

BANGKOK CLIMATE CHANGE CONFERENCE: 30 AUGUST-5 SEPTEMBER 2012

The informal additional sessions of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention (AWG-LCA), *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP) and the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP) open today at the UN Conference Centre of the UN Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific in Bangkok, Thailand, and will continue until Wednesday, 5 September 2012.

The AWG-KP session will be used towards resolving outstanding issues to ensure the successful completion of the group's work in Doha, Qatar, in December 2012 by recommending an amendment to the Conference of the Parties (COP) serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP) for adoption. This would allow a second commitment period under the Protocol to start immediately from 1 January 2013.

The AWG-LCA will continue working on practical solutions to fulfill specific mandates from COP 17 in Durban. The focus will be on what substantive outcomes are needed to conclude each element in Doha, how the elements will be reflected in the final outcome of the AWG-LCA and whether additional work might be needed beyond COP 18 and if so, identifying concrete issues and whether those issues require technical work or political consideration. Parties are expected to initiate the textual basis for the Doha outcome of the AWG-LCA. Five workshops based on Decision 2/CP.17 (outcome of the work of the AWG-LCA) will also convene in Bangkok.

Under the ADP, parties are expected to discuss their vision and aspirations for the ADP, the results of its work and how these results can be achieved. Parties will also discuss how to enhance ambition and the opportunities to bridge the gap, the role of means of implementation and how to strengthen international cooperative initiatives, as well as the elements that could frame the ADP's work. Parties will also discuss how they envisage giving effect to the Convention principles.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE UNFCCC AND THE KYOTO PROTOCOL

The international political response to climate change began with the adoption of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in 1992, which sets

out a framework for action aimed at stabilizing atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases to avoid "dangerous anthropogenic interference" with the climate system. The Convention, which entered into force on 21 March 1994, now has 195 parties.

In December 1997, delegates to COP 3 in Kyoto, Japan, agreed to a Protocol to the UNFCCC that commits industrialized countries and countries in transition to a market economy to achieve emission reduction targets. These countries, known as Annex I parties under the UNFCCC, agreed to reduce their overall emissions of six greenhouse gases by an average of 5% below 1990 levels between 2008-2012 (first commitment period), with specific targets varying from country to country. The Kyoto Protocol entered into force on 16 February 2005 and now has 192 parties.

LONG-TERM NEGOTIATIONS IN 2005-2009:

Convening in Montreal, Canada, at the end of 2005, the first session of the CMP decided to establish the AWG-KP under Protocol Article 3.9, which mandates consideration of Annex I parties' further commitments at least seven years before the end of the first commitment period. COP 11 also created a process to consider long-term cooperation under the Convention through a series of four workshops known as "the Convention Dialogue."

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 and established the AWG-LCA with a mandate to focus on mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology 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 in Copenhagen in December 2009. In preparation, both AWGs held several negotiating sessions in 2008-2009.

COPENHAGEN: The UN Climate Change Conference in Copenhagen, Denmark, took place in December 2009. The high-profile event was marked by disputes over transparency and process. During the high-level segment, informal negotiations took place in a group consisting of major economies and representatives of regional and other negotiating groups. Late in the evening of 18 December, these talks resulted in a political agreement: the "Copenhagen Accord," which was then presented to the COP plenary for adoption. After 13 hours of debate, delegates ultimately agreed to "take note" of the Copenhagen Accord. In 2010, over 140 countries indicated support for the Accord. More than 80 countries also provided information on



their national mitigation targets or actions. Parties also agreed to extend the mandates of the AWG-LCA and AWG-KP until COP 16 and CMP 6, respectively.

CANCUN: The UN Climate Change Conference in Cancun, Mexico, took place in December 2010, where parties finalized the Cancun Agreements. Under the Convention track, Decision 1/CP.16 recognized the need for deep cuts in global emissions in order to limit global average temperature rise to 2°C. Parties agreed to keep the global long-term goal under regular review and consider strengthening it during a review by 2015, including in relation to a proposed 1.5°C target. They took note of emission reduction targets and nationally appropriate mitigation actions (NAMAs) communicated by developed and developing countries, respectively (FCCC/SB/2011/INF.1/Rev.1 and FCCC/AWG/LCA/2011/INF.1, both issued after Cancun). Decision 1/CP.16 also addressed other aspects of mitigation, such as: measuring, reporting and verification (MRV); and REDD+.

The Cancun Agreements also established several new institutions and processes, including the Cancun Adaptation Framework and the Adaptation Committee, and the Technology Mechanism, which includes the Technology Executive Committee and the Climate Technology Centre and Network. The Green Climate Fund (GCF) was created and designated as a new operating entity of the Convention's financial mechanism, governed by a 24-member board. Parties agreed to set up a Transitional Committee tasked with the Fund's design, and a Standing Committee to assist the COP with respect to the financial mechanism. Parties also recognized the commitment by developed countries to provide US\$30 billion of fast-start finance in 2010-2012, and to jointly mobilize US\$100 billion per year by 2020.

Under the Protocol track, the CMP urged Annex I parties to raise the level of ambition towards achieving aggregate emission reductions consistent with the range identified in the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, and adopted Decision 2/CMP.6 on land use, land-use change and forestry.

The mandates of the two AWGs were extended to the UN Climate Change Conference to Durban.

DURBAN: The UN Climate Change Conference in Durban, South Africa, took place from 28 November to 11 December 2011. The Durban outcomes cover a wide range of topics, notably the establishment of a second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol, a decision on long-term cooperative action under the Convention, and agreement on the operationalization of the GCF. Parties also agreed to launch the new 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." The new negotiating process, which began in May 2012, is scheduled to end by 2015. The outcome should come into effect and be implemented from 2020 onwards.

The mandates of the AWG-LCA and AWG-KP were again extended to Doha.

BONN CLIMATE CHANGE CONFERENCE 2012: The Bonn Climate Change Conference took place from 14-25 May 2012 in Bonn, Germany. The conference comprised the 36th sessions of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation and the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice. It also included AWG-LCA 15, AWG-KP 17 and the first session of the ADP. Under the AWG-KP, the focus was on issues to be finalized for adopting a second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol and for the AWG-KP to conclude its work at CMP 8.

Many outstanding questions remained, including the length of the second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol and carry-over of surplus units.

Under the AWG-LCA, after agreement on the agenda, debates continued on which issues require consideration so that the AWG-LCA can finalize its work at COP 18. Developed countries stressed "significant progress" and the various new institutions established in Cancun and Durban. Many developing countries identified the need to continue discussing issues required to fulfill the Bali Action Plan mandate.

Under the ADP, discussions centered on the agenda and the election of officers. After nearly two weeks of discussions, the ADP plenary adopted the agenda, initiating two work streams: one addressing matters related to paragraphs 2-6 of Decision 1/CP.17 (post-2020 regime) and the other paragraphs 7-8 (enhancing mitigation ambition during the pre-2020 timeframe) and agreed on the election of officers during the final day of the conference.

INTERSESSIONAL HIGHLIGHTS

UNFCCC WORKSHOP ON LONG-TERM FINANCE:

This workshop was held in Bonn, Germany, from 9-11 July 2012. One hundred forty representatives from governments, major financial institutions, private sector entities and civil society, participated in the workshop. Participants discussed key issues for scaling-up finance mobilization for climate change.

11TH BASIC MEETING ON CLIMATE CHANGE:

The 11th BASIC Ministerial Meeting on Climate Change was held in Johannesburg, South Africa, from 12-13 July 2012 and attended by representatives from Brazil, South Africa, India and China (BASIC). In line with the "BASIC-Plus" approach, representatives from other negotiating groups also attended. The meeting concluded with a joint statement, reaffirming that the ADP process and outcome should be under the Convention, in full accordance with all its principles and provisions.

CARTAGENA DIALOGUE: The Cartagena Dialogue for Progressive Action (Cartagena Dialogue) met in Dushanbe, Tajikistan, from 19-20 July 2012, to discuss key questions ahead of the informal additional sessions of the AWGs and COP 18. On the ADP, participants addressed, *inter alia*: how the Bangkok session can be used to kick-start the ADP's work; expectations on what COP 18 should deliver regarding the new legally-binding agreement; and the elements that should be included in the ADP's organization of work. On finance issues, participants discussed, among other issues: the type of finance discussions parties foresee beyond COP 18, given the closure of the AWG-LCA; and how to include innovative sources of finance and private finance in the negotiations to provide greater clarity on their potential and role in meeting the 2020 goal on finance.

FIRST MEETING OF THE GREEN CLIMATE FUND:

The first board meeting of the GCF, which took place from 23-25 August 2012 in Geneva, Switzerland, considered the work plan of the Board, and initiated the work towards the operationalization of the Fund. Zaheer Fakir (South Africa) and Ewen McDonald (Australia) were elected as Board Co-Chairs to serve for one year. Participants also adopted a decision on how to select the host country of the GCF based on the following offers: Bonn, Germany; Mexico City, Mexico; Windhoek, Namibia; Warsaw, Poland; Songdo City, Republic of Korea; and Geneva, Switzerland. The Board agreed to convene its second meeting in Songdo, Republic of Korea, from 18-20 October 2012, where a decision on the host country is expected to be forwarded to COP 18.

BANGKOK CLIMATE TALKS HIGHLIGHTS: THURSDAY, 30 AUGUST 2012

The informal additional sessions of the AWG-LCA, AWG-KP and the ADP opened in Bangkok, Thailand. The AWG-KP contact group met in the morning. Under the AWG-LCA, a workshop on financing options for the full implementation of the results-based actions relating to REDD+, including modalities and procedures for financing, took place throughout the day. In the afternoon, the ADP Workstream 1 roundtable on vision for the ADP was held. The AWG-LCA contact group met in the afternoon and addressed adaptation and technology, and an informal group on shared vision also convened. The AWG-KP spin-off group on numbers/text met in the afternoon.

AWG-KP

PLENARY: Opening the session, AWG-KP Chair Madeleine Diouf (Senegal) encouraged parties to make progress on outstanding issues, including: the length of the Kyoto Protocol second commitment period; quantified emission limitation and reduction objectives (QELROs); implications of carry-over of assigned amount units (AAUs); access to mechanisms for parties not participating in a second commitment period; and legal issues to ensure the smooth transition from the first to the second commitment period.

CONTACT GROUP: Algeria, on behalf of the G-77/CHINA, encouraged Annex I parties to raise their level of ambition, and urged those parties who have not put forward QELROs to do so. The Republic of Korea, for the EIG, expressed support for an eight-year second commitment period, emphasizing the mid-term review of QELROs and the need to maintain a flexible process.

The EU emphasized that the second commitment period is only one part of the “Durban package,” supported an eight-year second commitment period, and proposed a review in 2015 of the level of ambition of parties’ commitments, in line with the review process under the AWG-LCA.

Nauru, for AOSIS, raised concerns over “window dressing,” such as accounting tricks and conditionalities, and supported a five-year commitment period.

Swaziland, for the AFRICAN GROUP, called for: a higher level of ambition; a five-year commitment period; swiftly resolving the issue of carry-over of surplus AAUs; and restricting the flexibility mechanisms to parties entering a second commitment period.

The Gambia, for the LDCs, called for successful completion of the AWG-KP in order to make progress on a new protocol under the ADP, and supported a five-year second commitment period.

Saudi Arabia, on behalf of the ARAB GROUP, called on developed countries to continue the legally-binding nature of their obligations and avoid a gap between commitment periods.

Venezuela, for ALBA, called on developed countries to live up to their historical responsibilities in adopting a “clear and meaningful” second commitment period in Doha.

South Africa, on behalf of BASIC, urged raising the level of ambition of current pledges, and said the adoption of amendments to the Protocol is “the cornerstone” for a successful outcome in Doha.

The Philippines, representing a group of “like-minded developing countries,” cautioned against adopting a pledge-based approach, emphasizing the need for an aggregate system, common accounting and comparability of efforts.

NUMBERS/TEXT SPIN-OFF GROUP: In the afternoon informal meeting, two presentations were made. Ukraine elaborated on their recent submission on a QELRO, and the Secretariat presented a technical paper on “QELROs expressed as a percentage of the base year and absolute emission levels.” Delegates also discussed: the scope of the spin-off group; efforts to consolidate the proposals on carry-over; relation of QELROs and the IPCC range; and the status of the paper compiled by the Secretariat.

AWG-LCA

PLENARY: AWG-LCA Chair Aysar Tayeb (Saudi Arabia) opened the informal AWG-LCA plenary, noting tasks for the group in Bangkok include continuing practical work and exploring other decisions that may be required, and developing a textual basis for the AWG-LCA outcome to be finalized in Doha. He noted the preparation of: a matrix table that provides an



overview of issues from the BAP mandate and identifies progress made; and informal notes on the issues that also reflect differing levels of maturity of various items.

Australia, for the UMBRELLA GROUP, said no further decisions were required for the AWG-LCA to terminate in Doha. He urged identifying areas where consensus might be possible, observing that not all unresolved issues will garner consensus, and asked what outcome or product was envisaged at the conclusion of the Bangkok session.

Algeria, for the G-77/CHINA, emphasized the need for: balance between mitigation and adaptation; and finance to ensure ambition is enhanced, highlighting public long-term finance and not transferring the financing burden to developing countries. The EU advocated determining the most appropriate body to take work forward on individual issues when the AWG-LCA closes in Doha, and avoiding transferring them to the ADP. She said decisions related to closing the AWG-LCA should not delay progress in the ADP.

Swaziland, for the AFRICAN GROUP, called for progress from developed countries on converting pledges to economy-wide emission reduction targets, and with the Gambia, for the LDCs, expressed concern with the lack of clear projections for mid-term financing. Ecuador, for ALBA, emphasized developed country mitigation as a critical pending issue from the BAP. He identified the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities (CBDR) and respective capabilities as the main element for guiding the work of the group and called for considering draft decision text by the group. South Africa, for BASIC, highlighted unresolved issues, including equity, intellectual property rights (IPRs) and unilateral trade measures. Egypt, for the ARAB GROUP, called for: affirming the principles of the Convention; effectively implementing the BAP; and considering how to carry forward any incomplete work from the AWG-LCA.

The Democratic Republic of the Congo, also for Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia, China, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, India, Iraq, Kuwait, Malaysia, Nicaragua, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand and Venezuela, said termination of the AWG-LCA in Doha should only occur after a successful agreed outcome on all elements of the BAP mandate. He highlighted outstanding issues, including: improving joint understanding of “contextual elements,” such as historical responsibility, equitable access to sustainable development and IPRs; enhancing mitigation ambition for a second commitment period; and ensuring comparability of efforts for those not party to the Protocol. Costa Rica, for the COALITION FOR RAINFOREST NATIONS, emphasized the need to reach agreement on market mechanisms and to increase investment in REDD+.

Nicaragua, for SICA, said reaching an agreed outcome on all pillars of the BAP was a precondition for terminating the AWG-LCA and noted pending issues related to, *inter alia*, long-term finance and shared vision.

Closing the session, AWG-LCA Chair Tayeb urged delegates to put in writing their ideas on how to resolve outstanding issues.

AWG-LCA CONTACT GROUP: Adaptation: AWG-LCA Chair Tayeb opened the AWG-LCA contact group and invited parties to consider an informal note on “enhanced action on adaptation,” highlighting framing elements and questions arising from the Bonn session including: support for adaptation; national adaptation plans; strengthening the catalytic role of the Convention; and economic diversification to build resilience. He also introduced a matrix table, illustrating decisions and action taken on adaptation from COP 13 to SB 36.

Argentina, for the G-77/CHINA, Bangladesh, for the LDCs, and others noted the need to strengthen and intensify the means of implementation for adaptation. Bolivia, on behalf of a number of countries, proposed establishing a process through the Adaptation Committee, in collaboration with the Standing Committee, to develop recommendations with relevant Convention bodies and others on means to incentivize the implementation of adaptation actions and to organize a workshop in parallel with SB 38 on ways to promote the implementation of enhanced action on adaptation in a coherent manner.

Nauru, for AOSIS, called for joint implementation of disaster risk management and climate change adaptation and stressed the need to strengthen national-level institutions.

NORWAY noted relevant decisions supporting and underpinning the work that will be done on adaptation. The US observed that relevant mechanisms, such as the Adaptation Committee, have been set up, noting however concerns on how the mechanisms would work. He pointed out that means of implementation was being considered by the finance group. Discussions will continue.

Technology: AWG-LCA Chair Tayeb presented an informal note entitled “enhanced action on technology development and transfer,” including: framing elements; functions of the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN) and the Technology Executive Committee (TEC); and linkages with the financial mechanism and other thematic bodies. He also presented a matrix table on the technology decisions taken since adopting the BAP. In the ensuing discussion, parties presented their views, *inter alia*: on the relationship between the TEC and CTCN; the functions and the mandate of these new bodies; the need to discuss items beyond those decided upon in Durban; the scope of decisions needed in Doha; and whether to address IPR issues under the UNFCCC.

IN-SESSION WORKSHOP: Financing Options for the Full Implementation of Results-based Actions Relating to REDD+, including Modalities and Procedures for Financing: This workshop was facilitated by Yaw Osafo (Ghana).

Overview presentations: The Secretariat introduced a technical paper (FCCC/TP/2012/3) on modalities and procedures for financing REDD+ results-based actions.

Technical presentations: Papua New Guinea, for the COALITION FOR RAINFOREST NATIONS, presented key elements of a new market-based mechanism that is: envisaged only for financing phase 3 of REDD+ activities; on an

appropriate national scale; and with a “hybrid” trading approach, whereby a national reference level is defined *ex-ante* and an equivalent allowance is issued.

BRAZIL introduced the Amazon Fund as an example of a simple and transparent approach that enables environmental integrity and national autonomy to support activities according to national priorities. He suggested avoiding undue technical requirements for REDD+ financing taking into consideration other mitigation areas, and stressed that an appropriate market mechanism approach does not include offset mechanisms.

BOLIVIA highlighted that his country recently passed the “law of Mother Earth and integral development for living well,” which creates the Joint Mitigation and Adaptation Mechanism for the integral and sustainable management of forests. He said the mechanism is based on *ex-ante* funding, and suggested, *inter alia*: creating a GCF window for the mechanism and establishing a consultative group of experts under SBSTA guidance.

Sudan, for LDCs, said public funding must be the major source for REDD+ implementation, and highlighted the need to: address REDD+ under a socioeconomic development context; and adequately consider non-carbon benefits and national implementation risks.

INDONESIA urged developing different options for financing at different phases of REDD+, including filling the gaps between fast-start and long-term financing. She highlighted that a REDD+ framework should provide multiple benefits beyond verified emission reductions.

The US provided an overview of possible financial tools, including: up-front or *ex-post* financing, such as grants and loans; and risk-reducing tools, including commercial and political risk insurance. MEXICO, for Colombia, Costa Rica and Honduras, elaborated on elements of a national financial arrangement for REDD+, introducing the concept of a REDD+ unit equivalent to one ton of carbon dioxide, which should be issued on the basis of: MRVed actions; established forest reference levels; a safeguards information system; and a national REDD+ registry.

The PHILIPPINES and SWITZERLAND stressed ensuring that national experiences inform the framework for financing the full implementation of results-based actions in line with REDD+ safeguards.

In-depth discussions: Participants discussed financing options, sources and related enabling conditions and considerations necessary for scaling-up financing for the full implementation of the results-based actions. Some parties highlighted that, *inter alia*: public finance should be the main enabling condition for countries to engage in REDD+ phases 1 and 2; and leakage, additionality, in-country capacities and adequate national governance frameworks are key for REDD+ phase 3. One party suggested basic elements are already identified in Decision 2/CP.17 (outcome of the work of the AWG-LCA), including national strategies or plans, monitoring systems, national reference levels and information systems on safeguards.

Discussions then addressed the role of the private sector in REDD+ investments, particularly the conditions that could be developed under the UNFCCC to incentivize such investments. Many parties underscored the need to increase the level of ambition in emission reduction targets in order to send a positive signal to the private sector. Some highlighted: putting a price on carbon; ensuring investment predictability and an enabling regulatory environment; fostering private-sector partnerships; and further clarifying modalities and methodologies. Many developing countries stressed that the role of the private sector in financing REDD+ cannot replace Annex I parties’ financing obligations, nor public funding. Other suggestions included: focusing on national programmes; incentives for developing country governments to deal with the private sector; and social, environmental and governance safeguards to facilitate private-sector involvement.

Parties subsequently discussed elements of a framework for financing the full implementation of results-based REDD+ actions, focusing on policy aspects, governance and institutional requirements, payments related to REDD+ actions and activities that go beyond verified emission reductions, and linkages to other financing options and institutions.

Other key elements discussed included the need to: ensuring a REDD+ window under the GCF; coordinating mechanisms for a REDD+ governing body under the UNFCCC; and facilitating linkages between a national and international registry. Parties also discussed activities providing non-carbon benefits.

ADP

PLENARY: ADP Co-Chair Harald Dovland opened the ADP informal plenary, noting work this week would be undertaken in roundtable sessions on the two workstreams, namely work of the ADP and ambition. He emphasized that the roundtables should be interactive in nature, promote frank discussions, and forward concrete ideas.

The G-77/CHINA said the Durban Platform: must ensure strong linkages between mitigation, adaptation and means of implementation; and include the principles of equity and CBDR. Switzerland, for the EIG, said Doha must set out a work plan up to 2015, including milestones.

The AFRICAN GROUP supported limited use of carbon markets, and highlighted the need for establishing accounting rules and processes for technology transfer, among other measures. Australia, for the UMBRELLA GROUP, said assistance should be provided through existing mechanisms, called for a legally-binding regime applicable to all parties, and stressed the need to update the existing regime in line with 21st century realities.

Nauru, for AOSIS, questioned whether adaptation can provide a sufficient solution to climate change impacts in SIDS, and whether the GCF can afford to pay for such measures, and called for prioritizing mitigation under the ADP. She opposed a separate roundtable on principles, noting the principles should guide the work of the two workstreams.

The Dominican Republic, for the COALITION FOR RAINFOREST NATIONS, said closing the ambition gap requires a REDD+ mechanism in the future climate regime. South Africa, for BASIC, stressed that the ADP outcome should be in full accordance with all the Convention principles, particularly CBDR and equity.

ARGENTINA, for Algeria, Bolivia, China, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, India, Kuwait, Malaysia, Mali, Nicaragua, Pakistan, the Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand and Venezuela, reiterated that all ADP work is under the Convention and must adhere to the Convention principles, and said universality of application is not uniformity of application. He said the ADP should not become the means by which developed countries “jump ship” from their legally-binding commitments under the Convention. He said substantive work by the ADP on issues still being considered by the other AWGs should not be undertaken until the successful conclusion of work of those bodies. The EU underscored the need to discuss how the Convention principles will be applied in a post-2020 framework so all parties take on commitments, and that any work going forward must adhere to the two workstreams. Bolivia, for ALBA, called for developed countries to meet their historical responsibility. Nicaragua, for SICA, said work under the ADP should include all pillars of the BAP.

SINGAPORE urged developed countries to refrain from taking unilateral measures, and to accommodate and acknowledge national circumstances.

CLIMATE ACTION NETWORK called for: agreement on CBDR in MRV; and an ADP work programme with options for fair allocation of responsibility in global efforts. CLIMATE JUSTICE NETWORK expressed concern regarding shifting the burden of mitigation actions to the poor, and said ADP work should not prejudice negotiations being undertaken by other working groups.

ROUNDTABLE: ADP Co-Chair Jayant Moreshwar Mauskar (India) invited participants in the ADP roundtable on Workstream 1 to address: vision for the main contours and elements of the work of the ADP; and the work that is needed between now and 2015, and in particular in 2013, to achieve those results.

Nauru, for AOSIS, urged closure of the pre-2020 mitigation gap in order to determine whether adaptation measures should address a temperature increase of less than 1.5°C from pre-industrial levels, or increases of 3°C or more.

CHINA urged parties to close the pre-2020 mitigation gap in terms of increasing developed countries’ commitments on emission reductions, as well as increasing the provision of finance and technology for developing-country parties.

SINGAPORE urged consideration of countries’ “three Cs”: their differing contexts, constraints and contributions.

BOLIVIA called for a compliance system for those countries exiting the Kyoto Protocol to ensure they are reducing their emissions, and highlighted equity and the right to development. The EU supported a new protocol under the Convention in which all parties would take on commitments. She emphasized that the

context in which the Convention principles are being applied has changed and that mitigation must be at the heart of the new agreement.

GRENADA supported a new protocol, and acknowledged the varying interpretations of Decision 1/CP.17. She stressed addressing all BAP pillars, closing the mitigation gap and raising ambition. JAPAN emphasized applicability to all parties, and a durable, flexible and dynamic structure. He supported consideration of national circumstances. Regarding work between now and 2015, he suggested an in-session workshop or ministerial roundtable in Doha on elements of a future framework, brainstorming sessions involving various stakeholders, and moving from a general to more structured discussion in 2013.

SWITZERLAND commented that focusing on the post-2020 climate regime does not reduce the importance of resolving pre-2020 levels of ambition, and urged delegates to view the two ADP work streams as being mutually supportive. He urged the ADP to strive for an effective post-2020 regime that is ambitious, fair, reflects economic and social dynamics, and provides assurance of a low-carbon future to investors.

The PHILIPPINES highlighted the importance of: coherence between both ADP work streams; an integrated approach to finance, technology and capacity building; and reaffirmation of the primacy of the UNFCCC.

IN THE CORRIDORS

Delegates arriving in the capacious interior of the UNESCAP building in Bangkok hit the ground running, as they attended a number of parallel discussions and events, in an effort to make the most of the last few remaining negotiating days before the Doha COP.

Feelings and expectations were mixed, with some developing country delegates indicating that ADP discussions could not really “take flight” until the AWG-LCA and AWG-KP are satisfactorily concluded, fearing promises from Bali will never be realized. As one noted, “New treaties are a promise, not a fact. We can’t expect others to jump off a plane without a parachute, with only promises of parachute delivery on the way down.”

Others commented on the fact that various like-minded countries were coming together to voice their opinions on specific issues with increasing frequency, perhaps, as noted by one seasoned observer, indicating “widening differentiation of positions among developing countries as discussions progress on implementation.”

Relaxing at the reception after a hard day of work, some delegates took refuge in a bit of grim humor, as they noted the efforts of a particular country planning to decrease the use of (imported) natural gas, while increasing the use of (domestic) coal – all the while continuing to develop its low-carbon economy strategy.

BANGKOK CLIMATE TALKS HIGHLIGHTS: FRIDAY, 31 AUGUST 2012

In the morning, an in-session workshop took place under the AWG-LCA on a framework for various approaches. Under the ADP, a Workstream 2 roundtable on ambition convened. In the afternoon, under the AWG-LCA, an in-session workshop on the new market-based mechanism (NMM) was held and the ADP Workstream 1 roundtable on vision for the ADP continued from Thursday. In the morning and afternoon, a number of contact groups and informal consultations under the AWG-KP and AWG-LCA convened.

AWG-LCA

IN-SESSION WORKSHOP: A FRAMEWORK FOR VARIOUS APPROACHES: Alexa Kleysteuber (Chile) chaired the workshop. Niclas Svenningsen, UNFCCC Secretariat, presented a technical paper (FCCC/TP/2012/4) drawing on recent workshop presentations and discussions, as well as party submissions following Decision 2/CP.17 (outcome of the work of the AWG-LCA), paragraphs 79-86.

Panel 1: Fundamental principles and relations: Hugh Sealy, Grenada, outlined AOSIS' expectations that the framework: define relationships between the UNFCCC and other approaches; and between market and non-market approaches; deliver real mitigation benefits; and not allow countries to evade their obligations under the Convention.

Matt Paterson, New Zealand, suggested that the framework could be a "library of approaches" or a forum that coordinates efforts, and would not compete with or duplicate existing UNFCCC measures. He proposed inviting countries to provide information and practical examples of schemes they have adopted or may adopt.

Alex Hanafi, Environmental Defense Fund, suggested the framework could provide guidelines for national and subnational jurisdictions to trade emissions internationally, highlighting transparency as a key element of ensuring environmental and market integrity. He said the framework could encourage broad participation in mitigation efforts, but at the risk of a low level of ambition. He suggested that parties are given access to the GCF provided they have a harmonized MRV system.

Sealy questioned whether the principles of complementarity and shared profits would be part of the framework, and cautioned against neglecting the potential of non-market mechanisms.

Panel 2: Tools to operationalize the framework: This panel addressed: key elements required for the functioning of the framework and practical options for operationalizing those elements; ensuring environmental integrity of activities; and

processes or models that should be applied in approving or rejecting activities and whether they should be centralized or county-led and administered.

Yuji Mizuno, Japan, discussed basic principles and a reporting system to be established by the COP, emphasizing: clearly defined eligibility criteria; a feasible and not excessively burdensome monitoring system taking into account national circumstances; ensuring transparency; and standards developed by implementing parties.

Tarsicio Granizo, Ecuador, discussed his country's net avoided emissions mechanism, whereby activities that increase emissions would be reduced or halted in exchange for compensation. He emphasized a coherent, coordinated and transparent framework for both market and non-market mechanisms, prioritizing environmental performance over fungibility. He recommended complying with strict commonly agreed standards to ensure environmental integrity and a mechanism for reporting and registries. Regarding models or processes, he suggested, *inter alia*, a robust structure, national-level participation, a steering committee, an executive board and designated national authorities.

Andrew Prag, OECD, discussed tracking and reporting unit movements in a uniform format, the use of registries and ensuring accounting rules. He outlined various possible levels of international scrutiny and governance, such as: no direct UNFCCC involvement; UNFCCC bodies approving mechanisms; or more direct involvement in issuing procedures, similar to the CDM approach. He saw the CDM model continuing for countries that do not wish to pursue other options, and emphasized a common currency for units.

During the ensuing discussion, issues were raised related to, *inter alia*: rules for common accounting and for ensuring environmental integrity; enhanced reporting to avoid double counting of units; how and who would prevent double counting; countries taking on offsets bilaterally to fulfill Convention obligations; and the importance of a harmonized approach to ensure business continues working within the Convention rather than in alternative offset mechanisms.

IN-SESSION WORKSHOP: THE NEW MARKET-BASED MECHANISM: This workshop was chaired by Alexa Kleysteuber (Chile). The Secretariat introduced the technical paper on various approaches, including opportunities for using markets to enhance the cost-effectiveness of, and to promote, mitigation actions, bearing in mind different circumstances of developed and developing countries (FCCC/TP/2012/4).

Scope and Participation: Questions presented to participants addressed options for defining the activities that could be eligible under the NMM and conditions for hosting and benefitting from outcomes from such activities.



Comparing the NMM to the CDM, Artur Runge-Metzger, EU, said the NMM implies more active involvement of developing country governments in creating incentives for emission reductions through policy making at the national level. He suggested that parties transitioning from a CDM to an NMM approach would need to implement a transition phase to avoid double counting.

Carola Borja, Ecuador, presented her country's proposal on a net avoided emissions mechanism. Among conditionalities for host activities, she suggested that the party would need to have had officially declared mitigation actions or commitments under the Convention.

On the role of the UNFCCC in the NMM, David Hone, World Business Council for Sustainable Development, said it should encourage and support countries in implementing selected measures. He added that the UNFCCC should generate market demand for carbon emissions as the Kyoto Protocol does. He said putting a price on carbon is key for redirecting private investment, which can be done through cap-and-trade systems and project-based mechanisms.

In the ensuing discussion, participants addressed, *inter alia*: the sovereign right of each country to undertake relevant activities; how to ensure environmental integrity and avoid double counting; and possible ways to implement the NMM.

Accounting and Unit Tracking: On governance of market approaches under the framework for various approaches, Andrew Prag, OECD, stressed the importance of agreeing on common accounting rules for emissions and targets. Acknowledging that the overall form of the NMM remains unclear, he said making a decision on a valid baseline was a crucial governance step for the NMM, suggesting that broad baselines could be useful to address specific country circumstances and policies, whilst also being subject to international review.

Mandy Rambharos, South Africa, stressed the need to develop a mechanism to convert domestic credits into internationally recognized credits, which could include: eligibility of sectors; conversion of methodologies; and guidelines on minimum criteria to participate in the international market. She suggested a centralized way to track international units, and said there is potential for using existing structures, such as the ICA and the IAR.

Sveinung Kvalo, Norway, called for a system to track units that is centralized and under UNFCCC verification, and has a single registry issuing and tracking transactions of international credits. He emphasized the need for: more detailed and stringent MRV processes than the ICA and IAR can provide; a common unit accounting framework with clear *ex-ante* rules for all participating countries; and establishment of conservative baselines in order to ensure environmental integrity.

In the ensuing discussions, participants addressed, among other issues, overlaps between the work streams on a framework for various approaches and the NMM.

CONTACT GROUP: Finance: Discussions on finance took place in the morning and afternoon. Parties considered an informal note on "enhanced action on the provision of financial resources and investment to support action on mitigation and adaptation and technology cooperation," highlighting framing elements and questions on: financing during the period 2012-2020; linkages with other bodies and financial institutions; MRV; fast-start finance; GCF; and long-term finance. A matrix table was also introduced illustrating decisions and action taken since COP 13. AWG-LCA Chair Tayeb invited parties to consider whether draft decision text on financing is needed.

Divergent views were expressed, with developed countries pointing to decisions from Cancun and Durban, maintaining that the AWG-LCA has already achieved significant results and other arrangements had been set up where finance discussions would continue. Several developed countries said the AWG-LCA is not the appropriate forum for discussing mid-term finance.

Calling for a decision on finance in Doha, developing countries expressed concern over the mid-term financing gap, and noted the need to consider MRV of financial support and enhancing transparency of its provision.

INFORMAL CONSULTATIONS: Developing Country Mitigation: Facilitator Gary Theseira (Malaysia) introduced two facilitation tools: a matrix table providing a "bird's eye view" of the work done on NAMAs by developing country parties since COP 13; and an informal note containing framing elements, elements on NAMAs communicated by parties, and elements on support to prepare and implement NAMAs.

The US, NEW ZEALAND, NORWAY, CANADA, the EU, AUSTRALIA, SWITZERLAND, and the Marshall Islands, for AOSIS, stressed that the group's mandate is to continue clarifying mitigation pledges by developing country parties, which is vital to build confidence and trust and to identify practical solutions for moving forward. They encouraged parties that have not yet submitted pledges to do so, and requested a more structured compilation of actions already submitted.

CHINA, BRAZIL and SOUTH AFRICA stressed that further work is needed on the issue of MRV of support to developing countries. Opposing this, the EU said the matter is under consideration elsewhere and called for avoiding duplicating work. CHINA pointed out that the relevant NAMA information was compiled in the Registry. MALI called for support through regional workshops and a handbook on preparation and implementation of NAMAs for COP 18.

Developed Country Mitigation: Facilitator Andrej Kranjc (Slovenia) presented an informal note and a matrix table reflecting decisions taken since Bali. Many developed country parties highlighted progress made in areas such as clarification of pledges and IAR, while many developing country parties underscored their disappointment over, *inter alia*: lack of concrete results; the low level of ambition in existing developed country pledges; and gaps in comparability of efforts. NORWAY, supported by AUSTRALIA and the EU, suggested common accounting rules for all parties, opposed by BRAZIL, CHINA, INDIA and KENYA.

AWG-KP

INFORMAL CONSULTATIONS: Second Commitment

Period: Parties reviewed options and approaches for addressing the gap between the two commitment periods, including: regular ratification; provisional application; unilateral declarations; and CMP decisions. Several parties underscored that the approaches are mutually supportive, not exclusive. Parties raised concerns over the non-legally binding nature of CMP decisions, while others noted the difficulties and time requirements associated with provisional application. Some parties underscored that anything short of provisional application would not be legally binding internationally, and would not address the legal consequences of the gap. Some parties said that CMP decisions could help in enabling the Kyoto mechanisms "roll over smoothly" during the inevitable gap. Others underscored that the Kyoto Protocol includes provisions that are independent of the second commitment period.

ADP

ROUNDTABLE: Ambition: ADP Co-Chair Dovland invited participants to address the mitigation gap and options and ways to increase the level of ambition. Socorro Flores (Mexico) introduced the report from the workshop on increasing the level of ambition under paragraph 8 of Decision 1/CP.17 (establishment of the ADP) held in Bonn, Germany, in May 2012 (FCCC/ADP/2012/INF.1).

AOSIS emphasized that the ambition workstream must be prioritized under the ADP. He proposed focusing on international policies and measures that are enabling countries' domestic actions, in order to facilitate more ambitious developed country

commitments and developing country NAMAs. He suggested addressing ambition during regular high-level roundtable sessions.

The LDCs stressed that raising ambition pre-2020 is essential to any meaningful outcome under the ADP. He supported convening a ministerial session before Doha and called on developed countries to: remove conditionalities on pledges; and convert pledges into legally-binding QELROs and comparable commitments. He encouraged developing countries to put forward NAMAs, noting that LDCs have done so.

The EU said industrialized countries must take the lead on climate change through ambitious domestic action and encouraged developing countries to deliver NAMAs through, *inter alia*, the multiple institutions set up in Cancun and Durban. Underscoring that parties are not likely to step up existing targets and pledges this year, she supported holding a high-level forum before Doha and focusing work on issues such as HFCs, bunker fuels, REDD+, fossil fuel subsidies, and private-sector financing.

INDIA called for maintaining the “delicate balance” of Durban, including in relation to the completion of the AWG-LCA and AWG-KP. She cautioned against unilateral measures taken by countries “in the name of climate.”

COSTA RICA, for Chile, Colombia and Peru, encouraged the UNFCCC to further engage with other multilateral bodies, namely ICAO and IMO. He requested that developing countries put forward NAMAs, noting they have “no-lose” opportunities.

South Africa, for the AFRICAN GROUP, underscored that “there is no ambition without commitments” and stressed that work on ambition under the ADP does not substitute commitments under the Kyoto Protocol and negotiations on mitigation under the AWG-LCA. He favored basing work on a historical approach rather than on a “crystal ball” approach that tries to guess “where parties will be in ten years.” He suggested focusing on how to close the gap, addressing areas that include mitigation, adaptation and means of implementation to support developing country contributions.

The US acknowledged the existence of “a generic gap” and said the temperature goal is “a vision” to try to work towards, but that there are many pathways to reach 2°C. He outlined different approaches for moving forward on ambition, including: the submission of pledges by countries that have not done so, emphasizing that some of them could act but have chosen not to; and framing efforts in the context of existing pledges through voluntary actions.

The AFRICAN GROUP said efforts to reduce emissions from activities under other multilateral bodies should be recognized under the Convention. The US said enhancing ambition through activities outside the process, such as bilateral initiatives, should be fostered, but not submitted for recognition or approval under the UNFCCC. The AFRICAN GROUP clarified his proposal is for accountability and transparency purposes, and not intended to dictate other initiatives. The EU emphasized the role of the UNFCCC in providing transparency for actions taken outside the Convention.

ROUNDTABLE: Vision for the ADP: Discussions chaired by Co-Chair Dovland continued on Thursday. ECUADOR urged addressing the impacts of climate change from a human rights perspective, and proposed that working groups meet twice a year until 2015 to develop recommendations.

The RUSSIAN FEDERATION cautioned against an overly narrow approach that disregards current realities. He supported universality and called on countries to announce their own mitigation pledges. He said an ADP roadmap should enable discussion of pertinent issues, not just satisfy procedural requirements.

CHILE, for Colombia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic and Panama, called for means of implementation to address both mitigation and adaptation. He supported discussing CBDR in the context of specific adaptation and mitigation issues, suggesting

this discussion take place in the two roundtables corresponding to the agreed work streams, and not separately in a third roundtable.

The US said that the agreement must be worthwhile for everyone, or no incentive would exist to engage in the process. He underscored a flexible, dynamic and transparent process that builds on national circumstances and individual capacity. Regarding next steps, he suggested, *inter alia*, continuing the current format of roundtables and workshops on technical issues that may come up. He proposed reflecting on issues and exploring workable options before developing text.

AUSTRALIA supported a “climate effective” agreement that: is applicable to all; is capable of evolving over time to promote increasing ambition as countries’ capabilities and confidence grow; and provides incentives for countries to take action. He said Convention principles are enduring but dynamic, and stressed “actionable differentiation” under the new agreement.

NORWAY said the new agreement must: be effective, fair, realistic, flexible and science-based, and include mitigation commitments relative to responsibilities and capabilities. He envisaged a legally-binding rules-based multilateral regime that addresses “dynamic differentiation.”

PAKISTAN said clarification was required on the set of objectives, core principles and their application, and lessons to be drawn upon. He emphasized that applicability to all parties must not override CBDR and the notion of equity. He stressed: lack of a common understanding of how much circumstances have changed; maintaining the existing differentiated structure; and an effective compliance mechanism. He suggested addressing these elements through workshops, studies or expert panels.

INDIA urged differentiation based on equity, CBDR and historical responsibility. She recommended that post-2020 arrangements include quantified and specific terms for developed countries to provide support to developing countries in a “facilitative regime” that ensures transfer of environmentally-friendly technologies. She said the ADP should be flexible to allow consideration of new elements, including from the IPCC, the 2013-15 Review and the other AWGs.

The LDCs called for a new protocol and robust MRV to ensure compliance and transparency. The AFRICAN GROUP said any future legal outcome should be a further articulation of commitments reflected in the Convention, such as financing commitments to developing countries, appropriate burden sharing, inclusion of operational tools and mechanisms, and acceptance of all sources of finance.

IN THE CORRIDORS

With all three working groups in full swing by day two, delegates in AWG-LCA groups had some new tools to facilitate their work, including some newly produced matrices and informal notes mapping progress made thus far since Bali and indicating what further work will be needed. “This was a good idea as it really lays everything out clearly, so we can see where things stand,” said one.

Meanwhile, in the ADP roundtable discussions, developing countries grappled with applying principles enshrined in the UNFCCC to the view ahead. One seasoned negotiator called for an end to the “notorious firewall” between developed and developing countries. With many issues to be accomplished by Doha in order to terminate both AWGs, many feared that the ADP could become the new “dumping ground for unresolved issues,” rather than enabling real progress or bridging gaps for a future climate regime.

ENB Meeting Coverage

on your handheld



ENB Mobile

Available for iPhone, iPad
and Android smartphones
from

iTunes and Google play stores

Available for Blackberry
and all other devices
via <http://enb.iisd.mobi/>

BANGKOK CLIMATE TALKS HIGHLIGHTS: SATURDAY, 1 SEPTEMBER 2012

On Saturday, the ADP met throughout the day to consider ambition and vision for the ADP. In the morning and afternoon, a number of contact groups and informal consultations under the AWG-KP and AWG-LCA convened.

ADP

ROUNDTABLE: Ambition: Discussions on ambition continued from Friday. Many developing countries highlighted that ambition must address adaptation, mitigation and means of implementation. Many stressed the need for parties that have not done so to present their pledges.

The REPUBLIC OF KOREA underscored the need for: a holistic approach to strengthen both domestic actions and international cooperation; and a balance between mitigation and adaptation. He suggested that parties that have presented pledges should remove conditionalities and move to the higher range of their pledges.

SAUDI ARABIA stressed the need to address ambition on adaptation, including through pledges by parties, a registry and a workshop to discuss these matters. BARBADOS said increasing participation through increased pledges is vital, stressing that the issue is not about a participation gap but an ambition gap.

SWITZERLAND, supported by NORWAY, said the workstreams should not be seen as competitive but rather as complementary. BARBADOS emphasized that the ambition workstream should be approached with a sense of urgency.

SWITZERLAND highlighted aspects hindering progress on raising ambition, namely: a technical understanding of the potential for joint and individual actions; and political will. He called for technical discussions on ambition, focusing on exchanging experiences and analyzing the potential for raising ambition in different sectors. The SOLOMON ISLANDS said exchanging experiences would not be useful if means of implementation to enhance NAMAs are not ensured. The MARSHALL ISLANDS said engagement with non-state actors should be enhanced, focused and interactive.

JAPAN called for enhanced transparency over mitigation actions, and improved cooperation, including outside the UNFCCC. NORWAY said raising ambition requires clarity on

emission reduction accounting to understand what and how much countries are doing, noting that it is easy to do this for parties with commitments under the Kyoto Protocol.

SINGAPORE highlighted three aspects for raising ambition: deepening the range of actions, particularly ambition in the context of the Kyoto Protocol, and the range of pledges; broadening the range of actions, saying complementary initiatives are relevant but should strengthen the multilateral system and respect the different competencies of multilateral organizations; and broadening the range of actors.

BOLIVIA highlighted the reluctance of some parties to join a second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol, and questioned why parties want to “kill” a system that works for many. He highlighted the need for a system providing clear accounting rules, a high level of ambition and commitments. ECUADOR proposed a compliance regime linked to the International Court of Justice.

CHINA highlighted implementation, commitment and equity gaps. He emphasized: a holistic and balanced approach to raising the ambition level of all the BAP pillars; that ambition is not a matter of potential but of responsibility; the importance of briefings or reports from other relevant processes, including on long-term finance and the workshop on equitable access to sustainable development; and that any reference to supplementary actions should not be an excuse for undertaking unilateral measures.

AUSTRALIA emphasized: building understanding on issues, such as what drives and what can incentivize ambition, through sharing experiences, best practices and success stories; the important catalytic and demonstration effect of complementary activities taking place outside the UNFCCC; hearing from parties on what they require to ramp up ambition; and the development of credible carbon markets. The EU proposed further discussion on: how the UNFCCC can provide transparency; and catalyzing action in other multilateral bodies. He suggested the Secretariat prepare a technical paper with structured and quantified options on complementary initiatives.

BRAZIL stressed: equity and ambition as mutually supportive; the importance of attractive agreements, pointing to possible examples to look towards, such as the WTO and the Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (disarmament treaty); that “no party exits the Kyoto Protocol to

do more"; and the importance of recognizing ambition, pointing to developing countries that have put forward NAMAs as an example. He highlighted the paradox of having to produce NAMAs to get support, and suggested developed countries are reluctant to provide support that could create competition from the developing world. The US noted the lack of differentiation among parties in the disarmament treaty referred to by Brazil.

SWITZERLAND said that ministerial meetings should not be overused and should be timely and well organized to ensure productivity. The PHILIPPINES reiterated that developing country ambition is linked to support from developed countries, and that developed country mitigation ambition relates to discussions in the AWGs.

COLOMBIA suggested that climate change discussions be framed in a broader context, advocating that climate change is a global security issue and that it should be placed on the Security Council's agenda. She stressed that adaptation should be the centerpiece and said there is a "no going back option" of climate change in relation to climate refugees. The US recalled climate discussions in the Security Council. MICRONESIA, supported by the US, highlighted the value of outside initiatives, such as those focused on HFCs, black carbon, methane and ground-level ozone. She underscored that, in order to close the ambition gap, outside actions must be additional to current pledges. Nauru, for AOSIS, said next week's discussions should focus on, *inter alia*: the outcome of Doha; the 2013 workplan; and closing the ambition gap in 2013.

ROUNDTABLE: Vision for the ADP: Discussions continued from Friday. Reiterating that the ADP must be negotiated under the Convention, BRAZIL affirmed that the negotiation of a new legal instrument for 2020 is the main focus of the Durban Platform. Warning against starting to negotiate the instrument too early, he said this would contaminate the "real" deliverables for Doha, which should be the AWG-KP and the AWG-LCA. BARBADOS said, *inter alia*, that the new legally-binding agreement must be: comprehensive in scope; and address adaptation, mitigation, finance and technology.

Venezuela, for ALBA, expressed concern with some parties questioning the validity of the Convention after 20 years, and reinterpreting certain terms. He underlined that a flexible system of bilateral and plurilateral agreements might undermine the multilateral rule-based system.

The EU stressed the need to set out a work plan aimed at adopting a legally-binding agreement in 2015, applicable to all, and invited parties to make submissions and begin discussing informally what this means in practical terms.

NEW ZEALAND said universal participation would deliver an enhanced level of ambition and would be the best platform on which to build. TANZANIA emphasized that support to countries suffering the impacts of climate change is an equity issue.

The REPUBLIC OF KOREA recommended flexibility in a post-2020 agreement, with incentives for developing-country participation, which should take into account national circumstances, such as population growth rate and density, energy mix, renewable energy endowment, and the extent of coastline.

Nauru, on behalf of AOSIS, called for the workstream on ambition to be prioritized in order to reach agreement on a new protocol, and opposed a separate roundtable on principles, saying these should not be discussed in isolation.

MEXICO proposed that a post-2020 outcome with legal force could work together with a cluster of related instruments that have separate contractual, prescriptive and facilitative dimensions. He expressed disappointment at the "deafening silence" on mid-term finance. The MARSHALL ISLANDS suggested that the "binary division" between countries under the AWG-KP could be replaced by a number of lists with a more differentiated middle ground, from which countries could "graduate" to more stringent requirements.

The UNITED ARAB EMIRATES said that the CBDR principle could be reinforced, while enabling a wider group of parties to play "a fair role" in reducing emissions, considering countries' demographics, resource endowments and other factors. SAUDI ARABIA highlighted the need for greater mutual understanding in negotiations.

AWG-KP

INFORMAL CONSULTATIONS: Second Commitment

Period: Parties continued to discuss options for ensuring continuity between the first and second commitment periods. Several parties reiterated concerns that provisional application of an amendment to the Kyoto Protocol may not be operationalized quickly enough to address the gap and therefore give the Protocol "a solid legal footing."

IN THE CORRIDORS

On Saturday, the ADP roundtables on the workstreams concluded. Meanwhile, in the AWG-LCA contact group and informal groups, delegates continued to "hit walls." The aim of the AWG-LCA here in Bangkok was to put "text on pieces of paper for Doha" as one delegate put it. But even getting text on pieces of paper seems to be a difficult task. "Durban clearly only mandated further work on specific issues, and we cannot accept text or decisions in Doha on any other issues," said one developed country representative. "The other issues were already allocated for consideration by the Subsidiary Bodies or the institutions created in Cancun and Durban," he added.

On the other hand, developing countries have identified numerous unresolved issues under the Bali Action Plan that must be addressed in the AWG-LCA. "Decisions on these issues are necessary for the AWG-LCA to successfully terminate in Doha. Otherwise, what becomes of them? We can't just leave them hanging and right now the ADP is a vacuum so we can't assume they will be picked up there," one delegate stated.

With these two divergent views, some were hoping a middle ground could be found. We can't have a "dictionary of outstanding issues," but we also "can't have nothing at all," expressed one who was sitting in the AWG-LCA discussions.

BANGKOK CLIMATE TALKS HIGHLIGHTS: SUNDAY, 2 SEPTEMBER 2012

On Sunday morning, the AWG-LCA workshop on quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets by developed country parties took place. In the afternoon the AWG-LCA workshop to further the understanding of the diversity of NAMAs by developing country parties, underlying assumptions, and any support needed for implementation of these actions was held.

AWG-LCA

IN-SESSION WORKSHOP: QUANTIFIED ECONOMY-WIDE EMISSION REDUCTION TARGETS BY DEVELOPED COUNTRY PARTIES: Panel 1: Approaches to measure the progress towards achievement of the targets by developed countries parties: Andrej Kranjc (Slovenia)

opened the workshop, referring to the latest update of the Secretariat's technical paper on targets and approaches (FCCC/TP/2012/5). Thelma Krug, IPCC, moderated the session.

SWITZERLAND emphasized that clarification of approaches should not be seen as compliance or monitoring, but as a means to understand the intention of parties, suggesting that the Subsidiary Bodies take up this discussion. SAINT LUCIA said that progress is measured to know: "what the atmosphere sees," and what individual countries are doing. She suggested using the Kyoto Protocol rules, since they have been negotiated by all parties. SOUTH AFRICA proposed convening a technical workshop on comparability before Doha.

The US said multiple ways to achieve robust accounting are recognized in the Durban decisions. He pointed to the danger of double counting, observing that some developing countries have indicated their intention to count units they have sold internationally as part of the fulfillment of their national pledges.

NEW ZEALAND emphasized that fully harmonizing rule-based approaches may imply a trade-off with participation, because some parties may move away from cooperation.

Discussion: During the ensuing debate, one participant urged removing the "fear syndrome," bottlenecks in methodologies, and loopholes, and stressed the importance of a fair, harmonized, rule-based approach. The EU sought clarification from the US about: states, such as California, planning to use offsets and how they would ensure double counting is avoided; possible banking and borrowing from earlier years if using a point year target; and what rules would be used for the treatment of natural disturbances and whether the Kyoto Protocol rules should be used. The US responded that banking and borrowing is inconsistent with their inventory approach.

SAINT LUCIA said rules and harmonization should encourage, not deter, parties from taking action, and that no international credits should accrue to countries with point year accounting.

NEW ZEALAND distinguished between a common set of rules and full harmonization, saying the latter may not be possible for markets and LULUCF. She called for: flexibility within the reporting process to allow for national circumstances; and striking a balance between participation, scrutiny and compliance. She acknowledged the need to avoid market fragmentation and highlighted her country's difficulties in meeting emission targets without extensive offsetting, since half of its emissions come from the agricultural sector.

Several countries supported holding a technical workshop before Doha, while others highlighted that a joint workshop involving both developed and developing countries would be inconsistent with the Durban decisions.

On further rules, the US emphasized the need for a system that can accommodate all, so as to maximize both effort and participation.

Panel 2. Ambition of the pledges by developed country parties and related assumptions and conditions: John Christensen, UNEP, moderated the panel.

On ways to enhance the ambition of pledges, NORWAY emphasized: participation of all major emitters; clarity of major emitters' individual commitments; and a collective level of ambition.

BELARUS stressed that the road to significantly raising ambition runs through appropriate social policy and sustainable economic strategies, rather than through technical reforms.

BRAZIL highlighted that: some countries have not put forward unconditional targets; others presented conditions that are outdated, unclear or qualitative; and many countries' targets do not include pathways to achievement.

Reaffirming that the pre-2020 mitigation ambition is an absolute priority for AOSIS, the MARSHALL ISLANDS stressed the need to provide regular opportunities for high-level meetings that put the issue of removal of conditions at the top of the political agenda.

Maintaining that the Kyoto Protocol works, BOLIVIA presented figures demonstrating that the EU, Japan and other countries reduced their emissions between 1990 and 2010.

The RUSSIAN FEDERATION suggested considering lessons learned from the Kyoto Protocol, including that: agreed rules have to be fulfilled; and the need for flexibility to enable parties willing to participate to do so.

AUSTRALIA highlighted that some major economies are yet to submit pledges, and stressed that the process of clarifying pledges should not be confrontational. He highlighted



his country's plan to cap emissions, saying these precede consideration of what international arrangements they will enter into.

CHINA said comparability should include consideration of: the legal nature of commitments; the magnitude of mitigation targets; and the compliance systems. He underscored that only through rigorous common accounting rules is it possible to show that developed countries are taking the lead.

The EU said that emission reductions in the aviation sector do not count towards its Kyoto Protocol commitments. He stressed that common accounting rules should be the core of the post-2012 period.

MALI called for three decisions from Doha: establishing a work programme on common accounting rules; converting the pledges to emission trajectories; and establishing a panel for compliance.

Discussion: JAPAN highlighted the potential role of the biennial reports from IAR in enhancing comparability. CANADA said that he does not support limitations on the use of banking or international market-based mechanisms, although his country does not intend to use these mechanisms.

IN-SESSION WORKSHOP: TO FURTHER THE UNDERSTANDING OF THE DIVERSITY OF NAMAS BY DEVELOPING COUNTRY PARTIES, UNDERLYING ASSUMPTIONS, AND ANY SUPPORT NEEDED FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THESE ACTIONS: Panel 1: Underlying assumptions and methodologies, sectors and gases covered, global warming potential (GWP) values used and estimated mitigation outcomes: John Christensen, UNEP, moderated the panel.

On methodological challenges for NAMA preparation and implementation, INDONESIA mentioned, *inter alia*: "constructing business as usual" projections and establishing baselines; selection of effective and efficient mitigation actions and financial schemes; and stakeholder engagement.

Recognizing that NAMAs vary and are country-driven, the EU said that assumptions considered in the preparation of a NAMA need to be developed by countries individually. She listed challenges, such as: the establishment of baselines; inclusion of sectors, gases and GWP values; and the role of offsets. She proposed that in 2013 SBSTA address the information requirements for each type of NAMA, with a view to reducing uncertainty and ensuring transparency, while preserving diversity.

SOUTH AFRICA emphasized that NAMAs should be designed to: ensure "maximum flexibility;" respect the diversity of actions; promote further action; and include poverty reduction aims, beyond emission reductions. The MALDIVES identified challenges with establishing MRV systems, noting that CDM approaches have been "project-centric" and costly.

MEXICO identified assumptions in design and implementation of credible and accountable NAMAs, including: existence of a national certifying body; development of sectoral baselines; and the availability of funding and technology through soft loans, national budgets, and private sector sources.

JAPAN identified limitations in data availability in developing countries, the challenge of establishing MRV systems and potential double counting of offset credits.

Discussions: Several developing countries underscored that instruments for transparency have been developed under the AWG-LCA, such as ICA and biennial update reports, and therefore they did not see the need for additional processes. SOUTH AFRICA, with BRAZIL, CHINA and SINGAPORE, underscored that NAMAs are country-driven, diverse and must respect national circumstances; and expressed reservations about their standardization.

The US and EU highlighted the value of increased transparency on NAMAs, through expressing the underlying assumptions, such as GDP growth and baseline emissions. In

response to a question from CLIMATE ACTION NETWORK, many parties acknowledged the potential usefulness of developing indicators of progress for NAMA implementation.

Panel 2: Support for NAMAs: The second panel was moderated by Youba Sokona, UN Economic Commission for Africa.

Underscoring her country's mitigation initiatives in the renewable energy sector, URUGUAY said operationalizing support is essential for NAMA preparation and NAMA registry development.

Presenting a national initiative on mitigation in the renewable energy sector, the PHILIPPINES described the role of international support for covering the incremental costs of implementing measures, for example, the need to provide international support to cover incremental costs of extending the electric grid for renewable energies.

MALI said his country is developing a green growth strategy focused on several sectors, suggesting a handbook for NAMA preparation and regional workshops would be helpful for providing guidance to countries developing their NAMAs.

Acknowledging the importance of international climate finance to support implementation of NAMAs, the EU noted, *inter alia*, the need for countries to contribute their own finance.

AUSTRALIA highlighted that NAMAs should fit with the country's broader low-emission development strategy.

Discussions: Issues discussed included, *inter alia*: new and additional resources of financing for NAMAs; operationalization of support through the Registry; and donor coordination. Developing countries emphasized human, technological and institutional capability challenges and, supported by CLIMATE ACTION NETWORK, suggested that the UNFCCC organize regional workshops to increase capacities and allow countries to link up.

IN THE CORRIDORS

On Sunday, the hallways of the UN Conference Center were quieter than usual, with only the mitigation workshops on the official agenda.

Reflecting on the remaining days, attention turned to the ADP. "The roundtables were definitely a useful exercise, and I think that we have a clearer understanding of each other's positions on vision and ambition, but there is lack of clarity on what comes next," said one delegate. Meanwhile, the ADP Co-Chairs were purportedly busy conducting informal consultations aimed at gathering parties' views on how the ADP should take its work forward.

Considering the challenges on the road to Doha, another delegate pointed to the chicken-and-egg dilemma of simultaneously terminating the AWG-LCA and AWG-KP, with developed countries eager to conclude the AWG-LCA, and developing countries urging finalization of the AWG-KP first. "Adding to this conundrum, the content of the ADP remains unclear," said one observer. "We must have a successful conclusion of these bodies before work on the ADP begins in earnest so we know what we are working with," he added. Pointing to a prevailing atmosphere of mistrust, in particular as certain promises under the Bali Action Plan remain unfulfilled, some cited a phrase heard in plenary, "One should never confuse an obligation with a bargaining chip."

On a more hopeful note, civil society staged a number of actions outside the UN Conference Centre, including the "bikers for the climate" initiative that promotes alternative modes of transport.

BANGKOK CLIMATE TALKS HIGHLIGHTS: MONDAY, 3 SEPTEMBER 2012

On Monday morning, the President Designate of COP 18/ CMP 8 convened opened-ended informal consultations on expectations of parties and observers for Doha. In the afternoon, the ADP Workstream 1 roundtable on vision for the ADP was held. The AWG-LCA stocktaking contact group met in the afternoon. The AWG-KP contact group also met in the afternoon. Contact groups and informal consultations under the AWG-KP and AWG-LCA took place throughout the day.

ADP

ROUNDTABLE: Vision for the ADP: During this discussion, delegates addressed questions posed by the Co-Chairs related to: what is meant by “national circumstances” and how they could be accommodated in the ADP’s work; understanding of the term “applicable to all”; how broader participation can be encouraged; incorporating “flexibility” in the ADP’s work; and how the Convention principles should be applied in the context of vision for the ADP.

A number of countries emphasized that universality of application does not mean uniformity of application. Nauru, for AOSIS, called for a “climate effective” outcome and said current discussions should not prejudice any future discussions as this was only the beginning of a long conversation.

SINGAPORE emphasized understanding the context and constraints of national circumstances before talking about parties’ contributions. He said this template implies: no formulas or “one size fits all” approach; mitigation actions will be nationally determined not internationally imposed and without prejudice to the question of legal form; and universal participation must acknowledge and accommodate national circumstances.

GRENADA emphasized that flexibility allowed for “differentiated participation,” and that “ambitious adaptation” is the path that brings climate change and sustainable development together.

The EU stressed: delinking emissions from economic growth; least-cost mitigation actions addressing all drivers of emissions; absolute economy-wide emission reduction targets for those most capable; and scope and stringency reflected in a “spectrum of commitments.”

PAKISTAN underlined that the term “applicable to all” must take into consideration both national circumstances and the Convention principles. On broader participation, he sought clarification as to whether this only refers to mitigation or whether it also applies to adaptation and finance. The Gambia, for the LDCs, said broader participation can only be effective if developed countries demonstrate leadership. The PHILIPPINES emphasized means of implementation in order to achieve broader participation.

SAUDI ARABIA supported Singapore on the centrality of national circumstances, and added that any country’s contribution “is, has been and will be nationally-driven.”

On flexibility of the future framework, JAPAN emphasized the need to balance broader participation through inclusion of initiatives outside the UNFCCC, and environmental effectiveness. He called for interpreting the Convention principles according to evolving socioeconomic situations.

INDIA stressed the importance of equity and CBDR as “guiding norms” in determining obligations and the nature and level of efforts. Stressing the importance of universality, BARBADOS said this should not imply a “race to the bottom” in terms of legal form or rules, and called for a careful balance between designing a climate-effective agreement that is fair, and that enjoys the confidence of all parties.

The US stressed: diversity is in the actions themselves, not in whether a party acts; that universal participation, new technologies and linking climate policy to development, among other things, encourage more action; and a flexible instrument that stands the test of time. He said the principles should not constitute an artificial divide between developed and developing countries, and that the agreement must be acceptable to all.

Noting continuing poverty and lack of access to energy and sanitation in developing countries, BOLIVIA underscored a lack of capacity, and said action requires technological and financial support, and that access to this support must be facilitated.



He recalled that the Rio+20 outcome document reaffirmed the Convention principles, particularly equity and CBDR. He said capacities and priorities are linked to national circumstances.

In order to ensure climate objectives, CHILE said CBDR should not be interpreted in a way that blocks ambition or evades responsibility, and that development and climate protection should be seen as complementary, and not clashing, goals. He stressed flexibility in how individual commitments are met, incentives for high ambition and rewards for achieving such ambition, and a common understanding of equity and fairness.

In closing, ADP Co-Chair Dovland said he looked forward to hearing parties' ideas on how to organize and structure the ADP's work in Doha and that further discussions on this would take place on Wednesday.

AWG-LCA

CONTACT GROUP: In the afternoon, delegates heard reports by the facilitators of spin-off groups on progress achieved in the negotiations.

On a shared vision, AWG-LCA Chair Aysar Tayeb, on behalf of facilitator Zou Ji, reported divergence on whether the context or the numbers for a global goal and peaking timeframe should be addressed first. He said parties have not yet discussed which body will undertake this issue after the closure of the AWG-LCA.

On developed country mitigation, facilitator Andrej Kranjc reported a useful exchange on substantive issues and on the way forward, adding that parties agreed on the need to further engage in discussions on clarification of targets and approaches for measuring progress.

On developing country mitigation, facilitator Gary Theseira reported that the spin-off group considered a note on elements which could become part of an outcome in Doha, saying elements identified by parties included: reiterating calls for NAMAs and enhanced provision of support; further discussions on understanding the diversity of NAMAs; development of guidelines for MRV of support; and proposals for building the capacity of countries to prepare and implement NAMAs, such as through regional workshops, guidelines and handbooks.

On REDD+ financing, facilitator Yaw Osafo reported the group discussions built on the in-session workshop on REDD+, and focused on, *inter alia*: guiding principles; enabling conditions necessary for scaling-up and facilitating financing; issues that require further exploration; and signals required from Doha to incentivize financing for the full implementation of REDD+. He reported rich exchanges on the institutional arrangements required, including the establishment of a REDD+ board, registries, insurance or reserve mechanism, review and regulatory bodies. He said an updated informal note would be prepared for parties' consideration.

On sectoral approaches, facilitator George Wamukaya reported that parties exchanged views on four options on the general framework, and that diverging views remain. On bunker fuels, he reported discussions addressed five options that will continue to narrow them down.

On various approaches, facilitator Alexa Kleysteuber reported that the group discussions were based on an informal note containing a map of elements that need to be addressed. On a framework for various approaches, she said parties exchanged views on purposes and roles. On a NMM she underscored productive exchanges on modalities and procedures.

AWG-LCA Chair Tayeb reported on the progress of issues addressed under the AWG-LCA contact group. On response measures, he reported different views on whether decision text should be prepared for Doha and which body should consider the issue of unilateral measures.

On adaptation, he indicated that parties identified issues requiring further work on, *inter alia*: means of implementation for adaptation; financing for 2013-2015; linkages with finance; national adaptation plans for non-LDCs; and the catalytic role of the Convention. He said divergent views remain on whether the AWG-LCA should further address these issues and if additional decisions are required.

On technology, he said parties identified pending issues, such as: the relationship between the CTCN and the TEC; possible additional functions for both bodies; and IPRs. He reported agreement on the need to further consider these issues but disagreements on how and when to do it.

On finance, he reported that discussions focused on, *inter alia*, the financing period between 2012 and 2020, fast-start finance and MRV of financial support. He said disagreement remains on whether further decisions under the AWG-LCA are necessary, and on how and where finance issues could be further considered.

On capacity building, he said views diverge on where and how to address outstanding issues and on whether the AWG-LCA should provide further guidance.

On Review, facilitator Gertraud Wollansky reported that two options on the scope of the Review are on the table, one based on Decision 1/CP.16 para 138 (Review) and the other further defining the scope to include the assessment of the implementation of commitments under the Convention, including means of implementation provided to developing countries. On expert consideration of inputs, he underscored two options under discussion: a review expert group to be established in Doha; and a joint contact group of SBSTA and SBI.

On EIT and countries whose special circumstances have been recognized by the COP, he reported ongoing consultations held by the AWG-LCA Vice-Chair.

AWG-LCA Chair Tayeb concluded that progress in the Bangkok negotiations had been limited, saying divergent views remain on whether further work on the issues is needed beyond Doha and what body would be suited for addressing them.

SWITZERLAND, on behalf of the EIG, cautioned parties "not to change the focus and character" of the contact group, called for focusing energies on discussions in the spin-off groups and said topics for discussion in the spin-off group should complement "the agreed outcome" under the AWG-LCA. He highlighted achievements under the AWG-LCA, including mitigation pledges from 87 countries, and renewed focus on adaptation, technology and finance.

Australia, on behalf of the UMBRELLA GROUP, said that building “permanent homes” for finance, technology and capacity building has been no small feat, and emphasized that this work will continue through the new established mechanisms.

The PHILIPPINES urged parties to consider where progress has and has not been made on implementing BAP, highlighting that the AWG-LCA’s work is not complete. She underscored the importance of providing means of implementation, in order for developing countries to meet their obligations under the Convention.

The EU highlighted the need to build “a better technical understanding” of the scale of the implementation gap, calling for clarification of pledges, and progress on REDD+ finance and bunker fuels.

COLOMBIA said the BAP had set up “a long-term horizon,” and does not have a definite end point. She recommended exploring a transition into a post-AWG-LCA scenario.

Kenya, for the AFRICAN GROUP, called for a process to take forward technical issues, saying a “very comprehensive” decision on this will be needed in Doha.

INDIA recommended identifying the technical and political issues that may not be completed in Doha, including a timeframe for peaking of emissions, and issues of long-term finance and trade-related IPRs, in order to determine how to take forward that work. He noted that “successful closure” of the AWG-LCA was a key part of the Durban decision.

SOUTH AFRICA noted lack of clarity on key elements, such as comparability, finance, technology and adaptation. He said the institutions established in Cancun and Durban were not the right platform to discuss commitments under the Convention, and urged engaging on substantive discussion on these issues to bring them to a logical conclusion in Doha.

SINGAPORE said the updates provide a “sobering reality” of what is happening in the AWG-LCA, and that we have “crystallized our divergences,” but have not made much progress towards convergence. He said a decision was needed for closure of the AWG-LCA in Doha. The US said that a decision to close the AWG-LCA is not needed, but that a formal decision would be required to extend it.

SAUDI ARABIA said convergence must be reached on areas where there is disagreement and that innovative ways to address them must be found or they will “keep coming back” in the future.

In closing, AWG-LCA Chair Tayeb said that closing an agenda item does not mean discussion on that issue ends or that work cannot continue, and that everyone wants to close the work of the AWG-LCA.

AWG-KP

CONTACT GROUP: In the afternoon, AWG-KP Chair Diouf convened a stocktaking meeting. Jürgen Lefevere, co-facilitator of the spin-off group on numbers/text reported that while there seemed to be a common goal on raising the level of ambition, divergent views remained on how and when. On informal consultations on a second commitment period, AWG-KP Vice-Chair Jukka Uosukainen noted increased clarity on the elements

needed to address the gap between commitment periods in Doha, emphasizing that now is the time for parties to enrich and build textual proposals on these elements.

The EU requested text emerging from Bangkok in order to ensure a clear mandate from capitals for Doha. AUSTRALIA said the review should include all parties and over-achievement should not be penalized in the carry-over limitations. Saint Lucia, for AOSIS, registered deep concern over the lack of ambition, saying that the consequences of a 3°C world had not been fully appreciated. SWITZERLAND said that the carry-over issue should be approached from a comprehensive perspective and that the alternative to the CDM is “the Wild West” of disparate carbon markets. The EU, NEW ZEALAND, SWITZERLAND and AUSTRALIA underscored the importance of maintaining demand for CDM credits.

The RUSSIAN FEDERATION said that parties that do not join a second commitment period should not be isolated, in order to ensure easy transition into the post-2020 legal regime. South Africa, for the AFRICAN GROUP, and AOSIS said that only parties to a second commitment period should have access to the flexible mechanisms. NEW ZEALAND said access to CDM *per se* is not an enticement for countries to join the second commitment period. SENEGAL, for LDCs, noted that without movement on the Kyoto track, other tracks cannot move significantly.

The MARSHALL ISLANDS said that his position on a five-year commitment period is driven by mitigation ambition and not symmetry between the negotiation tracks. He expressed concern over voluntary processes with respect to increasing mitigation ambition.

IN THE CORRIDORS

On the ADP, some felt that Sunday’s informal consultations with the Co-Chairs were useful and productive. “The tough part will be on Wednesday when we start considering how to have more structured discussions in Doha,” said one delegate who was privy to the informal discussions. He wondered whether the question of the workplan for 2013 will get some “flesh on the bones,” suggesting that a series of workshops could be the appropriate way forward. However, another said, sighing, “Some delegates are just not ready to negotiate so they are stalling. Personally, I am still very unclear as to the purpose of this meeting here in Bangkok.”

The Qatari President Designate of COP 18/CMP 8 convened well-attended, open-ended informal consultations on the expectations of Parties and observers in the morning, followed by a “greeting meeting.” While the opening plenaries earlier in the meeting focused on each AWG separately, these open-ended consultations provided participants with an opportunity to link their expectations for all the AWGs, in a mutually-supportive manner. After listening to the briefing by the incoming COP Presidency and the interventions by parties, a couple of observers were caught speculating whether some Arab states might soon be submitting NAMAs. “Some are definitely ready to take that step, and are only waiting for higher political support within their countries,” predicted one hopeful observer.



Climate Change Policy & Practice

<http://climate-l.iisd.org/>

Climate Change Policy & Practice (formerly called Climate-L.org) is a knowledge management project carried out by the International Institute for Sustainable Development Reporting Services (IISD RS) in collaboration with the UN System Chief Executives Board for Coordination.

This knowledgebase of UN and intergovernmental activities addressing the challenge of global climate change features:

- news on UN and intergovernmental activities related to international climate change policy, updated on a daily basis;
- an iCal of upcoming climate change events;
- guest articles by key figures of the climate community and UN leaders; and
- policy updates.

New posts to the knowledgebase are distributed through the Climate Change Daily Feed, which is distributed exclusively through our community listserve, CLIMATE-L.

Climate Change Policy & Practice: <http://climate-l.iisd.org/>

To receive the Climate Change Daily Feed and to subscribe to the CLIMATE-L community listserve: <http://climate-l.iisd.org/about-the-climate-l-mailing-list/>

To subscribe to our iCal of climate change events:
<webcal://climate-l.iisd.org/subscribe/icalendar/>

Climate Change Policy & Practice is supported by the
Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, Global Program Climate Change



Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft
Confédération suisse
Confederazione Svizzera
Confederaziun svizra

Swiss Agency for Development
and Cooperation SDC

BANGKOK CLIMATE TALKS HIGHLIGHTS: TUESDAY, 4 SEPTEMBER 2012

On Tuesday morning, the ADP Workstream 2 roundtable on ambition for the ADP was held. Contact groups and informal consultations under the AWG-KP and AWG-LCA took place throughout the day.

ADP

ROUNDTABLE: Ambition for the ADP: During this discussion, delegates addressed questions posed by the ADP Co-Chairs related to: how the work of the ADP should relate to relevant work within and outside the UNFCCC; which international cooperative initiatives have the potential to deliver sizeable emission reductions to close the gap, and how they can be supported and scaled up; how the workplan can help to scale-up and intensify support to enhance mitigation action by developing countries; and how the principles of the Convention should be applied in the context of this workstream.

A number of countries supported holding ministerial roundtables before and in Doha on issues related to ambition. Nauru, for AOSIS, supported by VENEZUELA, welcomed complementary activities to raise ambition, but stressed that these should not distract from activities under the UNFCCC.

The MARSHALL ISLANDS called for “specific information, possibly with numbers,” on what could happen if the necessary means of implementation and technologies were not accessible.

The EU said complementary initiatives should be recognized by the UNFCCC and their impacts must be quantified. He called for: submissions by parties before Doha on possible initiatives, such as fluorinated gases, REDD+, bunker fuels, and renewable energy; a Secretariat summary of this information; and intersessional workshops to further address the issues.

BARBADOS, supported by BRAZIL and INDIA, expressed concern over potentially limiting discussions on these questions, emphasizing the workstream’s more “expansive mandate.” He recommended focusing on the emission reduction options identified in UNEP’s Emissions Gap Report, including strengthening LULUCF rules, avoiding double counting, and delivering on means of implementation. Citing the UNEP report, BOLIVIA noted that large mitigation potential exists in different sectors, but will require means of implementation.

NEW ZEALAND proposed increasing technical dialogue with the private sector and think tanks, and discussing parties’ domestic drivers and constraints. The US suggested that the COP could be a venue for catalyzing and encouraging complementary actions, including those by non-state actors. He noted potential areas of progress, such as REDD+, HFCs and low-emission development strategies.

SWITZERLAND emphasized that thematically-focused technical work should be complemented by more frequent political dialogue, saying that the starting point should be potential, costs, and readiness for action, rather than assessing whether an action is “inside or outside” the Convention.

ICAO highlighted recent actions in four key areas: development of a CO2 certification standard for aircraft; development and implementation of more efficient operational measures; sustainable alternative fuels for aviation; and a framework and global scheme for market-based measures.

BRAZIL stressed migration from rural areas to cities, noting: city dwellers have lower emissions per capita; municipal and city initiatives are more flexible than national initiatives; and that cities’ innovative solutions will only be implemented nationally at a later stage. On international cooperative initiatives, recalling the outcome of Rio+20, he underscored that the sustainable development goals (SDGs) were an extraordinary opportunity to address unsustainable production and consumption patterns, noting they strongly impact on climate change. COLOMBIA stressed that the SDG process offers a way forward, but said the process must not be “contaminated” by bringing in the climate negotiations.

On scaling-up and intensifying support, BRAZIL said the uncertainty related to the 2012-2020 financing gap must be overcome, and observed that some non-Annex I countries are doing more mitigation than Annex I countries. INDIA stressed ambition must also cover means of implementation and MRV of support to ensure broad participation, and said that short-term difficulties should not “tie hands” on ambition. On international cooperative initiatives, he stressed access to and transfer of technology was key to all future actions, and the broader question of IPRs should be addressed.

COLOMBIA said means of implementation were fundamental for delivering action, and called for predictability and clear signals of support. She urged creating incentives for the private sector to enable developing countries to access technologies.

JAPAN stressed looking at activities and initiatives undertaken outside the UNFCCC to determine how to encourage them and which ones will be effective for ambition, noting for example efforts to phase out HFCs, regional cooperation, and voluntary initiatives by industry. He suggested parties make submissions on their own activities and initiatives for the Secretariat to compile for Doha.

BOLIVIA said the 2012-2020 period should not be a period of developing rules, systems and regulations, but of concrete implementation of actions.

South Africa, for the AFRICAN GROUP, said that some mitigation actions, such as addressing energy efficiency, do not fall under the mandates of existing multilateral bodies, and

suggested the CTCN could work on energy efficiency issues. He called for increasing clarity on how the ADP work relates to the 2013-2015 Review and work undertaken on other tracks.

SINGAPORE underscored that in order to strengthen the multilateral rules-based system, the UNFCCC should respect the mandates of, not dictate to, other organizations, such as IMO and ICAO. He suggested: a forum for information sharing between international organizations, and concrete initiatives to encourage more countries to submit pledges.

NORWAY said the ADP mitigation ambition workplan should look at both pledges and complementary initiatives. She called for: common rules for accounting for 2020; robust clarification of pledges; concrete technical options for complementary initiatives; and implementation of complementary actions at the national level. She said that there should be no "iron curtain" between pledges and complementary initiatives. SAUDI ARABIA stressed that initiatives above and beyond national actions should be encouraged, especially in the area of carbon capture and storage. NIGERIA said the ADP workplan should be robust, concrete and time-specific.

PAKISTAN emphasized that: the ambition gap is not restricted to mitigation, but also encompasses means of implementation and legal aspects.

The PHILIPPINES stressed that ambition must be addressed in the context of the mandates of the AWG-LCA and AWG-KP, and that working outside the UNFCCC risks undermining the multilateral process, causes proliferation of redundant institutions and structures, and fosters inequity. On the ADP workplan, he emphasized the need to: continue the examination of financial flows and needs assessment; mobilize resources; and enhance tracking of climate finance performance, including through a transparent mechanism for publication of information.

CHINA proposed focusing on "narrowing" the ambition gap, before "closing" it. He proposed including in the workplan a specific process or mechanism for scaling-up intensified support to developing countries, and the need for mid-term finance up to 2020.

COLOMBIA urged "thinking outside the box" and, with the EU, suggested exploring the issues in more informal settings, such as sub-groups.

Co-Chair Mauskar concluded the session, saying that informal consultations with parties will be organized to elicit further guidance on next steps, and that a reflection note will be prepared.

AWG-LCA

CONTACT GROUP: Finance: Delegates continued discussions on a new note by the AWG-LCA Chair, which elaborates various options for the following issues: continuity of climate finance during the period between 2013 and 2020; fast-start finance; MRV; and arrangements between the GCF and the COP.

Regarding arrangements between the GCF and the COP, delegates addressed: whether the GEF provided a good model; ensuring proper dialogue between the GCF and the COP; and providing the Standing Committee with guidance to develop arrangements for the GCF. AUSTRALIA said this is not the proper place for discussions on this issue. BARBADOS said a decision should be taken in relation to the GCF host, arrangements between the COP and the GCF, and initial capitalization to provide some degree of certainty.

On continuity of climate financing during the period 2013-2020, some developing countries asked for elaboration of reassurances by developed countries. The US distinguished between providing reassurance about continuity of finance after 2012 and having a numerical target, noting that his country was scaling-up financing. While commending work being undertaken, COLOMBIA said that this did not provide adequate reassurance that the US\$100 billion target would be met.

AWG-KP

INFORMAL CONSULTATIONS: Second Commitment period: Parties continued discussions on the transition to the second commitment period, facilitated by a non-paper by AWG-KP Vice-Chair Uosukainen. The non-paper, entitled "possible elements for a decision adopting the Kyoto Protocol amendments," is comprised of parties' proposals on: a preamble; adoption of the amendments contained in the annex to the decision; urging parties to ratify the amendments in an expedited manner, with a view to facilitating their prompt entry into force; provisional application; any additional language related to legal continuity; operational and technical continuity; and any outstanding consequential revisions of the previous CMP decisions, including by linking to any outstanding work under the SBSTA; and "other." Many parties called for a revised draft text consolidating parties' proposals to be produced in Bangkok. Several parties also underscored the need for decisions that ensure technical and operational continuation of the flexibility mechanisms in 2013.

Numbers/Text: In the afternoon, parties in the spin-off group discussed a non-paper presented by the co-facilitators on "proposed amendments to the Kyoto Protocol." Delegates exchanged views on: which body should conduct the review of the second commitment period; the relationship of the second commitment period review and the 2015 Review; and the need for more political discussions at the pre-COP. Some parties expressed difficulties with moving forward with the review issue in Bangkok. BRAZIL proposed an amendment that will enable parties to raise the level of ambition of their commitments, at any time they wish to do so, with immediate effect under international law. The co-facilitators said that the non-paper still requires technical work and input from parties, but will offer a structured starting point for Doha.

IN THE CORRIDORS

As the Bangkok climate talks wind down, delegates and observers have been adopting a variety of innovative approaches to navigating the informal status of these talks, circulating rough notes with bullet points, "informal notes" with headings that foreshadow possible decision text to be added, and discussion questions to encourage focus on the pertinent issues, while refraining from solidifying actual text.

Some observers felt that a greater degree of convergence is occurring, while others struggled with the semantics of referring to text that technically, as yet, does not exist. One delegate prefaced his remarks to the facilitator of his group with, "Thanks for the non-paper, with these non-bullets, that have a non-status, I think everybody understands that..."

While the agenda reflected a full day of various informal discussions, at least one scheduled meeting, on adaptation, did not take place, as participants reportedly could not envisage that further discussions at this point would be productive. Informal "pieces of text," meanwhile, are quietly making the hand-to-hand rounds, and circulating from one email queue to another. The real action, said a veteran of the process, was occurring today in the bilaterals and in hallway huddles.

Some delegates involved in the Kyoto Protocol discussions observed that more progress has been made in the last five days in Bangkok, than in the two weeks in Bonn, noting the non-status of the Bangkok talks has provided a space for developing a structure and approach to resolving the issues that could be satisfactory to all concerned.

Wednesday's sessions, some said, will reveal what processes will be undertaken in the space between now and Doha.

ENB SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS: The *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* summary and analysis of the Bangkok Climate Change Conference will be available on Saturday, 8 September 2012 online at: <http://www.iisd.ca/climate/ccwg17i/>

SUMMARY OF THE BANGKOK CLIMATE TALKS: 30 AUGUST – 5 SEPTEMBER 2012

The informal additional sessions of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention (AWG-LCA), the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP) and the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP) took place at the UN Conference Centre of the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific in Bangkok, Thailand, from 30 August to 5 September 2012.

Under the ADP, parties convened in roundtable sessions to discuss their vision and aspirations for the ADP, the desired results of its work and how these results can be achieved. Parties also discussed how to enhance ambition, the role of means of implementation and how to strengthen international cooperative initiatives, as well as the elements that could frame the ADP's work.

The AWG-KP session was devoted to resolving outstanding issues to ensure the successful completion of the group's work in Doha, Qatar, in December 2012, by recommending an amendment to the Conference of the Parties (COP) serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP) for adoption. This amendment would allow a second commitment period under the Protocol to start immediately from 1 January 2013. The AWG-KP produced an informal paper outlining the elements for a Doha decision adopting the amendment to the Kyoto Protocol. Many parties welcomed progress made in Bangkok, particularly the increased clarity on options to address the transition to the second commitment period.

The AWG-LCA continued working on practical solutions to fulfill specific mandates from COP 17 in Durban. The focus was on what outcomes might be needed to conclude the group's work in Doha, how the elements will be reflected in the final outcome of the AWG-LCA, and whether additional work might be required beyond COP 18 and, if so, identifying concrete issues and whether those issues would require technical work or political consideration. Five workshops based on Decision 2/CP.17 (outcome of the work of the AWG-LCA) also convened in Bangkok. The work of the AWG-LCA was captured in an informal overview note of the AWG-LCA Chair to help clarify areas of convergence. Some parties expressed concern over

the lack of distinction between items mandated for further consideration in Durban and other elements of the Bali Action Plan (BAP) and the fact that the Chair's paper did not fully reflect discussions during the session.

While some were concerned that the meeting had not achieved adequate results in the run-up to Doha, others welcomed progress made, particularly under the Kyoto Protocol discussions.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE UNFCCC AND THE KYOTO PROTOCOL

The international political response to climate change began with the adoption of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in 1992, which sets out a framework for action aimed at stabilizing atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases to avoid "dangerous anthropogenic interference" with the climate system. The Convention, which entered into force on 21 March 1994, now has 195 parties.

In December 1997, delegates to COP 3 in Kyoto, Japan, agreed to a Protocol to the UNFCCC that commits industrialized countries and countries in transition to a market economy to

IN THIS ISSUE

A Brief History of the UNFCCC and the Kyoto Protocol.	1
Report of the Meeting	3
<i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action	3
<i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol	8
<i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group for Long-Term Cooperative Action under the Convention	10
A Brief Analysis of the Meeting	14
Upcoming Meetings	16
Glossary	18

This issue of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* © <enb@iisd.org> is written and edited by Asheline Appleton, Leila Mead, Delia Paul, Eugenia Recio, Mihaela Secieru and Antto Vihma, Ph.D. The Digital Editor is Francis Dejon. The Editor is Pamela S. Chasek, Ph.D. <pam@iisd.org>. The Director of IISD Reporting Services is Langston James "Kimo" Goree VI <kimo@iisd.org>. The Sustaining Donors of the *Bulletin* are the European Commission (DG-ENV), the Government of the United States of America (through the Department of State Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs), the Government of Canada (through CIDA), the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ), the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU), and the Government of Australia. General Support for the *Bulletin* during 2012 is provided by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Environment of Sweden, the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, SWAN International, the Swiss Federal Office for the Environment (FOEN), the Finnish Ministry for Foreign Affairs, the Japanese Ministry of Environment (through the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies - IGES), the Japanese Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (through the Global Industrial and Social Progress Research Institute - GISPRI), and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). Funding for translation of the *Bulletin* into French has been provided by the Government of France, the Belgium Walloon Region, the Province of Québec, and the International Organization of the Francophone (OIF and IEPF). The opinions expressed in the *Bulletin* are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of IISD or other donors. Excerpts from the *Bulletin* may be used in non-commercial publications with appropriate academic citation. For information on the *Bulletin*, including requests to provide reporting services, contact the Director of IISD Reporting Services at <kimo@iisd.org>, +1-646-536-7556 or 300 East 56th St., 11D, New York, NY 10022, USA.



<http://enb.iisd.mobi/>

achieve emission reduction targets. These countries, known as Annex I parties under the UNFCCC, agreed to reduce their overall emissions of six greenhouse gases by an average of 5% below 1990 levels between 2008-2012 (first commitment period), with specific targets varying from country to country. The Kyoto Protocol entered into force on 16 February 2005 and now has 192 parties.

LONG-TERM NEGOTIATIONS IN 2005-2009: Convening in Montreal, Canada, at the end of 2005, the first session of the CMP decided to establish the AWG-KP under Protocol Article 3.9, which mandates consideration of Annex I parties' further commitments at least seven years before the end of the first commitment period. COP 11 also created a process to consider long-term cooperation under the Convention through a series of four workshops known as "the Convention Dialogue."

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 and established the AWG-LCA with a mandate to focus on mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology 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 in Copenhagen in December 2009. In preparation, both AWGs held several negotiating sessions in 2008-2009.

COPENHAGEN: The UN Climate Change Conference in Copenhagen, Denmark, took place in December 2009. The high-profile event was marked by disputes over transparency and process. During the high-level segment, informal negotiations took place in a group consisting of major economies and representatives of regional and other negotiating groups. Late in the evening of 18 December, these talks resulted in a political agreement, the "Copenhagen Accord," which was then presented to the COP plenary for adoption. After 13 hours of debate, delegates ultimately agreed to "take note" of the Copenhagen Accord. In 2010, over 140 countries indicated support for the Accord. More than 80 countries also provided information on their national mitigation targets or actions. Parties also agreed to extend the mandates of the AWG-LCA and AWG-KP until COP 16 and CMP 6, respectively.

CANCUN: The UN Climate Change Conference in Cancun, Mexico, took place in December 2010, where parties finalized the Cancun Agreements. Under the Convention track, Decision 1/CP.16 recognized the need for deep cuts in global emissions in order to limit global average temperature rise to 2°C. Parties agreed to keep the global long-term goal under regular review and consider strengthening it during a review by 2015, including in relation to a proposed 1.5°C target. They took note of emission reduction targets and nationally appropriate mitigation actions (NAMAs) communicated by developed and developing countries, respectively (FCCC/SB/2011/INF.1/Rev.1 and FCCC/AWG-LCA/2011/INF.1, both issued after Cancun). Decision 1/CP.16 also addressed other aspects of mitigation, such as: measuring, reporting and verification (MRV); and REDD+ (Reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries, and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries).

The Cancun Agreements also established several new institutions and processes, including the Cancun Adaptation Framework and the Adaptation Committee, and the Technology Mechanism, which includes the Technology Executive Committee and the Climate Technology Centre and Network. The Green Climate Fund (GCF) was created and designated as a new operating entity of the Convention's financial mechanism, governed by a 24-member board. Parties agreed to set up a Transitional Committee tasked with the Fund's design, and a Standing Committee to assist the COP with respect to the financial mechanism. Parties also recognized the commitment by developed countries to provide US\$30 billion of fast-start finance in 2010-2012, and to jointly mobilize US\$100 billion per year by 2020.

Under the Protocol track, the CMP urged Annex I parties to raise the level of ambition towards achieving aggregate emission reductions consistent with the range identified in the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, and adopted Decision 2/CMP.6 on land use, land-use change and forestry.

The mandates of the two AWGs were extended to COP 17 and CMP 7 in Durban.

DURBAN: The UN Climate Change Conference in Durban, South Africa, took place from 28 November to 11 December 2011. The Durban outcomes cover a wide range of topics, notably the establishment of a second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol, a decision on long-term cooperative action under the Convention, and agreement on the operationalization of the GCF. Parties also agreed to launch the new 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." The new negotiating process, which began in May 2012, is scheduled to end by 2015. The outcome should come into effect and be implemented from 2020 onwards.

The mandates of the AWG-LCA and AWG-KP were again extended to COP 18 and CMP 8 in Doha.

BONN CLIMATE CHANGE CONFERENCE 2012: The Bonn Climate Change Conference took place from 14-25 May 2012 in Bonn, Germany. The conference comprised the 36th sessions of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) and the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA). It also included AWG-LCA 15, AWG-KP 17 and the first session of the ADP. Under the AWG-KP, the focus was on issues to be finalized for adopting a second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol and for the AWG-KP to conclude its work at CMP 8. Many outstanding questions remained, including the length of the second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol and carry-over of surplus units.

Under the AWG-LCA, after agreement on the agenda, debates continued on which issues require consideration so that the AWG-LCA can finalize its work at COP 18. Developed countries stressed "significant progress" through the various new institutions established in Cancun and Durban. Many developing countries identified the need to continue discussing issues required to fulfill the Bali Action Plan mandate.

Under the ADP, discussions centered on the agenda and the election of officers. After nearly two weeks of discussions, the ADP plenary adopted the agenda, initiating two workstreams: one addressing matters related to paragraphs 2-6 of Decision

1/CP.17 (post-2020 regime) and the other on paragraphs 7-8 (enhancing mitigation ambition during the pre-2020 timeframe), and agreed on the election of officers during the final day of the conference.

REPORT OF THE MEETING

The Bangkok Climate Talks opened on Thursday morning, 30 August 2012. This report summarizes the informal discussions of the following three bodies:

- *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP);
- *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP); and
- *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention (AWG-LCA).

AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON THE DURBAN PLATFORM FOR ENHANCED ACTION

The ADP, co-chaired by Harald Dovland (Norway) and Jayant Moreshwar Mauskar (India), held its first substantive discussions in Bangkok. After the informal opening plenary on Thursday, 30 August, the work of the ADP was organized into roundtables on two workstreams addressing vision for the ADP and ambition. On Sunday, 2 September, the ADP Co-Chairs held informal consultations on how to proceed during the second half of the meeting in Bangkok and based on these consultations, held additional roundtable sessions on Monday and Tuesday to further consider some of the specific issues raised during the initial exchange of views. On Wednesday morning, the Co-Chairs convened an informal consultation so that delegates could exchange views on how to organize the work of the ADP going forward to Doha and beyond.

OPENING PLENARY: ADP Co-Chair Dovland opened the ADP informal plenary on Thursday, noting work would be undertaken in roundtable sessions on the two workstreams. He emphasized that the roundtables should be interactive in nature, promote frank discussions and forward concrete ideas.

Algeria, for the Group of 77 and China (G-77/China), said the Durban Platform must ensure strong linkages among mitigation, adaptation and means of implementation, and include the principles of equity and common but differentiated responsibilities (CBDR). Switzerland, for the Environmental Integrity Group (EIG), said Doha must set out a work plan up to 2015, including milestones. Swaziland, for the African Group, supported limited use of carbon markets, and highlighted the need for establishing accounting rules and processes for technology transfer, among other measures.

Australia, for the Umbrella Group, said assistance should be provided through existing mechanisms, called for a legally-binding regime applicable to all parties, and stressed the need to update the existing regime in line with 21st century realities.

Nauru, for the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS), questioned whether adaptation can provide a sufficient solution to the impacts of climate change in small island developing states and whether the Green Climate Fund can afford to pay for such measures, and called for prioritizing mitigation under the ADP. She opposed a separate roundtable on principles, noting the principles should guide the work of the two workstreams.

The Dominican Republic, on behalf of the Coalition for Rainforest Nations, said closing the ambition gap requires a REDD+ mechanism in the future climate regime.

South Africa, for BASIC (Brazil, South Africa, India and China), stressed that the ADP outcome should be in complete accordance with all the Convention principles, particularly CBDR and equity.

Argentina, for Algeria, Bolivia, China, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, India, Kuwait, Malaysia, Mali, Nicaragua, Pakistan, the Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand and Venezuela, reiterated that all ADP work is under the Convention and must adhere to its principles, and said universality of application is not uniformity of application. He said the ADP should not become the means by which developed countries “jump ship” from their legally binding commitments. He said substantive work by the ADP on issues still being considered by the other AWGs should not be undertaken until the successful conclusion of work of those bodies.

Cyprus, for the European Union (EU), underscored the need to discuss how the Convention principles will be applied in a post-2020 framework so all parties take on commitments, and that any work going forward must adhere to the two workstreams. Bolivia, for the Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America (ALBA), called for developed countries to meet their historical responsibilities. Nicaragua, for the Central American Integration System (SICA), said work under the ADP should include all pillars of the BAP.

Singapore urged developed countries to refrain from taking unilateral measures, and to accommodate and acknowledge national circumstances.

Climate Action Network called for: agreement on CBDR in MRV; and an ADP work programme with options for fair allocation of responsibility in global efforts.

Climate Justice Network expressed concern about shifting the burden of mitigation actions to the poor, and said ADP work should not prejudice negotiations undertaken by the other working groups.

ROUNDTABLE: Vision for the ADP: This roundtable, addressing Workstream 1, met four times during the Bangkok session. During initial discussions from Thursday to Saturday, participants were invited to address: vision for the main contours and elements of the ADP’s work; and the work that is required between now and 2015, in particular in 2013, to achieve those results.

During the discussions, many countries reaffirmed: the primacy of the Convention in the work of the ADP; and that in no way should the ADP’s work involve a rewriting of the Convention.

The EU supported a new protocol in which all parties would take on commitments, and emphasized that the context in which the Convention principles are being applied has changed and that mitigation must be at the heart of the new agreement. Grenada supported a new protocol that would be “climate-effective,” and acknowledged the varying interpretations of Decision 1/CP.17 (establishment of the ADP).

Venezuela, for ALBA, expressed concern with some parties questioning the validity of the Convention after 20 years and “reinterpreting” certain terms. He cautioned that a flexible system of bilateral and plurilateral agreements might undermine the multilateral rules-based system.

Bolivia highlighted equity and the right to development, Ecuador urged addressing the impacts of climate change from a human rights perspective, and Tanzania emphasized that support to countries suffering the impacts of climate change is an equity issue.

India urged differentiation based on equity, CBDR and historical responsibility, and that post-2020 arrangements include quantified and specific terms for developed country support to developing countries. She said the ADP should be flexible to allow consideration of new elements, including from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the 2013-15 Review and the other AWGs.

Chile, for Colombia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic and Panama, called for means of implementation to address both mitigation and adaptation. He supported discussing CBDR in the context of specific adaptation and mitigation issues, and within the two workstreams.

Switzerland urged viewing the two workstreams as mutually supportive. The Philippines highlighted the importance of: coherence between workstreams; and an integrated approach to finance, technology and capacity building. Barbados said, *inter alia*, that the new legally binding agreement must address adaptation, mitigation, finance and technology.

Singapore urged consideration of national circumstances and of countries’ “three Cs”: their differing contexts, constraints and contributions. Japan supported consideration of national circumstances. The United Arab Emirates said that the CBDR principle could be reinforced, while enabling a wider group of parties to play “a fair role” in reducing emissions, considering national circumstances, such as demographics and resource endowments.

The Russian Federation cautioned against disregarding current realities and urged removing the “notorious firewall” between developed and developing countries. Australia supported a “climate-effective” agreement that: is applicable to all; is capable of evolving over time to promote increasing ambition as countries’ capabilities and confidence grow; and provides incentives for taking action. Stressing the Convention principles are enduring but dynamic, he supported “actionable differentiation” under the new agreement.

Norway said the new agreement must be effective, fair, realistic, flexible and science-based, and include mitigation commitments relative to responsibilities and capabilities. He envisaged a legally-binding, rules-based multilateral regime that addresses “dynamic differentiation.” The Republic of Korea supported incentives for developing country participation that take into account national circumstances, such as population growth rate and density, energy mix, renewable energy endowment, and the extent of coastline.

The LDCs called for a new protocol and robust MRV to ensure compliance and transparency. The African Group said any future legal outcome should be a further articulation of

commitments reflected in the Convention, such as financing commitments to developing countries, appropriate burden sharing, and acceptance of all sources of finance.

Pakistan emphasized: that applicability to all must not override CBDR and the notion of equity; lack of a common understanding regarding how much circumstances have changed; maintaining the existing differentiated structure; and an effective compliance mechanism.

Regarding work between now and 2015, Japan suggested an in-session workshop or ministerial roundtable in Doha on the elements of a future framework, brainstorming sessions involving various stakeholders, and moving from a general to more structured discussion in 2013. The US suggested continuing the current format of roundtables and convening workshops on technical issues that may come up, and supported reflecting on issues and exploring workable options before developing text. Brazil said beginning to negotiate the instrument too early would “contaminate” the real deliverables for Doha, which he said is the work under the AWG-KP and the AWG-LCA.

The Marshall Islands suggested that the “binary division” between countries under the Kyoto Protocol could be replaced by lists with varying levels of differentiation, from which countries could “graduate” to more stringent requirements as their circumstances change.

On Sunday, the Co-Chairs held informal consultations with parties on how to proceed with work under the ADP in Bangkok.

On Monday, delegates addressed questions posed by the Co-Chairs based on some of the issues raised during the first three days of roundtable discussions, and for which further elaboration might be useful. Questions related to: what is meant by “national circumstances” and how they can be accommodated in the ADP’s work; understanding of the term “applicable to all”; how broader participation can be encouraged; incorporating “flexibility” in the ADP’s work; and how the Convention principles should be applied in the context of vision for the ADP.

On the term “applicable to all,” countries emphasized that universality of application does not mean uniformity of application. Pakistan underlined that “applicable to all” must take into consideration both national circumstances and the Convention principles. Barbados said universality should not imply a “race to the bottom” in terms of legal form or rules, and called for a careful balance between designing a climate-effective agreement that is fair, and that enjoys the confidence of all parties.

On national circumstances, Singapore emphasized understanding the context and constraints of national circumstances before talking about parties’ contributions. He said this template implies: no formulas or “one size fits all” approach; mitigation actions will be nationally determined not internationally imposed and without prejudice to the question of legal form; and universal participation must acknowledge and accommodate national circumstances. Supporting Singapore, Saudi Arabia added that any country’s contribution “is, has been and will be nationally driven.”

On incorporating flexibility in the ADP’s work, Grenada emphasized that flexibility allowed for “differentiated participation,” and that “ambitious adaptation” is the path that brings climate change and sustainable development together.

On broader participation, the Gambia, for the LDCs, said this can only be effective if developed countries demonstrate leadership. The Philippines emphasized means of implementation in order to achieve broader participation. Japan stressed the need to balance broader participation through inclusion of initiatives outside the UNFCCC.

On principles, India stressed the importance of equity and CBDR as “guiding norms” in determining obligations and the nature and level of efforts. Chile said CBDR should not be interpreted in a way that blocks ambition or evades responsibility, and that development and climate protection should be seen as complementary, and not clashing, goals. Japan called for interpreting the Convention principles according to evolving socioeconomic situations. Bolivia recalled that the Rio+20 outcome document reaffirmed the Convention principles, particularly equity and CBDR. The US said the principles should not constitute an artificial divide between developed and developing countries.

Chile stressed flexibility regarding how individual commitments are met, incentives for high ambition and rewards for achieving such ambition, and a common understanding of equity and fairness.

The EU stressed: delinking emissions from economic growth; least-cost mitigation actions addressing all drivers of emissions; absolute economy-wide emission reduction targets for those most capable; and scope and stringency reflected in a “spectrum of commitments.”

The US stressed: diversity is in the actions themselves, not in whether a party acts; universal participation, new technologies and linking climate policy encourage more action; and the need for a flexible instrument that stands the test of time.

Noting continuing poverty and lack of access to energy and sanitation in developing countries, Bolivia said action requires technological and financial support, and that access to this support must be facilitated.

In closing, ADP Co-Chair Dovland said he looked forward to hearing parties’ ideas on how to organize and structure the ADP’s work in Doha and that further consultations on this would take place on Wednesday.

ROUNDTABLE: Ambition: The roundtable on enhancing mitigation ambition (Workstream 2) convened on Friday and Saturday. Participants addressed the mitigation gap and options and ways to increase the level of ambition. On Friday, Socorro Flores (Mexico) introduced the workshop report on increasing the level of ambition under paragraph 8 of Decision 1/CP.17 held in Bonn, Germany, in May 2012 (FCCC/ADP/2012/INF.1).

AOSIS and the LDCs called for prioritizing this workstream. The African Group stressed that this work should not replace Kyoto Protocol commitments, or negotiations on mitigation under the AWG-LCA.

The LDCs and the EU supported convening a high-level forum before Doha, with the EU suggesting a focus on such issues as hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), bunker fuels, REDD+, fossil fuel subsidies and private-sector finance. The LDCs, the EU, Costa Rica, Chile, Colombia and Peru encouraged developing countries to put forward NAMAs. The US said there could be various pathways to a 2°C goal, including: submission of pledges by countries that have not done so; and voluntary actions, which he said should not require recognition or approval

under the UNFCCC. The African Group, supported by the EU, said efforts by other multilateral bodies should be recognized under the Convention, for accountability and transparency purposes. India cautioned against unilateral measures “in the name of climate change.”

Many developing countries highlighted that ambition must address adaptation, mitigation and means of implementation, reiterating the call for parties to present their pledges, if they have not done so, and to provide means of implementation to developing countries.

Parties further discussed transparency of mitigation actions, with Norway and Bolivia calling for clear rules on emission reduction accounting. Ecuador proposed a compliance regime linked to the International Court of Justice. Brazil put forward the World Trade Organization and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons as examples the climate regime could consider, and Colombia proposed that climate change be placed on the Security Council’s agenda.

On complementary initiatives, Singapore said that these are relevant, and should strengthen the multilateral system. China warned that “supplementary actions” should not justify unilateral measures. Australia and the US encouraged complementary activities outside the UNFCCC, including by non-state actors, with the US suggesting the COP could be a venue for catalyzing such actions. Australia highlighted the importance of credible carbon markets. Micronesia, supported by the US, highlighted the value of initiatives outside the UNFCCC, such as those focused on HFCs, black carbon, methane and ground-level ozone. The EU suggested the Secretariat prepare a technical paper with structured and quantified options on complementary initiatives.

On Tuesday morning, 4 September, delegates addressed questions posed by the Co-Chairs based on informal consultations and on the previous days’ discussions. Questions related to: how the work of the ADP should relate to relevant work within and outside the UNFCCC; which international cooperative initiatives have the potential to deliver sizeable emission reductions to close the gap, and how they can be supported and scaled up; how the work plan can help to scale up and intensify support to enhance mitigation action by developing countries; and how the principles of the Convention should be applied in the context of the workstream on ambition.

AOSIS and Venezuela welcomed complementary activities to raise ambition, cautioning these should not detract from UNFCCC activities. The EU called for submissions by parties before Doha on possible initiatives, a Secretariat summary and intersessional workshops.

Barbados emphasized the “expansive mandate” of the ambition workstream, noting it could extend beyond international cooperative action. He recommended focusing on options in UNEP’s Emissions Gap Report, including strengthening land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF) rules, avoiding double counting and delivering on means of implementation. Brazil highlighted the importance of action by cities, and underscored the Rio+20 agreement to create sustainable development goals (SDGs). Colombia stressed that SDG process should not be “contaminated” by the climate negotiations.

Many developing countries highlighted the mid-term financing gap and the need to provide clear signals and predictability to the private sector, as well as provide technology transfer and address questions related to intellectual property rights (IPRs), so as to enable and encourage concrete implementation. The African Group proposed that the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN) work on energy efficiency issues. Singapore proposed a forum for information sharing among international organizations.

On the ADP work plan, the Philippines stressed that ambition must be addressed in the context of the mandates of the AWG-LCA and AWG-KP, and requested tracking of financial flows and climate finance performance, including through a transparent mechanism for publication of information. The African Group called for greater clarity on how the work of the ADP will relate to the 2013-2015 Review. China proposed including a specific process or mechanism for scaling up intensified support to developing countries.

INFORMAL CONSULTATIONS: On Wednesday morning, Co-Chair Dovland highlighted the need to draft outcomes that will define aspects of the ADP's work in 2013, possibly including the number of meetings planned, opportunities for input, and intersessional meetings and workshops. He invited delegates to express their views on how the ADP's work should be organized going forward, including in the first half of 2013.

Discussions revolved around work modalities in the lead-up to and in Doha. Divergent views were expressed regarding, *inter alia*: establishing contact groups on the two workstreams; convening ministerial roundtables and/or workshops in the pre-COP, to be held in the Republic of Korea in late October, and in Doha; and holding more workshops/intersessional meetings in addition to the pre-COP and Doha. Delegates also discussed further submissions or technical papers that may be required. Many supported keeping the two workstream discussions separate, and that flexibility in the format of discussions and working modalities should be maintained going forward.

On contact groups, many parties supported establishing contact groups in Doha on the two workstreams. Others opposed establishing formal contact groups and supported further exploring the issues in workshops or maintaining the current roundtable format. A number of parties suggested convening sub-roundtables on certain issues.

On the convening of ministerial roundtables, many supported holding such roundtables at the pre-COP and in Doha, while others cautioned that convening ministerial roundtables was premature, with one reiterating the ADP is in a "nascent stage." One developing country said the ADP should first be allowed to work for a year and that ministers should focus their attention on the other two tracks.

Some suggested ministerial roundtables on both vision and ambition, while others said the roundtables must also address the other AWGs. Ministerial discussions were also suggested on complementary initiatives and equity. One party said the ministerial discussions should be exploratory and visionary in Doha, rather than requiring the type of formal outcome that would be expected from the other AWGs.

One party said ministerial discussions were instrumental in providing visibility for the ADP. Another said the absence of ministerial oversight was one of the reasons difficulties

were encountered in the other AWGs, and that firm ministerial guidance was necessary toward 2015. Others stressed that discussions in Doha should focus on successful conclusion of the work of the AWG-KP and AWG-LCA, with one cautioning that "Doha should not be contaminated by the ADP discussions, and *vice versa*."

On ambition, one proposal called for further submissions on complementary initiatives that quantify mitigation, supported discussing them at the pre-COP, and proposed that a Secretariat technical paper be prepared before Doha. While agreeing complementary actions should be incentivized, one country opposed bringing the issue of complementary actions into the process.

Delegates also discussed the future work plan, with some expressing hope that Doha would agree on a work plan with milestones for 2013. Proposals for future work included: adopting in Doha a work plan for 2013 and the following years; submissions in early 2013 from parties and non-state actors on how the ADP should proceed and on elements to be included in a post-2020 outcome; intersessional workshops on vision, differentiation and how to capture a spectrum of commitments, and decoupling emissions from growth; holding discussions on non-state actor involvement; and a specific paper elaborating on what has worked and what has not worked.

Some reiterated the ADP outcome in Doha will be part of a package, based on progress in the other AWGs. Others stressed that efforts in Doha should focus on developing a work plan, not on negotiating and formulating text, with one arguing that this is still a phase of conceptualizing ideas and discussing options.

Some parties cautioned against getting "bogged down" in lengthy discussions on the work plan, and that a formal work plan was not necessary to move ahead. One argued for a step-by-step approach and cautioned against timetables and work plans.

One country urged ensuring from the outset that adaptation be given equal importance to mitigation, while another emphasized that Doha must send a strong common message on mitigation.

One party said the ADP will need to work out how to: ensure flexibility for national circumstances without endangering ambition; ensure the system remains dynamic within changing economic realities; and enable mutual understanding of parties' commitments so as to trigger increased ambition.

On holding further workshops, some developed countries supported in-session workshops in Doha, as well as in-session and intersessional workshops in 2013, while some developing countries emphasized in-session work to allow for broad participation. Some parties believed that no further intersessional meetings, workshops, submissions or technical papers were required before Doha, and that time would be better spent reflecting and coordinating internally on work done in Bangkok. One said additional sessions were not needed between now and mid-2013.

Some welcomed the opportunity for submissions on the structure of the ADP work, while others supported beginning the submission process after Doha. On ambition, a number of parties supported party submissions on the different options for increasing mitigation ambition, and asked that the Secretariat compile this information in a technical paper before Doha.

Many countries called for a summary and a technical paper to be prepared by the Co-Chairs synthesizing the ADP discussions in Bangkok, with some stressing the summary should not be seen as a negotiated text. Another stated such a summary could be used to develop focused questions for the next phase of discussions and proposed taking stock at the end of Doha.

In conclusion, Co-Chair Dovland urged delegates to be flexible due to a limit on the number of parallel meetings that can be convened at in Doha.

CLOSING PLENARY: The ADP closing plenary took place on Wednesday, 5 September. Co-Chair Mauskar advised delegates that summaries of the discussion would be made available on the UNFCCC website, as would a note containing the reflections of the Co-Chairs on the session as a whole and looking forward to Doha and beyond. Many countries commended the Co-Chairs for successfully guiding the discussions in Bangkok.

Germany briefed delegates on the climate dialogue that convened in Berlin on 16 July 2012, involving climate ministers from 30 countries. She highlighted that raising ambition does not only refer to mitigation, but includes providing means of implementation and technology transfer. She stressed that the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol is seen as an important step, and that countries will continue to have different responsibilities in a future climate regime, observing that Doha will be “a point of transition where one journey ends and another begins.”

The G-77/China stressed that completing the work of the AWG-LCA will provide the necessary and solid basis for the Durban Platform, and that the ADP must not be “an exercise of rewriting the Convention,” and must be in accordance with the principles of equity, CBDR and respective capabilities. He described Workstream 1 discussions as still in the phase of clarifying conceptual ideas, while Workstream 2 required more detailed work in order to move forward.

Australia, for the Umbrella Group, supported organizing ministerial roundtables in Doha. On a new climate agreement, he proposed open discussions on how to design an agreement that: takes into account national circumstances; builds ambition; elicits broad participation; incorporates lessons learned; understands countries’ domestic drivers; stimulates low-emission development strategies; and is capable of responding to changing circumstances. On ambition, he highlighted the need to explore drivers for enhancing ambition, particularly of those parties that have not yet made pledges, and how best to encourage complementary measures, including, for example, the engagement of cities and the private sector.

The EU called for “concrete initiatives” and the application of clear milestones, underlining the urgency of raising ambition. He proposed that “sufficient time” be devoted to the ADP next year, including intersessional meetings, saying that an immediate priority should be to “clarify and capture” next steps in 2013. He supported a compilation of options by the Secretariat, including implications in terms of emission reductions. With AOSIS, he endorsed: holding ministerial discussions on pre-2020 mitigation ambition at the pre-COP and in Doha; and establishing contact groups on the two workstreams, emphasizing different timescales for deliverables.

Switzerland, for the EIG, supported a work plan with broad guidelines and milestones for continuing work to 2015, as well as focused and technical work and mitigation action in addition to what is already on the table.

Stating that the ADP work is critical to the final package in Doha, AOSIS said that the workstream on ambition was of fundamental importance and a priority for AOSIS, and that ways of increasing ambition identified in UNEP’s Emissions Gap Report should be part of the Doha outcome. He stressed: the need for developed countries to increase their means of implementation to enable developing countries to implement existing NAMAs and to adopt more ambitious ones; and the work plan should support, not detract, from raising ambition under the other AWGs.

Swaziland, for the African Group, said Workstream 1 should culminate in an enhanced multilateral rules-based regime, and adhere to historical responsibility, CBDR and the development priorities of developing countries. He said that Workstream 2 should emphasize ambition actions beyond the commitments inscribed under the Bali Roadmap, and that the work plan should not be a substitute for commitments under the Bali Roadmap.

The Gambia, for the LDCs, supported: establishing contact groups to progress deliberations; deepening understanding on the ADP roadmap to be adopted in Doha; and progressive discussions on a 2013 work plan on ambition. He hoped for more clarification on complementary measures, the contribution of these initiatives to closing the gap, and provision of costs and associated means of implementation. He said proposed initiatives should be prioritized, and suggested the Secretariat play a role in leveraging these efforts. He supported holding ministerial-level discussions in Doha.

Egypt, for the Arab Group, said the ADP should take as its departure point the results of the other AWGs. He proposed: the Co-Chairs prepare a matrix incorporating the various elements of Decision 1.CP/17 and present their proposals on how these could be implemented at the beginning of 2013; convening two roundtables in Doha on means of implementation and equity; and a briefing on the conclusions of the long-term finance workshop. He said equity must be the “gateway to ambition” and that no contradiction exists between the two.

Cuba, for ALBA, said: the Kyoto Protocol must be safeguarded; the fate of Doha depends on the fate of the second commitment period; the new regime must not be weaker than the existing one; and historical responsibility and the use of common space cannot be sidelined. He called for discussions on sustainable patterns of consumption and production and equity, and said developing countries are showing more ambition than developed countries on a voluntary basis.

South Africa, for BASIC, stressed that 2012 should focus on the Kyoto Protocol amendment, the adoption of an agreed outcome under the AWG-LCA, and the launching of the Durban Platform. He underlined that the work of the ADP must build on that of the other AWGs, and called for continuing the roundtable working format in Doha.

Nicaragua, for SICA, expressed concern over the slow progress in Bangkok, and urged all parties to make greater commitments, and advance in a balanced and equitable manner on both Convention tracks.

Papua New Guinea, for the Coalition for Rainforest Nations, stressed the need to agree on a clear and ambitious action plan for the ADP, which should include REDD+ implementation as a primary element. Referring to international cooperative initiatives on REDD+, she said the REDD+ Partnership failed in fulfilling its role for the effective disbursement of phase 1 and 2 committed support.

Peru, for Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica and the Dominican Republic, highlighted the need for reassurance that developed countries will take the lead through ambitious and binding climate action and reliable finance.

Malaysia, for Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia, China, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, India, Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Malaysia, Mali, Nicaragua, Pakistan, the Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand and Venezuela, stressed that it was premature to launch contact groups before Doha and to hold ministerial meetings on the ADP in Doha, considering the early and exploratory stage of the discussions under the ADP. He called for the principles of equity and CBDR to be applied to the work under both streams of the ADP, and emphasized that Doha should focus on the successful conclusion of the AWG-LCA and AWG-KP.

Thailand, as host country, said the Bangkok talks were a starting point for the Doha talks. In conclusion, the Co-Chairs said they would reflect on the ideas raised in the discussions in Bangkok and commended the spirit of cooperation shown by delegates. The ADP informal plenary closed at 4:24 pm.

AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON FURTHER COMMITMENTS FOR ANNEX I PARTIES UNDER THE KYOTO PROTOCOL

Opening the session on Thursday, 30 August, AWG-KP Chair Madeleine Diouf (Senegal) encouraged parties to make progress on outstanding issues, including: the length of the Kyoto Protocol second commitment period; quantified emission limitation and reduction objectives (QELROs); implications of carry-over of assigned amount units (AAUs); access to mechanisms for parties not participating in a second commitment period; and legal issues to ensure the smooth transition from the first to the second commitment period. A contact group convened, as well as a spin-off group on numbers/text and informal consultations on the second commitment period.

CONTACT GROUP: During the contact group that convened immediately following the opening plenary, delegates gave their opening statements. Algeria, on behalf of the G-77/China, encouraged Annex I parties to raise their level of ambition, and urged those parties who have not put forward QELROs to do so. The Republic of Korea, for the EIG, with the EU, expressed support for an eight-year second commitment period, emphasizing the mid-term review of QELROs and the need to maintain a flexible process.

The EU emphasized that the second commitment period is only one part of the “Durban package,” and proposed a review in 2015 of the level of ambition of parties’ commitments, in line with the AWG-LCA Review.

AOSIS, the LDCs and the African Group supported a five-year commitment period. AOSIS raised concerns over “window dressing,” such as accounting tricks and conditionalities.

Swaziland, for the African Group, called for: a higher level of ambition; swiftly resolving the issue of carry-over of surplus AAUs; and restricting the flexibility mechanisms to parties entering a second commitment period.

The Gambia, for the LDCs, called for successful completion of the AWG-KP in order to make progress on a new protocol under the ADP.

Saudi Arabia, on behalf of the Arab Group, called on developed countries to continue the legally-binding nature of their obligations and to avoid a gap between commitment periods.

Venezuela, for ALBA, called on developed countries to live up to their historical responsibilities in adopting a “clear and meaningful” second commitment period in Doha.

South Africa, on behalf of BASIC, urged raising the level of ambition of current pledges, and said the adoption of amendments to the Protocol is “the cornerstone” for a successful outcome in Doha.

The Philippines, for Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia, China, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, El Salvador, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Iran, Kuwait, Malaysia, Mali, Nicaragua, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand and Venezuela, cautioned against adopting a pledge-based approach, emphasizing the need for an aggregate system, common accounting and comparability of efforts.

ANNEX I FURTHER COMMITMENTS: Continuing from Bonn, a spin-off group on numbers/text convened, co-facilitated by Jürgen Lefevere (EU) and Sandea de Wet (South Africa), met throughout the week. Legal and technical issues on the transition from the first commitment period to the second were considered in informal consultations facilitated by AWG-KP Vice-Chair Jukka Uosukainen (Finland).

Numbers/Text: Parties discussed a number of proposals for amendments, which were compiled into a non-paper by the co-facilitators. Parties also heard presentations from the Secretariat related to technical papers on: quantitative implications on the carry-over options; and QELROs expressed as a percentage of base year and absolute emission levels. Ukraine presented on the assumptions behind its forthcoming QELRO.

On **QELROs**, parties received information from Ukraine on the assumptions behind its point-year target of a 20% reduction by 2020 and work conducted to transform the target into a QELRO. Developed countries that had not yet put forward their QELROs were urged to do so. In bilateral consultations, parties discussed the possible forthcoming QELRO submissions from Belarus and Kazakhstan.

On **ambition**, many parties expressed sharing a common goal of raising the level of ambition, but divergent views remained regarding how and when. Many developing countries expressed concerns that an eight-year commitment period would lock in the current low level of ambition. In order to raise the ambition of the QELROs, parties discussed conducting a mid-term review. Delegates exchanged views on: which body should conduct the review of the second commitment period; and the relationship between the second commitment period review and the 2015 Review under the Convention. Also related to ambition, Brazil proposed an amendment to the protocol that will enable parties to raise the level of ambition of their commitments at any time

they wish to do so, with immediate effect under international law. Parties noted the need for ministerial-level discussions on ambition and review before Doha.

On *carry-over of surplus AAUs*, parties discussed the proposals to limit the carry-over surplus by AOSIS, the African Group and Brazil, which were consolidated into a new proposal by the G-77/China, in which 2.5% of the second commitment period forms the ceiling of carry-over. The option not to limit the carry-over is also on the table. Parties noted that the quantitative implications of the surplus from the first commitment period were significant, but also limited to few parties, namely the EU, the Russian Federation and Ukraine. Strict limitations to carry-over were supported by all developing countries, while some developed countries said that the regime should approach the carry-over issue from a comprehensive perspective and be careful not to signal penalizing over-achievement.

On *eligibility*, parties discussed whether access to the Kyoto mechanisms should be possible for: only countries who apply provisional application; countries who have submitted their QELROs; countries that have indicated that they will join the second commitment period; all parties to the Kyoto Protocol; or all parties to the Convention. Most developing countries supported limiting access to the flexible mechanisms, most importantly the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM), to countries who join the second commitment period. Many developed countries underscored the importance of maintaining demand for CDM credits, and said that ensuring operational continuity is not enough without ensuring demand. Some also flagged the dangers of “the Wild West” of disparate carbon markets.

On a *second commitment period*, during informal consultations facilitated by Vice-Chair Uosukainen, parties discussed number of textual proposals for decisions in Doha to address the gap between the commitment periods. Many parties stressed the need to ensure a “seamless continuation” of the Protocol beyond 2012, concerning, for example, the flexible mechanisms. Parties reviewed options and discussed elements needed in decisions in Doha.

Parties discussed textual proposals from AOSIS, the African Group, Brazil, Australia, the EU and Brazil, which were compiled into a non-paper. The paper clustered the various proposals into eight categories, including: preamble; adoption of amendments; a paragraph urging parties to ratify; provisional application; additional language related to legal continuity; operational and technical continuity; consequential revisions to previous CMP decisions; and other proposals, such as welcoming unilateral declarations. Many parties underscored that some proposed elements are mutually supportive, not exclusive. In the discussions, parties raised concerns over the non-legally binding nature of CMP decisions, while others noted the difficulties and time requirements associated with provisional application. Some parties underscored that anything short of provisional application would not be legally binding internationally, and thus would not address the legal consequences of the gap, highlighting the need for “maximum bindingness with maximum coverage.” Several parties said that text emerging from Bangkok on the second commitment period is especially important in order to ensure a clear mandate from capitals for Doha.

CLOSING PLENARY: During the informal closing plenary on Wednesday afternoon, AWG-KP Chair Diouf indicated agreement over the comprehensiveness of the proposed text. She informed parties that she will issue a text capturing progress made so far, which should be a major step in preparation of the pre-COP in Seoul and a basis for negotiations in Doha. She said the text will be made available on the UNFCCC website, hopefully by the beginning of October.

Algeria, for the G-77/China, highlighted the importance of a second commitment period that is ambitious in terms of emission reductions and that begins on 1 January 2013. Calling for a strong and legally-binding outcome in Doha, he stressed that Annex I parties not taking legally-binding commitments under the AWG-KP should not seek to benefit from its flexible mechanisms. He urged parties that have not yet put forward QELROs to do so, and said that those who have should consider greatly improving the ambition of their QELROs by Doha.

Switzerland, for the EIG, said that the text to be prepared by the Chair contains all elements that will allow for a smooth transition to a second commitment period and successful conclusion of the AWG-KP in Doha.

Australia, for the Umbrella Group, called for work in Doha to focus on the outstanding issues, including managing the transition to the second commitment period from 1 January 2013, and ensuring that Kyoto Protocol infrastructure and mechanisms continue to deliver.

The EU stressed the need to: adopt a ratifiable amendment to the Protocol; inscribe QELROs in Annex B; and agree on an eight-year second commitment period, which should be combined with a review process. He emphasized the importance of enabling continued use of Kyoto mechanisms, especially for those parties accepting a second commitment period, and urged Annex B parties that have signaled their intention not to take part in the second commitment period to reconsider their position in light of the progress made in Durban towards a single global agreement.

Swaziland, for the African Group, expressed concern over the slow progress in the AWG-KP discussions, and said that Annex I parties should not use the “excuse” of national circumstances and domestic laws as a justification for leaving the Protocol, staying out of the second commitment period, or not taking up QELROs. Lamenting the lack of leadership by Annex I parties, their low pledges and intent to lock their low level of ambition into an eight-year commitment period, he condemned this as “a reckless disregard of human rights.”

The Gambia, for the LDCs and AOSIS, called for: Annex I parties, including those that have not taken up QELROs, to raise the ambition and submit legally-binding single-number QELROs without conditions for inclusion in an amended Annex B of the Protocol; a five-year second commitment period; and a dramatic cut in surplus AAUs from the first commitment period. He stressed that: QELROs inscribed in Annex B for the second commitment period are required for all Annex I parties wishing to participate in the mechanisms; and non-Kyoto parties should undertake ambitious commitments under the AWG-LCA.

Saudi Arabia, for the Arab Group, stressed the importance of reaching agreement in Doha on a second commitment period that begins on 1 January 2013. He expressed concern over developed countries’ efforts to make their mitigation action contingent on

that of developing countries, and, together with ALBA countries, said that access to the CDM should be conditional on ratification of the second commitment period.

Underscoring that the Kyoto Protocol is the only legal instrument to tackle the increase in developed countries' emissions, Dominica, for ALBA, expressed concern over diverting the Kyoto Protocol discussions to the ADP.

Iran, for Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia, China, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, India, Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Malaysia, Mali, Nicaragua, Pakistan, the Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Sudan and Venezuela, said success in Doha will require: an ambitious and legally-binding second commitment period that includes a fair and science-based contribution by Annex I parties to closing the ambition gap; an ambitious agreed outcome under the BAP that ensures comparable mitigation ambition by non-Kyoto parties, financing ambition and addressing other unfinished business under the BAP; and greater clarity on the ADP work.

The Democratic Republic of the Congo, for the Coalition for Rainforest Nations, said REDD+ can offer a significant contribution to the closure of the ambition gap provided that finance to support results-based actions is ensured.

Nicaragua, for SICA, expressed concern over slow progress in Bangkok, and questioned whether voluntary pledges will reach the level of mitigation demanded by science. He said that SICA countries are voluntarily using their own resources for mitigation activities.

AWG-KP Chair Diouf encouraged parties to focus on the proposals that are already on the table between Bangkok and Doha, and closed the informal plenary at 6:46 pm.

AD HOC WORKING GROUP FOR LONG-TERM COOPERATIVE ACTION UNDER THE CONVENTION

AWG-LCA Chair Aysar Tayeb (Saudi Arabia) opened the informal AWG-LCA plenary, noting tasks for the group in Bangkok, including continuing practical work and exploring other decisions that may be required, and developing a textual basis for the AWG-LCA outcome to be finalized in Doha. He noted the preparation of: matrix tables that provide an overview of issues from the BAP mandate and identify progress made since Bali; and informal notes on the issues that also reflect differing levels of maturity of various items.

Australia, for the Umbrella Group, said no further decisions were required for the AWG-LCA to terminate in Doha. He urged identifying areas where consensus might be possible, observing that not all unresolved issues will garner consensus, and asked what outcome or product was envisaged at the conclusion of the Bangkok session.

Algeria, for the G-77/China, emphasized the need for: balance between mitigation and adaptation; and finance to ensure ambition is enhanced, highlighting public long-term finance and not transferring the financing burden to developing countries.

The EU advocated determining the most appropriate body or bodies to take work forward on individual issues when the AWG-LCA closes in Doha, and avoiding transferring them to the ADP. She said decisions related to closing the AWG-LCA should not delay progress in the ADP.

Swaziland, for the African Group, called for progress from developed countries on converting pledges to economy-wide

emission reduction targets and, with the Gambia, for the LDCs, expressed concern over the lack of clear projections for mid-term financing. Ecuador, for ALBA, emphasized developed country mitigation as a critical pending issue from the BAP. He identified the principle of CBDR and respective capabilities as the main element for guiding the work of the group, and called for considering draft decision text by the group. South Africa, for BASIC, highlighted unresolved issues, including equity, IPRs and unilateral trade measures. Egypt, for the Arab Group, called for: affirming the Convention principles; effectively implementing the BAP; and considering how to carry forward any incomplete work from the AWG-LCA.

The Democratic Republic of the Congo, for Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia, China, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, India, Iraq, Kuwait, Malaysia, Nicaragua, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand and Venezuela, said termination of the AWG-LCA in Doha should only occur after a successful agreed outcome on all elements of the BAP mandate. He highlighted outstanding issues, including: improving joint understanding of what he called "contextual elements," such as historical responsibility, equitable access to sustainable development and IPRs; enhancing mitigation ambition for a second commitment period; and ensuring comparability of efforts for those that are not party to the Protocol. Costa Rica, for the Coalition for Rainforest Nations, emphasized the need to reach agreement on market mechanisms and to increase investment in REDD+.

Nicaragua, for SICA, said reaching an agreed outcome on all pillars of the BAP was a precondition for terminating the AWG-LCA, and noted pending issues related to, *inter alia*, long-term finance and shared vision.

CONTACT GROUP (AGENDA ITEMS 3, 4 AND 5)

AWG-LCA Chair Tayeb chaired the contact group, assisted by facilitators on the various issues. Following discussions in Bonn, parties continued consideration of issues mandated by COP 17 for further implementation in spin-off groups, including on: shared vision; developed country mitigation; developing country mitigation; the Review; REDD+; sectoral approaches; and various approaches, including markets.

Technology, adaptation, finance, capacity building, response measures, and economies in transition (EITs) were considered in the AWG-LCA contact group. The AWG-LCA stocktaking contact group was held on Monday, 3 September, where progress on all the items was reported. The AWG-LCA closing plenary took place on Wednesday, 5 September. Work conducted in Bangkok was captured in a 34-page informal overview note prepared by the AWG-LCA Chair.

Shared Vision: This issue was considered in a spin-off group facilitated by Zou Ji (China). AWG-LCA Chair Tayeb reported to the AWG-LCA stocktaking contact group that there was divergence of views regarding whether the context or the numbers for a global goal and peaking timeframe should be addressed first. He said parties had not yet discussed which body will undertake this issue after the closure of the AWG-LCA.

Mitigation: Developed country mitigation: This issue was considered in a spin-off group facilitated by Andrej Kranjc (Slovenia). Parties considered an informal note and a matrix table reflecting decisions taken since Bali. Many developed country parties highlighted progress made in areas, such as

clarification of pledges and International Assessment and Review, while many developing country parties underscored their disappointment over, *inter alia*: lack of concrete results; the low level of ambition in existing developed country pledges; and gaps in comparability of efforts. Norway, supported by Australia and the EU, but opposed by Brazil, China, India and Kenya, suggested common accounting rules for all parties.

Reporting to the AWG-LCA stocktaking contact group, Kranjc highlighted a useful exchange on substantive issues and the way forward, adding that parties agreed on the need to further engage in discussions on clarification of targets and approaches for measuring progress.

Developing country mitigation: This issue was considered in a spin-off group facilitated by Gary Theseira (Malaysia). Parties considered two facilitation tools: a matrix table providing a “bird’s eye view” of the work done on NAMAs by developing country parties since COP 13; and an informal note containing framing elements, elements on NAMAs communicated by parties, and elements on support to prepare and implement NAMAs.

The US, New Zealand, Norway, Canada, the EU, Australia, Switzerland, and the Marshall Islands, for AOSIS, stressed that the group’s mandate is to continue clarifying mitigation pledges by developing country parties, which is vital to build confidence and trust and to identify practical solutions for moving forward. They encouraged parties that have not yet submitted pledges to do so, and requested a more structured compilation of actions already submitted.

China, Brazil and South Africa stressed that further work is needed on the issue of MRV of support to developing countries. Opposing this, the EU said the matter is under consideration elsewhere and cautioned against duplicating work. China pointed out that the relevant NAMA information was compiled in the Registry. Mali called for support through regional workshops and a handbook on preparation and implementation of NAMAs for COP 18.

Reporting to the AWG-LCA stocktaking contact group, Theseira highlighted that the spin-off group considered a note on elements that could become part of an outcome in Doha, saying elements identified by parties included: reiterating calls for NAMAs and enhanced provision of support; further discussions on understanding the diversity of NAMAs; development of guidelines for MRV of support; and proposals for building the capacity of countries to prepare and implement NAMAs.

REDD+: This issue was considered in a spin-off group facilitated by Yaw Osafo (Ghana). Reporting to the AWG-LCA stocktaking contact group, Osafo said the group discussions built on the in-session workshop on REDD+, and focused on, *inter alia*: guiding principles; enabling conditions necessary for scaling-up and facilitating financing; issues that require further exploration; and signals required from Doha to incentivize financing for the full implementation of REDD+. He reported rich exchanges on the institutional arrangements required, including the establishment of a REDD+ board, registries, insurance or reserve mechanism, and review and regulatory bodies. He said an updated informal note would be prepared for parties’ consideration.

Sectoral approaches: This issue was considered in a spin-off group facilitated by George Wamukoya (Kenya). Reporting to the AWG-LCA stocktaking contact group, Wamukoya noted that parties exchanged views on four options on the general framework, and that diverging views remain. On bunker fuels, he reported discussions addressed five options that the group would continue to narrow down.

Various approaches: This issue was considered in a spin-off group facilitated by Alexa Kleysteuber (Chile). Kleysteuber reported to the AWG-LCA stocktaking contact group that the group discussions were based on an informal note containing a map of elements that need to be addressed. On a framework for various approaches, she said parties exchanged views on purposes and roles. On a new market mechanism she underscored productive exchanges on modalities and procedures.

Response measures: AWG-LCA Chair Tayeb reported to the AWG-LCA stocktaking contact group that different views were expressed on whether decision text should be prepared for Doha and which fora should consider the issue of unilateral measures.

Adaptation: During contact group discussions, chaired by Tayeb, parties considered an informal note on “enhanced action on adaptation,” highlighting framing elements and questions arising from the Bonn session, including: support for adaptation; national adaptation plans; strengthening the catalytic role of the Convention; and economic diversification to build resilience. A matrix table, illustrating decisions and action taken on adaptation from COP 13 to SB 36 was also introduced.

Argentina, for the G-77/China, Bangladesh, for the LDCs, and others noted the need to strengthen and intensify the means of implementation for adaptation. Bolivia, on behalf of a number of countries, proposed establishing a process through the Adaptation Committee, in collaboration with the Standing Committee, to develop recommendations with relevant Convention bodies and others on means to incentivize the implementation of adaptation actions, and to organize a workshop in parallel with SB 38 on ways to promote the implementation of enhanced action on adaptation in a coherent manner.

Nauru, for AOSIS, called for joint implementation of disaster risk management and climate change adaptation, and stressed the need to strengthen national-level institutions.

Norway noted relevant decisions supporting and underpinning the work that will be done on adaptation. The US observed that relevant mechanisms, such as the Adaptation Committee, have been set up, but noted concerns on how the mechanisms would work. He pointed out that the issue of means of implementation was being considered by the finance group.

Reporting to the AWG-LCA stocktaking plenary, Tayeb indicated that parties had identified issues requiring further work, including: means of implementation for adaptation; financing for 2013-2015; linkages with finance; national adaptation plans for non-LDCs; and the catalytic role of the Convention. He said divergent views remain on whether the AWG-LCA should further address these issues and if additional decisions are required.

Finance: In contact group discussions chaired by Tayeb, parties considered an informal note on “enhanced action on the provision of financial resources and investment to support action on mitigation and adaptation and technology cooperation,” highlighting framing elements and questions on: financing during the period 2012-2020; linkages with other bodies and financial

institutions; MRV; fast-start finance; GCF; and long-term finance. A matrix table was also introduced, illustrating decisions and action taken since COP 13.

Divergent views were expressed on whether draft decision text was needed. Developed countries pointed to decisions from Cancun and Durban, maintaining that the AWG-LCA has already achieved significant results and other arrangements had been set up where finance discussions would continue. Several developed countries said the AWG-LCA is not the appropriate forum for discussing mid-term finance. Calling for a decision on finance in Doha, developing countries expressed concern over the mid-term financing gap, and noted the need to consider MRV of financial support and enhancing transparency of its provision.

During subsequent contact group sessions, parties discussed a revised note by the AWG-LCA Chair elaborating various options for continuity of climate finance during the period 2013-2020, fast-start finance, MRV, and arrangements between the GCF and the COP.

Regarding arrangements between the GCF and the COP, parties discussed: whether the GEF provided a good model; ensuring proper dialogue between the GCF and the COP; and guidance to the Standing Committee to develop arrangements for the GCF. Australia said this was not the proper place for discussions on this issue. Barbados said a decision should be taken in relation to the GCF host, arrangements between the COP and the GCF, and initial capitalization, to provide some degree of certainty. On continuity of climate financing during the period 2013-2020, some developing countries asked for elaboration of reassurances by developed countries. The US distinguished between providing reassurance about continuity of finance after 2012 and having a numerical target, noting that his country was scaling up financing. While commending work undertaken, Colombia said that this did not provide adequate reassurance that the US\$100 billion target would be met.

Tayeb reported to the AWG-LCA stocktaking contact group, *inter alia*, that disagreement remains on whether further decisions under the AWG-LCA are necessary, and on how and where finance issues could be further considered.

Technology: In contact group discussions chaired by Tayeb, parties considered an informal note entitled “enhanced action on technology development and transfer,” including: framing elements; functions of the CTCN and the Technology Executive Committee (TEC); and linkages with the financial mechanism and other thematic bodies. He also presented a matrix table on the technology decisions taken since adopting the BAP. In the ensuing discussion, parties presented their views, *inter alia*: on the relationship between the TEC and CTCN; the functions and the mandate of these new bodies; the need to discuss items beyond those decided in Durban; the scope of decisions needed in Doha; and whether to address IPR issues under the UNFCCC.

Reporting to the AWG-LCA stocktaking contact group, Tayeb said parties identified pending issues, such as: the relationship between the CTCN and the TEC; possible additional functions for both bodies; and IPRs. He reported agreement on the need to further consider these issues but disagreements on how and when to do it.

Capacity Building: This issue was considered in the AWG-LCA contact group. Reporting to the AWG-LCA stocktaking contact group, Tayeb observed that views diverge on where and how to address outstanding issues and on whether the AWG-LCA should provide further guidance.

Review: This issue was considered in a spin-off group facilitated by Gertraud Wollansky (Austria). Wollansky reported to the stocktaking contact group that two options on the scope of the Review are on the table, one based on Decision 1/CP.16 para 138 (Review) and the other further defining the scope to include the assessment of the implementation of commitments under the Convention, including means of implementation provided to developing countries. On expert consideration of inputs, he underscored two options under discussion: a review expert group to be established in Doha; and a joint contact group of SBSTA and SBI.

EIT and countries whose special circumstances have been recognized by the COP: Tayeb reported that consultations being conducted by the AWG-LCA Vice-Chair were still ongoing.

AWG-LCA Stocktaking Contact Group: Delegates made interventions on progress made thus far. Switzerland, on behalf of the EIG, cautioned parties “not to change the focus and character” of the contact group, called for focusing energies on discussions in the spin-off groups and said topics for discussion should complement the agreed outcome under the AWG-LCA. He highlighted achievements under the AWG-LCA, including mitigation pledges from 87 countries, and renewed focus on adaptation, technology and finance.

Australia, on behalf of the Umbrella Group, said that building “permanent homes” for finance, technology and capacity building has been no small feat, and emphasized that this work will continue through the newly established mechanisms.

The Philippines urged parties to consider where progress has and has not been made on implementing the BAP, highlighting that the AWG-LCA’s work is not complete. She underscored the importance of providing means of implementation in order for developing countries to meet their obligations under the Convention.

The EU highlighted the need to build “a better technical understanding” of the scale of the implementation gap, calling for clarification of pledges, and progress on REDD+ finance and bunker fuels.

Colombia said the BAP had set up “a long-term horizon,” and does not have a definite end point. She recommended exploring a transition into a post-AWG-LCA scenario.

Kenya, for the African Group, called for a process to take forward technical issues, saying a “very comprehensive” decision on this will be needed in Doha.

India recommended identifying the technical and political issues that may not be completed in Doha, including a timeframe for peaking of emissions, and issues of long-term finance and trade-related IPRs, in order to determine how to take forward that work. He noted that “successful closure” of the AWG-LCA was a key part of the Durban decision.

South Africa noted lack of clarity on key elements, such as comparability, finance, technology and adaptation. He said the institutions established in Cancun and Durban are not the right

platform to discuss commitments under the Convention, and urged engaging on substantive discussion on these issues to bring them to a logical conclusion in Doha.

Singapore said the updates provide a “sobering reality” of what is happening in the AWG-LCA, and that we have “crystallized our divergences,” but have not made much progress towards convergence. He said a decision was needed for closure of the AWG-LCA in Doha. The US said that a decision to close the AWG-LCA is not needed, but that a formal decision would be required to extend it.

Saudi Arabia said convergence must be reached on areas where there is disagreement and that innovative ways to address them must be found or they will “keep coming back” in the future.

AWG-LCA Chair Tayeb said that closing an agenda item does not mean discussion on that issue ends or that work cannot continue, and that everyone wants to close the work of the AWG-LCA.

AWG-LCA IN-SESSION WORKSHOPS: On Thursday, 30 August, a workshop took place on Financing Options for the Full Implementation of Results-based Actions Relating to REDD+, including Modalities and Procedures for Financing. For detailed coverage of the workshop, see <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12549e.html>

On Friday, 31 August, two workshops were held on: a Framework for Various Approaches; and the new market mechanism. For detailed coverage, see <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12550e.html>

On Sunday, 2 September, two workshops took place on: Quantified Economy-wide Emission Reduction Targets by Developed Country Parties; and Understanding of the Diversity of NAMAs by Developing Country Parties, Underlying Assumptions, and any support needed for implementation of these actions. For detailed coverage, see <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12552e.html>

CLOSING PLENARY: During the closing plenary on Wednesday afternoon, AWG-LCA Chair Tayeb recalled the process undertaken and presented his “informal overview note,” which, he said, brought together the issues covered in Bangkok. He said the 34-page document reflects the exchanges on the various topics on the AWG-LCA agenda and possible ways to address the issues, but that it does not represent consensus regarding the content, forum or way forward, including on possible decision text. He said the note draws from views, interventions and options presented by parties, advising delegates that the note was intended to assist parties in their reflection on progress made and remaining challenges.

Algeria, for the G-77/China, called on parties to address the 2012-2020 funding gap; long-term finance; arrangements between the COP and the GCF; and MRV of financial support, particularly in light of new obligations from Durban.

The Gambia, for LDCs, requested: a decision on the long-term global goal for emission reductions; assessment on the adequacy of the long-term global goal under the Review process; adoption of common accounting rules; assistance for developing countries to make pledges, including development of a handbook for preparing and implementing NAMAs; a decision on long-term finance with reference to the GCF; MRV of support; and mid-term finance to 2020.

Swaziland, for the African Group, called for decisions on means of implementation, including finance, technology transfer and capacity building, and expressed concern about the 2013-2020 financing gap. He called for common accounting rules on mitigation by developed countries and emphasized that parties cannot “pick and choose” parts of the Durban package.

Nauru, for AOSIS, called for greater urgency appropriate to the scale of the challenge, especially in identifying a time frame for peaking of global emissions. He reminded parties that the scope and modalities of the 2013-15 Review were agreed as part of a political compromise for acceptance of the goal. He requested comparability of pledges and targets through a common accounting framework, and adoption of a mid-term financial target to provide clarity and predictability.

Venezuela, for ALBA, called for efforts on: a global goal on greenhouse gas reductions and a timeframe for global peaking of emissions; means of implementation for developing countries, with finance and technology transfer through the institutions created in Cancun; and a system of clear rules and methodologies to promote environmental integrity. He requested agreed outcomes be expressed in substantive decisions, and in procedural decisions where agreement is not possible.

Switzerland, for the EIG, assured parties that concluding the AWG-LCA at COP 18 will not end work on financing and adaptation, and lamented that the Chair’s informal note did not reflect progress made in Bangkok.

Saudi Arabia, for the Arab Group, called for the full and fair implementation of the Durban package and the successful closure of the AWG-LCA upon reaching an agreed outcome pursuant to the BAP.

Papua New Guinea, for the Coalition for Rainforest Nations, expressed concern that developed countries were not moving forward on financing for REDD+ results-based payments.

Cyprus, for the EU, expressed disappointment with the lack of distinction in the informal overview note between issues mandated by Durban and other issues. He emphasized that the closure of the AWG-LCA would not lead to a vacuum and the issues would be a key part of the regime from 2012-2020.

Australia, for the Umbrella Group, observed that there had been useful progress on most of the Durban-mandated tasks. He pointed out lack of agreement on additional issues that the contact group should consider, and that the Chair’s informal overview note did not fully reflect exchanges over the past week. He said the AWG-LCA should focus on the few mandated issues from Durban.

Nicaragua, for SICA, expressed disappointment and frustration with lack of progress under the AWG-LCA, pointing to the lack of decisions that would allow work to be advanced, and called for draft decision text between now and Doha, as well as greater clarity on what is going to happen with unresolved and pending issues.

Bolivia, speaking for Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia, China, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, India, Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Malaysia, Mali, Nicaragua, Pakistan, the Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Sudan and Venezuela, said they had proposed draft decision text on nearly all elements of the BAP and highlighted the need to reach agreement on ambitious and equitable results on all

elements of BAP in order to close the AWG-LCA. He called for a list indicating successfully concluded issues and those that are still outstanding.

The Dominican Republic, for Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica and Peru, underscored the sizeable steps taken on the AWG-LCA since Bali. She said that rather than endpoints, the climate process is characterized by milestones that mark achievements, and that closing the AWG-LCA does not mean closing talks on all its issues.

The US voiced concerns about the process. He said that that the agreement in Durban and Bonn was to focus the work on, *inter alia*, REDD+, shared vision and market mechanisms. He emphasized that countries could examine the other issues if consensus could be found to discuss them, but that this had not been the case in Bangkok. He said that the lack of balance in the document was “disturbing” and lamented that comments made by his delegation, including on accounting for developing countries and work on finance undertaken in other UNFCCC bodies, were not adequately reflected. He said the Chair’s informal note did not provide a useful framing for Doha and noted it brings in 34 pages of “contested” text, including a new chapter on response measures.

Singapore said that in order to achieve results in Doha, parties must capture both convergence and divergence as accurately as possible. He raised concerns over the Chair’s overview note, which he said is unbalanced and misrepresents a proposal on trade by Singapore.

The United Arab Emirates said that the AWG-LCA has “served us well” and achieved a great deal of progress.

Indonesia welcomed the Chair’s informal note, but also raised concerns about the lack of progress, especially on adaptation and means of implementation. He urged parties to submit all textual proposals to be considered in Doha as soon as possible.

India underscored that the AWG-LCA must fulfill its mandate in Doha, which was a central element of the balance in the Durban package. He said that large, unresolved political issues should be forwarded to the ADP, and technical ones to the new UNFCCC bodies.

China emphasized that the Durban decision does not terminate the AWG-LCA, but rather should continue the work of the AWG-LCA until a successful outcome is reached.

Urging parties to close the rich chapter of AWG-LCA in Doha, Chair Tayeb closed the session at 8:47 pm.

A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF THE MEETING

The informal Bangkok climate talks convened against the backdrop of depressing and sobering news concerning the melting of Arctic sea ice, which in August broke the previous record set in 2007. Leading scientists affirm that the ice over the Arctic Sea could vanish altogether in as little as four years’ time. Elsewhere, extreme weather events, often attributed to climate change, were experienced as hurricanes battered cities and coastlines, devastating droughts ravaged crops and farmland, and destructive wildfires raged.

Delegates in Bangkok did not reach any agreements on new measures to combat climate change, yet they did make some progress that will hopefully enable there to be a successful outcome and balanced package of measures to be adopted at the

Doha Climate Change Conference at year’s end. This was very much a “roll up your sleeves and work session,” as the UNFCCC Executive Secretary said in her opening press conference, referring in particular to the informal nature of the meeting. The informal Bangkok session, which almost did not happen due to lack of funding, had a full plate, with one delegate clearly elaborating what should be on the menu: a Doha amendment(s) to the Kyoto Protocol to deliver a robust second commitment period; the successful closure of the AWG-LCA; and initial consolidation of the work of the ADP that will map out the path towards concluding negotiations on a new legal regime by 2015 to be implemented beginning in 2020.

This analysis will examine the Bangkok meeting in the context of these three elements and discuss how far the session went towards contributing to a successful outcome in Doha.

WHEN YOU’RE COMMITTED TO SOMETHING, YOU ACCEPT NO EXCUSES, ONLY RESULTS — KENNETH BLANCHARD

Discussions on the Kyoto Protocol track focused on the second commitment period. A robust second commitment period envisages several elements, including a “smooth” or “seamless transition” between the first and second commitment periods, as well as legal and technical and operational continuity. To ensure legal continuity, QELROs or commitments from industrialized countries presented in a second commitment period have to be legally-binding as of 1 January 2013, when the second commitment period is due to begin. Adoption of a Doha Amendment(s) to the Kyoto Protocol could address this, but ratification of such an amendment is a lengthy domestic process for many countries. Having missed the opportunity to get the ball rolling by adopting an amendment in Cancun or Durban, parties now have to exercise a great deal of creative and legal ingenuity to circumvent the inevitable ratification gap.

Developing countries, particularly AOSIS, favor provisional application, whereby the amendments to the Kyoto Protocol would be applied provisionally from 1 January 2013, pending entry into force or ratification by individual parties. Precedent for this does exist. For example, the GATT, which preceded the WTO, was famously provisionally applied from 1948 to 1995. However, due to domestic legislative constraints in some countries, this might not be an option open to all parties. For example, provisional application appears to be an obstacle for countries like Australia, whose constitution does not allow for their executive to provisionally apply treaties unless it is “urgent and in the public good.” Delegates in Doha will need to find agreement on how to proceed on the issue of providing legal certainty of the second commitment period.

Another issue to be resolved during a second commitment period is eligibility to use the Kyoto Protocol’s flexibility mechanisms. Different views remain, with AOSIS proposing that only countries that have signed onto a second commitment period, and are provisionally applying the Protocol amendments or have deposited their instrument of acceptance, should have access to the mechanisms. Parties will also have to decide in Doha whether countries that are not parties to the Kyoto Protocol and also those who are parties but do not intend to participate in the second commitment period will be eligible to use these mechanisms.

Delegates have also not yet reached agreement on having a five-year or eight-year commitment period. Some who support an eight-year commitment period believe that “it is easier to have an overlap than a gap,” referring to the fact that a bit of overlap will exist with any new regime that will be implemented in 2020, as opposed to having to address another gap in 2018 if a five-year commitment period is adopted. Those supporting a five-year commitment period believe that a longer commitment period would lock in a lower level of ambition. Some proposed addressing this issue with a review of commitments or with an amendment that would enable increasing ambition at any time.

In Bangkok, parties made some progress on these issues, which was captured in the AWG-KP Vice Chair’s non-paper on possible amendments for a Doha decision adopting the Kyoto Protocol amendment(s). Parties still have a lot of work to do in Doha, but at least this non-paper goes a long way towards putting possible options on the table.

EVERYTHING WILL BE ALL RIGHT IN THE END...AND IF IT IS NOT ALL RIGHT, THEN IT IS NOT THE END — INDIAN PROVERB

On the AWG-LCA side, delegates grappled with the various elements of the Bali Action Plan, with countries “worlds apart” on some issues regarding whether more work was required under the AWG-LCA. As laid out in Decision 1/CP.17 in Durban, delegates agreed to extend the AWG-LCA’s “mandate for one year in order for it to continue its work and reach the agreed outcome pursuant to the Bali Action Plan, at which it “shall be terminated.” The language itself is “purposefully ambiguous and open to interpretation,” an observer opined. Durban mandated further work to be taken to Doha on specific issues, namely: shared vision; developed country mitigation; developing country mitigation; REDD+; sectoral approaches; various approaches, including markets; and Review. In Bonn, parties agreed to launch spin-off groups on those issues, and informal discussions continued in Bangkok, together with several workshops.

Disagreement persists, however, on whether issues under the Bali Action Plan not being considered in spin-off groups need to be addressed before the closure of the AWG-LCA. Developed countries consider that many issues mandated by the Bali Action Plan have already been sufficiently addressed and forwarded to different bodies for further consideration, including institutions created for that purpose in Cancun and Durban. In this view, if any relevant issues are not solved in Doha, the permanent Subsidiary Bodies or the COP will be able to address them. Many developing countries, however, adamantly disagree that issues, such as finance for the 2012-2020 period, have been adequately addressed. This resulted in speculation in Bangkok as to whether the AWG-LCA would actually conclude in Doha if these issues are not addressed. “We did not agree to extend the AWG-LCA only to terminate it,” said one developing country delegate. “We have to have a successful outcome on those issues that we deem to be of critical importance to us.” These diametrically opposing views led some countries to speculate on whether a decision—and therefore consensus—would be required for terminating or extending the AWG-LCA. What is certain for many is that some form of text containing the work accomplished since Durban by the AWG-LCA will have to be presented in Doha.

During the last day of the Bangkok meeting, the AWG-LCA Chair presented an informal overview note intended to assist parties in their reflection on progress made and remaining challenges. While many developing countries expressed satisfaction with the compilation, many developed countries said that they “would not consider it as a basis for negotiations.” In the closing remarks, some parties complained that the note “did not sufficiently distinguish between elements mandated for discussion by Durban and those other issues that some, but not others, believed required further consideration.” A veteran negotiator explained: “a successful outcome in Doha will depend, to a great extent, on whether parties can build trust with one another and really agree on which, where and how key pending issues under the AWG-LCA will continue to be addressed.”

DON'T BURY YOUR THOUGHTS; PUT YOUR VISION TO REALITY — BOB MARLEY

As for the ADP, after parties spent most of the time in June agreeing on the agenda and the election of officers, in Bangkok they were able to have an initial exchange of views on the workstreams agreed to in Bonn. Under the agreed ADP agenda, the workstreams address matters related to paragraphs 2-6 of Decision 1/CP.17 (post-2020 regime) and paragraphs 7-8 (enhancing mitigation ambition during the pre-2020 timeframe). In Bangkok, discussions on the ADP were held as roundtables that provided parties a space to “shed light” on what they envisioned for the post-2020 regime, how to address the work on ambition for the pre-2020 period, and how to organize their work for Doha and beyond. As one delegate aptly put it, “The ADP airplane has taken off under the charge of two copilots, but it may be too early to unbuckle our seatbelts because of turbulence ahead, but we are flying, and the journey has begun.”

As in Bonn, parties expressed different views on how principles should guide the work of the ADP and what “applicable to all” implies. Different groupings of developing countries maintained that the common but differentiated responsibilities and the equity principles, as currently interpreted, should continue to apply since the ADP is framed under the Convention. They added that “universality of application” should not become “uniformity of application” and that universal participation must take into account the variety of national circumstances. Meanwhile, developed countries increasingly referring to current socio-economic realities, called for flexible and dynamic structures that could “evolve over time to promote increasing ambition as countries’ capabilities and confidence grow.”

Whether focus should be retained on mitigation or equally consider the other Bali pillars remained controversial under both workstreams. While most developed countries suggested focusing on mitigation, particularly on raising the level of ambition for the pre-2020 era, developing countries said adaptation, finance and technology should be also considered. On the differences in views, an experienced negotiator explained that “many fear that the ADP could become the new dumping ground for unresolved AWG-LCA issues,” rather than enabling real progress or bridging gaps for a future climate regime. Views on the way forward also diverged in Bangkok, as some countries believed discussions under this body should play a central role in

Doha and be balanced with progress in the other AWGs. Others, however, noted that “beginning to negotiate the instrument too early would contaminate the real deliverables for Doha,” which they said is the work under the AWG-KP and the AWG-LCA.”

Moreover, some developed countries see the work in and beyond Doha could be better advanced if a work plan with concrete milestones is agreed and if ministers are engaged in ADP roundtables, while others believed that focusing on the “happy ending” of the other two AWGs should be the priority.

WHAT MAKES THE DESERT BEAUTIFUL IS THAT SOMETIMES IT HIDES A WELL — ANTOINE DE SAINT-EXUPERY

At the end of the week, most delegates acknowledged that some progress had been made on all three tracks, although with varying degrees. The next important meeting is the pre-COP to be held in the Republic of Korea towards the end of October. “We have to bring the three groups together in Doha,” said one. Many developing countries believe that work cannot progress in the ADP until they are satisfied with the conclusions of the other two AWGs. In this context, many think that Bangkok met its objectives in illuminating the linkages and tradeoffs among the three AWGs. While some, in the end, questioned the necessity of holding the Bangkok meeting, the UNFCCC Executive Secretary was optimistic in her closing press conference, noting Bangkok created the space for a “landing zone” in Doha. Doha will not be an easy meeting. “I feel like here in Bangkok we were lining up our armies and everyone was taking their positions, but no shots were fired,” said one delegate who is positioning herself on the front line. The real battle will come in the desert in December.

UPCOMING MEETINGS

69th Meeting of the CDM Executive Board: The Executive Board of the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) will hold its 69th meeting to consider matters relating to the operation of the CDM. **dates:** 9-13 September 2012 **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

14th Regular Session of the African Ministerial Conference on the Environment: The 14th Regular Session of the African Ministerial Conference on the Environment (AMCEN-14) will provide a platform for African Ministers to debate the key outcomes of the UNCSO (Rio+20), and address other emerging issues. The meeting will also provide an opportunity for the Ministers to refine their strategies in preparation for UNFCCC COP 18. **dates:** 10-14 September 2012 **location:** Arusha, Tanzania **contact:** Angele Luh Sy **phone:** +254-20-762-4292 **email:** Angele.Luh@unep.org **www:** <http://www.unep.org/roa/amcen/>

Transitions to Low Carbon Energy Systems: Which Pathways to Energy Access for All? This workshop is organized by the Low Carbon Energy for Development Network and hosted by the University of Sussex, UK. It will reflect on the outcomes of the UNCSO and consider how low-carbon development can simultaneously address energy access, poverty reduction, human development and economic growth. The aim of the workshop is to identify and discuss priority questions that need to be answered to meet the UN goal of “Sustainable

energy for all.” **dates:** 10-11 September 2012 **location:** Brighton, United Kingdom **contact:** Dr. Rob Byrne **phone:** +44-1273-873-217 **email:** r.p.byrne@sussex.ac.uk **www:** http://www.ukcds.org.uk/event-Transitions_to_low_carbon_energy_systems_which_pathways_to_energy_access_for_all_-1819.html

International Conference on Climate, Water and Policy: This conference will bring together climate scientists, water resource managers and other specialists to discuss the impacts of climate change on water resources across four categories: climate variability impacts on water availability and floods at short term to seasonal time scales; climate change and variability impacts on water security and flood damage at decadal and inter decadal time scales; dissemination of probabilistic climate and water information for operational planning and decision making; and building international cooperation and policy coordination for adaptation to climate change. **dates:** 11-13 September 2012 **location:** Busan, Republic of Korea **contact:** Jin-Ho Yoo **email:** jhyoo@apcc21.net **www:** <http://www.apcc21.org/eng/acts/int/ann/japcc020701.jsp>

Third Symposium on the Ocean in a High-CO2 World: This symposium is sponsored by the Scientific Committee on Oceanographic Research (SCOR), the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) of UNESCO, and the International Geosphere-Biosphere Programme. The symposium aims to attract over 300 of the world’s leading scientists to discuss the impacts of ocean acidification on marine organisms, ecosystems and biogeochemical cycles. It will also cover socioeconomic consequences of ocean acidification, including policy and management implications. **dates:** 24-27 September 2012 **location:** Monterey, California, USA **email:** secretariat@scor-int.org **www:** <http://www.highco2-iii.org>

30th Meeting of the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee: The Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee will meet in September. **dates:** 26-28 September 2012 **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

22nd LEG meeting: The Least Developed Countries Expert Group will meet in late September 2012. **dates:** 26-29 September 2012 **location:** Funafuti, Tuvalu **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

UNU-WIDER Conference on Climate Change and Development Policy: The UN University (UNU)-World Institute for Development Economics Research (WIDER) conference on “Climate Change and Development Policy” aims to reflect the diverse range of perspectives on how to balance climate and development objectives. The conference will evaluate how research can inform development policy and identify existing knowledge gaps, focusing on both low-carbon development (mitigation) and climate-resilient strategies (adaptation). **dates:** 28-29 September 2012 **location:** Helsinki, Finland **contact:** Anne Ruohonen **email:** anne@wider.unu.edu **www:** http://www.wider.unu.edu/events/2012-conferences/Climate-change-2012/en_GB/28-09-2012/

LEG workshop for Pacific LDCs: The LEG workshop for Pacific LDCs will be held in Tuvalu. **dates:** 28 September - 3 October 2012 **location:** Funafuti, Tuvalu **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

Second Workshop on long-term finance: The aim of the long-term finance work programme is to contribute to the on-going efforts to scale up the mobilization of climate change finance after 2012. **dates:** 1-3 October 2012 **location:** Cape Town, South Africa **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/cooperation_support/financial_mechanism/long-term_finance/items/6814txt.php

October CDM Meetings: The 8th CDM Assessment team workshop will be held from 1-2 October, the 39th meeting of the CDM small-scale working group will be held from 9-12 October, the 5th CDM roundtable will be held on 12 October, the 58th meeting of the CDM Methodology Panel will be held from 15-19 October, and the 62nd meeting of the CDM Accreditation Panel will be held from 22-25 October 2012. **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

Pre-COP 18 Ministerial Meeting: This ministerial meeting will be held in preparation for the 18th session of the Conference of the Parties (COP 18) to the UNFCCC. **dates:** 21-23 October 2012 **location:** Seoul, Republic of Korea **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** <http://unfccc.int>

African Sustainable Energy Finance Summer Academy: The Sustainable Energy Finance Academy, held within the new framework of the Frankfurt School – UNEP Collaborating Centre for Climate and Sustainable Energy Finance, will provide a comprehensive framework on renewable energy and energy efficiency financing in Nairobi, Kenya, with a special emphasis on renewable energy in Africa. **dates:** 21-26 October 2012 **location:** Nairobi, Kenya **contact:** Summer Academy Team **phone:** +49-069-154008-692 **fax:** +49-069-154008-4692 **email:** summeracademy@fs.de **www:** http://www.frankfurt-school.de/content/en/consulting/ias/summer_and_winter_academies/sustainable_energy_finance_nairobi.html

Fifth Asian Ministerial Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction: The Fifth Asian Ministerial Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction (AMCDRR) will be jointly hosted by the Indonesian National Agency for Disaster Management (BNPB) and the UN International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (UNISDR), with support from regional and international development partners. AMCDRR will convene under the theme “Strengthening Local Capacity for Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR).” **dates:** 22-25 October 2012 **location:** Yogyakarta, Indonesia **phone:** +62-21-4452-1802 **fax:** +62-21-3860-745 **email:** secretariat@5thamcdrr-indonesia.net **www:** <http://5thamcdrr-indonesia.net/>

Assistance for Action: Aviation and Climate Change: This seminar is organized by the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) and will provide states and other stakeholders with an opportunity to exchange views and information on the assistance required to develop and implement

policies and actions related to international aviation and climate change. In addition, the seminar will consider synergies, existing measures and mechanisms by which ICAO and other relevant stakeholders can assist states in developing and implementing climate policies and actions. Topics will include: capacity building; alternative fuels; financing for emissions reduction actions; technology transfer; and technical support – ICAO web-based tools and databases. **dates:** 23-24 October 2012 **location:** Montreal, Quebec, Canada, **contact:** ICAO Secretariat Environment Branch Air Transport Bureau **phone:** +1-514-954-8219, ext. 8243 **email:** acli@icao.int **www:** <http://www.icao.int/meetings/acli/Pages/default.aspx>

Eighth African Development Forum: The eighth African Development Forum (ADF) is being held under the theme “Governing and Harnessing Natural Resources for Africa’s Development.” The ADF will focus on the following six areas: knowledge base, human and institutional capacities; policy, legal and regulatory issues; economic issues; governance, human rights and social issues; participation and ownership of natural resources; and environmental, material stewardship and climate change. **dates:** 23-25 October 2012 **location:** Addis Ababa, Ethiopia **contact:** Isatou Gaye **phone:** +251-11-544- 5098 **fax:** +251-11-551-0365 **email:** igaye@uneca.org **www:** http://new.uneca.org/adfviii/adf_news.aspx

Ninth Meeting of the UN-REDD Programme Policy Board: Pre-meetings to the ninth meeting of the UN-REDD Policy Programme Board will be held on 25 October. The Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) Participants Committee meeting will take place in the same location 21-23 October, and an optional field visit for participants of both meetings will take place on 24 October. **dates:** 26-27 October 2012 **location:** Brazzaville, Republic of the Congo **contact:** Rosa Andolfato, UN-REDD Programme Secretariat **phone:** +41-22 917-8946 **email:** rosa.andolfato@un-redd.org **www:** <http://www.un-redd.org/PolicyBoard/tabid/102628/Default.aspx>

Nigeria Alternative Energy Expo: The Nigeria Alternative Energy Expo will bring together renewable energy and power professionals, government and civil society representatives, as well as over 200 exhibiting companies from all over the world. It aims to: create a platform for all stakeholders to network and transfer knowledge and skills; raise awareness and educate the public about climate change; and showcase both local and international initiatives and technologies that are at the forefront of renewable energy and climate change resilience. **dates:** 29-31 October 2012 **location:** Cultural Centre Kuto, Abeokuta, Ogun State, Nigeria **contact:** Conference Organizers **phone:** +234-9-480-6271 **email:** info@nigeriaalternativeenergyexpo.org **www:** <http://www.nigeriaalternativeenergyexpo.org/>

Climate Investment Funds Partnership Forum and Associated Meetings: The Climate Investment Funds (CIF) and European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) are co-hosting the CIF 2012 Partnership Forum, on 6-7 November 2012, as well as associated meetings. The Forum will provide an opportunity for stakeholders to contribute to deepening global understanding of the linkages between climate change and development as they have been addressed within the context of the CIF. The Forum will be preceded by Pilot Country meetings for all CIF programs (the Clean Technology Fund, the Forest Investment Program, the Pilot Program for Climate Resilience,

and the Program for Scaling-Up Renewable Energy in Low Income Countries), from 30 October-1 November, and a Private Sector Forum, on 5 November. **dates:** 30 October - 7 November 2012 **location:** Istanbul, Turkey **contact:** CIF Administrative Unit **email:** cifevents@worldbank.org **www:** http://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/partnership_forum_2012_home

World Energy Outlook 2012 Launch: The International Energy Agency (IEA) will launch its flagship publication, the World Energy Outlook (WEO) 2012. The WEO-2012 will include analysis and insights into global energy market trends and their meaning for energy security, environmental protection and economic development. It will also contain updated forecasts to 2035 of energy production and demand, investment, trade and emissions, broken down by country, fuel and sector. The WEO-2012 will also investigate specific strategic energy issues, including: “golden rules” for the coming “Golden Age of Gas,” an in-depth examination of the value of improving energy efficiency; the increasing importance of the water-energy nexus; climate feedbacks on energy trends; and the International Year of Sustainable Energy for All. **date:** 12 November 2012 **location:** Paris, France **contact:** Pawel Olejarnik, IEA **phone:** +33-1-40-57-67-57 **email:** pawel.olejarnik@iea.org **www:** <http://www.worldenergyoutlook.org/publications/weo-2012/>

70th Meeting of the CDM Executive Board: The 70th meeting of the CDM Executive Board precedes UNFCCC COP 18/CMP 8. **dates:** 19-23 November 2012 **location:** Doha, Qatar **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

Bogota Summit: Cities and Climate Change: Organized by the Mayor of Bogota, with support from the Latin American Development Bank, the French Embassy, the French Development Agency (AFD), Avina Foundation, FINDETER bank, the El Tiempo news group, UN-HABITAT and others, this summit aims to bring together experts, finance organizations, international organizations and Latin American regional, national and municipal leaders to discuss concrete actions Latin American cities can take to mitigate and adapt to climate change and convert them into resilient, low-carbon cities. The conference will include a series of thematic debates and workshops on key issues, such as housing density, sustainable construction, energy efficiency, water services, risk management and mobility management. **dates:** 19-21 November 2012 **location:** Bogota, Colombia **contact:** Eleonora Betancur, International Affairs, Office of the Mayor **email:** ebetancur@alcaldiabogota.gov.co **www:** <http://www.ciudadesycambioclimatico.org/>

14th meeting of the CDM DNA Forum: The 14th meeting of the CDM Designated National Authorities (DNA) Forum will be held in late November. **dates:** 24 -25 November 2012 **location:** Doha, Qatar **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

UNFCCC COP 18: The 18th session of the Conference of the Parties (COP 18) to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the eighth session of the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP 8), among other associated meetings, are scheduled to take place in Doha, Qatar. **dates:** 26 November - 7 December 2012 **location:** Doha, Qatar **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/meetings/doha_nov_2012/meeting/6815.php

GLOSSARY

ADP	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action
AAUs	Assigned Amount Units
ALBA	Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America
AOSIS	Alliance of Small Island States
AWG-KP	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol
AWG-LCA	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention
BAP	Bali Action Plan
BASIC	Brazil, South Africa, India and China
CBDR	Common but Differentiated Responsibilities
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
COP	Conference of the Parties
CMP	Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol
CTCN	Climate Technology Centre and Network
GCF	Green Climate Fund
EIG	Environmental Integrity Group
EITs	Economies in Transition
HFCs	Hydrofluorocarbons
IPRs	Intellectual Property Rights
LDCs	Least Developed Countries
MRV	Measuring, reporting and verification
NAMAs	Nationally appropriate mitigation actions
QELROs	Quantified Emissions Limitation and Reduction Commitments
REDD+	Reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries, and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries
SBI	Subsidiary Body for Implementation
SBSTA	Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice
SICA	Central American Integration System
TEC	Technology Executive Committee
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change