



BONN CLIMATE CHANGE CONFERENCE: 2 JUNE 2015

The Bonn Climate Change Conference continued on Tuesday, 2 June. ADP negotiating groups took up the first reading of the sections on technology and finance in the Geneva negotiating text in the morning, and transparency and capacity building in the afternoon. Informal facilitated discussions on technology, finance, transparency and capacity building were held in the afternoon and evening.

Contact groups and informal consultations convened under SBI and SBSTA throughout the day. The first session of the 3rd Dialogue on Convention Article 6 (education, training and public awareness) and an in-session workshop on the development of early warning systems and contingency plans in relation to extreme weather events and their various effects in the context of agriculture also took place in the afternoon.

ADP

NEGOTIATING GROUPS: Technology: Discussions were chaired by ADP Co-Chair Reifsnyder. Co-facilitators Diann Black-Layne (Antigua and Barbuda) and Andrea Guerrero (Colombia) reported respectively on the facilitated group discussions on general/objective, and adaptation and loss and damage, held on Monday, 1 June. Co-Chair Reifsnyder indicated that the resulting consolidated paragraphs will be introduced into the working document.

In the discussions on technology, parties considered the consolidation of paragraphs 130 and 132.8 on cooperative action. India, for the G-77/CHINA, said 132.8 is different from the options contained in 130 and the two should not be merged. After some discussion, parties agreed to continue considering the possible consolidation of options 2 and 3 in paragraph 130.

On paragraphs 132.6 on global collaboration on research, development and demonstration of technologies, and 133 and 133.1 on institutional arrangements for technology development and transfer, INDIA cautioned against interpretive approaches to consolidation, preferring mechanical streamlining, with TUVVALU agreeing that the proposed consolidation of 133 and 133.1 would change the meaning of the paragraphs.

Co-Chair Reifsnyder noted that the intention of the process is a mechanical streamlining and acknowledged that some of the proposals “offend this notion.”

CHINA proposed merging the chapeaus of options a and c of paragraph 132.4 on establishment by all parties of means to facilitate access to and the deployment of technology.

Parties agreed that the facilitated group would undertake a “mechanical streamlining” of paragraphs: 130, options 2 and 3; 132.4 options a and c; and 133 and 133.1.

The EU, opposed by Argentina, noted that the substantive text applicable to “all” parties was being streamlined while numerous options referring to developed countries remained in the text, underscoring this could be an unbalanced approach.

During the facilitated discussion, delegates made some progress in consolidating the text on general provisions, commitments and institutional arrangements.

Finance: Co-facilitator Franz Perrez (Switzerland) provided a status update on the facilitated group session on mitigation held on Monday, 1 June. Turning to the finance section of the negotiating text, ADP Co-Chair Djoghlafl clarified that “everything in the Geneva negotiating text remains in brackets as nothing was agreed.” The session centered around the G-77/China’s consolidation proposals in sections on guiding principles and anchoring institutions under the legal agreement.

Bolivia, for G-77/CHINA, informed that the group had been, and still was, working on consolidating options proposed by its members in the Geneva text. She presented the group’s consolidated proposals on: guiding principles; financial resources provided by developed country parties; and anchoring institutions under the legal agreement. ZAMBIA noted these proposals reflect the group’s consensus but explained the LDCs may still make additions. A number of developing countries, including BOLIVIA, SOUTH AFRICA and Belize, for AOSIS, presented additional textual proposals or brackets to the G-77/China proposals.

NORWAY, the EU and SWITZERLAND commended the consolidations as useful while noting that, wherever new language is introduced, they reserve the right to come back to text.

The G-77/CHINA further explained that paragraphs 86, 87 and 88 on assessment and review contain the group’s proposals. She suggested, opposed by the EU and NORWAY, deleting paragraphs 82.3-4, 83, 84 and 85 on: simplified access to funding; evolving needs, capabilities and responsibilities; provision of support; a transparency framework; and efforts of non-state actors.

Discussions on the G-77/CHINA proposals continued in the facilitated group on finance.

Transparency: ADP Co-Chair Reifsnyder provided an overview of what he described as the “difficult” section of the negotiating text on transparency of action and support, and asked parties to consider ways for streamlining.

Parties addressed several proposed areas for consolidation suggested by Co-Chair Reifsnyder.



On the proposed consolidation of options 1 and 2 in paragraph 141 on the transparency framework, the US cautioned against consolidations leading to unclear options, using paragraph 141 as an example, which contains two different ideas on differentiation in their respective chapeaus. KENYA and INDIA agreed with focusing on options with similarities that could be merged. Parties agreed to forward the paragraph, leaving the chapeau untouched, for consideration by the facilitated group.

On paragraph 145 on MRV arrangements, parties did not object to considering merging options 2 and 3. On the proposal to include option 6 in the merger, the EU expressed reservations. The proposed consolidation of options 1 and 7 in this paragraph was opposed by CHINA, who noted the options contain separate ideas, with differentiation based on type of contribution on the one hand, and based on classification of countries on the other.

Parties then debated how and when conceptual issues such as differentiation should be discussed. Several parties, including BRAZIL, TUVALU, ARGENTINA and MEXICO, suggested conceptual issues should be discussed at ADP 2-9 without the expectation of being resolved. INDIA and CHINA called for remaining focused on streamlining text.

The EU suggested ways to detangle the issue of differentiation from substantive questions, either by having differentiation in the chapeaus of each sub-section and taking political decisions at a later stage, or deciding on the political issue first. The US called for focusing on: the structure of the section; the relationship to other sections in the text; and differentiation. With AUSTRALIA and NORWAY, the US proposed identifying what should go in the agreement and what should go in decisions.

Co-Chair Reifsnnyder suggested exchanges on conceptual ideas could begin in the facilitated group and that the way forward on conceptual discussions be addressed again during the stocktaking session.

On paragraph 143 on the subjects and mechanisms of the transparency framework, Co-Chair Reifsnnyder proposed the facilitated group examine the possibility of merging option 1 sub-options a and b, and option 3, on guiding principles, rules and arrangements.

On paragraph 152, on arrangements for elaborating rules and modalities, SWITZERLAND suggested merging options a and b under option 1 sub-paragraph g on recognizing the use of market mechanisms. NEW ZEALAND questioned if the options can be combined, saying one is general and the other is specific.

The negotiating group agreed to request the facilitated group to explore merging: option 1, sub-options a and b, and option 3 of paragraph 143; the sub-bullets of options 1 a-h and 2 a-d of paragraph 141; options 2, 3 and 6 of paragraph 145, recognizing the EU's reservation; and options a and b under option 1 sub-paragraph g of paragraph 152.

The facilitated group continued discussing text, as mandated, through the afternoon and evening.

Capacity Building: The negotiating group was chaired by ADP Co-Chair Djoghlaif. The EU presented a proposal to delete redundant language. SWAZILAND preferred, and parties agreed, to work on the basis of the Secretariat's proposals for consolidation, which were, after examination, subsequently rejected.

Parties considered merging various sub-items in paragraph 136 on guiding principles for capacity building. They also agreed, pending discussion in the facilitated group, to merge options 1 and 3 in paragraph 138 on commitments on capacity building.

On institutional arrangements for capacity building, China, for the G-77/CHINA, agreed to present a consolidation proposal for options a and b under paragraph 140.2.

Parties took up this proposal, as well as paragraphs 136 and 138, in a facilitated discussion later in the afternoon.

SUBSIDIARY BODIES

CONTACT GROUPS: Methodological Guidance for REDD+ (SBSTA): Co-Chair Robert Bamfo (Ghana) urged delegates to complete discussion on all issues under this agenda item, namely: further guidance on safeguards information systems; guidance on non-market-based approaches; and guidance on non-carbon benefits. He recalled that parties came close to reaching a compromise on the first two issues at SBSTA 41.

BOLIVIA announced a new submission on non-market-based approaches, including text for a draft decision establishing a joint mitigation and adaptation mechanism, and a joint SBI/SBSTA session to address the mechanism at SB 44.

Ghana, for the AFRICAN GROUP, announced a submission on non-carbon benefits. Supported by several parties, he suggested starting informal consultations on this item.

NORWAY, with the US and the EU, underscored the importance of further guidance on safeguards information systems. Parties agreed to begin informal consultations on all issues under this agenda item.

Protocol Articles 5, 7 and 8 (SBSTA): This session, chaired by Co-Chair Anke Herold (Germany), agreed to focus on three priorities: brackets around clarifying paragraphs on the assigned amounts for parties with economies in transition for the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol in the draft decision (FCCC/KP/CMP/2014/L.6); update of the training programme for the second commitment period; and the implications of delayed reporting on the Kyoto Protocol review.

On the first item, UKRAINE agreed to remove the brackets, while KAZAKHSTAN and BELARUS requested more time for consultation. On the second item, the EU said they would propose draft text requesting the Secretariat to make the necessary updates. Work on these items will continue in informal consultations.

Accounting, Reporting and Review Requirements for Annex I Parties without QELRCs (SBSTA): This session was chaired by Co-Chair Guilherme do Prado Lima (Brazil). Presenting technical paper FCCC/TP/2014/6, the Secretariat said Section G (clarification of reporting requirements for Annex I Parties without a QELRC for the second commitment period) identifies issues that, as of November 2014, either have been clarified by CMP decisions, or may require further discussion and clarification by parties.

Questions were raised about how parties without QELRCs would use their CDM registries during the second commitment period. Parties will return to these issues in informal consultations.

Clarification of the Text in Section G (Article 3.7ter) of the Doha Amendment to the Kyoto Protocol (SBSTA): Opening this session, Co-Chair Anke Herold (Germany) reviewed the five options contained in document FCCC/SBSTA/2014/L.25 for clarifying the language on "average annual emissions for the first three years of the preceding commitment period."

SOUTH AFRICA, supported by BRAZIL and SAINT LUCIA, and opposed by KAZAKHSTAN and BELARUS, proposed deleting option 4, which states that Article 3.7ter refers to the preceding commitment period of that party.

SAINT LUCIA, opposed by TURKEY, BELARUS and KAZAKHSTAN, proposed also deleting option 1, which states that Article 3.7ter is not applicable in the second commitment period of parties that did not have QELRCs during the first commitment period.

The contact group agreed to combine options 1 and 4 into a single option, which remains under consideration. Informal consultations will be held on these issues.

Response Measures (SBI/SBSTA): SBSTA Chair Lidia Wojtal opened the joint contact group.

Parties reflected on the way forward. Argentina, for the G-77/CHINA, called for the continuation of the forum on response measures and for further discussions of enhanced action on response measures. She emphasized, *inter alia*: addressing response measures in the context of sustainable development; carrying out further technical and substantive work; and identifying specific needs for economic transformation.

The EU noted the need for adding value to the UNFCCC process and called for inclusively addressing the concerns of all. The US, with AUSTRALIA, proposed not limiting discussions to the draft decision forwarded from Lima. SAUDI ARABIA called for, *inter alia*, a platform to report on impacts of response measures. SINGAPORE emphasized the need for an institutionalized mechanism to systematically address response measures.

SBI Chair Amena Yauvoli proposed, and parties agreed to, informal consultations, co-facilitated by Eduardo Calvo (Peru), Delano Ruben Verwey (the Netherlands) and Crispin D'Auvergne (Saint Lucia).

2013-2015 Review (SBI/SBSTA): This contact group was chaired by Co-Chair Gertraud Wollansky (Austria), who called for parties' views on the format and timing of the output from the 2013-2015 review. The US, SWITZERLAND, SOUTH AFRICA, the EU, Solomon Islands, for the LDCs, Trinidad and Tobago, for AOSIS, BOTSWANA and NORWAY supported developing draft conclusions and a draft decision covering substantial matters. CHINA and SAUDI ARABIA called for a procedural outcome. JAPAN and CANADA stressed the importance of the technical summary of the SED report.

On the content of the draft decision, AOSIS, supported by the LDCs, BOTSWANA and Colombia, for AILAC, said the decision should call for strengthening the long-term global goal to 1.5°C. INDIA, supported by BOTSWANA and BHUTAN, pointed to the need to address information gaps. SAUDI ARABIA, BRAZIL and CHINA cautioned against "cherry picking" from the SED report.

The US, SWITZERLAND, the EU, AOSIS, CHINA and NORWAY suggested concluding this item at the Bonn session. AOSIS and the EU added that this matter could also be considered at COP 21.

Co-Chair Wollansky indicated that a paper containing options will be circulated on Wednesday, 3 June.

SBI/SBSTA SPECIAL EVENT ON THE 2013-2015

REVIEW: The SED co-facilitators Andreas Fischlin (Switzerland) and Zou Ji (China) presented the report of the SED on the 2013-2015 review (FCCC/SB/2015/INF.1), with a focus on key messages contained in the technical summary.

The subsequent discussions among parties, IPCC experts and the SED co-facilitators addressed, *inter alia*: the need for negative emissions in various emission reduction scenarios; gaps in scientific research on the 1.5°C scenario; competition between bioenergy production and food security; the relationship between climate change mitigation and sustainable development; equity and MOI; the 2°C limit as a "defense line," as opposed to a "guardrail," against dangerous anthropogenic interference; and the IPCC's future work.

IN-SESSION WORKSHOP ON AGRICULTURE:

Opening the workshop, SBSTA Chair Wojtal encouraged parties to explore ways in which agriculture can benefit all countries, including generations to come. Richard Choularton, World Food

Programme, said systems of early warning and contingency planning should: integrate multiple hazards and disciplines; be aligned with regular decision-making processes; and empower people and communities.

CANADA and the PHILIPPINES shared experiences on the development of early warning systems and contingency plans, with CANADA underscoring the need to share sound scientific and technical information on agriculture in a more formal mode under the SBSTA. The EU and GABON shared views on how various processes under the Convention facilitate the development of early warning systems and contingency plans, with the EU emphasizing the role of the TEMs and international actors outside the UNFCCC.

BRAZIL and the RUSSIAN FEDERATION shared their views on potential areas for synergies among various processes under the Convention to facilitate the development of early warning systems and contingency plans, with the RUSSIAN FEDERATION emphasizing the need for closer cooperation between bodies dealing with adaptation, and research and systematic observation under the Convention.

3RD DIALOGUE ON CONVENTION ARTICLE 6: In the afternoon, the first session of the 3rd Dialogue on Article 6 (education, training and public awareness) focused on climate change education and international cooperation. SBI Chair Yauvoli opened the event, stressing the importance of educating citizens who make responsible decisions and empowering people as agents of change.

Noting that not one human endeavor will be unaffected by climate change, UNFCCC Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres called for integrating this "new reality" into the "DNA of education." She also requested renaming "Article 6" in a way that "makes sense," inviting suggestions by all.

Stressing that Article 6 is fundamental for preparing societies for the transition ahead, co-facilitator Katarzyna Snyder (Poland) suggested the Lima Ministerial Declaration on Education and Awareness-Raising highlights the importance of the issue at hand.

Presentations covered topics such as human psychology and climate change, and advancing climate change education through the Global Action Programme on Education for Sustainable Development of the UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. Participants also heard presentations on good practices and lessons learned on climate change education, and engaged in break-out working groups on key topics related to climate change education.

IN THE CORRIDORS

After a procedure-heavy first day, on Tuesday the subsidiary bodies of the UNFCCC got into full swing, with delegates rushing between the multiple parallel sessions and events. The mood in the corridors ranged from careful optimism to tempered uneasiness. Some participants assured that steady progress was being made in streamlining the negotiating text for the 2015 agreement. Others expressed deep concern about the absence of a sense of urgency.

Some wondered whether delegates were only creating the illusion of streamlining text by shifting it around, and were worried that the "real" questions might eventually be left to be solved at later meetings, or even in Paris. At the end of a difficult round of streamlining discussions on finance, one seasoned delegate noted "this is supposed to be the easy part, so how are we going to get through the hard part?"

