

SUMMARY OF THE FIJI / BONN CLIMATE CHANGE CONFERENCE: 6-17 NOVEMBER 2017

The UN Climate Change Conference convened from 6-17 November 2017, in Bonn, Germany under the Presidency of Fiji. It included the 23rd session of the Conference of the Parties (COP 23) to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the 13th session of the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP 13), and the second session of the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA 1-2). Three subsidiary bodies also met, the 47th sessions of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA 47) and Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI 47), and the fourth part of the first session of the *Ad hoc* Working Group on the Paris Agreement (APA 1-4).

The UN Climate Change Conference brought together over 16,000 participants, including over 9,200 government officials, 5,500 representatives of UN bodies and agencies, intergovernmental organizations and civil society organizations, and 1,200 members of the media.

Negotiations, which did not conclude until early on Saturday morning, 18 November, focused on the various aspects of the Paris Agreement work programme. Parties adopted 31 decisions, 24 under the COP, seven under the CMP, that, *inter alia*: give guidance on the completion of the Paris Agreement work programme, launch the Talanoa Dialogue (the name for the 2018 Facilitative Dialogue called for by decision 1/CP.21, which adopted the Paris Agreement), and give prominence to pre-2020 implementation and ambition, under the “Fiji Momentum for Implementation”; decide that the Adaptation Fund shall serve the Paris Agreement subject to decisions to be taken at CMA 1-3; operationalize the local communities and indigenous peoples platform; establish a gender action plan; assess the technical examination process on mitigation and adaptation; take work forward on long-term finance; and conclude reviews of the Standing Committee on Finance, the Adaptation Fund, capacity building in countries with economies in transition, and in developing countries; and give guidance to the Executive Committee of the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage associated with Climate Change Impacts.

The joint high-level segment under the COP, CMP and CMA brought together 15 heads of state and government, in addition to ministers and heads of delegation.

Negotiations took place in the “Bula Zone” and side events were in the “Bonn Zone.” In the Bonn Zone, many state and non-state actors announced initiatives for climate action, including the

launch of the Ocean Pathway Initiative, to link healthy oceans with climate change action through the UN climate processes, and the Bonn-Fiji Commitment, which was adopted by over 300 local and regional leaders to deliver on the Paris Agreement.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE UNFCCC

The international political response to climate change began with the 1992 adoption of the UNFCCC, which sets out a legal framework for stabilizing atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases (GHGs) to avoid “dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system.” The Convention, which entered into force on 21 March 1994, has 197 parties. In December 1997, delegates to COP 3 in Kyoto, Japan, agreed to a protocol to the UNFCCC that committed industrialized countries and countries in transition to a market economy to achieve emissions reduction targets. These countries, known as Annex I parties under the UNFCCC, agreed to reduce their overall emissions of six GHGs by an average of 5% below 1990 levels in 2008-2012 (the first commitment period), with specific targets

IN THIS ISSUE

A Brief History of the UNFCCC	1
Report of the Meetings	2
Opening Ceremony	3
Conference of the Parties	3
Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol	10
Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement	11
<i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group on the Paris Agreement	11
Subsidiary Body for Implementation	17
Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice	26
Joint SBI/SBSTA Closing Plenary	29
Joint COP/CMP/CMA Closing Plenary	29
A Brief Analysis of the Fiji / Bonn Climate Conference	30
Upcoming Meetings	32
Glossary	33

varying from country to country. The Kyoto Protocol entered into force on 16 February 2005 and now has 192 parties.

In December 2015, at COP 21 in Paris, France, parties agreed to the Paris Agreement that specifies all countries will submit nationally determined contributions (NDCs), and aggregate progress on mitigation, adaptation and means of implementation (MOI) will be reviewed every five years through a global stocktake. The Paris Agreement entered into force on 4 November 2016 and, as of 19 November 2017, has been ratified by 170 parties out of the 195 signatories.

LONG-TERM NEGOTIATIONS, 2005-2009: Convening in Montreal, Canada, in 2005, CMP 1 established the *Ad hoc* Working Group on Annex I Parties' Further Commitments under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP) in accordance with Protocol Article 3.9, which mandated consideration of Annex I parties' further commitments at least seven years before the end of the first commitment period.

In December 2007, COP 13 and CMP 3 in Bali, Indonesia, resulted in agreement on the Bali Roadmap on long-term issues. COP 13 adopted the Bali Action Plan (BAP) and established the *Ad hoc* Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention (AWG-LCA), with a mandate to focus on mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology, capacity building and a shared vision for long-term cooperative action. Negotiations on Annex I parties' further commitments continued under the AWG-KP. The deadline for concluding the two-track negotiations was 2009 in Copenhagen, Denmark.

COPENHAGEN: The UN Climate Change Conference in Copenhagen met in December 2009. The event was marked by disputes over transparency and process. After lengthy debate, delegates ultimately agreed to "take note" of the Copenhagen Accord and to extend the mandates of the negotiating groups until COP 16 and CMP 6 in 2010. In 2010, over 140 countries indicated support for the Accord. Over 80 countries provided information on their national mitigation targets or actions.

CANCUN: The UN Climate Change Conference in Cancun, Mexico, convened in December 2010, where parties adopted the Cancun Agreements and agreed to consider the adequacy of the long-term global goal during a 2013-2015 review. The Cancun Agreements established several new institutions and processes, including the Green Climate Fund (GCF), the Cancun Adaptation Framework, the Adaptation Committee and the Technology Mechanism, which includes the Technology Executive Committee (TEC) and the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN).

DURBAN: The UN Climate Change Conference in Durban, South Africa, took place in November and December 2011. Among other outcomes, parties agreed to launch the *Ad hoc* Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP) with a mandate "to develop a protocol, another legal instrument or an agreed outcome with legal force under the Convention applicable to all Parties" no later than 2015, to enter into force in 2020. In addition, the ADP was mandated to explore actions to close the pre-2020 ambition gap in relation to the 2°C target.

DOHA: The UN Climate Change Conference in Doha, Qatar, took place in November and December 2012. The conference resulted in a package of decisions referred to as the "Doha Climate Gateway." These included amendments to the Kyoto Protocol to establish its second commitment period (2013-2020), and agreement to terminate the AWG-KP's and AWG-LCA's work and negotiations under the BAP.

WARSAW: The UN Climate Change Conference in Warsaw, Poland, took place in November 2013. The meeting adopted an ADP decision that, *inter alia*, invites parties to initiate or intensify

domestic preparations for their intended nationally determined contributions (INDCs). Parties also adopted decisions establishing the Warsaw International Mechanism on loss and damage associated with climate change impacts (WIM), and the Warsaw Framework for Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation in developing countries (REDD+).

LIMA: The UN Climate Change Conference in Lima, Peru, took place in December 2014. COP 20 adopted the "Lima Call for Climate Action," which furthered progress on the negotiations towards the 2015 agreement by elaborating the elements of a draft negotiating text for the 2015 agreement and the process for submitting and synthesizing INDCs, while also addressing pre-2020 ambition. Parties also adopted 19 decisions that, *inter alia*, help operationalize the WIM, establish the Lima work programme on gender, and adopt the Lima Ministerial Declaration on Education and Awareness-raising.

PARIS: The UN Climate Change Conference convened in Paris, France, in November-December 2015 and culminated in the Paris Agreement on climate change. The Agreement specifies that each party shall communicate successive NDCs that it intends to achieve. By 2020, parties whose NDCs contain a time frame up to 2025 are requested to communicate a new NDC and parties with a NDC time frame up to 2030 are requested to communicate or update these contributions. Starting in 2023, aggregate progress on mitigation, adaptation and MOI will be reviewed every five years in a global stocktake.

MARRAKECH: The UN Climate Change Conference convened from 7-18 November 2016 in Marrakech, Morocco, and included CMA 1. Parties adopted 35 decisions, several related to the Paris Agreement work programme, including: that such work should conclude by 2018; that the Adaptation Fund should serve the Paris Agreement; 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 (biennial finance communications by developed countries). COP 22 also adopted decisions, including approving the five-year workplan of the WIM, enhancing the Technology Mechanism, and continuing and enhancing the Lima work programme on gender.

SBSTA 46, SBI 46, APA 1-3: These bodies convened from 8-18 May 2017 in Bonn, Germany. The APA adopted conclusions outlining intersessional and pre-session work under each substantive agenda item. The SBI's conclusions addressed: public registry/ies for NDCs and adaptation communication; scope and modalities for the periodic assessment of the Technology Mechanism in relation to supporting the Paris Agreement; and the third review of the Adaptation Fund. The SBSTA adopted conclusions on, *inter alia*: the Paris Agreement Technology Framework; agriculture; matters relating to Agreement Article 6 (cooperative approaches); and modalities for accounting of financial resources provided and mobilized through public interventions under Agreement Article 9.7. Joint conclusions were adopted on response measures, and scope of the next periodic review of the long-term goal under the Convention and progress toward achieving it, which also contained a COP decision.

REPORT OF THE MEETINGS

This report summarizes the discussions by the six bodies based on their respective agendas. On Monday, 6 November, the opening plenaries of COP 23, CMP 13 and CMA 1-2 convened, followed by a joint plenary, which heard opening statements.

OPENING CEREMONY

Salaheddine Mezouar, President of COP 22, CMP 12 and CMA 1, opened COP 23. He recalled the victims of natural disasters over the past year, saying that such events underlined the costs of inaction. A traditional Fijian ceremony, the Qaloqalovi, followed.

UNFCCC Executive Secretary Patricia Espinosa identified as goals for COP 23: taking essential steps to ensure that the Paris Agreement structure is completed, its impacts are strengthened, and its goals achieved; and moving forward to fulfil pre-2020 commitments.

World Meteorological Organization (WMO) Secretary-General Petteri Taalas reported record-breaking global temperatures, carbon dioxide concentrations and sea temperatures, as well as increasing ocean acidification, and more intense hurricane, monsoon, and drought seasons.

Hoesung Lee, Chair, Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), reported that the special report “Global Warming of 1.5°C,” will be approved in time for the 2018 facilitative dialogue.

Barbara Hendricks, Minister for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety, Germany, stated that every dollar invested today will pay off in cleaner air, better health, and new economic opportunities. She announced that Germany will contribute an additional €50 million to the Adaptation Fund in 2017.

Welcoming delegates to Germany’s “United Nations City,” Ashok-Alexander Sridharan, Mayor of Bonn, stressed that local and regional action will drive global climate action.

CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES

OPENING STATEMENTS: Ecuador, for the Group of 77 and China (G-77/China), outlined that COP 23 needs to achieve progress on, *inter alia*: the design of the 2018 facilitative dialogue; work on loss and damage; financial support for the Warsaw International Mechanism on loss and damage associated with climate change impacts (WIM); an outcome on the Adaptation Fund serving the Paris Agreement; and clarifying eligibility criteria for the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and the GCF.

The European Union (EU) outlined as priorities: draft decisions or textual elements on all areas of the Paris Agreement work programme; clarity on how the Talanoa Dialogue will be conducted; and contributions by all to the momentum of the Global Climate Action Agenda.

Switzerland, for the Environmental Integrity Group (EIG), called for COP 23 to work on developing implementation guidelines for the Paris Agreement, clarifying the Talanoa Dialogue design, and advancing the Global Climate Action Agenda.

Australia, for the Umbrella Group, said that a central component of COP 23 must be a strong and effective enhanced transparency framework.

Maldives, for the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS), stressed that COP 23 must advance progress on loss and damage, including establishing a five-year work programme, long-term support for the WIM as a standing agenda item and accelerating finance flows to small island developing states (SIDS).

Calling for a “COP of action,” Ethiopia, for the Least Developed Countries (LDCs), expressed concern that financing appears to be tapering, especially for the LDC Fund (LDCF) and the Adaptation Fund.

Saudi Arabia, for the Arab Group, called for an omnibus decision that will include all items related to the Paris Agreement.

Mali, for the African Group, stressed the importance of finance for implementation of Convention commitments, and for achieving progress on the Paris Agreement.

The Democratic Republic of the Congo, for the Coalition for Rainforest Nations (CfRN), underscored the need for coordinated public and private finance for REDD+ implementation.

Iran, for the Like-Minded Group of Developing Countries (LMDCs), called for this meeting to be an “implementation COP” that addresses commitments on finance, technology transfer, capacity building, and loss and damage.

Peru, for the Independent Association of Latin America and the Caribbean (AILAC), called for progress on, *inter alia*: designing the 2018 facilitative dialogue; adopting a gender action plan; and supporting work on emerging issues such as oceans, health, and indigenous peoples.

Dominica, on behalf of the Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of our America (ALBA), said the Paris Agreement’s message of “life and hope” has been postponed as vulnerable countries receive few financial, technological, or capacity building benefits. He underscored that international efforts to combat climate change have been insufficient and regretted the exit of an Annex I party from the agreement.

Brazil, for Brazil, South Africa, India and China (BASIC), expressed concern about developed countries unilaterally creating new criteria for funding under the GCF, stressing that this practice has no legal basis.

The US recalled his country’s decision to withdraw from the Paris Agreement, but stressed intent to continue engagement, including in laying the foundations for guidelines for implementing the Paris Agreement.

ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS: Election of the President: On Monday, 6 November, Prime Minister Frank Bainimarama, Fiji, was elected President of COP 23, CMP 13 and CMA 1-2 by acclamation. He stressed that ambition, innovation, ingenuity and “sheer hard work” could keep global temperature rise below 1.5°C, and highlighted the importance of the coming Talanoa Dialogue.

Rules of Procedure: On 6 November, parties agreed to apply the draft rules of procedure (FCCC/CP/1996/2), with the exception of draft rule 42 on voting. COP 23 President Bainimarama informed that Fiji would hold informal consultations.

Adoption of the agenda: The agenda was first considered on 6 November, and the COP adopted it. There were informal consultations on three issues related to the agenda that were undertaken by the COP Presidency throughout the conference, related to two proposals for additions to the provisional agenda (FCCC/CP/2017/1/Add.1/Rev.1 and Add.2) and on the outstanding proposal from Turkey on access to the GCF and the CTCN. On Saturday, 18 November, COP 23 President Bainimarama reported that consultations on the specific needs and special circumstances of Africa, as mandated by COP 22, had not reached consensus, and that the Presidency will continue to consult on this matter next year.

The two proposed additions to the agenda were: from Iran, for the LMDCs, on the acceleration of implementation of pre-2020 commitments and actions, and increasing pre-2020 ambition; and from the Democratic Republic of the Congo, supported by Mozambique, on a gateway to encourage, monitor, report, verify, and account for ambition of non-party organizations.

In plenary, the Democratic Republic of the Congo stressed that its proposal had been made within the existing rules and stated its expectation that the consultations would lead to a COP decision. The LMDCs noted that the need for progress on pre-

2020 ambition is widely agreed and, as such, is not “a new item.” China called for equal treatment of the two workstreams launched in 2012 and lamented that the Doha Amendment had yet to enter into force.

On 18 November, in plenary, COP 23 President Bainimarama informed that consultations on the proposal put forward by the Democratic Republic of the Congo had not achieved consensus.

Regarding the proposal from the LMDCs, informal consultations yielded agreement that the issues raised by the proposal would be discussed in, *inter alia*, the Talanoa Dialogue to be held over the course of 2018.

On the proposal from Turkey, informal consultations were undertaken by Jochen Flasbarth (Germany), and, on 18 November, COP 23 President Bainimarama informed that informal consultations had been unable to reach consensus and would not continue. Turkey characterized their demand as “just,” saying that there is “no concrete reasoning” behind the opposition to its proposal.

Election of officers other than the President: On 18 November, the COP elected members of the COP Bureau: Mohamed Nasr (Egypt); Majid Shafie-Pour (Iran); Georg Børsting (Norway); and Ian Fry (Tuvalu).

The COP also elected members to the: Adaptation Committee; Adaptation Fund Board; Advisory Board to the CTCN; Consultative Group of Experts (CGE); Compliance Committee, both the facilitative and enforcement branches; Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) Executive Board; WIM Executive Committee (ExCom); Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee; Technology Executive Committee (TEC) and LDC Expert Group (LEG).

Admission of observers: On 6 November, the COP admitted the organizations contained in document FCCC/CP/2017/2 as observers.

Organization of work: On 6 November, parties agreed to refer to the SBSTA and SBI the following agenda items and sub-items: report of the Adaptation Committee; WIM; joint annual report of the TEC and the CTCN; and implementation of the Buenos Aires programme of work on adaptation and response measures. Parties also agreed to refer to the SBI the following items: reporting from and review of Annex I parties; reporting from and review of non-Annex I parties; capacity building under the Convention; matters related to LDCs; gender and climate change; audit report and financial statements for 2016; and budget performance for the biennium 2016-2017.

Dates and venues: In its decision (FCCC/CP/2017/L.9/Rev.1) the COP, *inter alia*, expresses its appreciation for the nomination of Jan Szyszko (Poland) to serve as COP President, and invites parties to undertake further consultations on the hosting of COP 25 and COP 26, with the hosts to come from Latin American and Caribbean Group, and Western European and Others Group, respectively; and requests SBI 48 to consider hosting arrangements.

Credentials: On Friday, 17 November, the COP adopted the report on credentials (FCCC/CP/2017/10).

REPORTS OF THE SUBSIDIARY BODIES: On 17 November, the COP took note of the SBI 46 report (FCCC/SBI/2017/7 and Add.1), draft SBI 47 report (FCCC/SBI/2017/L.19), the SBSTA 46 report (FCCC/SBSTA/2017/4) and draft SBSTA 47 report (FCCC/SBSTA/2017/L.18). On Saturday, 18 November, the COP took note of the APA 1-3 report (FCCC/APA/2017/2) and draft APA 1-4 report (FCCC/APA/2017/L.3).

PREPARATIONS FOR ENTRY INTO FORCE OF THE PARIS AGREEMENT AND CMA 1: This item was first taken up in plenary on Tuesday, 7 November, and focused on the design of the 2018 facilitative dialogue, which became known as the Talanoa Dialogue, inspired by the Pacific concept of constructive discussion, debate and story-telling. Informal consultations were held throughout the conference, undertaken by Nazhat Shameem Khan (Fiji) and Aziz Mekouar (Morocco), COP 22 Presidency.

On 7 November, Khan highlighted the features of the Talanoa Dialogue, including that it: is a constructive, facilitative, and solutions-oriented dialogue; avoids confrontation; builds empathy; and fosters stability and inclusiveness by creating a safe space. She suggested that the dialogue would be structured around three questions: Where are we? Where do we want to go? How do we get there?

Supporting the work led by Fiji in developing modalities for the Talanoa Dialogue, Maldives, for AOSIS, said enhancing mitigation ambition should shape all elements of the process. Iran, for LMDCs, said orchestration will be key to the success of the dialogue. While agreeing that it is not necessary to launch negotiations on the Dialogue’s design, the EU and Australia stressed that parties must leave COP 23 with clarity on its conduct. Colombia highlighted the importance of non-state actor participation in the process.

Youth NGOs (YOUNGOs) underscored that the dialogue cannot fall into “meaningless conversation and superficial statements.”

Local Government and Municipal Authorities (LGMAs) called for parties to make use of vertical and horizontal integration to connect climate action across all levels of government.

In plenary on 18 November, COP 23 President Bainimarama reported on the COP 22 and COP 23 presidencies’ open-ended consultations with parties on the completion of the Paris Agreement work programme, the 2018 facilitative dialogue, and pre-2020 implementation and ambition. He then presented a draft COP decision, “Fiji Momentum for Implementation,” noting it: sets the stage for negotiations in 2018 in a transparent, inclusive and cost-effective manner; contains, in an annex, the design of the 2018 facilitative dialogue; and outlines the importance of pre-2020 implementation and action. The COP adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/CP/2017/L.13), the COP, *inter alia*: underscores the importance of maintaining momentum and continuing to uphold the spirit and vision of the Paris Agreement; and highlights the urgency of the completion of the work programme under the Paris Agreement.

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

- confirms its firm determination to oversee and accelerate the completion of the work programme under the Paris Agreement by its twenty-fourth session (December 2018) and to forward the outcomes for consideration and adoption by CMA 1-3;
- requests the Secretariat to develop an online platform that will provide an overview, with weblinks to complete information and references on the work of the COP and the subsidiary and constituted bodies on the work programme under the Paris Agreement;
- recognizes that an additional negotiating session for all three subsidiary bodies may be needed between SB 48 (April-May 2018) and COP 24 to facilitate the timely completion of the work programme;
- decides that the COP President, in consultation with the COP Bureau and APA Co-Chairs, will assess the need for the additional negotiating session, on the basis of the outcomes of

SBI and SBSTA 48 and APA 1-5, and guide the Secretariat accordingly;

- agrees that, should the additional negotiating session be convened, it would address matters relating to the work programme under the Paris Agreement being considered by the subsidiary bodies;
- also agrees that the additional negotiating session should be organized in a cost-effective manner, including with respect to the length of the session and related logistical matters such as interpretation and translation into the official UN languages, while also allowing for the effective participation of delegates from developing countries; and
- requests the Secretariat to make provisional and, if required, final arrangements for the additional negotiating session, and to finalize the arrangements should the additional negotiating session be confirmed, subject to the availability of resources.

The COP welcomes the design of the 2018 facilitative dialogue, to be known as the Talanoa Dialogue, announced at COP 23, as contained in the informal note by COP22 and COP 23 Presidencies, and contained in an annex that includes the mandate, and features of the preparatory and political phases of the Dialogue. The COP agreed to launch the Talanoa Dialogue, which will start in January 2018.

On pre-2020 implementation and ambition, the COP, *inter alia*:

- requests the COP Presidency and UNFCCC Executive Secretary to send joint letters to parties to the Kyoto Protocol that are yet to ratify the Doha Amendment, urging them to deposit their instruments of acceptance as soon as possible;
- also requests the Secretariat to consult the UN Secretary-General on ways to promote the ratification of the Doha Amendment;
- invites parties to submit via the submission portal by 1 May 2018 additional information on progress in implementing decision 1/CP.21 (the Paris outcome), section IV on enhanced action prior to 2020;
- requests the Secretariat to provide a synthesis report on the submissions as an input to the stocktake on pre-2020 implementation and ambition referred to below;
- welcomes the report of the COP that noted that the 2018 facilitative dialogue (Talanoa Dialogue) will consider, as an element of the dialogue, the efforts of parties in relation to action and support, as appropriate, in the pre-2020 period;
- decides to convene a stocktake on pre-2020 implementation and ambition at COP 24, which will apply the format of the 2016 facilitative dialogue, and consider, *inter alia*: the inputs of the COP, CMP, SBI, SBSTA, the constituted bodies under the COP and Kyoto Protocol, and the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism; the mitigation efforts of parties in the pre-2020 period; and the provision of support in the pre-2020 period; the work of the Marrakech Partnership for Global Climate Action, including the summaries for policymakers of the technical examination processes (TEPs) and the yearbooks on climate action prepared by the high-level champions;
- also decides to convene a stocktake on pre-2020 implementation and ambition at COP 25, which will apply the format of the 2018 dialogue and consider, *inter alia*, the inputs on the COP, CMP, SBI, SBSTA, constituted bodies under the Convention and Kyoto Protocol, and the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism; the outcomes of the high-level ministerial dialogue on climate finance to be held at COP 24; the relevant outcome of the Talanoa Dialogue; the outcomes of the stocktake occurring in 2018; the work of the Marrakech Partnership for Global Climate Action, including

the summaries for policymakers of the TEPs and the yearbooks on climate action prepared by the high-level champions; and,

- requests the Secretariat to prepare reports on the stocktakes.

CONSIDERATION FOR PROPOSALS BY PARTIES TO AMEND THE CONVENTION UNDER ARTICLE 15:
Proposal from the Russian Federation to amend Article 4.2(f): This item (FCCC/CP/2011/5) was held in abeyance.

Proposal from Papua New Guinea and Mexico to amend Articles 7 and 18: Parties first considered this item (FCCC/CP/2011/4/Rev.1) on 6 November, and agreed to informal consultations under the Presidency. On 17 November, the COP agreed to continue consideration at COP 24.

REPORT OF THE ADAPTATION COMMITTEE:

This item (FCCC/SB/2017/2) was taken up by the COP on 6 November and referred to the SBI and SBSTA. It is summarized under the SBI. (See page 19.)

WIM: This item (FCCC/SB/2017/1) was first taken up by the COP on 6 November and referred to the SBSTA and SBI. It is summarized under the SBI. (See page 21.)

DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGIES AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE TECHNOLOGY MECHANISM: Joint report of the TEC and CTCN: This item is summarized under the SBI. (See page 21.)

Independent Review of Effective Implementation of the CTCN: This item (FCCC/CP/2017/3) was first taken up in plenary on 6 November and subsequently in a contact group and in joint informal consultations, co-facilitated by Balisi Gopolang (Botswana) and Elfriede-Anna More (Austria).

In informal consultations, parties elaborated a draft decision that, *inter alia*, invites CTCN and UN Environment (as the host of the CTCN) to respond to the review, and requests SBI 48 to draft a decision on the basis of the review and responses. It also notes the need for sustainable funding of the CTCN's functions. On Friday, 17, November the COP adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/CP/2017/L.1), the COP, *inter alia*, decides to renew the memorandum of understanding between the COP and UN Environment regarding the hosting of the CTCN for an additional four-year period; requests SBI 48 to consider the findings and recommendations of the independent review, and the management response from UN Environment, with a view to recommending a draft decision on enhancing the performance of the CTCN for consideration by COP 24; and requests the Secretariat, subject to the availability of financial resources, to commission the second independent review.

SECOND REVIEW OF THE ADEQUACY OF ARTICLE 4.2(A) AND 4.2(B) OF THE CONVENTION: This item was held in abeyance.

MATTERS RELATING TO FINANCE: This item, including all its sub-items, was first taken up in plenary on Tuesday, 7 November.

In plenary, Women and Gender said that adaptation and mitigation financing must be balanced 50/50, with additional finance for loss and damage. YOUNGOs asked for concrete progress and public finance for the Adaptation Fund. LGMAAs called upon operating entities of the UNFCCC Financial Mechanism to prioritize funding for low-carbon, resilient urban development. Trade Union NGOs (TUNGOs) underscored the importance of realizing the US\$100 billion finance commitment as soon as possible.

Discussions continued in contact groups and informal consultations: a joint contact group was established for the sub-items on Long-term Finance (LTF) and the sixth review of the Financial Mechanism; and a contact group was established for

the Standing Committee on Finance (SCF); a joint contact group for the sub-items on reports from, and guidance to, the GEF and GCF. Several issues required further consultations.

On Thursday, 17 November, Luke Daunivalu, COP 23/CMP 13 Presidency, chaired a joint COP/CMP contact group on matters relating to finance. On matters relating to the SCF, he proposed the Presidency continue bilateral consultations. On guidance to the GCF and GEF, he proposed Tosi Mpanu-Mpanu (Democratic Republic of the Congo) and Stefan Schwager (Switzerland) continue to co-facilitate consultations. On information for Agreement Article 9.5 (*ex-ante* finance transparency), he proposed that Outi Honkatukia (Finland) and Andrés Eduardo Mogro Zambrano (Ecuador) continue co-facilitating.

Several countries, including Ecuador, for the LMDCs, noted the linkages between the sub-item on Agreement Article 9.5 and discussions that were ongoing under the APA. Consultations on this matter continued at the heads of delegation level until Saturday, 18 November.

Long-term Finance: In the joint contact group, co-chaired by Georg Børsting (Norway) and Zaheer Fakir (South Africa), deliberations began with parties providing inputs for a draft decision text. The G-77/China notified that the group would submit a draft decision. Colombia, for AILAC, said the text should make reference to scaling up provision and mobilization of climate finance. Malawi highlighted scale, progression, and predictability. Maldives stressed transparency and called for a synthesis of biennial submissions by developed countries by COP 24 to track progress towards the US\$100 billion goal. The EU, Switzerland, and Canada indicated commitment to scaling up climate finance to the US\$100 billion goal by 2020.

Parties continued deliberations, in informal consultations, on a five-page draft COP decision. Developing countries stressed the SCF's LTF in-session workshop reports and biennial assessments and overviews of climate finance flows as the sole inputs to the high-level ministerial dialogues. Many developed countries cautioned against "cherry-picking" from these inputs and also called for removing paragraphs referring to assistance to developing countries' NDC-related needs, noting this is beyond the scope of LTF and prejudices APA discussions. On a paragraph on the COP 22 President's note on the second biennial high-level ministerial dialogue, many highlighted reservations, including related to referencing an annex attached to the note. Parties diverged on, *inter alia*: referring to progress towards the US\$100 billion goal; and whether to give guidance to the incoming COP Presidency on the topic of the next high-level ministerial dialogue.

In further consultations, developing countries called for, *inter alia*: the deletion of a paragraph on multilateral development banks; capturing the key messages from the 2017 in-session LTF workshop; and reintroduction of text requesting the Secretariat to assist developing countries in assessing their NDC-related needs and priorities. Developed countries stressed the need for recognition of progress made towards the 2020 goal, and text welcoming other parties' efforts in this regard. Developed and developing countries diverged on paragraphs on, *inter alia*: a reference to "recognizing the need for public and grant-based resources for adaptation" in a paragraph on public climate funds; and requesting developed countries to further enhance the available quantitative and qualitative elements of a pathway to 2020 through the provision of information. Parties also diverged on the feasibility of requesting a compilation and synthesis of developed countries' biennial submissions in time to inform the 2018 high-level ministerial dialogue on climate finance.

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

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/CP/2017/L.5), the COP, *inter alia*:

- welcomes with appreciation the continued progress of developed countries towards the joint mobilization goal of US\$100 billion annually by 2020, in the context of meaningful mitigation actions and transparency of implementation;
- recalls the commitment of developed countries, in the context of meaningful mitigation actions and transparency of implementation to a goal of mobilizing jointly US\$100 billion per year by 2020 to address the needs of developing countries, and urges developed countries to continue to scale up mobilized climate finance towards this goal;
- urges developed countries to continue their efforts to channel a substantial share of public climate funds to adaptation and to strive to achieve a greater balance between finance for mitigation and adaptation, recognizing the importance of adaptation finance and the need for public and grant-based resources for adaptation;
- welcomes the progress of parties in their efforts to strengthen domestic enabling environments, and requests parties to continue to enhance their enabling environments and policy frameworks;
- requests developed countries to prepare their next round of updated biennial submissions on strategies and approaches for scaling up climate finance for 2018-2020, with a view to updating information available on a pathway towards the goal of jointly mobilizing US\$100 billion per year by 2020, and requests the Secretariat to prepare a compilation and synthesis of these submissions;
- requests the Secretariat, in collaboration with various entities, to explore ways and means to assist developing countries in assessing their needs and priorities, in a country-driven manner, including technology and capacity building needs, and translating climate finance needs into action;
- requests the Secretariat to organize a 2018 in-session workshop and prepare a summary report thereof for consideration by COP 24;
- notes that the 2018 in-session workshop should further build on the key findings and messages from the 2017 workshop and its summary report; and
- invites the COP Presidency, in organizing the 2018 high-level ministerial dialogue, to consider a focus on the topic of access to climate finance.

Standing Committee on Finance: On Tuesday, 7 November, the SCF reported on the Committee's work. The COP referred this issue to a contact group on this sub-item. Discussions on the review of the functions of the SCF pertaining to this agenda sub-item were conducted in informal consultations under the SBI item on matters relating to climate finance. (See page 22.) These consultations did not result in agreement and the SBI referred the item back to the COP.

Informal ministerial-level consultations took place on Thursday and Friday, 16-17 November, to resolve the issue.

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

Final Outcomes: In its decision on the report of the SCF (FCCC/CP/2017/L.6), the COP, *inter alia*:

- endorses the updated workplan of the SCF for 2018;
- requests the SCF to enhance its work on measurement, reporting, and verification (MRV) of support beyond the biennial assessment, acknowledging the progress made by the SCF and noting the need to avoid duplication of ongoing work under the SBSTA and APA;

- requests the SCF, in fulfilling its function with regard to the MRV of support, and in the context of its extended workplan, to continue its cooperation with relevant stakeholders and experts;
- invites the SCF to conclude its deliberations on the topic of its next forum at the latest at its first meeting in 2018; and
- requests the SCF to report to COP 24 on the progress made in the implementation of its workplan, and consider the guidance provided to it in other relevant COP decisions.

In its decision on the review of the functions of the SCF (FCCC/CP/2017/L.10), the COP, *inter alia*:

- requests the SCF to continue to provide and enhance the dissemination and utilization of specific and targeted outputs and recommendations in order to effectively advance the work of the COP;
- requests the SCF to further refine its approach to maintaining linkages with the subsidiary and constituted bodies;
- requests the SCF to ensure the value added of its forum when deciding on its topic, to provide clear recommendations to the COP, as appropriate, regarding follow-up actions on the forum, and enhance the dissemination, use, and ownership of the accumulated knowledge and expertise gathered at the forum;
- requests the SCF to further strengthen its stakeholder engagement;
- decides to continue its deliberations on ways to enhance the participation of SCF members, acknowledging the need to ensure the full participation and contribution of all constituencies in the meetings of the SCF;
- requests the SCF to provide options for the enhancement of the participation of members and to report back to COP 24; and
- decides to agree on the timeline for the second review of the functions of the SCF at COP 25, at the latest.

Report of the GCF and guidance to the GCF: In plenary on Tuesday, 7 November, the GCF reported that the Fund is now “truly operational and delivering on its mandate.” The COP established a joint contact group on this sub-item and the sub-item on the report of, and guidance to, the GEF. The contact group, co-chaired by Tosi Mpanu Mpanu and Stefan Schwager, held informal consultations to consider draft decision text.

In the informal consultations on Thursday, 16 November, parties discussed a revised draft decision text. Parties briefly discussed a paragraph requesting the Board ensure that all developing country parties have access to all financial instruments available through the GCF. Parties also discussed, but did not agree to, adding a paragraph requesting the GCF to report to the COP on the activities of initiatives that the trustee is taking to promote alignment of the Fund’s assets with the Paris Agreement. The parties agreed to forward the draft decision for consideration by the COP.

In plenary, on Saturday, 18 November, the COP adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/CP/2017/L.8), the COP, *inter alia*:

- encourages the GCF Board to ensure that the post-approval process facilitates the timely disbursement of approved funding;
- notes that accreditation is pending for a significant number of entities;
- welcomes the Board’s decision to trigger the review of the accreditation framework and its fit-for-purpose approach, and urges the Board to swiftly adopt and implement the revised framework with a view to simplifying and facilitating access to the GCF;

- requests the Board to ensure that all developing countries have access to all the financial instruments available through the GCF in line with the eligibility criteria referred to in the governing instrument and relevant COP decisions and to ensure application of the agreed policies of the GCF;
- encourages the Board to continue improving the process to review and approve readiness and preparatory support requests;
- invites the Board to consider ways to improve the availability of information on accessing funding from the GCF, as appropriate;
- encourages parties to enter into agreements to grant the privileges and immunities needed for the effective and efficient operationalization of the GCF, as appropriate, and encourages the Board to intensify its efforts to ensure that the GCF will enjoy such privileges and immunities;
- decides to continue its consideration of the Board’s request as reflected in GCF Board decision B.08/24 (on the administrative budget of the Fund for 2015) and the procedure agreed in decision 7/CP.20 (on the report of the GCF to the COP);
- urges the Board to ensure the continuation of trustee services and to conclude its deliberations on the selection of a trustee;
- encourages the Board to launch the first GCF replenishment process;
- invites parties to submit their views and recommendations on elements to be taken into account in developing guidance for the Board no later than 10 weeks prior to COP 24, and requests the SCF to take these into consideration when providing its draft guidance for the GCF Board for consideration by the COP; and
- requests the GCF to include in its annual report to the COP information on the steps that it has taken to implement the guidance provided in this decision.

Report of the GEF and guidance to the GEF: In plenary on Tuesday, 7 November, the GEF reported on its activities, affirming commitment to continue supporting countries. The COP established a joint contact group on this sub-item and the sub-item on the report of, and guidance to, the GCF, co-chaired by Stefan Schwager and Tosi Mpanu Mpanu, which met throughout the two weeks to consider draft decision text.

Informal consultations on Thursday, 16 November, focused on a revised draft decision text. Parties made textual proposals and indicated their preferences with regard to paragraphs on, *inter alia*: a request to the GEF to ensure its policies and procedures for consideration and review of funding proposals are followed, or a request that the GEF support climate projects in its seventh replenishment period; and the operationalization of the Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT) and an encouragement/request to the GEF to assist/provide adequate resources to all developing countries, in particular the LDCs and SIDS, to help them access resources from the CBIT.

Parties agreed to a paragraph requesting the GEF to continue implementing its established policies for grants and concessional funding in its seventh replenishment period, in support of all developing countries.

Noting parties had not been able to conclude a review of all paragraphs, Schwager encouraged parties to consult among themselves. Discussions continued in informal informals throughout the day and on Friday, 17 November.

In plenary, on Saturday, 18 November, the COP adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/CP/2017/L.11), the COP, *inter alia*, reiterates its call to ensure a robust seventh replenishment in order to assist in providing adequate and predictable funding. The COP also requests the GEF to:

- enhance the consultation process with developing countries and other stakeholders in the context of the GEF replenishment process;
- further consider the needs and priorities of developing countries in the allocation for the climate change focal area in its seventh replenishment period;
- continue implementing in its seventh replenishment period its established policies for grants and concessional funding;
- provide adequate support to assist developing countries, in line with decision 1/CP.21 paragraph 86 (urging and requesting the GEF to support the establishment and operation of CBIT);
- as appropriate, to ensure that its policies and procedures related to the consideration and review of funding proposals be duly followed in an efficient manner; and
- include in its annual report to the COP information on the steps that it has taken to implement the guidance provided in this decision.

The COP also encourages the GEF to further enhance engagement with the private sector, including in its technology projects, and invites parties to submit their views and recommendations on the elements to be taken into account in developing guidance for the GEF no later than 10 weeks prior to COP 24, and requests the SCF to take these into consideration when providing its draft guidance for the GEF for consideration by the COP.

Sixth review of the Financial Mechanism: In plenary on Tuesday, 7 November, parties agreed to establish a joint contact group for this sub-item and the sub-item on LTF, co-chaired by Georg Børsting and Zaheer Fakir.

In the contact group, parties began deliberations by providing inputs for a draft decision text. Many parties and groups expressed support for the recommendations in the SCF self-assessment report (FCCC/CP/2017/9). The Philippines, for the G-77/China, called for, *inter alia*: an overview of the climate finance architecture; avoiding duplication; and assessing other sources of financing. Egypt, for the African Group, stressed the need for predictability and assessment of financing needs. Switzerland, the US, and the EU called for a structure similar to that of the COP decision on the fifth review, with the US and the EU supporting consideration of highlighting some SCF recommendations. The US supported observer and private sector engagement with the SCF and the GEF. The Co-Chairs were mandated to compile a draft text, based on discussions and parties' additional submissions.

In the final session of the informal consultations, noting lack of time, Fakir proposed parties consider the draft decision, based on parties' input and containing paragraphs reflecting an SCF recommendation (FCCC/CP/2017/9, Annex II) that requests the Financial Mechanism operating entities to continue to enhance complementarity and coherence, and deciding to initiate the seventh review of the Financial Mechanism at COP 26. Before considering the draft text, parties debated: whether to incorporate other recommendations from the SCF report; how to capture the updated sixth review guidelines for the next review; and whether to note lack of consensus and have the co-facilitators report this to the COP 23 President for his consideration on the way forward. Two countries proposed postponing closing the review by a year, with others objecting. Parties then considered, and agreed to, the draft decision as proposed by the co-facilitators.

In plenary, on Saturday, 18 November, the COP adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/CP/2017/L.4), the COP:

- notes the expert input of the SCF to the sixth review of the Financial Mechanism;
- takes note of the efforts made by the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism to enhance complementarity and coherence between them and between the operating entities and other sources of investment and financial flows;
- requests the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism to continue to enhance complementarity and coherence;
- decides to initiate the seventh review of the Financial Mechanism at COP 26 in accordance with the criteria in the updated guidelines contained in the annex to decision 12/CP.22 (on the sixth review of the Financial Mechanism), or as those guidelines may be subsequently amended; and
- requests the SCF to provide expert input to the seventh review of the Financial Mechanism in 2021 with a view to the review being completed by COP 27.

Process to identify information in accordance with Article 9.5 of the Paris Agreement: In plenary on Tuesday, 7 November, the COP agreed to establish a contact group on this sub-item, co-chaired by Outi Honkatukia and Andrés Eduardo Mogro Zambrano.

In informal consultations, developing country groups and parties, opposed by some developed countries, stressed this item belongs to the Paris Agreement work programme and requires an outcome at COP 24, and called for a COP 23 decision forwarding this item to one of the subsidiary bodies, citing the need to ensure continued consideration throughout 2018.

Parties then shared views on the potential elements and format for the preparation of information. Many developing country groups and parties stressed the need to track progress towards the collective finance goal. Developed countries supported the use of biennial submissions on strategies and approaches as a basis, and stressed the feasibility of additional qualitative information. Parties highlighted, *inter alia*: an overview of trends of support to be provided; pledges; indications for mitigation and adaptation finance; base years; channels used; economic sectors; instruments, such as grants and loans; the principle of new and additional financial resources; strategies and approaches for scaling up climate finance; enhanced transparency and comparability of information; drawing from the common tabular format; and a definition of climate finance. Some developing and developed countries' views diverged on whether the mandate for this item also includes a focus on mobilizing climate change finance, and whether official development assistance (ODA) and climate finance can be separated.

Informal consultations continued. With parties unable to agree to the text in a final contact group meeting on Wednesday, 17 November, Honkatukia informed that the co-chairs would report to the COP 23 President.

Informal ministerial-level consultations convened throughout the day on Thursday, 16 November, through Saturday, 18 November.

In plenary, on Saturday, 18 November, the COP adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/CP/2017/L.12), the COP:

- reiterates that developed countries shall biennially communicate indicative quantitative and qualitative information related to Paris Agreement Article 9.1 and 9.3, as applicable, including, as available, projected levels of public financial resources to be provided to developing countries, and that other parties providing resources are encouraged to communicate biennially such information on a voluntary basis;

- welcomes the constructive sharing of views during the roundtable discussion among parties organized by the Secretariat on 16 May 2017, its summary report, and the progress made on this matter as reflected in the informal note by the co-chairs of the contact group thereof; and
- requests SBI 48, and at subsequent sessions on the Paris Agreement work programme, to consider the identification of the information to be provided by parties in accordance with Paris Agreement Article 9.5, and to forward the outcomes to COP 24 with a view to the COP providing a recommendation for consideration and adoption by CMA 1-3.

REPORTING TO AND FROM ANNEX I PARTIES: This item was referred to the SBI. (See page 18.)

REPORTING TO AND FROM NON-ANNEX I PARTIES: This item was referred to the SBI. (See page 18.)

CAPACITY BUILDING UNDER THE CONVENTION: This item was referred to the SBI. (See page 22.)

IMPLEMENTATION OF ARTICLE 4.8 AND 4.9 OF THE CONVENTION: Implementation of the Buenos Aires programme of work on adaptation and response measures (decision 1/CP.10): This item was referred to the SBI and SBSTA (See page 25.)

Matters related to LDCs: This item was referred to the SBI. (See page 19.)

ASSESSMENT OF TECHNICAL EXAMINATION PROCESSES ON MITIGATION AND ADAPTATION: This item was first taken up in plenary, on Tuesday, 7 November, and subsequently discussed in informal consultations facilitated by Deo Saran (Fiji).

In informal consultations, parties and observers shared views on a facilitator's summary note on: context; and improving the effectiveness of the TEP pre-2020 generally, and the TEP on mitigation (TEP-M) and TEP on adaptation (TEP-A), specifically.

Many groups and parties called for the recommendations to contain "strong" language that captures the sense of urgency to act, and more detail on how they will be implemented. Parties also supported: mandating expert organizations to organize Thematic Expert Meetings (TEMs); organizing regional TEMs under existing forums for cost effectiveness; enhancing TEP-A based on the "needs for climate action"; enhancing TEC and CTCN involvement in developing a multi-year workplan for TEP-M; and ensuring stronger non-party stakeholder involvement, including thorough processes that facilitate conversations with governments.

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

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/CP/2017/L.2), the COP, *inter alia*:

- strongly urges the SB Chairs, the high-level champions, the Adaptation Committee, the TEC, and the CTCN to focus the TEPs on specific policy options and opportunities for enhancing mitigation and adaptation that are actionable in the short term, including those with sustainable development co-benefits;
- strongly urges the high-level champions of the Global Climate Action Agenda to identify, by 12 January 2018, in consultation with the TEC and the CTCN, topics for the TEPs on mitigation for the period until 2020;
- requests the TEC and the CTCN to include in their joint annual report to the COP, having consulted with the high-level champions thereon, recommendations for parties and other organizations on ways forward and necessary actions to be taken based on the outcomes of the TEMs;
- also requests the Adaptation Committee, in conducting the TEPs on adaptation, to consider the needs of parties expressed

in their NDCs, National Adaptation Plans (NAPs) and national communications, to address all four functions of the TEPs on adaptation, and to include in its annual report to the COP recommendations for respective processes and for constituted bodies under the Convention, parties and other organizations on ways forward and necessary actions to be taken, based on the outcomes of the TEMs; and

- strongly urges the SB Chairs, the high-level champions, the Adaptation Committee, the TEC and the CTCN to ensure the necessary continuity of, and follow-up on, the identified policy options and opportunities referred to above, including by informing the summaries for policymakers, the high-level events and the 2018 facilitative dialogue.

GENDER: This item was referred to the SBI. (See page 25.)

ADMINISTRATIVE, FINANCIAL AND INSTITUTIONAL MATTERS: Audit report and financial statements for 2016: Budget performance for the biennium 2016-2017: Programme budget for the biennium 2018-2019: These items were referred to the SBI. (See page 25.)

Decision-making in the UNFCCC process: On Monday, 6 November, Amena Yauvoli (Fiji) was asked to facilitate informal consultations on this item, which will be considered at COP 24.

HIGH-LEVEL SEGMENT: COP 23 President Bainimarama opened the high-level segment on Wednesday, 15 November. Stressing that the threat from climate change is real, urgent, and "growing overnight," 12-year old Fijian Timoci Naulusala asked attendees: "Are you ready to face life without earth?"

COP 23 President Bainimarama appealed to parties to remain focused on a successful outcome from COP 23, and reported that agreement had been reached on the proposed COP agenda item on the acceleration of implementation of pre-2020 commitments and actions, and increasing pre-2020 ambition.

UN Secretary-General António Guterres underlined that SIDS are at the frontlines of climate change and that they must be the "voice of us all." With respect to big infrastructure projects, he said, "if they are not green they should not be given the green light," and urged donor nations to bring the GCF fully to life.

President Frank-Walter Steinmeier, Germany, said the reality of climate change is dramatic and urgent. He noted that the Paris Agreement must be followed up with deeds, and that the multilateral structure is indispensable for a peaceful and sustainable future.

Miroslav Lajčák, President, UN General Assembly, described the negative impacts of climate change, and noted the necessary tools to combat it already exist. He argued that while the people who will suffer from climate impacts are not in the room, parties are accountable to them.

The high-level segment continued through Thursday, 16 November, with over 130 national statements and statements from observers.

CLOSING PLENARY: In plenary on Saturday, 18 November, the UNFCCC Secretariat provided a preliminary assessment of the budgetary implications of the decisions adopted at this COP.

COP Rapporteur Georg Børsting presented the draft report of the session (FCCC/CP/2017/L.3), which the COP adopted.

Parties also adopted a resolution expressing gratitude to the Government of Germany and people of the city of Bonn (FCCC/CP/2017/L.7–FCCC/KP/CMP/2017/L.3–FCCC/PA/CMA/2017/L.2).

A joint COP/CMP/CMA closing plenary was held to hear statements. (See page 29.) COP President Bainimarama gavelled the session to a close at 6:56 am, on Saturday, 18 November.

**CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES SERVING AS
THE MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE KYOTO
PROTOCOL**

ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS: Parties adopted the agenda (FCCC/KP/CMP/2017/1) and agreed to refer to the SBSTA the agenda sub-item on matters relating to Kyoto Protocol Article 2.3. Parties also agreed to refer to the SBI the following items and sub-items: the third review of the Adaptation Fund; national communications of Annex I parties; capacity building under the Kyoto Protocol; matters relating to Kyoto Protocol Article 3.14; audit report and financial statements for 2016; and budget performance for the biennium 2016-2017.

Credentials: On Saturday, 18 November, the CMP adopted the report on credentials (FCCC/KP/CMP/2017/7).

Status of ratification of the Doha Amendment of the Kyoto Protocol: On Monday, 6 November, the Secretariat reported that 84 parties had submitted instruments of acceptance. CMP 13 President Bainimarama introduced a note on the action taken by Annex I parties in reporting information to establish their assigned amounts for the second commitment period and other related information required by the reporting guidelines (FCCC/CMP/2017/INF.1). He stated that informal consultations will convene.

On Saturday, 18 November, Bainimarama updated parties on seven additional deposited instruments of acceptance, by Belgium, Finland, Germany, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, and the UK, noting 54 additional instruments are required for the entry into force of the Doha Amendment.

The CMP took note of the updated status of the ratification of the Doha Amendment.

REPORTS OF THE SUBSIDIARY BODIES: On Friday, 17 November, the CMP took note of the SBI 46 report (FCCC/SBI/2017/7 and Add.1), draft SBI 47 report (FCCC/SBI/2017/L.19), SBSTA 46 report (FCCC/SBSTA/2017/4), and draft SBSTA 17 report (FCCC/SBSTA/2017/L.18).

MATTERS RELATED TO THE CDM: This item (FCCC/KP/CMP/2017/5) was first taken up in plenary on Monday, 6 November, and subsequently in a contact group and informal consultations co-facilitated by Takalani Rambau (South Africa) and Karoliina Anttonen (Finland).

In informal consultations, two country groups and a developed country made a number of proposals related to transparency and environmental integrity. A developing country group and two developing countries made proposals related to strengthening the CDM and ensuring its continued use. In a final contact group meeting, parties agreed to a draft decision that did not include those proposals.

In its closing plenary on Friday, 17 November, the CMP adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: In its decision on guidance relating to the CDM (FCCC/KP/CMP/2017/L.2), the CMP, *inter alia*, urges parties to deposit their instruments of acceptance of the Doha Amendment, and requests the CDM Executive Board to continue to simplify the process for development and approval of standardized baselines.

MATTERS RELATED TO JOINT IMPLEMENTATION: On Monday, 6 November, the CMP took note of the annual report of the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee (FCCC/KP/CMP/2017/2).

MATTERS RELATED TO THE ADAPTATION FUND:
Report of the Adaptation Fund Board: This item (FCCC/KP/CMP/2017/6) was first taken up in plenary on Tuesday, 7 November, and in informal consultations co-facilitated by Patience Damptey (Ghana) and Gemma O'Reilly (Ireland).

In plenary, the Adaptation Fund Board reported that the Fund: has never been more in demand; is delivering effectively on its mandate; and is already facilitating the implementation of the Paris Agreement. He reported the Fund received US\$81.4 million in contributions in the past year.

In informal consultations, parties expressed views on proposed draft conclusions, discussing how to incorporate in the draft conclusions more recent numbers on funding. Some developed countries suggested the Adaptation Fund Board should release an addendum to its report with more updated numbers in conjunction with COP sessions, in a manner similar to the GCF and the GEF.

Related discussions occurred under the APA, where countries discussed the Adaptation Fund in relation to its role serving the Paris Agreement, with reference to the APA's CMA 1 and COP 22 mandate. Many developing countries underscored that the Adaptation Fund "shall" serve the Agreement, with most, if not all, of its governance and institutional aspects applying *mutatis mutandis*. Several developed countries underlined that a decision on the Fund, saying that it "should" serve the Paris Agreement, should occur after various governance and institutional modalities are reviewed, and that a transitional period should occur to transfer authority of the Fund from the CMP to the CMA. These discussions are more fully described under the APA. (See page 15.)

On Saturday, 18 November, the CMP adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/KP/CMP/2017/L.4) the CMP, *inter alia*:

- reiterates its concern regarding the issues related to the sustainability, adequacy and predictability of funding for the Adaptation Fund due to the current uncertainty about the prices of Certified Emission Reductions (CERs);
- encourages the scaling up of financial resources, including the provision of voluntary support, that is additional to the share of proceeds levied on CERs, in order to support the resource mobilization efforts of the Adaptation Fund Board with a view to strengthening the Adaptation Fund;
- encourages the Adaptation Fund Board to continue its deliberations on enhancing and streamlining accreditation policies for implementing entities, including reaccreditation of previously accredited entities;
- requests the Adaptation Fund Board to make available, as part of its annual report, information on board meetings and other relevant developments that have taken place after the publication of the main part of the annual report;
- decides that the Adaptation Fund shall serve the Paris Agreement subject to and consistent with decisions to be taken at the third part of the first session of the CMA (December 2018);
- also decides that it will consider whether the Adaptation Fund shall serve the Paris Agreement exclusively, under the guidance of and accountable to the CMA, following a recommendation from the CMA on this matter to CMP 15 (November 2019); and
- notes the progress of the APA in undertaking the necessary preparatory work to address governance and institutional arrangements, safeguards, and operating modalities for the Adaptation Fund to serve the Paris Agreement, including sources of funding, to be defined by parties, and looks forward to the recommendations thereon from the APA in 2018.

Third review of the Adaptation Fund: This item (FCCC/TP/2017/6) was referred to the SBI. (See page 22.)

REPORT OF THE HIGH-LEVEL MINISTERIAL ROUNDTABLE ON INCREASED AMBITION OF KYOTO PROTOCOL COMMITMENTS: This item was introduced on Monday, 6 November, and subsequently taken up in consultations led by Luke Daunivalu, CMP 13 Presidency.

REPORTING TO AND FROM ANNEX I PARTIES: National Communications: This item was referred to the SBI. (See page 18.)

Annual compilation and accounting report for the second commitment period for Annex B parties under the Kyoto Protocol: On Monday, 6 November, the CMP took note of the information presented (FCCC/KP/CMP/2017/3 and Add.1).

CAPACITY BUILDING UNDER THE PROTOCOL: This item was referred to the SBI. (See page 23.)

MATTERS RELATED TO KYOTO PROTOCOL ARTICLE 2.3: KYOTO PROTOCOL ARTICLE 3.14:

In plenary, on Saturday, 18 November, CMP 13 President Bainimarama informed that there were no specific conclusions on these matters, and SBI 48 and SBSTA 48 would continue consideration.

ADMINISTRATIVE, FINANCIAL AND INSTITUTIONAL MATTERS: Audit report and financial statements for 2016: Budget performance for the biennium 2016-2017: This item was referred to the SBI. (See page 25.)

Programme budget for the biennium 2018-2019: This item was referred to the SBI. (See page 25.)

CLOSING PLENARY: In plenary on Saturday, 18 November, parties adopted a resolution expressing gratitude to the Government of Germany and people of the city of Bonn (FCCC/KP/CMP/2017/L.3).

CMP Rapporteur Georg Børsting presented the draft report of the session (FCCC/KP/CMP/2017/L.1), which the CMP adopted.

CMP 13 President Bainimarama gavelled the session to a close at 6:34 am on Saturday, 18 November.

CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES SERVING AS THE MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE PARIS AGREEMENT

ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS: On Monday, 6 November, the CMA adopted its agenda and organization of work (FCCC/PA/CMA/2017/1).

Election of officers: On Saturday, 18 November, CMA 1-2 President Bainimarama noted that one group elected a member to the COP Bureau from a country that is not yet a party to the Paris Agreement, and said that the group will consult on its Bureau member for the CMA.

Status of ratification of the Paris Agreement: On Monday, 6 November, the UNFCCC Secretariat reported that there were 169 parties to the Paris Agreement.

Credentials: On Friday, 17 November, the CMA adopted the report on credentials (FCCC/PA/CMA/2017/2).

MATTERS RELATED TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PARIS AGREEMENT: These discussions, particularly those related to the 2018 facilitative dialogue, to be known as the Talanoa Dialogue, are summarized under the COP item on preparing for the entry into force of the Paris Agreement. (See page 4.)

CLOSURE OF THE SESSION: On Saturday, 18 November, parties adopted a resolution expressing gratitude to the Government of Germany and people of the city of Bonn (FCCC/PA/CMA/2017/L.2). CMA Rapporteur Georg Børsting presented the draft report of the session (FCCC/PA/CMA/2017/L.1), which the CMA adopted.

CMA 1-2 President Bainimarama gavelled the session to a close at 6:29 am on Saturday, 18 November.

AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON THE PARIS AGREEMENT

On Tuesday, 7 November, noting the APA had made steady, incremental progress since COP 22, Co-Chair Sarah Baashan (Saudi Arabia) stressed there is still much work remaining.

Several parties underlined the benefits of, and need for, balance and coherence among the issues addressed and among the subsidiary bodies. Most groups outlined their expectations for the most substantive agenda items, with several developing countries underscoring the need to address mitigation, adaptation, MOI, and response measures in several substantive items.

On process and possible outcomes of COP 23, the EU said it was not convinced that compilations of submissions or parties' views are an efficient way to conduct the process. Australia, for the Umbrella Group, stressed that the APA must also be flexible and allow each item to move forward at its own pace. Switzerland, for the EIG, called on the Co-Chairs to ensure overall balance in the process, gradually deepening the substance and robustness of the text.

Mali, for the African Group, and Ethiopia, for the LDCs, highlighted the urgency of textual negotiations. Iran, for the LMDCs, called for a single draft negotiating text that includes all elements. Saudi Arabia, for the Arab Group, stated preference for an omnibus decision in 2018.

Maldives, for AOSIS, stated parties should leave Bonn with a comprehensive plan of work and a timetable. Brazil, for Brazil, Argentina, and Uruguay, supported developing textual elements and suggested distinguishing the elements that need to be agreed in 2018 from those that can be addressed later.

On the Adaptation Fund, the LMDCs said the Fund should serve the Paris Agreement. The LDCs called for a COP 23 decision. Brazil, Argentina, and Uruguay suggested a COP decision in 2018.

Women and Gender called for rules that will realize fair, inclusive, and gender-sensitive implementation of the Paris Agreement.

YOUNGOs identified Action for Climate Empowerment (ACE) as the core element of the Paris Agreement.

Business and Industry NGOs (BINGOs) called for an inclusive dialogue with business as part of an "all economy" approach.

Climate Action Network (CAN) called for implementation guidelines that encourage ambition and facilitate action, and for leaving Bonn with negotiating text.

Climate Justice Now! (CJN!) lamented that some parties are stating their NDCs pertain only to mitigation and not to MOI.

Indigenous Peoples underscored their vulnerabilities to climate variabilities and extremes, and the effect of climate change on their subsistence and sovereignty.

LGMA highlighted their contributions to, *inter alia*, the GST and transparency framework.

TUNGOs urged countries to include a just transition in their NDCs.

ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS: Election of officers: Parties elected Sarah Baashan and Jo Tyndall (New Zealand) for a second consecutive one-year term on Tuesday, 7 November.

On Saturday, 18 November, Co-Chair Baashan informed that Anna Serzysko (Poland) would continue as Rapporteur.

Adoption of the agenda: Co-Chair Baashan informed that, given that this is a resumed session, the agenda adopted at APA 1 would continue to be applied, with the exception of the sub-

item on preparing for the entry into force of the Paris Agreement, which was completed in Marrakech in 2016 (FCCC/APA/2017/3).

Organization of work: Co-Chair Baashan proposed, and parties agreed, to apply the modalities established in May 2016 (FCCC/APA/2016/2). She explained that: the contact group will meet at least three times; informal consultations will take up technical work; the APA Co-Chairs will coordinate daily with the co-facilitators and regularly with the UNFCCC Subsidiary Bodies (SB) Co-Chairs to ensure coherence and consistency; and parties are encouraged to keep the informal consultations open to observers. She also called on parties to reach, at APA 1-4, an understanding on all items on: scope, including “skeleton” outlines; and content, including narrative, bullets, and/or options, as well as placeholders to take into account linkages to work undertaken elsewhere.

APA CONTACT GROUP: The APA met in a contact group to consider all of its substantive agenda items. The group met Tuesday, 7 November, and Tuesday, 14 November. Informal consultations convened on all the substantive items, and are summarized below.

On Tuesday, 7 November, APA Co-Chair Tyndall reiterated the proposed organization of work of the session, to which parties again agreed. She then provided an update, and suggested objectives for this session, on each substantive agenda item.

On agenda item 3, further guidance in relation to the mitigation section of Decision 1/CP.21, she identified the need to clarify elements of the guidance, and how the guidance is applied.

On agenda item 4, adaptation communication, she suggested parties focus on creating a framework that captures both general guidance, called for by some parties, and vehicle-specific guidance, called for by others.

On agenda item 5, modalities, procedures and guidelines for the transparency framework for action and support, she proposed, *inter alia*, focusing on identifying the elements in a holistic manner that builds on existing arrangements.

On agenda item 6, matters related to the GST, she suggested parties now work towards an outline for the modalities and sources of input.

On agenda item 7, modalities and procedures for the committee to facilitate implementation and promote compliance, she said deliberations must address multiple possible linkages with other areas of the Paris Agreement work programme.

On agenda item 8, further matters related to implementation of the Paris Agreement, she explained that work would continue on matters relating to the Adaptation Fund serving the Paris Agreement, as well as on five possible additional matters.

China, supported by India and Saudi Arabia, said identifying modalities for communicating information on the provision of public financial resources to developing countries in accordance with Paris Agreement Article 9.5 (*ex-ante* finance transparency) is a “homeless issue” that is lacking progress, calling for allocating time and two co-facilitators for this issue. Co-Chair Tyndall said this issue would be considered in the informal consultations under the sub-item on further matters.

On Tuesday, 14 November, Co-Chair Tyndall presented draft conclusions, containing ten paragraphs, with bracketed text in four paragraphs, relating to: whether to append the informal notes from this session as an annex to the APA conclusions (paragraph 4); a call for submissions (paragraph 7); a request for technical papers (paragraph 8); and a recommendation to hold an additional APA session in August or September 2018 (paragraph 9).

On paragraph 4, Brazil, for Brazil, Argentina, and Uruguay, Ethiopia, for the LDCs, Iran, for the LMDCs, the EU, Switzerland, for the EIG, and Indonesia supported annexing the

informal notes to the conclusions. Australia, for the Umbrella Group, opposed. The EIG suggested adding that the APA agrees to focus its further work in the upcoming session on substantive elements of the agreed working areas, which China opposed, saying that this could imply that the APA was not already working on substantive matters.

South Africa, for the African Group, called for the inclusion of three options on how to take forward work relating to the possible additional matter of modalities for communicating finance information in accordance with Agreement Article 9.5 (*ex-ante* finance transparency). Australia, the US, and the EU opposed this, with the EU saying that the proposal was substantive while the APA conclusions are procedural. The African Group countered that the proposal was on a way forward, which he characterized as procedural.

On paragraph 5 (recommending the COP President to consider options for bringing together the outcomes of the work under various bodies), Saudi Arabia, for the Arab Group, suggested deleting the reference to the objective of illustrating the progress made, saying it is duplicative. The US expressed concern over the ambiguity of “bringing together,” saying that it should not involve consolidating text.

On paragraph 6 (Co-Chairs’ reflections note), the LMDCs requested a timeline for preparation of the note. Peru, for AILAC, supported by the African Group, and opposed by India, suggested that the Co-Chairs’ reflection note seek to eliminate duplications and improve the contents of the informal notes.

On paragraphs 7 and 8, Brazil, Argentina, and Uruguay, the Umbrella Group, the EU, and the US opposed inviting submissions or technical papers. Maldives, for AOSIS, Peru, for AILAC, Indonesia, and India said new submissions were not necessary at this point. The EIG said not all items needed submissions, and suggested item 6 (GST) could have submissions and a technical paper.

On paragraph 8, the LMDCs said that streamlining views would be unnecessary and would overburden the Secretariat. China noted a lack of clarity on how streamlining would be done, and supported keeping compilation texts to preserve all views.

The LDCs supported substantive submissions containing textual proposals that streamline work.

On paragraph 9, the Umbrella Group opposed calling for targeted roundtables on several items, and stressed the need to reach agreement at APA 1-4 that the outputs will feed into discussions at the next session. The EU said an additional session is unnecessary, but if one was decided she suggested October 2018. The LDCs, AOSIS, Indonesia, and China supported an additional session.

After suspending for half an hour, Tyndall reconvened the session, introducing textual amendments, namely: annexing the informal notes to the conclusions; removing text on recommending the COP President bring together the outcomes of all Paris Agreement work programme-related matters to illustrate progress; specifying that the Co-Chairs’ reflections note will be issued by early April 2018; replacing the draft paragraphs on submissions and synthesis papers with a paragraph recalling the general call for submissions by parties; and noting that additional negotiating time in 2018 might be useful.

Tyndall also proposed that, given the lack of consensus on the African Group’s proposal, the Co-Chairs include the proposal in their oral report to the COP and request its inclusion in the written report of the COP. In addition, she said the Co-Chairs would convey the divergence of views on the need for an additional session in 2018 when reporting to the COP.

Noting the proposal did not address the Group's concerns, the African Group reserved the right to return to this issue after consultations. The EIG requested clarity on how the Co-Chairs will treat the group's proposal to have a clear call for the next APA session to be focused on substance.

After noting that revised draft conclusions would be made available the same evening and taken up in the APA closing plenary on Wednesday, 15 November, Tyndall closed the contact group. Informal consultations convened Thursday, 16 November, through Saturday, 18 November. The conclusions were adopted by the APA plenary on Saturday, 18 November.

FURTHER GUIDANCE ON THE MITIGATION SECTION OF DECISION 1/CP.21 (PARIS OUTCOME): Features of NDCs, as specified in paragraph 26 (guidance on NDCs); Information to facilitate clarity, transparency and understanding of NDCs, as specified in paragraph 28; Accounting for parties' NDCs, as specified in paragraph 31 (guidance for accounting for NDCs): Informal consultations on this item were co-facilitated by Sin Liang Cheah (Singapore) and Gertraud Wollansky (Austria).

On Wednesday, 8 November, parties noted with appreciation the in-session roundtable held on Monday, 6 November, and the co-facilitators' non-paper from the previous session (APA.2017.5.InformalNote). Many countries agreed that differing capacities need to be reflected in the guidance, with some developing countries suggesting general information supplemented by developing and developed country-specific guidance. Some developed countries agreed on the need for a differentiated approach but rejected "bifurcation." Others stressed the need to find a balance between guidance that could be so detailed that it would act as a "shaming mechanism," and so general as to be unhelpful in fulfilling the Agreement's obligations. Several stressed the need for capacity building. Parties disagreed on whether to have a single set of draft guidelines, or two to reflect diverging views on operationalizing differentiation.

Noting the limited time available, Co-Facilitator Cheah presented a one-page document, containing headings on: caveats, general approach, procedural aspects, and preliminary material for developing substantive elements. He proposed parties provide inputs to the paper. Parties were, however, unable to agree on a way forward.

A number of developed and developing countries proposed to use the appendices in the co-facilitators' non-paper as the basis for the way forward. A developing country group, supported by many other countries, proposed including, in the document a structure, headings, and sub-headings, as well as specific issues, and formulating clusters of information or options. One group, opposed by a country, called for having two sets of guidance in the substantive elements for information and accounting. Many supported a "preliminary material document," but disagreed on the exact format and content. Parties expressed support for the co-facilitators' proposal to prepare such a document, stressing it should capture all views and respect red lines.

Parties reacted to a 45-page "preliminary material" document containing text on all three sub-items, with substantive elements for information and accounting placed in appendices containing parties' views grouped in three clusters. A large number of groups and countries commended the co-facilitators' work, but noted the document contained redundancies and duplication. One developing country group called for moving the clusters into the main text and removing duplication across two information-related clusters. A number of countries opposed removing duplication across clusters but supported doing so within clusters.

Some developed countries said the document gave more visibility to one group, calling for all views to be treated equally. Parties did not agree on proposals to streamline the text at this stage, and a number of parties and groups called for time to further examine the text.

Reflecting on the preliminary material document, one developed country proposed: lifting two clusters from appendices on information and accounting into the main body of the text; requesting parties' additional submissions, to be included as attachments after each respective section; and that the co-facilitators streamline the text, including the clusters. One developing country group proposed replacing the two clusters with submissions from parties, and opposed attributing parties or groups' submissions. Wollansky proposed, and parties agreed to, in-session submissions from parties on information and accounting, and on anything that might be missing from the text. Parties also mandated the co-facilitators to streamline the document and agreed that parties could indicate in their submissions their preference regarding attribution.

In later informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Cheah presented a 180-page "preliminary material" document. While conveying apprehension about the length of the document, but noting that it included several caveats to take into account parties' concerns, he expressed hope that the document would enable parties to start substantive negotiations at APA 1-5. Many expressed their comfort in mandating the co-facilitators to work further on the text before APA 1-5, with one developing country group proposing that the co-facilitators streamline the document and consolidate views. Countries agreed to forward the document to the APA Co-Chairs as the co-facilitators' informal note from APA 1-4.

FURTHER GUIDANCE IN RELATION TO THE ADAPTATION COMMUNICATION, INCLUDING, *INTER ALIA*, AS A COMPONENT OF NDCS, REFERRED TO IN ARTICLE 7.10 AND 7.11 OF THE PARIS AGREEMENT: Informal consultations on this item were co-facilitated by Julio Cordano (Chile) and Beth Lavender (Canada).

Delegates started considering a preliminary material document that contained a "skeleton" list of headings and sub-headings, which further evolved into three iterations of informal notes, based on parties' inputs, which went further in depth on the possible contents of the headings and sub-headings.

One developing country proposed the following headings and sub-headings: preamble; guiding principles; purpose; elements, with sub-headings on opt-in or opt-out elements; vehicles, with sub-headings on timing and frequency issues; linkages; support, with sub-headings on support for preparation and submission of adaptation communication, implementation of the needs, priorities, plans, and strategies in the communications; modalities of support; and other matters. Views diverged among developed and developing countries on whether negotiations should proceed based on this proposal or address only areas of convergence. Several developing countries stressed that support should be for developing countries, and guiding principles need to include common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, national circumstances, and flexibility. Many developed countries objected to including guiding principles, saying these are covered under the Paris Agreement. One developed country stated that mandatory or common reporting formats increase burdens and reduce flexibility, and proposed that a list of elements would ensure the least burden.

One developing country group, supported by another, proposed there should be two separate sets of adaptation communication guidance: general guidance and NDC-specific guidance. Several

developed countries opposed this, noting that the group is mandated to develop guidance for adaptation communication and not for communicating on adaptation through the NDCs. A developing country group explained that this proposal stems from a lack of guidance for adaptation communication in the NDCs. Several countries stated this proposal could generate an additional burden.

In later informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Lavender informed that the APA Co-Chairs had asked the co-facilitators to produce a second iteration of the informal note with more detail, especially under the elements heading, to ensure “comparability” with work under other APA agenda items. On the second iteration of the informal note, several developing countries requested the inclusion of language that reflects that the informal note does not represent convergence among parties, especially on elements. A developed country, supported by two developing country groups, suggested not singling out NDCs in the two options for adaptation guidance, by including the options on: vehicle specific guidance, with sub-bullets for possible vehicles; and non-specific guidance. Many developing countries supported including in the informal note a request to the IPCC to prepare guidelines regarding methodologies and approaches for aggregating data towards a global goal on adaptation. Several parties questioned the feasibility of this proposal, with one suggesting this would be beyond the scope of the agenda item.

The informal note was revised to include suggestions raised, and was forwarded to the APA contact group.

MODALITIES, PROCEDURES, GUIDELINES FOR THE TRANSPARENCY FRAMEWORK FOR ACTION AND SUPPORT:

This item was discussed in informal consultations co-facilitated by Xiang Gao (China) and Andrew Rakestraw (US). Countries discussed: the basis for differentiating commitments in the modalities, procedures and guidelines; the notation key developed by the co-facilitators in the preliminary material document to indicate which provisions applied to which party groupings; additional headings, including one related to Paris Agreement 9.5 (*ex-ante* finance transparency) on support for preparation of NDCs and adaptation communication; the facilitative multilateral consideration of progress and technical expert review (TER); and the need for support registered in the framework to be agreed, by both providers and receivers, to be aimed exclusively at meeting Paris Agreement obligations.

Following revisions, the co-facilitators forwarded the preliminary material document to the APA contact group for consideration.

MATTERS RELATING TO THE GST: Identification of the sources of input for the GST: Development of the modalities of the GST:

Informal consultations were co-facilitated by Outi Honkatukia (Finland) and Richard Muyungi (Tanzania). Countries discussed the “building blocks” preliminary material document prepared by the co-facilitators, focusing on: the possibility of structuring inputs around guiding questions; whether the subsidiary bodies or CMA would be an appropriate governance body; and the need to define the timing and duration of the technical process.

Countries also discussed how to operationalize equity in the context of the GST, agreeing the concept should: be overarching; ensure inclusivity; be linked to the concepts of sustainable development and poverty eradication; not place undue burden on developing country parties; utilize objective measures; apply to adaptation, mitigation, and MOI; and encourage the participation of non-party stakeholders and expert groups. Among proposals, parties suggested: holding technical dialogues in conjunction with regular sessions; considering sources of input that could provide

analysis of equity; conducting specific dialogues; and including references to equity in the GST outcome.

Following revisions, the co-facilitators forwarded the preliminary material document to the APA contact group for consideration.

MODALITIES AND PROCEDURES FOR THE EFFECTIVE OPERATION OF THE COMMITTEE TO FACILITATE IMPLEMENTATION AND PROMOTE COMPLIANCE:

Informal consultations on this item were co-facilitated by Janine Felson (Belize) and Peter Horne (Australia). Participants agreed to develop a preliminary material document to help inform the development of an informal note. Participants also discussed systemic issues and linkages with the transparency framework (APA agenda item 5).

On linkages with the transparency framework, one group suggested that exploring the link is premature and another stated that there is no such link. One country viewed the transparency framework as the key institution for compliance. Several countries noted the information that could be provided by the TER in the transparency framework, with some highlighting the potential duplication between the committee’s and the TER’s facilitative functions. Some countries observed links to triggers, with one group noting the TER could serve as the basis to initiate the committee’s work and others suggesting a party could refer itself, based on its experience with the TER.

On systemic issues, many stated that such an analysis should be done on an aggregate level, without seeking to identify individual parties. One group underscored the potential for duplication with other institutions. Another group said the focus should be on common or recurring issues, while others suggested looking at core reasons why parties have difficulty complying. For some, systemic issues could be an added value of the committee, while others suggested that the CMA should handle systemic issues.

Reacting to the preliminary material document, parties focused on: principles, systemic issues, linkages to other bodies, and functions.

On principles, developing countries preferred retaining this section, while many developed countries argued that Article 15 already included sufficient guidance regarding principles. Suggestions from parties on additional principles included non-duplication, independent, expert-based, facilitative, transparent, and not modifying other mechanisms.

Multiple groups of developing countries underscored that common but differentiated responsibilities (CBDR) should guide the work of the committee, while some developed countries expressed concern that the document is “heavy” on differentiation, by including many references to different forms of differentiation, citing references to CBDR, bifurcated approaches, and national circumstances and capabilities.

On systemic issues, three groups of developing countries called for more attention to systemic issues at the aggregate level, while others suggested this is not a role for the committee. A group of developing countries called for reflection of systemic issues in sections on sources of information, triggers, and outputs.

On linkages to other bodies, some did not support a GST link, with others proposing links to the response measures forum and Agreement Article 6 (cooperative approaches). One group underscored that other institutions should not be triggers.

On functions, some said the committee’s work should be for legally-binding provisions only, while others said that the two functions, for facilitating implementation and promoting compliance, should apply to legally-binding provisions, while the facilitating compliance function should apply to non-legally

binding provisions. Some developed countries said their views on the continuum of functions is not adequately reflected, and asked that the previous text be re-inserted.

One group called for several sections to be discussed under the umbrella of each type of trigger, saying that how each modality will be discussed and decided depends on the triggers chosen for the committee.

In later informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Horne presented the revised informal note. All viewed the informal note as a useful basis, noting it is a compilation of views. One developing country group, opposed by two developing country groups, suggested including special circumstances for all developing countries, not only LDCs and SIDS. Some developed countries asked that the note reflect that bodies other than the committee could initiate the committee's work.

On the way forward, one developing country group suggested written submissions, which two developed countries opposed, saying that the informal note adequately captured positions.

The informal note was revised to include the suggestions raised, and was forwarded to the APA contact group.

FURTHER MATTERS RELATED TO IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PARIS AGREEMENT:

Preparing for entry into force: Taking stock of progress made by the subsidiary and constituted bodies in relation to their mandated work under the Paris Agreement and section III of decision 1/CP.21 (Decisions to give effect to the Paris Agreement), in order to promote and facilitate coordination and coherence in the implementation of the work programme, and, if appropriate, take action, which may include

recommendations: Informal consultations were co-facilitated by APA Co-Chairs Sarah Baashan and Jo Tyndall. Parties considered the Adaptation Fund, and five possible additional matters.

Adaptation Fund: This item was considered in informal consultations co-facilitated by María del Pilar Bueno (Argentina) and Pieter Terpstra (the Netherlands). Views diverged on whether there should be an outcome at COP 23 stipulating that the Adaptation Fund shall serve the Paris Agreement and modalities should be developed in a time frame to be discussed. Several developed countries argued that work must progress to address the issues related to the Adaptation Fund, mainly to governance and institutional arrangements, safeguards, and operating modalities, before a decision is taken.

One developing country group presented two draft decisions: a COP decision that states that the Adaptation Fund shall serve the Paris Agreement; and a CMP decision that states that the Adaptation Fund shall serve the Paris Agreement and identifies operational policies and guidelines related to, *inter alia*, access to resources and a resource mobilization strategy, that should apply *mutatis mutandis*. Several developed countries' proposals highlighted the need for a transitional period, with one group proposing that the Fund should serve the Agreement from 2020. A developed country underlined that the primary source of funding should be a share of proceeds from markets, and several others called for clarifying the relationship with Agreement Article 6, while one developing country group characterized a condition of accepting markets in this context as "a non-starter."

In response to the first iteration of the informal note, several developing country groups and parties objected to the mention of "innovative sources of finance" and underscored the need to define the term, with one developed country arguing that Certified Emission Reduction (CER) contributions to the Fund constitute innovative finance. One developing country cautioned

against pre-judging negotiations related to Agreement Article 6. A developed country noted that the overall future of the Fund is a political decision.

In later informal consultations several developing country groups and parties expressed concern about the lack of progress, with one country adding that discussions are "not going anywhere," while several developed countries noted areas of convergence.

Informal informal consultations on the matter continued under the CMP agenda item on matters relating to the Adaptation Fund until Saturday, 18 November. (See page 10.)

Other further matters: In informal consultations on the five possible additional matters, countries responded to further questions proposed by the Co-Chairs aimed at supporting the deliberations, which were additional to the three questions already proposed in the APA Co-Chairs' reflection note from the previous session (APA.2017.3.InformalNote).

Many parties raised concerns regarding scheduling clashes with other finance-related items being discussed under other bodies. On the need for considering modalities for biennially communicating finance information on the provision of public financial resources to developing countries in accordance with Paris Agreement Article 9.5 (*ex-ante* finance transparency), parties' views diverged on whether this matter is sufficiently addressed under the COP item on Article 9.5.

These views were reiterated in later consultations, with developing countries calling for the COP to mandate the APA to take up the matter, citing linkages to work under APA item 5 on the transparency framework. One developing country group informed it would be submitting a conference room paper containing substantive elements on how the group proposes to take this matter forward.

Parties discussed the need for initial CMA guidance to the GCF and GEF, where a developing country group clarified the legal and accountability arrangements among relevant bodies, stating that any guidance from the CMA, which will be on matters related to the Paris Agreement only, will be requested from the SCF, then considered by the CMA and finally brought to the COP. Many countries agreed that the matter should not be taken up at this point. Many developed countries stressed no additional guidance was needed, suggesting the SCF already has a mandate from decision 1/CP.21 (Paris outcome) to prepare draft guidance. Developing countries expressed a preference to wait for more clarity on the "CMA workplan" before discussing additional guidance. A developing country group proposed that CMA 1 start a process to consider possible additional guidance. Tyndall requested the group prepare a textual proposal.

Parties considered the need for initial guidance by the CMA to the LDCF and the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF), with many developing country groups proposing the mandate of issuing the initial guidance to be given to the COP via the SBI, and to establish the LDCF initial guidance as a specific SBI agenda item at CMA 1 in 2018, with the aim to provide recommendations to the CMA, and to conclude by SBI 50. One developing country group further noted that the LDCF and SCCF are Convention Funds, which are the purview of the COP, and said that if the SBI, and not the APA, deals with the matter, it needs to be done under an agenda item that could be titled "other matters relating to the operationalization of the Paris Agreement relevant to the functioning of the LDCF." Several developed countries said there is no need to consider this mandate now as the LDCF initial guidance falls within the guidance to the GEF, with one country adding it cannot support the initial guidance to be considered by the SBI.

On the possible additional matter of setting a new collective quantified goal on finance prior to 2025, views diverged on whether work is already being undertaken under the COP sub-item on LTF and the new goal is within the scope of this sub-item; and the matter is already on the CMA agenda through a reference to the relevant decision 1/CP.21 (Paris outcome) paragraph in a CMA 1-2 agenda footnote. Many developing country groups stressed the need for the work to start at CMA 1-2, noting that goals take time to finalize, with some calling for the APA to recommend a CMA procedural decision to allow for inputs as early as possible. Two developing countries stressed the need to focus on “taking into account the needs and priorities of developing countries” when setting the goal. Many developed countries and a developing country group saw no need for preparatory work to start now, proposing that the CMA start discussions before 2025, possibly in 2023, and, with another developing country group, stressed the need to incorporate lessons from delivery on the 2020 finance goal, and inputs from the Talanoa Dialogue and GST. Two developing countries, in turn, suggested that discussions on the new goal need to inform the Dialogue and GST. A conference room paper submitted by the African Group on Friday, 10 November, containing the group’s views relating to the modalities for communicating information under Agreement Article 9.5, was briefly presented. Baashan informed that the co-facilitators would prepare a final iteration of their informal note.

Presidency-led consultations among parties continued from 15-17 November to resolve the African Group’s concern relating to the need to consider and include modalities for communicating information under Agreement Article 9.5 into the Paris Agreement work programme.

CLOSING PLENARY: On Wednesday, 15 November, Co-Chair Baashan invited parties to consider the draft conclusions on agenda items 3-8 (FCCC/APA/2017/L.4 and Add.1). She said that: given the lack of consensus on the African Group’s proposal relating to addressing the modalities for Agreement Article 9.5 (*ex-ante* finance transparency), the Co-Chairs would include the proposal in their oral report to the COP and request its inclusion in the written report of the COP; and the Co-Chairs would convey the divergence of views on the need for an additional session in 2018 when reporting to the COP.

South Africa, for the African Group, stressed that the COP Presidency had pledged to undertake consultations with all parties on Article 9.5 and requested that plenary adjourn until consultations were complete.

Co-Chair Baashan recalled paragraph 106 of the SBI 46 report (FCCC/SBI/2017/7), in which the SBI recommends SBSTA, SBI, and APA conclude their work by noon on Wednesday, 15 November, in order to translate draft texts into all six official UN languages for adoption. She invited statements from the floor on the draft conclusions.

South Africa underlined that adoption of conclusions requires consensus and said that, in light of the African Group’s reservations, there was no consensus. He reiterated his request to adjourn plenary to await the outcome of the Presidency’s consultations. Baashan noted the African Group’s reservation and said that statements might offer solutions.

The African Group called for addressing procedure before any substantive discussions. Noting consensus is needed for adopting conclusions, Ecuador, for the G-77/China, stated that this issue deserves consideration. Iran, for the LMDCs, supported adjourning the meeting.

Australia, for the Umbrella Group, supported by the EU and Japan, opposed adjourning the meeting.

Co-Chair Baashan then proposed, and parties agreed, to suspend the meeting for further consultations.

In the evening, Co-Chair Baashan resumed the plenary, requesting parties to provide updates on progress in informal consultations to address the African Group’s proposal.

The African Group reported that informal consultations among the G-77/China had produced two options, but that there had not been enough time for engagement with other parties. He welcomed proposals on how to continue consultations and conclude the work of the APA.

The G-77/China said the draft APA conclusions should remain as they are, and proposed “putting them aside.” He suggested consultations on where and how to address the African Group’s proposal.

Co-Chair Baashan said that the COP 23 Presidency would continue consultations in order to find a procedural way forward. She suspended the plenary to allow these consultations to continue, saying that the APA would resume later in the week. Informal consultations convened Wednesday, 15 November, through Saturday, 18 November.

On Saturday, 18 November, Co-Chair Baashan resumed the plenary and reported on COP Presidency-led consultations. On the concern raised by the African Group relating to Paris Agreement Article 9.5, she noted that parties had reached agreement. On proposals on possible additional APA sessions in 2018, Co-Chair Baashan noted parties had reached agreement, which would be reflected in a draft COP decision. She noted the informal notes of the APA co-facilitators are contained in an annex to the APA draft conclusions (FCCC/APA/2017/L.4/Add.1). She opened the floor for parties’ statements.

Ecuador, for the G-77/China, called for maintaining the delicate balance of the Paris Agreement and accelerating progress on the work programme, and looked forward to additional information on a possible additional session in 2018.

Ethiopia, for the LDCs, looked forward to working with the Co-Chairs to meet the tight deadline of 2018. Saudi Arabia, for the Arab Group, looked forward to working with the Co-Chairs towards a balanced package that will “take us to the finish line.”

The EU called for accelerating technical discussions, achieving progress on all items and focusing on mandated issues of the work programme. Australia, for the Umbrella Group, noted progress had been made and more remains to be done. Switzerland, for the EIG, noted the need for advance work in 2018 on substance.

Iran, for the LMDCs, Peru, for AILAC, and Argentina, for Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay, expressed support for the APA Co-Chairs.

The COP adopted draft conclusions on APA agenda items 3-8 (FCCC/APA/2017/L.4 and Add.1).

Co-Chair Tyndall invited the APA Rapporteur to present the draft report of the APA (FCCC/APA/2017/L.3). The APA adopted the draft report.

Co-Chair Tyndall suspended the APA at 2:37 am Saturday, 18 November, saying it would resume in April 2018.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions on items 3-8 of the agenda (FCCC/APA/2017/L.4 and Add.1), the APA:

- takes note of the documents prepared in advance of the session and the pre-session round tables on agenda items 3-7;
- agrees that the documents and the pre-session round tables helped to facilitate a better understanding of, and clarify parties’ views on, the respective agenda items and provided useful inputs to the negotiations under the APA;
- notes the progress made at this session, but also noted that substantive progress in the deliberations under agenda items

3-8 needs to be accelerated to ensure all issues achieve a sufficient degree of maturity and detail to allow for the timely completion of the work by December 2018;

- reiterates its recognition of the need to progress on all items in a coherent and balanced manner, and to ensure a coordinated approach to the consideration of matters related to the Paris Agreement work programme by the SBI, the SBSTA, and the COP;
- recommends that the President of the COP consider options for bringing together, under his own responsibility and without prejudice to the future work of the subsidiary bodies, the outcomes of the work of the APA, the SBI, the SBSTA, and the COP, on Paris Agreement work programme-related matters at this session;
- notes the intentions of its Co-Chairs to issue, by early April 2018, a reflections note with an overview of the outcomes of this session and to suggest a way forward on the basis of the views and ideas that parties put forward at this session and in their submissions for the session, including as these have been reflected in the informal notes prepared at this session;
- notes that focused textual proposals would be most helpful in allowing parties to focus on substance in their deliberations on the APA agenda items; and
- expresses its view that additional negotiating time in 2018 may be useful, depending on the progress being made and the feasibility of convening an additional session in a cost-effective manner while also allowing effective participation of experts from developing countries.

SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR IMPLEMENTATION

SBI Chair Tomasz Chruszczow (Poland) and SBSTA Chair Carlos Fuller (Belize) opened a joint plenary to hear opening SBSTA and SBI statements on Monday, 6 November.

Ecuador, for the G-77/China, emphasized, *inter alia*: the urgent need for pre-2020 action; adaptation as a priority for developing countries; and enhanced participation of indigenous peoples in the UNFCCC process.

The EU stressed, *inter alia*: the need to adopt a gender action plan and launch the local communities and indigenous peoples platform; transparency discussions under the subsidiary bodies; and the need to start work on common NDC time frames, and on enhancing the implementation of training and public awareness, participation and access to information under the Paris Agreement.

Mali, for the African Group, called for ensuring coherence and balance in the Paris Agreement work programme. He called for reaching understanding on the public registry, elaborating modalities on transparency of support, and providing flexibility to the Secretariat in using voluntary funds.

Ethiopia, for the LDCs: called for a standing agenda item for loss and damage; lamented insufficiency of resources in the LDC Fund; and called for ensuring the sustainability of the Adaptation Fund's operations.

Australia, for the Umbrella Group, questioned the inclusion on the agenda of the biannual budget for 2018-2019, given SBI 46 agreed to a draft decision.

Maldives, for AOSIS, said recent climate disasters in SIDS are evidence of their special circumstances, and that the UN Environment Gap Report shows it is not too late to get "us back on track to limit warming to 1.5°C."

The Republic of Korea, for the EIG, stated that market and non-market approaches should be guided by principles of transparency, environmental integrity, and avoiding double counting, while considering the diversity of NDCs.

Peru, for AILAC, underscored the adoption of a gender action plan as an important COP 23 deliverable.

Iran, for the LMDCs, emphasized that accelerating pre-2020 implementation is fundamental to establishing mutual trust and a solid foundation for post-2020 ambition.

Underlining that climate change is a historic consequence of capitalism in industrialized countries, Bolivia, for ALBA, said it is urgent to implement the WIM.

The Democratic Republic of the Congo, for CfrN, called for forestry to be part of cooperative approaches under Paris Agreement Article 6.

Panama, for the Central American Integration System, called for ensuring resources for implementing the WIM, and for transparency and environmental integrity of the Article 6 mechanisms.

Indigenous Peoples said they can bring unique and essential perspectives on mitigation, adaptation, loss and damage, and capacity building.

Women and Gender stressed that gender equality is a cross-cutting issue that needs comprehensive targets and explicit financial commitments.

YOUNGOs called for the work programme on agriculture to open venues for youth participation.

BINGOs asked for the co-facilitators on response measures to actively seek business participation in the contact group.

CAN called for COP 23 to enable the WIM to fulfil its mandate toward the most vulnerable, by ensuring adequate resources.

CJN! underscored that climate finance must serve public, not private, interests.

Farmers identified elements to deliver improvements in agriculture, including finance and technology transfer.

LGMA highlighted how local and regional governments are contributing to raising ambition of NDCs.

Research and Independent NGOs (RINGOs) looked forward to defining gaps between current and desired capacities, and devising ways to close those gaps.

TUNGOs regretted that a pre-session workshop on response measures was organized without observers.

ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS: On Monday, 6 November, parties adopted the agenda and organization of work (FCCC/SBI/2017/8 and Add.1) with the sub-item on information contained in national communications from non-Annex I parties held in abeyance.

Multilateral Assessment: The multilateral assessment convened on Friday, 10 November. Belarus completed its multilateral assessment.

Facilitative Sharing of Views: The facilitative sharing of views met on Friday, 10 November. Armenia, Ecuador, Georgia, Jamaica, and Serbia presented.

Election of officers: On Wednesday, 15 November, the SBI elected Naser Moghaddasi (Iran) as Vice-Chair for the Asia-Pacific region and Tuğba İçmeli (Turkey) as Rapporteur.

REPORTING FROM AND REVIEW OF ANNEX I PARTIES: Status of Submission and Review of Second Biennial Reports:

On Monday, 6 November, the SBI took note of the information on the status of submission and review of the second biennial reports (FCCC/SBI/2017/INF.1).

Compilation and synthesis of second biennial reports:

This item was first taken up on Monday, 6 November, in the SBI plenary. Informal consultations met, co-facilitated by Anne Rasmussen (Samoa) and Helen Plume (New Zealand).

On Tuesday, 14 November, SBI Chair Chruszczow reported that no agreement was reached and, as per rule 16 of the rules of procedure, this issue would be taken up by SBI 48.

Report on national GHG data from Annex I Parties for the period 1990–2015: On Monday, 6 November, the SBI took note of the national GHG inventory data (FCCC/SBI/2017/18).

REPORTING FROM NON-ANNEX I PARTIES:

Information contained in National Communications: This item was held in abeyance.

Work of the Consultative Group of Experts on National Communications from Non-Annex I Parties: This item (FCCC/SBI/2017/12, 15-17) was introduced in plenary on Monday, 6 November, and subsequently addressed in informal consultations co-facilitated by Anne Rasmussen and Helen Plume.

On Tuesday, 14 November, the SBI adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2017/L.31), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- notes the problems and constraints, lessons learned, and best practices identified in the progress report and technical reports and encouraged the CGE, as per its mandate, to take these into consideration in the provision of technical assistance to non-Annex I parties and to facilitate cooperation with interested potential partners, as appropriate;
- notes the CGE's 2018 work programme, including focus areas on: enhancing, in the light of the constraints in financial support, collaboration with interested potential partners to implement key activities planned; creating formal regional networks of experts and practitioners involved in the process and preparation of national communications and biennial update reports (BURs) to serve as vehicles for the dissemination of information from the CGE to stakeholders; strengthening communications and outreach so that stakeholders gain a better understanding of the training products and opportunities available through the CGE for the preparation of national communications and BURs; playing a catalytic role in promoting and attracting collaboration with interested potential partners to provide strategic guidance and direction in responding to the needs of non-Annex I parties with regard to the preparation of national communications and BURs;
- notes with concern that the planned regional hands-on training workshop for the Latin American and Caribbean region on the preparation of mitigation actions and reporting on them in national communications and BURs could not be conducted in 2017 owing to insufficient financial resources; and
- invites multilateral entities to collaborate with the CGE, as appropriate, in the provision of technical support to non-Annex I parties in preparing their national communications and BURs.

Provision of financial and technical support: This item (FCCC/SBI/2017/INF.9 and INF.10) was first taken up by plenary on Monday, 6 November, and subsequently in informal consultations co-facilitated by Anne Rasmussen and Helen Plume.

On Tuesday, 14 November, the SBI adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2017/L.21), the SBI agrees to continue its consideration of this matter at SBI 48.

Summary reports of Biennial Update Reports: On Monday, 6 November, the SBI took note of the information.

COMMON TIME FRAMES FOR NDCS: This item was first taken up in plenary on Monday, 6 November. SBI Chair Chruszczow stated that informal consultations, co-facilitated by Marianne Karlsen (Norway) and George Wamukoya (Kenya), would be held with a view to adopting conclusions, if possible. China, for the LMDCs, stressed that COP 22 had agreed that the

SBI would consult, but was not mandated to adopt conclusions on this item, expressing concern over prejudicing negotiation outcomes. Brazil expressed hope for constructive negotiations that could yield an outcome.

In informal consultations, the co-facilitators outlined potential provisions in the Paris Agreement and decision 1/CP.21 (Paris outcome) related to common time frames, and invited parties to share their expectations for the session and views on common time frames. All agreed that there should be common time frames, with many suggesting the next communication should be in 2025 with a post-2030 endpoint. Many stressed the need to consider the GST. Others stressed that the paragraphs on the time frames in decision 1/CP.21 that refer to parties' INDCs are not part of the scope of discussions under this item, and that common time frames should apply to post-2030 NDCs only.

Most parties agreed on the usefulness of a discussion on the "pros and cons" of five- and ten-year time frames, and possibly other options, with some noting that implementation periods should not lock in low ambition but should also respect different national circumstances and processes. Some parties expressed support for a five-year time frame. Many parties supported developing procedural conclusions for this session, with many calling for submissions and some supporting reaching agreement in 2018.

Informal consultations continued on Thursday and Friday, 9-10 November, and parties agreed to draft conclusions.

In plenary, on Tuesday, 14 November, the SBI adopted the conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2017/L.20), the SBI, *inter alia*, takes note of the request to report back on this matter to CMA 1; invites parties and observers to submit their views on common time frames, including on the usefulness of, and options for, common time frames and the (dis)advantages of those options by 31 March 2018; and agrees to continue its consideration of the matter at SBI 48 with a view to making a recommendation for consideration and adoption by the CMA.

DEVELOPMENT OF MODALITIES AND PROCEDURES FOR THE OPERATION AND USE OF A PUBLIC REGISTRY REFERRED TO IN PARIS AGREEMENT ARTICLE 4.12 (NDC REGISTRY): This item was first taken up on Monday, 6 November. China, for LMDCs, noted that the item is related to the registry on adaptation, and proposed the items be considered in joint informal consultations. Parties agreed to send the item to informal consultations, co-facilitated by Peer Stiansen (Norway) and Madeleine Diouf Sarr (Senegal).

Informal consultations focused on capturing parties' suggestions and proposals in a co-facilitators' informal note. During the first consideration of a draft informal note, one group raised a point of order and called for suspending the meeting without an outcome, stating that the co-facilitators had not been mandated to include linkages to APA item 3 (mitigation section of decision 1/CP.21) that prejudice its outcome, stating this was a "trust issue." Many other groups and countries expressed willingness to consider removing text, as proposed by the group, pending a clarification from the group raising the point of order. After consulting internally, the group stated willingness to continue discussing the text on the condition that parts of the text are removed.

Noting lack of agreement, Co-Facilitator Stiansen said the co-facilitators would revise the note and consult with the SBI Chair on the way forward.

In a subsequent session of the consultations, parties considered a revised draft of the informal note and procedural draft conclusions. One developing country group called for a balanced treatment of the two SBI public registry items, including language on the elements of the modalities similar to that in the informal note and draft conclusions for the registry under Agreement Article 7.12 (registry for adaptation communication). Many supported adding a section on proposals in the note, including proposals for using the interim NDC registry as is or building on it, but views diverged on whether to include a proposal referring to a registry “equipped with advanced content search functionality.”

A revised informal note, containing sections on proposals and detailed elements, with a structure identical to the revised informal note prepared under the other SBI registry item was then presented to parties. One developing country group strictly opposed a proposal referring to “advanced searchability functions.” Parties agreed to remove this proposal and, after aligning the text with relevant parts of the informal note text under the other SBI registry item, agreed to draft conclusions, containing a reference to the informal note as a source for parties to draw upon at SBI 48.

In plenary, on Tuesday, 14 November, the SBI adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2017/L.30), the SBI, *inter alia*, agrees to continue its consideration of the matter at SBI 48, drawing upon a co-facilitators’ informal note on this agenda item, and on the basis of parties’ deliberations at current and previous sessions of the SBI and the views they have submitted.

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): This item was first taken up on Monday, 6 November. China, for LMDCs, requested clarification on whether parties agreed on considering the two SBI registry items in a joint informal consultation. Chair Chruszczow noted that parties agreed at SBI 44 that these items should be distinct on the agenda. The Republic of Korea, for the EIG, said the functions and characteristics are different. The SBI agreed to convene informal consultations, co-facilitated by Madeleine Diouf Sarr (Senegal) and Peer Stiansen (Norway).

In informal consultations, countries focused on capturing parties’ views and proposals in a co-facilitators’ informal note. One country suggested including four possible proposals that represented the range of views among parties: no registry; mandating an existing registry, namely the NDCs registry; a new registry; and a registry with hyperlinks to parties’ communications in other registries. Parties indicated their preferences and provided related justifications. Many stressed the need for a separate registry to give visibility to adaptation. One group called for channeling adaptation information through the NDCs. One country proposed merging the two registries into a registry for both NDCs and adaptation communication. Parties opposing a “registry of hyperlinks” said it would not promote transparency. One group opposed using the NAP Central as a repository for adaptation communication. Parties eventually agreed to mandate the co-facilitators to capture the discussions in an informal note.

An initial draft informal note was discussed in further consultations where parties exchanged views on the note’s structure and contents. Parties identified, and partly diverged on,

language that might prejudice the outcome of the negotiations under this item, including “metadata,” “versions,” “document,” or “adaptation communication.”

A revised draft informal note was then presented to the parties, containing sections on proposals and detailed elements, with a structure identical to a revised informal note prepared under the SBI item on the public registry referred to in Agreement Article 4.12 (registry for NDCs). After agreeing to textual amendments, parties agreed to draft conclusions, containing a reference to the informal note as a source for parties to draw upon at SBI 48.

In plenary, on Tuesday, 14 November, the SBI adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2017/L.33), the SBI, *inter alia*, agrees to continue its consideration of the matter at SBI 48, drawing upon a co-facilitators’ informal note on this agenda item and on the basis of parties’ deliberations at current and previous sessions of the SBI and the views they have submitted.

MATTERS RELATED TO THE KYOTO PROTOCOL MECHANISMS: Review of modalities and procedures for the CDM: On Monday, 6 November, the SBI Chair noted that consideration of this item has been postponed until SBI 48.

Report of the administrator of the international transaction log under the Protocol: The SBI took note of the report (FCCC/SBI/2017/INF.11) on Monday, 6 November.

COORDINATION OF SUPPORT FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION ACTIVITIES IN THE FOREST SECTOR BY DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: This item was first taken up in plenary on Monday, 6 November and subsequently in informal consultations co-facilitated by Keith Anderson (Switzerland) and Ayman Cherkaoui (Morocco).

In informal consultations, parties discussed: if voluntary focal point meetings have fulfilled their purpose in providing sufficient coordinated support for REDD+ implementation, or if meetings should continue; the need for alternative governance arrangements, such as a formal authoritative body to support REDD+ implementation; how to coordinate implementation and address gaps and limitation in finance; and the need to recognize the GCF in the decision.

In plenary on Tuesday, 14 November, SBI Chair Chruszczow noted that consultations did not result in conclusions, and therefore draft rules of procedure 10(c) and 16 would apply. Norway said rule 16 has consequences for the status of the voluntary meeting of experts and argued that without conclusions the meetings might not continue automatically. Brazil noted that the decision that established the voluntary meetings did not specify an end year and therefore the meetings should continue to be organized by the Secretariat. She asked for this to be reflected in the final SBI report.

MATTERS RELATED TO LDCS; REPORT OF THE ADAPTATION COMMITTEE: These items were taken up together, in joint SBI/SBSTA informal consultations with the report of the Adaptation Committee co-facilitated by Richard Merzian (Australia) and Hamza Tber (Morocco) and on matters relating to LDCs (FCCC/SBI/2017/14) co-facilitated by Malcolm Ridout (UK) and Mamadou Honadia (Burkina Faso).

These items were first considered in SBI plenary on Monday, 6 November, where the Adaptation Committee noted work with the LEG to provide technical support and guidance to parties on adaptation action and the LEG, presented on the LEG’s activities, including: engagement with the GEF Secretariat and expansion of technical guidance on NAPs.

In informal consultations on the report of the Adaptation Committee, parties discussed two recommendations made by the Adaptation Committee, namely, review of adaptation-related institutional arrangements and methodologies for assessing adaptation needs. Several countries noted: that the recommendations made in the report are “politically charged” and constitute a balance that has taken two years to develop; and linkages with APA agenda item 4 (adaptation communication) and 8 (further matters).

In informal consultations on matters relating to LDCs, parties considered draft conclusions without agreeing on whether to keep a paragraph on whether the LEG together with the GCF Secretariat should guide LDCs in accessing the GCF Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme.

In joint consultations, the recommendations from the Adaptation Committee and the LEG for addressing their mandated issues from the Paris outcome were presented (FCCC/SB/2017/2/Add.1 and FCCC/SBI/2017/14/Add.1), with Beth Lavender, ExCom member, noting they had been unable to complete work on the mandate to develop methodologies on reviewing the adequacy of adaptation and support. Several developing countries proposed that the Paris mandates for the Adaptation Committee and the LEG be moved to the subsidiary bodies as a standalone agenda item.

Subsequent informal consultations discussed how to take the work forward regarding how to address the recommendations in the report and when to forward them to the COP and ultimately the CMA, with three options highlighted: that the recommendations are forwarded at COP 23; that the joint informal group take ownership of the recommendations, and work on and strengthen them to conclude at either COP 23, SB 48, or COP 24; or take ownership of the recommendations, and work on and strengthen them under a new joint agenda item during SB 48 and potentially COP 24.

Parties disagreed on whether to: continue considering the three joint LEG and Adaptation Committee mandates as well as the two Adaptation Committee mandates under this agenda item or under a new agenda item at SB 48; and call for submissions on the mandates before SB 48.

On Wednesday 15 November, the SBI adopted conclusions, and forwarded two draft decisions for consideration by the COP. Timor-Leste, supported by Mauritania, underscored the lack of financial resources in the LDCF that he said can leave proposals for National Adaptation Programmes of Action implementation unfunded.

Final Outcomes: In its decision on the report of the adaptation committee, the SBSTA and the SBI (FCCC/SB/2017/L.6), *inter alia*: agree to continue their consideration of this matter at SBSTA 48 and SBI 48 (April–May 2018) with a view to making a recommendation to be forwarded by the COP at its twenty-fourth session (December 2018) to CMA 1 for its consideration and adoption.

In its decision relating to matters relating to LDCs (FCCC/SBI/2017/L.36), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- welcomes the work of the LEG in providing technical guidance and advice on accessing funding from the GCF for the process to formulate and implement NAPs in collaboration with the GCF Secretariat, in accordance with the mandate of the LEG;
- takes note of the preparations for the NAP Expo that is planned for 4-6 April 2018 in Bonn, Germany, and invites parties and relevant organizations to assist in the organization of and participate in the event;

- requests the Secretariat to prepare a report on the provisions for support and flexibility provided to the LDCs under the Convention and the Paris Agreement, and how the provisions can assist LDCs in a smooth transition from LDC status, in the light of UN General Assembly Resolution 67/221; and
- requests the LEG to continue to prioritize its activities under its work programme, subject to the availability of resources.

NATIONAL ADAPTATION PLANS: This item was first taken up in plenary on Monday, 6 November, and subsequently in informal consultations co-facilitated by Pepetua Latasi (Tuvalu) and Malcolm Ridout (UK).

Many developing countries highlighted the need to simplify access modalities for the GCF Readiness Programme for NAPs funding. They stressed that their concerns were related to technical aspects of accessing funding and not levels of finance. Several developed countries stated that this was not the forum to discuss GCF access issues.

Co-facilitator Ridout noted that, given the divergence, the co-facilitators would not produce a decision text at this time, and parties could use the next session to discuss areas of convergence on what they might forward to the CMP. In later informal consultations, one developing country group provided updates on text it had recently proposed regarding mandating the Adaptation Committee and the LEG to produce an information paper on the experiences of countries in accessing the GCF Readiness Programme, including for the process to formulate and implement NAPs. The group argued that this is within the scope of the mandate of this agenda item. Several parties noted the lack of time to consider the new proposed text.

On Tuesday, 14 November, subject to small textual changes, parties agreed to draft conclusions.

On Wednesday, 15 November, the SBI adopted the conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2017/L.35), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- notes the approval, as of 30 October 2017, by the GCF of 10 out of 38 funding proposals through the GCF Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme to support the formulation of NAPs, as well as the approval by the GEF of funding proposals from four countries to support the process to formulate and implement NAPs;
- recognizes that many developing country parties continue to face challenges in accessing funding from the GCF for the formulation and implementation of NAPs;
- invites the Adaptation Committee and the LEG, following the NAP Expo 2018, to consider ways to assist with the implementation of NAPs in their future work programmes and to include information thereon in their reports, as appropriate; and
- invites parties to continue to provide information on progress towards the achievement of the objectives of the process to formulate and implement NAPs and on experience, best practices, lessons learned, gaps and needs, and support provided and received in the process to formulate and implement NAPs via the online questionnaire on NAP Central.

REPORT OF THE WIM EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

This item (FCCC/SB/2017/1 and Add.1) was first taken up in plenary on Monday, 6 November, and was further discussed in informal consultations jointly with SBSTA, co-facilitated by Beth Lavender (Canada) and Alf Wills (South Africa).

In informal consultations, developing countries proposed that a decision on this item include reference to, *inter alia*: user-friendly knowledge products; the WIM becoming a permanent agenda item of the subsidiary bodies; and including the WIM in

the Secretariat's core budget. Developed countries highlighted, *inter alia*, that: budget issues belong in the budget consultations; resources are more than finance; and a WIM standing item might inhibit progress by the ExCom. Parties disagreed on when the preparatory work for the 2019 review should commence, and whether there should be a standing agenda item on the WIM or whether it should be incorporated into high-level engagements such as workshops and dialogues at future sessions of the subsidiary bodies or the COP. There were also disagreements regarding resources, whether to use the ExCom report language or provide further specific guidance.

On Wednesday, 15 November, the SBI and SBSTA adopted conclusions, and forwarded a draft decision for consideration by the COP. During their respective plenaries, both SBSTA Chair Fuller and SBI Chair Chruszczow announced that the expert dialogue to be held in conjunction with SB 48 would be named the Suva Expert Dialogue, and that the clearing house on risk transfer would be called the Fiji clearing house on risk transfer.

On Friday, 17 November, the COP adopted their conclusions, containing a COP decision.

Final Outcome: In their conclusions, SBI and SBSTA (FCCC/SB/2017/L.5) agree to a decision for the COP's consideration. In its decision, the COP agrees to, *inter alia*:

- request the ExCom to include in its annual reports, as appropriate, more detailed information on the work undertaken by its expert groups, subcommittees, panels, thematic advisory groups, and task-focused *ad hoc* working groups on, to the extent possible, issues of relevance to the regional and national context as identified by parties in their submissions;
- request the Secretariat, under the guidance of the ExCom and the SBI Chair, to organize, in conjunction with SB 48, an expert dialogue to explore a wide range of information, inputs and views on ways to facilitate the mobilization and securing of expertise, and enhancement of support, including finance, technology and capacity building, for averting, minimizing and addressing loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change, including extreme weather events and slow onset events, with a view to informing the preparation of a technical paper;
- request the Secretariat to prepare a report on the expert dialogue referred to above for consideration by the ExCom at its second meeting in 2018;
- encourage parties to actively engage in the work and to disseminate, promote and make use of the products of the WIM and its ExCom, including by: establishing a loss and damage contact point through their respective UNFCCC national focal points; participating in the meetings of the ExCom as observers, recognizing the constraints of time and resources; incorporating or continuing to incorporate, the consideration of extreme weather events and slow onset events, non-economic losses, climate change impacts on human mobility, including migration, displacement and planned relocation, and comprehensive risk management into relevant policy, planning and action, as appropriate, and encouraging relevant bilateral and multilateral entities to support such efforts; and
- request the ExCom in accordance with its mandate to: consider, when updating its five-year rolling workplan, cross-cutting issues and current, urgent and emerging needs related to extreme weather events and slow onset events; enhance its efforts in ensuring that information generated from its work is converted into user-friendly products, such as tools and methods, and material for training modules, with a view to enhancing the coherence and effectiveness of relevant efforts

undertaken at the regional and national levels, as appropriate; and consider, through collaboration and partnerships, the development and the dissemination at all levels of user-friendly information and communication products on averting, minimizing and addressing loss and damage issues of relevance to the regional and national context.

DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFER OF

TECHNOLOGIES: Joint annual report of the TEC and

CTCN: This item was first taken up by the COP on Monday, 6 November, and referred to SBI and SBSTA where it was addressed in a contact group and joint informal consultations, co-facilitated by Balisi Gopolang (Botswana) and Elfriede-Anna More (Austria).

In the SBI opening plenary, the CTCN reported it had completed nearly 30 requests for technical assistance, and is currently acting on 111 others. The TEC highlighted work completed in 2017, including on South-South and triangular cooperation on adaptation, with a focus on the water and agricultural sectors.

In informal consultations, parties elaborated a draft decision for the COP covering the work of the Technology Mechanism, the activities and performance of the TEC, and the activities and performance of the CTCN. One developing country group opposed including gender in the mandate for CTCN considerations, and a draft decision was sent to the SBI Chair with the term bracketed. In its closing plenary, on Wednesday, 15 November, the SBI removed the brackets and adopted its conclusions and forwarded a decision to the COP for its consideration.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SB/2017/L.4/Rev.1), the SBI and SBSTA recommend a draft COP decision. In its decision, the COP, *inter alia*:

- acknowledges work undertaken in support of the implementation of the Paris Agreement and looks forward to enhanced efforts in this regard, taking into consideration gender, endogenous technologies, including knowledge from local communities and indigenous peoples, and the balance between adaptation and mitigation; and
- requests the TEC and CTCN to carry out monitoring and evaluation of the impacts of the implementation of their respective mandates.

On activities and performance of the TEC in 2017, the COP: invites the TEC to continue to enhance the linkages between the technology needs assessments process and NDCs, and NAPs; encourages the TEC to continue strengthening collaboration with constituted bodies under the Convention, including the Adaptation Committee and the WIM ExCom; and encourages the TEC to enhance its communication and outreach strategy.

On the activities and performance of the CTCN in 2017, the COP: encourages the TEC to continue strengthening partnerships and collaboration with stakeholders; invites the CTCN to continue providing support for enhancing the capacity of national designated entities; and invites parties that have not yet nominated their national designated entities to communicate their nomination to the Secretariat through their national focal point.

Poznan strategic programme on technology transfer: This item (FCCC/CP/2017/7 and FCCC/CP/2017/3) was first taken up in plenary on Monday, 6 November and subsequently in a joint contact group and in informal consultations by the SBSTA and SBI Chairs, co-facilitated by Stella Gama (Malawi) and Kunihiro Shimada (Japan). In informal consultations, parties elaborated draft conclusions to be forwarded to the SBSTA and SBI Chairs,

inviting the GEF to support developing countries in undertaking technology needs assessments, and piloting priority technology projects to foster innovation and investment.

On Tuesday, 14 November, the SBSTA and SBI plenaries adopted the conclusions.

Final Outcome: In their conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2017/L.23), the SBI and SBSTA:

- recommend that the COP invite the GEF to allocate provisions in the climate change focal area of its seventh replenishment for supporting developing country parties in undertaking technology needs assessments, and piloting priority technology projects to foster innovation and investment;
- recommends that the COP invite the GEF to include information in its reports to the COP on: the collaboration between the GEF focal points and the national designated entities for technology development and transfer, as communicated by the CTCN to the GEF; whether and how parties have used their System for Transparent Allocation of Resources allocation for piloting the implementation of the technology needs assessment results; and the outcomes of the collaboration between the Poznan strategic programme on technology transfer and the CTCN.

MATTERS RELATED TO CLIMATE FINANCE: Review of the functions of the Standing Committee on Finance:

This item (FCCC/TP/2017/4 and FCCC/CP/2017/9) was first taken up by the COP on Monday, 6 November, and referred to the SBI, which discussed this matter in conjunction with other COP finance issues. The informal consultations, co-facilitated by Delphine Eyraud (France) and Olai Uludong (Palau), under the SBI were unable to reach agreement and, on Wednesday, 15 November, SBI Chair Chruszczow reported that the COP Presidency will continue consultations. Discussions and the decision are summarized under the COP. (See page 5.)

Third Review of the Adaptation Fund: This item was first taken up in plenary on Tuesday, 7 November, and in informal consultations co-facilitated by Patience Dampety (Ghana) and Gemma O'Reilly (Ireland), where parties welcomed the third review (FCCC/TP/2017/6), with many highlighting the Fund's success. A developing country argued that the review cannot be discussed without considering the wider context related to, *inter alia*, developing country commitments to tackle adaptation in their NDCs, and climate science.

On the draft conclusions, some countries argued that several paragraphs are outside the mandate of the agenda item, with one developing country group highlighting text on diversifying sources of funding as beyond the scope. Parties also noted irregularities regarding the timing of the next review, with several developed countries suggesting the next review should occur in conjunction with the review of the Financial Mechanism in four years. One developed country suggested the inclusion of references to future adaptation needs and the gap in adaptation funding.

On Tuesday, 14 November, the SBI adopted conclusions and forwarded a draft decision to the CMP. On Friday, 17 November, the CMP adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: In its final outcome (FCCC/SBI/2017/L.32) the CMP *inter alia*, encourages the Adaptation Fund Board to:

- consider options for improvement of efficiency with regard to the operation of the Adaptation Fund;
- continue to engage with subnational actors and the private sector through, *inter alia*, microfinance schemes, weather-based insurance arrangements, involvement with local industry groups and farmers in adaptation projects, and public-private partnerships;

- consider voluntary tracking of climate finance mobilized, where appropriate; and
- continue the efforts to enhance complementarity and coherence with other funds both under and outside the Convention.

The decision requests the Adaptation Fund Board to:

- consider lessons learned from the Adaptation Fund's engagement with private sector stakeholders in adaptation projects at the local level, including in the decision-making processes of the Adaptation Fund and in communications with donors;
- monitor and assess project approval time under the Readiness Programme, identifying any linkages of this time to the introduction of the Adaptation Fund's environmental and social policy, and to take measures to reduce the time, as necessary, while continuing to implement its environmental and social safeguards and gender policy;
- continue to provide information on project approval time;
- continue monitoring the adaptation impacts and results of the Adaptation Fund, including using local and sector-specific metrics; and
- report on progress made on the mandates arising from this decision in the future reports of the Adaptation Fund to the COP serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol.

The decision also requests the SBI, at its session to be held in June 2020, to initiate the fourth review of the Adaptation Fund, in accordance with the terms of reference contained in the annex to decision 1/CMP.12, or as amended, and to report back to its governing body to be convened in conjunction with COP 27 (November 2021).

MATTERS RELATING TO CAPACITY BUILDING:

This item, including all its sub-items (FCCC/SBI/2017/9 and 11), was first taken up on Monday, 6 November. The SBI agreed to conduct back-to-back informal consultations on capacity building under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol, and separate informal consultations on the annual report of the Paris Committee on Capacity-building (PCCB).

Capacity Building under the Convention: The joint informal consultations were co-facilitated by Jeniffer Hanna Collado (Dominican Republic) and Makoto Kato (Japan). Parties provided inputs to the annual monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of the framework for capacity building in developing countries. Countries called for attention to, *inter alia*: building long-term capacity, including institutional capacity; ensuring that capacity building is country- and needs-driven; addressing gaps in capacity; ensuring civil society involvement through legislation; coordinating donor activities; creating a process to capture information on activities annually to support the review; strengthening the PCCB; and examining how the PCCB fits in the capacity-building framework.

Parties also exchanged views on the usefulness of common performance indicators for monitoring both activities and support provided, and their effectiveness. Parties mandated the co-facilitators to prepare elements for a draft text, which was discussed in further informal consultations during the first week, alongside draft text on capacity building in countries with economies in transition (EITs).

On Monday, 13 November, parties considered, and agreed to, revised draft conclusions, and draft COP and CMP decisions.

In plenary, on Tuesday, 14 November, the SBI adopted conclusions on capacity building in developing countries and in EITs, and a draft COP decision on EITs. The COP adopted the decision in plenary on Friday, 17 November.

Final Outcomes: In its conclusions on capacity building in developing countries under the Convention (FCCC/SBI/2017/L.24), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- recognizes the Durban Forum on Capacity-building as a means of effective and continuous sharing of information, good practices and lessons learned;
- notes that the objective and scope of capacity building in developing countries, as contained in decision 2/CP.7, are still relevant, and that current and emerging areas in the context of the Convention and the Paris Agreement should also be taken into account;
- recalls that the PCCB aims to address both current and emerging gaps and needs in implementing capacity building in developing countries and to further enhance efforts with regard to coherence and coordination in activities under the Convention; and
- invites parties and observers to submit their views on potential topics for the seventh meeting of the Durban Forum on Capacity-building, to take place at SBI 48, by 16 February 2018.

In its conclusions on capacity building in EITs under the Convention (FCCC/SBI/2017/L.25), the SBI: concludes its work on the fourth review of the implementation of the framework for capacity building in EITs under the Convention; takes note of information provided by parties and submissions received; takes note of and welcomes the compilation and synthesis report on the implementation of activities in countries that are currently receiving support (FCCC/SBI/2017/INF.5); and recommends a draft decision to the COP.

In its decision (FCCC/SBI/2017/L.25.Add.1), the COP, *inter alia*:

- recognizes, *inter alia*, that significant progress has been made in building the capacity of countries with EITs to mitigate and adapt to climate change, Annex I parties and the GEF have provided adequate resources and assistance for the implementation of the framework for capacity building in countries with EITs, and countries with EITs that are currently receiving support are in need of further capacity building;
- reaffirms that the scope of the needs identified in the framework for capacity building for EITs established under decision 3/CP.7 and key factors defined in decision 3/CP.10 remain relevant and continue to be the basis for, and guide the implementation of, activities in EITs that are currently receiving support;
- invites Annex II parties and other parties in a position to do so, the GEF, multi- and bilateral agencies, international organizations, multilateral development banks, international financial institutions, and the private sector to continue to provide support for activities in EITs that are currently receiving support; and
- decides to conclude the fourth review and request SBI 52 to initiate the fifth review of the implementation of the framework for capacity building in EITs with a view to completing the review at COP 26.

Annual Report of the Paris Committee on Capacity-building: In the SBI plenary on Monday, 6 November, the PCCB presented its annual technical progress report for 2017, noting significant progress.

Co-Facilitators Paul Watkinson (France) and Jeniffer Hanna Collado (Dominican Republic) presented the draft elements, noting the work of the PCCB had been well received and that all but one of the 11 proposed text elements could be part of a draft COP decision, which many supported. Many developed countries raised questions regarding paragraphs on financial

support and resources, enquiring if these should not be addressed under the budget discussions. Developing countries noted that the recommendations come from the PCCB report, and said the text is “stating that something should be done” rather than “asking for more.” Parties mandated the co-facilitators to prepare an updated text, which was further discussed informally, alongside draft text on capacity building in economies in transition.

On Monday, 13 November, parties considered, and agreed to, revised draft conclusions, and a draft COP decision.

In plenary, on Tuesday, 14 November, the SBI adopted conclusions and a draft COP decision. The COP adopted the decision on Friday, 17 November.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2017/L.28), the SBI recommends a draft decision to the COP. In its decision, the COP, *inter alia*:

- appreciates the work of the PCCB in its first year and welcomes the 2017 PCCB annual technical progress report, taking note of its recommendations and of the rules of procedure and working modalities of the PCCB, and the rolling workplan of the PCCB for 2017-2019;
- invites parties and relevant institutions to provide support and resources to the PCCB in implementing its 2017-2019 workplan;
- encourages the PCCB, when implementing its workplan, to identify and collaborate with institutions and other stakeholders with relevant expertise, tools and resources, including bodies established under the Convention;
- takes note of the PCCB’s decision to continue its 2017 focus area or theme, capacity-building activities for the implementation of NDCs in the context of the Paris Agreement, in 2018;
- requests the SBI to align the next Durban Forum with the 2017-2018 PCCB focus area or theme; and
- requests the Secretariat to help to identify modalities that would better accommodate the intersessional work of the PCCB.

Capacity Building under the Protocol: Discussions in the joint informal consultations are summarized under the sub-item on capacity building under the Convention above.

In plenary, on Tuesday, 14 November, the SBI adopted conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2017/L.26, L.27) and a draft CMP decision (FCCC/SBI/2017/L.27/Add.1). The CMP adopted the decision on Friday, 17 November.

Final Outcomes: In its conclusions on capacity building in developing countries under the Protocol (FCCC/SBI/2017/L.26), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- recognizes the Durban Forum on Capacity-building as a means of effective and continuous sharing of information, good practices and lessons learned;
- notes that the objective and scope of capacity building in developing countries as contained in decision 2/CP.7 (on capacity building in developing countries) and the priority areas relating to the participation of developing countries in project activities under the CDM as contained in decision 29/CMP.1 (on capacity building relating to the implementation of the Kyoto Protocol in developing countries) are still relevant, and that current and emerging areas should be taken into consideration in the further implementation of activities in developing countries; and
- invites parties and observers to submit their views on potential topics for the seventh meeting of the Durban Forum on Capacity-building, to take place at SBI 48, by 16 February 2018.

In its conclusions on capacity building in EITs under the Kyoto Protocol (FCCC/SBI/2017/L.27), the SBI: concludes its work on the fourth review of the implementation of the framework for capacity building in EITs under the Kyoto Protocol; takes note of information provided by parties and submissions received; takes note and welcomes the compilation and synthesis report on the implementation of activities in countries that are currently receiving support (FCCC/SBI/2017/INF.5); and recommends a draft decision to the CMP.

In its decision (FCCC/SBI/2017/L.25.Add.1), the CMP:

- recognizes, *inter alia*, that significant progress has been made in building the capacity of countries with EITs to mitigate and adapt to climate change, Annex I parties and the GEF have provided adequate resources and assistance for the implementation of the framework for capacity building in countries with EITs, and countries with EITs that are currently receiving support are in need of further capacity building;
- reaffirms that the scope of the needs identified in the framework for capacity building for EITs established under decision 3/CP.7 (on capacity building for EITs) and decision 30/CMP.1 (on capacity building relating to the implementation of the Kyoto Protocol in EITs), and key factors defined in decision 3/CP.10 (on capacity building for EITs) remain relevant and continue to be the basis for, and guide the implementation of, activities in EITs that are currently receiving support;
- invites Annex II parties and other parties in a position to do so, the GEF, multi- and bilateral agencies, international organizations multilateral development banks, international financial institutions and the private sector to continue to provide support for activities in EITs that are currently receiving support; and
- decides to conclude the fourth review and request SBI 52 to initiate the fifth review of the implementation of the framework for capacity building in EITs with a view to completing the review at CMP 16.

RESPONSE MEASURES: Improved forum and work programme: This item (FCCC/SB/2017/INF.2) was first taken up in plenary on Monday, 6 November, and subsequently in a joint contact group and, later, informal consultations, co-facilitated by Andrei Marcu (Panama) and Nataliya Kushko (Ukraine).

In informal consultations, parties discussed the value of modeling as a means of identifying and quantifying impacts at the country level, stressing the need to look at cross-border effects. One developing country group argued that the Forum's discussions have shown that there is not enough work on modeling, and highlighted the need for training materials, regional workshops, and sharing of experiences. Two developed countries noted the need to utilize and improve the existing UNFCCC web portal on economic modeling tools.

On Wednesday, 15 November, the SBI and SBSTA adopted conclusions after agreeing to an oral amendment.

Final Outcome: In their conclusions (FCCC/SB/2017/L.7), as orally amended, the SBI and SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- take note of the discussions on the needs expressed by some parties for capacity building for assessment of the impacts of response measures, and for acknowledging and enhancing existing capacity-building opportunities, including through cooperation on response measures, and invites the Secretariat to collaborate with relevant intergovernmental and international organizations to raise awareness with a view to enhancing capacity-building programmes or activities for parties in order

to maximize the positive and minimize the negative impacts of response measures, with a view to informing the in-session discussions;

- requests the Secretariat to organize, under the guidance of the SBI and SBSTA Chairs, a two-day training workshop on use of economic modeling tools related to the areas of the work programme of the improved forum on the impact of the implementation of response measures that will include experts invited from both developing and developed countries, as well as from intergovernmental and international organizations, and requests the Secretariat to prepare a report on the workshop for consideration at the sessions of the SBI and SBSTA taking place in December 2018; and
- invites parties and observers to submit, by 30 March 2018, their views on the scope of the review of the work of the improved forum that will take place at the sessions of the SBI and SBSTA taking place in December 2018, in line with the work programme, with a view to informing the in-forum discussion at SBI 48 and SBSTA 48.

Modalities, work programme and functions under the Paris

Agreement: This item was first taken up in plenary on Monday, 6 November, and subsequently in a joint contact group and informal consultations, co-facilitated by Andrei Marcu (Panama) and Nataliya Kushko (Ukraine). The contact group agreed to draft conclusions that repeat the call (from the SBI/SBSTA 46 conclusions) for the CMA to take procedural steps to enable the forum to serve the Paris Agreement.

In informal consultations, a developed country group noted the need to avoid duplicating existing work in other international organizations. Two developing country groups proposed adding international trade as a heading in the workplan. This was opposed by a developed country group, with one developed country arguing that trade is the purview of the World Trade Organization. A developed country group, supported by several developing countries, stressed the importance of noting that the CMA shall take procedural steps to enable the forum to serve the Paris Agreement.

Some developed countries opposed a proposal to prepare an informal note containing draft elements of the recommendation on the modalities, work, and functions of the forum. Ultimately it was agreed to put similar text in both the response measures and Agreement Article 6 conclusions.

Final Outcome: In their conclusions (FCCC/SB/2017/L.8), the SBI and SBSTA: agree that the recommendation being prepared under this agenda sub-item for consideration and adoption by the CMA will include language for the CMA to take the necessary procedural steps to enable the forum to serve the Paris Agreement; and, to facilitate deliberations at SBI 48 and SBSTA 48, request the SBI and SBSTA Chairs to prepare an informal document containing draft elements of the recommendation, for consideration and adoption at CMA 1.

Matters relating to Article 3.14, of the Kyoto Protocol: This item was considered in conjunction with SBI/SBSTA discussions on forum on the impact of the implementation of response measures.

Progress on the implementation of decision 1/CP.10 (Buenos Aires programme of work on adaptation and response measures): This item was considered in conjunction with SBI/SBSTA items forum on the impact of the implementation of response measures.

ENHANCING IMPLEMENTATION OF TRAINING, AND PUBLIC AWARENESS, PARTICIPATION AND ACCESS TO INFORMATION: This item was first considered on Monday, 6 November, and subsequently in informal consultations, facilitated by Albert Magalang (the Philippines).

In informal consultations, countries focused on preparing procedural draft conclusions containing a request for an SBI 48 workshop mandated to develop a list of actions to enhance the implementation of the Paris Agreement through Action for Climate Empowerment (ACE)-related activities, with the participation of parties and observers. Countries agreed to further specifying that the participants of the workshop can include representatives of relevant bodies under the Convention, relevant experts, youth, practitioners, and stakeholders.

In plenary, on Tuesday, 14 November, the SBI adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2017/L.22), the SBI:

- recognizes the progress made by parties and observers in implementing the Doha work programme on Article 6 of the Convention (ACE), and that the six elements of ACE are fundamental to enhancing the effective implementation of the Paris Agreement;
- requests the Secretariat to organize a workshop, preferably in session or, as appropriate, in conjunction with SBI 48 to develop a list of actions to enhance the implementation of the Paris Agreement through ACE-related activities under the guidance of the SBI Chair and with the participation of parties, representation of relevant bodies established under the Convention, relevant experts, youth practitioners, and stakeholders;
- invites parties and observers to submit their views on the role of ACE and topics for the workshop by 26 January 2018; and
- agrees to continue its consideration of the matter at SBI 48.

REPORT FROM THE ACE: On Monday, 6 November, the SBI took note of the summary report of the fifth dialogue on Action for Climate Empowerment (FCCC/SBI/2017/10).

GENDER: This item was first taken up in plenary on Tuesday, 7 November, and subsequently in informal consultations co-facilitated by Winfred Lichuma (Kenya) and Geert Fremout (Belgium). Parties discussed: financing for implementation of the gender action plan; Secretariat capacity to undertake activities related to the plan; and proposals for workshop topics. On Tuesday, 14 November, the plenary adopted the conclusions. Costa Rica, for AILAC, noted the historic adoption of the UNFCCC's first gender action plan, emphasizing that gender issues in the Global South are a "matter of life and death."

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2017/L.29), the SBI recommends a draft decision for the COP's consideration. In the decision, the COP agrees to, *inter alia*:

- adopt the gender action plan, under the Lima work programme on gender;
- invite parties, members of constituted bodies, UN organizations, observers, and other stakeholders to participate and engage in implementing the gender action plan, with a view to advancing towards the goal of mainstreaming a gender perspective into all elements of climate action;
- note the lack of progress made in delegations and constituted bodies towards the goal of gender balance;
- request the Secretariat to prepare, for consideration by SBI at its session to be held in November 2019, a synthesis report on the implementation of the gender action plan, identifying

areas of progress, areas for improvement, and further work to be undertaken in subsequent actions plans, so as to elaborate recommendations for consideration by COP 25;

- decide that the topics of the annual in-session workshops to be held in conjunction with the sessions of the subsidiary bodies taking place in the first sessional period of 2018 and 2019 will be based on the submission referred to in activity E (sex-disaggregated data and gender analysis) of priority area E (monitoring and reporting), and on the short- and long-term impacts of the gender action plan;
- decide to review, at COP 25, the implementation of the gender action plan in the context of the review of the Lima work programme on gender so as to consider the next steps, including an assessment of the impacts of the gender action plan; and
- invite parties and relevant organizations to participate and engage in the implementation of gender-related activities within the gender action plan, including enhancing the capacity of the gender focal point of the Secretariat.

ADMINISTRATIVE, FINANCIAL AND INSTITUTIONAL MATTERS: Budget performance for the biennium 2016-2017: Audit report and financial statements for 2016: Other budgetary and financial matters: On Monday, 6 November, this item (FCCC/SBI/2017/13, FCCC/SBI/2017/INF.13-14) was taken up with UNFCCC Deputy Executive Secretary Ovais Sarmad presenting the reports (FCCC/SBI/2017/INF.15 and Add.1), highlighting key performance areas and noting a 90% overall payment rate under the Convention.

The SBI plenary adopted the draft conclusions, a draft COP decision, and a draft CMP decision.

The COP and CMP adopted the decisions on Saturday, 18 November.

Final Outcomes: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2017/L.34), the SBI recommended two draft decisions on administrative, financial, and institutional matters, one for consideration and adoption at COP 23 and one for consideration and adoption by CMP 13.

In its decision (FCCC/SBI/2017/L.34/Add.1), the COP, on budget performance for the biennium 2016-2017: urges parties that have not made contributions in full to the core budget for the current and/or previous bienniums to do so without further delay; calls upon parties to make their contributions to the core budget for 2018 in a timely manner; and urges parties to further contribute to the Trust Fund for Participation in the UNFCCC Process to ensure the widest possible participation in the negotiations in 2018, and to the Trust Fund for Supplementary Activities.

On the audit report and financial statements for 2016, the COP urges the Executive Secretary to implement the recommendations of the auditors, as appropriate.

In its decision (FCCC/SBI/2017/L.34/Add.2), the CMP, on budget performance for the biennium 2016-2017, the CMP: calls upon parties to make their contributions to the core budget for the year 2018 in a timely manner; and urges parties to further contribute to the Trust Fund for Participation in the UNFCCC Process, to ensure the widest possible participation in the negotiations in 2018, and to the Trust Fund for Supplementary Activities.

On the audit report and financial statements for 2016, the CMP urges the Executive Secretary to implement the recommendations of the auditors, as appropriate.

CLOSURE OF THE SESSION: The SBI adopted the report of the session (FCCC/SBI/2017/L.19) and SBI Chair Chruszczew closed the session on Wednesday, 15 November at 12:48 pm.

SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE

On Monday, 6 November, the SBSTA opened and statements were made in a joint SBI/SBSTA plenary. (See page 17.)

ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS: The SBSTA adopted the agenda (FCCC/SBSTA/2017/5) and agreed to the organization of the work of the session.

Election of officers other than the Chair: On Saturday, 18 November, the COP elected Paul Watkinson (France) as SBSTA Chair.

NAIROBI WORK PROGRAMME: This item (FCCC/SBSTA/2017/INF.6) was first taken up in plenary on Monday, 6 November, and subsequently in informal consultations, co-facilitated by Julio Cordano (Chile) and Kunihiko Shimada (Japan). On Wednesday, 15 November, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2017/L.25), the SBSTA agrees to, *inter alia*:

- encourage parties to enhance the engagement of their UNFCCC national focal points in Nairobi Work Programme (NWP) activities with a view to strengthening partnerships with NWP partner organizations;
- request parties to consider the following areas in improving the relevance and effectiveness of the NWP, including how to: enhance the engagement of partner organizations with the aim of improving the linkages of their work plans to the themes addressed under the NWP; ensure the NWP has delivered on its mandate; and enhance the role of the NWP to be more relevant to the work of the Adaptation Committee and the LEG;
- extend the deadline for the submission of views on further improving the relevance and effectiveness of the NWP from 12 January 2018 to 30 March 2018; and
- request the Secretariat, under the guidance of the SBSTA Chair, to prepare a synthesis report summarizing the outcomes of the work undertaken under the NWP since SBSTA 44 to serve as input to the review of the NWP at SBSTA 48.

REPORT OF THE ADAPTATION COMMITTEE: This item is summarized under the SBI. (See page 19.)

REPORT OF THE WIM: This item is summarized under the SBI. (See page 20.)

DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGIES: Joint annual report of the TEC and CTCN: This item is summarized under the SBI. (See page 21.)

Technology framework under Paris Agreement Article 10.4: This item (FCCC/SBSTA/2017/INF.5) was first taken up in plenary on Monday, 6 November, and subsequently in informal consultations co-facilitated by Stella Gama (Malawi) and Elfriede-Anna More (Austria).

Parties discussed: the scope of support, agreeing it should not be limited to financial support; the potential to ground the decision in Agreement Article 10.6 (support for technology development and transfer); and the need for a clear linkage to Agreement Article 13 (transparency framework).

On Tuesday, 14 November, the SBSTA adopted the conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2017/L.22), the SBSTA, *inter alia*, requests the SBSTA Chair to prepare an initial draft of the technology framework by 15 March 2018, taking into account ongoing deliberations and progress made at SBSTA 45, 46, and this session, for consideration at SBSTA 48.

AGRICULTURE: This item was first taken up in plenary on Monday, 6 November, and subsequently in informal consultations co-facilitated by Emmanuel Dlamini (Swaziland) and Heikki

Granhölm (Finland). Participants discussed: the need for concrete outputs linked to implementation; how work could be jointly addressed by the SBI and SBSTA; and the possibility of a Secretariat mapping exercise to provide information on agriculture work already undertaken by other Convention bodies. A developing country group introduced a proposed draft decision text that requests the SBI to establish and periodically assess a five-year work programme and continue work on six topics.

On Tuesday, 14 November, the SBSTA adopted the conclusions and a decision for the consideration of the COP.

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

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2017/L.24), the SBSTA agrees to:

- continue its work on issues relating to agriculture, in accordance with decision 2/CP.17 (outcome of the work of the *Ad hoc* Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention);
- continue the exchange of views on issue relating to agriculture, taking into account the outcomes of the past five in-session workshops and progress made at SBSTA 46; and
- recommend a draft decision on issues relating to agriculture for consideration and adoption by COP 23.

In its decision (FCCC/SBSTA/2017/L.24/Add.1), the COP:

- requests the SBSTA and the SBI to jointly address issues related to agriculture, including through workshops and expert meetings, working with constituted bodies under the Convention, and taking into consideration the vulnerabilities of agriculture to climate change and approaches to addressing food security;
- invites parties and observers to submit by March 2018 their views on elements to be included in the work for consideration at SB 48, starting with but not limited to: modalities for implementation of the outcomes of the five in-session workshops; methods and approaches for assessing adaptation, adaptation co-benefits, and resilience; improved soil carbon, health, and fertility; improved nutrient use and manure management; improved livestock management systems; and socio-economic and food security dimensions of climate change; and
- requests the subsidiary bodies to report to COP 26 on progress and outcomes of work.

RESEARCH AND SYSTEMIC OBSERVATION: This item was first considered in the SBSTA plenary on Monday, 6 November, and in informal consultations, co-facilitated by Fred Kossam (Malawi) and Stefan Roesner (Germany).

In plenary, the IPCC provided highlights from work on its sixth assessment cycle, including the delivery of eight outputs.

The WMO informed that the WMO and UN Environment are working toward an integrated global GHG information system to help track parties' progress on implementation.

The Committee on Earth Observation Satellites updated on space-based climate monitoring work, stressing that high-quality GHG information will be useful for the global stocktake (GST).

The Global Climate Observing System (GCOS) reported that WMO and GCOS are working on seven climate indicators, and lamented gaps in the coverage of the global network of climatological centers due to insufficient resources.

The World Climate Research Programme noted its work on advanced modeling and the regional downscaling of climate data.

The Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission of UN Economic, Social, and Cultural Organization (IOC-UNESCO) noted the many threats that climate change pose to ocean health.

In informal consultations, parties considered draft conclusions and discussed whether specific GHG and climate data from the WMO GHG Bulletin and State of the Global Climate Statement should be included in the draft conclusions, and, if so, how. One developing country stated that highlighting these numbers showcases the urgency of the need to address the state of the climate. Several parties argued that referencing the WMO report is sufficient with some arguing that referencing numbers would make the conclusions too technical.

On Tuesday, 14 November, SBSTA adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2017/L.21) the SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- notes the importance of ocean-related climate indicators, including ocean heat content, ocean acidification, sea level rise, and Arctic and Antarctic sea ice extent for informing on the state of the global climate;
- encourages parties to sustain observations underpinning these indicators, noting the Ocean Conference 2017 and the importance of systematic observations related to the oceans;
- notes the increasing capability to systematically monitor GHG concentrations and emissions, through *in situ* as well as satellite observations, and its relevance in support of the Paris Agreement;
- notes the needs and the challenges of sustaining systematic observations, particularly in developing countries, including upper air observations, encouraging parties and relevant organizations to work towards sustaining such observations; and
- encourages parties and relevant organizations to enhance systematic observations related to the monitoring of GCOS essential climate variables and the understanding and prediction of extreme events and slow onset events.

RESPONSE MEASURES: This item is summarized under the SBI. (See page 24.)

METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES UNDER THE

CONVENTION: Common metrics: This item was first taken up in plenary on Monday, 6 November, and subsequently in informal consultations co-facilitated by Takeshi Enoki (Japan) and Stephen King'uyu (Kenya)

On Tuesday, 14 November, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2017/L.19), the SBSTA: notes that the APA has initiated work on common metrics in relation to elaborating guidance for NDCs; recognizes further consideration by the APA is necessary; and agrees to continue consideration at its June 2019 session to be able to take into account the deliberations of the APA and the findings of the IPCC in its Fifth Assessment Report.

Bunker Fuels: This item was first taken up in plenary on Monday, 6 November, and subsequently in informal consultations by the SBSTA Chair.

In plenary, the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) reported on progress on: aircraft technology; operational improvements; sustainable aviation fuel options; and the Carbon Offsetting and Reduction Scheme for International Aviation (CORSA).

The International Maritime Organization (IMO) reported that members approved a roadmap for the development of a comprehensive strategy for the reduction of GHG emissions from ships.

The EU called for ensuring environmental integrity and avoiding double counting under CORSA, and said action under the IMO should not be delayed until 2023. The Marshall Islands urged countries to ensure that the IMO strategy is consistent with staying below 1.5°C.

Japan stated that emissions from bunker fuels should continue to be addressed by ICAO and IMO. Saudi Arabia called for ICAO and IMO to consider the principles and provisions of the UNFCCC.

On Tuesday, 15 November, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2017/L.20), the SBSTA takes note of the information provided by ICAO and IMO and invites their secretariats to continue to report at future SBSTA sessions.

MATTERS RELATING TO ARTICLE 6 UNDER THE PARIS AGREEMENT: The three sub-items under this agenda item were taken up in plenary on Monday, 6 November, and subsequently in a contact group and in informal consultations, co-chaired and co-facilitated by Kelley Kizzier (Ireland) and Hugh Sealy (Maldives).

In the contact group, where all three sub-items were addressed together, many parties commented on the value of the pre-session workshops in clarifying positions. Norway and the EU praised the Co-Chairs' informal notes as a long-awaited starting point for discussions. All parties welcomed the presence of observers in the contact groups and informal consultations.

In informal consultations, parties disagreed on the approach to revising the informal notes, with some urging a consolidation of ideas and improved logical flow while others, who prevailed, insisted that the revised texts should include all suggested additions and revisions, in compilation texts that highlighted divergences. For each of the three sub-items a third version of the co-facilitators' informal note was produced.

Guidance on cooperative approaches referred to in Article 6.2: In informal consultations on Agreement Article 6.2 on internationally transferred mitigation outcome (ITMOs), parties requested additions to the co-facilitators' note, including related to: sustainable development; environmental integrity; human rights; achieving overall mitigation in global emissions; use of ITMOs for other than NDCs; negative social and economic impacts; clarity on treatment of Certified Emission Reductions; and complementarity. Several parties suggested an alternative to the informal note's text on reporting and accounting for all three agenda items, by simple reference to Agreement Article 13.7 (reporting obligations under the enhanced transparency framework).

Rules, modalities and procedures for the mechanism established by Article 6.4: In informal consultations on Agreement Article 6.4 (mechanism), parties requested, *inter alia*, the following in the co-facilitators' note: engagement by public and private entities; operationalizing the overall mitigation goal; limits in use toward NDCs; the need to ensure continuity of existing CDM institutions and elements; and negative social and economic impacts. One party noted that it would be important to ensure complementarity of procedural treatment between Article 6.2- and 6.4-related activities, so as to avoid creating perverse incentives.

Work programme under the framework for non-market approaches referred to in Article 6.8: In informal consultations on Agreement Article 6.8 (non-market approaches), parties noted the difference between this sub-item and the other two sub-items, recalling that the mandate is to produce a workplan. Parties recalled suggested elements from their submissions, including sharing of experiences and best practices, and the establishment of a permanent forum held in conjunction with the meetings of the subsidiary bodies.

On Thursday, 16 November, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions for all three sub-items, (FCCC/SBSTA/2017/L.26; FCCC/SBSTA/2017/L.27; FCCC/SBSTA/2017/L.28), the SBSTA: takes note of the submissions from parties, and of the third iteration of the informal note prepared by the Co-Chairs; requests the SBSTA Chair to prepare an informal document containing the draft elements of guidance on cooperative approaches based on prior submissions and the third iteration of the informal note; and agrees to continue work on this matter at SBSTA 48.

MODALITIES FOR ACCOUNTING OF FINANCIAL RESOURCES PROVIDED AND MOBILIZED THROUGH PUBLIC INTERVENTIONS UNDER ARTICLE 9.7 OF THE AGREEMENT: This item was first considered on Monday, 6 November, and parties agreed to establish a contact group, co-chaired by Outi Honkatukia (Finland) and Andres Eduardo Mogro Zambrano (Ecuador).

In informal consultations, parties first provided inputs to a Co-Chairs' informal note from SBSTA 46, containing considerations for elements and additional potential considerations in the development of accounting modalities. Parties shared views on cross-cutting considerations and climate finance provided through bilateral, regional, and other channels. Many called for clarifying the definition of climate finance, with many proposing using the SCF definition as a starting point. Parties also called for attention to, *inter alia*: defining "climate-specific" and "climate-related," and "new and additional"; an MRV system for finance; reporting against progression on climate finance; and information on support pledged, approved, and disbursed. Parties also reflected on how, and when, to use, or build on, the common tabular format for the UNFCCC biennial reporting guidelines for developed countries.

Countries proposed that the co-facilitators restructure the informal note in two columns, containing elements in one column and definitions in another. Informal consultations continued based on revised versions of the informal note. On Monday, 13 November, in the contact group, parties agreed to the Co-Chairs' informal note, containing draft elements on: timing of SBSTA work; objective and principles; general considerations; cross-cutting considerations (in a tabular format); climate finance provided through bilateral, regional and other channels (in a tabular format); climate finance provided through multilateral channels (in a tabular format); and climate finance mobilized through public interventions (in a tabular format). Parties also agreed to forward draft conclusions to the SBSTA.

In plenary, on Tuesday, 14 November, the SBSTA adopted the conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2017/L.23), the SBSTA:

- welcomes progress made in the work, as reflected in the Co-Chairs' informal note on this item;
- requests the SBSTA Chair to continue consultations with the APA Co-Chairs with a view to ensuring coherence and coordination, and the timely incorporation of Agreement Article 9.5 accounting modalities, developed by the SBSTA, into the modalities, procedures and guidelines for the transparency framework referred to in Agreement Article 13, to be developed by the APA; and
- agrees to advance and aims to complete its work on this matter as soon as possible, taking into account the considerations referred to in the previous paragraphs and the Co-Chairs' informal note, and building on the recommendations of the SCF 2016 biennial assessment and overview of climate finance flows.

LOCAL COMMUNITIES AND INDIGENOUS PEOPLES PLATFORM: This item (FCCC/SBSTA/2017/6) was first taken up in plenary on Monday, 6 November, and subsequently in informal consultations co-facilitated by Kunihiko Shimada (Japan) and Spencer Thomas (Grenada).

Parties discussed where the platform will "sit" in the UNFCCC. A developing country argued that the Paris Agreement mandates that the platform should be within the UNFCCC, while several developed countries argued that the platform is not intended to be a negotiating body, but could still be linked to the UNFCCC.

On Wednesday, 15 November, SBSTA adopted conclusions and a draft decision for consideration by the COP. The Indigenous Peoples Forum on Climate Change requested voluntary financial support to help facilitate the platform's full operationalization. The EU, Costa Rica, Australia, Canada, and Brazil welcomed the operationalization of the platform, with the EU indicating readiness to consider establishing a facilitative working group and Costa Rica asking for balanced representation at the first multi-stakeholder workshop.

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

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2017/L.29), the SBSTA recommends a draft decision for the COP's consideration. In its decision, the COP, *inter alia*:

- decides that the overall purpose of the platform will be to strengthen the knowledge, technologies, practices, and efforts of local communities and indigenous peoples related to addressing and responding to climate change, to facilitate the exchange of experience and the sharing of best practices and lessons learned on mitigation and adaptation in a holistic and integrated manner, and to enhance the engagement of local communities and indigenous peoples in the UNFCCC process;
- decides that the platform will deliver the following functions: promote the exchange of experience and best practices aiming at applying, strengthening, protecting, and preserving traditional knowledge; build the capacities of indigenous peoples and local communities to enable their engagement in the UNFCCC process; and facilitate the integration of diverse knowledge systems, practices, and innovations in designing and implementing the international and national policies;
- decides to continue to work towards the full operationalization of the platform;
- recommends that the processes under the platform, including its operationalization, take into account, *inter alia*, the interests and views of local communities and indigenous peoples, as well as the principles proposed by indigenous peoples' organizations of full and effective participation of indigenous peoples, equal status of indigenous peoples and parties, self-selection of indigenous peoples' representatives in accordance with indigenous peoples' own procedures, and adequate funding to enable the functions outlined;
- decides that the first activity of the platform will be a multi-stakeholder workshop on implementing the functions outlined, which would be co-moderated by the SBSTA Chair and a representative of local communities and indigenous peoples' organizations, and that these co-moderators make an equal contribution to the workshop design; and
- requests the SBSTA to consider at SB 48 the further operationalization of the platform, including the establishment of a facilitative working group, which would not be a negotiating body under the Convention.

REPORTS ON OTHER ACTIVITIES: Annual report of technical information reported by Annex I parties in their biennial reports and national communications: The SBSTA took note of the reports (FCCC/SBSTA/2017/INF.4).

Annual report of Annex I parties' GHG inventories: The SBSTA took note of the reports (FCCC/SBSTA/2017/INF.8).

Annual report on the technical review of GHG inventories and other information provided by Annex I parties: The SBSTA took note of the reports (FCCC/SBSTA/2017/INF.7).

CLOSURE OF THE SESSION: The SBSTA adopted the report of the session (FCCC/SBSTA/2017/L.18) and SBSTA Chair Fuller closed the session on Wednesday, 15 November, at 1:32 pm.

JOINT SBI/SBSTA CLOSING PLENARY

On Tuesday, 14 November, the SBI and SBSTA held a joint plenary to hear statements.

The EU welcomed progress, especially related to, *inter alia*: agriculture; the gender action plan; and the focus on oceans in the conclusions on research and systemic observation.

Australia, for the Umbrella Group, expressed satisfaction with the finalization of the gender action plan, and noted this is a strong outcome for women and the climate. He also applauded the approval of the budget.

Maldives, for AOSIS, called for operationalizing the WIM so that it fulfils its original vision and delivers for people on the ground.

Ethiopia, for the LDCs, expressed concern at a lack of inclusivity, transparency, and time to participate in negotiations on matters relating to LDCs, and regretted that text in the draft conclusions was not discussed during the negotiations.

CAN said the draft decision on loss and damage falls short on provisions for finance, and expressed hope that the COP Presidency will work to establish a clear pathway for the financing of loss and damage to benefit the most vulnerable.

CJN! said approaches like carbon capture and storage (CCS), bioenergy, geoengineering, and Agreement Article 6 market approaches “will do nothing” to keep temperature increase below 1.5°C and called for quantifiable finance commitments, especially on loss and damage.

Farmers said the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism need to assign higher priority to agriculture and called for ensuring participation of civil society, especially farmers and farmers' NGOs, in the negotiations.

LGMA's stated that they will continue to engage with the Adaptation Fund Board on adaptation projects and improving monitoring of adaptation impacts using local and regional metrics.

RINGOs said researchers can help illuminate values that lie beneath issues under negotiations and noted that the constituency is committed to contributing to capacity building and training.

The Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN (FAO) welcomed the draft COP decision requesting SBI/SBSTA to jointly address issues related to agriculture and said the FAO would provide technical inputs and support.

Women and Gender congratulated parties on the adoption of the first gender action plan under the UNFCCC, supported the local communities and indigenous peoples platform, and opposed CCS, geoengineering, and agriculture- or forest-based carbon markets.

YOUNGOs welcomed, *inter alia*, the decisions on agriculture, and on education, training, public awareness, public participation and public access to information, and hoped the COP 23 President's Ocean Pathways initiative could become part of the UNFCCC workplan.

BINGOs welcomed progress, but called for more clarity on Agreement Article 6 and broader engagement with business on the Technology Mechanism.

JOINT COP/CMP/CMA CLOSING PLENARY

On Saturday, 16 November, the joint COP/CMP/CMA closing plenary convened. Ecuador, for the G-77/China, said this COP advanced the textual work of the Paris Agreement Work Programme and several deliverables for developing countries, including pre-2020 implementation and ambition, loss and damage, local communities and indigenous peoples platform, agriculture, gender action plan, and discussion of equity in the context of the Global Stocktake (GST). He argued that the “story of finance at this COP is an unhappy one.”

Noting that Georgia had become a member of the EIG on Friday, 17 November, Mexico, for the EIG, said the “Bula and Talanoa approaches” had helped move work forward but noted that, in some areas of negotiations, progress lags behind the goals parties set themselves. He asked all countries to focus on moving forward together.

The Democratic Republic of the Congo, for the CfrN, stressed that the forest sector's mitigation potential cannot be ignored. He also lamented the delay in, and procedures related to, processing the group's proposed COP agenda item on a gateway to encourage MRV and account for greater ambition from non-party stakeholders, stressing the group had made a timely submission. He informed that the proposal will be back at COP 24 and that the group will be organizing a voluntary consultation on the proposal at the April-May conference.

Stressing that “pre-2020 action is back,” Brazil, on behalf of BASIC, said that stocktake sessions on pre-2020 action will contribute to raising collective ambition.

Observing that this meeting began in the aftermath of one of the worst hurricane seasons in the Caribbean, Maldives, for AOSIS, expressed concern that the urgency that led to the Paris Agreement “has already begun to fade.”

Australia, for the Umbrella Group, said the COP 23 outcomes provide a strong platform to continue to progress work next year on the Paris mandates.

The EU said the spirit of Paris is alive but there is a lot of work ahead. He noted that the gender action plan and the local communities and indigenous peoples platform will add impetus to important aspects of the agenda. He further announced the EU and its Member States intend to deposit their instruments of ratification of the Doha Amendment to the Kyoto Protocol by the end of 2017.

Ethiopia, for the LDCs, underlined the work remaining to meet the 2018 deadline and looked forward to engaging in work under the Fiji Momentum for Implementation.

Mali, for the African Group, expressed disappointment in the lack of pre-2020 action, noting that only 84 parties have ratified the Doha Amendment.

Iran, on behalf of the LMDCs, regretted that developing countries have been told to look to their own strained resources and private financing to adapt.

Peru, for AILAC, requested the COP report reflect the group's position that the special circumstances of all developing countries should be taken into account.

China welcomed the decision on the Fiji Momentum for Implementation, and said the COP 23 outcome reflects a balance in representing parties' views and lays a good basis for the scheduled conclusion of the Paris Agreement work programme. Noting that the Paris Agreement has built “irreversible momentum,” he said China will continue to take robust domestic

action, implement its NDC, enhance South-South Cooperation on climate change, and work collectively to implement the Paris Agreement, the Kyoto Protocol, and the Convention.

Indonesia said this session generated a number of substantive documents that are crucial for parties' work at the next meeting.

Australia noted that it accepted the Doha Amendment on the condition that no further guidance is required from the CMP.

YOUNGOs underscored that the longer action is delayed, the more loss and damage will cost, calling on parties to prioritize the WIM.

Women and Gender highlighted the invaluable contribution of civil society from the Pacific Island states.

Indigenous Peoples stressed the need for parties to promote and protect indigenous peoples' rights and knowledge, which should guide the implementation of the indigenous peoples platform and the Paris Agreement.

RINGOs said multi-stakeholder discussions will be more effective in identifying solutions that work for all and "will motivate" parties to further enhance their ambition.

Noting COP 23 has advanced the implementation guidelines of the Paris Agreement and prepared the ground for more ambitious action through the Talanoa Dialogue, COP President Bainimarama gavelled the session to a close at 6:56 am, on Saturday, 18 November.

A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF THE FIJI / BONN CLIMATE CONFERENCE

One must endure the presence of a caterpillar if one wants to become acquainted with a butterfly. – paraphrased from *The Little Prince* by Antoine de Saint-Exupéry

The 23rd Conference of the Parties (COP 23) to the UNFCCC was, in some ways, destined to be the proverbial caterpillar. In a position shared by many in the past, it was a transitional COP, taking place before a set deadline for agreement and expected to move conversations from the abstract to the concrete.

Like Poznan in 2008 and Doha in 2012, despite a full agenda, the Fiji / Bonn COP was expected to be more technical in character. And, like other transitional COPs before it, COP 23 was marked by procedural wrangling and positioning in advance of the long-expected "package deal" that is expected to result from the completion of the Paris Agreement work programme at COP 24 in 2018.

With the year 2020—the start of Paris Agreement implementation—quickly approaching, this COP was also transitional in trying to bridge between the pre- and post-2020 eras. Many discussions revolved around how to build on existing institutions and processes, and how to deliver meaningful outcomes on issues like finance and adaptation to raise parties' political will and build trust to "move further, faster, together."

This brief analysis examines how COP 23 delivered on these two transitional mandates: moving the technical negotiations forward on the Paris Agreement implementation guidelines in 2018; and ensuring that pre-2020 commitments and ambition are not forgotten.

WEAVING THE COCOON: TRANSITIONING TO NEGOTIATING MODE ON THE PARIS GUIDELINES

As the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Paris Agreement (APA) Co-Chairs Sarah Baashan and Jo Tyndall observed in their reflections note issued during the intersessional period, this session of the APA needed to take a "significant step forward" to keep negotiations on track to deliver what

many have acknowledged is likely to be a package deal on the Paris Agreement work programme at COP 24. The tasks, they recognized, were complex and interlinked. Ultimately, while the APA's conclusions take a few halting steps closer to operationalizing the Paris Agreement, many are worried that the lack of mandated intersessional work and insufficient convergence on key issues will make it difficult to deliver.

In moving from the conceptual to the technical, many felt that the APA produced uneven outcomes across the five main items (mitigation, adaptation communication, transparency framework, global stocktake, and compliance). In informal consultations, the co-facilitators worked to compile parties' views in "preliminary material" documents, which grew in length throughout the week as parties added what they considered to be missing elements. These preliminary material documents presented both challenges and opportunities. The co-facilitators demonstrated some creativity in structuring the information, developing for example a "building blocks" scheme for the global stocktake, which organizes work into preparatory, technical, and political phases. In informal consultations on the transparency framework, on the other hand, a "notation key" developed by the co-facilitators, which sought to indicate parties' views on how different provisions would apply to different countries, shortened the length of the document, but also led to mistakes, confusion, and calls for improved readability.

While the preliminary material documents and informal notes allowed the co-facilitators to comprehensively compile views, the outcome is unwieldy: a 266-page addendum to the conclusions, which has yet to be meaningfully streamlined. On mitigation alone, the informal note is 180 pages, "bloated" in one delegate's view, from the 47-page document that emerged from APA 1-3 in May 2017. While several acknowledged the value of compilation documents that put parties' positions side by side, citing the compliance informal note as a useful example, considerable work remains on mitigation to crystallize areas of convergence and divergence, let alone find bridging proposals. It is not at all clear how any of the elements will move from the lengthy texts in the addendum to a negotiating text.

At the same time, progress was made in many areas of the work programme that fall under the COP, SBI, and SBSTA. Discussions got under way on two new items, common time frames for NDCs and Action on Climate Empowerment (ACE). In addition, discussions on other items, including the public registries and *ex post* finance accounting, were captured in co-facilitators' informal notes. Given the close interlinkages between these items and those under the APA agenda, many felt these notes will help move the entire work programme forward in a more balanced manner.

Many felt that discussions on market and non-market mechanisms under Paris Agreement Article 6 (cooperative approaches)—an area still requiring detailed definition—captured key ideas. Concerns, however, remained about how to make governance of the two market-based approaches coherent, and how to ensure sustainable development and environmental integrity in their use. There is also as yet less clarity about how to operationalize non-market approaches.

Overall, many felt that uneven progress was made on the work programme. Because parties are calling to move the text forward as a coherent whole, more "ripe" issues, such as adaptation communication, were slowed by more contentious items, such as mitigation. Given the many interlinkages among the elements of the work programme, both substantively and politically, parties' demands for balanced progress may mean that the entire package advances only as fast as its slowest element.

With the 2018 deadline for the work programme “package deal” approaching, parties also sought to ensure their priority issues would not fall off the table. As has become clear in negotiations since 2016, the Paris outcome is a delicate balance, with parties interpreting it in different ways. At this COP, an often-heard call was by the developed countries to stick to the Paris mandate, as they felt developing countries were trying to add issues that were outside the mandate, in particular in the area of finance. Developing countries, in turn, viewed that many important issues that are part of the package are not fully reflected in the Paris decision text, which some noted was “consulted, not negotiated.” These different interpretations came to the fore most obviously in the APA’s list of possible additional items, many of which were related to finance. In fact, even the closing of the APA plenary was temporarily held hostage to the African Group’s proposal to expand discussion on Article 9.5 (*ex ante* finance transparency).

ENSURING EVERYONE CAN BE A BUTTERFLY: BUILDING ON THE PRE-2020 REGIME

The Fiji / Bonn COP also had the task of moving forward numerous institutions, processes, and discussions into the post-2020 regime, some of which date back several years and others that were mandated in the COP 21 decision on the Paris outcome. Many of these institutions are also key in the pre-2020 regime. Action on the pre-2020 regime has remained, in the view of many developing countries, woefully inadequate. Developing countries have forcefully argued that pre-2020 action—a key part of the deal struck in Durban in 2011—remains neglected while post-2020 preparations shine in the limelight. At COP 23, developing countries pushed the pre-2020 regime to the forefront of the agenda, characterizing it as a matter of trust. Prominent issues in this regard at this COP were finance and the design of the 2018 Facilitative Dialogue. In parallel, non-state actors raised their voices to ensure that they, too, can enter the post-2020 regime as legitimate climate actors.

As at any COP, finance took center stage during the final days, with most of the crunch issues sent to heads-of-delegation level consultations relating to finance. In addition to the African Group’s call to discuss modalities of developed countries’ *ex-ante* finance communications, the lingering question of whether this COP should take the decision that the Adaptation Fund “shall” serve the Paris Agreement was the final issue to be resolved in a closing plenary huddle in the wee hours of Saturday, facing opposition from one major developed country. Dear to developing countries for both its focus on adaptation and its governance arrangements, the debate had been whether the Adaptation Fund could be linked to the Paris Agreement directly or if its institutional and governance arrangements required discussion prior to this linkage. The final CMP decision on the report of the Adaptation Fund Board contains a decision that the Fund “shall” serve the Agreement, subject to decisions taken at CMA 1-3 in 2018. In addition, the CMA is expected to recommend, in 2019, if the Fund, which currently serves the Kyoto Protocol, should serve the Agreement exclusively. In essence, while developing countries succeeded in elevating the Adaptation Fund’s prominence in the post-2020 regime, the governance and funding arrangements of the Fund are still unclear.

A priority for the COP 23 Presidency was the design of the 2018 Facilitative Dialogue, mandated from Paris and dubbed the “pre-global stocktake” because many suggest that the form of the 2018 Facilitative Dialogue may become a model that could inform the global stocktake under the Paris Agreement. Delivering on this expectation, the COP decision on the “Fiji

Momentum for Implementation” outlines the design of the 2018 Facilitative Dialogue, now known as “Talanoa Dialogue” (named after a Pacific storytelling tradition that fosters empathy and trust). While parties now have detailed guidance on the features, topics, inputs, and organization of the Dialogue, which will be mainly carried out during the April-May 2018 Bonn session and COP 24, and divided into technical and political phases, some expressed disappointment with the lack of a strong feedback link to the intergovernmental negotiating process. Outputs from the Talanoa Dialogue, as agreed in COP 23 Presidency-led consultations before and during the COP, will include only reports and summaries, and will not be submitted to the COP.

Also, the Talanoa Dialogue will consider pre-2020 action and support, in addition to the original mitigation-centric and more forward-looking mandate from Paris, which is to take stock of collective efforts to progress towards the long-term mitigation goal of Paris Agreement Article 4.1 and inform the preparation of NDCs. This addition was a part of a concession made in exchange for a group of developing countries withdrawing their proposal to add a new COP agenda item on pre-2020 commitments, actions, and ambition.

Another process detailed in the Fiji Momentum for Implementation decision related to building trust establishes a set of “stocktakes” that expand on the 2016 facilitative dialogue, which was mandated from Paris and focused both on action and support in the more clearly bifurcated pre-2020 period. The decision mandates these events at COP 24 and 25, and also requests the COP President, and the UNFCCC Executive Secretary, and the Secretariat to draw attention to the need for parties to ratify the Doha Amendment—the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol. This is also seen as a key area for trust-building by developing countries who are disappointed that this amendment, agreed in 2012, has yet to enter into force while the Paris Agreement entered into force in record time. In a related gesture of goodwill, the EU announced that the Union and its Member States intend to deposit their ratification instruments for the Doha Amendment by the end of 2017.

Strengthening the Warsaw International Mechanism on loss and damage (WIM) in the post-2020 period is also considered an important area for building trust. The WIM is important to developing countries trying to recover from increasingly intense storms and decreasingly productive crops, to name a few “losses and damages” incurred by climate change. At COP 23, occurring after a year of particularly destructive natural disasters, many developing countries placed a high priority of raising the profile of loss and damage, by calling for a standing agenda item on the WIM, to allow year-long conversation, rather than an annual review of the report of the WIM’s Executive Committee. As one delegate from a small island state underlined, “the Executive Committee is not the whole of the WIM.” This call was not realized, disappointing many developing country delegates, although some expressed cautious optimism that the Suva expert dialogues and Fiji Clearinghouse on Risk Transfer could help strengthen the mechanism in the future.

Beyond UNFCCC institutions and trust-building, non-party stakeholders are increasingly key components of the future of climate action. The Democratic Republic of the Congo, supported by a few other countries, called for a new agenda item on enabling greater ambition by measuring, reporting, verifying, and accounting for non-party stakeholders’ contributions to emissions reductions, which piqued the interest of many. Several noted the need to figure out how, and how much, corporate, subnational, and other non-state action actually contributes to mitigation and adaptation. Others noted the difficulties of bringing non-state

actors into a state-led process, which perhaps explains the lack of enthusiasm demonstrated by parties at this COP in engaging with this issue.

This tension slowed progress in the discussions on the local communities and indigenous peoples platform as parties debated how much decision-making power to concede to non-party stakeholders. Nevertheless, marking a bright spot of the negotiations, and applauded by many, the platform was eventually operationalized. The decision specified shared chairmanship by state and indigenous peoples' representatives, much like the Convention on Biological Diversity's Working Group on Traditional Knowledge, Innovations, and Practices (Article 8(j)), enabling these stakeholders at the frontlines of climate change to have a greater role in the intergovernmental talks and contribute to deciding their future.

For many, a key role of non-state actors is highlighting, and rapidly responding to, the increasing urgency of the climate crisis. The World Meteorological Organization's announcement that atmospheric carbon dioxide concentrations were at their highest level in 800,000 years and UN Environment's "Emissions Gap" report confirming that national pledges only bring one third of the emissions reductions required by 2030 to avoid dangerous climate change, brought the urgency of ensuring higher ambition to the forefront. Where this was reflected, however, was not in the grey corridors of the intergovernmental area but in the bustling atmosphere of the civil society space, where subnational governments, businesses, and civil society convened to network, exchange knowledge, and make announcements of commitment and higher ambition. The energy from this zone conveyed a strong message through global media that actors from all countries, including the United States, remain strongly committed to taking action on climate change.

The striking physical and psychological separation of the "Bula Zone," where the negotiations took place, and the "Bonn Zone," where side events featured activities by civil society, business, industry, and other intergovernmental organizations, may have contributed to the seeming lack of urgency in the negotiations but also underscored the difficulty of addressing the growing demands of non-state actors for integration into an intergovernmental process. Many commented that the Fiji / Bonn model of two separate zones needs improvement at future COPs, especially as the UNFCCC seeks better integration of these two spheres with highly interdependent functions—one providing the basis for action and ambition, and the other helping to deliver on it.

REVEALING THE BUTTERFLY

At this COP, the intergovernmental process was not burdened with monumental expectations. The two goals set by the Fijian Presidency—advancing work on the Paris Agreement implementation guidelines and agreeing on the design of the Talanoa Dialogue—were met. Due attention was paid to calls to focus on countries' pre-2020 commitments, but results from the discussions under the APA left some uneasy. With the deliberations in Bonn focused more on structure rather than substance, and with no mandated streamlining work for the intersessional period, many felt like more could have been done to enable parties to start developing language that will, when agreed in 2018, guide parties in their implementation of the Paris Agreement.

How the many aspects of the Paris Agreement work programme will come together in 2018 is still wrapped in a cocoon of uncertainty. But, as has been the case in the past, including the COPs that negotiated the Kyoto Protocol rulebook

(the Marrakech Accords), such deal making may come down to last-minute huddles on the plenary floor. With the 2018 deadline looming, many called for increasing the pace of work, or for additional negotiation time. Some underscored the need for both. Finding this deal to guide the future of the climate regime will have to build on the trust and institutions of the past. The key to unlocking climate action for tomorrow may rest on strengthening the global response today.

UPCOMING MEETINGS

Joint 11th Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention and the 29th Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol: COP 11 of the Vienna Convention and MOP 29 of the Montreal Protocol will consider, *inter alia*: the Kigali Amendment to the Montreal Protocol to phase down hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs); the Multilateral Fund replenishment; issues related to Article 2 of the Protocol; use of controlled substances as process agents; energy efficiency; and safety standards relevant to low global-warming-potential alternatives. The COP will consider the report of the tenth meeting of the ozone research managers of the parties to the Vienna Convention and the status of the general trust fund for financing activities on research and systematic observations relevant to the Vienna Convention. **dates:** 20-24 November 2017 **location:** Montreal, Canada **contact:** Ozone Secretariat **phone:** +254-20-762-3851 **fax:** +254-20-762-0335 **email:** ozone.info@unep.org **www:** <http://ozone.unep.org>

53rd Meeting of the GEF Council: The GEF Council will approve projects to realize global environmental benefits in the GEF's focal areas, provide guidance to the GEF Secretariat and implementing agencies, and to discuss its relations with the conventions for which it serves as the financial mechanism. In addition, the 23rd Least Developed Countries Fund and the Special Climate Change Fund Council Meeting will be held on Thursday, 30 November. On Monday, 27 November, there will be a consultation with civil society organizations. **dates:** 28-30 November 2017 **location:** Washington DC, US **contact:** GEF Secretariat **phone:** +1-202-473-0508 **fax:** +1-202-522-3240/3245 **email:** secretariat@thegef.org **www:** www.thegef.org/events/53rd-gef-council-meeting

4th Global Science Conference on Climate Smart Agriculture: The 4th Global Science conference on Climate Smart Agriculture (CSA) will be organized around the theme "Catalysing local innovations and action to accelerate scaling up of CSA." The Conference is hosted by the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD). **dates:** 28-30 November 2017 **location:** Johannesburg, South Africa **contact:** Conference Organizers **email:** 4thGlobalScienceConference2017@nepad.org **www:** <http://csa2017.nepad.org/en/>

Climate Finance Day 2017: Climate Finance Day 2017 will take stock of climate action in the financial sector since COP 21. It will showcase recent initiatives and innovations from the financial sector to accelerate the adoption of forward-looking strategies around the world. Those initiatives will be highlighted the following day at the One Planet Summit that will be attended by international leaders, CEOs, and government representatives. **date:** 11 December 2017 **location:** Paris, France **contact:** Paris Europlace and French Ministry for the Economy and Finance **email:** climatefinanceday@paris-europlace.com **www:** <http://www.climatefinanceday.com/>

One Planet Summit: French President Emmanuel Macron has announced that, two years after the adoption of the Paris Agreement, he will convene a summit to take further action on

climate, notably on the financial front. A main focus of this event will be to determine how those working in public and private finance can innovate to support and accelerate our common efforts to fight climate change. Attendance at the summit is by invitation only. **date:** 12 December 2017 **location:** Paris, France **www:** <https://www.oneplanetsummit.fr/en/>

Asia Pacific Carbon Forum 2017: Organized by the UNFCCC, Asian Development Bank (ADB), International Emissions Trading Association (IETA), and the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES), the 2017 Asia Pacific Carbon Forum (APCF 2017) will provide a platform to exchange knowledge and information on carbon markets and implementation of NDCs at the regional level. **dates:** 13-15 December 2017 **location:** Bangkok, Thailand **contact:** Forum organizers **email:** asiacarbonforum@dtu.dk **www:** <http://asiacarbonforum.com/>

World Future Energy Summit 2018: The World Future Energy Summit (WFES) is an annual event that is dedicated to advancing future energy, energy efficiency and clean technology. WFES brings together over 30,000 visitors from 175 countries attracting government leaders, policy makers, entrepreneurs, and thought leaders. WFES is part of Abu Dhabi Sustainability Week. **dates:** 15-18 January 2018 **location:** Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates **www:** <https://www.worldfutureenergysummit.com/>

47th Session of the IPCC: IPCC-47 will meet to discuss, *inter alia*, funding, developing country participation in the IPCC process and alignment of IPCC and GST. **dates:** 30 January – 3 February 2018 (to be confirmed) **location:** Paris, France (to be confirmed) **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>

NAP Expo: The NAP process was established under the Cancun Adaptation Framework. It enables parties to formulate and implement NAPs as a means of identifying medium- and long-term adaptation needs and developing and implementing strategies and programmes to address those needs. The NAP Expo aims to catalyze actions and support for the NAP process. It is conducted by the LEG and supported by the UNFCCC Secretariat in collaboration with relevant organizations. **date:** 10 April 2018 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/adaptation/workstreams/national_adaptation_plans/items/10137.php

48th Sessions of the UNFCCC Subsidiary Bodies: The 48th sessions of the subsidiary bodies to the UNFCCC and the APA are expected to take place in April-May 2018. **dates:** 30 April - 10 May 2018 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php?year=2018

UNFCCC COP 24: The 24th session of the Conference of the Parties (COP 24) to the UNFCCC and associated meetings will take place in Poland. **dates:** 3-14 December 2018 **location:** Katowice, Poland **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php?year=2018

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

GLOSSARY

ACE	Action for Climate Empowerment
AILAC	Independent Association of Latin America and the Caribbean
ALBA	Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of our America
AOSIS	Alliance of Small Island States
BASIC	Brazil, South Africa, India and China
BINGOs	Business and Industry NGOs
CAN	Climate Action Network
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CfRN	Coalition for Rainforest Nations
CGE	Consultative Group of Experts
CJN!	Climate Justice Now!
CMA	Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement
CMP	Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol
COP	Conference of the Parties
CTCN	Climate Technology Centre and Network
EIG	Environmental Integrity Group
ExCom	WIM Executive Committee
GCF	Green Climate Fund
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GHG	Greenhouse gas
GST	Global Stocktake
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
LDCs	Least Developed Countries
LDCF	Least Developed Countries Fund
LEG	Least Developed Countries Expert Group
LGMA	Local Government and Municipal Authorities
LMDCs	Like-Minded Group of Developing Countries
LTF	Long-term finance
MOI	Means of implementation
MRV	Measurement, reporting, and verification
NAPs	National Adaptation Plans
NDC	Nationally-determined contribution
PCCB	Paris Committee on Capacity-building
REDD+	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation in developing countries
RINGOs	Research and Industry NGOs
SCF	Standing Committee on Finance
SB	Subsidiary Bodies
SBI	Subsidiary Body for Implementation
SBSTA	Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technical Advice
SIDS	Small island developing states
TEC	Technology Executive Committee
TEP	Technical Examination Process
TUNGOS	Trade Union NGOs
UNFCCC	UN Framework Convention on Climate Change
WIM	Warsaw International Mechanism on loss and damage associated with climate change impacts
WMO	World Meteorological Organization
YOUNGOS	Youth NGOs