

## SB 36 AND AWG HIGHLIGHTS: WEDNESDAY, 23 MAY 2012

A number of contact groups and informal consultations were held under the SBI, SBSTA, AWG-KP, AWG-LCA and ADP throughout the day.

### CONTACT GROUPS AND INFORMAL CONSULTATIONS

**SHARED VISION (AWG-LCA):** The spin-off group on shared vision convened in the morning, open to observers.

Parties focused on identifying possible areas of convergence. Facilitator Ji said that the in-session workshop on equitable access to sustainable development could serve as a catalyst.

Botswana, for the AFRICAN GROUP, Uganda, for LDCs, CHINA, BRAZIL and others stressed the importance of the means of implementation. Some developing countries urged for a discussion on the context, whereas several developed countries said the focus should be on the global goal and peaking timeframe.

CHINA, supported by BRAZIL, requested that the importance of context be included in the Facilitator's report. JAPAN cautioned against duplication of work. MEXICO, the PHILIPPINES and others said that relevant contextual elements need to be defined. Trinidad and Tobago, for AOSIS, said that burden-sharing cannot be discussed without identifying the burden first.

**REVIEW (AWG-LCA):** In the spin-off group on Review, which was open to observers, parties addressed the expert consideration of inputs, and made proposals on the way forward.

JAPAN proposed an open-ended expert meeting format and called for avoiding duplicating the work of the IPCC. Trinidad and Tobago, for AOSIS, opposed by Botswana, for the AFRICAN GROUP, CHINA, BRAZIL and the PHILIPPINES, reiterated support for establishing an expert group, highlighting the guiding role that such a body could play. NORWAY said an expert body should support and inspire the review process.

CANADA, supported by the US and AUSTRALIA, proposed establishing a joint SBSTA/SBI contact group to allow for full deliberation of the Review.

On scope, SAUDI ARABIA, CHINA, the PHILIPPINES and the AFRICAN GROUP drew attention to Decision 2/CP.17 (Outcome of the work of the AWG-LCA), which stipulates that parties will continue working on the scope of the Review and consider its further definition. AOSIS and others questioned the value of expanding the scope of the Review.

**NUMBERS/TEXT (AWG-KP):** In the morning informal meeting of the spin-off group on numbers/text, a presentation was made regarding a third proposal on surplus units.

The presentation elaborated on aspects of the proposal, which, *inter alia*: addresses all banked units (Certified Emission Reductions, Emission Reduction Units and Assigned Amount Units); eliminates surplus for parties that have submitted second commitment period QELROs above their current emission levels; states that previous period surplus reserve units may only be used toward domestic compliance assessment; incentivizes QELROs that are below current emissions; and provides clear measurement points.

In the afternoon spin-off group, parties requested additional information on QELROs expressed in tons of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent, in addition to QELROs expressed as a percentage of emissions during a base year or period. A group of developing countries called for parallel treatment of QELROs under five- and eight-year commitment periods. Informal consultations continued.

**REDD+ (SBSTA):** In the morning contact group, Co-Chair Graham explained that agreement has been reached on SBSTA conclusions, including forwarding an annex with outstanding text for consideration in Doha that includes views by parties on MRV and national monitoring systems. He explained that parties consider drivers of deforestation and forest degradation as critical and that further discussion is needed. He highlighted issues that could not be properly addressed due to lack of time, including guidance and safeguards and guidance for forest reference levels and/or forest emission reference levels.

**REDD+ (AWG-LCA):** The spin-off group met in the morning and was open to observers.

AWG-LCA Chair Aysar Tayeb highlighted the importance of making progress under this issue. He said that the Secretariat will prepare a technical paper and efforts will be made to organize the REDD+ workshop before Doha, despite financing difficulties.

Parties then exchanged views on what they want to achieve in Doha, in particular what conditions are necessary for the financing of REDD+ results-based actions. Some countries preferred broader discussions, with some cautioning against the use of the word “conditions.” Key issues discussed included, *inter alia*: adaptation and other co-benefits of REDD+; availability of post-2012 finance for countries to implement REDD+; a new market mechanism for REDD+ third phase; fixing the gaps for supporting REDD+ during preparatory phases one and two; the configuration of a forest governance framework and its linkages with finance; whether to forward the work on finance to the SBI and the scope of that work; MRV of support; support of non-carbon activities; enhancing understanding of “results-based performance;” and interlinkages with discussions held in other groups, such as finance and various approaches.

**AWG-LCA CONTACT GROUP:** In the afternoon contact group, parties first addressed finance.

Many developing countries drew attention to the funding gap from 2013 to 2020, underscoring the need for scaling up finance and for ensuring new, additional and predictable funding. BANGLADESH proposed an incremental increase from 2013 to 2020. He also called for a balanced allocation between mitigation and adaptation. COLOMBIA suggested considering an intermediate funding target for the mid-term period. BARBADOS proposed an additional mid-term period of fast-start finance like commitments. He also indicated that the US\$100 billion per year of long-term finance would be “grossly inadequate” for assisting countries in adaptation.

The US noted that the 2020 finance goal was made in the context of meaningful mitigation action for 2020, questioning whether those parties calling for mid-term finance commitments would also take on mid-term mitigation commitments.

On technology, AWG-LCA Chair Tayeb outlined issues for discussion, including: IPRs; linkages between the technology and financial mechanisms; possible additional functions for the Technology Executive Committee (TEC) in evaluating environmental aspects of technology; and the relationship between the TEC and the Climate Technology Centre (CTC).

On response measures, AWG-LCA Chair Tayeb highlighted that further work is needed on “unilateral measures with global implications.” INDIA called for a spin-off group to address unresolved issues on response measures with clear timelines. He elaborated on discussions needed under the AWG-LCA and indicated that the statement, supported by several developing countries, would be delivered to the AWG-LCA Chair.

AUSTRALIA opposed a spin-off group, pointing to Decision 2/CP.17, which “consolidates all progressive discussions related to response measures under the Convention.” SAUDI ARABIA stressed that parties are working to complete and not consolidate work, and that he does not see a mandate for consolidation. The US explained that work in Durban was “painstakingly negotiated” and, supported by AUSTRALIA, the EU, NEW ZEALAND, MEXICO and AOSIS, opposed the proposal to establish a spin-off group.

### IN THE CORRIDORS

As the Bonn session began to draw to a close, several AWG-LCA and SBs groups started to wrap up as focus began to shift towards the way forward after Bonn.

Expectations for Doha seemed to be mixed as revealed in the afternoon open-ended informal consultations by the COP 18 and CMP 8 Presidency. Many interventions reflected the fear that the lack of progress and “procedural wrangling” in Bonn had put the Doha outcome in jeopardy. Some also questioned what the ADP would be able to report to the COP as even the seat reserved for the ADP Chair on the podium remained empty and agreement on an agenda was still pending as of Wednesday evening.

On the election of officers, an online announcement was made late in the afternoon that the COP 17 Presidency had informed regional group coordinators that the emerging consensus had fallen apart and in view of the “impasse, the only avenue left is an election of the officers of the ADP Bureau.” It was also initially announced that the ADP plenary would convene in the evening. The news caused excitement in the Maritim: “If a vote actually takes place, this will be the first time since the adoption of the Convention that such an event takes place.” Many began preparing for a long night, while hoping that a solution could be reached without resorting to a vote. Eventually, the ADP plenary was postponed until Thursday and uncertainty prevailed as to what the next day would bring.

Informal consultations on the ADP agenda were also held throughout the day and continued late into the evening based on a new proposal from the interim ADP Chair. “Thursday will be an interesting day,” speculated one delegate, adding: “My impression from the ADP discussions is that the dynamics of this process is changing and the majority of parties, both developed and developing, are gearing towards a new approach under the ADP that is no longer strictly based on the traditional distinctions between developed and developing countries, where common but differentiated responsibilities is at the core, as it has been in the past.”