other vulnerable countries. On Protocol Article 3, paragraph 7ter, related to the Doha Amendment, he expressed concern that the rule seems “under attack.” He called for clarification in future SED meetings on the differences in the impacts of climate change at 1.5° and 2°C.

Nepal, for the LDCs, called for expediting arrangements to operationalize the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage and for a decision in Lima integrating the Poznan Strategic Programme on technology transfer into the Technology Mechanism. He noted lack of progress on methodological guidance on non-market-based approaches and non-carbon benefits for REDD+.

The Philippines highlighted agriculture as a vulnerable sector, stressing the focus of discussions should be on adaptation. On loss and damage, he noted the challenges ahead in operationalizing the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage, saying it cannot be allowed to become another “meaningless mechanism.”

BINGOs called for opportunities for businesses to provide their expertise and input in the process, citing the TEMs as an example of what businesses can do to amplify the actions of governments.

CAN, for ENGOs, stressed that climate change puts all at risk, outlining the importance of agriculture actions to support the rights of vulnerable groups.

CJN!, for ENGOs, underscored there is no room for offsets trading, saying they are riddled with fraud and human rights violations, calling instead for non-market-based approaches and RE feed-in tariffs.

Farmers welcomed progress on agriculture in light of their previous calls for a work programme on the issue, and highlighted food security, mitigation and adaptation.

Indigenous Peoples underscored that excluding non-carbon benefits, such as land tenure, from REDD+ discussions weakens the position of indigenous peoples. She called for representation of indigenous peoples’ organizations in the GCF.

Youth expressed regret that loss and damage is included under adaptation, underlining that one “cannot adapt to a hurricane.” She called for human rights as the basis for a new system to solve the climate crisis.

SBSTA Chair Dlamini gavelled the meeting to a close at 12:59 pm, on 15 June.

#### **AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON THE DURBAN PLATFORM FOR ENHANCED ACTION (ADP 2-5)**

ADP Co-Chair Kishan Kumarsingh (Trinidad and Tobago) opened the session on 4 June. He emphasized the world expects the UNFCCC process to deliver a response commensurate with the climate challenge, and that parties are the decision makers. UNFCCC Executive Secretary Figueres reported that an additional ADP session will take place from 20-25 October in Bonn, and that funding was nearly secured, except for funding for developing country participation.

The meeting proceeded on the basis of the agenda (ADP/2013/AGENDA) adopted at ADP 2-1, which took place from 29 April to 3 May 2013 in Bonn. ADP Co-Chair Kumarsingh introduced supporting documents (ADP.2014.3.InformalNote and ADP.2014.4.InformalNote). He highlighted agreement in March 2014 to establish a contact group, saying the core objectives under the two workstreams would be to: further elaborate the elements of the draft negotiating text; make significant progress towards identification of information that parties will provide in their INDCs; and advance work on pre-2020 ambition by stimulating action on the ground that is sufficient to close the ambition gap.

**OPENING STATEMENTS:** Bolivia, for the G-77/China, highlighted the importance of focused and urgent work, particularly in light of the outcomes of the IPCC AR5. He looked forward to balanced negotiations on all elements, calling for support for developing country INDCs. He stressed that workstream 2 is an integral part of the ADP, noting the TEMs should also address Annex I parties’ mitigation actions.

Noting IPCC AR5, the EU hoped that collective, urgent global action can achieve the 2°C objective in a manner that promotes sustainable economic growth. He stressed the need to, *inter alia*: focus on a draft decision on upfront information for Lima; identify a list of policy options for ministers; and engage intergovernmental organizations to facilitate action and implementation on the ground.

Australia, for the Umbrella Group: underlined opportunities to identify mutually agreeable elements for a draft negotiating text; called for agreement on upfront information to ensure transparency, clarity and understanding; and stressed the need to build understanding on the process by which INDCs will be proposed and considered by parties.

Switzerland, for the EIG, called for: a draft negotiating text that includes clearly defined targets and commitments according to CBDR; a draft decision on information to be submitted by parties along with their INDCs; more effective adaptation instruments; and capitalization of the GCF.

Sudan, for the African Group, said the Co-Chairs’ information note: does not represent parties’ views in their totality; contains some elements that do not conform with the principles of the Convention; and refers to “NDCs” whereas the Warsaw decision stipulated “INDCs.”

On pre-2020 ambition, Nauru, for AOSIS, called for political discussions on paragraphs 3 (full implementation of the Bali Action Plan) and 4 (enhancing pre-2020 mitigation ambition)

of Decision 1/CP.19 (advancing the ADP), and suggested the ministerial events could help enhance short-term ambition, in particular by developed countries. On the 2015 agreement, he called for focus on further elaborating its elements and identifying the information needed to allow parties to submit INDCs, stating the new agreement must include commitments from developed countries on finance.

Nepal, for the LDCs, said the 2015 agreement should, *inter alia*, be legally binding, deliver high ambition, have short commitment periods, include a compliance mechanism, have adequate and predictable MOI, and accommodate a reference to LDCs' special circumstances.

Egypt, for the LMDCs, said the 2015 agreement must be, *inter alia*, balanced, legitimate, credible, and avoid reinterpreting the Convention's principles. Opposing the use of the "landscape of issues" prepared by the ADP Co-Chairs as a basis for negotiations, he said formal text originating from inputs and submissions by parties should be used.

Venezuela, for ALBA, expressed concern over new arrangements, such as market mechanisms, which undermine developed and developing countries' responsibilities and lamented that the GCF had not received sufficient contributions. Emphasizing fairness, equity and justice, he identified the need for: the new agreement to build on what has been achieved to avoid a legal vacuum; measurable, reportable and verifiable commitments; and respect for principles of the Convention.

Saudi Arabia, for the Arab Group, stressed the need for a draft negotiating text based on decisions taken by consensus rather than a Co-Chairs' draft. He said that the six elements identified in Decision 1/CP.17, (mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology development and transfer, transparency of action and support, and capacity-building) should have the same legal nature and that consequences of any adverse effects must be accounted for.

India, for BASIC, emphasized the need to: address all elements of Decision 1/CP.17 in a balanced and comprehensive manner; identify NDCs, which should be in accordance with the principles and provisions of the Convention; and include a provision on MOI.

Papua New Guinea, speaking for a group of countries from the Coalition for Rainforest Nations, said COP 20 should: incorporate REDD+ and coastal marine ecosystems into the draft negotiating text; capture the results of the TEMs so that concrete mitigation actions are identified to close the pre-2020 ambition gap; launch the Warsaw REDD+ Framework; and open a REDD+ window in the GCF.

The Dominican Republic, for SICA, emphasized: balancing progress under both workstreams; working towards the 1.5°C objective; capitalizing the GCF; and having a separate session on loss and damage to ensure its inclusion in the 2015 agreement.

Noting that businesses seek clarity and predictability, BINGOs expressed readiness to work with parties on enabling environments, carbon pricing and risk management issues.

CAN, for ENGOs, called for further work on loss and damage and renewable energy and preventing backtracking from Kyoto Protocol commitments by developed countries.

CJN!, for ENGOs, expressed concern over lack of progress under workstream 1 (2015 agreement) and called for: closing the mitigation and finance gap; capitalizing the GCF; and basing NDCs on science, equity and justice.

Farmers stressed the new agreement must include MOI as well as agriculture, as key elements relevant to food security.

Indigenous Peoples called for urgent action that respects human rights, indigenous peoples' rights, traditional knowledge and customary practices.

Local Governments and Municipal Authorities called for a political outcome recognizing the role of local governments and a 10-year action plan for a Decade of Urban Low Emissions Development in 2016-2026.

Trade Unions lamented the lack of ambition in the negotiations, warning "there will be no jobs on a dead planet" and calling for integrating gender equality in the new agreement.

**CONTACT GROUP ON ADP ITEM 3—WORKSTREAM 1 (2015 AGREEMENT):** On 5 June, the ADP contact group met to discuss the organization of work for both workstreams and initial ideas on the process for INDCs. On organization of work, ADP Co-Chair Runge-Metzger (EU) reported that there would be dedicated meetings on the 2015 agreement and pre-2020 ambition, as well as a stocktaking plenary.

ADP Co-Chair Runge-Metzger outlined the "building blocks" of the 2015 agreement, all of which, he said, required clarification. He then presented a proposal of a circular process for INDCs, starting with communication, *ex ante* review of INDCs, formalization, *ex post* review once INDCs are implemented, and new contributions informed by the review. He underlined that the timing and sequencing of these steps is an open question.

The LMDCs introduced two conference room papers (CRPs) during the course of the meeting, one with elements of a 2015 agreement and one on information requirements for INDCs. Parties disagreed over whether to base discussions on text submitted by parties, the Co-Chairs' text of a draft decision on elements for the 2015 agreement or on no text at all. Parties also disagreed on whether to enter into "drafting mode" or continue conceptual discussions.

**Adaptation:** This issue was first taken up in a contact group on 7 June. ADP Co-Chair Kumarsingh observed adaptation should feature prominently in the 2015 agreement and provided guiding questions on: long-term and collective aspects of adaptation; commitments and contributions; and institutional arrangements, and cooperation and coordination.

Bhutan, for the LDCs, said NAPs should be the entry points for communicating and supporting adaptation, and called for adaptation, loss and damage, and MOI to be integral parts of the new agreement. He also underscored that adaptation is not secondary to mitigation, but an additional "burden."

On *long-term and collective aspects of adaptation*, Nauru, for AOSIS, questioned a global goal on adaptation as adaptation actions are region- and country-specific. She supported defining the relationship between mitigation, adaptation, and loss and damage in the 2015 agreement. Noting the localized nature

of adaptation responses, New Zealand opposed a quantified global goal on adaptation but supported an expression of shared commitment.

Japan questioned whether a global goal on adaptation and common methodologies for an adaptation assessment framework would be achievable by COP 21. Brazil cautioned against establishing a global goal on adaptation that would “freeze our needs.”

Australia said adaptation should be the responsibility of all countries, and called for an information-sharing process for adaptation responses for receiving recognition, sharing lessons and best practices, and drawing international attention to the issue.

Colombia supported an aspirational long-term adaptation objective. South Africa suggested a global goal on adaptation that: reflects a common commitment to reduce vulnerability to climate change; and links mitigation ambition and means of implementation. The EU preferred a “normative goal.” The Dominican Republic urged capturing synergies and co-benefits arising from adaptation action.

Switzerland proposed “to increase resilience and build adaptive capacities” as an adaptation goal, and suggested that it be included in national adaptation strategies. India urged a common understanding and common metrics.

On *commitments and contributions*, Colombia called for focus on how the provisions of the Convention translate into implementation and a qualitative commitment from all parties to strengthen resilience. AOSIS called for individual commitments that include adaptation.

Bangladesh emphasized implementation and linking finance to adaptation as main challenges. Brazil emphasized the need to: translate cooperation into implementation; provide adaptation finance; and mainstream adaptation through NDCs. Egypt, for the LMDCs, stressed the importance of economic diversification to build resilience, and highlighted financial support by developed countries as a basis for adaptation action.

China underscored the need to capture in the new agreement the Convention articles relevant to adaptation. Ecuador called for recognizing Convention provisions to scale up adaptation finance.

The Philippines called for developed country reporting requirements in the new agreement on support for adaptation in developing countries. Referring to INDCs, the EU questioned the usefulness of assessing individual parties’ commitments to adaptation.

On *institutional arrangements, and cooperation and coordination*, Chile, for AILAC, AOSIS, Canada, Japan, Colombia, Norway, Switzerland and New Zealand called for using existing institutional arrangements and mechanisms. New Zealand encouraged parties to streamline the existing adaptation “components.”

Mexico called for: an adaptation mechanism that would bring the NWP to the national and local levels. The Philippines proposed establishing an adaptation registry, noting, with Singapore, it could help share best practices.

Mexico also suggested inclusion of local and social capabilities in institutional arrangements, noting the need for methodologies, functioning knowledge platforms and stakeholder involvement.

The US, with Canada, saw value in integrating adaptation into national and subnational activities. AILAC urged parties to commit to adaptation efforts in accordance with nationally determined priorities, emphasizing the need for, *inter alia*: better understanding the metrics and methodologies for vulnerability assessment; social and economic dimensions of adaptation actions; and stakeholder engagement. Ethiopia expressed uneasiness with a “common” methodology for adaptation assessment, noting differences in national circumstances.

The United Arab Emirates said the 2015 agreement should reflect: diversity of adaptation actions; recognition of individual and collective adaptation efforts, including regional partnerships; and links to finance.

The Philippines called attention to the “adaptation funding crisis,” and suggested linking existing institutions to the financial mechanism of the Convention.

Sudan, for the African Group, stressed the need for adaptation needs assessment and assessment of support, including clarifying the type and sources of support. Tuvalu suggested incorporating a review mechanism to assess if finance matches adaptation needs, and called for a process to ensure that people displaced as a result of climate change are afforded human rights.

#### **Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDCs):**

This issue was first addressed in the ADP contact group on 11 June. ADP Co-Chair Kumarsingh opened the session on INDCs recalling Decision 1/CP.19 (further enhancing the ADP), and the Co-Chairs’ draft decision text distributed on 5 June.

Calling for the negotiations to move forward based on text put forward by parties, Nicaragua presented a new CRP by the LMDCs, containing draft decision text on the development of INDCs. He explained that it identifies the information to be provided by parties in their INDCs and reflects differentiation under the Convention, in the provision of information and types of information provided.

Stating that the Co-Chairs’ text is fully in line with the principles agreed at ADP 2-4, including that the process is party-driven and “outputs should be based on inputs from parties,” Switzerland, with South Africa, the Dominican Republic and Tuvalu, for the LDCs, cautioned against rushing into textual discussions. Nauru, for AOSIS, and the Russian Federation also welcomed the Co-Chairs’ paper.

In response to the LMDCs’ text, Switzerland agreed that the Durban mandate for a comprehensive agreement requires inclusion of mitigation, as well as adaptation and MOI, but cautioned against: portraying mitigation as solely applied to Annex I parties; suggesting INDCs would pre-empt the content of the new agreement; and focusing on process at the expense of other issues.

On the *definition of INDCs*, Costa Rica, for AILAC, said the definition of INDCs should be guided by the principles of no backsliding and no additional or unfair burdens on most vulnerable countries, and stressed that contributions should be treated equally in the new agreement.

Brazil, with Sudan, for the African Group, described NDCs as a permanent tool to increase ambition in the context of a long-term agreement, rather than a one-time affair.

Venezuela called for establishing a legal contact group to avoid any possible legal gaps between the current climate change regime and the future agreed outcome, including ensuring the legal coherence of national contributions. The Russian Federation urged awareness of possible legal consequences of including mitigation, adaptation and MOI in INDCs.

Singapore stressed the need to avoid placing new burdens on developing countries so as not to discourage them from submitting INDCs.

China said INDCs should provide appropriate differentiation, with: comparable contributions among developed countries, including on support; and developing countries' contributions to be in the context of sustainable development.

Iran stressed that: Annex I parties must take the lead on mitigation; non-Annex I parties' contributions should reflect the diversity of national circumstances and be in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication; and the level of developing countries' ambition will depend on the provision of MOI.

New Zealand favored differentiation based on the type of commitments and not country categories. Mexico said INDCs should showcase opportunities and challenges to global low-carbon development.

On the *scope of INDCs*, many countries, including the African Group, AILAC, the Philippines, for the LMDCs, Algeria, for the Arab Group, Brazil and Mexico agreed contributions should cover mitigation, adaptation, and MOI. Colombia said the elements do not need to be treated symmetrically, and called for a quantified goal on MOI.

Singapore stressed the need to recognize the linkage between adaptation and mitigation, while cautioning that information requirements for adaptation and mitigation should not be identical. Saudi Arabia highlighted the need to give equal weight to adaptation and mitigation. South Africa called for mitigation to be guided by the 2°C global temperature goal and adaptation to be guided by country-specific options and associated costs.

India said information in INDCs should differ for mitigation, adaptation and MOI, including differentiation in the context of the Convention, with non-Annex I parties' contributions depending on support and national development priorities.

The Marshall Islands expressed openness to including adaptation and other elements, but observed, with Jamaica, that adaptation is difficult to measure.

The Dominican Republic mentioned: the need for a common mitigation objective with mitigation by all; a process that facilitates understanding the proposed commitments and their fairness; and space for parties to make contributions in areas other than mitigation.

AOSIS identified mitigation as the core component of INDCs, saying INDCs should be submitted by a "greater" number of parties in a transparent manner and cohere with the global goal.

New Zealand said INDCs should cover mitigation "as a minimum." Mexico said mitigation should be a component of INDCs, with each party defining activities it will undertake.

Noting that adaptation and MOI are fundamental elements of the 2015 outcome, the US stressed all countries must have a quantifiable contribution on mitigation, and said that creating an expectation that all parties should provide information on all elements would create a technical and political burden on many parties.

The EU noted that all INDCs should include mitigation, and suggested some information, such as on the time frame, sectors and gases, may be similar for all countries, and said existing processes could address MOI and adaptation.

Canada said contributions should reflect parties' best efforts without conditions, and called for developing countries to indicate what additional mitigation contributions they could put forward with support.

Ecuador raised concerns about mitigation being the central focus of INDCs, fearing that developing countries will take on commitments without MOI materializing, risking their development priorities. Australia said INDCs should: be nationally determined; include a mitigation component from all countries; and not exclude any elements. He stressed that adaptation cannot substitute mitigation.

Bolivia, for the LMDCs, and AOSIS stressed the need to support development of INDCs by developing countries. Malaysia stressed MOI is not a condition but an obligation of developed countries.

The LDCs worried there is insufficient time to adequately reflect LDCs' needs if INDCs on adaptation are required by Paris, however he also expressed concern that if INDCs do not include adaptation, the issue will not be properly treated in the 2015 agreement.

On *developing INDCs, such as information to be provided and process, including the timeline up to 2015 through a possible review or assessment*, Belize, for CARICOM, suggested a decision in Lima provide a timeline for INDCs to be submitted by 31 March 2015 by parties in a position to do so and contain a cut-off date of 31 August 2015.

South Africa outlined the communication process for INDCs, including an *ex ante* process for assessment of fairness and adequacy by a technical panel in 2016, and subsequent final inscription of INDCs in the agreement in 2017. South Africa also called for addressing "critical mass," namely defining the number of countries that must submit INDCs before initiating the assessment process.

Singapore stressed the need to reach agreement in Lima if countries are to submit their INDCs in a timely manner, and called for facilitating the clarity and transparency of contributions by all parties.

On **information requirements**, the African Group stated that developed countries' INDCs should include information on adaptation support, including the type of support, scale, and delivery mechanism, while developing countries' INDCs should provide information on nationally determined adaptation processes.

China, with Malaysia, called for: up-front information on developed countries' economy-wide absolute emission reduction targets, referenced to a 1990 base year and to be achieved without offsets; quantifiable and comparable up-front

information from developed countries on their financial and technical support to developing countries, including a clear roadmap, timetable, sources of finance, and plans for technology transfer; and voluntary information from developing countries on contributions, including the diversity of mitigation and adaptation actions, finance and technology needs, and barriers to enhanced action.

Norway stressed that it is up to parties to decide what information to provide in their INDCs. He said countries may wish to include adaptation in their INDCs, but should not be requested to do so through a pre-determined information list.

The Republic of Korea opposed including indicators on the adequacy of aggregate contributions in view of the global temperature goal or on the equity or fairness of individual contributions, suggesting they be considered when defining rules on the *ex ante* process.

Noting that the future regime should be comprehensive in nature and universal in membership, the Russian Federation observed that the format for submitting INDCs should not be over-prescriptive or deter countries from providing INDCs.

Japan stressed information that can be subject to MRV is needed on mitigation from all parties. He said it is not possible to have the same methodology or metrics for adaptation as for mitigation.

Norway emphasized that mitigation contributions should be numerically inscribed, stressing that emission reductions need to be estimated in accordance with common parameters, such as the scope, target year and base year.

Australia said up-front information should focus on mitigation, expressed by a limited set of known variables, and stressed the need for assurances that all key economies play a part and work towards the global goal.

On **communicating INDCs**, Australia said modalities should: be simple; not be embedded in the current reporting requirements under the Convention; and include a facilitative process to advance understanding on INDCs.

Noting that INDCs are not the only way to reflect commitments, Chile called for formulating quantified climate action and qualitatively defined efforts, including communicating what parties will contribute towards the achievement of the Convention's goal and global climate resilience.

New Zealand announced her country has started work on its INDC with a focus on mitigation, and called for agreement in Lima on sequencing the preparation of INDCs and their elements, including time, scope and expected impact. She called for finalizing principles and rules for submitting INDCs in 2015, noting that INDCs will have to be inscribed as provisional until rules are agreed.

On **review and assessment**, Australia said an *ex ante* assessment on mitigation should be finalized by Paris and not be applied in the same way to adaptation and support.

China, with Cuba and the Arab Group, supported draft decision text that only includes information requirements for INDCs, noting parties did not agree to discuss a review process for INDCs. He warned this could lead to an agenda fight in Lima. India noted no consensus on an *ex ante* review process.

The US discussed aspects of a “consultative period,” including: presentation of contributions by the first quarter of 2015; compilation of communications by the Secretariat; presentation by parties of their contributions and subsequent discussion thereof; bilateral and other consultations outside the formal process; re-visitation of contributions by parties, wherever possible; and finalization of the process in 2015.

Singapore suggested the consultation process: be open and light in format, non-intrusive but respect national sovereignty, and facilitative of broadening participation; include a focus on needs of parties that have not submitted their INDCs; and apply to all submitted INDCs.

Brazil encouraged countries to start domestic preparations for their NDCs as this will allow countries to engage in negotiations with a mandate supported by stakeholders at home. He called for a facilitation process for increasing ambition that would allow for communication between the national and multilateral levels on the global goal.

Highlighting “intended” and “towards achieving the objective of the Convention” as key aspects of paragraph 2 (on the 2015 agreement) of Decision 1/CP.19 (further enhancing the ADP), Sudan, for the African Group, stated that “intended” suggests a multilateral process for INDCs to become NDCs. He called for an *ex ante* multilateral assessment process that examines INDCs in terms of adequacy and fairness.

**Finance, Technology and Capacity Building:** This issue was first addressed on 10 June. On *finance*, ADP Co-Chair Runge-Metzger noted: convergence among parties that the financial mechanism of the Convention could serve the 2015 agreement in the context of strengthening institutional arrangements; differences among parties on finance commitments; and related work in other bodies. He presented a roadmap for scaling up post-2020 climate finance, outlining dimensions based on parties' views, including demand, support, delivery and transparency.

On **finance commitments**, Belize, for CARICOM, called for inscribing in the new agreement the pledge of US\$100 billion per year by 2020. Malaysia, for the G-77/China, called US\$100 billion per year by 2020 a “starting point” to enhance financial commitments in the post-2020 period. Sudan, for the African Group, called for a mid-term target of US\$60-80 billion per year by 2016 and a pathway for moving to US\$600 billion per year by 2030.

Chile, for AILAC, stressed MOI as key to enabling future action, identifying the need for a mid-term finance target of US\$70 billion for 2016, and calling for the capitalization of the GCF with at least US\$50 billion in 2014. Tuvalu, for the LDCs, with the Philippines, for the LMDCs, and Nauru, for AOSIS, called for an initial resource mobilization of US\$15 billion for the GCF.

The LDCs called for developed countries to provide new and additional funds before Paris. AOSIS highlighted the need for adequate and predictable financial support to developing countries for implementation of their actions. Switzerland opposed including in the new agreement pre-2020 financing and details on the funding procedures of the GCF.

The LMDCs opposed conditions on finance, and called for quantified commitments by developed countries with levels

of finance to be commensurate with needs as identified by developing countries. AOSIS stressed developed countries should have the same obligations under the new agreement as under the Convention, and take the lead in scaling up finance.

The Republic of Korea, for the EIG, with New Zealand, said all countries in a position to do so should support country-driven actions in accordance with CDDRRC. New Zealand noted that the 30 richest developing countries have larger economies than the poorest Annex II country, and suggested those developing countries begin making financial contributions in accordance with CDDRRC. Norway said a broader range of countries “will have to shoulder a share.”

Brazil suggested those non-Annex I countries that are willing to could contribute to finance, based on their nationally determined circumstances. China expressed concern over “blurring the lines” between developing and developed countries. India opposed as unfair attempts to renegotiate finance obligations or require developing countries to provide market access.

India stressed a substantial amount of finance is a prerequisite for submission of INDCs by developing countries. South Africa called for an agreed burden-sharing formula for Annex II countries.

Egypt noted a “sequencing” issue because the intended financial contributions of developed countries have a direct impact on the intended actions of developing countries, calling for addressing this in the 2015 agreement.

The US said that INDCs should not be conditional, and that countries should state in their INDCs what they can do within existing capabilities, and what is possible with additional resources.

On **adaptation finance**, CARICOM, the African Group and the G-77/China called for a balance between mitigation and adaptation finance. China suggested a subsidiary body on adaptation within the GCF. The LDCs noted an adaptation funding debt and deficit, stressing the need for special consideration of most vulnerable countries.

On **institutions**, CARICOM called for harmonization and rationalization of approval criteria among the various existing channels and institutions. The African Group, CARICOM and Guyana called for enhanced access to climate finance. AOSIS, the LDCs and LMDCs called for simplified access to resources. Many developing countries called for capitalization of the GCF. The G-77/China, with Kenya and others, said the GCF should be “anchored” in the new agreement.

Noting institutions inside and outside the Convention, the EIG called for integrated and coordinated supply of MOI. He said the GCF should be the main operating entity of the financial mechanism and that the Standing Committee’s role should be strengthened. The African Group emphasized the Standing Committee’s function is evaluating and analyzing financial flows.

Guyana requested a REDD+ window in the GCF. Papua New Guinea said the 2015 agreement should further mobilize REDD+ finance to ensure implementation. Nicaragua called for including loss and damage as part of a finance mechanism in the new agreement.

The EU said the GCF should be a major player in the post-2020 arrangement. He welcomed the GCF’s agreement on having a 50/50 balance between adaptation and mitigation.

On **transparency**, CARICOM, Bangladesh and Guyana called for developing a common definition of climate finance. The LMDCs called for robust MRV on provision of finance, and Algeria, with other developing countries, called for clear accounting rules in the 2015 agreement.

The EIG said reporting systems should be common to all, but differentiated in “depth” and that the COP should mandate a system for transparency of support, including common definitions and guidelines on effectiveness.

The LDCs called for a finance review mechanism so that a finance target can be scaled up according to post-2020 adaptation, mitigation, loss and damage, technology transfer and capacity-building needs.

AOSIS suggested *ex ante* predictability through time-bound financial targets, *ex post* reporting, and learning from existing mechanisms. South Africa called for an *ex ante* review of financial components of INDCs, including an adequacy and fairness assessment.

On **sources**, the LDCs supported public sources, with supplementary funding coming from other sources. Iran called for a clear road map for public finance with specific targets, sources and timelines, and inclusion of individual and aggregate targets for financial support by developed countries. Developed countries identified a role for private finance.

Bangladesh called for leveraging “auto-generation mechanisms,” such as passenger levies.

Switzerland emphasized recognizing the importance of a variety of instruments, including grants and loans, and enabling environments to promote investments in developing countries. The EU stressed the need for domestic enabling environments to facilitate green investment and better understanding of private finance flows.

Venezuela stressed that developed countries’ responsibility cannot be transferred to the private sector. India lamented lack of information on climate finance flows.

On **capacity building**, ADP Co-Chair Kumarsingh outlined existing capacity-building processes under the UNFCCC. China, for the LMDCs, suggested capacity building must focus on human skills, national institution building and development of endogenous technology.

Jamaica, for AOSIS, called for: a formal and structured approach to allow countries to plan and implement measures; commitment by the international community to provide assistance; and enhancement of the Durban Forum on Capacity Building through an action-oriented process.

Canada suggested focusing on capacity-building needs that arise from implementation of the 2015 agreement. The EU expressed support for a focused and thematic approach to capacity building, noting that capacity building is the responsibility of many UNFCCC institutions.

Iraq called for special consideration of capacity-building needs of countries recovering from political turmoil and natural disasters. Zambia underlined the need to move from short-term approaches to local, country-driven and long-term approaches.

On an **institutional mechanism**, the LMDCs, supported by Algeria, for the Arab Group, called for the establishment of an international mechanism for capacity building to: be funded by the GCF; be linked to the work of the TEC; and have an evaluation mechanism to assess the effectiveness of delivery of support.

Tuvalu, for the LDCs, with Sudan, for the African Group, supported the establishment of a capacity-building committee under the new agreement to monitor and review the effectiveness of such activities.

Japan observed existing arrangements on capacity building are functioning well and could be strengthened based on the principles of durability and flexibility. Citing capacity building as “inherently” cross-cutting and country-driven, the US said that establishing new institutions may not improve implementation by the many existing institutions with capacity-building mandates.

The LDCs responded that a capacity-building committee could bring coherence to these existing institutions’ efforts and review their effectiveness, including adequacy of funding and geographic distribution of projects.

On **technology**, ADP Co-Chair Kumarsingh provided parties with facilitative points for the discussion on institutional arrangements, cooperation and coordination.

Tuvalu, for the LDCs, stressed technology as a key element of low-carbon pathways and called for links to finance mechanisms. India, for the LMDCs, supported by Belize, for AOSIS, emphasized enhanced action on technology transfer and operational modalities. Mexico called for focus on both public and private funds to ensure dynamic technology markets.

The LMDCs stressed the need for political will for large-scale global coordination to move towards sustainable production and consumption patterns. He suggested addressing, *inter alia*, different technology needs and the role of public funds for research and development.

South Africa outlined differentiated, enhanced commitments on technology transfer. China identified three elements in the 2015 agreement on technology: developing quantifiable, comparable and transparent plans by developed countries to support technology development and transfer to developing countries; developing or strengthening endogenous technologies, with support from developed countries; and establishing global research and development processes. Iran called for a dedicated technology window in the GCF.

The EU said INDCs should identify specific mitigation and adaptation actions that will lead to technology development and transfer, and that the TNAs will help connect the supply and demand for specific technologies. With the US and Canada, he called for increasing outreach to the private sector.

South Africa called upon developing countries to update their TNAs with the support of developed countries, and implement appropriate structures and policies to encourage effective technology transfer.

On **institutions**, the LDCs called for: formalizing existing institutions for coherence; incorporating the Poznan Strategic Programme on Technology Transfer into the new agreement; and ensuring linkages between the Technology Mechanism and bodies inside and outside the Convention. AOSIS, the

LMDCs, Mexico and the US called for strengthening existing mechanisms, with the US urging identification of reliable sources of funds for existing mechanisms.

Japan called for enhancing the Technology Mechanism’s institutions through COP decisions, rather than in the 2015 agreement.

AOSIS stressed the need to ensure other climate change-focused technology centers and initiatives are guided by the UNFCCC, and called for establishing a special programme for SIDS and low-lying states.

Malaysia said technology transfer mechanisms reflect developed countries’ commitments under the Convention.

Uganda suggested incorporating the Poznan Strategic Programme on technology transfer into the Technology Mechanism. Peru called for regional technology centers to help produce and adapt technologies to local circumstances and to be included in the CTCN as technology providers.

On **trade-related issues**, the LDCs, AOSIS, and the LMDCs noted IPR-related barriers. South Africa called for developed country parties not to use IPRs in specific circumstances, and to deploy a subsidy scheme for preferential licensing rights. Algeria, for the Arab Group, said IPRs should be addressed in a “fair and comprehensive” way, including through the establishment of an international mechanism on IPRs.

Mexico called for enabling environments and creating feedback channels to inform economic, regulatory and tax policies. The EU noted that the work plan of the TEC could respond to enabling environments and barriers, including IPRs. The US underlined that IPRs are an area of divergence with little likelihood of parties reaching agreement on them and, with Canada, said IPRs constitute an incentive for innovation, not a barrier.

**Mitigation:** This issue was first addressed on 8 June. The Marshall Islands, Colombia, for AILAC, Bangladesh, Nauru, for AOSIS, and Kenya called for mitigation commitments to be guided by science, with many highlighting the IPCC AR5.

On **differentiation**, the LDCs called for differentiation in mitigation based on a fair categorization, ranging from absolute economy-wide reduction targets for all developed countries to results- and activity-based commitments by developing countries.

Brazil, India, China, AOSIS, Algeria and Papua New Guinea underlined that developed countries should present quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets. Flexibility for developing countries to tailor contributions, as appropriate, was stressed by Singapore, Bangladesh, Sudan, for the African Group, India and China. China clarified that developing countries should be able to choose between, *inter alia*, intensity targets, low carbon strategies, and mitigation plans, policies and projects.

Mexico called on developed countries and others in a position to do so to assume quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets. The Marshall Islands raised concern that “pure self-differentiation” would lead to a “free-for-all,” and called for ground rules.

Australia and Japan called for “serious action” by all major economies, with Japan saying they should present quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets. The EU said those

with greatest capabilities should present absolute economy-wide mitigation targets.

India, China and Algeria said developing country commitments should be contingent on provision of MOI. Singapore said identifying possible additional contributions by developing countries is contingent on provision of support.

The Republic of Korea said contributions should be defined by each party, reflecting CBDRRC. AILAC called for differentiation based on CBDRRC. Japan emphasized operationalizing CBDR in a “dynamic context,” stressing contributions should be based on national circumstances and should not be conditional on provision of support. Switzerland underscored that the depth and type of contributions should reflect CBDRRC “in light of today’s realities.” Australia said that using fixed categories of countries would be disconnected from current realities and create a ceiling on what certain countries can do.

New Zealand suggested a design applicable to all that would allow for differentiation with built-in flexibility and agreed parameters.

On **time frame**, South Africa said INDCs should be implemented over a 10-year period, while the LDCs, with the Marshall Islands, and Antigua and Barbuda, called for a 5-year commitment period.

On **mitigation in the 2015 agreement**, Norway suggested as options for a long-term goal: a goal of stabilized maximum CO<sub>2</sub> concentration in the atmosphere; a temperature goal, noting the 2°C target needs to be operational; and, with the Marshall Islands, a goal for global emission reductions that are able to achieve the 2°C goal, with a view to achieving net zero emissions by 2050.

AILAC said the agreement should, *inter alia*, include a long-term mitigation goal, with mitigation commitments from all parties arising from INDCs, and “the right incentives” to encourage all parties to take action. Antigua and Barbuda said it should: recognize that the SIDS and LDCs require special treatment; reflect strong global ambition on mitigation and developed countries’ leadership; and include a mitigation goal based on the latest science and the 2013-2015 Review.

Ecuador, for the LMDCs, said mitigation in the new agreement should reflect equity and CBDR through differentiation, with enhanced commitments going beyond Cancun pledges by Annex I parties and enhanced NAMAs by non-Annex parties enabled by MOI.

AILAC said the agreement should incorporate a review mechanism to allow for ambition to be increased.

The LMDCs called for recognizing the social and economic consequences of response measures, and proposed an international institution on response measures. The LMDCs also said the agreement should operationalize Convention Article 3.5 (discriminatory climate change-related trade measures) and, with Papua New Guinea, stressed the agreement should strengthen MRV of MOI provision by developed countries.

New Zealand highlighted: a global goal for mitigation; an obligation to have domestic measures to implement NDCs; the need for broad parameters for contributions and “default

settings” that can be opted out of in agreed instances; and that outcomes of mitigation contributions need to be measurable and verifiable in quantified terms.

**Transparency of Action and Support:** This issue was discussed on 11 June. ADP Co-Chair Runge-Metzger encouraged parties to structure discussions around: transparency of action, including differentiation and flexibility, and accounting; transparency of support, including differentiation and flexibility, accounting and specifics of MRV of support; and support for implementing MRV.

Many parties: identified transparency as a critical element of the 2015 agreement, both for trust building and ensuring environmental integrity; called for a strong transparency regime; and highlighted building on existing institutions and reporting and accounting mechanisms under the Convention and Kyoto Protocol.

Canada said transparency promotes knowledge sharing and encourages learning from each other. Venezuela called for transparency based on responsibility, fairness, equity and justice. Colombia, for AILAC, said different types of commitments require adaptable methodologies.

The EU said the agreement should include key elements and principles for a common MRV system, including common metrics, methodologies, reporting obligations, review and key principles for the land-use sector. South Africa said *ex post* assessment of post-2020 commitments, once implemented, should include a review process.

Canada said the 2015 agreement should lay out the core commitments, while specifics should be negotiated post-2015. Algeria, for the Arab Group, Ecuador and Iran emphasized elements for enhancing transparency under the 2015 outcome, including relevant Convention articles and implementation of relevant decisions from Bali.

On **differentiation**, Canada, the EU, Japan, Australia, the Russian Federation and New Zealand said the post-2020 transparency framework should be applicable to all while including built-in flexibility, *inter alia*, to accommodate a spectrum of national circumstances or for differentiation by the type of commitments. AILAC said the transparency system should take into account parties’ evolving capacities, and called for countries’ MRV capacities to be enhanced through international support.

Algeria, for the Arab Group, Ecuador, Iran and Dominica referred to the Convention as providing the basis for differentiation regarding communication of information, and suggested this be based on, *inter alia*: annual GHG inventories and international assessment and review, biennial reports and national communications for developed countries; and national communications, BURs and international consultation and analysis for developing countries.

On **transparency of action**, Nauru, for AOSIS, stressed the need for information from parties to allow assessment of their NDCs against global goals, and to ensure the special status of SIDS and LDCs.

Tuvalu, for the LDCs, identified the need for: transparency in the lead-up to Paris; clear, verifiable and additional emission reductions subject to reporting provisions no less stringent than those under the Protocol, particularly for developed countries; and a compliance system.

Australia supported transparency arrangements adapted to the types of NDCs to be developed, calling for moving away from the binary system to enable countries to move to the highest levels of MRV.

Suggesting MRV and accounting systems build on the current systems, which will develop into a common system for all parties, Norway said the MRV system should fit parties' commitments on mitigation and respective capabilities, and improve overtime.

Noting that transparency is not an end in itself but aims to promote a regime that encourages "a race to the top rather than a race to the bottom," the Philippines called for enhanced transparency of Annex I countries' mitigation commitments that are based on comparability of efforts.

Mexico said MRV should be tailored to types of commitments and should assess progress towards the Convention's objective. The Dominican Republic favored a flexible transparency system based on a common framework and emphasized the need for different types of MRV for different types of commitments.

China said common MRV and accounting rules should only apply to developed countries. The US said a transparency of action system should be flexible, and promote ambition and mutual trust. He urged developing countries with greater emissions and capabilities to provide information on their projected emissions, and proposed a single MRV system based on capabilities, which would: encourage learning by doing; not be punitive; and include increased flexibility for LDCs and SIDS.

The Russian Federation called for understanding the minimum information required to achieve net emission reductions without placing unnecessary burdens on any parties. He called for a single MRV system, and urged agreement on general criteria to ensure transparency.

Brazil called for a strong methodology to compare parties' efforts, requested mandating the SBSTA to intensify its work on common metrics, and emphasized *ex post* and *ex ante* transparency.

AILAC said MRV of action should be based on the principle of no backsliding. The Arab Group said transparency of action by developing countries should be non-intrusive, non-punitive and respect national sovereignty.

On **accounting for action**, Norway stressed the accounting system should: track overall progress and hold countries accountable; include the land sector and market mechanisms; and be under a flexible and manageable system. The US encouraged "borrowing" from the Kyoto Protocol, rather than adopting it wholesale.

Sudan, for the African Group, South Africa, New Zealand and Japan called for common accounting rules, with South Africa proposing specific working groups to develop rules for land-based emissions and market mechanisms.

AILAC called for specific accounting rules that prevent double counting, ensure environmental integrity, and prevent carry-over of assigned amount units to subsequent commitment periods.

Switzerland, for the EIG, said the agreement should include core accounting rules, such as: a comprehensive land sector approach; thorough review processes; constant improvement of methods; and inclusion of all gases. The EU called for accounting for LULUCF and markets.

On **transparency of support**, the Arab Group called for enhancing transparency of financial and technology support. China expressed concern over lack of methodology for reporting on support. The US said the post-2020 transparency system should evolve to incorporate all countries providing support.

The EU and Japan said MRV of support should reflect support provided and received. AILAC supported an internationally agreed methodology for tracking financial flows, including information on donor and recipient countries, and a common definition of climate finance to avoid double counting.

South Africa said MRV of support should include an assessment of the types, sources and methods of delivery of finance, and effectiveness of the agreed pathways for delivering support.

Iran said developed countries should provide *ex ante* information on MOI in a common template. Ecuador suggested sequencing contributions so that transparency of support is addressed first, followed by an assessment by developing countries of enhanced action possibilities based on the level of support.

Bangladesh called for consideration of consistency of information on delivering support and whether the biennial reports serve this purpose. The LDCs said MRV of support should be commensurate with MRV of action.

The Dominican Republic stated that MRV of finance must be robust and "give us a good idea of where we are headed." The Philippines said MRV of support should include enhanced reporting procedures for Annex II parties based on comparability of efforts.

Brazil emphasized preventing double-counting and called for linkages with work under the SBSTA.

**Other Issues Related to Elements:** This issue was first addressed on 13 June. ADP Co-Chair Runge-Metzger invited parties to explore a cycle of future contributions under the new agreement, including assessment and review, compliance, and duration of these cycles.

On **assessment and review**, the Russian Federation said an international assessment in 2015 or 2016 would risk not having a "ready package" of definitive and understandable contributions in Paris.

Saudi Arabia said the Convention provides the necessary mechanisms to address assessment, review and compliance. China characterized an assessment and review of INDCs as outside the mandate of the ADP. Singapore called for rules regarding up-front information and arrangements for *ex ante* consultation, applicable to all parties. Nepal, for the LDCs, suggested an expert review for an adequacy assessment of

INDCs and a similar *ex ante* review process for financial support from developed countries.

Japan called for the *ex ante* process to be simple, and the *ex post* process build on existing MRV systems and be common to all parties. Norway, with Switzerland called for two international review processes, one prior to Paris and another carried out periodically thereafter.

South Africa outlined the timing of an *ex ante* process and described an *ex post* process with a 10-year commitment period punctuated by midterm “checks,” the possibility of adjustments at any time, and a “seamless” inscription of new commitments during the period.

China said an *ex post* process could assess emission reductions by developed countries, and barriers faced by and needs of developing countries. The Marshall Islands expressed preference for a five-year review cycle.

New Zealand suggested that review and assessment take place during, and at the end of, a commitment period.

Brazil noted that a mid-term review is different than current approaches, which do not inspire increasing ambition. A review, he said, could use global temperature or emission levels as a reference, noting that using different base years and metrics could complicate review efforts.

Opposing long-term locking-in of contributions, the Dominican Republic called for “a direction of travel” towards the 1.5°C or 2°C goal.

On **compliance**, the Russian Federation suggested building on the lessons from the Kyoto Protocol’s compliance mechanism. The LDCs called for robust MRV of contributions and, with Colombia, for a compliance system comparable to the one under the Protocol.

Saudi Arabia said the Protocol’s command-and-control approach would not incentivize participation.

The EU said every regime needs a compliance system tailored to its specific commitments, but generally it must promote participation, transparency and accountability. China underlined it is “premature” to discuss compliance because of uncertainty about the 2015 agreement’s legal form.

Switzerland favored legally-binding commitments and different compliance approaches for mitigation and adaptation. South Africa said the compliance mechanism should be a “house with many rooms,” with various means for parties to receive compliance assistance.

The US suggested a strengthened MRV system that: is applicable to all parties; includes reporting, expert review and exchange among parties; and is capable of evolving.

On the **structure of the 2015 agreement**, New Zealand called for a ratifiable, legally-binding agreement, with readily updatable schedules, including on parties’ commitments, and COP decisions to support implementation. Norway said the new agreement should be durable and include market-based mechanisms.

Singapore called for operational text on, *inter alia*, strengthening the multilateral, rules-based system and anchoring NDCs in the core agreement, including recognizing the importance of national circumstances and sustainable development priorities.

Nauru, for AOSIS, proposed inclusion of loss and damage in the new agreement.

Bolivia emphasized: the rights of Mother Earth; non-market-based approaches; and alternative approaches to results-based payments under REDD+.

Japan called for: a universal obligation to submit INDCs; a transparency mechanism applied to all; and integration of adaptation into national planning processes.

The US described as core elements: an international legal obligation for each party to put forward and maintain mitigation contributions, reflected in a schedule; up-front information clarifying commitments; an obligation to report on implementation; and review. Ecuador said a “mitigation-centric” agreement would dilute other issues important to developing countries.

On the **legal form**, Nauru, for AOSIS, and Belize, for CARICOM, said the agreement should be legally binding, with CARICOM calling for five-year commitment periods. The Republic of Korea said the agreement should be a rules-based instrument.

On the **structure of the agreement**, the Marshall Islands, the US and Australia called for the core agreement to be concise and durable.

CARICOM called for sections on: adaptation, mitigation, finance, technology development and transfer, capacity building, loss and damage, and compliance.

The Republic of Korea listed mitigation, adaptation, MOI, and transparency as core elements.

Argentina, for the LMDCs, presented the structure for the new agreement as outlined in the LMDC submission, adding on other appropriate standard provisions. Switzerland opposed differentiation between Annex I and non-Annex I, saying support is a tool and not an objective, and called for MRV to be integrated into the parts of the agreement on mitigation, adaptation and finance.

Australia further suggested: national schedules to capture contributions and allow for adjustments without ratification requirements; a broader package on instruments and evolving arrangements; and details on information-sharing processes.

China, with India, proposed attachments to the agreement on: developed countries’ mitigation commitments; developing countries’ enhanced mitigation actions; and developed countries’ MOI contributions, including finance targets and roadmaps.

The LMDCs cautioned that “there is no place for dynamic differentiation under the UNFCCC.” China disapproved of new categorizations, dynamic interpretations and self-differentiation.

On the final clauses of the 2015 agreement, the EU called for, *inter alia*: a clause on entry into force; effectiveness through sufficient coverage of parties and emissions; and provisions to reflect the specific situation of regional economic integration organizations. Switzerland called for clauses on, *inter alia*, amendment of the agreement, and a simple process for updating annexes that would include NDCs.

On **inter-relationships and inter-linkages between elements**, Switzerland and Japan distinguished between mitigation and adaptation as objectives, and MOI as a tool helping achieve these objectives.

Sudan, for the African Group, stressed the relationship between the ADP workstreams, said there are strong linkages between the global temperature goal, mitigation and adaptation, and called for an aggregate assessment of adequacy and fairness of efforts on all elements. The Republic of Korea said mitigation and adaptation are closely interconnected.

South Africa suggested anchoring in the agreement linkages between mitigation, adaptation and MOI, and between existing institutions under the Convention. The Dominican Republic stressed the co-benefits between mitigation and adaptation.

Saudi Arabia described: synergies between work under the ADP and the SBs; co-benefits relating to enhancing action; alignment of response measures with reduction of emissions and promotion of the Sustainable Development Goals; and synergies from building resilience through economic diversification.

Tuvalu, for the LDCs, highlighted as key inter-relationships the overall goal of the agreement to limit the global temperature rise to 1.5°C, and linkages between ambition and the core MRV and accounting provisions coming from the Kyoto Protocol, to be applied in the new agreement.

Argentina, for the LMDCs, stressed linkages between pre- and post-2020 ambition. China and Malaysia reiterated key linkages between enhanced action by developing countries and MOI, with China emphasizing the need for transparency of support.

Bolivia stressed linking indigenous local and traditional knowledge systems and practices to adaptation actions.

On *cross-cutting elements*, Switzerland mentioned compliance, amendment of the agreement, annexes, and MRV, but said MRV should only be addressed in “horizontal chapters” when relevant for mitigation and adaptation in a similar manner.

Sudan, for the African Group, stressed as cross-cutting issues, *inter alia*: equity and CBDRRC; *ex ante* and *ex post* assessments for adequacy and fairness; and transparency and compliance. He also said gender should be mainstreamed as a cross-cutting issue. South Africa and Japan mentioned transparency as a cross-cutting issue.

South Africa proposed International Cooperative Initiatives should be recognized for their contributions. The LDCs mentioned applicability to all, based on CBDR, should be reflected in all elements.

On *placement*, namely whether to address issues in the agreement or in COP decisions, the LDCs called for inscribing into the new agreement a recognition of various existing provisions and institutions under the Convention, including *inter alia*: the Adaptation Committee, GCF, LEG, TEC and CTCN, and the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage. He suggested commitments: be included as an annex to the agreement so as to provide for the possibility of upward adjustment. South Africa suggested locating common global commitments on mitigation, adaptation and MOI in the agreement text, and national contributions in a schedule.

The Republic of Korea said technical matters to support the implementation of the agreement could be addressed through COP decisions, as in the Marrakesh Accords. The African Group called for the agreement to address all elements and further define the established institutions, and decisions to elaborate on more specific issues. Japan called for testing the elements against

durability: those that can survive for 10-20 years can go into the agreement, and those that are not durable should be addressed in decisions. The US described three elements of the Paris agreement: the core agreement containing basic provisions; COP decisions elaborating details; and future decisions to implement the agreement.

**CONTACT GROUP ON ADP ITEM 3—WORKSTREAM 2 (PRE-2020 AMBITION):** This issue was first addressed on 12 June. Opening the session on workstream 2, ADP Co-Chair Runge-Metzger suggested parties discuss: options to take forward and strengthen actions under workstream 2, including informing the COP on TEMs, and actions the COP should take in relation to UNFCCC institutions supporting implementation; and ways to further strengthen the workplan on enhancing mitigation ambition, including activities in 2015 and actions by COP 20 towards establishing longer-term arrangements to enhance ambition.

On *strengthening actions under workstream 2*, Kuwait, for the G-77/China, called for balanced progress on both workstreams and for developed countries to enhance ambition by revisiting existing quantified emission limitation and reduction objectives, and through comparable efforts.

Canada stressed workstream 2 should help build confidence among parties, highlighting TEMs as an opportunity to tap into the expertise of cities and subnational entities, and urging recognition of initiatives outside the UNFCCC process as they contribute to the achievement of the Convention’s objective.

Nauru, for AOSIS, suggested high-level events during the COP, expansion of existing online resources, and engagement of organizations such as the GCF. The African Group called for involving institutions under the Convention, such as the TEC and CTCN.

Algeria, for the Arab Group, emphasized the need for: balanced progress on both workstreams and their elements; developed countries’ leadership; and consideration of the IPCC AR5.

With Iran, for the LMDCs, the Arab Group stressed that the pre-2020 mitigation ambition gap would not exist if developed countries reduced their GHG emissions by 40% below 1990 levels by 2020.

The LMDCs urged developed countries not to delay pre-2020 action, and called for immediate ratification of the Kyoto Protocol’s second commitment period.

Jordan, supported by India and Cuba, suggested a work programme to cover all the elements of paragraphs 3 and 4 (implementing the BAP and enhancing pre-2020 ambition) of Decision 1/CP.19 (enhancing the ADP) and review the adequacy of their implementation. China, with the Philippines and Dominica, and opposed by the EU, called for launching a work programme with a review mechanism of the adequacy of financial and technological support provided by developed countries.

India proposed a “revisit mechanism” for evaluating the barriers to, and ways to incentivize, enhanced pre-2020 mitigation ambition by developed countries, and advancement of MOI of support between Warsaw and Lima, describing these as “essential” elements for building confidence and trust.

On *strengthening the technical process*, AOSIS, the US, Norway, Saudi Arabia, Colombia, for AILAC, and others supported a continuation of the TEMs, with options ranging from through 2015 to through 2020. Mali, for the African Group, called for the technical process to move beyond the sectoral approach, maintaining the link with the political process, and with processes under the Convention, including the NAMA registry and the GCF.

Peru identified three phases for workstream 2: identifying opportunities with high mitigation potential; identifying policies to untap mitigation potential; and undertaking action and cooperation to implement identified policies.

The US noted the constructive engagement in TEMs complements the more political discussions under workstream 1, and said TEMs should build on each other rather than be a “string of events.”

The LDCs and Indonesia suggested periodically updating the Secretariat’s technical paper on renewable energy and energy efficiency. The LDCs encouraged Annex I parties and those in a position to do so to extend support toward this end.

Papua New Guinea emphasized the involvement of the GCF in addressing the results of the TEMs, and Indonesia called for a more robust link between the TEMs’ discussions and institutions, such as the GCF and the NAMA Registry.

The US, Norway, Saudi Arabia, the African Group, Papua New Guinea, India and Cuba suggested ideas for new or additional TEMs on, *inter alia*: buildings; transport; RE and energy efficiency (EE), specifically looking at contributions of the TEC and CTCN; urban environments; SLCs; carbon capture and storage; carbon pricing; clean fossil fuel technologies; response measures; RE feed-in tariffs; and sustainable consumption.

On *actions by COP 20*, AOSIS called for a COP decision extending the TEM process. Palau said the decision in Lima on workstream 2 should stress the urgency to close the mitigation ambition gap. Papua New Guinea said a Lima COP decision could include the result of the TEMs and conclusions on how the TEMs’ results contribute towards closing the ambition gap, including quantified mitigation options.

The US suggested the COP encourage existing institutions, such as the CTCN, to support parties in implementing ideas from the TEMs.

AILAC said a decision on workstream 2 should, *inter alia*: urge developed countries to take the lead on mitigation and provision of MOI; create a work programme for TEMs through 2020; and provide guidance to UNFCCC institutions to work in areas with high mitigation potential.

The LDCs supported providing guidance to enable UNFCCC institutions and mechanisms and other international agencies to enhance engagement with parties in order to implement options identified in the TEMs. The Marshall Islands, with Palau and Tonga, called for connecting outputs from the technical process to the political level, lamenting that ministerial discussions on ambition so far had been aspirational. Supported by Mexico, the Marshall Islands called for COP 20 to launch “truly interactive” ministerial discussions on specific policy options emerging from the TEMs and for supporting action through partnerships.

**Follow-up on the TEMs:** On 12 June, Halldór Thorgeirsson, UNFCCC Secretariat, facilitated the discussion. He invited the partner organizations for the TEM on RE and EE to present their activities related to these issues undertaken since March. Presentations were heard from the International Energy Agency, International Partnership on Energy Efficiency Cooperation, International Renewable Energy Agency, World Bank, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, GEF, GCF, TEC, CTCN, and Partnership on Sustainable Low Carbon Transport.

Nauru, for AOSIS, with Colombia, suggested condensing the Secretariat’s technical paper (FCCC/TP/2014/3 and Add.1) into a summary for policymakers, and requested that the summary be forwarded to the UN Secretary-General for his upcoming Climate Summit. AOSIS called for focus on specific policy options addressing: financial challenges, such as subsidized capital costs; legal challenges, such as transitions to decentralized energy systems; and technical challenges, including smart grids and technical thresholds.

Mali, for the African Group, underlined the need to move from information sharing toward the promotion and acceleration of implementation on the ground. Colombia called for a work programme for TEMs that includes: creating a platform to strengthen partnerships; working on specific policy options; and increasing political will internationally and nationally.

Noting the potential catalytic role of the Convention, the EU queried if the actions taken by partner organizations were “coincidental,” or spurred by the TEMs.

The US suggested a format designed to maximize interaction and allow follow-up on issues identified by parties. On links with other organizations, he identified the need to think about working arrangements going forward, and said the TEC and CTCN are well placed to deliver outcomes under workstream 2.

#### **FORUM ON EXPERIENCES AND BEST PRACTICES OF CITIES AND SUBNATIONAL AUTHORITIES IN RELATION TO ADAPTATION AND MITIGATION:**

Opening the session on 10 June, Aisa Kirabo Kacyira, Deputy Executive Director, UN-HABITAT, called on participants to share views on how to ensure the centrality of cities in responding to climate change.

Tomasz Chruszczow, Special Envoy for Climate Change, Poland, stressed the importance of building both top-down and bottom-up momentum.

UNFCCC Executive Secretary Figueres stressed the need to be on a path to carbon neutrality by the second half of the century.

On the building sector, Edward Mazria, Architecture 2030, identified the need for information and technology to go carbon neutral by 2030.

Mark Kenber, the Climate Group, emphasized that low-carbon development policies are not only good for the environment, but also drive investment, growth and jobs.

Mark Watts, C40, highlighted reducing the need to travel, moving mobility to more efficient transport modes and improving vehicle efficiency as ways to reduce emissions in cities.

On how national governments can support subnational action, Nick Harrison, Ecofys and Low Emissions Development

Strategies Global Partnership, identified the need to provide direct financial, skills and knowledge support, and improve integration, coordination and access to data.

Vanessa Castán Broto, 4CPPD, emphasized that effective action is context-specific, addresses structural drivers and vulnerability, and leads to knowledge co-production.

Mussa Natty, City of Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania, stressed as barriers to addressing climate change: lack of project development capacity; weak institutional and policy frameworks; and inability to access international funding.

Yann Françoise, City of Paris, France, emphasized opportunities for cities to connect with other actors at regional and national levels to develop integrated climate change programmes in sectors, such as building retrofits, organic agriculture and sustainable mobility.

Louise Bedsworth, State of California, US, said states can play a unique role in building connections between the different levels of governance.

In the ensuing discussion, participants focused on examples of successful implementation, including national-level support programmes for cities and provinces, subnational and regional carbon markets, and an integrated “smart city department” for city-level departmental coordination.

On the 2015 agreement, participants suggested it: include capacity building on GHG management systems for developing countries; promote coordination between national and subnational levels; and recognize the diversity of carbon markets.

In conclusion, Gino van Begin, ICLEI – Local Governments for Sustainability, stressed the need to cement local action in the climate regime between now and 2020.

Brian Kilkelly, World Cities Network, stressed understanding success stories allows “replicating them and accelerating change.”

Rohit Aggarwala, Bloomberg Philanthropies, underscored the critical role of both national and subnational governments. Chair Kirabo Kacyira emphasized “it is in cities where the sustainable development battle will be won or lost.”

#### TECHNICAL EXPERT MEETINGS: Urban

**Environment:** The TEM on Urban Environment convened on 10 June, to discuss ways to support and scale up feasible policy options for sustainable urban development.

Opening the meeting, ADP Co-Chair Kumarsingh said the design of the “new urban world” will define the success or failure in achieving a low-carbon, climate-resilient world.

In his opening remarks, Facilitator Brian Kilkelly, World Cities Network, stressed the urgency of action in urban environments, and called on participants to discuss: good practices; matching of projects and funding; feasibility of policies and actions; achieving commitment by more parties; and conducting outreach on the issue.

#### *Session 1: Scaling Up Efforts – Finance, Technology and Capacity-Building Support for Sustainable Infrastructure:*

James Close, World Bank, stressed the need for linkages between evidence-based planning and investment, and increasing cities’ credit worthiness to enable access to low-cost finance.

Matthew Lynch, World Business Council for Sustainable Development, stressed the importance of avoiding lock-in of

high-carbon infrastructure and highlighted opportunities around smart infrastructure, which can maximize the efficiency and resilience of existing systems at a modest cost.

In the ensuing discussions, participants addressed, *inter alia*: promoting good investments; putting a price on carbon; and understanding political dynamics around decision-making in order to move to a green economy.

Jonas Kamleh, City of Malmö, Sweden, presented on the transformation of the Malmö shipyard into a sustainable area, urging cities “not to wait for a perfect solution.”

Jennifer Semakula Musisi, City of Kampala, Uganda, reported on climate resilience projects undertaken in her city and plans to incorporate climate-change responsive aspects in all infrastructure project designs.

Susana Muhamad, City of Bogotá, Colombia, presented on her city’s experience transforming the public transport system from a diesel to an electric/hybrid one.

Alfredo Arquillano, Cebu Province, the Philippines, presented on his municipality’s bottom-up disaster risk management system.

Masahiro Kimura, City of Tokyo, Japan, presented the city’s cap-and-trade programme, emphasizing the importance of data collection and measurement, and developing local alliances and capacity in local governments, and highlighted the potential of the UNFCCC to change public perceptions by drawing attention to the local level.

During the ensuing discussion, participants considered, *inter alia*: recognizing national and subnational actions in the UNFCCC process; avoiding lock-in while promoting energy efficiency in buildings; leveraging financial resources for credit worthiness in cities; and moving jobs and services to reduce commutes.

Rohit Aggarwala, Bloomberg Philanthropies, stressed: the city level bridges divides between the North and South; many urban issues are low cost; good management and leadership; and effectively organizing municipal authorities.

Zitouni Ould-Dada, CTCN, reported that the CTCN is now fully operational.

Franck Jésus, GEF Secretariat, discussed the GEF’s integrated approach to financing projects targeting multiple environmental benefits.

Marcelo Jordan, GCF, announced that the GCF had completed the essential requirements to launch its resource mobilization process.

Kunihiko Shimada, TEC, reported on the Committee’s work in support of actions relating to technology implementation.

Zitouni Ould-Dada, UNEP, presented on the UNEP and UN-HABITAT Greener Cities Partnership and UNEP’s Global Initiative for Resource Efficient Cities.

Renate Christ, IPCC, summarized findings from the AR5 WGIII chapter on human settlements, infrastructure and spatial planning, including on the need to align institutional arrangements, governance mechanisms and financial resources with urban mitigation goals for effective design and implementation.

Bettina Menne, World Health Organization, discussed climate resilient, low-carbon, “healthy cities” and how they

are established through political commitment, leadership, institutional change and a process and structure aimed at achieving this.

During the discussion, participants considered incentives from national governments to engage local authorities, and the need for robust policy tools.

**Session II: Way Forward:** Mark Watts, C40, stressed: cities' credit worthiness; the importance of leadership; and opportunities for creating markets through horizontal cooperation among cities.

Gino Van Begin, ICLEI – Local Governments for Sustainability, proposed to build on the Forum and TEM by seeking a mandate from the ADP for the Local Governments and Municipal Authorities constituency to work on an action programme, and establish it through a COP decision in 2015, with implementation starting in 2016.

Nauru suggested that a COP decision be moved up to Lima. The US welcomed the recognition of, and supported additional action on, subnational ambition. Participants also discussed barriers to propagating successful examples.

Facilitator Kilkelly closed the meeting observing that cities are in the vanguard of creating an environment for action.

**Land Use:** Opening the meeting, Facilitator Tony Simons, World Agroforestry Centre, said the session is about dialogue to “chart a path forward” in the land-use sector and realize the multiple benefits of land-use planning.

**Session 1: Policies, Practices and Technology – Global State of Play:** María José Sanz Sánchez, FAO, underscored the importance of local-level action, and called for building evidence bases to inform land-use planning, and enabling integrative approaches.

Mark Broadmeadow, UK, outlined the Woodland Carbon Code, a domestic initiative to establish woodlands and help the UK meet its climate goals.

Chunfeng Wang, China, identified challenges in the forestry sector, including increased urbanization and timber demand, and insufficient financial support.

Adriano Santhiago de Oliveira, Brazil, outlined actions to improve forest monitoring and enforcement, territorial planning, and sustainable forest management that have decreased deforestation and improved agricultural efficiency.

Victoria Hatton, New Zealand, outlined lessons learned from reducing the emission intensity of agriculture, including working with stakeholders to manage local impacts, and measuring, reporting and verifying emission savings.

Robert Bamfo, Ghana, emphasized the importance of landscape approaches when implementing REDD+.

Ana Karla Perea Blázquez, Mexico, highlighted institutional and policy frameworks to reduce emissions from deforestation.

During discussions, delegates debated: integration of climate actions into development objectives; public participation; and holistic versus market approaches to land use management. Other issues included: linkages between forestry, agriculture, bioenergy and food security; illegal logging; and accounting rules for LULUCF in the CDM.

**Session 2: Implementing Actions: Finance, Technology and Capacity Building:** Ellysar Baroudy, World Bank, stressed incentivizing climate-smart landscape programmes, including

through public-private partnerships to scale up access to resources and spur innovative sustainable land use models.

Louis Verchot, Centre for International Forestry Research, highlighted principles for landscape approaches, including: accounting for different scales; recognizing multiple uses and needs; and engaging with stakeholders.

Based on country success stories, Thais Linhares-Juvenal, UN-REDD, identified the need for: supporting country-specific needs assessments; high-level participation and coordination; and linkages with other land-based activities.

Susana Velez Haller, WWF, emphasized the need to understand: ecosystem services; conservation needs and activities; land-use changes including their drivers; and engagement with local communities.

Henry Neufeldt, CGIAR Research Programme on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security, said farmers cope with climate variability through diversifying their management practices and using available safety nets, and invest in climate-smart agriculture practices when provided with technical and financial support.

Ibila Djibril, LEG, observed that LDCs have been designing and implementing concrete adaptation plans mainly through land-based activities.

Junu Shrestha, GEF, outlined sources of support for the land-use sector in the GEF's sixth replenishment period.

The TEC identified adaptation technologies and climate finance as relevant for land-use activities.

The CTCN reported three land use-relevant requests had been received, including on monitoring systems for mangrove forests and biodiversity.

The GCF reported that some of the initial focal areas of the Fund include sustainable forest management, REDD+ implementation and adaptation.

Brief remarks were invited from the floor from the Consumer Goods Forum on private sector participation, and from the Ramsar Convention Secretariat on the importance of protecting wetlands and peatlands in the context of climate change.

During the discussion, participants mentioned, *inter alia*: the role of governments in preventing negative impacts of large-scale foreign investment; the role of REDD+ in enhancing pre-2020 ambition; and the need to integrate REDD+ in national development strategies. They also queried whether carbon is a commodity or a public good.

**Session 3: The Way Forward:** Renate Christ, IPCC, highlighted findings from the land use chapter in AR5, noting that agriculture, forestry or land use accounts for 25% of GHG emissions, and that is the dominant emitting sector in many developing countries, and that non-CO2 emissions from agriculture exceed deforestation emissions.

During the discussions, participants highlighted the need for, *inter alia*: finance and technology for enabling actions, including removing barriers and enabling access to the GCF; and incorporating social aspects, such as food security, equity, rights-based approaches and gender.

Participants also suggested accelerating REDD+ by integrating decision-making across the land sector and learning from experience, for example for reducing transaction costs.

Summarizing the discussion, María José Sanz Sánchez, FAO, observed that some obstacles could be removed, such as remote sensing data, for catalyzing pre-2020 ambition.

Ellysar Baroudy, World Bank, said that forests and agriculture have a role in the UN Secretary-General's Climate Summit, and underscored the importance of partnerships and collaboration.

Facilitator Simons underscored that the label "smart" does not necessarily make a policy successful, which often requires overcoming governance challenges and using rights-based approaches.

**CLOSING ADP PLENARY:** The ADP closing plenary convened on 14 June. ADP Co-Chair Kumarsingh noted convergence on some elements to be included in the 2015 agreement, and identified remaining challenges, such as the relationship between INDCs and the 2015 agreement, and how to assess the aggregate level of ambition.

On workstream 2, he underlined the importance of political commitment and momentum to build trust for Lima and Paris, and emphasized operationalizing the GCF and ratifying the Doha Amendment.

He reported that the Co-Chairs intend to produce a reflections note and a non-paper containing bullet points of parties' views, as expressed in their submissions, interventions, and CRPs. He also reported that, at the request of parties, the Co-Chairs will prepare a revised proposal for a decision on information to be included in INDCs and on pre-2020 ambition.

Anna Serzysko (Poland), ADP Rapporteur, introduced the draft report of the session (FCCC/ADP/2014/L.2), which parties then adopted.

The ADP 2-5 session was suspended on 14 June at 8:00 pm.

### A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF THE MEETING

*"And those who were seen dancing were thought to be insane by those who could not hear the music."*

— Friedrich Nietzsche

Unlike the last two June sessions, which were marred by procedural delays and agenda fights, the June 2014 Bonn Climate Change Conference was a quiet, slow dance, marked by coordinated chorography at times, and syncopated stumbling at others. To those listening to the IPCC's urgent calls for action, the rhythms and pace of the SBSTA, SBI and ADP seemed oddly out of step. According to IPCC Working Group III, despite climate change policies, GHG emissions grew more quickly between 2000-2010 than in each of the previous three decades, driving the impacts on health, agriculture, land and oceans, water and peoples' livelihoods detailed by IPCC Working Group II. In light of these scientific findings, many did not initially expect a quiet meeting in Bonn.

Yet parties' steps here were surer and more coordinated than at first glance, with their own internal rhythm. As parties explored the building blocks of the 2015 agreement, attention moved away from the routine work of the subsidiary bodies, leaving them out of the limelight to advance on some issues. ADP Workstream 2 on pre-2020 ambition also largely stayed off the floor, waiting perhaps for its time to shine at COP 20, where Lima's Latin beats will require parties to be more nimble

in order to fulfill a very full mandate and make progress towards Paris in 2015.

This brief analysis will consider the progress of the subsidiary bodies, and the efforts of the ADP to work toward concrete outcomes for Lima, on the way to the 2015 agreement and raising pre-2020 ambition.

### THE SUPPORTING CAST

The ADP meetings drew a lot of time and attention and, against this flashy kaleidoscope, the agendas of the SBI and SBSTA were viewed as "necessary, but not fun." Parties continued implementation work on various issues with varying degrees of success. Agriculture fared well, with parties identifying specific areas for future work, which the G-77/China called "a roadmap to COP 22." Progress on other agenda items was less tangible. Initial work under the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage on the composition and procedures of its Executive Committee was painstakingly slow, with AOSIS in the SBI closing plenary asking for "more time, attention and expeditious efforts in Lima." The leftover issues under REDD+, such as methodologies for non-market approaches and for non-carbon benefits proved sticky, and were deferred to Lima.

While work under the SBI and SBSTA appeared to be slowly, if steadily advancing, delegates could not shake off the feeling that the subsidiary bodies were merely third violins to the ADP. It is well known that implementation issues do not receive much political attention, and with issues such as loss and damage, response measures, market approaches and REDD+, surfacing in the ADP's discussions, some were left wondering whether parties introduced them under the ADP to give them more visibility. Yet, although the relationship between the ongoing implementation work under the Convention and Kyoto Protocol on the one hand, and negotiations towards the 2015 agreement on the other, may not necessarily be straightforward, it takes two to tango. An effective post-2020 climate regime requires the sound implementation of existing rules, as well as the ability to implement the rules still to be determined.

### DANCING TO ITS OWN TUNE

It was the first time ministers were present at a June session. While the expectation was that high-level ministerial engagement would help move the negotiations forward, it appeared instead as a stutter-step in the rhythmical flow of the talks. Despite high hopes, ministerial roundtables on the ADP and Kyoto Protocol were not conducive to constructive discussions, as only roughly 30 ministers delivered their statements in what turned out to be a mini-high-level segment. The ministerials took two full days, and since no concurrent meetings could be scheduled, many felt they were a waste of negotiating time, with the African Group labeling the roundtable on the Kyoto Protocol "a lost opportunity for raising ambition." Yet, one optimistic delegate hoped that Bonn fostered relationships that will prove useful at the UN Secretary-General's upcoming Climate Change Summit.

The ADP also met in a contact group setting for the first time, moving to a more focused mode of work. While discussions were more concrete, there could have been more substantive interaction between parties who instead often read prepared

statements and engaged in procedural debates about how and when to engage with text, and indeed whose text it would be. Parties' performance led some to question whether the group was in fact negotiating, although some cautiously claimed that areas of convergence were beginning to emerge as parties made more concrete proposals on the elements of the 2015 agreement and intended nationally determined contributions (INDCs).

Despite the ADP being saddled with an exceptionally busy agenda, INDCs stole the show. Delegates engaged in heated debates over: how INDCs should be defined, developed and communicated; what information should be included in INDCs; and whether they should be subject to any assessment and review.

Initially, developed countries saw INDCs as mitigation-based, with built-in flexibility based on capabilities rather than country groupings. Yet, as the negotiations pressed on, some began to accept the fact that INDCs will likely include more than mitigation alone. The Like-Minded Developing Countries (LMDCs) maintained that developed countries' INDCs should include not only quantified economy-wide emission reduction commitments, but also commitments on timely provision of finance, capacity building and technology to developing countries. Meanwhile, according to the LMDCs, developing countries' INDCs should contain information on actions on adaptation, including loss and damage, mitigation, capacity building, and sustainable development—all enabled by developed countries' support. While there may be emerging willingness by some developed countries not to limit INDCs to mitigation alone, the exact elements for inclusion remain to be addressed in Lima.

There was also disagreement on whether or not INDCs should be subject to review, opening questions of how to sequence the steps of INDCs communication, review, adjustment, inscription, and possible further review and adjustment. Indeed, parties disagreed on what steps were even required. Many feared that without review, they would be heading for a "minimal agreement" in Paris since there would be no mechanism to ensure that nationally-determined contributions produce the level of ambition commensurate with the global temperature goal. The timing and order of the submission of INDCs, a possible review and an even more circumspect increase of INDCs' ambition remain unclear. The announcement by the EU and the US that they intend to have their INDCs ready in the first quarter of 2015 could help build trust, however numerous developed countries have yet to specify when their INDCs will be complete. Some developing countries may follow China's lead and announce their INDCs in the first half of 2015, perhaps waiting to see the extent of developed countries' INDCs. Other developing countries will require support for the preparation of their INDCs. Some delegates expressed concern that many parties' INDCs may not be ready for COP 21, which could jeopardize the Paris agreement because the full extent of countries' participation and commitments will be unknown.

For an ambitious, climate-friendly outcome in Paris, many hoped that, in Lima, parties will decide on the elements INDCs will consist of, and demarcate the relationship between parties' nationally determined contributions and the new agreement.

Thus far, as the Bonn meeting demonstrated, attempts to secure broad participation threaten to reduce global ambition to the level where it may no longer be possible to stay under 2°C warming and prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system.

### THE PARTNER LEFT BEHIND?

With parties making proposals for the new agreement, and dancing around fundamental issues, such as its legal form and differentiation, pre-2020 ambition had a surprisingly minor role in the ADP's work. The Doha Amendment still requires 133 ratifications to enter into force, a target that, two years after its adoption, seems increasingly out of reach. The Amendment covers 15% of global emissions, and comparable efforts by developed countries not party to the second commitment period are difficult to incentivize without relying on a rules-based system. To some, pre-2020 ambition also necessitates increased emission reduction targets by all major emitters, ensuring which can also be seen as a challenge. Perhaps for these reasons, efforts under workstream 2 largely occurred in the Thematic Expert Meetings (TEMs), which focused on the urban environment and land-use.

In Bonn, it became clear that the TEMs format has evolved into "starting points for new action, rather than one-off events." Originally envisioned as a means to share experiences on issues with high mitigation potential, the TEMs are now an ongoing process. TEMs now involve ongoing partnerships with organizations outside the UNFCCC, although it is still unclear to many how these relationships will play out. Such collaboration between an *ad hoc* Convention body and outside organizations designed for different, albeit related issues, is rare, although the implications for pre-2020 ambition are yet to be seen.

Many hoped that TEMs will catalyze action by organizations outside the Convention, but seemed unsure if this innovation can live up to the task. Some issues, such as land use, and particularly REDD+, may be better placed to capitalize on existing UNFCCC rules and the related work of other organizations. While the role and potential of cities are at the enthusiastic, brainstorming stage, they lack the turnkey institutions resourced and ready to quickly start new work.

There was considerable enthusiasm for the TEMs despite the lack of clarity how these processes will play out, and many hoped they would evolve beyond a "talk shop" format. Some worried it would be difficult to capture and measure the TEMs' success and assess whether, and if, the TEMs will be able to generate emission reductions over and above what these partner organizations are already undertaking.

The two ADP workstreams have always been partners. Allowing workstream 1 to lead has implications for and beyond Lima, where an outcome on pre-2020 ambition is expected, although poorly sketched. As one delegate observed, the Lima outcome on pre-2020 ambition is "a vital trust-builder" for those who agreed to an agreement to take effect in 2020 in exchange for pre-2020 ambition. In light of the IPCC Fifth Assessment Report, some openly stated that policy "is a step or two behind the science," and worried that failure to raise ambition before 2020 will raise the future costs of mitigation and adaptation,

and exacerbate loss and damage from adverse impacts of climate change, which will become more frequent and costly in economic and human terms.

**DANCING TO THE MUSIC THAT OTHERS CAN HEAR**

Thus far, the ADP has been dancing to its own music, at its own pace, and did achieve some progress in Bonn. Yet, it is becoming increasingly clear that science is playing a different tune, requiring a quicker, more ambitious choreography. “The message is clearer than ever, yet there is no sense of urgency here,” opined a delegate while civil society called on countries to “stand up or stand aside.” The slow, self-conscious movements in Bonn will need to make way for a decidedly livelier samba in order to show the world that the ADP can deliver an outcome commensurate with the science. Lima has a weighty mandate, including a high-level ministerial on finance, achieving agreement on elements of the 2015 agreement, determining information to be included in the INDCs, and reaching an outcome under workstream 2.

A mantra repeated during this conference was “without Lima, there is no Paris.” Eager to avoid the lethargy often characterizing “in-between COPs,” many delegates stressed the importance of outcomes on all aspects of the Lima mandate. The Paris agreement is 18 months away, with little time for missteps. To complete work in Lima necessary for success at and beyond Paris, delegates must learn to dance to the music that everyone else can hear.

**UPCOMING MEETINGS**

**Pre-Pre-COP Ministerial Meeting for UNFCCC COP 20 and CMP 10:** This event is organized by the Venezuelan Government and aims to examine: the role of local governments in climate change; how to engage local governments and citizens on the ground; and how local actions can be an integral part of the global agenda. **dates:** 15-18 July 2014 **location:** Caracas, Venezuela **contact:** Cesar Aponte Rivero, General Coordinator **email:** precop20@gmail.com

**Second Forum of the Standing Committee on Finance:** The Second Forum of the UNFCCC Standing Committee on Finance (SCF) has the theme “Mobilizing Adaptation Finance.” Sessions on the first day will focus on: the state of adaptation finance; mainstreaming adaptation in national planning; mobilizing public and private sector sources of finance; and ways to improve dissemination of adaptation best practices. The second day will feature break-out groups on: urban areas and infrastructure; water management and human health; agriculture and land-use; and energy and transport. **dates:** 21-22 June 2014 **location:** Montego Bay, Jamaica **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** [http://unfccc.int/cooperation\\_and\\_support/financial\\_mechanism/standing\\_committee/items/8138.php](http://unfccc.int/cooperation_and_support/financial_mechanism/standing_committee/items/8138.php)

**2014 CIF Partnership Forum:** The Climate Investment Funds (CIF) and the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) are jointly convening the 2014 CIF Partnership Forum. A special pre-conference event on 22 June, “Stakeholder Day,” will be dedicated to discussing progress and challenges in engaging key stakeholders in the CIF’s activities. During the conference, panels will address a variety of topics including

managing climate change programmes and unlocking private finance from mini-grids to REDD+. **dates:** 22-25 June 2014 **location:** Montego Bay, Jamaica **phone:** +1-202-458-1801 **email:** CIFAdminUnit@worldbank.org **www:** <https://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/event-partnership/2014>

**National Adaptation Plan (NAP) Expo:** This year’s Expo, convened by the Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG) under the UNFCCC, will provide a platform for countries to showcase progress in their NAP processes and offer an opportunity to exchange experiences, methods and tools. The event will target both LDCs and non-LDCs and a wide range of stakeholders, including country representatives, organizations, civil society and the private sector. **dates:** 8-9 August 2014 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** Batu Uprety, Chair of the LEG **email:** napexpo@unfccc.int **www:** [http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc\\_calendar/items/2655.php](http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php)

**Ninth Meeting of the Technology Executive Committee:** The TEC meets at least twice per year. Its meetings are open to attendance by accredited observer organizations and observers from Parties, except where otherwise decided by the TEC. **dates:** 18-21 August 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/ttclear/templates/render cms\\_page?TEC\\_meetings](http://unfccc.int/ttclear/templates/render cms_page?TEC_meetings)

**High-level Dialogue on Sustainable Cities, Transport and Tourism (HLD) and Global Forum on Human Settlements (GHFS):** As a follow-up event to commemorate the second anniversary of the Rio+20 Conference and implement its decisions, the HLD and GHFS aim to support the rapid and effective implementation of the Rio+20 decisions. The objectives of the HLD and GHFS include: providing a platform for information exchange; highlighting proven policies and measures and identifying best practices; facilitating capacity building through exchanges of information; and contributing to the discussions under the post-2015 UN development agenda and Sustainable Development Goals. **dates:** 10-12 August 2014 **location:** Bogotá, Colombia **contact:** Carolina Chica Builes **phone:** +57-1-335-8000 **email:** cchica@sdp.gov.co **www:** <http://www.idu.gov.co/web/guest/riomas20>

**WHO Conference on Health and Climate:** This three-day conference, hosted by the World Health Organization (WHO), will bring together leading experts in the fields of health and climate change, to discuss: strengthening health system resilience to climate risks; and promoting health while mitigating climate change. **dates:** 27-29 August 2014 **location:** Geneva, Switzerland **contact:** Marina Maiero **phone:** +41-22-791-2402 **email:** maierom@who.int **www:** <http://www.who.int/globalchange/mediacentre/events/climate-health-conference/en/>

**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 **www:** <http://www.un.org/climatechange/summit2014/>

**TEC Workshop on National Systems of Innovation:** The Technology Executive Committee (TEC) of the UNFCCC will organize a Workshop on National Systems of Innovation. **dates:** 13-14 October 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/ttclear/templates/ttclear/pages/ttclear/templates/render\\_cms\\_page?s=events\\_main](http://unfccc.int/ttclear/templates/ttclear/pages/ttclear/templates/render_cms_page?s=events_main)

**Climate Symposium 2014:** This event will focus on the theme “Enhanced Understanding of Climate Processes through Earth Observation.” It will help in developing an efficient and sustained international space-based Earth observing system; bring together international experts in climate observations, research, analysis and modeling; and emphasize the role of space-based Earth observations in improving knowledge of the climate at global and regional scales, and in assessing models used for climate projections. **dates:** 13-17 October 2014 **location:** Darmstadt, Germany **contact:** Organizing Secretariat **email:** [climate.symposium@eumetsat.int](mailto:climate.symposium@eumetsat.int) **www:** <http://www.theclimatesymposium2014.com>

**UNFCCC ADP 2-6:** The ADP will convene for the sixth part of the second session in October 2014. **dates:** 20-25 October 2014 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** [secretariat@unfccc.int](mailto:secretariat@unfccc.int) **www:** <http://unfccc.int>

**IPCC-40:** This IPCC meeting will be held to adopt the AR5 Synthesis Report and approve its Summary for Policymakers. **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](mailto:IPCC-Sec@wmo.int) **www:** <http://www.ipcc.ch/>

**Pre-COP Ministerial Meeting for UNFCCC COP 20 and CMP 10:** This event, organized by the Venezuelan Government, aims to revisit the engagement of civil society in the UNFCCC negotiations. **dates:** 4-7 November 2014 **location:** Caracas, Venezuela **contact:** Cesar Aponte Rivero, General Coordinator **email:** [precop20@gmail.com](mailto:precop20@gmail.com)

**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 (CMP) 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](mailto:secretariat@unfccc.int) **www:** <http://unfccc.int>

For additional meetings and updates, go to <http://climate-1.iisd.org/>

CBDR	Common but differentiated responsibilities
CBDRRC	Common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CMP	Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol
COP	Conference of the Parties
CRP	Conference Room Paper
CTCN	Climate Technology Centre and Network
EE	Energy efficiency
EIG	Environmental Integrity Group
ENGOs	Environmental NGOs
FVA	Framework for Various Approaches
GCF	Green Climate Fund
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GHG	Greenhouse gas
INDCs	Intended nationally determined contributions
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IPRs	Intellectual property rights
LDCs	Least Developed Countries
LEG	LDC Expert Group
LMDCs	Like-Minded Developing Countries
LULUCF	Land use, land-use change and forestry
MOI	Means of implementation
MRV	Measuring, reporting and verification
NAMAs	Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions
NAP	National adaptation plan
NDCs	Nationally determined contributions
NMMs	New Market Mechanisms
NWP	Nairobi Work Programme on climate, vulnerability and adaptation
QELRCs	Quantified Emission Limitation or Reduction Commitments
RE	Renewable energy
REDD+	Reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries, including conservation, sustainable forest management and enhancement of forest carbon stocks
SB	Subsidiary bodies
SBI	Subsidiary Body for Implementation
SBSTA	Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice
SCF	Standing Committee on Finance
SED	Structured Expert Dialogue
SICA	Central American Integration System
SIDS	Small island developing states
SLCPs	Short-lived climate pollutants
TEC	Technology Executive Committee
TEM	Technical Expert Meeting
TNA	Technology needs assessments
UNEP	UN Environment Programme
UNFCCC	UN Framework Convention on Climate Change

### GLOSSARY

ADP	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action
AILAC	Independent Alliance of Latin America and the Caribbean
ALBA	Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America
AOSIS	Alliance of Small Island States
AR5	Fifth Assessment Report
BASIC	Brazil, South Africa, India and China
BINGOs	Business and industry NGOs
BUR	Biennial Update Report
CAN	Climate Action Now
CJN!	Climate Justice Now!