

Summary of the Bangkok Climate Change Conference: 4-9 September 2018

The Bangkok Climate Change Conference was convened under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) to advance work on the Paris Agreement Work Programme (PAWP): the details required to operationalize the 2015 Paris Agreement. Over 1600 participants, including more than 1200 government officials, almost 400 representatives from UN bodies and agencies, intergovernmental organizations, civil society organizations, and the media attended the meeting.

At their May 2018 meeting, UNFCCC parties had agreed to an additional meeting in Bangkok to ensure the Work Programme's "timely completion" by the Katowice Climate Change Conference (COP 24) in December 2018. To enable this work, parties in Bangkok met in resumed 48th sessions of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI 48-2) and Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA 48-2), as well as the sixth session of the first meeting of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Paris Agreement (APA 1-6).

With COP 24 drawing near, many viewed substantial progress in Bangkok as necessary for a successful outcome in Katowice. Negotiations on nearly 20 substantive agenda items took place throughout the week, including on issues related to:

- mitigation;
- adaptation;
- finance;
- transparency;
- the global stocktake;
- response measures;
- market and non-market approaches;
- compliance with, and implementation of, the Paris Agreement; and
- possible additional PAWP items, including matters related to the Adaptation Fund and to loss and damage.

The meeting's "Bangkok outcome" captures progress made across these issues in a 307-page compilation, and mandates the Presiding Officers to undertake intersessional work to help advance parties' deliberations towards the PAWP. At the close of the meeting, many characterized progress as "uneven." Numerous delegates underlined that the pace of work had been too slow, and stressed as fundamental the need to provide assurances on finance. Differentiation between developed and developing countries also emerged as a contentious issue under various agenda items, including under guidance for nationally determined contributions (NDCs).

A Brief History of the UN Climate Change Process

The international political response to climate change began with the 1992 adoption of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), which sets out the basic legal framework and principles for international climate change cooperation with the aim of 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 order to boost the effectiveness of the UNFCCC, the Kyoto Protocol was adopted in December 1997. It commits industrialized countries, and countries in transition to a market economy, to achieve quantified emissions reduction targets for a basket of six GHGs. The Kyoto Protocol entered into force on 16 February 2005 and has 192 parties. Its first commitment period took place from 2008 to 2012. The 2012 Doha Amendment established the second commitment period from 2013 to 2020. It will enter into force after reaching 144 ratifications. As of August 2018, 114 parties had ratified the Doha Amendment.

In December 2015, parties adopted the Paris Agreement. Under the terms of the Agreement, all countries will submit NDCs, and aggregate progress on mitigation, adaptation, and means of implementation will be reviewed every five years through a global stocktake. The Paris Agreement entered into force on 4 November 2016 and, as of 3 September 2018, 180 parties had ratified the Agreement.

In this Issue

A Brief History of the UN Climate Change Process	1
Report of the Meetings	2
<i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group on the Paris Agreement	3
Subsidiary Body for Implementation	7
Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice	10
Joint Closing Plenary	12
A Brief Analysis of the Bangkok Climate Change Conference	13
Upcoming Meetings	14
Glossary	15

Key Turning Points

Durban Mandate: The negotiating mandate for the Paris Agreement was adopted at the UN Climate Change Conference in Durban, South Africa, in 2011. 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 2°C target.

Lima: The UN Climate Change Conference in Lima, Peru, in 2014 adopted the “Lima Call for Climate Action,” which furthered progress on the negotiations towards the Paris Agreement. It elaborated the elements of a draft negotiating text and the process for submitting and synthesizing intended nationally determined contributions (INDCs), while also addressing pre-2020 ambition.

Paris: The 2015 UN Climate Change Conference convened in Paris, France, and culminated in the adoption of the Paris Agreement on 12 December. The Agreement includes the goal of limiting the global average temperature increase to well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels, and pursuing efforts to limit it to 1.5°C. It also aims to increase parties’ ability to adapt to the adverse impacts of climate change and make financial flows consistent with a pathway towards low GHG emissions and climate resilient development. The Agreement will be implemented to reflect equity and the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, in light of different national circumstances.

Under the Paris Agreement, each party shall communicate, at five-year intervals, successively more ambitious NDCs. By 2020, parties whose NDCs contain a time frame up to 2025 are requested to communicate a new NDC and parties with an NDC time frame up to 2030 are requested to communicate or update these contributions.

Key features of the Paris Agreement include a transparency framework, and a process known as the global stocktake. Starting in 2023, parties will convene this process at five-year intervals to review collective progress on mitigation, adaptation, and means of implementation. The Agreement also includes provisions on adaptation, finance, technology, loss and damage, and compliance.

When adopting the Paris Agreement, parties launched the PAWP to develop the Agreement’s operational details, including through the APA, SBI, and SBSTA. They agreed to convene in 2018 a facilitative dialogue to take stock of collective progress towards the Paris Agreement’s long-term goals. This process is now known as the Talanoa Dialogue.

In Paris, parties also agreed the need to mobilize stronger and more ambitious climate action by all parties and non-party stakeholders to achieve the Paris Agreement’s goals. Building on the Lima-Paris Action Agenda, several non-party stakeholders made unilateral mitigation pledges in Paris, with more than 10,000 registered actions. Attention to actions by non-party stakeholders continued through the Marrakech Partnership for Global Climate Action, launched in 2016.

Marrakech: The UN Climate Change Conference in Marrakech took place from 7-18 November 2016, and included the first Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA 1). Parties adopted several decisions related to the PAWP, including: that the work should

conclude by 2018; the terms of reference for the Paris Committee on Capacity-building; and initiating a process to identify the information to be provided in accordance with Agreement Article 9.5 (*ex ante* biennial finance communications by developed countries). Other decisions adopted included approving the five-year workplan of the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage (WIM), enhancing the Technology Mechanism, and continuing and enhancing the Lima work programme on gender.

Fiji/Bonn: The Fiji/Bonn Climate Change Conference convened from 6-17 November 2017 in Bonn, Germany, under the COP Presidency of Fiji. The COP launched the Talanoa Dialogue and established the “Fiji Momentum for Implementation,” a decision that gives prominence to pre-2020 implementation and ambition. The COP also provided guidance on the completion of the PAWP and decided that the Adaptation Fund shall serve the Paris Agreement, subject to decisions to be taken by CMA 1-3. Parties also further developed, or gave guidance to, the Local Communities and Indigenous Peoples Platform, the Executive Committee of the WIM, the Standing Committee on Finance, and the Adaptation Fund.

SBSTA 48, SBI 48, APA 1-5: Many of the conclusions reached and decisions taken at this session from 30 April - 10 May 2018 capture discussions on the PAWP, and include parties’ agreement to continue consideration of these issues. To assist in this endeavor, parties requested the APA Co-Chairs to prepare, by 1 August, “tools” to help with the development of an “agreed basis for negotiations.” A unique feature of the conference was the Talanoa Dialogue. In a process designed around the questions “Where are we?” “Where do we want to go?” and “How do we get there?” parties and stakeholders shared stories that will inform a synthesis report to be presented at the Katowice Climate Change Conference in December 2018.

Report of the Meetings

On Tuesday, 4 September, the Bangkok Climate Change Conference convened with an opening ceremony, followed by opening plenaries for SBI 48-2, SBSTA 48-2, and APA 1-6. Stressing that “frankly, we are not ready for Katowice,” COP 23 President Frank Bainimarama called on parties to agree to a package of decisions to ensure the Paris Agreement’s full implementation. Incoming COP 24 President Michał Kurtyka called on delegates to show that governments are keeping pace with society, urging them to leave Bangkok with a clear understanding of what will be negotiated in Katowice. UNFCCC Executive Secretary Patricia Espinosa echoed calls for progress. No opening statements were made in plenary. They are available on the [UNFCCC website](#). The conference closed on Sunday, 9 September, with the adoption of identical conclusions under the APA (FCCC/APA/2018.L.4), SBI (FCCC/SBI/2018/L.19), and SBSTA (FCCC/SBSTA/2018/L.16) that capture progress made at the session in their annexes: the so-called “Bangkok outcome.” The work of the three bodies has also been compiled in a 307-page “[PAWP compilation](#).”

With the outcomes of the meeting in hand, a key question for negotiators was how work would be taken forward after the Bangkok meeting to ensure the PAWP’s adoption at COP 24. On the meeting’s penultimate day, heads of delegation met with the APA, SBI, and SBSTA Presiding Officers to discuss this question, among others. A draft conclusions note on this matter was also deliberated in the closing APA contact group.

In their conclusions, the APA, the SBI, and the SBSTA agree that:

- their Presiding Officers should prepare a joint reflections note addressing progress made at this session, and identifying ways forward, “including textual proposals” to help advance parties’ deliberations towards the PAWP; and
- the purpose of this joint note is to address all PAWP matters so as to ensure their “balanced and coordinated” consideration, and facilitate successful completion of the PAWP at COP 24.

The Presiding Officers’ note is due by mid-October 2018, in time to inform the “pre-COP” meeting to be held from 24-27 October 2018 in Krakow, Poland.

Ad Hoc Working Group on the Paris Agreement

On Tuesday, 4 September, APA Co-Chair Sarah Baashan (Saudi Arabia) opened the session. Parties agreed to continue work under the APA 1 agenda (FCCC/APA/2018/1) and the existing organization of work (FCCC/APA/2016/2). Co-Chair Baashan indicated the APA Co-Chairs would hold bilateral consultations with parties and groups, noting that the SBSTA and SBI Chairs could be included on issues of joint interest, such as the format of the PAWP outcome at COP 24.

Delegates agreed to forward all substantive APA items to informal consultations, namely:

- Further guidance on the mitigation section of Decision 1/CP.21 (Paris Outcome);
- Adaptation communication;
- Modalities, procedures, and guidelines for the transparency framework for action and support;
- Matters related to the global stocktake;
- Modalities and procedures for the effective operation of the committee to facilitate implementation and promote compliance; and
- Further matters related to implementation of the Paris Agreement.

On each agenda item, delegates considered an issue-specific “tool” that had been released by the APA Co-Chairs in early August to facilitate deliberations in Bangkok.

Further Guidance on the Mitigation Section of Decision 1/CP.21 (Paris Outcome): Discussions under this item focused on:

- developing further guidance on features of the NDCs, which each party is required to prepare, communicate, and maintain under Agreement Article 4.2;
- developing further guidance for the information to be provided by parties in order to facilitate clarity, transparency, and understanding of NDCs; and
- elaborating guidance for accounting for NDCs.

Informal consultations met throughout the week, co-facilitated by Sin Liang Cheah (Singapore) and Federica Fricano (Italy). Discussions also occurred in informal informal consultations in two streams. One stream focused on the outline of a draft decision. The other focused on substantive issues, including information to facilitate clarity, transparency, and understanding (ICTU), and accounting. The informal consultations did not result in agreement on a revised iteration of the tool.

In informal consultations, parties accepted the APA Co-Chairs’ tool as a basis for further negotiations and worked toward a revision that could form the basis of a decision in Katowice. Informal informal negotiations convened throughout the week, and the results of those talks formed the basis for much of the discussion in informal consultations.

A key element of divergence centered on features of NDCs. Some, mostly developing countries, proposed guidance on new and additional features of NDCs, which might include adaptation efforts. Several developed countries underscored that the group’s

mandate is to develop further guidance on existing features outlined in the Paris Agreement, noting that this mandate focuses on mitigation. A few parties supported text in the decision comprising a paragraph on existing features, a paragraph on new or additional features, and a paragraph on guidance or elaboration on features.

This disagreement spilled over into negotiations on the outline of a draft decision text. In reporting back from informal informal discussions on this topic, some developing countries and groups argued that their views—including a proposal that the outline include a section on scope of coverage of NDCs, which could be a vehicle for discussing new and additional features of NDCs—were being “blocked” from consideration. Other countries and groups recalled that the draft outline in the Co-Chairs’ tool had been the product of long negotiations at SB 48-1, and urged engagement in substantive discussion rather than on the outline.

On Sunday, Co-Facilitator Cheah thanked delegates for their work in addressing all the agenda sub-items. He noted that the group had been unable to agree on a new iteration of the APA Co-Chairs’ tool and indicated that this would be reported to the APA contact group as the informal consultations’ outcome.

Outcome: A revised Co-Chairs’ tool for this item was issued in order to correct a previous omission ([APA1.6.IN.i3](#)). Negotiations will continue at the Katowice Climate Change Conference based on this document, which does not reflect any discussions from Bangkok.

Adaptation Communication: Agreement Article 7.10 states that each party should, as appropriate, submit and update periodically an adaptation communication, which may include its priorities, implementation and support needs, plans, and actions. Discussions under this item focused on developing guidelines for this adaptation communication.

Informal consultations were co-facilitated by Beth Lavender (Canada) and Julio Cordano (Chile). An informal informal consultation on the purpose of the guidance also convened.

During informal consultations, parties supported the Co-Chairs’ tool as a basis for further negotiations. They discussed the draft decision and two annexes, on elements of the adaptation communication and on a proposal for vehicle-specific guidance.

On the draft decision, one group suggested moving some of the text in the preamble to sections on principles or purpose, while other countries suggested items that could be removed. Some developed countries questioned the need for sections that specify a preamble, principles, or purpose, saying that the Paris Agreement already provides enough guidance. A developing country group said they could not accept the “no text” option in these sections. Regarding purpose, some developed countries objected to including reference to clarity, transparency, and understanding, noting that this language is used in the NDC registry discussions, while some developing countries supported retaining it as an option in the text.

On modalities for communicating, submitting, and updating the communication, several delegates identified the need to discuss whether parties “shall,” “should,” or “may” apply the guidance. On modalities to update, revise, and/or review the guidance, several clarified that the intention is to learn from experiences and revise or update the guidance accordingly. Two groups preferred removing the term “review,” suggesting it could lead to a complete, rather than stepwise, change of the guidance. Others viewed a review as encompassing the steps involved in a revision in a less prescriptive way. Another group suggested revisions were short-term fixes, while reviews are long-term processes.

Many suggested possible common elements, such as: national circumstances; impacts, vulnerabilities, and risk assessments; national goals; and adaptation priorities, policies, plans, actions, strategies, and/or programmes. One group and a developed country suggested using headings similar to these elements. Several developing country groups cited adaptation support needs as a common element. One developing country underscored that all elements should be opt-in/opt-out.

Two developing country groups stated that it is necessary to develop guidance specific to NDCs as a vehicle for adaptation communication (so-called “vehicle-specific” guidance). Three other developing country groups, and some developed countries, opposed, citing the need for one form of guidance and flexibility in vehicle choice. On Sunday, parties agreed to forward to the APA contact group a revised version of the tool, noting that the document reflects options and not consensus.

Outcome: The outcomes of the informal consultations are captured in document [APA1-6.IN.i4v2](#). Negotiations will continue at the Katowice Climate Change Conference.

Modalities, Procedures, and Guidelines for the Transparency Framework for Action and Support: Work under this item focused on developing common modalities, procedures, and guidelines for the transparency framework established in Agreement Article 13. Informal consultations met throughout the week, co-facilitated by Xiang Gao (China) and Andrew Rakestraw (US). Informal informal consultations also convened throughout the week to discuss, *inter alia*:

- objectives and guiding principles;
- if there should be references to the Consultative Group of Experts;
- which aspects of the UNFCCC’s existing measurement, reporting, and verification system should be superseded by the transparency framework’s modalities, procedures, and guidelines (MPGs);
- what synthesis reports would contain, and how they would link to the global stocktake;
- the relationship between the timing of technical expert reviews and the facilitative multilateral consideration of progress; and
- adaptation communication.

In informal consultations, parties accepted the Co-Chairs’ tool as a basis for further discussions, noting two “tensions”: the need to consider eight sections including subheadings, while ensuring focused discussions; and the need to ensure a party-owned text that remains streamlined and manageable.

On overarching considerations and guiding principles, several developing countries highlighted the need to reflect flexibility for certain developing countries as a guiding principle. One group of developing countries underscored the need to identify “information on loss and damage” as an objective of the framework’s MPGs.

On adaptation, some developed countries preferred incorporating the adaptation communication guidance into the transparency framework. A developing country group noted the different nature of the two types of guidance. Two groups suggested that substantive issues remain in the adaptation communication guidance, while information to be reported and reporting formats be addressed in the transparency framework.

On inventories, parties provided general comments on definitions, institutional arrangements, methods, and metrics. Several developing countries noted the need to add flexibility in the relevant sections, and one developed country observed that

the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) 2006 guidelines for inventories provide flexibility that could serve as useful language for the MPGs, including on data availability.

On information necessary to track progress on NDC implementation and achievement, two developing country groups said the transparency framework should be informed by discussions on accounting of NDCs, and on ICTU. Some developed countries drew a distinction between these discussions, saying that NDC discussions are about potential NDC content, while the transparency framework tracks progress. Others identified connections to discussions on markets under Agreement Article 6.

On Sunday, 9 September, the Co-Facilitators presented their revised tool, which parties accepted as a basis for future negotiations. Some groups requested additional brackets be added to some phrases or options in the text. Many other countries observed that the textual exercise thus far had been to accurately reflect options, noting that brackets may be necessary only when substantive discussions occur.

Several developed countries characterized the placeholder in the section on information on financial support—to insert the outcomes from SBI discussions on Article 9.5 (identification of information to be provided by developed countries on future financial flows)—as beyond the discussions’ mandate. Several developing countries rejected deleting any text at this time.

Parties agreed to forward the revised tool to the APA contact group without changes, except for the addition of a disclaimer regarding the brackets, including that parties may add brackets in later discussions. Some parties said that they will raise the issues they discussed regarding this last iteration of the tool at a later date.

Outcome: The outcomes of the informal consultations are captured in document [APA1-6.IN.i5](#). Negotiations will continue at the Katowice Climate Change Conference.

Matters Relating to the Global Stocktake: Discussions under this item focused on identifying the sources of input for, and developing the modalities of, the global stocktake established by Agreement Article 14. Negotiations were co-facilitated by Xolisa Ngwadla (South Africa) and Outi Honkatukia (Finland).

Informal consultations proceeded on the basis of the Co-Chairs’ tool. Delegates worked to clarify options, ensure all parties’ views were reflected, and streamline the tool. Parties shared proposals on how to advance work on a draft negotiating text. Several groups suggested ways to consider insights from the round table on interlinkages and improve coordination with other APA agenda items. Others suggested that streamlining the tool would provide needed clarity on how inputs from other APA items will feed into the stocktake. A developing country expressed concern that equity is insufficiently reflected across the tool’s various elements. A developed country, supported by others, emphasized that incorporating equity should not “over-complicate” the stocktake process.

A first iteration of the Co-Chairs’ tool was issued, and supported by parties. Delegates discussed sources of information for the stocktake, with some supporting a paragraph that builds on the sources identified in Decision 1/CP.21 (Paris Outcome), and a paragraph that lists other sources of information in a non-exhaustive way. A group of developing countries underscored that consensus is needed for any source to be included. On the management of sources, some identified roles for UNFCCC constituted bodies, while a group stressed that parties should manage the process.

On the modalities for the technical phase (Activity B), some questioned the utility of specifying Activity B's aim, while others noted value in specifying that it will be a technical assessment of progress. On equity, several developing countries supported references to the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities (CBDR-RC). One developing country group, supported by other developing countries, called for only referring to equity indicators, which one country described as quantitative proxies for principles or criteria, such as distribution of the global carbon budget. Several developed countries said that equity should not be a stand-alone part of Activity B.

On overarching elements of modalities, several parties said that although the proposed guiding questions in the Co-Chairs' tool are identical to those considered under the Talanoa Dialogue, the global stocktake should not replicate the Dialogue. A developed country said the tool should have a "much lighter touch" because the Paris Agreement already covers much of what is needed. She proposed deleting the majority of paragraphs on overarching elements of modalities.

A second iteration of the Co-Chairs' tool was prepared, and welcomed by delegates. A developing country group expressed concern about the active participation of non-party stakeholders in the global stocktake and suggested that non-party stakeholder participation should take place in a separate forum. Regarding input from other UN bodies to the stocktake, the group also suggested inclusion of a caveat that these bodies "will respect" the UNFCCC process, noting that this respect is "currently in question."

A third and final iteration of the Co-Chairs' tool was issued. Parties welcomed the iteration as a basis for further work, and made suggestions to ensure all views were reflected in the text, as well as editorial remarks. Three developing country groups, supported by other developing countries, expressed discomfort with sources of input for the global stocktake being "information at a collective level," saying this is outside the mandate of the Paris Agreement and Decision 1/CP.21. They also questioned the use of brackets around some of the listed sources of input but not others. Co-Facilitator Ngwadla said delegates' views expressed in this session will be collected and compiled as part of the Co-Facilitators' report to the APA Co-Chairs. The third iteration of the Co-Chairs' tool was forwarded to the APA contact group on this basis.

Outcome: The outcomes of the informal consultations are captured in document [APA1.6.IN.i6.v3](#). Negotiations will continue at the Katowice Climate Change Conference.

Modalities and Procedures for the Effective Operation of the Committee to Facilitate Implementation and Promote Compliance: Agreement Article 15 establishes a mechanism, consisting of a committee, to facilitate implementation and promote compliance with the provisions of the Agreement. Discussions under this item were concerned with developing the modalities and procedures for the effective operation of the committee.

Negotiations were co-facilitated by Janine Felson (Belize) and Christina Voigt (Norway). Informal consultations proceeded on the basis of the Co-Chairs' tool. Delegates worked to clarify options, ensure all parties' views were reflected, remove duplications and synthesize similar options, and provide sufficient detail so that the results of the discussion could be turned into draft decision text.

One focus of discussions was which, if any, elements should be deferred for decision by the Committee itself in developing its

rules of procedure, rather than decided by CMA 1-3 in Katowice. Many supported leaving some elements to be decided later, although views diverged on which elements these should be. A developing country group suggested that the committee should have the discretion to develop its own rules of procedure, but proposed several guidelines that should bound this discretion. Other developing countries strongly opposed deferring decision on any elements of the tool, expressing concern about discarding two years of work on these elements.

Delegates exchanged views on initiation of consideration, process, sources of information, and measures and outputs. On process, many supported referring to "dialogues" or "consultations" rather than "hearings," stressing that the latter term is inconsistent with the committee's non-adversarial nature. Some developing country parties, opposed by other parties, advocated removing a requirement for parties to have made reasonable efforts to address non-compliance under existing arrangements, stressing access barriers for developing countries. A developing country party, opposed by several, suggested that assistance for participation and flexibility in timeframes should only apply to developing country parties.

On this basis, a first iteration of the Co-Chairs' tool was prepared, containing updated sections on initiation of consideration, process, scope, and measures and outputs. Parties welcomed this first iteration as a basis for further work, and provided comments to ensure all parties' views were reflected in the updated sections.

Parties exchanged views on: purpose, principles, and nature; functions; institutional arrangements; and scope. A developing country group, supported by many, suggested entirely deleting sections on: scope; functions; and purpose, principles, and nature. Another developing country group, supported by many, opposed. Several developed countries suggested replacing these sections with a restatement of Agreement Article 15.

Under institutional arrangements, views differed on what elements should be retained. Following informal consultations, consensus was reached on retaining text on the committee's composition, members, bureau, quorum requirements, decision-making procedure, and rules of procedure. Views diverged on whether other elements could be deferred, including term of office, resignation and replacement, frequency of meetings, open or closed meetings, electronic means of communication, reasoning, and conflict of interest.

A second iteration of the Co-Chairs' tool was issued, which delegates welcomed as a basis for further work. On systemic issues, views diverged on: modes of initiation; the scope of systemic issues; whether party involvement would be required in the committee's process on systemic issues; outputs; and the definition of systemic issues.

On what information should be contained in the committee's annual report to the CMA, views diverged. A developing country group, with a developed country, supported not including information on any decisions in cases of self-referral, while another developing country said the report should not name any party involved. Many developed countries supported not specifying any details on the information to be included.

A third iteration of the Co-Chairs' tool was issued, which delegates welcomed as containing all parties' views, while noting that disagreements remained on both format and substance. Delegates provided input to clarify options in the text, and highlighted areas where previous proposals had not been adequately reflected. A fourth and final iteration of the Co-Chairs'

tool was prepared on this basis, and forwarded to the APA contact group.

Outcome: The outcomes of the informal consultations are captured in document [APA1.6.IN.i7.4](#). Negotiations will continue at the Katowice Climate Change Conference.

Further Matters Related to Implementation of the Paris Agreement: Adaptation Fund: Discussions under this item focused on elaborating the governance and institutional arrangements, safeguards, and operating modalities for the Adaptation Fund to serve the Paris Agreement. Negotiations were co-facilitated by María del Pilar Bueno (Argentina) and Pieter Terpstra (Netherlands).

Reviewing the first iteration of the Co-Chairs' tool, groups and parties expressed their views on options under the various topics covered in the tool, including on:

- arrangements in the transition period, such as reporting requirements and funding arrangements;
- duration of transition;
- the composition of the Adaptation Fund Board (AFB);
- safeguards; and
- eligibility criteria.

Victor Viñas (Dominican Republic), Chair of the AFB, presented on the Fund's operating modalities, social and environmental safeguards, and recent enhancements. Parties asked Viñas, the Secretariat, and the interim trustee (the World Bank) about institutional arrangements that would allow the Fund to serve the Paris Agreement, including if the interim trustee could receive funding through a new financial mechanism. Parties requested that the AFB prepare a report on the legal consequences of different governance options.

On governance, parties clarified their views on timing, exclusivity, and the need for a transitional period. Several groups requested that the Co-Facilitators circulate a document that clearly reflects parties' separate submissions. On Board composition, a developing country expressed discomfort with the introduction of new concepts in the text, which he said lacked a clear rationale.

Discussing the need to explicitly include "no text" options under different headings, parties agreed to the implicit understanding that there is always the option not to include text. A developing country group requested that the Co-Facilitators undertake intersessional work to organize the Co-Chairs' tool in a way that illustrates how decisions will be logically sequenced, noting that it is difficult for small delegations to evaluate the consequences of particular approaches. The revised iteration of the Co-Chairs' tool was forwarded to the APA contact group.

Outcome: The outcomes of the informal consultations are captured in document [APA1.6.IN.i8.v3](#). Negotiations will continue at the Katowice Climate Change Conference.

Further Matters, except the Adaptation Fund: These discussions focus, *inter alia*, on issues that some parties consider relevant to the PAWP, but that are not covered under other PAWP agenda items.

Informal consultations were co-facilitated by APA Co-Chairs Baashan and Jo Tyndall (New Zealand), focusing on the five additional possible matters:

- Process for setting a new collective quantified goal on finance;
- Initial guidance by the CMA to the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism;
- Initial guidance by the CMA to the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) and the SCCF (Special Climate Change Fund);
- Guidance by the CMA on adjustment of existing NDCs; and

- Modalities for biennially communicating finance information on the provision of public financial resources to developing countries in accordance with Agreement Article 9.5.

On Agreement Article 9.5, parties' views diverged on the options in the APA Co-Chairs' tool, which specify either making a recommendation to the CMA or not doing so. Several developing country groups stressed the need for a decision, while several developed countries noted that the issue is sufficiently addressed under the SBI. Two groups introduced conference room papers (CRPs).

On setting a new quantified collective goal on finance, a developing country group, supported by three others, introduced a CRP that proposes initiating a process to consider, and approve by 2023, a new finance goal. Several developed country groups opposed the proposal, saying it is too early to decide on a process.

On initial guidance to the operating entities of the financial mechanism, and the LDCF and SCCF, groups disagreed on options for each item. Some underscored that no guidance is needed because the Standing Committee on Finance already has the mandate to provide guidance to the financial mechanism, LDCF, and SCCF. Other groups stressed that guidance is necessary.

On guidance on NDC adjustment (Agreement Article 4.11), a developed country group suggested that the APA recommend that the SBSTA consider the matter, for decision by CMA 3 in 2020.

In addition to the two CRPs on Agreement Article 9.5, parties also discussed a developing country's in-session submission that seeks confirmation that CMA 1-3 will "take up" loss and damage. Several developed countries said the matter is already under consideration by existing mechanisms and that there is no need for an additional recommendation.

Following two countries' concerns that changes would be incorporated into the Co-Chairs' tool without discussion, parties agreed that the revised tool will capture progress made during the session and that the entire text will be bracketed.

Outcome: The outcomes of the informal consultations are captured in document [APA1.6.IN.i8.v3](#). Negotiations will continue at the Katowice Climate Change Conference.

Closing: During the closing session of the APA contact group, parties discussed progress made and the APA's draft conclusions.

Reflecting on progress made, APA Co-Chair Tyndall said that some issues had advanced to more detailed discussions while, for other issues, strongly held positions still need to be resolved.

On guidance related to the mitigation section of NDCs, Co-Facilitator Chea reported that, despite parties' efforts, it was not possible to reflect discussions from this session in a new iteration of the tool. Co-Chair Tyndall stated that a revised version of the tool would be issued only to reinstate concepts under the features section that were inadvertently omitted in the first version.

On adaptation communication guidance, Co-Facilitator Cordano reported that parties had expressed readiness to work from the second iteration of the tool. He noted that further work remains to fully reflect options, and that options are not necessarily exclusive.

On the transparency framework, Co-Facilitator Rakestraw reported that parties had agreed to forward a revised tool to the APA, which he said would include a caveat around brackets. He said that the contents of the tool reflect progress, but not consensus.

On the global stocktake, Co-Facilitator Ngwadla presented the third and final iteration of the Co-Chairs' tool, noting that

the Co-Facilitators will submit a note containing corrections and minimal additions to the tool.

On the committee to facilitate implementation and promote compliance, Co-Facilitator Coye-Felson reported that the fourth iteration of the Co-Chairs' tool had been released.

On issues related to the Adaptation Fund, Co-Facilitator del Pilar Bueno noted that parties had begun streamlining text and had transitioned into developing legal language and decision text, but that more work was needed. She reported the release of a second iteration of the Co-Chairs' tool, which she said contained progress on concrete options.

On further matters except the Adaptation Fund, Co-Chair Baashan noted that delegates had discussed all five additional matters and an in-session submission on loss and damage. She said three iterations of the Co-Chairs' tool had been issued.

On the draft APA conclusions, Co-Chair Tyndall said the APA, SBI, and SBSTA will prepare three identical documents. She outlined the content of the conclusions, highlighting that they mandate the Co-Chairs to prepare a joint reflections note addressing progress made to date and identifying ways forward, including textual proposals that would be helpful for advancing parties' deliberations. She underlined that the Co-Chairs recognize the need to work towards a comparable level of progress on all PAWP items.

In the ensuing discussion, Gabon, for the African Group, outlined their views on several agenda items, noting, *inter alia*, that parties should have a chance to provide submissions, that the sub-items under the possible additional matters should be listed in the annex to the conclusions, and that no parallel negotiations on the mitigation section of NDCs and the transparency framework should be held at APA 1-7 in Katowice.

Switzerland, for the Environmental Integrity Group (EIG), underlined that the scale of work may require parallel sessions and said that new submissions are not needed. Gabon, for the African Group, recalled that parties have the right to submit their views at any time.

Australia and the US noted that parties at COP 23 had agreed how to reflect the issues discussed under possible additional matters. Co-Chair Tyndall recalled that the annotated agenda reflects this agreement.

China suggested that, in preparing the joint reflections note, the Co-Chairs follow the same guidance and procedures as provided under their previous mandate to prepare the Co-Chairs' tool.

Switzerland, for the EIG, stressed that a draft legal text would be the best tool to assist parties in their deliberations in Katowice.

Parties engaged in a lengthy discussion on how to reflect possible additional matters in the annex to the draft conclusions. The issue was resolved when parties accepted Co-Chair Tyndall's suggestion to list each of the five possible additional matters in a footnote to the annex, which would also acknowledge that parties have expressed different views on whether the possible additional matters should be added to the PAWP.

Outcome: The APA plenary adopted the conclusions (FCCC/APA/2018/L.4). Co-Chair Baashan noted no financial implications of the decisions. The APA also adopted the report of the session (FCCC/APA/2018/L.3).

Subsidiary Body for Implementation

On Tuesday, 4 September, SBI Chair Emmanuel Dlamini (eSwatini) opened the resumed SBI session. Noting the importance of leaving Bangkok with draft negotiating text, he indicated he would meet with groups and heads of delegation to identify possible ways forward on key issues. The SBI adopted

the agenda for this session (FCCC/SBI/2018/10) and agreed to the organization of work. The following PAWP items were then referred to informal consultations:

- Common timeframes for NDCs;
- Development of modalities and procedures for the operation and use of a public registry referred to in Paris Agreement Article 4.12 (NDC registry);
- Development of modalities and procedures for the operation and use of a public registry referred to in Paris Agreement Article 7.12 (adaptation communication registry);
- Adaptation Committee's report, together with matters relating to the Least Developed Countries (LDCs), for joint consideration with the SBSTA;
- Scope of and modalities for the periodic assessment of the Technology Mechanism;
- Identification of the information to be provided by parties in accordance with Paris Agreement Article 9.5; and
- Modalities, work programme, and functions under the Agreement of the forum on response measures, convened jointly with the SBSTA.

Joint informal consultations on the registry/-ies for NDCs and adaptation communication also convened.

Common Timeframes for NDCs: Discussions on this item focused on the common frequency by which parties update or communicate their NDCs. Currently, those parties with a 5-year NDC are requested to communicate by 2020 a new NDC and those parties with a 10-year NDC are requested to communicate or update their NDC by 2020. Agreement Article 4.10 requires common timeframes for NDCs to be considered.

Negotiations were co-facilitated by Marianne Karlsen (Norway) and George Wamukoya (Kenya). In informal consultations, parties requested the Co-Facilitators to prepare a paper to guide discussions that included, among other issues:

- links between common timeframes, and the NDC and global stocktake cycles;
- options for the length of timeframes;
- the date when the common timeframes would start; and
- the distinction between common timeframes and common implementation timelines.

When the Co-Facilitators presented the first iteration of a document, consisting of a list of bullet points, parties could not agree whether it formed a starting point for negotiations. One group underscored that developed countries should apply common timeframes, while developing countries should have more flexibility. Several developed and developing countries objected to the option of multiple common timeframes, noting that a single common timeframe is needed to ensure the global stocktake's effectiveness.

During discussions of the revised bullets, one developing country group requested that the revised bullets reflect their proposal that flexibility should apply to the timeframes. A developed country group and a developing country argued that the Paris Agreement does not allow for flexibility in common timeframes.

On procedural issues, a developing country group requested adding that COP 24 may adopt procedural conclusions, and suggested that resolution of this issue may not be necessary as part of the PAWP. A developing country requested including an option for a decision at CMA 1-3 in Katowice on this matter, and characterized a decision on common timeframes as an "integral" part of the PAWP.

At the request of a developing country group, the entire text was bracketed. Two other developing country groups expressed

disappointment with the outcome. The text was forwarded to the SBI.

Outcome: The outcomes of the informal consultations are captured in document [SBI48.2.IN.i5](#). Negotiations will continue at the Katowice Climate Change Conference.

Development of Modalities and Procedures for the Operation and Use of a Public Registry Referred to in Paris Agreement Article 4.12 (NDC Registry): Agreement Article 4.12 states that NDCs shall be recorded in a public registry maintained by the Secretariat. Discussions under this item focused on developing modalities and procedures for the registry's operation and use.

Negotiations were co-facilitated by Tosi Mpanu-Mpanu (Democratic Republic of the Congo) and Peer Stiansen (Norway). In informal consultations, parties reviewed one iteration of the informal note first prepared at SB 47, in 2017. A developing country group suggested removing references to the registry having a search function.

Several developing countries expressed concern about a perceived difference in pace between negotiations on this item and on the registry under Agreement Article 7.12 (adaptation communication registry).

On Sunday, parties agreed to forward the informal note to the SBI plenary.

Outcome: The outcomes of the informal consultations are captured in document [SBI48.2.IN.i6](#). Negotiations will continue at the Katowice Climate Change Conference.

Development of Modalities and Procedures for the Operation and use of a Public Registry Referred to in Paris Agreement Article 7.12 (Adaptation Communication Registry): Discussions under this item focused on developing modalities and procedures for the operation and use of the public registry where adaptation communication shall be recorded under Agreement Article 7.12.

Negotiations were co-facilitated by Mpanu-Mpanu and Stiansen. In informal consultations, parties reviewed a new iteration of the informal note first prepared at SB 47 in 2017, as well as a draft outlining elements of this agenda item. Some countries noted a link between this agenda item and discussions on a registry under Article 4.12, if NDCs are the vehicle for adaptation communication. Others noted the "unique" challenge that there are multiple vehicles for adaptation communication, including NDCs, national adaptation plans, and national communications.

Outcome: The outcomes of the informal consultations are captured in document [SBI48.2.IN.i7_1](#). Negotiations will continue at the Katowice Climate Change Conference.

Registry/-ies for NDCs and Adaptation Communication: On Friday, joint informal consultations were held between the two groups negotiating registry/ies. The SBI Chair explained the mandate for the group, namely a single joint meeting with no follow-up or outcome. He said that the meeting should avoid the one or two registry/-ies debate and only discuss the questions previously agreed in his consultations:

- On modalities: are there any commonalities in the technical design requirements? What is the possible structure of the tabular format?
- On functions: is a search function needed?
- On submitting: how are the documents going to be managed?

Many groups and countries observed that adaptation communication can be transmitted through several vehicles that have their own registries. One developing country group supported creating only an NDC registry, which can include

adaptation communication incorporated in NDCs. Another developing country group underlined that having two registries ensures parity between mitigation and adaptation.

On whether the registry/-ies should be searchable, which was an issue discussed in both the NDC registry and adaptation communication registry agenda items, several groups and countries supported a search function. Two groups opposed, with one suggesting that including a search function could prejudice negotiations on the content of NDCs and adaptation communication by focusing the search on pre-determined categories of information.

Outcome: The two groups called for joint informal consultations at COP 24.

Report of the Adaptation Committee and Matters Related to LDCs: Discussions under these items focused on requests to the Adaptation Committee regarding the nature and substance of its reporting and workplan, and on various issues of importance to LDCs, including financial support, capacity building, and the LDC Expert Group.

Negotiations were co-facilitated by Gabriela Fischerova (Slovakia) and Pepetua Latasi (Tuvalu). Parties worked largely in informal informal consultations to turn the informal notes from SB 48-2 into draft decision text. The final draft text, which is heavily bracketed, contains options on:

- Recognizing the adaptation efforts of developing countries;
- Reviewing the work of adaptation-related institutional arrangements under the Convention;
- Considering methodologies for assessing adaptation needs;
- Facilitating the mobilization of adaptation support; and
- Reviewing the adequacy and effectiveness of adaptation and support.

In informal consultations on Saturday, parties agreed to forward the draft decision text to the SBSTA and SBI Chairs as a basis for negotiation in Katowice.

Outcome: The outcomes of the informal consultations are captured in document [SB48.2.DT.SB_i11&12-SBSTA_i4](#). Negotiations will continue at the Katowice Climate Change Conference.

Development and Transfer of Technologies: Scope and Modalities for the Periodic Assessment of the Technology Mechanism in Relation to Supporting the Paris Agreement: Discussions under this item are focused on elaborating the scope of and modalities for the periodic assessment of the effectiveness of the Technology Mechanism, established under paragraph 117 of Decision 1/CP.16 (Cancun Agreements), in supporting the implementation of the Paris Agreement on matters relating to technology development and transfer.

Informal consultations were co-facilitated by Ian Lloyd (US) and Claudia Octaviano (Mexico). Delegates provided input on the periodic assessment's modalities. Views diverged, *inter alia*, on whether:

- the periodic assessment should be preceded by a pre-implementation assessment;
- an independent expert group is needed;
- the assessment's timing should be aligned with the global stocktake; and
- the global stocktake's outcomes should be a source of information for the periodic assessment.

Parties also disagreed on whether IPCC reports should be a source of information. Some said the sources should be as wide as possible, while others observed that the IPCC reports do not contain information on the Technology Mechanism's functioning.

Parties also discussed whether and how the periodic assessment should relate to the review of the Climate Technology Centre and Network. Delegates mandated the Co-Facilitators to convert the informal note into draft text, accompanied by a short procedural draft decision.

Outcome: The outcomes of the informal consultations are captured in document [SBI48.2.DT.i14a](#). Negotiations will continue at the Katowice Climate Change Conference.

Matters Related to Climate Finance: Identification of the Information to be Provided by Parties in Accordance with Agreement Article 9.5: Discussions under this item were concerned with identifying the information to be provided under Agreement Article 9.5. Under this article, developed country parties shall biennially communicate indicative quantitative and qualitative information related to Agreement Articles 9.1 and 9.3, which provide that:

- developed country parties shall provide financial resources to assist developing country parties with respect to both mitigation and adaptation; and
- developed country parties should continue to take the lead in mobilizing climate finance.

Informal consultations were co-facilitated by Edmund Mortimer (Australia) and Seyni Nafo (Mali). Co-Facilitator Mortimer clarified that paragraph numbers had been added to the informal note to facilitate discussion but it remained otherwise unaltered from SBI 48-1. Parties accepted the note as a basis for discussion. Some countries advocated deleting duplications, streamlining, and adding structure to the note. Other parties opposed deletions and said that adding structure at this stage would constrain discussion.

Co-Facilitator Nafo presented three questions to guide work towards draft decision text:

- what textual elements should be included in draft conclusions, and what should be included in a possible annex;
- how to better structure information in the informal note; and
- what information is relevant to fulfilling the provisions of Agreement Article 9.5.

Many countries expressed interest in learning more about the concept of “partnership” previously proposed by a developed country. A developing country stressed that while partnerships are important, Article 9.5 is “about financial resources.” The country that proposed the concept disagreed, arguing that forms of support such as capacity building and technology transfer cannot be captured in cash flows.

A developing country group suggested that the informal note include a reference to a “built-in review process” that will consider whether information is sufficiently robust, and how it will inform the global stocktake and transparency framework. A developed country group expressed a strong preference to focus at this stage on the types of information to be biennially communicated under Article 9.5.

Reporting on informal consultations, a developing country group said that parties were unable to agree on summary conclusions or procedural steps towards a draft negotiating text. They accepted a revised version of the Co-Facilitators’ informal note, with the understanding that it does not substantively change the annexes from the previous version, which contains parties’ submissions.

Outcome: The outcomes of the informal consultations are captured in document [SBI48.2.IN.i15fv](#). Negotiations will continue at the Katowice Climate Change Conference.

Impact of the Implementation of Response Measures: Modalities, Work Programme, and Functions under the Agreement of the Forum on the Impact of the Implementation of Response Measures: Discussions under this item are focused on elaborating the modalities, work programme and functions of the forum on the impacts of the implementation of response measures. The mandate of the existing forum ends at COP 24, and the new forum will serve the Paris Agreement.

A contact group and informal consultations were co-chaired by Andrei Marcu (Panama) and Nataliya Kushko (Ukraine), who prepared a revision of their informal note of 8 May 2018 as a basis for discussions. In the course of the week the Co-Chairs produced two more iterations of the informal note. Parties agreed to forward the third iteration of the note to the SBSTA and SBI Chairs.

On modalities, parties differed on whether there should be intersessional meetings; whether to constitute a technical expert group as a permanent body, as an *ad hoc* body, or not at all; and whether the forum should operate as a permanent executive committee established under the CMA. On the work programme, parties debated whether to outline the programme in detail in the COP 24 decision, or whether to elaborate details as part of ongoing work, with some arguing that it was premature to elaborate details before the mandated review of the improved forum, which will take place in Katowice. Several developing country groups argued for a detailed work programme that includes work on international trade and investment, and value chain integration. Some developed country parties opposed, arguing for a work programme that simply reiterates the areas of focus for the improved forum: economic diversification and just transition. The discussions on function revealed a similar divergence on whether to elaborate in detail at this point or to keep options open with a broader description.

Outcome: The outcomes of the contact group are captured in document [SB48.2.DT.SBI_17b-SBSTA_9b](#). Negotiations will continue at the Katowice Climate Change Conference.

Closing: During the SBI closing plenary, SBI Chair Dlamini asserted that parties had reached their objective for the session. He said that in most cases there were clear and streamlined options, while on certain agenda items parties had made even more progress, and on others parties continue to engage.

The Co-Facilitators for each agenda item reported back on progress. On common timeframes for NDCs, Dlamini reported that the output for this item was a list of bullet points, which did not represent agreed views.

On the public registry under Agreement Article 4.12 (NDC registry), Co-Facilitator Stiansen thanked the SBI Chair for efforts to organize a joint meeting of the two registry negotiating groups, and reported that the group had produced an iteration of the previous informal note.

On the public registry under Agreement Article 7.12 (adaptation communication), Stiansen stated that numerous informal consultations had helped to achieve progress, and that an iteration of the previous informal note had been produced.

On the report of the Adaptation Committee and matters related to LDCs, Co-Facilitator Latasi characterized the roundtable of linkages very helpful, and a draft decision text had been produced.

On the periodic assessment of the Technology Mechanism, Co-Facilitator Octaviano reported that a draft text was produced that includes annexed draft scope and modalities of the periodic assessment.

On developed countries' biennial *ex-ante* financial communication, Co-Facilitator Mortimer reported that the informal note had been streamlined and parties had identified elements that can be easily turned into decision language.

On response measures, SBI Chair Dlamini reported that the final iteration of the text contains draft elements of a CMA decision.

In closing, SBI Chair Dlamini urged parties to make progress, stating: "Knowing is not enough; we must apply. Being willing is not enough; we must do."

Outcome: The SBI adopted its report (FCCC/SBI/2018/L.18).

Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice

On Tuesday, 4 September, SBSTA Chair Paul Watkinson (France) opened the session. Noting uneven and insufficient progress, he pledged to work with the SBI and APA Chairs to ensure comparable progress on all items. He expressed hope that delegates would manage to consider at least one, and perhaps two, iterations of text on SBSTA items at the Bangkok meeting. The SBSTA adopted the meeting's agenda (FCCC/SBSTA/2018/5) and agreed to the organization of work. The following items were referred to contact groups or informal consultations:

- Report of the Adaptation Committee, for joint consideration with the SBI;
- Technology framework under Agreement Article 10.4;
- Modalities, work programme, and functions under the Agreement of the forum on response measures, for joint consideration with the SBI;
- Matters relating to Agreement Article 6 (market and non-market approaches); and
- Accounting of financial resources provided and mobilized through public interventions under Agreement Article 9.7.

Report of the Adaptation Committee: This item is summarized under the SBI on page 8.

Development and Transfer of Technologies: Technology Framework under Article 10.4 of the Paris Agreement:

Discussions under this item focused on elaborating the technology framework under Agreement Article 10.4, established to provide overarching guidance to the work of the Technology Mechanism. Informal consultations were co-facilitated by Carlos Fuller (Belize) and Mette Møglestue (Norway).

Parties considered an updated draft technology framework produced by the Co-Facilitators as mandated at SBSTA 48-1. A developed country party said that the framework should reflect balance across all stages in the technology cycle—including promoting deployment and dissemination of existing innovative technology—rather than focus on research and development. Views diverged on whether to refer to "goals," "aims," or "objectives" of the Paris Agreement.

Parties discussed what "structure" means in the context of the technology framework. They expressed approval of the Co-Facilitators' understanding that this involves questions of how the technology framework guides the Technology Mechanism and how the framework can be operationalized.

Consensus could not be reached on whether the Technology Mechanism's proposed implementation actions should take into account the specific needs and special circumstances of all countries, or only of developing countries. Many developing countries stressed the need to account for their special circumstances, saying the Technology Mechanism is intended to respond to developing country needs. Many developed countries opposed, noting that the Technology Mechanism serves

the Paris Agreement and all countries have special needs and circumstances.

On implementation of technology transformation, a developing country group proposed that the Technology Mechanism should provide guidance for establishing: targets, timelines, transformation metrics, and monitoring and reporting. The proposal was bracketed. Discussions also focused on, *inter alia*, the promotion of "endogenous technologies," and whether to specifically refer to the Paris Committee on Capacity-building given that its future has not been decided.

A developing country group, supported by many other developing countries, proposed new text providing that the Technology Mechanism should recognize the importance of rapidly accelerating the transformational changes to shift towards climate resilience and low emissions development. Developed countries indicated more time was needed to digest the proposal, and suggested to keep it in brackets.

Outcome: The outcomes of the informal consultations are captured in document [SBSTA48.2.DT.i5](#). Negotiations will continue at the Katowice Climate Change Conference.

Response Measures: This item is summarized under the SBI on page 9.

Matters Relating to Article 6 under the Paris Agreement: Discussions under this item aimed at operationalizing three types of market and non-market mechanisms under the Paris Agreement: a cooperative mechanism for transfers between countries of internationally transferred mitigation options (ITMOs); a mechanism for allowing private sector parties to generate and sell emission reduction units; and a non-market mechanism.

A contact group and informal consultations were co-chaired by Kelley Kizzier (EU) and Hugh Sealy (Barbados). Starting from their informal notes from SB 48-1, which covered each agenda sub-item separately, the Co-Facilitators produced three further iterations of each in the course of the week. The Co-Chairs worked to sort items in the informal note into those essential for operationalizing the PAWP, and those that could be delegated to further elaboration post-COP 24. Parties noted the need to achieve outcomes that showed balanced progression across all three sub-items.

Guidance on Cooperative Approaches referred to in Article 6.2: Discussion under this sub-item focus on accounting and reporting, and the necessary flow of events in the course of a cooperative approach.

On *ex-ante* reporting, parties disagreed on whether there was a mandate for rules to limit participation in cooperative approaches, such as eligibility requirements. Some argued for requirements that ensured environmental integrity and sustainable development, while others argued that sustainable development is a nationally determined parameter.

On *ex-post* reporting, there was discussion on how to link reporting to existing biennial and end-of-NDC reporting, and what the trigger should be for corresponding adjustment. There was discussion of how to handle vintage ITMOs, with some suggesting that activities would need to occur within the NDC target period. Some argued for metrics that encompassed all types of mitigation outcomes while others argued for the use of CO₂ equivalents. Some parties argued for cooperative mechanisms to involve a share of proceeds and overall mitigation in global emissions (OMGE), so as not to disadvantage the Agreement Article 6.4 mechanism, while others countered that these features are not part of the Agreement's mandate.

Parties also discussed whether the technical expert review referred to in Agreement Article 13 should be carried out by a dedicated Agreement Article 6 body, or by the review body constituted under Article 13.

Outcome: The outcomes of the contact group are captured in document [SBSTA48.2.DT.i12a](#). Negotiations will continue at the Katowice Climate Change Conference.

Rules, Modalities, and Procedures for the Mechanism

Established by Article 6.4: Discussion under this sub-item focused on the mechanism's design. Parties differed on whether the mechanism is legally embedded in Article 6.2, with some suggesting that Article 6.4 transactions should follow the Article 6.2 accounting and reporting guidelines when any international transfer occurs that is credited toward an NDC.

Parties disagreed on whether national baselines were required, with some arguing that since Article 6.4 transactions will be between private sector actors and buyers, the focus should rather be on additionality.

Parties differed on whether the mechanism should involve activities from outside parties' NDCs. They also diverged on how to ensure OMGE, with some proposing a share of units to be retired, while others argued that current practice under the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM), such as conservative baselines and limited crediting periods, ensured OMGE.

On transition, some parties argued that the CDM bodies and institutions (e.g., CDM Executive Board, the body of methodologies) should be adopted as models, and that existing units (e.g., certified emission reductions) should have validity under the mechanism, as a way to maintain private sector trust. Others countered that the mechanism should simply draw lessons from those bodies and institutions, since it has distinct requirements and involves activities occurring in all parties. They argued that Kyoto Protocol units should have no validity under the mechanism, as this would erode the ambition of parties' NDCs.

Parties also discussed in some detail the composition and rules of procedure for a supervisory body, and many urged that these should be decided by parties in the PAWP rather than be left to the body itself to elaborate. Some suggested a supervisory body that spans all of Agreement Article 6, while others argued for a body specific to the mechanism.

Outcome: The outcomes of the contact group are captured in document [SBSTA48.2.DT.i12b](#). Negotiations will continue at the Katowice Climate Change Conference.

Work Programme under the Framework for Non-Market

Approaches Referred to in Article 6.8: Discussion under this sub-item focused on design of the work programme, and how to achieve parity of results across the three sub-items when there was still an agreed need for more conceptual clarity on non-market approaches. Many parties urged elaborating a clear outline of the steps involved and timeline in implementing the work programme. The draft decision includes options for activities aimed at:

- identifying existing non-market approaches;
- exploring linkages and synergies;
- identifying ways to enhance linkages and synergies, and opportunities to facilitate coordination and implementation of non-market approaches; and
- assessment of results, and recommendations to the CMA.

On modalities, options discussed included workshops, technical reports and syntheses, public web-based platforms, and party and non-party submissions. Many parties urged a work programme that would elaborate greater detail after a period

of increased discussion and learning, with one noting that it had taken eight years for the idea of Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation in developing countries (REDD+) to be understood and incorporated into the UNFCCC.

Outcome: The outcomes of the contact group are captured in document [SBSTA48.2.DT.i12c](#). Negotiations will continue at the Katowice Climate Change Conference.

Modalities for Accounting of Financial Resources Provided and Mobilized through Public Interventions under Article

9.7 of the Agreement: Discussions under this item focused on elaborating the modalities for the accounting of financial resources provided and mobilized through public interventions in accordance with Agreement Article 9.7.

Informal consultations were co-facilitated by Delphine Eyraud (France) and Seyni Nafo (Mali). Starting from their informal notes from SB 48-1, the Co-Facilitators produced three further iterations of each in the course of the week.

Parties discussed a submission by a developing country group and another submission by several developed countries. They mandated the Co-Facilitators to merge the two submissions into a "hybrid text" that moves towards decision text. Several parties urged the Co-Facilitators to be mindful of how draft decision text will fit into placeholders under APA item 5 (transparency framework).

Parties accepted the revised "hybrid" text as a basis of negotiation, on the condition that every paragraph would be bracketed. Under assumptions, definitions, and methodologies, several developing country groups expressed concern about proposals to expand the scope of parties that report on finance. Several countries also stressed the importance of retaining references to finance being "new and additional." A developed country group, supported by a developed country, stressed that, for regional projects, it is operationally impossible to identify and report funding disbursed per country.

A second revision of the draft text incorporated submissions from six groups and countries. Parties provided clarifications and added text, with several countries requesting a clear numbering scheme to facilitate negotiations. A developing country group expressed concern that some existing reporting parameters are bracketed in the text, and urged parties not to "backslide" on enhanced accounting. Another developing country group suggested that the Co-Facilitators verify that elements of the draft text conform to Agreement Articles 9 (finance) and 13 (transparency framework). A developing country group stressed that the text will not "automatically" transfer to APA agenda item 5 (transparency framework).

In the last session, Co-Facilitator Nafo presented the final iteration of the draft negotiating text and, noting that the text had been reduced from sixty to six pages, commended the group on its progress. Switzerland, supported by Norway, the European Union (EU), and Belize, for the Independent Association of Latin America and the Caribbean (AILAC), proposed a joint session between SBSTA and APA Agenda Item 5 (transparency framework) at COP 24, stressing the need for coherence. Several countries also suggested "spin-off" groups run in parallel to the joint session. Saudi Arabia, for the Group of 77 and China (G-77/China), said the group would accept the draft text as a basis for negotiations on the understanding that parties could present new ideas in Katowice. Co-Facilitator Nafo agreed to convey the proposal for a joint session to the Presiding Officers of SBSTA and APA.

Outcome: The outcomes of the informal consultations are captured in document [SBSTA48.2.DT.i13_v3](#). Negotiations will continue at the Katowice Climate Change Conference.

Closing: In the closing plenary, SBSTA Chair Watkinson said parties had made good, albeit “perhaps not enough,” progress. The Co-Facilitators for each agenda item reported back on their work.

On the technology framework, Co-Facilitator Møglestue reported that parties had produced a draft text with elements of a draft CMA decision, with revised text on elements of a technology framework as an annex.

On market and non-market approaches, Co-Facilitator Sealy said that parties had produced three iterations of the informal notes for all three sub-items.

On accounting of financial resources provided and mobilized under Agreement Article 9.7, Co-Facilitator Eyraud reported that two iterations of the informal note had been produced.

Outcome: The SBSTA adopted its report (FCCC/SBSTA/2018/L.15).

Joint Closing Plenary

On Sunday, 9 September, SBI Chair Dlamini opened the floor for joint APA, SBI and SBSTA closing statements.

Egypt, for the G-77/China, lamented that progress remained uneven across the PAWP and that parties are not leaving Bangkok with a textual basis for negotiations. He expressed concern about “the attempt by some to undermine” the CBDR-RC principle, and stressed the need to move forward on finance and other means of implementation.

Australia, for the Umbrella Group, applauded broad progress made in Bangkok but pointed to a lack of advancement on specific items. He highlighted negotiations on guidance for NDCs in the context of mitigation, where he argued that a bifurcated approach “has no basis” in the Paris Agreement.

Republic of Korea, for the EIG, expressed concern about “insufficient and disappointing” progress in some areas. He underlined the need to focus on bridge-building proposals.

The EU stressed that while progress was uneven, many key issues did not require resolution in Bangkok. Noting a collective sense of urgency to advance progress, he supported informal work before COP 24 and encouraged the Presiding Officers to take a “bold step” in textual proposals.

Iran, for the Like-Minded Group of Developing Countries (LMDCs), lamented developed countries’ “repeated attempts” to renegotiate the Paris Agreement by “erasing differentiation” in negotiations on compliance, the transparency framework, and NDCs in the context of mitigation.

Ethiopia, for the LDCs, noted that it was crucial that interessional work delivers formal negotiating text by the start of COP 24.

Gabon, for the African Group, highlighted that adaptation and finance issues are cornerstones for a successful outcome and, on the way forward, quoted Henry Ford: “Coming together is a beginning; keeping together is progress; working together is success.”

Maldives, for the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS), emphasized the need for a COP decision on the Talanoa Dialogue, and said an omnibus decision on the PAWP would run the risk of progress on some agenda items being held back because other items are less evolved.

Expressing concern about lack of progress, Saudi Arabia, for the Arab Group, lamented that parties are attempting to renegotiate the Paris Agreement. He urged progress towards a

consolidated text, based on parties’ views, to produce an omnibus decision in Katowice.

South Africa, for BASIC (Brazil, South Africa, India and China), regretted that some parties had refused to engage on finance and technology issues, and had prevented his group’s views from being reflected as options in negotiating text. He emphasized that transparency arrangements cannot mean the replacement of existing reporting requirements in favor of a weaker reporting system.

Colombia, for AILAC, expressed deep concern that the current pace of work was too slow, and requested the Presiding Officers to give “decisive and strong” guidance. She announced that AILAC and the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) will be submitting a paper on how the Talanoa Dialogue can help realize more ambitious NDCs.

Brazil, for Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay, noted they had “expected a lot more” from Bangkok, and warned that parties were leaving themselves a lot of work for Katowice. On transparency, he called for no backsliding from current reporting arrangements, and said that new requirements should not set up developing countries for failure.

Palestine stressed that the PAWP should not depart from the principles of the Convention including CBDR-RC and equity, stating that “no country should be left behind.” Noting that loss and damage events occurred worldwide in 2018, he said “nobody is immune from the impacts of climate change.”

Indonesia expressed “deep concern” about the lack of progress on mitigation issues, and stressed the importance of recognizing parties’ diverse national circumstances, capacities, and capabilities in the PAWP.

The Philippines expressed concern over the uneven reflection of issues in the draft text, especially in relation to finance.

Turkey underlined that parties should adhere to Paris Agreement language, particularly regarding classification of countries.

Business and Industry NGOs called on parties to provide the political signals for businesses to invest in a low-carbon future.

For the Environmental NGOs, Climate Action Network recalled the hundreds of thousands who had protested a lack of climate action over the weekend, and said “real money for real action” was needed to instill trust in the process and unlock progress. Climate Justice Now! called for keeping fossil fuels in the ground, energy systems transformation, and an end to deforestation.

Indigenous Peoples stressed that the implementation guidelines must reflect a rights-based approach, and highlighted the importance of full and effective participation of indigenous peoples, including indigenous women, in Paris Agreement implementation.

Research and Independent NGOs urged delegates to consider the IPCC Special Report on 1.5°C in future talks, and stressed the importance of full and effective participation of non-state actors.

Trade Union NGOs regretted insufficient progress in integrating just transition into the PAWP, and urged a ministerial declaration in Katowice that addresses the issue.

Women and Gender lamented that too many agenda items seemed stalled and that loss and damage discussions had been absent. She urged developed countries to announce when and how they will provide new and additional finance.

Youth NGOs called for inclusion of civil society in the global stocktake and for Agreement Article 6 (market and non-market approaches) to be guided by the principles of equity

and environmental integrity. She urged the Polish Presidency to “lead by example” to facilitate a strong outcome in the Talanoa Dialogue.

The SBI, SBSTA and APA all closed at 7:57 pm. In closing, APA Co-Chair Tyndall declared: “Katowice, here we come!”

A Brief Analysis of the Bangkok Climate Change Conference

“Frankly, we are not ready,” declared COP 23 President Frank Bainimarama on the opening day of the Bangkok Climate Change Conference. Few disagreed. In 2016, riding the wave of momentum generated by the entry into force of the Paris Agreement, parties set themselves an ambitious two-year deadline to assemble the gears needed to kickstart the Agreement’s machinery. In December, parties will have to determine the operational details of how mitigation is measured, financing accounted, and transparency assured. Without agreement on these details and many others, they will not be able to build the trust and ambition needed to move towards the collective goal of limiting global temperature increase to well below 2°C.

Many delegates observed that this sense of being unprepared before a major deadline was reminiscent of the negotiations before both the Copenhagen and Paris conferences, only one of which ended in success. The Bangkok climate conference did not reveal if Katowice would lead to similar accomplishment or collapsed negotiations. Given the scope and complexity of the task, and the need to resolve enduring political differences, this brief analysis will consider the progress made in Bangkok and how it may shape outcomes at the rapidly-approaching COP 24 in Katowice, Poland.

Gearing Up

Parties arrived in Bangkok with a clear set of expectations. Recognizing progress that was uneven and “in every area insufficient,” the Chairs of the subsidiary bodies urged parties to reach an agreed basis for negotiations on all Paris Agreement Work Programme (PAWP) items. By the end of the week, the Chairs urged, they should produce text that clearly reflects their preferred options and provides enough detail to be turned into draft decisions to be adopted in Katowice. On the eve of negotiations, UNFCCC Executive Secretary Patricia Espinosa upped the ante, calling for official negotiating text by the conclusion of the week. In response to this call, a workmanlike manner pervaded the United Nations Conference Centre in Bangkok, with minimal distractions allowing some groups to meet for more than twenty hours during the session. But work ethic could only do so much to advance progress at this complex and deeply political stage of the negotiations. The Paris Agreement set the broad outlines of machinery that links mitigation and adaptation efforts, market solutions, financial support and technology transfer, and transparency and accountability mechanisms.

Not only must these gears work individually, they also must fit together coherently. The transparency framework, for example, is itself complex. It will ensure parties provide clear and consistent information on everything from their mitigation efforts to financial flows. While this information is essential to build trust and increase ambition, parties have different capacities and willingness to share. In addition to negotiating the technical details, parties must also consider if and how to include inputs from several other PAWP items. Similarly, the global stocktake gathers inputs from various parts of the machinery, still to be

determined, and the implementation and compliance committee may review how parties do their part to make the gears turn. With all these interlinking cogs, negotiations on one item may hinge on progress on another. With some parties calling for balanced progress across these components, disagreements over process have become as frequent as those over the technical details. As one seasoned negotiator explained, “In this process, process is substance.”

Grinding the Gears

Amidst these challenges, progress in Bangkok was, to the regret of many parties and observers, “still uneven.” Some noted, more optimistically, that the session was not intended to resolve issues, but rather to clearly establish negotiating positions and options. In this respect, there was some success. Parties left the Bonn session in May with several different types of text: informal notes organized under different headings and structures, conveying parties’ divergent views in differing formats. Bangkok brought some coherence to this textual chaos. Many groups significantly streamlined the text and options. Article 9.7 (on accounting modalities for provided finance), for example, started with 60 pages of text and finished work with six. In some cases, parties produced draft negotiating text with options that clearly outline parties’ differing positions. Nevertheless, the compilation text produced in Bangkok contains 307 pages, which is unwieldy but does offer the necessary foundation for negotiations in Katowice.

However, while the options are now more clearly identified, they reveal fundamental disagreement on many of the key issues. Discussions on mitigation and on the predictability of finance did not advance as far as other items, with some thinking they stalled completely. Throughout the process of clarifying their positions, parties reiterated that nothing was agreed, and indeed that agreement was not the mandate for the session. While the intersessional mandate to the Co-Chairs to prepare a joint reflections note that includes textual proposals is, in the words of one observer, “usefully broad,” some left Bangkok questioning if the task in Katowice is still too challenging. Parties will arrive with a large body of text and short time—potentially as little as only five days—to negotiate it down to an operational rulebook. Although many parties expressed willingness to engage informally in the coming months, and intersessional work is expected on the sidelines of the Global Climate Action Summit in California, the UN General Assembly, and the G20, it is not clear how work will further narrow down options before Poland, when pressure will be on negotiators to deliver the PAWP.

Throwing a Wrench in the Gears

While the task is technically daunting, in terms of its volume and complexity, familiar political disagreements underpin several key issues. It is these issues that could throw a wrench in the gears, potentially halting negotiations and threatening a successful outcome at COP 24. If resolved, on the other hand, these issues could grease the gears and unlock the PAWP.

Finance remains a perennial roadblock. Many were surprised how little finance features in the Paris Agreement. Yet, among those few provisions, one has become a flashpoint for lingering distrust between parties on “broken promises” over financial commitments. Article 9.5, which specifies that developed countries shall communicate quantitative and qualitative information related to the financial resources they intend to provide in the future, is under discussion in both the SBI and the APA. Under SBI, parties seek to identify the information to

be provided; under APA, parties aim to develop the modalities and processes to communicate this information. Developed countries prefer to start by identifying information, saying that it's important to know the "what" (the information) before the "how" (the modalities). Developing countries, most vocally the African Group, want to discuss both in parallel, underscoring how important it is to their planning to be able to predict what financial support, in what form, is on the horizon.

The result is deadlock. To highlight the importance of this issue, the African Group, supported by other developing countries, added references to Article 9.5 in other areas of the negotiations, most controversially in the transparency framework. Developed countries viewed the link between Article 9.5 and the transparency framework as "out of scope," because Article 9.5 is about providing information about future finance flows, and the transparency framework guides national reporting about past actions. Yet, by tying these issues together, a lack of resolution on Article 9.5 could result in parties stalling, or blocking, the realization of the transparency framework, potentially leading to the collapse in Katowice that some fear.

Another principal roadblock is also familiar: differentiation. This long-running debate centers on burden sharing in the collective effort to reduce emissions, given countries' different historical responsibilities for the problem and capacities to address it. The Convention reflects differentiation by delineating between Annex I (developed) and non-Annex I (developing) countries. Developed and developing countries disagree about how, or even whether, the Paris Agreement evolves this debate. The Agreement reflects differentiation in multiple ways, sometimes referring only to countries' capacities and drawing distinctions between different capacity levels among developing countries. In its provisions on mitigation and transparency, the Agreement is relatively vague on the expectations for some developing countries, particularly emerging economies. As countries write operational guidebooks for how to interpret and apply the Agreement's provisions, they must collectively clarify these ambiguities.

The Like-minded Developing Countries (LMDCs)—a coalition that includes many of these emerging economies, such as China, India, and Saudi Arabia—interpret this ambiguity by recalling the Convention's bifurcated approach. One area that the differentiation debate and need to interpret the Agreement crystallizes is on the scope of NDCs—the information that should be included countries' pledges to the collective effort. The LMDCs insist that NDCs are "full scope," which would mean that they include mitigation, adaptation, and finance and that developing countries should have flexibility on the degree to which each aspect is included. Developed countries, on the contrary, argue that the Paris Agreement anchors NDCs in its mitigation article, which they interpret to mean that NDCs are primarily a mitigation mechanism that could also include adaptation and finance. Currently these differing interpretations are holding up negotiation on several agenda items. At stake in these negotiations is the degree to which all major emitters, including key emerging economies, will contribute to mitigation.

Differentiation and finance have long been the wrenches in the gears of global climate action. Developing countries continue to call for new, additional, and predictable finance that will enable them to undertake sustainable development. Developed countries continue to demand broader participation in the mitigation effort and transparency of all countries' actions. In Katowice, parties will have to find a way to interpret deeply held political differences papered over by the Paris Agreement's

ambiguous language, while providing the guarantees for finance and assurances for wider participation in the mitigation and transparency effort. Given these disagreements have fueled tensions for at least two decades, the task for Katowice is indeed daunting.

Assembling the Machine in Katowice

How will these disparate, yet intimately linked, discussions come together? While parties undertook significant technical work in Bangkok, they did little to bring the PAWP into sharper focus. At this stage, there is lingering uncertainty over exactly what issues are in the PAWP. Parties have stocked an agenda drawn from the decision adopted in Paris with a number of additional items, such as setting a new collective finance goal or guidelines for countries when they adjust their NDCs, which they can use as leverage in the final phase of negotiation. The PAWP is as much a mandated work programme as it is a politically-constituted list of bargaining chips for negotiation. With less than three months until Katowice, parties have yet to even decide what they need to decide.

It is unclear how the larger parts of the PAWP machinery will fit together, and if and how the smaller gears will slot into place. Several were also unsure how these discussions would align, or compete for time, with the other issues at the COP, including the Talanoa Dialogue and the COP Presidency's desire for three political declarations on a just transition, forests, and electric mobility. Leaving with a ballooned 307-page compilation text, one delegate observed the "ritualistic" nature of these negotiations: the self-imposed deadlines, the posturing through adding issues, and the palpable sense that the machinery may break down. Looking up from the details and documentation, there may be a package in view that sets the main gears in place and creates processes to elaborate how they will function in the future. Whether that is enough to fulfill the Paris Agreement's aim to catalyze ambitious action is an open question. As one observer reminded, "every asterisk, every comma, has implications for those living with the effects of climate change."

Upcoming Meetings

Global Climate Action Summit: Convened by California Governor Jerry Brown and the US State of California, the Global Climate Action Summit will bring leaders from government, business, and the global community to inspire greater global ambition to act on climate change. The Summit is co-chaired by Governor Brown, UNFCCC Executive Secretary Patricia Espinosa, the UN Secretary-General's Special Envoy for Climate Action Michael Bloomberg, and Mahindra Group Chairman Anand Mahindra. **dates:** 12-14 September 2018 **location:** San Francisco, California, US **www:** <https://globalclimateactions summit.org/>

8th Meeting of the Executive Committee of the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage: The Executive Committee promotes the implementation of approaches to address loss and damage associated with climate change impacts. **dates:** 18-21 September 2018 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** loss-damage@unfccc.int **www:** <https://unfccc.int/7543>

Climate Week NYC 2018: Climate Week NYC will convene on the side of the opening of the UN General Assembly, and will gather representatives from businesses, governments, academic institutions, arts and music organizations, and NGOs for a variety

of panel discussions, concerts, exhibitions and seminars. **dates:** 24-30 September 2018 **location:** New York City, US **contact:** The Climate Group **email:** info@theclimategroup.org **www:** www.climateweeknyc.org/

17th Meeting of the Technology Executive Committee: The Technology Executive Committee will consider, among other matters, the implementation of its rolling workplan 2016-2018. **dates:** 25-28 September 2018 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** Technology Executive Committee **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** tec@unfccc.int **www:** <http://unfccc.int/ttclear/tec>

48th Session of the IPCC: The IPCC's 48th session will meet to approve the Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5 °C. **dates:** 1-5 October 2018 **location:** Incheon, Republic of Korea **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>

12th Meeting of the CTCN Advisory Board: The Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN) Advisory Board provides direction on the CTCN's fulfilment of the guidance provided by the COP to the UNFCCC. **dates:** 3-5 October 2018 **location:** Vienna, Austria **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** www.ctc-n.org/

32nd Meeting of the Adaptation Fund Board: The Adaptation Fund Board will meet to continue its work. **dates:** 9-12 October 2018 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat **phone:** +1-202-458-7347 **email:** afbsec@adaptation-fund.org **www:** www.adaptation-fund.org/

Private Investment for Climate Conference: The 2018 Green Climate Fund Private Investment for Climate Conference is the only global conference on private investment for climate, and is expected to bring key players from the private sector together to explore innovative ways of investing in climate activities. **dates:** 10-11 October 2018 **location:** Incheon, Republic of Korea **contact:** Green Climate Fund Secretariat **phone:** +82-32-458-6059 **fax:** +82-32-458-6094 **email:** info@gcfund.org **www:** <https://gcfconference.com/>

21st Meeting of the Green Climate Fund Board: The 21st meeting of the Board of the Green Climate Fund follows the 20th meeting of the Board, which convened from 1-4 July and failed to agree on a number of decisions. **dates:** 17-20 October 2018 **location:** Manama, Bahrain **contact:** GCF Office of Governance Affairs **phone:** +82-32-458-6038 **fax:** +82-32-458-6094 **email:** info@gcfund.org **www:** <https://www.greenclimate.fund/>

Pre-COP to the Katowice Climate Change Conference: The pre-COP will convene governments for political discussions in advance of the UN Climate Change Conference in December. Involvement of the private sector is also foreseen. **dates:** 24-27 October 2018 **location:** Krakow, Poland **contact:** Incoming COP 24 Presidency **email:** cop24@mos.gov.pl **www:** <http://cop24.gov.pl/>

19th Meeting of the Standing Committee on Finance: The UNFCCC Standing Committee on Finance assists the COP in exercising its functions in relation to the Financial Mechanism. **dates:** 29-31 October 2018 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** Standing Committee on Finance **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **email:** standingcommittee@unfccc.int **www:** <https://unfccc.int/event/nineteenth-meeting-of-the-standing-committee-on-finance-scf-19>

2018 CVF Virtual Climate Summit: The Climate Vulnerable Forum (CVF) will convene a global political leaders' summit to build increased support to safeguard those that are most vulnerable to the growing climate change impacts. Meeting ahead of UNFCCC COP 24, the Summit will serve to: highlight new national efforts; share perspectives on climate risks and opportunities to be gained by putting the world on a safer 1.5°C pathway in terms of health, jobs and other benefits, while building wider international support; and help ensure that the necessary resources and finance are delivered to make this possible. **date:** 22 November 2018 **location:** virtual **contact:** Marshall Islands CVF Presidency **phone:** +692-625-2233/3445 **fax:** +1 212 983 3202 **email:** info@thecvf.org **www:** <http://thecvf.org/virtual-leaders-summit-to-raise-climate-ambition-and-accelerate-action/>

101st Meeting of the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) Executive Board: The CDM Executive Board supervises the Kyoto Protocol's CDM under the authority of the CMP.

dates: 26-29 November 2018 **location:** Katowice, Poland **contact:** Clean Development Mechanism **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **email:** cdm-info@unfccc.int **www:** <http://cdm.unfccc.int/>

Katowice Climate Change Conference: The Katowice Climate Change Conference includes COP 24 to the UNFCCC, along with meetings of the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol, the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice and the Subsidiary Body for Implementation, and the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement. **dates:** 2-14 December 2018 **location:** Katowice, Poland **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** <https://unfccc.int/cop24/> and <http://cop24.katowice.eu/> and <http://cop24.gov.pl/>

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

Glossary

AILAC	Independent Association of Latin America and the Caribbean
APA	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group for the Paris Agreement
CBDR-RC	Common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CMA	Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement
COP	Conference of the Parties
EIG	Environmental Integrity Group
ICTU	Information to facilitate clarity, transparency, and understanding
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
LDCs	Least developed countries
NDCs	Nationally determined contributions
PAWP	Paris Agreement Work Programme
SBI	Subsidiary Body for Implementation
SBSTA	Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice
UNFCCC	UN Framework Convention on Climate Change