



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.

ADP

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 prejudice 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 agreement 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.

Mali, for the G-77/CHINA, announced a submission, highlighting: improvement of access to the TEP by country experts; an accelerated implementation process; and MRV of support. He called for: improving the focus and structure of the TEMs; requesting the Secretariat to prepare a technical paper analyzing gaps in MOI provision; and strengthening multilateral cooperation.

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.



INDIA and ARGENTINA reiterated the LMDCs proposal on clustering. Many parties supported the proposal by Kenya, for the AFRICAN GROUP, to structure the mitigation section around: long-term global goal on mitigation; individual commitments; characteristics; arrangements/mechanisms; and mandate/authority for the governing body.

BOLIVIA called for including the 1.5°C or 2°C limit, and opposed addressing markets and land use. BRAZIL cautioned against reopening negotiations on REDD+, which he viewed as linked to the finance section. SAUDI ARABIA called for including the issue of equity.

Many parties suggested using the African Group's proposal as a starting point. Others called for all proposals to inform future work.

After prolonged discussions on the way forward, Perez suggested, and parties agreed, that the co-facilitators work on the basis of all inputs and prepare a "neutral storyline" that does not pre-empt any negotiating position, and "lump" text under different headings.

NORWAY proposed, and parties agreed, that paragraphs in the text be included under only one heading, and not be repeated several times.

Capacity Building: Co-facilitator Artur Runge-Metzger facilitated the session. Discussions centered on the operationalization of paragraph 140 options 2-3 on no new institutions and strengthening existing institutions, respectively.

Responding to calls by China, for the G-77/CHINA, with other developing countries, to clarify developed countries' views on how to fill existing gaps in capacity building, the US identified the TEC, CTCN and the Climate Technology Initiative Private Financing Advisory Network.

Countries debated whether the CTCN could become the capacity-building mechanism for the new agreement. SAINT LUCIA and others said capacity building goes beyond technical aspects. SWAZILAND noted the mandate of the Technology Mechanism from Cancun does not match with that suggested in paragraph 140.1.

On work between this and the next ADP session, parties suggested, *inter alia*: clarification of parties' views on text options and sequencing; a third iteration of the text; a workshop; and a list by the Secretariat of existing institutions working on capacity building.

Technology: Co-facilitator Tosi Mpanu Mpanu facilitated the session, suggesting conceptual discussions on various paragraphs. China, for G-77/CHINA, opposed, arguing that the mandate from the ADP Co-Chairs is to continue streamlining.

After parties agreed to merge the two chapeaus in paragraph 131.4 of the consolidated text on elements on intellectual property rights, AUSTRALIA argued that further streamlining would be difficult, calling for moving to other paragraphs.

NORWAY and the US suggested, and the G-77/CHINA and SOUTH AFRICA opposed, moving to conceptual discussions. The US and INDIA noted that some paragraph options could be further streamlined.

Parties then discussed paragraph 132 of the consolidated text on strengthening the Technology Mechanism/institutional arrangements, with CANADA saying it cannot be further streamlined. The US, NORWAY and AUSTRALIA argued these issues should be addressed in decision text. The G-77/CHINA and SOUTH AFRICA said a discussion on which language should be included in decisions is beyond the group's mandate.

SUBSIDIARY BODIES

CONTACT GROUPS: Methodological Guidance for REDD+ (SBSTA): Parties agreed to forward to the SBSTA, for consideration, draft conclusions and three draft decisions on: further guidance on safeguards information systems; guidance on non-market-based approaches; and guidance on non-carbon benefits.

Contact group Co-Chair Robert Bamfo (Ghana) said these negotiations send a "very positive signal" for REDD+ implementation, with SBSTA Chair Lidia Wojtal adding they are a "role model for negotiations."

Many parties expressed appreciation for the conclusion of work on this agenda item, with PANAMA announcing she looked forward to focusing attention on ADP negotiations, and the EU noting that guidance on safeguards information systems could be improved.

Protocol Articles 5, 7, 8: Co-Chair Anke Herold presented draft conclusions, noting the first two annexed decisions would be further considered at SBSTA 43. She explained the annexed decision on updating the expert review teams' training programme would be forwarded to CMP 11. After including reference to the linkages between this sub-item and that on no QELRCs, at the request of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, the contact group agreed to forward the draft conclusions for SBSTA's consideration.

Accounting, Reporting and Review Requirements for Annex I Parties without QELRCs (SBSTA): Co-Chair Guilherme do Prado Lima presented draft conclusions, noting deliberation would continue at SBSTA 43 on the basis of text submitted by parties. The contact group agreed to forward the draft conclusions to the SBSTA.

Clarification of the Text in Section G (Article 3.7ter) of the Doha Amendment to the Kyoto Protocol: 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."