



SUMMARY OF THE BONN CLIMATE CHANGE CONFERENCE: 3-14 JUNE 2013

The Bonn Climate Change Conference, which took place in Germany from 3-14 June 2013, comprised the 38th sessions of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) and Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA). The resumed second session of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP 2) also convened. Approximately 1480 government delegates, 900 observers and 30 media representatives attended the meeting.

SBI 38 was characterized by an agenda dispute concerning a proposal by the Russian Federation, Belarus and Ukraine to introduce a new item on legal and procedural issues related to decision-making under the Conference of the Parties (COP) and Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP). Underlying the proposal was their dissatisfaction with the decision-making process at the UN Climate Change Conference in Doha in 2012. While recognizing the importance of the issue, other parties opposed considering it as a new SBI agenda item. Instead, a proposal was made to consider the issue as part of the SBI agenda item on arrangements for intergovernmental meetings. This was unacceptable to the Russian Federation, Ukraine and Belarus. As no solution to the dispute was found, the SBI was unable to launch substantive work in Bonn. Many were disappointed with the outcome and concerned about the implications for COP 19 and CMP 9 to be held in Warsaw in November 2013.

SBSTA 38 had a busy agenda and swiftly began working through it. The various SBSTA negotiating groups were allocated more negotiating time slots than usual given that no substantive negotiations formally took place under the SBI. SBSTA 38 achieved what many saw as good progress, *inter alia*, on reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries and the role of conservation and enhancement of forest carbon stocks (REDD+), and several methodological issues.

The resumed ADP 2 was structured around workshops and roundtables on Workstream 1 (2015 agreement) and Workstream 2 (pre-2020 ambition). No agreement was reached on establishing one or more contact groups to move part of

the work to a more formal setting. Many, however, felt that switching to a negotiating mode will be important to ensure that the ADP makes progress in future sessions.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE UNFCCC AND THE KYOTO PROTOCOL

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

In December 1997, delegates to the third session of the Conference of the Parties (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.

IN THIS ISSUE

| | |
|--|----|
| A Brief History of the UNFCCC and the Kyoto Protocol. . . | 1 |
| Report of the Bonn Climate Change Conference | 3 |
| Subsidiary Body for Implementation | 3 |
| Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice | 5 |
| <i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action | 12 |
| A Brief Analysis of the Bonn Climate Change Conference | 17 |
| Upcoming Meetings. | 19 |
| Glossary | 20 |



LONG-TERM NEGOTIATIONS IN 2005-2009: Convening in Montreal, Canada, at the end of 2005, the first session of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (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. COP 11 created a process to consider long-term cooperation under the Convention through a series of four workshops known as "the Convention Dialogue."

In December 2007, COP 13 and CMP 3 in Bali, Indonesia, resulted in agreement on the Bali Roadmap on long-term issues. COP 13 adopted the Bali Action Plan and established the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention (AWG-LCA) with a mandate to focus on mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology and a shared vision for long-term cooperative action. Negotiations on Annex I parties' further commitments continued under the AWG-KP. The deadline for concluding the two-track negotiations was in Copenhagen in 2009. In preparation, both AWGs held several negotiating sessions in 2008-2009.

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

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

The Cancun Agreements also established several new institutions and processes, including the Cancun Adaptation Framework and the Adaptation Committee, and the Technology Mechanism, which includes the Technology Executive Committee and the Climate Technology Centre and Network.

The Green Climate Fund (GCF) was created and designated as an operating entity of the Convention's financial mechanism governed by a 24-member board. Parties agreed to set up a Transitional Committee tasked with the Fund's design and a Standing Committee to assist the COP with respect to the financial mechanism. Parties also recognized the commitment by developed countries to provide US\$30 billion of fast-start finance in 2010-2012, and to jointly mobilize US\$100 billion per year by 2020.

Under the Protocol track, the CMP urged Annex I parties to raise the level of ambition towards achieving aggregate emission reductions consistent with the range identified in the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), and adopted Decision 2/CMP.6 on land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF). The mandates of the two AWGs were extended for another year.

DURBAN: The UN Climate Change Conference in Durban, South Africa, took place from 28 November to 11 December 2011. The Durban outcomes cover a wide range of topics, notably the establishment of a second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol, a decision on long-term cooperative action under the Convention and agreement on the operationalization of the GCF. Parties also agreed to launch the new ADP with a mandate "to develop a protocol, another legal instrument or an agreed outcome with legal force under the Convention applicable to all Parties." The ADP is scheduled to complete these negotiations by 2015. The new instrument should enter into effect from 2020 onwards. In addition, the ADP was also 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 took place from 26 November to 8 December 2012. The conference resulted in a package of decisions, referred to as the "Doha Climate Gateway." These include amendments to the Kyoto Protocol to establish its second commitment period and agreement to terminate the AWG-KP's work in Doha. The parties also agreed to terminate the AWG-LCA and negotiations under the Bali Action Plan. A number of issues requiring further consideration were transferred under the SBI and SBSTA, such as: the 2013-15 review of the global goal; developed and developing country mitigation; the Kyoto Protocol's flexibility mechanisms; national adaptation plans; MRV; market and non-market mechanisms; and REDD+. Key elements of the Doha outcome also included agreement to consider loss and damage, "such as an institutional mechanism to address loss and damage in developing countries that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change."

ADP 2: ADP 2 met in Bonn, Germany, from 29 April to 3 May 2013. The session was structured around workshops and roundtable discussions, covering the ADP's two workstreams. Many felt this format was helpful in moving the ADP discussions forward. Several delegates noted, however, that the ADP needs to become more focused and interactive in future sessions.

REPORT OF THE BONN CLIMATE CHANGE CONFERENCE

SBI 38 and SBSTA 38 opened on Monday, 3 June. ADP 2 held its opening plenary on Tuesday, 4 June. This report summarizes the discussions by the three bodies based on their respective agendas.

SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR IMPLEMENTATION

Opening SBI 38 on Monday, 3 June, SBI Chair Tomasz Chruszczow (Poland) urged parties to look towards 2015, stressing that the SBI “has to make progress here and now.”

UNFCCC Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres applauded the United Arab Emirates as the first party to ratify the Doha amendment to the Kyoto Protocol. She encouraged others to follow, noting that 143 ratifications are necessary for the amendment to enter into force.

ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS: On the supplementary provisional agenda (FCCC/SBI/2013/1/Add.1), the Russian Federation, with Belarus and Ukraine, introduced a proposal for a new item on procedural and legal issues relating to decision-making by the COP and CMP, in response to “deficiencies in the UNFCCC’s application of UN system rules of procedure, norms and principles.”

Fiji, for the Group of 77 and China (G-77/China), proposed proceeding on the basis of the provisional agenda (FCCC/SBI/2013/1). Acknowledging the importance of adopting the rules of procedure, the European Union (EU) stressed it was not for the SBI to adopt these rules.

Chair Chruszczow proposed that the SBI launch its work based on the supplementary provisional agenda (FCCC/SBI/2013/1/Add.1) without adopting it and invite SBI Vice-Chair Robert Van Lierop (Saint Kitts and Nevis) to consult informally on the proposed new item. The Secretariat advised that parties could proceed based on the provisional agenda without adopting it, while consulting on whether to include the proposed supplementary item.

The Russian Federation, Belarus and Ukraine opposed starting work without adopting the agenda. Noting a lack of consensus, Chair Chruszczow suspended the meeting and invited heads of delegation to consult with him on the issue. Later on Monday afternoon, Chruszczow reported that his proposal to consider the issue raised by the Russian Federation, Belarus and Ukraine under the agenda item on arrangements for intergovernmental meetings was not acceptable to many parties. He asked parties to consider a proposal by the G-77/China to launch the SBI’s work based on the supplementary provisional agenda without adopting it formally, pending inclusive consultations on the proposal. The Russian Federation, Belarus and Ukraine opposed.

Following informal consultations, the SBI plenary reconvened on Friday, 7 June. The G-77/China suggested addressing the item proposed by the Russian Federation, Ukraine and Belarus under the agenda item on arrangements for intergovernmental meetings. The EU agreed, suggesting adding assurances to the annotated agenda that the proposed item would be discussed. Alternatively, he suggested starting work without formally adopting the agenda, and revisiting the agenda issue later.

After further discussion, the G-77/China requested that the Chair clarify the legal options available. SBI Chair Chruszczow explained that the SBI can only adopt the agenda by consensus and the Chair cannot take decisions on matters of substance. China proposed that the Chair make a ruling to start work under SBI and conduct parallel consultations to explore the agenda issue. The G-77/China subsequently made a point of order, requesting the SBI Chair to make a ruling in accordance with China’s proposal. Chruszczow ruled to allow delegations on the speakers list to proceed with their interventions. The G-77/China appealed the ruling. The matter was put to a vote, with the Russian Federation voting in favor of continuing with the list of speakers and the majority of parties abstaining.

The Russian Federation stressed that discussions under the proposed agenda item would address issues of “systemic importance,” including the notion of consensus, the role of elected public officers and voting. Tuvalu, for the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS), observed that it was unclear whether the SBI has the competence to deal with procedural issues under the COP. He proposed, and parties agreed, to convene an open-ended Friends of the Chair meeting to consider how to address the proposed agenda item. Chair Chruszczow confirmed that the purpose of the meeting would be to discuss whether and how to address the concerns of the Russian Federation, Belarus and Ukraine under the agenda item on arrangements for intergovernmental meetings.

The SBI plenary reconvened on Tuesday, 11 June. Detailing efforts to resolve the issue, SBI Chair Chruszczow lamented that the SBI had lost eight days of working time in Bonn. He proposed a “solution box,” including: a statement by the SBI Chair to provide assurance that issues related to decision-making would be addressed; inclusion of the Chair’s statement in the meeting’s report; and adoption of the SBI’s supplementary provisional agenda (FCCC/SBI/2013/1/Add.1), while deleting the proposed new item on procedural and legal issues related to decision-making by the COP and CMP. He stressed that immediately after adoption of the agenda, a contact group, co-chaired by the SBI Chair and Vice-Chair, would be established to consider legal and procedural issues related to decision-making by the COP and CMP under the agenda item on arrangements for intergovernmental meetings. SBI Chair Chruszczow invited parties to adopt the provisional agenda in accordance with the solution proposed. The Russian Federation, supported by Ukraine and Belarus, objected and stressed the need for an agenda that takes into account the interests of all parties.

The G-77/China emphasized the Group’s support for the SBI Chair’s efforts and for his proposal. Swaziland, for the African Group, and Nepal, for the Least Developed Countries (LDCs), also supported the Chair’s proposal. Switzerland, for the Environmental Integrity Group (EIG), said it is difficult to understand why the Chair’s proposal is unacceptable to some parties. The EU supported the Chair’s proposal and, acknowledging the importance of the issue, stressed willingness to discuss the matter in a contact group.

Japan regretted the loss of working time under the SBI and supported the Chair's proposal. Noting "unusually broad" agreement on the importance of the matter, the US supported the Chair's proposal and stressed that lack of agreement would hold up SBI discussions on this and other important issues. Australia called for the SBI's work "to get on its way." Identifying the Chair's proposal as "a good way forward," New Zealand expressed willingness to discuss matters raised by the Russian Federation, Ukraine and Belarus. Supporting the SBI's Chair's approach, Canada agreed that the issues raised were important and needed to be discussed.

Highlighting the rules of procedure, Singapore noted that any party has the right to propose new agenda items but consensus is required for their inclusion on the agenda. He emphasized that otherwise there would be an incentive for parties to add new agenda items "at every meeting of the UNFCCC." He expressed regret that the three proponents of the new item have not accepted "the normal courses of action" in such a situation either to reject the proposal or hold the proposed item in abeyance, while continuing consultations.

SBI Chair Chruszczow recalled that in Durban, parties decided to launch the work of the COP and CMP without adopting their agendas and worked hard to find a solution allowing for the agendas to be adopted at a later stage. He reiterated his proposal on the way forward, but the Russian Federation, Belarus and Ukraine continued to oppose it.

Tuvalu requested that the SBI Chair rule on how to address the matter. Chair Chruszczow observed that the rules of procedure did not allow for voting and that decisions under the SBI must be taken by consensus. The G-77/China requested the Chair to apply the principle of necessity and "gavel the way forward," saying this would be viewed as "a personal attempt by the Chair to save the countries of the world." Chair Chruszczow suspended the meeting briefly.

When the meeting resumed, the Russian Federation stressed the importance of transparency, state sovereignty and political will, noting that "constant procedural problems" under the UNFCCC illustrate the rationale behind the proposed new agenda item. He stressed the need to examine decision-making procedures and prepare a COP decision on the rules of procedure. He underscored that the SBI Chair taking a decision on the agenda based on the principle of necessity would "fall outside any legal context" and that adopting the agenda without a consensus would be a "blatant breach" of the rules of procedure.

SBI Chair Chruszczow acknowledged the lack of consensus to adopt his proposal, saying "there is no way to start the SBI's work." Highlighting the need for transparency and inclusiveness, as well as confidence in the process and parties' ownership of it, he noted that the Chair is in the service of the parties and that "it is up to the parties to save the world."

UNFCCC Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres acknowledged that the last hours of COP 18 were held in a context that "everyone would have preferred to have avoided." She noted that such a context does not support the right of parties to be heard to the fullest. Figueres indicated that while all parties have expressed commitment to engage in discussions on decision-making, including in an informal setting, these

discussions could neither continue without adoption of the agenda, nor could the SBI's work begin. She expressed hope that the next time parties come together to consider the SBI's work, deliberations could begin in a different spirit, with parties guided by the timely pursuit of the Convention's ultimate objective.

SBI Chair Chruszczow informed parties that the SBI plenary would resume on Friday, 14 June, to close the session.

SBI/SBSTA Response Measures Forum: The Response Measures Forum workshops took place from 4-6 June, facilitated by SBSTA Chair Richard Muyungi and SBI Chair Tomasz Chruszczow. On Tuesday, 4 June, participants exchanged experiences and shared views on opportunities for economic diversification and transformation. Discussion focused on possible recommendations, trade issues and subsidies. For more details, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12571e.html>.

On Wednesday, 5 June, participants discussed just transition of the work force and creation of decent work and quality jobs. For more details, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12572e.html>.

On Thursday, 6 June, participants discussed assessment and analysis of impacts of the implementation of response measures. For more details, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12573e.html>.

On Friday, 7 June, participants discussed economic modeling and socio-economic trends. For more details, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12574e.html>.

Durban Forum on Capacity Building: The Durban Forum on Capacity Building took place on 4 and 6 June, co-facilitated by Helen Plume (New Zealand) and Kishan Kumarsingh (Trinidad and Tobago). Participants heard presentations and discussed building capacity for: mitigation, adaptation, and gender and climate interlinkages. For more details, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12571e.html> and <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12573e.html>.

Dialogue on Implementation of the Doha Work Programme on Convention Article 6: The Dialogue on implementation of the Doha Work Programme on Convention Article 6 (education, training and public awareness) took place on 10 and 11 June 2013, co-facilitated by Adriana Valenzuela (Dominican Republic) and Richard Merzian (Australia). For more details, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12576e.html> and <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12577e.html>.

CLOSING PLENARY: The SBI closing plenary took place on Friday, 14 June. Recalling that parties were not able to adopt the agenda, SBI Chair Chruszczow reminded parties that "this is your process and you are the only ones who can bring the solutions." He called on parties to share ideas on how to come to Warsaw prepared to deliver on all items, especially those where "major deliverables" are expected.

Observer organizations made closing statements first. The Climate Action Network (CAN) expressed disappointment with the missed opportunity to strengthen action. Underscoring the need for progress on loss and damage, he emphasized that local communities suffered on a daily basis throughout Germany, Europe and the globe. LDC Watch urged parties to work together constructively to establish an international mechanism on loss and damage. Youth NGOs reminded parties that "we are not here to discuss what is politically feasible but what is scientifically

necessary.” She promised “to stand in solidarity with your children, even if at the negotiating table you are either unable, or unwilling to stand with them yourselves.”

The G-77/China expressed “deep disappointment” that the SBI was not able to commence its work due to lack of agreement on the agenda. He said this is “not the time for reprobation or finger-pointing,” but for collectively reflecting on the UNFCCC decision-making processes, noting the need for consistency and clarity on the interpretation of the rules of procedure. He called on the Secretariat, SBI Chair and parties to resolve the SBI impasse prior to SBI 39.

Underscoring that work under the SBI and SBSTA is crucial for progress under the ADP, the EU expressed disappointment with the lack of progress under the SBI, including on: loss and damage, nationally appropriate mitigation actions (NAMAs), and the 2013-15 Review.

Nauru, for AOSIS, stressed that procedural issues must not impede substantive work and encouraged the Chair to forward draft text emerging from informal work during SBI 38 for consideration in Warsaw. She emphasized loss and damage as a “fundamental issue.” Mexico, for the EIG, expressed disappointment that the SBI had not been able to conduct its work. He said what happened in Bonn “speaks loudly” on the need to define decision-making procedures under the UNFCCC based on good faith and cooperation, and expressed willingness to discuss the issue, including the related proposal on the COP agenda by Papua New Guinea and Mexico to amend Convention Article 15 related to voting.

Nepal, for the LDCs, expressed disappointment with parties’ inability to launch the SBI’s work in Bonn. He highlighted progress on national adaptation plans (NAPs), including on technical guidance and the NAP expo held in Bonn. Swaziland, for the African Group, noted his disappointment with the inability to discuss issues under the SBI and stressed that a delay in negotiations means a delay in implementation. Emphasizing that what happened in Bonn creates a precedent that cannot be repeated, Colombia, for the Independent Association for Latin America and the Caribbean (AILAC), urged solving the current SBI situation.

Belarus, for Ukraine and the Russian Federation, regretted that the results of the session were not satisfactory. He highlighted that almost all parties recognized the need to discuss their proposed new agenda item to “put an end to the violations that we have repeatedly seen in the UNFCCC process.” He hoped that parties use the time before Warsaw to find mutually acceptable solutions.

Tuvalu pointed to the “supreme irony” of “using procedure to make the process even worse,” which he compared to “deliberately crashing a car to show that the seatbelts do not work.”

Underscoring the critical role of the SBI, Australia expressed disappointment with the lack of resolution on the SBI agenda and supported an open discussion of the issues raised. He also noted the need for progress on items, including: loss and damage; transparency and clarity; review of the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM); means of implementation; and the 2013-15 Review. The US expressed “dismay” that the SBI was unable

to begin its work, noting, however, that the matter raised by the Russian Federation, Belarus and Ukraine is important. He emphasized that all parties have a stake in ensuring an orderly process and it is important for parties to be recognized and heard. He called for finding a way forward before Warsaw. Japan said he was disappointed with the lack of substantive discussions under the SBI, especially on the budget, loss and damage, and NAMAs. He called for avoiding a similar situation in Warsaw to prevent damaging credibility of the process. New Zealand observed that good process is of fundamental importance for the functioning of the UNFCCC and called for an open discussion and a solution before Warsaw.

In a video address, Manuel Pulgar-Vidal, Minister of the Environment, Peru, expressed confidence that Peru would receive support from all parties to ensure the success of COP 20 in 2014. Wishing Peru every success, Venezuela noted that they were pleased to be hosting the pre-COP.

SBI Chair Chruszczow thanked delegates for their “constructive, positive and forward looking statements.” He noted that although consensus could not be reached on the SBI agenda, judging by what had been said, parties “will come to Warsaw with a new spirit of compromise, trust, openness and understanding.” Quoting Desmond Tutu, he said: “differences are not intended to separate, to alienate. We are different precisely in order to realize our need of one another.” He then closed SBI 38 at 4:20 pm.

SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE

SBSTA 38 opened on Monday, 3 June, with Richard Muyungi (Tanzania) continuing as the Chair. Parties adopted the agenda and agreed to the organization of work (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/1).

OPENING STATEMENTS: Fiji, for the G-77/China, stressed, *inter alia*, that guidelines for biennial update reports should build on existing domestic systems and capacity, and allow for voluntary use of independent third-party verification at the domestic level. The EU called for progress on all SBSTA agenda items, particularly agriculture as a potential sector to progress on both mitigation and adaptation.

The Republic of Korea, for the EIG, called for decisions on the framework for various approaches and the new market-based mechanism (NMM) to establish a pilot phase at COP 19. Australia, for the Umbrella Group, called for progress on the work programme on market- and non-market-based approaches.

Swaziland, for the African Group, highlighted the need for progress on the Nairobi work programme on impacts, adaptation and vulnerability (NWP); and addressing agriculture to enhance food security and build resilience. Nepal, for the LDCs, urged a focus on, *inter alia*: “concrete outcomes” on the NWP; finalizing the institutional arrangements between the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN) and Technology Executive Committee (TEC); and ensuring a role for science in the 2013-15 Review.

Papua New Guinea, for the Coalition for Rainforest Nations, called for finalization of work on: MRV; national reporting; and payments for results-based action. She supported the establishment of a REDD+ committee. Bolivia, for the

Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America (ALBA), cited vulnerability as a “top priority” linked to the provision of technology, finance and capacity building.

Thailand, for the like-minded developing countries (LMDC), said the Doha outcome on Annex I countries’ ambition was “extremely disappointing.” He stressed that NAMAs must not create new obligations for developing countries. Chile, for AILAC, urged progress on market and non-market approaches. India, for Brazil, South Africa, India and China (BASIC), called for: progress on intellectual property rights; agriculture discussions to focus only on adaptation; and for the COP to provide guidance to the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) and International Maritime Organization (IMO).

Climate Justice Now described market-based mechanisms as environmentally and socially flawed. CAN said that discussions on the NMM should reflect environmental integrity and warned against double-counting. The International Indigenous Peoples Forum on Climate Change called for respecting indigenous peoples’ rights to forests and lands and ensuring their full and effective participation in all phases of REDD+.

NAIROBI WORK PROGRAMME: This issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/2, FCCC/SBSTA/2013/INF.1 and FCCC/SBSTA/2013/MISC.2) was considered by the SBSTA plenary on 3 June, and in informal consultations co-facilitated by Donald Lemmen (Canada) and Juan Hoffmaister (Bolivia).

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.9), the SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- agrees to continue discussion of the NWP at SBSTA 39 on the basis of: considering the scope of the NWP through additional cross-cutting issues, as agreed in the annex of Decision 2/CP.11; sequencing activities and engaging adaptation practitioners; and developing linkages with adaptation-related workstreams and bodies under the Convention;
- requests the Secretariat to prepare a technical paper before SBSTA 39 and organize a technical expert meeting before SBSTA 40 on best practices and available tools for the use of indigenous knowledge and practices for adaptation, the application of gender-sensitive approaches, and tools for understanding impacts, vulnerability and adaptation;
- expresses readiness to support the Adaptation Committee in the implementation of relevant activities through the NWP;
- invites submission from parties and relevant organizations by 2 September 2013 on how to enhance the relevance of the NWP; and
- initiates its reconsideration of the NWP work areas in line with the mandate of Decision 6/CP.17 based on, *inter alia*, the draft text annexed to the SBSTA conclusions.

METHODOLOGICAL GUIDANCE FOR REDD+:

This issue was first addressed in the plenary on Monday, 3 June. It was further considered in a contact group and informal consultations co-chaired by Peter Graham (Canada) and Victoria Tauli-Corpuz (Philippines).

These discussions resulted in draft COP 19 decisions on: modalities for national forest monitoring systems; timing and frequency of presentations of the summary of information on how all the safeguards in Decision 1/CP.16 are addressed and respected; and addressing the drivers of deforestation and forest

degradation. In addition, text with elements for possible draft decisions was forwarded to SBSTA 39 on: modalities for MRV; and guidelines and procedures for the technical assessment of party submissions on forest reference emission levels and/or forest reference levels.

On **MRV**, parties’ views diverged on whether information on forest-related emissions should be subject to international consultation and analysis (ICA) or some other type of assessment. Many developing countries supported that ICA be applied, while a number of developed countries stressed the need to ensure that the information provided is accurate, transparent and consistent over time, which could be assured through other types of assessments. Text indicating that the information reported is subject to ICA remains in brackets.

Parties also discussed at length technical assessment of information submitted for the estimation of forest-related emissions and the role of technical experts, including whether recommendations could be provided and clarifications required. Many highlighted that some of these issues should be considered during the SBI discussions on ICA. Parties agreed on specific aspects of technical assessment, while also including a footnote indicating that the process outlined in the draft text does not “intend to prejudice related decisions pending under ICA, including those related to the technical team of experts.” A number of developing countries underscored the need to foster capacity building and provide support for MRV.

Work will continue based on the text on possible elements for a draft decision on MRV. During the closing plenary, many parties expressed their willingness to make substantive progress on this issue at COP 19.

On **guidelines for the technical assessment of submissions on forest reference emission levels and/or forest reference levels**, divergences centered on the type of feedback that the technical assessment could provide to developing country parties, including the possibilities of providing recommendations, suggestions or guidance. A number of developing countries highlighted that, in principle, ICA should be “non-intrusive.” Parties also discussed in detail the guidelines for the technical assessment, with divergent views remaining on the timing provided for the different steps of the revision process, with some favoring a step-wise approach to enable incorporating lessons learned through its implementation.

On information on how the **safeguards** are addressed, some parties drew attention to the need to share experiences and best practices. They agreed to invite submissions on this issue and to request the Secretariat to compile them. On the **timing and the frequency** of presentations of the summary of information on how safeguards are addressed and respected, parties discussed whether this information should be presented only through national communications or also through biennial update reports, with some developing countries emphasizing that submissions through biennial update reports should be on a voluntary basis. Many parties highlighted the linkage of provision of this information with receiving international support for the full implementation of the results-based actions, but parties did not agree on language to reflect this.

On addressing the **drivers of deforestation and forest degradation**, a number of developing countries underscored that the drivers should be addressed through implementation of national strategies and action plans. They also underscored the uniqueness of countries' national circumstances. Some parties commented on the linkages between drivers of deforestation and agriculture, as well as with international trade.

Parties agreed to reflect in a preambular paragraph that livelihoods may be dependent on activities related to drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, and that addressing these drivers may have an economic cost and implications for domestic resources. During the SBSTA closing plenary, Tuvalu highlighted that the reference to "livelihoods" should not be interpreted so as to mean that indigenous peoples are the drivers of deforestation but, on the contrary, could be the victims of the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation. Supported by the Philippines, he called for removing this ambiguity at COP 19. The International Indigenous Peoples Forum on Climate Change emphasized that traditional livelihoods are not related to drivers of deforestation but instead have contributed both to adaptation and mitigation of climate change.

Parties also addressed **non-carbon benefits**, as mandated by COP 18. Some developing countries highlighted the potential of considering compensation for the provision of non-carbon benefits. Other developing countries highlighted difficulties with measuring non-carbon benefits and that other international organizations, such as the Convention on Biological Diversity, have been addressing the issue. Parties eventually agreed to organize activities to further explore, and provide clarity on, the issue, including through submissions.

On **non-market based approaches**, parties agreed that further clarity is needed on the issue and agreed to invite submissions and hold a workshop, subject to availability of resources.

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.12, Add.1, 2 & 3), the SBSTA:

- decides to recommend a draft decision on modalities for national forest monitoring systems for adoption by COP 19;
- agrees to continue its work on methodological guidance for MRV on the basis of the elements contained in Annex I to the conclusions for a possible draft decision, with the aim of completing this work at SBSTA 39; and
- agrees to continue its work on guidance for the technical assessment of the proposed forest reference emissions levels and/or forest reference levels on the basis of elements contained in Annex II to the conclusions, with the aim of completing this work at SBSTA 39.

On safeguards, the SBSTA:

- encourages developing countries to continue building experiences and best practices;
- invites developing countries to submit, by 24 September 2014, their views on experiences and lessons learned and requests the Secretariat to compile the submissions for consideration at SBSTA 41;
- invites parties and observers to submit, by 24 September 2014, their views on the type of information from systems for providing information on how the safeguards are being

addressed, and request the Secretariat to compile them for consideration at SBSTA 41;

- decides to recommend a draft decision on the timing and the frequency of presentations of the summary of information on how all the safeguards are being addressed and respected for adoption by COP 19; and,
 - agrees to consider at SBSTA 41 the need for further guidance.
- On drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, the SBSTA:
- recognizes the importance of cross-sector coordination in the context of the development of national strategies or action plans in addressing drivers of deforestation and forest degradation;
 - further recognizes that international cooperation can contribute to addressing the drivers; and,
 - decides to recommend a draft decision for consideration by COP 19.

On non-market based approaches, the SBSTA:

- notes that non-market-based approaches, such as joint mitigation and adaptation approaches for the integral and sustainable management of forests are important to support the implementation of the activities referred to in decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 70;
- further notes the need for clarity on the types of these approaches and takes note of the relationship between this issue and the provision of adequate and predictable support, including financial resources;
- invites parties and observers to submit, by 26 March 2014, their views on methodological guidance for non-market-based approaches, and requests the Secretariat to compile the submissions and organize an in-session workshop at SBSTA 40; and,
- decides to continue consideration of methodological guidance at SBSTA 40.

On non-carbon benefits, the SBSTA: takes note of ongoing work on the issue under other international organizations and conventions; agrees that clarity is needed on the types of non-carbon benefits and associated methodological issues; invites submissions by parties and observers by 26 March 2014; and requests the Secretariat to compile them for consideration by SBSTA 40.

The decision contains two annexes, one on elements for a possible draft decision on modalities for MRV, and the other on elements for a possible draft decision on guidelines and procedures for the technical assessment of submissions from parties on proposed forest reference emission levels and/or forest reference levels.

COORDINATION OF SUPPORT FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTIVITIES IN RELATION TO MITIGATION ACTIONS IN THE FOREST SECTOR BY DEVELOPING COUNTRIES, INCLUDING INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS: This issue (FCCC/SB/2013/MISC.3 and Add.1) was first addressed by the SBSTA on Monday, 3 June.

The US indicated that the COP in Doha only mandated party submissions and a workshop on this issue, while Guyana stated that the COP mandated "a process, not just a workshop." A joint SBI/SBSTA contact group was established, co-chaired by

Madeleine Diouf (Senegal) and Keith Anderson (Switzerland). No negotiations took place, however, as the SBI did not agree on its agenda.

A workshop on this issue took place on Friday, 7 June. For more details, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12574e.html>.

TECHNOLOGY: This issue (FCCC/SB/2013/INF.5) was briefly considered by the SBSTA on 3 June and subsequently considered in a contact group and informal consultations co-chaired by Majid Al Suwaidi (United Arab Emirates) and Stig Svenningsen (Norway).

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.11), the SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- commends UNEP, as the Climate Technology Centre (CTC) host, for making arrangements to promptly launch the work of the CTC, including convening the first meeting of the CTCN Advisory Board;
- encourages the CTCN Advisory Board to submit its report on modalities and procedures of the CTCN and its Advisory Board with a view to making a decision at COP 19;
- requests the CTCN Advisory Board, in elaborating those modalities and procedures, to take into account: Decisions 1/CP.16, paras. 120 and 123, 2/CP.17, para. 135 and 2/CP.17, Annex VII; and coherence and synergy within the Technology Mechanism in accordance with Decision 1/CP.18, para. 59;
- welcomes parties' nominations of their national designated entities (NDEs), underlines NDEs' essential role in the operationalization of the CTCN and encourages parties that have not yet nominated their NDEs to urgently do so; and
- requests the CTCN Advisory Board, in elaborating modalities and procedures of the CTCN, to consult with stakeholders, in particular NDEs, on: how technical support may be provided to NDEs on requests from developing countries; and how interaction is enabled between the CTC, NDEs and the CTCN.

RESEARCH AND SYSTEMATIC OBSERVATION: This issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/MISC.4, FCCC/SBSTA/2013/MISC.5 & Add. 1 and FCCC/SBSTA/2013/MISC.6 & Add. 1-2) was considered by the SBSTA on 3 June. It was subsequently taken up in informal consultations by Christopher Moseki (South Africa) and Christiana Textor (Germany).

The SBSTA Research Dialogue convened on 4 June. For more details, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12571e.html>.

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.2), the SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- stresses the important role of capacity building and encourages increased efforts towards a higher level of participation by scientists from developing countries;
- invites party submissions on topics for consideration at SBSTA 40;
- notes enhanced availability and visibility of scientific information on the UNFCCC website and requests that the Secretariat report on this work to SBSTA 40;
- takes note of parties' views on the content of a workshop to be held at SBSTA 39 on technical and scientific aspects of ecosystems with high-carbon reservoirs not covered by other agenda items, such as coastal marine ecosystems, in the context of wider mitigation and adaptation efforts; and

- requests that the Secretariat prepare a report on the workshop before SBSTA 40.

RESPONSE MEASURES: Forum and work programme: The SBSTA first considered this issue (FCCC/SB/2013/INF.2, INF.3. and INF.4) on 3 June. No joint SBSTA/SBI contact group on this issue was possible since the SBI was unable to agree on its agenda.

Four in-forum workshops co-chaired by SBSTA Chair Muyungi and SBI Chair Chruszczow took place, summarized under the SBI above (see page 4).

Protocol Article 2.3 (adverse effects of policies and measures): Parties disagreed on whether to consider this issue together with the item on response measures. The report of the session reflects that SBSTA and SBI will continue consultations on how to consider this item at SB 39.

AGRICULTURE: This item was first address by the SBSTA on 3 June and subsequently in a contact group co-chaired by Hans Åke Nilsagård (Sweden) and Esther Magambo (Kenya).

Discussions focused on elements of a draft COP decision. Many developing countries emphasized common but differentiated responsibilities (CBDR), adaptation and means of implementation and some countries requested workshops on some of these issues. Some developed countries stated their objective is to provide farmers with access to science and technological advice to improve resilience, productivity and efficiency, and one developed country urged inclusion of mitigation.

After discussion of an initial draft decision text, with some parties producing additional texts, consensus could not be reached whether to annex a draft decision text to the SBSTA conclusions. Australia suggested that if there was no agreement to annex a text, parties could consider a workshop at COP 19 on areas of convergence, namely adaptation and co-benefits. Egypt, for the G-77/China, proposed an in-session workshop in Warsaw and submissions on "adaptation and additional co-benefits," which many parties supported.

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.20), the SBSTA, *inter alia*, invites submissions from parties and observer organizations by 2 September 2013 on the current state of scientific knowledge on how to enhance the adaptation of agriculture to climate change impacts while promoting rural development, sustainable development and productivity of agricultural systems and food security in all countries, particularly developing ones. This should take into account the diversity of agricultural systems and the differences in scale as well as possible adaptation co-benefits.

The SBSTA also requests the Secretariat to organize an in-session workshop at SBSTA 39 on the same issues and prepare a report on the workshop for consideration at SBSTA 40.

METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES UNDER THE CONVENTION: Work programme on the revision of the guidelines for the review of developed country biennial reports and national communications, including national inventory reviews: This issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/INF.2) was first addressed by the SBSTA on 3 June and was subsequently taken up in a contact group chaired by Riitta Pipatti (Finland) and Qiang Liu (China).

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.10), the SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- requests the lead reviewers to discuss options to improve cost-effectiveness, efficiency and practicality of the review process;
- concludes that the review of national communications should be conducted in conjunction with the review of biennial reports in the years when both are submitted and agreed that the same information would be reviewed only once;
- acknowledges concerns of parties with small-scale economies with the format of reviews, and agrees that further discussions on the specific format and combination of reviews will be held during a workshop in October 2013;
- concludes that supplementing the expert review teams with a standing group of experts, or introducing service fees for review experts, could be explored;
- identifies two alternatives to detailing and restructuring the work on the revision of the review guidelines: revision of the review guidelines for national communications, biennial reports and GHG inventories envisaging that the structure and elements of the review guidelines would include a general approach and specific requirements; or that the review guidelines for national communications, biennial reports and GHG inventories should consist of three separate review guidelines;
- invites submissions by 15 July 2013, *inter alia*, on the scope, structure, timing, outline and publication of review reports, and specific views on key elements of the review guidelines for national communications and biennial reports;
- highlights the importance of training for the review, in particular for developing countries' experts, and requests the Secretariat to begin the development of new training materials and procedures, to be presented at SBSTA 39; and
- requests the Secretariat to review the nomination form for the UNFCCC roster of experts and to inform parties of any changes.

General guidelines for domestic MRV of domestically supported NAMAs by developing countries: This issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/MISC.7 and Add.1) was first addressed by the SBSTA on 3 June, and subsequently discussed in a contact group co-chaired by Qiang Liu (China) and Sarah Kuen (Belgium). During these meetings, developing country parties supported general guidelines that build on existing domestic systems and capacities, while some developed country parties suggested identifying elements of the guidelines.

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.19), the SBSTA:

- takes note of the views of parties;
- initiates the process of the development of the guidelines and agrees to continue this process at SBSTA 39 based on elements of the general guidelines contained in the annex to the SBSTA conclusions, without prejudging where these elements should be placed, in the draft decision or the draft guidelines; and
- reiterates that it will forward draft guidelines to COP 19.

Revision of the UNFCCC reporting guidelines on Annex I annual inventories: This issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/MISC.14 & Add.1) was first addressed by the SBSTA on 3 June and subsequently taken up in a contact group chaired by Riitta Pipatti (Finland) and Chebet Maikut (Uganda).

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.15), the SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- advances its work on the draft UNFCCC Annex I inventory guidelines, including common reporting format (CRF) tables, and agrees to continue its discussions at SBSTA 39, with a view to forwarding a draft decision to COP 19;
- identifies the need to consider at SBSTA 39 the reporting of CO₂ emissions related to ammonia production and urea application, and supplementary guidelines on wetlands and invited parties to submit views on these matters;
- notes that the completion of the CRF Reporter, at the latest in June 2014, is critical for parties to use for submission of their national inventories in 2015, and requests the Secretariat to continue to update the Reporter with a view to making it available to parties for testing in the fourth quarter of 2013; and
- notes that there may be differences in reporting emissions/removals from harvested wood products due to the alternative approaches to estimate the contribution of such products to annual emissions/removals, and agrees to continue discussions on this matter at SBSTA 39.

Greenhouse gas data interface: This issue was first taken up by the SBSTA on 3 June and subsequently discussed in a contact group chaired by Chia Ha (Canada).

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.4), the SBSTA *inter alia*:

- recognizes the need to make changes to the interface if COP 19 adopts changes to the Annex I reporting guidelines; and
- agrees to consider further development of the GHG data interface at SBSTA 39.

Emissions from fuel used for international aviation and maritime transport: This issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/MISC.15) was first discussed by the SBSTA plenary on 3 June, and in informal consultations by SBSTA Chair Muyungi.

The IMO reported that mandatory energy efficiency measures for new ships recently entered into force. Several developing countries outlined elements that should guide the ICAO and IMO in addressing emissions from international aviation and maritime transport, including: Protocol Article 2.2 (Annex I parties' emission reductions from international transport); respect for CBDR; and recognition of the legal distinction between developed and developing countries' obligations. China added that market-based mechanisms should not link unilateral measures with multilateral processes. Japan noted that IMO's decision on technical cooperation states that parties are "cognizant" of CBDR and opposed applying CBDR to ships because of their complex legal administration. Australia stressed that ICAO and IMO have their own principles and provisions. Singapore called for the "most competent bodies" to develop measures to limit emissions and sustain growth in the sectors.

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.18), the SBSTA takes note of the information received from ICAO and IMO on their ongoing work to address emissions from their respective sectors. It invites the ICAO and IMO to continue reporting to future sessions of the SBSTA.

METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES UNDER THE PROTOCOL: Implication of the implementation of Decisions 2/CMP.7 to 4/CMP.7 and 1/CMP.8 on the previous decisions on methodological issues related to the Protocol, including Protocol Articles 5 (national systems), 7 (GHG inventories) and 8 (expert review): This issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/INF.3, FCCC/SBSTA/2013/MISC.1 & Add. 1-2) was considered by the SBSTA plenary on 3 June, and in a contact group and informal consultations co-chaired by Nagmeldin Elhassan (Sudan) and Anke Herold (Germany).

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.17), the SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- notes that considerable progress will need to be made in 2013 on: references to the calculation of assigned amounts and the first commitment period; implementation modalities in relation to the standard electronic format tables related to carry-over, previous period surplus reserve accounts, Article 3.7 *ter* of the Protocol, reporting on the share of proceeds and any increases of ambition; and clarification of reporting requirements for Annex I parties without a commitment during the second commitment period;
- invites party submissions, in particular, on the draft changes to the CRF tables for reporting LULUCF activities during the second commitment period;
- requests the Secretariat to prepare draft CRF tables and update the technical paper contained in FCCC/TP/2012/6; and
- agrees to continue discussions at SBSTA 39 with a view to preparing draft CMP 9 decisions, taking into account the draft text contained in the annex to the SBSTA conclusions.

LULUCF under Protocol Articles 3.3 (afforestation, reforestation and deforestation) and 3.4 (additional activities) and under the CDM: This issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/MISC.8 & Add.1) was addressed by the SBSTA plenary on Monday, 3 June, and in a contact group and informal consultations co-chaired by Marcelo Rocha (Brazil) and Lucia Perugini (Italy).

Issues discussed included: a more comprehensive accounting of anthropogenic emissions; possible additional LULUCF activities under the CDM; and modalities and procedures for applying the concept of additionality. Parties agreed on the need to further discuss these issues.

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.5), the SBSTA:

- takes note of the views submitted by parties and observers on questions related to LULUCF;
- agrees to continue consideration of issues relating to more comprehensive accounting of anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks from LULUCF at SBSTA 39;
- agrees to continue consideration of issues relating to modalities and procedures for possible additional LULUCF activities under the CDM and procedures for alternative approaches to addressing the risk of non-permanence under

the CDM at SBSTA 39, and invites submissions by 2 September 2013;

- requests the Secretariat to organize a workshop to address possible additional LULUCF activities; and
- agrees to continue consideration of issues relating to modalities and procedures for applying the concept of additionality at SBSTA 39, inviting parties' and observers' submissions by 2 September 2013.

Lands with Forest in Exhaustion under the CDM: This issue was first addressed in the SBSTA plenary on Monday, 3 June. It was further addressed in a contact group and informal consultations chaired by Eduardo Sanhueza (Chile).

Issues discussed included the implications of a possible revision to the eligibility of lands as CDM afforestation and reforestation project activities during the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol.

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.14), the SBSTA invites parties' submissions by 19 February 2014 on the implications of a possible revision to the eligibility of lands as CDM afforestation and reforestation project activities during the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol, and requests the Secretariat to compile the submissions for consideration by SBSTA 40.

Market and non-market mechanisms under the Convention: The SBSTA opened all issues related to market and non-market mechanisms on 3 June.

At the closing SBSTA plenary on 14 June, the Philippines, supported by Venezuela, Bolivia, Cuba, Nicaragua and India, commented on workshops agreed during SBSTA 38 on market and non-market mechanisms, stressing the need for: balanced representation and support to ensure effective participation of developing country parties; balanced treatment of issues with respect to determination of themes and selection of presenters; transparency; and the workshops to be open to all parties and held back-to-back with the formal sessions to avoid overlaps.

Framework for various approaches (FVA): This issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/MISC.11, Add.1 and MISC.16) was first taken up by the SBSTA plenary on 3 June. It was subsequently addressed in a contact group and in informal consultations co-chaired by Giza Gaspar Martins (Angola) and Martin Cames (Germany).

Discussions covered: the role of the FVA, including its linkages with other relevant matters under the Convention and its instruments; technical design of the FVA, including how its elements may be elaborated; and further steps.

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.6), the SBSTA, *inter alia*: agrees to continue consideration of this matter at SBSTA 39; invites submissions from parties and observers on the role and technical design of the FVA; and requests the Secretariat to organize a workshop on the same issue prior to SBSTA 39, ensuring broad participation of developing and developed countries.

Non-market-based approaches: This issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/MISC.12, Add.1 and MISC.13) was first taken up during the SBSTA plenary on 3 June. It was subsequently

addressed in a contact group and informal consultations co-chaired by Eduardo Sanhueza (Chile) and Nataliya Kushko (Ukraine).

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.7), the SBSTA, *inter alia*: agrees to continue consideration of non-market-based approaches at SBSTA 39; invites parties and observers to submit views on elements of the work programme and specific examples of non-market-based approaches; and requests the Secretariat to organize a workshop on non-market-based approaches prior to SBSTA 39, ensuring broad participation of developing and developed countries.

New market-based mechanism (NMM): This issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/MISC.9 & Add. 1-2 and FCCC/SBSTA/2013/MISC.10) was first taken up during the SBSTA plenary on 3 June. It was subsequently addressed in a SBSTA contact group and informal consultations co-chaired by Collin Beck (Solomon Islands) and Laurence Mortier (Switzerland).

Parties considered: the role of the NMM, including its links with other relevant matters under the Convention and its instruments; the technical design of the NMM, including how its possible elements may be embodied in modalities and procedures; and further steps.

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.8), the SBSTA agrees to, *inter alia*: continue consideration of the NMM and invite discussions at SBSTA 39 on the role and technical design of NMM; invite submissions from parties and observers on their views on the role and technical design of the NMM; and request the Secretariat to organize a workshop on the role and technical design of the NMM prior to SBSTA 39, while ensuring broad participation of developing and developed countries.

2013-15 REVIEW: Decision 1/CP.18 invited the SBSTA and the SBI to establish a joint contact group on this item and also established a structured expert dialogue on this matter.

Parties agreed during the SBSTA opening plenary on 3 June to consider this item jointly with the SBI agenda item on the 2013-2015 Review and to establish a joint contact group co-chaired by Gertraud Wollansky (Austria) and Leon Charles (Vanuatu). The group did not convene since the SBI did not reach agreement on its agenda.

An in-session workshop took place on 5 June, under the structured expert dialogue of the 2013-15 Review, co-facilitated by Zhou Ji (China) and Andreas Fischlin (Switzerland). Participants addressed the adequacy of the long-term global goal in light of the ultimate objective of the Convention and overall progress made towards achieving it, including consideration of the implementation of the commitments under the Convention. For more details, see: www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12572e.html.

Co-facilitators Ji and Fischlin also conducted bilateral consultations with negotiating groups. The next structured expert dialogue will take place in conjunction with SBSTA 39 where consideration of this issue will continue.

WORK PROGRAMME ON CLARIFICATION OF DEVELOPED COUNTRY QUANTIFIED ECONOMY-WIDE EMISSION TARGETS: This issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/MISC.3 & Add.1) was briefly considered by the SBSTA plenary on 3 June. It was subsequently taken up in

a contact group co-chaired by Karine Hertzberg (Norway) and Brian Mantlana (South Africa).

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.13), the SBSTA, *inter alia*: initiates the work programme; welcomes the information exchange during the in-session event on developed countries' quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets; and agrees to continue its consideration of the matter at SBSTA 39 with a view to reporting on progress to COP 19.

SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF MITIGATION OF CLIMATE CHANGE: This issue was first taken up during the SBSTA plenary on 3 June. It was subsequently addressed in informal consultations co-chaired by George Wamukoya (Swaziland) and Mikhail Ginarskiy (Russian Federation).

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.3), the SBSTA agreed to continue its consideration of the matter at SBSTA 40, taking into account the best available scientific information on mitigation, in particular information from the IPCC and the ongoing work of other Convention bodies on related matters.

COOPERATION WITH OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS: This issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/INF.4) was first taken up during the SBSTA plenary on 3 June. SBSTA Chair Muyungi prepared conclusions in consultation with interested parties.

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.16), the SBSTA, *inter alia*: takes note of activities and efforts of the UN Convention to Combat Desertification to advance the implementation of actions to address climate; reaffirms the importance of the Secretariat engaging with other intergovernmental organizations; and encourages the Secretariat to seek support, where appropriate, from relevant international organizations and to work in partnership with them towards effective implementation of the UNFCCC and the Kyoto Protocol.

CLOSING PLENARY: The SBSTA closing plenary convened on Friday, 14 June, and adopted the meeting's report (FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.1).

Fiji, for the G-77/China, welcomed work on, *inter alia*, the NWP and called for concrete adaptation actions on the ground. He reaffirmed the importance of addressing response measures, calling for discussions on unilateral measures. On agriculture, he stressed that the focus must remain on adaptation and underlined the importance of the Convention's principles, including CBDR.

The EU welcomed conclusions on the NWP, agriculture and REDD+. He also cited important work on the work programme for clarification of pledges, but noted that without work on the diversity of NAMAs under the SBI, it is not possible to "see the full picture." He called for finalizing, in Warsaw, rules for the implementation of Protocol Articles 5, 7 and 8 during the second commitment period.

Australia, for the Umbrella Group, welcomed outcomes on, *inter alia*, technology, MRV, agriculture and the NWP. On REDD+, she thanked delegates for "rising to the challenges of a packed agenda."

The Republic of Korea, for the EIG, welcomed progress and new ideas on markets, including credited NAMAs, and, citing EIG members' experience with the Protocol's flexibility mechanisms, said these tools could enhance ambition both before and after 2020. He welcomed references to small Annex I parties and avoiding double review of the same information in the national communications and biennial reports.

Swaziland, for the African Group, welcomed, "a breakthrough on agriculture after five years of stalemate." On the NWP, she highlighted plans to prepare a technical paper on indigenous and traditional knowledge. On REDD+, she called for discussing coordination of support in a joint SBSTA/SBI contact group in Warsaw.

Nepal, for the LDCs, stressed the need for increased capacity to contribute to REDD+ and expressed disappointment with "not very action-oriented" conclusions on agriculture. On the FVA, he expressed hope that parties' submissions will help create "a toolbox rather than a monster."

Noting island communities are experiencing life-altering climate impacts, Nauru, for AOSIS, emphasized, *inter alia*: the 2013-15 Review as a priority to limit global average temperature rise to below 1.5°C; the need to explore how a new market mechanism can reduce net emissions beyond offsetting; and how non-market-based mechanisms could target areas where market-based approaches have proven problematic.

Egypt, for the Arab Group, welcomed steps taken on agriculture and stressed the sector's impact on livelihoods and food security. He underlined that the mistakes of the CDM and market mechanisms should not be repeated and noted support for non-market-based mechanisms as the core mechanisms under the Convention.

Papua New Guinea, for the Coalition for Rainforest Nations, welcomed progress on methodological guidance for REDD+, but noted that implementation requires adequate and predictable support. He also suggested that a new market-based mechanism should recognize the role of REDD+.

Highlighting climate vulnerability, food security and production in the region, Costa Rica, for the Central American Integration System (SICA), emphasized the need for support for adaptation, effective implementation of REDD+ and recognition that the region's agricultural sector is transforming.

Algeria, for LMDC, highlighted, *inter alia*: the role of non-market mechanisms; the need to minimize adverse impacts of response measures, particularly unilateral measures; the need to focus discussions on agriculture on adaptation; and the need to observe CBDR in addressing emissions from international aviation and maritime transport.

Chile, for AILAC, welcomed successful work on, *inter alia*, NWP, REDD+, agriculture, FVA, NMM and the 2013-15 Review.

Business and Industry NGOs stated that market-oriented approaches offer the most cost-effective means to catalyze action and deployment of technologies, and reaffirmed support for the CTCN and TEC to provide means for business to engage with countries at a practical level.

CAN said parties must ensure climate policies related to agriculture include safeguards protecting, *inter alia*, food security, biodiversity and the rights of indigenous peoples, and called the REDD+ safeguards "toothless." On FVA, he underscored the need for a strict accounting framework and increased mitigation ambition.

Climate Justice Now urged developed countries not to insert markets, which "are an ineffective tool," in place of leadership. He underlined that REDD+ threatens forest peoples and the push toward a REDD+ market mechanism signals that "it is bound to fail."

Farmers said the UNFCCC could make a "huge contribution" to food security, adaptation and resilience while helping close the mitigation gap. He called it "essential" to treat agriculture comprehensively and not to create "artificial" divisions between food security, adaptation and mitigation.

Saying she was part of the first generation to be affected by climate change at this scale, Youth NGOs called for more transparency and observer access, and for inclusion of intergenerational equity on the agenda.

SBSTA Chair Muyungi said delegates' hard work has led to the SBSTA's success and said he would work to ensure balanced participation in the intersessional workshops before COP 19. He gavelled the meeting to a close at 2:04 pm.

AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON THE DURBAN PLATFORM FOR ENHANCED ACTION

The opening plenary of the second part of ADP 2 took place on 4 June with Jayant Moreshever Mauskar (India) and Harald Dovland (Norway) continuing as Co-Chairs. The ADP's work was based on the agenda (FCCC/ADP/2013/AGENDA) adopted at the first part of ADP 2.

For a summary of the ADP opening statements, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12571e.html>

ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS: Election of officers:

At the ADP closing plenary on 13 June, Co-Chair Mauskar announced Kishan Kumarsingh (Trinidad and Tobago) and Artur Runge-Metzger (EU) as the incoming ADP Co-Chairs and Isabel Di Carlo Quero (Venezuela) as the new Rapporteur.

IMPLEMENTATION OF ALL THE ELEMENTS OF DECISION 1/CP.17: The agenda item (FCCC/ADP/2013/L.2) on the implementation of all the elements of Decision 1/CP.17 (Durban Platform for Enhanced Action) includes Workstreams 1 (the 2015 agreement) and 2 (pre-2020 ambition). It was first taken up in the ADP opening plenary. Subsequent work was structured around workshops and roundtables, as well as an informal plenary held on Wednesday, 12 June. During the closing plenary on Thursday, 13 June the ADP adopted conclusions.

Workstream 1: Under Workstream 1 (ADP.2013.2. InformalSummary, ADP.2013.5. InformalSummary, ADP.2013.7. InformalSummary, ADP.2013.8. InformalNote and ADP.2013.9. InformalNote), a workshop took place on enhancing adaptation through the 2015 agreement. For more details, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12573e.html>. Two roundtables were also held on: variety of actions, which met throughout the first week; and linkages, which met on Tuesday, 11 June.

On *proposals for the 2015 agreement*, Bangladesh said the agreement must be: applicable to all; rules-based; predictable, robust, clear, enforceable and scientifically-sound; and take into account long-term perspectives, CBDR and equity, and loss and damage.

The EU proposed a step-wise approach to formulating mitigation commitments consisting of: exploration of options for post-2020 commitments; allowing parties to formulate and put forward their commitments; a review of proposed commitments assessing whether they are sufficient to meet the 2°C targets; and inscribing commitments into the 2015 agreement. Switzerland proposed a hybrid approach to burden sharing, including: common rules and expectations; a consultative phase; and a common MRV system. He called for the consultative phase to include: a compilation of pledges; comparison of pledges against the 2°C degree objective; and cooperation to address remaining gaps. Australia elaborated on the design of a spectrum of commitments and highlighted the benefits of a hybrid approach, which would enable parties to take ownership of their bottom-up nationally determined commitment and robust internationally-agreed rules.

Calling for elaboration of an equity reference framework, the Gambia, for the LDCs, supported the use of metric and non-metric criteria, such as historical responsibility, future sustainable needs and vulnerabilities. Ethiopia proposed a hybrid approach based on, *inter alia*: historical and per capita emissions; the global temperature goal; quantified and apportioned atmospheric space; and quantified emission rights.

Chile emphasized the need to understand the mitigation potential of pledges *ex ante* to avoid double-counting and assess whether mitigation pledges are fair and based on equity. Mexico highlighted the need to identify areas for improvement and the link between efficient and transparent application of rules and their ability to impact the attainment of goals.

Parties also discussed the Brazilian proposal, which was advocated by several developing countries during the first part of ADP 2. Brazil explained that the proposal, originally made in 1997, addresses historical responsibility not just in terms of emissions, but also in terms of relative historical contributions to the temperature increase. On the proposal, he suggested that the SBSTA: invite the IPCC to carry out methodological work; invite parties to provide estimates of their historical emissions; and form an expert group to measure developed countries' contributions to the temperature increase.

Ecuador proposed to: establish an international court of climate justice and promote the UN Declaration on the Rights of Nature as an instrument to protect the Earth and its ecosystems.

On *transparency, accountability and support for actions*, Mali called for a rules-based regime equipped with international review systems and a compliance mechanism with facilitative and enforcement functions, and suggested that the Standing Committee on Finance coordinate an international mechanism for MRV of support. Nepal, for the LDCs, said transparency measures should include a comparable and complete accounting system for support provided and received. Saudi Arabia underlined the need for reporting impacts of climate actions and reporting on finance.

The EU said countries should provide information on the type and scope of commitments and the sectors covered, as well as quantitative commitments and assumptions behind indicators used. Australia, supported by New Zealand, Norway, the US and Japan, stressed the importance of *ex ante* and *ex post* transparency and accountability, emphasizing the need for: providing clarity to predict and quantify the impacts of parties' commitments; understanding the methods used by parties to track their efforts; and tracking impacts and learning lessons to enhance actions. The US said accounting guidance should apply to all parties, be flexible, promote ambition, and avoid double-counting.

Switzerland said that: a common accounting framework is needed for all types of commitments; economy-wide emission reduction commitments may not need exact *ex ante* information; and transparency and accounting are key to both delivery and reception of support. The Republic of Korea suggested a workshop on *ex ante* clarity.

Nauru, for AOSIS, stressed that transparency of mitigation commitments must be as robust as those under the Kyoto Protocol and be understood before adoption of commitments.

On *finance, technology and capacity building*, Norway said support would always be forthcoming if it resulted in action. India called for provision of concessional technology to allow developing countries to take early and effective action. China proposed considering a mechanism for technology transfer.

Colombia called for the inclusion of a review process for means of implementation in light of evolving needs, such as intensifying impacts of climate change. Peru drew attention to early action to avoid a steep rise in adaptation costs. Nepal underscored means of implementation for developing countries to deal with vulnerabilities and undertake a low-carbon development path. Nauru highlighted, *inter alia*, identification of sources, and scaling up provision, of climate finance.

To bridge the trust gap and address the challenge of the insufficient provision of means of implementation, the Republic of Korea proposed developing MRV for finance with clear definitions, baselines and scope. He called for improved coordination between existing mechanisms inside and outside the UNFCCC.

Australia said the 2020 finance goal must be seen in the context of effective mitigation action and transparent implementation of support. The EU stressed the need to ensure that existing institutions, such as the GCF, deliver and continue their work beyond 2020. Japan suggested that consideration of capacity building, technology transfer and finance in the 2015 agreement build on existing arrangements and discussions.

Mexico called for complementarities between national and international efforts, and private and public sources of finance. The Philippines cautioned against applying the notion of respective capabilities to developed countries' commitments. Switzerland underscored the need for a strong enabling environment, a blend of public and private sources, and domestic and multilateral finance for a low-carbon future.

Discussions also addressed *linkages* between the workstreams, and between the Subsidiary Bodies and the ADP. India stressed the need to establish linkages between Workstreams 1 and 2, and

to consider how the work of the SBs, the IPCC and the 2013-15 Review will inform the 2015 agreement.

Ecuador called for a focus on linkages between gaps in mitigation, finance, technology and adaptation. The EU called for submissions on the necessary mitigation and adaptation elements in the 2015 agreement. Switzerland stressed the need to link the new agreement with: the scientific reality, looking beyond fossil fuel emissions; and political realities, looking forward beyond adaptation and public funding. The US advocated a new agreement that is sellable to a broad audience of domestic constituencies.

During an informal plenary on Wednesday, 12 June, parties identified areas of convergence and those requiring further work.

The EU noted the need for submissions before Warsaw on key issues and invited the Co-Chairs to capture priority areas in a paper reflecting parties' ideas. Switzerland urged that all "should commit to commit" in a COP 19 decision on mitigation. He called for: a common understanding of modalities of mitigation commitments; continuing to exchange views on fair differentiation; and elaborating elements of a process to "anchor" commitments. The US noted agreement on, *inter alia*: addressing mitigation through nationally determined contributions with rules that provide for transparent MRV but are flexible enough to be applicable to all; and that support will continue in the post-2020 period. New Zealand noted common views on a hybrid bottom-up and top-down approach.

India underlined that discussions on a dynamic interpretation of CBDR and the post-2015 structure, such as two-step or hybrid processes, need to refocus on the Convention's principles. The Philippines, for the LMDC, and Saudi Arabia called for a focused process structured around the four pillars of the Convention. Chile, for AILAC, called for creative thinking and proposals on, *inter alia*: means of implementation; compliance and incentives; and *ex ante* and *ex post* review processes to ensure the necessary dynamism for enhancing ambition and participation.

Saudi Arabia highlighted linkages with the 2013-15 Review and response measures. Singapore highlighted areas for further work, including: the leadership role of developed countries; how to enhance implementation; how to clarify actions put forward by parties; and how to ensure that the rules facilitate universal participation. Nauru, for AOSIS, highlighted means of implementation and called for further work on linkages between existing institutions.

Workstream 2: Under this workstream (ADP.2013.3. InformalSummary, ADP.2013.4.InformalSummary, ADP.2013.6.InformalSummary, ADP.2013.7.InformalSummary, ADP.2013.8.InformalNote, ADP.2013.9.InformalNote and FCCC/TP/2013/4), a workshop took place on energy transformation on Friday, 7 June. For more details, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12574e.html>. A series of roundtables on building a practical results-oriented approach to increasing pre-2020 ambition were held on Wednesday, 5 June; Saturday, 8 June; and Monday, 10 June.

During discussions on **building a practical results-oriented approach to increasing pre-2020 ambition**, UNEP presented its Emissions Gap Report 2012, highlighting the pre-2020 emissions

gap of at least 8 Gt CO₂ equivalent, and possibilities for closing the gap while reaping co-benefits.

China highlighted his country's analysis showing that the emissions gap can be closed if Annex I countries achieve reductions of 25-40% below 1990 levels. Indonesia highlighted the need to understand opportunities and costs to catalyze action at the national level and how actions should be allocated among parties. Nepal, for LDCs, warned that international cooperative initiatives cannot replace mid- and long-term commitments.

Nauru, for AOSIS, proposed a technical process to deploy specific mitigation solutions. He underlined the importance of leveraging outside initiatives, even if they are not primarily addressing climate change. The EU outlined three areas of convergence: encouraging new pledges; increasing the ambition of existing pledges; and scaling up efforts in areas with high mitigation potential.

South Africa called for further discussion on: phasing out fossil fuel subsidies; supporting technology transfer; encouraging local innovation; and involving women and youth.

On **enhancing finance, technology and capacity building**, China underlined gaps in: mitigation; adaptation; equitable access to sustainable development based on historical responsibilities; and support to developing countries. The US underscored that, currently, emissions emitted every 12 years equal all historical emissions up to 1970.

The EU highlighted that policy choices made now, such as investment in fixed capital and infrastructure, have future impacts. He also said risk sharing and risk analysis are required to reduce risk and improve certainty of returns. Uganda observed that adjustments towards low-carbon development need to begin with informed policies, while also maintaining the development objectives of developing countries. Venezuela noted the need to transform unsustainable lifestyles and cautioned against leaving policy setting to the markets.

The US emphasized that a low-emissions development strategy is crucial for ensuring that domestic and donor spending are aligned with climate change and development objectives, but cautioned that there is "no silver bullet" to address the finance mobilization challenge.

China suggested using developed countries' public finance as a catalyst to provide incentives for the private sector in capital and technology markets. Nauru, for AOSIS, called for a technical paper reflecting policy options for specific mitigation solutions in the areas of energy efficiency, renewable energy and carbon capture and storage. Indonesia highlighted the importance of considering enabling environments in developed countries and at the global level to mobilize finance and technology. South Africa cautioned against using global economic instability as an excuse for delaying the delivery of means of implementation, and stressed the need to focus on capitalizing the GCF.

Venezuela, for LMDC, supported by Mauritius, emphasized that developed countries' emission reductions should be based on domestic actions and called for delivery of means of implementation. Brazil agreed with the need for structural changes in the economy and for low-carbon investment choices, but underscored that developed countries need to take the lead.

On the way forward to COP 19, Nauru, for AOSIS, supported by Nepal, Indonesia and Kenya, proposed: submissions, including on energy policies and technologies with emphasis on the scale of emission reductions, barriers and strategies to overcome those barriers; a technical paper compiling parties' submissions on specific problems they face, with corresponding solutions from technical expert meetings; a technical workshop; and a ministerial roundtable at COP 19. The Philippines suggested broadening the proposal to also cover adaptation. Venezuela said it would be more useful to discuss "normative trends," pilot practices and means to facilitate a paradigm shift.

The EU outlined encouraging new pledges and increasing ambition of existing pledges with developed countries in the lead; a decision on phasing out hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs); elaborating the role of the UNFCCC in catalyzing international initiatives; and linking the UNFCCC to other processes, including the 2014 UN Leaders' Summit.

China called for revisiting Annex I quantified emission limitation or reduction objectives (QELROs) and inviting Annex I parties not participating in the second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol to undertake comparable targets. Mali, for the African Group, said parties should not focus on a particular option or sector and called for: a process to review support from Annex I parties; clarity on the delivery of the US\$100 billion of annual long-term finance; and options to strengthen the price of carbon.

During an informal plenary on Wednesday, 12 June, parties identified *areas of convergence and those requiring further work*. Several developing countries underscored linkages between the workstreams, emphasizing that action to increase ambition under Workstream 2 is necessary to build trust and make progress toward a 2015 agreement under Workstream 1.

Several parties discussed HFCs, on which views differed. Switzerland, the Federated States of Micronesia, the EU and others identified the need to address HFCs also under the Montreal Protocol, while Venezuela, for the LMDC, opposed, indicating that the issue relates to GHGs and should therefore be considered only under the UNFCCC.

Among areas for further work, the EU identified land use, energy efficiency, renewables, carbon sequestration and sustainable development. Australia highlighted the energy sector as an area warranting technical work, while India, with Argentina, indicated that a technical paper on raising mitigation ambition and sectoral issues would be premature without clarity on which sectoral issues should be addressed.

Nauru, for AOSIS, proposed: targeted energy efficiency measures; a practical and action-oriented process to identify the most effective and scalable options for mitigation; harvesting mitigation potential in areas other than energy; and drawing upon the work taking place in other fora. Malaysia stated that with means of implementation, more could be accomplished by developing countries. Bangladesh stressed the need to reduce gaps and raise ambition in adaptation, finance, technology transfer and capacity building.

Nepal, for the LDCs, emphasized developed country leadership and called for: information on increasing the ambition of pledges; addressing barriers to enable action; review of targets

under the Kyoto Protocol; implementation of pledges by Annex I parties not participating in the second commitment period; removal of conditionalities; and submission and implementation of NAMAs by developing countries.

Chile, for AILAC, called for further work on enhancing the role of existing institutions in order to create a suitable environment for increasing pledges and moving to their upper end; and identified the need to also address sectors other than energy. Brazil indicated that the GCF is "not at the level we expected" and Iran highlighted paragraph 26 of the Rio+20 outcome document on countries refraining from unilateral economic, financial or trade measures violating international law.

Switzerland called for, *inter alia*: developing a common understanding of mitigation potential as the "best basis" for a ministerial roundtable and creating space for new pledges. Australia called pledges "critical," he said more work is required on conditions to encourage more pledges and enhance the existing ones.

Venezuela, for the LMDC, urged Annex I parties to, *inter alia*: ratify the Kyoto Protocol amendment as soon as possible; increase commitments through domestic action; remove conditionalities from their pledges; and provide full financing for mitigation projects in developing countries without seeking emission credits in return. She also called for flexibilities in the intellectual property rights regime. Saudi Arabia stated that Workstream 2 should be party-driven and include all sectors, gases, emissions and sinks, and said it is premature to take a decision on Workstream 2 at COP 19.

ADP Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/ADP/2013/L.2), the ADP:

- agrees on the need to convene at least one session in 2014;
- invites, under Workstreams 1 and 2, submissions by parties and observers building on, and in relation to, the ADP's conclusions;
- invites, under Workstream 2, submissions by parties and observers on further activities for its plan of work in 2014;
- invites the incoming Co-Chairs to propose, drawing upon submissions, a balanced, focused and more formal mode of work for consideration at ADP 3;
- requests the Secretariat to prepare, by 30 October 2013, taking into account submissions, two technical papers, namely: a second version of the technical paper on mitigation benefits of actions, initiatives and options to enhance mitigation ambition (FCCC/TP/2013/4); and the first version of a technical paper synthesizing submissions on the costs, benefits and opportunities for adaptation based on different drivers of climate impacts, including the relationship between adaptation and mitigation;
- requests the Secretariat to prepare an overview of the mandates and progress of work under institutions, mechanisms and arrangements under the Convention, to inform the work of the ADP, including on linkages; and
- invites the Co-Chairs to prepare a note on progress based on discussions during the first and second parts of ADP 2.

CLOSING PLENARY: The ADP closing plenary took place on Thursday, 13 June. Parties adopted the report for first two parts of ADP 2 (FCCC/ADP/2013/L.1).

Fiji, for the G-77/China, recognized progress achieved, but called for, *inter alia*: advancing in a more focused and party-driven mode in Warsaw, and following a balanced approach, including mitigation, adaptation and means of implementation. He stressed the need for developed country leadership under Workstream 2. He welcomed the two technical papers to be prepared by the Secretariat to inform further work of the ADP.

On Workstream 1, the EU said the new agreement should be fair, comprehensive and legally-binding, as well as durable, dynamic and capable of evolving overtime. On Workstream 2, he stressed the need for: parties without pledges to undertake them; increasing ambition of existing pledges; and setting out the role of the UNFCCC for enhancing action.

On Workstream 1, Australia, for the Umbrella Group, called for, *inter alia*, up-front transparency measures to ensure predictability of commitments and a consultative process to consider ambition and fairness. On Workstream 2, he proposed looking at how mitigation potential can be captured by parties with diverse national circumstances and encouraging complementary work through international cooperative initiatives.

Switzerland, for the EIG, called for a decision in Warsaw outlining common understanding on the core elements of the 2015 agreement, including: each party's mitigation commitment towards the 2°C target; modalities of such commitments; and a timeframe for, and structure of, the new agreement. On Workstream 2, he called for parties who have not submitted their pledges to do so; urged further technical exchange on mitigation potential to create the basis for ministerial dialogue; and encouraged reforming fossil fuel subsidies.

Swaziland, for the African Group, reaffirmed that the 2015 agreement is not intended to renegotiate the Convention but to define its implementation beyond 2020. He requested a revised technical paper on mitigation that should include information on: applicability of the Convention's principles; benefits of adaptation and mitigation actions; means to address barriers; and means of implementation.

Warning against shifting the mitigation burden to developing countries, Nauru, for AOSIS, called for developed countries to examine and exploit untapped mitigation potential at home through new policies and strategies translating into more ambitious commitments under the Kyoto Protocol. She further called for comparably ambitious targets under the Convention by 2014 and a mechanism to address loss and damage, including in the context of the 2015 agreement.

Nepal, for the LDCs, called for: moving to more focused negotiations; the adoption of an effective protocol in 2015 that provides, *inter alia*, enhanced action on adaptation, a mechanism on loss and damage, and financial support.

Costa Rica, for SICA, supported: the establishment of a single contact group to consider financing, adaptation, mitigation, capacity building and technology transfer; and an oversight and MRV mechanism for the provision of support by developed countries under the 2015 agreement.

Saudi Arabia, for the Arab Group, highlighted the need for: clarity on the level of finance to be provided by developed countries between 2013 and 2020; and addressing response measures.

Pakistan, for the LMDC, recalled that the ADP mandate is to enhance the Convention's implementation; and said sectoral activities, such as on HFCs and energy, must not impose additional burdens on developing countries.

Chile, for AILAC, called for: a decision in Warsaw that structures the substance and elements of the 2015 agreement; a 2015 agreement with adaptation at its core; a robust compliance mechanism; and more work under the UNFCCC to contribute to closing the ambition gap.

Ecuador, for ALBA, stressed that work should focus on the Convention and CBDR, and said fairness should be at the core of a new agreement, while noting different interpretations of the concept. Papua New Guinea, for the Coalition for Rainforest Nations, underlined the potential of REDD+ to contribute to closing the mitigation gap with new and additional financial and technical support.

South Africa underscored the need for a fair and equitable sharing of efforts, including equitable access to sustainable development, and called for common commitments on adaptation and means of implementation. Uganda reminded parties that there are 930 days left to negotiate the 2015 agreement and called for a move toward negotiating text. Bangladesh called for proposals on how specific rules should be applied to adaptation under a rules-based multilateral system, while Mexico expressed interest in including HFCs under Workstream 2.

Co-Chair Mauskar indicated that the Co-Chairs had aimed to lay a solid foundation for the 2015 agreement and addressing pre-2020 ambition, stating that, in his view, such a foundation had been established. He concluded that "a ten-thousand-mile journey starts with one step and we have taken several, but the real difficulties start now." Co-Chair Mauskar expressed confidence that with the new ADP Co-Chairs and with parties' continuing in a constructive spirit, the outcome will be successful.

Co-Chair Dovland recalled that when starting their work, the Co-Chairs came up with the idea of proceeding through roundtables and workshops, and indicated that while this approach has served the ADP well, "time has come to move some activities to a more formal setting" and noted that there is "some repetition in the workshops and roundtables." Thanking the Secretariat and the parties, Dovland noted that he is retiring from the process "for the third time," saying he always misses the people involved, but is "getting tired of some of the finger-pointing around climate change." He urged for a cooperative spirit and suspended ADP 2 at 6:09 pm.

A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF THE BONN CLIMATE CHANGE CONFERENCE

“Differences are not intended to separate, to alienate. We are different precisely in order to realize our need of one another.” – Desmond Tutu.

As delegates assembled for the annual two-week climate change conference in Bonn, the meeting was overshadowed by external events. Atmospheric carbon dioxide concentrations had surpassed the critical 400 ppm threshold, floods ravaged parts of Europe, and the new report, “Redrawing the Energy-Climate Map,” by the International Energy Agency, picked up widely by the international media, all highlighted the need for intensive action before 2020 to combat climate change. Many wondered whether governments will be up to the challenge.

All three UNFCCC bodies—the Subsidiary Body for Implementation, the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice and the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Durban Platform—had to make progress on a long list of agenda items. Expectations for the Subsidiary Bodies included tackling loss and damage; finance; arrangements for intergovernmental meetings; budget; agriculture; market and non-market mechanisms; REDD+; and the 2013-15 Review. The ADP discussions were expected to consider ways for advancing work on the 2015 agreement and pre-2020 ambition.

In the end, due to a procedural dispute, the SBI never even started its substantive work. In contrast, the SBSTA made progress on a number of agenda items and the ADP continued a “conversation” structured around outlining the contours of a possible agreement and enhancing ambition for the pre-2020 period, which was met with mixed reviews. This analysis will discuss the Bonn meeting and examine possible implications for COP 19 and CMP 9 in Warsaw, in November 2013.

SBI 38 – THE MEETING THAT NEVER HAPPENED

To the surprise of many, the SBI never actually started in Bonn because parties could not adopt the agenda. The Russian Federation, Belarus and Ukraine proposed to add an agenda item on procedural and legal matters relating to decision-making under the COP and CMP. This proposal was in response to events that transpired during the closing CMP in Doha where the second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol was gavelled through amid controversy.

The Russian Federation justified the proposal referring to “constant procedural problems” under the UNFCCC and the fact that after 18 years parties are still provisionally applying the draft rules of procedure. In the absence of voting rules under the UNFCCC, all decisions must be taken by consensus and every party has the right to be heard. The Russian Federation highlighted a number of “unfortunate” examples, including Cancun, when Bolivia’s opposition to the Cancun Agreements was openly overruled by the COP President.

While knowing that a discussion on decision-making procedures will not be an easy one, most parties agree that issues raised by the Russian Federation, Belarus and Ukraine are valid. A related proposal from Papua New Guinea and Mexico to amend the Convention in order to allow voting in situations

where a consensus cannot be reached is in fact already on the COP agenda. Nevertheless, the dispute could not be resolved in Bonn. One of the issues was where—under the COP and CMP, or the SBI—and how to resolve this delicate matter. Some parties also wanted to avoid a dangerous precedent. As Singapore put it, if we accept this proposal “every party will have every incentive to add additional agenda items at every meeting of the UNFCCC,” going on to caution that “how we resolve this impasse will set a precedent for the future. If we make an exception to our procedure for the three proponents, then every party will request the same treatment.” In her closing press conference, UNFCCC Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres noted that parties all agreed on the need to discuss the issue highlighted by Belarus, Russia and Ukraine, but could not agree on how to do it.

Most parties left Bonn deeply concerned that the SBI had been unable to launch its work. While acknowledging shortcomings in the UNFCCC decision-making process, Tuvalu pointed to the “supreme irony, of using procedure to make the process even worse,” which he described as “deliberately crashing a car to show that the seatbelts don’t work.” The paradox is that consensus would have to be reached in order to adopt the rules of procedure, which only adds to the conundrum.

The expectation is that consultations will take place between now and SBI 39 in November to overcome the impasse and reach a compromise, albeit a delicate one, so that the SBI will be able to proceed with substantive work in Warsaw. Many feel that since the proposal by Belarus, Russia and Ukraine relates to decision-making by the COP and CMP, it should be considered by these bodies and not the SBI. Some in Bonn were in fact anticipating that the issue might find its way into the COP agenda. The SBI has a lot on its plate and, as UNFCCC Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres put it, will have to “squeeze three weeks into one” in Warsaw in order to make up for lost time. Whatever decision is taken on this matter will have implications for the future work of the process in, and beyond, SBI 39.

SBSTA – EXCEEDING EXPECTATIONS

Given that the SBI was unable to move forward, many SBSTA contact groups received more negotiating time than usual, with agriculture and REDD+ being among the key beneficiaries. The mood on the SBSTA side was, therefore, largely positive, and many were happy with progress achieved in Bonn. However, many SBSTA items are linked to discussions under the SBI and, as one delegate put it, “taking decisions on technical aspects in isolation from interrelated issues on implementation is challenging.”

With more than seven outstanding issues related to methodological aspects of REDD+ on the agenda, delegates in Bonn proved to be up to the challenge. The SBSTA 38 outcome was a clear step forward from Doha where some of the interlinkages between methodology and implementation were controversial enough to put agreement out of reach. For example, in Doha, parties could not agree on the type of assessment to be carried out when developing countries submit information on emissions avoided through REDD+ activities. A number of

developing countries stressed that REDD+ should be subject to International Consultation and Assessment (ICA) in the same manner as NAMAs, while some developed countries, concerned with transparency and the accuracy of the information, proposed a more thorough review process. But, as one forest negotiator pointed out, “if we had more clarity from the SBI side on some aspects of ICA, including those related to the technical team of experts, discussions would be better informed and parties more reassured.” In Bonn, however, parties managed to move ahead with REDD+ methodological work. They agreed to compromise and to work on the basis of some “assumptions.” A footnote clarifying the intention not to prejudge the ICA outcome under the SBI was therefore included.

With three draft decisions on REDD+ recommended for adoption by COP 19 and text on possible draft decisions on MRV and reference levels forwarded for further consideration in Warsaw, some said that Bonn may go down as “the session that opened the path for impressive progress on REDD+.” However, as one delegate acknowledged, “if decisions on provision of finance do not encompass the progress achieved on methodological issues, it is possible that we will lose this momentum.”

On agriculture, parties in Doha had not been able to agree on a workshop and a technical paper on “opportunities and challenges from mitigation in the agricultural sector,” since the G-77/China favored addressing adaptation concerns rather than mitigation. In Bonn, India, the Philippines and Argentina articulated the concerns of many developing countries that a cap on emissions in agriculture would threaten the livelihoods of many and maintained that food security should not be relegated to mitigation objectives. Yet, Bonn managed to deliver unprecedented progress. Parties agreed to shift the focus of the workshop and the technical paper to address “adaptation of agriculture to climate change impacts while promoting rural development, sustainable development and productivity of agricultural systems and food security, particularly in developing countries.” To the satisfaction of a good number of developing countries and some developed countries, they also agreed to consider the possible adaptation co-benefits of agriculture.

Despite the progress achieved under different agenda items in the SBSTA, many expressed fears that if the SBI impasse extends into Warsaw, SBSTA’s work will be substantially affected. “We need the SBI up and running,” one delegate broached.

ADP – STUCK IN NEUTRAL

Continuing its discussions in workshops and roundtables, ADP-2-2 was characterized by “marathon sessions,” where, as one delegate put it, “previous discussions were rehashed.” Others, however, expressed satisfaction with the process, saying that the session had presented an opportunity to start “defining the scope, structure and design of the new agreement.” Many developing countries called for an end to the “talk shops” in Warsaw, and a switch to more focused discussions, while others continued to highlight the usefulness of workshops and roundtables for providing different perspectives. According to the ADP work programme, COP 19 is expected to provide a clear

roadmap for 2014 and so parties will have to decide on how to capture progress for that purpose, with the knowledge that elements of a draft negotiating text are expected by COP 20 in 2014.

On mitigation, various “hybrid approaches” seeking to find a middle ground between a top-down system that ensures the aggregation of mitigation commitments to avoid surpassing the 2°C temperature increase limit, and the bottom-up approach that enables countries to submit nationally determined commitments, were mooted. At this point, it is clear that deciding on transparency and common accounting rules is crucial, as is agreement on a “fast track” system to facilitate updating and enhancing commitments without the need for further negotiations. Parties will also have to agree on how adaptation and means of implementation should be reflected in the 2015 agreement.

Some delegates highlighted that advancement under Workstream 1 (2015 agreement) must be balanced against Workstream 2 progress on raising ambition for the period before 2020. In Doha, parties agreed to identify and explore in 2013 a range of actions to close the pre-2020 ambition gap. In Bonn, African countries, AOSIS and the EU were vocal on the need to ensure that current pledges and commitments under the Kyoto Protocol and the Convention are enhanced. In this regard, AOSIS submitted a proposal containing “technical, targeted and result-oriented discussions” to secure additional ambitious pre-2020 mitigation efforts ahead of Warsaw.

While under the guidance of Co-Chairs Harald Dovland and Jayant Moreshver Mauskar, the ADP has had a relatively “easy ride,” the incoming Co-Chairs, Artur Runge-Metzger and Kishan Kumarsingh, are taking the reins as the “ADP honeymoon phase” is ending. As Chair Dovland noted, the ADP has “a dramatic task ahead of it.” Without any doubt, agreeing on a *modus operandi* that keeps everyone happy, as well as ensuring that decisions are made in a transparent and participatory manner to successfully complete the ambitious agenda mandated in Durban under the two workstreams, will be no easy feat for the ADP. Looking ahead, what many want to definitely avoid is, as one NGO representative put it, “the kind of last-minute scramble that made the 2009 Copenhagen Summit such a disaster.”

WARSAW – REKINDLING THE SPIRIT?

At a time when the climate change stakes have never been higher, the multilateral process is bedeviled with a lack of momentum, waning public interest and other competing priorities. The post-Bali, pre-Copenhagen idealism and energy has long since dissipated. What is beyond any doubt, however, is the enormity of the challenge ahead in securing a meaningful agreement in 2015, with Warsaw the first of three crucial COPs.

Carefully considered and meaningful decisions on both process and substance will need to be taken to ensure that the 2015 agreement ultimately delivers. Warsaw has a role to play in achieving a strong package of implementation measures to lead to a clear pathway for a legally-binding agreement and progress to raise pre-2020 ambition. Bonn has demonstrated that progress

can be made under the right conditions, but, at the same time, matters can arise that are capable of taking everyone's eyes off the winding road ahead.

UPCOMING MEETINGS

32nd Meeting of the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee: The Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee will convene its 32nd meeting to consider matters relating to Joint Implementation. **dates:** 17-18 June 2013 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://ji.unfccc.int/Sup_Committee/Meetings/index.html

GEF 44th Council Meeting: The Global Environment Facility's Council meets twice a year to approve new projects with global environmental benefits in the GEF's focal areas, and provide guidance to the GEF Secretariat and agencies. **dates:** 18-20 June 2013 **location:** Washington, DC, USA **contact:** GEF Secretariat **phone:** +1-202-473-0508 **fax:** +1-202-522-3240 **email:** secretariat@thegef.org **www:** <http://www.thegef.org/gef/content/gef-44th-council-meeting>

Global Symposium on REDD+ in a Green Economy: The symposium, convened by the UN Collaborative Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries (UN-REDD), will examine lessons learned from pilot activities linking REDD+ to sustainable development and the green economy. **dates:** 19-21 June 2013 **location:** Jakarta, Indonesia **contact:** John Prydz **email:** John.Prydz@unep.org **www:** http://www.un-redd.org/REDD_in_Green_Economy_Global_Symposium/tabid/105931/Default.aspx

33rd Meeting of the Open-Ended Working Group of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol: This meeting will consider issues related to the implementation of the Montreal Protocol in preparation for the 25th Meeting of the Parties. **dates:** 24-28 June 2013 **location:** Bangkok, Thailand **contact:** Ozone Secretariat **phone:** +254-20-762-3851 **fax:** +254-20-762-0335 **email:** ozoneinfo@unep.org **www:** <http://conf.montreal-protocol.org/meeting/oewg/oewg-33/presession/default.aspx>

Sixth meeting of the Technology Executive Committee: The sixth meeting of the UNFCCC TEC will: discuss progress made on producing new technology briefs, enabling further engagement with arrangements under and outside of the Convention; present modalities for increasing engagement with stakeholders; and continue the Committee's other work. **dates:** 26-28 June 2013 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/tteclear/pages/tec_home.html

Fifth Africa Carbon Forum: The Africa Carbon Forum is a trade fair and knowledge sharing platform for carbon investments in Africa, and will consider ways to promote access to low-carbon development in Africa. **dates:** 3-5 July 2013 **location:** Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire **contact:** Emilie Wieben **email:** acf@risoe.dtu.dk **www:** <http://africacarbonforum.com/2013/english/>

Joint Assembly of the International Association of Hydrological Sciences (IAHS), the International Association for the Physical Sciences of the Oceans (IAPSO), and the International Association of Seismology and Physics of the Earth's Interior (IASPEI): This scientific conference will include symposia on: ocean mixing; regional seas; ocean observations and climate change; climate and land surface changes in hydrology; cold and mountain region hydrological systems under climate change; characterizing water quantity and quality; understanding freshwater quality problems in a changing world; interactions between sediment and aquatic ecology; adaptive water resources management; and hydrology education and capacity building in developing countries. **dates:** 22-26 July 2013 **location:** Gothenburg, Sweden **contact:** Congress Secretariat **phone:** +46-31-708-60-00 **fax:** +46-31-708-60-25 **email:** iahs.iapso.iaspei2013@congrex.com **www:** <http://iahs-iapso-iaspei2013.com>

74th Meeting of the CDM Executive Board: The Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) Executive Board will convene its 74th meeting to consider matters relating to the operation of the CDM. **dates:** 22-26 July 2013 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** <http://cdm.unfccc.int/EB/index.html>

30th Meeting of the Joint Implementation Accreditation Panel: The Joint Implementation Accreditation Panel will meet to consider matters relating to the accreditation of independent entities. **dates:** 22-23 August 2013 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** <http://ji.unfccc.int/index.html>

75th Meeting of the CDM Executive Board: The CDM Executive Board will convene its 75th meeting to consider matters relating to the operation of the CDM. **dates:** 23-27 September 2013 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** <http://cdm.unfccc.int/EB/index.html>

IPCC Working Group I Session and IPCC-36: The IPCC Working Group I plenary session for endorsement of the Fifth Assessment Report (AR5) will be held in September 2013. Subsequently, IPCC-36 will convene to endorse the WGI contribution to the AR5. **dates:** 23-26 September 2013 **location:** Stockholm, Sweden **contact:** IPCC Secretariat **phone:** +41-22-730-8208 **fax:** +41-22-730-8025 **email:** IPCC-Sec@wmo.int **www:** http://www.ipcc.ch/scripts/_calendar_template.php?wg=8#.UYPBCBxBgrI

33rd Meeting of the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee: The Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee will convene its 33rd meeting to consider matters relating to the operation of Joint Implementation. **dates:** 3-4 October 2013 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** <http://ji.unfccc.int/index.html>

CBD SBSTTA 17: The meeting is expected to address, among others, issues related to marine and coastal biodiversity, biodiversity and climate change, and collaboration with IPBES.

dates: 14-18 October 2013 **location:** Montreal, Canada
contact: CBD Secretariat **phone:** +1-514-288-2220 **fax:**
 +1-514-288-6588 **email:** secretariat@cbd.int **www:** <http://www.cbd.int/doc/?meeting=SBSTTA-17>

IPCC-37: The 37th session of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC 37) will consider two methodology reports: the “2013 Supplement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: Wetlands”; and the good practice guidance on estimating GHG emissions and removals from LULUCF under the Kyoto Protocol. **dates:** 14-18 October 2013 **location:** Georgia **contact:** IPCC Secretariat **phone:** +41-22-730-8208 **fax:** +41-22-730-8025 **email:** IPCC-Sec@wmo.int **www:** http://www.ipcc.ch/scripts/_calendar_template.php?wg=8#.UYPBCBxBgrI

Third International Marine Protected Area Congress: The third International Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) Congress aims to define actions to promote cooperation through different initiatives, and to inspire a new way of thinking to face global challenges, such as climate change, poverty reduction, and resource sharing. **dates:** 21-27 October 2013 **location:** Marseille and Corsica, France **contact:** IUCN **email:** info@impac3.org **www:** <http://www.impact3.org/en/>

25th Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol: MOP 25 is scheduled to consider a number of issues, including nominations for critical- and essential-use exemptions. **dates:** 21-25 October 2013 **location:** Bangkok, Thailand **contact:** Ozone Secretariat **phone:** +254-20-762-3851 **fax:** +254-20-762-4691 **email:** ozoneinfo@unep.org **www:** <http://ozone.unep.org>

76th Meeting of the CDM Executive Board: The Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) Executive Board will convene its 76th meeting to consider matters relating to the operation of the CDM. EB76 will be held in conjunction with the 19th session of the Conference of the Parties (COP 19) to the UNFCCC. **dates:** 4-8 November 2013 **location:** Warsaw, Poland **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** <http://cdm.unfccc.int/EB/index.html>

19th Session of the Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC: COP 19, CMP 9, ADP 3, SBSTA 39 and SBI 39 will convene in Warsaw, Poland. **dates:** 11-22 November 2013 **location:** Warsaw, Poland **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** <http://www.unfccc.int>

GLOSSARY

| | |
|--------|---|
| ADP | <i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action |
| AILAC | Independent Association of Latin America and the Caribbean |
| ALBA | Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America |
| AOSIS | Alliance of Small Island States |
| CAN | Climate Action Network |
| 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 |
| CO2 | Carbon dioxide |
| COP | Conference of the Parties |
| CRF | Common Reporting Format |
| CTC | Climate Technology Centre |
| CTCN | Climate Technology Centre and Network |
| EIG | Environmental Integrity Group |
| FVA | Framework for various approaches |
| GCF | Green Climate Fund |
| GHGs | Greenhouse gases |
| HFCs | Hydrofluorocarbons |
| ICA | International Consultation and Analysis |
| ICAO | International Civil Aviation Organization |
| IMO | International Maritime Organization |
| IPCC | Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change |
| LDCs | Least Developed Countries |
| LMDC | Like-Minded Developing Countries |
| LULUCF | Land use, land-use change and forestry |
| MRV | Measuring, Reporting and Verification |
| NAMAs | Nationally appropriate mitigation actions |
| NAPs | National Adaptation Plans |
| NDEs | National Designated Entities |
| NMM | New Market-based Mechanism |
| NWP | Nairobi work programme on impacts, adaptation and vulnerability |
| REDD+ | Reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries, including conservation and enhancement of carbon stocks |
| SBI | Subsidiary Body for Implementation |
| SBSTA | Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice |
| SICA | Central American Integration System |
| TEC | Technology Executive Committee |
| UNFCCC | United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change |