



SUMMARY OF THE PARIS CLIMATE CHANGE CONFERENCE: 29 NOVEMBER – 13 DECEMBER 2015

The Paris Climate Change Conference convened from 29 November to 13 December 2015, in Paris, France. It included the 21st session of the Conference of the Parties (COP 21) to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the 11th session of the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP 11). Three subsidiary bodies (SBs) also met, the 43rd sessions of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA 43) and the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI 43), and the 12th part of the second session of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP 2-12).

The Paris Climate Change Conference brought together over 36,000 participants, nearly 23,100 government officials, 9,400 representatives from UN bodies and agencies, intergovernmental organizations and civil society organizations, and 3,700 members of the media.

Focus in Paris centered on advancing negotiations on the Paris Outcome, including a legally-binding agreement and associated decisions, to fulfill the mandate outlined in Durban, South Africa, at COP 17, for the ADP “to develop a protocol, another legal instrument or an agreed outcome with legal force under the Convention applicable to all Parties” to be adopted at COP 21. The ADP opened a day early, on Sunday, 29 November, in order to launch technical negotiations.

A leaders event, which brought together over 150 Heads of State and Government, was held on Monday, 30 November, to generate political will towards an agreement. During the first week, work concentrated under the ADP, which launched a contact group to consider crosscutting issues and items not associated with agreement articles, and established spin-off groups to work on the text of individual articles in the draft agreement text and their associated decision text, as well as decision text on pre-2020 ambition.

Following the closure of the ADP on Saturday, 5 December, and the transmission of the ADP’s outcome to the COP, the Comité de Paris was established under the COP 21 Presidency to continue work on the draft agreement and decision text.

Minister-led *indabas*, bilaterals and other consultations took place under the Comité de Paris from Sunday through Saturday, 6-12 December. Following intensive consultations by the COP 21 Presidency on Thursday and Friday, 10-11 December, the Comité de Paris convened briefly on Saturday morning, 12 December, for the presentation of the final text. After consultations by groups of parties, the Comité de Paris reconvened in the evening to forward the final text of the Paris Agreement and associated decision to COP 21. At 7:29 pm, COP 21 adopted the Paris Agreement and the associated decision.

Parties also adopted 34 decisions, 23 under the COP and 12 under the CMP, that, *inter alia*: adopt the Paris Agreement; enhance technology development and transfer through the Technology Mechanism; decide on the process to assess progress made in the process to formulate and implement national adaptation plans (NAPs); extend the mandate of the Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG); adopt the terms of reference for the third comprehensive review of the implementation of the capacity-building framework; address methodological issues under the Kyoto Protocol,

IN THIS ISSUE

A Brief History of the UNFCCC and the Kyoto Protocol.	2
Paris Climate Conference Report	3
Leaders Event	3
COP 21 and CMP 11 Joint High-level Segment.	3
The Paris Agreement	4
Conference of the Parties	23
Conference of the Parties Serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol	28
Subsidiary Body for Implementation	31
Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice	36
A Brief Analysis of the Paris Climate Change Conference	42
Upcoming Meetings.	45
Glossary	47

This issue of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* © <enb@iisd.org> is written and edited by Jennifer Allan, Beate Antonich, Rishikesh Ram Bhandary, Mari Luomi, Ph.D., Anna Schulz, and Virginia Wiseman. The Digital Editor is Kiara Worth. 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 Union, the Government of Switzerland (the Swiss Federal Office for the Environment (FOEN), the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)), and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. General Support for the *Bulletin* during 2015 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 conference has been provided by the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the European Union (EU), the Austrian Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment, and Water Management, the Ministry of the Environment of Finland and the Italian Ministry for the Environment Land and Sea. 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/>

including clarification of the Section G, Article 7.3^{ter} of the Doha Amendment; provide methodological guidance for 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 (REDD+); provide guidance to the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) and Joint Implementation (JI); and approve the programme budget for the UNFCCC for the biennium 2016-2017.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE UNFCCC AND THE KYOTO PROTOCOL

The international political response to climate change began with the 1992 adoption of the UNFCCC, which sets out a legal framework for stabilizing atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases (GHGs) to avoid “dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system.” The Convention, which entered into force on 21 March 1994, has 196 parties. In December 1997, delegates to COP 3 in Kyoto, Japan, agreed to a protocol to the UNFCCC that committed industrialized countries and countries in transition to a market economy to achieve emissions reduction targets. These countries, known as Annex I parties under the UNFCCC, agreed to reduce their overall emissions of six GHGs by an average of 5% below 1990 levels in 2008-2012 (the first commitment period), with specific targets varying from country to country. The Kyoto Protocol entered into force on 16 February 2005 and now has 192 parties.

LONG-TERM NEGOTIATIONS, 2005-2009: Convening in Montreal, Canada, in 2005, the first session of the CMP established the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Annex I Parties’ Further Commitments under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP) in accordance with Protocol Article 3.9, which mandated consideration of Annex I parties’ further commitments at least seven years before the end of the first commitment period.

In December 2007, COP 13 and CMP 3 in Bali, Indonesia, resulted in agreement on the Bali Roadmap on long-term issues. COP 13 adopted the Bali Action Plan (BAP) and established the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention (AWG-LCA), with a mandate to focus on mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology, capacity building and a shared vision for long-term cooperative action. Negotiations on Annex I parties’ further commitments continued under the AWG-KP. The deadline for concluding the two-track negotiations was 2009 in Copenhagen.

COPENHAGEN: The UN Climate Change Conference in Copenhagen, Denmark, took place in December 2009. The high-profile event was marked by disputes over transparency and process. Late in the evening of 18 December, these talks resulted in a political agreement, the “Copenhagen Accord,” which was then presented to the COP plenary for adoption. After 13 hours of debate, delegates ultimately agreed to “take note” of the Copenhagen Accord, and to extend the mandates of the negotiating groups until COP 16 and CMP 6 in 2010. In 2010, over 140 countries indicated support for the Accord. More than 80 countries also provided information on their national mitigation targets or actions.

CANCUN: The UN Climate Change Conference in Cancun, Mexico, took place in December 2010, where parties adopted the Cancun Agreements and extended the mandates of the two AWGs for another year. Parties agreed to consider the adequacy of the global long-term goal during a 2013-2015 review. The Cancun Agreements also established several new institutions and processes, including the Cancun Adaptation Framework, the Adaptation Committee and the Technology Mechanism, which includes the Technology Executive Committee (TEC) and the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN). The Green Climate Fund (GCF) was created and designated as an operating entity of the Convention’s financial mechanism.

DURBAN: The UN Climate Change Conference in Durban, South Africa, took place in November and December 2011. The Durban outcomes covered a wide range of topics, notably a decision on long-term cooperative action under the Convention and agreement on the operationalization of the GCF. Parties also agreed 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 no later than 2015, with the new instrument entering into force in 2020. In addition, the ADP was mandated to explore actions to close the pre-2020 ambition gap in relation to the below 2°C target.

DOHA: The UN Climate Change Conference in Doha, Qatar, took place in November and December 2012. The conference resulted in a package of decisions, referred to as the “Doha Climate Gateway.” These included amendments to the Kyoto Protocol to establish its second commitment period (2013-2020) and agreement to terminate the AWG-KP’s work. Parties also agreed to terminate negotiations under the BAP, including the AWG-LCA.

WARSAW: The UN Climate Change Conference in Warsaw, Poland, took place in November 2013. The meeting adopted an ADP decision that, *inter alia*, invites parties to initiate or intensify domestic preparations for their intended nationally determined contributions (INDCs). Parties also adopted a decision establishing the Warsaw International Mechanism on Loss and Damage associated with Climate Change Impacts (WIM), and the Warsaw Framework for REDD+.

LIMA: The UN Climate Change Conference in Lima, Peru, took place in December 2014. Negotiations in Lima focused on outcomes under the ADP necessary to advance toward an agreement at COP 21 in Paris in 2015. Following lengthy negotiations, COP 20 adopted the “Lima Call for Climate Action” (Decision 1/CP.20), which sets in motion the negotiations towards a 2015 agreement, including the process for submitting and reviewing INDCs. The decision also addresses enhancing pre-2020 ambition. Parties also adopted 19 decisions, 17 under the COP and two under the CMP that, *inter alia*: help operationalize the WIM; establish the Lima work programme on gender; and adopt the Lima Ministerial Declaration on Education and Awareness-raising.

The Lima Conference was able to lay the groundwork for Paris by capturing progress made in elaborating the elements of a draft negotiating text for the 2015 agreement and adopting a decision on INDCs, including their scope, upfront information, and steps to be taken by the Secretariat after their submission.

ADP 2-8: ADP 2-8 took place in February 2015, in Geneva, Switzerland. The objective of the session, as mandated by COP 20, was to develop the negotiating text based on the elements for a draft negotiating text annexed to Decision 1/CP.20. The Geneva negotiating text adopted at ADP 2-8 served as the basis for the negotiations of the 2015 agreement.

ADP 2-9: ADP 2-9 convened in June 2015 in Bonn, Germany, and undertook streamlining and consolidation, clustering and conceptual discussions of the Geneva negotiating text, including on: preamble; general/objective; mitigation; adaptation and loss and damage; finance; technology development and transfer; capacity building; transparency; timeframes; implementation and compliance; and procedural and institutional provisions. The ADP also discussed workstream 2 (pre-2020 ambition), in particular its mandate, and proposed elements that could comprise a decision on workstream 2.

ADP 2-10: ADP 2-10 convened in August-September 2015, in Bonn, Germany. To guide the work, the ADP Co-Chairs produced, at the request of parties, a “Tool” based on the streamlined and consolidated text resulting from ADP 2-9. Delegates engaged on various parts of the Tool in facilitated groups and “spin-offs,” or informal meetings of the facilitated groups. The groups considered placement of paragraphs in the Tool, engaged in conceptual discussions on key issues, and, in some cases, started developing textual proposals. The ADP Co-Chairs were mandated to produce a revised non-paper to serve as the basis for further negotiations.

ADP 2-11: ADP 2-11 convened in October 2015, in Bonn, Germany. The ADP Co-Chairs opened the session proposing to begin text-based negotiations on the basis of the text they prepared, including the non-papers (ADP.2015.8.InformalNote and ADP.2015.9.InformalNote) with draft agreement and decision text under workstream 1, and draft decision text under workstream 2. After meeting in a contact group to reinsert “must-haves” into the non-paper text on workstream 1, parties convened in spin-off groups to advance negotiations on specific sections in the agreement and decision text, and in an open-ended contact group to take stock of progress and discuss issues not addressed in spin-off groups.

Parties agreed to forward the revised non-paper, dated 23 October at 23:30, which captured the work undertaken by parties at ADP 2-11, to serve as the basis for further negotiations under the ADP. Parties also requested that the Secretariat prepare a technical paper, which would identify closely related paragraphs and duplication within sections, and possible areas for streamlining, without making any changes to the content of the text.

PARIS CLIMATE CONFERENCE REPORT

On Monday, 30 November, observing that we are in a “spectacular year,” COP 20/CMP 10 President Manuel Pulgar-Vidal, Minister of Environment, Peru, underscored that fulfilling the Durban mandate for a universal, legally-binding agreement will help frame sustainable development for the next generation.

Parties then elected Laurent Fabius, Minister of Foreign Affairs and International Development, France, as COP 21/CMP 11 President by acclamation. COP 21/CMP 11 President Fabius outlined the role of the French presidency as: listening to

all views; ensuring transparency and inclusiveness; seeking an ambitious agreement; ensuring compromise among parties; and leaving only “final points” for consideration by ministers during the second week.

UNFCCC Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres emphasized the parties’ responsibility to finalize an agreement that “enables the achievement of national climate change goals, delivers necessary support for the developing world, and catalyzes increasing action by all.”

Echoing Figueres’ assertion that “never before has a responsibility so great been in the hands of so few,” His Royal Highness Charles, the Prince of Wales, called on delegates “in pursuing national interest, not to lose sight of international necessity.”

This report summarizes how the Paris Agreement and its associated decision were reached, under the “Paris Agreement,” which includes discussions on the ADP, the COP and the Comité de Paris. This report also summarizes the discussions by the COP, CMP, SBI and SBSTA.

LEADERS EVENT

On Monday, 30 November, President François Hollande, France, opened the leaders event, which brought together over 150 Heads of State and Government, and said the Paris outcome would be successful if it: determines a credible path to limit temperature rise below 2°C, or 1.5°C if possible; responds to climate change with solidarity so that no state can abstain from its commitments; and mobilizes all societies and sectors to act.

Stressing that leaders convening in Paris had the moral and political responsibility to show leadership, UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon said that the Paris agreement must be: durable; dynamic; balance between the leading role of developed countries and growing responsibilities of developing countries according to their resources and level of development; and credible, with the current level of ambition “as the floor.”

COP 21/CMP 11 President Fabius outlined conditions for success in Paris including mobilizing Heads of State and Government. The leaders event then continued with statements of Heads and Deputy Heads of State and Government. For a summary of the statements made during the leaders event, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12653e.html>

COP 21 AND CMP 11 JOINT HIGH-LEVEL SEGMENT

On Monday, 7 December, COP 21/CMP 11 President Laurent Fabius opened the joint high-level segment, entreating ministers that the “time for decisions has come.” UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon called Paris the “opportunity to define destiny.”

UN General Assembly President Mogens Lykketoft underlined that the Paris meeting needed to deliver a political agreement with equity and ambition at its core. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Chair Hoesung Lee said that science has outlined the problem and is providing solutions.

UNFCCC Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres called on ministers to exercise political leadership to craft an agreement that meets national and local needs, lives up to scientific integrity, safeguards the vulnerable and promotes sustainable prosperity for all.

The high-level segment then continued through Tuesday, 8 December, with statements from Heads of State and Government, Deputy Heads of State and Government, ministers and other heads of delegation. A webcast of the statements is available at: <http://unfccc6.meta-fusion.com/cop21/events/>

THE PARIS AGREEMENT

During the first week of the Paris Climate Change Conference, negotiations on the Paris Agreement, and the associated decision, took place under the ADP. Following transmission of the outcome of the ADP to COP 21 on Saturday, 5 December, the Comité de Paris, an open-ended body, was established by the COP to move negotiations forward. Negotiations during the second week took place under the Comité de Paris, including in the open-ended Comité, in informal ministerial *indabas*, informal consultations, and bilaterals.

ADP 2-12

On Sunday, 29 November, ADP Co-Chair Ahmed Djoghla (Algeria) opened ADP 2-12. COP 20/CMP 10 President Manuel Pulgar-Vidal called on delegates to show solidarity and work efficiently in a time-bound manner to find textual solutions. Incoming COP 21/CMP 11 President Laurent Fabius called on delegates to build compromises.

ADP Co-Chair Daniel Reifsnyder (US) highlighted informal notes on workstream 1 (the 2015 Agreement) and workstream 2 (pre-2020 ambition) (ADP.2015.10-11.InformalNote), and a technical paper produced by the Secretariat identifying closely related concepts, duplications and areas for streamlining (ADP.2015.12.InformalNote). Outlining the mode of work, he said the open-ended contact group would review progress made by spin-off groups and allow for coherence on cross cutting issues. He said that spin-off groups would address: preamble and purpose/general (draft Article 2 and *2bis*), co-facilitated by George Wamukoya (Kenya) and Diann Black-Layne (Antigua and Barbuda); mitigation (draft Article 3, *3bis* and *3ter*), co-facilitated by Franz Perrez (Switzerland) and Fook Seng Kwok (Singapore); adaptation, and loss and damage (draft Articles 4 and 5) co-facilitated by Andrea Guerrero (Colombia) and Georg Børsting (Norway); finance (draft Article 6), co-facilitated by Georg Børsting (Norway) and Diann Black-Layne (Antigua and Barbuda); technology development and transfer (draft Article 7), co-facilitated by Tosi Mpanu-Mpanu (Democratic Republic of Congo) and Artur Runge-Metzger (EU); capacity building (draft Article 8), co-facilitated by Artur Runge-Metzger (EU) and Tosi Mpanu-Mpanu (Democratic Republic of Congo); transparency (draft Article 9), co-facilitated by Fook Seng Kwok (Singapore) and Franz Perrez (Switzerland); global stocktake (draft Article 10), co-facilitated by Roberto Dondisch (Mexico) and George Wamukoya (Kenya); implementation and compliance, and final clauses (draft Article 11 and Articles 12-26), co-facilitated by Sarah Baashan (Saudi Arabia) and Aya Yoshida (Japan); and workstream 2, co-facilitated by Aya Yoshida (Japan) and George Wamukoya (Kenya).

Parties agreed that the informal notes issued on 6 and 10 November (ADP.2015.10-12.InformalNote) would form the basis for negotiations, with the exception of discussions on finance, which would be based on the 23 October text, which was issued at the close of ADP 2-11. ADP Co-Chair Djoghla

said a consolidated new draft would be prepared by Friday, 4 December, and the outcome of the ADP would be forwarded to the COP for its consideration on Saturday, 5 December.

CONTACT GROUP: The ADP contact group first convened on Tuesday, 1 December, and daily throughout the first week. Each meeting of the contact group began with reports back from the co-facilitators of the spin-off groups. Matters not assigned to specific spin-off groups were discussed in the contact group, including both decision and agreement text. A compilation text capturing progress made in the ADP on the draft agreement and decision text was published on Thursday morning 3 December.

During the Thursday evening contact group, ADP Co-Chair Reifsnyder proposed concluding the work of the spin-off groups. Parties agreed that the ADP Co-Chairs would produce an updated, clean and streamlined text, with clear options, developed in consultation with spin-off group co-facilitators. They agreed that bridging proposals developed by the spin-off group co-facilitators would be kept in a separate document, and that spin-off groups be used when necessary to reach agreement.

On Friday morning, 4 December, ADP Co-Chair Ahmed Djoghla invited comments on two documents, a revised draft agreement and decision text on workstreams 1 and 2, “the compilation text,” and a document containing the work of the ADP contact group incorporating bridging proposals by the co-facilitators, “the compilation text with bridging proposals.” Parties agreed to negotiate on the basis of the compilation text with bridging proposals, indicated key elements of concerns and requested that a reflection note from the ADP Co-Chairs capturing parties’ comments be provided alongside the compilation text with bridging proposals. These documents were then presented to and adopted by the ADP on Saturday, 5 December, and subsequently forwarded to the COP.

Decision Paragraphs Not Related to Specific Articles in the Draft Agreement: During substantive negotiations, discussions in the contact group on these issues centered around the adoption of the agreement and took place throughout the week.

Parties converged on provisionally applying the agreement pending entry into force, as well as on a body to prepare for entry into force, including using the ADP under a new name or mandate, with its operational arrangements.

Parties agreed to use an existing body, specifically the ADP under a new name, by “importing” its governance arrangements, particularly regarding the Bureau as proposed by Colombia, on behalf of the Independent Alliance of Latin America and the Caribbean (AILAC). Parties emphasized the need to convey that the ADP’s mandate was completed successfully. ADP Co-Chair Djoghla presented a proposal to rename the ADP as the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Paris Outcome, and that the working group: prepare for the entry into force of the agreement and convene the first session of the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Agreement (CMA); oversee implementation of the work programme resulting from relevant requests in the decision; report to the COP; and hold its first session in 2016.

Tuvalu, supported by Saudi Arabia, AILAC and others, suggested adding a new paragraph, after clarifying that the ADP has finished its mandate, which decides to establish the *Ad Hoc*

Working Group on the Paris Outcome. The US, China, Saudi Arabia, Iran and others asked for more clarity on the working modalities, particularly chairing arrangements.

Views diverged on support for the communication of INDCs, their communication itself and noting the gap between the aggregate effect of the INDCs and emissions consistent with the 2°C or 1.5°C limit as well as information on the fairness and ambition of INDCs communicated by parties.

On a paragraph on updating the synthesis report on the aggregate effect of INDCs, parties engaged in a long discussion on text requesting the Secretariat to “provide information on the fairness and ambition of the INDCs communicated by parties.” Malaysia for the Like-Minded Developing Countries (LMDCs), India, Saudi Arabia for the Arab Group, and the Russian Federation, among others, called for deleting the text. Others made alternative proposals, with Tuvalu suggesting “information on how parties have reported on fairness and ambition.”

In a subsequent contact group meeting, ADP Co-Chair Reifsnnyder presented a revised proposal containing paragraphs on: taking note of the synthesis report on the aggregate effect of INDCs; noting the ambition gap; and noting expressed adaptation needs. Parties also considered an amended draft decision paragraph on updating the synthesis report.

Saint Lucia, supported by a number of parties, and opposed by the Arab Group, introduced a new paragraph urging the update to the synthesis report to take into account 1.5°C scenarios.

Parties also debated decision text on: giving effect to the agreement, specifically efforts by various actors; administrative and budgetary matters; a facilitative dialogue; and a request to the IPCC for a special report.

On the role of various actors, the Co-Chairs proposed replacing references to local communities and indigenous peoples in the paragraph on welcoming the efforts of all actors to address climate change with a new paragraph recognizing the knowledge, technologies and efforts made by local communities and indigenous peoples. Bolivia opposed juxtaposing local communities and indigenous peoples with the private sector.

The Arab Group proposed deleting paragraphs that request all actors to scale up and demonstrate efforts, cautioning against passing the burden to actors outside the Convention, and expressed concern about the legal implications of “inviting” non-state actors’ activities that may then cause environmental, social or other harm. With the clarification that parties “welcome,” rather than “invite,” all actors to scale up and demonstrate efforts, parties removed the brackets around these paragraphs.

On a paragraph requesting the IPCC to provide a special report on the impact of a temperature increase of 1.5°C, Saudi Arabia and others questioned its “added value” beyond the IPCC assessment reports. Tuvalu noted that newer information may be available that was not considered during the last assessment report cycle. India and China underscored the need for information on how to achieve temperature goals. Several parties requested, and ADP Co-Chair Reifsnnyder agreed, to consult with the IPCC.

General and Cross-Cutting Issues: The contact group took up issues of relevance to the agreement as a whole at various points during the week.

On the title of the draft agreement, the Russian Federation, opposed by China, recommended deleting the option of “implementing agreement.”

On differentiation, all parties agreed that the new agreement should reflect differentiation. Several parties observed the need to recognize the special circumstances of small island developing states (SIDS) and least developed countries (LDCs), with Saudi Arabia noting that this is already in the Convention.

Sudan, for the African Group, proposed a formula for inscribing differentiation in the relevant sections: state the level of obligation or precision for developed and developing countries; provide flexibility for developing countries, such as “all countries willing to do so,” which Tuvalu, for the LDCs, supported; and provide further flexibility for African countries, LDCs and SIDS. China and India opposed phrases such as “willing to do so.”

Saying the world has not changed, Malaysia, for the LMDCs, underlined that historical responsibility lies with developed countries. He underscored that developed countries have yet to meet their Convention or Protocol obligations regarding mitigation and means of implementation (MOI), which the EU and Australia disputed in their cases.

Preamble and Purpose/General (draft Articles 2 and 2bis) and Associated Decision Text: The preamble and purpose/general (draft Articles 2 and 2bis) were discussed on Monday, 30 November, and Thursday, 3 December, in spin-off groups. Informal consultations were held on Tuesday-Thursday, 1-3 December.

In the spin-off group, parties were divided on preamble paragraphs regarding, *inter alia*: vulnerability; historical emissions; human rights; food security; land use; forestry; sinks and reservoirs; and carbon pricing. Many pointed to one or more terms or concepts that fall outside the Convention, or are not internationally “agreed” or defined. Several countries called for deleting “in light of different national circumstances” in a paragraph on the pursuit of the Convention’s objective. Many developing countries called for references to vulnerability and special circumstances.

Two parties, opposed by two others, requested that language on response measures be bracketed in a paragraph on the intrinsic relationship between climate change, poverty eradication and sustainable development. Parties also disagreed on the clarity of the phrase “harmony with nature,” on the term “best available science,” and on the accuracy of a paragraph on historical and *per capita* emissions.

In the ADP text that was forwarded to the COP, brackets remained around the paragraphs on historical emissions and evolving economic and emission trends. In addition, phrases on people under occupation in the paragraph on human rights and REDD+ and joint mitigation and adaptation approach in the paragraph on sinks and reservoirs remained bracketed.

On general (Article 2), one developed country party noted the science is not in dispute and brackets should be removed from “on the basis of science.” Two other developed country parties stressed the importance of a “no text” option for this article. Parties were divided on whether to see climate change in isolation, or as intertwined with economic and social issues, human rights, gender equality, and rights of indigenous peoples

and local communities, among others. Some suggested these issues could be addressed in the preamble. Parties also differed on whether the agreement should “enhance implementation” or “further the objective” of the Convention. One group of parties, opposed by another, strongly supported the inclusion of a 1.5°C warming limit. One party, opposed by another, suggested replacing “transformation” with “tractable shift” in a paragraph referencing sustainable development. Another suggested “pathways” to sustainable development.

In the ADP text that was forwarded to the COP, most of the text remained bracketed, with particular disagreement on the long-term temperature goal and mention of response measures, loss and damage, and the rights of people under occupation. In addition, two options remained for enhancing implementation or achieving the objective of the Convention.

On purpose (draft Article 2*bis*), one group of parties, opposed by several parties, stressed that this article was needed as a crosscutting article to ensure all elements in the agreement, including transparency of action and support, are treated with parity in terms of differentiation. Another said the article might be a prudent way to determine differentiation without having to address it separately in every element of the agreement. Three parties opposed, saying that the article undermines the nuances of what is being negotiated in other parts of the agreement. Several parties noted that the language would have to be improved upon to make clear linkages with the rest of the agreement. One party asked that both paragraphs in the article be bracketed, noting the legal implications must be clear. A group of parties explained that the article was not intended to be a legal obligation but rather to guide the legal obligations in the rest of the agreement. In the ADP text that was forwarded to the COP, the entire text, and many terms and phrases within the text, remained bracketed.

On Friday, 4 December, the ADP contact group also took up these parts of the text briefly. On preambular paragraphs on special needs, El Salvador requested adding “and the Central American isthmus,” and the African Group called exclusion of African countries “a red line.” Kyrgyzstan asked to include the vulnerability of mountain areas.

On purpose (draft Article 2), Venezuela opposed language on sustainable development, saying it “belongs to a different agenda” and goes beyond low GHG emissions and climate resilience. She supported “stabilization” of GHG emissions, and, with Saudi Arabia and Pakistan, opposed the inclusion of “decarbonization” and “carbon neutrality.” Bolivia called for the reinsertion of language on protecting the environmental integrity of Mother Earth. The US reiterated that purpose should be reflected in the respective parts of the agreement, preferring no text for this article.

Mitigation (draft Articles 3, 3*bis* and 3*ter*) and Associated Decision Text: On mitigation, parties discussed, *inter alia*, features, support and timing of contributions, and non-market mechanisms.

On Tuesday, 1 December, spin-off group Co-Facilitator Perrez reported from bilateral consultations that no landing zone existed yet on information, housing and long-term strategies. Parties agreed to replace agreement text on the long-term goal with text developed in informal consultations under the spin-off group.

On Wednesday, 2 December, the spin-off group heard reports from facilitators of party-led informal discussions, which reflected some progress in identifying clearer options in the draft agreement. The group observed that parties’ views continued to differ on, *inter alia*: support; differentiation; and accounting. Co-Facilitator Perrez also reported back from consultations, noting, *inter alia*, work by two parties on a textual proposal on response measures. India indicated interest in further consultations on unilateral measures. Brazil emphasized the importance of the concept of “developed country parties taking the lead.”

On Thursday, 3 December, parties reviewed a new compilation text, and new agreement and decision text proposals prepared by the co-facilitator and two party facilitators that sought to capture existing options on: accounting, and methods and guidance; cooperative approaches; and a mechanism to support sustainable development. On the compilation text, parties briefly discussed the treatment of support in the agreement article and agreed to an amended footnote that states that “this is a placeholder until decided where support should be dealt with.” On the text proposals on accounting, and methods and guidance, parties, *inter alia*, bracketed references to land use, to enable more parties to engage on related options.

On the text proposals on cooperative approaches and mechanisms, parties made minor amendments. Several parties also requested to add references to INDCs alongside those to nationally determined mitigation contributions/nationally determined mitigation commitments or contributions. Parties agreed to forward the new text proposals, as amended, to the contact group as a starting point for discussions.

On Thursday, 3 December, in the contact group, the EU, Colombia for AILAC, the US, and others said that the INDCs imply self-differentiation. The EU stated all countries should seek economy-wide targets but there should not be shared timelines. The US added that developing countries should be eligible for support in implementing their contributions, and LDCs and others should have flexibility to submit at their discretion without expectation. Japan stated that only vulnerable countries should have “partly conditional” INDCs.

Sudan, for the African Group, and Malaysia, for the LMDCs, underlined that developed country parties should have quantified economy-wide targets. South Africa said binding obligations to implement should “back up” developed countries’ commitment to take the lead.

On Friday, 4 December, the EU, supported by Colombia for AILAC, Maldives for the Alliance of Small Islands States (AOSIS), and the US called for clarifying the date for the submission of contributions. Nicaragua and Bolivia called for Mother Earth to be reinserted in the text. Bolivia, with Venezuela, urged the inclusion of non-market mechanisms.

Adaptation, and Loss and Damage (draft Articles 4 and 5) and Associated Decision Text: In the spin-off group, parties’ discussions focused on: the global goal or long-term vision; links between mitigation and adaptation; and cooperation. On the links between adaptation and mitigation, several parties supported referencing that the more parties mitigate, the less all countries will need to adapt, as a universal concept. Two parties underlined the need for this to be factually correct, noting that regardless

of mitigation actions there will be a need for countries to adapt. A group of parties underlined the need for an assessment of the adequacy of support from developed countries and recognition of the adaptation efforts by developing countries, or increasing adaptation costs and needs, and the limits to adaptation.

On the cluster of paragraphs related to cooperation, a group of developing country parties, supported by a developed country party, underlined the importance of strengthening institutional arrangements, and another noted a proposal to create a technical and knowledge platform. The US, EU and Canada suggested that the paragraph on the adequacy of support could be in decision text or the global stocktake.

On Wednesday, 2 December, in the contact group, Co-Facilitator Andrea Guerrero (Colombia) reported that despite progress on some parts of the text, there was substantial work remaining. On Thursday, 3 December, Bolivia, for the Group of 77 and China (G-77/China), asked to include details on a long-term vision and urged avoiding prescriptive language.

On Thursday, 3 December, Tuvalu expressed worry that there had not been substantive discussions on loss and damage in the spin-off group and urged reinsertion of language on loss and damage that preserves the issue as an independent article.

Finance (draft Article 6) and Associated Decision Text: Parties addressed finance in the context of the new agreement during the ADP contact group meetings and debated textual proposals in spin-off group meetings and party-led informal meetings throughout the week.

In the spin-off group, on Tuesday, 1 December, parties focused on *ex ante* communications and their linkages with the global stocktake, scale and scaling up, actions and commitments, as well as on predictability and institutional arrangements in informal meetings.

On institutional arrangements, parties identified some bridging proposals and discussed, *inter alia*: the necessity of listing existing funds in the text; relevance of existing guidance from the COP to the operating entities; and the ability of the CMA to recommend decisions to the COP.

On Thursday, 3 December, parties agreed on language stating that the provision of financial resources should or shall aim to achieve a balance between adaptation and mitigation, taking into account country-driven strategies, and the priorities and needs of developing countries. Parties exchanged views: on the special treatment and access modalities for LDCs and African countries; the need to simplify procedures for accessing financial resources; whether certain provisions on measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) of support could be better placed within the transparency section of the agreement; text on enabling environments, results-based payments, carbon pricing and variety of sources, among others.

New textual proposals, including developing country parties' needs and food security, prompted many parties to express concern about little progress and one group suggested "moving on to the next stage at the political level." Parties agreed that the co-facilitators and Secretariat would capture the discussions in a revised version, which was then presented back to the contact group.

During the contact group meetings on Thursday and Friday, 3-4 December, delegates expressed their respective views on differentiation and MRV in the context of the provision of support, predictability of support, and the issue of balancing support between mitigation and adaptation.

Technology Development and Transfer (draft Article 7) and Associated Decision Text: The ADP decided to create a spin-off group on this topic on Sunday, 29 November, and the spin-off group reported back as needed.

A group of developing country parties introduced a new bridging proposal on the technology framework. After numerous amendments to the proposal, including on the role of developing countries and economies in transition and the need to enhance support for technology development and transfer, Co-Facilitator Mpanu-Mpanu agreed to forward the proposal as originally formulated.

Discussions in the spin-off groups further focused on the continued use of the TEC and the CTCN, with the possibility of supporting technology research, development and demonstration.

Capacity Building (draft Article 8) and Associated Decision Text: The ADP decided to create a spin-off group on this topic, which first met on Monday, 30 November, developing bridging proposals for options on objective, principles, support and reporting.

Transparency (draft Article 9) and Associated Decision Text: On Tuesday, 1 December, in the spin-off group, parties focused on support to developing countries for transparency. Parties discussed how to clarify that support for the Cancun MRV system will continue, and differed on whether developing countries "shall" or "be eligible to" receive support. The group then met informally to discuss the latter issue.

On Wednesday, 2 December, parties identified respective views: on text providing for the CMA to adopt common modalities, procedures and guidelines; and a proposed text for a provision on providing, in the transparency framework, flexibility for developing countries, in light of their capabilities, capacities, or capacity-building support received.

The group also discussed placing in the agreement or decision text provisions on: types or modalities of flexibility; a periodic review of future transparency modalities and guidelines; and providing for the transparency system to be guided by Convention principles and to be implemented in, *inter alia*, a non-intrusive, non-punitive manner respectful of national sovereignty. Parties further discussed these paragraphs informally.

On Thursday, 3 December, discussions focused on revised text on agreement paragraphs related to the purpose of transparency systems for action and support, and provision of information, and on decision text paragraphs related to transparency.

On the paragraphs on provision of information, some countries expressed hesitation to language on, *inter alia*, frequency, pointing to a lack of textual assurances on support for improving national capabilities. Others expressed willingness to explore text that would provide such assurances.

On the decision paragraphs, parties discussed, *inter alia*, the level of detail required in providing guidance for development of modalities and procedures for transparency.

Parties agreed that Co-Facilitator Kwok would develop bridging proposals based on parties' oral and textual inputs.

During discussions in the contact group, parties discussed the MRV of information provided by parties, several parties proposed a wider scope for facilitative dialogue that would go beyond mitigation. The EU expressed flexibility on this, suggesting referring to the purpose of the agreement. China and Saudi Arabia expressed concern that a facilitative dialogue could represent an *ex ante* review and opposed this. The EU and the US said a dialogue would inform the next round of INDCs.

On Thursday, 3 December, the LDCs opposed a one-size-fits-all approach to reporting. The EU, Colombia for AILAC, the US, and others supported a common framework, with flexibility regarding the timing and detail in the reporting, and with support to developing countries.

On Friday, 4 December, India urged inclusion of MRV of finance from developed countries in the agreement article on transparency.

Global Stocktake (draft Article 10) and Associated

Decision Text: The spin-off group first convened on Wednesday, 2 December. Discussions focusing on the decision portion of the text, centered around inputs to the global stocktake, including: connections with the long-term goal; relevance of individual and overall or aggregate efforts; outcomes of the 2013-2015 review; linkages with MRV processes; the role of non-state actors; and the possibility of a no text option on inputs for the global stocktake to avoid a prescriptive approach.

Parties also exchanged views on, *inter alia*: the need for and degree of specificity in modalities for a body to prepare for entry into force; the possibility of aligning the IPCC's work with the global stocktake; and request to the SBSTA to provide advice on how the IPCC assessment reports could inform the stocktaking.

Focusing on the agreement portion of the text, parties debated language on MOI and purpose and the "outcome" of the stocktake. Parties agreed that the co-facilitator and Secretariat would capture the discussions in a revised version, which was then presented back to the contact group.

Implementation and Compliance, and Final Clauses (draft Article 11, 12-26) and Associated Decision Text: On final clauses and associated decision text, the ADP contact group discussed decision paragraphs not allocated to spin-off groups. Other compliance issues and final clauses were addressed by the compliance spin-off group and in informal discussions.

On Monday, 30 November, in the spin-off group, parties discussed the rules of procedure for the CMA. Many parties supported having the CMA adopt its own rules of procedure, or using the draft rules of procedure used by the COP. Some parties expressed support for developing the rules of procedure for the CMA before it meets, and suggested that if that option was not possible, a work programme could be developed for the adoption of such rules. Another delegation noted that such a work programme could prejudice that the CMA needs new rules of procedure. Colombia suggested a consultative process to determine if new rules of procedure are required and, if so, to develop the rules. Several parties supported only using the COP's rules of procedure without any additional processes.

Workstream 2: Pre-2020 ambition was primarily discussed in a spin-off group, starting on Monday, 30 November. In addition, informal consultations were held throughout the week, resulting in "clean" paragraphs on, *inter alia*, inviting developed countries to increase pledges under the Cancun Agreements, housing of the mitigation technical examination process (TEP), and assessment of the TEP. The informal consultations also considered the institutional location, timing and content of a new adaptation TEP.

During spin-off group discussions, developed country parties called for focusing on the mitigation section of the text, including the role of non-party stakeholders, the existing TEP's institutional location going forward and linkages to Convention bodies, while developing country parties emphasized accelerated implementation and adaptation.

On mitigation, parties introduced compromise language on paragraphs related to the participation of relevant experts in the TEP, engaging the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism in the Technical Expert Meetings and involving two high-level champions in preparing the summary for policymakers. One party proposed language welcoming the Montreal Protocol's work on hydrofluorocarbons, and the importance of addressing shipping and aviation emissions. Many opposed introducing language at this point in the negotiations.

On accelerated implementation, three groups of parties supported an option on an accelerated implementation process to assess progress on closing the mitigation and adaptation gaps and adequacy of MOI. Others introduced a bridging proposal on a paragraph establishing a facilitative dialogue in conjunction with COP 23. Preferring the "no text" option, developed country parties opposed inclusion of this section in the decision, noting overlaps with other assessment processes.

On adaptation, parties diverged on the content, institutional location and timing of a proposed adaptation TEP, with one group of parties opposed to housing it under an existing institution, such as the Adaptation Committee.

On support, one developing country party requested "a concrete roadmap" be inserted for achieving the US\$100 billion goal. Opposing this language, a developed country party suggested recalling Decision 1/CP.19 (Further Advancing the Durban Platform), paragraphs 3 and 4(e), on accelerating the full implementation of the Bali Action Plan and increasing MOI support from developed countries. Another developing country party called for language on a 2016-2017 review of gaps in implementation of developed country parties' mitigation commitments and MOI provision.

On the preamble of the workstream 2 draft decision text, one party proposed, opposed by many, referencing the Montreal Protocol's work on hydrofluorocarbons and international transport emissions, instead of including them in the mitigation section, as a compromise. One party requested bracketing 1.5°C, and adding "in accordance with common but differentiated responsibilities (CBDR)" to a paragraph on recognizing the importance of international and regional cooperation in mobilizing ambitious climate action by all.

Parties agreed the co-facilitators would consult with the ADP Co-Chairs on remaining contentious issues.

ADP CLOSING: On Saturday morning, 5 December, in the ADP contact group, ADP Co-Chair Reifsnyder presented ADP draft conclusions (FCCC/ADP/2015/L.6), with the draft agreement and decision text on workstream 1 and 2 in Annex I, and a reflection note in Annex II providing textual suggestions by parties. He explained that the draft text had not changed from the compilation text with bridging proposals, and that should there be a comment that a party was unable to make due to time constraints, or an inaccuracy or omission in the reflection note, parties could make submissions until 1:00 pm on Saturday, 5 December. The contact group agreed to forward the draft conclusions to the ADP plenary.

ADP Co-Chair Reifsnyder then opened the ADP closing plenary. After thanking the parties and co-facilitators for their hard work and dedication, ADP Co-Chair Reifsnyder turned to ADP agenda item 3 (implementation of all the elements of Decision 1/CP.17), noting significant progress had been made in reducing gaps between parties' positions, and saying the ADP's work would now be passed on to the COP to "complete the last leg."

Following assurances by ADP Co-Chair Reifsnyder that, *inter alia*, the reflections note would be revised to include parties' remaining comments and "nothing has been decided or left behind," including the issue of loss and damage, the ADP adopted conclusions (FCCC/ADP/2015/L.6) to be forwarded to the COP for further consideration.

Laurence Tubiana, COP 21 Presidency, assured parties that negotiations would continue on the basis of the ADP text that was agreed. She highlighted the importance of party ownership to make progress.

Statements by parties during the closing plenary are available at: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12658e.html>

In closing, ADP Rapporteur Yang Liu (China) presented, and parties adopted, the report of the meeting (FCCC/ADP/2015/L.5).

Saying that "sometimes words cannot capture our feelings," ADP Co-Chair Djoghlaflaf congratulated parties for their achievement so far, and thanked parties for their trust.

UNFCCC Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres noted her appreciation for the full dedication of parties on this "complex" task and said work needed to continue next week.

Thanking all, ADP Co-Chair Reifsnyder gavelled ADP 2-12 to a close at 1:07 pm.

COP 21

DURBAN PLATFORM FOR ENHANCED ACTION

(DECISION 1/CP.17): Report of the ADP: Following the closure of ADP 2-12, this item (FCCC/CP/2014/10/Add.1, FCCC/ADP/2014/4, FCCC/ADP/2015/2-5, FCCC/CP/2015/4, FCCC/TP/2015/4 and Add.1-2, and ADP.2015.6.NonPaper) was considered by the COP on Saturday evening, 5 December. ADP Co-Chairs Reifsnyder and Djoghlaflaf presented and transmitted the draft agreement and decision and reflection note (FCCC/ADP/2015/L.6/Rev.1 and Add.1) to the COP. The report of the ADP was adopted.

Parties agreed to the mode of work outlined by COP 21 President Fabius, including work in the Comité de Paris, an open-ended single-setting group, presided over by the COP 21 President, to progress the text and facilitate compromise. He

said the Comité de Paris would work under the principle, *inter alia*, of "nothing is agreed until everything is agreed," and its meetings would be transmitted to screens at the conference site to facilitate transparency.

He stated that the outcome should be concluded in time for a review group on legal and linguistic matters to address related issues before Friday, 11 December.

South Africa, for the G-77/China, emphasized the importance of clarity and predictability in the negotiation process, and asked that the reflection note be updated with suggestions that are still missing.

Maldives, for AOSIS, asked for clarity on how the issues of adaptation, and loss and damage would be handled.

Sudan, for the African Group, noted that important issues have been left out of the agreement, but expressed certainty that parties will address these issues. Marshall Islands called for the Paris agreement to include, *inter alia*, a 1.5°C temperature goal and assurances on long-term climate finance.

Australia, for the Umbrella Group, said the ADP text is party-driven and party-owned. Saudi Arabia, for the Arab Group, emphasized that setting a goal for governments' efforts "needs to be substantiated by proven science," provided by the IPCC.

Guatemala, for AILAC, called for awareness that "this is our text and it will be our ability to listen to one another and our ability to articulate our needs" that will enable an effective agreement. Angola, for the LDCs, expressed disappointment that the COP Bureau "formulation" was used to form the legal and linguistic review group, excluding the LDCs.

Malaysia, for the LMDCs, underscored the group's commitment to goodwill and expressed concern over the repeated use of the refrain "the world has changed." China underlined that an ambitious Paris outcome should give equal weight to all of the Durban mandate components and said developed countries should take the lead.

Azerbaijan asked his insertions to be incorporated into the reflection note. Turkey asked to be considered as a group for consultations on negotiations. Nepal highlighted the fragility of mountain ecosystems.

Comité de Paris: On Saturday, 5 December, after accepting the draft text from the ADP, COP 21 President Fabius outlined three principles for the Comité that: nothing is agreed until everything is agreed; all parties are included; and transparency is upheld.

He announced four informal ministerial consultations, referred to as *indabas*, that would convene under the Comité, on: support, facilitated by Emmanuel Isoze-Ngondet (Gabon) and Jochen Flasbarth (Germany); differentiation in the context of mitigation, transparency and finance, including pre-2020 finance, facilitated by Izabella Teixeira (Brazil) and Vivian Balakrishnan (Singapore); and ambition, long-term objectives and periodic review, facilitated by Pa Ousman (The Gambia) and Amber Rudd (UK).

On Monday, 7 December, COP President Fabius announced additional *indabas* on: adaptation, and loss and damage, led by René Orellana (Bolivia) and Åsa Romson (Sweden); cooperative approaches and mechanisms, led by Catherine McKenna (Canada) and Raymond Tshibanda N'Tungamulongo (Democratic Republic of the Congo); and forests, led by Daniel

Vicente Ortega Pacheco (Ecuador), Doris Leuthard (Switzerland) and Henri Djombo (Republic of the Congo). He also announced a working group on response measures, led by Jan Szyszko (Poland) and Khaled Mohamed Fahmy Abdelall (Egypt) and an *indaba* on the preamble, led by Claudia Salerno (Venezuela), and on facilitating implementation and compliance, led by Rafael Pacchiano (Mexico).

The *indabas* met Sunday, 6 December, through Tuesday, 8 December, and the Comité met Monday, 7 December, through Wednesday, 9 December, to hear reports from most of the *indabas*. The Comité continued to meet until Saturday, 12 December.

On **support/MOI**, the co-facilitators reported progress toward possible common ground on, *inter alia*, provision of support and mobilization of climate finance, and reported reassurances regarding the fulfillment of existing commitments and continued leadership of developed countries. They outlined specific proposed language on how the role of other parties could be captured, such as “voluntary contributions,” “contributions by others in a position/willing/able to do so,” or reference to South-South cooperation, but also reported that some parties expressed strong reservations, calling for consistency with existing provisions and principles of the Convention.

The co-facilitators reported that parties found convergence in the draft article on technology development and transfer (Article 7), and related decision text, with common ground on, *inter alia*, cooperative action, long-term vision and the technology framework.

On **capacity building**, they reported agreement on a Paris Committee on Capacity-building and an understanding on a long-term work programme on capacity building, and said work would continue on the modalities of the committee.

On **differentiation**, the co-facilitators said that assurances of no backsliding on commitments and that developed countries would continue to take the lead “resonated strongly.” On differentiation in the sections on transparency and finance, they reported on assurances that developed countries will continue to take the lead without backsliding, and on general convergence that differentiation will be operationalized through flexibility for developing countries.

On transparency, they reported “broad acknowledgement” that capacity building and support are key reflections of differentiation and, on finance, reported that several parties underscored there is no intention to create new legal obligations for developing countries, but an encouragement to voluntarily contribute.

On Wednesday, 9 December, co-facilitator Balakrishnan noted that “parties are not yet ready to place their final positions on the table,” saying the co-facilitators would work with the Presidency and Secretariat to crystallize existing fault lines in the text.

On **ambition**, the co-facilitators reported convergence on a common “global moment” every five years to take stock and review aggregate progress, and provide an opportunity to confirm or raise targets, but without an obligation to do so. They said that, while several developed and developing country parties indicated willingness to refer to a 1.5°C limit, others reaffirmed the temperature limit in the Cancun Agreements.

On Wednesday, 9 December, they reported that most parties were willing to reflect a 1.5°C temperature limit in the purpose of the agreement, with accompanying provisions related to sustainable development, MOI, equity, and food security.

On **pre-2020**, the co-facilitators reported parties considered a compromise proposal containing a facilitative dialogue, potentially in 2017, which would examine the state of, and options to further enhance, implementation under the Convention for all parties with a stronger focus on developed countries’ undertakings. They relayed that parties had found common ground on an adaptation TEP that would add value, as long as it does not duplicate work under existing bodies under the Convention. They reported emerging convergence on mirroring the mitigation TEP’s institutional arrangements for an adaptation TEP, with a key role for the Adaptation Committee. On accelerating implementation, they noted divergence of views.

On **cooperative approaches**, the co-facilitators reported that parties considered guiding principles, including, *inter alia*: environmental integrity; avoiding double counting; and the voluntary nature of such approaches. On mechanisms to support sustainable development (draft Article 3ter), she reported some parties stressed that such mechanisms would need to be durable over time, while others said they should not be part of the agreement.

On **adaptation, and loss and damage**, the co-facilitators highlighted landing zones on: a clear goal for adaptation, with a link to Convention Article 2 (objective); recognition of the link between mitigation and adaptation; and a communication process that is flexible and does not further burden developing countries. They also highlighted crosscutting issues needing resolution, including references to a temperature goal, vulnerability and CBDR. On loss and damage, they noted ongoing discussions on institutional arrangements, saying there was no convergence.

On **facilitating implementation and compliance**, the co-facilitator noted general acknowledgement on the need for the agreement to define nature and purpose, leaving modalities and procedures for later. He identified divergence on whether or not to reflect differentiation in this part.

On Wednesday, 9 December, COP 21 President Fabius presented a revised draft text of the Paris outcome. Parties welcomed the transparency of the process, and accepted the text as a basis for negotiations. Many parties expressed some concerns with the text.

South Africa, for the G-77/China, and Egypt, for the African Group, noted concern on “delinking” textual language from the Convention and dilution of Convention principles, particularly on differentiation. The G-77/China lamented the lack of adequate resources on MOI and, with the LMDCs, expressed concern about the lack of text regarding unilateral measures. She further called for a distinct article on loss and damage.

Malaysia, for the LMDCs, emphasized capturing CBDR and expressed concern on language on nationally determined mitigation contributions. With the Arab Group, he opposed references to carbon pricing. He further underscored that progress under workstream 2 is fundamental for progress under workstream 1.

Australia, for the Umbrella Group, stressed developed countries' continued assurances to continue to lead in the context of a universal agreement in which all parties do their best.

Angola, for the LDCs, highlighted the need to ensure access to finance.

The African Group noted concern on the reflection of individual commitments without references to support and worried that key elements to operationalize the global goal on adaptation were missing.

The EU underlined that after 2020 countries in a position to do so should join in increasing financial flows to countries in need and expressed concern that the mechanism to raise ambition over time had been significantly weakened.

Saudi Arabia, for the Arab Group, further expressed concern with references to "those in a position to do so" and called for the reinstatement of adaptation co-benefits coming in the "form" of mitigation. He, and the EU, noted the lack of a double threshold for compliance.

The Maldives, for AOSIS, with Barbados for the Caribbean Community (CARICOM), and many others, stressed a below 1.5°C goal as critical. He underscored ongoing work among parties on language regarding loss and damage.

Guatemala, for AILAC, said the preamble should include a reference to gender and supported a quantified or quantifiable unilateral component in "features" under the mitigation article. She called for a registry of adaptation actions.

On Thursday, 10 December, COP 21 President Fabius presented a revised draft text at 9:00 pm, and announced that two groups would meet in parallel throughout the night, an "*indaba* of solutions," chaired by himself, and an informal consultation, chaired by COP 20 President Manuel Pulgar-Vidal (Peru).

During the *indaba* of solutions, parties discussed differentiation, ambition and finance. Many expressed support for differentiation, but disagreed on the extent to which differentiation should be reflected in the various provisions on mitigation, transparency and finance, among others. One party called the INDCs a "monument to differentiation," while another underscored that the differences between developed and developing countries must be reflected in the transparency system.

A spin-off group on differentiation reported progress on mitigation and transparency. Many parties underlined the need to reflect a 1.5°C temperature goal, which a few parties opposed. Several supported the need for five-year cycles.

On Friday, 11 December, parties met in informal consultations and conducted bilaterals throughout the day to resolve key issues surrounding ambition, differentiation and finance.

On Saturday, 12 December, the Comité de Paris reconvened at 11:30 am. COP 21 President Fabius announced the final text of a balanced ambitious agreement would be distributed after the meeting, underscoring it contained "the principle elements that we felt would be impossible to achieve: being differentiated, fair, durable, dynamic, balanced and legally binding." He stressed that this agreement is necessary for the entire world and for each country, that it will help island countries, expedite financial means, and assist fossil fuel countries in the attempt to diversify their economies, while aiding all countries in building low-carbon economies.

Noting the world has come to a defining moment on a journey dating back decades, UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon said parties would be presented with a document that is historic and promises to set the world on a new path to a low-emission, climate-resilient world. Underscoring that time has come to acknowledge that national interest is best served by acting in global solidarity, he called on parties to "finish the job" in a spirit of compromise.

Stressing "history is here" and postponement is not possible, French President François Hollande said negotiations had reached a decisive moment and only parties could answer the question: "Do we want an agreement?" Describing the draft text as ambitious but also realistic, he called on delegates to seize the opportunity to change the world by adopting the first universal agreement on climate change.

COP 21 President Fabius explained the final version of the draft Paris outcome was being translated into all UN languages and would be available at 1:30 pm. He suggested parties examine the text and that the Comité de Paris convene in plenary to take up "a series of necessary procedures."

At 5:30 pm, COP 21 President Fabius re-opened the Comité de Paris and outlined the organization of work: report back by the co-chairs of the open-ended group of legal and linguistic experts; clarifying remarks on the draft Paris outcome by the Secretariat (FCCC/CP/2015/L.9); and transmittal of the draft Paris outcome to the COP.

On the legal and linguistic review, Co-Chair Jimena Nieto Carrasco (Colombia) said the group had met on Thursday, 10 December, and Saturday, 12 December. She said the group recommended making technical amendments, noting that the language in translations in the draft agreement should be consistent with the Kyoto Protocol when the English version parallels the Protocol, and spelling out all of the acronyms.

UNFCCC Deputy Executive Secretary Richard Kinley listed technical corrections. These are now reflected in the revised document (FCCC/CP/2015/L.9/Rev.1).

COP 21 President Fabius proposed and the parties agreed to transmit to the COP the draft Paris Agreement, reflecting the technical amendments made by the legal and linguistic review group and the Secretariat. The Comité de Paris closed at 7:25 pm.

Adoption of a Protocol, Another Legal Instrument, or an Agreed Outcome with Legal Force under the Convention Applicable to All Parties: The COP plenary convened to consider the draft Paris Agreement at 7:25 pm on Saturday, 12 December.

COP 21 President Fabius invited the COP to adopt the decision contained in the document. With no objections, the Paris Agreement was adopted at 7:26 pm. Many parties lauded the Agreement and the work of the French Presidency in achieving it. Many noted that while the Agreement is not perfect, it is necessary.

Quoting Nelson Mandela on "the long road to freedom," South Africa noted there is further technical work needed on the decisions and on increasing finance pre-2020.

Australia, for the Umbrella Group, said COP 21 has produced a global agreement that creates a framework for all nations to play a part in securing a prosperous future, noting the Agreement

confirms that developed countries will continue to lead in providing support for climate action, while recognizing the important role that others can play.

Lamenting the COP 21 Presidency had not acknowledged his country before adopting the Agreement, Nicaragua stressed the Agreement should include a paragraph allowing for the calculation of a global carbon budget in line with historical responsibilities and climate justice in case the results of the INDCs do not keep the global average temperature below 1.5°C from pre-industrial levels, and text allowing for the creation of a compensation fund based on historical responsibilities. He also lamented not being able to register reservations to the Agreement.

Switzerland, for Environmental Integrity Group, described the Agreement as legally-binding, ambitious and fair, saying it is flexible for future developments and provides an ambitious basis for combating climate change.

Welcoming the “historic agreement” as a landmark that will provide security and stability, the EU emphasized “we all have to translate this agreement to concrete actions.” Echoing that “today we can celebrate but tomorrow we have to act,” the EU noted the launch of the High-Ambition Coalition and underscored the EU “will scale up financial support as of 2020 and make it more predictable.”

Egypt, on behalf of African Group, said the historic Paris Agreement had “far reaching consequences” for sustainable development and asked the COP 21 Presidency to convene consultations on Africa’s special circumstances at SB 44. Sudan, for the African Group, emphasized issues of financing and transparency of support as the backbone of the implementation of the agreement.

Saint Lucia, for CARICOM, described the Paris Agreement as a resounding triumph of multilateralism and welcomed increased ambition, in the form of the 1.5°C goal, and the separate treatment of loss and damage in the agreement.

Maldives, for AOSIS, highlighted a recent and significant shift in action on climate change and bigger commitments in capitals around the world, and said “history will not judge us from what we did today, but what we do from this day forward.”

Underscoring the importance and inclusion of human rights and gender, Colombia, for AILAC, lauded the Agreement for not only being applicable to all but also for belonging to all.

Saudi Arabia, for the Arab Group, congratulated the entire world for achieving an agreement that “allows us to better achieve sustainable development.”

Panama, for Coalition for Rainforest Nations, said the mechanism to implement REDD+ would allow state and non-state actors to participate and serve communities that depend on the ecosystem services provided by tropical forests.

Angola, for the LDCs, noted the Agreement is applicable to all and encourages movement toward a common global temperature goal of 1.5°C through, *inter alia*, periodic reviews, global stocktake, and the recognition of specific needs.

Suggesting the Paris Agreement is only the beginning, President Hollande announced France will commit to revising, by 2020, its GHG emission reduction target and its financial

contribution, in particular to adaptation in vulnerable countries, and invited all to join a coalition to achieve a carbon price to reorient investments “starting from tomorrow.”

Describing the Paris Agreement as a “monumental success for the planet and its people,” UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon identified “solid results on all key points.”

UNFCCC Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres said the Paris Climate Change Conference builds successfully on years of work by government delegates, individuals and institutions, and described the Paris Agreement as one of conviction, representing solidarity with the most vulnerable and a long-term vision to “turn this new legal framework into an engine of safe growth for the rest of this century.”

Turkey said he expected the COP 21 Presidency to work towards finding a solution to issues raised by Turkey, related to parties with special circumstances that have been recognized by the COP having access to support under the agreement. COP 21 President Fabius assured he would undertake consultations on the issue.

Describing the agreement as fair, just, comprehensive, ambitious, effective and durable, China said it also reflects the balance between mitigation and adaptation, and action and support.

The US said the Paris Agreement, *inter alia*: “empowers us” to chart a new path forward while preventing the most devastating consequences of climate change, and sends a critical message to the global marketplace, while inspiring technological breakthroughs.

Noting that the agreement could have been more ambitious, particularly on the “fair share” by developed countries, India welcomed the Paris Agreement highlighting, among others, consistent application of differentiation.

Morocco said her country, as host of COP 22 in Marrakesh in 2016, would work with all stakeholders towards making the Paris Agreement operational.

Venezuela and Bolivia welcomed the Agreement’s inclusion of, *inter alia*, climate justice and Mother Earth.

Senegal highlighted the “fully fledged” role of adaptation in the Paris Agreement and urged future work on support for vulnerable countries through internationally transferred mitigation outcomes. Ecuador called for quantifiable targets and highlighted the role of low emission development strategies.

The Philippines emphasized that the Agreement enshrines human rights and promised that his country, leading the Climate Vulnerable Forum, would continue to lead and sustain the fight against climate change for a safe and resilient future. Jamaica called the Paris Agreement a fair agreement that can be built upon, highlighting the reference to 1.5°C and loss and damage as a separate article.

Noting her country’s lapel pins made of dried coconut fronds are worn by members of the High-Ambition Coalition, a youth representative from the Marshall Islands said “if this is the story of islands it is a story of the world.” Tuvalu highlighted the leadership of his Prime Minister and said the Paris Agreement, in saving Tuvalu, will have saved the world.

Chile welcomed the recognition of carbon pricing, noting the Paris outcome marks the “beginning of the end of the fossil fuel era.”

Bahamas congratulated COP 21 for delivering a legally-binding agreement that addresses the needs of SIDS, and looked forward to advancing the WIM.

Brazil saw implementation of the Agreement as a means of strengthening the multilateral system and called multilateralism “the best way to address our common challenges.”

Papua New Guinea, with the Central African Republic, expressed “satisfaction that REDD+ has been incorporated in the Paris Agreement.”

Guinea hoped the funds announced for capacity building and technology transfer would be effective.

Palestine announced his country would submit the instrument of accession to the UNFCCC, expressing his country’s pride for becoming the 196th member state and 197th party to the Convention.

Stressing “we are stronger together,” Business and Industry NGOs welcomed the role of the private sector in the Agreement.

Noting with concern that current INDCs remain “dangerously inadequate,” Climate Action Network (CAN), for Environmental NGOs (ENGOS), called on parties to improve their pledges in 2018 so that all will have ambitious targets for 2025.

Suggesting that “the denial in this room is palpable,” Climate Justice Now!, for ENGOS, said the Agreement is weak but the climate justice movement is strong and will deliver an energy revolution that serves people.

Expressing commitment to partnering to implement the Paris Agreement, Research and Independent NGOs said scientists and educators will provide support through, *inter alia*, building capacity, developing programmes and proposing policies.

Trade Unions noted that the Agreement would set the right goals but lacks clarity on mechanisms for its implementation.

Women and Gender called for an operationalization of gender equality “not a mere recognition of it.”

Youth lamented countries of the North had exempted themselves from assuming liability for climate change, “which your generation caused.”

Local Government and Municipal Authorities welcomed Morocco’s announcement to build on the Lima-Paris Action Agenda for COP 22.

Indigenous Peoples highlighted that their three messages had been partly incorporated into the agreement, though not to the full extent requested: rights of indigenous peoples; temperature goal of under 1.5°C; and recognition and respect for traditional knowledge.

Paris Agreement and Associated Decision: Paris

Agreement: The Paris Agreement (annexed to FCCC/CP/2015/L.9/Rev.1) includes 16 preambular clauses and 29 operative clauses. The preamble addresses, among others:

- that the agreement is guided by the Convention’s principles, including the principle of equity and CBDR and respective capabilities, in light of different national circumstances;
- the need for an effective and progressive response to the urgent threat of climate change on the basis of the best scientific knowledge;
- the specific needs and special circumstances of developing country parties, especially those that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change, in

particular the needs of LDCs, with regard to funding and transfer of technology;

- that parties may also be affected by the impacts of measures taken in response to climate change;
- the relationship between climate change actions, responses and actions, with equitable access to sustainable development;
- the priority of safeguarding food security and ending hunger;
- the imperatives of a just transition of the workforce;
- the need to respect, promote and consider human rights, the right to health, the rights of indigenous peoples, local communities, migrants, children, persons with disabilities and people in vulnerable situations, the right to development, gender equality, empowerment of women and intergenerational equity when taking action on climate change;
- conservation and enhancement of GHG sinks and reservoirs;
- ecosystem integrity, including oceans and the protection of biodiversity, recognized by some cultures as Mother Earth, and noting for some the importance of the concept of “climate justice”; and
- the importance of sustainable lifestyles and sustainable consumption and production.

Article 1 (Definitions): The definitions contained in Convention Article 1 apply to this Agreement. In addition “Convention” means the UNFCCC, “Conference of the Parties” means the COP of the Convention, and “Party” means party to the Agreement.

Article 2 (Purpose): This Agreement, in enhancing the implementation of the Convention, including its objective, aims to strengthen the global response to the threat of climate change, in the context of sustainable development and efforts to eradicate poverty, including by:

- holding the increase in the global average temperature to well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels and to pursue efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels, recognizing that this would significantly reduce the risks and impacts of climate change;
- increasing the ability to adapt to the adverse impacts of climate change and foster climate resilience and low GHG emissions development, in a manner that does not threaten food production; and
- making finance flows consistent with a pathway towards low GHG emissions and climate-resilient development.

This Agreement will be implemented to reflect equity and the principle of CBDR and respective capabilities, in the light of different national circumstances.

Article 3 (Mitigation): As nationally determined contributions (NDCs) to the global response to climate change, all parties are to undertake and communicate ambitious efforts as defined in Articles 4, 7, 9, 10, 11 and 13 with the view to achieving the purpose of this Agreement (Article 2). The efforts of all parties will represent a progression over time, while recognizing the need to support developing country parties for the effective implementation of this Agreement.

Article 4 (Individual Contributions): This article provides that:

- in order to achieve the long-term temperature goal set out in Article 2, parties aim to reach global peaking of GHG

- emissions as soon as possible, recognizing that peaking will take longer for developing country parties, and to undertake rapid reductions thereafter in accordance with best available science, so as to achieve a balance between anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks of GHG in the second half of this century, on the basis of equity, and in the context of sustainable development and efforts to eradicate poverty;
- each party shall prepare, communicate and maintain successive NDCs that it intends to achieve. Parties shall pursue domestic mitigation measures, with the aim of achieving the objectives of such contributions;
 - each party's successive NDC will represent a progression beyond the party's then current NDC and reflect its highest possible ambition, reflecting CBDR and respective capabilities, in the light of different national circumstances;
 - developed country parties should continue taking the lead by undertaking economy-wide absolute emission reduction targets. Developing country parties should continue enhancing their mitigation efforts, and are encouraged to move over time towards economy-wide emission reduction or limitation targets in the light of different national circumstances;
 - support shall be provided to developing country parties for the implementation of this Article, in accordance with Articles 9, 10 and 11, recognizing that enhanced support for developing country parties will allow for higher ambition in their actions;
 - the LDCs and SIDS may prepare and communicate strategies, plans and actions for low GHG emissions development reflecting their special circumstances;
 - mitigation co-benefits resulting from parties' adaptation actions and/or economic diversification plans can contribute to mitigation outcomes under this Article;
 - in communicating their NDCs, all parties shall provide the information necessary for clarity, transparency and understanding in accordance with Decision 1/CP.21 and any relevant decisions of the CMA;
 - each party shall communicate an NDC every five years in accordance with Decision 1/CP.21 and any relevant decisions of the CMA, and be informed by the outcomes of the global stocktake referred to in Article 14;
 - the CMA shall consider common time frames for NDCs at its first session;
 - a party may at any time adjust its existing NDC with a view to enhancing its level of ambition, in accordance with guidance adopted by the CMA;
 - NDCs communicated by parties shall be recorded in a public registry maintained by the Secretariat;
 - in accounting for anthropogenic emissions and removals corresponding to their NDCs, parties shall promote environmental integrity, transparency, accuracy, completeness, comparability and consistency, and ensure the avoidance of double counting, in accordance with guidance adopted by the CMA;
 - in the context of their NDCs, when recognizing and implementing mitigation actions with respect to anthropogenic emissions and removals, parties should take into account, as appropriate, existing methods and guidance under the Convention, in the light of the provisions of paragraph 13 of this Article;
 - parties shall take into consideration, in the implementation of this Agreement, the concerns of parties with economies most affected by the impacts of response measures, particularly developing country parties;
 - parties, including regional economic integration organizations and their member states, that have reached an agreement to act jointly under paragraph 2 of this Article shall notify the Secretariat of the terms of that agreement, including the emission level allocated to each party within the relevant time period, when they communicate their NDCs. The Secretariat shall in turn inform the parties and signatories to the Convention of the terms of that agreement;
 - each party to such an agreement shall be responsible for its emission level as set out in the agreement referred to in Article 4.16 above in accordance with paragraphs 13 and 14 of this Article and Articles 13 and 15;
 - if parties acting jointly do so in the framework of, and together with, a regional economic integration organization which is itself a party to this Agreement, each member state of that regional economic integration organization individually, and together with the regional economic integration organization, shall be responsible for its emission level as set out in the agreement communicated under paragraph 16 of this Article in accordance with paragraphs 13 and 14 of this Article and Articles 13 and 15; and
 - all parties should strive to formulate and communicate long-term low GHG emission development strategies, mindful of Article 2 taking into account CBDR and respective capabilities, in the light of different national circumstances;
- Article 5 (Forests):** This article provides that:
- parties should take action to conserve and enhance, as appropriate, sinks and reservoirs of GHGs as referred to in Convention Article 4.1(d) including forests; and
 - parties are encouraged to take action to implement and support, including through results-based payments, the existing framework as set out in related guidance and decisions already agreed under the Convention for policy approaches and positive incentives for activities relating to REDD+, and alternative policy approaches, such as joint mitigation and adaptation approaches for the integral and sustainable management of forests, while reaffirming the importance of incentivizing, as appropriate, non-carbon benefits associated with such approaches.
- Article 6 (Cooperative Approaches):** This article provides that:
- parties recognize that some parties choose to pursue voluntary cooperation in the implementation of their NDCs to allow for higher ambition in their mitigation and adaptation actions and to promote sustainable development and environmental integrity;
 - parties shall, where engaging on a voluntary basis in cooperative approaches that involve the use of internationally transferred mitigation outcomes towards NDCs, promote sustainable development and ensure environmental integrity and transparency, including in governance, and shall apply robust accounting to ensure, *inter alia*, the avoidance of

- double counting, consistent with guidance adopted by the CMA;
- the use of internationally transferred mitigation outcomes to achieve NDCs under this Agreement shall be voluntary and authorized by participating parties;
 - a mechanism to contribute to the mitigation of GHG emissions and support sustainable development is established under the authority and guidance of the CMA for use by parties on a voluntary basis. It shall be supervised by a body designated by the CMA, and shall aim to promote the mitigation of GHG emissions while fostering sustainable development, to incentivize and facilitate participation in the mitigation of GHG emissions by public and private entities authorized by a party, to contribute to the reduction of emission levels in the host party, which will benefit from mitigation activities resulting in emission reductions that can also be used by another party to fulfil its NDC, and to deliver an overall mitigation in global emissions;
 - emission reductions resulting from the mechanism referred to in paragraph 4 of this Article shall not be used to demonstrate achievement of the host-party's NDC if used by another party to demonstrate achievement of its NDC;
 - the CMA shall ensure that a share of the proceeds from activities under the mechanism referred to in paragraph 4 of this Article is used to cover administrative expenses as well as to assist developing country parties that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change to meet the costs of adaptation;
 - CMA 1 shall adopt rules, modalities and procedures for the mechanism referred to in paragraph 4 of this Article;
 - parties recognize the importance of the availability of integrated, holistic and balanced non-market approaches to assist in the implementation of their NDCs, in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication, in a coordinated and effective manner, including through, *inter alia*, mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology transfer and capacity building, as appropriate. These approaches shall aim to promote mitigation and adaptation ambition, enhance public and private sector participation in the implementation of NDCs, and enable opportunities for coordination across instruments and relevant institutional arrangements; and
 - a framework for non-market approaches to sustainable development is defined to promote the non-market approaches referred to in paragraph 8 of this Article.
- Article 7 (Adaptation):** This article provides that:
- parties establish the global goal on adaptation of enhancing adaptive capacity, strengthening resilience and reducing vulnerability to climate change, with a view to contributing to sustainable development and ensuring an adequate adaptation response in the context of the temperature goal referred to in Article 2;
 - parties recognize that adaptation is a global challenge faced by all with local, subnational, national, regional and international dimensions, and that it is a key component of and makes a contribution to the long-term global response to climate change to protect people, livelihoods and ecosystems, taking into account the urgent and immediate needs of those developing country parties that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change;
 - the adaptation efforts of developing country parties shall be recognized in accordance with the modalities to be adopted by CMA 1;
 - parties recognize that the current need for adaptation is significant and that greater levels of mitigation can reduce the need for additional adaptation efforts, and that greater adaptation needs can involve greater adaptation costs;
 - parties acknowledge that adaptation action should follow a country-driven, gender-responsive, participatory and fully transparent approach, taking into consideration vulnerable groups, communities and ecosystems, and should be based on and guided by the best available science and, as appropriate, traditional knowledge, knowledge of indigenous peoples and local knowledge systems, with a view to integrating adaptation into relevant socio-economic and environmental policies and actions, where appropriate;
 - parties recognize the importance of support for and international cooperation on adaptation efforts and the importance of taking into account the needs of developing country parties, especially those that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change;
 - parties should strengthen their cooperation on enhancing action on adaptation, taking into account the Cancun Adaptation Framework, including with regard to: sharing information, good practices, experiences and lessons learned, including, as appropriate, as these relate to science, planning, policies and implementation in relation to adaptation actions; strengthening institutional arrangements, including those under the Convention that serve this Agreement, to support the synthesis of relevant information and knowledge, and the provision of technical support and guidance to parties; strengthening scientific knowledge on climate, including research, systematic observation of the climate system and early warning systems, in a manner that informs climate services and supports decision making; assisting developing country parties in identifying effective adaptation practices, adaptation needs, priorities, support provided and received for adaptation actions and efforts, and challenges and gaps, in a manner consistent with encouraging good practices; and improving the effectiveness and durability of adaptation actions;
 - UN specialized organizations and agencies are encouraged to support the efforts of parties to implement the actions referred to in paragraph 7 of this Article, taking into account the provisions of paragraph 5 of this Article;
 - each party shall, as appropriate, engage in adaptation planning processes and the implementation of actions, including the development or enhancement of relevant plans, policies and/or contributions, which may include: the implementation of adaptation actions, undertakings and/or efforts; the process to formulate and implement NAPs; the assessment of climate change impacts and vulnerability, with a view to formulating nationally determined prioritized actions, taking into account vulnerable people, places and ecosystems; monitoring and evaluating and learning from adaptation plans, policies, programmes and actions; and building the resilience of socio-

economic and ecological systems, including through economic diversification and sustainable management of natural resources;

- each party should, as appropriate, submit and update periodically an adaptation communication, which may include its priorities, implementation and support needs, plans and actions, without creating any additional burden for developing country parties;
- the adaptation communication referred to in paragraph 10 of this Article shall be, as appropriate, submitted and updated periodically, as a component of or in conjunction with other communications or documents, including a NAP, an NDC as referred to in Article 4, paragraph 2, and/or national communications (NC);
- the adaptation communications referred to in paragraph 10 of this Article shall be recorded in a public registry maintained by the Secretariat;
- continuous and enhanced international support shall be provided to developing country parties for the implementation of paragraphs 7, 9, 10 and 11 of this Article, in accordance with the provisions of Articles 9, 10 and 11;
- the global stocktake referred to in Article 14 shall, *inter alia*: recognize adaptation efforts of developing country parties; enhance the implementation of adaptation action taking into account the adaptation communication referred to in paragraph 10 of this Article; and review the adequacy and effectiveness of adaptation and support provided for adaptation; and
- review the overall progress made in achieving the global goal on adaptation referred to in paragraph 1 of this Article.

Article 8 (loss and damage): This article provides that:

- parties recognize the importance of averting, minimizing and addressing loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change, including extreme weather events and slow onset events, and the role of sustainable development in reducing the risk of loss and damage;
- the WIM shall be subject to the authority and guidance of the CMA and may be enhanced and strengthened, as determined by the CMA;
- parties should enhance understanding, action and support, including through the WIM, as appropriate, on a cooperative and facilitative basis with respect to loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change;
- accordingly, areas of cooperation and facilitation to enhance understanding, action and support may include: early warning systems; emergency preparedness; slow onset events; events that may involve irreversible and permanent loss and damage; comprehensive risk assessment and management; risk insurance facilities, climate risk pooling and other insurance solutions; non-economic losses; and resilience of communities, livelihoods and ecosystems; and
- the WIM shall collaborate with existing bodies and expert groups under the Agreement, as well as relevant organizations and expert bodies outside the Agreement.

Article 9 (finance): This article provides that:

- developed country parties shall provide financial resources to assist developing country parties with respect to both

mitigation and adaptation in continuation of their existing obligations under the Convention;

- other parties are encouraged to provide or continue to provide such support voluntarily;
- as part of a global effort, developed country parties should continue to take the lead in mobilizing climate finance from a wide variety of sources, instruments and channels, noting the significant role of public funds, through a variety of actions, including supporting country-driven strategies, and taking into account the needs and priorities of developing country parties. Such mobilization of climate finance should represent a progression beyond previous efforts;
- the provision of scaled-up financial resources should aim to achieve a balance between adaptation and mitigation, taking into account country-driven strategies, and the priorities and needs of developing country parties, especially those that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change and have significant capacity constraints, such as the LDCs and SIDS, considering the need for public and grant-based resources for adaptation;
- developed country parties shall biennially communicate indicative quantitative and qualitative information related to paragraphs 1 and 3 of this Article, as applicable, including, as available, projected levels of public financial resources to be provided to developing country parties. Other parties providing resources are encouraged to communicate biennially such information on a voluntary basis;
- the global stocktake referred to in Article 14 shall take into account the relevant information provided by developed country parties and/or Agreement bodies on efforts related to climate finance;
- developed country parties shall provide transparent and consistent information on support for developing country parties provided and mobilized through public interventions biennially in accordance with the modalities, procedures and guidelines to be adopted by CMA 1, as stipulated in Article 13, paragraph 13. Other parties are encouraged to do so;
- the Financial Mechanism of the Convention, including its operating entities, shall serve as the financial mechanism of this Agreement; and
- the institutions serving this Agreement, including the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism of the Convention, shall aim to ensure efficient access to financial resources through simplified approval procedures and enhanced readiness support for developing country parties, in particular for the LDCs and SIDS, in the context of their national climate strategies and plans.

Article 10 (technology development and transfer): This article provides that:

- parties share a long-term vision on the importance of fully realizing technology development and transfer in order to improve resilience to climate change and to reduce GHG emissions;
- parties, noting the importance of technology for the implementation of mitigation and adaptation actions under this Agreement and recognizing existing technology deployment and dissemination efforts, shall strengthen cooperative action on technology development and transfer;

- the Technology Mechanism established under the Convention shall serve this Agreement;
 - a technology framework is established to provide overarching guidance to the work of the Technology Mechanism in promoting and facilitating enhanced action on technology development and transfer in order to support the implementation of this Agreement, in pursuit of the long-term vision referred to in paragraph 1 of this Article;
 - accelerating, encouraging and enabling innovation is critical for an effective, long-term global response to climate change and promoting economic growth and sustainable development. Such effort shall be, as appropriate, supported, including by the Technology Mechanism and, through financial means, by the Financial Mechanism of the Convention, for collaborative approaches to research and development, and facilitating access to technology, in particular for early stages of the technology cycle, to developing country parties; and
 - support, including financial support, shall be provided to developing country parties for the implementation of this Article, including for strengthening cooperative action on technology development and transfer at different stages of the technology cycle, with a view to achieving a balance between support for mitigation and adaptation. The global stocktake referred to in Article 14 shall take into account available information on efforts related to support on technology development and transfer for developing country parties;
- Article 11 (capacity building):** This article provides that:
- capacity building under this Agreement should enhance the capacity and ability of developing country parties, in particular countries with the least capacity, such as the LDCs, and those that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change, such as SIDS, to take effective climate change action, including, *inter alia*, to implement adaptation and mitigation actions, and should facilitate technology development, dissemination and deployment, access to climate finance, relevant aspects of education, training and public awareness, and the transparent, timely and accurate communication of information;
 - capacity building should be country-driven, be responsive to national needs, and foster country ownership of parties, in particular, for developing country parties, including at the national, subnational and local levels. Capacity building should be guided by lessons learned, including those from capacity-building activities under the Convention, and should be an effective, iterative process that is participatory, cross-cutting and gender-responsive;
 - all parties should cooperate to enhance the capacity of developing country parties to implement this Agreement. Developed country parties should enhance support for capacity-building actions in developing country parties;
 - all parties enhancing the capacity of developing country parties to implement this Agreement, including through regional, bilateral and multilateral approaches, shall regularly communicate these actions or measures on capacity building. Developing country parties should regularly communicate progress made on implementing capacity-building plans, policies, actions or measures to implement this Agreement; and
- capacity-building activities shall be enhanced through appropriate institutional arrangements to support the implementation of this Agreement, including the appropriate institutional arrangements established under the Convention that serve this Agreement. CMA 1 shall consider and adopt a decision on the initial institutional arrangements for capacity building.
- Article 12 (education, training and public awareness):** Parties shall cooperate in taking measures, as appropriate, to enhance climate change education, training, public awareness, public participation and public access to information, recognizing the importance of these steps with respect to enhancing actions under this Agreement.
- Article 13 (transparency):** This article provides that:
- in order to build mutual trust and confidence and to promote effective implementation, an enhanced transparency framework for action and support, with built-in flexibility that takes into account parties' different capacities and builds upon collective experience is established;
 - the transparency framework shall provide flexibility in the implementation of the provisions of this Article to those developing country parties that need it in the light of their capacities. The modalities, procedures and guidelines referred to in paragraph 13 of this Article shall reflect such flexibility;
 - the transparency framework shall build on and enhance the transparency arrangements under the Convention, recognizing the special circumstances of the LDCs and SIDS, and be implemented in a facilitative, non-intrusive, non-punitive manner, respectful of national sovereignty, and avoid placing undue burden on parties;
 - the transparency arrangements under the Convention, including national communications (NCs), biennial reports and Biennial Update Reports (BURs), international assessment and review (IAR) and international consultation and analysis, shall form part of the experience drawn upon for the development of the modalities, procedures and guidelines under paragraph 13 of this Article;
 - the purpose of the framework for transparency of action is to provide a clear understanding of climate change action in the light of Article 2 of the Convention, including clarity and tracking of progress towards achieving parties' individual NDCs under Article 4, and parties' adaptation actions under Article 7, including good practices, priorities, needs and gaps, to inform the global stocktake under Article 14;
 - the purpose of the framework for transparency of support is to provide clarity on support provided and received by relevant individual parties in the context of climate change actions under Articles 4, 7, 9, 10 and 11, and, to the extent possible, to provide a full overview of aggregate financial support provided, to inform the global stocktake under Article 14;
 - each party shall regularly provide the following information: a national inventory report of anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks of GHGs, prepared using good practice methodologies accepted by the IPCC and agreed upon by the CMA; and information necessary to track progress made in implementing and achieving its NDC under Article 4;
 - each party should provide information related to climate change impacts and adaptation under Article 7, as appropriate;

- developed country parties shall, and other parties that provide support should, provide information on financial, technology transfer and capacity-building support provided to developing country parties under Article 9, 10 and 11;
 - developing country parties should provide information on financial, technology transfer and capacity-building support needed and received under Articles 9, 10 and 11;
 - information submitted by each party under paragraphs 7 and 9 of this Article shall undergo a technical expert review, in accordance with Decision 1/CP.21. For those developing country parties that need it in the light of their capacities, the review process shall include assistance in identifying capacity-building needs. In addition, each party shall participate in a facilitative, multilateral consideration of progress with respect to efforts under Article 9, and its respective implementation and achievement of its NDC;
 - the technical expert review shall consist of consideration of the party's support provided, as relevant, and its implementation and achievement of its NDC. The review shall also identify areas of improvement for the party, and include a review of the consistency of the information with the modalities, procedures and guidelines referred to in paragraph 13 of this Article, taking into account the flexibility accorded to the party under paragraph 2 of this Article. The review shall pay particular attention to the respective national capabilities and circumstances of developing country parties;
 - CMA 1 shall, building on experience from the arrangements related to transparency under the Convention, and elaborating on the provisions in this Article, adopt common modalities, procedures and guidelines, as appropriate, for the transparency of action and support;
 - support shall be provided to developing countries for the implementation of this Article; and
 - support shall also be provided for the building of transparency-related capacity of developing country parties on a continuous basis.
- Article 14 (global stocktake):** This article provides that:
- the CMA shall periodically take stock of the implementation of this Agreement to assess the collective progress towards achieving the purpose of this Agreement and its long-term goals (referred to as the “global stocktake”). It shall do so in a comprehensive and facilitative manner, considering mitigation, adaptation and the means of implementation and support, and in the light of equity and the best available science;
 - the CMA shall undertake its first global stocktake in 2023 and every five years thereafter unless otherwise decided by the CMA; and
 - the outcome of the global stocktake shall inform parties in updating and enhancing, in a nationally determined manner, their actions and support, in accordance with the relevant provisions of this Agreement, as well as in enhancing international cooperation for climate action.
- Article 15 (implementation and compliance):** This article provides that:
- a mechanism to facilitate implementation of and promote compliance with the provisions of this Agreement is established;
 - this mechanism shall consist of a committee that shall be expert-based and facilitative in nature and function in a manner that is transparent, non-adversarial and non-punitive. The committee shall pay particular attention to the respective national capabilities and circumstances of parties; and
 - the committee shall operate under the modalities and procedures adopted by CMA 1 and report annually to the CMA.
- The remaining articles of the Agreement include institutional provisions and final clauses: Article 16 (Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Agreement); Article 17 (Secretariat); Article 18 (SBSTA and SBI); Article 19 (Other SBs); Article 20 (Signature and Ratification); Article 21 (Entry Into Force); Article 22 (Amendment); Article 23 (Adoption and Amendment of Annexes); Article 24 (Settlement of Disputes); Article 25 (Voting); Article 26 (Depositary); Article 27 (Reservations); Article 28 (Withdrawal); and Article 29 (Official Languages). Article 21 on entry into force contains a double threshold, requiring ratification by at least 55 parties accounting for at least an estimated 55% of total global GHG emissions to enter into force.
- Associated Decision:** In the associated decision (FCCC/CP/2015/L.9/Rev.1), on adoption, the COP:
- decides to adopt the Paris Agreement under the UNFCCC;
 - requests the UN Secretary-General to be the Depositary of the Agreement and to have it open for signature in New York, US, from 22 April 2016 to 21 April 2017 and invites the Secretary-General to convene a high-level signature ceremony for the Agreement on 22 April 2016;
 - invites all parties to sign the Agreement and to deposit their respective instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, where appropriate, as soon as possible;
 - notes that the work of the ADP, in accordance with Decision 1/CP.17, paragraph 4, has been completed and decides to establish the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Paris Agreement (APA) under the same arrangement, *mutatis mutandis*, as those concerning the election of officers to the Bureau of the ADP;
 - decides that the APA shall prepare for the entry into force of the Agreement and for the convening of the first session of the CMA;
 - decides to oversee the implementation of the work programme resulting from the relevant requests contained in this decision;
 - requests the APA to report regularly to the COP on the progress of its work and to complete its work by CMA 1; and
 - decides that the APA shall hold its sessions starting in 2016 in conjunction with the sessions of the SBs and shall prepare draft decisions to be recommended through the CMA for consideration and adoption at CMA 1.
- On INDCs, the COP:
- welcomes the INDCs that have been communicated by parties;
 - reiterates its invitation to all parties to communicate to the Secretariat their INDCs towards achieving the objective of the Convention as set out in its Article 2 as soon as possible and well in advance of COP 22 and in a manner that facilitates the clarity, transparency and understanding of the INDCs;

- requests the Secretariat to continue to publish the INDCs communicated by parties on the UNFCCC website;
 - reiterates its call to developed country parties, the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism, and any other organizations in a position to do so to provide support for the preparation and communication of the INDCs of parties that may need such support;
 - takes note of the synthesis report on the aggregate effect of INDCs communicated by parties by 1 October 2015 (FCCC/CP/2015/7);
 - notes with concern that the estimated aggregate GHG emission levels in 2025 and 2030 resulting from the INDCs do not fall within least-cost 2°C scenarios but rather lead to a projected level of 55 gigatonnes in 2030, and also notes that much greater emission reduction efforts will be required than those associated with the INDCs in order to hold the increase in the global average temperature to below 2°C above pre-industrial levels by reducing emissions to 40 gigatonnes or to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels by reducing to a level to be identified in the requested IPCC special report on the impacts of global warming of 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels;
 - notes, in this context, the adaptation needs expressed by many developing country parties in their INDCs;
 - requests the Secretariat to update the synthesis report (FCCC/CP/2015/7) so as to cover all the information in the INDCs communicated by parties by 4 April 2016;
 - decides to convene facilitative dialogues among parties in 2018 to take stock of the collective efforts of parties in relation to progress towards the long-term goal referred to in Agreement Article 4.1, and to inform the preparation of NDCs pursuant to Agreement Article 4.8; and
 - invites the IPCC to provide a special report in 2018 on the impacts of global warming of 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels and related global GHG emission pathways.
- Under the sub-heading “Decisions to give effect to the Agreement,” the COP addresses a number of issues including mitigation, adaptation, loss and damage, finance, technology development and transfer, capacity building, transparency of action and support, global stocktake, facilitating implementation and compliance, and final clauses.
- On mitigation, the COP, *inter alia*:
- invites parties to communicate their first NDC no later than when the party submits its respective instrument of ratification, accession, or approval of the Paris Agreement. If a party has communicated an INDC prior to joining the Agreement, that party shall be considered to have satisfied this provision unless that party decides otherwise;
 - urges those parties whose INDCs pursuant to Decision 1/CP.20 contains a time frame up to 2025 to communicate by 2020 a new NDC and to do so every five years thereafter pursuant to Agreement Article 4.9;
 - requests those parties whose INDCs pursuant to Decision 1/CP.20 contains a time frame up to 2030 to communicate or update by 2020 these contributions and to do so every five years thereafter pursuant to Agreement Article 4.9;
 - decides that parties shall submit to the Secretariat their NDCs referred to in Agreement Article 4 at least 9-12 months in advance of the relevant meeting of the CMA with a view to facilitating the clarity, transparency and understanding of these contributions, including through a synthesis report prepared by the Secretariat;
 - requests the APA to develop further guidance on features of the NDCs for consideration and adoption by CMA 1;
 - agrees that the information to be provided by parties communicating their NDCs, in order to facilitate clarity, transparency and understanding, may include, as appropriate, *inter alia*, quantifiable information on the reference point (including, as appropriate, a base year), time frames and/or periods for implementation, scope and coverage, planning processes, assumptions and methodological approaches, including those for estimating and accounting for anthropogenic GHG emissions and, as appropriate, removals, and how the party considers that its NDC is fair and ambitious, in the light of its national circumstances, and how it contributes towards achieving the objective of the Convention as set out in its Article 2;
 - requests the APA to develop further guidance for the information to be provided by parties in order to facilitate clarity, transparency and understanding of NDCs for consideration and adoption by CMA 1;
 - requests the SBI to develop modalities and procedures for the operation and use of the public registry referred to in Agreement Article 4.12, for consideration and adoption by CMA 1;
 - further requests the Secretariat to make available an interim public registry in the first half of 2016 for the recording of NDCs submitted in accordance with Agreement Article 4, pending the adoption by the CMA of the modalities and procedures;
 - requests the APA to elaborate, drawing from approaches established under the Convention and its related legal instruments as appropriate, guidance for accounting for Parties’ NDCs, as referred to in Agreement Article 4.13, for consideration and adoption by CMA 1;
 - decides that parties shall apply the guidance mentioned above to the second and subsequent NDCs and that parties may elect to apply such guidance to their first NDC;
 - decides that the Forum on the Impact of the Implementation of response measures, under the SBs, shall continue, and shall serve the Agreement;
 - further decides that the SBSTA and the SBI shall recommend, for consideration and adoption by CMA 1, the modalities, work programme and functions of the Forum on the Impact of the Implementation of response measures to address the effects of the implementation of response measures under the Agreement by enhancing cooperation among parties on understanding the impacts of mitigation actions under the Agreement and the exchange of information, experiences, and best practices among parties to raise their resilience to these impacts;
 - invites parties to communicate, by 2020, to the Secretariat mid-century, long-term low GHG emission development strategies in accordance with Agreement Article 4.19 and requests the Secretariat to publish on the UNFCCC website parties’ low GHG emission development strategies as communicated;

- requests the SBSTA to develop and recommend the guidance referred to under Agreement Article 6.2 (cooperative approaches that involve the use of internationally traded mitigation outcomes towards INDCs) for adoption by CMA 1, including guidance to ensure that double counting is avoided on the basis of a corresponding adjustment by parties for both anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks covered by their NDCs under the Agreement;
 - requests the SBSTA to develop and recommend rules, modalities and procedures for the mechanism (on contributions to mitigation and support for sustainable development) for consideration and adoption by CMA 1;
 - requests the SBSTA to undertake a work programme under the framework for non-market approaches to sustainable development referred to in Agreement Article 6.8 with the objective of considering how to enhance linkages and create synergy between, *inter alia*, mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology transfer and capacity building, and how to facilitate the implementation and coordination of non-market approaches; and
 - requests the SBSTA to recommend a draft decision on the work programme, for consideration and adoption by CMA 1.
- On adaptation, the COP, *inter alia*:
- requests the Adaptation Committee and the LEG to jointly develop modalities to recognize the adaptation efforts of developing country parties, as referred to in Agreement Article 7.3, and make recommendations for consideration and adoption by CMA 1 to review in 2017 the work of adaptation related institutional arrangements under the Convention, and to consider methodologies for assessing adaptation needs;
 - requests the Adaptation Committee to review, in 2017, the work of adaptation-related institutional arrangements under the Convention, and consider methodologies for assessing adaptation needs of developing countries;
 - requests parties to strengthen regional cooperation on adaptation where appropriate, and where necessary, establish regional centers and networks, in particular in developing countries, taking into account Decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 13;
 - requests the Adaptation Committee and the LEG, in collaboration with the Standing Committee on Finance (SCF) and other relevant institutions, to develop methodologies, and make recommendations for consideration and adoption by CMA 1 on taking the necessary steps to facilitate the mobilization of support for adaptation in developing countries in the context of the limit to global average temperature increase referred to in Agreement Article 2, and reviewing the adequacy and effectiveness of adaptation and support referred to in Agreement Article 7.14(c); and
 - requests the GCF to expedite support for the LDCs and other developing country parties for the formulation of NAPs, consistent with Decisions 1/CP.16 and 5/CP.17, and for the subsequent implementation of policies, projects and programmes identified by them.
- On loss and damage, the COP, *inter alia*:
- decides on the continuation of the WIM, following the review in 2016;
 - requests the Executive Committee of the WIM to establish a clearinghouse for risk transfer that serves as a repository for information on insurance and risk transfer, in order to facilitate the efforts of parties to develop and implement comprehensive risk management strategies;
 - requests the Executive Committee of the WIM to establish, according to its procedures and mandate, a task force to complement, draw upon the work of, and involve, as appropriate, existing bodies and expert groups under the Convention including the Adaptation Committee and the LEG, as well as relevant organizations and expert bodies outside the Convention, to develop recommendations for integrated approaches to avert, minimize and address displacement related to the adverse impacts of climate change;
 - requests the Executive Committee of the WIM to initiate its work, at its next meeting, to operationalize the provisions above, and to report on progress thereon in its annual report; and
 - agrees that Agreement Article 8 does not involve or provide a basis for any liability or compensation.
- On finance, the COP, *inter alia*:
- decides that, in the implementation of the Agreement, financial resources provided to developing countries should enhance the implementation of their policies, strategies, regulations, action plans and their climate change actions with respect to both mitigation and adaptation to contribute to the achievement of the purpose of the Agreement (Article 2);
 - decides that, in accordance with Agreement Article 9.3 (developed country parties taking the lead in mobilizing finance), developed countries intend to continue their existing collective mobilization goal through 2025 in the context of meaningful mitigation actions and transparency on implementation; prior to 2025, the CMA shall set a new collective quantified goal from a floor of US\$100 billion per year, taking into account the needs and priorities of developing countries;
 - recognizes the importance of adequate and predictable financial resources, including for results-based payments, as appropriate, for the implementation of policy approaches and positive incentives for REDD+, as well as alternative policy approaches, such as joint mitigation and adaptation approaches for the integral and sustainable management of forests, while reaffirming the importance of non-carbon benefits associated with such approaches; encouraging the coordination of support from, *inter alia*, public and private, bilateral and multilateral sources, such as the GCF, and alternative sources in accordance with relevant decisions by the COP;
 - decides to initiate, at COP 22, a process to identify the information to be provided by parties, in accordance with Agreement Article 9.5 (*ex ante* communication of support), with the view to providing a recommendation for consideration and adoption by CMA 1;
 - decides to ensure that the provision of information in accordance with Agreement Article 9.7 (biennial communications on support) shall be undertaken in accordance with modalities, procedures and guidelines referred to below;
 - requests SBSTA to develop modalities for the accounting of financial resources provided and mobilized through public

interventions in accordance with Agreement Article 9.7 for consideration by COP 24, with the view to making a recommendation for consideration and adoption by CMA 1;

- decides that the GCF and the Global Environment Facility (GEF), the entities entrusted with the operation of the Financial Mechanism of the Convention, as well as the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) and the Special Climate Change Fund, administered by the GEF, shall serve the Agreement;
- recognizes that the Adaptation Fund may serve the Agreement, subject to relevant decisions by the CMP and the CMA, and invites the CMP to consider the issue and make a recommendation to CMA 1;
- recommends that the CMA provide guidance to the entities entrusted with the operation of the Financial Mechanism of the Convention on the policies, programme priorities and eligibility criteria related to the Agreement for transmission by the COP;
- decides that the guidance to the entities operating the Financial Mechanism of the Convention in relevant decisions of the COP, including those agreed before adoption of the Agreement, shall apply *mutatis mutandis*;
- decides that the SCF shall serve the Agreement in line with its functions and responsibilities established under the COP; and
- urges the institutions serving the Agreement to enhance the coordination and delivery of resources to support country-driven strategies through simplified and efficient application and approval procedures, and through continued readiness support to developing country parties, including the LDCs and SIDS, as appropriate;

On technology development and transfer, the COP, *inter alia*:

- takes note of the interim report of the TEC on guidance on enhanced implementation of the results of technology needs assessments (TNAs) (FCCC/SB/2015/INF.3);
- decides to strengthen the Technology Mechanism and requests the TEC and the CTCN, in supporting the implementation of the Agreement, to undertake further work relating to, *inter alia*, technology research, development and demonstration, and the development and enhancement of endogenous capacities and technologies;
- requests SBSTA 44 to initiate the elaboration of the technology framework established under Agreement Article 10.4 and to report on its findings to the COP, with a view to the COP making a recommendation on the framework to CMA 1 for consideration and adoption;
- decides that the TEC and the CTCN shall report to the CMA, through the SBs, on their activities to support the implementation of the Agreement;
- also decides to undertake a periodic assessment of the effectiveness of and the adequacy of the support provided to the Technology Mechanism in supporting the implementation of the Agreement on matters relating to technology development and transfer; and
- requests SBI 44 to initiate the elaboration of the scope of and modalities for the periodic assessment taking into account the review of the CTCN as referred to in Decision 2/CP.17, Annex VII, paragraph 20 and the modalities for the global stocktake

(Agreement Article 14) for consideration and adoption by the COP 25.

On capacity building, the COP, *inter alia*:

- decides to establish the Paris Committee on Capacity-building whose aim will be to address gaps and needs, both current and emerging, in implementing capacity building in developing country parties and further enhancing capacity-building efforts, including with regard to coherence and coordination in capacity-building activities under the Convention;
- also decides that the Paris Committee on Capacity-building will manage and oversee a work plan, and further decides to launch the work plan for the period 2016-2020;
- decides that the Paris Committee on Capacity-building will annually focus on an area or theme related to enhanced technical exchange on capacity building, with the purpose of maintaining up-to-date knowledge on the successes and challenges in building capacity effectively in a particular area;
- requests the SBI to organize annual in-session meetings of the Paris Committee on Capacity-building;
- also requests the SBI to develop the terms of reference for the Paris Committee on Capacity-building, in the context of the third comprehensive review of the implementation of the capacity-building framework, with a view to recommending a draft decision on this matter for consideration and adoption by COP 22;
- invites parties to submit their views on the membership of the Paris Committee on Capacity-building by 9 March 2016 and requests the Secretariat to compile the submissions into a miscellaneous document for consideration by the SBI 44;
- decides that the inputs to the Paris Committee on Capacity-building will include, *inter alia*, submissions, the outcome of the third comprehensive review of the implementation of the capacity-building framework, the Secretariat's annual synthesis report on the implementation of the framework for capacity-building in developing countries, the Secretariat's compilation and synthesis report on capacity-building work of bodies established under the Convention and its Kyoto Protocol, and reports on the Durban Forum and the capacity-building portal;
- requests the Paris Committee on Capacity-building to prepare annual technical progress reports on its work, and to make these reports available at the sessions of the SBI coinciding with the sessions of the COP;
- requests COP 25 to review the progress of the Paris Committee on Capacity-building, including need for extension, its effectiveness and enhancement, and to take any action it considers appropriate, with a view to making recommendations to CMA 1 on enhancing institutional arrangements for capacity building consistent with Agreement Article 11.5 (institutional arrangements);
- calls upon all parties to ensure that education, training and public awareness, as reflected in Convention Article 6 and in Agreement Article 12 are adequately considered in their contribution to capacity building; and
- invites CMA 1 to explore ways to enhance the implementation of, public awareness, public participation and public access to information so as to enhance actions under the Agreement.

On transparency of action and support, the COP, *inter alia*:

- decides to establish a Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency in order to build institutional and technical capacity, both pre- and post-2020. This initiative will support developing country parties, upon request, in meeting enhanced transparency requirements as defined in Agreement Article 13 (transparency) in a timely manner;
- decides that the Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency will aim to strengthen national institutions for transparency-related activities in line with national priorities, provide relevant tools, training and assistance for meeting the provisions stipulated in Agreement Article 13 (transparency), and assist in the improvement of transparency over time;
- urges and requests the GEF to make arrangements to support the establishment and operation of the Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency as a priority reporting-related need, including through voluntary contributions to support developing countries in the sixth replenishment of the GEF and future replenishment cycles, to complement existing support under the GEF;
- decides to assess the implementation of the Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency in the context of the seventh review of the financial mechanism;
- requests that the GEF include in its annual report to the COP the progress of work in the design, development and implementation of the Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency starting in 2016;
- decides that, in accordance with Agreement Article 13.2 (flexibility in implementation), developing countries shall be given flexibility in the implementation of the provisions of that article, including in the scope, frequency and level of detail of reporting, and in the scope of review, and that the scope of review could provide for in-country reviews to be optional, while such flexibilities shall be reflected in the development of modalities, procedures and guidelines referred to below;
- decides that all parties, except for LDCs and SIDS, shall submit the information referred to in Article 13.7-10, as appropriate, no less frequently than on a biennial basis, and that LDCs and SIDS may submit this information at their discretion;
- requests the APA to develop recommendations for modalities, procedures and guidelines in accordance with Article 13.13 (modalities and procedures), and to define the year of their first and subsequent review and update, as appropriate, at regular intervals, for consideration by COP 24, with a view to forwarding them to CMA 1 for adoption;
- requests the APA, when developing the modalities, procedures and guidelines, to draw on the experiences from and take into account other on-going relevant processes under the Convention;
- requests the APA, when developing recommendations for modalities, procedures and guidelines, to enhance the transparency of support provided in accordance with Agreement Article 9 (finance);
- requests the APA to report on the progress of work on the modalities, procedures and guidelines to future sessions of the COP, and that this work be concluded no later than 2018;

- decides that the modalities, procedures and guidelines developed shall be applied upon the entry into force of the Paris Agreement; and
- decides that the modalities, procedures and guidelines of this transparency framework shall build upon and eventually supersede the MRV system established by Decision 1/CP.16, paragraphs 40 to 47 and 60 to 64, and Decision 2/CP.17, paragraphs 12 to 62, immediately following the submission of the final biennial reports and BURs.

On the global stocktake, the COP, *inter alia*:

- requests the APA to identify the sources of input for the global stocktake referred to in Agreement Article 14 and to report to the COP, with a view to the COP making a recommendation to CMA 1 for consideration and adoption, including, but not limited to, information on the overall effect of the NDCs communicated by parties, and the state of adaptation efforts, support, experiences and priorities from the communications referred to in Agreement Article 7.10 and 7.11, and reports referred to in Agreement Article 13.7, and the mobilization and provision of support, the latest reports of the IPCC and reports of the SBs;
- requests the SBSTA to provide advice on how IPCC assessments can inform the global stocktake of the implementation of the Agreement pursuant to its Article 14 and to report on this matter to APA 2; and
- requests the APA to develop modalities for the global stocktake referred to in Agreement Article 14 and to report to the COP, with a view to making a recommendation to CMA 1 for consideration and adoption.

On facilitating implementation and compliance, the COP, *inter alia*:

- decides that the committee referred to in Agreement Article 15.2 (compliance mechanism) shall consist of 12 members with recognized competence in relevant scientific, technical, socio-economic or legal fields, to be elected by the CMA on the basis of equitable geographical representation, with two members each from the five regional groups of the UN and one member each from SIDS and LDCs, while taking into account the goal of gender balance; and
- requests the APA to develop the modalities and procedures for the effective operation of the committee referred to in Agreement Article 15.2 with a view to the APA completing its work on such modalities and procedures for consideration and adoption by CMA 1.

On final clauses, the COP also requests the Secretariat, solely for the purposes of Agreement Article 21 (entry into force), to make available on its website on the date of adoption of the Agreement as well as in the report of COP 21, information on the most up-to-date total and percent of GHG emissions communicated by parties to the Convention in their NCs, GHG inventory reports, biennial reports, or BURs.

Under the sub-heading enhanced action prior to 2020, the COP, *inter alia*:

- resolves to ensure the highest possible mitigation efforts in the pre-2020 period;
- encourages parties to promote the voluntary cancellation by party and non-party stakeholders, without double counting, of units issued under the Kyoto Protocol, including Certified

- Emission Reductions (CERs) that are valid for the second commitment period;
- urges host and purchasing parties to report transparently on internationally transferred mitigation outcomes, including outcomes used to meet international pledges, and emission units issued under the Kyoto Protocol with a view to promoting environmental integrity and avoiding double counting;
 - resolves to strengthen, in the period 2016-2020, the existing TEP on mitigation as defined in Decision 1/CP.19, paragraph 5(a), and Decision 1/CP.20, paragraph 19, taking into account the latest scientific knowledge;
 - encourages the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism of the Convention to engage in the Technical Expert Meetings and to inform participants of their contribution to facilitating progress in the implementation of policies, practices and actions identified during the TEP;
 - resolves to enhance the provision of urgent and adequate finance, technology and capacity-building support by developed country parties in order to enhance the level of ambition of pre-2020 action by parties, and, in this regard, strongly urges developed country parties to scale up their level of financial support, with a concrete roadmap to achieve the goal of jointly providing US\$100 billion annually by 2020 for mitigation and adaptation while significantly increasing adaptation finance from current levels and to further provide appropriate technology and capacity-building support;
 - decides to conduct a facilitative dialogue in conjunction with COP 22 to assess progress in implementing Decision 1/CP.19, paragraphs 3 and 4, and identify relevant opportunities to enhance the provision of financial resources, including for technology development and transfer and capacity-building support, with a view to identifying ways to enhance the ambition of mitigation efforts by all parties, including identifying relevant opportunities to enhance the provision and mobilization of support and enabling environments;
 - agrees to convene, pursuant to Decision 1/CP.20, paragraph 21, building on the Lima-Paris Action Agenda, and in conjunction with each session of the COP during the period 2016-2020, a high-level event that, *inter alia*, further strengthens high-level engagement on the implementation of policy options and actions;
 - decides that two high-level champions shall be appointed to act on behalf of the COP President, to facilitate through strengthened high-level engagement in the period 2016-2020, the successful execution of existing efforts and the scaling-up and introduction of new or strengthened voluntary efforts, initiatives and coalitions;
 - decides that the high-level champions should normally serve for a term of two years, with their terms overlapping for a full year to ensure continuity;
 - decides to launch, in the period 2016-2020, a TEP on adaptation;
 - decides that the TEP on adaptation will endeavor to identify concrete opportunities for strengthening resilience, reducing vulnerabilities and increasing the understanding and implementation of adaptation actions;

- decides that the TEP should be organized jointly by the SBI and the SBSTA, and conducted by the Adaptation Committee;
- decides that the TEP on adaptation will take into account the process, modalities, outputs, outcomes and lessons learned from the TEP on mitigation;
- decides that, in conducting the process, the Adaptation Committee will engage with and explore ways to take into account, synergize with and build on the existing arrangements for adaptation-related work programmes, bodies and institutions under the Convention so as to ensure coherence and maximum value; and
- decides to conduct an assessment of the process so as to improve its effectiveness.

On non-party stakeholders, the COP, *inter alia*, invites non-party stakeholders to scale up their efforts and support actions to reduce emissions and/or to build resilience and decrease vulnerability to the adverse effects of climate change and demonstrate these efforts via the Non-State Actor Zone for Climate Action platform.

On administrative and budgetary matters, the COP, *inter alia*, emphasizes the urgency of making additional resources available for the implementation of the relevant actions, including actions referred to in this decision, and the implementation of the work programme, and urges parties to make voluntary contributions for the timely implementation of this decision.

CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES

On Tuesday, 1 December, COP 21 President Laurent Fabius opened the COP plenary. For a summary of statements made during the joint COP/CMP opening statements, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12654e.html>

ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS: On Tuesday, 1 December, parties agreed to apply the draft rules of procedure (FCCC/CP/1996/2), with the exception of draft rule 42 on voting.

The COP adopted the agenda (FCCC/CP/2015/1 and Add.1) as proposed, with the agenda item on the second review of the adequacy of Convention Articles 4.2(a) and (b) (developed countries' mitigation) held in abeyance. The COP also agreed to the organization of work (FCCC/CP/2015/1, FCCC/SBSTA/2015/3, FCCC/SBI/2015/11 and FCCC/ADP/2013/1).

The COP referred to the SBI the items and sub-items on: reporting from and review of Annex I parties; reporting from non-Annex I parties; capacity building under the Convention; gender and climate change; matters relating to LDCs; the audit report and financial statements for 2014; and budget performance for the biennium 2014-2015.

The COP further referred to the SBI and SBSTA the items and sub-items on: the report of the Adaptation Committee; the WIM; the Joint Annual Report of the TEC and the CTCN; and the implementation of the Buenos Aires Programme of Work on Adaptation and Response Measures (Decision 1/CP.10).

Parties agreed to the accreditation of observer organizations (FCCC/CP/2015/5).

Election of Officers Other Than the President: On Tuesday, 1 December, COP 21 President Fabius said that consultations on the election of officers would be conducted. On Thursday, 10 December, the COP elected members of

the COP Bureau: SBSTA Chair Carlos Fuller (Belize); SBI Chair Tomasz Chruszczow (Poland); COP Rapporteur Georg Børsting (Norway); Ismail El Gizouli (Sudan); Hakima El Haite (Morocco); Khalid Abuleif (Saudi Arabia); Ravi Shanker Prasad (India); Oleg Shamanov (Russian Federation); Walter Schuldt-Espinell (Ecuador); and Colin Beck (Solomon Islands).

The COP also elected the SBSTA Bureau, with Tibor Schaffhauser (Hungary) as Vice-Chair and Aderito M. F. Santana (São Tomé and Príncipe) as Rapporteur, and the SBI Bureau, with Zhihua Chen (China) as Vice-Chair and Sidat Yaffa (The Gambia) as Rapporteur.

The COP also elected the members of the Adaptation Committee, the Advisory Board of the CTCN, and the TEC, and took note of the nominations for the Consultative Group of Experts on National Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention (CGE) and the LEG.

Dates and Venues of Future Sessions: On Thursday, 10 December, the COP adopted a decision on the dates and venues of future sessions. Morocco, in the capacity of the host of COP 22/CMP 12, thanked parties, in particular the African Group, for their trust, informing that the conference would take place in Marrakesh, from 7-18 November 2016.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/CP/2015/L.4), the COP, *inter alia*, decides to accept with appreciation the offer by Morocco to host COP 22 and CMP 12, and requests the Executive Secretary to continue consultations with Morocco and to negotiate and finalize a Host Country Agreement. On COP 23/CMP 13, the COP notes that in keeping with the principle of rotation among regional groups, the President of COP 23/CMP 13 would come from the Asia-Pacific States, and invites parties to undertake further consultations on the hosting of those sessions.

Adoption of the Report on Credentials: On Thursday, 10 December, the COP adopted the report on credentials (FCCC/CP/2015/9, FCCC/KP/CMP/2015/7), in addition to the credentials for ten countries as reported orally by the Bureau.

REPORTS OF THE SUBSIDIARY BODIES: On Thursday, 10 December, the COP adopted the reports of SBI 42 and SBI 43 (FCCC/SBI/2015/10 and Add.1, and FCCC/SBI/2015/L.19), and the reports of SBSTA 42 and SBSTA 43 (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/2 and Add.1-2, and FCCC/SBSTA/2015/L.15).

DURBAN PLATFORM FOR ENHANCED ACTION (DECISION 1/CP.17): Report of the ADP: This item (FCCC/CP/2014/10/Add.1, FCCC/ADP/2014/4, FCCC/ADP/2015/2-5, FCCC/CP/2015/4, FCCC/TP/2015/4 and Add.1-2, and ADP.2015.6.NonPaper) is summarized under the Paris Agreement (see page 4).

Adoption of a Protocol, Another Legal Instrument, or an Agreed Outcome with Legal Force under the Convention Applicable to All Parties: This item is summarized under the Paris Agreement (see page 4).

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSALS BY PARTIES UNDER CONVENTION ARTICLE 17: This item was first taken up on Wednesday, 2 December. Parties agreed that, in line with previous practice, the item would be kept open and COP 21 Vice-President Cheikh Ndiaye Sylla (Senegal) would report to the closing plenary on proposals by Japan (FCCC/CP/2009/3),

Tuvalu (FCCC/CP/2009/4), Australia (FCCC/CP/2009/5), Costa Rica (FCCC/CP/2009/6), the US (FCCC/CP/2009/7) and Grenada (FCCC/CP/2010/3).

On Sunday, 13 December, COP 21 President Fabius said that in light of the adoption of the Paris Agreement, the COP could conclude its consideration of these proposals. The COP closed the item with no conclusions.

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSALS BY PARTIES FOR AMENDMENTS TO THE CONVENTION UNDER ARTICLE 15: Proposal from the Russian Federation:

On Tuesday, 1 December, on amendments by parties under Article 15, COP Vice-President Sylla noted that the Russian proposal (FCCC/CP/2011/5) had been considered in informal consultations. Due to divergent views, the COP decided to include this item as a sub-item in the provisional agenda of COP 22.

Proposal from Papua New Guinea and Mexico: On Tuesday, 1 December, on the joint proposal by Papua New Guinea and Mexico on Convention Articles 17 and 18 (FCCC/CP/2011/4/Rev.1), Vice-President Sylla noted that informal consultations had not been able to resolve divergent views, and the item was forwarded to COP 22.

REPORT OF THE ADAPTATION COMMITTEE: Discussions on this item are summarized under the SBI agenda item on the Adaptation Committee (see page 33).

WARSAW INTERNATIONAL MECHANISM: This item was referred to the SBSTA and SBI for consideration. Discussions on this item are summarized under the SBI agenda item on the WIM (see page 33).

DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGIES AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE TECHNOLOGY MECHANISM: Joint Annual Report of the TEC and the CTCN: On Thursday, 10 December, the COP took note of the report of the Technology Mechanism (FCCC/SB/2015/L.4).

Linkages between the Technology Mechanism and the Financial Mechanism of the Convention: On Wednesday, 2 December, parties agreed to hold informal consultations facilitated by Carlos Fuller (Belize) and Elfriede More (Austria) on this item (FCCC/CP/2014/6, FCCC/SB/2015/1, FCCC/CP/2015/3 and Add.1). On Sunday, 13 December, the COP adopted a decision.

Final Outcome: In its decision, the COP (FCCC/CP/2015/L.11), *inter alia*:

- requests the TEC, the CTCN and the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism to continue to consult on and further elaborate, including through an in-session workshop at SB 44, the linkages between the Technology Mechanism and the Financial Mechanism;
- requests the TEC to include, in its annual report, the findings arising from the consultation and the in-session workshop for consideration by COP 22; and
- invites the Board of the GCF, in line with its governing instrument, to consider ways to provide support for facilitating access to environmentally sound technologies in developing countries, and for undertaking collaborative research and development for enabling developing countries to enhance their mitigation and adaptation action.

THE 2013-2015 REVIEW: Discussions on this item are summarized under the SBI (see page 35).

MATTERS RELATING TO FINANCE: Long-Term Climate Finance: On Wednesday, 2 December, parties decided to jointly consider this item (FCCC/CP/2015/2 and INF.1) with the sub-item on the report of the SCF (FCCC/CP/2015/8). Parties agreed to consider the items in a contact group co-chaired by Andrés Mogro (Ecuador) and Mark Storey (Sweden).

Noting ongoing negotiations under the ADP, parties had divergent views on where to discuss pre-2020 finance. Bolivia, for the G-77/China, requested a workshop on finance needs of developing countries. Malawi, for the LDCs, called for improving access to finance. After informal consultations, the COP adopted a decision on Thursday, 10 December.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/CP/2015/L.2) the COP, *inter alia*:

- urges parties to channel significant portions of public funds towards adaptation and calls for a greater balance between mitigation and adaptation;
- decides that the second high-level ministerial dialogue on climate finance will focus on adaptation finance, cooperation on enhanced enabling environments, and support for readiness activities; and
- requests the COP Presidency to prepare a summary of the second biennial high-level dialogue for consideration at COP 23.

Report of the SCF: Parties considered this item (FCCC/CP/2015/8) together with long-term finance. On the report of the SCF, the EU, with South Africa for the African Group, proposed working on the basis of the draft decisions contained the SCF report. Co-Chairs Andrés Mogro (Ecuador) and Mark Storey (Sweden) invited proposals. After informal consultations, the COP adopted the decision on Thursday, 10 December.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/CP/2015/L.5), the COP, *inter alia*:

- endorses the work plan of the SCF for 2016-2017;
- requests the SCF, on MRV of support beyond the biennial assessment and overview of climate finance flows, to continue to engage with relevant bodies under the Convention, multilateral and bilateral agencies, and international institutions;
- requests the SCF to report to COP 22 on progress in implementing its work plan; and
- decides to initiate the review of the functions of the SCF at COP 22, requests SBI 44 to prepare the review's terms of reference, and requests the members of the SCF, and invites parties and observer organizations, to submit their views.

Report of the GCF to the COP and Guidance to the GCF: On Wednesday, 2 December, the COP agreed to establish a contact group to jointly consider this sub-item with the sub-item on report of the GEF to the COP and guidance to the GEF, co-chaired by Stefan Schwager (Switzerland) and Nauman Bashir Bhatti (Pakistan).

In the contact group on Thursday, 3 December, Co-Chair Bashir Bhatti introduced the item (FCCC/CP/2015/3, Add.1 and Add.1/Corr.1, FCCC/CP/2015/8, INF.2 and MISC.1). Parties considered draft decision text proposed by the Co-Chairs in informal meetings throughout the week and in the contact group

on Wednesday, 9 December. Views differed on requesting the GCF Board to agree on replenishment arrangements and on a reference that GCF projects will contribute to “low-emission and climate-resilient” or “sustainable” development. On Thursday, 10 December, in plenary, COP 21 Vice-President Sylla noted this sub-item was still under consideration. On Sunday, 13 December, the COP adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/CP/2015/L.7/Rev.1), the COP, *inter alia*:

- notes with appreciation that the GCF Board reached its aim of taking its first funding decisions by its third meeting of 2015, committing US\$168 million to eight public and private projects that will promote, in the context of sustainable development, the paradigm shift towards low-emission and climate-resilient development pathways, thereby making the GCF fully operational;
- urges parties that made pledges under the initial resource mobilization process of the GCF but have not yet confirmed through fully executed contribution arrangements or agreements to do so as a matter of high priority;
- reiterates the invitation for financial inputs from a variety of sources, public and private, including alternative sources, throughout the initial resource mobilization process;
- requests the Board of the GCF to agree on the arrangements for the first formal replenishment process of the GCF as soon as feasible;
- welcomes the decision of the GCF Board to develop a strategic plan for the GCF and to adopt it as soon as possible;
- welcomes the decision of the GCF Board to simplify the funding proposal template and concept note template in an expeditious manner;
- requests the GCF Board to ensure that the revised funding proposal template and concept note template are designed to facilitate the application process;
- requests the GCF Board to adopt a simplified process for approval of proposals for certain activities, in particular for small-scale activities, as soon as possible in 2016, to reduce complexities and costs involved in project proposal development;
- welcomes the decisions of the GCF Board to approve the accreditation of 20 national, regional, international and private entities to the GCF (noting in a footnote this number derives from five national, three regional, three private and nine international entities);
- urges the GCF Board to streamline the accreditation modalities and to seek a balance of diversity in accredited entities;
- takes note of the progress achieved to date in the implementation of the readiness and preparatory support programme of the GCF and stresses the importance of improving the approval process and timely disbursement of resources to facilitate readiness programme implementation;
- requests the GCF Board to prioritize the development of its initial risk management framework and to enhance transparency and stakeholder engagement;
- urges the GCF Board to operationalize the Independent Evaluation Unit, Independent Redress Mechanism and Independent Integrity Unit as a matter of urgency and to make

public the procedures parties and affected individuals should follow when seeking redress until the Independent Redress Mechanism is operationalized;

- invites the GCF Board to take into account in its programmatic priorities the Cancun Adaptation Framework, in particular the principles referred to in paragraph 12 (taking a country-driven, gender-sensitive, participatory and fully transparent approach, taking into consideration vulnerable groups, communities and ecosystems, and being based on and guided by the best available science and, as appropriate, traditional and indigenous knowledge, with a view to integrating adaptation into relevant social, economic and environmental policies and actions, where appropriate) and the activities referred to in decision 1/CP.16 (the Cancun Agreements) paragraph 14 (planning, prioritizing and implementing adaptation actions, impact, vulnerability and adaptation assessments, strengthening institutional capacities and enabling environments for adaptation, building resilience of socio-economic and ecological system, enhancing climate change related disaster risk reduction strategies and improving climate-related research among others); and
- invites the GCF Board to consider ways to provide support, pursuant to the modalities of the GCF, for facilitating access to environmentally sound technologies in developing countries, and for undertaking collaborative research and development for enabling developing countries to enhance their mitigation and adaptation action.

Report of the GEF to the COP and Guidance to the GEF:

This item (FCCC/CP/2015/4 and Add.1, FCCC/CP/2015/8 and INF.2) was first considered on Wednesday, 2 December. Parties agreed to establish a contact group to jointly consider this sub-item with the sub-item on report from the GCF and guidance to the GCF, co-chaired by Stefan Schwager (Switzerland) and Nauman Bashir Bhatti (Pakistan).

Parties considered draft decision text proposed by the Co-Chairs in informal meetings throughout the week and in the contact group on Thursday, 3 December, and Wednesday, 9 December. Parties debated a proposal by Argentina, Uruguay and Colombia to delete reference to tackling “the drivers” of deforestation and forest degradation.

On support for the NAP process through contributions to the LDCF and the Special Climate Change Fund, China, supported by India and Malaysia, proposed deleting language inviting “parties that may make voluntary financial contributions” to provide such support. China explained its preference for South-South cooperation. The EU, with Japan and the US, suggested deletion of the entire paragraph if it lacks agreement. Stressing the importance of the paragraph, Zambia, for the LDCs, called for retaining the paragraph.

On Thursday, 10 December, the COP adopted the decision. Antigua and Barbuda lamented the process of discussions on COP items on finance matters. She said that because focus was given to streamlining rather than to negotiations due to limited time, many issues important to SIDS were left out. She asked this to be reflected in the report of the COP.

Echoing the same concerns, Bolivia, for the G-77/China, said the group reserves its right to bring up these issues at the next SBI meeting. The EU noted that parties agreed, in light of the

exceptional circumstances of COP 21, to focus on streamlining the decision. She expressed support for the approach taken and looked forward to discussing the items again at COP 22. COP 21 Vice-President Sylla said the comments will be reflected in the report of the COP.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/CP/2015/L.8), the COP, *inter alia*:

- welcomes the investments by the GEF in sustainable forest management and activities referred to in Decision 1/CP.16 (the Cancun Agreements) paragraph 70 (policy approaches and positive incentives on issues relating to REDD+), harnessing multiple benefits from forests and tackling deforestation and forest degradation in line with the programming directions of the sixth replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund;
- invites the GEF to continue to provide finance to the activities referred to above, also taking into account Decision 9/CP.19, (Warsaw Framework for REDD+ work programme on results-based finance) paragraph 8 (alternative policy approaches, such as joint mitigation and adaptation approaches for the integral and sustainable management of forests) and this decision, as appropriate;
- encourages additional voluntary financial contributions to provide support for the NAP process through contributions to the LDCF and the Special Climate Change Fund;
- requests the GEF to carry out a technical review of the programme priorities of the LDCF,
- urges the GEF to work with all its agencies and recipient countries to ensure that these countries can take full advantage of the expanded network of agencies;
- welcomes the exploration of innovative non-grant instruments by the GEF and encourages the GEF to work with its agencies, recipient countries and the private sector to submit proposals; and
- welcomes the approval of projects by the GEF to support 46 developing country parties in preparing their INDCs and encourages the GEF to continue providing such support.

REPORTING FROM AND REVIEW OF ANNEX I

PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION: These discussions are summarized under the SBI (see page 31).

REPORTING FROM NON-ANNEX I PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION: These discussions are summarized under the SBI (see page 31).

CAPACITY BUILDING UNDER THE CONVENTION: These discussions are summarized under the SBI (see page 33).

IMPLEMENTATION OF CONVENTION ARTICLE 4.8

AND 4.9: Implementation of the Buenos Aires Programme of Work on Adaptation and Response Measures (Decision

1/CP.10): These discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item on the impact of the implementation of response measures (see page 34) and the SBSTA item on the Nairobi work programme on impacts, vulnerability and adaptation to climate change (NWP) (see page 37).

Matters Related to LDCs: These discussions are summarized under the SBI (see page 32).

GENDER AND CLIMATE CHANGE: These are summarized under the SBI (see page 36).

OTHER MATTERS REFERRED TO THE COP BY THE SUBSIDIARY BODIES: Issues Relating to REDD+:

On Thursday, 10 December, the COP considered three draft decisions forwarded from SBSTA 42, on: further guidance on transparency, consistency, comprehensiveness and effectiveness when informing on how all the safeguards referred to in Decision 1/CP.16 (the Cancun Agreements), Appendix I, are being addressed and respected; alternative policy approaches, such as joint mitigation and adaptation approaches for the integral and sustainable management of forests; and methodological issues related to non-carbon benefits resulting from the implementation of the activities referred to in Decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 70. The COP adopted the decisions.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/2/Add.1) on further guidance on ensuring transparency, consistency, comprehensiveness and effectiveness when informing on how all the safeguards referred to in Decision 1/CP.16, Appendix I, are being addressed, the COP, *inter alia*:

- reiterates that developing country parties undertaking the activities referred to in Decision 1/CP.16 paragraph 70 (mitigation actions in the forest sector) should provide a summary of information on how all of the safeguards referred to in Decision 1/CP.16 Appendix I are being addressed;
- requests that the summary information on safeguards be provided on a periodic basis in accordance with Decisions 12/CP.17 and 12/CP.19;
- decides that developing country parties should provide information on which activity or activities (Decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 70) are included in the summary of information referred to above;
- encourages developing country parties, when providing the summary information, to include the following elements, where appropriate: national circumstances relevant to addressing and respecting safeguards; a description of each safeguard in accordance with national circumstances; a description of existing systems and processes relevant to addressing and respecting safeguards; and
- decides that there is no need for further guidance pursuant to Decision 12/CP.17, paragraph 6 (guidance on systems for providing information on how safeguards are addressed and respected), to ensure transparency, consistency, comprehensiveness and effectiveness when informing on how all the safeguards are being addressed and respected.

In its decision (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/2/Add.1) on alternative policy approaches, such as joint mitigation and adaptation approaches for the integral and sustainable management of forests, the COP, *inter alia*:

- decides that developing country parties seeking to receive support for the design and implementation of alternative policy approaches, such as joint mitigation and adaptation approaches for the integral and sustainable management of forests, may consider the following elements: development of national strategies or action plans for the implementation of the activities referred to in Decision 1/CP.16 paragraph 70; identification of support needs, including financial resources and technical and technological support; development of proposals demonstrating how alternative policy approaches, such as joint mitigation and adaptation approaches for

the integral and sustainable management of forests, are contributing to the activities referred to in Decision 1/CP.16 paragraph 70;

- notes that the financing entities referred to in Decision 9/CP.19, paragraph 5 (entities financing REDD-plus activities, including the GCF), are encouraged to continue to provide financial resources, including through the wide variety of sources referred to in Decision 2/CP.17, paragraph 65 (results-based finance), for alternative policy approaches;
- invites parties that want to implement alternative policy approaches, such as joint mitigation and adaptation approaches, to support the implementation of the activities referred to in Decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 70, to share information via the web platform on the UNFCCC website; and
- decides to conclude its consideration of alternative policy approaches, such as joint mitigation and adaptation approaches for integral and sustainable management of forests, in the context of Decision 1/CP.18, paragraph 39.

In its decision (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/2/Add.1) on methodological issues related to non-carbon benefits resulting from the implementation of the activities referred to in Decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 70, the COP, *inter alia*:

- invites developing country parties seeking support for the integration of non-carbon benefits into activities to provide information addressing, *inter alia*, the nature, scale, and importance of the non-carbon benefits via the web platform on the UNFCCC website for consideration by interested parties and relevant financing entities, as appropriate;
- decides that methodological issues related to non-carbon benefits resulting from the implementation of the activities in Decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 70, do not constitute a requirement for developing country parties seeking to receive support for the implementation of the actions and activities referred to in Decision 1/CP.16 or results-based payments; and
- agrees to conclude, at this session, the work on methodological issues related to non-carbon benefits from the implementation of the activities referred to Decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 70.

Methodologies for the Reporting of Financial Information by Annex I Parties: These discussions are summarized under the SBSTA (see page 38).

Annual Report on the Technical Review of GHG

Inventories from Annex I Parties: These discussions are summarized under the SBSTA (see page 42).

Terms of Reference for the Immediate Review of the Doha Work Programme on Convention Article 6: On Thursday, 10 December, the COP considered a draft decision forwarded from SBI 42 on this item. The COP adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/SBI/2015/10/Add.1), the COP, *inter alia*:

- requests the SBI to launch the intermediate review of the implementation of the Doha work programme on Article 6 of the Convention at SBI 44;
- requests the GEF to report on the progress made in providing financial support and implementing activities to contribute to the implementation of the Doha work programme;

- invites multilateral and bilateral institutions and organizations, the private sector and donors to report on financial resources provided to support the activities relating to the implementation of Convention Article 6; and
- requests the Secretariat to prepare a report on the progress made, as well as emerging gaps, needs, among others.

NAPs: These discussions are summarized under the SBI (see page 32).

ADMINISTRATIVE, FINANCIAL AND INSTITUTIONAL MATTERS: Audit Report and Financial Statements for 2014: These discussions are summarized under the SBI (see page 36).

Budget Performance for the Biennium 2014-2015: These discussions are summarized under the SBI (see page 36).

Programme Budget for the Biennium 2016-2017: On Thursday, 10 December, the COP adopted a decision forwarded by SBI 42 on the programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/SBI/2015/10/Add.1), the COP, *inter alia*:

- approves the programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017, amounting to €54,648,484, the Secretariat-wide staffing from the core budget, and a contingency budget for conference services;
- adopts the indicative scale of contributions for 2016 and 2017;
- urges parties to make voluntary contributions for the timely implementation of the decisions taken by COP 21 for which provisions are not made under the approved budget, using voluntary contributions and, to the extent possible, resources available under the core budget;
- invites parties to make contributions to the Trust Fund for Participation in the UNFCCC Process; and
- requests the Executive Secretary to report to COP 22 on income and budget performance, and to propose any adjustments that might be needed in the programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017.

Decision-Making in the UNFCCC Process: On Thursday, 10 December, the COP decided to continue to hold discussions on this item at SBI 44 and report to COP 22.

CONCLUSION OF THE SESSION: Adoption of the Report of COP 21: Following presentation of the report of the session (FCCC/CP/2015/L.1) by the Secretariat on behalf of Rapporteur Johanna Lissinger Peitz (Sweden), the COP adopted the report of the session.

Closure of the Session: The Secretariat reported on extra budgetary funds required, including €150,000 for matters related to economic diversification initiatives and €1.95 million for support to the Adaptation Committee. He explained that it was not possible to undertake an assessment of the implications of the Paris Agreement yet, but that a note on these financial implications would be posted to the UNFCCC website in the coming days.

COP 21 President Fabius invited, and parties agreed, to take note of the resolution presented by Morocco thanking France, as the host government, and the city of Paris (FCCC/CP/2015/L.3).

COP 21 President Fabius closed COP 21 at 12:28 am on Sunday, 13 December.

CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES SERVING AS THE MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE KYOTO PROTOCOL

On Tuesday, 1 December, CMP 11 President Laurent Fabius opened plenary. For a summary of the joint COP/CMP opening statements, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12654e.html>

ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS: On Tuesday, 1 December, parties adopted the agenda (FCCC/KP/CMP/2015/1) and agreed to the organization of work (FCCC/KP/CMP/2015/1, FCCC/SBSTA/2015/3 and FCCC/SBI/2015/11).

The CMP referred to the SBSTA the item on clarification of the text in section G (Article 3, paragraph 7*ter*) of the Doha Amendment to the Kyoto Protocol, and the sub-item on Protocol Article 2.3 (adverse effects of policies and measures).

The CMP referred to the SBI the items on: capacity building under the Kyoto Protocol; administrative, financial and institutional matters; reporting from and review of Annex I parties; as well as the sub-item on Protocol Article 3.14 (minimizing adverse effects).

Election of Replacement Officers: On Thursday, 10 December, the CMP elected the members and alternative members to the Adaptation Fund Board, JI Supervisory Committee (JISC), CDM Executive Board (EB), and Compliance Committee. CMP Vice-President Cheikh Ndiaye Sylla (Senegal) noted the COP Bureau members would also serve as CMP Bureau members. He also noted that the list of nominations is available on the UNFCCC website and urged parties to submit nominations for the remaining vacant positions by 29 January 2016.

Approval of the Report on Credentials: On Thursday, 10 December, the CMP adopted the report on credentials (FCCC/CP/2015/9 and FCCC/KP/CMP/2015/7), with the addition of the Cook Islands, Egypt, Fiji, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Haiti, Honduras, Kiribati, Nicaragua, Pakistan and Panama.

Status of Ratification of the Doha Amendment to the Kyoto Protocol: On Wednesday, 2 December, the Secretariat reported that, as of 30 November, 55 instruments of acceptance of the 144 required had been received. The CMP took note of the information.

On Thursday, 10 December, CMP 11 Vice-President Sylla informed parties that, since the Secretariat's statement on 2 December 2015, two additional instruments of ratification, from Argentina and Sri Lanka, had been received, bringing the total to 57. He reported 87 more are required to bring the amendment into force. The CMP took note of the information, urging all parties to ratify as soon as possible.

REPORTS OF THE SUBSIDIARY BODIES: On Thursday, 10 December, the CMP adopted the reports of SBI 42 and SBI 43 (FCCC/SBI/2015/10 and Add.1, and FCCC/SBI/2015/L.19), and the reports of SBSTA 42 and SBSTA 43 (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/2 and Adds.1 and 2, and FCCC/SBSTA/2015/L.15).

ISSUES RELATING TO THE CDM: On this item (FCCC/KP/CMP/2015/5), on Thursday, 3 December, CDM EB Chair Lambert Schneider (Germany) noted that revisions to project standards, and validation and verification standards had been adopted with a view to streamlining the work of the CDM. He noted with concern the low demand and prices for CERs, and outlined ways in which the Board continues to encourage

voluntary cancellation of CERs. Parties agreed to consider this item in a contact group, co-chaired by Karoliina Anttonen (Finland) and Jeffrey Spooner (Jamaica).

On Thursday, 10 December, the contact group focused on draft text produced during informal consultations on Tuesday evening, 8 December. After discussions on, among others, linkages between the CDM and the GCF, and the need for a workshop on international climate change financing institutions and the CDM, parties agreed to forward the draft decision to the CMP.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/KP/CMP/2015/L.4), the CMP, *inter alia*:

- welcomes the 2014-2015 report of the CDM EB and welcomes the launch of the online platform for voluntary cancellation of CERs;
- requests the CDM EB and the Secretariat to facilitate access to the sustainable development section of project and programme design documents on the online platform for voluntary cancellation of certified emission reductions;
- encourages the CDM EB to continue to simplify and streamline, among others, the project cycle, the registration and verification process, the development and approval of standardized baselines, the methodological standards and procedures, and the accreditation procedure;
- encourages the CDM EB to explore financing opportunities for the CDM through international institutions such as the GCF and, in this regard, invites the CDM EB to consider holding an in-session workshop at SB 44, and asks the CDM EB to report back to CMP 12;
- designates as operating entities those entities that have been accredited, and provisionally designated, as operational entities by the CDM EB to conduct sector-specific validation functions and/or sector-specific verification functions as contained in the annex;
- requests the CDM EB to analyze the means to ensure sustained participation of designated operational entities in the CDM;
- decides to allow requests to revise baseline and monitoring methodology without project specific information in cases where the CDM EB considers such information not necessary;
- requests the CDM EB to develop more cost-effective and context-appropriate approaches for MRV by addressing procedures to manage data gaps, regionally appropriate calibration requirements, and the use of sectoral and nationally collected data, where appropriate;
- requests the CDM EB to develop a stand-alone programme of activity guidance, consisting, among others, of a “CDM Programme of Activities standard,” a “CDM Programme of Activities validation and verification standard,” and a “CDM Programme of Activities cycle procedure”;
- requests the CDM EB to consider formulating a standardized registration template using objective criteria for activities that qualify as automatically additional;
- requests the designated operational entity to confirm that the request for issuance of emission reductions is submitted only to the CDM EB; and
- requests the CDM EB to expand the scope and scale of regional collaboration centers’ assistance activities in

developing countries by exploring the emerging technical and methodological areas.

ISSUES RELATING TO JI: On Thursday, 3 December, JISC Chair Julia Soto (Peru) reported that activity under JI has “virtually stopped,” saying that there are no new requests for projects or for instances of emissions reduction units. Parties agreed to establish a contact group, co-chaired by Dimitar Nikov (France) and Yaw Osafo (Ghana), on this item (FCCC/KP/CMP/2015/4).

In the contact group, parties exchanged views on: the necessity of changes to rules of procedure of the JISC; providing a mandate for third-party review; revitalizing JI; exploring synergies with other market mechanisms; and requesting an analysis on the role of JI beyond 2020. Parties agreed that the Co-Chairs would prepare a draft decision for consideration.

On Monday, 7 December, Co-Chair Osafo presented the draft decision. After exchanging views on, among others, the difficult market situation of JI, revision of JI guidelines, and incorporation of views of stakeholders, parties decided to forward the draft decision to the CMP with amendments.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/KP/CMP/2015/L.1), the CMP:

- requests the JISC to submit recommendations for consideration by SBI 44 on actions that would be necessary to implement the draft JI modalities, including changes to rules of procedure of the JISC as adopted by Decision 3/CMP.5, and provisions under other decisions of the CMP relating to JI;
- requests the JISC to submit recommendations for consideration by SBI 44 in the context of the review of JI guidelines, *inter alia*, to address concerns raised by stakeholders and validation by an accredited independent entity of post-registration changes;
- invites parties and admitted observer organizations to submit, by 31 March 2016, their views on experiences and lessons learned from JI for the possible design of mitigation mechanisms and on links and interactions with other tools;
- requests the JISC to reflect synergies between JI and other mitigation mechanisms to ensure the cost-efficient use of resources, the coherence of mitigation instruments and the avoidance of double counting; and
- requests the JISC to prepare recommendations and reflections based on an analysis of experiences and lessons learned for consideration by CMP 12.

REPORT OF THE COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE:

This item was first considered on Wednesday, 2 December. Facilitative Branch Chair Delano Ruben Verwey (the Netherlands) outlined the activities of the Enforcement and Facilitative Branches, including the Committee’s continued interaction with expert review teams. The CMP took note of the report (FCCC/KP/CMP/2015/3) and invited parties to contribute to the Trust Fund.

REPORT OF THE ADAPTATION FUND BOARD:

This item (FCCC/KP/CMP/2015/2) was first considered on Wednesday, 2 December. Adaptation Fund Board Chair Hans Olav Ibrekk (Norway) reported that the “fund has never been more in demand” and has delivered effectively on its mandate,

but that the sustainability of the Fund is “in danger.” Parties established a contact group co-chaired by Richard Muyungi (Tanzania) and Herman Sips (the Netherlands).

On Sunday, 13 December, the COP adopted the report of the Adaptation Fund Board and a decision.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/KP/CMP/2015/L.3/Rev.1), the CMP, *inter alia*:

- requests the Adaptation Fund Board to continue efforts to simplify accreditation procedures for national implementing entities and report back on progress made at CMP 12;
- urges parties that responded to the fundraising target of the Adaptation Fund Board but have not yet made financial contributions to do as soon as possible;
- encourages the provision of voluntary support that is additional to the share of proceeds from CDM activities to support resource mobilization of the Adaptation Fund Board; and
- recommends the CMA consider that the Adaptation Fund may serve the Paris Agreement and invites COP 22 to request the APA to undertake necessary preparatory work and to forward a recommendation to the CMP for adoption no later than CMP 15.

REPORT ON THE HIGH-LEVEL MINISTERIAL ROUND TABLE ON INCREASED AMBITION OF KYOTO PROTOCOL COMMITMENTS: This item was first considered on Wednesday, 2 December. CMP Vice-President Sylla recalled there was no consensus on this issue at CMP 10 (FCCC/KP/CMP/2014/3). Saying that the high-level roundtable did not increase the ambition of Annex I parties, China, opposed by the EU, Australia and Norway, proposed a contact group. Parties agreed to informal consultations on a way forward facilitated by Paul Watkinson (France).

On Thursday, 10 December, CMP 11 Vice-President Sylla informed that parties were unable to reach consensus on this issue. The item will be included on the provisional agenda of CMP 12. The COP 21 Presidency will conduct intersessional consultations on the way forward.

REPORTING FROM AND REVIEW OF ANNEX I PARTIES: National Communications: These discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item on the status of submission and review of the sixth NCs and first biennial reports from Annex I parties (see page 31).

Annual Compilation and Accounting Report from Annex B Parties under the Kyoto Protocol: This item was first taken up on Tuesday, 1 December. Upon the recommendation of SBI 43, the CMP took note of the report (FCCC/KP/CMP/2015/6 and Add.1/Rev.1).

CLARIFICATION OF THE TEXT IN SECTION G (ARTICLE 3.7TER) OF THE DOHA AMENDMENT TO THE KYOTO PROTOCOL: Discussions on this item are summarized under the SBSTA (see page 41).

CAPACITY BUILDING UNDER THE KYOTO PROTOCOL: These discussions are summarized under the SBI (see page 34).

MATTERS RELATING TO RESPONSE MEASURES: Protocol Articles 2.3 and 3.14: Discussions on these items are summarized under the SBI agenda item on the forum and work programme (see page 34). On Sunday, 13 December, CMP 11

President Fabius reported that parties were unable to conclude consideration of these items, and parties agreed to take note of this.

OTHER MATTERS REFERRED TO THE CMP BY THE SUBSIDIARY BODIES: Training Programme for Members of Expert Review Teams Participating in Annual Reviews under Protocol Article 8: On Thursday, 10 December, the CMP considered a draft decision forwarded by SBSTA 42 on this item. The CMP adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/2/Add.2) the CMP, *inter alia*, requests the Secretariat to:

- update and implement the courses on national systems, application of adjustments, modalities for the accounting of assigned amounts under Protocol Article 7, paragraph 4, review of national registries and information on assigned amounts, and review of activities under Protocol Article 3, paragraph 3 included in the training programme for members of expert review teams; and
- develop and implement the courses if possible in time for the first inventory review of the second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol.

The annex to the decision contains an overview of the training programme for members of expert review teams, with one section on details of the training programme and another section on courses of the training programme, including descriptions of: national systems; application of adjustments; modalities for the accounting of assigned amounts under Article 7, paragraph 4; review of national registries and information on assigned amounts; and review of activities under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol.

Implications of the Implementation of Decisions 2/CMP.7 to 4/CMP.7 and 1/CMP.8 on the Previous Decisions on Methodological Issues Relating to Protocol Articles 5, 7 and 8: The discussions on the two draft decisions under this item are summarized under the SBSTA (see page 38).

Annual Report on the Technical Review of GHG Inventories of Annex I Parties to the Convention, as Defined in Protocol Article 1.7: These discussions are summarized under the SBSTA (see page 42).

ADMINISTRATIVE, FINANCIAL AND INSTITUTIONAL MATTERS: Audit Report and Financial Statements for 2014: These discussions are summarized under the SBI (see page 36).

Budget Performance for the Biennium 2014-2015: These discussions are summarized under the SBI (see page 36).

Programme Budget for the Biennium 2016-2017: On Thursday, 10 December, the CMP adopted two decisions, forwarded by SBI 42, on the programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017 and on the methodology for the collection of international transaction log (ITL) fees in the biennium 2016-2017.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/SBI/2015/10/Add.1), on the programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017, the CMP, *inter alia*:

- endorses the COP 21 decision on the programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017 as it applies to the Kyoto Protocol;
- adopts the indicative scale of contributions for 2016 and 2017;

- approves the budget for the ITL for the biennium 2016-2017, amounting to €5,351,356, for the purposes specified in the proposed budget for the ITL; and
- adopts the fees for the ITL for the biennium 2016-2017. In its decision (FCCC/SBI/2015/10/Add.1), on the methodology for the collection of ITL fees in the biennium 2016-2017, the CMP, *inter alia*:
 - adopts the scale of fees for the ITL for the biennium 2016-2017;
 - decides on the basis for the calculation of the fees for the ITL paid by a party for the biennium 2016-2017; and
 - requests the ITL administrator to provide, in its annual reports for 2016 and 2017, information on transactions of Kyoto Protocol units, and a table listing the scale and the level of fees and the status of payments for all parties connected to the ITL.

CONCLUSION OF THE SESSION: Adoption of the Report of CMP 11: Following presentation of the report of the session (FCCC/KP/CMP/2015/L.2) by the Secretariat, on behalf of Rapporteur Johanna Lissinger Peitz (Sweden), the CMP adopted the report.

Closure of the Session: On resource implications of the decisions taken, UNFCCC Deputy Executive Secretary Richard Kinley noted the need for €325,000 to conduct the technical review of GHG inventories and initial reports of Annex 1 parties that are also parties to the Kyoto Protocol.

CMP 11 President Fabius invited, and parties agreed, to take note of the draft resolution presented by Morocco thanking France, as the host government, and the city of Paris (FCCC/KP/CMP/2015/L.5).

CMP 11 President Fabius gave CMP 11 to a close at 12:33 am on Sunday, 13 December.

SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR IMPLEMENTATION

On Tuesday, 1 December, SBI Chair Amena Yauvoli (Fiji) opened SBI 43. For a summary of opening statements see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12654e.html>

ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS: On Tuesday, 1 December, parties adopted the agenda (FCCC/SBI/2015/11) with the item on information in non-Annex I national communications held in abeyance. Parties agreed to the organization of work as presented.

Multilateral Assessment Working Group Session under the International Assessment and Review (IAR) Process: On Tuesday, 1 December, SBI Chair Yauvoli informed that the multilateral assessment of Belarus and Kazakhstan would complete the third and final multilateral assessment working group session of the first round of the IAR process. For a summary of the presentations and discussions during this round, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12654e.html>

Election of Officers Other than the Chair: On Tuesday, 1 December, SBI Chair Yauvoli indicated that consultations on the election of officers other than the Chair would be conducted by the COP 21/CMP 11 Presidency.

On Friday, 4 December, SBI Chair Yauvoli said that consultations on the nomination of the SBI Vice-Chair had been concluded, but no nominations had been received for the SBI

Rapporteur. The SBI agreed to nominate Zhihua Chen (China) as the SBI Vice-Chair and that Sidat Yaffa (The Gambia) shall remain in office until his replacement has been elected.

REPORTING FROM AND REVIEW OF ANNEX I PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION: Status of Submission and Review of Sixth National Communications (NCs) and First Biennial Reports (BRs) from Annex I Parties to the Convention: On Tuesday, 1 December, the SBI took note of the status of submission and review of sixth NCs and first BRs from Annex I parties (FCCC/SBI/2015/INF.9).

Outcome of the First Round of the IAR Process (2014-2015): On Tuesday, 1 December, parties agreed to conduct informal consultations, co-facilitated by Fatuma Mohamed Hussein (Kenya) and Helen Plume (New Zealand) on this item. On Friday, 4 December, the SBI adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2015/L.20), the SBI agrees to continue its consideration of the outcome of the first round of the IAR process at SBI 44.

Revision of the “Guidelines for the Preparation of National Communication by Parties Included in Annex I to the Convention Part II: UNFCCC Reporting Guidelines on National Communications”: On Tuesday, 1 December, parties agreed that SBI Chair Yauvoli would prepare draft conclusions on this item (FCCC/TP/2015/3) in consultation with interested parties. On Friday, 4 December, the SBI adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2015/L.23), the SBI, *inter alia*, requests the Secretariat to organize a pre-session workshop, and prepare a report thereof, prior to SBI 44, under the guidance of the SBI Chair, in order to advance the discussion under this agenda sub-item, and agrees to continue its work on the revision of the UNFCCC reporting guidelines on NCs at SBI 44 with a view to finalizing and recommending them for adoption by COP 22.

Report on National GHG Inventory Data from Annex I Parties to the Convention for the Period 1990-2013: On Tuesday, 1 December, parties took note of the report on national GHG inventory data from Annex I parties for 1990-2013 (FCCC/SBI/2015/21).

Annual Compilation and Accounting Report for Annex B Parties under the Kyoto Protocol for 2015: This item was held in abeyance.

REPORTING FROM NON-ANNEX I PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION: Information Contained in National Communications from Non-Annex I Parties to the Convention: On Tuesday, 1 December, the SBI recommended that the CMP take note of the annual compilation and accounting report for Annex B parties under the Kyoto Protocol for 2015 (FCCC/KP/CMP/2015/6 and Add.1/Rev.1).

Work of the Consultative Group of Experts on National Communications from Non-Annex I Parties to the Convention (CGE): During the SBI opening plenary, parties agreed to conduct informal consultations, co-facilitated by Anne Rasmussen (Samoa) and Helen Plume (New Zealand), on this item (FCCC/SBI/2015/17, 18, 20 and FCCC/SBI/2015/INF.13). On Friday, 4 December, the SBI adopted its conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2015/L.21) the SBI, *inter alia*:

- welcomes progress made by the CGE focusing on adaptation and the launch of the training programme to enhance the capacity of experts to conduct efficient and effective technical analysis of biennial update reports (BURs);
- notes the plan of the CGE to organize regional training workshops on the preparation of BURs in 2016;
- urges developed country parties in Annex II and other developed country parties in a position to do so to provide financial resources to enable the CGE to implement its work programme for 2016-2018;
- encourages the CGE to prioritize elements of its 2015 work programme that have not yet been undertaken; and
- invites multilateral programmes and organizations to collaborate with the CGE, as appropriate, in the provision of technical support to non-Annex I parties in preparing their NCs and BURs.

Provision of Financial and Technical Support: During the SBI opening plenary, parties agreed that SBI Chair Yauvoli would prepare draft conclusions on this item (FCCC/SBI/2015/INF.15 and FCCC/CP/2015/4). On Friday, 4 December, the SBI adopted its conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2015/L.24), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- invites the GEF to continue to provide information on its activities relating to the preparation of NCs by non-Annex I parties and an approximate date for completion of draft NCs and for submission of final NCs to the Secretariat, for consideration at SBI 45;
- also invites the GEF to continue to provide information on its activities relating to the preparation of BURs, and an approximate date for submission of BURs to the Secretariat, for consideration at SBI 44;
- encourages non-Annex I parties that have not submitted their first BURs to complete and submit them in a timely manner;
- urges non-Annex I parties that have yet to submit their request to the GEF for support for the preparation of their first BUR to do so in a timely manner and encourages the GEF agencies to facilitate the preparation and submission of project proposals by non-Annex I parties for the preparation of their BURs;
- notes the information provided by the GEF in its report to COP 21 on the procedures available to facilitate access by non-Annex I parties to funding for the preparation of their NCs and multiple BURs with one application, and information provided on its Global Support Programme for NCs and BURs (GSP); and
- encourages non-Annex I parties to take advantage of the opportunities for technical assistance and support available under the GSP.

Summary Reports on the Technical Analysis of BURs from Non-Annex I Parties to the Convention: On Tuesday, 1 December, parties took note of summary reports on the technical analysis of BURs from non-Annex I parties.

MATTERS RELATED TO THE MECHANISMS UNDER THE KYOTO PROTOCOL: Review of the Modalities and Procedures for the CDM: On Tuesday, 1 December, parties

agreed to informal consultations, co-facilitated by Jeffery Spooner (Jamaica) and Karoliina Anttonen (Finland), on this item. On Friday, 4 December, the SBI adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2015/L.28), the SBI agrees to continue its consideration of this matter at SBI 44.

Review of the JI Guidelines: On Tuesday, 1 December, parties agreed to conduct informal consultations, co-facilitated by Yaw Osafo (Ghana) and Dimitar Nikov (France), on this item. On Friday, 4 December, the SBI adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2015/L.30), the SBI agrees to continue its consideration of this issue at SBI 44 on the basis of a draft decision text proposed by the co-facilitators of the informal consultations, as contained in the annex to the document.

Modalities for Expediting the Continued Issuance, Transfer and Acquisition of JI Emission Reduction Units (ERUs): On Tuesday, 1 December, parties agreed that SBI Chair Yauvoli would prepare draft conclusions on this item. On Friday, 4 December, the SBI adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2015/L.25), the SBI agreed to conclude its consideration of this matter.

Report of the Administrator of the International Transaction Log (ITL) under the Kyoto Protocol: On Tuesday, 1 December, parties took note of the report (FCCC/SBI/2015/INF.12).

MATTERS RELATING TO LDCS: On Tuesday, 1 December, parties considered the report of the LEG (FCCC/SBI/2015/19 and Corr.1) and information on the NAP Expo (FCCC/SBI/2015/INF.14). SBI agreed to conduct informal consultations, facilitated by Mamadou Honadia (Burkina Faso).

On Friday, 4 December, the SBI adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2015/L.22), the SBI, *inter alia*, notes that 32 project proposals for the implementation of national adaptation programmes of action (NAPAs) and for the process of NAPs, accounting for a total of US\$235.7 million, had been technically cleared by the GEF, but were awaiting funding under the LDCF. The SBI noted with appreciation the continued collaboration of the LEG with the Adaptation Committee and other constituted bodies under the Convention, the NWP and a wide range of relevant organizations, agencies and regional centers, and requests the LEG to continue to enhance this engagement.

NATIONAL ADAPTATION PLANS: On Tuesday, 1 December, the SBI considered the report of the LEG (FCCC/SBI/2015/19), GEF (FCCC/CP/2015/4), GCF (FCCC/CP/2015/3), Adaptation Committee (FCCC/SBI/2015/2), progress in the process to formulate and implement NAPs (FCCC/SBI/2015/INF.11) and information on the NAP Expo (FCCC/SBI/2015/INF.14). Parties agreed to conduct informal consultations, co-facilitated by Mamadou Honadia (Burkina Faso) and Jens Fugl (EU).

On Friday, 4 December, the SBI adopted conclusions and forwarded a draft decision to COP 21.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/SBI/2015/L.32 and Add.1), the COP, *inter alia*, requests the SBI to assess progress in the process to formulate and implement NAPs at SBI 44.

The COP also decides that the following steps are necessary for the SBI to initiate the assessment:

- to invite parties and relevant organizations to submit by 1 February 2018 information on their progress toward achieving the objectives of the process to formulate and implement NAP experiences, best practices, lessons learned, gaps and needs, and support provided and received in the process to formulate and implement NAPs;
- to invite parties to provide information, guided by a questionnaire, on an ongoing basis through NAP Central;
- to request the Secretariat to prepare a synthesis report on the progress made towards the achievement of the objectives of the process to formulate and implement NAPs; and
- to request the LEG, in collaboration with the Adaptation Committee, to organize a meeting of party experts, with a view to providing a summary of progress made in the process to formulate and implement NAPs, and to provide a report on the meeting.

REPORT OF THE ADAPTATION COMMITTEE:

On Tuesday, 1 December, SBI considered the report of the Adaptation Committee (FCCC/SB/2015/2) and parties agreed to joint SBI/SBSTA informal consultations, co-facilitated by Malia Talakai (Nauru) and Anton Hilber (Switzerland).

On Friday, 4 December, the SBI adopted the conclusions and forwarded a draft decision to the COP.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/SB/2015/L.3), the COP, *inter alia*:

- invites the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) to enhance outreach activities that would facilitate policymakers' understanding of the impact of different levels of warming on adaptation planning and actions;
- requests the TEC, with the CTCN, the Adaptation Committee and the LEG, to consider how it can help parties to align their TNAs with the process to formulate and implement NAPs;
- invites parties to take into account climate risk screening of national development strategies and policies aimed at enhancing livelihoods and economic diversification to enhance climate resilience; and
- requests the Adaptation Committee to further strengthen cooperation with the SCF and other constituted bodies under the Convention, with a view to enhancing coherence and collaboration regarding adaptation finance as contained in the work plan of the Adaptation Committee.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE

WIM: On Tuesday, 1 December, the SBI considered the report of the WIM (FCCC/SB/2015/3) and parties agreed to discuss this issue in joint SBI/SBSTA informal consultations, co-facilitated by Beth Lavender (Canada) and Kishan Kumarsingh (Trinidad and Tobago). On Friday, 4 December, the SBI adopted the conclusions and forwarded a draft decision for consideration and adoption by the COP.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/SB/2015/L.5/Rev.1), the COP, *inter alia*:

- decides that the terms of the Co-Chairs who are currently in office will end immediately before the first meeting of the Executive Committee in 2017;
- notes with concern the limited progress made in the implementation of the initial two-year work plan; and

- decides that, as a consequence of the late nomination of members to the Executive Committee in 2015, the term of the members of the Committee currently in office will end immediately before the first meeting of the Executive Committee in 2018 for members with a term of two years, and immediately before the first meeting of the Executive Committee in 2019 for members with a term of three years.

DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGIES AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE TECHNOLOGY MECHANISM: On Tuesday, 1 December, parties agreed to conduct informal consultations on all sub-items under the TM (FCCC/SB/2015/1 and INF.3, FCCC/SBI/2015/16 and FCCC/CP/2015/4), co-facilitated by Carlos Fuller (Belize) and Elfriede More (Austria).

Joint Annual Report of the TEC and the CTCN: Friday, 4 December, the SBI and SBSTA adopted conclusions on this joint item and forwarded a draft decision for consideration and adoption by the COP.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/SB/2015/L.4), the COP, *inter alia*:

- welcomes the joint annual report of the TEC and the CTCN and invites parties to consider its key messages;
- invites the TEC and the advisory board of the CTCN to update procedures for preparing the joint chapter in the joint report;
- welcomes the interim report of the TEC on enhanced implementation of TNAs; and
- invites the CTCN to use the TEC's guidance on technology action plans for informing the TNA process.

Poznan Strategic Programme on Technology Transfer

(PSP): On Friday, 4 December, the SBI adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2015/L.29), the SBI, *inter alia*, invites parties, the CTCN and relevant entities to act upon the recommendation provided in the TEC's evaluation report of the PSP, and encourages the GEF to share midterm evaluations of PSP technology transfer and finance centers and pilot projects of the fourth replenishment of the GEF, and being informed by these lessons, invites the TEC to update its report for consideration by the COP no later than COP 23, through the SBI.

CAPACITY BUILDING: Capacity Building under the Convention: On Tuesday, 1 December, parties agreed to conduct informal back-to-back consultations with capacity building under the Kyoto Protocol, co-facilitated by Bubu Jallow (The Gambia) and Kunihiko Shimada (Japan), on this item (FCCC/SBI/2015/14 and FCCC/SBI/2015/INF.16).

On Friday, 4 December, several parties expressed willingness to further engage constructively on this item under the COP. The US, Australia and Japan raised concerns about the process by which the draft conclusions were reached. Swaziland, supported by The Gambia, noted the draft text "provides a landing ground and marks the beginning of defining capacity building." The EU understood the need to strengthen capacity-building institutions under the Convention as "our common vision" and hoped for the establishment of a capacity-building committee as an outcome of COP 21. Senegal, for the LDCs, with the Philippines, thanked the EU for their positive spirit that had allowed capacity building

to be taken up at a higher level. Burundi lamented that “the text is still bracketed” and emphasized capacity building as necessary for her country to adapt to climate change impacts.

The SBI adopted conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2015/L.33) and forwarded annexed draft decision text to the COP for further consideration.

The COP continued consideration of the draft decision text contained in the annex to the SBI conclusions. On Thursday, 10 December, the COP adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/CP/2015/L.6), the COP, *inter alia*:

- adopts the terms of reference for the third comprehensive review of the implementation of the framework for capacity building in developing countries, annexed to the decision;
- requests SBI 44 to conduct the comprehensive review on the basis of these terms of reference, with a view to recommending a draft decision for consideration and adoption at COP 22;
- requests the Secretariat to prepare a technical paper based on these terms of reference as input to the comprehensive review;
- invites parties and observer organizations to submit their views on the comprehensive review by 9 March 2016;
- urges relevant bodies established under the Convention to continue to undertake capacity-building activities in their work, as appropriate;
- decides that the fifth meeting of the Durban Forum, to be held during SBI 44, will explore potential ways for enhancing capacity building by sharing information and varied experiences; and
- invites parties to submit suggestions on additional topics for the fifth meeting of the Durban Forum and views on possible ways to enhance the information included in the capacity-building portal by 9 March 2016.

Capacity Building under the Kyoto Protocol: On Tuesday, 1 December, parties agreed to conduct informal back-to-back consultations with capacity building under the Convention, co-facilitated by Bubu Jallow (The Gambia) and Kunihiko Shimada (Japan), on this item (FCCC/SBI/2015/14 and FCCC/SBI/2015/INF.16).

On Friday, 4 December, the SBI adopted conclusions and forwarded on annexed draft decision text to CMP 11 for further consideration. CMP 11 continued consideration of the draft decision text contained in the annex to the SBI conclusions.

On Friday, 10 December, the CMP adopted a decision.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2015/L.34), the SBI notes it was unable to conclude its consideration of this agenda sub-item and recommends that CMP 11 continue consideration of this matter on the basis of draft decision text contained in the annex to the conclusions.

In its decision (FCCC/KP/CMP/2015/L.6), the CMP:

- requests SBI 44 to conduct the third comprehensive review of the implementation of the framework for capacity building in developing countries, on the basis of the terms of reference contained in the annex to the COP 21 decision on capacity building under the Convention (FCCC/CP/2015/L.6), with a view to recommending a draft decision for consideration and adoption at CMP 12;

- decides that the fifth meeting of the Durban Forum, to be held during SBI 44, will explore potential ways for enhancing capacity building by sharing information and varied experiences related to the Kyoto Protocol; and
- invites parties to submit suggestions on additional topics related to the Kyoto Protocol for the fifth meeting of the Durban Forum by 9 March 2016.

IMPACT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF RESPONSE MEASURES: Forum and Work Programme: During the SBI opening plenary on Tuesday, 1 December, parties agreed to establish a joint SBI/SBSTA contact group, co-chaired by SBI Chair Yauvoli and SBSTA Chair Lidia Wojtal (Poland) on this item, including to address the agenda sub-items on matters relating to Protocol Article 3.14 (adverse impacts) and progress on the implementation of Decision 1/CP.10 (Buenos Aires Programme of Work).

The contact group first met on Wednesday, 2 December, co-facilitated by Delano Verwey (the Netherlands) and Eduardo Calvo (Peru), and considered draft decision text contained in the annex to document FCCC/SB/2015/L.2, as decided by SBI 42 and SBSTA 42.

The US said the text needed further consideration and that, because of ongoing negotiations under the ADP, the US would not be “in a position to adopt the decision text.”

The EU noted that the text attempts to bridge different visions, but acknowledged the need to know how all discussions on this issue in Paris will come together. Argentina for the G-77/China, Ghana for the African Group, and Saudi Arabia expressed concern about linking this item to the ADP, with Singapore suggesting the draft decision should focus on pre-2020 measures. The EU said the pre-2020 focus is not indicated in the text. Parties agreed to continue discussions in informal consultations.

On Thursday, 3 December, the contact group agreed to forward to the COP the draft decision and draft conclusions prepared, on the basis of parties’ input, by the co-facilitators with the help of the Secretariat.

On Friday, 4 December, the SBI adopted its conclusions (FCCC/SB/2015/L.6) and forwarded the annexed draft decision text to the COP for further consideration.

On Sunday, 13 December, the COP adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/CP/2015/L.12) the COP, *inter alia*:

- decides to continue and improve the forum on the impact of the implementation of response measures, which shall provide a platform to allow parties to share, in an interactive manner, information, experiences, case studies, best practices and views, and to facilitate assessment and analysis of the impact of the implementation of response measures, with a view to recommending specific actions;
- decides to focus work under the improved forum, *inter alia*, on the provision of concrete examples, case studies and practices in order to enhance the capacity of parties, in particular developing country parties, to deal with the impact of the implementation of response measures;
- requests the Chairs of the SBs to convene the improved forum to implement the work programme on the impact of the implementation of response measures, which will continue to be convened under a joint agenda item of the SBs, and operate

in accordance with the procedures applicable to contact groups;

- also requests the SBs, in order to advance the work of the improved forum, to constitute *ad hoc* technical expert groups, as appropriate, to elaborate on the technical work under the improved forum. The technical *ad hoc* expert groups shall consist of balanced regional representation of parties;
- adopts the work programme comprising the areas of economic diversification and transformation, just transition of the work force, and the creation of decent work and quality jobs;
- decides that the implementation of the work programme shall address the needs of all parties, in particular, developing country parties, and shall be informed, *inter alia*, by the assessment and analysis of impacts, including the use and development of economic modeling, and taking into account all relevant policy issues of concern;
- requests the SBs to review every three years, beginning at SB 49, the work programme of the improved forum, including the modalities for its operation;
- decides that the improved forum shall provide recommendations to the SBs on the actions referred to in paragraph 1 (under the forum on the impact of the implementation of response measures) for their consideration, with a view to recommending those actions, as appropriate, to the COP, beginning at COP 23; and
- requests the Secretariat to prepare, subject to the availability of financial resources, a guidance document to assist developing countries to assess the impact of the implementation of response measures, including guidance on modeling tools, as well as technical materials to assist developing countries on their economic diversification initiatives, for consideration at SB 44.

Protocol Article 3.14: Discussions on this item are summarized under the SBI item on the impact of the implementation of response measures, sub-item on the forum and work programme (see page 34).

THE 2013-2015 REVIEW: This item was first considered on Tuesday, 1 December. SBI Chair Yauvoli and SBSTA Chair Wojtal proposed, and parties agreed to, a joint SBI/SBSTA contact group, co-chaired by Gertraud Wollansky (Austria) and Leon Charles (Grenada), on this item. The contact group first met on Tuesday, 1 December.

Most parties called for substantive conclusions on this item and a draft COP decision. Elements of the draft conclusions and decision included: taking note of the report of the structured expert dialogue (SED) (FCCC/SB/2015/INF.1); mentioning the ten messages highlighted in the SED report; stating that the goal to hold global temperature rise below 2°C is inadequate; noting negative impacts are already being felt at current levels of warming; and that in consideration of overall progress towards the long-term global goal, parties should act urgently and ambitiously, while recognizing the technological, economic and institutional challenges. The draft decision also contained various options that would have the COP: reaffirm the 2°C limit; reaffirm the 2°C limit and recognize the need to strive to 1.5°C; or strengthen the long-term goal to 1.5°C.

Saudi Arabia and China preferred procedural conclusions, such as taking note of the report and thanking those experts involved. Since other parties did not want to adopt only procedural conclusions, arguing that such conclusions would not fulfill the mandate of the review, no conclusions were adopted and no draft decision was forwarded to the COP.

On Friday, 4 December, SBI Chair Yauvoli and SBSTA Chair Wojtal reported that parties had been unable to complete work on this matter. The SBI and SBSTA agreed that the SBI and SBSTA Chairs would seek the guidance of the COP 21 President on the matter.

On Saturday, 5 December, COP 21 President Fabius said the 2013-2015 review would be considered together with ambition and long-term goal during discussions on the Paris agreement, as the review could help inform parties in their consideration of temperature targets and agreement on ambition could unlock a final decision on the 2013-2015 review. The issue was not specifically addressed in the ministerial consultations, which focused on the agreement.

On Sunday, 13 December, the COP adopted a decision on this item.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/CP/2015/L.10), the COP, *inter alia*:

- takes note of the work of the SED, which contributed to completing the phases of the 2013-2015 review and of the SED report, including the ten messages highlighted therein;
- decides, in relation to the adequacy of the long-term global goal, and in the light of the ultimate objective of the Convention, that the goal is to hold the increase in the global average temperature to well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels and to pursue efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels, recognizing that this would significantly reduce the risks and impacts of climate change;
- decides that, in light of the overall progress made towards achieving the long-term global goal, including consideration of the implementation of the commitments under the Convention, parties should act urgently and ambitiously under the Convention while recognizing the technological, economic and institutional challenges;
- notes that, although some progress has already been made by UNFCCC bodies in scaling up financial, technological and capacity-building support, significant gaps still exist in terms of both the scale and speed of such progress;
- notes that there continue to be information gaps in relation to the areas covered within the scope of the 2013-2015 review;
- encourages the scientific community to address information and research gaps identified during the SED, including scenarios that limit warming to below 1.5°C relative to pre-industrial levels by 2100 and the range of impacts at the regional and local scales associated with those scenarios;
- agrees that the next periodic review should be conducted in an effective and efficient manner, avoid duplication of work, and take into account the results of relevant work conducted under the Convention, its Kyoto Protocol and the subsidiary bodies;
- requests the SBSTA and SBI to consider the scope of the next periodic review with a view to forwarding a recommendation for consideration by the COP no later than 2018, as appropriate;

- agrees to reconvene the SED in conjunction with the next periodic review; and
- notes that the first periodic review fulfilled its mandate.

GENDER AND CLIMATE CHANGE: This item (FCCC/CP/2015/6 and FCCC/SBI/2015/12) was first considered on Tuesday, 1 December. SBI Chair Yauvoli proposed, and parties agreed, that he prepare draft conclusions on this item.

On Friday, 4 December, the SBI adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2015/L.31) the SBI, *inter alia*:

- takes note of the report by the Secretariat on the gender composition of constituted bodies established under the Convention and its Kyoto Protocol and party delegations attending sessions under the Convention and its Kyoto Protocol, and notes with concern that, since the last report, only one constituted body has seen an increase in the representation of women, which remains between 6% and 35% in the majority of constituted bodies;
- recalls Decision 23/CP.18 where parties agreed to review progress made towards the goal of gender balance at COP 22;
- welcomes the report by the Secretariat on the in-session workshop on gender-responsive climate policy with a focus on mitigation action and technology development and transfer;
- invites the Secretariat to include information on relevant tools and methods to assess the environmental, social and economic benefits of involving men and women equally in climate change related activities when preparing the technical paper on guidelines or other tools on integrating gender considerations into climate change related activities under the Convention;
- encourages parties to use the information contained in the report by the Secretariat on gender composition to inform, support and strengthen the implementation of gender responsive climate policy in the areas of mitigation action and technology development and transfer;
- notes with appreciation the efforts of parties and relevant organizations to support the implementation of Decision 18/CP.20 (Lima work programme on gender) and encourages interested parties, relevant organizations, and the Secretariat to continue such efforts pursuant to that decision; and
- encourages parties and admitted observer organizations to submit, by 3 February 2016, their views on the matters to be addressed at the in-session workshop on gender-responsive climate policy with a focus on adaptation and capacity building and training for delegates on gender issues to be held during SBI 44.

ADMINISTRATIVE, FINANCIAL AND INSTITUTIONAL MATTERS: Budget Performance for the Biennium 2014-2015: On Tuesday, 1 December, noting the situation of outstanding contributions as pressing, UNFCCC Deputy Executive Secretary Richard Kinley presented the budget performance for the biennium 2014-2015 as at 30 June 2015 (FCCC/SBI/2015/13) and status of contributions as at 15 November 2015 (FCCC/SBI/2015/INF.17). The SBI agreed that SBI Chair Yauvoli would draft conclusions in consultation with interested parties.

On Friday, 4 December, the SBI adopted conclusions and forwarded draft decisions, jointly with the sub-item on audit report and financial statements for 2014, to the COP and CMP.

Final Outcome: In their decisions (FCCC/SBI/2015/L.26 and L.27), the CMP and COP:

- welcome the Executive Secretary's efforts to address budgetary limits by enhancing effectiveness and efficiency, via, among others, reducing staffing costs;
- urge parties that have not made contributions to the core budget to do so without delay and call upon parties to make contributions for the biennium 2016-2017 in a timely manner; and
- urge parties to further contribute to the Trust Fund for Participation in the UNFCCC.

Audit Report and Financial Statements for 2014: On Tuesday, 1 December, parties took note of the audited financial statements for the year 2014 (FCCC/SBI/2015/INF.10). The SBI agreed that SBI Chair Yauvoli would draft conclusions in consultation with interested parties.

On Friday, 4 December, the SBI adopted conclusions and forwarded draft decisions, jointly with the sub-item on budget performance for the biennium 2014-2015, to the COP and CMP.

Final Outcome: In their decisions (FCCC/SBI/2015/L.26 and L.27), on the audit report and financial statements for 2014, the CMP and COP take note of the audit report of the UN Board of Auditors and urge the Executive Secretary to implement the recommendations of the auditors, as appropriate.

REPORT ON OTHER ACTIVITIES: Summary Report on the 3rd Dialogue on Article 6 of the Convention: On Tuesday, 1 December, parties took note of the summary report on the 3rd Dialogue on Article 6 of the Convention (FCCC/SBI/2015/15). The SBI endorsed replacing "Article 6 of the Convention" with "Action for Climate Empowerment."

CLOSURE AND REPORT ON THE SESSION: On Friday, 4 December, SBI Rapporteur Sidat Yaffa (The Gambia) presented, and the SBI adopted, the report of SBI 43 (FCCC/SBI/2015/L.19). SBI Chair Yauvoli thanked all delegates for their work and noted SBI 43 accomplished much work, including the completion of the first round of the IAR. SBI 43 was gavelled to a close at 9:23 pm.

For a summary of statements made during the closing plenary of the SBI, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12657e.html>

SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE

On Tuesday, 1 December, SBSTA Chair Wojtal opened the session. For a summary of opening statements, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12654e.html>

ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS: Parties adopted the agenda (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/3) and agreed to the organization of work.

Election of Officers other than the Chair: On Tuesday, 1 December, SBSTA Chair Wojtal reported that consultations on the election of officers other than the Chair would be coordinated by the COP 21/CMP 11 Presidency.

On Friday, 4 December, SBSTA Chair Wojtal announced that Tibor Schaffhauser (Hungary) would serve as SBSTA Vice Chair and Aderito Santana (São Tomé and Príncipe) would serve as Rapporteur.

NAIROBI WORK PROGRAMME: On Tuesday, 1 December, parties agreed that SBSTA Chair Wojtal would produce draft conclusions on this item (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/4 and INF.8).

The UN Environment Programme highlighted the progress of the Lima Adaptation Knowledge Initiative (LAKI) in various sub-regions and outlined its two aims, to identify and prioritize knowledge gaps at the sub-regional level and to fill those gaps. Botswana and Sri Lanka welcomed LAKI's progress and future workshops.

On Friday, 4 December, the SBSTA adopted the conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions, the SBSTA (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/L.19), *inter alia*, notes with appreciation the reports provided on good practices and lessons learned in adaptation planning and progress on implementing activities under the NWP, and the information provided by LAKI, the Adaptation Committee and the LEG.

The SBSTA further welcomes the launch of the Adaptation Knowledge Portal and recognized its role in enhancing the dissemination of knowledge developed under the NWP, the Adaptation Committee and the WIM Executive Committee.

REPORT OF THE ADAPTATION COMMITTEE:

Discussions on this item are summarized under the SBI (see page 33).

DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGIES AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE TECHNOLOGY MECHANISM:

Joint Annual Report of the TEC and the CTCN: On Tuesday, 1 December, TEC Chair Kunihiko Shimada (Japan) reported key achievements, including enhanced access to climate technology finance and support for development of national systems of innovation.

CTCN Advisory Board Chair Jukka Uosukainen (Finland) said the CTCN now has over 100 network members providing technical assistance in response to developing country requests.

Further discussions under this item are summarized under the SBI (see page 33).

ISSUES RELATING TO AGRICULTURE: On Tuesday, 1 December, the SBSTA considered the report of the workshop on early warning systems and contingency plans in relation to extreme weather events (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/INF.6) and the report on the assessment of risk and vulnerability of agricultural systems to different climate change scenarios (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/INF.7).

Parties agreed to discuss this issue in informal consultations, co-facilitated by Emmanuel Dlamini (Swaziland) and Heikki Granholm (Finland). Informal consultations convened Wednesday, 2 December.

On Friday, 4 December, the SBSTA adopted the conclusions, with minor amendments.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/L.17), the SBSTA takes note of the reports and agreed to further consider reports and the additional issues already identified for workshops at SBSTA 44 and 45.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE WIM: Discussions on this item are summarized under the SBI (see page 33).

MATTERS RELATING TO SCIENCE AND REVIEW:

Research and Systematic Observation: This item was first considered on Tuesday, 1 December. SBSTA Chair Wojtal proposed, and parties agreed to, informal consultations, co-facilitated by Chris Moseki (South Africa) and Stefan Rösner (Germany).

The Global Climate Observing System (GCOS) reported on progress made against the implementation plan and the assessment of the adequacy of the global observing network.

The World Meteorological Organization (WMO) reported, *inter alia*, that the WMO Global Framework for Climate Services (GFCS) developed a supplement to the technical guidelines for NAPs and that the WMO Congress adopted a policy on climate data and products for the GFCS.

The Committee on Earth Observation Satellites reported that, on sensing, data from the essential climate variable inventory were provided to complement the existing database, and highlighted progress on the implementation of carbon observation from space.

The Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission of the UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) underlined that ocean observation is integral to the climate observation system and highlighted challenges sustaining observations often supported by short-term research budgets.

Informal consultations were first held on Tuesday, 1 December. On Friday, 4 December, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/L.18), the SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- recognizes the progress made in improving observing systems for climate, as relevant to the Convention, and encouraged GCOS to consider the outcomes of COP 21 when preparing the GCOS Implementation Plan 2016;
- invites GCOS to collaborate with relevant partners to continue enhancing access to, and understanding and interpretation of, data products and information to support decision-making on adaptation and mitigation at national, regional and global scales;
- urges parties to work towards addressing the priorities and gaps identified in the GCOS Status Report 2015, and invites parties and relevant organizations to provide inputs to, and contribute to the review of, the GCOS Implementation Plan 2016; and
- welcomes the WMO supplement to the Technical Guidelines for the NAP process outlining how GFCS could provide support.

The 2013-2015 Review: This item is summarized under the SBI (see page 35).

IMPACT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF RESPONSE MEASURES: Forum and Work Programme:

During the SBSTA opening plenary on Tuesday, 1 December, parties agreed to establish a joint SBI/SBSTA contact group, co-chaired by SBSTA Chair Wojtal and SBI Chair Yauvoli. Discussions and outcomes on this item are summarized under the SBI (see page 34).

Matters Relating to Protocol Article 2.3 (adverse effects of policies and measures): This sub-item was considered jointly with the forum and work programme (see page 34).

METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES UNDER THE CONVENTION: Methodologies for the Reporting of Financial Information by Annex I Parties to the Convention:

This item was first considered on Tuesday, 1 December. SBSTA Chair Wojtal proposed, and parties agreed, to establish a contact group co-chaired by Hussein Alfa Nafo (Mali) and Roger Dungan (New Zealand). The contact group first met on Wednesday, 2 December. On Friday, 4 December, the SBSTA adopted the conclusions and forwarded a draft decision to the COP. On Thursday, 10 December, the COP adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/L.22), the SBSTA recommends a draft decision for consideration by COP 21. In its decision, the COP, *inter alia*:

- recognizes the need to enhance common understanding on key terminology for reporting financial information under the Convention to facilitate transparency and comparability of information and data on support over time and across parties;
 - decides to enhance consistency and transparency in reporting through adjustments in the reporting parameters in tables 7 (Provision of public financial support: summary information in 20XX-3), 7(a) (Provision of public financial support: contribution through multilateral channels in 20XX-3) and 7(b) (Provision of public financial support: contribution through bilateral, regional and other channels in 20XX-3) of the common tabular format;
 - requests the Secretariat to revise the electronic reporting application for a common tabular format, in accordance with the provisions contained in the annex (Revised common tabular format for the “UNFCCC biennial reporting guidelines for developed country parties”), in time for the preparation and submission of parties’ biennial reports due in 2018;
 - decides that developed country parties shall use the revised electronic reporting application, taking into account their national circumstances, when preparing and submitting their biennial reports in 2018;
 - requests Annex II parties to continue to provide information on the underlying assumptions and the methodologies used in their biennial reports;
 - requests the Secretariat to improve the software of the biennial report data interface to allow for search functions on the UNFCCC website to collect information per key category in tables 7, 7(a) and 7(b) of the common tabular format (i.e. category “recipient country/region, financial instrument”);
 - requests the Secretariat to explore ways to create links to other reporting software and platforms to facilitate the importation and exportation of activity-level data and to inform the SCF to take this into consideration in its work plan;
 - requests the Secretariat to update the UNFCCC national focal points when the information referred to above on climate finance directed to recipient countries as reported under the Convention is made available;
 - requests the SCF to consider the enhanced information referred to above provided by Annex II parties in its biennial assessment and overview of climate finance flows;
- requests the SCF to take into account the work on the methodologies for the reporting of financial information from Annex I parties in the context of its work plan on the MRV of support; and
 - invites the SBI to take into consideration the adjustments referred to above in its revision of the “Guidelines for the Preparation of National Communications by Parties Included in Annex I to the Convention, Part II: UNFCCC Reporting Guidelines on National Communications,” to be completed at COP 22.

GHG Data Interface: On Tuesday, 1 December, during the SBSTA opening plenary parties agreed to defer consideration of this item until SBSTA 44.

Emissions from Bunker Fuels: This item (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/MISC.5) was first considered on Tuesday, 1 December. SBSTA Chair Wojtal proposed, and parties agreed, that she prepare a draft decision on this item.

The International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) reported on efforts to improve fuel efficiency, encourage alternative fuels and more efficiently manage air traffic. The International Maritime Organization (IMO) reported agreement on a three-step approach to data collection and on technology cooperation and capacity-building efforts. Saudi Arabia, for the G-77/China, underscored the importance of multilateral solutions and supported working through the IMO and ICAO while respecting the principles of the Convention and avoiding unilateral measures. Argentina, for a number of developing countries, said that measures should not constitute a disguised restriction on international trade. She urged further technical analysis of a market-based mechanism proposed under ICAO and said such a mechanism could only be based on mutual and multilateral consent and, with China, should include CBDR. On the IMO, China expressed concern on the adoption of the European system to monitor CO₂ emissions from ships in its ports. Japan, Singapore and the EU said the IMO and ICAO are the suitable places to address these issues. The Republic of Korea urged parties to work toward agreement in these organizations.

On Friday, 4 December, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/L.16), the SBSTA takes note of the information received from and progress reported by ICAO and IMO on their ongoing work, notes the views expressed by parties, and invites ICAO and IMO to continue to report, at future sessions of the SBSTA, on relevant work on this issue.

METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES UNDER THE KYOTO PROTOCOL: Implications of the Implementation of Decisions 2/CMP.7 to 4/CMP.7 and 1/CMP.8 on the Previous Decisions on Methodological Issues to the Kyoto Protocol, Including Those Relating to Articles 5, 7 and 8 of the Kyoto Protocol: This item was first considered on Tuesday, 1 December. SBSTA Chair Wojtal proposed, and parties agreed to, a contact group, co-chaired by Anke Herold (Germany) and Guilherme do Prado Lima (Brazil), on this item. The contact group first met on Tuesday, 1 December. On Friday, 4 December, the SBSTA adopted conclusions and forwarded a draft decision to the CMP.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/L.27), the SBSTA recommends two draft decisions for consideration by CMP 11. In the decision (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/L.27/Add.1) regarding part I of the item, implications related to accounting and reporting and other related issues, the CMP, *inter alia*:

- decides that, for the purpose of the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol and pending the entry into force of the Doha Amendment, contained in Annex I to Decision 1/CMP.8, any references in this decision and Decision 2/CMP.8 (implications of the implementation of Decisions 2/CMP.7 to 5/CMP.7 on the previous decisions on methodological issues related to the Kyoto Protocol, including those relating to Articles 5, 7 and 8 of the Kyoto Protocol) to Annex A, Annex B, Article 3.1*bis* (reducing overall emissions by 18% below 1990 levels and not exceeding assigned amounts), 3.1*ter* (Annex B party adjustments), 3.1*quater* (Annex I party adjustments), 3.7*bis* (assigned amounts for Annex I parties), 3.7*ter* (transfer of positive difference to cancellation account), 3.8 (insertion of reference to paragraph 7*bis*), 3.8*bis* (1995 or 2000 as base year for nitrogen trifluoride), 3.12*bis* (units generated from market-based mechanisms) and 3.12*ter* (share of these units used to cover administrative expenses and assist developing country parties to meet the costs of adaptation), and Articles 4.2 (informing the Secretariat of terms of acceptance of any amendment to Annex B) and 4.3 (agreement shall remain in operation for the duration of the commitment period specified in Article 3 (Annex I party GHG emission reductions) to which it relates), unless otherwise specified, shall be understood as referring to those articles and annexes as contained in the Doha Amendment, and that, upon the entry into force of the Doha Amendment, such references shall be read as references to the relevant articles of the Kyoto Protocol as amended;
 - decides that, for the purpose of the second commitment period, Decisions 13/CMP.1 (modalities for the accounting of assigned amounts under Protocol Article 7.4 (requirement to adopt and review guidelines for the preparation of information required under Article 7)), 15/CMP.1 (guidelines for the preparation of the information required under Protocol Article 7), 18/CMP.1 (criteria for cases of failure to submit information relating to estimates of GHG emissions by sources and removals by sinks from activities under Protocol Articles 3.3 (net changes in GHG emissions by sources and removals by sinks from afforestation, reforestation and deforestation since 1990) and 3.4 (level of carbon stocks in 1990)) and 19/CMP.1 (guidelines for national systems under Protocol Article 5.1 (national system for the estimation of anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks)) shall apply *mutatis mutandis*, except where otherwise specified in Decisions 1/CMP.8 and 2/CMP.8 and in this decision;
 - clarifies that, for the purpose of the second commitment period, unless otherwise specified in this decision, any references in Decision 13/CMP.1 and in Annexes I (modalities for the accounting of assigned amounts under Protocol Article 7.4) and II (standard electronic format for reporting information on Kyoto Protocol units) to “parties included in Annex I” or to “parties” shall be understood as referring to parties included in Annex I with commitments inscribed in the third column of Annex B; and
 - clarifies that, for the purpose of the second commitment period, unless otherwise specified in this decision, any references in Decision 13/CMP.1 and Annexes I and II to parties included in Annex I or to parties are not applicable to the parties included in Annex I without Quantified Emission Limitation and Reduction Commitments (QELRCs) for the second commitment period.
- The CMP also decides that, for the purpose of the second commitment period, the following changes shall apply to Decisions 13/CMP.1 and 15/CMP.1:
- all references to Article 3.1 (reducing overall emissions by 5% below 1990 levels and not exceeding assigned amounts) shall be read as references to Article 3.1*bis*, except those in paragraphs 12(e) (cancellation of ERUs, CERs, assigned amount units (AAUs) and/or removal units (RMUs) by a party not in compliance in previous commitment period) and 47(h) (quantity of ERUs, CERs, AAUs and/or RMUs by a party not in compliance reflected in national registry) of the annex (modalities for the accounting of assigned amounts under Protocol Article 7.4) to Decision 13/CMP.1;
 - all references to Articles 3.7 (assigned amounts) and 3.8 (use of 1995 as base year for hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons and sulphur hexafluoride), shall be read as references to Articles 3.7*bis*, 3.8 and 3.8*bis*, except in paragraph 4 (publication of the annual compilation and accounting reports) of Decision 13/CMP.1;
 - all references to the first commitment period shall be read as references to the second commitment period, except that in paragraph 3(e) (failing to meet methodological and reporting requirements through an adjustment for any key source category that accounted for 2% or more of the party’s aggregate emissions) of Decision 15/CMP.1;
 - all references to activities under Article 3.3 and elected activities under Article 3.4 shall be read as references to activities under Article 3.3, forest management under Article 3.4 and any elected activities under Article 3.4;
 - all references to the “Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines for National GHG Inventories” or to the IPCC “Good Practice Guidance and Uncertainty Management in National GHG Inventories” in decision 15/CMP.1 shall be read as references to the “2006 IPCC Guidelines for National GHG Inventories” (hereinafter referred to as the 2006 IPCC Guidelines), as implemented through the “Guidelines for the Preparation of National Communications by Parties Included in Annex I to the Convention, Part I: UNFCCC Reporting Guidelines on Annual GHG Inventories” and the “2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol.” References to Chapter 7 (Methodological Choice and Recalculation) of the IPCC “Good Practice Guidance and Uncertainty Management in National GHG Inventories” shall be read as references to Chapter 4 (Methodological Choice and Identification of Key Categories) of Volume 1 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines; and
 - all references to Decision 16/CMP.1 (land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF)) shall be read as references

to Decision 2/CMP.7 and 6/CMP.9 (guidance for reporting information on activities under Articles 3.3 and 3.4 of the Kyoto Protocol).

The CMP also decides that:

- for the purpose of the second commitment period, paragraph 3(b) (failing to meet methodological and reporting requirements through lack of an estimate for an Annex A source category accounting for 7% or more of the party's aggregate emissions) of Decision 15/CMP.1 shall be replaced by the following paragraph, "3(b) The party concerned has failed to include an estimate for an Annex A source category (as defined in Chapter 4 of Volume I of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines) that individually accounted for 7% or more of the party's aggregate emissions, defined as the aggregate submitted emissions of the gases and from the sources listed in Protocol Annex A, in the most recent of the party's reviewed inventories in which the source was estimated";
- Decisions 14/CMP.1 (standard electronic format for reporting Kyoto Protocol units), 17/CMP.1 (good practice guidance for LULUCF activities under Articles 3.3 and 3.4 of the Kyoto Protocol) and 6/CMP.3 (good practice guidance for LULUCF activities under Articles 3.3 and 3.4 of the Kyoto Protocol) shall not apply for the purpose of the second commitment period; and
- Annex I parties without QELRCs for the second commitment period shall provide information on which voluntary activities under Protocol Article 3.4 they will include in their reporting, at the latest in their 2016 annual inventory submission.

The CMP adopts: the revisions to the modalities for the accounting of assigned amounts under Protocol Article 7.4 as set out in Annex I; the standard electronic format for reporting Kyoto Protocol units and the reporting instructions for the second commitment period contained in Annex II for reporting in accordance with paragraph 11 (information to be reported in standard electronic format) of the annex to decision 15/CMP.1; and the revisions to the "Guidelines for the Preparation of the Information Required under Article 7 of the Kyoto Protocol" for the second commitment period contained in Annex III.

The CMP also decides that each of the Annex I parties that have reached an agreement to fulfill its commitments under Protocol Article 3 jointly, in accordance with Protocol Article 4 (joint fulfillment), shall clarify in their reports, so as to facilitate the calculation of the assigned amount submitted pursuant to Decision 2/CMP.8, how the information listed in Annex I to that decision, the application of Article 3.7*ter*, including its technical implementation, and Chapter VI (continuation of ongoing activities into second commitment period) of Decision 1/CMP.8 are determined. Such clarification shall describe, in detail, methodologies and, if applicable, any relevant assumptions applied by those parties for their joint fulfillment in relation to:

- the application of paragraphs 23–26 (previous period surplus reserve accounts) of Decision 1/CMP.8;
- the calculation of base year emissions in accordance with Articles 3.5 (base year for Annex I parties in transition to a market economy), 3.7*bis*, 3.8 and 3.8*bis*;
- the calculation of those parties' assigned amounts in accordance with Articles 3.7*bis*, 3.8 and 3.8*bis*, and the respective emission level allocated to each of the parties as

set out in the agreement pursuant to Article 4.1 (meeting joint commitments);

- the calculation of those parties' commitment period reserves in accordance with Decision 11/CMP.1 (modalities, rules and guidelines for emissions trading under Protocol Article 17 (emissions trading)), Decision 1/CMP.8, paragraph 18 (regarding paragraphs 6–10 on commitment period reserve of the annex to Decision 11/CMP.1), and this decision; and
- the application and calculation pursuant to paragraph 13 (additions to the assigned amount from forest management) in the annex of Decision 2/CMP.7;

The CMP decides that:

- each Annex I party with a QELRC inscribed in the third column of Annex B shall annually report tables in a standard electronic format to the Secretariat, that any related information of a non-quantitative nature shall be submitted separately, and that, unless otherwise indicated, parties shall submit information for the previous calendar year (based on Universal Coordinated Time), which is referred to as the "reported year" (e.g. in the 2017 standard electronic format submission, the "reported year" will be the 2016 calendar year);
- an Annex I party without a QELRC inscribed in the third column of Annex B shall continue to provide relevant information on its national registry, or changes thereto, including information on the units in its registry, by submitting the standard electronic format tables in conjunction with its annual inventory submission for the second commitment period, in accordance with Decisions 13/CMP.1 and 15/CMP.1 and Annex I to this decision, if its registry is connected to the ITL at any time during the relevant calendar year;
- for the second commitment period, each Annex I party with a QELRC inscribed in the third column of Annex B shall submit its first standard electronic format for reporting Kyoto Protocol units for the second commitment period in conjunction with its first annual inventory submission for that commitment period, in accordance with paragraph 5 (submission of first standard electronic format in conjunction with first annual inventory submission) of Decision 2/CMP.8; and
- the contribution of assigned amount units as a share of proceeds shall be executed in the most transparent manner, taking into account environmental integrity at the international level.

The CMP also:

- decides that, where an Annex I party undertakes a corrective transaction to reflect a correction to the compilation and accounting database applied by the Compliance Committee, pursuant to Chapter V (Enforcement Branch), paragraph 5(b) (possibility of a correction to the compilation and accounting database in the event of a disagreement between an expert review team and the party not in compliance), of the annex to Decision 27/CMP.1 (procedures and mechanisms relating to compliance under the Kyoto Protocol), the information in the compilation and accounting database shall be appropriately amended to avoid double counting, following the review of

- the corrective transaction in accordance with Protocol Article 8 and the resolution of any questions of implementation;
- decides to extend the code of practice for the treatment of confidential information for the review of inventories under Protocol Article 8 to the review of information on assigned amounts under Article 8; and
 - requests the administrator of the ITL to develop an application to facilitate the submission of the standard electronic format referred to above and to report on progress made in the development and testing of that application in its annual report for 2015.

In the decision (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/L.27/Add.2) regarding part II of the item, implications related to the review and adjustments and other related issues, the CMP, *inter alia*, decides that:

- for the purpose of the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol and pending the entry into force of the Doha Amendment, contained in Annex I to Decision 1/CMP.8, any references in this decision to Annex A, Annex B, Articles 3.1*bis*, 3.1*ter*, 3.1*quater*, 3.7*bis*, 3.7*ter*, 3.8, 3.8*bis*, 3.12*bis* and 3.12*ter*, and Articles 4.2 and 4.3, unless otherwise specified, shall be understood as referring to those articles and annexes as contained in the Doha Amendment, and that upon the entry into force of the Doha Amendment such references shall be read as references to the relevant Protocol Articles as amended;
- for the purpose of the second commitment period, Decisions 20/CMP.1 (good practice guidance and adjustments under Protocol Article 5.2) and 22/CMP.1 (guidelines for review under Protocol Article 8) shall apply *mutatis mutandis*, except where otherwise specified;

The COP also decides that for the purpose of the second commitment period, a list of reference changes shall apply to Decisions 18/CMP.1, 19/CMP.1, 20/CMP.1 and 22/CMP.1.

The CMP adopts the revisions to the “Guidelines for Review under Article 8 of the Kyoto Protocol” for the second commitment period contained in Annex I and the revisions to the “Good Practice Guidance and Adjustments under Article 5.2 (methodologies for estimating anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks) of the Kyoto Protocol” for the second commitment period set out in Annex II.

The CMP also:

- clarifies that for the purpose of the second commitment period, the adjustments under Article 5.2 of the Kyoto Protocol referred to above are not applicable to Annex I parties without QELRCs for the second commitment period;
- requests the Secretariat, in view of the revision of the “Guidelines for Review under Article 8 of the Kyoto Protocol,” to modify the relevant information technology tools, as needed, so as to support the implementation of the review process;
- recognizes that the deadline of June 2014, set out in Decision 6/CMP.9, paragraph 4, for providing the upgraded common reporting format (CRF) Reporter to parties in order to enable them to submit their inventories, was not met; and
- urges Annex I parties to submit the report to facilitate the calculation of the assigned amount referred to in Decision 2/CMP.8, paragraph 2, as soon as practically possible.

Accounting, Reporting and Review Requirements for Annex I Parties without QELRCs for the Second Commitment Period:

This item (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/L.10) was first considered on Tuesday, 1 December. Parties established a contact group, co-chaired by Anke Herold (Germany) and Guilherme do Prado Lima (Brazil), on this item. The contact group first met on Tuesday, 1 December. On Friday, 4 December, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/L.28), the SBSTA agrees that its work under this agenda item has been completed, noting that the draft decisions contained in FCCC/SBSTA/2015/L.27/Add.1 and Add. 2 for the agenda item above (on implications of the implementation of Decisions 2/CMP.7 to 4/CMP.7 and 1/CMP.8 on the previous decisions on methodological issues to the Kyoto Protocol, including those relating to Articles 5, 7 and 8 of the Kyoto Protocol) address these matters sufficiently.

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

This item (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/L.11) was first considered on Tuesday, 1 December. SBSTA Chair Wojtal proposed, and parties agreed to, a contact group, co-chaired by Anke Herold (Germany) and Guilherme do Prado Lima (Brazil), on this item. The contact group first met on Tuesday, 1 December. On Friday, 4 December, the SBSTA adopted conclusions and forwarded a draft decision for consideration and adoption by the CMP.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/L.29 and Add.1), the SBSTA recommends a draft decision for consideration by CMP 11. In its decision, the CMP:

- clarifies that Article 3.7*ter* of the Doha Amendment contained in Annex I to Decision 1/CMP.8 is applicable for the second commitment period to parties that did not have a QELRC during the first commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol;
- clarifies that, for the purpose of implementing Article 3.7*ter*, of the Doha Amendment, the reference in Article 3.7*ter* of the Doha Amendment to “average annual emissions for the first three years of the preceding commitment period” refers to the average of the annual emissions of a party for the years 2008, 2009 and 2010, and that parties with a QELRC inscribed in the third column of Annex B to the Kyoto Protocol contained in Annex I to Decision 1/CMP.8 shall clarify, in their reports to facilitate the calculation of the assigned amount submitted pursuant to Decision 2/CMP.8, whether they have used, in the calculation of the average annual emissions for the first three years of the preceding commitment period, the gases and sources listed in Annex A to the Kyoto Protocol, or the same GHGs, sectors and source categories as those used to calculate the assigned amount for the second commitment period; and
- decides that, for an Annex I party undergoing the process of transition to a market economy and without a QELRC in the first commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol, the positive difference between the total emissions during the second commitment period and the assigned amount adjusted in accordance with Article 3.7*ter* of the Doha Amendment shall be added to the quantity of AAUs to be taken into account for the purpose of the assessment referred to in Decision 13/CMP.1, annex, paragraph 14 (basis for the compliance assessment), and that the added quantity shall be limited to

the quantity of AAUs cancelled by that party for the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol, in accordance with Article 3.7ter, of the Doha Amendment.

LULUCF under Protocol Article 3.3 and 3.4, and under the CDM: On Tuesday, 1 December, parties agreed that SBSTA Chair Wojtal would produce a draft decision on this item. On Friday, 4 December, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/L.20), the SBSTA takes note of the CDM Executive Board's (CDM EB) assessment of the applicability of the modalities and procedures to project activities involving revegetation, contained in the 2015 report of the CDM EB and requests the Secretariat to organize a workshop on the issue at SBSTA 44.

MARKET AND NON-MARKET MECHANISMS UNDER THE CONVENTION: On Tuesday, 1 December, parties agreed that SBSTA Chair Wojtal would produce a draft decision on the three sub-items of this agenda item. On Friday, 4 December, SBSTA Chair Wojtal reported that parties could not reach agreement on this issue for any of the sub-items: the framework for various approaches; non-market based approaches; and new market-based approaches. This item will be taken up at SBSTA 44.

REPORTS ON OTHER ACTIVITIES: On Tuesday, 1 December, parties took note of the Annual Report on the Technical Review of Information Reported under the Convention Related to Biennial Reports and NCs by Annex I Parties to the Convention (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/INF.5) and the Report on the Implementation of Domestic Action by Annex I Parties, as defined in Protocol Article 1.7, based on information reported in their NCs (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/INF.4).

Annual Report on the Technical Review of GHG Inventories from Annex I Parties to the Convention: This item (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/INF.9) was first considered on Tuesday, 1 December. SBSTA Chair Wojtal proposed, and parties agreed to, informal consultations, co-facilitated by Riitta Pipatti (Finland) and Washington Zhakata (Zimbabwe).

The informal consultations first convened on Tuesday, 1 December. On Friday, 4 December, the SBSTA adopted the draft conclusions and forwarded a draft decision to the COP. On Thursday, 10 December, the COP adopted the decision, with an amendment read out by SBSTA Chair Wojtal.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/L.21 and Add.1), the SBSTA recommends a draft decision for consideration by COP 21. In its decision, the COP, *inter alia*:

- requests the Secretariat to organize, for Annex I parties that did not undergo a review of their annual GHG inventory in 2015, the review of their 2015 GHG inventory submissions under the Convention in conjunction with the review of their 2016 GHG inventory submission, ensuring that the reviews are organized in accordance with Decision 13/CP.20 (guidelines for the technical review of information reported under the Convention related to GHG inventories, biennial reports and NCs by Annex I parties);
- decides that the expert review teams shall review identical information only once and shall produce a separate, complete review report for each party for each year;

- decides that the exceptional measures taken for the review of the 2015 GHG inventory submissions referred to above for the years 2015 and 2016 shall not be precedent-setting for future work;
- requests the Secretariat to make every effort to facilitate future reviews in accordance with Decision 13/CP.20 and any subsequent relevant decisions, without exception; and
- requests the Secretariat to continue to make improvements to the Common Reporting Format Reporter functionality, prioritizing the resolution of outstanding issues related to transparency and accuracy.

Annual Report on the Technical Review of GHG Inventories and Other Information Reported by Annex I Parties, as Defined in Protocol Article 1.7: On Tuesday,

1 December, the SBSTA considered the report (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/INF.10/Rev.1) and agreed to informal consultations, co-facilitated by Riitta Pipatti (Finland) and Washington Zhakata (Zimbabwe). On Friday, 4 December, the SBSTA adopted conclusions and forwarded a draft decision to the CMP.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/L.30 and Add.1), the CMP requests the Secretariat: to organize a review of the 2015 and 2016 GHG inventory submissions from Annex I parties; requests the Secretariat to organize a review of the reports to facilitate the calculation of the assigned amount for the second commitment period, striving to complete each review no later than one year after the submission date of the report; and to continue to make improvements to the CRF reporter functionality, prioritizing the resolution of outstanding issues related to transparency and accuracy. The CMP invites Annex I parties that have not yet submitted their 2015 GHG inventories and supplementary information to do so as soon as possible.

CLOSURE OF THE SESSION: On Friday, 4 December, SBSTA Rapporteur Stasile Znutiene (Lithuania) presented, and the SBSTA adopted, its report (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/L.15). Thanking everyone for their efforts during this intensive and brief SBSTA session, SBSTA Chair Wojtal gavelled the meeting to a close at 10:26 pm.

For a summary of statements made during the closing plenary of the SBSTA, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12657e.html>

A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF THE PARIS CLIMATE CHANGE CONFERENCE

*In Paris, we have seen many revolutions.
The most beautiful, most peaceful revolution has been achieved, a climate revolution.*

—François Hollande, President of France

The 2015 Paris Climate Change Conference was perhaps destined to succeed. After a bruising failure in Copenhagen in 2009 to produce a legally-binding agreement, many felt that Paris could not afford to fail. Yet there was also concern that the outcome would be watered-down or meaningless. In the end, the outcome of UNFCCC COP 21 exceeded expectations, producing an agreement that while perhaps not a revolution, is an important step in the evolution of climate governance and a reaffirmation of environmental multilateralism.

At COP 21, 195 countries gathered to complete the task they had set for themselves in Durban, in 2011, to complete a “protocol, another legal instrument or an agreed outcome with legal force under the Convention applicable to all parties.” This brief analysis explores the extent to which parties fulfilled this mandate, in terms of universal participation, but also in terms of the Paris Agreement’s ability to catalyze ambitious action by parties and action by a wide range of actors, which many cited as indispensable to address the climate crisis.

EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION

The Paris Agreement can be characterized as an evolution in climate governance, and a revolution in the UNFCCC COP process. At the center of the Paris Agreement are five-year cycles: each nationally determined contribution (NDC) cycle is to be more ambitious than the last and a global “stocktake” will inform collective efforts on mitigation, adaptation and support, and occur midway through the contribution cycle, every five years after 2023.

Through these cycles, parties are to “ratchet up” efforts to keep global temperature rise “well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels and to pursue efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels.” To track progress, parties are bound to a transparency framework, which represents the legally-binding portion of the agreement, alongside an obligation to undertake and communicate their NDCs.

The Paris Agreement also anchors, strengthens and creates institutions and mechanisms, particularly for means of implementation. The decision supporting the Agreement identifies modalities to be created or established for several new mechanisms, such as the new Paris Committee for Capacity-building and the mitigation and sustainable development mechanism. The decision also requests SBSTA to develop new modalities to account for public climate finance.

As many pointed out during the COP closing plenary, the Paris Agreement, as a compromise, “is good, but not perfect.” The communication of NDCs is legally-binding, but their content and targets are not. The Agreement includes reference to loss and damage, and the Warsaw International Mechanism on Loss and Damage associated with Climate Change Impacts, as a distinct article from adaptation. This separation was a “win” for many small island developing states (SIDS), yet the explicit exclusion of liability and compensation in the decision was a disappointment to many, as the costs associated with loss and damage cannot be covered by risk insurance alone.

In the immediate term, developed countries are not bound by the Agreement to increase their mitigation or support efforts beyond existing commitments. As many lamented, the US\$100 billion finance mobilization goal, set to be reached by developed countries in 2020, is “essentially extended in the decision through 2025,” after which time parties will have to negotiate a new collective goal, which some interpreted as including an expectation that some developing countries should participate in the mobilization.

The inclusion of human rights in the preamble of the agreement was celebrated by many, including Venezuela and Bolivia. This makes the Paris Agreement the first multilateral environmental agreement to recognize human rights. The preamble also includes concepts not traditionally considered

“climate issues,” such as intergenerational equity, climate justice and the right to health. Yet the Agreement does not operationalize these rights throughout, which disappointed, in particular, gender advocates who pointed out that the final text omits references to gender responsiveness that were present in a number of sections in earlier drafts.

In terms of the broader development of global climate governance, the Agreement reflects an evolution of the “bottom-up” approach. The Paris Agreement can be described as a hybrid between a top-down, rules-based system and a bottom-up system of pledge and review. The NDCs “codify” the bottom-up approach that emerged from Copenhagen. Yet, many pointed to “vestiges” of a Kyoto Protocol-type, top-down system, in the form of the common rules for transparency and the compliance mechanism, although some noted that the compliance mechanism is “merely” facilitative in nature as it lacks an enforcement branch. In short, the procedural aspects of the Paris Agreement are legally-binding. Nevertheless, most substantive elements, including the specific goals of the NDCs that will be housed in a public registry maintained by the Secretariat, are not legally-binding.

The Agreement also represents an evolution in how parties address differentiation. The Agreement builds on the compromise in Lima, which drew from a 2014 US-China joint announcement on climate change, that adds the element of “in light of different national circumstances” to the end of the familiar CBDR and respective capabilities. It makes no explicit mention of the annexes of the Convention, the historic harbingers of differentiation, but only developed and developing countries, with subtle re-alignments in various sections. The NDCs represent, as US Secretary of State John Kerry called them, a “monument to differentiation”: each country determines its “fair contribution,” according to its respective capabilities and in light of its “different national circumstances.”

The transparency framework is, according to one observer “subtly trifurcated,” asking all to take legally-binding reporting requirements, with recognition of developing countries’ need for support, and a further recognition of the special capacity-building needs of SIDS and least developed countries. As insisted by many developing countries, the provision of support is more strictly bifurcated, as developed countries “shall provide financial resources,” while other countries are encouraged to “provide such support voluntarily.”

Achieving such an evolution in global governance requires nothing short of a procedural revolution. This was the major innovation of the French Presidency. Under the guidance of COP 21 President Laurent Fabius, COP 21 managed to uphold a highly-transparent and inclusive process for parties, which catered to the needs of individual states, while challenging parties to craft an agreement that was more substantive than many thought possible.

The French borrowed the *indaba* model from the Durban COP, and learned from Copenhagen that Heads of State and Government provide political guidance and should not negotiate text. In a process that started before the 2014 Lima COP, the French Presidency worked in partnership with the Peruvian Presidency, to convene several ministerial meetings “to get the ministers well-acquainted.”

On the margins of the meetings organized by the French Presidency, a group of approximately 15 “like-minded” ministers from different regions and groups was brought together by the Marshall Islands. These informal meetings formed the basis of what became known as the “High-Ambition Coalition.” This loose alliance, eventually representing up to 100 countries, rallied around a list of “ambitious asks,” such as a clear long-term goal and five-year review cycles, creating a show of solidarity that some said effectively marginalized those not in the group. Many noted that these ambitious asks eventually found their way into the Agreement.

Another procedural revolution by the Presidency was to keep the full responsibility for the text’s development on the parties’ shoulders. Ministers had to engage with the lengthy, heavily bracketed text parties had developed in the ADP contact group, and subsequent iterations released during the second week faithfully reflected parties’ consultations. By not dropping a surprise text late in the proceedings, the French Presidency ensured that the text was party-owned and parties understood they had the collective responsibility for its success or failure. Many parties had quietly speculated throughout the meeting that the Presidency had its own text, but regardless of its existence, one was never unveiled. This galvanized ministers to do the heavy lifting of sorting through options and brackets themselves.

The transparency of the process, as one delegate put it, drove the ambition of what parties could achieve; this time, there was no “easy out of rejecting the President’s text.” Above all, the French Presidency said it would, and did, listen. That every party praised the Presidency is not only a tribute to the French Presidency, but a recognition that they all believed their positions were heard.

A PARTICIPATORY OR AN AMBITIOUS EVOLUTION?

Universal participation can come at the expense of ambition. Oftentimes, bringing all on board can result in a watering down of the overall level of ambition. At first glance, this appears to be the case, leading some observers to reject the deal as “business as usual.” Contributions that are nationally-determined, however, became a “necessity” to achieve universal participation because no single set of rules or targets could accommodate the vastly different circumstances of 195 states. The current set of 189 intended NDCs, representing 95% of global emissions—which many lauded as a remarkable level of participation—put collective efforts only on a path to an approximately 3°C temperature increase. For some, much of the success of the Paris Agreement will hinge on its ability to encourage parties to ratchet up their contributions to a sufficient level of ambition to safeguard the planet.

One way to increase ambition that many sought when they arrived in Paris was a legally-binding agreement. Yet specifying that an agreement is legally binding does not guarantee implementation and may reduce both ambition and participation. As Minister Vivian Balakrishnan of Singapore observed, “the Kyoto Protocol had the best of intentions,” yet was modest in its aims. It also lacked participation by key countries. While the NDCs represent significant participation, their non-legally binding character raised concerns over their low collective ambition.

Others viewed goal-setting as a way to increase the ambition of the agreement. The Agreement’s references to pursuing efforts to limit global average temperature rise to 1.5°C, coupled with references to peaking emissions as soon as possible, and achieving a balance between anthropogenic emissions and removals by sinks, a phrase many believe refers to net-zero emissions, are significantly more ambitious than many expected before COP 21. These new goals have implications for governments. As one delegate observed, the intended NDCs submitted before COP 21 need to be re-evaluated in light of the goals articulated in the Paris Agreement. Some observers hoped this would inspire at least some countries to revise their intended NDCs into more ambitious NDCs.

The transparency framework and the global stocktake were described by some as the Agreement’s “mechanisms for ambition.” The dual obligation to report and take stock of mitigation, adaptation and support every five years creates a collective assessment of achievements and needed efforts. Reviewing the extent of support provided “places a microscope” on developed countries to provide adequate support to meet developing countries’ mitigation and adaptation ambitions. Many hoped this would also provide assurances to help some countries remove the conditionalities from the mitigation section of their INDCs.

For many developing countries, post-2020 ambition relies on pre-2020 ambition. The Paris Outcome includes the Durban Platform’s workstream 2, tasked to address the pre-2020 mitigation gap, in a number of ways. These include a strengthened technical examination process (TEP) on mitigation that strives to involve more developing country experts and other actors, and formalizes the role of the technology and financial mechanisms of the Convention in the process. Also a new TEP is established on adaptation, welcomed by many developing countries where adaptation is as important as mitigation. Some viewed these institutional links as potentially moving the TEPs beyond “talk shops” and into “solutions spaces” where technologies and practices for both mitigation and adaptation become globally disseminated.

In addition, a facilitative dialogue at COP 22 will assess progress in pre-2020 implementation, and a high-level event at each COP from 2016-2020 will build on the current and previous COP Presidencies’ Lima-Paris Action Agenda (LPAA) initiative. Whether these processes together can raise pre-2020 ambition will only be determined in the coming years. For many, the answer to unlocking pre-2020 ambition lies in the Convention’s ability to engage transnational and subnational actors.

CREATING A “CLIMATE REVOLUTION FOR ALL”

As noted by COP 21 President Fabius, the success of the Paris conference would not only depend on a universal intergovernmental agreement. Action by state and non-state actors will ultimately determine whether Paris will go down in history as “the beginning of the end of the fossil fuel era,” as one country announced. The Paris Agreement could deliver in this area in three ways: through the agreement; by showcasing and mobilizing action by all actors; and by expanding the UNFCCC’s role in the fast-changing global implementation space.

At the Leaders Event on 30 November, numerous Heads of State and Government called for Paris to send strong long-term signals. UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon called on Paris to send a clear message to markets that transition to a low-carbon, climate resilient global economy is “inevitable, beneficial and already under way.” Also, some countries called for the Agreement to provide assurances that climate finance would be available and scaled up post-2020, in particular for the most vulnerable.

The Paris Agreement indeed sends strong signals for climate action by all. The ambitious goals of the Agreement, five-year review cycles, and the transparency framework were welcomed by many as much-needed signals to markets to enable investments to be redirected to low-carbon and climate-resilient development. Some also pointed out that the universal nature of the agreement and near-universal coverage of intended NDCs alone send signals that opportunities for investments, innovation and technology development are opening up around the world. Article 6 on cooperative approaches and mechanisms was also praised for “having something for everyone” and giving carbon markets a much-needed, renewed basis for support, complete with demand for credits driven by countries’ progressively ambitious NDCs.

Another important goal set for COP 21 was to accelerate climate action by both state and non-state actors. In forming the LPAA in late 2014, the Peruvian and French COP Presidencies, together with the UN Secretary-General and the UNFCCC Secretariat, built on the momentum achieved by the September 2014 UN Climate Summit to bring non-state actors “inside the COP walls,” as described by COP 20 President Manuel Pulgar-Vidal.

Despite some concern that COP 21 would be a one-off *tour de force* of state and non-state actor commitments, many initiatives were launched or strengthened in Paris that will build momentum in the longer term. These include India’s International Solar Alliance involving more than 120 countries and the private investor-led US\$2 billion Breakthrough Energy Coalition. Also, thousands of pledges of action and hundreds of billions of dollars in commitments to emission reductions and resilience measures were articulated through and alongside the LPAA, ranging from electrification in Africa to emission cuts in forest countries and climate risk insurance in SIDS.

Finally, many felt the Durban Platform, in particular its pre-2020 workstream, offered the UNFCCC a chance to reposition itself as the hub for global climate action. By Paris, this opportunity was seized at least three ways: the LPAA’s Non-State Actor Zone for Climate Action (NAZCA) portal and the public registry for NDCs, both maintained by the UNFCCC Secretariat, will serve as important focal points for aggregated information on climate plans, actions and support. The strengthened mitigation TEP, new adaptation TEP, and the LPAA-based high-level events, too, are likely to spur accelerated engagement with non-state actors within the UNFCCC space. Also, while the Paris outcome decision simply includes an invitation to non-party stakeholders to scale up their efforts and support actions, UNFCCC COPs have already managed to establish themselves

firmly as the main annual “cross-fertilization space” for civil society, scientists, businesses and industry from all around the world to rally public attention, network and share best practices.

“VIVE L’UN, VIVE LA PLANETE, VIVE LA FRANCE”

—François Hollande, President of France

Getting to an agreement was an arduous, lengthy task, and yet, as many recalled during the closing plenary “the work starts tomorrow.” Work to catalyze climate action before 2020 is pressing, and immediately lying ahead is the substantial technical and methodological work in order to prepare the many modalities to support the Paris Agreement for when it enters into force. It was not lost for many that the entry into force is not a foregone conclusion, given that 55 countries representing at least 55% of global emissions are required to ratify. Before 2020, many eyes will be on the major emitters whose ratification is necessary for the Paris Agreement to “come into effect and be implemented by 2020,” thereby completing the final leg of the Durban mandate.

During the COP 21 closing plenary, many lauded the Paris Agreement as an ambitious, fair and universal climate agreement, and many more celebrated the return to successful multilateral efforts to address climate change. Some observers viewed Paris as the culmination of a vital year for the UN development agenda, with the adoption of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, including its Sustainable Development Goals, and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda on financing for development, which together with the Paris Agreement on climate change can be said to provide a strong basis for multilateralism for the coming decade.

After years of doubt and indecision, the Paris Agreement represents renewed faith that multilateralism can address pressing challenges facing the international community. With its adoption on Saturday, 12 December 2015, most participants agreed with UNFCCC Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres that “we must, we can and we did.”

UPCOMING MEETINGS

Sixth Session of the IRENA Assembly: The sixth session of the International Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA) Assembly will convene in January 2016. The event will consider, among other things, the Agency’s work programme for 2016/2017 and review its medium-term strategy. **dates:** 16-17 January 2016 **location:** Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates **contact:** IRENA Secretariat **phone:** +971-2-417-9000 **email:** info@irena.org **www:** <http://www.irena.org/>

Abu Dhabi Sustainability Week: This global forum brings together leaders, policy makers and investors to address renewable energy and sustainable development. As part of the meeting the World Future Energy Summit, the International Water Summit and an EcoWASTE Exhibition will take place, among other events. **dates:** 16-23 January 2016 **location:** Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates **contact:** ADSW Secretariat **phone:** +971-2-653-3333 **fax:** +971-2-653-6002 **www:** <http://abudhabisustainabilityweek.com/>

Dialogue on Climate Services and Food Security: This event will be hosted by the World Food Programme (WFP) with key research, practitioner and user stakeholders to discuss the priorities for climate services in the food security and agriculture

sectors. **dates:** 18-19 January 2016 **location:** Rome, Italy
contact: WFP **phone:** +39-06-65131 **fax:** +39-06-6590632
email: fiona.guy@wfp.org **www:** <https://www.wfp.org/climate-change/innovations/climate-services>

Asia-Pacific Forestry Week 2016: The Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN (FAO) is hosting this event under the theme “Growing Our Future!” One of the five thematic streams of the event is “Tackling Climate Change: Challenges and Opportunities.” The week is being organized in partnership with, among others, the International Tropical Timber Organization, Secretariat of the Pacific Community and Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) of the CIGAR Consortium. **dates:** 22-26 February 2016 **location:** Pampanga, Philippines **contact:** FAO **phone:** +39-06-57051 **email:** AP-Forestry-Week@fao.org **www:** www.fao.org/about/meetings/asia-pacific-forestry-week/en

37th Meeting of the Open-Ended Working Group of the Montreal Protocol: OEWG 37 will meet in April 2016. **dates:** 4-8 April 2016 **location:** Geneva, Switzerland **contact:** Ozone Secretariat **phone:** +254-20-762-3851 **fax:** +254-20-762-0335 **email:** ozoneinfo@unep.org **www:** <http://ozone.unep.org/en/meetings>

IPCC-43: The 43rd session of the IPCC will be held in Nairobi, Kenya. **dates:** 11-13 April 2016 **location:** Nairobi, Kenya **contact:** IPCC Secretariat **phone:** +41-22-730-8208/54/84 **fax:** +41-22-730-8025/13 **email:** IPCC-Sec@wmo.int **www:** <http://www.ipcc.ch>

UNGA High-level Thematic Debate: Implementing Commitments on Sustainable Development, Climate Change and Financing: The President of the UN General Assembly (UNGA), Mogens Lykketoft, will convene a high-level thematic debate to support coherent implementation of commitments relating to sustainable development, climate change and financing. The event aims to mobilize and catalyze multilateral, collective, multi-stakeholder and individual actions and commitments in these areas, and to support early progress on the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). This event is one of three high-level events the President will convene during UNGA 70. **dates:** 11-12 April 2016 **location:** UN Headquarters, New York **contact:** Office of the President of the UNGA **email:** dowlatshahi@un.org **www:** <http://www.un.org/en/ga/revitalization/>

High-Level Signature Ceremony for the Paris Agreement: The UN Secretary-General, as Depositary of the Agreement, is expected to host a signing ceremony at the UN on the day the Agreement is opened for signatures. **date:** 22 April 2016 **location:** UN Headquarters, New York **contact:** Executive Office of the UN Secretary-General **www:** <http://www.un.org/sg/>

Global Change and Forest Health: Climate Change, Biological Invasions, Air Pollution, Forest Pathology, Forest Entomology and Their Interactions (IUFRO All-Division 7 Conference): The International Union of Forest Research Organizations (IUFRO) will hold its Forest Health Division conference on how climate change is affecting forests, whether forests will be able to adapt to these threats and to what extent forests can mitigate global change effects. **dates:** 25-29 April 2016 **location:** Istanbul, Turkey **contact:** IUFRO

phone: +43-1-877-01-51-0 **fax:** +43-1-877-01-51-50 **email:** eckehard.brockerhoff@scionresearch.com **www:** <http://www.foresthealth2016.com/>

Living Planet Symposium: The European Space Agency (ESA) is organizing this event to, *inter alia*: present the progress and plans for the implementation of the ESA Earth Observation (EO) strategy and the relevance of ESA’s EO Programme to societal challenges, science and economy; provide an international forum for scientists, researchers and users to present and share state of the art results based on ESA’s Earth Observation and third-party mission data; review the development of Earth Observation applications; and report on ESA’s Exploitation Programmes, including the Climate Change Initiative. **dates:** 9-13 May 2016 **location:** Prague, Czech Republic **contact:** ESA Living Planet Symposium Secretariat **phone:** +39-06-94180912 **fax:** +39-06-94180902 **email:** esa.conference.bureau@esa.int **www:** <http://lps16.esa.int/>

44th Sessions of the UNFCCC Subsidiary Bodies: The 44th sessions of the subsidiary bodies to the UNFCCC are expected to take place in May 2016. **dates:** 16-26 May 2016 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** <http://unfccc.int>

World Humanitarian Summit: The first World Humanitarian Summit (WHS) is an initiative of UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon and is managed by the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA). It will bring together governments, humanitarian organizations, people affected by humanitarian crises and new partners, such as the private sector, to propose solutions to pressing challenges like climate change and set an agenda to keep humanitarian action fit for the future. **dates:** 23-24 May 2016 **location:** Istanbul, Turkey **contact:** WHS Secretariat **email:** info@whsummit.org **www:** <https://www.worldhumanitariansummit.org/>

Fourth Dialogue on Article 6 of the Convention: Organized by Action for Climate Empowerment (ACE), the two-day Fourth Dialogue on Article 6 of the UNFCCC will take place in conjunction with SBI 44 and will focus on public participation, public awareness, public access to information and international cooperation on these matters. **dates:** May 2016 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** ACE/UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** www.unfccc.int/ace

50th Meeting of the GEF Council: The GEF Council meets twice a year to approve new projects with global environmental benefits in the GEF’s focal areas of biodiversity, climate change mitigation, chemicals and waste, international waters, land degradation, and sustainable forest management; and in the GEF’s integrated approach programs on sustainable cities, taking deforestation out of commodity chains, and sustainability and resilience for food security in Sub-Saharan Africa. On 9 June the Council will convene as the 20th meeting of the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) and Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF), also at the same location. **dates:** 6-9 June 2016 **location:** Washington, DC, US **contact:** GEF Secretariat **phone:** +1-202-473-0508 **fax:** +1-202-522-3240 **email:** secretariat@thegef.org **www:** http://www.thegef.org/gef/council_meetings

Asia Clean Energy Forum: The Asia Clean Energy Forum (ACEF), organized since 2006, seeks to provide a space for sharing best practices in policy, technology and finance to support climate and energy security in the region. The event comprises plenary sessions, keynote presentations, panel discussions and workshops on specific topics. **dates:** 15-19 June 2016 **location:** Manila, Philippines **contact:** ADB **phone:** +63-2-632-4444 **fax:** +63-2-636-2444 **email:** cleanenergy@adb.org **www:** <http://www.asiacleanenergyforum.org/>

Fifth Asia-Pacific Climate Change Adaptation Forum 2016: The Asia-Pacific Adaptation Network (APAN) is organizing this event with the UN Development Programme, Asian Development Bank, Global Water Partnership, UN Environment Programme and other partners under the theme “Mainstreaming Adaptation into Development,” with a focus on topics such as food security and adaptation financing. **date:** October 2016 **location:** Sri Lanka **contact:** APAN **e-mail:** info@asiapacificadapt.net **www:** www.asiapacificadapt.net

UN-HABITAT III: The Third UN Conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development (Habitat III) aims to secure renewed political commitment for sustainable urban development, assess progress and accomplishments to date, address poverty, and identify and address new and emerging challenges. The conference is expected to result in an action-oriented outcome document and the establishment of the New Urban Agenda. **dates:** 17-20 October 2016 **location:** Quito, Ecuador **contact:** UN-Habitat **phone:** +1-917-367-4355 **email:** Habitat3Secretariat@un.org **www:** <https://www.habitat3.org/>

UNFCCC COP 22: The 22nd session of the Conference of the Parties (COP 22) to the UNFCCC is expected to take place in Morocco. **dates:** 7-18 November 2016 **location:** Marrakesh, Morocco **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=2016

For additional meetings, see <http://climate-1.iisd.org/>

CMP	Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol
COP	Conference of the Parties
CRF	Common reporting format
CTCN	Climate Technology Centre and Network
ERUs	Emission reduction units
GCF	Green Climate Fund
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GHG	Greenhouse gas
IAR	International assessment and review
ICA	International consultation and analysis
INDCs	Intended nationally determined contributions
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
ITL	International Transaction Log
JI	Joint Implementation
JISC	Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee
LDCs	Least developed countries
LDCF	LDCs Fund
LEG	LDCs Expert Group
LMDCs	Like-Minded Developing Countries
LULUCF	Land use, land-use change and forestry
MOI	Means of implementation
MRV	Measurement, reporting and verification
NAPs	National adaptation plans
NCs	National communications
NDC	Nationally determined contribution
NWP	Nairobi work programme
REDD+	Reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, conservation of existing forest carbon stocks, sustainable forest management and enhancement of forest carbon stocks
SB	Subsidiary Body
SBI	Subsidiary Body for Implementation
SBSTA	Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice
SCF	Standing Committee on Finance
SIDS	Small island developing states
TEC	Technology Executive Committee
TEP	Technical examination process
TNAs	Technology needs assessments
UNFCCC	UN Framework Convention on Climate Change
WIM	Warsaw International Mechanism on Loss and Damage associated with Climate Change Impacts

GLOSSARY

AAUs	Assigned amount units
ADP	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action
AILAC	Independent Alliance of Latin America and the Caribbean
AOSIS	Alliance of Small of Island States
APA	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group on the Paris Agreement
BURs	Biennial update reports
CARICOM	Caribbean Community
CBDR	Common but differentiated responsibilities
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CDM EB	Clean Development Mechanism Executive Board
CERs	Certified emission reductions
CGE	Consultative Group of Experts
CMA	Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Agreement