



## SUMMARY OF THE BONN CLIMATE CHANGE CONFERENCE: 16-26 MAY 2016

The Bonn Climate Change Conference of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) convened from 16-26 May 2016 in Bonn, Germany. The conference included the 44th sessions of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI 44) and the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA 44), and the first meeting of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Paris Agreement (APA 1). Approximately 1,900 government delegates, 1,500 observers and 100 media representatives attended the meeting.

APA 1 adopted its agenda, heard initial views on its work mandated by the Paris Agreement and adopted its conclusions for further work.

SBI 44 adopted several conclusions related to its regular work on implementation, including on mechanisms under the Kyoto Protocol, capacity building, gender and national adaptation plans (NAPs). It also began work on issues mandated by the Paris Agreement, including the development of modalities and procedures for a public registry for nationally determined contributions (NDCs), and for adaptation communications.

SBSTA 44 adopted several conclusions, including on methodological issues under the Convention, and the Protocol, and the Nairobi work programme on impacts, vulnerability and adaptation to climate change (NWP). SBSTA 44 also began consideration of issues mandated to it by the Paris Agreement, including on the technology framework and modalities for Article 6 of the Agreement (cooperative approaches).

SB 44 was also the last meeting for Christiana Figueres, as UNFCCC Executive Secretary. On Thursday, 26 May, a special joint SBI/SBSTA/APA plenary was held to commemorate her service. All parties and observers expressed their gratitude and respect for her work, particularly her leadership culminating in the Paris Agreement. In response, Executive Secretary Figueres thanked parties, civil society and the Secretariat, and congratulated them for “capturing the winds of change” in Paris.

## 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 197 parties. In December 1997, delegates to the third session of the Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC (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 emission 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 meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP 1) established the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Annex I Parties’ Further Commitments under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP) in accordance with Protocol Article

### IN THIS ISSUE

A Brief History of the UNFCCC and the Kyoto Protocol. . .	1
Report of the Meetings . . . . .	3
Opening Plenary . . . . .	3
<i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group on the Paris Agreement . . . . .	3
Subsidiary Body for Implementation . . . . .	8
Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice . . . . .	17
A Brief Analysis of the Bonn Climate Change Conference . . . . .	23
Upcoming Meetings . . . . .	25
Glossary . . . . .	26

This issue of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* © <enb@iisd.org> is written and edited by Jennifer Allan, Beate Antonich, Rishikesh Ram Bhandary, Alice Bisiaux, Mari Luomi, Ph.D., 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)), Italian Ministry for the Environment, Land and Sea, and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. General Support for the *Bulletin* during 2016 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). 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/>

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 that included the Bali Action Plan (BAP), which 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 at COP 15 in Copenhagen, Denmark.

**COPENHAGEN:** The UN Climate Change Conference in Copenhagen 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 agreed to consider the adequacy of the global long-term goal during a 2013-2015 review. The Cancun Agreements established several new institutions and processes, including the Green Climate Fund (GCF), 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).

**DURBAN:** The UN Climate Change Conference in Durban, South Africa, took place in November/December 2011. Among other outcomes, parties agreed to launch the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (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" no later than 2015, to enter 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/December 2012, and 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 work of the AWG-KP and AWG-LCA and negotiations under the BAP.

**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 decisions establishing the Warsaw International Mechanism on Loss and

Damage associated with Climate Change Impacts (WIM), and the Warsaw Framework for REDD+ (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).

**LIMA:** The UN Climate Change Conference in Lima, Peru, took place in December 2014. COP 20 adopted the "Lima Call for Climate Action," which set in motion the negotiations towards the 2015 agreement by elaborating the elements of a draft negotiating text for the 2015 agreement, and the process for submitting and synthesizing INDCs, while also addressing pre-2020 ambition. Parties also adopted 19 decisions 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.

**ADP NEGOTIATIONS (2015):** 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 the Lima Call for Climate Action. The Geneva negotiating text adopted at ADP 2-8 served as the basis for further negotiations.

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 the mandate and proposed elements for a decision on pre-2020 ambition.

ADP 2-10 convened in August/September 2015 in Bonn. Delegates engaged on various parts of a "Tool" drafted by the ADP Co-Chairs, based on the streamlined and consolidated text resulting from ADP 2-9. Delegates considered placement of paragraphs in the Tool, engaged in conceptual discussions on key issues, and, in some cases, began 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 convened in October 2015 in Bonn. The ADP Co-Chairs proposed to begin text-based negotiations on the basis of the text they had prepared. Parties agreed to forward a revised non-paper for further negotiations and requested that the Secretariat prepare a technical paper identifying closely related paragraphs and duplication within sections, and possible areas for streamlining.

**PARIS:** The UN Climate Change Conference convened in Paris, France, in November-December 2015 and culminated in the Paris Agreement. The Agreement sets the goals of: keeping global average temperature rise to well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels and pursuing efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels; and enhancing global adaptive capacity, strengthening resilience and reducing vulnerability to climate change. The Agreement creates two five-year cycles. One cycle is for parties to submit NDCs, with each successive contribution representing a progression from the previous contribution, reflecting common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities (CBDRRC), in

the light of different national circumstances. Parties with a 10-year INDC timeframe are requested to communicate or update these contributions. The second cycle is a global stocktake of collective efforts, beginning in 2023, following a facilitative dialogue in 2018. All parties are to report using a common transparency framework, with support provided for developing countries to fulfill their reporting obligations. The Agreement establishes, *inter alia*, a mechanism to contribute to the mitigation of GHG emissions and support sustainable development and a technology framework to provide overarching guidance to the Technology Mechanism. The threshold for entry into force is 55 country ratifications accounting for at least 55% of global GHG emissions.

### REPORT OF THE MEETINGS

SBSTA 44 and SBI 44 opened on Monday, 16 May, and the APA opened on Tuesday, 17 May. This report summarizes the discussions by the three bodies based on their respective agendas.

Several in-session workshops under the COP were also held. The workshop on long-term finance is summarized here: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12669e.html>.

The workshop on the linkages between the Technology Mechanism and the Financial Mechanism is summarized here: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12672e.html>.

The workshop on exploring financing and use of the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) by international climate finance institutions convened under the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP) and is summarized here: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12667e.html>.

### OPENING PLENARY

On Monday, 16 May, COP 21/CMP 11 President Ségolène Royal, France, convened an opening meeting and called on negotiators to act as “builders,” working from the foundation laid in Paris.

Receiving a standing ovation in gratitude for her service, UNFCCC Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres announced that “today marks a new era for all of us.”

COP 22/CMP 12 President-Designate Salaheddine Mezouar, Morocco, said COP 22 will be one of action, and emphasized a focus on climate finance, agriculture and resilience.

During the opening statements, several groups highlighted the importance of building on the Paris Agreement, taking pre-2020 action and providing means of implementation (MOI).

Thailand, for the Group of 77 and China (G-77/China), underscored that action on adaptation and loss and damage cannot be deferred to after 2020.

The European Union (EU) underlined the importance of domestic implementation of INDCs. Australia, for the Umbrella Group, called for COP 22 to be an “implementation and action COP.”

Switzerland, for the Environmental Integrity Group (EIG), underscored the need to maintain the substance and balance of the Paris outcome. Colombia, for the Independent Alliance of Latin America and the Caribbean (AILAC), called for a coherent

and balanced set of recommendations for the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA).

The Democratic Republic of the Congo, for the Least Developed Countries (LDCs), noted that vulnerable countries are “leading the way to put the Paris Agreement into action.”

Panama, for the Coalition for Rainforest Nations, called for clear rules on transparency and market mechanisms.

Mali, for the African Group, said COP 22 should prioritize: ensuring a comprehensive and rules-based process; crystalizing adaptation action; and elaborating the technology framework.

Maldives, for the Alliance of Small of Island States (AOSIS), and Honduras, for the Central American Integration System (SICA), called for scaling up climate action.

Saudi Arabia, for the Arab Group, emphasized commitment to the principle of CBDRRC, and procedural transparency and inclusiveness.

India, for Brazil, South Africa, India and China (BASIC), noted the importance of the transparency framework, including for support.

Jordan, for the Like-Minded Developing Countries (LMDCs), called for treating all issues with the same degree of importance and recalibrating the bodies’ agendas as necessary.

Local Governments and Municipal Authorities called for coordinating with other processes, including Habitat III.

Women and Gender warned against falling into complacency and said ambition should be raised.

Youth NGOs (YOUNGOs) welcomed the recognition of inter-generational equity in the Paris Agreement. Noting their expertise, Indigenous Peoples highlighted the need to respect, protect and fulfill human rights.

Climate Action Network (CAN) emphasized civil society’s role in ensuring transparency.

Climate Justice Now! (CJN!) cautioned against implementing the Paris Agreement using unproven technologies.

Business and Industry NGOs (BINGOs) looked forward to providing their expertise to define common rules for measuring and reporting.

Farmers stressed the need to ensure that the global response to climate change does not threaten food production.

### AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON THE PARIS AGREEMENT

On Tuesday, 17 May, the APA convened its opening plenary. After opening statements, the APA met in informal consultations to discuss the agenda and the organization of work. After the agenda was adopted, parties met in a contact group and later in open-ended informal consultations to discuss each of the agenda items.

Discussions on each agenda item are summarized below, followed by a summary of the APA conclusions and closing plenary.

**OPENING STATEMENTS:** Laurence Tubiana, COP 21/CMP 11 Presidency, opened the session.

Thailand, for the G-77/China, called for the APA to give equal attention to all issues, and for flexibility for developing countries in the transparency framework.

Stressing focus on rules and guidance, including on the NDCs, the global stocktake and transparency, the Umbrella Group, suggested conceptual discussions on how to take work forward.

The EIG said the session should improve parties' understanding of the issues mandated to the APA, and proposed technical submissions and a Co-Chairs' reflection note after the session. The EU welcomed the planned in-session stocktaking to review efforts on assigned work.

AOSIS called for simplified procedures for small island developing states (SIDS) to access resources to implement climate actions.

The Arab Group stated the group's expectations for a party-driven and inclusive process.

AILAC called for protecting environmental integrity and human rights, and support for developing countries to implement their NDCs.

Venezuela, for the Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America (ALBA), said climate change limits implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

Mali, for the African Group, stressed that the APA must be comprehensive, and reflect the "delicate" balance achieved in the Paris Agreement. He identified building blocks for modalities on transparency of action and support, including flexibility and support.

The LDCs asked for assurance that all issues would receive equal and balanced treatment on the agenda.

Trade Union NGOs (TUNGOS) called for including a just transition as an element of the global stocktake.

Women and Gender urged parties to utilize the Lima work programme on gender to ensure climate responsiveness in all policy areas.

YOUNGOs called on parties to take into account future generations when making difficult decisions, noting the "youth are here to help."

BINGOs called for synergy with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and working to realize the "unprecedented message" of support to business from COP 21.

CAN emphasized the need for: raised ambition; a roadmap for the US\$100 billion pledge; scaled up pre-2020 targets; and agreement on support for loss and damage.

CJN! stressed "staying true to the spirit of Paris" and called geoengineering a "false solution."

Indigenous Peoples said guidance on NDCs should ensure full and effective participation of indigenous peoples and should include social safeguards.

**ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS: Election of officers:** On Tuesday, 17 May, the APA elected Sarah Baashan (Saudi Arabia) and Jo Tyndall (New Zealand) as Co-Chairs. Anna Serzysko (Poland) was elected rapporteur during the closing plenary on Thursday, 26 May.

**Adoption of the agenda:** On Tuesday, 17 May, the APA suspended plenary to allow further consultations on the agenda. These informal consultations convened 18 and 19 May.

On Friday, 20 May, APA Co-Chair Tyndall introduced the draft agenda, explaining that it included an item on adaptation communications and an item to ensure coherence in the implementation of the work programme. She further explained

that issues related to the registry referred to in Paris Agreement Article 7.12 (adaptation communications registry) would be addressed under the SBI. The APA then adopted the draft agenda (FCCC/APA/2016/L.1).

**Organization of work:** On Friday, 20 May, the APA turned to its organization of work. Many developing countries called for balanced treatment of all issues.

Thailand, for the G-77/China, and Malaysia, for the LMDCs called for, *inter alia*, limited parallel meetings. Switzerland, supported by Australia, Norway, the EU and others, proposed to begin with an exchange of ideas in a plenary setting and then engage in contact or spin-off groups. Colombia, for AILAC, said discussions on process should remain in plenary.

The EU and the LDCs, suggested starting work with Agenda Items 3 to 7 (mitigation, adaptation communications, transparency framework, global stocktake, and implementation and compliance).

Noting general eagerness to begin work swiftly, APA Co-Chair Baashan suspended the session for open-ended consultations on the organization of work. These informal consultations occurred on 20 and 21 May.

On Monday, 23 May, Co-Chair Tyndall proposed work continue in a single contact group on all substantive agenda items, moving into open-ended informal consultations on 24 and 25 May for technical elaborations and reconvening in the contact group to review progress, determine the way forward and consider draft conclusions. The APA then adopted its organization of work.

#### **FURTHER GUIDANCE ON THE MITIGATION SECTION OF DECISION 1/CP.21 (PARIS OUTCOME):**

This item was discussed in a contact group on Monday, 23 May, and in open-ended informal consultations on Tuesday, 24 May.

A number of countries, including Kenya, for the African Group, stressed the nationally-determined nature of NDCs. Several countries cautioned against prescriptive guidance.

Many countries called for reflecting the diversity of NDCs with some guidance common to all NDCs and some guidance specific to certain types of NDCs. Noting differences in capacities and capabilities, China, for the LMDCs, opposed by the US, called for differentiation between developed and developing countries.

India, with China, said further guidance on NDCs should be in the context of Paris Agreement Article 3 (NDCs, including progression and support), and called for technical work on how equity and CBDRRC inform NDC preparation processes.

The US, Switzerland and Australia stated that this agenda item is limited to mitigation. The EU, South Africa, Australia, and Colombia, for AILAC, stressed the need for quantifiability of NDCs.

On types of mitigation NDCs requiring tailored guidance, countries suggested, *inter alia*, economy-wide emission reduction/limitation targets, deviations from business-as-usual, intensity and sectoral targets, and low-emission development strategies, plans and actions. Norway highlighted clarity for the land sector and markets. Canada underlined the need for enhancing information on baselines and projections.

On the timing of NDC communication, Jordan, for the LMDCs, with the LDCs, stated that guidance on features, information and accounting would only apply to the subsequent cycle of NDCs. The LMDCs said common timeframes for the periodic communication of NDCs could only apply if developed countries commit, in a binding, clear, operational and verifiable manner, to providing for the full costs required by developing countries to regularly submit NDCs.

On accounting, many countries called for building on the Paris Agreement, the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol, and stressed the principles of environmental integrity and avoidance of double counting. The LMDCs called for general principles rather than detailed operational procedures or modalities. Some suggested conceptual clarity around “accounting,” with Brazil stressing work should focus on tracking progress, not counting units. AILAC and Norway called for specific rules on land use.

On the way forward, many countries supported submissions with a clearly defined scope. Grenada called for a technical paper on the challenges encountered in INDC preparation. Many expressed openness to exploring inter-, pre- or in-session technical workshops, with some calling for guaranteeing participation by all countries. South Africa called for a programme of work for further deliberations at COP 22. New Zealand called for submissions on accounting guidance with a focus on: principles and norms to safeguard environmental integrity; drawing from existing approaches; and how to accommodate all NDCs.

**FURTHER GUIDANCE IN RELATION TO THE ADAPTATION COMMUNICATION, INCLUDING, *INTER ALIA*, AS A COMPONENT OF NDCS, REFERRED TO IN ARTICLE 7.10 AND 7.11 OF THE PARIS AGREEMENT:**

Parties discussed this item in a contact group on Monday, 23 May, and in open-ended informal consultations on Wednesday, 25 May. Parties discussed: what adaptation communications seek to achieve, and their linkages with other issues; scope of guidance; and balance between the need for guidance on adaptation communications and flexibility.

On what adaptation communications seek to achieve, Thailand, for the G-77/China, emphasized the objective as catalyzing action by clearly communicating national needs, priorities and plans, and urged viewing adaptation communications as means to assist developing countries towards achieving the global goal on adaptation without being punitive.

Ecuador, for the LMDCs, called for a differentiated approach to adaptation communications and underscored the need for a voluntary and discretionary approach.

A few parties urged a “common minimum element” in communications, noting that “sufficient detail” was necessary to track progress. Some parties stressed that adaptation communications should not create additional burdens on parties to report.

The US proposed that adaptation communications be “high-level” summaries of NAPs and information related to existing vehicles of adaptation communication. Indonesia noted that adaptation communications could help increase ambition in adaptation and strengthen response to Article 2 (purpose) of the Paris Agreement.

Many parties identified linkages with existing vehicles of communication and parts of the Paris Agreement, including the global stocktake and transparency.

**MODALITIES, PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES FOR THE TRANSPARENCY FRAMEWORK FOR ACTION AND SUPPORT:**

This item was first discussed in a contact group on Monday, 23 May, and later in open-ended informal consultations on Tuesday, 24 May. Parties discussed: scope and key issues of the framework; the notion of “flexibility;” the structure of technical work; and lessons from experiences under the Convention.

On scope and key issues, several parties noted the need to address all elements of the transparency framework in a balanced manner. Kenya, for the African Group, emphasized transparency of action and support, while the EU stressed the framework’s importance for implementing and tracking progress on NDCs. The LDCs called for clear guidelines on what should be accounted for in the measurement, reporting and verification system, and for an agreed operational definition of climate finance.

On flexibility, countries discussed how to operationalize flexibility, and many developed and developing countries called for consideration of differing capacities among developing countries, particularly LDCs and SIDS. Saint Lucia called for, *inter alia*, common reporting formats and the use of common Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) guidelines and metrics.

China called for identifying, *inter alia*, how support would be continuously provided to developing countries for the framework’s implementation. India, for the LMDCs, called for operationalizing differentiation and the principle of CBDRRC and systematically integrating flexibility into the modalities, procedures and guidelines.

Saudi Arabia identified two layers of flexibility: systematic application; and flexibility embedded in current guidelines.

The EU and Norway opposed categorical application of flexibility. The US said flexibility could only be discussed in the context of common procedures.

Many parties underlined the principle of continuous improvement over time in the design of the transparency framework. New Zealand suggested learning from the use of the IPCC’s tiered approach. The US and Norway noted that reporting and review are opportunities to build capacity. Kenya, for the African Group stressed, *inter alia*, the political will of developing countries to participate effectively in the transparency framework.

On structuring technical work, several parties supported a step-wise approach, beginning with guidelines for reporting before moving to guidelines for the technical expert review, and the modalities and procedures for the transparency framework. The US suggested that this approach recognize the unique characteristics of different elements. Saudi Arabia proposed an initial mapping of current requirements through parties’ submissions and identifying and subsequently addressing any gaps in the common modalities and guidelines.

On lessons from other areas of work under the Convention, Peru, for AILAC, highlighted REDD+ and noted that REDD+

guidelines will not be superseded by modalities, procedures and guidelines of the transparency framework.

Several parties identified the facilitative sharing of views (FSV) as instructive of capacity gaps and challenges. Brazil noted that one of the lessons of the FSV is that more general guidance is not synonymous with flexibility, but that detailed guidance could be more helpful for implementation and review. Mexico suggested entrusting the Adaptation Committee and the LDC Expert Group (LEG) with the technical work on adaptation.

On the way forward, many parties supported focused submissions. Canada proposed launching technical work in Marrakesh. Japan called for a work programme to further negotiations. Saudi Arabia opposed submissions at this stage. South Africa proposed the Secretariat prepare a document providing an overview of existing guidelines and modalities that may be applicable to this and other APA agenda items.

#### **MATTERS RELATING TO THE GLOBAL**

**STOCKTAKE:** This item was taken up in a contact group on Monday, 23 May, and in open-ended informal consultations on Tuesday, 24 May.

Discussions focused on: inputs to the global stocktake; how the global stocktake will be conducted; and the relationship between the global stocktake and the 2018 facilitative dialogue.

On inputs to the global stocktake, many parties mentioned: reports of the IPCC and of the constituted and subsidiary bodies, as well as the outputs of the transparency framework. Some noted non-state actors' input and regional information. Many also noted that inputs would vary for mitigation, adaptation and MOI.

Kuwait, for the G-77/China, highlighted overall assessments of NDCs and information on mobilization of support, with India, Argentina and Norway calling for including information on the state of adaptation support.

On how to conduct the global stocktake, several developed countries suggested tailoring the process to the different nature of mitigation, adaptation and MOI, while many developing countries stressed the need to make information available with enough time for its consideration. Many countries, opposed by Saudi Arabia, suggested learning from the structured expert dialogue (SED) on the 2013-2015 review. The LMDCs suggested drawing upon the experience from the international assessment and review (IAR) and the international consultation and analysis (ICA).

On output, parties suggested: a summary report of a high-level roundtable issued after 2023; a high-level "political moment" in 2023; and a chair's summary. Some developing countries stressed the need for the global stocktake to conclude in 2023 to inform parties' preparations of their NDCs.

On the relationship between the global stocktake and the 2018 facilitative dialogue, there was general recognition that the facilitative dialogue and the global stocktake differ in scope, but that the latter could learn from the former. The LDCs said the dialogue provides an opportunity for parties to enhance ambition. India stated that the dialogue should address how equity, sustainable development and poverty eradication efforts are considered in mitigation efforts. Argentina suggested the dialogue look at the possible early entry into force of the Agreement.

On the way forward, many called for submissions. New Zealand and AILAC welcomed a list of possible questions presented by the LMDCs, who suggested submissions on information in addition to what is listed in decision 1/CP.21 (Paris outcome) on, *inter alia*: linkage between the global stocktake and other institutional arrangements; procedural format; inclusion of science; establishment of a SED; timeframe; and possible outputs.

**MODALITIES AND PROCEDURES FOR THE EFFECTIVE OPERATION OF THE COMMITTEE TO FACILITATE IMPLEMENTATION AND PROMOTE COMPLIANCE:** The APA discussed this item in a contact group on Monday, 23 May, and in open-ended informal consultations on 25 May.

Parties discussed: features of a mechanism to facilitate implementation and promote compliance; triggers for the work of the compliance committee; and actions the committee could take.

On features, many parties stressed that the mechanism should be facilitative, non-punitive and non-adversarial. Some parties emphasized the unified approach of the compliance mechanism with attention to national circumstances and capabilities, while others noted the need to operationalize differentiation. Parties also discussed: inclusion of both individual and collective obligations in scope; facilitation of implementation of binding and non-binding elements; and linkages to other mechanisms under the Paris Agreement.

On triggers, parties suggested options, including self-referrals, party-to-party, technical expert review, and the Secretariat. One party objected to non-state actors as triggers while others supported a party-driven process. Some parties emphasized the need for full transparency at all stages and said the concerned party must be kept informed during the entire process. Parties also discussed how the output of the transparency framework could be used as a trigger. A number of parties supported a technical paper on triggers, while others opposed and called for further discussion.

On actions by the committee, many parties supported the need to identify the causes of non-compliance. Thailand, for the G-77/China, supported making recommendations to the Financial Mechanism to support implementation. Some parties noted that the compliance committee could provide recommendations to the CMA.

**FURTHER MATTERS RELATED TO IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PARIS AGREEMENT:** This item was discussed in the contact group on Monday, 23 May, and in open-ended informal consultations held Wednesday, 25 May.

**Preparing for entry into force:** Parties exchanged views on potential early entry into force, and the procedural and administrative arrangements in the event of early entry into force.

On potential early entry into force, Venezuela, for the LMDCs, expressed concern that some parties are advocating early entry into force, but not demonstrating the same urgency for ratifying the Doha Amendment and other pre-2020 action. The US stressed it would fulfill its pre-2020 pledges and join the Agreement in 2016.

Colombia, for AILAC, the EU and the US supported early entry into force, and, with the LMDCs, emphasized it should not affect parties' right to fully participate in the rulemaking process. The LDCs, said early entry into force should incentivize parties to ratify so that they can participate in the CMA. To avoid perverse incentives for parties to delay ratification, the EU suggested a clear deadline to finish preparations.

On procedural and administrative arrangements, the Secretariat explained that the Paris Agreement's institutions become operational when the Agreement enters into force and that CMA 1 must convene at the first COP following entry into force. The Secretariat presented two options, noting that if enough ratifications are secured by 7 October 2016, CMA 1 would convene in Marrakesh. First, the CMA could carry the work programme forward with the assistance of the APA and subsidiary and constituted bodies, which would require a COP decision to extend the APA. Second, the CMA could suspend its first session, requesting the COP to continue the work programme, and resume at subsequent COPs to take stock and appropriate decisions.

Switzerland, the EU, Peru, for AILAC, the US, Norway and Japan supported the suspension option with a specific deadline, with some suggesting 2018. Algeria, for the LMDCs, proposed extending the mandate of the APA until the work programme concludes. South Africa supported suspension, adding that COP 22 should adopt a decision that captures this understanding.

The LDCs underlined they would consider suspension of CMA 1 only after consideration of the provisional application of the Paris Agreement and prompt ratification of the Doha Amendment. Brazil worried that suspending CMA 1 would send the wrong political signal.

AOSIS called for using the practice established for the Kyoto Protocol, whereby observer parties were able to fully participate in discussions, but not in decision making. The US, Indonesia and South Africa supported the principle of inclusiveness. Mali, for the African Group, called for "effective and fair" participation of all parties and supported creating a contact group on this item at COP 22.

**Preparing for the convening of CMA 1:** AOSIS said procedural decisions on the process that will be used to complete the work and on who has responsibility for it should be taken at CMA 1.

**Taking stock of progress made by the subsidiary and constituted bodies in relation to their mandated work under the Paris Agreement and Section III of Decision 1/CP.21 (decisions to give effect to the Paris Agreement), in order to promote and facilitate coordination and coherence in the implementation of the work programme, and, if appropriate, take action, which may include recommendations:** Parties discussed ways to enhance coordination among the bodies mandated with work by the Paris Agreement.

Parties identified: stocktaking sessions, beginning at COP 22; a contact group to assist the Co-Chairs and Presidencies in ensuring parallel progress; and invitations for the Chairs of the subsidiary and constituted bodies to report to the APA. The EU said decision 1/CP.21 (Paris outcome) already contains all the necessary modalities.

**CLOSING PLENARY:** The APA closing plenary took place on Thursday, 26 May. On items 3-8, APA Co-Chair Tyndall presented draft conclusions (FCCC/APA/2016/L.3), which were adopted as presented.

Morocco, speaking for the COP 22 Presidency, reported on consultations regarding inclusiveness in the event of early entry into force. He noted that countries welcomed rapid early entry into force and said the Presidency would continue to engage with parties on this issue. He said a summary of the consultations will be posted on the UNFCCC website.

Thailand, for the G-77/China, noted: the usefulness of guiding questions to focus discussions on agenda items; the need to accelerate pre-2020 action; and the importance of coherence across all issues under the APA. The EU welcomed the constructive mode of work.

The Umbrella Group emphasized the need for, *inter alia*: experts to begin work on the transparency framework; continued discussions on the global stocktake; and preservation of the balance of the Paris Agreement of which adaptation is a component.

Mexico, for the EIG, welcomed potential early entry into force and urged parties to maintain the spirit of Paris to produce concrete results.

The LDCs expressed disappointment about the lack of agreement to proceed with technical papers and workshops and hoped for constructive work ahead.

Mali, for the African Group, urged continued balanced treatment of issues under the APA and highlighted the pre-2020 ambition and support gap, including the few Doha Amendment ratifications.

AOSIS highlighted the need to begin work on the global stocktake and noted the need for simplified procedures for expedited access to finance for states lacking capacity.

The LMDCs called for a quantified climate finance roadmap by COP 22 and raised concern over the political imbalance caused by prioritizing an early entry into force of the Paris Agreement over the ratification of the Doha Amendment.

Nicaragua, for ALBA, called on developed countries to prioritize ratification of the Doha Amendment, and fulfill their obligations with the aim of limiting temperature rise to below 1.5°C to protect Mother Earth.

AILAC said technical issues must not stop ambition and hoped work would begin at COP 22 on adaptation, mitigation, transparency and the global stocktake.

Indonesia underlined the need for coordination among the subsidiary bodies. Ukraine underscored developing rules and modalities for the transparency framework that avoid double counting as a major task for Marrakesh. Stressing urgency, the Philippines drew attention to the severe drought in her country and called for early and predictable progress toward the US\$100 billion commitment for annual financial support.

Research and independent non-governmental organizations (RINGOs) expressed their commitment to work with their peers in developing countries to build capacity.

Women and Gender stressed that applying gender considerations to climate issues ensures a more efficient and

adequate response and called for NDCs to include information on equity.

YOUNGOs encouraged parties to ratify the Paris Agreement as soon as possible, while also remembering the importance of taking pre-2020 action.

CAN called for focusing on: efforts to enhance pre-2020 action and support; the 2016 facilitative dialogue; high-level climate finance events; the capacity-building work programme; and the work of the high-level champions.

CJN! reminded delegates of the reality unfolding “outside these walls” with people losing livelihoods and lives, stressing that emissions need to be cut now, according to “your fair shares.”

Noting the need to address the effects of climate change by fostering resilience and low-emissions development, Farmers called for investing in research and extension services.

Highlighting their unique and crucial perspective as longstanding caretakers of the environment, Indigenous Peoples said the mechanism established under Article 15 (compliance) must take into account the perspectives and concerns of indigenous peoples.

APA Rapporteur Anna Serzysko introduced the draft report (FCCC/APA/2016/L.2), which the APA adopted.

On closure of the session, Co-Chair Tyndall noted that this session of the APA would be suspended to allow parties to focus on substantive work in Marrakesh. She noted that the suspension would be an exception from standard APA practice. The APA was suspended at 9:03 pm.

**APA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/APA/2016/L.3), the APA notes that it had launched work on all of its substantive agenda items, and decides to:

- invite the Co-Chairs to prepare a scenario note for the resumed session of APA 1;
- encourage parties that have not done so to sign the Paris Agreement and deposit their instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval;
- welcome consultations undertaken by the incoming COP 22 Presidency on possible early entry into force; and
- request the Co-Chairs to prepare, by 30 August, a set of guiding questions to assist parties in developing their conceptual thinking on features and elements of the committee to facilitate implementation and promote compliance.

On modalities for its organization of work at its first session, the APA agrees to: continue working in a single contact group setting; meet to set the direction of work, take stock midsession and close the meeting; and carry out technical work on the six agenda items through informal consultations. The conclusions specify that the Co-Chairs will announce the facilitators well in advance of the resumed session of APA 1.

The APA also agrees to invite parties to submit, by 30 September 2016, their views on agenda items 3-6.

## SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR IMPLEMENTATION

**ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS:** SBI Chair Tomasz Chruszczow (Poland) opened the session on Monday, 16 May, and invited parties to adopt the provisional agenda (FCCC/2016/SBI/1) with the sub-item on information contained in national

communications from non-Annex I parties to the Convention held in abeyance. He said that SBI Vice-Chair Zhihua Chen (China) would convene informal consultations on this sub-item.

Thailand, for the G-77/China, supported by Saudi Arabia and opposed by the Umbrella Group, and the EU, called for amending the agenda item on the NDC registry by removing a reference to Paris Agreement Article 4.12 (NDC registry) from its title. Many parties called for consideration of capturing adaptation efforts in a public registry.

After some debate, Chair Chruszczow proposed, and parties agreed, to adopt the agenda with the sub-item on non-Annex I national communications held in abeyance, and without the item on the NDC registry, on which parties agreed to hold further consultations to find a way forward.

On Friday, 20 May, Chair Chruszczow reported on the results of the consultations held on item 5 (NDC registry), and parties agreed to change its title to development of modalities and procedures for the operation and use of a public registry referred to in Paris Agreement Article 4.12 (NDC registry). Parties agreed to add a new item on the development of modalities and procedures for the operation and use of a public registry referred to in Paris Agreement Article 7.12 (adaptation communications registry).

Egypt suggested that this change would mean one registry for both adaptation and mitigation actions. The US clarified, and Chair Chruszczow confirmed, that at this stage, the SBI can only approve the revised agenda, leaving the operationalization of these items for later. The SBI then adopted the revised SBI agenda (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.2) to replace the provisional agenda adopted on 16 May.

On Thursday, 26 May, Chair Chruszczow reported that consultations conducted by Vice-Chair Zhihua Chen on the agenda item on national communications from non-Annex I parties did not result in consensus. Chair Chruszczow proposed, and the SBI agreed, to include it on the provisional agenda of SBI 45, with a footnote indicating that at SBI 44 there was no consensus to include this sub-item on the agenda, and, upon proposal by the Chair, the SBI decided to include the sub-item on the provisional agenda for SBI 45.

**International Consultation and Analysis:** Two FSV workshops were held. For highlights of the session on Friday, 20 May, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12671e.html>. For highlights of the session held on Saturday, 21 May, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12672e.html>.

**Mandated events:** The SBI convened several mandated events:

- The 4th Dialogue of Action for Climate Empowerment (ACE) held on 18 May: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12669e.html> and on 19 May: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12670e.html>
- Technical expert meeting (TEM) on mitigation: Social and Economic Value of Carbon: concrete tools based on a reference value of carbon to inform investment decisions, re-evaluate risks and incentivize early action, held on 20 May: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12671e.html>.
- TEM on mitigation: Shifting to more efficient public transport and increasing energy efficiency of vehicles, held on 23 May: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12673e.html>

- TEM on adaptation: Enhancing the implementation of adaptation action, held on 24 May: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12674e.html>; and
- TEM on adaptation: Effective policy frameworks and institutional arrangements for adaptation planning and implementation, held 25 May: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12675e.html>

**Election of officers:** On Thursday, 26 May, Chair Chruszczow reported that consultations on this item had not resulted in a nomination for SBI rapporteur, and that, according to Rule 22.2 of the draft rules of procedure being applied, SBI Rapporteur Sidat Yaffa (the Gambia) will remain in office until his successor is elected at the next session.

**ANNEX I REPORTING: Status of submission and review of second biennial reports (BRs):** This sub-item (FCCC/SBI/2016/INF.1) was first taken up by the SBI plenary on Monday, 16 May. The SBI took note of the status of the submissions and review of second BRs.

**Compilation and synthesis of sixth national communications (NCs) and first BRs:** This sub-item was first taken up by the SBI plenary on Monday, 16 May. It was subsequently discussed in informal consultations co-facilitated by Anne Rasmussen (Samoa) and Helen Plume (New Zealand).

In the informal consultations, some parties proposed to include, in the conclusions text, references to information on GHG emission trends in a chapter of the compilation and synthesis report of the sixth NCs and first BRs, with others proposing references to all chapters. After a short discussion, recognizing that the information in the compilation and synthesis of the sixth NCs and first BRs is “outdated,” and that the compilation and synthesis of the second BRs will be discussed at SBI 45, parties agreed to simply take note of the documents referred to in the SBI agenda under this sub-item.

The SBI plenary adopted conclusions on Wednesday, 25 May.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.1), the SBI takes note of the compilation and synthesis of sixth NCs and first BRs from Annex I countries prepared by the Secretariat in 2014, and notes that the compilation and synthesis of second BRs from Annex I parties will be discussed at SBI 45.

**Outcome of international assessment and review (IAR) (2014-2015):** This sub-item was first taken up by the SBI plenary on Monday, 16 May. It was subsequently discussed in informal consultations co-facilitated Xiang Gao (China) and Helen Plume (New Zealand).

In the informal consultations, on Wednesday, 18 May, parties presented their views on: the possible content of draft conclusions and where to forward them; and the possible revision of the IAR modalities and procedures, including which body should undertake it. On the content of the draft conclusions, parties suggested, *inter alia*: an assessment of the implementation of methodological and reporting requirements; a recommendation to include MOI in the scope of the multilateral assessment; and to draft procedural conclusions only. Many parties stated that the SBI should conduct the revision in 2017.

The SBI plenary adopted conclusions on Wednesday, 25 May.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.12), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- notes the IAR multilateral assessment sessions held at SBI 41, 42 and 43, during which 43 developed country parties were assessed;
- takes note of the party records for these parties, noting that these represent part of the experience gained in the first round of IAR and will inform the revision of the modalities and procedures referred to in Decision 2/CP.17, paragraph 26 (revision of the modalities and procedures based on the first IAR round in 2016);
- notes with appreciation that this IAR round is contributing to the achievement of the overall objectives of Decision 2/CP.17, Annex II, paragraph 1 (IAR objectives), and to building trust; and
- recommends a draft decision (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.12/Add.1) for consideration by COP 22.

**Revision of guidelines for the preparation of NCs:** This sub-item (FCCC/SBI/2016/INF.4/Rev.1) was first taken up by the SBI plenary on Monday, 16 May, and subsequently discussed in informal consultations, co-facilitated by Fatuma Hussein (Kenya) and Helen Plume (New Zealand).

In informal consultations on Thursday, 26 May, Chair Chruszczow briefed parties on his consultations with heads of delegation held to resolve outstanding issues. He explained parties were not able to reach consensus on one remaining paragraph of the draft guidelines (paragraph 71), on the communication of the information identified in the guidelines, including its format, length and language.

Parties agreed to procedural draft conclusions, with the understanding that agreement had been reached on all but the remaining paragraph, which would be considered at SBI 45.

The SBI plenary adopted conclusions on Thursday, 26 May.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.22), the SBI:

- notes its continued consideration of the revision of the UNFCCC reporting guidelines on NCs;
- acknowledges progress made in the revision of the reporting guidelines during a workshop held from 13-14 May 2016;
- agrees on the text of the draft revised guidelines, as contained in the annex to the conclusions, except for the bracketed text in paragraph 71; and
- agrees to continue consideration of the bracketed text in paragraph 71, with a view to finalizing the revised UNFCCC reporting guidelines on NCs at SBI 45 and recommending them for consideration by COP 22.

**NON-ANNEX I REPORTING: Information contained in NCs:** The SBI decided in plenary on Monday, 16 May, to hold this item in abeyance.

**Provision of financial and technical support:** The SBI opening plenary considered this sub-item on Monday, 16 May, when it heard the report by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) on its activities relating to the preparation of biennial update reports (BURs) (FCCC/SBI/2016/INF.2). Subsequently, Chair Chruszczow held informal consultations with interested parties.

In plenary, Iran noted the unresponsiveness of the GEF Secretariat to its inquiries on why project support was not received. On Thursday, 26 May, the SBI adopted its conclusions.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.11), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- invites the GEF to continue to provide detailed information on its activities relating to the preparation of BURs;
- notes that, as of 24 May 2016, there were many outstanding submissions of BURs from non-Annex I parties, and encourages non-Annex I parties that have not yet completed and submitted their first BUR to do so as soon as possible;
- encourages GEF agencies to continue to facilitate the preparation and submission of project proposals by non-Annex I parties for BUR preparation and to respond to the project proposals;
- encourages non-Annex I parties to take advantage of the opportunities for technical assistance and support available under the Global Support Programme;
- recognizes the contribution made by the Consultative Group of Experts on NCs from non-Annex I parties (CGE) in providing technical support, and urges Annex II developed country parties and other developed country parties in a position to do so to provide financial resources for the implementation of the CGE work programme, as well as to the Secretariat to implement the activities supporting non-Annex I parties in building their transparency-related capacity; and
- requests the Secretariat to report, at SBI 45, on the progress made in this regard, including on relevant regional workshops held in 2016.

**Technical analysis of BURs:** On Monday, 16 May, the SBI took note of the summary reports on the technical analysis of BURs published since SBI 43.

**DEVELOPMENT OF MODALITIES AND PROCEDURES FOR THE OPERATION AND USE OF A PUBLIC REGISTRY REFERRED TO IN PARIS AGREEMENT ARTICLE 4.12 (NDC REGISTRY):** This item (FCCC/SBI/2016/INF.6) was first taken up by the SBI plenary on Monday, 16 May, under the provisional agenda title “Registry of NDCs referred to in Paris Agreement Article 4.12.”

In the SBI plenary on Tuesday, 17 May, Thailand, for the G-77/China, called for recording adaptation communications in the public NDC registry maintained by the Secretariat. The Republic of Korea, for the EIG, called for creating an accessible and simple NDC registry, and Mali, for the African Group, underlined the need to clarify its objective, function and nature.

In plenary on Friday, 20 May, the SBI agreed to convene informal consultations on this item co-facilitated by Gertraud Wollansky (Austria) and Madeleine Diouf Sarr (Senegal) after agreeing to the new title for the agenda item.

In the informal consultations, parties shared views on the modalities and procedures for the registry, and on the organization of work, where several reiterated calls for a single contact group for this item and work on the adaptation communications registry.

On the registry, many stressed transparency, user-friendliness and public accessibility. Some proposed a single registry containing information on adaptation and mitigation, possibly divided into two parts.

Discussions on draft conclusions focused on paragraphs: taking note of views expressed by parties on this item at SBI 44; and noting linkages of the work on the registry to issues under SBI and APA agenda items. After lengthy discussions, parties agreed to delete the paragraph on the linkages to two SBI and APA agenda items and to reference them in a paragraph, taking note of parties’ views. Parties also decided to add text, acknowledging that “the Secretariat will continue to improve, as appropriate, the interim registry.”

In plenary, on Thursday, 26 May, parties agreed to the draft conclusions with oral amendments, replacing “and Article 4, paragraph 12” with “referring to Article 4, paragraph 12,” in paragraph 1, and adding “as referred to in decision 1/CP.21, paragraph 29” after “registry” in paragraph 3.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.18), with oral amendments, the SBI:

- notes it initiated deliberations in accordance with decision 1/CP.21 paragraph 29 (development of the modalities and procedures for the NDC registry) referring to Paris Agreement Article 4.12 (NDC registry);
- takes note of the information provided by the Secretariat on its approach to developing an interim public registry for NDCs and acknowledges that the Secretariat will continue to improve, as appropriate, the interim registry;
- takes note of the views exchanged by parties on the modalities and procedures for the operation and use of the public registry, as referred to in decision 1/CP.21, paragraph 29, including the linkages of its work under this agenda item to the work under SBI 44 agenda item 6 (adaptation communications registry), and to the work of the APA; and
- agrees to continue its consideration of this matter at SBI 45.

**DEVELOPMENT OF MODALITIES AND PROCEDURES FOR THE OPERATION AND USE OF A PUBLIC REGISTRY REFERRED TO IN PARIS AGREEMENT ARTICLE 7.12 (ADAPTATION COMMUNICATIONS REGISTRY):** This agenda item was first taken up in the SBI plenary on Friday, 20 May, when it was added to the agenda after consultations among parties. The SBI agreed to convene informal consultations co-facilitated by Georg Børsting (Norway) and Madeleine Diouf Sarr (Senegal).

In the informal consultations, parties discussed organization of work, diverging on whether this item and the SBI item on the NDC registry should be taken up in a single contact group. Some parties stressed NDCs as vehicles for reporting on adaptation communications, cautioning against duplication of efforts. Others called for two different spaces for discussion, emphasizing that the SBI agenda was a “delicate balance” and pointing to other vehicles for submitting adaptation communications.

On draft conclusions text prepared by the Co-Facilitators, parties deleted draft paragraphs on: requesting the Secretariat to prepare an information paper; inviting submissions as input for further consideration; and organizing an in-session workshop. Parties also discussed how to refer to linkages to other registries, and to SBI and APA agenda items.

The SBI plenary adopted conclusions on Thursday, 26 May.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.19), the SBI notes that it initiated its consideration of a public registry referred to in Paris Agreement Article 7.12 (adaptation communications registry) and takes note of the views expressed by parties during SBI 44 on this matter, including on the existing or potential linkages to SBI 44 Agenda Item 5, the continued work of the Secretariat on the interim registry, the website maintained by the Secretariat on undertakings in adaptation planning and work of the APA. The SBI agrees to continue its consideration of this matter at SBI 45.

**KYOTO PROTOCOL MECHANISMS: Review of modalities and procedures for the CDM:** This sub-item was first taken up by the SBI plenary on Monday, 16 May, and was subsequently discussed in informal consultations facilitated by Karoliina Anttonen (Finland) and Takalani Rambau (South Africa).

During the informal consultations, a party asked for unresolved issues to be reflected in the draft conclusions text, including double counting, crediting period length and host country benefits. Another party opposed including issues without agreement, noting that a list of such items would never be agreed to. Parties exchanged divergent views on the necessity of such a list, the scope of the mandate to the Secretariat to capture progress on the review, and whether this item would be closed at CMP 12.

Given the diversity of views, the Co-Facilitators revised the conclusions to include a footnote with web links to party submissions where the changes to the modalities and procedures that some parties feel are needed can be found. Parties agreed to this, although some expressed reservations about including web links, while others expressed concern that the submissions are still too difficult to locate.

On Wednesday, 25 May, the SBI adopted the conclusions.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.13), the SBI:

- requests the Secretariat to prepare draft provisions containing definitions and/or requirements at a principle level on programmes of activities and roles of designated national authorities to supplement the current CDM modalities and procedures, based on the existing rules adopted by the CDM Executive Board (EB);
- notes that there continues to be divergent views on the need for further changes to the CDM modalities and procedures (with a footnote referencing party submissions on this sub-item); and
- agrees to continue its consideration of this agenda sub-item at SBI 45 with a view to concluding it at that session.

**Review of Joint Implementation (JI) guidelines and implementation of draft procedures:** This sub-item (FCCC/SBI/2015/L.30, FCCC/SBI/2016/INF.7 and INF.8) was first taken up by the SBI plenary on 16 May. It was subsequently discussed in informal consultations facilitated by Dimitar Nikov (France) and Gerald Lindo (Jamaica).

In informal consultations, the Secretariat presented the recommendations of the JI Supervisory Committee (JISC) on implementing the draft JI modalities and procedures and on the JI guidelines (FCCC/SBI/2016/INF.7 and 8). Parties agreed

that this agenda item should be concluded at CMP 12, while emphasizing the importance of capturing lessons of JI for the implementation of Paris Agreement Article 6 (cooperative approaches).

Parties initially expressed general support for the JISC's recommended amendments to the draft JI modalities and procedures, but had reservations about accepting all the amendments as presented. They agreed to draft conclusions, including a draft CMP decision. In the recommended draft decision, the CMP would decide to conclude its review of the JI guidelines without adopting any revisions to them and note that the draft conclusions of the SBI represent experience gained and lessons learned in relation to the review of the JI guidelines.

The SBI adopted its conclusions on Wednesday, 25 May.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.8 and Add.1), the SBI: agrees that the work it has undertaken on the review of JI guidelines is as recorded in the annex to the conclusions; recommends a draft decision (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.8/Add.1) on this matter for consideration and adoption by CMP 12; and notes it concluded its consideration of this agenda sub-item.

**Arrangements for appeals against decisions of CDM EB:** This item (FCCC/SBI/2012/33/Add.1) was first taken up by the SBI plenary on Monday, 16 May, and was subsequently discussed in informal consultations facilitated by Karoliina Anttonen (Finland).

Parties were not able to agree on this item in informal consultations and considered procedural conclusions that would have specified the session at which parties would take the item up again. As parties could not agree on which session, Facilitator Anttonen said Rule 16 of the draft rules of procedures would apply, and the item would be considered at SBI 45.

On Thursday, 26 May, in plenary, SBI Chair Chruszczow explained that under Rules 10(c) and 16 of the draft rules of procedure, this item will be included in the provisional agenda of the next session. He said that it would be helpful to be transparent about which documents will be used as the basis for the discussion at the next session. He proposed, and parties then adopted, draft conclusions.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.23), the SBI agrees to continue its consideration of the matter at SBI 45 on the basis of, *inter alia*, the appeals mechanism draft text (FCCC/SBI/2012/33/Add.1).

**MATTERS RELATING TO LDCS:** This item (FCCC/SBI/2016/7) was first taken up by the SBI plenary on Monday, 16 May. It was subsequently discussed in informal consultations facilitated by Mamadou Honadia (Burkina Faso).

In the informal consultations, parties discussed draft conclusions, including a paragraph inviting developed country parties and other parties in a position to do so to fill the finance gap. After a proposal to delete "other parties in a position to do so" and hesitance about the term "finance gap," parties deleted the paragraph and inserted slightly amended, agreed language, which notes the lack of funding in the LDC Fund (LDCF), and urges parties "and others" to contribute to "the LDCF and/or the GCF." With other amendments, parties agreed to the draft conclusions.

On Wednesday, 25 May, Chair Chruszczow introduced the draft conclusions. The SBI adopted the conclusions with an oral amendment from China, subsequently tweaked by the US, to the paragraph urging parties and others to contribute to the LDCF, replacing “parties and others to contribute” with “additional contributions” and “and/or the GCF” with “and the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism.”

Timor Leste said the five-year rolling work plan of the LEG would help vulnerable countries implement their NAPs and national adaptation programmes of action (NAPAs), noting the usefulness of further contributions to the LDCF.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.6, with oral amendments), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- welcomes the vision developed by the LEG to guide its work in supporting adaptation in the LDCs: the achievement of demonstrable results in building adaptive capacity, strengthening resilience and reducing vulnerability to climate change in the LDCs; the formulation of robust and good-quality NAPs and the implementation of priority adaptation needs identified therein with funding from the GCF and other sources; and the existence of a well-structured adaptation planning process in the LDCs;
- notes with appreciation the progress made by the LEG in collaborating with the GCF Secretariat on providing technical guidance and advice to countries on accessing funding from the GCF for the process to formulate and implement NAPs;
- notes that, as of 17 May 2016, 34 project proposals for the implementation of NAPAs and for the process to formulate and implement NAPs, with requested funds totaling US\$226 million, had been technically cleared by the GEF and were awaiting funding from the LDCF;
- notes that, as of 31 March 2016, the funds available for those pipeline projects amounted to only US\$9.8 million;
- notes with concern the lack of funding in the LDCF and urges additional contributions to the LDCF and the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism, recognizing the importance of the full implementation of NAPAs for addressing urgent and immediate adaptation needs, building capacity for medium- and long-term adaptation planning and implementation and successfully undertaking the process to formulate and implement NAPs;
- notes with appreciation the pledges made by parties and others at COP 21 to the LDCF, totaling US\$252 million as of 5 December 2015 and encourages those parties to convert their pledges into contributions as soon as possible;
- notes with appreciation the contributions made by parties to the GCF, totaling US\$9.9 billion as at 19 May 2016;
- takes note of the progress made by the LDCs in undertaking the process to formulate and implement NAPs; and
- invites parties and relevant organizations to continue to provide support for the implementation of the LEG work programme.

**NATIONAL ADAPTATION PLANS:** This item (FCCC/SBI/2016/7) was first taken up by the SBI plenary on Monday, 16 May, and was subsequently discussed in informal consultations facilitated by Mamadou Honadia (Burkina Faso) and Beth Lavender (Canada).

Considering draft conclusions in the informal consultations, parties discussed a proposed paragraph inviting parties to submit their experiences in accessing the GCF’s readiness funding for NAP preparation. Some opposed requesting submissions given the Adaptation Committee’s expected work and possible interviews with parties about their experiences in 2017. Others said gathering experiences in 2016 would be informative and suggested submissions are more comprehensive than interviews. Parties eventually converged on a formulation that “looks forward to the work of the Adaptation Committee and the LEG” on this issue and “to information on such work being provided in their reports.”

On Wednesday, 26 May, the SBI adopted its conclusions.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.9), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- acknowledges that the process to formulate and implement NAPs will help parties effectively engage in adaptation planning processes and the implementation of actions;
- acknowledges that the process to formulate and implement NAPs will also help parties engage in the process of identifying priorities, needs and gaps, and to enhance adaptation actions;
- notes with appreciation the progress made by the LEG and the Adaptation Committee so far in fulfilling their respective mandates relating to providing information on accessing funding from the GCF for the process to formulate and implement NAPs;
- looks forward to the further engagement of the LEG and the Adaptation Committee with the GCF and requests them to include information on that engagement in their reports;
- looks forward to the work of the Adaptation Committee and the LEG related to the experience of countries in accessing funding from the GCF for the process to formulate and implement NAPs, and further looks forward to information on such work being provided in their reports;
- recommends that COP 22 change the submission deadline for information on their progress in the process to formulate and implement NAPs, including experiences and support provided to 4 October 2017; and
- notes it continued its consideration of enhancing reporting related to the process to formulate and implement NAPs and agreed to continue the discussion thereon at SBI 46, taking into account relevant activities to be discussed under the APA.

**THIRD REVIEW OF THE ADAPTATION FUND:** This item was introduced in the SBI plenary on Monday, 16 May, and subsequently discussed in informal consultations co-facilitated by Gemma O’Reilly (Ireland) and Richard Muyungi (Tanzania).

In plenary, AOSIS stressed the key role of the Adaptation Fund, with Thailand, for the G-77/China, urging its enhancement pre-2020 and beyond.

In informal consultations, discussions focused on the draft Terms of Reference (ToR) of the review, including sections on objective, scope and information sources. On the objective, one group proposed including language to ensure the adequacy of the Adaptation Fund’s resources. On scope, parties considered: language on lessons learned from the access modalities; inclusion of references to mobilization and effective use of financial

resources and to institutional linkages and relationships; and assessment of effectiveness and transparency. On information sources, parties suggested: including references to the technical examination process on adaptation; relevant CMA decisions; and the WIM report.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.10), the SBI recommends that COP 22/CMP 12 consider and adopt the attached draft decision stating that the third review of the Adaptation Fund will be undertaken in accordance with the ToR contained in the annex.

The annexed ToR for the third review of the Adaptation Fund explains that its objective is to ensure the effectiveness, sustainability and adequacy of the Fund and its operations, and, further provides a non-exclusive list of sources of information that the review shall draw upon. The ToR also sets out that the scope of the review will cover progress made to date and lessons learned in the operationalization and implementation of the Fund and that the review will focus on, *inter alia*:

- provision of sustainable, predictable and adequate financial resources, and the mobilization of financial resources to fund concrete adaptation projects and programmes that are country driven and based on the needs, views and priorities of eligible developing country parties;
- lessons learned from the application of the access modalities of the Adaptation Fund, project approval procedures, results and impacts of approved adaptation projects, the readiness programme for direct access to climate finance and pilot programme for regional projects;
- programming and project coherence and complementarity between the Adaptation Fund and other adaptation funding institutions; and
- institutional arrangements for the Adaptation Fund.

**SCOPE AND MODALITIES FOR THE PERIODIC ASSESSMENT OF THE TECHNOLOGY MECHANISM:** This item was first taken up in plenary on Monday, 16 May, and forwarded to informal consultations facilitated by Kishan Kumarsingh (Trinidad and Tobago) and Gabriela Fischerova (Slovakia).

In informal consultations, parties exchanged views on draft conclusions on the sources of input for the periodic assessment. One party expressed concern about the inclusion of work on transparency of action and support as a source of input for the periodic review, noting that it was not identified as an input in decision 1/CP.21 (Paris outcome). A party noted that sources of input should be as inclusive as possible.

On timing, a group of parties stressed the importance of concluding this item at COP 22. Views diverged over whether to retain this item on the agenda for COP 22 and the timing of submissions.

The SBI adopted conclusions on Wednesday, 26 May, in plenary.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.5), the SBI agrees that the scope of the review will focus on the effectiveness of the Technology Mechanism and adequacy of support in light of Paris Agreement Article 10 (technology development and transfer). In elaborating the scope and modalities for the periodic assessment, input from the following

will be incorporated: the review of the CTCN; the development of the modalities for the global stocktake; work on transparency of action and support; and elaboration of the technology framework. The SBI invites parties and observer organizations to submit their views on the scope and modalities for the periodic assessment by 25 January 2017.

**CAPACITY BUILDING: Third review of the implementation of the capacity-building framework under the Convention:** This item (FCCC/SBI/2016/3, 4 and MISC.1; and FCCC/TP/2016/1) was first taken up by the SBI plenary on Monday, 16 May, and was subsequently discussed in informal consultations co-facilitated by Crispin d' Auvergne (Saint Lucia) and Paul Watkinson (France). Discussions on this item were held back-to-back with other sub-items on capacity building.

On Friday, 20 May, the Durban Forum on Capacity Building was held, and is summarized at: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12671e.html>.

In the informal consultations, the Secretariat answered parties' questions about impact analyses, information sharing, influence of domestic institutions on results and other UNFCCC bodies' activities. Parties shared views on how to draw, for the draft conclusions, from the outcomes of the fifth Durban Forum and the technical paper on the third comprehensive review of the capacity building framework (FCCC/TP/2016/1). Countries stressed: country-driven approaches and ownership; impact assessments; institutional capacity building; in-country coordination; and capacity building for access to finance. Parties also emphasized the role of indigenous peoples, women and the private sector in supporting implementation.

On Thursday, 26 May, the SBI adopted conclusions and a draft decision.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions on the third comprehensive review of the capacity-building framework under the Convention (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.21), the SBI notes that it initiated, but did not conclude, its consideration of this matter, and agrees to continue its consideration at SBI 45 on the basis of a draft decision text annexed to the conclusions, with a view to recommending a draft decision for consideration by COP 22.

**Third review of the implementation of the capacity-building framework under the Kyoto Protocol:**

On Thursday, 26 May the SBI adopted its conclusions.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions on the third comprehensive review of the capacity-building framework under the Kyoto Protocol (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.20), the SBI decides to continue consideration of this agenda sub-item at SBI 45.

**Paris Committee on Capacity-building ToR:** In informal consultations, parties shared views on a pre-prepared list of ToR, including: terms; gender; chairmanship; cross-membership rules; participation of observers; annual workplan; rules of procedure; and decisions. Parties suggested adding quorum, transparency, and cooperation with bodies and institutions within and outside the Convention.

Parties suggested requesting that the Paris Committee on Capacity-building (PCCB): take into account Durban Forum outcomes; coordinate capacity-building activities of other UNFCCC and non-UNFCCC bodies; and prepare standardized

tools for reporting and assessment. Parties diverged on, *inter alia*, paragraphs related to PCCB composition and decision making, with some supporting the consensus principle.

On Thursday, 26 May, the SBI adopted its conclusions:

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions on the PCCB ToR (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.24), the SBI:

- recommends a draft decision on the PCCB ToR for consideration by COP 22 (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.24/Add.1);
- invites parties to consider their PCCB nominations, as outlined in the draft ToR, with a view to commencing work of the PCCB at SBI 46; and
- invites parties to submit, by 29 August 2016, their views on the annual focus area or theme for the PCCB for 2017, for consideration at SBI 45, with a view to making a recommendation on this matter for consideration by COP 22.

**ARTICLE 6 OF THE CONVENTION:** This item (FCCC/SBI/2016/5 and 6) was first taken up by the SBI plenary on Monday, 16 May, and was subsequently discussed in informal consultations facilitated by Albert Altarejos Magalang (Philippines). In plenary, YOUNGOs underscored focus on public participation to ensure delivery of NDCs.

The Fourth ACE Dialogue took place Wednesday, 18 May (<http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12669e.html>) and Thursday, 19 May (<http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12670e.html>).

The informal consultations focused on the intermediate review of progress made in implementing the Doha work programme on Article 6 of the Convention, sharing views on gaps and barriers experienced while implementing the Doha work programme, and on related needs, recommendations and proposed next steps. Parties exchanged views on best practices and lessons learned, indicating progress on the ACE Dialogue, with some stressing more needs to be done.

The SBI plenary adopted conclusions on Thursday, 26 May. The Dominican Republic welcomed the launch of the ACE Dialogue and announced the first meeting of the Article 6 National Focal Points would take place on 27 May 2016. He invited all parties to communicate to the Secretariat the names of their focal points, and said the draft decision sends “a clear signal that we will have Article 6 for many years to come.”

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.15), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- concludes that the annual in-session ACE Dialogue will continue to be convened in conjunction with SBI sessions in Bonn, Germany, and that the ACE Dialogue sessions should focus on good practices and lessons learned on integrating the six elements of Article 6;
- invites parties, observers and other stakeholders to submit, by 25 January 2017, their feedback on the organization of the Fourth ACE Dialogue and their views on the agenda for the Fifth Dialogue; and
- notes that the SBI completed the intermediate review of progress made in implementing the Doha work programme and recommends a draft decision (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.15/Add.1) on improving its effectiveness for consideration by COP 22.

**RESPONSE MEASURES:** This joint SBI/SBSTA item with sub-items (FCCC/TP/2016/3 and FCCC/TP/2016/4) was introduced during the SBI and SBSTA plenaries on Monday, 16 May. It was subsequently addressed in a joint SBI/SBSTA contact group under the leadership of the SBI and SBSTA Chairs, with the assistance of Co-Facilitators Andrei Marcu (Panama) and Natalya Kushko (Ukraine).

Discussions centered on: areas for enhancing cooperation; focus, activities and elements of the work programme for the improved forum on response measures, including deliverables and timelines; a ToR for future *ad hoc* technical expert groups; and the possibility and arrangements for expert workshops.

**Improved forum and work programme:** On Thursday, 26 May, the SBI adopted its conclusions.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SB/2016/L.2/Rev.1), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- encourages developing countries to use the technical papers as guidance in their assessment of the impact of the implementation of response measures and their economic diversification initiatives;
- notes that parties considered the information contained in these technical papers for work on the work programme;
- welcomes the offer by a Gulf Cooperation Council country to host a workshop to enhance work under the improved forum;
- notes the interest of some parties in holding a high-level event on economic diversification and sustainable development at COP 22;
- agrees to implement the work programme on the impact of the implementation of response measures as contained in Annex I, under the guidance of the SBI and SBSTA Chairs;
- agrees that the *ad hoc* technical expert groups shall function in accordance with the ToR contained in Annex II; and
- requests the Secretariat to support, under the guidance of the SBI and SBSTA Chairs, implementation of the work programme, including the activities of the *ad hoc* technical expert groups.

Annex I of the conclusions contains the work programme of the improved forum (June 2016 to November 2018) and Annex II contains the ToRs of the *ad hoc* technical expert groups.

**Modalities, work programme and functions under the Paris Agreement:** On Thursday, 26 May, the SBI adopted its conclusions.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SB/2016/L.3), the SBI, *inter alia*, invites parties and observer organizations to submit, by 12 September 2016, their views on the modalities, work programme and functions under the Paris Agreement of the forum on the impact of the implementation of response measures and to consider these at their next sessions.

**Matters relating to Article 3, paragraph 14, of the Protocol (implementation of response measures), and Progress on the implementation of decision 1/CP.10 (Buenos Aires programme of work on adaptation and response measures):** On Thursday, 26 May, Chair Chruszczow said that consultations on these items could not be completed. He requested, and parties agreed, that the meeting report reflect that these items be included in the agenda of SBI 45.

**SCOPE OF NEXT REVIEW OF LONG-TERM GLOBAL GOAL:** This item was taken up in the SBI and SBSTA plenaries on Monday, 16 May, and by a joint SBI/SBSTA contact group and informal consultations co-chaired by Leon Charles (Grenada) and Gertraud Wollansky (Austria).

Most parties agreed that to avoid duplication of work, the scope of the next review should be discussed after the modalities of the global stocktake have been agreed. Parties made proposals for additions to the draft conclusions prepared by the Co-Chairs in relation to the 2018 facilitative dialogue. Some parties raised concerns about references to the facilitative dialogue, noting that no work will have been carried out on it by SB 46.

While some expressed willingness to consider a workshop on the review at COP 22, others expressed concerns over its timing and its usefulness. Some debate took place on whether to have the subsidiary bodies “consider,” “consider and refine,” or “consider and modify” the scope of the next periodic review at SB 46. Parties finally agreed to “consider the scope of the next review” and “refine it.” Parties also agreed to make the reference to a possible in-session workshop on the scope of the next review less definitive.

On 26 May, the SBI adopted the draft conclusions.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SB/2016/L.1), the SBI recalls its mandate from COP 21 to consider the scope of the next periodic review with a view to forwarding a recommendation for consideration by the COP by 2018. Noting the relevant work on the global stocktake under the APA, the 2018 facilitative dialogue and the technical examination processes, they agreed to consider the scope of the next periodic review at SB 46 and refine it, taking into account relevant experiences with the 2013-2015 review.

The SBI notes that an in-session workshop on this issue could be useful and may be considered at SB 46.

**GENDER:** This item (FCCC/TP/2016/2) was first taken up by the SBI plenary on Monday, 16 May, and was subsequently discussed in informal consultations co-facilitated by Martin Hession (EU) and Winfred Lichuma (Kenya).

Two workshops on gender-responsive policy occurred Wednesday, 18 May (<http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12669e.html>) and Thursday, 19 May (<http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12670e.html>).

In the informal consultations, parties discussed expectations on a draft conclusion text. The Secretariat provided an overview of a technical paper on guidelines and tools for integrating gender considerations (FCCC/TP/2016/2), and summarized outcomes from the SBI 44 workshop on gender-responsive climate policy. Many parties and groups called for the extension of the Lima work programme on gender at COP 22. Parties suggested building on the Lima work programme, including previous decision text establishing the work programme; SBI 42 and 44 gender workshop outcomes; and the technical paper.

Some countries, opposed by others, proposed removing a reference to insufficiency of funding for the Lima work programme. One country suggested adding references to “subject to national circumstances,” and removing references to preparing, at SBI 45, a draft decision for COP 22 and to inputs from parties annexed to the draft conclusions. Some suggested

keeping the references to national circumstances and to the draft decision, without reference to the annex, as a compromise. Parties were unable to agree on these remaining issues. The SBI plenary adopted conclusions on Thursday, 26 May.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.16), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- welcomes the outcomes of the SBI 44 in-session workshop on gender-responsive climate policy and a technical paper by the Secretariat;
- expresses its appreciation for the two-year Lima work programme on gender and contributions received in its support;
- expresses its support for the continuation and enhancement of the work programme, and invites parties and observers to submit their views, by 29 August 2016, on possible elements and guiding principles for continuing and enhancing the work programme;
- invites parties and observers to provide information on progress made in meeting the goals of achieving gender balance and gender-responsive climate policy; and
- agrees to continue its consideration of this matter at SBI 45, with a view to preparing a draft decision for consideration at COP 22.

**INTERGOVERNMENTAL MEETINGS:** This item (FCCC/SBI/2016/2) was first taken up by the SBI plenary on Monday, 16 May, and was subsequently discussed in a contact group chaired by Chair Chruszczow.

In the contact group, participants discussed COP 22/CMP 12 organization, and organization of the intergovernmental process, including the role of observers. Many supported discussions on improving observer engagement. BINGOs called for recognized and regular interfaces, and CAN suggested increasing opportunities for submissions. Morocco, on behalf of the incoming COP/CMP Presidency, assured continued engagement on the issue. On the way forward, the EU proposed an in-session workshop, and submissions or an examination of best practices.

A group of countries called for a reference to launch, at COP 22, the platform for sharing best practices in mitigation and adaptation referred to in decision 1/CP.21 (Paris outcome) paragraph 135 (on strengthening the knowledge and efforts of local communities and indigenous peoples).

Parties diverged on the issue of conflict of interest, particularly on a proposal to request the Secretariat to prepare a report for SBI 45 on procedures for identifying and avoiding the risk of conflict of interest between participation by non-state actors and the Convention’s objectives. Consequently, parties agreed to include, in the report of SBI 44, text taking note of these discussions and inviting parties and observers to take advantage of an in-session workshop on opportunities to further enhance the effective engagement of non-party stakeholders, to be convened at SBI 46.

On Thursday, 26 May, in plenary, SBI Chair Chruszczow noted that the in-session workshop referred to in paragraph 18 of the draft conclusions would provide an opportunity for parties and observer organizations to share their views on any topic of their choice, and that this observation would be reflected in the report of SBI 44. The SBI then adopted the conclusions.

Ecuador, for the LMDCs, asked that paragraph 23 of the conclusions (taking note of the information provided by the Secretariat on existing procedures and practices for the admission of observer organizations) be deleted and a paragraph calling on identifying modalities to minimize conflict of interest be inserted. Chair Chruszczow noted that the SBI had already adopted the conclusions and reconsideration of this matter, at this session, was not possible without a vote.

The LMDCs, supported by Egypt, affirmed Ecuador had asked for the floor prior to the adoption. A number of countries supporting the LMDCs called for attention to the importance of addressing conflict of interest.

The EU said no consensus had been reached on the issue, noting that conflict of interest of non-state actors could be discussed at the SBI 46 in-session workshop. The US said it could not support language that restricts participation by NGOs and non-state actors. Australia underscored lack of clarity on what conflict of interest implied and opposed its inclusion. After parties consulted informally, Chair Chruszczow said the views expressed by parties would be fully reflected in the proceedings of the session.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.14), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- emphasizes the importance of the principles of openness, transparency and inclusiveness in making arrangements for COP22/CMP 12 in Marrakesh;
- underlines the importance of the three mandated events to be convened at COP 22, including the second biennial high-level ministerial dialogue on climate finance, the high-level event on climate action and a facilitative dialogue;
- invites parties, as a matter of urgency, to come forward with offers to host COP 23/CMP 13, and COP 24/CMP 14;
- agrees to further consider session frequency and organization scenarios at SBI 48;
- reaffirms the value of contributions from observer organizations to deliberations on substantive issues and acknowledges the need to further enhance their effective engagement as the UNFCCC process moves forward into implementation and operationalization of the Paris Agreement;
- agrees to convene an in-session workshop at SBI 46 on opportunities to further enhance the effective engagement of non-party stakeholders, with a view to strengthening implementation of the provisions of decision 1/CP.21 (Paris outcome);
- requests the Secretariat to prepare a report on that workshop for consideration at SBI 46;
- invites parties, observer organizations and interested UN agencies to submit their views on opportunities to further enhance the effective engagement of non-party stakeholders with a view to strengthening implementation of the provisions of decision 1/CP.21 (Paris outcome) by 28 February 2017;
- requests the Secretariat to prepare, by 30 April 2017, a summary report on the views contained in those submissions;
- takes note of the work of the Secretariat on the establishment of a platform for exchanging experiences and sharing best practices on mitigation and adaptation in a holistic and

integrated manner, and requests further information on the implementation of such work by SBI 46; and

- takes note of the information provided by the Secretariat on existing procedures and practices for the admission of observer organizations.

#### **ADMINISTRATIVE, FINANCIAL AND INSTITUTIONAL MATTERS: Financial and budgetary matters:**

This sub-item (FCCC/SBI/2016/INF.3 and INF.5) was first taken up by the SBI plenary on Tuesday, 17 May. The SBI agreed that SBI Chair Chruszczow would prepare draft conclusions in consultation with interested parties. In plenary on Thursday, 26 May, Chair Chruszczow explained the Secretariat will prepare a note to be considered at SBI 45, with the expectation that consideration of the issue will continue at SBI 46.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.17), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- takes note of the information relating to the status of contributions as of 29 April 2016, expressing its appreciation to parties that have paid their indicative contributions and fees, and urging parties that have not yet paid their contributions for 1996-2005 to do so as soon as possible;
- expresses its appreciation to parties that have made voluntary contributions;
- requests the Executive Secretary to prepare an information note on the revised indicative contributions for the biennium 2016-2017 for consideration at SBI 45 with a view to preparing draft decisions for consideration by COP 22 and CMP 12;
- takes note of the information relating to an overview of structures and bodies within the UN system that may inform parties in making the budget process more efficient and transparent (FCCC/SBI/2016/INF.5), and requests the Secretariat to prepare an information document to further elaborate on this document for SBI 45;
- takes note of the UN Secretary-General's decision to upgrade the position of the UNFCCC Executive Secretary from Assistant Secretary-General to Under-Secretary-General, and to upgrade one of the D2 positions to the level of Assistant Secretary-General to serve as Deputy Executive Secretary; and
- recommends draft decisions on these matters for consideration by COP 22 (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.17/Add.1) and CMP 12 (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.17/Add.2.).

**Continuing review of the Secretariat:** This sub-item was first taken up by the SBI plenary on Tuesday, 17 May. The SBI agreed to consider this sub-item at SBI 46.

**Privileges and immunities for individuals serving on constituted bodies under the Convention:** This sub-item was first taken up by the SBI plenary on Tuesday, 17 May, and subsequently in informal consultations facilitated by Peter Horne (Australia).

In the informal consultations, noting the lack of readiness among parties to approve the draft treaty arrangements, parties agreed to recommend that COP 22 and CMP 12 conclude consideration of this issue.

The SBI plenary adopted conclusions on Wednesday, 25 May.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.4), the SBI takes note of the views of parties on the matter, and recommends that the COP conclude consideration of this issue at COP 22.

**Privileges and immunities for individuals serving on constituted bodies under the Kyoto Protocol:** This sub-item was first taken up by the SBI plenary on Tuesday, 17 May, and subsequently in informal consultations also facilitated by Horne.

**SBI Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.3), the SBI takes note of the views of parties on the matter, and recommends that the CMP conclude consideration of this issue at CMP 12.

**CLOSING PLENARY:** The SBI closing plenary took place on Thursday, 26 May.

Thailand, for the G-77/China, *inter alia*: said the ICA should be facilitative and lead to the identification of capacity-building needs of developing countries for transparency; called for support from developed countries for the LEG; and emphasized the need to identify actions to address the needs of developing countries arising from negative impacts of response measures.

The Republic of Korea, for the EIG, the EU and the Umbrella Group, welcomed the FSV as well as the ToR for the PCCB.

The EU noted a clear decision on the future use of market mechanisms and indicated readiness to conclude discussions. With the Umbrella Group, she recognized the initial exchange of views on the adaptation communications registry and informal consultations on the review of the WIM with the COP 22 Presidency.

AOSIS called for prioritizing the review of the WIM, the third review of the Adaptation Fund, and the “redesign” or review of the modalities and procedures for the CDM. Mali, for the African Group, emphasized the WIM and raised concerns about the slow progress in the initiation of its work programme.

The LDCs emphasized the need to close additional remaining agenda items on: periodic assessment of the Technology Mechanism; the scope of the next periodic review of the long-term global goal under the Convention; and development of modalities and procedures for a public registry referred to in Paris Agreement Article 4.12 and Article 7.12.

Costa Rica, for AILAC, emphasized close links between the three subsidiary bodies.

RINGOs emphasized research as a foundation for decision-making and implementation.

Woman and Gender called for safeguarding the rights of peoples whose lives are most affected and called for carrying out systematic analysis and establishing gender-sensitive data.

Indigenous Peoples emphasized that adaptation action should be based on and be guided by the best available science and traditional knowledge, knowledge of indigenous peoples and local knowledge systems.

Noting future generations will collectively face challenges and responsibilities, YOUNGOs called for better inclusion of their initiatives. CAN called for solutions to ensure the process is safeguarded from those with interests that run against the Convention’s objectives, such as fossil fuel corporations. CJN! shared the disappointment of some parties on the “failed conclusions” on intergovernmental arrangements.

Chair Chruszczow thanked parties for rising to the challenge set forth by the Paris mandate and, after the SBI adopted its report (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.7), closed SBI 44 at 7:31 pm.

### **SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE**

SBSTA Chair Carlos Fuller (Belize) opened the session on Monday, 16 May.

**ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS:** With an amendment to the agenda sub-item on assessments of the IPCC and the global stocktake to read “Advice on how the assessment of the IPCC can inform the global stocktake referred to in Article 14 of the Paris Agreement,” parties adopted the agenda (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/1) and agreed to the organization of work.

**NAIROBI WORK PROGRAMME:** This item (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/INF.1 and INF.4) was first taken up by the SBSTA plenary on 16 May, and was subsequently discussed in informal consultations facilitated by Beth Lavender (Canada) and Julio Cordano (Chile).

With many parties expressing satisfaction with progress under the NWP, the informal consultations focused on how to elaborate on additional activities under the Programme. After submitting detailed proposals on the “why, who and what” elements of their suggested activities, parties incorporated them into draft conclusions outlining the future activities to be undertaken under the NWP.

In the closing plenary on Thursday, 26 May, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/L.9), the SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- invites the Adaptation Committee, the LEG and other relevant bodies to consider providing recommendations for activities to be undertaken under the NWP in supporting new processes under decision 1/CP.21;
- requests the Secretariat to undertake the activities recommended by the Adaptation Committee and the LEG to be undertaken under the NWP under the guidance of the SBSTA Chair;
- invites NWP partner organizations and other relevant organizations, including the IPCC, to submit to the Secretariat, by 20 September 2017, information on indicators of adaptation and resilience at the national and/or local level or for specific sectors;
- requests the Secretariat to utilize those submissions to inform the meeting that the Adaptation Committee will convene in 2018 for exchanging views on national adaptation goals and indicators, and how they relate to goals and indicators for sustainable development and disaster risk reduction in the context of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030;
- invites the Adaptation Committee and the LEG to consider the submissions to inform their work on reviewing the effectiveness and adequacy of adaptation; and
- requests the Secretariat to foster collaboration among, *inter alia*, policymakers, research and scientific communities, including the IPCC, practitioners and financial institutions to contribute to closing adaptation knowledge gaps at the national and subnational levels.

On health, the SBSTA:

- invites parties, NWP partner organizations and other relevant organizations to submit, by 29 August 2016, information on: their recent work on climate impacts on human health; new and emerging health issues, including tropical diseases and their impacts on social and economic structures; and the effects of climate change on health and productivity in the workplace, with implications for occupational health, safety and social protection;
- requests the Secretariat to utilize those submissions to inform the 10th Focal Point Forum, to be held during SBSTA 45; and
- requests the Secretariat to organize the 10th Focal Point Forum on the topic of health and adaptation, and to prepare a synthesis report for consideration at SBSTA 46 (May 2017).

On human settlements, the SBSTA:

- requests the Secretariat to prepare a document summarizing initiatives in the area of human settlements within the context of the NWP's mandate for consideration at SBSTA 46;
- invites parties, NWP partner organizations and other relevant organizations to submit, by 20 September 2017, information on topics such as good practices, lessons learned, and available tools and methods, based on their recent work in the area of human settlements and adaptation; and cross-cutting issues and linkages to the NAPs process;
- requests the Secretariat to utilize those to inform the 11th Focal Point Forum, to be held in conjunction with SBSTA 47;
- requests the Secretariat to organize the 11th Focal Point Forum around the topic of human settlements and adaptation that includes speakers from local and municipal governments; and
- requests the Secretariat to prepare a synthesis report of those submissions and the topics discussed at the 11th Focal Point Forum for consideration at SBSTA 48.

On ecosystems and water resources, the SBSTA:

- invites parties, NWP partner organizations and other relevant organizations to submit, by 25 January 2017, information on: lessons learned and good practices in relation to adaptation planning processes that address ecosystems and interrelated areas such as water resources; lessons learned and good practices in monitoring and evaluating the implementation of ecosystem-based adaptation; and tools for assessing the benefits of mitigation and adaptation to enhancing resilience and emission reductions that ecosystem-based adaptation provides; and
- requests the Secretariat, in collaboration with relevant NWP partner organizations, to prepare a synthesis report of those submissions for consideration at SBSTA 46.

On economic diversification, the SBSTA:

- invites parties and NWP partner organizations and other relevant organizations to submit, by 20 September 2017, information on lessons learned and good practices in relation to adaptation actions and plans that could enhance economic diversification and have mitigation co-benefits; and
- requests the Secretariat to compile all those submissions into a miscellaneous document for consideration at SBSTA 47.

The SBSTA also concludes that the following actions, among others, would be carried out under the guidance of the SBSTA Chair and with the support of the Secretariat:

- strengthening the engagement of existing NWP partner organizations and developing new partnerships, including with local and municipal governments, the private sector, scientific organizations, academia, organizations representing indigenous and traditional communities, spiritual and religious groups, gender constituencies, youth organizations and mass media;
- improving access to and usability of knowledge for end users, including through the adaptation knowledge portal, for example by linking the adaptation knowledge portal with other knowledge platforms;
- enhancing the participation of UNFCCC national focal points in meetings, workshops and other relevant activities under the NWP, and their role in disseminating knowledge outputs generated under the NWP to countries, including through the adaptation knowledge portal;
- engaging regional centers and networks in undertaking knowledge sharing and training activities and disseminating the outcomes at the regional, national and subnational levels;
- communicating with NWP partner organizations and other relevant organizations on the process to formulate and implement NAPs in collaboration with the Adaptation Committee and the LEG; and
- improving consideration of gender issues, and the inclusion of traditional knowledge, knowledge of indigenous peoples and local knowledge systems in tools and methods for adaptation planning processes.

**TECHNOLOGY FRAMEWORK UNDER THE PARIS AGREEMENT:** This item was first taken up by the SBSTA plenary on Monday, 16 May, and was subsequently discussed in informal consultations facilitated by Gabriela Fischerova (Slovakia) and Kishan Kumarsingh (Trinidad and Tobago).

In the informal consultations, parties converged around the idea that the framework should be a strategic document providing guidance to the Technology Mechanism. Several parties suggested elaborating on the framework's purpose, while others stated that it is already outlined in the Agreement. In draft conclusions, parties annexed an indicative compilation of initial views on the context, features, characteristics and content of the technology framework, including its purpose, role and key themes. Two developed countries stressed specifying "climate-relevant" technology in the draft conclusions.

One group proposed using the annex as a basis for discussions at COP 22. Some parties said this would obviate the need for submissions, while others suggested having both would be useful. Parties also exchanged ideas on how to proceed at COP 22 and what supporting documentation might be useful to request of the Secretariat, such as a synthesis of parties' views.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/L.8), the SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- requests the Secretariat to prepare an information note on mapping climate technology development and transfer activities and initiatives under and outside the Convention relevant to the implementation of the Paris Agreement,

including on the implementation status of the framework for meaningful and effective actions to enhance the implementation of Convention Article 4.5 (transfer of, or access to, environmentally sound technologies and knowhow from developed country parties to other parties) as adopted by COP 7 and enhanced by COP 13;

- invites parties to submit their views by 15 September 2016 on the elaboration of the technology framework, including its content, features and characteristics, purpose and themes in order for the Secretariat to prepare a compilation of parties' submissions for consideration at SBSTA 45; and
- agrees to continue its consideration of this matter at SBSTA 45.

**AGRICULTURE:** This item (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/INF.6 and INF.7; FCCC/SBSTA/2016/MISC.1) was first taken up by the SBSTA plenary on Monday, 16 May, and was subsequently discussed in informal consultations facilitated by Heikki Granholm (Finland) and Emmanuel Dumisani Dlamini (Swaziland).

A workshop on the identification of adaptation measures, taking into account the diversity of the agricultural systems, indigenous knowledge systems and the differences in scale, as well as possible co-benefits and sharing experiences in research and development and on the ground activities, including socio-economic, environmental and gender aspects, was held on Friday, 20 May. Highlights are available at: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12671e.html>.

A second workshop, on the identification and assessment of agricultural practices and technologies to enhance productivity in a sustainable manner, food security and resilience, considering the differences in agro-ecological zones and farming systems, such as different grassland and cropland practices and systems, was held on Monday, 23 May. Highlights are available at: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12673e.html>.

During the informal consultations, parties agreed that the workshops held at SBSTA 43 were successful and the reports reflected the outcomes. Parties were supportive of creating a platform or knowledge hub as a repository for good practices, experiences and lessons learned. They suggested inviting submissions on ideas for the platform, as well as general ideas on how or whether the SBSTA's agriculture work should evolve in the context of the Paris Agreement.

Parties also considered draft conclusions intended to reflect the work accomplished at SBSTA 44, including: considering workshop reports; taking note of submissions from parties and observers; holding two in-session workshops; and agreeing to continue consideration of workshop reports at SBSTA 45. One group of developing countries proposed inserting a reference to "Article 9 of the Convention, on the basis of the objective, principles and provisions of the Convention," in a paragraph indicating SBSTA had continued its scientific and technical work as decided at SBSTA 40. Several developed countries opposed this insertion.

In the closing plenary, Chair Fuller explained the group was unable to conclude its deliberations on this matter and that, following Rule 16 of the draft rules of procedure, the issue would be taken up at SBSTA 45.

#### SCIENCE AND REVIEW: Research and Systemic

**Observation:** This item was taken up in plenary on Monday, 16 May, and in informal consultations co-facilitated by Ann Gordon (Belize) and Christiane Textor (Germany). In informal consultations, discussions focused on the invitation to the Secretariat to organize a workshop and references to 1.5°C scenarios.

On a possible workshop, several options for the focus of such a workshop were considered, including on Africa, cities and co-benefits of mitigation action. Various developed countries opposed a possible workshop, noting that the need for a workshop and its topic had not emerged from the discussions held at the research dialogue. As a compromise, parties agreed to refer to the regional workshops held by research programmes and organizations in their call for submissions from these bodies on their activities related to the identification of research gaps.

On 1.5°C scenarios, a group of parties proposed two paragraphs. The first referred to the encouragement to the scientific community to continue to address information gaps related to 1.5°C scenarios. The second proposal included a call on the World Climate Research Programme (WCRP) to revisit the scenario layout of Phase 6 of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project, which coordinates climate model experiments, to give priority to the 1.5°C scenario. One party opposed the two proposed paragraphs. After further informal consultations, parties could not reach agreement on these paragraphs, which were subsequently removed from the draft.

The SBSTA adopted the conclusions in plenary on Thursday, 26 May.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/L.17), the SBSTA:

- notes the statements delivered by the Global Climate Observing System (GCOS), the IPCC and the WCRP, as well as the information note of the SBSTA Chair on the eighth meeting of the research dialogue prepared by the SBSTA Chair and the letter to the SBSTA Chair from the Executive Committee of WIM, which suggested to consider slow onset events at the research dialogue;
- welcomes the eighth meeting of the research dialogue and invites the SBSTA Chair to continue organizing poster sessions prior to subsequent dialogues;
- requests the SBSTA Chair to produce a summary report on the research dialogue by SBSTA 45;
- welcomes the information that the IPCC will prepare three special reports and a methodology report on GHG inventories during its sixth assessment cycle;
- encourages relevant research programmes and organizations to present their efforts, including activities they are undertaking, such as regional workshops, to identify relevant climate research and data information and gaps at the research dialogue meeting to be held at SBSTA 46; and
- invites parties' submissions, by 10 April 2017, on possible topics for consideration at the research dialogue to be held at SBSTA 46 and beyond.

**Advice on how IPCC assessments can inform the global stocktake of the Paris Agreement:** This issue was taken up in plenary on Monday, 16 May, and in informal consultations

co-facilitated by Nagmeldin Elhassan (Sudan) and Frank McGovern (Ireland).

Related to this agenda item, a SBSTA-IPCC special event on advice on how the assessments of the IPCC can inform the global stocktake was held on Wednesday, 18 May. For a summary of discussions, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12669e.html>

Discussions in informal consultations focused on, *inter alia*, how to refer to the special reports of the IPCC's sixth assessment cycle, recognition of the SED on the 2013-2015 review, and encouragement to address information gaps.

One party opposed a reference to the SBSTA Chair's information note on the SBSTA-IPCC special event on this matter, as well as to the report the SBSTA Chair will be preparing on that event, and these references were removed from the draft.

On the SED, all parties but two recognized that the SED could provide useful lessons in relation to how the IPCC assessments can inform the global stocktake. After lengthy deliberations, parties agreed to refer, in a footnote, to the 2013-2015 review and not the SED, and to note its "successes and shortcomings."

On information gaps, views diverged on a paragraph proposed by a group of countries, opposed by two parties, encouraging the scientific community to address information gaps, including on 1.5°C scenarios. After lengthy negotiations, parties were unable to reach agreement and consulted further. Parties agreed to replace the contentious paragraph with language agreed to during informal informals that welcomes the IPCC decisions enumerating the forthcoming products of the sixth IPCC assessment cycle, including a 2018 special report on the impacts of global warming of 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels, noting its relevance to the first global stocktake.

On Thursday, 26 May, the SBSTA plenary adopted the conclusions.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/L.16), the SBSTA:

- welcomes the in-session SBSTA-IPCC special event on this issue and acknowledges the rich exchange of information that took place;
- acknowledges the importance of the outputs of IPCC assessment cycles for the global stocktake and notes the importance of the effective communication of IPCC's work to the UNFCCC;
- welcomes the IPCC decision to take into account the outcomes of COP 21 when determining its programme of work and the products of its sixth assessment cycle, as well as the IPCC decisions enumerating the forthcoming products of the sixth IPCC assessment cycle;
- invites submissions from parties and observer organizations on how the IPCC assessments can inform the global stocktake, taking relevant experience into account, by 12 September 2016; and
- agrees to continue its consideration of this matter at SBSTA 45, bearing in mind the relevant work of the APA on the global stocktake.

**Scope of the next periodic review of the long-term global goal:** This item is summarized under the SBI section. The SBSTA adopted the conclusions in its plenary on Thursday, 26 May.

**RESPONSE MEASURES:** This item is summarized under the SBI (see page 14).

**METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES UNDER THE CONVENTION: GHG data interface:** This sub-item was taken up by SBSTA in plenary on Monday, 16 May, and in informal consultations facilitated by Elsa Hatanaka (Japan). In light of the fact that, at present, Annex I and non-Annex I parties have different reporting guidelines, parties recognized the need for more time to understand and decide how to guide data-related work. Parties did not reach agreement and, in accordance with Rule 16 of the UNFCCC draft provisional rules of procedure, the issue will be taken up by SBSTA 45.

**Common metrics to calculate the carbon dioxide equivalence of GHG:** This sub-item was first taken up in plenary on Monday, 16 May. Washington Zhakata (Zimbabwe) and Takeshi Enoki (Japan) co-facilitated informal consultations.

In informal consultations, parties discussed whether to: close the agenda item; defer its consideration to 2021; or continue the item and call for submissions from parties and observers. Various developed countries supported deferring consideration of common metrics, noting that the APA will be considering this issue, while various developing countries preferred to continue the item and call for submissions. Parties agreed to specify that SBSTA 46 would reconsider the issue and generally agreed that the APA would call for submissions by parties on the use of common metrics.

On Thursday, 26 May, the SBSTA plenary adopted the draft conclusions.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/L.3), the SBSTA notes that the COP requested the APA to elaborate guidance for accounting for parties' NDCs that ensures that accounting is in accordance with common metrics assessed by the IPCC, and therefore agrees to defer its consideration to SBSTA 46.

**Bunker Fuels:** On Monday, 16 May, the SBSTA plenary took up this sub-item (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/MISC.2), which was addressed in informal consultations led by the SBSTA Chair. On Tuesday, 17 May in plenary, the EU encouraged parties to "take the spirit of Paris to the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) and the International Maritime Organization (IMO)."

On Thursday, 26 May in plenary, the SBSTA adopted the conclusions.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/L.7), the SBSTA: takes note of the information reported by the ICAO and IMO Secretariats and of the views expressed by parties on this information; and invites the ICAO and IMO Secretariats to continue to report, at future SBSTA sessions, on relevant work.

**Training programme for review experts for the review of GHG inventories of Annex I parties:** This item was taken up in plenary on Monday, 16 May, and in informal consultations led by the SBSTA Chair.

On Thursday, 26 May, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/L.6), the SBSTA notes that the implementation of the training programme started in September 2015 and that no experience has yet been gained in technical reviews of GHG inventories of Annex I parties using the guidelines by experts who undertook the training programme. SBSTA recognizes that not enough information is yet available to enable it to assess the results of the training programme and agrees to consider the assessment of the results of the training programme at SBSTA 46.

**METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES UNDER THE KYOTO PROTOCOL: Land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF):** This item was first taken up by the SBSTA plenary on Monday, 16 May, and was subsequently discussed in informal consultations, facilitated by Jose Antonio Prado (Chile) and Maya Hunt (New Zealand).

In the informal consultations, parties considered a proposal that revegetation using woody perennial plants on at least 0.05 hectares, which would not meet the definition of forests for the purposes of reforestation or afforestation, would be eligible under the CDM. The party agreed to submit draft text to this effect and the Co-Facilitators issued a conference room paper (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/CRP.1) with proposed language. Several parties noted the need to work further on the modalities and procedures for other types of vegetation.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/L.15), the SBSTA:

- requests the Secretariat to prepare a report on the workshop on revegetation activities for consideration at SBSTA 45;
- agrees to continue considering the work programme referred to in decision 2/CMP.7, paragraph 6 (on possible additional LULUCF activities under the CDM), at SBSTA 45, with a view to recommending a draft decision on the matter for consideration and adoption by CMP 12; and
- agrees to continue considering the work programmes referred to in decision 2/CMP.7, paragraphs 5 (more comprehensive accounting of emissions by sources and removals by sinks), 7 (the risk of non-permanence) and 10 (additionality) at SBSTA 45, with a view to recommending a draft decision or reporting on the outcomes, for consideration and possible adoption at CMP 12.

**Implications of the choice of metrics used to calculate the carbon dioxide equivalence of GHGs listed in Kyoto Protocol Annex A:** This item was taken up briefly in plenary on Monday, 16 May, and in informal consultations co-facilitated by Washington Zhakata (Zimbabwe) and Takeshi Enoki (Japan).

In the consultations, some parties called for closing this agenda item, noting that the “life of the CDM was coming to an end,” and that parallel discussions on this matter were scheduled to take place under the APA. Other parties preferred keeping the issue on the SBSTA’s agenda, stressing that it would be relevant if a third commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol was considered. Parties agreed to suspend the agenda item until the CMP considered a third commitment period.

On Thursday, 26 May, the SBSTA plenary adopted the draft conclusions.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In the conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/L.2), the SBSTA agrees to defer its assessment of the implications of the choice of metrics and to return to it only if the CMP initiates consideration of a third commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol.

**Reforestation of lands with forests in exhaustion as afforestation and reforestation in CDM project activities:**

This item was taken in plenary on Monday, 16 May, and in informal consultations facilitated by José Sanhueza (Chile).

In informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Sanhueza recalled that this issue had been examined since SBSTA 32 without any progress, and that no submissions had been received on this issue, despite a call for such submissions issued at the last SBSTA session. One party explained the rationale for the proposal to include lands with forests in exhaustion as afforestation and reforestation CDM activities. Other parties raised concerns over the environmental integrity of the proposal and suggested closing the agenda item. As no consensus emerged on closing the item after two informal consultations, parties agreed to continue its consideration at SBSTA 46.

On Thursday, 26 May, the SBSTA plenary adopted the draft conclusions.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/L.4), the SBSTA agrees to continue its consideration of this item at SBSTA 46.

**MARKET AND NON-MARKET MECHANISMS: Framework for various approaches; Non-market-based approaches; and New market-based approaches:** This agenda item and its sub-items were first taken up back-to-back by SBSTA plenary on Monday, 16 May. Subsequently, SBSTA Chair Fuller held informal consultations with interested parties.

In plenary, Chair Fuller reported from pre-sessional consultations that parties were eager to proceed with maximum efficiency in operationalizing Paris Agreement Article 6 (voluntary cooperative approaches). SBSTA adopted its conclusions on Thursday, 26 May.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/L.10), the SBSTA takes note of the work undertaken, including the information collected through submissions from parties and the related technical papers and workshop reports, and agrees to conduct its next consideration of these issues at SBSTA 50.

**MATTERS RELATING TO ARTICLE 6 UNDER THE PARIS AGREEMENT: Guidance on cooperative approaches referred to in Article 6.2; Rules, modalities and procedures for the mechanism established by Article 6.4; and Work programme under the framework for non-market approaches referred to in Article 6.8:** This item and its sub-items were first taken up in plenary on Monday, 16 May, and in a contact group co-chaired by Hugh Sealy (Maldives) and Kelley Kizzier (EU). Parties agreed to address the three sub-items in a balanced manner with equal time allocated across the sub-items in informal meetings.

In informal consultations on internationally transferred mitigation outcomes (ITMOs) (Article 6.2), parties exchanged views on the nature of ITMOs, their types, governance

arrangements and corresponding adjustments, including the need for quantifying NDCs. Some parties called for guidance to make operational the binding provisions of Article 6.2.

On the mechanism for mitigation and sustainable development (Article 6.4), parties exchanged views on the similarities and differences between the mechanism and the CDM. Many parties emphasized the changed context of the Paris Agreement whereby all parties have NDCs. Many parties stressed the importance of avoiding double counting and ensuring environmental integrity. Views diverged among parties on the inclusion of REDD+ in this item's scope and linkages with Paris Agreement Article 5 (sinks and removals).

On non-market approaches (Article 6.8), parties exchanged views on how to define non-market approaches and their scope. One country noted that non-market approaches achieved results without yielding transferrable units and did not involve the market. A party noted that this approach is based on needs and not on results. Some parties urged avoiding duplication of ongoing work under the Convention. Parties' views diverged on whether non-market approaches are strictly cooperative or domestic.

On Saturday, 21 May, the Co-Chairs issued a reflection note for each sub-item providing general views expressed by parties during the previous three informal meetings. Parties agreed that these reflection notes were informal and did not have any status.

On Thursday, 26 May, the SBSTA adopted its conclusions.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/L.11, L.12 and L.13), the SBSTA agrees to focus on arriving at a common understanding on these sub-items at COP 22 and agrees to invite submissions by parties and observer organizations by 30 September 2016.

**MODALITIES FOR ACCOUNTING OF FINANCIAL RESOURCES PROVIDED AND MOBILIZED THROUGH PUBLIC INTERVENTIONS UNDER ARTICLE 9.7 OF THE AGREEMENT:** This issue was taken up by plenary on Monday, 16 May, and later in a contact group co-chaired by Rafael da Soler (Brazil) and Outi Honkatukia (Finland), and in informal consultations, during which parties "brainstormed" the possible elements of the draft conclusions. Some debate occurred on the legal status of three guiding questions that parties and observers may consider when preparing their submissions on this issue. A legal adviser from the Secretariat confirmed that the guiding questions would have no legal status and would not bind parties. Parties agreed to the draft conclusions prepared by the Co-Chairs with minor changes on Saturday, 21 May.

On Thursday, 26 May, the SBSTA plenary adopted the draft conclusions.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/L.5), the SBSTA invites parties and observer organizations to submit their views by 29 August 2016, inviting them to consider guiding questions relating to: the existing modalities for the accounting of such financial resources; the accounting modalities that need to be developed; and the timing of the development of these accounting modalities.

The SBSTA also requests the Secretariat to organize an in-session workshop during SBSTA 45 to inform the work of the SBSTA on this matter, and prepare a technical paper, prior to SBSTA 46, summarizing information from the in-session workshop and submissions.

**COOPERATION WITH OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS:** This item (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/INF.3) was first taken up by SBSTA plenary on Monday, May 16. The Secretariat reported on its cooperative activities and the IPCC reported on IPCC 43 decisions, including on producing a special report on the impacts of global warming of 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels.

**SBSTA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/L.14), the SBSTA takes note of the summary of the Secretariat's cooperative activities with other intergovernmental organizations.

**CLOSING PLENARY:** The SBSTA plenary took place on Thursday, 27 May. Thailand, for the G-77/China, emphasized as key issues: enhanced pre-2020 action; provision of MOI; adaptation in agriculture; and accounting of finance. He welcomed progress made on the transparency framework, emphasizing it should be flexible, comprehensive and balanced.

The Umbrella Group highlighted progress in discussions on non-market and market approaches, anticipating more technical discussions to ensure market mechanisms are ready pre-2020. He welcomed the Presidencies' informal consultations on the WIM and looked forward to its review in Marrakesh.

The EIG welcomed discussions on how IPCC assessments can inform the global stocktake, and suggested "closely linking, if not integrating" the work on the 2013-2015 review and the global stocktake. He expressed concern over the lack of minimum guidance on submissions and disagreement on holding workshops on matters relating to Article 6 of the Paris Agreement.

The LDCs said they look forward to further engagement in the activities of the NWP and the technology framework discussions. He expressed disappointment that no conclusions were reached on agriculture, and hoped for engagement from the "climate change family" to enable concrete actions to protect vulnerable farmers.

The EU expressed support for the research dialogue and the IPCC special event, which he said could be a key input to the global stocktake. He welcomed the "pragmatic engagement" of parties on the technology framework, and underlined the cross-sectoral role of technology.

AOSIS called for synchronizing the IAR cycles with the global stocktake as early as possible in 2018 as an input to the 2018 facilitative dialogue, and urged the scientific community to provide research on 1.5°C scenarios. She looked forward to engaging on the WIM review at COP 22.

Mali, for the African Group, welcomed the TEMs, particularly on adaptation, and called for "more than workshops," for identifying and scaling up actions on the ground. He welcomed the inclusion of IPCC information as input into the global stocktake.

Costa Rica, for AILAC, welcomed the start of discussions on the NDC registry and the advice of how the IPCC assessment reports can feed into the global stocktake. He highlighted the need to achieve agreement on a global market-based mechanism at ICAO.

Highlighting that women are on the front lines of fighting poverty and food insecurity, Women and Gender welcomed the inclusion of gender considerations in the agriculture workshops, and called for effective financing for gender-responsive adaptation.

YOUNGOs lamented the limited progress on agriculture, reminding parties that food security cannot wait. She identified how the IPCC can inform the global stocktake as an area requiring more attention.

BINGOs acknowledged the “expanded scope” of SBSTA, and expressed disappointment on the lack of progress on Paris Agreement Article 6 at this session.

CAN called on parties to reach agreement on “what counts as climate finance” and a definition of “new and additional.”

CJN! called for REDD+ and joint mitigation and adaptation projects to be developed as non-market mechanisms, and underscored the vulnerability of agriculture to climate change.

Farmers underscored the need for research and extension, and innovation and technology transfer to address climate change in a way that does not threaten food production.

Indigenous Peoples emphasized the importance of applying safeguards and ensuring non-carbon benefits of REDD+, and their role as fundamental actors in the implementation of the Paris Agreement.

SBSTA then adopted the draft report of the session (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/L.1), and SBSTA Chair Fuller gavelled the meeting to a close at 7:49 pm.

## A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF THE BONN CLIMATE CHANGE CONFERENCE

*A journey of a thousand miles begins with a single step. – Lao Tzu, Chinese philosopher*

Delegates gathered in Bonn for the first official climate talks since the landmark adoption of the Paris Agreement in December 2015 with the glitter of the “city of lights” still in their eyes. Although five months had passed since the Paris Climate Change Conference, momentum for increased climate action was still high following a record 175 countries signing the Agreement at a high-level ceremony in April. With 17 ratifications already submitted and a promise by the world’s two largest emitters to ratify in 2016, entry into force before the originally planned date of 2020 was on the minds of many. Pressure was on delegates to show the world they were able to keep the “spirit of Paris” alive by rapidly taking up the technical work needed to operationalize the Agreement and not resting on their laurels following the success in Paris.

Taking place in the shadow of the historic Paris Conference, Bonn was a low-profile meeting. It nevertheless had an ambitious agenda. The meeting was the first of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Paris Agreement (APA), the body created in Paris to prepare for the entry into force of the Agreement. At the opening of the Bonn talks, COP 21 President Ségolène Royal

called on delegates to “be builders” and enable the transition from the rule making of the Paris COP to the technical work that will be undertaken by the Marrakesh COP. The two permanent subsidiary bodies, SBI and SBSTA, were also expected to take up a large list of issues that had been postponed in the run up to Paris, when the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP) had taken center stage.

This brief analysis looks at whether the Bonn session was successful in initiating work on building the necessary foundation for the operationalization of the Paris Agreement, not only by launching work under the APA, but also by identifying overlaps and synergies among the tasks of the three subsidiary bodies, a key endeavor for the coherence of the future climate regime. It also examines how delegates in Bonn managed the transition to a more technical phase of work, and lay the groundwork for a successful COP in Marrakesh in November.

### MAPPING OUT THE PARIS OUTCOME

The 36-page Paris Agreement and accompanying decision constitute a very complex and carefully balanced outcome that includes a myriad of tasks and mandates for the subsidiary and constituted bodies under the Convention. The first job for delegates in Bonn was therefore to “unpack” the Paris outcome by identifying gaps, synergies and overlaps among these mandates. Equipped with the reflections note issued by the COP 21 and incoming COP 22 Presidencies ahead of the meeting mapping out these various mandates, parties carried out this “unpacking” in various ways.

The APA spent the first four days of the session negotiating its agenda. While these agenda discussions may have seemed trivial to an outsider, they were important in framing the issues that will be negotiated for the months to come. These negotiations led to the addition of an item on adaptation communications, thereby filling a gap in the provisional agenda, which had been deemed too “mitigation-centric” by many developing countries. Many delegates commented on the positive spirit with which these negotiations were carried out and how they had led to a more balanced agenda. The resulting delay in the substantive APA negotiations also provided space for the SBI and SBSTA to “catch up” on issues that had been put on the back burner in the lead up to the Paris Conference, such as national adaptation plans, arrangements for intergovernmental meetings and appeals against decisions of the CDM Executive Board.

Parties also began identifying overlaps among the various mandates of the three subsidiary bodies in an effort to avoid duplication and ensure coherence. For example, parties decided to defer negotiations under the SBI and SBSTA on the scope of the periodic review, metrics under the Convention, and the framework for various approaches and non-market approaches to allow the APA to address related items first.

Efforts to ensure coherence were also carried out among the various bodies within and outside the UNFCCC process. While no specific institution is tasked with such a coordinating role, various developments in Bonn aimed to address this issue. Parties welcomed the COP 21 and 22 Presidencies’ initiative of holding joint stocktaking events during the meeting to provide an overview of progress under the three bodies. The APA also added an item to its agenda on taking stock of relevant progress

made by other bodies. In addition, institutional coordination was the subject of various events organized during the meeting, such as the workshop on the linkages between the Technology Mechanism and the Financial Mechanism, and the IPCC-SBSTA special event, which addressed synchronization of the five-year global stocktake and the seven-year IPCC cycles.

Negotiators in Bonn also endeavored to improve coherence by starting to envision how to build on existing mechanisms and learn from past experiences. They began determining what could be relevant to their work, drawing on the wealth of experience offered by the Convention and its Kyoto Protocol. In this regard, many called for the global stocktake under the Paris Agreement to learn from the structured expert dialogue on the 2013-2015 review, which was praised by the IPCC Chair as having enabled the Paris Agreement to be “truly based on science.”

There was also general recognition of the need for the transparency framework of the new regime to build on the international consultation and analysis and the international assessment and review, which currently form the measurement, reporting and verification framework under the Convention. In this regard, many welcomed the frank and constructive dialogue under the facilitative sharing of views that took place in Bonn, during which 13 developing countries presented their biennial update reports, hoping it would inspire the future transparency regime.

While drawing these links and parallels was seen as a useful exercise, some parties had hoped the discussions would be taken a step further. They lamented leaving Bonn without calls for technical papers or technical workshops, which would have provided the basis for digging deeper into these questions at COP 22.

### **GETTING TECHNICAL WORK OFF THE GROUND**

In addition to getting the “clockwork” right in terms of coherence and coordination, negotiators were called on to leave the political negotiations of Paris behind and transition into a “technical” mode of work. Indeed, the areas where progress was expected were seemingly technical in nature: developing the Paris Agreement “rulebook”; strengthening the institutional mechanisms to support national action; and preparing for the entry into force of the Paris Agreement.

On the Paris Agreement rulebook, parties engaged in the second week in what many described as a positive exchange of views on all substantive items of the APA agenda. However, some observed that the apparent candidness of the discussions on the transparency framework and global stocktake was due to their conceptual nature, with parties yet having to delve into the “devil of the details.”

Under the SBI and SBSTA as well, important technical work was advanced that will support institutions in their implementation of the Agreement. This included agreeing on the terms of reference of the third review of the Adaptation Fund, the Paris Committee on Capacity-building and the *ad hoc* technical expert groups of the work programme on the impact of the implementation of response measures.

Nonetheless, it became clear in Bonn that many of the “technical” issues on the different bodies’ agendas had significant political undertones, with one observer suggesting

that “rumors of the demise of political negotiation” had been overplayed.

The Paris Agreement represents a complex and delicately crafted balance, both in terms of its elements and in how it “resolves” the issue of differentiation between developed and developing countries. The “constructive ambiguity” interwoven into the Agreement, which was necessary for its adoption, allows for different interpretations to coexist. It will inevitably shape many of the discussions under all the subsidiary bodies as they begin putting flesh on the Agreement’s bones. Some did not welcome these political undertones, with one delegate calling for parties to “not try to address unresolved political questions” and focus on “the technical ones.” Others, however, recognized them as unavoidable, and recalled that negotiations of the Kyoto Protocol rulebook also had their fair share of political wrangling.

This was already seen, for example, in the APA discussions on mitigation where countries expressed diverging views on whether to provide guidance on the NDCs based on their type, such as an absolute economy-wide target or an intensity target, or on whether a country is developed or developing. Differentiation among countries also re-emerged in transparency and compliance discussions, as countries tried to operationalize this notion in the rules of the post-Paris regime, including by discussing how to design common procedures with flexibility based on national circumstances.

In the SBI, parties were unable to make progress on the modalities and procedures for one or two public registry/ies to house countries’ NDCs and adaptation communications, given disagreement on whether to address these issues jointly or separately—a difference of views that reflects the longstanding call by developing countries to grant adaptation and mitigation equal status.

As some rightly pointed out, it was not so much a transition into “technical negotiations” that Bonn had to achieve, but rather a kick-start of the technical work mandated by Paris and, by doing so, prepare the ground for a successful COP in Marrakesh in November 2016.

### **PACKING FOR MARRAKESH**

The tools available to parties to lay the ground for technical work in Marrakesh included workplans, calls for submissions, requests for technical papers from the Secretariat and technical workshops. In this regard, SBI and SBSTA delivered substantial results. For example, on the new SBSTA item on modalities for accounting of public finance, related to the transparency of finance under the Paris Agreement, parties were able to agree to a clear workplan containing all these elements.

The scorecard for the APA is more mixed. As one seasoned participant noted, the transition periods after important UNFCCC milestones have never been easy, and are often accompanied by agenda fights and, initially, slow progress. From this perspective, many saw the first meeting of the APA as a relative success, pointing to the smooth election of its first (female) Co-Chairs and the constructive spirit that had prevailed over the first week of agenda consultations, which contributed to building trust and confidence between parties and the newly-elected APA Co-Chairs.

However, despite much discussion on technical papers and pre-, inter- or in-session workshops, the APA conclusions only include calls for submissions of views on all but one of its agenda items, prompting some to lament the prospect of being underequipped going into COP 22 ahead of what everyone agrees is a substantial amount of work. The need to carry out this groundwork is even more pressing with the “rapid” entry into force of the Paris Agreement expected to be looming on the horizon. Discussions in Bonn showed agreement on the need to ensure that countries still in the process of joining the Agreement are not excluded from participating in the remaining technical work after entry into force. In its future consultations, the COP 22 Presidency will be able to build on these constructive discussions held in Bonn.

### **NEXT STEP: COP 22**

The Bonn meeting was also expected to set the broader foundation for COP 22, which many expect to be an “implementation and action COP.” On the implementation side, COP 22 will take up a number of items that were given less attention at this session, such as loss and damage, which was not on the agenda in Bonn. The mandated events in Marrakesh, including the facilitative dialogue on finance, and pre-2020 ambition and implementation are expected to help provide clarity on the US\$100 billion pledge, and address the concerns of many developing countries that pre-2020 action might be overshadowed by negotiations on the post-2020 period.

On the action side, the Bonn conference reiterated calls to engage non-state actors, including cities, businesses and civil society, which many viewed as a sign that it is now “a given” that the objectives of the Paris Agreement will not be fully achieved without their active engagement in the UNFCCC process.

Despite a slower start than those cognizant of the urgency of taking action against climate change had originally hoped for, the Bonn meeting did make important progress in unpacking the Paris Agreement. It also kick-started the technical work, which, in the words of outgoing Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres, is required “to breathe life to the vision that parties embedded into the Paris Agreement.” In doing so, the meeting also sent a signal to the world that the UNFCCC managed to maintain the momentum achieved in Paris and stay on track to delivering on its crucial mandates.

## **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

**Seventh Clean Energy Ministerial (CEM 7):** Energy ministers from the CEM’s 24 participating governments will gather for CEM7 to fully implement the CEM 2.0 vision of a more ambitious and effective CEM ready to respond to climate and clean energy challenges. Ministers will assess progress to date and launch new campaigns and efforts to drive progress in priority, high impact areas. As an implementation forum, the CEM will play a critical role on the “road from Paris” to help countries deliver on their respective national clean energy goals and to build confidence and the capacity to increase ambition over time. **dates:** 1-2 June 2016 **location:** San Francisco, CA,

**US contact:** CEM Secretariat **email:** CEMSecretariat@hq.doe.gov **www:** <http://energy-l.iisd.org/events/seventh-clean-energy-ministerial-cem7/www.cleanenergyministerial.org>

**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 the GEF’s integrated approach programmes 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 the 20th meeting of the LDCF and Special Climate Change Fund, 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](mailto:secretariat@thegef.org) **www:** [https://www.thegef.org/gef/council\\_meetings/50th/docs](https://www.thegef.org/gef/council_meetings/50th/docs)

**Asia Clean Energy Forum:** The Asia Clean Energy Forum, 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. **dates:** 6-10 June 2016 **location:** Manila, Philippines **contact:** Asian Development Bank **phone:** +63-2-632-4444 **fax:** +63-2-636-2444 **email:** [cleanenergy@adb.org](mailto:cleanenergy@adb.org) **www:** <http://www.asiacleanenergyforum.org/>

**Africa Carbon Forum:** The 8th Africa Carbon Forum will inform participants on the latest investment, finance and development opportunities relating to climate change. Issues for discussion include: opportunities for Africa in a post-Paris global landscape; policy options and opportunities for transformational development in the region presented by NDCs; innovative projects, programmes and investment opportunities for climate-resilient development, such as the Africa Renewable Energy Initiative and the African Initiative on Adaptation and Loss and Damage; sources of climate finance and how to access them, including market-based approaches to sustainable development; results-based financing; and cooperative initiatives under the Nairobi Framework Partnership, which aims to improve the level of participation of developing countries, especially those in sub-Saharan Africa, in the CDM. **dates:** 28-30 June 2016 **location:** Kigali, Rwanda **contact:** Vintura Silva, UNFCCC Secretariat **email:** [vsilva@unfccc.int](mailto:vsilva@unfccc.int) **www:** <http://www.africacarbonforum.com/2016/english/objective.htm>

**Resilient Cities 2016: 7th Annual Global Forum on Urban Resilience and Adaptation:** This Forum, which is expected to bring together over 400 experts and practitioners, will focus on a range of issues related to urban resilience and climate change adaptation, including inclusive resilience strategies, financing the resilient city, measuring and monitoring progress, resilience and adaptation planning, governance and collaboration, resource management, and resilient infrastructure. Participants will be able to network, build new partnerships, and exchange ideas and best practices. **dates:** 6-8 July 2016 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** ICLEI – Local Governments for Sustainability **email:** [resilient.cities@iclei.org](mailto:resilient.cities@iclei.org) **www:** <http://resilientcities2016.iclei.org/>

**Fifth Asia-Pacific Climate Change Adaptation Forum**

**2016:** The Asia-Pacific Adaptation Network (APAN) is organizing this event with the UN Development Programme, ADB, Global Water Partnership, the 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. **dates:** 17-19 October 2016 **location:** Colombo, Sri Lanka **contact:** APAN **email:** info@asiapacificadapt.net **www:** www.asiapacificadapt.net

**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 adoption 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/

**IPCC-44:** The 44th session of the IPCC will be held in October. **dates:** October 2016, exact dates TBC **location:** Geneva, Switzerland, or Vienna, Austria, TBC **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

**UNFCCC COP 22/CMP 12:** During COP 22/CMP 12, parties will meet to, *inter alia*, continue preparations for entry into force of the Paris Agreement. **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/

**GLOSSARY**

ADP	Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action
AILAC	Independent Alliance of Latin America and the Caribbean
ALBA	Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America
AOSIS	Alliance of Small Island States
APA	Ad Hoc Working Group on the Paris Agreement
BINGOs	Business and industry non-governmental organizations
CAN	Climate Action Network
CBDRRC	Common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CJN!	Climate Justice Now!
CMA	Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement
CMP	Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol
COP	Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC
CTCN	Climate Technology Centre and Network
EB	CDM Executive Board
EIG	Environmental Integrity Group

FSV	Facilitative sharing of views
GCF	Green Climate Fund
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GHG	Greenhouse gas
IAR	International assessment and review
ICA	International consultation and analysis
ICAO	International Civil Aviation Organization
IMO	International Maritime Organization
INDC	Intended nationally determined contribution
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
ITMOs	Internationally transferred mitigation outcomes
LDCF	LDC Fund
LDCs	Least Developed Countries
LEG	LDC Expert Group
LMDCs	Like-Minded Developing Countries
LULUCF	Land use, land-use change and forestry
MOI	Means of implementation
NAPs	National Adaptation Plans
NAPA	National adaptation programme of action
NC	National communication
NDC	Nationally determined contribution
NWP	Nairobi work programme on impacts, vulnerability and adaptation to climate change
PCCB	Paris Committee on Capacity-building
REDD+	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
RINGOs	Research and independent non-governmental organizations
SBI	Subsidiary Body for Implementation
SBSTA	Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice
SED	Structured expert dialogue on the 2013-2015 review
SIDS	Small island developing states
TEM	Technical Expert Meeting
ToR	Terms of reference
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
WIM	Warsaw International Mechanism on Loss and Damage associated with Climate Change Impacts
YOUNGOs	Youth non-governmental organizations