

## BONN HIGHLIGHTS: WEDNESDAY, 17 MAY 2017

The Bonn Climate Change Conference continued on Wednesday. Throughout the day, informal consultations, contact groups and mandated events convened.

### SBSTA

**PARIS AGREEMENT ARTICLE 6 (COOPERATIVE APPROACHES):** Co-Facilitator Hugh Sealy (Maldives) invited parties to reflect on the draft conclusions. Parties agreed on the Co-Facilitators' proposal for SBSTA to take note of the roundtable discussions. Parties then discussed as a package the informal note containing the lists of elements and an invitation for submissions. Co-Facilitator Kelley Kizzier (EU) identified three issues to be resolved within this package: observers making submissions; guiding submissions; and linkage with the lists. While parties generally agreed on the need for submissions, they disagreed on whether, and the extent to which, submissions should be guided by the list of elements. On inviting submissions from observers, many parties emphasized the need to reach a level of "maturity" in discussions before inviting further views, with several parties opposing. After discussions, parties agreed to a compromise proposal making an implicit reference to the list of elements in guiding submissions.

On inviting the Secretariat to produce a synthesis paper of parties' submissions, many developing countries, supported by some developed countries, underlined the utility to smaller delegations of synthesis papers. A group of developing countries, opposed by another party, proposed to mandate the SBSTA Chair to prepare a non-paper capturing convergence, divergence, and options and views expressed.

In the afternoon, parties continued to consider the draft conclusions. Parties diverged on inviting the SBSTA Chair to produce a synthesis document based on party submissions.

Views also diverged on the engagement of observers in roundtables and submissions. On the roundtable's output, parties extensively discussed who would produce the informal note and what its status would be. Co-Facilitator Kizzier proposed a package agreement on all items and suggested forwarding the participation of observers as an unresolved issue to the SBSTA Chair. Deliberations continued in the evening.

### MODALITIES FOR THE ACCOUNTING OF FINANCIAL RESOURCES PROVIDED AND MOBILIZED THROUGH PUBLIC INTERVENTIONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH AGREEMENT ARTICLE 9.7:

Parties agreed to amended text in an informal note that reflected requests for, *inter alia*: reference to the transparency framework in the objectives section; and moving three items to the additional further consideration, namely, harmonization of reporting approaches across parties, loss and damage, and Article 9.5 (biennial communication of support to developing countries). On these last

two items, some developed countries suggested these are beyond the SBSTA's mandate, which some developing country groups opposed. The contact group then convened to agree to draft conclusions and that the Co-Chair's informal note be uploaded to the UNFCCC website.

**AGRICULTURE:** Co-Facilitator Emmanuel Dlamini (Swaziland) introduced a Co-Facilitators' non-paper. All parties supported it as a basis for future discussions. Developing countries underlined the need to move toward implementation, and welcomed that the non-paper includes advice to implementing bodies as issues for consideration, with some noting the need to respect the mandates of UNFCCC bodies and the process. Developed countries welcomed the substantive discussions and steps forward.

Speaking at the invitation of the Co-Facilitators, CAN proposed a joint SBSTA/SBI work programme to enable implementation, and learning and identification of knowledge gaps.

### SBI

#### REPORTING FROM NON-ANNEX I PARTIES:

**Provision of financial and technical support:** Helen Plume (New Zealand) co-facilitated. Parties could not reach agreement on draft conclusions. Parties' views differed, *inter alia*, on the responsiveness of the GEF. The Co-Facilitators will inform the SBI Chair and await further guidance regarding the possibility of additional negotiating time.

### SBI/SBSTA

**RESPONSE MEASURES:** Co-Facilitator Andrei Marcu (Panama) presented text drafted the previous evening by the G-77/China, the EU and the Umbrella Group, to which parties agreed. SBI and SBSTA Chairs convened the contact group and parties adopted the draft conclusions, which include agreement on the convening of pre-sessional meetings and production of a report of the Bonn TEG by the Co-Facilitators.

### APA

In the contact group, Co-Chair Jo Tyndall (New Zealand) presented the second iteration of the APA draft conclusions and outlined three options for organizing pre-sessional work. The Co-Facilitators of informal consultations reported on the discussions and next steps.

Ecuador, for the G-77/CHINA, called for: more harmonized reflections across items; clarity on addressing pre-2020 work; and further focus on linkages.

On further guidance on mitigation, Iran, for the LMDCs, supported having a non-paper prepared by the Co-Facilitators to identify areas of divergences and convergences. Switzerland, for the EIG, Ethiopia, for the LDCs, and BRAZIL, also for ARGENTINA and URUGUAY, opposed by Iran, for the LMDCs, supported holding a pre-sessional roundtable.

On adaptation communications, the EIG, Maldives, for AOSIS, the LDCs, South Africa, for the AFRICAN GROUP, and BRAZIL, also for ARGENTINA and URUGUAY, supported a call for focused submissions. The LDCs and BRAZIL, also for ARGENTINA and URUGUAY, opposed by the EIG, called for a pre-session roundtable. The AFRICAN GROUP characterized the technical paper as a repetition of the one already on the table. Australia, for the UMBRELLA GROUP, opposed a technical paper synthesizing types of adaptation-related information included in NDCs.

On transparency, the LMDCs supported having a pre-session roundtable. The EIG and the EU called for a two-day workshop. The LDCs suggested consolidating submissions as an input to the roundtable. The AFRICAN GROUP expressed concern that transparency of support was not as elaborated as the other elements.

On the GST, many expressed disappointment with the results of discussions. The LMDCs, the EIG and the UMBRELLA GROUP supported targeted parties' submissions, and AOSIS and Guatemala, for AILAC, called for submissions on areas of convergence and divergence. Opposed by the LMDCs and the EIG, the AFRICAN GROUP supported a roundtable. Various developing country groups called for a reference to the Co-Facilitators' informal note.

On compliance, the EIG was "not convinced" of the need to have a workshop. AOSIS and the UMBRELLA GROUP called for focused submissions. The LDCs called for a compilation of submissions and a technical paper for the roundtable.

On the Adaptation Fund, the LDCs, the AFRICAN GROUP and the US stated the draft conclusions do not capture progress. AOSIS, supported by BRAZIL, also on behalf of ARGENTINA and URUGUAY, stressed the need for in-depth dialogue on the governance and operational modalities of the Adaptation Fund serving the Paris Agreement.

The UMBRELLA GROUP opposed a paragraph stating that COP 23 will address the need for procedural clarity regarding draft decisions at CMA 1 relating to the response measures forum and recognition of adaptation efforts. The US underlined that these mandates are clear.

On the format of the roundtables, the AFRICAN GROUP called for prioritizing issues where work is not sufficiently advanced before COP 23. The LMDCs supported half-day events and stressed the need to avoid overlaps with related issues.

The EIG, the LDCs and AILAC supported capturing the roundtables' outcomes in informal notes; the LMDCs opposed.

Noting that in some areas parties expressed "equal and opposite" views, Co-Chair Tyndall urged parties to consult informally and present solutions on the way forward later in the afternoon.

In the afternoon, Co-Chair Sarah Bashaan (Saudi Arabia) presented the changes made to the draft Co-Chairs' conclusions.

On pre-session workshops, the LMDCs stressed that emphasis be given to pre-session roundtables on issues that are "lagging behind" and opposed a roundtable for agenda item 3 (mitigation), requesting a non-paper instead.

The EIG, supported by the AFRICAN GROUP, the LDCs, the EU and NORWAY, proposed one day for mitigation, two days for transparency, and, with ARGENTINA, also for BRAZIL and URUGUAY, one day for adaptation communications. The AFRICAN GROUP, supported by AOSIS and AILAC, stressed that one day of the transparency roundtable should be dedicated to transparency of support. AUSTRALIA and NEW ZEALAND questioned the propriety of allocating one full day to support, noting this is only one of the areas needing further discussion.

CHINA proposed a one-day workshop on transparency, split in half between support and adaptation, and opposed a roundtable on "NDCs," citing a lack of consensus on the issues. He supported a roundtable on adaptation communications.

The LDCs called for roundtables on all items, including, and supported by ARGENTINA, also for BRAZIL and URUGUAY, and AOSIS, an in-session roundtable on compliance.

The LDCs called for non-papers capturing convergence and divergence from all other agenda items. The AFRICAN GROUP supported such a non-paper for adaptation communications, which the US, JAPAN and NORWAY opposed.

On the Adaptation Fund, ARGENTINA, also for BRAZIL and URUGUAY, proposed text welcoming the substantive progress achieved in "exchanging views and information" instead of "the negotiations."

After extensive huddles among parties, Co-Chair Baashan proposed: a two-day roundtable on transparency, with one day devoted to transparency of support, technical expert review and facilitative multilateral consideration, and the other day for transparency of action, including mitigation and adaptation; a one-day roundtable on adaptation communications; and a one-day roundtable on the GST. She also proposed two parallel in-session roundtables on mitigation and compliance.

The AFRICAN GROUP called for specifying that the technical expert review and facilitative multilateral consideration are linked to transparency of support. The LMDCs suggested deleting reference to the technical expert review and facilitative multilateral consideration. The Co-Chairs will revise the draft conclusions.

### ***MULTI-STAKEHOLDER DIALOGUE ON THE OPERATIONALIZATION OF THE LOCAL COMMUNITIES AND INDIGENOUS PEOPLES PLATFORM***

Opening the second day, SBSTA Chair Fuller highlighted three possible functions of the platform: knowledge; climate change policies and actions; and capacity for engagement.

Participants reflected on these functions, highlighting, among many others, the need to build on indigenous peoples' knowledge and capacity to communicate climate impacts and participate in decision making to improve policies.

On structure, the INTERNATIONAL INDIGENOUS PEOPLES FORUM ON CLIMATE CHANGE called for a fully-funded work programme coordinated by a secretariat and, with some parties, supported co-leadership of indigenous and state representatives.

CANADA, supported by others, expressed willingness to co-lead with indigenous peoples intersessional work to further advance the practical details, noting that they would need to be agreed by indigenous peoples and parties at COP 23.

The session closed with a prayer by Chief Francois Paulette, Dene Nation Elder's Council.

### ***IN THE CORRIDORS***

As SBSTA and SBI contact groups agreed to draft conclusions, those involved in the Paris work programme seemed to wearily accept that it was now up to future meetings to further unpack the Paris Agreement. In this regard, one noted the need to "re-balance this 'three-wheeled vehicle' that left Paris too mitigation focused." He lamented some parties' reluctance to engage constructively in the effort to improve the "weaker moving parts," namely, adaptation and support.

Enumerating total minutes spent in discussions, others rejected the notion that aspects of support had received less time than mitigation-related issues at this session. As the contact group coalesced into huge "Warsaw-like" huddles to work out how many roundtables to convene and on what issues, one seasoned delegate wondered "how will we ever be able to agree on substance when we return to Poland in 2018?"

**ENB SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS:** The *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* summary and analysis of the Bonn Climate Conference will be available on Monday, 22 May 2017, online at: <http://enb.iisd.org/climate/sb46/enb/>