BONN CLIMATE CHANGE CONFERENCE: TUESDAY, 9 JUNE 2015

The Bonn Climate Change Conference continued on Tuesday, 9 June. Facilitated groups under the ADP convened on: workstream 2 (pre-2020 ambition) and finance in the morning; mitigation, capacity building and technology in the afternoon; and adaptation and loss and damage, and finance in the evening.

Contact groups and informal consultations took place under the SBI and SBSTA throughout the day. In the morning, the second part of the in-session workshop on gender-responsive climate policy with a focus on mitigation action and technology development and transfer convened.

FINANCING

FACILITATED GROUPS: Finance: Co-facilitator Georg Børsting announced a revised document would be available after the session and outlined a proposed mode of work.

All parties noted with appreciation the streamlining work by the co-facilitators and Secretariat, with many encouraging the co-facilitators to continue further streamlining the text.

On flow, AUSTRALIA, supported by CANADA, NEW ZEALAND, the US and Switzerland, for the EIG, suggested placing paragraphs on contributions under the legal agreement before those on the scale of resources. BRAZIL suggested that, for developing countries, the most evident way of fulfilling the ADP’s mandate to enhance action is by addressing scale.

On identification of decision text, Bolivia, for the G-77/CHINA, supported by many developing countries, said this step should be preceded by a discussion on substance. Ecuador, for the LMDCs, stressed that first discussing placement would prejudge the negotiating outcome.

The EU proposed identifying paragraphs for different kinds of decisions. The EIG stated that discussions on “separation” may be premature but the agreement should be durable. NEW ZEALAND said elements in the text should be durable, future-focused and applicable to all parties.

On linkages, the G-77/CHINA, supported by many developing countries, said finance should be reflected in all relevant sections of the text. BOLIVIA, speaking on her country’s behalf, said finance is among the overarching goals of the 2015 agreement.

The US said finance-related paragraphs should be placed in the finance section. The EU called for not having operational details on finance in other sections. The EIG proposed a conceptual discussion on all finance-related paragraphs without shifting them.

The facilitated group on finance reconvened in the evening to discuss further streamlining the text, based on the revised document.

Workstream 2: Co-facilitator Aya Yoshida announced questions to guide parties’ discussions on the Technical Examination Process (TEP) and advancing implementation under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol.

Maldives, for AOSIS, identified ways to enhance action, including: making better use of existing institutions; exploring new multilateral avenues for action; and establishing enduring institutional support for high-level engagement.

On translating the TEP into effective actions on the ground, the US, with the EU and AUSTRALIA, said the TEP should evolve, and be regularly reviewed and improved. BRAZIL stressed scaling up actions and linkages to MOI.

JAPAN opposed addressing the flow of climate finance under workstream 2.

On high-level engagement, JAPAN, with the EU, NORWAY and BANGLADESH, supported timely delivery of TEM outcomes to policymakers. The US and AUSTRALIA cautioned against overly prescriptive guidance to COP Presidencies on high-level engagement.

On institutional arrangements, the EU called for the TEP to remain under the COP. NEW ZEALAND, NORWAY and AUSTRALIA suggested it be “housed” under the SBI, with PERU adding that a joint SBSTA/SBI agenda item is possible.

Many developing countries stressed a party-driven process and called for TEMs to address adaptation.

On implementation, BRAZIL emphasized voluntary cancellation of CERs and recognizing the value of voluntary mitigation activities. The G-77/CHINA called for transparency on finance and MRV of support. The EU highlighted institutions and provisions on MRV, the IAR and ICA.

INDIA, supported by BRAZIL, and opposed by the US, suggested compiling parties’ submissions as the basis for a draft decision.

Mitigation: Co-facilitator Franz Perrez invited comments on the co-facilitators’ table, which aimed to structure the section into themes and ideas, and to identify text and linkages to other sections.

Many parties expressed willingness to work on the basis of the table. CHINA suggested alternative clustering options. SOUTH AFRICA emphasized that reorganization should retain everything agreed so far. SAUDI ARABIA called for a party-driven clustering process.
Co-Chair Anke Herold presented draft conclusions to continue consideration of this matter at SBSTA 43, taking into account the annexed options for draft decision elements. Following discussions on the annex, the contact group put brackets around section II on options related to “average annual emissions” of the draft decision and agreed to forward the draft conclusions for SBSTA’s consideration.

WORKSHOP ON GENDER-RESPONSIVE CLIMATE POLICY: Veronica Nonhlanhla Gundu moderated the second part of the workshop, focusing on mitigation, and technology development and transfer.

Panelists presented on: gender aspects of the CTCN and TEC work; gender mainstreaming efforts by the GEF; the GCF gender policy and action plan; improvement of CDM projects’ gender components; gender-responsive climate financing; gender-responsive mitigation technology under the UNFCCC; and gender-responsive technology needs at the country level in Africa.

Discussions addressed: engagement of women in the decarbonization of economies; clean cookstove CDM projects; the role of the GEF Small Grants Programme in financing gender-responsive projects; and the lack of knowledge and understanding related to gender equality.

IN THE CORRIDORS

Tuesday began with jubilant delegates streaming from negotiations that closed the SBSTA agenda item on methodological guidance on REDD+. Many agreed that work on this issue in Bonn had set a positive precedent for compromise and flexibility. The celebratory mood, however, did not extend to all SB items, with some despairing that intransigence of a handful of parties on the 2013-2015 review would prevent the inclusion of any substance in draft conclusions.

The wave of optimism missed the ADP negotiations on the text of the new agreement, prompting one senior observer to lament that, while last week parties were “speaking to each other” on procedural issues, when discussing substantive ones, they “retreated to long-held positions.” With only two more days left in Bonn, many doubted whether parties could build on the trust generated by the streamlining exercise, and start addressing “the real issues on the table.”