



BONN CLIMATE CHANGE CONFERENCE: SATURDAY, 6 JUNE 2015

The Bonn Climate Change Conference continued on Saturday, 6 June. ADP facilitated groups convened on: adaptation and mitigation in the morning; finance, technology, and implementation and compliance in the afternoon; and transparency in the evening. The TEM on accelerating energy efficiency action in urban environments continued in the morning.

A contact group convened under the SBI in the morning, and informal consultations under the SBI and SBSTA met throughout the day. The in-session SBI/SBSTA/Standing Committee on Finance (SCF) workshop on methodologies for reporting of financial information by Annex I parties took place in the morning.

ADP

FACILITATED GROUPS: Mitigation: Focusing on paragraph 21 on mitigation commitments/contributions/actions, co-facilitator Franz Perrez proposed identifying and documenting the concepts of each sub-paragraph in a table. The US and the EU suggested parties present their submissions on how to cluster this paragraph.

Parties engaged in a procedural discussion, with some preferring to address the key concepts in each sub-paragraph, including using the co-facilitators' suggested concepts as a starting point. Some countries supported identifying concepts, followed by the sub-paragraphs that contain those concepts.

Parties then discussed paragraphs 21 and 21.1, using the co-facilitators' suggested concepts presented in a table format as a starting point.

On the chapeau of paragraph 21, BRAZIL identified legal strength, differentiation and references to articles of the Convention as key concepts. Chile, for AILAC, identified "anchoring" as a concept encapsulated by the term "national schedule."

SOUTH AFRICA suggested using the verbs in the paragraph as "shorthand." CHINA proposed clustering into two groups: options 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6; and options 3 and 7. The US preferred only having "establishment of commitments/contributions/actions."

On paragraph 21.1 on quantifiability, BRAZIL suggested quantifiability, comparability and transparency. CHINA identified a number of elements, including differentiation. INDIA stressed historical responsibilities. The US called for focusing on one or two concepts. ARGENTINA suggested differentiating between "what" and "how" elements.

TUVALU, supported by JAPAN and KENYA, expressed concern over entering into negotiations on the table's content, with co-facilitator Perrez assuring the table has no legal status. The UNITED ARAB EMIRATES proposed mandating the co-facilitators to develop a middle ground proposal.

AUSTRALIA suggested creating a new column in the table on linkages within the section. CHINA opposed "tearing apart" paragraphs. Co-facilitator Perrez proposed, and parties agreed, that the co-facilitators will prepare a table containing parties' proposals on concepts and linkages, as well as proposals on the sequencing of paragraphs to be made available on Monday, 8 June.

Adaptation: Co-facilitator Andrea Guerrero facilitated discussions, which focused on three clustering proposals from: the G-77/China; the EU; and Australia, Canada, Japan, New Zealand, Norway and the US.

After a lengthy discussion on the mode of work, parties agreed to: identify sub-themes in each paragraph; indicate these in a table column, with the understanding that the themes and sub-themes will be removed later on; and avoid splitting the paragraphs that contain more than one sub-theme.

On how to label the themes in some of the sections' paragraphs, the US pointed to large convergence among the three proposals for clustering and suggested bundling all paragraphs labeled as "support." After informal consultations among all parties, the G-77/CHINA proposed, and parties agreed, to task the co-facilitators with re-organizing the section based on the three proposals and comments made during the session.

The G-77/CHINA noted the importance of maintaining linkages among paragraphs, as well as essential elements on principles and support. He also identified the possibility of collapsing some sub-themes, including on NAPs and commitments to undertake adaptation measures, and quantitative and qualitative aspects. CANADA preferred keeping the quantitative and qualitative sub-themes separate. The EU underlined the need not to leave any party behind.

While supporting the G-77/China proposal, TANZANIA and EGYPT expressed unease with the process, worrying that the different pace and methodologies of the facilitated groups could lead to inconsistencies. CHILE, supported by the US, stated that, while the facilitated groups may advance at different speeds, they shared the common purpose of making the Geneva text more workable.

Co-facilitator Guerrero indicated that all co-facilitators coordinate regularly to ensure the production of coherent results.

Finance: Co-facilitator Georg Børsting led discussions paragraph-by-paragraph, collecting input on how to further streamline and consolidate the text.

The US suggested moving paragraph 79 on guiding principles under contributions/commitments/actions, with Bolivia, for G-77/CHINA noting its proposal, option 5, belongs under guiding principles.

The US and EU supported moving paragraph 81 on reduced support to high-carbon investments under commitments/contributions/actions.



On paragraphs 83 on cooperating in the implementation of the agreement, and 84 on a common transparency framework, the EU, opposed by BOLIVIA, speaking on their own behalf, proposed moving both under commitments/contributions/actions. SWITZERLAND, supported by BELIZE, said paragraph 84 should be grouped with paragraphs on transparency.

The US viewed paragraph 85 on efforts of non-state actors as belonging to contributions/commitments/actions.

The EU suggested paragraph 86 on clarity on scaling up of resources be put under scalable resources. SWITZERLAND, supported by NAURU, suggested placing the paragraph under dynamic elements.

The G-77/CHINA suggested moving paragraph 87 on a process for periodic reviews, and paragraph 88 on an MRV of support mechanisms, to the objectives. AUSTRALIA suggested consolidating paragraph 88 with paragraph 84. The US said paragraph 88 could be in the transparency section of the Geneva text.

On paragraph 89 on the Financial Mechanism, PANAMA, supported by SWITZERLAND, suggested moving text on the SCF to paragraph 90 on new institutional arrangements.

The G-77/CHINA proposed text to consolidate paragraphs 91 and 92 on scaling up climate finance to provide MOI and on the scale of resources. NORWAY and the EU opposed, saying the content and context of the paragraphs are different.

Parties then agreed to task the co-facilitators with producing a streamlined text that takes into consideration the views of parties submitted during the meeting and in writing.

Technology: Co-facilitator Tosi Mpanu Mpanu facilitated the session. Parties agreed to consolidate paragraph 132.5 on developing countries assessing their technology needs with support of developed countries.

During discussion on placement of text, many agreed paragraph 132.6 on global collaboration would be better placed in the agreement than in a decision. TUVALU, with INDIA, opposed by AUSTRALIA, supported anchoring existing institutions in the agreement.

South Africa, for the AFRICAN GROUP, proposed text to replace a placeholder for paragraph 131 on a framework for scaling up technology development and transfer.

The US and INDIA supported holding a conversation on text on intellectual property rights and a long-term technology goal.

On paragraph 129 on a long-term technology goal, CHINA explained it would help motivate and develop a technology "circulation process." NEW ZEALAND opposed the long-term goal, saying that technology is better understood as an enabler to achieve the Convention's objective. The US asked for clarification on language on suggested regular assessments of ready-to-transfer technologies. Parties agreed to continue discussions on the issues raised.

Implementation and Compliance: This session was facilitated by co-facilitator Sarah Baashan, and focused on the proposals for unpacking this section made by Australia, the EU, Colombia, for AILAC, and China, for the LMDCs.

Parties engaged in a question and answer session on these proposals. Tuvalu, for the LDCs, with the LMDCs, AILAC and JAPAN, suggested that the co-facilitators combine the proposals into a document.

The EU, supported by INDIA, questioned the usefulness of the exercise, stressing the proposals' different purposes. AILAC suggested, and parties agreed, that the co-facilitators identify the commonalities among the proposals and synthesize them.

Sudan, for the AFRICAN GROUP, supported by AILAC and the LDCs, called for restructuring the section before deciding what to transfer to decision text. The co-facilitators will prepare a synthesis of the proposals and comments made before the group's next session.

TEM ON ACCELERATING ENERGY EFFICIENCY ACTION IN URBAN ENVIRONMENTS: Accelerating Implementation of Scalable, Replicable and Transformative

Actions in Urban Environments: Three separate parallel break-out groups considered: lighting and district energy systems in cities; energy-efficient buildings; and sustainable urban transport.

More and Faster Energy Efficient Action Now Through the "Accelerator Partnerships": Turning Potential into Action on the Ground: Participants heard reports from the break-out groups.

On lighting and district energy systems in cities, moderator John Christensen, UN Environment Programme, reported on presentations on: operating district cooling networks in Paris, France; a pilot project on district energy systems in Rajkot, India; lighting and district energy systems in Catalonia, Spain; and financing energyefficiency projects in urban environments in Latin America.

On energy efficient buildings, moderator James Drinkwater, World Green Building Council, reported on presentations on: a legal framework for implementing a green buildings policy in Tshwane, South Africa; legislation on green roofs in Recife, Brazil; the Energy Freedom Project in Byron Bay, Australia; VELUX's perspective on ways to advance energy efficiency policies and actions; and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development's experience with solutions in buildings, energy and resource efficiency.

On sustainable urban transport, moderator Karl Peet, Partnership on Sustainable Low Carbon Transport, reported on presentations on: a sustainable urban transport programme in Bogor, Indonesia; electrified public transport; mode choice in urban transport, fuel use and emissions; and the Global Fuel Economy Initiative.

During discussions, participants debated the potential role of the UNFCCC process in harnessing untapped potential in energy efficiency, implementing policies, and scaling-up existing implementation efforts. They also addressed next steps in the technical examination of policies, actions and technologies for accelerating energy efficiency action in urban environments.

SUBSIDIARY BODIES

SBSTA/SBI/SCF WORKSHOP ON REPORTING OF FINANCIAL INFORMATION: Seyni Nafo (Mali) and Roger Dungan (New Zealand) co-facilitated the workshop. Participants observed discrepancies and a lack of transparency in reporting on climate finance, and linkages to ADP transparency framework discussions.

They suggested focusing work on, *inter alia*, instructions on the application of the biennial report common tabular format (CTF) and modifications to the CTF, and simplified verification formats for cataloging support received and reported by non-Annex I parties.

IN THE CORRIDORS

On Saturday, the multiple parallel meetings seemed to deliver disparate results. Leaps were made under some of the SB items, with one delegate characterizing Friday evening's informal discussions on agriculture as "the best ever in this process." The various groups working on the ADP negotiating text, instead, continued to proceed at different paces.

Commenting on the dozens of proposals submitted over the last two days on how to reorganize the ADP negotiating text for the new agreement, one observer worried that "parties may not be bickering on which text to negotiate as last year, but they are definitely struggling to move ahead."

Some negotiating groups entrusted their co-facilitators with the delicate task of clustering sections of the text around themes. Noting that on some issues parties' expectations were clearer than on others, one delegate hoped that the break on Sunday would be useful to "regroup our thoughts, as well as regroup our text."