COP 22 FINAL

Earth Negotiations Bulletin

A Reporting Service for Environment and Development Negotiations

Vol. 12 No. 689 **Online at: http://www.iisd.ca/climate/cop22/enb/** Monday, 21 November 2016

SUMMARY OF THE MARRAKECH CLIMATE CHANGE CONFERENCE: 7-19 NOVEMBER 2016

The UN Climate Change Conference convened from 7-19 November 2016, in Marrakech, Morocco. It included the 22nd session of the Conference of the Parties (COP 22) to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the 12th session of the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP 12), and, with the entry into force of the Paris Agreement, the first session of the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA 1). Three subsidiary bodies (SBs) also met, the 45th sessions of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA 45) and Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI 45), and the second part of the first session of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Paris Agreement (APA 1-2).

The UN Climate Change Conference brought together over 22,500 participants, including nearly 15,800 government officials, 5,400 representatives of UN bodies and agencies, intergovernmental organizations and civil society organizations, and 1,200 members of the media.

Negotiations in Marrakech focused on matters relating to the entry into force and the implementation of the Paris Agreement, including under the COP, CMP, CMA, APA, SBI and SBSTA. During the first week, work was concentrated under the APA, SBI and SBSTA, which closed on Monday, 14 November, and Tuesday, 15 November.

During the second week, following the closure of the APA, SBI and SBSTA, the CMA opened. The joint high-level segment under the COP, CMP and CMA brought together over 70 heads of state and government, in addition to ministers and heads of delegation to generate political will. In addition, work continued under the COP and CMP. On Thursday, 17 November, the Presidency read out the Marrakech Action Proclamation for Our Climate and Sustainable Development to the COP plenary.

Throughout the meeting informal consultations convened under the COP on entry into force of the Paris Agreement and under the COP Presidency on the convening of CMA 1. These informal consultations were conducted back-to-back, engaging, *inter alia*, on where to house "orphan issues," the timing of the next or resumed CMA session (2017 or 2018), and whether the Adaptation Fund should serve the Paris Agreement.

Parties adopted 35 decisions, 25 under the COP, eight under the CMP and two under the CMA, that, *inter alia*: provide guidance on the completion of the work programme under the Paris Agreement and decide that the Adaptation Fund should serve the Paris Agreement; advance the preparations for the entry into force of the Paris Agreement and CMA; adopt the terms of reference (ToR) for the Paris Committee on Capacity-building (PCCB); approve the five-year workplan of the Warsaw International Mechanism to address loss and damage associated with impacts of climate change (WIM) Executive Committee (ExCom); provide further guidance on the review of the WIM; enhance climate technology development and transfer through the Technology Mechanism; address long-term finance; provide guidance to the Green Climate Fund (GCF) and the Global Environment Facility (GEF); initiate a process to identify the information to be provided in accordance with Paris Agreement Article 9.5 (biennial finance communications by developed countries); continue and enhance the Lima work programme on gender; improve the effectiveness of the Doha work programme on Article 6 of the Convention (education, training and public awareness); adopt the ToR for the third review of the Adaptation Fund; and adopt a revised scale of contributions to the Trust Fund for the core budget of the UNFCCC in 2016-2017.

IN THIS ISSUE

This issue of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* (ENB) © <enb@iisd.org> is written and edited by Anna Schulz, Ph.D., Jennifer Allan, Beate Antonich, Sandra Gagnon, Ph.D., Mari Luomi, Ph.D., Cleo Verkuijl, 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 *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* is published by the International Institute for Sustainable Development. The Sustaining Donors of the *Bulletin* are the the European Union, the Government of Switzerland (the Swiss Federal Office for the Environment (FOEN)), the 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 Austrian Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management (BMLFUW), 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.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE UNFCCC

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 COP 3 in Kyoto, Japan, agreed to a protocol to the UNFCCC that committed industrialized countries and countries in transition to a market economy to achieve emissions reduction targets. These countries, known as Annex I parties under the UNFCCC, agreed to reduce their overall emissions of six GHGs by an average of 5% below 1990 levels in 2008-2012 (the first commitment period), with specific targets varying from country to country. The Kyoto Protocol entered into force on 16 February 2005 and now has 192 parties. In December 2015, at COP 21 in Paris, France, parties agreed to the Paris Agreement that specifies that countries will submit progressively ambitious nationally determined contributions (NDCs) and that aggregate progress on mitigation, adaptation and means of implementation will be reviewed every five years in a global stocktake. The Paris Agreement entered into force on 4 November 2016.

LONG-TERM NEGOTIATIONS, 2005-2009: Convening in Montreal, Canada, in 2005, 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 3.9, which mandated consideration of Annex I parties' further commitments at least seven years before the end of the first commitment period.

In December 2007, COP 13 and CMP 3 in Bali, Indonesia, resulted in agreement on the Bali Roadmap on long-term issues. COP 13 adopted the Bali Action Plan (BAP) and established the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention (AWG-LCA), with a mandate to focus on mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology, capacity building and a shared vision for long-term cooperative action. Negotiations on Annex I parties' further commitments continued under the AWG-KP. The deadline for concluding the two-track negotiations was 2009 in Copenhagen, 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 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 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 and 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 and December 2012. The conference resulted in a package of decisions referred to as the "Doha Climate Gateway." These included amendments to the Kyoto Protocol to establish its second commitment period (2013-2020), and agreement to terminate the AWG-KP's and AWG-LCA's work 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 WIM, and the Warsaw Framework for REDD+.

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 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.

PARIS: The UN Climate Change Conference convened in Paris, France, in November and December 2015 and culminated in the adoption of the Paris Agreement on climate change. The Agreement sets the goals of: keeping global average temperature rise 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, each successive contribution representing a progression from the previous contribution, reflecting common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, in the light of different national circumstances. By 2020, parties whose NDCs contain a timeframe up to 2025 are requested to communicate a new NDC and parties with an NDC timeframe up to 2030 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 on their efforts 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.

PARIS AGREEMENT ENTRY INTO FORCE: The Paris Agreement entered into force on 4 November 2016, 30 days after the dual entry into force requirement of ratification by at least 55 countries representing at least 55% of global GHG emissions was met. As of 19 November 2016, 111 countries have ratified the agreement.

REPORT OF THE MARRAKECH CLIMATE CHANGE CONFERENCE

On Monday, 7 November 2016, COP 21/CMP 11 President Ségolène Royal, France, opened UN Climate Change Conference, reporting that 100 countries had ratified the Paris Agreement and appealing to remaining parties to the UNFCCC to ratify before the end of 2016. Describing COP 22 as an "African COP," she called for climate justice for the continent.

Salaheddine Mezouar, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Morocco, was elected as the COP 22/CMP 12 President by acclamation. Welcoming delegates to the "red city," he said the conference demonstrates a whole continent's commitment to climate action. Commending countries on the rapid entry into force of the Paris Agreement, he called for building on this dynamic to give tangible meaning to the Agreement and to "finalize support mechanisms."

UNFCCC Executive Secretary Patricia Espinosa emphasized that achieving the aims of the Paris Agreement is not a given, noting the need for: adaptation support; progress on the loss and damage mechanism; and a level and predictability of finance that can catalyze low-emission development.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Chair Hoesung Lee relayed the IPCC's "action-packed" work programme contributing to the implementation of the Paris Agreement on the basis of science, including the approval of the outline of the special report on Global Warming of 1.5°C, as requested by the UNFCCC COP.

Highlighting Marrakech's famous gardens, Mohammed Larbi Belcadi, Mayor of Marrakech, relayed the city's efforts to protect the environment, including through green areas and energy efficiency projects, as well as its commitment to a successful COP leading to concrete solutions.

This report summarizes the negotiations under the COP, CMP, CMA, APA, SBI and SBSTA.

CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES (COP 22)

On Monday, 7 November, COP 22 President Mezouar opened COP 22. A summary of the joint COP 22/CMP 11 opening statements, which took place on Tuesday, 8 November, are available at: http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12680e.html.

The facilitative dialogue on enhancing ambition and support took place on Friday, 11 November, and Wednesday, 16 November. Summaries of the events are available at: http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12683e.html and http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12687e.html.

On Wednesday, 16 November, the High-Level Ministerial Dialogue on Climate Finance took place. A summary of the events is available at: http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12687e.html.

On Thursday, 17 November, the High-Level Event on Accelerating Climate Action took place. A summary of the event is available at: http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12688e.html.

ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS: On Monday, 7 November, following consultations, parties agreed to adopt the agenda (FCCC/CP/2016/1 and Add.1), holding the agenda item on the second review of the adequacy of Convention Articles 4.2 (a) and (b) (developed countries' mitigation) in abeyance. An item, requested by Turkey for inclusion on access to support from the GCF and the CTCN under the Paris Agreement by parties whose special circumstances are recognized by the COP, was left pending under other matters.

Parties agreed to the organization of work, including for the sessions of the SBs (FCCC/CP/2016/1, FCCC/SBSTA/2016/3, FCCC/SBI/2016/9 and FCCC/APA/2016/3). Parties requested the APA undertake the preparatory work so that the Adaptation Fund may serve the Paris Agreement and forward a recommendation to the CMP for consideration no later than CMP 15.

The COP referred to the SBI the items and sub-items on: reporting from and review of Annex I parties to the Convention; reporting from non-Annex I parties to the Convention; capacity building under the Convention; gender and climate change; audit report and financial statements for 2015; and budget performance for the biennium 2016-2017.

The COP referred to the SBSTA items on: report of the Adaptation Committee; the implementation of the Buenos Aires programme of work on adaptation and response measures (Decision 1/CP.10); and matters relating to the least developed countries (LDCs).

The COP referred to the SBI and SBSTA joint items and sub-items on the WIM, and the joint annual report of the TEC and the CTCN.

Parties agreed to the accreditation of observer organizations (FCCC/CP/2016/3).

Parties agreed to apply the draft rules of procedure (FCCC/CP/1996/2), with the exception of draft rule 42 on voting. On Thursday, 17 November, parties agreed that consultations on the draft rules of procedure would continue at COP 23.

Election of Officers Other than the President: On Friday, 18 November, the COP elected members of the COP Bureau: SBSTA Chair Carlos Fuller (Belize); SBI Chair Tomasz Chruszczow (Poland); Hussein Alfa Nafo (Mali); Khalid Abuleif (Saudi Arabia); Rajani Ranjan Rashmi (India); Walter Schuldt Espinel (Ecuador); Collin Beck (Solomon Islands); and Helmut Hojesky (Austria). Rapporteur Georg Børsting (Norway) and Vice-President Oleg Shamanov (Russian Federation) will remain in office until their replacements have been elected.

The COP also elected: the SBSTA Bureau, with Tibor Schaffhauser (Hungary) as Vice-Chair remaining in office until his replacement has been elected, and Aderito Santana (São Tomé and Príncipe) elected as Rapporteur; and the SBI Bureau, with Zhihua Chen (China) as Vice-Chair and Tuğba İçmeli (Turkey) as Rapporteur.

The COP also elected the members of the Adaptation Committee, the Advisory Board of the CTCN, the TEC, the Standing Committee on Finance (SCF), the PCCB and took note of the nominations for the Consultative Group of Experts on National Communications from non-Annex I parties to the Convention (CGE).

The COP also elected the members of the Adaptation Committee, the Advisory Board of the CTCN and TEC, and took note of the nominations of the CGE and the LDCs Expert Group (LEG).

Dates and Venues of Future Sessions: On Wednesday, 9 November, Saudi Arabia, for the Asia-Pacific Region, said Fiji had offered to preside over COP 23, to be held at UNFCCC headquarters in Bonn, noting the group's final decision was pending. COP 22 President Mezouar invited proposals for hosting COP 24. On Friday, 18 November, the COP adopted its decision.

Fiji, as the host of COP 23/CMP 13, noted the commitment of his country to do everything in its power to place climate change at the "very top" of the development agenda. He reiterated his invitation to US President-elect Donald Trump to visit Fiji, stressing "you came to save us during World War II, it is time for you to save us now," referring to climate change.

Poland announced his country would host COP 24 in 2018.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/CP/2016/L.10), the COP, *inter alia*, accepts with appreciation the offer by Fiji to host COP 23 and CMP 13 from 6-17 November 2017, in Bonn, Germany, and requests the Executive Secretary to make the necessary arrangements for convening the sessions at the seat of the Secretariat.

The COP also decides to accept with appreciation the offer by Poland to host COP 24 and CMP 14, from 3-14 December 2018, and requests the Executive Secretary to negotiate and finalize a Host Country Agreement.

Adoption of the Report on Credentials: On Friday, 18 November, the COP adopted the report on credentials (FCCC/CP/2016/11).

REPORTS OF THE SUBSIDIARY BODIES: Report of the SBSTA: The COP took note of the SBSTA 44 report and the draft report of SBSTA 45 (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/2 and L.18).

Report of the SBI: The COP took note of the report of SBI 44 and the draft report of SBI 45 (FCCC/SBI/2016/8 and Add.1, and L.25).

Report of the APA: The COP took note of the reports of APA 1 and APA 1-2 (FCCC/APA/2016/2 and L.5) and adopted the decision (FCCC/APA/2016/L.4/Add.1).

PREPARATIONS FOR ENTRY INTO FORCE OF THE PARIS AGREEMENT AND CMA 1: This item was introduced on Monday, 7 November and subsequently discussed in informal consultations led by the COP Presidency, generally in conjunction with informal consultations convened under the auspices of the CMA Presidency. The COP adopted the draft decision on Friday, 18 November.

During informal consultations, parties' views diverged on whether to have a decision from the CMA, and, in the event of a decision, whether it should be short and procedural or substantive. Parties diverged on whether to use the early versions of draft COP or CMA decisions on this matter as the basis for negotiation. On Friday, 18 November, a draft was proposed that parties accepted as a basis for negotiations. Regarding a possible decision, parties' discussions centered on: timing issues related to reconvening CMA 1; addressing issues mandated under the Paris outcome without an agenda item; and organizing the 2018 facilitative dialogue.

On when to reconvene CMA 1, parties favored either 2017 or 2018. Those in favor of 2017, all of which were developing countries, stressed that some decisions under the APA and other SBs could be ready in 2017 and should be promptly adopted. These countries warned of reputational risks to delaying decisions until 2018, given the political momentum around the Paris Agreement.

Developed and some developing countries in favor of reconvening CMA 1 in 2018, recalled that the 2001 Marrakech Accords required three years of negotiations, and that the Accords were a "package" of rules. These countries noted the reputational risks to reconvening the CMA in 2017 without any decisions ready to adopt. One group of developing country parties suggested reconvening in 2017 to undertake a stocktaking exercise and adopt no decisions, which other groups opposed.

On issues mandated under the Paris outcome without an agenda item, both developed and developing countries identified such "orphan issues." During informal consultations, parties discussed the informal note put forward by the COP Presidency that cited: common time frames for NDCs; adjustment of NDCs; "enabling" the response measures forum; recognition of adaptation efforts; guidance to the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism; guidance to the LDCs Fund (LDCF) and Special Climate Change Fund; new collective goal on finance; *ex ante* finance information; and education, training and public awareness.

Some developed countries opposed listing orphan issues at this stage, noting that the APA agenda includes an item on further matters related to implementation of the Paris Agreement, which has a sub-item on preparing for entry into force of the Paris Agreement. Other developed countries stressed that the CMA should invite the COP to continue to undertake any work related to the CMA's work programme. Other parties suggested a tiered approach that first mentions issues mandated to CMA 1. Some developing country groups urged addressing all orphan issues in a comprehensive manner to ensure that all are addressed without delay, or prioritizing among issues, while some developed countries noted that only two issues are mandated by the Paris outcome for CMA 1, asking parties to "renegotiate."

The Adaptation Fund was the subject of discussion in this context. Many developing countries suggested that a CMA decision be taken that the Adaptation Fund "will," "should" or "shall" serve the Paris Agreement, while others recalled the Paris Agreement's wording that the Adaptation Fund "may" serve it.

On the 2018 facilitative dialogue, views diverged on whether, and how, to provide guidance to the COP Presidencies, with some suggesting submissions and many stressing the need for consultations with parties and observers. Some parties suggested an agenda item on this, which others opposed. One group proposed that the 2018 dialogue be based upon the 2016 facilitative dialogue on enhancing ambition and support, which others opposed.

In the CMA plenary, Venezuela and India asked that a footnote be added to the decision paragraph stating that the COP takes note of the resolutions adopted at the 39th session of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) Assembly to reflect their reservations and concerns about ICAO 39's resolutions. CMA President Mezouar stated that these reservations would be taken note of. On Saturday, 19 November, the COP adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: Decision FCCC/CP/2016/L.12 is comprised of six parts.

On the entry into force and signature of the Paris Agreement, the COP, *inter alia*, congratulates parties that have ratified, accepted of approved the Paris Agreement and invites those that have not done so to deposit their instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, where appropriate, with the depository as soon as possible.

On the completion of the work programme under the Paris Agreement, the COP, *inter alia*:

- decides to convene at COP 23 a joint meeting with the second session of CMA 1 (CMA 1-2) to review progress on the implementation of the work programme under the Paris Agreement; and
- also decides to conclude the work programme under the Paris Agreement as soon as possible and to forward the outcomes, at the latest, to the third part of CMA 1 (CMA 1-3) to be convened in conjunction with COP 24 for its consideration and adoption.

On additional matters relating to the implementation of the Paris Agreement, the COP takes note of the invitation of the CMA to request the APA to continue its consideration of possible additional matters relating to the implementation of the Paris Agreement and the convening of CMA 1.

On the Adaptation Fund, the COP requests the APA in its consideration of the necessary preparatory work on the Adaptation

Fund to address the governance and institutional arrangements, safeguards and operating modalities for the Adaptation Fund to serve the Paris Agreement. The COP invites parties to submit their views on the governance and institutional arrangements, safeguards and operating modalities for the Adaptation Fund to serve the Paris Agreement.

On the 2018 facilitative dialogue, the COP requests the COP 22 President, in collaboration with the incoming COP 23 President, to undertake inclusive and transparent consultations with parties on the organization of the facilitative dialogue referred to in Decision 1/CP.21, paragraph 20, including during the SB 46 and at COP 23, and to jointly report to COP 23 on the preparations for the dialogue.

On enhanced action prior to 2020, the COP, *inter alia*:

- underscores the urgent need for the entry into force of the Doha Amendment and calls on those parties to the Kyoto Protocol that have not done so to deposit their instruments of acceptance with the Depositary as soon as possible;
- commends the High-Level Champions and welcomes the Marrakech Partnership for Global Climate Action;
- takes note of the resolutions adopted at ICAO 39; and
- welcomes the adoption of the Kigali Amendment to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer.

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSALS BY PARTIES FOR AMENDMENTS OT THE CONVENTION UNDER ARTICLE 15: Proposal from the Russian Federation to Amend Convention Article 4.2(f): Parties first considered this item (FCCC/CP/2011/5) on Wednesday, 9 November, and agreed to informal consultations under the Presidency. On Thursday, 17 November, the COP agreed to continue consideration of this sub-item at COP 23.

Proposal from Papua New Guinea and Mexico to Amend Convention Articles 7 and 18: Parties first considered this item (FCCC/CP/2011/4/Rev.1) on Wednesday, 9 November, and agreed to informal consultations under the COP Presidency. On Thursday, 17 November, the COP agreed to continue consideration of this sub-item at COP 23.

REPORT OF THE ADAPTATION COMMITTEE: This item (FCCC/SB/2016/2) was first considered on Wednesday, 9 November, and was referred to SBSTA and SBI for consideration. Discussions on this item are summarized under the SBI agenda item on the Adaptation Committee (see page 25).

WIM: This item (FCCC/SB/2016/3) was first considered on Wednesday, 9 November, and was referred to the SBSTA and SBI for consideration. Discussions on this item are summarized under the SBI agenda item on the WIM (see page 25).

DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGIES: Joint Annual Report of the TEC and the CTCN: This item (FCCC/SB/2016/1) was first considered on Wednesday, 9 November, and referred to the SBSTA and SBI for consideration. Discussions on this item are summarized under the SBI agenda item on the joint annual report of the TEC and the CTCN (see page 26).

Linkages between the Technology Mechanism and the Financial Mechanism of the Convention: This item (FCCC/CP/2014/6, SB/2016/1, CP/2016/7 and Add.1) was first considered by the COP on Wednesday, 9 November. Parties agreed the COP Presidency would conduct informal consultations. Informal consultations, co-facilitated by El Hadji Mbaye Diagne (Senegal) and Elfriede More (Austria), and informal informal consultations also took place throughout the meeting.

During the informal consultations, parties considered, *inter alia*: progress made; areas for enhanced cooperation; guidance to the GCF; inviting developing countries to use support from the GCF Readiness and Support Programme to implement Technology Action Plans; and whether or not to conclude this agenda item.

On progress made, many parties appreciated: an SBI 44 in-session workshop; GCF, GEF and TEC presence at one another's meetings; and annual meetings convened by the GCF to enhance cooperation with UNFCCC bodies.

On areas for enhanced cooperation, parties discussed relaying progress in annual reports and creating a coordination mechanism.

On guidance to the GCF, parties discussed, *inter alia*, requesting the GCF to prioritize CTCN-supported projects. A number of developed countries, opposed by a large group of developing countries, advocated deleting a paragraph on this matter, noting guidance to the GCF should be addressed under the respective COP agenda sub-item. Parties eventually agreed to this approach.

On inviting developing countries to use support from the GCF Readiness and Support Programme to implement Technology Action Plans, many parties, opposed by others, supported deleting a reference to the Poznan strategic programme on technology transfer, since all its funds have already been allocated. A GCF representative clarified that matters related to the implementation of Technology Action Plans "should be oriented to other modalities rather than readiness under the GCF."

On whether to conclude this agenda item, parties considered two text options: concluding the agenda item and deciding that future consideration of issues relating to this agenda item will be undertaken under other relevant items; or agreeing to further consider this matter at the "Xth" COP session.

Some groups of developing countries stressed the need to include this agenda item on the next COP agenda to ensure the Technology Mechanism is "tied to support." Many developed countries preferred to conclude this agenda item and hold an in-session workshop, not in four years as previously proposed, but at the first SB session in 2018. Parties eventually agreed to continue consideration of this item at COP 24.

On Thursday, 17 November, the COP adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/CP/2016/L.6), the COP, emphasizing the importance of financial resources at all stages of the technology cycle, including at the early stages, in order to enable parties to enhance their mitigation and adaptation action, *inter alia*:

- welcomes: the progress made by the TEC, the CTCN and the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism in further elaborating the linkages between the Technology Mechanism and the Financial Mechanism; and the increased engagement between the GCF and the CTCN, particularly with respect to utilizing the GCF's Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme and Project Preparation Facility;
- encourages: the GCF Board to continue to invite the Chairs of the TEC and the Advisory Board of the CTCN to future meetings of the GCF Board on issues of common interest; and the TEC, the CTCN and the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism to enhance the involvement of relevant stakeholders as they strengthen the linkages between the Technology Mechanism and the Financial Mechanism;
- invites: GCF national designated authorities and focal points to use the support available to them under the Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme to conduct Technology Needs Assessments (TNAs) and develop Technology Action Plans,

among other things; and developing countries to develop and submit technology-related projects, including those resulting from TNAs and from the technical assistance of the CTCN, to the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism for implementation; and
- agrees to continue its consideration of this matter at COP 24.

MATTERS RELATED TO FINANCE: Long-Term Climate Finance: This item (FCCC/CP/2016/5) was first considered during the COP plenary on Wednesday, 9 November and subsequently addressed in a contact group and informal consultations held during the first and second week, co-chaired by Georg Borsting (Norway) and Andres Mogro (Ecuador).

Parties began their work during the first week with identifying elements of a draft decision text, including through presentation of written submissions by several groups of parties on Saturday, 12 November. Based on these exchanges, the Co-Chairs produced a revised draft decision text on which delegates worked during the second week of COP 22.

Parties focused on, *inter alia:* how to avoid a finance gap; access to and delivery of finance; SCF recommendations and work on loss and damage; and adaptation finance. India underscored the need to identify sources within and outside the UNFCCC and called for reviewing the ToR of the "financial bodies." Mauritania said the allocation of financial resources should be based on criteria of justice and fairness.

Parties agreed on the usefulness of an in-session workshop and welcomed the SCF's second biennial assessment. On the **in-session workshop**, parties' views differed on text requesting the Secretariat to conduct a needs assessment programme for developing countries and on workshop topics. Some preferred focusing on developing countries' access to climate finance and setting a new quantified goal for finance, while others supported focusing on the role of policies and enabling environments in mobilizing finance at scale.

Agreeing to focus the 2017 workshop on long-term climate finance, parties commented on the workshop's scope, with the Philippines, for the Group of 77 and China (G-77/China), calling for it to: be informed by the High-Level Ministerial Dialogue on Climate Finance; increase clarity on how to scale up climate finance; and, with the Independent Alliance of Latin America and the Caribbean (AILAC), consider how to advance adaptation finance. The European Union (EU) said the workshop should "help understanding the apparent gaps" in clarity. Canada noted submissions on strategies and approaches that can increase clarity. Parties' views differed on whether to emphasize progress made or to highlight the adaptation finance gap. Some parties suggested focusing not only on needs but more specifically on how to: translate needs into projects; address and obtain access to finance for the identified projects; and realize enabling environments and policies to attract financial resources at the scale necessary to support those actions. Others stressed their opposition to referring to "bankable projects."

Views further differed on how to work on scaling up finance support and *ex ante* information.

On scaling up, several groups stressed they wanted to see "something robust on adaptation finance." In addition, in a paragraph on "urging developed countries to scale up their provision of financial support to developing countries in line with the latter's increasing needs and priorities identified in a country-driven manner," one developing country group suggested adding "as identified in adaptation communications where they exist," and one developing country party suggested replacing "financial support" with "financial resources." Other parties suggested deleting the paragraph.

On *ex ante* information, several parties sought deletion of all paragraphs under this section, suggesting "this goes beyond the scope of the discussion under this agenda sub-item."

On Friday, 18 November, the COP adopted the decision on long-term climate finance.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/CP/2016/L.11), the COP, *inter alia*:
- notes with appreciation the 2016 biennial assessment and overview of climate finance flows of the SCF, in particular its key findings and recommendations, highlighting the increase of climate finance flows from developed country parties to developing country parties;
- welcomes the progress by developed country parties towards reaching the goal of jointly mobilizing US$100 billion annually by 2020, and urges them to continue to scale up mobilized climate finance towards this goal;
- welcomes the progress made and requests parties to continue to enhance their enabling environments and policy frameworks to facilitate the mobilization and effective deployment of climate finance;
- urges developed country parties to continue their efforts to channel a substantial share of public climate funds to adaptation activities and to strive to achieve a greater balance between finance for mitigation and for adaptation, recognizing the importance of adaptation finance;
- notes the increase in adaptation finance to date and the need to significantly scale up adaptation finance, as well as the progress made in enhancing access to finance by developing countries, while emphasizing the continued challenges that developing countries face and encouraging parties and relevant institutions to enhance access to finance from a wide variety of sources, public and private, bilateral and multilateral;
- requests the Secretariat to prepare a compilation and synthesis of the biennial submissions from developed country parties on updated strategies and approaches for scaling up climate finance from 2014 to 2020;
- invites developing country parties that have not already done so to submit their biennial update reports as soon as possible;
- decides that the in-session workshops on long-term climate finance in 2017 and 2018 will, with a view to scaling up climate finance for mitigation and adaptation, focus on experiences and lessons learned from articulating and translating needs identified in country-driven processes into projects and programmes, roles of policies and enabling environments for mitigation and adaptation finance, and facilitating enhanced access; and
- requests the Secretariat to organize these workshops, ensure they are balanced in and attended by both public and private sector actors, and prepare summary reports.

The COP also invites parties and relevant institutions to consider that:
- country-driven processes for the assessment of adaptation needs in developing countries are fundamental for scaling up adaptation finance;
- the NDCs and adaptation communications could constitute a good opportunity for supporting the scaling up of adaptation finance;
- the role of the private sector in adaptation finance needs to be further enhanced;

- access to adaptation finance remains a challenge, particularly for small island developing states (SIDS) and LDCs;
- better information needs to be generated for more efficient planning, including through enhanced tracking of adaptation flows;
- strengthening national public financing management systems is vital to support countries to effectively manage, track and monitor climate finance; and
- maximizing the effectiveness of adaptation finance is important in ensuring that limited financial resources achieve the greatest possible impact.

Report of the Standing Committee on Finance (SCF) and Review of the Functions of the SCF: This item (FCCC/CP/2016/8 and MISC.1) was first considered during the COP plenary on Wednesday, 9 November, and subsequently addressed in contact group meetings and informal consultations co-chaired by Ngedikes Olai Uludong (Palau) and Delphine Eyraud (France).

Parties began their work during the first week by commenting on the draft decision, including: welcoming the report; acknowledging the useful forum on loss and damage, which engaged with the private sector; recognizing the SCF's achievements in building linkages with other bodies, such as the Technology Mechanism; and urging the SCF to take into account alternative non-market approaches.

In addition, one group of parties noted the SCF would benefit from engaging with the UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) and the private sector in developing countries. Another group called for clear timelines and outputs from this session on how to advance facilitation of adaptation in developing countries. Some countries noted the review of the functions as relevant regarding the SCF's transition to serving the Paris Agreement.

During the second week, parties worked on the Co-Chairs' streamlined draft decision text until it was ready, on Thursday, 17 November, to be forwarded to the COP.

On Friday, 18 November, the COP adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/CP/2016/L.9/Rev.1), the COP, *inter alia*:

- welcomes the report of the SCF and takes note of its recommendations;
- endorses the workplan of the SCF for 2017;
- notes the 2016 biennial assessment and overview of climate finance flows;
- requests the SCF, in fulfilling its function on the measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) of support, and in the context of its existing workplan, to cooperate with relevant stakeholders and experts and to consider ongoing work under the Convention and further action envisaged under the Paris Agreement;
- welcomes the 2016 forum of the SCF on the topic of financial instruments that address the risks of loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change;
- takes note of the summary report on the 2016 forum, including the recommendations and follow-up activities of the SCF and invites the SCF to follow up on the recommendations in its 2017 workplan;
- invites the SCF to continue its deliberations on the topic of its 2017 forum at its first meeting in 2017; and
- reiterates that the SCF will integrate financing for forests-related considerations into its 2017 workplan, where appropriate, and continue work on this matter in the context of the overall issue of improving coherence and coordination in the delivery of climate change financing, taking into account all relevant decisions on forests.

The annex to the decision contains the summary and recommendations by the SCF on the 2016 biennial assessment and overview of climate finance flows, with sections on: context and mandates; challenges and limitations; key findings; and recommendations. The key findings: explicate methodological issues relating to MRV of public and private climate finance; provide an overview of current climate finance flows in 2013-2014; and, by way of assessment of climate finance flows, offer insights into key questions of interest in the context of the UNFCCC negotiations, including support for adaptation and mitigation, levels of finance for different regions, and how finance is delivered.

Report of the GCF to the COP and Guidance to the GCF: This item (FCCC/CP/2016/7 and Add.1, 8, and INF.1) was first considered during the COP plenary on Wednesday, 9 November, and subsequently addressed in contact group meetings and informal consultations co-chaired by Richard Muyungi (Tanzania) and Stefan Schwager (Switzerland).

Parties began their work during the first week by commenting and providing written submissions on the draft decision. The Co-Chairs streamlined the draft decision several times, including on the basis of progress reached during the second week during self-facilitated drafting meetings among parties. On Wednesday, 16 November, the contact group forwarded agreed draft text to the COP.

During the discussions, many welcomed the SCF's report and draft guidance, noting they provided a good basis and reflected progress made. Parties further highlight various issues. The Philippines, for the G-77/China, stressed the need to ensure that the GCF continues to serve all developing countries in the Convention. Egypt, for the African Group, suggested highlighting that the GCF is "an institution to stay." The Like-Minded Developing Countries (LMDCs) sought for ways to help the GCF Board with transforming the pledges made by countries into finalized support.

Maldives, for the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS), and South Africa lamented that the procedures of accreditation remain too complex. The US and New Zealand highlighted the important role of the private sector in ensuring the Fund functions. Nicaragua said private sector investments in general could be better directed to renewable energy, energy efficiency, reforestation and avoidance of deforestation.

On Friday, 18 November, the COP adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/CP/2016/L.5), the COP, *inter alia*:

- notes the draft decision on the guidance to the GCF prepared by the SCF;
- welcomes the report of the GCF to the COP and a list of actions taken by the Board in response to previous guidance from the COP;
- looks forward to the ongoing and timely implementation by the Board, including the initial strategic plan, and the scaling up of investments in ambitious country-driven climate action;
- urges the Board to finalize in a timely manner its work related to the guidance of the COP on financing for forests;
- urges parties that made pledges under the initial resource mobilization process of the GCF but have not yet confirmed them through fully executed contribution arrangements or agreements to do so as a matter of high priority;

- requests the Board to facilitate an increase in the amount of direct access proposals in the pipeline and to report to the COP on progress made in this regard and to enhance the coordination and delivery of resources to support country-driven strategies through simplified and efficient application and approval procedures, and through continued readiness support to developing country parties;
- notes with concern the lack of signed bilateral agreements related to privileges and immunities in order for the GCF to undertake its activities;
- requests the Board to enhance the delivery of resources by addressing those measures that are delaying the implementation of projects that have been approved by the Board, including the conclusion of pending accreditation master agreements and funded activity agreements;
- encourages the Board to develop modalities to support activities enabling private sector involvement in LDCs and SIDS, and to seek opportunities to engage with the private sector, including local actors, on adaptation action at the national, regional and international levels;
- invites national designated authorities and focal points to utilize the Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme, and to collaborate with accredited entities to use the Project Preparation Facility, where appropriate, to prepare adaptation and mitigation proposals of increasing quality and impact potential;
- reiterates its request to the Board to agree on the arrangements for the first formal replenishment process of the GCF;
- invites parties to submit annually their views and recommendations on elements for guidance to the GCF;
- requests the SCF to take into consideration these submissions when preparing draft guidance to the GCF; and
- requests the GCF, as an operating entity of the Financial Mechanism, to include in its annual report to the COP information on the steps it has taken and the timeline for the implementation of the guidance provided in this decision.

Report of the GEF to the COP and Guidance to the GEF: This item (FCCC/CP/2016/6 and Add.1, 8, and INF.1) was first considered during the COP plenary on Wednesday, 9 November, and subsequently addressed in contact group meetings and informal consultations co-chaired by Richard Muyungi (Tanzania) and Stefan Schwager (Switzerland).

Parties began their work during the first week by providing written submissions for and commenting on a Co-Chairs' draft decision. Throughout the second week, parties considered a streamlined Co-Chairs' draft decision, including in informal informal consultations, until reaching agreement on Thursday, 17 November, when the contact group forwarded the draft text to the COP.

Parties' views differed, *inter alia*, on a reference to "welcoming the SCF 2016 Biennial Assessment as context for the provision of guidance," and various textual proposals, including: that the GEF, in its deliberation on the strategy for the seventh replenishment, take into account "any CMA decisions"; and "that all requests for funding which meet GEF focal area strategies and standards are duly and timely examined and responded."

Parties also disagreed on several additions, including on inserting after text on ensuring that "the support for the Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT) will be included in the seventh replenishment," the addition "as additional resources to be set aside."

Discussions also focused on a paragraph requesting the GEF to continue providing, in its annual reports, information on, *inter alia*, financial support provided for the preparation of national communications and Biennial Update Reports, with parties disagreeing on references to: "non-Annex I parties"; "developing country parties"; or "parties eligible for funding."

On Friday, 18 November, the COP adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/CP/2016/L.7), the COP, *inter alia*:

- emphasizes the need for the GEF to consider lessons learned from past replenishment periods and to take into account the entry into force of the Paris Agreement in its deliberations on the strategy for the seventh replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund;
- calls on developed country parties, and invites other parties that make voluntary financial contributions to the GEF, to ensure a robust seventh replenishment, in order to assist in providing adequate and predictable funding, taking into consideration the Paris Agreement;
- requests the GEF in its seventh replenishment programming, to continue to assist developing countries, in particular LDCs and SIDS, in accessing resources in an efficient manner;
- requests the GEF, as appropriate, to ensure that its policies and procedures related to the consideration and review of funding proposals be duly followed in an efficient manner;
- requests the GEF to continue its efforts, as appropriate and as needed, to minimize the potential consequences of the projected shortfall for its support to developing countries, aiming to fulfill the relevant programming directions of the sixth replenishment of the GEF;
- requests the GEF to continue providing information on the establishment and operation of the CBIT;
- urges the GEF and recipient countries to continue exploring with the CTCN ways to support climate technology-related projects through country allocations of the sixth replenishment of the GEF;
- requests the GEF to take into consideration climate risks in all its programmes and operations, as appropriate, keeping in mind lessons learned and best practices;
- encourages the GEF to encourage countries to align their GEF programming with priorities as identified in their NDCs during the seventh replenishment, and to continue to promote synergies across its focal areas; and
- requests the GEF to enhance capacity development in LDCs for the development of project proposals with a focus on identifying potential funding sources, both national and international, and enhancing long-term domestic institutional capacities.

Sixth Review of the Financial Mechanism: This item was first considered during the COP plenary on Wednesday, 9 November, when parties agreed on the ToR for the sixth review, with a view to finalizing the review at COP 23. The item was subsequently addressed in contact group meetings and informal consultations co-chaired by Rafael da Soler (Brazil) and Outi Honkatukia (Finland).

Parties accepted the ToR and made various comments on the draft text. The Philippines, for the G-77/China, emphasized the need for coherence of financing under the Convention and "enhanced support to enable enhanced actions." Canada suggested focusing on areas of complementarity and on increased effectiveness of the Financial Mechanism.

During the second week, parties continued negotiations, including during informal informal meetings, on the Co-Chairs' revised draft text on updated guidelines for the review, with discussions focusing on sources of information and criteria. On

Wednesday, 16 November, the contact group agreed to: delete most textual additions made to the draft text on guidelines; the procedural part of the decision; and forward the draft decision to the COP.

On Friday, 18 November, the COP adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/CP/2016/L.4), the COP, *inter alia*:

- decides to adopt the updated guidelines for the sixth review of the Financial Mechanism contained in the annex;
- requests the SCF to provide, in its report to COP 23, expert input to the sixth review of the Financial Mechanism, with a view to the review being finalized by COP 23; and
- invites parties, observers and organizations involved in the activities of the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism to submit, by 30 April 2017, their views on the sixth review of the Financial Mechanism based on the guidelines contained in the annex to the decision, for consideration by the SCF in preparing its expert input to the review.

The annex of the decision contains the updated guidelines for the sixth review of the Financial Mechanism, with sections on: objectives; sources of information; and criteria.

Initiation of the Process to Identify the Information to be provided by Parties in Accordance with Paris Agreement Article 9.5: This item was first considered during the COP plenary on Wednesday, 9 November, when parties agreed to initiate the process. The item was subsequently addressed in contact group meetings and informal consultations co-chaired by Rafael da Soler (Brazil) and Outi Honkatukia (Finland).

During the first week, parties exchanged views, including on mechanisms and parameters, which the Co-Chairs captured in a list. During the second week, parties engaged further on several revised Co-Chairs' non-papers drafted on the basis of bilateral consultations with parties and held several self-facilitated informal informal meetings. On Wednesday, 16 November, the contact group agreed to the draft decision text and forwarded it to the COP.

During discussions, many parties recognized the need for predictability and use of qualitative and quantitative information. The EU noted interlinkages with other agenda items, including submissions on strategy approaches and roadmaps. The Philippines, for the G-77/China, stressed that emphasis should be on country-driven strategies and the needs and priorities of developing countries. Several parties emphasized the need to provide more clarity on *ex ante* information.

Several parties preferred not to discuss the timelines and frequency of financial information to be communicated, suggesting the Paris Agreement is clear on "biennial communications." Others noted the text lacks information on how timeframes will be used in submissions. Several parties also stressed a clear distinction between *ex ante* and *ex post* information, noting obtaining the latter is more challenging.

Some parties called for focusing on process rather than information and views among parties diverged on identifying the SCF as a "home" for this issue once the agenda item is closed.

Parties' views continued to differ on a non-exhaustive list of elements with options under sections on: objectives and scope; existing arrangements to build upon; linkages; next steps; and timeline and other arrangements. They also differed on: the way forward; the usefulness of a facilitated in-session workshop in conjunction with SB 46; and a resulting Secretariat's summary report for consideration at COP 23.

On Friday, 18 November, the COP adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/CP/2016/L.2), the COP recalls that developed country parties shall biennially communicate indicative quantitative and qualitative information related to Paris Agreement Articles 9.1 (developed country parties' existing obligation to provide financial resources to assist developing country parties with respect to mitigation and adaptation) and 9.3 (developed country parties progress in their efforts taking the lead in mobilizing climate finance), including, as available, projected levels of public financial resources to be provided to developing country parties, and that other parties providing resources are encouraged to communicate biennially such information on a voluntary basis.

The COP further: requests the Secretariat to organize a roundtable discussion among parties on this matter in conjunction with SB 46 and to prepare a summary report of the roundtable for consideration by COP 23; and agrees to advance work on this matter at COP 23, with a view to providing a recommendation on information to be provided by parties in accordance with Paris Agreement Article 9.5 for consideration and adoption by CMA 1.

REPORTING FROM AND REVIEW OF ANNEX I PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION: This item was first considered on Wednesday, 9 November, and was referred to the SBI for consideration. Discussions on this item are summarized under the SBI agenda item on reporting from and review of Annex I parties to the Convention (see page 22).

REPORTING FROM NON-ANNEX I PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION: This item was first considered on Wednesday, 9 November, and was referred to the SBI for consideration. Discussions on this item are summarized under the SBI agenda item on reporting from non-Annex I parties to the Convention (see page 22).

CAPACITY-BUILDING UNDER THE CONVENTION: This item was first considered on Wednesday, 9 November, and was referred to the SBI for consideration. Discussions on this item are summarized under the SBI agenda item on capacity-building under the Convention (see page 27).

IMPLEMENTATION OF CONVENTION ARTICLES 4.8 AND 4.9: Implementation of the Buenos Aires Programme of Work on Adaptation and Response Measures (Decision 1/CP.10): This item was first considered on Wednesday, 9 November, and was referred to the SBSTA for consideration. Discussions on this item are summarized under the SBSTA agenda item on the Buenos Aires programme of work (see page 29).

Matters Relating to the LDCs: This item was first considered on Wednesday, 9 November, and was referred to the SBSTA for consideration. Discussions on this item are summarized under the SBSTA agenda item on the matters relating to the LDCs (see page 24).

GENDER AND CLIMATE CHANGE: This item (FCCC/CP/2016/4) was first considered on Wednesday, 9 November, and was referred to the SBI for consideration. Discussions on this item are summarized under the SBI agenda item on gender and climate change (see page 29).

OTHER MATTERS REFERRED TO THE COP BY THE SBs: On Thursday, 17 November, the COP adopted decisions forwarded from SBI 44 contained in FCCC/SBI/2016/8/Add.1 on: the outcome of the first round of the international assessment and review (IAR) process; the PCCB; improving the effectiveness of the Doha work programme on Article 6 of the Convention; and financial and budgetary matters.

The COP adopted a decision recommended by SBI 45 on national adaptation plans (NAPs) (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.32/Add.1). Discussions on this item are summarized under the SBI agenda item on NAPs (see page 24).

The COP also adopted a decision recommended by SBSTA 45 on implementation of the Global Observing System for Climate (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/L.26/Add.1). Discussions on this item are summarized under the SBSTA agenda item on research and systematic observation (see page 32).

In addition, the COP adopted two recommendations by SBI 44 (FCCC/SBI/2016/8): concluding consideration of privileges and immunities for individuals serving on constituted bodies established under the Convention; and changing the submission deadline referred to in Decision 4/CP.21, paragraph 12 (a) (on NAPs) to 4 October 2017.

Outcome of the First Round of the IAR Process: On Thursday, 17 November, the COP adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/SBI/2016/8/Add.1), the COP: welcomes the implementation of the first round of the IAR process; invites parties to submit their views on the revision of the modalities and procedures for IAR on the basis of this experience; and requests the SBI to revise the modalities and procedures for IAR on the basis of this experience and parties' submissions, with a view to recommending revised modalities and procedures for consideration and adoption at COP 23.

Paris Committee on Capacity-building: On Thursday, 17 November, the COP adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/SBI/2016/8/Add.1), the COP, *inter alia*:

- adopts the ToR for the PCCB, as contained in the decision's annex;
- reaffirms that the objective of the PCCB is to address gaps and needs, both current and emerging, in implementing capacity building in developing countries and further enhance capacity-building efforts, including with regard to coherence and coordination in capacity-building activities under the Convention;
- recalls that COP 25 will review the progress, need for extension, the effectiveness and enhancement of the PCCB and that the PCCB will manage and oversee the 2016-2020 workplan outlined in Decision 1/CP.21, paragraph 73; and
- requests the PCCB to further develop and adopt its working modalities and procedures at its first meeting, and the SBI to organize the first meeting of the PCCB in conjunction with SB 46.

Improving the Effectiveness of the Doha Work Programme on Article 6 of the Convention: On Thursday, 17 November, the COP adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/SBI/2016/8/Add.1), the COP, *inter alia*, recognizes progress in planning, coordinating and implementing climate change education, training, public awareness, public participation and public access to information, as well as in international cooperation on these matters, and encourages parties to:

- continue to promote the systematic integration of gender-sensitive and participatory education, training, public awareness, public participation and public access to information into all mitigation and adaptation activities implemented under the Convention, as well as under the Paris Agreement, including into the implementation of their NDCs and the formulation of long-term low GHG emission development strategies;
- foster the participation of relevant stakeholders in all mitigation and adaptation activities implemented under the Convention;
- to designate, if they have not already done so, a national focal point for Article 6 of the Convention and to inform the Secretariat accordingly; and
- submit information as part of their national communications, and where possible in other reporting under the Convention, on their actions taken to implement the Doha work programme on Article 6 of the Convention and to share their experiences and best practices for the purpose of reviewing the Doha work programme in 2020.

The COP also, *inter alia*:

- urges parties, intergovernmental organizations, NGOs, academia, research institutions, the private sector, state and local governments, and youth to continue to implement policies and activities pursuant to Article 6 of the Convention;
- invites multilateral and bilateral institutions and organizations, including operating entities of the Financial Mechanism, to provide financial resources to support activities related to the implementation of Article 6 of the Convention;
- invites relevant international organizations to continue supporting parties and stakeholders in the implementation of the Doha work programme, and identifies activities to this end;
- requests the Secretariat to, among other things, continue facilitating a regular exchange of views, good practices and lessons learned among the national focal points for Convention Article 6; organize workshops, video conferences and activities at the international and regional levels in order to build and strengthen the existing skills and capacity of the national focal points for Convention Article 6; and continue collaborating with admitted observer organizations, other stakeholders and international organizations, with a view to catalyzing further action in fulfilment of Convention Article 6; and
- decides that efforts related to the implementation of Article 6 of the Convention shall be referred to as Action for Climate Empowerment (ACE).

Financial and Budgetary Matters: On Thursday, 17 November, the COP adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/SBI/2016/8/Add.1), the COP, recalling Decision 12/CP.15, table 2, in relation to the possible upgrading of the position of Assistant Secretary-General (UNFCCC Executive Secretary) to Under-Secretary-General and the possible upgrading of one position from D-2 to Assistant Secretary-General level:

- approves that the upgrade of the current Assistant Secretary-General position to the level of Under-Secretary-General be reflected in the approved staffing table for the biennium 2016-2017;
- decides that any additional costs resulting from this approval and the upgrading of a D-2 position will be absorbed from existing resources available under the approved programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017; and
- also decides that one of the three D-2 positions contained in the approved staffing table for the biennium 2016-2017 shall be abolished as soon as the Deputy Executive Secretary assumes office at the level of Assistant Secretary-General.

ADMINISTRATIVE, FINANCIAL AND INSTITUTIONAL MATTERS: This item, and its associated sub-items, was first considered on Wednesday, 9 November.

Audit Report and Financial Statements for 2015: This item was referred to the SBI for consideration. Discussions

on this item are summarized under the SBI agenda item on administrative, financial and institutional matters (see page 30).

Budget Performance for the Biennium 2016-2017: This item was referred to the SBI for consideration. Discussions on this item are summarized under the SBI agenda item on administrative, financial and institutional matters (see page 30).

Decision-Making in the UNFCCC Process: This sub-item was taken up by the COP plenary on Wednesday, 9 November. Paul Watkinson (France) reported on consultations among parties in May 2016, noting that, while all parties had emphasized the importance of transparency and adherence to the rules of procedure, parties' views diverged on whether to conclude this agenda item at COP 22. The COP Presidency then consulted informally facilitated by Azoulay Lahcen (Morocco).

In informal consultations, citing the importance of upholding the draft rules of procedure for the legitimacy of the process, three parties called for a draft decision, which one group opposed, saying that the dialogue was useful but should not be codified. On the way forward, one party observed the "exceptional workload" of the SBs in May 2017 and suggested continuing the discussion at COP 23. Parties agreed.

Final Outcome: In plenary on Thursday, 17 November, the COP agreed to continue consideration of this sub-item at COP 23.

Review of the Process Established by Decision 14/CP.1 relating to the Selection and Nomination of the Executive Secretary and the Deputy Executive Secretary: On Wednesday, 9 November, COP 22 President Mezouar introduced this item (FCCC/CP/2016/INF.2). Saudi Arabia suggested that parties review developments since the original decision. Switzerland drew attention to the process of appointment in the Convention on Biological Diversity, suggesting that model, in which parties define eligibility criteria, could be adopted. The COP Presidency then facilitated informal consultations.

In is closing plenary on Thursday, 17 November, the COP decided to request SBI 46 to consider this matter, with a view to forwarding a recommendation to COP 23.

OTHER MATTERS: Two items were considered under this agenda item.

On Wednesday, 9 November, COP 22 President Mezouar reported that on the previous day he had started informal consultations on the sub-item requested by Turkey on its special circumstances.

On Saturday, 19 November, Aziz Mekouar (Morocco) reported that conclusions could not be reached and that consultations will continue on this item. Turkey welcomed efforts in this regard, stressing their motivation is to increase their capacity to take ambitious action.

On Wednesday, 9 November, Bolivia and Ecuador requested that the COP consider Decision 1/CP.21, paragraph 136 (platform for local communities and indigenous peoples to exchange experiences and share best practices on mitigation and adaptation) and begin work. Parties agreed to informal consultations on this issue, to be conducted by the COP 22 Presidency. On Saturday, 19 November, COP 22 Vice President Khalid Abuleif (Saudi Arabia) proposed, and parties agreed, to an incremental approach and that the SBSTA undertake work on operationalization of the platform.

Ecuador, with Nicaragua, appreciated efforts on this item, and with Bolivia welcomed the inputs of local communities and indigenous peoples. Bolivia noted the lengthy negotiation process leading to this decision and underscored the importance of operationalizing the platform.

The EU welcomed the initiation of a step-by-step approach to enhancing local communities' and indigenous peoples' participation in the UNFCCC.

CLOSING SESSION: On Friday, 18 November, COP 22 President Mezouar reported on informal open-ended consultations on the vulnerability of Africa. He noted that many countries had elaborated on the continent's specific vulnerability to the adverse effects of climate change, and stressed the tangible value of many initiatives shared during COP 22. He noted that conclusions on this matter had not been reached and that consultations focusing on the special needs and circumstances of Africa would continue.

COP 22 President Mezouar invited the Global Climate Action Champions to report on their work.

Champion Hakima El Haité noted that the thematic events organized at COP 22 had attracted over 5,600 participants and highlighted "game-changing" announcements made by different actors to fast-track Paris Agreement implementation.

Champion Laurence Tubiana highlighted the Marrakech Partnership for Global Climate Action as a key outcome of COP 22 that will "bring the objectives of the Convention and Paris Agreement out into the world" through engagement with all stakeholders.

Closing Statements: On Saturday, 19 November, COP 22 President Mezouar highlighted "historic progress" on capacity building, adaptation, loss and damage, finance, technology, gender issues and education at COP 22 and stressed that strengthening action well before 2020 "is not a choice, it is a duty."

UNFCCC Executive Secretary Espinosa said COP 22 had proven to be a conference for implementation and joint action, citing, *inter alia*, the presentation of the US$100 billion roadmap, exceeding the US$80 million target for the Adaptation Fund in 2016, pledges to NAPs and capacity building, and large-scale private investments.

Thailand, for the G-77/China, regretted that, while the Paris Agreement has entered into force, the Doha Amendment has not and underscored this "unfinished business" must be urgently addressed. He stressed that enhanced action requires enhanced support, and called for scaling up finance, particularly adaptation finance.

The EU said that COP 22 shows that the world is ready to move ahead and "drastically accelerate" work to establish a rules-based system fit for purpose and turn the Paris Agreement into a fully-operational agreement.

Switzerland, for the Environmental Integrity Group, underscored the importance of short- and long-term action and commitment to successfully completing the Paris Agreement rulebook in 2018.

The US, for the Umbrella Group, underlined that the momentum behind the Paris Agreement "cannot and will not be stopped," highlighting responding markets and financial flows because this "makes sense for sustainable economic development" and stressing that the private sector, non-state parties, civil society and indigenous peoples "all will drive the shift to solutions."

Maldives, for AOSIS, highlighted the 2018 facilitative dialogue as a key moment in history to bring collective ambition in line with science.

The Democratic Republic of the Congo, for the LDCs, urged ensuring that urgency and ambition are "more than words for preambles and statements."

Saudi Arabia, for the Arab Group, commended the COP 22 presidency for "leading complex negotiations towards satisfactory

results, both for all parties and for the implementation of the Paris Agreement."

Nicaragua, for the Central American Integration System, emphasized that the group's vulnerable countries, in addition to dealing with the effects of climate change are already assuming greater responsibilities in transitioning to low-emission economies.

Emphasizing pre-2020 ambition as the foundation of post-2020 action, Bolivia, for the LMDCs, said "the greatest goal of this century" must be to eradicate unsustainable consumption and production patterns.

Mali, for the African Group, supported by many others, commended outgoing Deputy Executive Secretary Richard Kinley and Dan Bondi Ogolla, UNFCCC Secretariat, for their dedication and outstanding work.

Costa Rica, for AILAC, said although we took first steps in defining the Paris Agreement rulebook we must accelerate our work to meet the urgency of the global challenge of climate change.

China highlighted his country's commitment to Paris Agreement implementation and building "eco-civilization."

France noted the "historic" first CMA decision confirms the irreversible nature of the Paris Agreement.

Argentina, also for Brazil and Uruguay, highlighted ensuring food security as a priority and urged remaining united "to overcome the greatest challenge of our time."

India stressed that the Convention, with its principles of equity and common but differentiated responsibilities, continues to be the political and legal basis for parties to enhance climate action and international cooperation in the post-2020 period.

Indonesia highlighted the need to achieve pre-2020 targets and maintaining the balance between mitigation, adaptation and means of implementation (MOI) achieved in Paris.

Indigenous Peoples underscored their crucial role in finding climate change solutions and looked forward to sharing experiences, knowledge and best practices within the related platform established by the decision on the Paris outcome.

Trade Unions called for ensuring, *inter alia*, economic diversification and transformation; a just transition of the workforce and decent work and quality jobs.

Women and Gender stressed the need for transforming economies to be "gender just," "nuclear free" and 100% based on renewable energy.

Youth NGOs called for roadmaps to end fossil fuels, guidance on the carbon budget and building a climate just and sustainable future.

Business and Industry said businesses provide solutions to moving to low-carbon economies, inside the UNFCCC and outside, including through the World Trade Organization (WTO).

Climate Action Network (CAN) urged parties to ensure that civil society can: strengthen ambition; provide expertise; and provide for public accountability.

Cautioning that "private sector involvement is no substitute for public finance," Climate Justice Now! highlighted the need for reallocating public financial resources from war and fossil fuel subsidies towards addressing adaptation and loss and damage.

Local Governments and Municipal Authorities noted that strengthened local action requires greater access to finance.

Adoption of the Report of COP 22: UNFCCC Deputy Executive Secretary Richard Kinley noted that budgetary provisions have not been made for sessions held at the seat of the Secretariat. He noted the Secretariat's work on funding scenarios, including on the entry into force of the Paris Agreement, which will require an additional €1.9 million. He noted the need for an additional €320,000 for implementation of gender-related activities in 2017.

The COP adopted the draft report of the session (FCCC/CP/2016/L.1).

Closure of the Session: On Saturday, 19 November, the COP took note of the resolutions expressing gratitude to the Government of Morocco and the people of Marrakech (FCCC/CP/2016/L.8/Rev.1, FCCC/KP/CMP/2016/L.5/Rev.1, FCCC/PA/CMA/2016/L.1/Rev.1).

The COP closed at 2:47 am.

CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES SERVING AS THE MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE KYOTO PROTOCOL (CMP 12)

On Monday, 7 November, CMP 12 President Mezouar opened plenary. A summary of the statements from the joint COP 22/CMP 12 opening, which took place on Tuesday, 8 November, is available at: http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12680e.html.

ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS: On Monday, 7 November, parties adopted the agenda (FCCC/KP/CMP/2016/1) and agreed to the organization of work, including the sessions of the SBs (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/3 and FCCC/SBI/2016/9).

The CMP referred to the SBSTA the sub-item on matters relating to Kyoto Protocol Article 2.3 (adverse effects of policies and measures).

The CMP referred to the SBI the items and sub-items on: national communications (NCs); the annual compilation and accounting report for the second commitment period for Annex B parties under the Kyoto Protocol; capacity building under the Kyoto Protocol; matters relating to Kyoto Protocol Article 3.14 (minimizing adverse effects); audit report and financial statements for 2015; and budget performance for the biennium 2016-2017.

Election of Replacement Officers: On Friday, 18 November, the CMP elected the members and alternate members to the Adaptation Fund Board (AFB), Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee (JISC), Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) Executive Board (EB), and Compliance Committee.

CMP 12 President Mezouar noted the COP Bureau members would also serve as CMP Bureau members. He also noted that the list of nominations is available on the UNFCCC website and urged parties to submit nominations for the remaining vacant positions by 31 January 2017.

Approval of the Credentials Report: On Friday, 18 November, the CMP adopted the report on credentials (FCCC/KP/CMP/2016/9), in addition to the credentials for Nauru and Ukraine, as reported orally by CMP 12 President Mezouar.

Status of the Ratification of the Doha Amendment to the Kyoto Protocol: On Wednesday, 9 November, UNFCCC Deputy Executive Secretary Richard Kinley reported that, as of Tuesday, 8 November, 72 parties had ratified the amendment out of 144 required for entry into force. Parties took note of the report. On Thursday, 17 November, CMP President Mezouar informed that an additional ratification had been received on Wednesday, 9 November, from Australia, bringing the total to 73. The CMP took note of the call made by CMP 12 President Mezouar for all parties to accelerate their domestic procedures to ratify the amendment.

REPORTS OF THE SBs: Report of the SBSTA: On Thursday, 17 November, the CMP took note of the report of SBSTA 44 and the draft report of SBSTA 45 (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/2 and L.18).

Report of the SBI: On Thursday, 17 November, the CMP took note of the report of SBI 44 and the draft report of SBI 45 (FCCC/SBI/2016/8 and Add.1, and L.25).

MATTERS RELATING TO THE CDM: This item was first considered on Wednesday, 9 November, when CDM EB Vice-Chair Frank Wolke (Germany) presented the annual report (FCCC/KP/CMP/2016/4), noting efforts to improve the CDM, and invited voluntary cancellation of certified emission reductions (CERs).

Parties agreed to a contact group co-chaired by Karoliina Anttonen (Finland) and Hlobsile Sikhosana (Swaziland). In discussions, views diverged on most issues, and the contact group decided to delete a large portion of the draft text and forward the "clean" draft decision to the CMP for consideration.

Parties' views differed on most paragraphs of the draft and revised draft decision sections on: general; baseline and monitoring methodologies; registration of project activities and issuance of CERs; regional and sub-regional distribution; the CDM Loan Scheme; and resources for work on the CDM. Parties could not reach agreement on, *inter alia*: voluntary cancellation; international aviation issues; references to the GCF; restrictive practices; length of crediting periods; and relevance of the CDM in the context of Paris Agreement Article 6 (cooperative approaches). Parties agreed to delete references to the Paris Agreement.

Brazil stressed use of CERs in the context of ICAO's Carbon Offsetting and Reduction Scheme for International Aviation (CORSIA). India called for consideration of small projects. The EU called for exploring possibilities to reduce the cost of monitoring by expanding the use of tiered projects. Saint Lucia, for AOSIS, expressed hope for progress on the CER registry's transparency, double counting, and CDM loan schemes. Some parties underscored concerns with the CDM, including the lack of demand for CERs and ratifications of the Doha Amendment, and suggested that the SBSTA note, rather than express satisfaction with, the CDM's results.

Parties were able to agree on paragraphs: on the CDM EB report for 2015-2016; on progress of the CDM to date; and encouraging the EB to continue its activities in response to Decision 6/CMP.11 paragraphs 7 and 8 (on exploring options for using the CDM as a tool for other uses, and for the financing of the CDM through international climate financing institutions).

On Thursday, 17 November, the CMP adopted a decision on guidelines on the CDM.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/KP/CMP/2016/L.4), the CMP, *inter alia:*

- encourages the EB to continue the simplification of the CDM, with the aim of further simplifying and streamlining, in particular, the registration and issuance processes, and methodologies, while maintaining environmental integrity;
- requests the EB to analyze the overall cost for designated operational entities and to report back to CMP 13; and
- designates as operational entities those entities that have been accredited, and provisionally designated, as operational entities by the EB to carry out the sector-specific validation functions and/or sector-specific verification functions described in the annex.

The guidelines contain a general section and sections on: baseline and monitoring methodologies; regional and sub-regional distribution; the CDM Loan Scheme; and resources for work on the CDM. In its annex, the decision provides an overview of the designation of operational entities by CMP 12 and changes in the accreditation status of entities during the EB's reporting period (17 October 2015 to 17 September 2016).

MATTERS RELATING TO JOINT IMPLEMENTATION (JI): This item was first considered on Wednesday, 9 November, when JISC Chair Konrad Raeschke-Kessler (Germany) presented the JISC's annual report (FCCC/KP/CMP/2016/5). He noted activity under JI virtually ceased at the end of the first Protocol commitment period and thus, no new projects were created or emission reduction units (ERUs) issued since the previous year's report. On the review of the JI guidelines, he said the JISC had forwarded recommendations to SBI 44 and the SBI is recommending the CMP close the review and not adopt revised guidelines for the time being.

Parties considered draft recommendations on the annual report of the JISC in the contact group and in informal consultations co-chaired by Dimitar Nikov (France) and Arthur Rolle (Bahamas).

The EU, Switzerland, China and New Zealand supported noting the report. The EU stressed that virtual participation should count towards quorum at JISC meetings, while Ukraine expressed concern, noting technical and time zone constraints. Japan warned against prejudging work undertaken on the creation of new mechanisms under the Paris Agreement.

On Thursday, 17 November, the CMP adopted a decision on guidelines on the implementation of Kyoto Protocol Article 6.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/KP/CMP/2016/L.2), the CMP, decides that, *inter alia:*

- in order to continue the prudent management of resources, the JISC shall meet at least once each year;
- with regard to the meetings referred to in the rules of procedure of the JISC, the virtual participation of members or alternates acting as members in its meetings counts towards a quorum and that virtual meetings of the JISC are meetings of the Committee; and
- electronic submission of the signed oath of service by members and alternates of the JISC is sufficient to fulfill the requirements of the rules of procedure.

REPORT OF THE COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE: This item (FCCC/KP/CMP/2016/3) was first considered on Wednesday, 9 November.

Compliance Committee Co-Chair Gerhard Loibl (Austria) presented the report, highlighting the Committee's suggestion that the CMP consider ways for Ukraine to formally demonstrate its first commitment period compliance by requesting the Secretariat to make the necessary arrangements to enable the country to retire its units for compliance on an exceptional basis. Parties took note of the report and agreed to informal consultations facilitated by Khalid Abuleif (Saudi Arabia).

On Friday, 18 November, the CMP agreed to encourage the efforts of Ukraine to formally demonstrate its compliance for its commitment under Protocol Article 3.1 for the first commitment period, and to request the Secretariat to make, on an exceptional basis, the necessary arrangements enabling Ukraine to do so by CMP 13.

MATTERS RELATING TO THE ADAPTATION FUND:
Report of the AFB: This item (FCCC/KP/CMP/2016/2) was first considered on Wednesday, 9 November, when Naresh Sharma, AFB, informed parties that the predictability of the Fund's financing "is not secure" due to its reliance on voluntary contributions and the "meltdown" of the carbon market. Bahamas, for the G-77/China, called for additional support for the Fund.

Parties worked on a draft conclusion and a draft decision during contact group meetings and informal consultations

co-chaired by Herman Sips (the Netherlands) and Patience Damptey (Ghana).

Bahamas, for the G-77/China, suggested, *inter alia*, emphasizing the importance of addressing fundraising strategies and recognizing the Adaptation Fund was established at COP 7. Parties' requests also included references to: the status of available funds, reporting on cash flows, and status of the active pipeline of projects and programme proposals submitted to the Adaptation Fund; fundraising strategies; and the AFB report's addendum on added value of the Adaptation Fund for the operationalization of the Paris Agreement.

Egypt proposed including paragraph 53 (the overall evaluation of the Adaptation Fund) of the report in the draft decision. Parties' views differed on this and several other proposals, including to "recognize the need to revise the CDM" in order to increase predictability and sustainability of the Adaptation Fund's resources. One developing country group suggested as an alternative option, "recognizing the need for the Doha Amendment to enter into force" to revive the carbon market. Another proposed welcoming the efforts of the AFB to address the predictability and sustainability of its resources, including through the resource mobilization strategy.

On Thursday, 17 November, the CMP adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/KP/CMP/2016/L.3), the CMP:

- notes a list of information, actions and decisions relating to the Adaptation Fund contained in the report of the AFB;
- decides to renew the interim institutional arrangements with the GEF as the interim Secretariat of the AFB for an additional three years, from 30 May 2017 to 30 May 2020;
- decides to restate the terms and conditions of the services to be provided by the World Bank as the interim trustee of the Adaptation Fund and to extend the term of the trustee's services for an additional three years, from 30 May 2017 to 30 May 2020;
- takes note of the resource mobilization strategy of the AFB;
- notes with concern issues related to the sustainability, adequacy and predictability of funding for the Adaptation Fund based on the current uncertainty on the prices of CERs, assigned amount units and emission reduction units;
- notes a current funding gap of US$3 million;
- encourages developed country parties to scale up financial resources for the implementation of adaptation projects in the active pipeline of the Adaptation Fund;
- encourages the provision of voluntary support that is additional to the share of proceeds from CDM project activities in order to support the resource mobilization efforts of the AFB, with a view to strengthening the Adaptation Fund;
- encourages the AFB, in implementing its resource mobilization strategy, to further consider all potential sources of funding;
- encourages the AFB to continue its consideration of linkages between the Adaptation Fund and other funds and to report on its findings to CMP 13; and
- takes note of the information provided by the AFB on the added value of the Adaptation Fund for the operationalization of the Paris Agreement, as contained in the addendum to Annex I to the report of the AFB and invites the COP to bring this information to the attention of the APA.

REPORT ON THE HIGH-LEVEL MINISTERIAL ROUND TABLE ON INCREASED AMBITION OF KYOTO PROTOCOL COMMITMENTS: This agenda item was first considered on Wednesday, 9 November, when parties agreed to informal consultations by Ismail Chekkori, CMP 12 Presidency.

On Thursday, 17 November, CMP 12 President Mezouar informed parties that no consensus had been reached and that this item will be included on the provisional agenda for CMP 13.

REPORTING FROM AND REVIEW OF ANNEX I PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION: NCs: This item was first considered on Wednesday, 9 November, and was referred to the SBI for consideration. Discussions on this item are summarized under the SBI agenda item on NCs (see page 22).

Final Compilation and Accounting Report for the Second Commitment Period for Annex B Parties under the Kyoto Protocol: This item was first considered on Wednesday, 9 November. The CMP took note of the information contained in the final compilation and accounting report for the first commitment period for Annex B parties under the Kyoto Protocol.

Annual Compilation and Accounting Report for the Second Commitment Period for Annex B Parties under the Kyoto Protocol: This item (FCCC/KP/CMP/2016/6 and Add.1) was first considered on Wednesday, 9 November, and was referred to the SBI for consideration. Discussions on this item are summarized under the SBI agenda item on the annual compilation and accounting report (see page 22).

CAPACITY BUILDING UNDER THE KYOTO PROTOCOL: This item was first considered on Wednesday, 9 November, and was referred to the SBI for consideration. Discussions on this item are summarized under the SBI agenda item on capacity building under the Kyoto Protocol (see page 27).

MATTERS RELATING TO PROTOCOL ARTICLES 2.3 (ADVERSE EFFECTS OF POLICIES AND MEASURES) AND 3.14 (MINIMIZING ADVERSE EFFECTS): Protocol Article 2.3: This item was first considered on Wednesday, 9 November, and was referred to the SBSTA for consideration. Discussions on this item are summarized under the SBSTA agenda item on the impact of the implementation of response measures (see page 33).

Protocol Article 3.14: This item was first considered on Wednesday, 9 November, and was referred to the SBI for consideration. Discussions on this item are summarized under the SBI agenda item on the impact of the implementation of response measures (see page 29).

OTHER MATTERS REFERRED TO THE CMP BY THE SBs: On Thursday, 17 November, the CMP adopted decisions forwarded from SBI 44 contained in FCCC/SBI/2016/8/Add.1 on: financial and budgetary matters; review of the JI guidelines; and the third review of the Adaptation Fund.

The CMP also adopted a conclusion recommended by SBSTA 45 on carbon capture and storage (CCS) in geological formations as CDM project activities (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/L.19/Add.1). Discussions on this item are summarized under the SBSTA agenda item on CCS in geological formations as CDM project activities (see page 34).

In addition, the CMP adopted an action recommended by SBI 44 (FCCC/SBI/2016/8) on concluding consideration of privileges and immunities for individuals serving on constituted bodies established under the Protocol.

Financial and Budgetary Matters: On Thursday, 17 November, the CMP adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/SBI/2016/8/Add.1), the CMP, having considered the proposed revised staffing table for the biennium 2016-2017, endorses the decision taken at COP 22 on the revised staffing table for this biennium within its approved programme budget.

Review of the JI Guidelines: On Thursday, 17 November, the CMP adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/SBI/2016/8/Add.1), the CMP, *inter alia*:

- recognizes that the level of activity in relation to JI has significantly decreased;
- commends the work done by the SBI and the JISC over the past years in responding to the requests of the CMP in relation to the review of the JI guidelines;
- decides to conclude its review of the JI guidelines without adopting any revisions to them; and
- notes that the draft conclusions of the SBI contained in FCCC/SBI/2016/L.8 represent experience gained and lessons learned from JI in relation to the review of the JI guidelines.

Third Review of the Adaptation Fund: On Thursday, 17 November, the CMP adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/SBI/2016/8/Add.1), the CMP, *inter alia*:

- decides that the third review of the Adaptation Fund will be undertaken in accordance with the ToR contained in the decision's annex;
- invites parties, observer organizations, and other interested international organizations, stakeholders and NGOs involved in the activities of the Adaptation Fund and implementing entities accredited by the AFB, to submit by 30 April 2017 their views on this review for consideration by SBI 46;
- requests the AFB to make available information on the financial status of the Adaptation Fund in its report to CMP 13;
- requests the Secretariat, in collaboration with the AFB Secretariat, to prepare a technical paper on the Adaptation Fund's third review for consideration by SBI 47, in accordance with the ToR and taking into account SBI 46's deliberations and conclusions as well as submitted views; and
- requests the SBI to complete its work on the third review of the Adaptation Fund at SBI 47.

ADMINISTRATIVE, FINANCIAL AND INSTITUTIONAL MATTERS: Audit Report and Financial Statements for 2015: This item was first considered on Wednesday, 9 November, and was referred to the SBI for consideration. Discussions on this item are summarized under the SBI agenda item on administrative, financial and institutional matters (see page 30).

Budget Performance for the Biennium 2016-2017: This item was first considered on Wednesday, 9 November, and was referred to the SBI for consideration. Discussions on this item are summarized under the SBI agenda item on administrative, financial and institutional matters (see page 30).

CLOSING SESSION: Joint closing statements are summarized under the COP closing statements (see page 11).

On Saturday, 19 November, the CMP adopted the report of the session (FCCC/KP/CMP/2016/L.1). The CMP took note of resolutions expressing gratitude to the Government of Morocco and the people of Marrakech (FCCC/CP/2016/L.8/Rev.1, FCCC/KP/CMP/2016/L.5/Rev.1, FCCC/PA/CMA/2016/L.1/Rev.1).

The CMP was gaveled to a close at 2:20 am.

CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES SERVING AS THE MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE PARIS AGREEMENT (CMA 1)

On Tuesday morning, 15 November, CMA President Mezouar opened the meeting, noting the "historic occasion" and describing the entry into force of the Paris Agreement within less than a year after its adoption as a testament to countries' commitment to addressing climate change. A summary of opening statements, delivered on Wednesday, 16 November, is available at: http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12687e.html.

ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS: On Wednesday, 16 November, parties adopted the agenda and organization of work (FCCC/PA/CMA/2016/1). Bolivia, for the LMDCs, indicated for the record their understanding that the work to be undertaken on Agenda Item 3 (matters relating to the Paris Agreement), including its footnote, is to be in the context of Paris Agreement Articles 2 (strengthening the global response to the threat of climate change, in the context of sustainable development and efforts to eradicate poverty) and 3 (NDCs' progression over time, while recognizing the need to support developing countries).

Application of the Rules of Procedure of the COP: This item was first considered under the APA. The APA, on Monday, 14 November, forwarded a draft decision to the COP, which was then forwarded to the CMA for consideration. On Friday, 18 November, the CMA adopted the decision. This item is summarized under the APA outcome (see page 20).

Election of Additional Officers: On Friday, 18 November, Paris Agreement parties elected Diego Pacheco (Bolivia) as an additional Vice-President to the Bureau of COP 22, CMP 12 and CMA 1.

Approval of the Report on Credentials: On Friday, 18 November, the CMA adopted the report (FCCC/PA/CMA/2016/2).

MATTERS RELATING TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PARIS AGREEMENT: This item was first taken up on Wednesday, 16 November. These issues were discussed in informal consultations held by the CMA 1 Presidency, in conjunction with informal consultations held by the COP 22 Presidency on preparations for the entry into force of the Paris Agreement and CMA 1. The informal consultations are summarized under that item of the COP (see page 4).

On Friday, 18 November, CMA President Mezouar invited, and parties agreed, to adopt the decision. He additionally proposed forwarding paragraph 83 of Decision 1/CP.21 (training, public awareness, public participation and public access to information) and Paris Agreement Article 4.10 (consideration of common timeframes for NDCs) to SBI 46 for consideration.

Bolivia, supported by India, said he was not able to support the proposal to forward a very specific, "mitigation-centric" issue for further discussion by the SBI. He stressed issues should be considered in a "comprehensive, single package" and called for a balanced approach to "remaining issues."

Brazil requested Bolivia reconsider his objection, noting that paragraph 9 of the CMA decision (continuation of consideration of possible additional matters under the APA) already addresses the issue of additional matters in a comprehensive matter. Many parties, including Mali, Costa Rica for AILAC, the US, Maldives for AOSIS, the Democratic Republic of the Congo for the LDCs, and the EU supported the Presidency's proposal. Several noted the proposal is in line with the Paris Agreement.

After informal consultations, Brazil requested the CMA 1 President to ask parties if the proposal to begin consideration of these matters at SBI 47 would be agreeable.

South Africa, for BASIC (Brazil, South Africa, India and China), stated that the group would endorse the proposal with the understanding that pre-2020 issues will be given "equal preference at the next session."

The CMA agreed to Brazil's proposal.

Final Outcome: The CMA's three-part decision is in document FCCC/PA/CMA/2016/L.3. On entry into force and signature of the Paris Agreement, the CMA, *inter alia*, congratulates parties to the Convention that have ratified, accepted or approved the Paris Agreement and invites those that have not done so to deposit their instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, where appropriate, with the Depositary as soon as possible.

On completion of the work programme under the Paris Agreement, the CMA, *inter alia*:

- invites the COP to continue to oversee the implementation of the work programme under the Paris Agreement in accordance with the arrangements contained in Decision 1/CP.21 (Paris outcome) and to accelerate work and forward the outcomes at the latest to CMA 1-3 to be convened in conjunction with COP 24 for its consideration and adoption;
- also invites the COP to continue to oversee the work on further guidance in relation to the adaptation communication, including, *inter alia*, as a component of NDCs referred to in Paris Agreement Articles 7.10 and 7.11;
- further invites the COP to continue to oversee the work 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);
- invites the COP to request the SBSTA, SBI, APA, and the constituted bodies under the Convention to accelerate their work on the work programme resulting from the relevant requests contained in Section III of Decision 1/CP.21 (Paris outcome) and to forward the outcomes to COP 24 at the latest;
- invites the COP to request the APA to continue its consideration of possible additional matters relating to the implementation of the Paris Agreement and the convening of CMA 1; and
- decides to convene, at CMA 1-2, a joint meeting with COP 23 to review progress on the implementation of the work programme under the Paris Agreement.

On the Adaptation Fund, the CMA decides that the Adaptation Fund should serve the Paris Agreement, following and consistent with decisions to be taken at CMA 1-3 to be convened in conjunction with COP 24 and CMP 14 that address the governance and institutional arrangements, safeguards and operating modalities of the Fund.

CLOSING SESSION: Joint closing statements are summarized under the COP closing statements (see page 11). On Saturday, 19 November, the CMA adopted the report (FCCC/PA/CMA/2016/L.2). The CMA took note of resolutions expressing gratitude to the Government of Morocco and the people of Marrakech (FCCC/CP/2016/L.8/Rev.1, FCCC/KP/CMP/2016/L.5/Rev.1 and FCCC/PA/CMA/2016/L.1/Rev.1).

CMA 1 was suspended at 2:16 am.

COP 22, CMP 12 AND CMA 1 JOINT HIGH-LEVEL SEGMENT

On Tuesday, 15 November, the King of Morocco Mohammed VI highlighted COP 22 as a "decisive turning point" in the implementation of the Paris Agreement.

UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon highlighted lessons learned during his tenure on: the importance of multilateral solutions and political leadership; the need to secure engagement of all actors; and the important role of the UN in championing science and advancing the moral case for action.

UN General Assembly President Peter Thomson, Fiji, called for maintaining the momentum in addressing climate change, and not only for future generations, as the impacts are felt today by all countries.

UNFCCC Executive Secretary Patricia Espinosa called for including indigenous peoples, youth, women and other groups in the transformation towards a low-carbon and climate-resilient world.

Laurene Powell Jobs, Founder and Chair, Emerson Collective, highlighted the stewardship of indigenous peoples in protecting the planet, water and biodiversity, and called for treating them as respected, equal partners.

Mariame Mouhoub, Youth Representative, Morocco, called on delegates to see beyond their differences, work for a just ecological transition, and build solidarity with the world's most vulnerable.

Highlighting his country's commitment to lead by example, President François Hollande, France, stressed that the Paris Agreement is "irreversible," noting governments, businesses, the financial sector, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and citizens worldwide are undertaking initiatives and finding concrete solutions. He underscored that the US must respect its climate commitments, adding that France would lead a dialogue with the new US President with respect and determination. He stated that, "despite all our differences, what unites us is what we have in common, our planet."

The joint high-level segment continued from Tuesday, 15 November, to Thursday, 17 November. Webcasts are available at: http://unfccc.cloud.streamworld.de/webcast/high-level-segment; http://unfccc.cloud.streamworld.de/webcast/joint-high-level-segment-5th-meeting-of-the-cop-an; http://unfccc.cloud.streamworld.de/webcast/joint-high-level-segment-6th-meeting-of-the-cop-an; http://unfccc.cloud.streamworld.de/webcast/joint-high-level-segment-7th-meeting-of-the-cop-an; and http://unfccc.cloud.streamworld.de/webcast/joint-high-level-segment-8th-meeting-of-the-cop-an.

MARRAKECH ACTION PROCLAMATION

The Marrakech Action Proclamation for Our Climate and Sustainable Development (MAP) was an initiative of the Moroccan Presidency. Drafts were informally circulated among groups of parties for comment. The final drafts were distributed to groups under the "silence procedure," where, if no party responds to the draft within 24 hours it is assumed to be agreed. The silence was broken and subsequent revisions were made with the relevant parties. Later, all parties were consulted.

On Thursday, 17 November, Aziz Mekouar, COP Presidency, read the MAP during plenary.

Marrakech Action Proclamation: Heads of state, government, and delegations, gathered in Marrakech, on African soil, for the High-Level Segment of COP 22, CMP 12 and CMA 1, at the gracious invitation of His Majesty the King of Morocco, Mohammed VI, issue this proclamation to signal a shift towards a new era of implementation and action on climate and sustainable development:

- our climate is warming at an alarming and unprecedented rate and we have an urgent duty to respond;
- welcome the Paris Agreement, adopted under the Convention, its rapid entry into force, with its ambitious goals, its inclusive nature and its reflection of equity and common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, in the light of different national circumstances, and we affirm our commitment to its full implementation;
- this year has seen extraordinary momentum on climate change worldwide, and in many multilateral fora. This momentum is irreversible—it is being driven not only by governments, but by science, business and global action of all types at all levels;

- our task now is to rapidly build on that momentum, together, moving forward purposefully to reduce GHG emissions and to foster adaptation efforts, thereby benefiting and supporting the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and its Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs);
- we call for the highest political commitment to combat climate change, as a matter of urgent priority;
- we call for strong solidarity with those countries most vulnerable to the impacts of climate change, and underscore the need to support efforts aimed to enhance their adaptive capacity, strengthen resilience and reduce vulnerability;
- we call for all parties to strengthen and support efforts to eradicate poverty, ensure food security and take stringent action to deal with climate change challenges in agriculture;
- we call for urgently raising ambition and strengthening cooperation amongst ourselves to close the gap between current emissions trajectories and the pathway needed to meet the long-term temperature goals of the Paris Agreement;
- we call for an increase in the volume, flow and access to finance for climate projects, alongside improved capacity and technology, including from developed to developing countries;
- we, the developed country parties, reaffirm our US$100 billion mobilization goal;
- we unanimously call for further climate action and support, well in advance of 2020, taking into account the specific needs and special circumstances of developing countries, the LDCs and those particularly vulnerable to the adverse impacts of climate change;
- we who are parties to the Kyoto Protocol encourage the ratification of the Doha Amendment;
- we collectively call on all non-state actors to join us for immediate and ambitious action and mobilization, building on their important achievements, noting the many initiatives and the Marrakech Partnership for Global Climate Action itself, launched in Marrakech;
- the transition in our economies required to meet the objectives of the Paris Agreement provides a substantial positive opportunity for increased prosperity and sustainable development;
- the Marrakech Conference marks an important inflection point in our commitment to bring together the whole international community to tackle one of the greatest challenges of our time; and
- as we now turn towards implementation and action, we reiterate our resolve to inspire solidarity, hope and opportunity for current and future generations.

AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON THE PARIS AGREEMENT (APA 1-2)

APA Co-Chair Sarah Baashan (Saudi Arabia) opened the meeting on Monday, 7 November, noting that the early entry into force of the Paris Agreement increases pressure on the APA to complete its work expeditiously. A summary of the opening statements is available at: http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12679e.html.

ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS: Co-Chair Baashan indicated that the agenda and organization of work (FCCC/APA/2016/3 and 2) adopted for APA 1 still apply for APA 1-2. Regarding the request from the COP to conduct the preparatory work so that the Adaptation Fund may serve the Paris Agreement, parties agreed to consider this under the agenda item on preparing for the convening of CMA 1.

Election of Officers: Co-Chair Baashan noted this had been completed at APA 1-1.

CONTACT GROUP ON AGENDA ITEMS 3-8: The contact group, co-chaired by APA Co-Chairs Baashan and Jo Tyndall (New Zealand) convened for the first time on Tuesday, 8 November.

Throughout the week, parties considered progress made in informal consultations on: the mitigation section of Decision 1/CP.21 (Paris outcome); further guidance in relation to adaptation communications; the transparency framework's modalities, procedures and guidelines (MPGs); the global stocktake; the committee to facilitate implementation and promote compliance; and further matters related to the Paris Agreement's implementation. They also discussed how to capture progress made and further work for the APA.

On capturing progress, Co-Chair Tyndall proposed, and parties agreed to, three components: formal conclusions reflecting further work required, possibly with an annexed decision on CMA-related work; notes from the Co-Facilitators with factual summaries of each item's discussions; and a Co-Chairs' note reflecting on outcomes from informals.

On further work for the APA, Maldives, for AOSIS, suggested noting that the APA will require additional time for work in 2017. Switzerland and the US expressed their preference for suspending rather than closing the APA session. Tuvalu, opposed by China and the US, suggested not referring to the need to progress on all items in a "balanced" manner, noting that some issues can be dealt with quickly. Many parties supported the APA holding a "resumed" rather than a "second" session in May 2017.

Parties agreed to a general call for submissions to advance the APA's work beyond May 2017.

On the final draft conclusions text presented to the contact group, many parties called for, *inter alia*, giving sufficient recognition to a draft decision proposed by the G-77/China on the Adaptation Fund serving the Paris Agreement. Parties agreed to add language referring to this draft decision, and reflecting other parties' views that such a decision is premature.

FURTHER GUIDANCE IN RELATION TO THE MITIGATION SECTION OF DECISION 1/CP.21 (Paris Outcome): This item (FCCC/APA/2016/INF.1) was first considered on Monday, 7 November. Parties agreed to informal consultations, co-facilitated by Gertraud Wollansky (Austria) and Sin Liang Cheah (Singapore). The informal consultations addressed the three agenda sub-items jointly, on: features of NDCs, as specified in the Paris outcome decision, paragraph 26; information to facilitate clarity, transparency and understanding of NDCs, as specified in paragraph 28; and accounting for parties' NDCs, as specified in paragraph 31.

During informal consultations, parties focused on: possible linkages between the three sub-items and with Paris Agreement Articles 6 (cooperative approaches) and 13 (transparency framework); guidance to be developed; features of NDCs; accounting for parties' NDCs, including building on existing arrangements under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol; information to facilitate clarity; and further work.

On guidance to be developed, parties suggested, *inter alia*: identifying under each sub-item sub-topics to be discussed; focusing on general information common for all parties and information specific to NDC type; and considering how to aggregate the collective impact of NDCs. Many pointed to the Paris Agreement and Decision 1/CP.21 as sources for guidance.

China, for the LMDCs, and Saudi Arabia, for the Arab Group, opposed by New Zealand, highlighted the need to define the scope of NDCs and reflect differentiation in the operational

guidance as crosscutting issues. The US underscored that guidance must recognize that parties have a common path but different starting points and paces.

On features of NDCs, parties proposed, among other things: elaboration of the features for each type of NDCs; clear, general, durable and simple guidance; and flexibility for LDCs.

Bolivia for the G-77/China, Colombia for AILAC, the Arab Group, and Australia stressed NDCs' nationally determined nature. Kuwait highlighted the need to consider the diversity of NDC types, which Argentina noted as important for identifying the specific information to be provided.

Brazil said the features should apply to future rounds of NDCs, which would help parties and the Secretariat to organize and aggregate information for the global stocktake.

On accounting for parties' NDCs, many developing countries stressed their need for flexibility. India called for "factoring in" differentiation, and the Arab Group said methodologies and approaches in developing countries should be nationally determined. Kenya, for the African Group, and the EU called for guidance to promote progression. Argentina suggested having "different layers of accountability" for different NDC types.

The Arab Group and Iran, opposed by the US and Switzerland, stressed the need to focus on the full scope of NDCs as defined in Paris Agreement Article 3 (NDCs, including progression and support). The LMDCs, opposed by the EU, proposed developing accounting guidance for technology and capacity-building support. Many agreed that Decision 1/CP.21 paragraph 31 (NDCs accounting guidance) provides the basis for developing guidance.

On information to facilitate clarity, parties diverged on whether information indicated in Decision 1/CP.21 paragraph 27 (information to be provided by countries communicating their NDCs) is mandatory, and whether to consider features and information simultaneously.

Brazil said some information specific to objectives should be quantifiable, with others stressing flexibility for qualitative NDCs. Saint Lucia, for the Caribbean Community, proposed identifying information integral to determining NDCs' aggregate effect.

A number of parties supported distinguishing between general guidance, common for all parties, and specific guidance, arising from different NDC types. The LMDCs advocated requiring a higher level of detail from developed countries.

On further work, Maldives, for AOSIS, and others called for setting a workplan through 2018. Many parties suggested inviting submissions, possibly with guiding questions, and some proposed mandating technical workshops or papers. Brazil proposed party-only workshops and the US a "non-intrusive" facilitated sharing of views. The Arab Group noted technical work would be premature.

New Zealand proposed submissions could address: the purpose of the guidance; linkages between relevant Decision 1/CP.21 paragraphs; how to build on submitted INDCs and NDCs, and guidance from Lima and Paris; and ways to structure and progress work. Countries agreed to have a roundtable, as proposed by AILAC and the LMDCs, instead of workshops.

FURTHER GUIDANCE IN RELATION TO THE ADAPTATION COMMUNICATION, INCLUDING, *INTER ALIA*, AS A COMPONENT OF NDCs: This item (FCCC/APA/2016/INF.2) was first considered on Wednesday, 9 November. Parties agreed to informal consultations co-facilitated by Richard Muyungi (Tanzania) and Beth Lavender (Canada) on the purpose, elements, linkages, vehicles, flexibility of adaptation communications, and further work.

On the purpose, many parties underlined the need to raise the profile of adaptation and understand collective progress towards the global adaptation goal. Argentina, for the G-77/China, stressed the need to operationalize the global goal on adaptation. Colombia, for AILAC, and Jamaica, for AOSIS, called for a streamlined purpose, which AILAC said is to catalyze and enhance adaptation action. Sudan, for the African Group, suggested separating the ideas of catalyzing and enhancing adaptation action from issues related to support.

On elements, several parties observed that the Paris Agreement refers to priorities, implementation and support needs, and plans and actions. Saudi Arabia, for the Arab Group, called for further reflection of the financial and other costs of adaptation efforts and actions, noting that some developing countries undertake adaptation actions without MOI and this information could be useful. AOSIS called for explicit reference to support provided.

On linkages, many highlighted the global stocktake's relevance. The G-77/China called for adaptation communications to inform the global stocktake while New Zealand reminded that adaptation communications are voluntary, and, therefore, could at best "contribute" to a meaningful global stocktake. Norway and others observed links with NAPs, which the Arab Group, said could be a starting point. The EU and US noted linkages with the transparency framework.

On vehicles, the G-77/China, Norway, the EU and others said that parties should be able to choose the most appropriate vehicle for their communications. Mexico suggested regional adaptation communications and reports could be a possibility. Ecuador, for the LMDCs, supported using existing vehicles. AOSIS, supported by many others, underscored the need to avoid reporting burdens.

On flexibility, Switzerland suggested that the APA should provide minimal guidance. Japan said there may be utility in having some basic information that helps each country. The US suggested an executive summary format while the LMDCs opposed high-level communications saying that such communications could undermine the goal of increasing the profile of adaptation.

On further work, the LMDCs and Arab Group proposed the development of a synthesis report on adaptation communications as a component of NDCs, based on submissions by parties. New Zealand opposed, suggesting the Secretariat synthesize parties' submissions on this item around common themes. The EU and Canada supported requesting the Secretariat to develop a technical paper, containing a compilation of existing guidance on adaptation communications.

Parties agreed to request the Secretariat to develop an information note, to be followed by: new submissions; a synthesis report of submissions; and a workshop.

MPGS FOR THE TRANSPARENCY FRAMEWORK FOR ACTION AND SUPPORT: This item (FCCC/APA/2016/INF.3) was first considered on Monday, 7 November. Parties agreed to informal consultations co-facilitated by Andrew Rakestraw (US) and Xiang Gao (China).

During informal consultations, parties considered framing questions on: identifying the key elements of the MPGs for the transparency framework; informing the MPGs from existing MRV arrangements and reflecting flexibility for developing countries that need it; and organizing work in 2017-2018.

On elements, Singapore, for the G-77/China, stressed that they should be outlined along the lines of the "shalls" and "shoulds" of Paris Agreement Article 13 (enhanced transparency framework). Many parties advocated addressing all relevant elements of Paris Agreement Article 13 and the decision. The EU noted general

agreement in parties' pre-sessional submissions on three sets of guidelines to be defined, for: reporting; technical expert review; and multilateral consideration. The US suggested elements for reporting, including a section on achievement of a party's NDC in target years. Bhutan, for the LDCs, called for reviews to take place at least once in every five-year cycle.

On flexibility, New Zealand and Canada supported raising the issue of flexibility in the context of each element of the guidelines. Highlighting the bifurcated structure of the current MRV framework under the Convention as a starting point, China, with Saudi Arabia, for the Arab Group, and the Philippines, stressed that differentiation should be embedded systematically in the structure of the framework, not as a varying aspect of each element.

On a workplan for 2017-2018, some stressed that this would be the most important outcome for COP 22 on this issue. While many agreed on the need for a clearly outlined workplan, opinions varied on the need for and type of further submissions, technical workshops and/or technical papers.

Regarding the topics for submissions and workshops, several parties, including China and Brazil, supported inviting parties to submit their views on all elements of the MPGs. Others, including the EU and Peru, for AILAC, supported focusing on reporting. The Arab Group and Brazil suggested the topics of workshops would emerge from the submissions. The LDCs, New Zealand, Norway, the US and Canada suggested the Secretariat could prepare a synthesis report or other paper as input to the workshop, while the Arab Group considered this premature.

MATTERS RELATING TO THE GLOBAL STOCKTAKE: This item (FCCC/APA/2016/INF.4) was first considered on Tuesday, 8 November. Parties agreed to informal consultations co-facilitated by Nagmeldin G. Elhassan (Sudan) and Ilze Prūse (Latvia).

During informal consultations, parties shared their views on: modalities; generic/overarching and specific sources of input; the outcome of the global stocktake; and the way forward.

On modalities, many saw the process comprising a technical and a political phase. Japan, supported by New Zealand, suggested having clear outputs from each phase, such as a report from the technical dialogue. Colombia, for AILAC, suggested an *ad hoc* working group that would process the technical aspects to produce an output for the political phase.

Brazil suggested, *inter alia,* having one framing dialogue for each element of the global stocktake's scope during the technical/analytical phase. Saudi Arabia, for the Arab Group, emphasized that it is premature to determine that there will be two phases. Iran, for the LMDCs, called for strengthening linkages between action and support, and identifying potential barriers to implementation.

On sources of input, many agreed that the scientific inputs should be mainly derived from the IPCC and called for distinguishing between sources, such as the IPCC, and information. The EU called for consideration of how to manage inputs. Several parties suggested a non-exhaustive list of inputs, with many stressing the importance of information on mobilization of support. Several countries cautioned against attempting to agree to a specific list, especially for the sake of durability.

Considering the scope of the global stocktake and its inputs, many developing countries emphasized equity, with Bolivia stressing a fair and equitable sharing of the global carbon budget, taking into account a country's historical responsibility, ecological footprint and development and technological capacity. Solomon Islands, for the LDCs, underscored the importance of the global stocktake to determine "whether the Paris Agreement is sufficient for dealing with runaway climate change."

South Africa advocated a scope that is both forward and backward looking. Some parties suggested there may be elements outside of "adaptation, mitigation and MOI and support" that should be considered.

On outcomes, the LMDCs suggested fostering international cooperation and AOSIS advocated integrating climate financing. AILAC and the EU emphasized driving action and greater ambition. Saudi Arabia, for the Arab Group, emphasized general principles, referencing the purpose of the global stocktake and the Convention. New Zealand cautioned against confounding "outcome" and "output."

On the way forward, Brazil suggested the need for an APA agenda item on common timeframes. Additional proposals made included requesting a Secretariat's synthesis report and technical paper, and holding an in-session technical workshop. Many said further submissions guided by more targeted questions would be useful.

MODALITIES AND PROCEDURES FOR THE EFFECTIVE OPERATION OF THE COMMITTEE TO FACILITATE IMPLEMENTATION AND PROMOTE COMPLIANCE: This item was first considered on Monday, 7 November. Parties agreed to informal consultations co-facilitated by Janine Felson (Belize) and Peter Horne (Australia).

In informal consultations, parties discussed: the scope and functioning of the mechanism; national capabilities and circumstances; triggers for action by the committee; the committee's relationship with existing arrangements and bodies; the participation of concerned parties; and the way forward.

On the scope and functioning, many countries, underscored the need for comprehensiveness and called for a general approach that facilitates implementation rather than imposing penalties. Antigua and Barbuda, for AOSIS, stated that, for legally-binding provisions, the committee should focus on compliance and otherwise on facilitating actions.

The EU stressed that the committee should be a single body with a facilitative function that helps achieve compliance. Mali, for the African Group, stressed that individual country assessments need to go in parallel with the collective assessment of progress. The US stressed the need to have effective accountability.

On national capacity, New Zealand suggested that all parties should be equally accountable for implementing their NDCs. Iran for the LMDCs, Chile for AILAC, and Mali for the African Group stressed the link between countries' capacities and their ability to implement their commitments.

On triggers, most countries, including Iran, New Zealand, Brazil, Pakistan and the US, highlighted the committee has to be self-triggered, while other options were also proposed.

On the relationship with existing arrangements and bodies, parties highlighted links to the Convention's MOI mechanisms, and the Paris Agreement's transparency, capacity-building and global stocktake mechanisms. The EU underscored that the operation of this mechanism must be transparent and respect legal arrangements of other processes.

On the participation of the concerned parties, all stressed that the involved countries should be fully included in the process.

On the way forward, countries agreed to submissions responding to the Co-Facilitators' questions, with many proposing specific deadlines. Several parties supported specifying modalities and procedures required for the effective operation of the

committee, elaborating elements that could be addressed through such modalities and procedures, and addressing further work in the submissions. Some suggested technical papers or synthesis reports be prepared by the Secretariat or by the Co-Facilitators based on parties' submissions. The US proposed, with many others, a workshop, opposed by the LMDCs as premature. The Gambia, for the LDCs, urged the development of a workplan at this session.

FURTHER MATTERS RELATED TO IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PARIS AGREEMENT: This item was first considered on Monday, 7 November. Parties agreed to informal consultations, co-facilitated by APA Co-Chairs Baashan and Tyndall.

The informal consultations jointly addressed the three agenda sub-items on: preparing for the entry into force of the Paris Agreement; preparing for the convening of 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, 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.

Regarding the request from the COP to conduct the preparatory work so that the Adaptation Fund may serve the Paris Agreement, parties agreed to consider this at APA 1-2 under the agenda item on preparing for the convening of CMA 1.

On issues concerning the implementation of the Paris Agreement that had not yet been raised, Brazil identified: common timeframes for NDCs; recognition of developing countries' adaptation efforts; initial guidance to the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism; and training, public awareness and participation. Parties identified additional "orphan issues," eventually creating a list of nine possible matters not being addressed under Decision 1/CP.21's work programme.

The EU cautioned against duplication and said some of these items could be addressed in the SBs or already have a "home" under the CMA.

Based on parties' request, the Co-Chairs prepared an initial table of these "orphan issues." Parties considered whether to provide recommendations to the COP on how or where such issues could be taken up. Several developing countries and groups sought a comprehensive arrangement for all the items in the Co-Chairs' table, opposed by others.

On preparing for the convening of CMA 1, parties were supportive of taking a streamlined approach to: parties' credentials; observer organization admission; and election of Bureau officers.

On taking stock of progress, South Africa, supported by China and Tuvalu, and opposed by the US, proposed consideration of modalities for biennial communications of indicative support. Switzerland suggested these modalities would fall under discussions on biennial reports (BRs).

On the Adaptation Fund, parties considered: the key questions to be addressed in order to complete the APA's work; steps to be undertaken to fulfill the mandate of the APA on this matter; and linkages to consider in undertaking the APA's work on this mandate.

A number of developing countries urged requesting the Adaptation Fund to serve the Paris Agreement. Various developed countries, including Australia, the EU, the US and Switzerland, for the Environmental Integrity Group, suggested this question warrants further discussion and requires consideration of, *inter alia*, lessons learned. Developing countries stressed the Adaptation Fund is already contributing to the operationalization of the Paris Agreement, and supported a procedural decision on this issue.

The US clarified concerns on: ensuring the governing structure includes countries not party to the Kyoto Protocol; fitting the Fund into the post-Paris financial architecture; evaluating the Fund's effectiveness; agreeing on all sources of funding; and reviewing the safeguards policy.

The EU added that: the Fund is under CMP authority and no other financial institution is under the CMA's authority; the third review of the Fund is not "business as usual"; and arrangements for the Fund's work must be examined. He called for agreeing on a clear workplan with issues to be resolved, a timeline and an end date.

Tuvalu, for the LDCs, and Argentina stressed possible resolutions for legal issues raised. The G-77/China suggested the CMA can make the necessary arrangements quickly, by 2018 at the latest.

CLOSING SESSION: On Monday, 14 November, APA Co-Chair Baashan presented, and parties adopted, conclusions (FCCC/APA/2016/L.4 and Add.1). Parties recommended two draft decisions, one to the COP and the other to the CMP. She explained that the APA Co-Chairs intend to release their informal reflections note with an overview of the outcomes of this resumed session, based on the views that parties put forward at, and expressed through their submissions for, this session. A summary of closing statements is available at: http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12685e.html.

The Secretariat reported on the preliminary administrative and budgetary implications of decisions, informing that actions: under item 3 (further guidance in relation to the mitigation section of Decision 1/CP.21) will require €65,000; under item 4 (further guidance in relation to the adaptation communication) will require €65,000; under item 5 (MPGs for the transparency framework for action and support) will require €427,000; and other mandated activities will require an additional €557,000.

APA Rapporteur Anna Serzysko (Poland) presented, and parties adopted, the report of APA 1-2 (FCCC/APA/2016/L.5). APA Co-Chair Tyndall proposed, and parties agreed, to suspend the APA at 11:23 pm, and reconvene in Bonn in May 2017.

Final Outcome: In their conclusions (FCCC/APA/2016/L.4), the APA Co-Chairs report that the APA, *inter alia*:

- welcomes the entry into force of the Paris Agreement on 4 November 2016 and encourages those parties that have not yet ratified, accepted or approved the Paris Agreement to do so as soon as possible;
- agrees that following the early entry into force of the Paris Agreement, no further work is required under its agenda sub-item 8(a) (preparing for the entry into force of the Paris Agreement);
- emphasizes that it stands ready to implement any further guidance on its future work that may be received from the COP;
- considers, under its agenda sub-item 8(b) (preparing for the convening of CMA 1), the rules of procedure of the CMA and recommends to the CMA, through the COP, a draft decision (FCCC/APA/2016/L.4/Add.1) on this matter for its consideration and adoption;
- notes that, at SBI 45, it has been possible to progress work on all substantive agenda items, but much remains to be done and, in the light of the early entry into force of the Paris Agreement;

- emphasizes the need to progress on all items in a coherent and balanced manner, and to ensure a coordinated approach with regard to related matters considered under the SBI and SBSTA;
- invites parties to submit, by 30 April 2017, their views on how to progress work in the period after APA 1-3 in a coherent, balanced and coordinated manner, bearing in mind the related matters being considered by the SBI and the SBSTA;
- agrees to apply at APA 1-3 the modalities for the organization of its work that were adopted by APA 1-1; and
- notes the progress made on all substantive items on the APA agenda as reflected in the informal notes prepared, under their own responsibility, by the Co-Facilitators of the informal consultations on the respective APA items, and agrees that the notes will be helpful for the future work of the APA.

On agenda item 3 (further guidance in relation to the mitigation section of Decision 1/CP.21) and its sub-items, the APA Co-Chairs report that the APA, *inter alia*:

- invites parties to submit, by 1 April 2017, their views on issues discussed under this agenda item, taking into consideration the questions identified by parties as relevant for this item and listed in the annex to the informal note by the Co-Facilitators;
- requests the Secretariat to compile these submissions and make that compilation available on the UNFCCC website before APA 1-3; and
- requests the Secretariat to organize, under the guidance of the APA Co-Chairs, a roundtable that is open to parties and observer states only to take place on 6 May 2017 in conjunction with APA 1-3.

On agenda item 4 (further guidance in relation to the adaptation communication, including, *inter alia*, as a component of NDCs, referred to in Paris Agreement Article 7.10 and 7.11), the APA:

- requests the Secretariat to prepare, by 15 February 2017, an information note identifying information on each possible element identified by parties, while considering the guidelines, where existent, for different vehicles mentioned in Paris Agreement Article 7.11. The information note should further consider the non-exhaustive list of elements captured in the submissions and the annex to the informal summary note prepared by the Co-Facilitators;
- invites parties to submit, by 30 March 2017, further views in relation to the adaptation communication, including, *inter alia*, as a component of NDCs, referred to in Paris Agreement Article 7.10 and 7.11, taking into account the discussions on this item at this session as well as the annex to the informal note prepared by the Co-Facilitators;
- requests the Secretariat to prepare, by 30 April 2017, a synthesis of all submissions by parties on this agenda item; and
- requests the Secretariat to organize, under the guidance of the APA Co-Chairs, a workshop on agenda item 4 to take place on 6 May 2017 in conjunction with APA 1-3.

On agenda item 5 (MPGs for the transparency framework for action and support referred to in Article 13 of the Paris Agreement), the APA:

- invites parties to submit, by 15 February 2017, their views on the a list of questions;
- requests the Secretariat to organize, under the guidance of the APA Co-Chairs, an intersessional workshop before APA 1-3 that will focus on themes covered in parties' submissions, starting with discussions on reporting and recognizing that it is closely linked with technical expert review and facilitative, multilateral consideration of progress. Therefore, when necessary, at the workshop discussions about technical expert review, and facilitative, multilateral consideration of progress should take place in conjunction and/or complementary with reporting;
- requests the APA Co-Chairs to prepare, with the support of the Secretariat, a workshop report for consideration at APA 1-3; and
- notes that in the organization of the workshop, the APA Co-Chairs and Secretariat should recognize the linkages with other agenda items to avoid duplication of work.

On agenda item 6 (matters relating to the global stocktake referred to in Paris Agreement Article 14) and its sub-items, the APA:

- welcomes the advice of the SBSTA on how the IPCC assessments can inform the global stocktake; and
- invites parties to submit, by 30 April 2017, their views on issues discussed under this agenda item, taking into consideration the questions identified by parties on linkages and context, sources of input, modalities and outcome/outputs.

On agenda item 7 (modalities and procedures for the effective operation of the committee to facilitate implementation and promote compliance referred to in Paris Agreement Article 15.2), the APA invites parties to submit, by 30 March 2017, their views and proposals, in which they are invited to:

- specify the modalities and procedures required for the effective operation of the committee referred to in Paris Agreement Article 15.2;
- elaborate elements that could be addressed through such modalities and procedures; and
- share their views on how to take the work under this agenda item further.

On agenda item 8 (further matters related to implementation of the Paris Agreement) and its sub-items, the APA:

- notes that during the session it had constructive and rich discussions on all issues under this agenda item, including substantive discussions on the Adaptation Fund that were launched at APA 1-2;
- notes that one group of parties presented a draft decision, with a view to the Adaptation Fund serving the Paris Agreement, for adoption by CMA 1 and other parties were of the view that such a decision would be premature; and
- takes note of possible additional matters concerning implementation of the Paris Agreement and the convening of CMA 1, which have been identified by some parties and which some parties were of the view may not yet have been addressed, as reflected in the annex to the informal note prepared, under their own responsibility, by the APA Co-Chairs of the informal consultations on agenda item 8(b), and agrees to provide this information to COP 22 for its consideration and appropriate action.

In addition, the APA:

- emphasizes that, for all items on the APA agenda where there is a call for the submission of views from parties, taking into consideration guiding questions, the questions in no way restrict parties from making submissions on any aspect of the issues on the APA agenda;
- reiterates its earlier invitation to parties and admitted observer organizations to provide information, views and proposals on any work of the APA before each of its sessions; and
- notes that the APA Co-Chairs intend to release their informal reflections note with an overview of the outcomes of this resumed session, based on the views and ideas that parties put forward at, and expressed through their submissions for, APA 1-2. The note will aim to advance understanding of the scope

of issues to be resolved under each agenda item, and, where possible, identify broad options for fulfilling the mandated work of the APA, without prejudice to any options that parties may identify in the future.

In its decision (FCCC/APA/2016/L.4/Add.1), the COP recommends that the CMA adopt the draft decision contained in the annex on the rules of procedure of the CMA.

In its decision (FCCC/APA/2016/L.4/Add.1), the CMA decides that when applying the draft rules of procedure of the COP, pursuant to Paris Agreement Article 16.5, it should be understood that:

- with respect to draft rules 22-26, the term of office of any replacement officer elected by and from among parties to the Paris Agreement in accordance with Paris Agreement Articles 16.3 and 18.3 would expire at the same time as that of the officer being replaced;
- with respect to draft rules 17-21, the credentials of representatives of parties to the Paris Agreement would apply to their representatives participating in sessions of the COP and the CMA, and a single report on credentials would be submitted for approval, following established procedures, by the Bureau of the COP to the CMA; and
- with respect to draft rules 6 and 7, organizations admitted as observers to previous sessions of the COP would be admitted to CMA 1, and a single process would be used for the admission of observer organizations to sessions of the COP and the CMA, with decisions on the admission of observer organizations being taken by the COP.

SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR IMPLEMENTATION (SBI 45)

On Monday, 7 November, SBI Chair Tomasz Chruszczow (Poland) opened SBI 45. A summary of opening statements made during the SBI plenary is available at: http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12679e.html.

ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS: On Monday, 7 November, parties adopted the agenda and organization of work (FCCC/SBI/2016/9), with the sub-item on information contained in national communications (NCs) from non-Annex I parties held in abeyance.

The SBI then opened individual agenda items, referring them to contact groups, informal consultations, or consultations conducted by the SBI Chair. The SBI adopted conclusions and recommended draft decisions for consideration by the COP and CMP during their closing plenaries.

Multilateral Assessment Working Group Session under the International Assessment and Review (IAR) Process: On Saturday, 12 November, and Monday, 14 November, the second round of multilateral assessment under the IAR process convened. Webcasts of the events are available at: http://unfccc.cloud.streamworld.de/webcast/first-working-group-session-of-the-multilateral-as; http://unfccc.cloud.streamworld.de/webcast/first-working-group-session-of-the-multilateral--2; http://unfccc.cloud.streamworld.de/webcast/first-working-group-session-of-the-multilateral--3; and http://unfccc.cloud.streamworld.de/webcast/first-working-group-session-of-the-multilateral--4.

Facilitative Sharing of Views under the International Consultation and Analysis (ICA) Process: On Thursday, 10 November, the facilitative sharing of views under the ICA process took place. Webcasts of the events are available at: http://unfccc.cloud.streamworld.de/webcast/sbi-facilitative-sharing-of-views-part-1; and http://unfccc.cloud.streamworld.de/webcast/sbi-facilitative-sharing-of-views-part-2.

Election of Officers Other than the Chair: On Monday, 14 November, the SBI elected Zhihua Chen (China) as SBI Vice-Chair and Tuğba İçmeli (Turkey) as SBI Rapporteur.

REPORTING FROM AND REVIEW OF ANNEX I PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION: Status of Submission and Review of Second BRs from Annex I Parties to the Convention: On Monday, 7 November, the SBI took note of the status of submission and review of second BRs from Annex I parties (FCCC/SBI/2016/INF.9).

Compilation and Synthesis of Second BRs from Annex I Parties to the Convention: This item (FCCC/SBI/2016/INF.10, Add.1 and Add.1/Corr.1) was first considered on Monday, 7 November. Parties agreed to informal consultations co-facilitated by Anne Rasmussen (Samoa) and Helen Plume (New Zealand).

In informal consultations on the draft COP decision text, Co-Facilitator Plume elaborated on the differences between options: welcoming the compilation and synthesis of BR2s from Annex I parties; containing specific information that draws from the compilation and synthesis; and containing general information on the compilation and synthesis.

Parties expressed support for the first and second options, but could not agree. Explaining she had consulted with the SBI Chair on the way forward, Co-Facilitator Plume noted there was no consensus on the matter and that this sub-item would be forwarded to SBI 46.

On Friday, 11 November, the SBI adopted procedural conclusions. SBI Chair Chruszczow said he would report to the COP that the SBI could not reach substantive conclusions on this item.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.26), the SBI agrees to continue consideration of this item at SBI 46.

Revision of the "Guidelines for the Preparation of NCs by Annex I Parties to the Convention, Part II: UNFCCC Reporting Guidelines on NCs": This item was first considered on Monday, 7 November, and subsequently in consultations led by the SBI Chair Chruszczow with interested parties.

On Monday, 14 November, SBI Chair Chruszczow noted that the revised guidelines are "nearly ready," but "the outstanding issue" on paragraph 71 (on communication of the information in the guidelines), on encouraging submitting an English translation, remained unresolved.

Many parties expressed regret that the revised guidelines had not been agreed. Several parties, including New Zealand, the US, Norway and Switzerland, expressed their intention to voluntarily apply the revised guidelines or consider including some of the guidelines' elements, in their NC7s.

The Russian Federation said applying the draft guiding principles would not ensure transparency, consistency and comparability of NCs and advocated applying only adopted principles. On Monday, 14 November, the SBI adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.42), the SBI agrees to continue consideration of the outstanding issue on the draft guidelines contained in document FCCC/SBI/2016/8, Annex I, paragraph 71.

Report on National GHG Inventory Data from Annex I Parties to the Convention for the Period 1990-2014: On Monday, 7 November, the SBI took note of the report (FCCC/SBI/2016/19).

Compilation and Accounting Reports for Annex B Parties under the Kyoto Protocol: On Monday, 7 November, the SBI agreed to recommend that the CMP take note of the annual compilation (FCCC/KP/CMP/2016/6 and Add.1).

REPORTING FROM NON-ANNEX I PARTIES: Work of the Consultative Group of Experts (CGE): This item (FCCC/SBI/2016/15, 16 and 17) was first considered on Monday, 7 November. Parties agreed to informal consultations co-facilitated by Anne Rasmussen (Samoa) and Helen Plume (New Zealand).

In informal consultations, parties considered, *inter alia*, a draft COP decision on the review of the CGE, agreeing to "consider" rather than "initiate" a review at SBI 48.

On Friday, 11 November, the SBI adopted conclusions and forwarded a draft decision and draft conclusions for consideration by the COP. On Thursday, 17 November, the COP adopted the decision and conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.28), the SBI takes note of the progress made by the CGE in implementing its 2016 workplan, with regard to, *inter alia*, training programmes, workshops and materials, including e-learning courses, webinars and an online platform. The SBI also takes note of the estimated budgetary implications of supporting the implementation of the work of the CGE in 2017-2018 and invites multilateral programmes and organizations to collaborate with the CGE, as appropriate, in the provision of support to non-Annex I parties for preparing their NCs and Biennial Update Reports (BURs).

In its decision (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.28/Add.1), the COP:

- decides that the mandate and ToR of the CGE as contained in Decision 19/CP.19 and the annex thereto shall remain unchanged;
- requests SBI 48 to consider a review of the term and mandate, including the ToR, of the CGE with a view to recommending a draft decision thereon for consideration and adoption by COP 24; and
- requests the Secretariat to facilitate the actions of the CGE called for above, subject to the availability of financial resources.

In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.28/Add.2), the COP invites a representative of non-Annex I parties not represented by the constituencies referred to in Decision 3/CP.8, annex, paragraph 3, on the membership of the CGE, to continue to participate in the group's work in an observer capacity.

Provision of Financial and Technical Support: This item (FCCC/SBI/2016/INF.17 and INF.18, FCCC/CP/2016/6, Add.1 and Add.2) was first considered on Monday, 7 November. Parties agreed to informal consultations co-facilitated by Anne Rasmussen (Samoa) and Helen Plume (New Zealand).

During informal consultations, parties discussed the operationalization of the Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT), including that CBIT "efforts" will be included in the next GEF replenishment, and recognized the challenges non-Annex I parties face in submitting BURs.

On Friday, 11 December, the SBI adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.33), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- welcomes the information provided by the GEF in its report to COP 22 on: the establishment of the CBIT, including its programming and implementation modalities and the voluntary contributions pledged by several countries; the financial support provided for non-Annex I parties' preparation of NCs and BURs; and the Global Support Programme for Preparation of NCs and BURs by non-Annex I parties, especially regarding the development and implementation of the 2016 work programme thereof;
- recommends that the COP request the GEF to continue providing the information referred to above in its annual reports;
- notes with appreciation the successful efforts of the GEF to take swift action in the establishment of the CBIT through voluntary contributions;
- encourages the GEF, subject to the availability of financial resources in the CBIT Trust Fund, to approve the first set of CBIT projects as early as possible and also encourages developing countries to submit project proposals to access financial resources from the CBIT Trust Fund;
- while recognizing the challenges that non-Annex I parties face in submitting their BURs in a timely manner, further notes that, as at 9 November 2016, there were many outstanding submissions of BURs from non-Annex I parties, and, recalling Decision 2/CP.17, paragraph 41(a), which states that non-Annex I parties, consistent with their capabilities and the level of support provided for reporting, should submit their first BUR by December 2014, encourages non-Annex I parties that have not yet completed and submitted their first BUR to do so as soon as possible; and
- recalling the request of non-Annex I parties for further technical support aimed at improving their domestic capacity to facilitate continuity in meeting their reporting requirements, encourages parties included in Annex II to the Convention, and other developed country parties in a position to do so, to provide financial resources to enable the Secretariat to continue responding to that request.

Summary Reports on the Technical Analysis of Non-Annex I Parties' BURs: On Monday, 7 November, the SBI took note of the summary reports (FCCC/SBI/ICA/2015/TASR.1/AND, and FCCC/SBI/ICA/2016/TASR.1/ARG, COL, CRI, LBN, MEX and PRY) finalized in the period 1 March-30 September 2016.

DEVELOPMENT OF MODALITIES AND PROCEDURES FOR THE OPERATION AND USE OF A PUBLIC REGISTRY REFERRED TO IN PARIS AGREEMENT ARTICLE 4.12: This item was first considered on Monday, 7 November. Parties agreed to informal consultations co-facilitated by Madeleine Diouf Sarr (Senegal) and Gertraud Wollansky (Austria).

During the informal consultations, parties differed primarily on the workplan for this item going forward, with two groups of developing countries calling for further exchange of views, while awaiting finalization of the APA's related work on NDCs. In addition, one party urged for procedural conclusions only.

Some developing and developed countries advocated calling for party submissions, while several developing countries opposed, saying this would be premature, as the scope of work and procedural next steps should be defined first.

On the Secretariat's efforts to improve the interim registry, parties debated a suggestion for the Secretariat to maintain and improve the registry "on the basis of suggestions received from its users," ultimately preferring to state "as appropriate" instead.

On parties' work at SBI 45, one group of developing countries opposed referencing a public registry "for NDCs," but in the case that reference to "NDCs" was not deleted, preferred "NDCs referred to in Article 3 of the Paris Agreement," rather than "in Article 4" (mitigation).

On reflecting the linkages with other SBI and APA work, some developed countries opposed referencing ensuring coherence and avoiding duplication, and parties ultimately agreed to use language from the SBI 44 conclusions.

On Friday, 11 November, the SBI adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.35), the SBI, *inter alia*, takes note of the views exchanged by parties at the session 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 on the linkages of its work under this agenda item to the work under SBI 45 agenda item 6 (development of modalities and procedures for the operation and use of a public registry referred to in Paris Agreement Article 7.12), and to the work of the APA.

The SBI also agrees to continue its consideration of this matter at SBI 46.

DEVELOPMENT OF MODALITIES AND PROCEDURES FOR THE OPERATION AND USE OF A PUBLIC REGISTRY REFERRED TO IN PARIS AGREEMENT ARTICLE 7.12: This item was first considered on Monday, 7 November. Parties agreed to informal consultations co-facilitated by Madeleine Diouf Sarr (Senegal) and Gertraud Wollansky (Austria).

During informal consultations, parties focused primarily on the nature of this agenda item and the workplan going forward. Two developing country groups supported procedural conclusions and, opposed by several developed country parties, underlined their preference that this agenda item be merged with SBI agenda item 5 (development of modalities and procedures for the operation and use of a public registry referred to in Paris Agreement Article 4.12).

Many parties noted the interlinkages among adaptation, mitigation and APA discussions, with some advocating postponing substantive discussions on what the registry will look like until the APA's work has produced further guidance for adaptation communications.

One developed country party noted parties have flexibility to submit, for instance, an NDC entirely about adaptation with mitigation co-benefits, as well as the option of not submitting an adaptation communication. One party said the SBI conclusions could request the Secretariat to assess the cost and resource implications of developing two registries.

Some parties, opposed by others, characterized requesting submissions as "premature." Unable to agree on intersessional work or next steps, parties agreed to continue consideration of this matter at SBI 46.

On Friday, 11 November, the SBI adopted conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.36). Saudi Arabia recalled that the Co-Facilitators were asked to report to the SBI Chair that, due to linkages between this SBI agenda item and item 5, some parties had requested that the two items be merged. SBI Chair Chruszczow noted the concern and said it would be taken into account in the preparation of the next session's provisional agenda.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.36), the SBI, *inter alia*, takes note of: the views expressed by parties during the session on this matter, including on the existing or potential linkages to SBI 45 agenda item 5; the continued work of the Secretariat on the interim registry; the web page maintained by the Secretariat on undertakings in adaptation planning; and the work of the APA.

The SBI also agrees to continue its consideration of this matter at SBI 46.

MATTERS RELATING TO THE MECHANISMS UNDER THE KYOTO PROTOCOL: Review of the Modalities and Procedures for the CDM: On Monday, 7 November, the SBI forwarded this item (FCCC/SBI/2016/INF.16) to informal consultations co-facilitated by Hlobsile Sikhosana-Shongwe (Swaziland) and Karoliina Anttonen (Finland). During informal consultations, throughout the week, parties considered a draft text provided by the Secretariat.

On CDM programmes of activities, one group of parties suggested methodologies may be developed for programmes of activities, and "top-down methodologies" be developed for underrepresented sectors. Another group suggested text reflecting that micro-scale activities under programmes of activities can apply micro-scale additionality and may demonstrate the applicability of micro-scale thresholds at the unit level. Several parties opposed these proposals.

On a proposal to encourage designated national authorities (DNAs) to communicate relevant information on the CDM to the public, some parties favored deletion, while others suggested further work.

On programmes of activities and roles of DNAs to supplement the CDM modalities and procedures, parties could not reach an agreement and engaged in lengthy discussions on postponing this agenda item.

Final Outcome: On Monday, 14 November, SBI Chair Chruszczow noted conclusions had not been reached and negotiations would continue at SBI 46.

Procedures, Mechanisms and Institutional Arrangements for Appeals against Decisions of the CDM Executive Board (EB): On Monday, 7 November, the item was forwarded for informal consultations co-facilitated by Karoliina Anttonen (Finland). On Friday, 11 November, the SBI adopted conclusions.

***Final Outcome*:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.30), the SBI agrees to continue its consideration of this matter at SBI 50 on the basis of, *inter alia*, the draft text contained in document FCCC/SBI/2012/33/Add.1.

Report of the Administrator of the International Transaction Log (ITL) under the Kyoto Protocol: On Monday, 7 November, the SBI took note of the report (FCCC/SBI/2016/INF.20).

MATTERS RELATING TO THE LDCs: On Monday, 7 November, Abias Huongo, Chair of the LDCs Expert Group (LEG), presented on the LEG's activities, including the National Adaptation Plan (NAP) Expo organized in July 2016. This item (FCCC/SBI/2016/18) was then forwarded to informal consultations co-facilitated by Mamadou Honadia (Burkina Faso) and Jens Fugl (Denmark).

In informal consultations, parties agreed to conclude that the SBI "urges" rather than "invites" additional contributions to the LDCs Fund (LDCF) and other funds under the Financial Mechanism, as appropriate, and on a number of other insertions.

On Friday, 11 November, the SBI adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.31), the SBI welcomes, *inter alia:* the report of the 30th meeting of the LEG; the progress made by the LEG in supporting the LDCs in the continued implementation of its rolling work programme for 2016-2017; the successful NAP Expo held in July 2016; and the decision of the GCF Board on expediting support for developing countries for the formulation of NAPs.

The SBI urges additional contributions to the LDCF and other funds under the Financial Mechanism, as appropriate, recognizing the importance of the full implementation of National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPAs) and successfully undertaking the process to formulate and implement NAPs.

NAPs: On Monday, 7 November, this item (FCCC/SBI/2016/18, FCCC/SB/2016/2, FCCC/SBI/2016/INF.11) was forwarded to informal consultations co-facilitated by Mamadou Honadia (Burkina Faso) and Jens Fugl (Denmark).

On Friday, 11 November, the SBI adopted conclusions and forwarded a draft decision for consideration by the COP. On Thursday, 17 November, the COP adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.32), the SBI welcomes the information paper on progress in the process to formulate and implement NAPs and takes note of other relevant documents for this session.

In its decision (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.32/Add.1) the COP, *inter alia*:

- welcomes the submission by Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Sri Lanka and Sudan of their NAPs via NAP Central and encourages other parties to forward relevant outputs and outcomes related to the process to formulate and implement NAPs to NAP Central;
- notes with appreciation the decision of the GCF Board that approved up to US$3 million per country through the GCF Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme to support the formulation of NAPs and/or other national adaptation planning processes, and invites developing countries to access this funding;
- appreciates the progress made by the GCF in expediting support for the formulation of NAPs and looks forward to how the GCF will support the subsequent implementation of policies, projects and programmes of developing countries, as requested in Decision 1/CP.21, paragraph 46;
- welcomes the support provided by the GEF for the process to formulate and implement NAPs;
- notes with concern that 12 funding proposals seeking to support elements of countries' work in the process to formulate and implement NAPs were technically cleared by the GEF but, as at 10 November 2016, were awaiting funding under the LDCF;
- encourages developed countries to contribute to the LDCF and the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF) and invites additional voluntary financial contributions to the LDCF, the SCCF and other funds under the Financial Mechanism, as appropriate;
- also notes with appreciation that most countries that have embarked on the process to formulate and implement NAPs are supported either by bilateral and multilateral agencies or by domestic resources; and
- decides to change the submission deadline for parties and relevant organizations to submit information on their progress made towards the achievement of the objectives of the process to formulate and implement NAPs, referred to in Decision 4/CP.21, to 4 October 2017.

REPORT OF THE ADAPTATION COMMITTEE: This item (FCCC/SB/2016/2) was first considered on Monday, 7 November, and forwarded to joint SBSTA/SBI informal consultations co-facilitated by Julio Cordano (Chile) and Gottfried von Gemmingen (Germany). On Monday, 14 November, the SBI and SBSTA adopted the conclusions and forwarded a draft decision to the COP for its consideration. On Thursday, 17 November, the COP adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: In joint SBI/SBSTA conclusions (FCCC/SB/2016/L.4) the SBI and SBSTA forwarded a draft decision for consideration by the COP.

In its decision (FCCC/SB/2016/L.4), the COP, *inter alia*:

- requests the Adaptation Committee to make use of additional modalities for responding to the relevant mandates contained in Decision 1/CP.21, including engaging with the Nairobi Work Programme on impacts, vulnerability and adaptation to climate change (NWP) and its partner organizations, research institutions and other institutional arrangements outside the Convention;
- requests the Adaptation Committee, in conducting the technical examination process (TEP) on adaptation, to accelerate the preparations for the 2017 technical expert meetings (TEMs) on adaptation, including the selection of topics;
- requests the Adaptation Committee to ensure that the TEP on adaptation meets its objective of identifying concrete opportunities for strengthening resilience, reducing vulnerabilities and increasing the understanding and implementation of adaptation action, including through technical papers;
- requests the Adaptation Committee, as an outcome of the review of the progress and performance of the Committee, to continue the implementation of its revised workplan, in particular by giving priority to activities in support of the Paris Agreement, and to seek further ways to enhance its progress, effectiveness and performance;
- decides to review the progress, effectiveness and performance of the Adaptation Committee again at COP 27, with a view to adopting an appropriate decision on the outcome of that review; and
- notes with concern the shortfall in resources available to the Adaptation Committee, the need for supplementary financial resources and the estimated budgetary implications of the activities to be undertaken by the Secretariat pursuant to Decision 1/CP.21, and encourages parties to make available sufficient resources for the successful and timely implementation of the Adaptation Committee's three-year workplan.

REPORT OF THE WIM EXCOM: This item (FCCC/SB/2016/3) was first considered on Monday, 7 November, and subsequently in joint SBSTA/SBI informal consultations co-facilitated by Beth Lavender (Canada) and Alf Wills (South Africa).

In informal consultations, parties discussed the report of the WIM Executive Committee (ExCom) and the review of the WIM separately and agreed to have separate decisions for the issues.

Many parties welcomed the report of the WIM ExCom, and noted the considerable work achieved by the WIM ExCom during its workplan. Parties' views diverged on encouraging submissions on possible activities under each strategic workstream of the indicative framework for the five-year workplan.

One developed country party suggested removing the paragraph while two developing country groups proposed including views on the workstream to enhance the mobilization and securing of financial support from developed to developing countries in the submissions. Another group suggested a synthesis report of these submissions.

Some parties noted that there is a placeholder for financial support in the five-year rolling workplan, to which one developing country group responded that the other placeholders are for items such as emerging issues, which are different in nature from the provision of financial support.

On the review of the WIM, parties agreed that the review should consider the structure, effectiveness and mandate of the WIM as mandated by COP 19. One group suggested assessing gaps, needs and challenges in delivering on the mandate, and making recommendations on how to strengthen work over the next five years. Some proposed also reviewing the structure and mandate in the context of the WIM serving the Paris Agreement, with one group suggesting separating the "backward-looking"

elements of the review from the "forward-looking" elements that will consider the Paris Agreement.

On Tuesday, 15 November, the SBI adopted conclusions, and forwarded two draft decisions for consideration by the COP. On Thursday, 17 November, the COP adopted both decisions.

Final Outcomes: In its decision (FCCC/SB/2016/L.8) on the WIM, the COP, *inter alia*:

- requests the ExCom to continue to implement activities from its initial two-year workplan;
- approves the indicative framework for the five-year rolling workplan of the ExCom as the basis for developing corresponding activities, starting at the first meeting of the ExCom in 2017, taking into account relevant inputs provided by parties and relevant organizations;
- requests the ExCom to include in its five-year rolling workplan a strategic workstream to guide the implementation of the WIM's function of enhancing action and support, including finance, technology and capacity building, to address loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change, as provided for in Decision 2/CP.19 (the WIM); and
- requests the ExCom to include in its five-year rolling workplan relevant work for advancing the operationalization of the mandates ensuing from Decision 1/CP.21, paragraphs 48 (establishing a clearinghouse for risk transfer) and 49 (establishing a task force to avert, minimize, address displacement).

In its decision (FCCC/SB/2016/L.9), on review of the WIM, the COP recommends that:

- there be a process to periodically review the WIM and that reviews take place no more than five years apart;
- the next review will be held in 2019, and the periodicity of future reviews be decided at that time;
- future reviews of the WIM should consider, *inter alia*, progress on the implementation of the workplan of the WIM ExCom as well as its long-term vision that guides ways in which the WIM may be enhanced and strengthened, as appropriate;
- the SBs finalize ToRs for each review of the WIM at least six months prior to the review being undertaken;
- the SBs take into consideration inputs and submissions from parties and relevant organizations, as appropriate, when developing the ToR for the review;
- as an input to the review in 2019, a technical paper be prepared by the Secretariat elaborating the sources of financial support, as provided through the Financial Mechanism, for addressing loss and damage as described in relevant decisions, as well as modalities for accessing such support;
- the technical paper include an elaboration of finance available for addressing loss and damage as described in relevant decisions, outside the financial mechanism, as well as the modalities for accessing it; and
- the Secretariat, assisted by the WIM ExCom, determine the scope of the technical paper, with a view to making the paper available to parties by SB 50 for consideration in the review of the WIM.

The COP further recommends that the following activities may advance the work of the ExCom:

- enhancing collaboration, cooperation and partnerships with bodies, entities and work programmes, including the PCCB, within and outside the Convention;
- considering the establishment of, as appropriate, additional expert groups, subcommittees, panels, thematic advisory groups or focused working groups to assist it in conducting its work and supporting its efforts to enhance action and support for loss and damage as provided for in Decision 2/CP.19, paragraph 5(c)(i-iii) (enhancing action and support to address loss and damage);
- improving access to, and interaction with, relevant scientific and technical panels, bodies and expertise available to the WIM ExCom and substructures over time, including by, *inter alia*, inviting relevant organizations at all levels and scientific research organizations with scientific expertise relevant to loss and damage to ensure that the best available science is highlighted in the work of the WIM; and
- inviting interested parties to establish a loss and damage contact point through their respective UNFCCC national focal point, with a view to enhancing the implementation of approaches to address loss and damage associated with the adverse impacts of climate change at the national level.

DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGIES: On Monday, 7 November, the sub-items under this matter were forwarded to joint SBI/SBSTA informal consultations, co-facilitated by Washington Zhakata (Zimbabwe) and Elfriede More (Austria).

Joint Annual Report of the TEC and CTCN: This sub-item (FCCC/SB/2016/1) was first considered on Monday, 7 November. TEC Chair Duduzile Nhlengethwa-Masina (Swaziland) noted that the TEC has identified several potential topics for future technical expert meetings (TEMs). CTCN Advisory Board Chair Spencer Thomas (Grenada) reported that the CTCN is engaged in a series of pilot projects with the GEF.

Informal consultations focused, *inter alia*, on the outcomes of informal informals on the important role of South-South cooperation and triangular cooperation for adaptation, and near-term and sustainable funding.

One party presented new consensus text regarding ongoing consultations between the CTCN and the GCF and GEF. Parties agreed to delete the paragraph on the important role of South-South cooperation and triangular cooperation for adaptation.

On near-term and sustainable funding, parties agreed to text that captures "sustainable funding," deleting the term "near-term" funding, and indicating that further "financial support" should be provided.

On Monday, 14 November, the SBI adopted conclusions and forwarded a draft decision to the COP for consideration. On Thursday, 17 November, the COP adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: In joint SBI/SBSTA conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.5), the SBI and SBSTA recommend a draft COP decision on enhancing climate technology development and transfer through the Technology Mechanism.

In its decision (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.5), the COP, *inter alia*, welcomes the 2016 joint annual report of the TEC and CTCN and its key messages and recommendations, and encourages the TEC and the CTCN to continue collaboration to enhance coherence and synergy in the Technology Mechanism's work.

On the activities and performance of the TEC in 2016, the COP, *inter alia*: invites parties and all relevant stakeholders working on technology development and transfer to consider the key messages of the TEC when implementing climate technology action; and notes that strengthening linkages between the technology needs assessments (TNAs), NDCs and NAPs processes would enhance their effectiveness and responsiveness towards implementation.

On activities and performance of the CTCN in 2016, the COP, *inter alia*: welcomes the increased demand for technical assistance and other services of the CTCN and the increased engagement between the GCF and the CTCN; notes that the

CTCN faces challenges regarding sustainable funding, and that further financial support should be provided to it; and underlines the importance of strengthened collaboration between the national designated authorities for the GCF, the focal points for the GEF and the national designated entities for technology development and transfer.

Scope and Modalities for the Periodic Assessment of the Technology Mechanism in Relation to Supporting the Implementation of the Paris Agreement: This sub-item was first considered on Thursday, 10 November.

On Friday, 11 November, the SBI adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.27), the SBI agreed to continue its consideration of this matter at SBI 46.

Poznan Strategic Programme on Technology Transfer: This sub-item (FCCC/CP/2016/6) was first considered on Tuesday, 8 November.

In informal consultations, parties considered the GEF report on progress made in carrying out the programme. Several parties welcomed the restructured GEF report. Parties supported, *inter alia*: encouraging the GEF to further develop reporting on challenges and lessons learned; encouraging, or requesting, additional information on the GEF's collaboration with the CTCN; and requesting the GEF to consider piloting Technology Action Plans.

On Friday, 11 November, the SBI adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.29), the SBI welcomes, *inter alia*: the report of the GEF on the progress made in carrying out the programme and the report's new structure; and approval by the GEF Council of 31 projects with technology transfer objectives for mitigation and 10 projects for adaptation during the GEF reporting period.

The SBI also encourages: the GEF to continue elaborating on the challenges and lessons learned, the GEF and the CTCN to continue enhancing their collaboration; and parties to enhance collaboration between their GEF focal points and their national designated entities for technology development and transfer, as well as to consider ways to use their System for Transparent Allocation of Resources allocation for piloting the implementation of the TNA results.

TOR FOR THE REVIEW OF THE FUNCTIONS OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCE (SCF): On Monday, 7 November, this item (FCCC/CP/2016/MISC.1) was forwarded for informal consultations co-facilitated by Ngedikes Olai Uludong (Palau) and Delphine Eyraud (France). During informal consultations parties commented on draft decision text with the annexed ToR for the review.

Many welcomed elements of the ToR, including: a focus on functioning and effectiveness of the SCF; how the SCF can best serve the Paris Agreement; and a reference to the sixth review of the Financial Mechanism in 2017. Some parties opposed including issues of mandate and governance.

On Monday, 14 November, the SBI adopted conclusions and forwarded a draft decision for consideration by the COP. On Thursday, 17 November, the COP adopted the decision.

***Final Outcome*:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.40), the SBI recommended a draft decision for consideration and adoption by COP 22.

In the decision, the COP (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.40), *inter alia*:

- adopts the ToR for the review of the functions of the SCF contained in the annex, which includes sections on objective, scope, sources of information and criteria;
- takes note of the report of the SCF (FCCC/CP/2016/8) and in particular Annex VII (on mandates provided to the SCF by the COP compared to outputs delivered by the Committee: 2011-2015);
- invites members of the SCF, parties, the constituted bodies under the Convention and external stakeholders to submit, by 9 March 2017, their views on the review of the SCF based on the ToR contained in the annex, for consideration by SBI 46;
- requests SBI 46 to initiate work on the review of the functions of the SCF in accordance with the ToR contained in the annex;
- requests the Secretariat to prepare a technical paper on the review of the SCF for consideration by SBI 47; and
- requests SBI 47 to complete its work on the review of the SCF with a view to recommending a draft decision on the matter for consideration by COP 23.

CAPACITY BUILDING IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: The three sub-items under this item were first considered on Monday, 7 November, and subsequently discussed in back-to-back informal consultations co-facilitated by Crispin d'Auvergne (Saint Lucia) and Paul Watkinson (France).

Third Comprehensive Review of the Implementation of the Framework for Capacity Building under the Convention: In the informal consultations on this sub-item (FCCC/SBI/2016/14) parties considered draft conclusions on the third comprehensive review under the Convention. Parties were not able to fully agree on a paragraph "requesting" or "encouraging" the PCCB to "incorporate," "take into consideration" or "include" initiatives and measures under the Convention and the Paris Agreement, and to "identify existing reporting mandates" or "take into consideration ways to enhance reporting" on capacity building.

Parties also disagreed on references to the Paris Agreement and to provision of coordinated and monitored support in a paragraph inviting the PCCB, in managing its 2016-2020 workplan, to, *inter alia*, promote linkages with other constituted bodies under the Convention. They further disagreed on paragraphs urging/encouraging developing country parties and other parties to provide support.

During the closing plenary on Monday, 14 November, the SBI adopted conclusions and recommended a draft decision for consideration by the COP. On Thursday, 17 November, the COP adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.38), the SBI, having conducted the third comprehensive review, recommends a draft decision for consideration and adoption by COP 22.

In its decision (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.38), the COP, *inter alia*:

- invites parties to consider how to enhance existing reporting on the impacts of capacity-building activities, good practices and lessons learned and on how these are fed back into relevant processes to enhance the implementation of capacity-building activities;
- invites the PCCB, in managing the 2016-2020 workplan to, *inter alia*: take into account crosscutting issues, take into consideration the outcome of the third comprehensive review, and previous work undertaken on relevant indicators; promote and explore linkages with other constituted bodies under the Convention and the Paris Agreement, and synergies for enhanced collaboration with institutions outside thereof; and take into consideration ways of enhancing reporting on capacity-building activities;
- invites parties to foster networking and collaboration with academia and research centers;
- invites parties to cooperate in order to enhance developing countries' capacity to implement the Convention and the Paris

Agreement, and developed countries to enhance support for capacity-building actions in developing countries;
- invites parties to submit, by 9 March 2017, their views on potential topics for the sixth meeting of the Durban Forum, and on the fourth review of the implementation of the framework for capacity-building in countries with economies in transition; and
- decides to conclude the third comprehensive review of the implementation of the framework for capacity-building in developing countries under the Convention, and to initiate the fourth comprehensive review at SBI 50.

Third Comprehensive Review of the Implementation of the Framework for Capacity Building under the Kyoto Protocol: Discussions under this sub-item (FCCC/SBI/2016/14) are summarized under the sub-item on the third comprehensive review of the implementation of the framework for capacity building under the Convention.

On Monday, 14 November, the SBI adopted conclusions and recommended a draft decision for consideration by the CMP. On Friday, 18 November, the CMP adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.39), the SBI, having conducted the third comprehensive review, recommends a draft decision for consideration and adoption by CMP 12.

In its decision (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.39), the CMP, *inter alia*:
- invites parties to continue to implement the framework for capacity building under the Kyoto Protocol in developing countries by, *inter alia*, enhancing consultations with all stakeholders throughout the development of projects, enhancing stakeholders' capacity, strengthening networking and information sharing, and strengthening DNAs' capacity;
- invites all parties to cooperate to enhance the capacity of developing countries to implement the Kyoto Protocol, and developed countries to enhance support for capacity-building actions in developing countries;
- decides to conclude the third comprehensive review of the implementation of the framework for capacity-building in developing countries under the Kyoto Protocol, and to initiate the fourth comprehensive review at SBI 52; and
- invites parties, observers and other stakeholders to submit, by 9 March 2017, their views on the fourth review of the implementation of the framework for capacity building in countries with economies in transition, and parties and observers to submit, by 9 March 2017, suggestions for potential topics related to the Kyoto Protocol for the sixth meeting of the Durban Forum.

PCCB: Discussions under this sub-item are summarized under the sub-item on the third comprehensive review of the implementation of the framework for capacity building under the Convention.

On Friday, 11 November, the SBI adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.34), the SBI agrees:
- that the first focus area for the PCCB in 2017 will be capacity-building activities for the implementation of NDCs in the context of the Paris Agreement;
- to invite, to the first meeting of the PCCB, held in conjunction with SB 46, the representatives of the GEF, GCF, Adaptation Committee, LEG, SCF and TEC; and
- that representatives of other bodies established under the Convention and the Financial Mechanism operating entities are invited to identify representatives to collaborate, as appropriate, on specific activities related to the work of the PCCB, and particularly encourages a representative of the CTCN to participate in the PCCB's first meeting.

IMPACT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF RESPONSE MEASURES: On Monday, 7 November, this item and its associated sub-items were forwarded to a joint SBI/SBSTA contact group, co-chaired by SBI Chair Chruszczow and SBSTA Chair Fuller. Informal consultations were co-facilitated by Andrei Marcu (Panama) and Nataliya Kushko (Ukraine).

The SBI and SBSTA also convened the second meeting of the improved forum on the impact of the implementation of response measures in conjunction with the contact group.

Improved Forum and Work Programme: In informal consultations on this sub-item (FCCC/SB/2016/INF.2 and FCCC/TP/2016/7), parties discussed, *inter alia*: referring to analysis and assessment of the impact of response measures; addressing the socio-economic impact of response measures; assessing response measures under the umbrella of sustainable development; working together to identify common ground for technical work; establishing an *ad hoc* technical expert group; and requesting international organizations to nominate two experts to this expert group.

On Monday, 14 November, the SBI and SBSTA adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In joint SBI/SBSTA conclusions (FCCC/SB/2016/L.6), the SBI and SBSTA, *inter alia*:
- take note of parties' and observer organizations' views on economic diversification and transformation and on just transition of the workforce and the creation of decent work and quality jobs in order to implement the work of the improved forum;
- agree to constitute an *ad hoc* technical expert group, which should meet in-session during SB 46 and elaborate on the technical work on the areas of the work programme in the context of sustainable development and will spend two days, one day on each, on considering the two areas of the work programme; and
- request parties to forward their nominations of experts through the coordinators of the regional groups and the SBI and SBSTA Chairs to invite relevant intergovernmental and international organizations, including UNCTAD, UN Development Programme (UNDP), International Labour Organization (ILO), International Trade Union Confederation or others, to nominate two experts.

Modalities, Work Programme and Functions under the Paris Agreement of the Forum on the Impact of the Implementation of Response Measures: During the contact group meetings and informal consultations on this sub-item, parties, *inter alia*, heard presentations on the modalities, work programme and functions of the forum on the impact of the implementation of response measures under the Paris Agreement. Some parties called for: a workshop for sharing experiences and case studies; assessment of the impacts of response measures taken by developed countries; and improving the functions of the forum by promoting cooperation and "substantively improving support for understanding building resilience."

Others inquired why the current forum is insufficient as a platform for sharing information and best practices, and noted that capacity building is being operationalized under the PCCB.

On Monday, 14 November, the SBI and SBSTA adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In joint SBI/SBSTA conclusions (FCCC/SB/2016/L.7), the SBI and SBSTA request preparation of a

reflections note on parties' views relating to the modalities, work programme and functions of the forum under the Paris Agreement, with a view to facilitating further discussions at SB 46.

Matters Relating to Protocol Article 3.14 (Minimizing Adverse Effects): This sub-item was considered jointly with the SBI sub-item on improved forum and work programme. On Monday, 14 November, Chair Chruszczow noted that no conclusion had been reached and that consideration of this sub-item would continue at SBI 46.

Progress on the Implementation of Decision 1/CP.10 (Buenos Aires Programme of Work on Adaptation and Response Measures): This sub-item was considered jointly with the SBI sub-item on improved forum and work programme. On Monday, 14 November, Chair Chruszczow noted no conclusion had been reached and that consideration of this sub-item would continue at SBI 46.

GENDER AND CLIMATE CHANGE: This item (FCCC/SBI/2016/10, MISC.2 and MISC.2/Add.1) was first considered on Monday, 7 November, and subsequently discussed in informal consultations co-facilitated by Winfred Lichima (Kenya) and Martin Hession (EU).

In informal consultations, parties discussed a draft text put forward by Costa Rica, for AILAC, based on informal informal consultations, which, *inter alia*, extended the Lima work programme on gender. The US expressed concern regarding the number of actions tasked to the Secretariat, noting the budgetary implications.

On Monday, 14 December, the SBI adopted conclusions and forwarded a draft decision for consideration by the COP. On Thursday, 17 November, the COP adopted its decision.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.37), the SBI agrees to forward a draft decision to the COP for consideration.

In its decision (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.37), the COP, *inter alia*, decides to continue and enhance the Lima work programme on gender for a period of three years and to undertake, at COP 25, a review of the work programme, and sets out the following for the work programme:

- invites parties to continue to assist in training and awareness-raising efforts for female and male delegates on issues related to gender balance and climate change and building the skills and capacity of their female delegates to participate effectively in UNFCCC meetings through training on, *inter alia*, negotiation skills, the drafting of legal documents and strategic communication;
- invites parties and relevant organizations to continue to assist in training and awareness efforts, with a special focus on training and capacity building for delegates from parties that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change;
- requests the Secretariat to continue to support the organization of the training and capacity-building efforts, *inter alia*, in conjunction with sessions of the SBs;
- invites parties to increase the representation and active participation of women in the bodies established under the Convention;
- decides that annual in-session workshops will be held in conjunction with the sessions of the subsidiary bodies in the first sessional period of 2018 and 2019 and requests the SBI to elaborate the topics for the in-session workshops during 2017 and to report on the topics that it recommends for the workshops to COP 23;
- requests the Secretariat to prepare a technical paper identifying entry points for integrating gender considerations in workstreams under the UNFCCC process for consideration by SBI 48;
- requests all constituted bodies under the UNFCCC process to include in their regular reports information on progress made towards integrating a gender perspective in their processes according to the entry points identified in the technical paper;
- requests the Secretariat to prepare biennial synthesis reports on the information contained in the reports for consideration by the COP, with the first biennial synthesis report to be prepared for consideration by COP 25;
- encourages parties and the Secretariat to take into consideration a gender perspective in the organization of the TEMs on mitigation and adaptation;
- invites parties to mainstream a gender perspective in the enhancement of climate technology development and transfer;
- requests the Secretariat, if updating the accreditation process for the parties, to improve, as appropriate, the accuracy of data on the gender of the participants as a means of providing accurate data to assess progress made on the participation of female delegates in UNFCCC meetings and those of constituted bodies;
- requests the Secretariat to continue to prepare an annual report on gender composition;
- requests the Secretariat to undertake research and analysis on challenges to the full and equal participation of women in climate-related processes and activities and to prepare a technical paper on achieving the goal of gender balance, based on submissions and its own research for consideration by COP 23;
- requests the Financial Mechanism and its operating entities to include, in their respective annual reports to the COP, information on the integration of gender considerations in all aspects of their work;
- invites parties to appoint and provide support for a national gender focal point for climate negotiations, implementation and monitoring;
- encourages parties, when reporting on their climate policies under the UNFCCC process, to include information on how they are integrating gender considerations into such policies;
- encourages parties to integrate local and traditional knowledge in the formulation of climate policy and to recognize the value of the participation of grassroots women in gender-responsive climate action at all levels;
- requests the Secretariat to maintain and regularly update its web pages for sharing information on women's participation and on gender-responsive climate policy;
- invites parties and non-party stakeholders to share information on their work related to integrating a gender perspective in the activities and work under the Convention, the Kyoto Protocol and the Paris Agreement;
- requests the SBI to develop a gender action plan in order to support the implementation of gender-related decisions and mandates under the UNFCCC process, which may include priority areas, key activities and indicators, timelines for implementation, the responsible and key actors and indicative resource requirements for each activity, and to further elaborate its process of review and monitoring;
- invites parties, members of constituted bodies, UN organizations, observers and other stakeholders to consult through meetings, prior to the SB 46 sessions, in order to

provide inputs to the formulation of the gender action plan referred to in the previous paragraph;
- requests the Secretariat to convene, in cooperation with parties and interested observers and other stakeholders, an in-session workshop during SB 46 to develop possible elements of the gender action plan for consideration by SBI 47; and
- invites submissions from parties, observers and other stakeholders, by 25 January 2017, on their views on the matters to be addressed at the in-session workshop.

ADMINISTRATIVE, FINANCIAL AND INSTITUTIONAL MATTERS: These items were first considered on Monday, 7 November. UNFCCC Executive Secretary Espinosa highlighted concerns about the sustainability of the Secretariat's workload given a decline in voluntary contributions and encouraged parties to pay their contributions for 2017 as soon as possible. The agenda sub-items on budget performance for the biennium 2016-2017, audit reports and financial statements for 2015, and other financial matters were forwarded for back-to-back discussions in a contact group chaired by Kunihiko Shimada (Japan).

Budget Performance for the Biennium 2016-2017: This item (FCCC/SBI/2016/13, INF.15 and INF.19) was first considered on Monday, 7 November. During the contact group and informal consultations, parties considered draft COP decision text on budget performance for the biennium 2016-2017, audit reports and financial statements for 2015, and other financial matters.

On budget performance, parties discussed, *inter alia*, New Zealand's proposal to highlight outstanding core budget contributions as a "significant problem," and require the Secretariat to follow up with parties and report back to SBI 46 with a proposal on ways to increase the predictability of cash flows.

Parties debated, *inter alia*: calling on parties to make their contributions for 2017 in a timely manner; requesting the Secretariat to follow up with countries with outstanding contributions on why payment has not been made; urging "further contributions," "parties to further contribute" or "Annex II parties to further contribute" to the Trust Fund for Participation in the UNFCCC Process; expressing appreciation for contributions to the Trust Fund for Supplementary Activities; and requesting the Secretariat explore ways to increase the flexible use and prioritization of funds in this Trust Fund.

New Zealand, opposed by Saudi Arabia, urged parties to accept a paragraph on the revised scale of contributions for 2016-2017, given that the Secretariat would otherwise lack sufficient funding for the 2017 programme of work.

On other financial matters, parties made suggestions on how to include text from the document on improving the efficiency and transparency of the UNFCCC budget process (FCCC/SBI/2016/INF.14).

On Monday, 14 November, the SBI adopted conclusions on all three sub-items under administrative, financial and institutional matters, and recommended draft decisions for consideration by the COP and CMP.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.41), the SBI recommends a draft decision for on financial and budgetary matters for consideration and adoption by COP 22 and a draft decision on financial and budgetary matters for consideration and adoption by CMP 12.

On Thursday, 17 November, the COP and CMP adopted the decisions. In its decision (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.41/Add.1), the COP, *inter alia*:
- takes note of the information contained in the report on budget performance for the period from 1 January to 30 June 2016, the note on the status of contributions to the trust funds administered by the Secretariat as of 21 October 2016 and the note on the revised indicative contributions for the biennium 2016-2017;
- expresses concern regarding the high level of outstanding contributions to the core budget, which has resulted in difficulties in cash flow, and strongly urges parties that have not made contributions in full to the core budget for the current and/or previous bienniums to do so without further delay;
- calls upon parties to make their contributions to the 2017 core budget in a timely manner;
- requests the Secretariat to explore options on ways to address outstanding contributions to the core budget for the consideration of SBI 46;
- urges parties to further contribute to the Trust Fund for Participation in the UNFCCC Process and the Trust Fund for Supplementary Activities;
- requests the Secretariat to explore options for increasing the flexibility of the funds in the Trust Fund for Supplementary Activities for the consideration of SBI 46;
- adopts a revised scale of contributions for 2016-2017 contained in an annex to the decision;
- takes note of the audit report of the UN Board of Auditors and the financial statements for 2015 and urges the Executive Secretary to implement the recommendations of the auditors, as appropriate;
- requests the Executive Secretary to gradually enhance the transparency of the budget process through the provision of additional documentation, and to pursue other possible ways to increase the efficiency and transparency of the budget process; and
- requests that the actions of the Secretariat called for in the decision be undertaken subject to the availability of financial resources.

In its decision (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.41/Add.2), the CMP, *inter alia*:
- takes note of the information contained in the report on budget performance for the period from 1 January to 30 June 2016, the note on the status of contributions to the trust funds administered by the Secretariat as at 21 October 2016 and the note on the revised indicative contributions for the biennium 2016-2017;
- expresses concern regarding the high level of outstanding contributions to the core budget, which has resulted in difficulties in cash flow, and strongly urges parties that have not made contributions in full to the core budget for the current and/or previous bienniums to do so without further delay;
- calls upon parties to make their contributions to the core budget for the year 2017 in a timely manner;
- requests the Secretariat to explore options on ways to address outstanding contributions to the core budget for the consideration of SBI 46;
- urges parties to further contribute to the Trust Fund for Participation in the UNFCCC Process and the Trust Fund for Supplementary Activities;
- requests the Secretariat to explore options for increasing the flexibility of the funds in the Trust Fund for Supplementary Activities for the consideration of SBI 46;
- adopts a revised scale of contributions for 2016-2017 contained in an annex to the decision;
- takes note of the audit report of the UN Board of Auditors and the financial statements for 2015 and urges the Executive

Secretary to implement the recommendations of the auditors, as appropriate; and
- endorses the decision taken at COP 22 on administrative, financial and institutional matters as it applies to the Kyoto Protocol, in particular the provisions contained in its Section III.

Audit Report and Financial Statements for 2015: This sub-item (FCCC/SBI/2016/INF.12 and Add.1) was first considered on Monday, 7 November. For a summary of the informal consultations, see the sub-item on budget performance for the biennium 2016-2017.

On Monday, 14 November, the SBI adopted conclusions and recommended draft decisions for consideration by the COP and CMP. The COP and CMP adopted the decisions on Thursday, 17 November.

Final Outcome: The outcome for this sub-item is summarized under the SBI sub-item on budget performance for biennium 2016-2017.

Other Financial Matters: This item (FCCC/SBI/2016/INF.13 and INF.14) was first considered on Monday, 7 November. For a summary of the informal consultations, see the sub-item on budget performance for the biennium 2016-2017.

On Monday, 14 November, the SBI adopted conclusions and recommended draft decisions for consideration by the COP and CMP.

Final Outcome: The outcome for this sub-item is summarized under the SBI sub-item on budget performance for biennium 2016-2017.

REPORTS ON ACTIVITIES RELATED TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF CONVENTION ARTICLE 6 (EDUCATION, TRAINING AND PUBLIC AWARENESS): On Monday, 7 November, the SBI took note of the information in the reports on the Fourth Dialogue on Action for Climate Empowerment (FCCC/SBI/2016/11) and the workshop to support the implementation of the Doha work programme on Article 6 of the Convention (FCCC/SBI/2016/12).

OTHER MATTERS: On Monday, 7 November, Palestine highlighted difficulties in accessing GEF resources and requested that a message be transferred to the COP on not excluding any non-Annex I parties from accessing resources.

CLOSING SESSIONS: On Monday, 14 November, the Secretariat reported on the budgetary and administrative implications of decisions adopted at the meeting thus far, noting the need for an additional €320,000 for implementation of gender-related activities in 2017. A summary of the SBI closing statements can be found at: http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12685e.html.

On Tuesday, 15 November, the SBI adopted the report of the session (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.25).

SBI Chair Chruszczow closed SBI 45 at 10:20 am.

SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE (SBSTA 45)

On Monday, 7 November, SBSTA Chair Carlos Fuller (Belize) opened SBSTA 45. Parties adopted the agenda (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/3) and organization of work. A summary of the opening statements from the SBSTA plenary are available at: http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12679e.html.

The SBSTA then opened individual agenda items, referring them to contact groups, informal consultations or consultations conducted by the SBSTA Chair. The SBSTA adopted conclusions and recommended draft decisions for consideration by the COP and CMP during closing plenaries on Monday and Tuesday, 14 and 15 November.

ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS: Election of Officers Other Than the Chair: Aderito Santana (São Tomé and Príncipe) was elected SBSTA rapporteur on Monday, 14 November. SBSTA Vice-Chair Tibor Schaffhauser (Hungary) will remain in office until his successor is nominated by his regional group.

NAIROBI WORK PROGRAMME: This item (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/INF.10) was first addressed in the SBSTA plenary on Monday, 7 November, and subsequently discussed in informal consultations co-facilitated by Shereen D'Souza (US) and Ainun Nishat (Bangladesh).

In informal consultations, parties discussed how to move forward work on climate change and health, and whether and how to include economic diversification.

On climate change and health, one group of parties requested that the Secretariat prepare a synthesis paper summarizing the gaps, needs and challenges as identified by parties and observers in their submissions, with a view to preparing recommendations at SBSTA 46 for consideration by COP 23. He also suggested that the Secretariat should organize a side event to facilitate the preparation of recommendations on climate change and health.

On economic diversification, two groups of parties requested including a reference in the draft conclusions, characterizing the issues as a "critical thematic area" of the NWP. Co-Facilitator Nishat noted that SBSTA 44 requested parties to pay attention to the issues of economic diversification and invited submissions on the issue for consideration at SBSTA 47. One group observed that other issues included in the SBSTA 44 conclusions were also included in the SBSTA 45 draft conclusions and urged reference to economic diversification.

On Monday, 14 November, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/L.22), the SBSTA, *inter alia*:
- acknowledges the submissions from parties, NWP partner organizations and other relevant organizations on their recent work in the area of climate impacts on human health and requests the Secretariat to prepare a synthesis paper for consideration at SBSTA 46;
- agrees to consider at SBSTA 46 ways to improve the effectiveness of the Focal Point Forum;
- welcomes the Secretariat's activities undertaken in collaboration with NWP partner organizations and other relevant organizations in response to recommendations made by the Adaptation Committee and the LEG and acknowledges that the activities have strengthened the role of the NWP in providing knowledge support to the work of the Adaptation Committee and the LEG;
- welcomes the recommendations of the Adaptation Committee and the LEG on the activities to be undertaken under the NWP and requests the Secretariat to undertake these activities, under the guidance of the SBSTA Chair: to prepare an overview of the landscape of existing platforms, including gaps, in collaboration with the CTCN; and to engage NWP partner organizations in supporting various activities of the LEG in providing overall technical support to the LDCs, including the convening of regional NAP Expos; the organization of training on NAPs; the development of open NAP case studies; and the preparation of an information paper on considerations regarding vulnerable communities, groups and ecosystems in the context of the process to formulate and implement NAPs;
- concludes that the activities under the NWP, in accordance with the SBSTA 44 conclusions, including the recommendations made by the LEG and the Adaptation

Committee, should be implemented in a way that enhances the role of the NWP as a knowledge hub that supports enhanced action on adaptation; and
- requests the Secretariat, in implementing these activities to explore opportunities to strengthen the partnerships with regional centers and networks, 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 the mass media, and linkages with the SDGs, as appropriate.

REPORT OF THE ADAPTATION COMMITTEE: This item (FCCC/SB/2016/2) was first considered in the SBSTA plenary on Monday, 7 November, and forwarded to joint SBSTA/SBI informal consultations co-facilitated by Julio Cordano (Chile) and Gottfried von Gemmingen (Germany). Discussions on this item are summarized under the SBI agenda item on the report of the Adaptation Committee (see page 25).

REPORT OF THE EXCOM OF THE WIM: This item (FCCC/SB/2016/3) was first considered in the SBSTA opening plenary on Monday, 7 November, and subsequently in joint SBSTA/SBI informal consultations co-facilitated by Beth Lavender (Canada) and Alf Wills (South Africa). Discussions on this item are summarized under the SBI agenda item on the report of the WIM ExCom (see page 25).

DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGIES: Joint Annual Report of the TEC and CTCN: This item (FCCC/SB/2016/1) was first discussed in the SBSTA opening plenary on Monday, 7 November and subsequently in joint SBI/SBSTA informal consultations on the development and transfer of technologies co-facilitated by Washington Zhakata (Zimbabwe) and Elfriede More (Austria). Discussions on this item are summarized under the SBI agenda item on the development and transfer of technologies (see page 26).

Technology Framework under Paris Agreement Article 10.4: This item (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/INF.9, INF.9/Corr.1 and MISC.4) was first considered on Monday, 7 November. Parties agreed to conduct informal consultations, co-facilitated by Elfriede More (Austria) and Washington Zhakata (Zimbabwe).

During informal consultations, parties discussed: the purpose of the technology framework; the initial key themes for the technology framework; an invitation for submissions from parties, observers and other stakeholders; and agreement to continue the elaboration of the technology framework at SBSTA 46.

On Monday, 14 November, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/L.21), the SBSTA, *inter alia*:
- agrees that the purpose of the technology framework is as stipulated in Paris Agreement Article 10.4, and that it can play a strategic role in improving the effectiveness and efficiency of the work of the Technology Mechanism by addressing the transformational changes envisioned in the Paris Agreement;
- agrees that the initial key themes for the technology framework are innovation, implementation, enabling environments and capacity building, collaboration and stakeholder engagement, and support; and
- invites parties, observers and other stakeholders to submit, by 10 April 2017, their views on the principles and structure of the technology framework.

ISSUES RELATING TO AGRICULTURE: This item (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/INF.5 and INF.6) was first taken up by the SBSTA plenary on Monday, 7 November, and subsequently in informal consultations co-facilitated by Emmanuel Dlamini (Swaziland) and Heikki Granholm (Finland).

During informal consultations, parties tried to find common ground between two draft decisions proposed by two different groups of parties. Some parties noted that the draft decisions differed in how they balance mitigation and adaptation. One party identified several commonalities, including: recommending a COP decision; promoting implementation; calling for workshops and submissions; citing the need for a knowledge hub; and highlighting food security.

Given continued differences in opinion, one group suggested that the document parties worked on in informal informals should be transmitted to SBSTA 46 as a non-paper, mandating only parties to give input. Another party stated the document should have no status. Parties eventually agreed to forward draft procedural conclusions to the SBSTA, with several groups and parties intervening to express their disappointment at the lack of a substantive COP decision on this item.

On Monday, 14 November, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/L.23), the SBSTA agrees to continue its consideration of this agenda item at SBSTA 46.

MATTERS RELATING TO SCIENCE AND REVIEW: Research and Systematic Observation: This item was first considered on Monday, 7 November. Parties agreed to informal consultations co-facilitated by Ann Gordon (Belize) and Sylvain Mondon (France).

During informal consultations, parties discussed, *inter alia*, the possibility of holding future Earth Information Days and the timing of such events, with all parties underscoring the need for party inputs to the event's agenda. They agreed to invite parties to consider inviting the Secretariat to organize similar events at SBSTA 49 based on parties' submissions.

On Monday, 14 November, the SBSTA adopted conclusions, following minor changes, and forwarded a draft decision for consideration and adoption by the COP. On Thursday, 17 November, the COP adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/L.26), the SBSTA, *inter alia*:
- notes the need for regional workshops, as identified by the 2016 implementation plan of the Global Climate Observing System (GCOS IP 2016), "The Global Observing System for Climate: Implementation Needs," and invites the GCOS to organize such workshops, taking into consideration the benefit of organizing these workshops in collaboration with relevant partners;
- encourages parties and relevant organizations to take advantage of support available via the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism as well as other relevant organizations and channels, as appropriate, to support the implementation of the GCOS IP 2016 and to strengthen and maintain observation networks and capabilities in all countries, especially in developing countries, including LDCs and SIDS;
- invites the GCOS Secretariat to report on progress made in the implementation of the GCOS IP 2016 on a regular basis, at subsequent sessions of the SBSTA, as appropriate;
- encourages Committee on Earth Observation Satellites to submit its comprehensive space agency response to the GCOS IP 2016 at SBSTA 47 (November 2017);
- invites the World Meteorological Organization to provide submissions on the state of the global climate on a regular basis, as appropriate, at subsequent sessions of the SBSTA;

- invites parties to submit via the submission portal, by 25 July 2018, their views on the organization of subsequent Earth Information Days, taking into account progress on the implementation of the GCOS IP 2016; and
- recommends a draft decision on the implementation of the GCOS IP 2016 for consideration and adoption by COP 22.

In its decision (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/L.26/Add.1), the COP, *inter alia*:

- encourages parties to work towards the full implementation of the GCOS IP 2016 and to consider what actions they can take to contribute towards its implementation;
- invites UN agencies and international organizations to support the full implementation of GCOS IP 2016, as appropriate;
- emphasizes, with regard to the GCOS IP 2016, the need to maintain, strengthen and build capacities for climate observations, monitoring and data management, including data rescue, digitization, analysis, archiving and sharing; and
- emphasizes the need to build capacity in developing countries through existing relevant mechanisms, including the GCOS Cooperation Mechanism.

Advice on How the Assessments of the IPCC Can Inform the Global Stocktake Referred to in Paris Agreement Article 14: This item was first considered on Monday, 7 November. Parties agreed to informal consultations co-facilitated by Frank McGovern (Ireland) and Patience Damptey (Mali).

During informal consultations, parties focused particularly on how to provide tailored guidance to the IPCC without overstepping their mandate.

On providing guidance, three developing countries called for elaborating more carefully on what is needed from the IPCC, noting its reports and assessments contain more than is necessary for the global stocktake. They suggested inputs from the IPCC on: the aggregate effect of NDCs in light of the 1.5°C limit; impacts on natural systems; avoided impacts; scientific approaches to evaluate the effectiveness of adaptation; scientific approaches to assessing climate finance; and progress towards the global adaptation goal.

In response, several developed and developing countries cautioned this may be too prescriptive for the agenda item's mandate to focus on "how" the IPCC assessments can inform the stocktake. One added that specific inputs will be decided by the IPCC in its scoping process.

Responding to several countries' support for requesting the IPCC to align its assessment cycles with those of the global stocktake, many countries noted the independence of the IPCC, adding that the Panel is already considering how to align its work with the Paris Agreement's provisions.

On Monday, 14 November, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/L.24), the SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- acknowledges that the products of the IPCC assessment cycles will be key inputs to the global stocktake and will provide the best available scientific knowledge that is policy-relevant but not policy-prescriptive, providing an integrated scientific, technical and socio-economic perspective;
- notes that the forthcoming products of the sixth IPCC assessment cycle will be key inputs to the first global stocktake in 2023;
- encourages the IPCC to pay particular attention to the first global stocktake when scoping its sixth assessment report, taking into account that the global stocktake will assess collective progress towards achieving the Paris Agreement's purpose and long-term goals in a comprehensive and facilitative manner, considering mitigation, adaptation, and MOI and support, in the light of equity and the best available science;
- welcomes the IPCC's decision to request its Secretariat to "prepare proposals for aligning the work of the IPCC during its seventh assessment report with the needs of the global stocktake foreseen under the Paris Agreement and to submit these proposals for consideration at a plenary session of the IPCC no later than 2018," and encourages the IPCC to continue this consideration, with a view to ensuring that the global stocktake is always informed in a timely manner by the best available science; and
- invites the IPCC to consider any outcome from the global stocktake, including possible scientific information gaps, that the IPCC views as relevant to inform its future assessment.

The SBSTA also provides the following advice on how the assessments of the IPCC can inform the global stocktake, recognizing that identification of the sources of input for the global stocktake will be undertaken by the APA:

- lessons can be learned from past experience; dialogue between IPCC experts and parties on the findings of the IPCC products, enabling a focused scientific and technical exchange of information in an open and transparent manner, could be utilized;
- convening special events, similar to the SBSTA-IPCC special event organized by the SBSTA on 18 May 2016, could be of value;
- views emerging from the rich exchange of information between the IPCC and parties at the SBSTA-IPCC special event could be further considered;
- inputs from the IPCC should be considered in an effective and balanced manner, as part of the overall input to the global stocktake; and
- the SBSTA-IPCC Joint Working Group could be used to enhance communication and coordination between the SBSTA and IPCC in the context of the global stocktake.

IMPACT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF RESPONSE MEASURES: Improved Forum and Work Programme: During the SBSTA opening plenary on Monday, 7 November, parties agreed to establish a joint SBI/SBSTA contact group on this item (FCCC/SB/2016/INF.2 and FCCC/TP/2016/7), co-chaired by SBI Chair Chruszczow and SBSTA Chair Fuller. Informal consultations were co-facilitated by Andrei Marcu (Panama) and Nataliya Kushko (Ukraine). Discussions on this item are summarized under the SBI agenda item on the impact of the implementation of response measures (see page 28).

Modalities, Work Programme and Functions under the Paris Agreement of the Forum on the Impact of the Implementation of Response Measures: This sub-item was considered jointly with the improved forum and work programme, summarized under the SBI agenda item on the impact of the implementation of response measures (see page 28).

Matters Relating to Protocol Article 2.3 (Adverse Effects of Policies and Measures): This sub-item was considered jointly with the improved forum and work programme, summarized under the SBI agenda item on the impact of the implementation of response measures (see page 28).

METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES UNDER THE CONVENTION: GHG Data Interface: This item was first considered on Monday, 7 November. Parties agreed to conduct informal consultations, co-facilitated by Takeshi Enoki (Japan)

and Thapelo Letete (South Africa). The SBSTA could not reach agreement and SBSTA 46 will continue consideration of this sub-item.

Bunker Fuels: This item (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/MISC.5) was first considered on Monday, 7 November. SBSTA Chair Fuller proposed, and parties agreed, that he would conduct informal consultations.

ICAO highlighted the agreement on the CORSIA. The International Maritime Organization (IMO) reported a new requirement for ships to record and report data on their fuel oil consumption.

India, on behalf of many developing countries and coalitions, stressed that mechanisms developed under ICAO and IMO should align with the principles of the Convention and COP decisions. Japan said IMO and ICAO are suitable forums to address emissions from international aviation and shipping. The US and Singapore welcomed the adoption of CORSIA and the IMO's amendment of the MARPOL Convention on fuel consumption by ships, with Singapore stressing the need to develop long-term measures on shipping emissions.

On Monday, 14 November, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/L.25), the SBSTA, *inter alia*, takes note of the information received from and results reported by the ICAO and IMO Secretariats, and invites the ICAO and IMO Secretariats to continue to report, at future SBSTA sessions, on their ongoing work on relevant issues.

METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES UNDER THE KYOTO PROTOCOL: Land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF) under Protocol Articles 3.3 and 3.4, and under the CDM: The SBSTA first considered this item (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/INF.7) on Monday, 7 November, and agreed to informal consultations co-facilitated by Maya Hunt (New Zealand) and José Antonio Prado (Chile).

In informal consultations, a party distributed a non-paper with substantive conclusions, *inter alia*, acknowledging that although the modalities for afforestation and reforestation could be, or are, technically applicable to certain revegetation activities, implementation of revegetation project activities in the remaining time of the Protocol's second commitment period would be difficult.

Characterizing this as a "significant concession," the party expressed flexibility on closing the agenda item if substantive conclusions were adopted that recognize certain revegetation activities, to avoid this becoming a "zombie item." Many supported the non-paper as a basis for negotiations, with some developed countries saying it would constitute a package that would include closing this item, which several developing countries opposed.

On Monday, 14 November, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/L.20), the SBSTA agrees to continue consideration of this issue at SBSTA 46.

CCS in Geological Formations as CDM Projects and Activities: This item was first considered on Monday, 7 November. SBSTA Chair Fuller proposed, and parties agreed, that he would conduct informal consultations with interested parties.

On Monday, 14 November, the SBSTA adopted conclusions and forwarded a draft decision to the CMP for consideration and adoption. On Thursday, 17 November, the CMP adopted its decision.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/L.19), the SBSTA recommends a draft decision (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/L.19/Add.1) for consideration by CMP 12.

In its decision, the CMP, *inter alia*:

- takes note of the work of the SBSTA, and the work undertaken by parties as contained in their submissions and the technical paper on transboundary CCS project activities;
- recognizes the role of CO2 capture and storage technology in addressing GHG emissions under the CDM;
- takes note that, to date, registration as a CDM project activity has not been requested by any activity under the modalities and procedures for CO2 capture and storage in geological formations, notwithstanding the adoption of the relevant documents by the CDM EB; and
- decides to conclude the consideration of the eligibility under the CDM of project activities consisting of CCS and storage in geological formations that involve the transport of CO2 from one country to another or geological storage sites that are in more than one country, and the establishment of a global reserve of CERs for CCS in geological formations.

MATTERS RELATING TO PARIS AGREEMENT ARTICLE 6: All three sub-items under this item were first considered on Monday, 7 November. Parties agreed to informal consultations co-facilitated by Hugh Sealy (Maldives) and Kelley Kizzier (EU).

In informal consultations, parties discussed ideas for the work programme and draft conclusions for all three sub-items. Several developed countries, supported by two groups of developing countries, suggested requesting focused submissions on the elements of the guidance that would need to be developed, requesting a synthesis of the submissions from the Secretariat and the convening of a workshop on that basis.

While there was strong support for focused submissions, many developing countries expressed hesitation at having the Secretariat synthesize views or produce a technical paper. One group worried this would eliminate ideas too early. Several developing countries also rejected the idea of a workshop, with one cautioning it could lead to parallel discussions.

Guidance on Cooperative Approaches Referred to in Paris Agreement Article 6.2: In informal consultations, parties reacted to guiding questions proposed by the Co-Facilitators on: options for ensuring environmental integrity and sustainable development; functioning of the corresponding adjustment; reach of the guidance; and managing relationships between Paris Agreement Articles 6.2 and 6.4, and between Articles 6.2 and 4.13 (accounting for NDCs). Several parties considered the corresponding adjustment too technical an issue for discussion at SBSTA 45.

On guidance for what can be transferred, many suggested keeping the scope open. Others called for centralized governance and appropriate institutions under the CMA.

On relationships, one party suggested that the exchange of internationally transferred mitigation outcomes (ITMOs) should happen under Paris Agreement Article 6.2, while ITMOs could be generated by any mechanism, including that established by Article 6.4.

On Monday, 14 November, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/L.28), the SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- invites parties to submit, by 17 March 2017, their views on, *inter alia*, the elements to be addressed, including their operationalization, in the guidance referred to in Paris Agreement Article 6.2, overarching issues, and relationships between Article 6.2 and other provisions of the Paris Agreement, the Convention and its related legal instruments, as relevant;

- requests the Secretariat to organize a roundtable discussion among parties based on the submissions, in conjunction with SBSTA 46, while ensuring broad participation of developing and developed countries; and
- agrees to continue its consideration of this matter at SBSTA 46.

Rules, Modalities and Procedures for the Mechanism Established by Paris Agreement Article 6.4: In informal consultations, parties considered clarifying questions from the Co-Facilitators on: the impact of all parties having NDCs on the operation of a centralized mechanism; additionality; governance; how to deliver overall mitigation; the sequencing of the development of project rules and defining scopes of other activities; and how to use the experiences from existing mechanisms.

On additionality, one party suggested that this provision is about enabling new projects that would not have taken place without Article 6.4, not activities that are already planned within a country's NDC. Another highlighted that additionality is inherently linked to environmental integrity.

Parties expressed strong support for centralized governance, and for enhancing and building on experience from the CDM and JI. One party noted interlinkages with the article's other provisions, especially in the context of not double counting units.

On sequencing, one party advocated prioritizing project-based rules and then building from there.

On Monday, 14 November, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/L.29), the SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- invites parties to submit, by 17 March 2017, their views on, *inter alia*, the elements to be addressed, including their operationalization, in the rules, modalities and procedures for the mechanism established by Paris Agreement Article 6.4, overarching issues, and relationships between Articles 6.4-6.6, and other provisions of the Paris Agreement, the Convention and its related legal instruments, as relevant;
- requests the Secretariat to organize a roundtable discussion among parties based on the submissions, in conjunction with SBSTA 46, while ensuring broad participation of developing and developed countries; and
- agrees to continue its consideration of this matter at SBSTA 46.

Work Programme under the Framework for Non-Market Approaches Referred to in Paris Agreement Article 6.8: In informal consultations, parties responded to guiding questions relating to whether governance, quantification, accounting and international cooperation, respectively, are relevant for non-market approaches.

Some highlighted the importance of governance in the context of tracking non-market approaches' contributions to NDCs. Many parties underlined that, where possible, quantification will be useful, with some suggesting existing reporting channels and GHG inventories can serve this purpose.

One party noted that accounting is not a necessity or obligation, but that procedures and guidelines for voluntary use would be useful. Some parties pointed to the possible synergies and overlaps with Paris Agreement Articles 6.2 and 6.4, with one group cautioning that these overlaps call for accounting to avoid double-counting.

Parties expressed views on the national nature of non-market approaches, with many pointing to areas where international cooperation can augment national action.

On institutional arrangements, one group suggested the work programme include workshops, with other parties suggesting: creating a clearinghouse; grouping non-market approaches by type; and undertaking a mapping exercise of approaches.

On Monday, 14 November, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/L.30), the SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- invites parties to submit, by 17 March 2017, their views on, *inter alia*, the elements to be addressed, including their operationalization, in the decision on the work programme on the framework for non-market approaches to sustainable development defined in Paris Agreement Article 6.9, overarching issues, and relationships between Articles 6.8 and 6.9, and other provisions of the Paris Agreement, the Convention and its related legal instruments, as relevant;
- requests the Secretariat to organize a roundtable discussion among parties based on the submissions, in conjunction with SBSTA 46, while ensuring broad participation of developing and developed countries; and
- agrees to continue its consideration of this matter at SBSTA 46.

MODALITIES FOR THE ACCOUNTING OF FINANCIAL RESOURCES PROVIDED AND MOBILIZED THROUGH PUBLIC INTERVENTIONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH PARIS AGREEMENT ARTICLE 9.7: This issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/MISC.3) was first considered by the SBSTA on Monday, 7 November, where it was forwarded to a contact group, co-facilitated by Rafael da Soler (Brazil) and Outi Honkatukia (Finland).

In the contact group, parties discussed, *inter alia*, whether the mandate of the group is limited to modalities for resources from developed to developing countries only. The Philippines, for the G-77/China, highlighted linkages with other issues, including transparency and the global stocktake, and called for examining definitions. Chile, for AILAC, called for defining public financing.

On session outcomes, several countries supported a draft decision. The EU and Switzerland, among others, stressed the need for clarity on the way forward to COP 24. The US inquired about other possible vehicles for capturing progress.

A summary of the in-session workshop on this issue is available at http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12680e.html.

During informal consultations, parties commented on the draft conclusions and decision proposed by the Co-Chairs. Belize, for AOSIS, supported by Costa Rica, Malawi and the Philippines, proposed amendments, including, *inter alia*, encouraging UN specialized funds and agencies to support the development of modalities with wide participation by, and through technical meetings among, experts; and ensuring that the modalities are developed in time to be integrated into the transparency framework.

On Monday, 14 November, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/L.27), the SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- requests the Secretariat, in its preparation of the technical paper referred to in document FCCC/SBSTA/2016/2, paragraph 110 (requesting a technical paper, prior to SBSTA 46, summarizing information from the in-session workshop held in conjunction with SBSTA 45 and submissions), to additionally draw on information on the structure of guiding questions from the in-session workshop, discussions held at SBSTA 45, relevant developments under and outside the Convention, and a reflection note on this agenda item by its contact group Co-Chairs;
- encourages UN funds, programmes and specialized agencies, and other organizations to inform the development of the

modalities under this agenda item, including by convening technical meetings;
- agrees to continue its consideration of this matter at SBSTA 46;
- recognizes the need to ensure the development of modalities under this agenda item in time for them to be integrated into the transparency framework referred to in Paris Agreement Article 13; and
- requests the SBSTA Chair to undertake consultations with the APA Co-Chairs regarding the work of the SBSTA on this matter and the work of the APA on the development of MPGs for the transparency framework referred to in Paris Agreement Article 13.

REPORTS ON OTHER ACTIVITIES: On Monday, 7 November, the SBSTA took note of the: Annual Report on the Technical Review of Information Reported under the Convention by Annex I Parties in their BRs and NCs (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/INF.8); Annual Report on the Technical Review of GHG Inventories of Annex I Parties (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/INF.11); and Annual Report on the Technical Review of GHG Inventories and Other Information Reported by Annex I Parties as Defined in Kyoto Protocol Article 1.7 (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/INF.12).

CLOSING SESSION: The SBSTA closing plenary took place on Monday and Tuesday, 14-15 November.

On Tuesday, 15 November, the Secretariat reported on the financial and budgetary implications of the decisions taken, stating that an additional €490,000 would be needed to organize the roundtable agreed by parties on Paris Agreement Article 6 (cooperative approaches). A summary of closing statements from SBSTA 45 is available at: http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12685e.html.

The SBSTA adopted the draft report (FCCC/SBSTA/2016/L.18) of the session.

SBSTA Chair Fuller closed SBSTA 45 at 10:33 am.

A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF THE MARRAKECH CLIMATE CHANGE CONFERENCE

COP 22 delegates returned to the city where 15 years ago they adopted the Marrakech Accords, the rulebook for the Kyoto Protocol, with a similar task at hand. Marrakech again became the site of technical negotiations aimed at operationalizing a treaty that the world hopes can combat global climate change amid ever-more alarming and certain evidence of its extent and effects. And, as before, US domestic politics created uncertainty on the ability of a treaty still in its infancy to achieve these necessary goals.

In many ways, the world is politically and economically very different than it was 15 years ago. The Paris Agreement has entered into force, providing certainty to parties' work on the rulebook and eliminating the possibility that a small "gang" of countries can demand concessions and weaken the treaty's operational rules in exchange for their ratifications. The US is no longer the world's largest emitter, meaning others can become climate leaders. Economically, the price and capacity of renewable energy rival fossil fuels in several developed and developing countries. Once China's national cap and trade system commences in March 2017, 60% of the world's gross domestic product will include a carbon price. During COP 22, 360 businesses, including global brands such as Nike and Starbucks, urged US President-elect Donald Trump to power the US economy with low-carbon energy. Today, governments, business leaders and investors routinely make climate-friendly decisions for the sake of their portfolios, if not the planet.

Occurring at the crest of this wave of momentum, COP 22 was perceived to have two tasks, each with a different audience. To the outside world, delegates had to demonstrate that the UNFCCC could contribute to the momentum generated post-Paris by the actions of non-state actors, as well as other international processes, including the Kigali Amendment to the Montreal Protocol that phases out the powerful greenhouse gas hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), and the International Civil Aviation Organization's new offsetting mechanism for carbon emissions from the international aviation sector. Internally, delegates had considerable technical work at hand, to build a foundation for the accelerated completion of the modalities, procedures and guidelines that will make the Paris Agreement implementable. This brief analysis considers the extent to which COP 22 achieved these two tasks.

CARRYING THE MOMENTUM

After a historically rapid entry into force of the Paris Agreement, many outside the process looked to COP 22 to maintain the momentum. Many anticipated CMA 1 as a moment of celebration. Indeed, during the pre-COP meeting, parties collectively worried that connotations of terms such as "suspend" and "adjourn" would send the signal that the UNFCCC is halting, rather than making progress.

It can be difficult to show significant progress when relatively bland technical work is at hand. COP 22 rose to the challenge, by creating a sense of urgency and accountability for the development of a rulebook that will make the Paris Agreement implementable from day one. The COP and CMA decisions both set 2018 as the deadline for the rulebook. This was a year earlier than many envisaged when they were in Paris, but a year later than coalitions such as the LDCs believed necessary for some parts of the rulebook. The LDCs advocated for adoption of decisions as they are ready, in order to avoid separate parts of the rulebook from being tied together in a package deal.

Parties also agreed to add to their workload by considering other items, such as the Adaptation Fund's role, as necessary components of the post-Paris climate regime, if not its rulebook. While delegates reached agreement on a fairly ambitious work programme and timeline for technical work, most of the high-level signals of commitment and energy came from outside the technical negotiations.

The Moroccan Presidency seemed determined to ensure that COP 22 would not be overly mundane, especially following the charismatic Parisian COP. Technical work concluded early in the second week, to the consternation of some who felt that the *Ad Hoc* Working Group for the Paris Agreement (APA) should enjoy the full two weeks of negotiating time that other *ad hoc* working groups traditionally received. Concluding this work, however, cleared the schedule for the many high-level events planned by the Moroccan hosts.

The Presidency invited and hosted approximately 50 heads of state and government during the high-level segment, and convened several other high-level events, including on accelerating action and on climate finance. The conference also strengthened the Global Climate Action Agenda, which dates back to 2014 and is designed to catalyze and showcase pre-2020 action by state and non-state actors. It did so by launching the Marrakech Partnership for Global Climate Action, which aims at concretizing the Agenda and providing a roadmap for action from 2017 to 2020.

Throughout the second week, quiet informal consultations on the Presidency-led Marrakech Action Proclamation continued in the background. Several delegates saw this political document as

a distraction, particularly as they continued to diminish its content through multiple rounds of consultations and revisions from four pages to a single page document essentially restating the least controversial elements of the Paris Agreement. Many understood the Presidency's desire for an outcome beyond disparate announcements and a technical work programme, yet some small delegations favored technical work over ministerial engagements.

Following the US Presidential election, these high-level forums also served as important platforms for states to signal their resolve to move forward, preferably with the US still engaged in the multilateral climate process. The election of Donald Trump, who advocated stronger climate action in 2009 and also promised to withdraw from the Paris Agreement in 2016, cast a shadow of uncertainty over the future of the Paris Agreement. The words "unstoppable" and "irreversible" became common qualifiers to describe climate action and momentum articulated by UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, at his last COP, UNFCCC Executive Secretary Patricia Espinosa, at her first COP, and US Special Envoy for Climate Change Jonathan Pershing, at his 22nd, and hopefully not final, COP.

Fifteen years ago, the announcement by US President George W. Bush that the US would not ratify the Kyoto Protocol dealt a blow to its entry into force and subsequent effectiveness. This time, many speculated that the rapid entry into force of the Paris Agreement was a quietly coordinated effort to "Trump-proof" the Paris Agreement since once the Agreement enters into force there is a three-year waiting period for any country wishing to withdraw, followed by a year before the withdrawal can take effect. Some celebrated that the Paris Agreement is secure, but others wearily noted that not withdrawing and actively engaging through implementation are very different actions. The US delegation and US Secretary of State John Kerry did their best to represent the Obama Administration, while sharing others' uncertainty of what lies ahead for their country's climate policy. Secretary of State Kerry had perhaps the most political room to speak, underscoring that "no one person has the right to make decisions on behalf of billions based solely on ideology."

While declarations for the US to "lead or get out of the way" rung somewhat naïve in 2007, when the US signed on to negotiations for a post-Kyoto agreement, as many recognized the necessity of the involvement of the country that was then the world's largest emitter. At COP 22 the resolve had precisely that message. With all the other significant emitters on board for the Paris Agreement, the engagement of social and economic actors, and dedication of subnational authorities, many ventured that the world could move ahead with the transformation to a low-emissions world and leave the US in the economy of the past.

COP 22 did much to ride and build the wave of momentum to show a united, progressive front. Disappointing for developing countries, however, was that this momentum was for post-2020 action, leaving, once again, pre-2020 action as a second act to the showier work of designing and operationalizing a new treaty. Many lamented that, "despite the Paris Agreement entering into force, the Doha Amendment from 2012 still has not." An important part of the balance struck by the Durban mandate in 2011 was that parties would both negotiate a new agreement and enhance pre-2020 ambition under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol. For developing countries, this was a promise still undelivered.

There were reasons to celebrate at COP 22, including the Paris Agreement's entry into force and many announcements of funding and action by state and non-state actors. However, some delegates worried that "lost in the festivities" was the fact that the current pledges are inadequate to stay below 2°C and bridge the estimated emissions gap of 12-14 gigatons (roughly equivalent to taking all cars in Europe off the road for 12-14 years). Announcements of US$81 million contributed to the Adaptation Fund, surpassing its fundraising target for 2016, helped, but did not fully placate calls to also close the finance gap and for equal treatment of pre-2020 and post-2020 ambition and action.

WRITING THE RULEBOOK

With regard to the Paris Agreement rulebook, Marrakech made a fair deal of progress. Important outcomes from the CMA included setting 2018 as the deadline for concluding the operationalization of the Agreement and rescuing the so-called "orphan issues" that had not yet been explicitly included on the agendas of the subsidiary bodies. Many parties welcomed the specific mandates given to the SBI to take up two of these orphan issues—common timeframes for NDCs and Paris Agreement Article 12 (education, training and public awareness)—in its second session in 2017.

Many also felt important clarity was provided on the preparations for the 2018 facilitative dialogue to take stock of collective progress towards the Paris Agreement's long-term emissions goal and inform the preparation of NDCs, through the COP's request to the COP 22 and 23 Presidents to undertake consultations on the organization of this dialogue and report back to COP 23.

There was also progress under the APA during the first week of the conference. Under the APA, informal consultations met six to seven times on each of the substantive items, namely mitigation, adaptation, transparency, global stocktake, implementation and compliance, and further matters relating to implementation. The agreed APA conclusions contain a reference to informal notes prepared by the co-facilitators of each of these discussions, capturing views expressed and, in some cases, guiding questions or elements to structure further discussions. Parties also welcomed the clear work programme set out in the APA conclusions for each item through May 2017, which includes, among other things, calls for submissions, workshops and a roundtable. For each substantive item, parties left COP 22 with homework, which many felt would enable progress to be made within, and across, all items in a balanced manner.

The SBI and SBSTA agreed on outcomes that advance both the institutional framework of the UN climate regime and work on the Paris Agreement rulebook, including the full operationalization of the Paris Committee on Capacity-building, which will start work in 2017, and agreement on a five-year rolling workplan for the Executive Committee of the Warsaw International Mechanism (WIM) on loss and damage, and agreement for subsequent periodic reviews of the WIM, which may become important as the mechanism shifts to serve the Agreement after 2020.

Work under the two SBs also supported the development of the post-2020 transparency framework for action and support in at least two ways. First, meetings to analyze and review individual parties' mitigation policies and measures convened under the two tracks currently forming the UNFCCC transparency system established in Cancún: the multilateral assessment and the facilitative sharing of views. Second, parties also made progress in SBSTA discussions on accounting modalities for information on "public climate finance," specifically support from developed countries provided and mobilized through public interventions to developing countries. An in-session workshop held on this item and a Co-Chairs' reflections note will provide inputs for a technical paper to take this work forward.

Despite unquestionable progress made on technical work, some felt Marrakech could have done more. A number of developed and developing countries expressed disappointment that the APA did not continue its discussions during the second week. However, as pointed out by many observers, some developing countries clearly expressed in a number of the APA's informal sessions that they were not ready to "rush" on the development of the rulebook, proposing instead submissions and further discussions as their preferred way forward. While many agreed that time could have been better utilized—especially given the fact that most negotiators and technical experts stayed on through the second week—a number of participants recognized that this was perhaps the best possible outcome given the differences in view on how quickly to proceed.

Discussions under, and beyond, the APA in Marrakech clearly demonstrated that important political misalignments remain, particularly with regard to the careful balance struck in the Paris Agreement between its elements, the differentiation of responsibilities and the attention given to the pre- and post-2020 eras. COP 22 confirmed the expectations—and fears—of long-term observers that different interpretations allowed by the constructive ambiguity of the Paris Agreement would continue to affect the pace and sequencing of work on its rulebook. In the APA discussions on mitigation, one developing country group made it clear that it was not happy to proceed further unless the discussions capture the "full scope of the NDCs" and provide specific information on means of implementation—finance, technology and capacity-building support. Seemingly straightforward, technical discussions under the SBI whether to have one or two public registries for countries' NDCs and adaptation communications made little progress due to calls to first advance work under the APA on adaptation communications and NDCs.

A number of the "roadblocks" in advancing technical discussions on the rulebook arguably derive from how the Paris Agreement resolved the issues of differentiation between developed and developing countries, and of how work in the pre-2020 period would be advanced. This latter issue is essential to developing countries who continue to worry about developed countries' wanting to "delay" fulfilling their obligations to the post-2020 era when all countries are expected to make contributions to climate action. During the closing plenary, South Africa, speaking for the BASIC countries, stressed the need to "give equal preference to pre-2020 issues" at the next UNFCCC session, expressing concern that these issues were not adequately dealt with in Marrakech.

A new discussion that emerged in Marrakech was that of the so-called "orphan issues," namely issues that were mandated in the Paris outcome but lacked a "home" on the subsidiary bodies' agendas. These included, as per an APA Co-Chairs' informal note, common timeframes for NDCs, adjustment of existing NDCs, the response measures forum, recognizing developing countries' adaptation efforts, guidance related to finance, setting a new collective goal on finance, developed countries' biennial finance communications, and education, training and awareness, among others.

Discussed during the first week under an APA sub-item on preparing for the convening of CMA 1, parties could not agree on which "orphan" issues should be addressed (including whether only issues mandated for CMA 1 should be included), which bodies should carry out related work, and, finally, how to mandate further work. The "orphans" became one of the final issues to be agreed before parties could adopt the COP and CMA decisions on the Paris Agreement in Marrakech, and was finally resolved by mandating the APA to continue its consideration of "possible additional matters relating to the implementation of the Paris Agreement and convening of CMA 1." This ambiguous wording, some suggested, may come back to haunt countries at the next APA session.

MOVING FURTHER, FASTER, TOGETHER

A lesson from the past on the minds of many at COP 22 is that the technical is often political. This year, expectations regarding progress in Marrakech were, perhaps unfairly, heightened by the Paris Agreement's rapid entry into force and raised further by the perceived need to send strong signals of unity and determination, given the uncertainty caused by the US election results. Rising to this call, delegates gave themselves only two years to complete work on the rulebook, a task that for the Kyoto Protocol required three years to realize and necessitated a resumed COP 6*bis* in 2001, given failure to reach consensus on a number of key political issues by the original deadline of 2000.

Another lesson learned is that at times of uncertainty the world looks for leadership. At COP 7, amid the vacuum left by the US departure from the Kyoto Protocol, parties bent over backwards to facilitate ratifications by Canada, Japan and the Russian Federation, and lauded EU leadership. With another possible leadership vacuum emerging, many looked for signs of new leaders stepping forward. Some looked to the big players, namely China and the EU, to carry on the torch of climate action. Yet, as the COP concluded, others nominated themselves, including the Climate Vulnerable Forum's 48 members who pledged to be 100% renewable by 2050. One observer suggested this was a sign of "leadership shifting to countries small in size and big in ambition." Moving ahead, delegates will have to go, as expressed by Global Climate Champion Hakima El Haité, "further, faster, together" in order to complete their dual tasks of finalizing the rulebook while delivering on pre-2020 climate action.

UPCOMING MEETINGS

Scoping of the IPCC Special Report on "Climate Change and Oceans and the Cryosphere": During this meeting, members will discuss the outline of the special report. **dates:** 6-9 December 2016 **location:** Monte Carlo, Monaco **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

Expert Meeting on Climate Change, Land Use and Food Security: This meeting will be co-hosted by the IPCC and the FAO. **dates:** 23-25 January 2017 **location:** Rome, Italy **contact:** Climate and Environment division (NRC) **phone:** +39-6-570 52714 **email:** NRC-Director@fao.org **www:** http://www.fao.org/nr/aboutnr/nrc/en/

29th Meeting of the AFB: The Adaptation Fund Board (AFB 29) will meet in Bonn, Germany. **dates:** 14-17 March 2017 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat **phone:** +1-202-458-7347 **fax:** +1-202-522-3240 **www:** https://www.adaptation-fund.org/events/29th-adaptation-fund-board-meeting/?instance_id=6

Expert Meeting on Mitigation, Sustainability and Climate Stabilization Scenarios: The aims of the expert meeting include developing a dialogue between different research communities, stimulating interdisciplinary research activity that can lead to literature for the AR6's assessment, and engaging with experts and stakeholders concerned with mitigation. **dates:** late March

2017 **location:** Norway **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

International Symposium on Soil Organic Carbon: This workshop is co-organized by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN (FAO), the Intergovernmental Technical Panel on Soils (ITPS) of the Global Soil Partnership, the Science-Policy Interface (SPI) of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) and the World Meteorological Organization (WMO). **dates:** 4-6 April 2017 **location:** Rome, Italy **contact:** Ronald Vargas, Global Soils Partnership **email:** ronald.vargas@fao.org **www:** http://www.fao.org/global-soil-partnership/en/

45th Session of the IPCC: The IPCC will meet to discuss, *inter alia*, Sixth Assessment Report (AR6) products, the methodology reports to refine the 2006 IPCC Guidelines on National GHG Inventories, and the Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5°C. **dates:** 3-9 April 2017 (TBC) **location:** 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

IPCC AR6 Scoping Meeting: During this meeting, members will discuss the outlines of AR6. **dates:** 1-7 May 2017 **location:** TBD **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 SB 46: The SBSTA and SBI will convene for their 46th sessions, in parallel with the 3rd meeting of the first session of the APA in May 2017. **dates:** 8-18 May 2017 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228 815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/

46th Session of the IPCC: The IPCC will meet to continue discussions to advance AR6 products. **dates:** 4-10 September 2017 **location:** TBD **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 23: During COP 23, parties will meet to, *inter alia*, continue preparations for entry into force of the Paris Agreement. **dates:** 6-17 November 2017 **location:** Bonn, Germany (chaired by Fiji) **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228 815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/

For additional meetings, see http://sdg.iisd.org/

GLOSSARY

AFB	Adaptation Fund Board
AILAC	Independent Alliance of Latin America and the Caribbean
AOSIS	Alliance of Small of Island States
APA	*Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Paris Agreement
BASIC	Brazil, South Africa, India and China
BR	Biennial report
CBIT	Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency
CCS	Carbon capture and storage
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CERs	Certified emission reductions
CGE	Consultative Group of Experts
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
CORSIA	Carbon Offsetting and Reduction Scheme for International Aviation
CTCN	Climate Technology Centre and Network
EB	Executive Board
ExCom	Executive Committee
GCF	Green Climate Fund
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GHG	Greenhouse gas
IAR	International assessment and review
ICAO	International Civil Aviation Organization
INDCs	Intended nationally determined contributions
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
JI	Joint Implementation
JISC	Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee
LDCs	Least developed countries
LDCF	LDCs Fund
LEG	LDCs Expert Group
LMDCs	Like-Minded Developing Countries
MOI	Means of implementation
MPGs	Modalities, procedures and guidelines
MRV	Measurement, reporting and verification
NAPs	National adaptation plans
NCs	National communications
NDCs	Nationally determined contributions
NWP	Nairobi Work Programme on impacts, vulnerability and adaptation to climate change
PCCB	Paris Committee on Capacity-building
SBs	Subsidiary Bodies
SBI	Subsidiary Body for Implementation
SBSTA	Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice
SCF	Standing Committee on Finance
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SIDS	Small island developing states
TEC	Technology Executive Committee
TNA	Technology needs assessment
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNCTAD	UN Conference of Trade and Development
UNFCCC	UN Framework Convention on Climate Change
WIM	Warsaw International Mechanism on Loss and Damage associated with Climate Change Impacts