

SUMMARY OF THE BONN CLIMATE CHANGE CONFERENCE: 1-11 JUNE 2015

The Bonn Climate Change Conference under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) convened in Bonn, Germany, from 1-11 June 2015, and included the 42nd sessions of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) and the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA). The ninth part of the second session of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP 2-9) also took place. The meeting brought together nearly 4,000 participants, representing parties and observer states, international organizations, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and media.

ADP 2-9 convened in negotiating groups and facilitated groups that undertook streamlining and consolidation, clustering and conceptual discussions of the Geneva negotiating text (FCCC/ADP/2015/1), including on: general/objective; adaptation and loss and damage; mitigation; finance; technology development and transfer; capacity building; transparency; preamble; definitions; time frames; implementation and compliance; and procedural and institutional provisions. The ADP also discussed workstream 2.

The groups streamlined and/or consolidated options and paragraphs within the text, began the process of clustering options and undertook conceptual discussions. Under workstream 2, Technical Expert Meetings (TEMs) on energy efficiency in urban environments and renewable energy supply convened.

SBI 42 made progress on, *inter alia*, matters relating to the mechanisms under the Kyoto Protocol, capacity building, Convention Article 6 (education, training and public awareness) and administrative, financial and institutional matters. The SBI forwarded draft decisions for consideration by the 21st session of the Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC (COP 21) and the 11th session of the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP 11) on matters relating to the least developed countries (LDCs), Convention Article 6 and the programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017.

SBSTA 42 also advanced its work, among other things, by closing the agenda item on methodological guidance for 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 (REDD+); and by adopting conclusions on response measures, forwarding substantive draft decisions for consideration at COP 21, taking place in December 2015, in Paris, France.

A workshop on long-term finance under the COP took place on Thursday and Friday, 4-5 June. A summary of the workshop is available at: <http://www.iisd.ca/climate/sb42/enbots/4jun.html#event1> and <http://www.iisd.ca/climate/sb42/enbots/5jun.html#event1>

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE UNFCCC AND THE KYOTO PROTOCOL

The international political response to climate change began with the adoption, in 1992, of the UNFCCC, which sets out a legal framework for stabilizing atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases (GHGs) to avoid “dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system.” The Convention, which entered into force on 21 March 1994, has 196 parties.

IN THIS ISSUE

A Brief History of the UNFCCC and the Kyoto Protocol . . .	1
Report of the Meetings	3
<i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action	3
Subsidiary Body for Implementation	12
Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice	17
A Brief Analysis of the Bonn Climate Change Conference	22
Upcoming Meetings	23
Glossary	24



In December 1997, delegates to COP 3 in Kyoto, Japan, agreed to a protocol to the UNFCCC that committed industrialized countries and countries in transition to a market economy to achieve emission reduction targets. These countries, known as Annex I parties under the UNFCCC, agreed to reduce their overall emissions of six GHGs by an average of 5% below 1990 levels in 2008-2012 (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, 2005-2009: Convening in Montreal, Canada, in 2005, CMP 1 decided to establish the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Annex I Parties' Further Commitments under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP) in accordance with Protocol Article 3.9, which mandates consideration of Annex I parties' further commitments at least seven years before the end of the first commitment period.

In December 2007, COP 13 and CMP 3 in Bali, Indonesia, resulted in agreement on the Bali Roadmap on long-term issues. COP 13 adopted the Bali Action Plan (BAP) and established the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention (AWG-LCA), with a mandate to focus on mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology, capacity building and a shared vision for long-term cooperative action. Negotiations on Annex I parties' further commitments continued under the AWG-KP. The deadline for concluding the two-track negotiations was in 2009 at COP15 in Copenhagen.

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. 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, and to extend the mandates of the negotiating groups until COP 16 and CMP 6 in 2010. In 2010, over 140 countries indicated support for the Accord. More than 80 countries also provided information on their national mitigation targets or actions.

CANCUN: The UN Climate Change Conference in Cancun, Mexico, took place in December 2010, where parties finalized the Cancun Agreements and extended the mandates of the two AWGs for another year. Under the Convention track, Decision 1/CP.16 (The Cancun Agreements) recognized the need for deep cuts in global emissions in order to limit the global average temperature rise to 2°C above pre-industrial levels. Parties agreed to consider the adequacy of the global long-term goal during a 2013-2015 review, which would also consider strengthening the goal, including in relation to a temperature rise of 1.5°C. 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, the Adaptation Committee and the Technology Mechanism, which includes the Technology Executive Committee (TEC) and the Climate Technology Centre and

Network (CTCN). The Green Climate Fund (GCF) was created and designated as an operating entity of the Convention's financial mechanism.

Under the Protocol track, the CMP urged Annex I parties to raise the level of ambition of their emission reductions, and adopted Decision 2/CMP.6 on land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF).

DURBAN: The UN Climate Change Conference in Durban, South Africa, took place in November and December 2011. The Durban outcomes covered a wide range of topics, notably the agreement to establish a second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol from 2013 to 2020, a decision on long-term cooperative action under the Convention and agreement on the operationalization of the GCF. Parties also agreed to launch the 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 ADP is scheduled to complete these negotiations by 2015, with the new instrument entering into force in 2020. In addition, the ADP was mandated to explore actions to close the pre-2020 ambition gap in relation to the 2°C target.

DOHA: The UN Climate Change Conference in Doha, Qatar, took place in November and December 2012. The conference resulted in a package of decisions, referred to as the Doha Climate Gateway. These included amendments to the Kyoto Protocol to establish its second commitment period and agreement to terminate the AWG-KP's work in Doha. Parties also agreed to terminate the AWG-LCA and negotiations under the BAP. A number of issues requiring further consideration were forwarded to the SBI and SBSTA, such as: the 2013-2015 review of the global goal; developed and developing country mitigation; the Kyoto Protocol's flexibility mechanisms; national adaptation plans (NAPs); MRV; market and non-market mechanisms; and REDD+.

WARSAW: The UN Climate Change Conference in Warsaw, Poland, took place in November 2013. Negotiations focused on the implementation of agreements reached at previous meetings, including pursuing the work of the ADP. The meeting adopted an ADP decision that, *inter alia*, invites parties to initiate or intensify domestic preparations for their intended nationally determined contributions (INDCs). Parties also adopted a decision establishing the Warsaw International Mechanism on Loss and Damage, and the Warsaw Framework for REDD+—a series of seven decisions on REDD+ finance, institutional arrangements and methodological issues.

LIMA: The UN Climate Change Conference in Lima, Peru, took place in December 2014. Negotiations focused on outcomes under the ADP necessary to advance toward an agreement at COP 21 in Paris in 2015, including elaboration of the information and process for submission of INDCs as early as possible in 2015, and progress on elements of a draft negotiating text. Following lengthy negotiations, COP 20 adopted the Lima Call for Climate Action, which sets in motion the negotiations toward a 2015 agreement, including the process for submitting and reviewing INDCs. The decision also addresses enhancing pre-2020 ambition.

Parties also adopted 19 decisions, 17 under the COP and two under the CMP that, *inter alia*: help operationalize the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage; establish the Lima work programme on gender; and adopt the Lima Ministerial Declaration on Education and Awareness-raising. The Lima Climate Change Conference was able to lay the groundwork for Paris by capturing progress made in elaborating the elements of a draft negotiating text for the 2015 agreement and adopting a decision on INDCs, including their scope, necessary upfront information, and steps to be taken by the Secretariat after their submission.

ADP 2-8: ADP 2-8 took place in February 2015, in Geneva, Switzerland. The objective of the session, as mandated by COP 20, was to develop the negotiating text based on the elements for a draft negotiating text annexed to Decision 1/CP.20 (Lima Call for Climate Action). The Geneva negotiating text (FCCC/ADP/2015/1) adopted at ADP 2-8 is serving as the basis for negotiations on the 2015 agreement.

REPORT OF THE MEETINGS

The Bonn Climate Change Conference opened on Monday morning, 1 June. UNFCCC Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres said this session should be seen as “a construction site” for the Subsidiary Bodies and the ADP to pave the way for the 2015 agreement.

In a recorded video address, COP 20/CMP 10 President Manuel Pulgar-Vidal, Minister of Environment, Peru, stated that the Paris outcome could include: a legally binding core instrument; a target for carbon neutrality; a process for the regular communication of nationally determined contributions (NDCs); a long-term qualitative goal for adaptation; substantial progress on climate finance; provisions on loss and damage; and the launch of a global effort to scale up technology and capacity building.

Incoming COP 21/CMP 11 President Laurent Fabius, Foreign Minister, France, urged progress on: distinguishing what will be included in the agreement versus COP decisions; determining the major political issues that ministers must decide upon; and preparing a decision on pre-2020 action for adoption in Paris.

The work of ADP 2-9, SBSTA 42 and SBI 42 are summarized below.

AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON THE DURBAN PLATFORM FOR ENHANCED ACTION

On Monday, 1 June, ADP Co-Chair Daniel Reifsnnyder (US) opened ADP 2-9. France and Peru reported on open-ended informal dialogues that took place in March and May 2015, and Germany reported on the 6th Petersberg Dialogue held in May 2015.

Following the opening plenary, the ADP convened in two negotiating groups. Co-Chair Reifsnnyder chaired the negotiating group that considered: general/objective; adaptation and loss and damage; technology development and transfer; transparency of action and support; implementation and compliance; and preamble. ADP Co-Chair Ahmed Djoghlaif (Algeria) chaired the negotiating group that addressed: mitigation; finance; capacity

building; time frames; procedural and institutional provisions; and definitions.

The negotiating groups undertook the first reading of these sections of the Geneva negotiating text (FCCC/ADP/2015/1), identifying paragraphs that could be streamlined and consolidated. The work of consolidating was then taken up in informal facilitated discussion groups.

The ADP contact group convened on Thursday, 4 June, to assess progress. During the session Co-Chair Djoghlaif noted parties’ concerns over the slow pace of the deliberations, lack of clarity on the method of work of the facilitated groups and limited coordination time for party groups. He emphasized, however, that the “mechanism” was working and progress was being made, and proposed continuing work in facilitated groups.

He reiterated that the Geneva text remains the only official document, with other documents being issued as non-papers. Following discussion on the uneven pace of progress on the different sections, and on how to best use the remaining time in Bonn, parties agreed to continue negotiations in facilitated groups. The facilitated groups worked on the basis of the Co-Facilitators’ inputs and the Co-Facilitators issued an output following each session. Working documents that captured the outcomes of discussions on specific paragraphs within the text were issued on a regular basis. A streamlined and consolidated text, which incorporates the work carried out by the negotiating groups and the informal facilitated discussion groups, was issued on 4 June to further guide negotiations.

Most facilitated groups then undertook an exercise to cluster, unpack and/or consider the placement of text, including with the help of tables. Some facilitated groups continued consideration of how to further streamline and consolidate the text, while others progressed to conceptual discussions.

On Monday, 8 June, a contact group meeting assessed the outcomes of the work of the facilitated groups during the first week. Discussions centered around consistency across facilitated groups, the need for clear guidance on the mode of work, and how and whether to identify text to be included in the agreement versus in decisions. Many called for the ADP Co-Chairs to capture parties’ inputs and the work in facilitated groups by producing a concise, coherent text with clear options to serve as the basis for negotiations.

The contact group also discussed the structure of draft decision 1/CP.21 (“the Paris package”), with parties identifying elements the decision should include, *inter alia*: adoption of the 2015 agreement; interim arrangements; recognition of INDCs; guidance on implementation of the agreement; a work plan for the period 2015-2020; budgetary and administrative matters; and MRV and accounting systems. Parties also called for progress on workstream 2.

Parties agreed to continue negotiations in facilitated groups. ADP Co-Chair Djoghlaif said the Co-Chairs would report back after the meeting with the Secretariat and the Co-Facilitators to discuss how to produce a streamlined text as requested by parties.

On Monday, 8 June, a second streamlined and consolidated text, which incorporated work undertaken by the facilitated groups, was issued. On Tuesday, 9 June, a document comparing

the numbering of the Geneva negotiating text, and the streamlined and consolidated text was issued to facilitate negotiations.

Throughout the second week the facilitated groups variously addressed conceptual issues, undertook further streamlining/consolidation, and considered how to cluster or link issues.

Discussions on specific sections of the Geneva negotiating text undertaken by the negotiating and facilitated groups are summarized below, followed by the outcomes of the final ADP contact group, including how to take the work of the ADP forward. New versions of the streamlined and consolidated text and a compilation working document, explaining the outputs of the work on the sections of the text, were issued on 11 June.

PREAMBLE: The first reading of section A (Preamble), containing 41 paragraphs in the Geneva negotiating text, commenced on Wednesday, 3 June. Canada and the US, opposed by Pakistan and India, said this section should be considered at a later stage. China proposed a technical streamlining and discussion on “mature” preamble paragraphs.

Parties considered opportunities for consolidation, as identified by the Secretariat, and agreed to forward five paragraphs to an informal facilitated discussion group, co-facilitated by George Wamukoya (Kenya) and Aya Yoshida (Japan), for streamlining and/or consolidation. A summary of discussions related to specific paragraphs is available at: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12631e.html>

On Monday, 8 June, delegates considered a table presented by the Secretariat, which clustered paragraphs around a number of issues. On the clusters, China identified themes missing from the table including: response measures; sustainable development; health; the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties; the Durban mandate; and implementation of the Convention. Bolivia called for including Mother Earth and indigenous peoples as themes. The EU identified low-carbon transitions and land use as missing themes.

Some parties emphasized the preamble should be short, with parties supporting or opposing using the format of the preamble in the Kyoto Protocol. Saudi Arabia noted the preamble needed to be either concise or comprehensive. Argentina identified some paragraphs that might be better placed in the general/objective section. Many parties noted the need to return to preambular discussions once the content and shape of the agreement is clearer.

The Co-Facilitators explained they will “clean up,” and reflect parties’ views in the table and noted views on the timing of preambular discussions.

DEFINITIONS: Section B (Definitions) was not taken up during this negotiating session.

GENERAL/OBJECTIVE: On Monday, 1 June, the first reading of section C (General/Objective), which comprises 16 paragraphs in the Geneva negotiating text, commenced in the negotiating group. Parties agreed to identify “low-hanging fruit” within the section for consolidating and streamlining.

Co-Chair Reifsnyder noted the need to address the “meta” question of whether this section should exist at all. Saudi Arabia and Malaysia, for the Like Minded Developing Countries (LMDCs), stressed that the section is not necessary.

Peru, for the Independent Alliance of Latin America and the Caribbean (AILAC), Tuvalu, for the LDCs, Mexico, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay and the Russian Federation emphasized the section contextualizes the agreement’s objective.

Parties identified four paragraphs for mechanical streamlining or consolidation by the informal facilitated discussion group co-facilitated by Diann Black-Layne (Antigua and Barbuda) and Artur Runge-Metzger (European Union). A summary of discussions related to specific paragraphs is available at: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12629e.html>

On Wednesday, 9 June, Co-Facilitator Black-Layne presented a Co-Facilitators’ table “mapping the section,” with topics and the paragraphs they are addressed in.

Many parties requested a table column with linkages to other sections in the Geneva negotiating text, and inclusion of sub-paragraph references. The European Union (EU) noted the table does not include a just transition to low-GHG economies, and, with India, gender equality. China suggested using the terms “differentiated commitments/contributions.” The US preferred retaining “commitments/contributions/action.”

A number of parties called for a balanced approach, including enhanced adaptation action and means of implementation (MOI), with the LDCs calling for setting out short- and long-term goals on GHG concentrations and temperature stabilization. Many said the section should be concise. Brazil added it should set out legal obligations with details to be clarified in other sections.

On general principles, Sudan highlighted common but differentiated responsibilities (CBDR), leadership by developed countries, and special circumstances. Malaysia and India emphasized MOI in the context of equity and historical responsibility. Bolivia cautioned against implying transfer of responsibilities to non-state actors, and called for referencing the global carbon budget and Mother Earth.

The Co-Facilitators reported they would capture parties’ inputs in a revised version of the table and inform the Co-Chairs of discussions.

MITIGATION: The first reading section D (Mitigation), containing 33 paragraphs in the Geneva negotiating text, commenced on Monday, 1 June in the negotiating group chaired by Co-Chair Djoghlaif.

Parties undertook mechanical streamlining and consolidation of several paragraphs, and continued in an informal facilitated discussion group, co-facilitated by Franz Perrez (Switzerland) and Fook Seng Kwok (Singapore). A summary of discussions on specific paragraphs is available at: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12629e.html>

On Thursday, 4 June, parties began “unpacking paragraphs” in a facilitated group, identifying linkages to other sections. Discussions focused on issues of accounting, land use, the use of markets and institutional arrangements for markets. Parties also addressed general principles in the agreement and leaving details to decisions.

The EU presented a proposal on general accounting principles. Kenya, for the African Group, opposed considering accounting, suggesting it is better placed under transparency. Brazil cautioned against clustering accounting and market issues, suggesting accounting relates to transparency and compliance.

Chile, for AILAC, suggested sub-issues under the use of market mechanisms could be “shuffled” at a later stage. Saudi Arabia and Venezuela opposed discussing markets at this stage, with Bolivia calling for including non-market-based approaches.

Saint Lucia, for the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS), noted linkages among market use, the compliance system, net benefits and eligibility rules to ensure environmental integrity, and recognized the potential to cluster: purpose of market mechanisms and principles for their use; accounting of market transfers; elaboration of further rules; and consistent use of estimation methodologies, adjustments and common metrics.

Parties considered clustering paragraphs to increase clarity of the text on Saturday, 6 June, and on Tuesday and Wednesday, 9 and 10 June, aided by a “technical tool,” which suggested concepts in a table continuously revised by the Co-Facilitators.

The African Group presented its proposal to structure the section around: a long-term global goal on mitigation; individual commitments; characteristics; arrangements/mechanisms; and mandate/authority for the governing body. Bolivia called for including the 1.5°C or 2°C limit, and opposed addressing markets and land use. Brazil cautioned against reopening negotiations on REDD+, which he viewed as linked to the finance section. Saudi Arabia called for including the issue of equity.

Parties noted some issues could fit under multiple headings, supported Brazil’s proposal to clarify options on differentiation and discussed placement of text in the core agreement versus decisions. Several parties, including China, Saudi Arabia, for the Arab Group, South Africa and AILAC noted it is premature to discuss placement.

Many parties agreed that paragraphs containing evolving elements should be in COP decisions. Tuvalu noted the need to differentiate between decisions to be taken prior to the entry into force of the agreement and those taken thereafter. Many suggested launching a work programme for adopting decisions to operationalize the agreement.

Australia suggested addressing interim arrangements and how they fit into decisions. The EU emphasized that mitigation commitments should be in the agreement. Norway and Brazil suggested markets be anchored in the agreement and details on markets be expressed in decisions.

The US suggested that carbon neutrality, low-emission development strategies and the long-term temperature goal be treated in decisions. Saint Lucia, supported by AILAC, opposed, stressing the long-term temperature goal should be in the agreement.

New Zealand underlined that durable elements need to be addressed in the agreement and that all parties must be transparent in reporting on delivery of commitments to build trust.

Co-Facilitator Perez explained discussions on the Co-Facilitators’ “technical tool,” which was introduced to facilitate clustering, and all inputs from parties would be conveyed to the ADP Co-Chairs.

ADAPTATION AND LOSS AND DAMAGE: The first reading of section E (Adaptation and Loss and Damage), containing 27 paragraphs in the Geneva negotiating text, commenced on Monday, 1 June, in the negotiating group co-chaired by Co-Chair Reifsnnyder.

During the first reading of the text, parties discussed how to approach streamlining. A number of parties supported addressing the text thematically, with Bolivia, for the Group of 77 and China (G-77/China), and Jamaica, for AOSIS, proposing to start with text on monitoring and evaluation. The EU suggested beginning with text on commitments.

Timor Leste proposed streamlining the section on loss and damage. AOSIS called for considering adaptation as separate from loss and damage.

Delegates agreed to consider options to streamline the text on adaptation in the context of an informal facilitated discussion group, co-facilitated by Andrea Guerrero (Colombia) and Georg Børsting (Norway), starting with text on: reporting for adaptation; commitments; and monitoring and evaluation.

A clustering exercise commenced on Thursday, 4 June, in the facilitated group. Co-Facilitator Guerrero proposed a methodology for clustering issues, presenting a table with columns for themes, paragraphs and text. Parties discussed this methodology, making suggestions for possible clustering themes.

Responding to concerns that the table would result in some parties’ views being left behind or be construed as parties’ positions, Co-Facilitator Guerrero stressed that the table was an internal tool for tracking progress. Parties agreed to work on the basis of the table and to submit their views on the themes.

On Saturday, 6 June, the facilitated group focused on three clustering proposals from: the G-77/China; the EU; and Australia, Canada, Japan, New Zealand, Norway and the US.

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, that the Co-Facilitators reorganize the section based on the three proposals and discussions.

Tanzania and Egypt expressed unease that the different pace and methodologies of the facilitated groups could lead to inconsistencies. Chile, for AILAC, 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.

On Thursday, 11 June, the final meeting of the facilitated group considered the Co-Facilitators’ working document capturing the agreed consolidations and parties’ proposals for clustering. Parties expressed views on the themes and categorization used and noted options that seemed to have been omitted or changed.

Argentina, opposed by the EU, stated the previous version of the text was more useful, suggesting both versions could serve as the basis for negotiations at the next ADP meeting. Many parties said the document was a “step in the right direction.”

Tuvalu, for the LDCs, asked that the view that loss and damage should be a separate section be clearly reflected. The EU called for a separate option clearly indicating that loss and damage should not be included in the agreement.

Parties agreed that the Co-Facilitators would revise the document to reflect the options for including, or not, a section on loss and damage, as well as other views raised. It was also agreed to include a note indicating the status of the document as, *inter alia*, “facilitating discussion” and “not prejudging any outcomes.”

The output document dated 11 June will inform negotiations on the adaptation and loss and damage section going forward.

FINANCE: Section F (Finance), comprising 50 paragraphs in the Geneva negotiating text, was first taken up on Tuesday, 2 June, in a negotiating group chaired by Co-Chair Djoghla. Discussions centered around the G-77/China’s consolidation proposals under sub-sections on guiding principles and anchoring institutions under the legal agreement.

Discussions continued in an informal facilitated discussion group on 2-3 June, co-facilitated by Georg Børsting (Norway) and Diann Black-Layne (Antigua and Barbuda). The negotiating group’s discussions on specific paragraphs are summarized at: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12630e.html>

The streamlining and consolidating exercise continued on Friday, 5 June, in a facilitated group session, co-facilitated by Børsting and Black-Layne. A summary of the discussions on specific paragraphs is available at: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12633e.html>

Parties also discussed restructuring and clustering. The EU proposed clustering paragraphs according to the structural suggestion at the end of the finance section of the Geneva text. The US presented a proposal by Australia, Canada, Japan, New Zealand and the US on clustering around: guiding concepts; contributions/commitments/actions; institutions; and transparency and reporting processes. Switzerland, for the Environmental Integrity Group (EIG), supported grouping together paragraphs on transparency and reporting. The G-77/China preferred beginning substantive negotiations, saying clustering would follow naturally.

On Saturday, 6 June, Co-Facilitator Børsting led paragraph-by-paragraph discussions, collecting input on how to further reorganize, cluster and consolidate paragraphs. Parties agreed to task the Co-Facilitators with producing a streamlined text that takes into consideration the views of parties submitted during the meeting.

On Tuesday morning, 9 June, Co-Facilitator Børsting announced the revised text would be available after the session. All parties welcomed the streamlining work by the Co-Facilitators and the Secretariat, with many encouraging the Co-Facilitators to continue further streamlining the text. Parties discussed: the “flow” of the section; placement of paragraphs in decisions or the agreement; and treatment of finance in other sections.

On the logical flow of the text, Australia, supported by Canada, New Zealand, the US and the EIG, suggested placing paragraphs on contributions under the legal agreement before

those on the scale of resources. Brazil opposed, suggesting that, for developing countries, the most evident way of fulfilling the ADP’s mandate to enhance action is by addressing scale.

On identification of decision text, Bolivia, for the G-77/China, said this step should be preceded by a discussion on substance. Ecuador, for the LMDCs, stressed that first discussing placement would prejudice the negotiating outcome.

The EU proposed identifying paragraphs for different kinds of decisions. The EIG stated that discussions on “separation” may be premature but the agreement should be durable. New Zealand said elements in the agreement should be durable, future-focused and applicable to all parties.

On linkages, the G-77/China, said finance should be reflected in all relevant sections of the text. Bolivia, speaking on her country’s behalf, said finance is among the overarching goals of the 2015 agreement.

The US said finance-related paragraphs should be placed in the finance section. The EU called for not having operational details on finance in other sections. The EIG proposed a conceptual discussion on all finance-related paragraphs without shifting them.

Following distribution of the revised document, the facilitated group reconvened on Tuesday evening, 9 June, to discuss further streamlining the text.

Co-Facilitator Børsting explained how several paragraphs and sub-paragraphs had been consolidated, reorganized and unpacked, and that two paragraphs had been re-inserted from the Geneva text, based on parties’ requests. Parties provided input on the changes and made further proposals to streamline, reorganize, unpack and reinsert text in the section.

Noting slow progress, the US proposed holding a conceptual discussion or seeking to identify elements for convergence. South Africa suggested a discussion on what underlies parties’ proposals. The G-77/China supported a substantive discussion, suggesting this will enable parties to decide on placement of text in the agreement or decisions.

In the final facilitated group meeting on Wednesday, 10 June, Børsting presented a revised streamlined text. He proposed, and parties agreed, to present the text to the ADP Co-Chairs. Parties then engaged in a conceptual discussion to provide additional input to the Co-Chairs.

A number of developing countries described finance as an enabler for ambition. Brazil said the agreement should enhance current obligations while finding “creative ways to indicate that there will be actions from everyone.” New Zealand called for an agreement that delivers effective outcomes. The EU said the finance text should build on the Convention while “capturing the world as it is.”

On the scale and sources of resources, the G-77/China said clarity on scale is required to determine how developing countries will be able to contribute to the agreement. Belize, for AOSIS, called for a goal for climate finance that will keep temperature rise below 1.5°C. Many developing countries called for adequate and predictable support.

The EU stressed sending a signal to the private sector on the need to “shift the trillions” to low-carbon, climate-resilient development. Nauru suggested having a basic commitment

for all parties to provide sources for domestic action. Canada highlighted the need to maximize flows globally, noting contributions and actions should precede discussions on scale and sources.

India and Saudi Arabia, for the Arab Group, stressed public sources should be the main source. Mexico identified the need for all sources of finance. The EIG noted different circumstances require different instruments and sources.

Many countries, including Malawi, for the LDCs, New Zealand and the US, supported recognizing the specific circumstances of small island developing states (SIDS) and LDCs, including through direct access and readiness support.

TECHNOLOGY: The first reading of section G (Technology development and transfer), containing six paragraphs in the Geneva negotiating text, commenced on Tuesday, 2 June, in the negotiating group chaired by Co-Chair Reifsnnyder.

Parties considered the consolidation of several paragraphs. During discussions in an informal facilitated discussion group co-facilitated by Tosi Mpanu Mpanu (Democratic Republic of the Congo) and Artur Runge-Metzger (EU), delegates made some progress in consolidating the text on general provisions, commitments and institutional arrangements. A summary of the discussions on specific paragraphs is available at: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12630e.html>

On Friday, 5 June, parties continued considering the section's text in a facilitated group, based on the Co-Facilitators' proposal for streamlining.

Discussions focused on steps by developed countries to: leverage enhanced support from the private sector for technology development and transfer to developing countries; address barriers to accessing technology and know-how; and promote access to public-sector technology, and its development and transfer to developing countries.

Mexico, supported by the US and Australia, and opposed by South Africa, China and the United Arab Emirates, proposed changing reference to "developed country parties" to "all parties," noting that both developed and developing countries need to address barriers to technology transfer.

Parties suggested reorganizing the text around the following themes: support for the operationalization and delivery of commitments related to technology; enhanced cooperation and synergy with other institutions; and review of adequacy and effectiveness.

Tuvalu noted that "including provisions on accounting" and "specific needs of countries with special circumstances in Africa, the LDCs and SIDS" can be applied to all themes. Argentina cautioned against moving text from one "context" to another. India suggested taking note of text that parties consider applicable to all elements.

Parties discussed placement of text in the core agreement or decisions. Supported by Norway and Australia, the EU proposed to move text on strengthening the Technology Mechanism to decision text, noting that these issues are currently discussed under the COP. India, the UAE, China, Belize and Tuvalu opposed.

Parties continued discussions on placement, and began considering conceptual ideas on Saturday, 6 June, and Monday and Tuesday, 8 and 9 June.

Many agreed the issue of global collaboration should be placed in the agreement. Tuvalu, with India, opposed by Australia, supported anchoring existing institutions in the agreement. Sudan, for the African Group, proposed text on a framework for scaling up technology development and transfer, explaining it would provide a strategy to guide the Technology Mechanism.

Australia cautioned against duplication and "cementing" details that will evolve over time. The United Arab Emirates and Argentina stressed the importance of enhancing existing arrangements. India called for addressing barriers created by intellectual property rights.

Noting diverging views, the US and India supported holding a conversation on text on intellectual property rights and a long-term technology goal. China explained that such a goal would help motivate and develop a technology "circulation process," as well as enable reviewing the gap between provision of support and technology needs.

The US, the EU and New Zealand expressed concern over the proposal. The US called for clarifying language on suggested regular assessments of ready-to-transfer technologies. Japan cautioned against creating new obligations for parties, stressing that providing incentives to the private sector would be more effective.

During the final consideration of this item on 9 June, Norway and the US proposed, opposed by the G-77/China and South Africa, moving to conceptual discussions. The US, Norway and Australia suggested that text on strengthening the Technology Mechanism/institutional arrangements should be addressed in decision text. The G-77/China and South Africa said a discussion on which language should be included in decisions is beyond the group's mandate.

Co-Facilitator Mpanu Mpanu explained that all inputs from parties would be conveyed to the Co-Chairs.

CAPACITY BUILDING: The first reading of section H (Capacity-building), containing six paragraphs in the Geneva negotiating text, was conducted in the negotiating group chaired by Co-Chair Djoghlaflaf on Tuesday, 2 June.

Parties discussed a consolidation proposal by the Secretariat and considered consolidating text in three paragraphs. An informal facilitated discussion group, co-facilitated by Artur Runge-Metzger (EU) and Tosi Mpanu Mpanu (the Democratic Republic of the Congo), agreed to the consolidation proposals. A summary of the discussions on specific paragraphs is available at: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12630e.html>

A second reading of the text was undertaken in the facilitated group on 4 and 5 June. Going through the section paragraph-by-paragraph, parties identified paragraphs for streamlining and unpacking, and engaged in conceptual discussions on institutional arrangements for capacity building.

On Friday, 5 June, Co-Facilitator Runge-Metzger explained the group had progressed as far as possible on streamlining and structuring the text of the section. Parties initiated a

conceptual discussion to clarify parties' views on gaps in existing mechanisms, and the need for a new capacity-building institution.

Conceptual discussions, which continued on Monday and Tuesday, 8 and 9 June, addressed: gaps in the work of, and strengthening and improving, existing institutions; and the structure and function of, and rationale for, establishing a capacity-building mechanism.

Jamaica identified gaps in reporting on capacity-building activities and said CTCN efforts are focused on building capacity to participate in the CTCN. Burundi noted a lack of coordination among Convention bodies with a capacity-building component. Malaysia suggested that developing countries' capacity has mainly been enhanced with respect to reporting requirements.

The US identified the TEC, the CTCN and the Climate Technology Initiative Private Financing Advisory Network as means for capacity building. Saint Lucia and others said capacity building goes beyond technical aspects. Swaziland noted the mandate of the Technology Mechanism from Cancun does not match with that proposed in the text. Australia suggested national climate change capacity-building plans for articulating countries' needs.

The EU called for exploring: why existing bodies are "not delivering" on capacity building; ways to enhance collaboration between existing bodies; and how to strengthen the Durban Forum on Capacity-building.

Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Burundi and Senegal called for a governing body to coordinate capacity-building efforts, with Senegal emphasizing MRV of support to developing countries. The EU questioned the ability of such a body to address the identified gaps.

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

The US enquired how such an institution would coordinate all capacity-building activities globally, and recalled a previous discussion on MRV of support had indicated difficulties in measuring capacity-building support.

Discussions also examined linkages with related work under the SBI, including on the third comprehensive review of the implementation of the framework for capacity building. Parties agreed on the need for capacity building to be at the core of the Paris agreement.

During the final facilitated group session, parties suggested as next steps: clarification of parties' views on text options and sequencing; a third iteration of the text; holding a workshop; and a list by the Secretariat of existing institutions working on capacity building.

TRANSPARENCY: The first reading of section I (Transparency of action and support), spanning 20 paragraphs in the Geneva negotiating text, was conducted in the negotiating group chaired by Co-Chair Reifsnyder on Tuesday, 2 June.

He provided an overview of what he described as a "difficult" section of the Geneva negotiating text. Parties discussed a proposal by the Secretariat to consolidate text in four paragraphs, identifying a series of sub-paragraphs for consolidation and streamlining by an informal facilitated discussion group, co-facilitated by Franz Perrez (Switzerland) and Fook Seng Kwok (Singapore). A summary of the discussions on specific paragraphs is available at: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12630e.html>

Following the consolidation exercise, on Friday, 5 June, the facilitated group discussed ways forward, asking the Co-Facilitators to prepare a conceptual map of the section, based on parties' suggestions.

On Saturday, 6 June, the facilitated group considered the conceptual map prepared by the Co-Facilitators. On Monday, 8 June, guided by the conceptual map, the facilitated group considered ways to reformulate and clarify concepts in paragraph 141 on a transparency framework, with a view to unpacking different concepts and options.

After prolonged and inconclusive discussions on this paragraph, the group asked the Co-Facilitators to repackage paragraph 145 on a transparency framework, as an example to present options in a concise manner, without losing any substance and maintaining parties' positions. The group considered this illustrative example of "unpacking" and "repacking" options on Thursday, 11 June. The group expressed appreciation for the Co-Facilitators' work, noting that this exercise served as a meaningful "pilot" for "unpacking" and "repacking" the entire section. China, the EU and Saudi Arabia provided specific suggestions to improve the repackaging of the paragraph.

Using examples in paragraph 145, parties also discussed placement of text in the agreement or in COP decisions. While some parties found this exercise useful, others viewed it as premature at this stage. The group agreed to convey parties' suggestions and the lessons learned from this exercise to the Co-Chairs.

TIME FRAMES: The first reading of section J (Time frames and process related to commitments/contributions/Other matters related to implementation and ambition), containing 33 paragraphs in the Geneva negotiating text, commenced on Wednesday, 3 June, in the negotiating group chaired by Co-Chair Djoghlaflaf. New Zealand observed the structure of the section could be clarified, and noted, with the EU, the link between the sections on time frames and mitigation.

Following Co-Chair Djoghlaflaf's suggestion, parties focused on the mechanical streamlining and consolidation of several paragraphs. The exercise continued in an informal facilitated discussion group, co-facilitated by Roberto Dondisch (Mexico) and George Wamukoya (Kenya). A summary of the discussions on specific paragraphs is available at: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12631e.html>

During discussions in the facilitated group on Friday, 5 June, parties: considered a number of streamlining proposals presented by the LMDCs; expressed views on the placement of issues in

the agreement versus decisions; discussed differentiation; and heard proposals from the EU, the LMDCs and AILAC on how to cluster the text for conceptual and structural clarity.

On placement of text, the Marshall Islands, with Tuvalu, for the LDCs, and the US, emphasized that the aggregate ambition assessment should be part of the agreement, while specific modalities could be established in future decisions. India said the review of implementation should be addressed in post-Paris decisions, an option China requested to remain on the table. China stressed decisions on placement depend on agreement under all elements considered by the ADP.

On the purpose of the review/assessment/mechanism, the EU saw this best placed in the agreement. Tuvalu emphasized that a review mechanism should apply to both mitigation and MOI.

On the application of differentiation in the context of time frames, Brazil, supported by India, said this would depend on the context of aggregate or individual review/assessment. He added that even in the aggregate review, CBDR would entail a nuanced differentiation. China opposed treating “applicability to all” in a one-size-fits-all, non-differentiated manner.

Clarifying her understanding of differentiation, Australia, with the EU, noted that a genuine aggregate review should include all parties. She called for synchronous communication of parties’ contributions during the update phase, taking into account national circumstances. Suggesting that *ex ante* consideration is time-consuming, she proposed differentiating by prioritizing countries with a high global share of emissions.

Parties focused on clustering issues on Monday, 8 June, aided by the Co-Facilitators’ technical suggestion as a “tool for a clearer section.” The EU, supported by the Republic of Korea, outlined a sequence in the mitigation cycle: a strategic review of implementation in the context of science; communication and commitments, involving the submission of NDCs; an *ex ante* process to gain an aggregate sense of NDCs in relation to the temperature goal; and the formalization of NDCs.

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

The US said the adaptation and mitigation cycles may be different. China, with Brazil and Saudi Arabia, opposed a “mitigation-centric” approach. The EU, opposed by the LDCs, suggested addressing the mitigation cycle in the mitigation section, and considering the adaptation and finance cycles in their respective sections.

Several parties observed the difference between the agreement and commitments’ duration. India and China called for focusing on the duration of the agreement first. New Zealand suggested moving the paragraphs on the duration of the agreement to the section on entry into force. Colombia supported creating sub-headings for durability and time frames.

On communications, Tuvalu said links among communications, *ex ante* review and final communications should be sequenced. Brazil pointed to the difference between

communicating and updating NDCs. Australia highlighted issues around maintaining commitments between initial and final communications.

The Marshall Islands observed initial and subsequent communication cycles, saying the former could be in a COP decision and the latter in the agreement. Norway disagreed, suggesting that the detailed timelines and upfront information be placed in a COP decision.

On Monday evening, 8 June, China suggested language on “cycles” could prejudice the outcome of negotiations. New Zealand said “cycles” is not new language. The EU explained the purpose of cycles or process is to increase ambition over time.

During the final consideration of this item on Wednesday, 10 June, parties agreed to forward revised Co-Facilitators’ technical suggestions to the Co-Chairs.

IMPLEMENTATION AND COMPLIANCE: The first reading of section K (Facilitating implementation and compliance), comprising eight paragraphs and including three options (I, II, III) in the Geneva negotiating text, was taken up in the negotiating group on Wednesday, 3 June, chaired by Co-Chair Reifsnnyder.

The EU made consolidation proposals on a paragraph within option I, which delegates agreed to consider, along with a streamlining proposal by the Secretariat in the same paragraph.

An informal facilitated discussion group, co-facilitated by Sarah Baashan (Saudi Arabia) and Aya Yoshida (Japan), convening the same day, considered the aforementioned proposals, agreeing to some. A summary of the discussions on specific paragraphs in the negotiating group is available at: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12631e.html>

Discussions on the section continued in the facilitated group on Friday, 5 June. A number of parties, including China, Canada and Saudi Arabia, called for consensus on the legal form of the agreement before discussing compliance in-depth.

The EU noted the usefulness of clarifying possible compliance models before COP 21. He suggested, and parties agreed to, reorganizing the section based on the alternative “models” contained in the section.

Australia proposed further identifying “baskets” of issues for labeling the paragraphs, namely purpose, establishment, tools, composition, and mode of work. The EU suggested: establishment and purpose; mandate, scope and structure; and modalities of the arrangements. Parties agreed to meet informally to agree on the “baskets.”

A group discussion on Saturday, 6 June, facilitated by Co-Facilitator Baashan, explored unpacking proposals from Australia, the EU, Colombia, for AILAC, and China, for the LMDCs. Many parties suggested the Co-Facilitators combine the proposals into a document, incorporating the comments made during the session. AILAC proposed, and parties agreed, that the Co-Facilitators also identify and synthesize the proposals’ commonalities.

On Wednesday, 10 June, Co-Facilitator Baashan introduced a table synthesizing parties’ proposals for unpacking the section. Parties requested the Co-Facilitators further consolidate the table.

Parties discussed elements to be included in the 2015 agreement versus decisions, operationalization and differentiation. Many countries identified the establishment of a compliance arrangement/committee/body as an element for the core agreement, adding the section can be short.

The US, the EU, New Zealand, Canada and AILAC supported a facilitative compliance mechanism, applicable to all. Norway suggested a mechanism with two branches to cover legal obligations and non-legally binding elements. Sudan, for the African Group and the LMDCs supported differentiation in the section, with the LMDCs calling for a compliance arrangement for developed countries and facilitative implementation for developing countries.

During the final group meeting, on Thursday, 11 June, Co-Facilitator Baashan presented a consolidated table, containing five options, four “baskets,” and bullet points summarizing proposed key outputs from the discussions on this section. She also presented the Co-Facilitators’ proposal for streamlined text, explaining the table had merely served as a tool to streamline text. Parties were unable to agree on forwarding the table as input from the discussions to the Co-Chairs, making proposals on reflecting, *inter alia*, differentiation, convergence and views that discussing compliance was premature. Parties also made proposals on the text.

Parties finally agreed to forward the Co-Facilitators’ text, together with the oral input received from parties during the final session, to the Co-Chairs.

PROCEDURAL AND INSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS:

The first reading of section L (Procedural and institutional provisions), comprising 23 paragraphs in the Geneva negotiating text, took place on Wednesday, 3 June, chaired by Co-Chair Djoghlaif.

Discussions focused on the Secretariat’s proposals for consolidation. Parties agreed to consolidate one paragraph, which they forwarded, together with suggestions for further consolidation, to an informal facilitated discussion group, co-facilitated by Sarah Baashan (Saudi Arabia) and Roberto Dondisch (Mexico). A summary of the discussions of specific paragraphs is available at: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12631e.html>

The section was addressed, for the second and final time, on Wednesday, 10 June, in the facilitated group. Co-Facilitator Baashan presented a list containing all institutions and frameworks referenced in the Geneva text, and invited parties to share their views on anchoring existing institutions into the 2015 agreement.

Most parties agreed on the need to build on existing institutional arrangements, discussing how they could be “anchored” in the 2015 agreement. Tuvalu, for the LDCs, and Mexico said such anchoring could be achieved by using the phrase “shall serve in this agreement.”

Colombia, for AILAC, suggested distinguishing between institutions under the Convention and those created by decisions. Brazil proposed referring to relevant institutions in each section of the text.

Australia, with Saudi Arabia, noted the need to “capitalize on what we have,” and proposed a “light-touch approach” to anchoring and enhancing existing institutions through COP and CMP decisions. Malaysia stated it is customary for protocols or instruments established under an existing instrument to adopt all its existing institutions.

Most parties agreed on a general provision in the agreement anchoring the main bodies, such as the COP, the SBI and SBSTA and the Secretariat. India called for a uniform approach to anchoring existing institutions, with flexibility for creating new ones. AOSIS, the LDCs, Malaysia and the EU opposed a “blanket provision” for anchoring thematic institutions and bodies established through decisions.

On the governing body, many parties saw the COP as the governing body under the new agreement. Parties also discussed how to transfer institutions created under the Kyoto Protocol if the COP is the governing body of the 2015 agreement. Australia stressed the issue must be properly addressed given that not all parties to the Convention are parties to the Kyoto Protocol.

The LDCs, opposed by the US, suggested that bodies created under the Kyoto Protocol, such as the Adaptation Fund and the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM), could be carried across to the new agreement by a COP decision.

The Co-Facilitators said they would report on discussions to the Co-Chairs.

WORKSTREAM 2 (PRE-2020 AMBITION): Workstream 2 was considered in a facilitated group co-facilitated by Aya Yoshida (Japan) and George Wamukoya (Kenya).

On Thursday, 4 June, there was widespread consensus on the need to develop elements for a draft decision on workstream 2. Several groups of parties, including the G-77/China and the EU, expressed willingness to propose draft elements.

Discussions touched on: accelerated implementation; high-level engagement, especially in the Technical Examination Process (TEP); the role of non-state actors; and coordination among Convention bodies.

On Friday, 5 June, parties discussed proposals for the draft decision. The EU presented a proposal centered on the objective of advancing the TEP, with incorporation of elements, such as a high-level segment, and engagement of Convention bodies and other actors.

Mali, for the G-77/China, outlined elements of the group’s proposal: a pre-2020 ambition work programme; an accelerated implementation process; an adaptation TEP; and a high-level engagement component.

Australia, for the Umbrella Group, suggested the objective of the decision should be recommending ways to enhance the TEP, and offered initial ideas, such as using existing institutional structures and creating a process to assess the TEMs.

Maldives, for AOSIS, proposed mandating an action platform and a regular meeting of representatives of the Convention bodies.

On the way forward, some called for a compilation text, while others questioned if this would be an appropriate next step, given limited negotiation time. Co-Facilitator Yoshida said the Co-Facilitators would consult with the Co-Chairs on next steps.

On Tuesday, 9 June, Co-Facilitator Yoshida announced questions to guide parties' discussions on the TEP, and advancing implementation under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol.

The G-77/China, suggested: improving the focus and structure of the TEMs; preparing a technical paper analyzing gaps in MOI provision; increasing transparency of finance; and strengthening multilateral cooperation.

On translating the TEP into effective actions on the ground, the US, with the EU and Australia, said the TEP should evolve, and be regularly reviewed and improved.

On high-level engagement, Japan, with the EU, Norway and Bangladesh, supported timely delivery of TEM outcomes to policy makers.

On implementation, the EU highlighted the importance of capitalizing on existing institutions and processes.

India, supported by Brazil, and opposed by the US, suggested compiling parties' submissions as the basis for a draft decision.

On Wednesday morning, 10 June, Co-Facilitator Yoshida asked for parties' views on an input document compiled by the Co-Facilitators.

Many developing countries supported using the input document as the basis of work going forward, but requested restructuring it, with sections in the following order: preamble; accelerated implementation process; TEP; and review.

The EU, with the US, New Zealand, Norway, Australia and Canada, opposed using the input document, saying many of its elements, namely those other than mitigation and the TEP, are outside the mandate of workstream 2. Many developing countries stated that all elements that can enhance ambition pre-2020 are within the mandate.

During discussions in a Wednesday evening facilitated group, parties exchanged views on proposals from the G-77/China and EIG, but continued to differ on a common interpretation of the mandate of workstream 2. Co-Facilitators Wamukoya and Yoshida issued an output document on 11 June, which captures the various proposals, as well as areas of convergence and divergence.

TECHNICAL EXPERT MEETINGS: Renewable Energy

Supply: The TEM on renewable energy supply took place on Wednesday, 3 June. For a summary of the TEM, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12631e.html>

Accelerating Energy Efficiency Action in Urban

Environments: The TEM on accelerating energy efficiency action in urban environments took place on Friday, 5 June, and Saturday, 6 June. For a summary of the TEM, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12633e.html> and <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12634e.html>

ADP CONTACT GROUP (FOCUS: STRUCTURE OF

AUGUST/SEPTEMBER SESSION: In the final contact group session on 11 June, ADP Co-Chair Reifsnnyder presented the Co-Chairs' suggestions for the way forward. He explained that the outputs of the facilitated groups had been made available online, and would be reflected in a working document and a revised, streamlined and consolidated text, both dated 11 June and issued as non-papers. He stated that, as requested by parties, the Co-Chairs would issue an additional tool, which will include a fully streamlined, consolidated, clear and concise version of the

Geneva negotiating text, as well as suggestions for paragraphs appropriate for a decision versus the agreement. He asked for parties' input on this suggested way forward.

On the mode of work, Maldives, for AOSIS, asked for clarification on the intended outputs of the next two ADP meetings, saying this would help parties stay on track.

Sudan, for the African Group, reflected on the way the world views the process, noting that the only outputs of the Bonn session are non-papers without official status.

Noting the need to ensure a transparent, inclusive and party-driven process, Malaysia, for the LMDCs, proposed terms of reference for the next sessions of the ADP, including that, *inter alia*: inclusiveness and transparency should always be reflected; consideration of elements for accompanying decisions should not prejudge the outcome; new iterations of the text should be distributed at least three weeks before each session; the negotiating text should be annotated with the source of each proposal; and no more than two negotiating sessions should take place simultaneously.

On the additional tool, parties stressed it should not delete any proposals or positions. The Republic of Korea, for the EIG, supported a consolidated document that takes all parties' ideas on board.

The LMDCs called for greater clarity on how the document will be structured, how many parts it will contain, and the criteria by which the Co-Chairs will determine what should be included in decisions versus the agreement.

Angola, for the LDCs, requested that the tool be made available in early July, stressing the need for sufficient preparation time for the next ADP meeting. AILAC asked that it be made available before the ministerial meeting in Paris in July.

Cuba, for the Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America (ALBA), said the Co-Chairs' text should ensure consistency and balance among all elements of the Durban Platform, avoid losing any item under negotiation, and capture the work done at ADP 2-9.

On the pace of work, Australia, for the Umbrella Group, underscored the need for a "change in gear" and a more workable text. South Africa, for the G-77/China, welcomed the constructive spirit, adding that, although progress had been modest, she was confident it will accelerate.

The EU said progress had been far too slow, noting that substantive discussions had only just begun and only in some areas. He called for substantive negotiations to start in earnest at the next session. Colombia, for AILAC, stated that while progress had been slow, the meeting had built trust among parties and established a good mode of work.

On workstream 2, the G-77/China and the LMDCs called for both workstreams to be treated in a balanced manner. AOSIS thanked the Co-Chairs for the time dedicated to workstream 2 in Bonn. The Umbrella Group welcomed the commencement of discussions on a decision. The G-77/China proposed that the Co-Chairs draft a paper based on parties' proposals and submissions, the Co-Facilitators' outputs and submissions made intersessionally, to be released before the next ADP meeting.

Co-Chair Reifsnnyder responded to parties' concerns, stressing the magnitude of the task of compiling the additional tool for

parties, reconfirming that it will be available as an annex to the Co-Chairs' scenario note to be issued on 24 July 2015. He emphasized that the document will: fully take into account parties' views; not leave any proposals or options behind; not prejudice the final structure of the agreement; and be at parties' disposal to amend or use as they please.

ADP CLOSING PLENARY: Co-Chair Djoghlafl opened the plenary saying that ADP 2-9 enabled parties to make progress by putting in place the "mechanics" that will facilitate a successful and timely outcome in Paris. He stated that the success of the session should be measured by the trust built and the fact that "nobody was left behind."

UNFCCC Deputy Executive Secretary Richard Kinley reported on the funding gap for arrangements for the additional August/September and October ADP sessions, noting recent pledges from various parties.

Recapping the agreed way forward, Co-Chair Djoghlafl reiterated that the Geneva negotiating text remains the only official document and that the Co-Chairs will produce the additional tool without omitting or deleting any options or party positions.

Representing the COP 20 Presidency, Jorge Voto-Bernales, Peru, commended the ADP Co-Chairs for their intensive consultations, and encouraged parties to seek to reduce options in each section of the negotiating text.

Representing the incoming, COP 21 Presidency, Laurence Tubiana, France, congratulated parties on their hard work and emphasized trust as a condition for success. She called for a clear roadmap for the ADP sessions in August/September and October.

ADP Rapporteur Yang Liu presented, and parties adopted, the report of the session (FCCC/ADP/2015/L.2). Co-Chair Djoghlafl suspended the ADP at 4:46 pm.

SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR IMPLEMENTATION

On Monday, 1 June, SBI Chair Amena Yauvoli (Fiji) opened the session, noting the need to deliver results on critical issues that will inform the ADP, including the 2013-2015 review and impact of response measures.

Parties adopted the agenda (FCCC/SBI/2015/1) with the item on information in non-Annex I countries' national communications held in abeyance, and agreed to the organization of work as presented. For a summary of opening statements, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12629e.html>

Multilateral Assessment Working Group Session under the International Assessment and Review (IAR) Process:

This item was first considered on Monday, 1 June, in plenary, with parties taking note of information provided by SBI Chair Yauvoli, who chaired the two-day multilateral assessment session.

On Thursday, 4 June, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Germany, Hungary, Iceland and Ireland were assessed. A summary of the discussions is available at: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12632e.html>

On Friday, 5 June, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Monaco, Norway, Poland, Romania, the Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Ukraine and the United Kingdom were assessed. A

summary of the discussions is available at: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12633e.html>

REPORTING FROM AND REVIEW OF ANNEX I PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION: Status of Submission and Review of 6th National Communications and 1st Biennial Reports:

This sub-item (FCCC/SBI/2015/INF.3) was taken up on Monday, 1 June. SBI Chair Yauvoli proposed, and parties agreed, to take note of information presented in document FCCC/SBI/2015/INF.3.

Compilation and Synthesis of 6th National Communications and 1st Biennial Reports: This sub-item was first considered on Monday, 1 June. On SBI Chair Yauvoli's proposal, parties agreed to informal consultations, co-facilitated by Fatuma Mohamed Hussein (Kenya) and Helen Plume (New Zealand). During the SBI closing plenary on Thursday, 11 June, the SBI adopted conclusions.

Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2015/L.9), the SBI agrees to continue consideration of the item at SBI 44.

Revision of the "Guidelines for the Preparation of National Communications by Annex I Parties, Part II: UNFCCC Reporting Guidelines on National Communications":

This sub-item was first taken up on Monday, 1 June. On SBI Chair Yauvoli's proposal, parties agreed to informal consultations co-facilitated by Fatuma Mohamed Hussein (Kenya) and Helen Plume (New Zealand). During the SBI closing plenary on Thursday, 11 June, the SBI adopted conclusions.

Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2015/L.10), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- notes progress made on the scope of the revision and its discussion of the revisions to the projection timeline specified in paragraph 37 of the UNFCCC reporting guidelines on national communications;
- invites parties to submit further views on the revision of the guidelines by 1 September 2015;
- requests the Secretariat to update the technical paper on the revision of the guidelines; and
- agrees to continue its work at SBI 43, with a view to the revised guidelines being adopted at COP 21, noting that if additional time beyond SBI 43 is required, the SBI requests the Secretariat to organize a pre-session workshop prior to SBI 44.

Outcome of the First Round of the IAR Process (2014-2015):

This item was first taken up on Monday, 1 June, in plenary. Informal consultations were co-facilitated by Fatuma Mohamed Hussein (Kenya) and Helen Plume (New Zealand). SBI Chair Yauvoli reported no agreement had been reached, and the SBI agreed to continue work on this item at SBI 43.

Regretting the lack of agreement, China suggested inviting parties' submissions to accelerate negotiations and agree on conclusions at SBI 43, to "avoid damaging mutual trust."

Brazil expressed disappointment with parties' inability to reach substantive conclusions and emphasized that a robust IAR framework promotes transparency. Stating that developing countries had engaged constructively, he called on developed countries to "enhance" information provided, and civil society to engage more in the IAR process, scrutinizing this information. No conclusions were adopted.

REPORTING FROM NON-ANNEX I PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION: Provision of Financial and Technical Support:

On Monday, 1 June, the SBI considered the information provided in the Global Environment Facility (GEF) report (FCCC/SBI/2015/INF.7), and in subsequent informal consultations co-facilitated by Ann Gann (Singapore) and Helen Plume (New Zealand). During the SBI closing plenary on Thursday, 11 June, the SBI adopted conclusions.

Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2015/L.8), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- notes that 13 non-Annex I parties had submitted their biennial update reports (BURs) by 8 June 2015, with a further 18 expected to submit their first BURs by 31 December 2015;
- encourages non-Annex I parties to take advantage of the opportunities for technical assistance and support available under the GEF's Global Support Programme regarding the preparation of their national communications and BURs; and
- notes requests from non-Annex I parties for technical support to improve their domestic capacity to facilitate continuity in meeting reporting requirements through training on the use of the 2006 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) guidelines for GHG inventories, building sustainable national GHG inventory management systems, and understanding and applying best practices for setting up domestic MRV systems.

MATTERS RELATING TO MECHANISMS UNDER THE KYOTO PROTOCOL: Review of the Modalities and Procedures for the CDM:

On Monday, 1 June, Chair Yauvoli proposed, and parties agreed to, informal consultations co-facilitated by Karoliina Anttonen (Finland) and Gerald Lindo (Jamaica). During the SBI closing plenary on Thursday, 11 June, Chair Yauvoli reported that parties were unable to reach agreement on the issue and that the sub-item would be placed on the provisional agenda of SBI 43.

Review of the Joint Implementation Guidelines: This item (FCCC/SBI/2015/5 and INF.1, and FCCC/TP/2015/1) was first considered on Monday, 1 June. Chair Yauvoli proposed, and parties agreed to, informal consultations co-facilitated by Dimitar Nikov (France) and Yaw Osafo (Ghana). During the SBI closing plenary on Thursday, 11 June, the SBI adopted conclusions.

Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2015/L.5), the SBI, *inter alia*, agrees to continue its consideration of this matter at SBI 43 on the basis of the draft decision text proposed by the Co-Facilitators of the informal consultations, as contained in the annex.

Modalities for Expediting the Continued Issuance, Transfer and Acquisition of Joint Implementation Emission Reduction Units: This item was first considered on Monday, 1 June. Chair Yauvoli proposed, and parties agreed to, informal consultations co-facilitated by Dimitar Nikov (France) and Yaw Osafo (Ghana). During the SBI closing plenary on Thursday, 11 June, the SBI adopted conclusions.

Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2015/L.2), the SBI agrees to continue its consideration of this matter at SBI 43 on the basis of the annexed draft decision.

Procedures, Mechanisms and Institutional Arrangements for Appeals against Decisions of the CDM Executive Board: On Monday, 1 June, Chair Yauvoli proposed, and parties agreed

to, informal consultations co-facilitated by Kunihiko Shimada (Japan) and Yaw Osafo (Ghana). During the SBI closing plenary on Thursday, 11 June, the SBI adopted conclusions.

Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2015/L.12), the SBI, including: agrees to continue its consideration of this matter at SBI 44, on the basis of, *inter alia*, the Co-Facilitators' draft text (FCCC/SBI/2012/33/Add.1); and invites parties and observers to submit to the Secretariat, by 1 March 2016, their views on the scope of the mechanism for appeals against decisions of the CDM Executive Board.

Matters Relating to the International Transaction Log

(ITL): This item (FCCC/SBI/2015/INF.2) was first considered on Monday, 1 June. Chair Yauvoli proposed, and parties agreed to, informal consultations facilitated by Yuji Mizuno (Japan). During the SBI closing plenary on Thursday, 11 June, the SBI adopted conclusions.

Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2015/L.3), the SBI, *inter alia*: concludes its consideration of information security management in systems supporting emissions trading under the Kyoto Protocol; welcomes the document prepared by the ITL administrator and the Security Working Group established under the Registry System Administrators Forum; and requests several actions from the ITL administrator related to information security implementation in registry systems.

MATTERS RELATING TO LDCS: This item was first considered on Monday, 1 June, in plenary, when the LDcs Expert Group (LEG) Chair Batu Krishna Uprety (Nepal) provided an oral report on the work of the LEG (FCCC/SBI/2015/6-8 and MISC.2). Informal consultations were co-facilitated by Mamadou Honadia (Burkina Faso) and Jens Fugl (EU).

During the SBI closing plenary, the SBI adopted conclusions and agreed to forward a draft decision on the extension of the mandate of the LEG for consideration and adoption by COP 21.

Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2015/L.13 and Add.1), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- welcomes the reports on the 27th meeting of the LEG, and on the stocktaking meeting on the work of the LEG;
- welcomes the NAP Expo held in Bonn, on 14-15 April 2015, the workshop on experiences, good practices, lessons learned, gaps and needs in the process to formulate and implement NAPs in Bonn on 16-17 April 2015 (FCCC/SBI/2015/INF.6), and the synthesis report on the progress, need for continuation and terms of reference of the LEG;
- notes the implementation, by five LDcs of at least one of their National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPAs) projects, the continued support from the LDcs Fund (LDCF) to the completion, by 50 countries of their NAPAs, and the access by 49 countries to US\$905.63 million for 161 projects;
- notes the contributions by some parties to the LDCF, and the progress made by LDcs and the technical support provided by support programmes and networks on the process to formulate and implement NAPs;
- notes with concern the lack of funding in the LDCF and urges parties to contribute to the Fund; and

- requests the LEG, with the Secretariat's assistance, to prepare an information paper on the NAP Expo and the regional training workshops on NAPs remaining in 2015.

NATIONAL ADAPTATION PLANS: On Monday, 1 June, Adaptation Committee Co-Chair Juan Hoffmeister (Bolivia) reported on the workshop on experiences with the formulation and implementation of NAPs (FCCC/SBI/2015/INF.6). Informal consultations on this agenda item were co-facilitated by Mamadou Honadia (Burkina Faso) and Beth Lavender (Canada).

During the SBI closing plenary, the SBI adopted conclusions.

Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2015/L.14), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- expresses its appreciation to the LEG and the Adaptation Committee for their engagement with the GCF, in considering how best to support developing countries in accessing GCF funding for the process to formulate and implement NAPs, and invites them to continue to collaborate with the GCF;
- notes with concern the lack of funds in the LDCF and the Special Climate Change Fund;
- notes that LDCs and other developing countries can access funding through the GCF readiness programme for activities related to NAPs;
- notes that the SBI initiated its consideration of options for enhancing reporting related to NAPs, and agrees to continue that consideration at SBI 44; and
- notes that SBI initiated consideration of the monitoring and evaluation of NAPs, and agrees to continue that consideration at SBI 43, with a view to recommending a draft decision for COP 21's consideration and adoption.

POZNAN STRATEGIC PROGRAMME ON

TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER: On Monday, 1 June, Chair Yauvoli invited parties to consider the GEF report on progress made in carrying out the Poznan strategic programme on technology transfer (FCCC/SBI/2015/INF.4) and the interim report by the TEC on the evaluation of the programme (FCCC/SBI/2015/INF.5). Chair Yauvoli proposed, and parties agreed to, informal consultations co-facilitated by Carlos Fuller (Belize) and Elfriede More (Austria).

During the SBI closing plenary, the SBI adopted conclusions.

Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2015/L.7), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- welcomes the collaboration between the CTCN and the regional technology transfer and finance centres supported by the GEF under the Poznan strategic programme, and invites the GEF to provide more details in its future reports on its ongoing collaboration with the CTCN;
- invites the GEF to provide financial support to non-Annex I parties to conduct their technology needs assessments (TNAs), and to support the implementation of the TNAs' results;
- encourages those providing inputs to the Poznan strategic programme's evaluation to consider how it may support technologies for adaptation and take into account gender responsiveness; and
- encourages the TEC, in evaluating the programme, to continue to consult parties, the GCF, GEF implementing agencies and other relevant entities on how to enhance the effectiveness of the Technology Mechanism.

CAPACITY BUILDING: This item (FCCC/SBI/2015/4 and Add.1, 9, and MISC.1) was first considered on 1 June. On Chair Yauvoli's proposal, parties agreed to back-to-back informal consultations on the sub-items on capacity building under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol, co-facilitated by Bubu Jallow (The Gambia) and Kunihiko Shimada (Japan).

Capacity Building under the Convention: During the SBI closing plenary on Thursday, 11 June, the SBI agreed to conclusions.

Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2015/L.15), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- agrees to continue its consideration of the terms of reference for the third comprehensive review of the implementation of the framework for capacity building in developing countries at SBI 43, on the basis of the draft text contained in Annex I of the conclusions;
- agrees to continue its consideration of capacity building for developing countries under the Convention at SBI 43, on the basis of the draft decision text contained in Annex II of the conclusions, with a view to recommending a draft decision to COP 21; and
- requests the Secretariat to organize a workshop back-to-back with an ADP session to further discuss potential ways to enhance capacity-building activities and prepare a report for consideration at SBI 43.

Capacity Building under the Kyoto Protocol: During the SBI closing plenary on Thursday, 11 June, the SBI agreed to conclusions.

Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2015/L.16), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- agrees to continue its consideration of the terms of reference for the third comprehensive review of the implementation of the framework for capacity building in developing countries at SBI 43, on the basis of the draft text contained in the annex to the conclusions;
- agrees to continue its consideration of capacity building for developing countries under the Kyoto Protocol at SBI 43, with a view to recommending a draft decision to CMP 11; and
- requests the Secretariat to organize a workshop back-to-back with an ADP session to further discuss potential ways to enhance capacity-building activities and prepare a report for consideration at SBI 43.

4th Durban Forum on Capacity-Building: This event convened on Wednesday, 3 June, and Monday, 8 June. A summary of discussions is available at: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12631e.html> and <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12635e.html>

ARTICLE 6 OF THE CONVENTION: This item was first considered by the SBI on Monday, 1 June. Chair Yauvoli proposed, and parties agreed to informal consultations facilitated by Albert Magalang (Philippines).

During the SBI closing plenary on Thursday, 11 June, the Dominican Republic stated that the interim review of the of the implementation of the Doha work programme on Article 6 showed that this article plays an important role in the implementation of the Convention, underscoring the need for resources for its effective implementation. He proposed

a high-level event on Article 6 at COP 21 and a publication summarizing best practices, and called for parties in a position to do so to provide funding to Article 6 focal points.

Expressing concern that the draft COP decision only invites “voluntary forms of financing,” Bolivia said she would strive to make the decision coherent with financing commitments under the Convention.

The SBI adopted conclusions and agreed to forward a draft decision to COP 21 on the intermediate review of the implementation of the Doha work programme, containing the terms of reference for the review, for consideration and adoption at COP 21.

Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2015/L.11 and Add.1), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- acknowledges the success of the third in-session Dialogue on Article 6;
- invites parties that have not yet done so to designate a national focal point for Article 6;
- invites parties, observer organizations and other stakeholders to submit to the Secretariat, by 19 February 2016, feedback on the organization of the third, and their views on the agenda for the fourth, in-session Dialogue on Article 6; and
- welcomes proposals on the intermediate review of the implementation of the Doha work programme on Article 6, and invites parties, admitted organizations and other stakeholders to submit to the Secretariat, by 19 February 2016, information on the steps they have taken to implement the work programme and recommendations on improving its implementation.

3rd Dialogue on Article 6 of the Convention: This event convened on Tuesday, 2 June, and Wednesday, 3 June. A summary of the dialogue is available at: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12630e.html> and <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12631e.html>

IMPACT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF RESPONSE MEASURES: Forum and Work Programme: This item was first considered on Monday, 1 June, and a joint SBI/SBSTA contact group co-chaired by SBSTA Chair Lidia Wojtal (Poland) and SBI Chair Yauvoli was established, which met on Tuesday, 2 June and Wednesday, 10 June.

During the joint SBI/SBSTA contact group on 2 June. Argentina, for the G-77/China, called for the continuation of the forum on response measures and for further discussions of enhanced action on response measures. She emphasized, *inter alia*: addressing response measures in the context of sustainable development; carrying out further technical and substantive work; and identifying specific needs for economic transformation.

The EU noted the need for adding value to the UNFCCC process and called for inclusively addressing the concerns of all. The US, with Australia, proposed not limiting discussions to the draft decision forwarded from Lima. Saudi Arabia called for, *inter alia*, a platform to report on impacts of response measures. Singapore emphasized the need for an institutionalized mechanism to systematically address response measures.

SBI Chair Yauvoli proposed, and parties agreed to, informal consultations, co-facilitated by Eduardo Calvo (Peru), Delano Ruben Verwey (the Netherlands) and Crispin D’Auvergne (Saint Lucia).

During the SBI closing plenary on Thursday, 11 June, the SBI adopted conclusions.

Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SB/2015/L.2), the SBI and SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- consider the draft decision text contained in the annex to Decision 20/CP.20 (the forum and work programme on the impact of the implementation of response measures), with a view to preparing a draft decision for adoption by COP 21;
- invites parties to submit to the Secretariat, by 21 September 2015, their views on the further elaboration of the work programme and the modalities for its implementation, as detailed in the draft decision text contained in the annex; and
- decides to consider the draft decision text contained in the annex at SB 43, with a view to recommending a draft decision for adoption at COP 21.

Matters relating to Protocol Article 3.14 (adverse effects) and Progress on the implementation of Decision 1/CP.10 (Buenos Aires programme of work): These sub-items were first considered on Monday, 1 June.

During the SBI closing plenary on Thursday, 11 June, SBI Chair Yauvoli reported that informal consultations with interested parties on how to take up these issues could not be completed and would continue at SBI 43. The SBI agreed to consider the sub-items at SBI 43.

2013-2015 REVIEW: This item is summarized under the SBSTA item on the 2013-2015 review. See page 18.

GENDER AND CLIMATE CHANGE: This item was taken up by the SBI opening plenary on Monday, 1 June. The Secretariat delivered an oral report on its gender-related policies.

In-Session Workshop on Gender-Responsive Climate Policy: This workshop took place from 8-9 June and a summary of discussions is available at: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12635e.html> and <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12636e.html>

ARRANGEMENTS FOR INTERGOVERNMENTAL MEETINGS: This item (FCCC/SBI/2015/2) was first taken up in plenary on Monday, 1 June. France, the incoming COP 21/CMP 11 Presidency, said the Conference would be the largest diplomatic conference ever held in France.

On Monday, 8 June, Laurence Tubiana, France, provided information on COP 21/CMP 11 logistics in open-ended informal consultations. The discussions under this item were taken up in a contact group chaired by Chair Yauvoli.

During the SBI closing plenary, Morocco, future host of COP 22/CMP 12, stated that success in Marrakesh is linked to that in Paris, saying: “we hope to achieve a new world order in Marrakesh and establish the mechanisms necessary to this end.”

The SBI adopted conclusions.

Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2015/L.6), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- takes note of the need to be flexible in the organization of COP 21/CMP 11, and invites the COP 21/CMP 11 President Designate, in consultation with the Secretariat and the Bureau, to finalize the details of the arrangements for COP 21/CMP 11

and requests the Secretariat to make this information available as soon as possible;

- takes note of the Lima-Paris Action Agenda, which showcases the actions of non-state actors;
- underlines the importance of the principles of openness, transparency and inclusiveness in making arrangements for high-level engagement at COP 21/CMP 11;
- takes note of the information provided by the Government of Morocco on the status of its plans to host COP 22/CMP 12 in Marrakesh;
- invites Asia-Pacific parties to come forward with offers to host COP 23/CMP 13;
- requests the Secretariat to provide information for SBI 44's consideration of a ten-year calendar for the organization of the intergovernmental process; and
- agrees to consider at SBI 44 the issue of the frequency and organization of the sessions, and the issue of adjusting the timing of the election of the President.

ADMINISTRATIVE, FINANCIAL AND INSTITUTIONAL MATTERS: Budget Performance for the Biennium 2014-2015: This sub-item (FCCC/SBI/2015/INF.8) was first taken up on Monday, 1 June. Chair Yauvoli proposed, and the SBI agreed, that he prepare draft conclusions with the assistance of the Secretariat and in consultation with interested parties.

During the SBI closing plenary on Thursday, 11 June, Bolivia expressed concern over insufficient funding for the participation of developing countries in the process leading to COP 21, urging developed countries to contribute accordingly. The SBI adopted conclusions.

Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2015/L.17), the SBI:

- takes note of the information relating to the status of contributions as of 15 May 2015;
- expresses its appreciation to parties that have paid their indicative contributions to the core budget and their fees for the ITL on time, particularly those that have made voluntary contributions;
- expresses concern over outstanding contributions, urging parties that have not yet paid to do so as soon as possible; and
- requests parties to contribute to the Trust Fund for Participation in the UNFCCC Process and the Trust Fund for Supplementary Activities in order to promote the effective and inclusive participation of all developing country parties in the lead-up to COP 21/CMP 11.

Programme Budget for the Biennium 2016-2017: On Monday, 1 June, UNFCCC Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres presented the sub-item (FCCC/SBI/2015/3 and Adds. 1-3). She drew attention to additional requirements arising from, *inter alia*, MRV implementation and institutional support to adaptation, and to the resource requirements for the Trust Fund for Participation in the UNFCCC Process.

Chair Yauvoli proposed, and parties agreed, that he chair a contact group on this sub-item. Parties also agreed to establish a spin-off group, facilitated by Dimitar Nikov (France), to consider issues relating to the ITL.

During the SBI closing plenary on Thursday, 11 June, the SBI adopted conclusions and agreed to forward three draft decisions to COP 21/CMP 11, with minor amendments in a footnote in two decisions.

Mexico congratulated Chair Yauvoli for the competent way of guiding parties' work, and expressed support for the outcome.

Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2015/L.18), the SBI, *inter alia*, recommends that COP 21 approve a core programme budget of €54.6 million for the biennium 2016-2017. The SBI also recommends draft decisions on: the programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017, for consideration and adoption at COP 21 (FCCC/SBI/2015/L.18/Add.1); the programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017 as it applies to the Kyoto Protocol and the budget for the ITL, for consideration and adoption at CMP 11 (FCCC/SBI/2015/L.18/Add.2); and the methodology for the collection of ITL fees, for consideration and adoption at CMP 11 (FCCC/SBI/2015/L.18/Add.3).

Continuing Review of the Functions and Operations of the Secretariat: On Monday, 1 June, SBI Chair Yauvoli noted that no report was mandated for consideration and no submissions had been received on this sub-item. Parties agreed to consider the item at SBI 44.

Implementation of the Headquarters Agreement:

On Monday, 1 June, a representative of the UNFCCC host government provided a presentation on the new UNFCCC meeting facilities in Bonn. Chair Yauvoli proposed, and parties agreed, that he would prepare draft conclusions on this matter with the assistance of the Secretariat and in consultation with interested parties.

During the SBI closing plenary on Thursday, 11 June, Bolivia requested the host government to further consider facilitating visa processes for UNFCCC delegates from developing countries. The SBI adopted conclusions.

Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2015/L.4), the SBI, *inter alia*: expresses satisfaction with the new World Conference Center Bonn; requests the Secretariat to maximize the combined use of the Secretariat's office facilities and the conference centre for UNFCCC sessions and meetings; takes note of reports on progress on the design of an extension building on the United Nations Campus; requests the Secretariat to continue to update parties on the UNFCCC website about the implementation of the headquarters agreement; and invites the host government and the UNFCCC Executive Secretary to report to SBI 46 on progress.

OTHER MATTERS: On Monday, 1 June, Palau called for progress reports on the status of nominations of members of the Executive Committee of the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage, and on the third review of the Adaptation Fund Board, lamenting these items are not on the SBI 42 agenda.

Chair Yauvoli proposed, and parties agreed, that he consult with interested parties on these issues.

During the SBI closing plenary on Thursday, 11 June, Chair Yauvoli reported that all nominations for the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage Executive Committee had been submitted. He informed that Decision 2/ CMP.10 (the second review of the Adaptation Fund), requests SBI 44 to initiate the third review of the Adaptation Fund, in

accordance with the terms of reference contained in the annex to Decision 2/CMP.9 (the second review of the Adaptation Fund), or as they may be subsequently amended.

CLOSING PLENARY: On Thursday, 11 June, the Secretariat informed parties of the budgetary implications of the conclusions adopted by the SBI. SBI Rapporteur Sidat Yaffa (The Gambia) introduced, and parties adopted, the report of the session (FCCC/SBI/2015/L.1).

Switzerland, for the EIG, *inter alia*, welcomed outcomes of the in-session workshop on gender-responsive climate policy and considered the multilateral assessment process as helpful to enhance understanding of parties' commitments; and regretted no progress was made on modalities of the CDM.

South Africa, for the G-77/China, highlighted, *inter alia*: the importance of reaching a decision on response measures by COP 21; progress on adaptation as an urgent priority for developing countries; disappointment over lack of progress on capacity building; and the need to provide support to enable the full and effective participation of developing countries in meetings.

Australia, for the Umbrella Group, noted a constructive atmosphere and stressed the need for the facilitative sharing of views under international consultation and analysis (ICA) to begin by Paris. He welcomed the agreement to extend the mandate of the LEG and welcomed Annex I parties' nominations to the Warsaw International Mechanism Executive Committee.

Maldives, for AOSIS, lamented lack of progress in the consideration of the SED report, on capacity building and in improving the environmental integrity of Kyoto flexibility mechanisms. He welcomed conclusions on technology.

Angola, for the LDCs, called for a long-term global temperature rise limit to be set below 1.5°C in the new agreement, underscored the special circumstances of LDCs and lamented the lack of resources for LDCs.

The EU, *inter alia*, welcomed the multilateral assessment process, saying it had enhanced transparency and built trust. She welcomed progress made on adaptation issues and constructive discussions on technology development and transfer.

Sudan, for the African Group, welcomed progress made on: the Poznan Strategic work programme, LDCs, Article 6 and NAPs. He lamented inadequate funds and lack of clear guidance on how developing countries can access direct financial support for formulating and implementing NAPs, and lack of progress made on the issue of capacity building.

Indigenous Peoples called for the 2015 agreement to respect the human rights of indigenous peoples, including rights to lands, territories and resources.

Climate Justice Now!, for Environmental NGOs (ENGOs), said developing countries cannot equitably scale up ambition without finance and technology support.

Stating that the multilateral assessment had provided a valuable opportunity for mutual learning and transparency, Climate Action Network, for ENGOs, said it also highlighted a collective international ambition gap in keeping temperature rise below 1.5°C.

Women and Gender expressed disappointment that the in-session workshop on gender-responsive climate policy had only addressed developing countries, and called for a just and gender-responsive agreement in Paris.

Business and Industry NGOs called for more effective institutional arrangements to create better channels for business to work with parties, groups and the Secretariat, suggesting businesses can bring insights into how public funding can leverage private capital.

Stating that the first "batch" of INDCs is unambitious, Youth NGOs said "you will decide what the world will look like in 2050." She underscored that human rights, gender, indigenous rights and education are "about more than keeping 'section C' (general/objective) in the Geneva text."

SBI 42 was gavelled to a close at 5:13 pm.

SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE

On Monday, 1 June, SBSTA Chair Lidia Wojtal (Poland) opened the plenary session. Parties adopted the agenda (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/1) and agreed to the organization of work of the session. For a summary of opening statements, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12629e.html>

Election of Officers Other than the Chair: On 1 June, Chair Wojtal announced that consultations on the nominations of the SBSTA Vice-Chair and Rapporteur will be conducted by the COP/CMP Presidency. During the closing plenary on Thursday, 11 June, Chair Wojtal noted that no nominations had been received and that the current officers would remain in place.

NAIROBI WORK PROGRAMME (NWP): This item (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/INF.2) was first considered on Monday, 1 June. During the SBSTA closing plenary on Thursday, 11 June, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/L.7), the SBSTA recognizes the importance of strengthening collaboration and linkages between the NWP, other relevant workstreams and bodies under the Convention; and looks forward to the 9th NWP Focal Point Forum at SBSTA 43.

METHODOLOGICAL GUIDANCE FOR ACTIVITIES RELATING TO REDD+: This item was first considered on Monday, 1 June. A contact group co-chaired by Robert Bamfo (Ghana) and Heikki Granholm (Finland) addressed all issues under this agenda item: further guidance on safeguards information systems; guidance on non-market-based approaches; and guidance on non-carbon benefits.

On Tuesday, 2 June, Bolivia announced a submission on non-market-based approaches, and Ghana, for the African Group, announced a submission on non-carbon benefits. Norway, with the US and the EU, underscored the importance of further guidance on safeguards information systems. Parties agreed to begin informal consultations on all issues under this agenda item.

On Tuesday, 9 June, parties agreed to forward to the SBSTA draft conclusions and three draft decisions. During the SBSTA closing plenary on Thursday, 11 June, the SBSTA adopted conclusions, and agreed to forward three draft decisions for consideration and adoption by COP 21, and agreed to close this agenda item.

Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/L.5), the SBSTA recommends three decisions for consideration and adoption by the COP on: further guidance on safeguards information systems (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/L.5/Add.1); guidance on alternative policy approaches for the integral and sustainable management of forests (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/L.5/Add.2); and methodological issues related to non-carbon benefits (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/L.5/Add.3).

ISSUES RELATING TO AGRICULTURE: This item (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/MISC.1 and Add.1, and MISC.2) was first considered on Monday, 1 June. SBSTA Informal consultations on this item were co-facilitated by Emmanuel Dumisani Dlamini (Swaziland) and Peter Iversen (Denmark). During the SBSTA closing plenary on Thursday, 11 June, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/L.2), the SBSTA agrees to consider the reports on the in-session workshops held at SBSTA 42 and SBSTA 43.

SBSTA Workshop on the Development of Early Warning Systems and Contingency Plans in Relation to Extreme Weather Events and Its Effects Such as Desertification, Drought, Floods, Landslides, Storm Surge, Soil Erosion, and Saline Water Intrusion: This event took place on Tuesday, 2 June. A summary of discussions is available at: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12630e.html>

SBSTA Workshop on the Assessment of Risk and Vulnerability of Agricultural Systems to Different Climate Change Scenarios at Regional, National and Local Levels, Including But Not Limited to Pests and Diseases: This event took place on Wednesday, 3 June. A summary of discussions is available at: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12631e.html>

MATTERS RELATING TO SCIENCE AND REVIEW: Research and Systematic Observation: This agenda sub-item (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/INF.1) was first addressed on Monday, 1 June, in plenary. The World Meteorological Organization (WMO) reported on the outcome of the Global Climate Observing System (GCOS) workshop, held in collaboration with the UNFCCC Secretariat and the IPCC, in Bonn, from 10-12 February 2015. The WMO also addressed activities of the World Climate Research Programme and provided an interim progress report on the implementation of the Global Framework for Climate Services. UN-Oceans addressed the adverse impacts of climate change and ocean acidification on the marine environment and marine biodiversity. The IPCC provided information on its recent activities, including preparations of the Panel for the next assessment cycle.

Discussions were then taken up by a contact group co-chaired by Christiane Textor (Germany) and Chris Moseki (South Africa), which met three times. Based on parties' views expressed at the first meeting of the contact group on Wednesday, 3 June, the Co-Chairs produced draft conclusions, which were considered by parties on Friday, 5 June. A revised version of these conclusions was considered and agreed to on Monday, 8 June. During its closing plenary, the SBSTA adopted the conclusions.

Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/L.4), the SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- notes the importance of the IPCC Fifth Assessment Report for the UNFCCC process and welcomes the IPCC outreach efforts to disseminate its findings;
- takes note of the information submitted by parties and by the research programmes and organizations for the seventh meeting of the research dialogue;
- requests the Secretariat to continue its efforts to enhance the availability and visibility of scientific information;
- encourages the scientific community to address information and research gaps identified during the research dialogue, including scenarios that limit warming in 2100 to below 1.5°C relative to pre-industrial levels, and the range of regional and local impacts associated with these scenarios; and
- invites parties to submit their views on possible topics for consideration at the research dialogue to be held at SBSTA 44 and beyond by 9 March 2016, and on themes for a possible research workshop in conjunction with SBSTA 46 by 9 March 2016, for consideration at SBSTA 44.

7th SBSTA Research Dialogue: The 7th SBSTA research dialogue took place on Thursday, 4 June, and featured two parts. The first part focused on addressing data and information gaps, including from the IPCC, and featured presentations by: the IPCC; the World Climate Research Programme, on behalf of other research organizations; the UN Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD); Japan; EURO-CORDEX; and the Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute.

The second part focused on lessons learned and good practices for knowledge and research capacity building, in particular in developing countries. It featured presentations by: Germany; the European Commission; the GCOS; the Asia-Pacific Network for Global Change Research; and the Caribbean Community Climate Change Centre. A webcast of the 7th SBSTA Research Dialogue and the presentations made are available at: <http://unfccc.int/6793.php>

2013-2015 Review: This item (FCCC/SB/2015/INF.1) was first addressed in the SBSTA plenary on Monday, 1 June, and subsequently in a joint SBI/SBSTA contact group co-chaired by Gertraud Wollansky (Austria) and Leon Charles (Grenada) and in informal consultations.

On Tuesday, 2 June, in the joint contact group most parties supported developing draft conclusions and a draft decision covering substantive matters. China and Saudi Arabia called for a procedural outcome.

Many parties also welcomed and suggested referring to the final factual report of the SED. Trinidad and Tobago, for AOSIS, supported by Solomon Islands, for the LDCs, and Botswana, called for strengthening the long-term global goal to 1.5°C. India, supported by Botswana and Bhutan, pointed to the need to address information gaps. Saudi Arabia, Brazil and China cautioned against "cherry picking" from the SED report. A majority of parties supported concluding this item at SB 42.

Over the course of several informal consultations, parties discussed versions of a non-paper containing options, with parties debating whether or not the mandate of the 2013-2015 review includes making substantive recommendations to the COP.

On Wednesday, 10 June, in informal consultations, parties discussed elements for draft conclusions which noted, *inter alia*: the contributions of the IPCC and other experts to the fourth SED session; initiation of consideration of findings from the 2013-2015 review; parties' submissions; appreciation to the SED Co-Facilitators and the Secretariat; the SED's final factual report; and an encouragement to parties to continue to take note of the 2013-2015 review as they engage in the ADP. These negotiations continued in the joint contact group chaired by Co-Chair Charles. Saudi Arabia and China opposed non-procedural paragraphs. As no consensus emerged, parties agreed to continue consideration of this matter at SB 43.

On Thursday, 11 June, during the SBSTA closing plenary, Chair Wojtal recalled that she had encouraged parties to reach an agreement on this important agenda item. SED Co-Facilitator Andreas Fischlin (Switzerland) said that during the SED's four sessions, experts and parties had engaged in a "remarkably fruitful" dialogue. He expressed his confidence that "despite hiccups" in the negotiations on this agenda item, the SED report will inform parties on the relevant science. The SBSTA adopted conclusions.

Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SB/2015/L.1), the SBSTA and SBI indicate that they began their consideration of the SED report (FCCC/SB/2015/INF.1) and agree to continue their consideration of this matter at SB 43.

SBSTA/SBI Special Event on the 2013-2015 Review:

This event convened on Tuesday, 2 June. A summary of the discussions is available at: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12630e.html>

IMPACT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF RESPONSE MEASURES: Discussions on these items, including the sub-items on the forum and work programme and matters relating to Protocol Article 2.3, are summarized under the SBI item on the impact of the implementation of response measures (see page 15).

METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES UNDER THE CONVENTION: Methodologies for the Reporting of

Financial Information by Annex I Parties to the Convention: This item (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/MISC.3 and FCCC/TP/2015/2) was first considered on Monday, 1 June. Chair Wojtal proposed, and parties agreed, that she would conduct informal consultations with interested parties and prepare draft conclusions.

During the SBSTA closing plenary on Thursday, 11 June, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/L.14), the SBSTA:

- welcomes views submitted by parties and observer organizations, the technical paper summarizing existing international methodologies, and the joint SBI/SBSTA/ Standing Committee on Finance (SCF) in-session workshop;
- takes note of the request made by COP 20 for the SCF to take into consideration the outcomes of the workshop, and looks forward to receiving an update on the work of the SCF on MRV of support beyond the biannual assessment and overview of climate finance flows, in particular its recommendations on the methodologies for the reporting of financial information prepared for consideration at SBSTA 43,

in accordance with Decisions 6/CP.20 and 11/CP.20;

- invites the SBI to take note of the technical paper, submissions, and the outcomes of the workshop in its work related to the reporting of financial information by Annex I parties; and
- agrees to consider this matter at SBSTA 43, taking into account the SCF recommendations, technical paper, workshop summary, and submissions, with a view to recommending a draft decision for consideration and adoption at COP 21.

Joint SBI/SBSTA/SCF Workshop on Methodologies for the Reporting of Financial Information by Annex I Parties to the Convention:

This workshop took place on Saturday, 6 June. A summary of the discussions is available at: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12634e.html>

Common Metrics to Calculate the CO2 Equivalence of GHGs: On Monday, 1 June, Chair Wojtal proposed, and parties agreed, to informal consultations facilitated by Takeshi Enoki (Japan). During its closing plenary, on Thursday, 11 June, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/L.8), the SBSTA welcomes the special event on common metrics, held in Bonn, on 7 June, expresses appreciation to the IPCC for providing information on their work and findings on common metrics in the context of the Fifth Assessment Report, and agrees to continue consideration of the issue at SBSTA 44.

Bunker Fuels: This item (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/MISC.4) was first considered on Monday, 1 June. The International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) reported progress on developing standards and guidelines for mitigating emissions from aircraft and related capacity-building activities, including regional workshops. The International Maritime Organization (IMO) highlighted that its Marine Environment Protection Committee had adopted amendments to energy efficiency guidelines. She noted current improvements to the energy efficiency of ships.

Argentina, for a number of developing countries, emphasized the role of aviation and maritime transport in trade. She said that measures to address climate change under the Kyoto Protocol should respect the CBDR principle, and opposed disguised trade restrictions and unilateral measures.

Japan said the application of the CBDR principle is not appropriate for international aviation. The EU expressed support for a robust global mechanism to address aviation emissions.

Parties agreed that Chair Wojtal would consult with interested parties. On Thursday, 11 June, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/L.3) the SBSTA takes note of information received from IMO and ICAO and invites the Secretariats of ICAO and IMO to continue to report on relevant work on this issue.

METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES UNDER THE KYOTO PROTOCOL: Implications of the Implementation of

Decisions 2/CMP.7 to 4/CMP.7 and 1/CMP.8: This item (FCCC/KP/CMP/2014/L.6 Annex) was first considered on Monday, 1 June. Chair Wojtal proposed, and parties agreed to, a contact group co-chaired by Anke Herold (Germany) and Guilherme do Prado Lima (Brazil).

In the contact group on Tuesday, 2 June, participants agreed to focus on three priorities: brackets around clarifying paragraphs on the assigned amounts for parties with economies in transition for the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol in the draft decision (FCCC/KP/CMP/2014/L.6); updating the training programme for expert review teams for the second commitment period; and the implications of delayed reporting on the Kyoto Protocol review.

On the first item, Ukraine agreed to remove the brackets, while Kazakhstan and Belarus requested more time for consultation. On the second item, the EU informed the group they would propose draft text requesting the Secretariat to make the necessary updates. Work on these items continued in informal consultations.

In the contact group on Tuesday, 9 June, Co-Chair Herold presented, and asked for parties' input on, draft conclusions. After including, at the request of the Russian Federation, a reference to the linkages between this sub-item and that on no Quantified Emission Limitation and Reduction Commitments (QELRCs), the contact group agreed to forward the draft conclusions for SBSTA's consideration.

During the SBSTA closing plenary on Thursday, 11 June, the Russian Federation expressed satisfaction with the resolution of several issues that had not been resolved over the past three sessions, and stressed the need for clarity on the application of these decisions to parties without obligations under the second commitment period.

He suggested taking into account in future work on this item: the integrated character of the regime; the need to ensure reliability and durability of the regime; and that the regime must ensure fulfillment of all the necessary tasks at the national level. The SBSTA adopted conclusions and agreed to forward a draft decision on the training programme for members of expert review teams participating in annual reviews under Article 8 of the Kyoto Protocol, contained in Annex III, for consideration and adoption at CMP 11.

Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/L.13), the SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- agrees to continue consideration of this item at SBSTA 43 on the basis of the draft decision texts contained in Annexes I and II, with a view to forwarding them for consideration and adoption at CMP 11;
- affirms the interlinkages between this sub-item and that on no QELRCs and notes that requirements for Annex I parties without a QELRC for the second commitment period will be included in a user-friendly document compiled by the Secretariat, after the conclusion of the item on no QELRCs in the appropriate sections addressing accounting, reporting, review and adjustments; and
- notes the review of the GHG inventory submissions under the Kyoto Protocol can start at the earliest in 2016, recognizing that starting in early 2016 may place an excessive burden on parties, the Secretariat and expert reviewers because of the simultaneous conduct of other review processes in 2016, and that the review of the first GHG inventory submissions for the second commitment period may be conducted in conjunction with the review of the 2016 GHG inventory submissions.

Accounting, Reporting and Review Requirements for Annex I Parties without a QELRC for the 2nd Commitment Period:

This item (FCCC/TP/2014/6) was first considered on Monday, 1 June. Chair Wojtal proposed, and parties agreed to, a contact group co-chaired by Anke Herold (Germany) and Guilherme do Prado Lima (Brazil).

In the contact group on 2 June, the Secretariat presented the technical paper on this item (FCCC/TP/2014/6), explaining that Section G (clarification of reporting requirements for Annex I Parties without a QELRC for the second commitment period) identifies issues that, as of November 2014, either had been clarified by CMP decisions, or may have required further discussion and clarification by parties. Parties returned to these issues in informal consultations.

In the contact group on 9 June, Co-Chair do Prado Lima presented draft conclusions, noting deliberations would continue at SBSTA 43 on the basis of textual proposals submitted by parties. The contact group forwarded the draft conclusions to the SBSTA.

During the SBSTA closing plenary on Thursday, 11 June, the SBSTA adopted the conclusions.

Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/L.10), the SBSTA notes it advanced its work on matters related to accounting, reporting and review for parties without QELRCs but was unable to conclude it, and agrees to continue its consideration of these matters at SBSTA 43, taking into account the texts contained in the annex.

Clarification of the Text in Section G (Article 3.7ter) of the Doha Amendment to the Kyoto Protocol: This item (FCCC/KP/CMP/2013/7 and FCCC/SBSTA/2014/L.25 Annex) was first considered on Monday, 1 June. Chair Wojtal proposed, and parties agreed to, a contact group co-chaired by Anke Herold (Germany) and Guilherme do Prado Lima (Brazil).

In the contact group on 2 June, Co-Chair Herold reviewed the five options contained in document FCCC/SBSTA/2014/L.25 for clarifying the language on "average annual emissions for the first three years of the preceding commitment period."

South Africa, supported by Brazil and Saint Lucia, and opposed by Kazakhstan and Belarus, proposed deleting option 4, which states that Article 3.7ter refers to the preceding commitment period of that party.

Saint Lucia, opposed by Turkey, Belarus and Kazakhstan, proposed also deleting option 1, which states that Article 3.7ter is not applicable in the second commitment period of parties that did not have QELRCs during the first commitment period.

The contact group agreed to combine options 1 and 4 into a single option, which, along with the other options, was discussed in informal consultations.

In the contact group on 9 June, Co-Chair Herold proposed procedural draft conclusions. Following discussions on the annex to the conclusions containing options for elements of a draft decision on this item, the contact group placed brackets around Section II on options related to "average annual emissions" of the draft decision and agreed to forward the draft conclusions for SBSTA's consideration.

During its closing plenary, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/L.11), the SBSTA agrees to continue its consideration of this matter at SBSTA 43, taking into account the options for elements of a draft decision.

Implications of the Inclusion of Reforestation of Lands with Forests in Exhaustion as Afforestation and Reforestation CDM Project Activities: This item was first considered on Monday, 1 June. During its closing plenary, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/L.6), the SBSTA agrees to continue consideration of this matter at SBSTA 44 with a view to reporting on the outcomes to CMP 12.

MARKET AND NON-MARKET MECHANISMS UNDER THE CONVENTION: These items, including sub-items on the framework of various approaches, non-market-based approaches and new market-based mechanisms, were first considered on Monday, 1 June, and subsequently in informal consultations co-facilitated by Aida Rocio Garcia Garcia-Naranjo (Peru) and Peer Stiansen (Norway). During the SBSTA closing plenary, Chair Wojtal reported no conclusions had been reached and that the sub-items would be placed on the provisional agenda of SBSTA 43.

SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF MITIGATION OF CLIMATE CHANGE:

This item was first considered by the SBSTA on Monday, 1 June. Parties agreed that SBSTA Chair Wojtal would conduct consultations with interested parties. During its closing plenary meeting on Thursday, 11 June, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/L.12), the SBSTA agrees the work carried out under this agenda item provided useful information, notes that discussions on this matter are taking place under various bodies and processes under the Convention, and concludes consideration of this matter.

COOPERATION WITH OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION: During the SBSTA opening plenary on Monday, 1 June, the UNFCCC Secretariat introduced this item (UNFCCC/SBSTA/2015/INF.3 and Corr.1) outlining the Secretariat's engagement with other international organizations and stakeholders. Parties agreed that Chair Wojtal would consult with interested parties. During its closing plenary, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/L.9), the SBSTA, *inter alia*, welcomes the presented documents, reaffirms the importance of the Secretariat engaging with other intergovernmental organizations, and recognizes that the resources and expertise of other intergovernmental organizations are relevant to the UNFCCC process.

CLOSING PLENARY: On Thursday, 11 June, Chair Wojtal informed that no administrative or budgetary implications had arisen from conclusions adopted at SBSTA 42. Rapporteur Stasile Znutiene (Lithuania) introduced, and parties adopted, the report of the session (FCCC/SBSTA/2015/L.1).

South Africa, for the G-77/China, welcomed constructive engagement on agriculture and conclusion of negotiations on REDD+ methodological guidance. She called for continuing consideration of response measures and methodological issues under the Kyoto Protocol in Paris.

Maldives, for AOSIS, expressed disappointment that parties were not able to recognize the SED report findings and called for an outcome on the 2013-2015 review in Paris that will serve as important input for the work of the ADP. He stressed the importance of developing methodologies for reporting financial information by Annex I parties.

The EU welcomed progress on REDD+, agriculture, financial information reporting methodologies and response measures. On expectations for Paris, she underscored: an agreement on methodological issues relating to Protocol Articles 5, 7 and 8; and a substantive outcome on the 2013-2015 review, including a long-term global goal under the ADP.

Mexico, for the EIG, said progress on REDD+ leaves it "poised to become a mechanism ready to deliver real, permanent outcomes." She expressed concern over the fact that the contact group on the 2013-2015 review had been unable to reach a meaningful conclusion, noting the SED has been exemplary in establishing a new science-policy interface. She called on parties to return to the table to show this process is guided by science.

Australia, for the Umbrella Group, welcomed the conclusion of the three REDD+ items and the rich sharing of information at the agricultural workshops, and expressed disappointment with the lack of a substantive conclusion on the 2013-2015 review.

Sudan, for the African Group, appreciated the successful work under REDD+, especially on non-carbon benefits, and looked forward to the report from the agricultural workshop, stressing it should be comprehensive and capture developing countries' views. He lamented lack of progress on finalizing rules for the Kyoto Protocol's second commitment period and concluding the item on the 2013-2015 review.

Panama, for the Coalition for Rainforest Nations, welcomed the conclusion of work on REDD+ after 10 years of negotiations, and advocated finishing work on integrating land use into market and non-market approaches.

Lauding the closure of REDD+ items, Angola, for the LDCs, looked forward to the provision of adequate and predictable support from developed countries. He urged finding the means to allow smallholder farmers to access information from the "extremely valuable" agricultural workshops.

Afghanistan called for workshops on adaptation that address landslides, such as those affecting her country.

The US cautioned against combining a CMP-mandated item with Convention-mandated items, as happened with the item on common metrics.

Brazil recalled that common metrics is of "utmost importance" under the Convention, its protocol and the outcome of the Durban Platform, saying discussing the item separately may not be most effective.

The Farmers' Constituency said their calls for a work programme on agriculture under SBSTA "finally fell on fertile ground" in 2014, noting the agriculture workshops had demonstrated a "real thirst" for this knowledge.

Women and Gender lamented the agriculture workshops did not highlight the differential impacts on women, and, with Youth NGOs, strongly opposed market mechanisms.

Saying the session lacked a sense of urgency, Youth NGOs asked delegates which side of history they wanted to be part of, highlighting the suffering lack of action will induce.

Climate Action Network, for ENGOs, called for the focus of REDD+ to shift to implementation.

Indigenous Peoples called on parties to ensure the Paris agreement respects, protects and fulfills the human rights of indigenous peoples.

In closing, UNFCCC Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres thanked SBSTA Chair Wojtal for her courage, good management and leadership. Wojtal thanked parties for their hard work and said communication channels will remain open as they work toward Paris.

The SBSTA was gavelled to a close at 11:40 am.

A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF THE BONN CLIMATE CHANGE CONFERENCE

With summer in the air, UNFCCC parties gathered in the newly inaugurated World Conference Center Bonn, halfway along the road to the Paris Climate Change Conference in December 2015, where they are expected to adopt a new legally-binding agreement. Delegates in Bonn were faced with a gargantuan task. ADP negotiators had to produce a streamlined and concise negotiating text for the 2015 agreement; consider which elements to include in the agreement, and which ones to leave to COP decisions; and start substantive negotiations. They also had to continue efforts to enhance pre-2020 climate action. This packed ADP agenda stole the limelight, in spite of the SBSTA and SBI having a long list of outstanding issues for consideration. While progress was made on some SBI and SBSTA items, negotiations under the ADP largely focused on minor editorial changes to the Geneva text and the mode of work. This brief analysis will examine the Bonn Climate Change Conference, review the outcomes of the session, and analyze current negotiation dynamics, as well as their implications for future meetings on the road to Paris.

STREAMLINING THE GENEVA NEGOTIATING TEXT

In the lead-up to the Bonn Climate Change Conference, there was much trepidation about how delegates would go about negotiating the 2015 agreement. The 90-page text that formed the basis for discussions had been hastily assembled at the Geneva Climate Change Conference in February 2015, on the basis of the mechanical compilation of parties' proposals and without negotiation. One shrewd observer described the result of this process as an "inedible fruit salad," with some paragraphs containing as many as 15 options, proposals on similar issues dispersed across sections of the text, and various duplications and overlaps.

In Bonn, 12 facilitated groups, each focusing on a section of the Geneva negotiating text, were asked to turn this concoction into a more "concise, coherent and streamlined" text. Nobody expected the streamlining of the Geneva text to be easy, yet many were disheartened by how hard this task proved to be. Facilitated groups spent a considerable amount of time in procedural discussions on the method to use to streamline and consolidate the Geneva negotiating text. They started with the

"easy" task of eliminating duplications and then attempted to "unpack" paragraphs and merge options that dealt with similar issues. Even though all groups received the same guidance from the ADP Co-Chairs, they proceeded in different ways and at different speeds, leading to a set of disparate outputs. For example, the facilitated group on transparency was the only one to agree on a sample template for restructuring the whole section. Some groups agreed on tables containing the themes addressed in the section, whereas others forwarded a re-clustered version of their sections of the text under different themes.

In spite of the best endeavors of the ADP Co-Chairs, the groups' facilitators and an army of supporting Secretariat staff, by the end of the session, the negotiating text had only shrunk by five pages, leaving a feeling that while some "low hanging fruit" had been picked, all of the difficult decisions were left for the next ADP session in late August. In Bonn, a few parties lamented that the streamlining of the Geneva text could have been carried out by the ADP Co-Chairs and the Secretariat ahead of the meeting, thus saving precious negotiating time. Yet others felt that, in order to ensure a sense of ownership and trust in the process, the mechanical streamlining had to be carried out by parties.

BUILDING TRUST

Cutting down the size of the text was not the ADP negotiators' only mission in Bonn. Another important and subtler task for the Co-Chairs and delegates was to generate a climate of trust for the negotiations ahead. In that, many agreed that the discussions at this session were arguably much more successful.

Most parties commended the spirit of compromise that prevailed in ADP negotiations. The streamlining exercise generated a feeling of trust, as parties relinquished the habit of reiterating pre-written statements to actually engage in dialogue on procedural matters, while forming unprecedented alliances with unlikely partners, usually on other side of the fence. This trust-building exercise owed much to the strenuous efforts of the facilitators of the various groups entrusted to streamline different sections of the Geneva text.

Attending to the task of streamlining and consolidating an extremely bulky negotiating text in a 196 parties-driven process could lead to, as one delegate put it, too many cooks spoiling the proverbial broth. Therefore, in the end of the Bonn conference, parties entrusted the ADP Co-Chairs to prepare a "fully streamlined, consolidated, clear and concise version of the Geneva negotiating text that will present clear options and will not omit or delete any option or position of parties." The Co-Chairs' mandate therefore entails striking a delicate balance between simplifying the text and making sure that no party's suggestion is removed from the text. With a streamlined version expected by the end of July, the ADP Co-Chairs have but a few weeks to attend to the highly sensitive task that parties barely managed to begin.

This climate of trust building in the ADP was also helped by positive developments in negotiations under the SBSTA and SBI. With a sudden leap forward, delegates managed to close the ten-year cycle of negotiations on methodological guidance for REDD+, including controversial issues, such as non-market-

based approaches and non-carbon benefits. The conclusion of negotiations on REDD+ demonstrated that reaching compromise in the climate regime is still possible, even if, according to some, compromise was reached at the expense of substance.

STARTING SUBSTANTIVE NEGOTIATIONS

The most important objective of the Bonn conference was to begin substantive negotiations on the Geneva text. In this regard, the results were rather modest. Since the bulk of negotiating time was dedicated to streamlining and rationalizing the text, it was only towards the end of the meeting that some facilitated groups managed to engage in conceptual discussions. In the facilitated group on institutional arrangements and that on finance, for example, parties debated the concepts behind their proposals, without negotiating the substance of the issues at hand.

Little progress was also made on whether or not to start identifying which elements of the Geneva text are to be housed in the agreement, and which are best treated in COP decisions. This exercise is key if governments want to start delineating a nimble agreement with general provisions, which can be fleshed out and operationalized by decisions over time. However, many parties in Bonn were reluctant to engage in this exercise, fearing that an agreement to move text into decisions would downgrade the new agreement's legal force.

The lack of progress on these and other issues will put more pressure on delegates when they meet again at the next two ADP meetings scheduled before Paris. The same may be said about lack of progress on catalyzing pre-2020 action. To the surprise of many, negotiations on this issue virtually stalled in Bonn, with parties unable to agree on what the mandate of the ADP workstream on pre-2020 ambition actually entails. Many developing countries consider pre-2020 ambition as a springboard for enhancing post-2020 action. The polarization of views on pre-2020 ambition could therefore set back progress towards the 2015 agreement.

Another potential threat comes from disputes over the mandate of the 2013-2015 review. In Bonn, a handful of parties disputed that matters of substance be captured in the results of the review, bringing negotiations under this issue to a halt. Since the ADP is meant to be informed by the results of the review, negotiators in Paris will be faced by the additional hurdle of bridging parties' differences and concluding work on this matter.

LOOKING AHEAD

In spite of limited progress under the ADP, things were not all doom and gloom in Bonn. Progress on issues such as REDD+ seems to suggest that intergovernmental cooperation could provide an important basis for developments beyond the UNFCCC. REDD+ is quintessentially a bottom-up, voluntary and sectoral approach to climate change mitigation, whose implementation so far has relied upon the initiative of willing countries, and support from international and bilateral arrangements beyond the UNFCCC.

Some in Bonn wondered whether this hybrid bottom-up/top-down approach could be a sign of climate governance to come. "Coalition of the willing" approaches are not new to climate negotiations. At the ill-fated Copenhagen Climate Change Conference in 2009, a bottom-up approach to climate

governance was initiated. Ever since, the climate regime has made significant strides in creating an intergovernmental process to encapsulate and review bottom-up efforts, through the international assessment and review and the international consultation and analysis. The Paris Climate Change Conference is largely expected to bring this process towards completion, by creating a hybrid architecture that brings together parties' nationally determined contributions under an internationally-agreed framework.

To this end, a positive signal came from the G7 leaders convening in southern Germany in parallel to the Bonn conference. The leaders committed to do their part to achieve a low-carbon global economy in the long-term. Like the UNFCCC parties, they recognized that this radical transformation cannot be achieved by states alone. In this vein, the G7 called on the multilateral development banks to use their capacity to mobilize other partners to help countries transition to low-carbon economies. Their call was echoed by the Global Environment Facility's adoption of a new work programme to expand engagement with private sector initiatives that seek to deliver global environmental benefits.

Initiatives undertaken by non-state actors also enjoyed ever-greater visibility in Bonn, in the Technical Expert Meetings on renewable energy and energy efficiency, as well as on banners that could be seen around the venue, announcing climate change mitigation or adaptation pledges by cities, regions and businesses. Also recognizing that success in Paris will partly depend on the commitment of non-state actors, the incoming COP 21 French Presidency announced a series of dedicated events to showcase the collaboration of cities, regions, companies, investors and national governments to increase global ambition to act on climate change.

It remains to be seen, however, whether these expressions of goodwill will inspire UNFCCC parties to overcome their differences and move beyond procedural debates to deliver much needed guidance and leadership, ensuring that all these various efforts converge towards climate action that is in line with that required by science.

UPCOMING MEETINGS

High-level Event on Climate Change: The President of the UN General Assembly will convene this high-level event, with the aim of giving momentum and adding impetus to efforts to reach a global agreement in 2015 under the UNFCCC. **date:** 29 June 2015 **location:** UN Headquarters, New York **contact:** Office of the President of the UN General Assembly **www:** http://www.un.org/pga/290615_hle-climate-change/

Our Common Future Under Climate Change: Organized by the UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the International Council for Science and Future Earth, in collaboration with a partnership of French organizations, this science-focused conference will examine the latest research around climate change. The event will touch upon: the state of knowledge on climate change; responding to climate change challenges; and collective action and transformative solutions. **dates:** 7-10 July 2015 **location:**

Paris, France **contact:** Conference Secretariat **email:** science@commonfuture-paris2015.org **www:** <http://www.commonfuture-paris2015.org/>

Third International Conference on Financing for Development: The Third International Conference on Financing for Development will be held at the highest possible political level, including Heads of State and Government, ministers for finance, foreign affairs and development cooperation, and other special representatives. The conference will result both in an intergovernmentally negotiated and agreed outcome and summaries of the plenary meetings and other deliberations of the Conference, to be included in the report of the Conference.

dates: 13-16 July 2015 **location:** Addis Ababa, Ethiopia **contact:** UN Financing for Development Office **phone:** +1-212-963-4598 **email:** ffdoffice@un.org **www:** <http://www.un.org/ffd3>

ADP 2-10: The tenth part of the second session of the ADP is expected to convene in August/September 2015. **dates:** 31 August - 4 September 2015 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** <http://www.unfccc.int>

CCAC Working Group Meeting: The Climate and Clean Air Coalition Working Group will continue its work in guiding CCAC's cooperative actions. **dates:** 8-9 September 2015 **location:** Paris, France **contact:** CCAC Secretariat **phone:** +33-1-44-37-14-50 **fax:** +33-1-44-37-14-74 **email:** ccac_secretariat@unep.org **www:** <http://www.ccacoalition.org/>

UN Summit to Adopt the Post-2015 Development Agenda: The summit is expected to adopt the post-2015 development agenda, including: a declaration; a set of Sustainable Development Goals, targets, and indicators; their means of implementation and a new Global Partnership for Development; and a framework for follow-up and review of implementation. **dates:** 25-27 September 2015 **location:** UN Headquarters, New York **contact:** UN Division for Sustainable Development **fax:** + 1-212-963-4260 **email:** dsd@un.org **www:** <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/post2015/summit>

42nd Session of the IPCC: The 42nd session of the IPCC is expected to convene in October 2015. **dates:** 5-8 October 2015 **location:** Dubrovnik, Croatia **contact:** IPCC Secretariat **phone:** +41-22-730-8208/54/84 **fax:** +41-22-730-8025/13 **email:** IPCC-Sec@wmo.int **www:** <http://www.ipcc.ch>

ADP 2-11: The eleventh part of the second session of the ADP is expected to convene in October 2015. **dates:** 19-23 October 2015 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** <http://www.unfccc.int>

UNFCCC COP 21: The 21st session of the COP to the UNFCCC and associated meetings will take place in Paris. **dates:** 30 November - 11 December 2015 **location:** Paris, France **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** <http://www.unfccc.int>

For additional meetings, see <http://climate-1.iisd.org/>

GLOSSARY

ADP	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action
AILAC	Independent Alliance of Latin America and the Caribbean
AOSIS	Alliance of Small Island States
BUR	Biennial update report
CBDR	Common but differentiated responsibilities
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CMP	Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol
COP	Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC
CTCN	Climate Technology Centre and Network
EIG	Environmental Integrity Group
ENGO	Environmental non-governmental organization
GCF	Green Climate Fund
GCOS	Global Climate Observing System
GHG	Greenhouse gas
IAR	International assessment and review
ICAO	International Civil Aviation Organization
INDC	Intended nationally determined contribution
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
ITL	International Transaction Log
LDCs	Least Developed Countries
LEG	Least Developed Countries Expert Group
LMDCs	Like-Minded Developing Countries
MOI	Means of implementation
MRV	Measuring, reporting and verification
NAP	National adaptation plan
NAPA	National adaptation programme of action
NDC	Nationally determined contribution
NGO	Non-governmental organization
QELRC	Quantified emission limitation and reduction commitment
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
SBI	Subsidiary Body for Implementations
SBSTA	Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice
SED	Structured expert dialogue on the 2013-2015 review
SIDS	Small island developing states
TEC	Technology Executive Committee
TEM	Technical Expert Meeting
TEP	Technical Examination Process
UNFCCC	UN Framework Convention on Climate Change