



BONN HIGHLIGHTS: WEDNESDAY, 2 SEPTEMBER 2015

ADP 2-10 continued on Wednesday, 2 September 2015, in Bonn, Germany. Delegates gathered in facilitated groups on: adaptation and loss and damage, technology, finance and transparency in the morning; mitigation, capacity building, finance and timeframes in the afternoon; and procedural and institutional provisions, and workstream 2 (pre-2020 ambition) in the evening. Throughout the day, informal meetings of the facilitated groups also took place. The ADP contact group convened for a stocktaking session in the evening.

FACILITATED GROUPS

ADAPTATION AND LOSS AND DAMAGE: This session was co-facilitated by Andrea Guerrero (Colombia). Bolivia, for the G-77/CHINA, stressed the importance of recognizing developing countries' development priorities. NORWAY suggested addressing an adaptation global goal in the facilitated group on "objective" to achieve parity with the mitigation objective.

Supported by the US, the G-77/CHINA said adaptation efforts should be guided by the best available science and, where appropriate, traditional knowledge. Supported by Chile, for AILAC, and Ghana, for the AFRICAN GROUP, the G-77/CHINA called for discussing linkages to support.

Tuvalu, for the LDCs, CANADA and CHILE emphasized a country-driven approach. JAPAN and the REPUBLIC OF KOREA emphasized the importance of monitoring and evaluation. The LDCs opposed use of the term "mainstreaming."

The EU suggested, and the G-77/CHINA agreed, discussing whether the communications related to national adaptation plans and other processes should be addressed in the agreement or in COP decisions. NEW ZEALAND called for using existing reporting mechanisms, noting that COP decisions will enable action pre-2020.

The US, supported by Jamaica, for AOSIS, warned against prescribing the contents of countries' adaptation communications.

MEXICO, the LDCs, the EU and TANZANIA called for referencing gender-sensitive approaches, with some parties also emphasizing human rights and ecosystem-based approaches.

TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER: This session was co-facilitated by Tosi Mpanu-Mpanu (the Democratic Republic of Congo). Parties engaged in a procedural debate. China, for the G-77/CHINA, suggested addressing areas with little divergence and issues in part 3 of the tool (provisions whose placement requires further clarity).

MEXICO encouraged an exercise to put provisions currently in part 3 into either the parts on the agreement or on COP decisions. VENEZUELA and ARGENTINA stressed the need to

work on text. The UNITED ARAB EMIRATES, JAPAN, the US and MEXICO proposed categories of convergence to structure the discussion on the technology section of the agreement.

Swaziland, for the AFRICAN GROUP, clarified that their proposal for a framework for enhanced action does not create new institutions, but gives medium and long-term guidance to, and reviews, existing institutions. The EU then supported further discussions on the framework. The G-77/CHINA called the framework a "foundation" that could include MRV and barriers.

After a procedural debate on spin-off groups, parties agreed to a spin-off group on the framework for enhanced action, to be facilitated by Canada.

FINANCE: Georg Børsting (Norway) co-facilitated the morning and afternoon sessions. Reporting back from the Wednesday morning spin-off on scaling-up finance, ECUADOR highlighted, *inter alia*: difficulties in discussing scaling up without clarity on actions to be financed; imbalance between INDC actions and support; and differentiation among parties.

Bolivia, for the G-77/CHINA, asked for clarity on when and how their impending text proposals on institutional arrangements and scaling-up finance would be discussed.

Summarizing discussions with the ADP Co-Chairs, Co-Facilitator Børsting noted: ongoing discussions with the transparency group's Co-Facilitators and a possible joint meeting with the adaptation group. KUWAIT and CHINA raised concerns about holding joint meetings.

CANADA, with AUSTRALIA, suggested addressing enabling environments. The G-77/CHINA proposed utilizing UNFCCC reports on long-term finance as a basis to understand enabling environments. AUSTRALIA also stressed discussing support for the most vulnerable countries.

After a procedural discussion, Co-Facilitator Børsting noted that time would be allocated according to the interests expressed by the group and invited parties to submit bridging proposals.

In the afternoon, reporting back from the spin-off group on commitments/obligations/actions held in the afternoon, SWEDEN highlighted discussions on: the wide-ranging scope of commitments; the need for new commitments/obligations/actions in the agreement; enhancement of provision of resources, their predictability and scalability; and the importance of enabling environments and associated concerns around national sovereignty. He said some areas could benefit from textual proposals.

Highlighting its impending submissions, the G-77/CHINA urged other parties to come up with textual proposals.

TRANSPARENCY OF ACTION AND SUPPORT: Fook Seng Kwok (Singapore) co-facilitated the session.



South Africa, for the AFRICAN GROUP, supported by the Bahamas, for AOSIS, called for clear recognition that developing countries require additional support from developed countries to participate effectively in the MRV system.

The EU, the US, SWITZERLAND and AUSTRALIA acknowledged developing countries' need for support, and BRAZIL pointed to broad agreement on this issue.

The EU called for a common, enhanced and flexible transparency framework that builds on the current MRV system. NEW ZEALAND, supported by AUSTRALIA, explained that a "unified system" should allow for various approaches and continuously improve.

The US said the transparency system should provide feedback and build capacity, not just supply funds. BRAZIL highlighted the time required to build effective MRV systems at the national level.

JAPAN said MRV of support should be in the agreement, but called for clarity in the current language.

Parties agreed to hold a fact-finding spin-off group on differentiation and another to identify a list of issues related to accounting.

CAPACITY BUILDING: Artur Runge-Metzger (EU) co-facilitated this session. SWAZILAND reported on Tuesday's spin-off group on pre-2020 "milestones" for capacity building, highlighting convergence on the importance of: clarity on what capacity-building needs are; prompt, effective, coherent and coordinated delivery; MRV of capacity-building support; and a long-term and sustainable perspective on capacity building.

Welcoming the fruitful discussion on what is needed, JAPAN called for addressing "the how." The US noted the text on MRV and capacity building lacks operationality.

SAUDI ARABIA, China, for the G-77/CHINA, Jamaica, for AOSIS, SWAZILAND, ARGENTINA and the GAMBIA called for new institutional arrangements to be included in the agreement.

The EU proposed strengthening institutional arrangements through COP decisions and the third comprehensive review of the capacity-building framework. AUSTRALIA said capacity building needs to be tailored to national circumstances, questioning the ability of an international, "macro-level" mechanism to achieve this task.

GHANA requested the group divide issues into three tables to separate out the remaining "hard" issues. SUDAN called for starting to discuss text directly. Parties agreed to address issues to be included in the agreement on Thursday.

MITIGATION: This session was co-facilitated by Franz Perez (Switzerland). Reporting from the spin-off on joint implementation, BRAZIL presented two draft paragraphs on the preparation, communication and implementation of INDCs by parties, and on arrangements for INDCs. Reporting on the spin-off on differentiation, SOUTH AFRICA noted agreement that differentiation is at the core of the negotiations and will only be solved by a political decision. Several parties then provided views on a Co-Facilitator's table on mitigation issues contained in the Tool, with SAINT LUCIA requesting time to discuss the annexes to the agreement.

Parties began textual discussions on collective efforts in the agreement. Welcoming reference to the temperature goal, the EU emphasized operationalizing the goal, including with notions of peaking and quantified emission reductions. INDIA opposed quantified emission reductions in the mitigation section.

SOUTH AFRICA and NORWAY called for the temperature goal to be reflected in the general section. The US preferred reflecting the temperature goal in the preamble, and referring to net-zero emissions or carbon neutrality in decisions. The MARSHALL ISLANDS opposed, underscoring the need for pathways with a higher probability of reaching the long-term temperature goal.

TIMEFRAMES: Roberto Dondisch (Mexico) co-facilitated the session, and asked parties to continue remarks from Tuesday, on the timeframes section of the agreement.

INDIA characterized the paragraphs as "workable" and stated the review could be a reference tool but should not revise individual adjustments.

JORDAN and ALGERIA stated that the review should not be limited to mitigation. ARGENTINA said adaptation follows a different logic from mitigation. Tuvalu, for the LDCs, said it should apply to mitigation and MOI but that the procedures for each may differ, and that parties should individually and collectively increase ambition.

Observing the cross-linkages among sections, Co-Facilitator Dondisch reported that he observed discussions in the group on procedural and institutional arrangements, where housing was considered to be a timeframes issue. He proposed, and parties agreed, that the Co-Facilitators from transparency and finance attend the next meeting of the group.

STOCKTAKING SESSION

ADP Co-Chair Ahmed Djoghlaif (Algeria) noted parties' concerns over the pace of work. Parties agreed on the urgent need to accelerate work. Noting uneven progress across facilitated groups, South Africa, for the G-77/CHINA, Angola, for the LDCs, Maldives, for AOSIS, Guatemala, for AILAC, Bolivia, for ALBA, and Sudan, for the AFRICAN GROUP, called for clarity on the intended outcome of this session, and for a clear mandate for the co-facilitators.

Australia, for the UMBRELLA GROUP, noted the usefulness of some spin-off groups, in particular on differentiation. Malaysia, for the LMDCs, stressed the need to engage in text-based negotiations. Saudi Arabia, for the ARAB GROUP, urged starting substantive negotiations. The EU said the Tool is "not ideal," but recognized that it structures the discussions.

Switzerland, for the EIG, said parties should blame themselves for engaging in procedural discussions. He called for convergence by the end of the week on elements for the agreement and COP decisions in order to arrive at the next session with a negotiable text. Many parties stressed that this session should not conclude with another compilation text.

Co-Chair Djoghlaif welcomed the collective determination of parties to "be ready for Paris," and pointed to the ADP Co-Chairs' scenario note and their further clarification on the mode of work as already providing clarity on the objective of this session. He indicated that the Co-Chairs will hold bilateral meetings to discuss the mode of work of the October session.

IN THE CORRIDORS

At mid-point in the week-long meeting, some delegates welcomed "small, but meaningful movements" in discussions on adaptation, capacity building, transparency, and joint implementation under mitigation. Yet, even this rather muted enthusiasm did not spread evenly across all the facilitated groups, with some commenting that the inevitable "binary issues" keep coming up as soon as negotiators scratch the surface of substance.

The stocktaking session mirrored frustrations, with groups looking upon the first days with regret and to the rest of the week with trepidation. Many noted the lack of bridging proposals and were surprised at returning to "storytelling and concept clarifying," while others lamented procedural debates.

Although most called for guidance on how work should progress, one delegate called for countries to engage with each other, reprimanding, "we should not blame each other, but ourselves." With continued lack of clarity on how to use the Co-Chairs' Tool, many left deeply concerned over the pace of negotiations when only seven negotiating days are left before what Co-Chair Ahmed Djoghlaif called negotiators' "date with history."