



BONN CLIMATE CHANGE CONFERENCE: MONDAY, 8 JUNE 2015

On Monday, 8 June, the Bonn Climate Change Conference continued. In the morning, the ADP contact group took stock of progress and exchanged views on a draft decision 1/CP.21 (the Paris package). Facilitated groups on time frames, capacity building and technology convened in the afternoon, and on time frames, transparency and the preamble in the evening.

An SBI contact group took place in the morning, and informal consultations under the SBI and SBSTA convened throughout the day. In the morning, the second part of the 4th meeting of the Durban Forum on Capacity-building and an in-session workshop on gender-responsive climate policy with a focus on mitigation action and technology development and transfer met.

ADP

CONTACT GROUP: Stocktaking: ADP Co-Chair Ahmed Djoghlaif announced that work will continue in facilitated groups, noting consistency among groups will depend on the consistency of parties' requests.

Many parties welcomed the trust built during the first week, but raised concern over the negotiations' slow pace, with the EU and US highlighting that the Secretariat could have undertaken most of the editorial work.

Sudan, for the AFRICAN GROUP, underscored the need for clarity and further guidance on the mode of work, including promoting consistency across facilitated groups; identification of key themes and concepts; and a party-driven process.

Many parties, including the EU, South Africa, for the G-77/CHINA, and the Republic of Korea, for the EIG, suggested the ADP Co-Chairs produce a concise, coherent text with clear options to enable effective negotiations.

Saudi Arabia, for the ARAB GROUP, highlighted early production of a consolidated text as important to ensure reflection before the closure of the session. The UNITED ARAB EMIRATES (UAE) said the consolidated text by the ADP Co-Chairs should: retain all options; not change positions; and serve as the basis for negotiations during the next ADP session.

Maldives, for AOSIS, called for developing indicative milestones for upcoming sessions. Many parties noted the dwindling of negotiating days before Paris, with Angola, for the LDCs, requesting that negotiations begin immediately, and the US, with EGYPT, suggesting adding days to the ADP's next session.

While Chile, for AILAC, the US and the EU supported beginning discussions on identifying elements for the agreement or decision text, Malaysia, for the LMDCs, said it is premature. TUVALU, opposed by NORWAY, cautioned against "downgrading" sections of the text into COP decisions.

On criteria to identify decision text, AILAC, the US and the EU mentioned timing, and levels of detail and flexibility. NEW ZEALAND said the agreement should include elements that are durable and universal.

TANZANIA stressed all elements should be in the core agreement. SWITZERLAND said identifying elements for decision text is an evolving process, and the UAE suggested the ADP Co-Chairs make annotations of suggested placement in the revised text.

Structure for Decision 1/CP.21: Several parties said the decision should encompass: adoption of the 2015 agreement; interim arrangements; recognition of INDCs; guidance on implementation of the 2015 agreement; a work plan for the period 2015-2020; and budgetary and administrative matters. NORWAY added MRV and accounting systems.

The G-77/CHINA stressed progressing on a draft decision on workstream 2 (pre-2020 ambition). The LDCs emphasized, with CHINA and INDIA, that work under workstream 2 must "shift gears" from technical examination to concrete implementation.

Several members of the Umbrella Group noted their submission on elements of workstream 2, with the US identifying the role of non-state actors as an evolving element.

ADP Co-Chair Djoghlaif said the Co-Chairs would report back after meeting with the Secretariat and the co-facilitators to discuss how to produce a streamlined text as requested by parties.

FACILITATED GROUPS: Time Frames: Co-facilitator Roberto Dondisch presented a technical suggestion as a tool for a clearer section, containing two options. Option I comprises most of the text, with headings on: overarching issues; scope of commitments/contributions/actions; commitment period/time frames; communications; review; *ex ante* consideration/further facilitation of transparency and clarity/consultative process/period; and update. Option II contains South Africa's alternative proposal.

The EU, supported by the REPUBLIC OF KOREA, outlined a sequence in the mitigation cycle: a strategic review of implementation in the context of science; communication and commitments, involving the submission of NDCs; an *ex ante* process to gain an aggregate sense of NDCs in relation to the temperature goal; and the formalization of NDCs.

Colombia, for AILAC, outlined the sequence as: communication; *ex ante* assessment; formalization; review; and update of commitments/contributions. The MARSHALL ISLANDS suggested sections on: scope and nature; commitment period and time frame; preparatory and updating processes; inscription; and strategic review.

The EU, AUSTRALIA and the US emphasized making the five-year cycle clear. TUVALU, for the LDCs, called for parallel cycles for mitigation and means of implementation. The US said



the adaptation and mitigation cycles may be different. CHINA, with BRAZIL and SAUDI ARABIA, opposed a “mitigation-centric” approach.

The EU, opposed by the LDCs, suggested addressing the mitigation cycle in the mitigation section, and considering the adaptation and finance cycles in those sections. BRAZIL and NEW ZEALAND cautioned against moving text.

On the commitment period/time frames, several parties observed that paragraphs 162 and 166 refer to the agreement’s duration, while paragraph 167 (option 2) addresses the commitments’ duration.

INDIA and CHINA called for focusing on the duration of the agreement first.

NEW ZEALAND suggested moving the paragraphs on the duration of the agreement to the section on entry into force. COLOMBIA supported creating sub-headings for durability and timeframes.

On communications, TUVVALU said links among communications, *ex ante* review and final communications should be sequenced. BRAZIL pointed to the difference between communicating and updating NDCs. AUSTRALIA highlighted issues around maintaining commitments between initial and final communications.

The MARSHALL ISLANDS observed initial and subsequent communication cycles, saying the former could be in a COP decision and the latter in the agreement. NORWAY disagreed, noting that the detailed timelines and upfront information could be in a COP decision.

Capacity Building: Co-facilitator Artur Runge-Metzger facilitated the session, which centered on the rationale for creating a capacity-building mechanism. Discussions also examined linkages with related work under the SBI, including on the third comprehensive review of the implementation of the framework for capacity-building, and the potential role of the CTCN in addressing capacity-building needs. Parties agreed on the need for capacity building to be at the core of the Paris agreement.

China, for the G-77/CHINA, Liberia, for the LDCs, and Swaziland, for the AFRICAN GROUP, with many developing countries, called for a capacity-building body or center to, *inter alia*: provide a more structured and holistic approach to capacity building; analyze gaps in, and help in the implementation of, activities; monitor implementation; increase coherence and synergies among activities; publicize financing opportunities; assist the LDCs in building climate resilience; and support country-driven actions.

The US enquired how such an institution would coordinate all capacity-building activities globally, and recalled a previous discussion on MRV of support had indicated difficulties in measuring capacity-building support. The EU called for exploring: why existing bodies are “not delivering” on capacity building; ways to enhance collaboration between existing bodies; and how to strengthen the Durban Forum. AUSTRALIA suggested national climate change capacity-building plans for articulating countries’ needs.

Technology: Co-facilitator Tosi Mpanu Mpanu facilitated the session. Describing its proposal on a global goal for technology development and transfer, CHINA, supported by the UAE, stressed the importance of the process generated by the proposed aspirational goal, which would help achieve the Convention’s objectives, and enable reviewing the gap between provision of support and technology needs. The US and the EU expressed concern over the proposal. JAPAN cautioned against creating new obligations for parties, stressing that providing incentives to the private sector would be more effective. CHINA said the proposal does not prejudge which technologies would be required to achieve the goal, and called for a focus on technologies’ supply side.

South Africa, for the AFRICAN GROUP, described its proposed framework on technology development and transfer. AUSTRALIA cautioned against duplication and “cementing”

details that will evolve over time. The UAE and ARGENTINA stressed the importance of enhancing existing arrangements. The AFRICAN GROUP explained the proposed framework would provide a strategy to guide the Technology Mechanism. INDIA called for addressing barriers created by intellectual property rights.

SUBSIDIARY BODIES

4TH MEETING OF THE DURBAN FORUM ON

CAPACITY-BUILDING: Co-facilitator Ama Essel (Ghana) opened the second part of the Forum, welcoming inputs on the first part, held on Wednesday, 3 June. The EU called for a space for discussing enhanced collaboration between the Convention bodies on capacity building. Swaziland, for the AFRICAN GROUP, called for more discussion time at the Forum.

Representatives of Mexico, Ghana, Indonesia, Gabon, Brazil, Viet Nam, Chile and Ethiopia shared experiences in preparing INDCs, including on: the technical process; building institutional and policy foundations for INDC development; capacity building for INDC preparation and implementation; coordination and financial challenges; multi-stakeholder consultations for enhanced transparency and quality of information; short-lived climate pollutants in INDCs; and mainstreaming climate change in national development strategies.

Questions addressed, *inter alia*, retaining and building on mitigation planning capacity over time, and co-benefits of capacity building for INDCs for broader climate change governance.

WORKSHOP ON GENDER-RESPONSIVE CLIMATE

POLICY: Veronica Nonhlanhla Gundu (Zimbabwe) moderated the first part of the workshop, focusing on mitigation, and technology development and transfer.

Panelists presented on definitions and examples of gender-responsive climate policy, including in public transportation, REDD+, climate finance and renewable energy. They also discussed case studies that highlighted, *inter alia*, women’s role in: installing and repairing solar power systems in Mozambique; participating in REDD+ projects in Sudan; and managing forests in Ecuador. Other presentations reported on mainstreaming gender into NAMAs in Georgia’s energy sector and mitigation programmes in Western Africa.

During the discussion, several participants shared national experiences on training and capacity building for women, and gender budgeting and mainstreaming. On future work, participants called for: compiling a glossary of gender-related terms; measuring results; and developing methodological guidance to integrate gender into mitigation and technology issues.

IN THE CORRIDORS

On Monday, with many new delegates arriving at the World Conference Center Bonn for the final days of negotiations, there was widespread convergence on the need to start negotiating the text for the new agreement.

During the morning’s ADP stocktaking exercise, a sense of urgency seemed to be growing with many parties searching for ways to pick up the pace. Some parties called for the ADP Co-Chairs to craft a consolidated text and others urged raising the number of negotiating days before Paris. Some called it “healthy” for delegates to recognize the limitations of a purely party-driven approach, and turn the text to the Co-Chairs for further streamlining.

Another reality check came in the afternoon’s facilitated discussions, where, as one observer remarked, “little seems to have changed.” Though many appreciated the new “tool” provided by the co-facilitators in the time frame group and parties keeping discussions “at the right level,” in other groups one lamented the reappearance of entrenched positions, as soon as matters of substance appeared on the surface.