BONN HIGHLIGHTS:
WEDNESDAY, 10 MAY 2017
The Bonn Climate Change Conference continued on Wednesday. Informal consultations and mandated events convened throughout the day.

SBSTA
NAIROBI WORK PROGRAMME: Beth Lavender (Canada) co-facilitated. The session focused on suggestions for the improvement of the Focal Point Forum. The Secretariat described the evolution of the Forum, from exchanging views to providing recommendations for actions. She noted challenges, including lack of time for discussion and inability to engage experts. Some parties supported the idea of greater focus for future forums. A focal point expressed concern that focused sessions might alienate those focal points not working in the chosen area. The Co-Chairs will produce draft conclusions.

PARIS AGREEMENT ARTICLE 6: After lengthy procedural discussions, parties decided to close the informal sessions to observers. Co-Facilitator Hugh Sealy (Maldives) proposed identifying elements for guidance for all three components of Article 6 in an open list and considering next steps. Many parties agreed to focus discussions on elements or headings under which text can be developed. Some suggested developing criteria by which elements will be chosen. Many parties stressed the need for further technical work before COP 23.

PARIS AGREEMENT ARTICLE 6.2 (ITMOS): Co-Chair Kelley Kizzier (EU) invited parties to identify headings, main elements and priority areas. Parties identified the need to: define ITMOS, including their quantification; delineate the scope of guidance; devise technical tools and infrastructure for ITMOS; and ensure environmental integrity through robust accounting rules and comparability of outcomes. They exchanged views on how ITMOS will be applied towards NDCs, with a few noting the need to map the application. Some parties noted that Article 6 includes raising ambition on both mitigation and adaptation. Several parties identified overarching principles such as additionality, comparability, supplementarity and national determination. Parties exchanged views on, inter alia, the extent of multilateral versus national oversight, and links with the Article 6.4 mechanism and its application to NDCs. The Co-Facilitators will produce a compilation of views.

PARIS AGREEMENT ARTICLE 6.4 (MECHANISM): Parties outlined a possible list of elements, including: principles and alignment with Paris Agreement’s objectives; definitions; scope; governance and institutional arrangements, including the role of the CMA; methodologies and project cycles; share of proceeds; overall mitigation, including its definition and operationalization; and transitional issues and means to ensure the credibility of the CDM. On supporting sustainable development, a party suggested links with the Sustainable Development Goals, while some described this as a national prerogative. On transitional issues surrounding the Protocol mechanisms, parties exchanged views on whether to include both the CDM and joint implementation. Co-Facilitators will prepare a compilation of views.

TECHNOLOGY FRAMEWORK UNDER PARIS AGREEMENT ARTICLE 10.4: Elfriede More (Austria) co-facilitated. Parties commented on an internal tool that: outlines purpose, principles and key themes; and presents a matrix containing parties’ previous discussions on the structure of the technology framework. Some parties expressed concerns around using the idea of the technology cycle as part of the structure of the framework, while others welcomed it as a good approach to capture the dynamics of technology-readiness levels. One party viewed listing options on research and development, demonstration and deployment, and diffusion and transfer as “premature.” Others called for specification of activities and flow of funds and technology. Many emphasized the need for interlinkages to relevant actors.

SB1
DEVELOPMENT OF MODALITIES AND PROCEDURES FOR THE OPERATION AND USE OF A PUBLIC REGISTRY (PARIS AGREEMENT ARTICLE 4.12): Co-Facilitator Gertraud Wollansky (Austria) suggested parties identify the elements of the modalities and procedures, and functions, of the registry for NDCs.

Parties emphasized user-friendliness, public accessibility, security and searchability. Many suggested discussing how to improve the interim NDC registry. Some said the registry should be able to evolve over time and accommodate various documents, including successive NDCs.

Views diverged on presenting additional country information, with one country noting information should be communicated in a country-determined fashion, not by the registry.

Co-Facilitator Wollansky encouraged parties to consult informally to clarify the scope of the discussions. Informal consultations will continue.

DEVELOPMENT OF MODALITIES AND PROCEDURES FOR THE OPERATION AND USE OF A PUBLIC REGISTRY (PARIS AGREEMENT ARTICLE 7.12): Co-Facilitator Madeleine Diouf-Sarr (Senegal) proposed that parties “park” discussions over the number of registries and linkages to APA discussions, inviting a focus on the operation of the registry for adaptation communications.

Countries supported user-friendliness, public accessibility, security for users and the Secretariat maintaining the registry. Many drew attention to the need for flexibility and linkages with other portals hosting vehicles for adaptation communications.

Many noted the modalities should not prejudice outcomes under APA item 4 (adaptation communications). Informal consultations will continue.
**GLOBAL STOCKTAKE (GST):** Co-Facilitators Xolisa Ngwadla (South Africa) and Ilze Prūse (Latvia) proposed updating the informal note from Marrakech. On possible linkages and context, some developing countries underlined the link to support for loss and damage, and one mentioned the impacts of response measures. Various developing countries called for operationalizing equity in the GST, while some developed countries underlined the difficulty of defining equity in a practical way. Others mentioned links to the ambition cycle and best available science.

On possible outputs/outcomes, many parties noted that the Paris Agreement outlines the GST’s outcome. Some said discussions of the GST’s modalities will enable the identification of outputs. Some also called for learning from the experience of the Structured Expert Dialogue on the 2013-2015 review, in particular how it distilled information to present outputs.

**COMMITTEE TO FACILITATE IMPLEMENTATION AND PROMOTE COMPLIANCE:** Co-facilitated by Peter Horne (Australia) and Janine Felson (Belize), informal consultations addressed the committee’s scope and function, and triggers. While various parties saw the “facilitating implementation” and “promoting compliance” functions as separate, some developed countries argued that they are a continuum. Discussions also focused on whether the committee’s activities would cover all provisions of the Agreement or only legally-binding ones. On triggers, a developing country group supported a self-trigger only, while two developing country groups and other countries called for additional triggers. Some opposed a Secretariat trigger, noting the Secretariat’s neutral, information gathering role, while others cited this as the reason for a Secretariat trigger. Several supported a CMA trigger for systemic issues. Informal consultations will continue.

**FURTHER MATTERS: Adaptation Fund:** Pieter Terpstra (the Netherlands) co-facilitated. The Secretariat’s legal team responded to parties’ questions from the previous session, explaining that the Adaptation Fund currently only reports to the CMP and its governance framework is designed to serve the Kyoto Protocol.

Parties presented further questions, including on: whether the Fund can serve the Agreement while sitting under the COP or CMP; legal precedents of a fund being transferred from one legal instrument to another or serving multiple instruments; provision of guidance under different scenarios; Board membership; and use of the share of proceeds or resources in general.

One country suggested the Secretariat formulate answers across three scenarios, namely whether the Fund serves the CMP, COP or CMA, with another party adding the option of the Fund serving both the Protocol and Agreement. The Secretariat will prepare answers for the next informal consultations.

**IN THE CORRIDORS**

Negotiations reached cruising speed by day three of the Bonn Climate Change Conference. In most rooms, many reported, “parties are starting to think about the guidance that is really needed” and addressing “constructive ambiguities” in the Paris Agreement. And delegates did dig into substance, with attention shifting to identifying the contours of draft texts that can be fleshed out during the year.

Some thorny issues, such as how to operationalize differentiation in the context of the Paris Agreement rulebook, were sometimes difficult to ignore. Although one observer said most of the discussions could be summarized as a debate between “one or two” – be it the modalities for the transparency framework or the compliance committee, or the number of public registries – several said these were “political” decisions that would need to be taken later. However, in a few areas an optimistic delegate said these technical discussions could help parties navigate through difficult political waters.