



SUMMARY OF THE BONN CLIMATE CHANGE CONFERENCE: 20-25 OCTOBER 2014

The sixth part of the second session of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP 2-6) under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) took place in Bonn, Germany, from 20-25 October 2014. The ADP focused on preparing key documents for the 20th session of the Conference of the Parties (COP 20) to the UNFCCC, scheduled to take place in Lima, Peru, in December 2014.

Under the ADP’s workstream 1 (the 2015 agreement), countries continued to elaborate the elements of a draft negotiating text, which will serve as the foundation for the final construction of the 2015 agreement, and considered a “non-paper” on parties’ views and proposals on the elements for a draft negotiating text (ADP.2014.6.NonPaper). The ADP also worked on a draft decision that captures the type of information countries will provide when they communicate their intended nationally determined contributions (INDCs) and how these contributions will potentially be considered (ADP.2014.7.DraftText). During the meeting, the ADP Co-Chairs prepared a new iteration of this draft decision, which will be submitted for consideration in Lima.

Under workstream 2 (pre-2020 ambition), Technical Expert Meetings (TEMs) focused on: opportunities for action on non-carbon dioxide greenhouse gases (GHGs); carbon capture, use and storage; and follow up to TEMs on unlocking mitigation opportunities through energy efficiency, renewable energy, urban environment and land use improvements in the pre-2020 period. Countries also addressed a draft decision on pre-2020 ambition prepared by the Co-Chairs ahead of the meeting (ADP.2014.8.DraftText). During the meeting, a new iteration of this draft was issued and will be considered in Lima.

Despite limited progress overall, as delegates left Bonn many appreciated that the meeting had provided much-needed space for more in-depth exchanges of views. Many felt the meeting helped clarify countries’ and groups’ understanding of the spectrum of views, possible areas of convergence and divergence, and what underlies their positions and how these concerns might be addressed in Lima in December.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE ADP PROCESS

The international political response to climate change began with the adoption of the UNFCCC in 1992, which sets out a framework for action aimed at stabilizing atmospheric concentrations of 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, COP 3 adopted the Kyoto Protocol to the UNFCCC that committed industrialized countries and countries in transition to a market economy to achieve emission reduction targets. The Kyoto Protocol entered into force on 16 February 2005, and now has 192 parties.

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, and agreement to launch the 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 by 2020. In addition, the ADP was mandated to explore actions to close the pre-2020 ambition gap in relation to the target of limiting global temperature increases to below 2°C.

ADP 1: The first session of the ADP (ADP 1) took place in conjunction with the Bonn Climate Change Conference from 17-24 May 2012, in Bonn, Germany. Discussions centered on

IN THIS ISSUE

A Brief History of the ADP Process	1
ADP 2-6 Report	2
Contact Group on ADP Item 3	3
Technical Expert Meetings	7
Closing Plenary	7
A Brief Analysis of ADP 2-6	8
Upcoming Meetings	10
Glossary	11

This issue of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* © <enb@iisd.org> is written and edited by Alice Bisiaux, LL.M., Mari Luomi, Ph.D., Annalisa Savaresi, Ph.D., and Anna Schulz. The Digital Editor is Brad Vincelette. 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 Donors of the *Bulletin* are the European Commission (DG-ENV and DG-CLIMATE) and the Government of Switzerland (the Swiss Federal Office for the Environment (FOEN) and the Swiss Agency for Development Cooperation (SDC)). 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 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). Specific funding for coverage of this meeting has been provided by the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia Ministry of Petroleum and Mineral Resources and Aramco. 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/>

the agenda and the election of officers. After nearly two weeks of discussions, the ADP plenary agreed on the election of officers and adopted the agenda, initiating two workstreams, one addressing matters related to paragraphs 2-6 of Decision 1/CP.17 (the 2015 agreement) and the other on paragraphs 7-8 (pre-2020 ambition).

ADP 1 INFORMAL SESSION: This informal session of the ADP took place in Bangkok, Thailand, from 30 August to 5 September 2012. Parties convened in roundtable sessions to discuss their vision and aspirations for the ADP, the desired results of its work and how these results can be achieved. Parties also discussed how to enhance ambition, the role of means of implementation and how to strengthen international cooperative initiatives, as well as the elements that could frame the ADP's work.

ADP 1-2: The second part of the first session of the ADP (ADP 1-2) took place from 27 November to 7 December 2012, in Doha, Qatar, in conjunction with COP 18. Parties, *inter alia*, agreed to: immediately advance its substantive discussions; move to a more focused mode of work in 2013; and encourage broad participation by party representatives and accredited observer organizations.

ADP 2-1: The first part of the second session of the ADP (ADP 2-1) met in Bonn, Germany, from 29 April to 3 May 2013. ADP 2-1, which was structured around workshops and roundtable discussions covering the ADP's two workstreams, aimed at preparing the basis for future discussions by gathering concrete proposals on, for example, key elements that the 2015 agreement could contain and sectors where further mitigation action could take place before 2020.

ADP 2-2: The second part of the second session of the ADP (ADP 2-2) met in conjunction with the Bonn Climate Change Conference from 4-13 June 2013, in Germany. The meeting was structured around workshops and roundtables on the two workstreams. Parties, *inter alia*: agreed on the need to convene at least one session in 2014; invited, under workstreams 1 and 2, submissions by parties and observers building on, and in relation to, the ADP's conclusions; invited, under workstream 2, submissions by parties and observers on further activities for its plan of work in 2014; invited the incoming Co-Chairs to propose, drawing upon submissions, a balanced, focused and more formal mode of work for consideration at the third part of the second session of the ADP (ADP 2-3). No agreement was reached on establishing one or more contact groups to move part of the work to a more formal setting.

ADP 2-3: This meeting took place in conjunction with COP 19 from 12-23 November 2013, in Warsaw, Poland. Guided by questions from the Co-Chairs, work during the first week took place under the two workstreams. Workstream 1 was discussed in open-ended consultations on content and elements of the 2015 agreement, including adaptation, mitigation, technology, finance, capacity building and transparency. Workstream 2 was discussed in open-ended consultations on the way forward, as well as workshops on lessons learned from relevant experience of other multilateral environmental agreements, and on pre-2020 ambition, urbanization and the role of governments in facilitating climate action in cities. The meeting adopted a decision that invites parties to initiate or intensify domestic preparations for their INDCs, and resolves to accelerate the full implementation of the Bali Action Plan (BAP) and pre-2020 ambition.

ADP 2-4: The fourth part of the second session of the ADP (ADP 2-4) took place from 10-14 March 2014, in Bonn, Germany. Under workstream 1 the meeting convened in open-ended consultations on agenda item 3, which addressed: adaptation; INDCs; finance, technology and capacity building (means of implementation (MOI)); 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, TEMs on renewable energy and energy efficiency convened. The session also agreed to establish a contact group and to continue under that format at subsequent ADP meetings.

ADP 2-5: This meeting took place in conjunction with the Bonn Climate Change Conference from 4-14 June 2014. ADP 2-5 convened in a contact group, structured around the two workstreams. Under workstream 1, the ADP discussed: mitigation; adaptation; finance, technology and capacity building (MOI); transparency; INDCs; and other issues related to elements. Convergence emerged on some elements to be included in the 2015 agreement, although challenges remained, such as the relationship between INDCs and the 2015 agreement, and how to assess the aggregate level of ambition. Under workstream 2, TEMs on the urban environment and land use, and a forum on the role of cities and subnational authorities in mitigation and adaptation convened.

ADP 2-6 REPORT

Welcoming delegates on Monday morning, 20 October, ADP Co-Chair Kishan Kumarsingh (Trinidad and Tobago) recalled that the draft 2015 agreement needs to be ready by early April 2015 in order to be translated into all UN languages by May. Calling for a "bridge-building session," he invited delegates to compromise, adding that "sticking to positions is not a negotiation."

Manuel Pulgar-Vidal, Minister of the Environment, Peru, and COP 20/Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP) 10 President-Designate, invited delegates to "work simultaneously" on: information for INDCs; the elements of the draft text of the 2015 agreement; and a careful review of the draft decision on workstream 2.

Noting that the UN Climate Summit brought unprecedented public mobilization, UNFCCC Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres told delegates "the eyes of the world turn to you," calling on them to "build bridges" and "find a path" towards a solution to climate change that is equitable and globally responsible.

Dan Bondi Ogolla, UNFCCC Secretariat, provided an overview of a questions and answers note by the Secretariat on legal aspects of the 2015 agreement.

Co-Chair Kumarsingh said parties should finalize the draft decisions on information for INDCs and pre-2020 ambition at this meeting, and agree on whether additional negotiating time is needed in 2015.

During opening statements, delegates addressed a variety of issues including: the ADP Co-Chairs' non-paper and draft decisions; elements of the 2015 agreement; INDCs; and workstream 2.

On the Co-Chairs' texts, Bolivia, for the Group of 77 and China (G-77/China), emphasized that the non-paper on elements for a draft negotiating text is "not perfect," but could be "a useful

starting point.” Switzerland, for the Environmental Integrity Group (EIG), expressed support for working on the basis of the Co-Chairs’ draft decisions and non-paper.

Ecuador, for the Like-Minded Developing Countries (LMDCs), called for an open, inclusive and transparent process based on inputs from parties. He welcomed the Co-Chairs’ non-paper on elements for the 2015 agreement as a starting point for focused negotiations. Costa Rica, for the Independent Alliance of Latin America and the Caribbean (AILAC), commended the Co-Chairs for their “bold and effective” work and said AILAC would “continue to build bridges.”

On elements of the 2015 agreement, the G-77/China stated that the elements identified in Decision 1/CP.17 (establishing the ADP) must be treated equally in the 2015 agreement. The EU stressed defining aspects of adaptation and MOI in the 2015 agreement. Australia, for the Umbrella Group, said the meeting should delineate the elements of the 2015 agreement and identify what can be elaborated in COP decisions.

Nauru, for the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS), called for including a mechanism on loss and damage in the 2015 agreement, and for clarifying that the COP 21 outcome will be a legally-binding protocol under the Convention and keep global warming below 1.5°C. Nepal, for the Least Developed Countries (LDCs), called for ADP 2-6 to organize elements of a post-2015 agreement.

Venezuela, for the Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America (ALBA), Argentina and El Salvador, called for Annex I countries’ leadership on mitigation and provision of finance and technology transfer. Saudi Arabia, for the Arab Group, suggested agreeing on the core elements of the 2015 agreement as quickly as possible and addressing information required for INDCs. South Africa, for Brazil, South Africa, India and China (BASIC), emphasized that the 2015 agreement must allow for progressive enhancement of contributions.

Belize, for the Central American Integration System, said adaptation, loss and damage, and the REDD+ (Reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries; and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries) framework must be anchored in the 2015 agreement. She called for establishing a contact group to consider legal aspects of the 2015 agreement.

On INDCs, the European Union (EU) called for ADP 2-6 to focus on defining: the role of INDCs in operationalizing differentiation; measuring, reporting and verification (MRV) rules; and a cycle for increasing post-2020 ambition. The EIG expressed the group’s commitment to timely communication of INDCs.

Sudan, for the African Group, stated that INDCs and elements of the 2015 agreement are aspects of the same mandate, expressing concern over the presentation of two separate documents. The LDCs said the meeting should advance discussions on INDCs, including their legal form and treatment.

The LMDCs said the draft decision on INDCs goes beyond the Warsaw mandate, which refers to the identification of information to be provided by parties. The Arab Group called for addressing information required for INDCs and distinguishing between developed countries’ compulsory actions and developing countries’ voluntary actions.

On workstream 2, the Umbrella Group emphasized a practical, educational and cooperative focus for the TEMs. The LDCs said workstream 2 should build on the UN Climate Summit’s momentum. BASIC noted that increased pre-2020 ambition by developed countries, including full capitalization of the Green Climate Fund, will build trust in the post-2020 process.

During civil society statements, Business and Industry Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) underlined the need for all sectors of the economy to be enlisted in mitigation and adaptation. Local Government and Municipal Authorities said the Co-Chairs’ draft text on pre-2020 ambition provides starting points for an action plan for cities and subnational authorities.

Farmers’ NGOs called for a work programme on agriculture under the Subsidiary Body on Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA), covering food security, mitigation and adaptation. Research and Independent NGOs emphasized the importance of a negotiating process that is evidence-based and grounded in sound science.

Women and Gender urged delegates to take into account the rights, needs and expertise of men and women alike in the 2015 agreement. Warning delegates that the climate window “is closing before our eyes,” Youth NGOs urged parties to commit to the highest level of ambition possible.

Climate Action Network, for Environmental NGOs (ENGOS), called for an INDCs text that is detailed and comprehensive enough to put the world back onto “a climate-safe trajectory.” Climate Justice Now!, for ENGOS, lamented restrictions on the number of civil society representatives at COP 20 and urged delegates to address all elements in the new climate agreement.

After the opening plenary on Monday, the contact group on ADP item 3 convened to address both workstreams throughout the week. TEMs were held on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday and a stocktaking meeting took place on Thursday afternoon.

CONTACT GROUP ON ADP ITEM 3

WORKSTREAM 2: The contact group on ADP item 3 considered the Co-Chairs’ draft decision on accelerating the implementation of enhanced pre-2020 climate action (ADP.2014.8.DraftText) on Monday and Friday. On Friday night, a new iteration of the draft decision was issued. Nauru, for AOSIS, Chile, Switzerland, the US, Bangladesh, for the LDCs, and New Zealand supported using the Co-Chairs’ draft decision as the basis for negotiations. New Zealand said the draft is a useful first step, despite being too lengthy. South Africa, Australia and Canada supported the Co-Chairs issuing a revised draft decision taking account of views expressed at this meeting.

On the AOSIS proposal, Nauru, for AOSIS, explained their submission concentrates on expanding the technical process post-2015, including: more effective and efficient TEMs through advance notice and increased interaction; regularly updated papers following TEMs; invitation of submissions by organizations at all levels with experience in implementing elements discussed in the TEMs; and ministerial engagement in workstream 2.

On the LMDCs proposal, China, for the LMDCs, highlighted their conference room paper (CRP), calling for, *inter alia*: immediate and early ratification of the Doha Amendment to the Kyoto Protocol; unconditional commitments by Annex I parties

in 2014 to reduce emissions by 40% below 1990 levels by 2020; commitment of Annex II parties to support the adaptation framework; the launch of an accelerated implementation mechanism; commitment to address response measures; rapid and substantial capitalization of the Green Climate Fund (GCF); MRV of financial commitments; and operational modalities for the Technology Executive Committee (TEC) and the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN) by SBSTA 42.

Norway, Canada, Australia, Japan and New Zealand said the LMDCs CRP goes beyond the Warsaw mandate, with Australia saying BAP implementation is addressed elsewhere. Canada added that the CRP would significantly limit parties' collective ability to reduce emissions.

Many supported the continuation of the workstream 2 work programme after 2015. AOSIS called for the BAP's fulfillment. Colombia, for AILAC, emphasized the importance of enhancing MOI and strengthening MRV systems in the context of workstream 2. Jordan suggested launching a review of the adequacy of financial support. China called for a 2015-2020 work programme to review achievement of pre-2020 commitments.

AOSIS said work under workstream 2 should continue until the mitigation gap is closed. Norway suggested considering fora for increased mitigation ambition after 2015, pointing to the Subsidiary Body on Implementation (SBI) and the TEC as examples. Brazil proposed considering expanding workstream 2 beyond 2020, either as part of the 2015 agreement or as a separate track.

Many supported continuing the TEMs after 2015 and various parties made suggestions for their improvement. AOSIS, the US and AILAC made suggestions regarding their planning and follow up. The US called for the TEC to manage the agenda and proceedings of the TEMs. Norway and Japan called for the TEC and CTCN to be more involved in the TEMs, with New Zealand suggesting they manage the TEMs and communicate their outcomes.

The EU said the TEMs should focus on facilitating action, and called for exploring how a web-based presence would add value to existing tools. Canada cautioned that a web-based information portal could become unmanageable by the Secretariat. Australia stressed ensuring the availability of financial resources and, with the US, reviewing the success of the TEMs. India expressed concern that the TEMs are shifting the onus of mitigation away from Annex I parties. South Africa supported an ambition mechanism to act only on the TEMs outcomes. AILAC suggested establishing a new forum for parties to voluntarily share information on support for nationally appropriate mitigation actions and a new mechanism to catalyze action on mitigation. New Zealand opposed this suggestion, calling for use of existing mechanisms and frameworks.

On the frequency of the TEMs, AOSIS and the EU said there is no need to have TEMs at all UNFCCC meetings, with AOSIS noting that quality, not quantity, is key.

On topics for the TEMs, Switzerland, Australia, Norway and New Zealand said the TEMs should focus on enhancing mitigation ambition of all parties. Mexico, AOSIS and Tuvalu suggested considering regional TEMs. Saudi Arabia said TEMs should address adaptation. Australia called for TEMs on enabling environments for implementing durable policies. Iran said they should address the BAP. AILAC proposed a TEM on reviewing

existing policy databases and, supported by Australia, said TEMs should focus on implementation. Norway, with New Zealand, called for revisiting previous TEM topics and adding sessions on carbon pricing and removal of fossil fuel subsidies. AOSIS suggested TEMs on transport, and local and indigenous peoples' knowledge. Bolivia called for a TEM on the technologies and knowledge systems of indigenous peoples and local communities. Japan called for maintaining a focus on technology.

On ministerial engagement, the EU, Chile, AILAC and AOSIS supported ministerial engagement under workstream 2. AILAC proposed high-level engagement on a summary of the TEMs and UN Climate Summit follow-up, and called for providing space for new announcements on enhanced mitigation efforts, increased multilateral cooperation and means of implementation to support these. Switzerland and Norway said ministerial engagement should not be a matter of routine, but add value to the process. The US called for "a strategic use" of ministers, including in the TEMs. New Zealand and Venezuela suggested providing ministers with focused questions. AOSIS called for greater interaction between ministers. Brazil and AOSIS warned against "ministerial fatigue."

The EU, Chile, Mexico, Mali and AOSIS welcomed workstream 2 as a tool to engage with non-state actors. While noting the important role of non-state actors, Tanzania stressed the need to avoid mixing actions by parties and those by others. A new iteration of the Co-Chairs' draft COP decision on accelerating the implementation of enhanced pre-2020 climate action was distributed on Friday night. The new draft will be considered by the contact group in Lima.

WORKSTREAM 1: ADAPTATION: This issue was addressed by the contact group on ADP item 3 on Tuesday, and in informal consultations on Thursday and Friday.

On action on adaptation, Bolivia, for the G-77/China, and Iran called for recognizing that adaptation is country-specific. The G-77/China, with Bangladesh, the African Group and Saint Lucia, described national adaptation plans (NAPs) as key in supporting adaptation. Switzerland said all parties should develop NAPs and report on national strategies and plans. Nigeria called for strong and clear commitments from Annex II parties. Algeria stressed the evolutionary character of adaptation needs.

Timor-Leste and Senegal urged linking adaptation and long-term mitigation measures. The G-77/China, Mexico, South Africa and Colombia drew linkages between mitigation and MOI. Tanzania, with the G-77/China, suggested that adaptation be seen in the context of sustainable development. Australia underscored that adaptation action is not a substitute for mitigation.

On a global goal on adaptation, Mexico, presenting a Mexico-AILAC proposal, supported by Jordan, suggested a global goal that includes an aspirational vision. Sudan, for the African Group, opposed by Norway and the US, said a quantitative goal for adaptation MOI could be aggregated from NAPs. Switzerland, Canada and the EU agreed that the global goal should be qualitative, with Switzerland, New Zealand and Japan stressing it should focus on promoting resilience by integrating adaptation into national policies. The US said the goal should "elevate" adaptation within national planning processes.

On institutions for adaptation, the G-77/China, Switzerland, Costa Rica, for AILAC, Nauru, for AOSIS, the EU, Norway, Japan, New Zealand, Brazil and Turkey called for building

on existing institutions and mechanisms, such as the Cancun Adaptation Framework. AOSIS and China supported strengthening the mandate of the Adaptation Committee to oversee UNFCCC adaptation efforts. The LDCs emphasized anchoring existing institutions in the 2015 agreement. AILAC called for a consolidation of adaptation institutions in 2017. Egypt suggested building synergies between the UNFCCC and other international organizations. The LDCs proposed an international clearinghouse and registry. Saudi Arabia, with Algeria, China and India, opposed by Canada, called for a “nationally appropriate mitigation action (NAMA)-like” registry. Switzerland called for a space to share best practices.

AOSIS and the LDCs called for regional adaptation platforms, while New Zealand suggested strengthening existing regional initiatives. South Africa supported the adaptation technical and knowledge platform from the Mexico-AILAC proposal. Singapore opposed “massive monitoring machinery” for MRV of adaptation.

The G-77/China, the LDCs, AOSIS, China and Saint Lucia, opposed by Australia and Canada, urged anchoring the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage in the 2015 agreement.

On Tuesday, the ADP Co-Chairs proposed that Franz Perrez (Switzerland) and Juan Hoffmaister (Bolivia) coordinate informal consultations, *inter alia*, on the global goal, institutional arrangements, including a possible registry, and linkages with support.

On Thursday, during the stocktaking meeting, Hoffmaister reported on constructive discussions in the informal consultations on adaptation, which focused on the global goal, noting the request by parties to continue the consultations until the end of the meeting.

On Friday, Perrez highlighted emerging consensus in the informal consultations on bringing forth and enhancing existing commitments. He indicated that many called for filling gaps in existing institutions, which should then be tailored to meet the needs of the 2015 agreement.

INDCs: This issue was taken up by the ADP contact group on item 3 on Wednesday and Thursday.

Several parties welcomed the Co-Chairs’ draft decision (ADP.2014.7.DraftText) as a basis for discussions. Ecuador and Algeria suggested negotiating on the basis of the CRP submitted by the LMDCs. Colombia, Saint Lucia, for the Caribbean Community (CARICOM), and Switzerland, opposed by Tanzania, supported adopting an INDC decision in Lima. Some Annex I parties stressed respecting the Warsaw mandate on INDCs.

On differentiation, Argentina, for the LMDCs, Sudan, for the African Group, and China suggested INDCs include differentiated information for Annex I, Annex II and non-Annex I parties. Many cautioned against backsliding, with Brazil suggesting a “concentric” approach to differentiation, where countries with absolute reduction targets are at the center of concentric cycles of less rigorous commitments going outward, with every party encouraged to move towards the center over time. Tuvalu, for the LDCs, and Kenya emphasized differentiation of information, especially for the most vulnerable. Switzerland, New Zealand, Australia and Canada opposed a “bifurcated approach.”

On scope of INDCs, many non-Annex I parties said INDCs should include mitigation, adaptation and MOI. New Zealand, Canada, and the Russian Federation said INDCs should address mitigation only, with Switzerland and the US arguing that including adaptation in the INDCs would delay their submission. Norway suggested including MOI needs for developing countries’ actions requiring international support. CARICOM, the US, Singapore, the Cook Islands and Switzerland, opposed by El Salvador, called for INDCs to focus on mitigation.

On information to be provided in INDCs, the EU suggested strengthening information requirements, including on: Land Use, Land Use Changes and Forestry; market mechanisms; and methodologies for calculating business as usual baselines. The Republic of Korea suggested INDCs be accompanied by information on mitigation applicable to all parties, and additional information reflecting national circumstances.

On review of INDCs, South Africa, Colombia, Nauru, for AOSIS, and Tonga highlighted the importance of an assessment process. Colombia and the EU suggested the Secretariat compile INDCs in a report. El Salvador and CARICOM, opposed by Japan, suggested the Secretariat draft a report assessing the adequacy and transparency of INDCs. Colombia suggested that the Secretariat compile and communicate INDCs, with a review by an external body. AOSIS called for assessing whether ambition is in line with the 1.5 or 2°C limit. Costa Rica, for AILAC, suggested that an *ex ante* review only cover mitigation and MOI, not adaptation. Brazil suggested INDCs be submitted in cycles.

Lamenting “positioning” by parties, Co-Chair Kumarsingh suspended the discussion on INDCs, noting the lack of significant progress despite some proposals and clarity on selected issues. On Thursday, a briefing on cooperation and support for domestic preparations for INDCs was held at lunchtime. A new iteration of the INDCs draft decision was distributed on Friday afternoon, which will be considered in Lima by the contact group.

FINANCE: The issue of finance was addressed by the contact group on ADP item 3 on Tuesday and Wednesday, and in informal consultations, coordinated by Gary William Theseira (Malaysia) and Christo Artusio (US) on Friday.

GCF Co-Chair Ayman Shasly (Saudi Arabia) and Standing Committee on Finance (SCF) Member Seyni Nafo (Mali) provided updates on work undertaken by the GCF and SCF. Peru reported on finance-related work undertaken by the incoming COP 20 Presidency.

On finance commitments, Malaysia, for the G-77/China, said developed countries should provide financial support in accordance with their obligations under the Convention. Jordan, for the LMDCs, called for an ambitious commitment by developed countries, and a clear roadmap and timetable for finance through 2020 and beyond.

China, Iran, Tuvalu, for the LDCs, and Ecuador called for quantitative commitments and, with the pledge of US\$100 billion per year by 2020 as a starting point, proposed a roadmap for scaling up finance post-2020. Malawi also supported a quantitative commitment.

Switzerland, Canada, the US, Norway, New Zealand and Australia opposed a short-term quantitative goal in the post-2020 period. Switzerland called for commitments by all countries to provide resources for climate change policies and, with the US

and the LDCs, for all countries in a position to do so to provide support to those who require it. Norway, with the EU, called for commitments from all parties, and pricing carbon. New Zealand proposed a political declaration on finance.

Colombia said the AILAC proposal is for: a global transformational goal; a short-term quantitative goal with a list of commitments by parties; and a dynamic process to scale-up the quantitative goal, which considers national budgetary cycles and responds to changing needs and capabilities.

Norway and Brazil called for moving away from project-based approaches to finance, with Norway clarifying their proposal builds on their REDD+ experience, with a step-wise approach to building readiness and capacity. The LDCs supported a readiness approach.

On institutional mechanisms, the G-77/China, Costa Rica, for AILAC, Chile, the LDCs, Turkey, Palau and the EU said the GCF should be anchored into the agreement. The Gambia, Ghana, the US, Palau and Malawi welcomed the earmarking of 50% of GCF finance for adaptation, and supported continued balance in the agreement.

The Republic of Korea called for strengthening the role of the SCF. Maldives, for AOSIS, called for the agreement to address the gaps in the current climate finance architecture. Ghana emphasized direct access to finance. Switzerland called for a COP mandate to assess and modify the financial mechanism as necessary.

Mexico, Guyana, Belize, for CARICOM, and Brazil emphasized building on existing institutions. Japan stressed existing institutions are functioning well.

On sources of finance, the Republic of Korea stressed the importance of private-sector engagement and supported strong public-private partnerships. The EU called for the agreement to send signals to the private sector. The US stressed the need to: use public finance to mobilize private investment; enhance enabling environments; and encourage limiting high-carbon investments and climate-proofing all financial flows.

The LMDCs, Algeria, China, Iran and India said public finance should be the major source of climate finance. The LMDCs suggested that developed countries mobilize 1% of their gross domestic product (GDP) in public finance. South Africa called for a mechanism to assess contributions of developed countries based on GDP. Ecuador suggested an “eco tax” on oil exports.

China, Iran, Ecuador, Palau and Tanzania said that private finance should be complementary, but not replace public finance. Switzerland noted the importance of a diversity of sources. Guyana, Ecuador, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Egypt distinguished between climate finance and official development assistance. Chile and CARICOM called for a definition of climate finance.

Japan, Canada and the US stressed enabling private investment and low-carbon growth, with the EU and the US clarifying that private finance will not replace public finance. Australia emphasized using public finance to support those unable to attract private finance, and prioritizing finance to those with the least capacity and greater vulnerability. Bolivia opposed market-based approaches to climate finance.

The LDCs, the EU and the US, opposed by India, suggested considering South-South cooperation in the 2015 agreement.

On transparency of support, Kenya supported a review mechanism, and Mexico called for robust MRV. AILAC called for reviewing and revising financial commitments upward on the same timeline as the review of mitigation ambition.

The EU supported considering impacts and results in climate finance. Colombia and the LDCs supported *ex ante* assessment and *ex post* review of climate finance.

MITIGATION, CYCLE AND OTHER MATTERS:

These issues were addressed by the contact group on ADP item 3 on Saturday. SBSTA Chair Emmanuel Dlamini (Swaziland) provided an overview of the 2013-2015 review, recalling the ADP shall be informed by the outcomes of the review and noting, *inter alia*: that climate-related impacts are already happening and the long-term global goal aims to help determine the level of acceptable impacts; the success of the structured expert dialogue; the technical and economic feasibility of the 2°C goal; and the long-term global goal as a catalyst for action.

Mitigation: Tuvalu, for the LDCs, proposed a legally-binding agreement and a system based on two annexes, including the possibility of making amendments for parties to increase their level of mitigation ambition through COP decisions. The US preferred schedules.

The LDCs called for all parties to make efforts to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, and to make the forum on the impact of the implementation of response measures a permanent institution under the agreement.

Nauru, for AOSIS, Norway, the EU, Japan and Switzerland called for time-bound, binding mitigation commitments by all parties. The US called for all parties except the LDCs to submit mitigation contributions that are quantified or quantifiable. AOSIS added that developed countries should take the lead. Norway stressed that additional action could be conditional on finance and support.

Norway suggested an operational goal of zero net emissions by 2050. New Zealand cautioned against using considerable negotiation time on a global goal, whereas Chile, for AILAC, said agreeing on a global goal is key.

China, the EU, Norway and Switzerland called for provisions against backsliding. South Africa said the “no backsliding rule” should apply to all parties. China added that the agreement should “encourage, not force” developed countries to take action on mitigation. Bolivia suggested a “compound index of country participation,” based on historical responsibilities, ecological footprint, capability and state of development. New Zealand proposed “bounded flexibility,” based on broad parameters, such as quantification of mitigation commitments. Nigeria called for strong mitigation commitments from Annex II parties.

On operationalizing differentiation, the EU suggested self-differentiation through INDCs. Brazil said self-differentiation “would not take us to an agreement,” and, supported by AILAC, suggested a “concentric” approach to differentiation. Saudi Arabia called for focusing on implementation. Canada said that national determination of contributions resolves the difficulty of differentiation.

Cycle: The LDCs, AOSIS, Belize, for CARICOM, Switzerland, Timor-Leste, the Marshall Islands and the US called for a five-year cycle. CARICOM pointed to the “poor track record” of mid-term reviews under the Convention. Singapore suggested seven-year cycles. Brazil, Japan, Jordan and the Republic of Korea supported a ten-year cycle, with the Republic

of Korea calling for a mid-term review to accommodate parties' capabilities. Iran said discussing cycles is beyond the Durban mandate.

Drawing attention to the numerous existing cycles, China and Iran cautioned against adding cycles to the process. The EU informed its INDC would have a 2030 target, and suggested: a robust mid-term review; and including mitigation commitments in a legally-binding annex, with details of the cycle to be defined in COP decisions. New Zealand and Australia preferred setting a common cycle, with Australia suggesting phased cycles linked to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) assessment cycles, including: *ex ante* and *ex post* MRV; and review of aggregate level. The US said the cycle should include: submission of contributions; a consultative period; formalization of contributions; and review.

On the review, China and Iran supported anchoring existing arrangements in the 2015 agreement, including the international consultation and analysis. Switzerland, Chile, for AILAC, and South Africa supported a compliance mechanism. Jordan proposed an *ex post* review for mitigation, adaptation and MOI. AOSIS, Norway and the LDCs stressed that an *ex ante* assessment of INDCs is necessary to inform whether "we are on the right track" to achieve the 2°C goal, suggesting the Secretariat assess aggregate ambition. Brazil proposed five-year contribution terms with an aggregate exercise to estimate the level of ambition in light of the 2°C goal. The LDCs stressed separate MRV systems for the new agreement and the INDCs.

Other Matters: On the legal form, the LDCs, AILAC and the Marshall Islands suggested a legally-binding protocol. The LDCs added that annexes should be enshrined in the agreement, not COP decisions. China said the legal form would depend on the substance of the agreement. AOSIS called for addressing loss and damage and the legal form in Lima. Iran stressed the need to address response measures. South Africa, supported by AILAC, emphasized that transparency is no substitute for legal force. AILAC and the Marshall Islands called for a legally binding protocol. Cautioning against a system of targets as in the Kyoto Protocol, New Zealand suggested a legally binding agreement, with commitments embedded in a formally logged schedule.

TECHNICAL EXPERT MEETINGS

TEM ON CARBON CAPTURE USE AND STORAGE:

On Tuesday, 21 October, Ulrika Raab, Swedish Energy Agency, facilitated a TEM where Canada, the UK and the United Arab Emirates shared perspectives on carbon capture and storage (CCS) options, barriers and opportunities, and an expert panel of business representatives presented on CCS implementation and options for carbon usage. A summary of the meeting is available at: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12601e.html>

TEM ON ACTION ON NON-CO2 GHGs: On Wednesday, 22 October, Marta Pizano, Colombia, facilitated a TEM during which parties, institutions and businesses presented on policies, actions and collaborative initiatives at sub-national, national and international levels to reduce and limit emissions from methane, nitrous oxide and fluorinated gases, in particular hydrofluorocarbons. A summary of the meeting is available at: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12602e.html>

FOLLOW UP TO TEMS ON UNLOCKING MITIGATION OPPORTUNITIES THROUGH ENERGY EFFICIENCY, RENEWABLE ENERGY, URBAN ENVIRONMENT AND LAND USE IMPROVEMENTS IN THE PRE-2020 PERIOD: On Thursday, Halldór Thorgeirsson, UNFCCC Secretariat, facilitated a debrief on the TEMs, where organizations and support institutions involved in the TEMs reported progress on: accelerating action on energy efficiency, renewable energy and transport; action in cities; forests and agriculture; and support from UNFCCC institutions. A summary of the meeting is available at: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12603e.html>

CLOSING PLENARY

ADP Co-Chair Artur Runge-Metzger (EU) opened the closing plenary at 5:34 pm on Saturday, expressing the hope that in the interest of time, parties would refrain from making closing statements.

Co-Chair Runge-Metzger said the discussions during the week had been "intense and fruitful," highlighting rich discussions in adaptation and finance. He added that progress made at the meeting would need to be captured before Lima, encouraging delegates to make submissions well in advance and engage informally. He said the Secretariat's note on legal aspects related to the 2015 agreement has been made available on the UNFCCC website. He emphasized that progress made at the meeting on INDCs was reflected in a new iteration of the draft decision on this issue on Friday afternoon.

On pre-2020 ambition, he thanked parties for their efforts to "build bridges," highlighting that a new iteration of the draft decision on this issue was made available on Friday night. He also indicated that summaries of the two TEMs held during the meeting would be posted on the UNFCCC website.

He stated that the Co-Chairs would provide before Lima: a Co-Chairs' reflection note on ADP 2-6; an updated version of the Co-Chairs' non paper on the elements of the 2015 agreement; and a scenario note for ADP 2-7.

He proposed to suspend the second session of the ADP and to resume the work of the contact group in Lima.

On additional meetings, Co-Chair Runge-Metzger noted general understanding on the need for at least two additional meetings of the ADP in 2015, informing that the first will take place from 8-13 February 2015, in Geneva, Switzerland.

Richard Kinley, UNFCCC Secretariat, provided an update on financial implications of the additional session and stressed that the ADP is considering actions that will have budgetary implications in 2015, urging parties to consider contributing towards their financing.

ADOPTION OF THE REPORT: ADP Rapporteur Anna Serzysko (Poland) introduced the report of the session (FCCC/ADP/2014/L.3), which was adopted with a minor amendment by the Russian Federation.

CLOSING STATEMENTS: Bolivia, for the G-77/China, Ecuador, for the LMDCs, Saudi Arabia, for the Arab Group, and Sudan, for the African Group, expressed dissatisfaction with the new iteration of the Co-Chairs' draft text on INDCs, lamenting that it fails to reflect the views of all parties. On elements of the 2015 agreement, the G-77/China, the LMDCs, the Arab Group and the African Group called for a shift in the working mode in Lima, with the LMDCs suggesting focused groups entering

into “formal negotiations for drafting text on all core elements.” The African Group added that INDCs and elements of the 2015 agreement should be addressed together.

Nepal, for the LDCs, said Bonn had provided a good opportunity to enhance understanding on each other’s positions. He called for a more focused discussion on elements, adding that all elements are of equal importance and require proper and balanced treatment.

South Africa, for BASIC, expressed disappointment with the lack of progress in the consideration of the elements of the 2015 agreement, and, with the LDCs, called for discussions in Lima in more focused groups. She suggested the Co-Chairs appoint facilitators for such groups, which would base their work on an updated version on the non-paper on the elements for a draft negotiating text. Australia, supported by the Russian Federation, expressed difficulty with moving to breakout groups, stressing the need to avoid operating in silos.

Switzerland, for the EIG, stated that progress “has been slow because of us, the parties, not because of the Co-Chairs.” He underlined that, despite slow progress, parties had deepened their understanding on key issues and called for focused discussions. The EU and Australia, for the Umbrella Group, looked forward to further iterations of the non-paper on the elements for a draft negotiating text.

Saying that they are a group of “bridge building engineers,” Costa Rica, for AILAC, urged all parties to redouble their efforts to find more points of convergence, calling for a mode of work that leads to tangible results in Lima. He stressed the INDC draft decision does not reflect progress made at the meeting.

Peru noted that all delegates had indicated their determination to step up the negotiating work, welcomed the honest dialogue carried out during the meeting, and supported the Co-Chairs.

Co-Chair Runge-Metzger thanked parties for their views and suspended the second session of the ADP at 6:41 pm.

A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF ADP 2-6

*Many rivers to cross
But I can't seem to find my way over...*
-Jimmy Cliff

UNFCCC Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres opened the sixth part of the second session of the ADP emphasizing the need to seize the momentum built by the UN Climate Summit in September, and calling on delegates to “build bridges and find a path forward you can all tread together.” Yet as the meeting proceeded, some delegations quickly fell back into old habits, repeating oft-heard statements. This left many to wonder whether the “rivers” dividing parties might be too broad to cross before COP 20 in Lima. This brief analysis will assess progress made in Bonn, overall group dynamics, and whether the exchanges of views that took place over the six days will enable construction of the bridges necessary for progress in Lima.

A BRIDGE TO LIMA

As mandated by the Warsaw decision on the ADP, parties arrived in Bonn to make progress on three key “pillars” on which outcomes are expected in Lima: a decision on intended nationally determined contributions (INDCs); advancing on the elements of the 2015 agreement to ensure a draft negotiating text is available before May 2015; and a decision on accelerating the implementation of enhanced pre-2020 climate action. More

specifically, parties were given the task to reach agreement, if possible, on draft decisions on both INDCs and pre-2020 ambition.

Delegates were also under pressure to capitalize on the momentum provided by the UN Climate Summit in September and the COP 20 Presidency’s informal meeting that took place early October—which many characterized as positive and constructive—to “build a bridge” to Lima. Despite a call made by incoming COP 20 President Manuel Pulgar-Vidal to make progress on the expected outcomes of Lima with “a sense of urgency and high level ambition,” it soon became evident that urgency and ambition would not characterize this round of talks.

While some made genuine attempts to engage with the texts and questions presented by the Co-Chairs and interact on the basis of the submissions and views by other countries and groups, the ADP contact group sessions more often than not resembled replays of the opening plenary, with delegates reading long statements containing their wish lists for the final agreements.

As parties reiterated and clarified their views on key aspects of INDCs, including differentiation, scope, types of information, and *ex ante* review or consideration, it became increasingly clear that positions remained far apart. This left many wondering if a decision on INDCs in Lima would be in jeopardy. Despite a generally cordial atmosphere, many were concerned that parties were clinging to long-held positions, or even walking back from understandings reached in Durban and Warsaw.

A disagreement persisted on the scope of the “Warsaw mandate” on INDCs, in particular on whether they include mitigation only, as insisted by many developed countries, or also adaptation and means of implementation, as suggested by a sizable number of developing countries. For developing countries, adaptation remains an overarching priority as they are the most affected by climate change and require means of implementation to address this challenge and contribute to mitigation ambition. Many developing countries resisted taking decisions on mitigation without simultaneous consideration of adaptation and means of implementation.

Some developing countries voiced concern over “locking in” the mitigation elements of the 2015 agreement, including weak MRV modalities, in Lima, while leaving other issues as afterthoughts in Paris. This concern left African countries calling for a single decision in Lima on INDCs and the elements of the 2015 agreement, rather than addressing these pillars in separate decisions. Some went as far as to suggest that the scope of INDCs be decided only in Paris, well after their submission deadline in the first quarter of 2015, to ensure all elements are addressed together. The developing countries’ continued hesitance to accept what they viewed as a “mitigation first” approach reinforced the probability that the Lima outcome will be another “package deal” with built-in indications on how all elements will move forward and provide assurance that no issues will be left behind in Paris.

BRIDGES TO NOWHERE?

As the week progressed, the continuing fragmentation of country groupings became a concern for those keeping track of the increasing number of aggregated interests to be catered to. Some long-term observers of the process pointed out that, as COP 21 in Paris approaches, traditional country groupings are

finding it increasingly difficult to reach common positions. In Bonn, this trend was reflected in the large number of developing country groups intervening, as well as in some solitary interventions by individual parties, such as Palau, Timor-Leste and Tanzania, that usually rely on their coalition's spokesperson to voice their positions.

While the EU continued to speak with a unified voice, the issue of group coherence was also played out, as many worried that divisions within the 28-member bloc would stymie agreement by the EU Council, meeting concurrently in Brussels, on a common position to reduce emissions. The EU's decision, on Thursday night, to cut GHG emissions by 40% below 1990 levels by 2030, therefore left many member states relieved. Some in the group felt the agreement on a core aspect of the EU's INDC was crucial to "get the ball rolling" and encourage other parties to come forward with mitigation contributions of their own.

With the growing complexity of positions, the meeting in Bonn made it clear that achieving compromise in Lima would be challenging. "We were asked to build bridges at this conference," opined one delegate "but, as it stands, we are constructing bridges from our own positions and it is hard to see how they will join up, and, if we are not careful we will just build bridges to nowhere."

In addition, disagreements on methods and modes of work on each of the three deliverables—whether or not to directly negotiate based on draft texts prepared by the Co-Chairs, and whether to continue a more conceptual discussion or enter into text-based negotiations on the elements of the 2015 agreement—carried over from the June session. This left some parties talking past each other as some addressed the Co-Chairs' non-paper and draft decisions, while others focused on conference room papers submitted by country groupings.

While most seemed to agree that text-based negotiations are crucial for moving the process forward, parties were unable to agree on which document should serve as the basis for negotiations and many left for home with a growing sense of unease over the work ahead in five weeks' time. This feeling boiled over during the closing plenary, with many developing countries expressing frustration at the lack of text negotiations and reiterating that there was no standing for texts issued by the Co-Chairs in a "party-driven" process. They called for a swift change in the working modality in Lima, including establishment of spin-off groups on each key element of the draft agreement text.

At the same time, developed countries, along with some developing countries, called for negotiations based on the Co-Chairs' non-paper and draft decisions, and for the Co-Chairs to update these texts to reflect the discussions that took place in Bonn. The Co-Chairs reminded parties that the process is party-driven and the decision on how to proceed in Lima is in the parties—not the Co-Chairs—hands. This fundamental disagreement over how to move forward is likely to be reflected in a procedural debate at the opening the ADP in Lima and potentially delay substantive discussions.

CONSTRUCTING THE PILLARS

Despite limited progress overall on the bridge to Lima, as delegates left Bonn many appreciated that the meeting had provided much-needed space for more in-depth exchanges of

views. Many felt the meeting helped clarify countries' and groups' understanding of the spectrum of views, possible areas of convergence and divergence, and what underlies their positions and how these concerns might be addressed.

On adaptation and finance, informal consultations resulted in fruitful and interactive exchanges. The launch of these consultations, according to some, did represent a significant shift in the mode of work and signaled that parties may be more willing in Lima to leave the comfort of open-ended discussions in one single contact group, for more focused negotiations taking place in parallel. Perhaps the most enthusiasm was generated around adaptation, which seemed to emerge as a "safe" topic to discuss given the overwhelming consensus on its importance in the new agreement. Clarity on some key aspects of adaptation and finance could serve to provide assurances for developing countries that these crucial issues are being given sufficient attention and carried forward at the same pace as mitigation.

In addition, some proposals attempted to provide middle ground between parties' either-or options. A number of Latin American countries, in particular, stood out as potential "bridge builders" by making concrete proposals on how to address differentiation and finance—perhaps the two most crucial aspects of a successful 2015 agreement. Much attention was attracted by Brazil's concept of "concentric differentiation," which seeks to create a dynamic agreement that "preserves the principles of the Convention" while "avoiding pure self-differentiation" in which countries decide for themselves their level of ambition. The proposals by the Independent Alliance of Latin America and the Caribbean on formulating short- and longer-term goals for finance, and by Norway, on adopting a step-wise readiness-based approach to finance, also drew interest across groups.

Some advances were also made in workstream 2, on pre-2020 ambition, where two technical expert meetings were held. While many wondered whether the TEMs, a key component of workstream 2, were generating any additional implementation of mitigation actions on the ground, a general consensus prevailed on their importance as a technical space alongside the political negotiations, and concrete proposals were made on how to institutionalize the TEMs under the Technology Mechanism. However, some noted that there were still significant differences on how to carry workstream 2 beyond 2015, including how to reflect elements of the Warsaw Decision on the ADP, such as existing commitments, in a Lima decision.

As the week drew to an end, the importance attached by different groups to each of three Lima pillars made it evident that a successful outcome at COP 20 would require skillful bridge building and balancing of issues, and possibly a much-disliked "package." While Bonn did not succeed in fully building the necessary bridges, delegates did manage to lay the groundwork for the main pillars of the expected ADP outcome in Lima. With only a few weeks remaining, and a multitude of rivers to cross, delegates will need to do their utmost to explore creative ways to build these bridges together, or failing that, they may need to learn how to swim.

UPCOMING MEETINGS

IPCC-40: The fortieth meeting of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change is convening in Copenhagen to consider and finalize the Synthesis Report (SYR), which integrates and synthesizes the findings from the three Working Group reports that comprise the Fifth Assessment Report (AR5). The Panel will approve the Summary for Policymakers (SPM) and adopt the SYR. **dates:** 27-31 October 2014 **location:** Copenhagen, Denmark **contact:** IPCC Secretariat **phone:** +41-22-730-8208 **fax:** +41-22-730-8025 **email:** IPCC-Sec@wmo.int **www:** <http://www.ipcc.ch/>

COP 20 Global Stakeholders Dialogues: Taking Action on Climate Change: This meeting is organized by the UNFCCC COP 20 and CMP 10 Presidency to engage Peruvian stakeholder group leaders with representatives of the nine UNFCCC observer constituencies, and the Peruvian UNFCCC negotiations team. **dates:** 28-30 October 2014 **location:** Lima, Peru **contact:** COP 20 Presidency **email:** infocop20@minam.gob.pe **www:** <http://ecpamericas.org/events/default.aspx?id=505>

First Ministerial and Policy Conference on Sustainable Transport: This conference aims to integrate sustainable transport into Africa's development and planning processes and increase funding to sustainable transport programmes. **dates:** 27-31 October 2014 **location:** Nairobi, Kenya **contact:** UNEP, Division of Technology, Industry and Economics, Energy Branch **phone:** +254-20-7623377 **www:** <http://www.unep.org/transport/ASTF/index.asp>

ICAO Environmental Seminars in the APAC Region: This seminar will cover: aviation and environmental outlook, aircraft noise, local air quality, global emissions, sustainable alternative fuels, market-based measures, technology, operations, green airports, states' action plans, assistance to states and financing. **dates:** 28-30 October 2014 **location:** Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia **contact:** ICAO **phone:** +1 514-954-8219 **fax:** +1 514-954-6077 **email:** icaohq@icao.int **www:** <http://www.icao.int/Meetings/EnvironmentalWorkshops/Pages/2014-Ap-RegionalSeminar.aspx>

REDD+ Academy – Asia: This first event in a series of REDD+ Academies is aimed at training REDD+ decision-makers in issues such as national REDD+ strategies, safeguards and stakeholder engagement. **dates:** 28 October-7 November 2014 **location:** Yogyakarta, Indonesia **email:** Levis.kavagi@unep.org **www:** <http://www.un-redd.org/REDDAcademy/tabid/132073/Default.aspx>

Workshop for Energy Regulators: Energy Pricing, Reform and Transition: This meeting will specifically focus on fuel pricing reform as a measure necessary for the transition to renewable energy. **dates:** 29-31 October 2014 **location:** Nairobi, Kenya **contact:** United Nations Office for Sustainable Development **phone:** +82-32-822-9088 **fax:** +82-32-822-9089 **email:** unosd@un.org **www:** <http://www.unosd.org/>

Sixteenth RRI Dialogue on Forests, Governance and Climate Change: This dialogue will consider progress and challenges in forest-based climate change mitigation. **date:** 30 October 2014 **location:** Lima, Peru **contact:** Rights and Resources Initiative Secretariat **phone:** +1-202-470-3900 **fax:** +1-202-944-3315 **email:** DialogoRRI@ibcperu.org. **www:** <http://www.rightsandresources.org/news-events/rri-dialogue-series/>

5th Conference of the International Society for Integrated Disaster Risk Management: This conference aims to bridge gaps and promote science-based solutions to empower local communities to advance disaster reduction, adapt to climate change and promote sustainable development. **dates:** 30 October-1 November 2014 **location:** London, Ontario, Canada **contact:** Conference Secretariat **email:** twaddington@iclr.org **www:** <http://www.has.uwo.ca/cs/idrim/>

Eighth Meeting of the IRENA Council: The meeting will cover: the Director-General's report on implementation of the 2014-2015 work programme and budget; discussions on the outcomes on the 2014 UN Climate Summit; and renewable energy and energy transformation. IRENA's Programme and Strategy Committee (PSC) and Administration and Finance Committee (AFC) will meet on 2 November, prior to the Council meeting. **dates:** 3-4 November 2014 **location:** Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates **contact:** IRENA Secretariat **phone:** +971-2-4179000 **email:** secretariat@irena.org **www:** <http://www.irena.org>

70th Meeting of the CDM Accreditation Panel: The CDM Accreditation Panel (CDM-AP) prepares the decision making of the CDM Executive Board in accordance with the procedure for accrediting operational entities. **dates:** 3-5 November 2014 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** <http://cdm.unfccc.int/Panels/accreditation/index.html>

The Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG) Regional Training Workshop on NAPs for the LDCs of the Pacific: The LEG will conduct regional training workshops as one of the means to provide technical guidance and advice to LDC Parties. **dates:** 3-7 November 2014 **location:** Port Vila, Vanuatu **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php?year=2014

2nd Technical Workshop on the Draft Revised Guidelines for the Technical Review of Annex I GHG Inventories: This workshop is part of the work programme on the revision of the guidelines for the review of biennial reports and national communications for developed country parties. **dates:** 4-6 November 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/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php?year=2014

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 **www:** <http://www.precopsocial.org>

Technical Discussion on Issues Related to Articles 5, 7 and 8 of the Kyoto Protocol: This meeting is being held at the request of SBSTA 40. **date:** 7 November 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/meetings/lima_dec_2014/workshop/8525txt.php

Workshop on Self-Consumption of Renewables: The Role of Storage in Revolutionising Grid Infrastructure: This workshop will examine ways for battery storage technologies to transform grid infrastructure and support on-site renewable electricity generation by consumers. **date:** 7 November 2014 **location:** Tokyo, Japan **contact:** IRENA Secretariat **phone:** +971-2-4179000 **email:** secretariat@irena.org **www:** <http://www.irena.org>

International Conference on Mountain People Adapting to Change: This conference is expected to produce insights into global climate change for mountainous regions. **dates:** 9-12 November 2014 **location:** Kathmandu, Nepal **contact:** ICIMOD **phone:** +977-1-5003222 **fax:** +977 1 5003299 **email:** adapthkh@icimod.org **www:** <http://www.icimod.org/adapthkh>

REN21 Renewables Academy 2014: This academy will take stock of renewable energy developments over the past decade and explore ways to further advance the global energy transition with renewables. **dates:** 10-12 November 2014 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** REN21 Secretariat c/o UNEP **phone:** +33-1-44-37-14-50-90 **email:** secretariat@ren21.net **www:** <http://www.ren21.net/REN21Activities/REN21RenewablesAcademy2014>

IEA Sustainable Buildings Workshop: This workshop will contribute to the development of the International Energy Agency's new initiative for Sustainable Building by seeking advice from key global building stakeholders. **dates:** 12-13 November 2014 **location:** Paris, France **contact:** Marc LaFrance, IEA **email:** marc.lafrance@iea.org **www:** <http://www.iea.org/workshop/iea-sustainable-buildings-workshop12-13-nov.html>

16th CDM Designated National Authorities Forum: This forum will provide opportunities for representatives of Designated National Authorities and National Focal Points to exchange views, share experiences, and provide feedback on follow-up actions. **dates:** 13-14 November 2014 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** <http://cdm.unfccc.int/>

UNECE Sustainable Energy Week: The week includes: the Group of Experts on Energy Efficiency; the Group of Experts on Renewable Energy; and the 23rd session of the Committee on Sustainable Energy. **dates:** 17-21 November 2014 **location:** Geneva, Switzerland **contact:** Stefanie Held, Secretary of the Committee on Sustainable Energy **phone:** +41-22-917-2462 **fax:** +41-22-917-0038 **email:** stefanie.held@unece.org **www:** <http://www.unece.org/index.php?id=35137>

81st Meeting of the CDM Executive Board: The 81st meeting of the CMD Executive Board will meet just before COP 20. **dates:** 24-28 November 2014 **location:** Lima, Peru **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** <http://cdm.unfccc.int/EB/index.html>

The Third Hemispheric Encounter of the Inter-American Network for Disaster Mitigation: The encounter will cover the theme 'Integrating Disaster Risk Management and Adaptation to Climate Change in the Development Agenda'. **dates:** 25-26 November 2014 **location:** Washington D.C., US **contact:** Pablo Gonzalez, Dept. of Sustainable Development, OAS Secretariat

phone: +1-202-370-4971 **fax:** +1-202-370-3560 **email:** pgonzalez@oas.org **www:** <http://www.rimd.org/actividad.php?id=615>

Second International Conference on Renewable Energies for Developing Countries (REDEC 2014): The conference will explore solutions for energy saving and production in developing countries. **dates:** 26-27 November 2014 **location:** Beirut, Lebanon **email:** redsecsecretary@redeconf.org **www:** <http://www.redeconf.org>

Lima Climate Change Conference: The 20th session of the Conference of the Parties (COP 20) to the UNFCCC and 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. Also meeting will be SBSTA 41, SBI 41 and ADP 2.7. **dates:** 1-12 December 2014 **location:** Lima, Peru **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/meetings/lima_dec_2014/meeting/8141.php

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

GLOSSARY

ADP	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action
AILAC	Independent Association of Latin America and the Caribbean
ALBA	Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America
AOSIS	Alliance of Small Island States
BAP	Bali Action Plan
BASIC	Brazil, South Africa, India and China
CARICOM	Caribbean Community
CCS	Carbon capture and storage
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
EIG	Environmental Integrity Group
GCF	Green Climate Fund
GHG	Greenhouse gases
INDCs	Intended nationally determined contributions
LDCs	Least Developed Countries
LMDCs	Like-Minded Developing Countries
MOI	Means of implementation
MRV	Measuring, reporting and verification
NAPs	National Adaptation Plans
REDD+	Reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries; and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries
SBSTA	Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice
SCF	Standing Committee on Finance
TEC	Technology Executive Committee
TEM	Technical Expert Meeting
UNFCCC	UN Framework Convention on Climate Change