

**SUMMARY OF THE DOHA CLIMATE CHANGE CONFERENCE:  
26 NOVEMBER – 8 DECEMBER 2012**

The United Nations Climate Change Conference in Doha, Qatar, took place from 26 November to 8 December 2012. It included the eighteenth session of the Conference of the Parties (COP 18) to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the eighth session of the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP 8). The conference also included meetings by five subsidiary bodies: the thirty-seventh sessions of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA 37) and the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI 37), the second part of the seventeenth session of the *Ad hoc* Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP 17), the second part of the fifteenth session of the *Ad hoc* Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the UNFCCC (AWG-LCA 15) and the second part of the *Ad hoc* Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP 1).

Marking the first time that UN climate change negotiations took place in the Middle East, the conference drew approximately 9,000 participants, including 4,356 government officials, 3,956 representatives of UN bodies and agencies, intergovernmental organizations and civil society organizations, and 683 members of the media.

Negotiations in Doha focused on ensuring the implementation of agreements reached at previous conferences. The package of “Doha Climate Gateway” decisions adopted on the evening of Saturday, 8 December, included amendments to the Kyoto Protocol to establish its second commitment period. Having been launched at CMP 1 in 2005, the AWG-KP terminated its work in Doha. The parties also agreed to terminate the AWG-LCA and negotiations under the Bali Action Plan. Key elements of the outcome also included agreement to consider loss and damage, “such as” institutional mechanism to address loss and damage in developing countries that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change.

While developing countries and observers expressed disappointment with the lack of ambition in outcomes on Annex I countries’ mitigation and finance, most agreed that the conference had paved the way for a new phase, focusing on the implementation of the outcomes from negotiations under the AWG-KP and AWG-LCA, and advancing negotiations under the ADP.

**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

**IN THIS ISSUE**

A Brief History of the UNFCCC and the Kyoto Protocol . 1

Report of the Doha Climate Change Conference . . . . . 3

Conference of the Parties . . . . . 3

Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol . . . . . 6

COP 18 and CMP 8 Joint High-level Segment. . . . . 8

*Ad Hoc* Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the UNFCCC . . . . . 8

*Ad Hoc* Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol . . . . . 13

*Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action . . . . . 16

Subsidiary Body for Implementation . . . . . 17

Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice . . . . . 22

A Brief Analysis of the Doha Climate Change Conference . . . . . 26

Upcoming Meetings . . . . . 29

Glossary . . . . . 30

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



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

anthropogenic interference” with the climate system. The Convention, which entered into force on 21 March 1994, now has 195 parties.

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

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

In December 2007, COP 13 and CMP 3 in Bali, Indonesia, resulted in agreement on the Bali Roadmap on long-term issues. COP 13 adopted the Bali Action Plan and established the AWG-LCA with a mandate to focus on mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology and a shared vision for long-term cooperative action. Negotiations on Annex I parties’ further commitments continued under the AWG-KP. The deadline for concluding the two-track negotiations was in Copenhagen in 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.

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

as: measuring, reporting and verification (MRV); and reducing emissions from deforestation and degradation in developing countries, including conservation (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 (TEC) and the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN). The Green Climate Fund (GCF) was created and designated as a new operating entity of the Convention’s financial mechanism governed by a 24-member board. Parties agreed to set up a Transitional Committee tasked with the Fund’s design and a Standing Committee to assist the COP with respect to the financial mechanism. Parties also recognized the commitment by developed countries to provide US\$30 billion of fast-start finance in 2010-2012, and to jointly mobilize US\$100 billion per year by 2020.

Under the Protocol track, the CMP urged Annex I parties to raise the level of ambition towards achieving aggregate emission reductions consistent with the range identified in the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (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 negotiations by 2015. The outcome should enter into effect from 2020 onwards.

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

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

Under the ADP, discussions centered on the agenda and the election of officers. After nearly two weeks of discussions, the ADP plenary agreed on the Bureau arrangements and adopted the agenda, initiating two work streams: one addressing matters related to paragraphs 2-6 of Decision 1/CP.17 (post-2020 regime)

and the other addressing paragraphs 7-8 (enhancing the level of ambition during the pre-2020 period), and agreed on the election of officers.

**BANGKOK CLIMATE CHANGE TALKS 2012:** This informal session took place from 30 August - 5 September 2012 in Bangkok, Thailand. Under the ADP, parties convened in roundtable sessions to discuss their vision and aspirations for the ADP, the desired results and how these results can be achieved. Parties also discussed how to enhance ambition, the role of means of implementation and how to strengthen international cooperative initiatives, as well as the elements that could frame the ADP's work.

The AWG-KP focused on resolving outstanding issues to ensure successful completion of the group's work in Doha by recommending an amendment to the CMP for adoption. This would allow a second commitment period under the Protocol to start immediately from 1 January 2013. The AWG-KP produced informal papers outlining the elements for a Doha decision adopting amendments to the Kyoto Protocol.

The AWG-LCA continued working on practical solutions to fulfill specific mandates from COP 17. The focus was on outcomes needed to conclude the group's work in Doha, how to reflect the elements in the final outcome of the AWG-LCA and whether additional work might be required beyond COP 18.

## REPORT OF THE DOHA CLIMATE CHANGE CONFERENCE

COP 18 and CMP 8 opened on Monday morning, 26 November 2012. COP 17 President Maite Nkoana-Mashabane, Minister of International Relations and Cooperation, South Africa, urged delegates to: adopt a second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol; complete work under the AWG-LCA; and find appropriate space to undertake other work under the COP, subsidiary bodies or new institutions. She stated that it would be a "step backwards for the ADP to become the AWG-LCA under a new name." UNFCCC Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres stressed that COP 18 will be unique in marking the end of the first commitment period and launching the next one and will move the Bali Action Plan from design to full and effective implementation. She urged work on a future framework that ensures equity and responds to science, and challenged delegates to find common ground.

This report summarizes the discussions by the COP, CMP, AWG-LCA, AWG-KP, ADP, SBI and SBSTA based on their respective agendas. Negotiations and outcomes under the COP and CMP on issues forwarded to the SBI, SBSTA, AWG-KP, AWG-LCA and ADP are summarized in the context of negotiations under the relevant subsidiary body.

## CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES

On Monday, 26 November, Abdullah bin Hamad Al-Attiyah, Deputy Prime Minister, Qatar, was elected COP 18/CMP 8 President by acclamation. He noted the challenge posed by seven bodies convening in Doha and called on delegates to agree to a second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol, finish work started in Bali and achieve progress on work undertaken in Durban.

**ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS:** Adoption of the agenda: Parties agreed to proceed based on the provisional agenda (FCCC/CP/2012/1), with the exception of the item on the second review of the adequacy of Convention Articles 4(a) and (b), which was held in abeyance.

**Rules of Procedure:** COP President Al-Attiyah reminded parties of the practice since COP 1 of applying the draft rules of procedure (FCCC/CP/1996/2), with the exception of draft rule 42 on voting. He informed parties that no consensus has been achieved in consultations by the COP 17 President, and parties agreed to apply the draft rules with the exception of draft rule 42. At the closing plenary, COP President Al-Attiyah reported that no consensus was reached during his informal consultations. The COP President will report back to COP 19 if any changes occur.

**Election of officers:** The COP closing plenary elected members of the COP Bureau: SBSTA Chair Richard Muyungi (Tanzania); SBI Chair Tomasz Chruszczow (Poland); Emmanuel Dumisani Dlamini (Swaziland); Su Wei (China); Claudia Salerno Caldera (Venezuela); Delano Bart (Saint Kitts and Nevis); Gary Cowan (Australia); Nicole Wilke (Germany); Jane J. Chigiyal (Federated States of Micronesia); and Marina Shvangiradze (Georgia) as Rapporteur.

The COP also elected the SBI Bureau, with Robert F. Van Lierop (Suriname) as Vice-Chair and Mabafokeng F. Mahahabisa (Lesotho) as Rapporteur.

The COP also elected officers to the CTCN Advisory Board. Consultations will continue on the outstanding nominations. The list of nominees for the CTCN Advisory Board is available at: [http://unfccc.int/files/bodies/election\\_and\\_membership/application/pdf/nominations\\_update\\_2012\\_latest.pdf](http://unfccc.int/files/bodies/election_and_membership/application/pdf/nominations_update_2012_latest.pdf)

**Accreditation of observers:** The COP agreed to admit the proposed organizations as observers (FCCC/CP/2012/12/Rev.1 and Add.1).

## PARTIES' PROPOSALS UNDER CONVENTION

**ARTICLE 17:** This issue was first taken up by the COP on 28 November. Parties noted proposals by Japan (FCCC/CP/2009/3), Tuvalu (FCCC/CP/2009/4), the US (FCCC/CP/2009/7), Australia (FCCC/CP/2009/5), Costa Rica (FCCC/CP/2009/6) and Grenada (FCCC/CP/2010/3). During the resumed COP closing plenary on Saturday, 8 December, the COP agreed to continue consideration of this issue at its next session.

## PARTIES' PROPOSALS FOR AMENDMENTS UNDER CONVENTION ARTICLE 15: Proposal by the Russian Federation

This issue (FCCC/CP/2011/5) was first taken up by the COP plenary on 28 November and subsequently taken up in a contact group facilitated by Javier Díaz (Costa Rica). The COP President reported to the closing plenary on 7 December that parties had not been able to reach agreement. Consideration of the issue will continue at COP 19.

**Proposal by Papua New Guinea and Mexico:** This issue (FCCC/CP/2011/4/Rev.1) was first taken up by the COP plenary on 28 November. It was subsequently taken up in informal consultations but no agreement was reached. On 7 December, the COP agreed to include this item on the agenda of COP 19. Papua New Guinea highlighted that the "right to vote" in Convention Article 18 is not being realized due to the lack of adoption of

the rules of procedure. He reported “growing” support for the proposal to address this issue by developed and developing countries.

**FINANCE:** This item comprises four sub-items: the work-programme on long-term finance; the Standing Committee report; the Green Climate Fund (GCF) report and COP guidance; and arrangements between the COP and GCF. It was first taken up by the COP on 28 November and was considered in a contact group and informal consultations co-chaired by Kamel Djemouai (Algeria) and Gregory Andrews (Australia). During the second week, informal ministerial consultations were conducted by Mariyam Shakeela (Maldives) and Bruno Oberle (Switzerland). Discussions focused on finance for the period 2013-2020. Many developing country parties called for firm commitments to mobilizing finance together with a pathway to scaling up finance.

**Work Programme on Long-term Finance:** Co-Chairs of the work programme on long-term finance Zaheer Fakir (South Africa) and Georg Børsting (Norway) presented the workshop report on the work programme on long-term finance (FCCC/CP/2012/3).

Barbados, for the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS), suggested that work on long-term finance should focus on: scaling up finance; improving access to finance for developing countries; and ensuring a balance between adaptation and mitigation activities. India said work on long-term finance should ensure consistency with the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities (CBDR), and discussions under other Convention bodies.

Japan stated that it would be inappropriate to consider international shipping and aviation a source of long-term climate finance. Japan and China also opposed establishing a high-level expert group, comprising the UNFCCC Secretariat, International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) and the International Maritime Organization (IMO), to examine options for ensuring that revenues from international aviation and shipping can be used for climate finance. Saudi Arabia observed that proposed international taxation methods would negatively impact developing countries and pointed to incompatibility of market-based mechanisms with World Trade Organization rules.

The European Union (EU) observed that it was important to recognize that no single source can address climate finance needs. He called for continuing technical work on mobilizing and deploying financial resources more effectively, with work on revenues from international aviation and maritime transport being an important aspect of such work.

Kenya and Uganda called for a clear definition of climate finance. Barbados, for AOSIS, with Colombia, for Chile, Peru, Costa Rica and Guatemala, and others, supported a political process covering the scaling up and mobilization of climate finance, as well as an intensified and more structured work under the Convention, focusing on sources and options for mobilizing climate finance in the short, medium and long term.

**COP Decision:** In its decision (FCCC/CP/2012/L.16), the COP decides to extend the work programme on long-term finance for one year. The COP invites the COP President to appoint two co-chairs, from a developing and developed country party, for the work programme. It also agrees to continue the existing processes within the Convention for

assessing and reviewing developing country parties’ needs for financial resources, including the identification of options for the mobilization of these resources, and their adequacy, predictability, sustainability and accessibility.

**Standing Committee Report:** Standing Committee Chair Diann Black Layne (Antigua and Barbuda) and Vice-Chair Stefan Schwager (Switzerland) introduced the Standing Committee report (FCCC/CP/2012/4).

**COP Decision:** In its decision (FCCC/CP/2012/L.16) on the Standing Committee, the COP:

- welcomes the operationalization of the Standing Committee and the progress achieved;
- endorses the work programme of the Standing Committee for 2013-2015;
- welcomes the work on the forum of the Standing Committee and encourages the Standing Committee to facilitate the participation of the private sector, financial institutions and academia in the forum;
- adopts the revised composition and working modalities of the Standing Committee;
- decides that the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Standing Committee shall serve as co-chairs of the Standing Committee, effective from the first meeting of the Standing Committee in 2013;
- decides to rename the committee as the Standing Committee on Finance; and
- requests the committee, in preparing the first biennial assessment and overview of financial flows, to consider ways of strengthening methodologies for reporting climate finance;

**Green Climate Fund (GCF) Report and COP Guidance:** GCF Co-Chairs Zaheer Fakir (South Africa) and Ewen McDonald (Australia) introduced the GCF’s report (FCCC/CP/2012/5) during the COP opening plenary. They highlighted the decision to select Songdo, the Republic of Korea, as the host of the GCF.

Barbados, for AOSIS, stressed that the COP should provide further guidance to the GCF Board on how to expedite the operationalization of the Fund and initiate an early and adequate replenishment process. The Philippines, for the Group of 77 and China (G-77/China), supported guidance on issues, such as what the Fund will do and how to consider funding for projects. Colombia, speaking for Chile, Costa Rica and Peru, with Bolivia, Uruguay and Togo, called for the provision of funds to facilitate the operationalization of the GCF. The Republic of Korea, as host of the GCF, expressed commitment to facilitate the establishment of the interim secretariat as soon as possible.

**COP Decision:** In its decision (FCCC/CP/2012/L.17), the COP requests the GCF Board and the Republic of Korea to: conclude the legal and administrative arrangements for hosting the GCF; ensure that juridical personality and legal capacity are conferred to the GCF; and the necessary privileges and immunities are granted to the GCF and its officials. The COP decides to provide initial guidance to the GCF at COP 19.

The COP requests the GCF Board to report to COP 19 on the implementation of decision 3/CP.17. The COP reaffirms its decision that the interim arrangements should terminate no later than COP 19.

**Arrangements between the COP and GCF:** On this issue (FCCC/CP/2012/5, FCCC/CP/2012/CRP.1, and FCCC/CP/2012/CRP.4), parties disagreed on which body should be responsible for drafting the arrangements between the GCF and the COP.

The US and Japan stated that the key elements of the arrangements were already agreed on; the GCF has independent juridical authority operating under the guidance of the COP, and is therefore capable of drafting the arrangements. Barbados, for AOSIS, cautioned against reopening the GCF governing instrument. He suggested a process to develop the arrangements with representatives from the COP and the GCF Board. South Africa said the GCF Governing Instrument already includes elements that would allow the work on arrangements to be concluded in Doha. Saudi Arabia, supported by Kenya and Zambia, for the least developed countries (LDCs), expressed concern about the GCF drafting its own accountability relationship, suggesting that the Standing Committee should undertake this task. Colombia, on behalf of Peru and Guatemala, proposed that representatives of the COP, possibly through the Standing Committee and the GCF Board, work on drafting the arrangements. The EU supported developing the arrangements in a cooperative manner and suggested a draft proposal be submitted for consideration by relevant bodies and approval by COP 19.

**COP Decision:** In its decision (FCCC/CP/2012/L.18), the COP recognizes that Convention Article 11.3, decision 3/CP.17 and the GCF governing instrument form the basis for arrangements between the COP and the GCF to ensure that the GCF is accountable to, and functions under the guidance of, the COP to support projects, programmes, policies and other activities in developing country parties. The COP further requests the Standing Committee and the GCF Board to develop arrangements between the COP and the GCF in accordance with these instruments, for agreement by the GCF Board and subsequent agreement by COP 19.

**CLOSING PLENARY:** The COP closing plenary first convened late at night on Friday, 7 December. Parties watched a short film by civil society, encouraging delegates to “get involved now” to build a better future for everyone. The COP then considered issues on which agreement had been reached. The plenary was suspended at 12:15 am on Saturday morning, pending consultations on outstanding issues.

The COP closing plenary resumed at 7:00 pm on Saturday, 8 December, to adopt the Doha Climate Gateway package of decisions, without amendment and subject to approval of the entire package, on: agreed outcome pursuant to the Bali Action Plan (FCCC/CP/2012/L.4); advancing the Durban Platform (FCCC/CP/2012/L.13); loss and damage (FCCC/CP/2012/L.4/Rev.1); work programme on long-term finance (FCCC/CP/2012/L.15); report of the Standing Committee (FCCC/CP/2012/L.16); report of the GCF (FCCC/CP/2012/L.17); and arrangements between the COP and GCF (FCCC/CP/2012/L.18). The ADP report (FCCC/ADP/2012/L.3) and the AWG-LCA report FCCC/CP/2012/L.14/Rev.1) were also adopted as part of the Doha Climate Gateway package.

After the adoption of the package, a joint COP and CMP plenary was opened for parties to make statements. The US underlined that “much good work” has been accomplished

under the AWG-LCA and clarified their interpretation of the Doha outcome. On reference to the CBDR principle in the text on shared vision, the US stated they would not accept the text to the extent it is not read as consistent with the UNFCCC and the Cancun Agreements. On the preambular text in the ADP decision, which references the Convention’s principles, the US stated that this cannot affect the mandate given to the ADP under the Durban Platform and will not be the basis on which the US will engage in the work of the ADP. On unilateral trade measures, the US clarified their interpretation of the wording “of concern” to mean the party that raises the issue.

Algeria, for the G-77/China, called this package a “milestone” for the implementation of a new post-2020 climate regime. She stated that the Doha package, with its “shortcomings,” should be seen as a “delicate balance” and should be considered in its entirety.

The Russian Federation underscored that he had requested the floor before the COP/CMP President gave the Doha Climate Gateway package, and stressed his expectation that the President would introduce the proposal submitted by the Russian Federation, Ukraine and Belarus on the CMP outcome to the plenary. President Al-Attiah responded that this concern and proposal would be reflected in the meeting’s report.

China, on behalf of BASIC (Brazil, South Africa, India and China), said that, although disappointed with certain aspects of the package, members of the group accept the decisions and promised a “proactive approach” to deal with climate change in the future. Australia expressed concern that surplus Assigned Amount Units (AAUs) could be as high as seven billion tons, noting that this puts the environmental integrity of the Kyoto Protocol at risk. He underscored that Australia will not purchase AAUs from the first commitment period and that such AAUs will not be eligible in the domestic emissions trading scheme. The EU, Liechtenstein, Japan, Monaco and Switzerland also stated they would not purchase surplus AAUs carried over from the first commitment period.

Nauru, for AOSIS, lamented that the adopted package is deficient in terms of mitigation ambition and finance, stating that it “only promises that something might materialize in the future.” He further expressed his expectation that the 2014 climate change leaders’ summit announced by UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon will work to close the ambition gap. He lamented that the outcome “provides little more than a gateway to a long path,” and warned that if delegates take “a wrong turn in the road, this process will collapse and our nations will disappear.”

The EU stated that it will undertake immediate application of the second commitment period, as this is already provided for in EU law. In addition, noting that Protocol Article 4 foresees the possibility of parties fulfilling their commitments jointly, the EU explained that the commitment inscribed in Protocol Annex B for the EU, Croatia and Iceland for the second commitment period is based on the understanding that this commitment will be fulfilled jointly.

Egypt, for the Arab Group, said that decisions taken in Doha represent hope for the future of multilateral action on climate change; noted success on ambitious objectives and the opening the second commitment period; and looked forward to full and continuous implementation of the decisions. Noting that

“we are heading towards dangerous territory” by failing to set a pathway toward keeping the global temperature rise below 1.5°C, Swaziland, for the African Group, said that the Doha decisions are in the right direction despite concerns on finance for implementing the Convention between now and 2020.

The Gambia, for the LDCs, said that they came to Doha for a balanced package and lamented that a number of elements have not been addressed. He said that commitments on mitigation are insufficient for closing the ambition gap and expressed disappointment with the lack of detail on 2013-2020 finance.

COP President Al-Attiah commended the parties’ support of the political initiative to move forward and the negotiators’ flexibility that has “helped us reach solutions.” Recognizing that on some issues it was not possible to achieve common ground, he noted that consensus on AWG-LCA strengthens the conviction that parties are willing to work together, and highlighted agreement on financial resources for the period 2013-2020.

The Philippines, speaking for Like-Minded Developing Countries, expressed concern with “uneven texts” and weak ambition. He also expressed “deep disappointment” that after Doha, finance remains an “empty shell.” He highlighted major deficiencies in the AWG-LCA outcome including on developed country mitigation, comparability of efforts, response measures and finance.

Climate Justice Now said that Doha had neither delivered on an effective and fair deal, nor ensured the required finance for fighting against climate change. He rejected the Doha texts and said the “Doha gateway” is a gateway to climate injustice and climate death. Climate Action Network (CAN) said parties’ attitudes must change to secure a binding deal by 2015. Trade Unions urged for transition to start now. Youth said the Doha Climate Gateway has shut the door on equity.

Noting the submission from Bahrain, Saudi Arabia, Qatar and United Arab Emirates (FCCC/CP/2012/MISC.2), the COP then adopted the decision on an economic diversification initiative (FCCC/CP/2012/L.11). The US congratulated the concerned states for this submission, saying it represents “a significant shift” in their positions and efforts to address climate change.

The COP also approved the credentials of delegations (FCCC/CP/2012/7), adopted the reports of SBI 36 and SBI 37 (FCCC/SBI/2012/15 & Add.1-2; and FCCC/SBI/2012/L.27), adopted the reports of SBSTA 36 and 37 (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/2 and FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.20), and adopted the report of the ADP (FCCC/ADP/2012/L.3).

The COP also adopted a decision on future sessions (FCCC/CP/2012/L.8). In the decision, the COP: accepts the offer by Poland to host COP 19 and CMP 9 in Warsaw from 11-22 November 2013; notes that COP 20 and CMP 10 will be in Latin America and the Caribbean, and invites parties to consult on the hosting of these sessions; and takes note of the offer of France to host COP 21 and CMP 11 in 2015.

The COP then adopted the meeting’s report (FCCC/CP/2012/L.1) and a decision expressing gratitude to Qatar and the people of the city of Doha (FCCC/CP/2012/L.3) for hosting the conference. COP 18 President Al-Attiah thanked the delegates for their hard work to reach a successful outcome and gavelled the meeting to a close at 9:34 pm.

## CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES SERVING AS THE MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE KYOTO PROTOCOL

Opening the session on 26 November, CMP 8 President Al-Attiah noted that the AWG-KP is expected to forward to the CMP a set of amendments to the Kyoto Protocol to allow the second commitment period to commence promptly on 1 January 2013. He urged all parties to show creativity and flexibility to ensure that the desired outcome is achieved. AWG-KP Chair Madeleine Diouf (Senegal) highlighted that there are some outstanding issues to be resolved to allow the second commitment period to commence as planned. She said the proposal by the Chair to facilitate negotiations (FCCC/KP/AWG/2012/CRP.1) will be the basis of discussions under the AWG-KP, and will be revised as work progresses.

**ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS: Agenda and organization of work:** On 26 November, the CMP adopted the agenda and organization of work (FCCC/KP/CMP/2012/1).

**PARTIES’ PROPOSALS TO AMEND THE PROTOCOL:** This issue was first taken up by the CMP plenary on 28 November. COP President Al-Attiah noted that 14 proposals to amend the Protocol have been submitted by parties to the CMP (FCCC/KP/CMP/2009/2-13 and FCCC/KP/CMP/2010/3-4), and that this year, a new proposal has been received from Nauru (FCCC/KP/CMP/2012/2). Parties agreed to leave the issue open and return to it during the closing plenary. During the resumed CMP closing plenary on Saturday, 8 December, parties agreed that, given that the CMP has now adopted an amendment to the Kyoto Protocol, the consideration of this agenda item is complete.

**KAZAKHSTAN’S PROPOSAL TO AMEND PROTOCOL ANNEX B:** This issue (FCCC/KP/CMP/2010/4) was first taken up by the CMP plenary on 28 November. It was subsequently taken up in informal consultations facilitated by Philip Gwage (Uganda).

**CMP Decision:** In its decision (FCCC/KP/CMP/2012/L.3), the CMP, *inter alia*: welcomes Kazakhstan’s intention to participate as an Annex I party with a commitment inscribed in Annex B to the Kyoto Protocol for the second commitment period.

**CLEAN DEVELOPMENT MECHANISM:** This issue (FCCC/KP/CMP/2012/11) was first taken up by the CMP plenary on 28 November. CDM Executive Board Chair Maosheng Duan (China) presented the Board’s annual report (FCCC/KP/CMP/2012/3).

Zambia called for accreditation of additional designated operational entities in Africa, and proposed continued reform of the CDM to address transparency and accountability, and simplify methodologies. Bolivia raised concerns about the CDM’s contribution to technology transfer and capacity building and its probable non-additionality. New Zealand noted that if only parties participating in the second commitment period can access the CDM, the demand for CDM projects is likely to be insufficient. Many parties raised concerns over the drop in Certified Emissions Reduction (CER) prices and made suggestions on how to address it. Venezuela emphasized that the CDM is linked to the level of ambition and is not “just another business opportunity.”

The issue was then further considered in a contact group and informal consultations co-facilitated by Kunihiko Shimada (Japan) and Giza Gaspar Martins (Angola). During the discussions, parties focused on, *inter alia*: eligibility to participate in the CDM during the Kyoto Protocol second commitment period; the CDM's 2013 work plan; voluntary cancellation of CERs; issues relating to regional and subregional distribution of CDM projects; and the establishment by parties of CDM stabilization funds. Discussions were based on a draft CDM decision prepared by the Co-Chairs. After lengthy consultations, parties were unable to agree on issues relating to: establishment of CDM stabilization funds; voluntary cancellation of CERs; baselines and additionality; eligibility to participate in the CDM in the second commitment period; and the carry-over of surplus units from the first commitment period.

The bracketed text was forwarded to the CMP for further consideration. On 8 December, the CMP adopted a decision on the issue.

**CMP Decision:** In its decision (FCCC/KP/CMP/2012/L.10), the CMP reiterates that the first review of the CDM modalities and procedures will be carried out by CMP 9, and requests SBI 39 to prepare recommendations on possible changes to the modalities and procedures, for consideration by CMP 9. It further requests the CDM Executive Board and the Secretariat to continue seeking ways to streamline the processes for the registration of CDM projects and programmes of activities, and the issuance of CERs, to ensure that the average time between the receipt of a submission and the commencement of the completeness check is less than 15 calendar days.

The CMP further invites parties and institutions wishing to do so to make voluntary contributions to the CDM loan scheme in order to expand the capacity of the scheme to provide loans to support eligible project activities.

**JOINT IMPLEMENTATION:** This issue was first taken up by the CMP plenary on 28 November. Wolfgang Seidel (Germany), Chair, Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee (JISC), presented the JISC's annual report to the CMP (FCCC/KP/CMP/2012/4). He noted that JI is at a critical junction and is facing an "uncertain future," and highlighted proposals made by the JISC for revising the JI guidelines (FCCC/KP/CMP/2012/5).

This issue was further considered in a contact group and informal consultations co-chaired by Balisi Gopolang (Botswana) and Helmut Hojesky (Austria). Discussions focused on the two sub-agenda items on: guidance on JI (FCCC/KP/CMP/2012/4); and the JI guidelines (FCCC/KP/CMP/2012/5, INF.1 and MISC.1).

**CMP Decision:** In its decision (FCCC/KP/CMP/2012/L.7), the CMP, *inter alia*, requests: the Secretariat to compile a report on possible changes to the JI guidelines, drawing on recommendations made by the JISC, parties, intergovernmental organizations and admitted observer organizations, for consideration by SBI 38; and SBI 38 to prepare recommendations, including draft revised JI guidelines, for consideration by CMP 9. It further agrees, with regard to the review of the JI guidelines, on a set of key attributes that shall characterize the future operation of JI, which includes: a single unified track for JI projects; closely aligned or unified

accreditation procedures between JI and the CDM; and an appeals process against decisions of the JISC under the authority of, and accountable to, the CMP.

**COMPLIANCE: Compliance Committee Report:** This issue (FCCC/KP/CMP/2012/6) was taken up by the CMP plenary on 28 November. Compliance Committee Co-Chair Khalid Abuleif (Saudi Arabia) presented the report of the Committee, noting that 2012 was the busiest year to date for the Committee's Enforcement Branch and a "significant year" for the Facilitative Branch. Ilhomjon Rajabov (Tajikistan) and Christina Voigt (Norway) facilitated informal consultations.

**CMP Decision:** In its decision (FCCC/KP/CMP/2012/L.2), the CMP, *inter alia*:

- acknowledges the continued interest of the Compliance Committee in having any legal arrangements for privileges and immunities adopted by the CMP cover members and alternate members of the Committee;
- notes that the JISC is seeking to elaborate modalities and procedures for the implementation of Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol, which may have implications for the procedures and mechanisms relating to compliance under the Kyoto Protocol;
- acknowledges the value to the work of the Compliance Committee of establishing a dialogue with compliance bodies under other treaties to exchange information on compliance-related matters; and
- notes the conclusions of SBI 36 with respect to the travel-related expenditure of members and alternate members of the Compliance Committee for participation in meetings of constituted bodies established under the Kyoto Protocol.

**ADAPTATION FUND: Adaptation Fund Board (AFB) Report:** This matter (FCCC/KP/CMP/2012/10) was first considered in the CMP plenary on 28 November. It was further considered in contact group discussions. AFB Chair Luis Santos (Uruguay) introduced the AFB report (FCCC/KP/CMP/2012/7). He highlighted a significant increase in the number of adaptation projects financed and national implementing entities accredited. He further noted a drop in the price of CERs, observing that this could jeopardize the fund's existence. He urged Annex I parties to make financial contributions to avoid compromising the Fund's capacity to meet the needs of vulnerable countries.

Jamaica, supported by Sudan, the Philippines, Vanuatu and Zambia, called on the CMP to facilitate mobilization of additional funds during CMP 8. Pointing to the limitations of the carbon market, Burkina Faso suggested exploring ways to institutionalize predictable funding sources. India noted that the record of Annex I countries leaves "no reason for optimism" on their willingness to voluntarily scale up contributions to the Adaptation Fund. He suggested allocating a share of the proceeds from JI and emissions trading to the Adaptation Fund. Noting that CERs are an important source for the Fund, New Zealand encouraged parties to take into consideration during discussions on eligibility, that sufficient demand for the CDM will provide financial resources for the fund.

**CMP Decision:** In its decision (FCCC/KP/CMP/2012/L.8), the CMP notes with concern issues related to the sustainability, adequacy and predictability of funding from the Adaptation Fund based on the current uncertainty on the CER prices and the continuation of the Adaptation Fund during and beyond the

second commitment period. The CMP requests the Adaptation Fund Board to report to SBI 38 on the status of resources of the fund, trends in the flow of resources and any identifiable causes of these trends. The CMP decides to consider at CMP 9 means to enhance the sustainability, adequacy and predictability of these resources, including the potential to diversify revenue streams of the Adaptation Fund. The CMP requests the Secretariat to prepare a technical paper, based on the experiences of bodies under the Convention and the wider UN system, on the process of selecting host institutions for entities under the Convention and the wider UN system, for consideration by SBI 38.

#### **ADMINISTRATIVE, FINANCIAL AND INSTITUTIONAL MATTERS: Privileges and immunities:**

On 28 November, the CMP President noted that CMP 2 had requested the SBI to consider this issue. He further noted that the SBI concluded its discussions at SBI 36 and forwarded draft treaty arrangements for adoption by CMP 8. He requested Javier Diaz (Costa Rica) to facilitate informal consultations. The CMP adopted draft conclusions on 8 December.

**CMP Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/KP/CMP/2012/L.6), the CMP takes note of the draft treaty arrangements and requests the SBI to consider this matter at its next session. The CMP invites the COP to consider the issue and decides that the CMP will continue consideration at CMP 9.

**CLOSING PLENARY:** The CMP closing plenary first convened at 12:15 am on Saturday, 8 December, to consider issues where agreement had been reached. The CMP closing plenary resumed at 7:00 pm to adopt Protocol amendments and decisions related to the second commitment period as part of the package of decisions known as the Doha Climate Gateway. The CMP approved the outcome of the work of the AWG-KP (FCCC/KP/CMP/2012/L.9) and implications of the decisions 2/CMP.7 to 5/CMP.7 (FCCC/KP/CMP/2012/L.4/Rev.1) without amendment and conditional on the approval of the entire package of decisions under the Doha Climate Gateway.

The CMP also approved the credentials (FCCC/KP/CMP/2012/12, with the addition of Burundi, adopted the reports of SBSTA 36 and SBSTA 37 (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/2 and FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.20), and adopted the reports of SBI 36 and SBI 37 (FCCC/SBI/2012/15 & Add. 1-2; and FCCC/SBI/2012/L.27). The CMP elected officers to the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) Executive Board, Adaptation Fund Board, Compliance Committee and Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee. The CMP Vice-President urged parties to submit nominations that are still pending.

The CMP then adopted the report of the meeting (FCCC/KP/CMP/2012/L.1) and a decision on the expression of gratitude to the government of Qatar and the people of the city of Doha submitted by Poland (FCCC/KP/CMP/2012/L.5). The CMP plenary closed at 9:48 pm.

#### **COP 18 AND CMP 8 JOINT HIGH-LEVEL SEGMENT**

On 4 December, the COP 18 and CMP 8 high-level segment opened. UNFCCC Executive Secretary Figueres underscored that Doha needs to ensure: agreement on an amendment to the Kyoto Protocol; a clear path on climate finance; effective Review of the long-term global goal; an urgent response to the widening emissions gap; and a firm foundation for a long-term framework applicable to all, equitably instituted and responsive to science.

COP 18/CMP 8 President Al-Attayah urged parties to work together towards mutual understanding and to ensure a balanced package, highlighting climate change as one of the most pressing challenges of our time.

Vuk Jeremić, President of the UN General Assembly, stated that addressing climate change must become a “core national interest” of every UN member state. He outlined plans to schedule a high-level thematic debate on climate change, green energy and water sustainability during the resumed 67th session of the UN General Assembly.

UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon underscored that there should be no illusion that this is a crisis. He outlined five deliverables from Doha: adopting a ratifiable second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol; making progress on long-term climate finance; working to fully equip institutions supporting mitigation and adaptation by developing countries; keeping negotiations on a legally-binding instrument on track; and showing determination to act on the gap between the current mitigation pledges and what is required to achieve the 2°C target.

H.H. Sabah IV Al-Ahmad Al-Jaber Al-Sabah, Emir of Kuwait, noted that the sizeable high-level participation in the conference reflects recognition by the international community of climate change as a pressing issue. He called for decisions to pave the way for long-term cooperation through: ensuring the effective implementation of the Bali Action Plan and all its elements; adopting a second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol; not imposing new commitments on developing countries; and backing voluntary actions by developing countries with finance and technology transfer from developed countries.

H.H. Sheikh Hamad Bin Khalifa Al-Thani, Emir of Qatar, called for: epitomizing the concept of interdependence; reaching a practical and effective agreement with flexible solutions; and finding equilibrium between the needs of countries and communities for energy on the one hand, and the requirements to reduce greenhouse gas emissions on the other hand.

The high-level segment continued until 7 December with national statements and statements by observer organizations. A webcast of the statements is available at: [http://unfccc.int/meetings/doha\\_nov\\_2012/meeting/6815/php/view/webcasts.php](http://unfccc.int/meetings/doha_nov_2012/meeting/6815/php/view/webcasts.php)

#### **AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON LONG-TERM COOPERATIVE ACTION UNDER THE UNFCCC**

The resumed 15th session of the *Ad hoc* Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the UNFCCC (AWG-LCA 15) opened on 27 November with Aysar Tayeb (Saudi Arabia) continuing as Chair and Mark Pallemerts (Belgium) continuing as Vice-Chair.

Many developing countries highlighted the need to provide clarity on mid-term finance. The Umbrella Group urged transition to a full implementation phase and emphasized that the fast-start finance commitment has been collectively surpassed. The EU stressed the continued provision of climate finance after 2012 and work to scale up finance towards 2020. Peru, for Colombia, Chile, Costa Rica and Panama, identified the need to make progress in defining the next steps for implementation and close the AWG-LCA negotiating track. He supported resolving pending issues at COP 18 and, if necessary, delegating specific tasks to the subsidiary bodies (SBs) and other processes. Swaziland, for the African Group, said the



Doha meeting must result in agreement on: a comparability and compliance framework for developed countries' mitigation efforts; and clear mid-term targets for finance. Nauru, for AOSIS, suggested focusing on the work mandated in Durban, including on a science-based Review that is narrow in scope. The Gambia, for the LDCs, said parties in Doha must establish a separate expert body for the Review to feed into the ADP, as well as a platform for developing common accounting rules. China, for BASIC, emphasized that a successful completion of the AWG-LCA must address all elements of the Bali Action Plan and must not leave key issues off the table, such as equitable access to sustainable development and intellectual property rights (IPRs). Egypt, for the Arab Group, suggested working towards agreement on outstanding issues and, where no agreement is reached, to consider transferring issues to other Convention bodies.

#### **PREPARATION OF AN AGREED COMPREHENSIVE AND BALANCED OUTCOME FOR COP 18:** On 27

November, Chair Tayeb introduced an informal overview text (FCCC/AWGLCA/2012/CRP.3), explaining that it is based on intersessional consultations. Parties' views diverged on the text. China, the Philippines, the Arab Group and others supported using the text as a basis for further work, while the Umbrella Group, the Environmental Integrity Group (EIG), the EU, Canada and others opposed this.

The AWG-LCA began working through spin-off groups on REDD+, developing country mitigation, developed country mitigation, sectoral approaches, market and non-market approaches, shared vision and Review. In parallel, Chair Tayeb consulted on the other AWG-LCA agenda items, including finance, technology transfer, adaptation, capacity building and response measures. During the second week, the AWG-LCA also worked through informal consultations facilitated by Vice-Chair Pallemmaerts, break-out groups, and informal ministerial consultations.

On Monday, 3 December, parties discussed a new text. Chair Tayeb indicated that it was "an unedited compilation of papers" from the spin-off groups, except for those groups where there was no agreement to have a text. Algeria, for the G-77/China, expressed disappointment, noting that the text is "unbalanced," failing to reflect the main elements of the Bali Action Plan. Nicaragua, for Like-Minded Developing Countries, with many other developing countries, stressed the need for text on adaptation, finance, technology and capacity building. Kenya, for the African Group, identified the inclusion of key elements of the Bali Action Plan as a precondition for discussions. The Philippines, the United Arab Emirates and others lamented lack of clarity on the means of implementation. Bolivia objected to the "market-oriented" focus of the text. South Africa and others emphasized that the closing text of the AWG-LCA must encompass all issues under the AWG-LCA's mandate, and that some issues require more elaboration. The US, Canada, Australia and New Zealand emphasized the importance of recognizing progress made under the AWG-LCA, including the various new institutional arrangements established. Several developed countries emphasized that discussions on issues, including adaptation and finance, will continue under other processes after the termination of the AWG-LCA.

Informal consultations under the AWG-LCA continued on 4 December and Chair Tayeb indicated that finance will be taken up in consultations by Ministers Mariyam Shakeela (Maldives) and Bruno Oberle (Switzerland). On 5 December, Chair Tayeb reported to the informal stocktaking plenary on texts that capture the status of discussion under each AWG-LCA agenda item with a view to providing parties with a complete overview. He explained that the AWG-LCA will continue to work through a single informal group throughout the evening with a view to making progress towards a more streamlined text by the following day. In the evening of 6 December, Chair Tayeb reported good progress on all elements, while indicating that there are still areas that require streamlining. He expressed hope that all elements would be brought together in one document "by some time tonight."

At the AWG-LCA closing plenary in the evening of 7 December, Chair Tayeb thanked delegates for their "continuous work" which resulted in text on the AWG-LCA agreed outcome pursuant to the Bali Action Plan (FCCC/AWGLCA/2012/L.4). He reported that he had heard "different concerns" about the text, which he said indicated a "certain degree of balance" and that the text was a good basis for the agreed outcome. He reminded parties that the AWG-LCA text is part of an overall package in Doha. With that, Chair Tayeb proposed, and parties agreed, to forward the outcome of the AWG-LCA to the COP for its further consideration and adoption.

After further informal consultations, in the evening of 8 December, the COP adopted the agreed outcome pursuant to the Bali Action Plan (FCCC/CP/2012/L.14/Rev.1) as part of the Doha Climate Gateway and the AWG-LCA terminated its work. The final outcomes from the AWG-LCA's work under the Bali Action Plan are summarized below.

**Shared Vision:** This issue was addressed by a spin-off group facilitated by Zou Ji (China). These consultations focused on the development of: a process to explore the numbers for a global goal for emission reductions and a timeframe for the peaking of global emissions, together with the implications of these numbers; and a process to consider equitable access to sustainable development.

During the AWG-LCA closing plenary on 7 December, many parties expressed concerns over the shared vision text. The EU expressed disappointment that consultations had yielded "no progress." Egypt requested references to next steps in the text. The US opposed the referencing of equity and the CBDR principle. During the COP closing plenary, the US asked to reflect in the meeting's report that it accepted this text "to the extent that it is not read in a matter that is inconsistent with the Convention or the Cancun agreements."

**Final Outcome:** The COP decides that parties will urgently work toward the deep reduction in global GHG emissions required to hold the global average temperature to below 2°C above pre-industrial levels and to attain a global peaking of global GHG emissions as soon as possible, consistent with science and the Fourth Assessment Report of the IPCC, reaffirming that the time frame for peaking will be longer in developing countries. The COP further decides that efforts should be undertaken on the basis of equity and common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, and the

provision of finance, technology transfer and capacity building to developing countries to support mitigation and adaptation, and take into account the imperatives of equitable access to sustainable development, the survival of countries and protecting the integrity of Mother Earth.

**Mitigation: Developed Country Mitigation:** Parties discussed this issue in a spin-off group and in informal, open-ended consultations conducted by the AWG-LCA Chair. Negotiations were based on non-papers and parties' submissions.

The main issues included the removal of conditions associated with developed country mitigation pledges, and the establishment of a work programme to continue discussions on the issue after the closure of the AWG-LCA. Many developing countries urged developed countries to move to the higher end of their pledges, highlighting the need to present their targets as a single number from a common base year of 1990, expressed as a carbon budget in tons of carbon dioxide equivalent over a period of time until 2020.

Different groups of developed country parties presented proposals about a work programme aimed at clarifying assumptions underlying the pledges from 2013 to 2014, before the implementation of reporting requirements already established from 2015. A number of developing countries supported that the work programme be aimed at removing conditionalities, raising ambition and developing common accounting rules, including a common base year. Parties eventually agreed to refer to the development of "common elements." Some parties supported that the work programme last only one year and deliver results in an expedited manner. Parties discussed whether to place the work programme under the SBSTA or the SBI, and ultimately agreed that the work programme should be placed under the SBSTA.

**Final Outcome:** The COP:

- urges developed country parties to increase the ambition of their quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets, with a view to reducing their aggregate anthropogenic GHG emissions to a level consistent with the IPCC Fourth Assessment Report;
- decides to establish a work programme under the SBSTA to commence in 2013 and end in 2014, to continue clarifying the targets, with a view to: identifying common elements for measuring the progress made towards the achievement of the targets; and ensuring the comparability of efforts among developed countries, taking into account differences in their national circumstances;
- requests parties' submissions on their views on the work programme by 25 March 2013;
- requests the Secretariat to annually update a technical paper on the process of clarifying the targets based on information provided by developed country parties in relation to their targets; and
- requests the SBSTA to report on the progress of the work programme to COP 19 and on the outcome of the work programme to be considered by COP 20.

**Developing Country Mitigation:** Parties discussed this issue in a spin-off group and in informal, open-ended consultations conducted by the AWG-LCA Chair. Negotiations were based on non-papers and parties' submissions.

The main issues discussed included the establishment of a work programme to continue discussions to clarify the underlying assumptions for developing countries' pledges after the closure of the AWG-LCA, as well as the compilation of relevant information on developing countries' pledges. Parties also had divergent views on the organization of regional technical workshops to prepare technical material to build capacity in the preparation, submission and implementation of NAMAs, and on the formulation of low-emission development strategies. Parties eventually agreed that these activities should be performed upon request by "interested" developing countries.

Other contentious issues included whether and how to request the Secretariat to prepare a compilation of the outcomes of the process to further understanding of the diversity of mitigation actions by developing country parties, with some countries supporting that the Secretariat prepare a compilation of the information, and others supporting a technical paper that synthesizes the information. While some parties initially supported that the SBSTA develop guidelines for MRV of support for the preparation and implementation of NAMAs and for the provision of support through the Registry, parties eventually agreed to remove the reference.

**Final Outcome:** The COP, *inter alia*:

- decides to establish a work programme to commence in 2013 and end in 2014, to further understanding of the diversity of NAMAs under the SBI, including on: regarding the underlying assumptions and methodologies; need for financial, technological and capacity-building support for the preparation and implementation of NAMAs; and the matching of NAMAs with support;
- requests the SBI to report on progress to COP 19 and on the outcome to COP 20; and
- requests the Secretariat, at the request of interested developing country parties, to organize regional technical workshops and to prepare technical material to build capacity in the preparation, submission and implementation of NAMAs, and in the formulation of low-emission development strategies.

**REDD+:** Parties discussed this issue in a spin-off group and in informal, open-ended consultations conducted by the AWG-LCA Chair. Negotiations were based on non-papers and parties' submissions.

A group of parties, opposed by a number of other countries, proposed the establishment of a REDD+ Committee to mainstream the implementation of REDD+ activities and ensure consistency of financial resources mobilization. Despite some parties' expressed opposition to creating new institutions, parties also discussed the possibility of establishing a governing body under the authority of the COP to promote and coordinate REDD+ activities. Parties eventually agreed that SBI 39 and SBSTA 39 should initiate a process to address the issue of support for REDD+ activities.

Developed countries emphasized the need to consider non-carbon benefits in REDD+ implementation and suggested a work programme to consider options for scaling up finance for REDD+ activities, taking into account non-carbon benefits. Some countries opposed, noting difficulties and the high amount of investment requirement in the measurement of such benefits. Parties eventually agreed to initiate work on methodological

issues related to non-carbon benefits for consideration by COP 19. Another controversial issue was how to refer to the need for additional financial support for REDD+ activities.

**Final Outcome:** The COP, *inter alia*:

- decides to undertake a work programme on results-based finance in 2013 to end by COP 19, including two in-session workshops, to progress the full implementation of the activities referred to in decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 70 (REDD+ activities);
- decides that the aim of the work programme is to contribute to the ongoing efforts to scale up and improve the effectiveness of finance for REDD+ activities, taking into account a wide variety of sources; and
- requests SBSTA 38 to consider how non-market-based approaches, such as joint mitigation and adaptation approaches, could be developed; and initiate work on methodological issues related to non-carbon benefits resulting from REDD+ activities, for reporting to COP 19.

The COP also:

- recognizes the need to improve the coordination of support for REDD+ activities, and to provide adequate and predictable support, including financial resources and technical and technological support, to developing country parties for implementation of those activities;
- requests the SBs at their 39th session to jointly initiate a process for addressing the need to improve the coordination of support for REDD+ activities, and to consider existing institutional arrangements or potential governance alternatives and to make recommendations to COP 19; and
- invites submissions of views by parties and observer organizations by 25 March 2013.

**Sectoral approaches:** Parties discussed this issue in a spin-off group, as well as later on in the context of the informal open-ended consultations conducted by the AWG-LCA Chair.

Many parties highlighted the need to avoid unilateral measures to address emissions from international aviation and maritime transport. Some parties emphasized that this issue should be considered in a multilateral manner, working through ICAO and IMO. A number of parties also supported inviting the ICAO and IMO Secretariats to continue to report at future SBSTA sessions.

**Final Outcome:** No text on sectoral approaches was included in the COP decision on the AWG-LCA outcome.

**Market and non-market approaches:** This issue was considered in informal consultations facilitated by Alexa Kleysteuber (Chile).

The EU highlighted specific tasks in the AWG-LCA's mandate, saying that no decision on market approaches would mean there is no process to consider the issue after Doha. Venezuela stressed that the text on paragraph 1(b)(v) of the Bali Action Plan (market and non-market approaches) had been rejected by many developing countries during informal consultations, and objected to presenting the text as the basis for further negotiations. Bolivia emphasized concerns over market mechanisms, including double counting and non-additionality, noting that these could increase emissions.

During the AWG-LCA stocktaking plenary on 1 December, Facilitator Kleysteuber reported positive progress and constructive discussions on the framework for various approaches and the new market mechanism, highlighting that divergence remains on both issues and the relationship between them.

**Final Outcome:** The COP acknowledges that parties may develop and implement various approaches for mitigation, including opportunities for using markets and non-markets, and that such approaches must meet appropriate standards. It further requests the SBSTA, with a view to recommending draft decisions to COP 19, to conduct separate work programmes to elaborate:

- a framework for such approaches, drawing on the work of the AWG-LCA on this matter;
- non-market-based approaches; and
- modalities and procedures for the new market-based mechanism defined in decision 2/CP.17.

**Adaptation:** This issue (FCCC/AWG/LCA/2012/CRP.2) was addressed in an informal group facilitated by AWG-LCA Chair Tayeb. Many developing countries repeatedly identified adaptation as one of the crucial issues that must be addressed. While many parties acknowledged the progress on adaptation issues since the adoption of the Bali Action Plan, including the establishment of the Adaptation Committee and a process to consider national adaptation plans, some developing countries pointed to outstanding elements under the Bali mandate, including: national-level institutions and regional centers; linking adaptation to other instruments under the Convention; and means of implementation.

**Final Outcome:** The COP, *inter alia*:

- decides that the COP, its SBs and other bodies under the Convention will continue to work to enhance action on adaptation;
- decides to give consideration to issues relating to the coherence of the action of, and support provided to, developing country parties, the engagement of regional centers and networks, and the promotion of livelihoods and economic diversification to build resilience in the context of planning, prioritizing and implementing adaptation actions; and
- requests the Adaptation Committee to consider the establishment of an annual adaptation forum to raise awareness and ambition with regard to adaptation.

**Technology:** Parties discussed this issue in the context of the informal open-ended consultations conducted by the AWG-LCA Chair.

Discussions addressed linkages between the CTCN and the TEC, and the Convention's financial mechanism; the role of the TEC; and the potential consideration of issues related to IPRs by the TEC. Some developing countries supported that the TEC continue work on issues related to IPRs, while some others, in particular developed countries, opposed references to IPRs, highlighting that those issues are considered under other relevant fora.

On the issue of arrangements among the different bodies, parties initiated consideration of the issue without reaching consensus and agreed to continue consideration of the issue at the next session.

**Final Outcome:** The COP, *inter alia*:

- agrees to initiate, at COP 19, the elaboration and consideration of the relationship between the TEC and the CTCN;
- requests the TEC, in elaborating its future workplan, to initiate the exploration of issues relating to enabling environments and barriers, including those issues referred to in document FCCC/SB/2012/2, paragraph 35;
- recommends the Advisory Board of the CTCN, in considering the CTCN programme of work, to consider the following activities: providing advice and support to developing country parties in relation to conducting assessments of new and emerging technologies; and elaborating the role of the CTCN in identifying currently available climate-friendly technologies for mitigation and adaptation that meet the key low-carbon and climate-resilient development needs of parties; and
- agrees to further elaborate, at COP 20, the linkages between the Technology Mechanism and the financial mechanism of the Convention.

**Finance:** Parties discussed finance in the AWG-LCA contact group and in informal consultations, including ministerial ones.

Discussion focused on the continuity of finance after 2012. The G-77/China introduced a proposal to address the “finance gap,” including accurate accounting of the provision of finance. The US cited compromises made on fast-start finance and a finance target for 2020, emphasizing that no further decisions are required for the AWG-LCA to complete its work on this issue. Japan maintained that there is no need for a decision on finance in Doha.

Colombia highlighted that a finance goal between now and the 2020 objective is necessary to support developed countries in achieving the 2020 target. Guatemala said that reaching an outcome in Doha will not be possible if a decision on finance is not part of the package. Barbados, for AOSIS, highlighted that the G-77/China proposal intends to contribute towards assessing the progress towards the 2020 finance objective.

**Final Outcome:** The COP:

- urges additional developed country parties to announce climate finance pledges when their financial circumstances permit;
- reiterates that a significant share of new multilateral funding for adaptation should flow through the GCF and requests the GCF Board to balance the allocation of the resources of the GCF between adaptation and mitigation activities;
- calls on developed country parties to channel a substantial share of public funds to adaptation activities;
- urges all developed country parties to scale up climate finance from a wide variety of sources, to achieve the joint goal of mobilizing US\$100 billion per year by 2020;
- decides to extend the work programme on long-term finance for one year to the end of 2013;
- requests the Standing Committee, in initiating the first biennial assessment and overview of climate finance flows, to take into account relevant work by other bodies and entities on MRV of support and tracking of climate finance;
- requests the GCF Board to expeditiously implement its 2013 workplan, with a view to making the GCF operational as soon as possible to enable an early and adequate replenishment process; and

- agrees to consider the progress made in the mobilization of long-term finance at COP 19, through an in-session high-level ministerial dialogue under the COP on efforts by developed country parties to scale up the mobilization of climate finance after 2012.

**Capacity Building:** Parties discussed this issue in the context of the informal open-ended consultations conducted by the AWG-LCA Chair.

Parties expressed divergent views on the need for the establishment of a work programme on capacity building. Some indicated that the forum on capacity building created in 2011 in Durban has already provided an adequate space for addressing the issue, while others said that the work under the forum should further support countries in implementing capacity building activities at the national level.

**Final Outcome:** The COP, *inter alia*:

- decides that the second meeting of the Durban Forum, to be held during SBI 38, shall explore potential ways to further enhance the implementation of capacity building at the national level;
- invites parties to submit, by 18 February 2013: information on capacity-building activities undertaken including needs and gaps; and views on issues to consider in the second meeting of the Durban Forum, as well as potential enhancement of its organization; and
- requests the SBI to explore potential ways to further enhance the implementation of capacity building at the national level, including through the Durban Forum.

**Review:** An informal group first addressed this issue on 28 November. In the informal consultations by the Chair on the agreed outcome convened on 3 December, Chair Tayeb asked the informal group to focus on the scope of the Review, coupled with considerations for expert input.

**Final Outcome:** The COP decides, *inter alia*, that the review should periodically assess the adequacy of the long-term global goal; and overall progress made towards achieving this goal, including consideration of the implementation of the commitments under the Convention. The COP also resolves to engage in a structured expert dialogue to support the work of the joint SBSTA/SBI contact group established to assist the COP in conducting the review, in order to ensure the scientific integrity of the review.

**EITs:** This issue was addressed in an informal group.

**Final Outcome:** The COP, *inter alia*, decides that a certain degree of flexibility shall be allowed to EITs with regard to the provision of new and additional financial resources, technology transfer and capacity building to non-Annex I parties, in order to enable them to enhance their implementation of mitigation and adaptation actions, and that this flexibility shall be extended until 2020. It further invites EITs in a position to do so to provide such resources on a voluntary basis.

**Parties whose special circumstances have been recognized by the COP:** This issue was addressed in an informal group.

**Final Outcome:** The COP, *inter alia*: urges Annex II parties in a position to do so to provide financial, technological, technical and capacity-building support to parties whose special

circumstances are recognized by the COP in order to assist them in implementing their national climate change strategies and action plans.

**CLOSING PLENARY:** The AWG-LCA closing plenary took place in the evening of Friday, 7 December.

Algeria, for the G-77/China, underlined that the issue of financing is of “utmost importance for a successful outcome in Doha.” She stated that without finance, institutions will be empty and ineffective, and expressed concern about the lack of progress on adaptation and technology transfer in the text.

The EU declared that there is much to be collectively proud of under the AWG-LCA, but that more urgent action is necessary to meet the 2°C target. She cited concerns with the text, including on shared vision, response measures, modalities for the new market mechanism, and various approaches. She said that, under technology, the EU cannot accept anything that interferes with the IPR regime.

Egypt, for the Arab Group, said he is still waiting to see a concrete outcome on finance as a “necessary component” of a package in Doha. He underlined the need for ambition and clear accountability for Annex I parties. He specified that paragraph 42 (bunker fuels) should be deleted because it does not send a clear signal to ICAO and IMO that the principles of the Convention should apply.

Switzerland, for the EIG, supported forwarding the text to the COP, noting that it can be used as a basis for further discussion and expressed confidence that the remaining issues can be resolved in the COP. He highlighted that the elements of the text on shared vision, mitigation, response measures and technology require more work.

Nauru, for AOSIS, said that in general, the text presents a “decent basis” to work from, but highlighted the lack of ambition in the text, and also called for more reference to the rules-based regime.

Swaziland, for the African Group, expressed willingness to work on the basis of the text, but noted that it lacks ambition on mitigation and adaptation, as well as on means of implementation. She further noted lack of ambition on finance, particularly a lack of reference to mid-term finance for the period 2013-2020.

The Philippines, on behalf of the Like-Minded Developing Countries, said that the text could be improved, highlighting: means of implementation, MRV of developed country finance, mitigation ambition, technology transfer, and capacity building. He also said that paragraph 42 should be deleted.

Costa Rica, for the Association of Independent Latin American and Caribbean states (AILAC), said although the text provides a good basis for further work, it is imperfect. She highlighted finance as an issue that needs further work, noting that although there are unilateral decisions on finance and other good signals, the text must still have stronger provisions on finance. Many individual parties made statements supporting moving the text to the COP and cited numerous outstanding issues.

The AWG-LCA adopted its final report (FCCC/AWGLCA/2012/L.3). In his closing remarks, Chair Tayeb announced that Minister Vivian Balakrishnan (Singapore) and Minister Peter Altmaier (Germany) would conduct ministerial

consultations on the outstanding issues of the AWG-LCA. Chair Tayeb observed that parties cited the same paragraphs and issues in the text, albeit from opposite directions and asked delegates to reflect on this further. The AWG-LCA closed at 6:11pm.

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

On 27 November, the resumed 17th session of the AWG-KP opened with Madeleine Diouf (Senegal) continuing as the AWG-KP Chair and Jukka Uosukainen (Finland) as Vice-Chair.

Algeria, for the G-77/China, suggested the following benchmarks for a successful outcome in Doha: an ambitious second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol effective as of 1 January 2013; ambitious quantified emission limitation or reduction objectives (QELROs) by Annex I parties; limited access to flexibility mechanisms by those Annex I parties that will not be undertaking commitments during the second commitment period; and addressing carry-over of surplus AAUs.

The EU highlighted: its immediate implementation of second commitment period commitments regardless of other parties’ ratification timing; the need for broad participation in the flexibility mechanisms based on environmental integrity; and the need to resolve the issue of carry-over of surplus AAUs.

Australia, for the Umbrella Group, emphasized that the second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol needs to be implementable on 1 January 2013, for an eight-year period. He expressed concern that “the benefits of the Kyoto Protocol flexibility mechanisms are threatened here in Doha” and called for ensuring “broad access to these.” Liechtenstein, on behalf of the EIG, emphasized three outstanding issues: length of the second commitment period, level of ambition, and the smooth transition to the second commitment period.

Nauru, for AOSIS, underscored that the overarching issue for consideration in Doha is the level of ambition of Annex I parties’ commitments, observing that the proposed QELROs derive from previous pledges that are “plainly inadequate” for the scale of the challenge.

Swaziland, for the African Group, stressed that the meeting should focus only on rules that will apply during the second commitment period and necessary amendments, and refer consequential amendments to the SBs for future consideration.

Saudi Arabia, for the Arab Group, urged Annex I parties to commit themselves to scaled-up emission reduction objectives in line with science and the reports of the IPCC.

Papua New Guinea, for the Coalition for Rainforest Nations, expressed preference for a five-year second commitment period but expressed willingness to consider an eight-year term provided it includes: a mid-term review mechanism requiring deeper targets consistent with the upcoming fifth IPCC Report; REDD+ actions under a national reference level; and national MRV systems to safeguard environmental integrity in another four-year commitment period.

The Philippines, on behalf of Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia, China, Cuba, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, India, Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Mali, Mauritania, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Paraguay, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Sudan and Venezuela, called on developed country parties to commit to QELROs to reduce emissions by at least 40-50%

below 1990 levels by 2020, and at least 25-40% by 2017. China, for BASIC, urged developed countries to raise their level of ambition in line with science and their historical responsibility, and suggested further discussions on ambition under the COP or CMP.

**ANNEX I FURTHER COMMITMENTS:** This issue was first taken up in plenary on 27 November and in a contact group, chaired by AWG-KP Chair Diouf. Discussions were initially based on the AWG-KP Chair's proposal to facilitate negotiations (FCCC/KP/AWG/2012/CRP.1). They took place in a spin-off group on numbers/text, co-facilitated by Sandea de Wet (South Africa) and Jürgen Lefevere (EU), and informal consultations on matters relating to the second commitment period, facilitated by AWG-KP Vice-Chair Uosukainen. On 3 December, CMP President Al-Attayah announced that Luiz Figueiredo Machado (Brazil) and Bård Vegar Solhjell (Norway) would hold an informal ministerial outreach process to assist the AWG-KP Chair on discussions related to access to participation in the flexibility mechanisms by parties not taking commitments under the second commitment period and extending the share of proceeds to the other flexibility mechanisms.

During the AWG-KP closing plenary on Thursday, 6 December, Chair Diouf introduced her revised proposal to facilitate negotiations under the AWG-KP (FCCC/KP/AWG/2012/CRP.3). She explained that the results of this work, which aim to provide ministers with clear options, had been incorporated in her draft conclusion text on the outcome of the work of the AWG-KP (FCCC/KP/AWG/2012/L.3), which she proposed to forward to the CMP for adoption. AOSIS requested bracketing parts of the text, including sections containing: the amended Protocol Annex B with parties' mitigation commitments; text on eligibility to participate in the flexibility mechanisms; and text on the fulfillment of the AWG-KP's mandate and conclusion of its work. Parties agreed to forward the outcome of the work of the AWG-KP, as orally amended by AOSIS, to the CMP for further consideration and finalization.

Chair Diouf recalled earlier agreement to form a group to conduct a legal review of the text forwarded to the CMP, saying the review will not reopen any substantive discussions. She said the group will comprise members from all regional groups and SIDS, and explained that she would report to the CMP President if any changes are required based on the findings of the legal review.

On the length of the second commitment period and level of ambition, parties' views differed, with AOSIS, the G-77/China, the African Group and LDCs favoring a five-year commitment period. Many parties lamented the low ambition of Annex I parties' proposed QELROs, stressing that these are not in line with science. They underscored the need to avoid locking-in low levels of ambition.

The EU and the Umbrella Group supported an eight-year second commitment period, with the EU highlighting its internal legislation already in force for 2013-2020. The Coalition for Rainforest Nations reiterated the Group's preference for a five-year second commitment period but expressed willingness to consider an eight-year term provided it includes a mid-term review mechanism requiring deeper targets consistent with the

forthcoming IPCC Fifth Assessment Report. The African Group supported inclusion of a mechanism for increasing mitigation ambition within two years of the start of the commitment period.

On 4 December, the G-77/China introduced a proposal for Annex I parties to take on QELROs consistent with the top end of their pledged ranges and to further increase ambition during the second commitment period. The proposal required Annex I parties to ensure that QELROs adopted for the second commitment period lead to overall emission reductions of at least 33% below 1990 levels by 2017. It also established a process for each party to revisit its QELRO by 2014 at the latest, in line with aggregate Annex I emission reductions of more than 45% below 1990 levels by 2020. AOSIS supported the proposal and the EU indicated willingness to explore it.

On legal application of the second commitment period from 1 January 2013, developing countries underscored the urgency of ratification and called for a deadline for adopting the amendments. Developed countries objected, highlighting the duration of the necessary national legislative processes. The EU highlighted that due to internal legislation already in force, it would immediately implement second commitment period commitments regardless of other parties' ratification timing.

On eligibility to participate in the flexibility mechanisms, parties expressed different views on whether Annex I parties that will not be undertaking commitments during the second commitment period should continue to be eligible to participate in the mechanisms, and, if so, in which mechanisms. The G-77/China, the African Group and the LDCs supported restricting access to only those Annex I parties with QELROs. The EIG supported allowing those Annex I parties that will not take on QELROs to participate in the CDM. The Umbrella Group supported broad access to flexibility mechanisms emphasizing its multiple benefits.

On carry-over of surplus AAUs, developing countries supported excluding carry-over of surplus AAUs from the first commitment period to the second one. The EIG stressed the limitation of carry-over of surplus AAUs. Parties, including Switzerland and the G-77/China, submitted several proposals on this issue. The G-77/China proposal also addressed the inter-linkage with ambition by supporting opportunities to raise ambition during the second commitment period.

**CMP Decision:** In its decision (FCCC/KP/CMP/2012/L.9), the CMP adopts the amendment to the Kyoto Protocol. The amendment, set out in Annex I, contains a new Annex B, setting out the quantified emission limitation and reduction commitment (QELRC) for each Annex I party for the second commitment period. The list of covered greenhouse gases in Protocol Annex A was amended by adding nitrogen trifluoride (NF<sub>3</sub>).

Amendments were also adopted to Protocol Article 3.1, including the objective of reducing overall emissions by Annex I parties of the covered greenhouse gases by at least 18% below 1990 levels in the commitment period from 2013 to 2020. A new provision was added to Article 3.1 whereby a party included in Annex B "may propose an adjustment to decrease" its QELRC listed in Annex B, and this proposal shall be considered adopted by the CMP unless more than three-quarters of the parties present and voting object to its adoption.

The CMP decision: recognizes that parties may provisionally apply the amendment pending its entry into force; and decides that each Annex I party will revisit its second commitment period QELRC by 2014 at the latest, and may increase the ambition of this QELRC in line with an aggregate reduction of GHG emissions of at least 25-40% below 1990 levels by 2020.

Regarding eligibility to participate in the flexibility mechanisms, the CMP clarifies that all Annex I parties can continue to participate in ongoing and new CDM projects, but only parties with second commitment period QELRCs can transfer and acquire CERs in the second commitment period. It further decides, with respect to JI eligibility requirements for participating in emissions trading, only parties with second commitment period QELRCs can transfer and acquire CERs, AAUs, emission reduction units (ERUs) and removal units (RMUs) valid for emissions trading in the second commitment period.

On the share of proceeds, the CMP extends the 2% share of proceeds levy to assist vulnerable developing countries to meet the costs of adaptation to emissions trading and JI. Regarding the carry-over of surplus AAUs, the CMP:

- requires Annex I parties with second commitment period QELRCs to establish “previous period surplus reserves”;
- decides that CERs or ERUs in the national registry of an Annex I party that have not been cancelled or retired may be carried over to the subsequent commitment period up to a maximum for each unit type of 2.5% of the party’s assigned amount;
- decides that AAUs in a party’s national registry that have not been retired or cancelled may be added to the party’s second commitment period assigned amount and transferred to its previous period surplus reserve account;
- such a party with surplus CERs, ERUs or AAUs can use this excess to fulfill its commitment, if its emissions exceed its assigned amount; and
- allows parties to acquire units from other parties’ previous surplus reserve accounts into their own such accounts, up to 2% of their first commitment period assigned amounts.

Annex II of the CMP decision contains political declarations on surplus AAUs, where Australia, the EU and its member states, Japan, Liechtenstein, Monaco, Norway and Switzerland declare that they will not purchase/use surplus AAUs carried over from the first commitment period.

The CMP concludes by deciding that the AWG-KP has fulfilled its mandate and has concluded its work.

**CLOSING PLENARY:** The AWG-KP closing plenary took place on 6 December. Algeria, for the G-77/China, highlighted outstanding issues, including operationalization of an ambitious second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol beginning on 1 January 2013, and commitment by Annex I parties to ambitious QELROs. With the Gambia, for the LDCs, he called for a decision to restrict access to the flexibility mechanisms to those Annex I parties that take on commitments under the second commitment period. The LDCs further supported an ambitious five-year second commitment period with provisional application.

Swaziland, for the African Group, expressed hope that ministers will be able to take the necessary political decisions.

He said the second commitment period should: exclude the carry-over of surplus AAUs; enable only parties with second commitment period QELROs to participate in the flexibility mechanisms; and include a mechanism for increasing mitigation ambition within two years of the start of the commitment period.

The EU underscored that the text before parties shows that the AWG-KP will contribute to the balanced outcome Doha is expected to deliver. He identified the need to secure uninterrupted access to market mechanisms for all parties who will take on commitments during the second commitment period, noting that the current text addresses this concern. On the possibility of Annex B parties strengthening their QELROs during the second commitment period, the EU indicated willingness to explore the ambition mechanism proposed by the G-77/China. He recognized the importance of the issue of carry-over of surplus AAUs, but noted that there will be minimal demand for such AAUs between 2013 and 2020.

Australia, for several Umbrella Group members, noted convergence on many issues and highlighted key elements that require agreement, including an eight-year second commitment period and expanded participation in market mechanisms. He underlined that the AWG-KP is “part of a much broader, shared endeavor.”

The Philippines drew attention to the Bopha typhoon afflicting his country. He appealed to parties to “open their eyes to the stark reality we face” in order to “let this be the year we found the courage to take responsibility for the future we want,” and asked delegates: “If not us, then who? If not now, then when? If not here, then where?”

Switzerland, for the EIG, said adopting the Protocol amendments in Doha will ensure a seamless transition to the second commitment period. He stressed the need to: ensure environmental integrity of the second commitment period through the limitation of carry-over of surplus AAUs from the first commitment period; and allow those Annex I parties that will not take on QELROs to participate in the CDM. He expressed solidarity with the people of the Philippines, as did Bolivia, who stated that the current situation in that country is “a testimony of what can be expected to take place more frequently.” Bolivia cautioned against “empty promises” and described the low level of ambition as a “death sentence” to some people. He opposed the idea of voluntary commitments, saying that since developed countries have not managed to raise the level of ambition in seven years, “why should they be believed now.”

Saint Lucia, for AOSIS, called for, *inter alia*: a five-year commitment period; Annex I parties moving to the top end of their pledges and beyond, and dropping their conditionalities; provisional application of the Protocol amendments to be adopted in Doha; and limiting participation in the flexibility mechanisms to Annex I parties with commitments under the second commitment period. She noted that the G-77/China’s proposal on the ambition mechanism is missing from the AWG-KP text, underlining her view that this proposal “remains on the table,” and stressed that the mechanism must “bear fruit” by 2014 at the latest.

The AWG-KP adopted its report (FCCC/KP/AWG/2012/L.2) and Chair Diouf closed the session at 12:24 pm.

## AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON THE DURBAN PLATFORM FOR ENHANCED ACTION

Opening the resumed ADP 1 on 27 November, ADP Co-Chair Jayant Moreshwar Mauskar (India) recognized progress in Bangkok and underlined the importance of delivering an agreement by 2015. He urged parties to work cooperatively “in the spirit of Bangkok” to achieve this goal. ADP Co-Chair Harald Dovland (Norway) identified goals for the ADP session in Doha as continuation of planning the work of the ADP for 2013 and advancing efforts to bridge the current mitigation gap and deliver a new agreement by 2015.

Algeria, for the G-77/China, stressed that discussions under the ADP must be party-driven, fully inclusive and transparent, and that the outcome should be in accordance with equity and the CBDR principle.

Egypt, for the Arab Group, called for: agreement on results-based objectives; conformity with Convention principles; and consideration of mitigation, adaptation and means of implementation. Australia, for the Umbrella Group, called for the ADP to outline a clear plan for taking forward the work required to deliver its mandate.

The EU stressed that for Doha to deliver a balanced outcome, work in the ADP must result in a decision that captures agreed next steps and provides political momentum for adopting an agreement in 2015. Switzerland, on behalf of the EIG, said a future agreement must be legally-binding, have global application, recognize differentiation and contain comparable and transparent targets.

Nauru, for AOSIS, said the process launched under the Durban platform should result in a new protocol under the Convention that strengthens the rules-based and legally-binding regime. The Gambia, for the LDCs, said their priorities in Doha include the adoption of a legally-binding, ratifiable second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol and strong financial commitments.

Papua New Guinea, for the Coalition for Rainforest Nations, urged parties to adopt a clear and ambitious action plan and work programme that incorporates REDD+ implementation as a key component. The Democratic Republic of the Congo, for India, China, the Philippines, El Salvador, Dominica, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Bolivia, Argentina, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Venezuela, Malaysia, Ecuador, Nicaragua, Algeria and Iran, and China, for BASIC, underscored that the ADP is not a venue to “renegotiate, rewrite, or reinterpret” the Convention principles.

Chile, for Colombia, Costa Rica, Panama and Peru, noted changing national circumstances and the need for incentives for developing countries to move to a low-carbon growth model. Ecuador, for the Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of our America (ALBA), highlighted that the future of the Durban Platform is intertwined with the adoption in Doha of ambitious legally-binding commitments under the Kyoto Protocol.

Swaziland, for the African Group, underlined that work on pre-2020 mitigation provides additional opportunities to close the ambition gap but is not an alternative to commitments under the Kyoto Protocol and the AWG-LCA.

The ADP continued working under the agenda adopted at the May session in Bonn (FCCC/ADP/2012/AGENDA).

## IMPLEMENTATION OF ALL ELEMENTS OF

**DECISION 1/CP.17:** The ADP plenary first addressed this item on 27 November. It was subsequently taken up in a contact group and informal consultations by the ADP Co-Chairs. Parties also held several roundtable discussions on workstream 1 (matters related to paragraphs 2 to 6 of decision 1/CP.17) and workstream 2 (matters related to paragraphs 7 and 8 of decision 1/CP.17), respectively. Scheduled ADP meetings were postponed or cancelled several times during the second week as especially developing countries expressed preference for focusing on the AWG-LCA. ADP conclusions and a COP decision were adopted as a part of the Doha Climate Gateway.

Discussions on workstream 1 addressed, *inter alia*, the role of the Convention principles in the new legal agreement to be developed by the ADP. On workstream 2 parties discussed: what balanced work under the ADP means; international and national actions that are additional and supplementary to pledges and international cooperative initiatives; and a thematic approach to enhance mitigation ambition. Parties also considered an ADP work plan for 2013.

On the Convention principles, the Umbrella Group, the EU and Colombia expressed the view that Convention principles should be seen in an “evolving context,” noting the need to discuss further the principle of equity in terms of fairness and reflecting changing realities. Many developing countries stressed their opposition to any “rewriting or re-negotiation of Convention’s principles,” with China, opposed by the US and others, suggesting that the CBDR principle should guide the ADP’s work.

On workstream 2, Nauru, for AOSIS, presented draft decision text on “enhancing pre-2020 mitigation ambition.” The text underscores an urgency to close the existing pre-2020 mitigation ambition gap, and provides a detailed work plan for 2013 with a series of workshops on several thematic areas. Several parties welcomed the AOSIS text as a helpful proposal to move discussions forward. Some parties proposed the addition of specific themes to the work plan, including HFCs, black carbon, and fossil fuel subsidies, while other parties cautioned that too many details might lead to inefficiencies.

On international and national actions, international cooperative initiatives, and a thematic approach, the Umbrella Group and Brazil supported a bottom-up approach engaging and incentivizing various stakeholders in the thematic areas. The EU stressed focusing on mitigation actions that are additional to those already in place and stressing transparency on complementary international cooperative initiatives. The EIG, the EU, LDCs and the Marshall Islands stressed that international cooperative initiatives are not the most efficient option and urged focus should be on options with highest mitigation potential.

On elements of a clear work plan for 2013, parties agreed that workstream 1 was at a conceptual stage, noting however that this should not hold back substantive work urgently needed in workstream 2. The Umbrella Group, EIG, AOSIS, the EU and Costa Rica stressed the need for a strong political signal that ADP work is on track.

In the evening of Friday, 7 December, the Co-Chairs introduced draft conclusions (FCCC/ADP/2012/L.4) and a draft decision (FCCC/ADP/2012/L.5) to the ADP closing plenary,



calling the documents a “balancing exercise.” The plenary exchange of views on the draft conclusions focused on the scope of proposed submissions and the frequency and purpose of ADP workshops. On the draft decision, parties’ discussions centered around a proposed reference to the Rio+20 outcome document. The US, Norway, Mexico and others supported removing the reference stating that Rio+20 is a broader “political” document than the Durban Platform and that “a lack of clarity” would not be beneficial. China, India, Egypt, for the Arab Group, and Bolivia underlined that all parties had agreed to the declaration, including a statement on climate change that recognizes the principle of CBDR. Co-Chair Dovland added brackets to paragraphs without agreement and the ADP agreed to forward the draft decision to the COP for finalization.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions, the ADP, *inter alia*:

- agrees to immediately advance its substantive discussions;
- decides to move to a more focused mode of work in 2013;
- agrees to encourage the broad participation by party representatives and accredited observer organizations;
- invites submissions on both workstreams on: application of the principles of the Convention to the ADP; mitigation and adaptation benefits; barriers, ways to overcome them, and incentives for actions; and finance, technology and capacity building to support implementation.

In its decision (FCCC/CP/2012/L.13), the COP, *inter alia*, decides to identify and to explore in 2013 options for a range of actions that can close the pre-2020 ambition gap with a view to identifying further activities for its plan of work in 2014 ensuring the highest possible mitigation efforts under the Convention; underlines the importance of high-level engagement; and decides that the ADP will consider elements of a draft negotiating text no later than COP 20 with a view to making available a negotiating text before May 2015.

**CLOSING PLENARY:** The closing plenary convened on Friday, 7 December. The ADP adopted its report (FCCC/ADP/2012/L.3). Co-Chair Dovland acknowledged that the last week was “hectic” and welcomed more “relaxed” conversations in the coming year. The ADP closed at 10:19 pm.

#### **SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR IMPLEMENTATION**

SBI 37 opened on Monday, 26 November, with Tomasz Chruszczow (Poland) continuing as the SBI Chair. Parties adopted the agenda and organization of work (FCCC/SBI/2012/16). The SBI closing plenary adopted conclusions on Sunday, 2 December. This section summarizes COP/CMP negotiations and outcomes on issues referred to the SBI.

**ANNEX I NATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS: Fifth national communications:** This issue was considered by the SBI on 26 November. The SBI took note of the report on the status of submission and review of the fifth national communications (FCCC/SBI/2012/INF.11).

**GHG Inventory Data for 1990-2010:** This issue was considered by the SBI on 26 November. The SBI took note of the report (FCCC/SBI/2012/31).

**Annual Compilation and Accounting Report by Protocol Parties:** This issue was first considered by the SBI on 26 November.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.28), the SBI recommends that the COP take note of the report (FCCC/KP/CMP/2012/9 & Add.1). The COP took note of the report on Friday, 7 December.

**NON-ANNEX I NATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS: Consultative Group of Experts on Non-Annex I National Communications (CGE):** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/17, 18, 25, 26, 28, 32 and INF.15) was considered by the SBI plenary on 26 November and taken up in informal consultations facilitated by Anne Rasmussen (Samoa) and Kiyoto Tanabe (Japan). Parties were not able to conclude their consideration of issues relating to the CGE’s mandate and decided to forward bracketed text to the COP. The SBI closing plenary adopted conclusions on Sunday, 2 December and forwarded the bracketed decision text to the COP. The issue was further considered by the COP through informal consultations facilitated by Anne Rasmussen and Kiyoto Tanabe. A COP decision was adopted on 7 December.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.53/Rev.1), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- welcomes progress reports of the five CGE regional hands-on training workshops for non-Annex I parties;
- commends the CGE’s efforts to deliver the content of the workshops remotely via the videoconferencing tool, thereby facilitating maximum participation;
- notes with appreciation the progress made by the CGE in implementing its planned activities, such as the development of e-learning programmes and establishment of a web-based network for experts involved in the preparation of non-Annex I national communications;
- requests the Secretariat to translate into the other official UN languages, the updated training materials on national GHG inventories, vulnerability and adaptation, and mitigation assessments, which are currently available on the UNFCCC website in English only; and
- urges Annex II parties and other Annex I parties in a position to do so, to provide financial resources to enable the CGE to implement its planned activities, and encouraged bilateral, multilateral and international organizations to continue supporting the CGE’s work.

The COP decision (FCCC/CP/2012/L.6), *inter alia*: extends the CGE’s mandate for one year; requests the CGE to develop a work programme for 2013; and forwards the text of a draft decision for consideration by SBI 38.

**Financial and Technical Support:** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/INF.10 and FCCC/SBI/2012/MISC.15) was first taken up by the SBI opening plenary on 26 November and considered in informal consultations facilitated by Anne Rasmussen and Kiyoto Tanabe. The SBI closing plenary adopted conclusions on Saturday, 1 December.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.52), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- notes non-Annex I parties’ concerns over the availability of sufficient financial and technical support for the preparation of biennial update reports (BURs);
- notes “with concern” that, as of 1 October 2012, the Global Environment Facility (GEF) had only received four requests for support to prepare BURs and urged non-Annex I parties to

submit their support requests to the GEF for the preparation of their first BUR;

- notes a submission by Colombia, a non-Annex I party, (FCCC/SBI/2012/MISC.15) on the cost of its most recent national communication and on the financial resources received through the GEF, and invited other non-Annex I parties to submit their views on this issue;
- encourages the GEF to continue to ensure that sufficient financial resources are provided to meet the agreed full costs incurred by developing country parties in complying with their reporting obligations under Convention Article 12.1;
- notes with appreciation the GEF's report on a new project to provide logistical and technical support to non-Annex I parties for the preparation of their national communications and BURs that will be jointly administered by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP); and
- recommends that COP 18 request the GEF to provide funds for technical support for the preparation of BURs by non-Annex I parties, recognizing that the costs of such technical support are not deducted from the funds for the preparation of their BURs, and invites the GEF to report on this to COP 19.

**NAMAs: Prototype of the Registry:** This issue was first taken up by the SBI opening plenary on 26 November and considered in a contact group and informal consultations co-chaired by Soren Jacobsen (Denmark) and Wondwossen Sintayehu (Ethiopia).

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.39), the SBI recommended a draft decision for the COP, which was adopted on 7 December. In the decision, the COP, *inter alia*:

- notes with appreciation the submissions of NAMAs by developing country parties to the Registry;
- reiterates its invitation to developed country parties, as well as public and private donors in a position to do so, to submit information on financial, technology and capacity-building support available and/or provided for the preparation and/or implementation of NAMAs;
- invites developing country parties to submit information on further individual NAMAs; and
- decides to operationalize the Registry by requesting the Secretariat to deploy the first release of the dynamic web-based Registry at least two months before COP 19.

**Technical Experts for ICA:** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/INF.9) was first taken up by the SBI on 26 November and considered in a contact group and informal consultations co-chaired by Soren Jacobsen and Wondwossen Sintayehu.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.50), the SBI recommended a draft decision text for further consideration by the COP. The COP closing plenary forwarded the text to SBI 38 with a view to recommending a decision to COP 19.

**FINANCE: Review of the Financial Mechanism:** This issue was first taken up by the SBI on 26 November and subsequently taken up in informal consultations co-facilitated by Ana Fornells de Frutos (Spain) and Suzanty Sitorus (Indonesia).

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.45), the SBI recommended a draft decision to the COP, which the COP adopted on 7 December. In the decision, the COP:

- decides to initiate the fifth review of the financial mechanism;
- requests the Standing Committee to further amend the guidelines for the review of the financial mechanism, and to provide draft updated guidelines for consideration and adoption by COP 19, with a view to finalizing the fifth review of the financial mechanism for consideration by COP 20;
- requests the Standing Committee to provide periodic updates to the SBI on the status of its work relating to the fifth review of the financial mechanism; and
- invites parties to submit their views by 1 March 2013 on further guidelines for the fifth review of the financial mechanism.

**GEF Report and Additional Guidance:** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/MISC.10, INF.10 and FCCC/CP/2012/6) was first taken up by the SBI on 26 November and considered in informal consultations co-facilitated by Ana Fornells de Frutos and Suzanty Sitorus.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.48), the SBI recommended a draft decision, which the COP adopted on 7 December. In its decision (FCCC/CP/2012/L.7), the COP, *inter alia*:

- urges contributing parties to fulfill their financial pledges for the fifth replenishment of the GEF;
- invites parties to submit to the Secretariat annually, their views on the elements to be taken into account in the development of annual guidance to the operating entities of the Convention's financial mechanism; and
- requests the Standing Committee to provide to the COP at each of its sessions, draft guidance to the GEF based on the GEF annual report and views submitted by parties.

**Initial Review of the Adaptation Fund:** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/INF.8/Rev.1, FCCC/SBI/2012/MISC.11 & Add.1, FCCC/KP/CMP/2012/7, FCCC/SBI/2012/INF.2, FCCC/KP/CMP/2011/MISC.1 and FCCC/KP/CMP/2011/6 & Add.1) was taken up by the SBI on 26 November and considered in informal consultations co-facilitated by Ruleta Camacho (Antigua and Barbuda) and Diane Barclay (Australia).

Discussions focused on adequacy and sustainability of the Adaptation Fund, and a possible extension of the interim trustee's term. On adequacy and sustainability of funds, some developed countries suggested taking up the discussion under the agenda item on the report of the Adaptation Fund under the CMP or under the report of the Standing Committee under the COP. Many developing countries said that tight timelines should not preclude the consideration of this matter by the group and supported retaining the paragraphs in the text. On the possible extension of the interim trustee's term, one party proposed an open bidding process. Many developed country parties, however, supported accepting the Adaptation Fund Board's recommendation to maintain the interim trustee arrangements.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.46), the SBI recommended a draft decision for adoption by the CMP, which was adopted on 7 December. In its decision, the CMP, *inter alia*:

- decides that the interim institutional arrangements of the trustee of the Adaptation Fund (the World Bank) will be extended until June 2015;

- decides to extend the interim institutional arrangements of the Secretariat of the Adaptation Fund Board (AFB) until the completion of the second review of the Adaptation Fund in 2014;
- encourages the AFB to continue working with the interim trustee for the Adaptation Fund on further enhancing the process of monetizing CERs;
- requests the AFB to consider how to further improve accessibility to funding from the Fund, especially through its direct access modality;
- notes with concern issues related to the sustainability, adequacy and predictability of funding from the Adaptation Fund based on the current uncertainty regarding CER prices and the continuation of the Adaptation Fund during and beyond the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol; and
- requests SBI 38 to initiate the second review of the Adaptation Fund.

**LDC Fund:** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/27, INF.13, MISC.12 & Add.1, MISC.13 and FCCC/CP/2012/6) was first taken up by the SBI on 26 November, and considered in informal consultations co-facilitated by Ana Fornells de Frutos and Suzanty Sitorus. The SBI adopted draft conclusions containing a draft COP decision, on 1 December.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.49), the SBI recommended a draft decision, which was adopted by the COP on 7 December. In its decision, the COP, *inter alia*:

- requests the GEF to: continue to support all activities under the LDC work programme; continue mobilizing resources to ensure full implementation of the LDC work programme; further facilitate access to the LDC Fund; and further enhance a country-driven process for the implementation of national adaptation programme of action (NAPA) projects;
- invites voluntary contributions to the LDC Fund from Annex II parties and other parties in a position to do so;
- invites parties and relevant organizations to submit to the Secretariat, by 1 August 2014, information on their experiences with implementing the remaining elements of the LDC work programme; and
- requests SBI 41 to consider the progress made in implementing the remaining elements of the LDC work programme, including the updating and implementation of NAPAs.

**CONVENTION ARTICLES 4.8 AND 4.9: Buenos Aires Programme of Work:** This issue was taken up by the SBI on 26 November. The SBI Chair will continue consultations with interested parties at SBI 38.

**Matters related to LDCs:** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/27) was taken up by the SBI plenary on 27 November and considered in informal consultations facilitated by Collin Beck (Solomon Islands).

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.35), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- requests the LDC Expert Group (LEG), in collaboration with the GEF and its agencies, to further explore issues raised by some LDC parties related to accessing the LDC Fund;

- requests the LEG to submit its views on the ways it could further support LDCs to prepare their national adaptation plans;
- requests the LEG to organize an event on LDC national adaptation plans in conjunction with SBI 38; and
- invites parties in a position to do so to continue to provide resources for the implementation of the LEG work programme.

**ADAPTATION COMMITTEE REPORT:** This issue (FCCC/SB/2012/3) was taken up by the SBI plenary on 27 November. It was subsequently considered jointly by the SBI and SBSTA in informal consultations facilitated by Kishan Kumarsingh (Trinidad and Tobago).

**Final Outcome:** In the conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.33 and FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.22), the SBI and SBSTA recommended a draft decision, which the COP adopted on 7 December. The COP, *inter alia*:

- approves the draft three-year work plan of the Adaptation Committee;
- endorses the draft rules of procedure of the Adaptation Committee;
- decides that, as a consequence of the late nomination of members for the Adaptation Committee in 2012, the term of the members currently in office will end immediately before the first meeting of the Committee in 2015 for members with a two-year term, and immediately before the first meeting of the Committee in 2016 for members with a three-year term;
- decides that, as a consequence of the adjustment to the terms of office of the members, the terms of the Chair and Vice-Chair currently in office will end immediately before the first meeting of the Adaptation Committee in 2014; and
- encourages parties to make available sufficient resources for the successful and timely implementation of the three-year workplan of the Adaptation Committee.

**NATIONAL ADAPTATION PLANS:** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/8, 27, MISC.1, MISC.2 & Add.1, MISC.3, FCCC/SB/2012/3 and FCCC/CP/2012/6) was taken up by the SBI plenary on 27 November, and considered in informal consultations co-facilitated by Richard Merzian (Australia) and Amjad Abdulla (Maldives). The COP further considered the issue and adopted a decision on 7 December.

**Final Outcome:** The SBI closing plenary adopted conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.41), which, *inter alia*:

- note the identification by the LEG of the support needs of the LDCs for the formulation and implementation of national adaptation plans;
- look forward to the operationalization, no later than SBI 39, of the provision of support to the LDCs for the national adaptation plan process under the LDC Fund;
- look forward to the operationalization of the provision of support to non-LDCs for the national adaptation plan process under the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF);
- invite developed country parties to further contribute to the LDC Fund and SCCF; and
- decide to recommend draft decision text for consideration and finalization by the COP.

In its decision (FCCC/CP/2012/L.2), the COP:

- requests the GEF to: provide funding from the LDC Fund to meet the agreed full cost of activities to enable the preparation of national adaptation plans by LDCs; provide support for the national adaptation plan process; and encourage a flexible approach that enables LDCs to access funding;
- urges developed country parties to mobilize financial support for the national adaptation plan process for interested non-LDC developing country parties, including through the SCCF;
- invites parties and relevant organizations to continue to assist the LDCs, drawing upon the work of the LEG, in building national institutional arrangements and capacities, and to support scientific and technical capacity needs, as identified by the LDCs, for undertaking the national adaptation plan process; and
- invites the UN and other relevant organizations, as well as bilateral and multilateral agencies, to support the national adaptation plan process in the LDCs.

**LOSS AND DAMAGE:** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/29, INF.14, MISC.14 & Add.1-2 and FCCC/TP/2012/7) was taken up by the SBI plenary on 26 November, and in informal consultations co-chaired by Don Lemmen (Canada) and Lucas Di Pietro (Argentina).

The issue proved controversial and was forwarded for ministerial consultations by Edna Molewe (South Africa) on 5 December. She reported that the main political issue concerned the potential establishment of an institutional arrangement, such as a mechanism. An institutional mechanism was proposed by developing countries, while developed countries were reluctant to accept this. After the last night of negotiations, text was included on establishing institutional arrangements at COP 19, “such as an international mechanism” to address loss and damage in developing countries that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change. The text also indicates that the functions and modalities of such an international mechanism will be elaborated in accordance with the role of the Convention and include: enhancing knowledge of comprehensive risk management approaches; strengthening dialogue with relevant stakeholders; and enhancing actions and support to address loss and damage.

The COP decision on loss and damage was adopted on Saturday evening, 8 December, as part of the Doha Climate Gateway package.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L44), the SBI:

- considers the progress made in the implementation of the work programme on loss and damage and noted that a range of approaches is required to address loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change, including impacts related to extreme weather events and slow onset events; and
- decides to recommend draft decision text for consideration and finalization by the COP.

In its decision (FCCC/CP/2012/L.4/Rev.1), the COP, *inter alia*:

- agrees that the role of the Convention in promoting the implementation of approaches to address loss and damage includes, *inter alia*: enhancing knowledge and understanding of comprehensive risk management approaches; strengthening dialogue among relevant stakeholders; and enhancing action

and support, including finance, technology and capacity-building, to address loss and damage;

- invites all parties to enhance action on addressing loss and damage by, *inter alia*: designing and implementing country-driven risk management strategies and approaches; implementing comprehensive climate risk management approaches; and promoting an enabling environment that would encourage investment and the involvement of relevant stakeholders in climate risk management;
- requests developed country parties to provide developing country parties with finance, technology and capacity building;
- decides to establish at COP 19 institutional arrangements, such as an international mechanism, to address loss and damage in developing countries that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change; and
- requests the Secretariat: to carry out, prior to SBI 39, an expert meeting to consider future needs, including capacity needs associated with possible approaches to address slow onset events; and to prepare technical papers on non-economic losses, and on gaps in existing institutional arrangements within and outside of the Convention to address loss and damage.

**PROTOCOL ARTICLE 3.14 (ADVERSE EFFECTS):**

These joint SBI/SBSTA discussions are summarized under the SBSTA agenda item on Protocol Article 2.3 (see page 24).

**FORUM AND WORK PROGRAMME ON RESPONSE MEASURES:** These joint SBI/SBSTA discussions are summarized under the SBSTA (see page 24).

**TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER: Report of the Technology Executive Committee:** These joint SBI/SBSTA discussions are summarized under the SBSTA (see page 23).

**Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN):** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/30) was taken up by the SBI plenary on 27 November, and considered in a contact group and informal consultations co-chaired by Carlos Fuller (Belize) and Kunihiko Shimada (Japan). The issue of the CTCN Advisory Board was subsequently considered under the COP in informal consultations facilitated by Maria del Socorro Flores (Mexico). The COP adopted a decision on 7 December.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.54) adopted on 1 December, the SBI considered the Secretariat’s report on the discussions on key elements of the potential host agreement for the Climate Technology Centre (CTC), including the draft memorandum of understanding regarding the hosting of the CTC and the constitution of the CTCN Advisory Board, and recommended draft decision text for consideration and finalization by the COP.

In its decision (FCCC/CP/2012/L.10) adopted on 7 December, the COP:

- selects UNEP as the CTC host for an initial term of five years, with possible renewal by COP 23;
- adopts a memorandum of understanding between the COP and UNEP regarding the hosting of the CTC;
- establishes the CTCN Advisory Board;
- encourages UNEP to make the necessary arrangements to promptly launch the work of the CTC upon the conclusion of COP 18;

- invites parties to nominate their national designated entities for the development and transfer of technologies;
- reaffirms that the CTCN shall be accountable to the COP through the Advisory Board; and
- reiterates that the CTCN Advisory Board will put in place the rules and procedures to monitor, assess and evaluate the timeliness and appropriateness of the responses of the CTCN to requests by developing country parties.

**Poznan Strategic Programme:** This issue (FCCC/CP/2012/6) was taken up by the SBI plenary on 27 November. It was subsequently taken up in a contact group co-chaired by Carlos Fuller and Kunihiko Shimada.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.37), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- acknowledges the support provided by the GEF to assist 36 non-Annex I parties in conducting their technology needs assessments (TNAs) and invited the GEF to report on its support provided to other non-Annex I parties to conduct or update their TNAs;
- stresses the need for further implementation of the element of the Poznan strategic programme on support for climate technology centers and a climate technology network; and
- invites the GEF to consult with the CTCN on the support the GEF will provide for the work of the CTCN.

**CONVENTION ARTICLE 6 (education, training and public awareness):** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/3, 4, 5, 19, MISC.4 and FCCC/CP/2011/7/Add.2) was taken up by the SBI plenary on 26 November and considered in informal consultations facilitated by Tony Carrit (EU). These discussions resulted in agreement on the Doha work programme on Convention Article 6.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.47), the SBI recommended a draft decision, which was adopted by the COP on 7 December. The COP, *inter alia*:

- adopts the eight-year Doha work programme on Convention Article 6 (contained in an annex to the decision);
- decides to undertake a review of the work programme in 2020, with an intermediate review of progress in 2016;
- invites parties to submit information on their efforts and steps taken to implement the work programme and to share their experiences for the purpose of the 2016 and 2020 review;
- requests the GEF to continue to provide financial resources to non-Annex I parties;
- requests the SBI to organize an annual in-session dialogue on Convention Article 6; and
- decides that the first session of the annual dialogue will be held at SBI 38 and focus on the first focal area.

**CAPACITY BUILDING (CONVENTION):** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/20, 21, 22 and MISC.9) was taken up by the SBI plenary on 27 November, and considered in informal consultations facilitated by Peter Wittoeck (Belgium).

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.42), the SBI agrees to continue its consideration of this issue at SBI 38 with a view to recommending a draft decision for adoption by COP 19. The COP took note of this action on 7 December.

**CAPACITY BUILDING (PROTOCOL):** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/21 and MISC.9) was first taken up by the SBI plenary on 26 November. It was subsequently taken up in informal consultations facilitated by Peter Wittoeck (Belgium).

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.38), the SBI recommends a draft decision for adoption by the CMP. The CMP adopted the decision on 7 December.

The CMP, *inter alia*:

- decides that the Durban Forum for in-depth discussion on capacity building is an appropriate arrangement for sharing and exchanging experiences regarding the implementation of capacity-building activities related to the Kyoto Protocol, and encourages parties to further improve the implementation of capacity-building activities; and
- invites parties to submit their views on specific thematic issues related to capacity building for the implementation of the Kyoto Protocol in developing countries, to be considered at the second meeting of the Durban Forum, to be held at SBI 38.

**PROTOCOL AMENDMENT WITH RESPECT TO COMPLIANCE:** This issue (FCCC/KP/CMP/2005/2) was taken up by the SBI plenary on 27 November. Subsequently, Christina Voigt (Norway) and Ilhomjon Rajabov (Tajikistan) consulted with parties on behalf of the SBI Chair.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.40), the SBI:

- recalls the proposal from Saudi Arabia to amend the Kyoto Protocol with respect to procedures and mechanisms relating to compliance;
- notes the initial concerns relating to the appropriateness and effectiveness of the procedures and mechanisms in determining and addressing cases of non-compliance with the provisions of the Kyoto Protocol;
- recognizes the ongoing implementation of decision 27/CMP.1 and the work undertaken by parties to further the development of the compliance mechanism of the Kyoto Protocol; and
- concludes that no further discussion was required and recommends that the CMP conclude its consideration of the proposal.

On 7 December, the CMP decided to conclude the consideration of this issue.

**APPEALS AGAINST CDM EXECUTIVE BOARD DECISIONS:** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2011/17, FCCC/SBI/2011/MISC.2 and FCCC/TP/2011/3) was taken up by the SBI plenary on 27 November. It was subsequently taken up in a contact group co-chaired by Kunihiko Shimada (Japan) and Yaw Bediako Osafo (Ghana).

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.43), the SBI agrees to continue its consideration of this issue at SBI 38 with a view to recommending a draft decision for adoption by CMP 9.

**COMMITMENT PERIOD RESERVE:** This issue was first taken up by the SBI plenary on 27 November. It was subsequently taken up in a contact group chaired by Karoliina Anttonen (Finland).

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.29), the SBI, *inter alia*, concludes that no changes would be needed to the design of the commitment period reserve and that, in order

to support the effective operation of emissions trading during the second commitment period, further decisions may need to be taken by the CMP.

**INTERNATIONAL TRANSACTION LOG:** This issue (FCCC/KP/CMP/2012/8) was first taken up by the SBI plenary on 27 November. SBI Chair Chruszczow consulted with interested parties.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.30), the SBI takes note of the annual report of the administrator of the international transaction log under the Kyoto Protocol, and agrees to continue its consideration of its recommendations at SBI 38.

**ADMINISTRATIVE, FINANCIAL AND INSTITUTIONAL MATTERS:** This issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/24 & Add.1-2) was first taken up by the SBI plenary on 27 November. SBI Chair Chruszczow consulted with interested parties.

**Final Outcome:** In its two sets of conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.31 and L.32), the SBI recommends draft decisions for adoption by the COP and the CMP, respectively.

In its decision adopted on 7 December, the COP, *inter alia*: takes note of audited financial statements for the biennium 2010-2011 and budget performance for the biennium 2012-2013; and requests the Executive Secretary to submit, for consideration by SBI 38, a proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015.

In its decision adopted on 7 December, the CMP, *inter alia*: takes note of audited financial statements for the biennium 2010-2011 and budget performance for the biennium 2012-2013; and requests the Executive Secretary to submit, for consideration by SBI 38, a proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015.

**OTHER MATTERS:** Discussions under this agenda item focused on gender balance and participation of women in the UNFCCC bodies. The issue was first taken up by the SBI plenary on 27 November when the EU tabled a draft decision on promoting gender equality by improving the participation of women in the UNFCCC negotiations and in the representation of parties in Convention and Protocol bodies (FCCC/SBI/2012/CRP.1). It was subsequently considered in informal consultations facilitated by Nozipho Mxakato-Diseko (South Africa) and Kunihiro Shimada (Japan). The COP adopted a decision on 7 December.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.36), the SBI recommended for adoption by the COP a draft decision on promoting gender balance and improving the participation of women in UNFCCC negotiations and in the representation of parties in bodies established pursuant to the Convention or the Protocol.

The COP decision, *inter alia*:

- agrees that additional efforts need to be made by all parties to improve the participation of women;
- adopts a goal of gender balance in bodies established pursuant to the Convention and the Protocol, in order to improve women's participation and inform more effective climate change policy that addresses the needs of women and men equally;

- invites current and future chairs of such bodies to be guided by the goal of gender balance when setting up informal negotiating groups and consultation mechanisms;
- invites parties to commit to meeting the goal of gender balance by, *inter alia*, nominating women to Convention and Protocol bodies with the aim to increase women's participation;
- invites parties to strive for gender balance in their delegations;
- decides to add the issue of gender and climate change as a standing item on the COP agenda;
- requests the Secretariat to organize, in conjunction with COP 19, an in-session workshop on gender balance in the UNFCCC process, gender-sensitive climate policy and capacity-building activities to promote greater participation of women; and
- invites the CMP to endorse this decision.

The CMP endorsed the decision on 7 December.

**CLOSING PLENARY:** On Sunday, 2 December SBI 37 adopted its report (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.27). Parties made brief closing remarks and the SBI closed at 2:32 am.

### **SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE**

SBSTA 37 opened on Monday, 26 November, with Richard Muyungi (Tanzania) as the Chair. Parties adopted the agenda and organization of work (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/3). The SBSTA plenary adopted conclusions on Saturday, 1 December. This section summarizes COP/CMP negotiations and outcomes on issues referred to the SBSTA.

**NAIROBI WORK PROGRAMME:** During the SBSTA opening plenary, Chair Muyungi reported on progress implementing activities under the Nairobi work programme (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/INF.5) and introduced the report from the technical workshop on water and climate change impacts and adaptation strategies (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/4) and a compilation of case studies on national adaptation planning processes (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/INF.6). He reminded parties that COP 17 requested the SBSTA to make recommendations to COP 19.

**Final Outcome:** In the conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.26), the SBSTA noted the development of new user-friendly knowledge products and the challenges faced by developing countries, in particular LDCs, in accessing such products; and noted a new database of Nairobi work programme partners and action pledges. The SBSTA agreed to reconsider the issue at SBSTA 38 with a view to making recommendations to COP 19 on how to best support the Nairobi work programme.

**METHODOLOGICAL GUIDANCE ON REDD+:** This issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/MISC.22) was first addressed in the SBSTA plenary on 26 November. Chair Muyungi outlined the large volume of work on this issue, particularly MRV and national forest monitoring systems. It was further addressed in a contact group co-chaired by Peter Graham (Canada) and Victoria Tauli-Corpuz (the Philippines) that met throughout the week.

During the closing plenary, Chair Muyungi reported a lack of agreement on the issues under this agenda item. Brazil, Argentina, India, Cuba, Venezuela and China expressed support for continuing discussions at SBSTA 38 while the US, with Australia, Canada, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Russia, the EU and Colombia, supported finding common ground in Doha,

especially on MRV. Chair Muyungi said that, in accordance with rule 26 of the draft rules of procedure, the issue will be taken up at SBSTA 38.

On 7 December, Chair Muyungi reported that the SBSTA adopted draft conclusions and would consider this issue further at SBSTA 38.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.31), the SBSTA agrees to:

- continue its consideration of methodological guidance relating to modalities for a national forest monitoring system as referred to in paragraph 71(c) of decision 1/CP.16 (outcome of the work of the AWG-LCA), and for MRV as referred to in decision 1/CP.16, appendix II, paragraph (c);
- continue its work on methodological guidance relating to modalities for a national forest monitoring systems and for MRV on the basis of the annex containing elements for a possible draft decision on these matters; complete this work at SBSTA 39 and prepare any recommendations for a draft decision for consideration and adoption at COP 19;
- resume consideration of the timing and the frequency of the presentation of the summary of information on how the safeguards referred to in decision 1/CP.16, appendix I, are being addressed and respected and on the need for further guidance to ensure transparency, consistency, comprehensiveness, and effectiveness in the presentation of the summary of information with a view to concluding consideration of this matter at SBSTA 39;
- continue its consideration of issues relating to drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, taking into account decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 72 and appendix II, paragraph (a), and the views of parties (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/MISC.1 and Add.1) and those of admitted observer organizations; and
- encourage parties, relevant international organizations and stakeholders to share information on how developing countries are addressing the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation and on the experiences gained in addressing such drivers in the implementation of the activities referred to in decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 70.

**TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER AND TEC REPORT:** This item (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/INF.7 and FCCC/SB/2012/2) was first taken up in the SBSTA plenary on 26 November. Gabriel Blanco (Argentina), Chair of the Technology Executive Committee (TEC), updated parties on the progress of the TEC.

A contact group, held with the SBI, co-chaired by Carlos Fuller (Belize) and Zitouni Ould-Dada (UK) considered this issue throughout the week. On 7 December, Chair Muyungi reported that informal consultations undertaken by himself and SBI Chair Chruszczow had resulted in a draft decision.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.32, FCCC/SBI/2012/L.51), the SBSTA welcomes the report on the experience-sharing workshop on technology needs assessments; and encourages parties to draw upon the outcomes of the workshop when preparing their NAMAs, national adaptation plans, low-emissions development strategies and technology road maps and action plans.

In its decision (FCCC/CP/2012/L.9), the COP, *inter alia*:

- requests the TEC to report on the outcomes of its consultations with other relevant institutional arrangements in its report on activities and performance for 2013;
- notes that the TEC, in addition to the activities already planned for 2012-2013 workplan, will undertake specific follow-up activities in 2013 on, *inter alia*, enabling environments for, and barriers to, technology development and transfer; and
- stresses the need for the implementation of the technology needs assessment results; and
- agrees that the technology needs assessment process should be integrated with other related processes under the Convention, including NAMAs, national adaptation plans and low-emissions development strategies.

**RESEARCH AND SYSTEMATIC OBSERVATION:** The SBSTA first considered this issue in the opening plenary with an update on: global observations in response to the relevant needs of the Global Climate Observing System (GCOS) (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/MISC.14); and progress in the development of methodologies, standards and protocols for climate-related terrestrial observations (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/MISC.15). Parties also heard a report of the World Meteorological Congress Extraordinary Session with respect to the implementation of the Global Framework for Climate Services (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/MISC.21). Informal consultations took place, co-chaired by Stefan Roesner (Germany) and Chris Moseki (South Africa).

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.25 & Add.1), the SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- welcomes the plan of the GCOS Steering Committee and the Secretariat to prepare by early 2015 a third report on the adequacy of the global observing systems for climate and, by 2016, a new implementation plan for the global observing system for climate;
- encourages parties to contribute to the identification of emerging needs for systemic observation;
- notes the importance of continuing and sustaining satellite observations on a long-term basis, and the role of the Committee on Earth Observation Satellites in promoting full and open data sharing;
- requests the Secretariat to organize a workshop, subject to the availability of resources, to be held by SBSTA 39, to consider information on the technical and scientific aspects of ecosystems with high-carbon reservoirs not covered by other agenda items under the Convention;
- invites parties to submit their views on the content of that workshop; and
- invites parties and regional and international research programmes and organizations to provide information on the technical and scientific aspects of emissions by sources, removals by sinks, and reservoirs of all GHGs, including emissions and removals from terrestrial ecosystems with a view to quantifying the impact of human activities. This information would be considered as a theme for the next research dialogue, also taking into account parties' submissions.

**FORUM AND WORK PROGRAMME ON RESPONSE MEASURES:** The SBSTA first considered this issue in its opening plenary on 26 November. Co-chaired by SBSTA Chair

Muyungi and SBI Chair Chruszczow, the forum met Tuesday through Friday to hear presentations on areas (a) and (h) of the work programme (reporting, and learning towards a transition to a low GHG-emitting society, respectively) and discuss parties' views on area (f) (aspects of implementation of relevant Convention and Protocol decisions) (FCCC/SB/2012/MISC.2).

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.23 and FCCC/SBI/2012/L.34), the SBSTA/SBI, *inter alia*: request the Chairs to prepare reports on the in-forum workshops on areas (a) and (h) of the work programme and to provide a summary of parties' discussion on area (f) before SB 38. The SBSTA also agreed to consider this information with reports on upcoming in-forum workshops during the review of the work of the forum at SB 39 with a view to provide recommendations to COP 19.

**PROTOCOL ARTICLE 2.3 (ADVERSE IMPACTS OF POLICIES AND MEASURES):** This issue was considered jointly with the SBI agenda item on Protocol Article 3.14. It was briefly introduced during the opening SBSTA plenary and Chair Muyungi said he would informally consult on how to take up this issue in future sessions. In the closing SBSTA plenary, the SBSTA was not able to conclude consultations on how to address Protocol Articles 2.3 and 3.14. The report of the session reflects that the SBSTA and SBI will continue consultations at SB 38.

**AGRICULTURE:** The SBSTA first addressed this issue in its opening plenary. The UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) reported on activities related to agriculture and climate change, including the report by the High-Level Panel of Experts on food security and nutrition. Several developing countries supported the need to focus on adaptation issues in agriculture. The issue was addressed in a contact group co-chaired by George Wamukoya (Kenya) and Alexandra Conliffe (Canada) in informal consultations throughout the week.

At the closing plenary, Chair Muyungi reported that the SBSTA had been unable to conclude consideration of this agenda item. Bangladesh, Brazil, the Gambia, Argentina, Nicaragua and Cuba supported deferring discussion of the item to the next SBSTA session. Venezuela and others said the issue is technical and should not, therefore, be sent to the COP, while Ethiopia reminded parties that the COP in Durban mandated the SBSTA to adopt a decision on agriculture at COP 18 and suggested that the COP decide whether to continue consideration of this issue at the next SBSTA session. After further interventions, Chair Muyungi said that he would report to the COP that no consensus had been achieved on this issue and that SBSTA would consider agriculture at its next session.

SBSTA Chair Muyungi reported to the COP on 7 December that this item would be taken up at SBSTA 38.

**METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES (CONVENTION):** The SBSTA opened all agenda items under methodological issues under the Convention on 26 November.

**Work programme on tabular format for the "UNFCCC biennial reporting guidelines for developed country Parties":** This issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/MISC.11 & Add. 1-3) was taken up in the opening plenary. The report on the workshop for a common tabular format for UNFCCC biennial reporting guidelines for developed country parties (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/INF.13), and synthesis report on submissions of parties' views (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/INF.4) were also introduced. Informal

consultations were held, co-chaired by Helen Plume (New Zealand) and Qiang Liu (China). During the closing plenary, Chair Muyungi noted discussions did not yet yield an agreement and agreed to submit the draft decision to the COP. The issue was subsequently considered in informal consultations by Chair Muyungi at the request of the COP President. The COP closing plenary adopted a decision on 7 December.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.33), the SBSTA agrees to submit the draft decision to the COP for consideration and finalization. The COP decision (FCCC/CP/2012/L.12), *inter alia*, adopts the common tabular format for the UNFCCC biennial reporting guidelines, as contained in the annex to the decision; and, requests parties to consider the best approach for future reporting on climate-related private finance at the next revision of the reporting guidelines.

**Work programme on the revision of the guidelines for the review of biennial reports and national communications, including national inventory reviews:** This issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/MISC.17 & Add.1) was taken up in the opening plenary. The Secretariat also introduced a technical paper on current review processes and the Secretariat's experience coordinating reviews of national communications and national GHG inventories (FCCC/TP/2012/8). The synthesis report of submissions from parties (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/INF.11) was also introduced. An informal group, co-chaired by Helen Plume and Qiang Liu, convened on 28 November.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.28), the SBSTA, *inter alia*, agrees to a work programme on the revision of the review guidelines, with specific timelines and activities for 2013 and 2014. The SBSTA notes that while the revision of the review guidelines for national communications and biennial reports will be completed by COP 19, the revision of the review guidelines for GHG inventories can only be completed by COP 20. The SBSTA also requests the Secretariat to organize technical workshops in 2013 and 2014.

**General guidelines for domestic MRV of domestically supported NAMAs by developing countries:** The SBSTA briefly discussed this item during the opening plenary and convened informal consultations from 28 November through 1 December, co-chaired by Helen Plume and Qiang Liu.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.24), the SBSTA agrees that the guidelines should: be general, voluntary, pragmatic, non-prescriptive, non-intrusive and country-driven; take into account national circumstances; respect the diversity of NAMAs; build on existing domestic systems and capacities; recognize existing systems; and promote a cost-effective approach. The SBSTA invites parties to submit their views on the guidelines by 25 March 2013. The SBSTA also agrees to continue the process of developing guidelines at SBSTA 39 to forward draft guidelines to COP 19.

**Bunker fuels:** In the opening SBSTA plenary, ICAO and IMO reported on relevant work (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/MISC.20). Initial discussions focused on the applicability of the CBDR principle to this issue. Japan said that global regulations should apply universally, regardless of the country of operation or registration, while a large number of developing countries underscored the importance of CBDR.



The SBSTA closing plenary took note of the information contained in the progress reports of ICAO and IMO and invited these organizations to continue to report on the issue.

**Annual report on the technical review of Annex I GHG inventories:** In the opening plenary, the SBSTA took note of the annual report on the technical review of Annex I GHG inventories (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/INF.10). Chair Muyungi encouraged parties to nominate new experts to participate in the review.

**METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES (PROTOCOL):** The SBSTA opened all the sub-items on methodological issues under the Protocol on 26 November.

**Carbon capture and storage under the CDM:** This issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/MISC.12 & Add.1) was introduced during the SBSTA opening plenary. The SBSTA also heard a report based on the technical paper on transboundary carbon capture and storage (CCS) project activities (FCCC/TP/2012/9). A contact group, co-chaired by Ulrika Raab (Sweden) and Abias Moma Huongo (Angola), met on 28-29 November.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.21), the SBSTA, *inter alia*, agrees to recommend to the CMP that eligibility of transboundary CCS projects under the CDM and the establishment of a global reserve of CERs for CCS project activities be considered at SBSTA 45; and agrees that while transboundary CCS projects would merit inclusion under the CDM, more practical experience would be beneficial.

In its decision (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.21), the COP decides that:

- eligibility under the CDM of CCS projects involving the transport of carbon dioxide between countries or involving geological storage sites in more than one country, and the establishment of a global reserve of CERs for CCS in geological formations projects, be considered at SBSTA 45; and
- while CCS in geological formations projects involving transport of carbon dioxide between countries or involving geological storage sites in more than one country would merit inclusion under the CDM, more practical experience of CCS projects in geological formations under the CDM would be beneficial.

**LULUCF under Protocol Articles 3.3 and 3.4 and under the CDM:** This issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/MISC.16, MISC.18 & Add.1 and MISC.19 & Add.1) was introduced during the opening plenary. Chair Muyungi reminded delegates that, previously, the SBSTA agreed to forward for consideration by CMP 9 some LULUCF issues, such as comprehensive accounting of sources and sinks, and modalities and procedures for additional LULUCF activities. A contact group, co-chaired by Peter Iversen (Denmark) and Marcelo Rocha (Brazil), met from 28-30 November.

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.30), the SBSTA agrees to continue at SBSTA 38, with a view to forward draft decisions to CMP 9, consideration of: more comprehensive accounting of anthropogenic GHG emissions by sources and removals by sinks from LULUCF through a more inclusive activity-based or land-based approach;

and modalities and procedures for possible additional LULUCF activities under the CDM and alternative approaches to addressing the risk of non-permanence.

**Implications of Decisions 2/CMP.7 and 5/CMP.7 on the previous decisions on methodological issues:** This issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/MISC.13) was first introduced in the opening plenary. The SBSTA also reviewed the report from the workshop (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/INF.12) and the technical paper on this agenda item (FCCC/TP/2012/6). A contact group convened throughout the week, co-chaired by Nagmeldin Elhassan (Sudan) and Anke Herold (Germany).

**Final Outcome:** In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.29), the SBSTA agrees to transmit the draft decision to the CMP for consideration and finalization. In its decision (FCCC/KP/CMP/2012/L.4/Rev.1), the CMP, *inter alia*:

- agrees that decision 5/CMP.7 does not result in any modification to the previous decisions;
- decides that each Annex I party with a commitment inscribed in the third column of Protocol Annex B to decision 1/CMP.8 shall submit to the Secretariat, by 15 April 2015, a report to facilitate the calculation of its assigned amount pursuant to Article 13, paragraphs 7 *bis*, 8 and 8 *bis* for the second commitment period and to demonstrate its capacity to account for its emissions and assigned amount;
- decides that each party with a QELRO inscribed in the third column of Annex B to the Kyoto Protocol shall submit its first standard electronic format for reporting Protocol units for the second commitment period in conjunction with its first annual inventory submission for that commitment period;
- requests the SBSTA to initiate consideration of any supplementary reporting tables required for the reporting of LULUCF activities under Protocol Article 3.3 and 3.4 for the second commitment period; and
- requests the Secretariat to implement measures necessary to enable the implementation of the decision, including workshops and reports from those workshops.

**HCFC-22/HFC-23:** This issue was initially taken up in the opening plenary and further consultations took place on 27 November. In the closing plenary, the SBSTA agreed to continue discussions of this issue at SBSTA 38. This will be reflected in the report of the meeting.

**Annual report on the technical review of Annex I GHG inventories and other information reported by Annex I parties under Protocol Article 7.1:** In the opening plenary, the SBSTA took note of the annual report on the technical review of Annex I GHG inventories and other information reported by Annex I parties under Protocol Article 7.1 (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/INF.8).

**Report on the implementation of domestic actions by Annex I Protocol parties:** In the opening plenary, the SBSTA took note of the report on the implementation of domestic actions by Annex I Protocol parties (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/INF.9).

**OTHER MATTERS:** Under this item, the SBSTA closing plenary on 1 December took up activities implemented jointly under the pilot phase. The SBSTA agreed to forward a draft decision to the COP. The COP adopted the decision on 7 December.

**Final Outcome:** In its decision (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.27), the COP considered the reports on activities implemented jointly and decided to conclude the pilot phase for activities implemented jointly.

**CLOSING PLENARY:** On Sunday, 2 December, SBSTA 37 adopted its report (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.20). Parties made closing statements. SBSTA Chair Muyungi thanked participants for their dedication and closed SBSTA 37 at 3:04 am.

## A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF THE DOHA CLIMATE CHANGE CONFERENCE

*“...If not us, then who? If not now, then when? If not here, then where?”*

*Naderev Saño – Lead Negotiator, the Philippines.*

Beamed across global mainstream and social media networks, one of the defining moments of the Doha Climate Change Conference was the impassioned plea from the Philippines’ Naderev Saño in the wake of typhoon Bopha. Calling for action, he stated: “even as we vacillate and procrastinate here the death toll is rising.” This appeal resonated in many quarters: climate change manifestations are increasingly typified by devastation, havoc and human tragedy wrought by hurricanes typhoons and other “natural” disasters. Unfortunately, international climate change negotiating sessions have not always responded with a concomitant sense of urgency.

The “transitional” Doha Climate Change Conference was a case in point. Doha was about moving forward on a trajectory towards adopting a universal climate agreement by 2015—rather than immediately raising ambition as demanded by many youth and NGOs. Delegates also arrived in Doha with the objective of adopting a second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol and finally closing the door on the two *Ad hoc* Working Groups: the AWG-KP and AWG-LCA. Doha was also very much about the cost of addressing climate change and, in particular, making progress on long-term funding to support action in developing countries, which is supposed to reach a level of US\$100 billion a year by 2020, as agreed in Copenhagen in 2009.

With this in mind, this brief analysis looks back on the contribution of the two AWGs to the climate change process over the years and examines the outcome of the meeting, known as the “Doha Climate Gateway,” and its implications for the future.

### THE GATEWAY TO A SECOND COMMITMENT PERIOD

When parties established the AWG-KP at CMP 1 in Montreal in 2005 to address industrialized countries’ commitments for the post-2012 period under the Kyoto Protocol, they requested the Working Group to present its results “as early as possible” to ensure there would not be a gap between the first and second commitment periods. At that time, negotiators probably could not imagine that this task would require seven long years of negotiations—the same amount of time it took for the Protocol to enter into force. If anything, these marathon negotiations point to the increasingly complex dynamics that now typify UN climate change negotiations.

It has been clear for some time that ensuring a “seamless transition from the first to the second commitment period” would not be enough to guarantee ambitious emission reductions.

The first commitment period included binding targets for 37 industrialized countries and the EU to achieve average emission reductions of 5% below 1990 levels in 2008-2012, a figure that was far from ambitious when it was adopted in 1997. By 2005, when the AWG-KP was established, many already accepted the fact that the US would never ratify the Protocol. However, they probably did not expect that some of the key Kyoto Protocol parties would jump ship, as Japan, Canada, New Zealand and the Russian Federation did, by refusing to take on commitments in the second commitment period. This, coupled with the fact that under the Kyoto Protocol major developing countries, such as China—currently the world’s highest emitter—do not have commitments, means that in 2012, the Kyoto Protocol only covers about 15% of global GHG emissions.

In the end, Doha was able to deliver on the AWG-KP mandate, with parties agreeing that the second commitment period “can” be provisionally applied from 1 January 2013. However, it is well-known that the average 18% emission reduction by Annex I parties from 1990 levels in 2013-2020 is not nearly enough to put the world on track to avoid the 2°C temperature increase limit. The AOSIS campaign for a five-year commitment period to avoid locking-in a low level of mitigation ambition bore no fruit. Annex I parties, such as the European countries, preferred a longer commitment period due to their internal legislation already in force and due to a desire to avoid a gap between the second commitment period and the new regime expected to enter into force in 2020. As a compromise, parties agreed to establish a voluntary mechanism to review Annex I parties’ QELRCs and thus hope for a rise in mitigation ambition under the Kyoto Protocol in the near future.

With the adoption of a second commitment period, the fears of many that institutions, common accounting rules and flexibility mechanisms developed under the Kyoto Protocol would collapse can be assuaged. However, some Annex I parties have been accused of only wanting to “cherry-pick” from elements of the Kyoto Protocol, such as the market mechanisms, which have spawned burgeoning carbon industries back home. Agreeing on the eligibility criteria for participating in the Protocol’s flexibility mechanisms, including the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM), occupied a great deal of delegates’ time in Doha. Parties eventually agreed that only those Annex I parties taking on commitments will be able to trade (“transfer and acquire”) carbon credits generated through the flexibility mechanisms during the second commitment period.

Without doubt, the most drama in Doha unfolded over the use of excess Assigned Amount Units (AAUs), and whether these could be carried over to the second commitment period. Parties that have AAUs to spare because of emission reductions above their Kyoto commitments are permitted to sell the excess units to other countries. However, these surplus AAUs are mostly “hot air” units that do not represent real mitigation efforts but are due to the economic decline experienced during the transition to a market economy by a number of countries, such as the Russian Federation, Ukraine and Poland.

The final “wrangling” took place in the closing plenary on Saturday afternoon between those wanting to limit the use of excess AAUs to ensure the “environmental integrity” of the emission reduction commitments put forward and those arguing

that “overachievement” of commitments should not be punished by a limitation in the use of AAUs. Russia, Ukraine and Belarus attempted to block the adoption of the AWG-KP outcome during the CMP closing plenary, but the nimble COP President gavelled its adoption before appearing to notice Russia’s raised flag. A round of applause welcomed the adoption of the decision, which limits the amount of surplus AAUs that can be used and provides that only parties taking on second commitment period QELRCs can use them. Russia objected to what he said was a breach of procedure by the President, while the COP President responded he would do no more than reflect his view in the final report. This action on the part of the COP President brought back echoes of the events of Cancun when Bolivia’s objections to the adoption of the Cancun Agreement were overruled/ignored in much the same way. It also made many wonder whether this was becoming a trend in the climate negotiations; as many have repeated, consensus does not mean the right of one party to block progress.

### LEAVING THE AWG-LCA BEHIND

On the Convention side, the AWG-LCA came to a rather anti-climactic demise in Doha, devoid of the excitement and resounding applause accompanying its birth five years ago when the Bali Action Plan (BAP) was adopted at COP 13. At that time, weary but good-spirited delegates headed home, heralding COP 13 as a “breakthrough,” stewarding a “new era of multilateralism.” After lengthy and difficult negotiations, delegates had agreed on a two-year process—or Bali Road Map—a set of decisions aimed at finalizing a post 2012-regime by Copenhagen in December 2009. The Bali Road Map was ostensibly about addressing some of the shortcomings of the Kyoto Protocol, particularly the US refusal to join a treaty that did not require emission reductions from major developing country emitters. In the meantime, the global economic landscape has been changing beyond recognition and China and India’s rising carbon emissions are increasingly under sustained scrutiny.

At its birth, the BAP was seen as progressive, because for the first time it introduced the notion of “developed” and “developing countries,” under the Convention as opposed to “Annex I” and “non-Annex I parties.” This new categorization opened up the possibility of differentiation according to levels of economic development among developing countries, a nascent concept at that time.

Fast-forward two years, and instead of adopting a new protocol at COP 15 in Copenhagen, the fractious meeting nearly collapsed with parties in the end merely agreeing to “take note” of the Copenhagen Accord. The AWG-LCA’s mandate was extended for another year and subsequently renewed at both COP 16 and COP 17, where parties finally agreed to terminate the AWG-LCA at COP 18.

Leading up to Doha, speculation had been rife that there would be no agreement on closing the AWG-LCA, if its work was not deemed to be satisfactorily completed. Negotiations under the AWG-LCA in Doha at times appeared haphazard—even chaotic—leaving many delegates second guessing AWG-LCA Chair Tayeb’s intentions and *modus operandi*. Agreement appeared elusive, especially with finance and loss and damage

still up in the air and only a weak framework for Annex I countries’ mitigation. Ultimately, after intense consultations and trade-offs, the AWG-LCA completed its work as scheduled.

But what is the AWG-LCA’s legacy? Was it able to deliver on its promises or were delegates naively aspirational in 2007? In Bali, even if anchored in the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities, both developing and developed countries ultimately agreed to undertake mitigation efforts. In a historic move, developing countries agreed to “nationally appropriate mitigation actions in the context of sustainable development, supported by technology and enabled by finance and capacity building in a measureable, reportable and verifiable manner.” Developed countries meanwhile agreed to undertake, “measurable, reportable and verifiable nationally appropriate mitigation commitments or actions, including QELROs, while ensuring the comparability of efforts among them, taking into account differences in their national circumstances.”

Since Copenhagen, over 85 developing and developed countries presented emission reduction pledges under the Convention. However, many of these pledges are unclear, contain targets to be achieved on conditionalities and wide ranges of possible reductions proposed. As one commentator noted, five years down the line, mitigation under the AWG-LCA has increasingly devolved from a “top-down to a race-to-the-bottom approach,” and, he added, “characterized by a pledge and report system, with emphasis on reporting mitigation actions through national communications and inventory reports.” Agreement in Doha under mitigation for developed countries “urges” them to increase the ambition of their quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets to levels recommended by science and establishes a work programme to continue clarifying these pledges. The work programme is aimed at identifying “common elements” for ensuring progress towards emission reduction targets and comparability of efforts.

“The decision does not refer to the establishment of common accounting rules, methodologies and common base years for developed countries,” lamented one developing country delegate. Assessing comparability of mitigation efforts among Annex I parties is key for many reasons, including for maintaining robust international carbon markets. This decision has left many questioning the commitment of developed countries to raising the level of ambition. On the side of developing country mitigation, Doha also establishes a work programme to “further the understanding of the diversity of NAMAs,” which for many, is a long way short of addressing the runaway emissions of several emerging economies.

If anything, the AWG-LCA has fashioned an entirely new institutional landscape under the Convention. Doha endorsed Songdo, Republic of Korea, as the Green Climate Fund’s (GCF) host. The Standing Committee on Finance is also firmly established. Under technology, a mechanism was created and Doha confirmed a UNEP-led consortium as the host of the Climate Technology Centre (CTC). The Adaptation Committee was established to work on adaptation. When the concept of loss and damage was first proposed by AOSIS during the AWG-LCA negotiations several years ago, it seemed inconceivable then that

parties would eventually agree in Doha to develop institutional arrangements to compensate developing countries for loss and damage caused by slow onset events, such as sea level rise.

Finance has always been the linchpin of the negotiations. While the Copenhagen Accord provided for fast-start finance up to 2012 and the mobilization of US\$100 billion both for adaptation and mitigation by 2020, the agreement was silent on financing during the period 2012-2020. This mid-term gap has preoccupied the hearts and minds of many during every negotiating session over the last few years. The agreement reached in Doha “encourages” developed countries to increase efforts to provide finance between 2013 and 2015 at the same levels as provided during the fast-start period. For many, this falls considerably short of the MRV of financial support envisaged in the wake of Bali. The agreement also extends the mandate of the work programme on long-term finance by one year, where “efforts to scale up the mobilization of climate finance” will be considered. Although the GCF has been established, without a concrete signal on its replenishment, many see it as just an “empty shell.”

At the end of the day the success of the AWG-LCA’s outcome will be judged by how effectively these new institutions can implement their mandates and enable developing countries to address climate change challenges.

#### **THE ADP: THE GATEWAY TO A NEW CLIMATE SYSTEM?**

In trying to forge the path towards a more ambitious climate regime, parties in Durban in 2011 decided to develop “a protocol, another legal instrument or an agreed outcome with legal force under the Convention applicable to all parties” with the objective to complete its work as early as possible but no later than 2015, so it can be implemented beginning in 2020. These negotiations have been entrusted to the recently-established *Ad hoc* Working Group on Enhanced Action under the Durban Platform (ADP).

In Doha, many feared that lack of agreement under the AWG-KP and AWG-LCA would have serious repercussions for the work of the ADP, preventing it from delivering a new agreement by 2015. Since agreeing on the ADP’s agenda in June, parties have exchanged views in a roundtable format addressing how to put its mandate into practice. These discussions for some, however, are reminiscent of similar discussions and positions during the early days of the AWG-LCA. Divergent views prevailed in Doha during many of these exchanges, particularly on how the mandate will be “applicable to all,” and whether the Convention principles, including the principles of equity and common but differentiated responsibilities, will be at the core of the new regime. For some, the core of the matter lies in how to apply the principles and not whether to apply them. As the decision adopting the ADP does not include explicit references to the Convention’s principles, for the US, it is rather an issue of not “rewriting the ADP’s mandate.”

Under the ADP, developed countries increasingly envisage an evolving and dynamic framework that reflects current socio-economic realities and definitively dismantles the “firewall” between developed and developing country mitigation. As European Commissioner for Climate Action Connie Hedegaard put it: “We are crossing the bridge from the old climate system to the new system. Now we are on our way to the 2015 global deal.”

The evolving negotiating dynamics perhaps herald a new world order on a different level. Developing countries have started to look at the future with different perspectives. A coalition, which emerged in Bonn, comprising Colombia, Peru, Costa Rica, Chile, Guatemala and Panama, formally spoke in Doha as AILAC (Association of Independent Latin American and Caribbean states). According to its members, AILAC is “founded on a collective conviction that a strong and robust Convention is the most effective way to achieve the objective of a below-2 degree world.” Meanwhile, another group, dubbed the “like-minded group,” primarily comprised of members of the Arab Group, some Latin American countries, including Argentina, Venezuela, Bolivia and Ecuador, as well as India and China, appears to be firmly established since June in Bonn. Their goal is to uphold the Convention’s principles of common but differentiated responsibilities and equity, as well as developed countries’ historical responsibility for climate change.

With the baton having now been passed to the ADP, many are asking how to ensure that the ADP delivers on a more effective regime, within such a tight timeframe and many opinions on how just to do it. The success of the ADP may depend, in part, on how negotiators manage to build on the experiences and lessons learned from other processes within and outside the Convention. As delegates left Doha, many appeared satisfied with the agreement on a “firm timetable to adopt a universal climate agreement by 2015” and a path to raise necessary ambition in the context of discussions on raising ambition for the pre-2020 period under the ADP’s workstream 2. Many also welcomed the announcement by UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon of his intention to convene world leaders in 2014 in what many see as “an attempt to keep climate change as the utmost priority on global leaders’ agendas.”

In the words of COP 18 President Abdullah bin Hamad Al-Attiah “Doha has opened up a new gateway to bigger ambition and to greater action—the Doha Climate Gateway.” He added “Now governments must move quickly through the Doha Climate Gateway to push forward with the solutions to climate change.”

#### **“IF NOT US, THEN WHO”**

Closing the meeting, COP President Al-Attiah remarked: “I am not saying what is in store is a perfect package. Perfection is just a concept. If great minds like Plato and Socrates were in the COP presidency, I assure that even they would not been able to deliver a perfect COP 18 package...” He acknowledged the sentiments of many that Doha had reached an agreement but at the same time had also fallen short. As a civil society representative pointed out “success should not be measured by saving the process” but by taking real action to combat climate change.

Under the Kyoto Protocol, for example, the expectations of non-Annex I parties in 2005 were far from realized, but as one insider mentioned “Doha will go down as a very modest step forward in safeguarding the only existing legally-binding top-down and rule-based system.”

The world is changing dramatically and it promises to change just as much or more before 2020, especially as some “developing” countries’ economies and even *per capita* emissions surpass developed countries, and as the impacts of

climate change become more common and destructive. All eyes now look ahead to see what a future universal climate change regime can deliver and whether this time around there will be the requisite urgency and political will to ensure that dangerous climate change is avoided. Only history will judge, as a negotiator from the Philippines said “whether we have opened our eyes to the stark realities that we face.”

## UPCOMING MEETINGS

**19th Meeting of the Adaptation Fund Board:** The Adaptation Fund Board supervises and manages the Adaptation Fund under the authority and guidance of the countries that are party to the Kyoto Protocol. **dates:** 13-14 December 2012 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** Jeannette Jin Yu Lee **phone:** +1-202-473-7499 **fax:** +1-202-522-2720 **email:** jlee21@thegef.org **www:** <http://www.adaptation-fund.org/page/calendar>

**Third IRENA General Assembly:** The third session of the International Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA) Assembly, IRENA’s supreme governing body, will take place in January 2013, to finalize remaining institution-building issues, report on its progress to member states and renew its mandate on encouraging the global uptake of renewable energy. **dates:** 13-14 January 2013 **location:** Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates **contact:** IRENA Secretariat **phone:** +971-2-4179000 **email:** [secretariat@irena.org](mailto:secretariat@irena.org) **www:** <http://www.irena.org/>

**Abu Dhabi International Renewable Energy Conference (ADIREC):** The Abu Dhabi International Renewable Energy Conference (ADIREC) brings together representatives from government, the private sector and civil society to discuss the advancement of renewable energy. Objectives of the conference are to analyze and highlight the achievements of the UN Secretary-General’s Sustainable Energy for All (SE4All) initiative and discuss the contribution of renewable energy to economic development, energy security and mitigation of climate change. The conference is expected to offer a strategic platform to discuss the impact of UNFCCC COP 18. **dates:** 15-17 January 2013 **location:** Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates **contact:** Jonathan Skeen **phone:** +33-1-44-37-50-98 **email:** [jonathan.skeen@ren21.net](mailto:jonathan.skeen@ren21.net) **www:** <http://ren21.net/>

**Thirteenth Dialogue on Forests, Governance and Climate Change:** The Dialogue, sub-titled “Harmonizing Tenure and Resource Policies in Central and West Africa’s Changing Landscape,” will engage policy makers and development experts on the social, economic, and environmental impact of land deals or concessions in Africa. **dates:** 23-25 January 2013 **location:** Yaounde, Cameroon **contact:** Boubacar Diarra **phone:** +223-76-45-55-45 **email:** [bdiarra@rightsandresources.org](mailto:bdiarra@rightsandresources.org) **www:** <http://www.rightsandresources.org/events.php?id=687>

**27th Session of UNEP Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum:** The 27th session of the UNEP Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum (GC 27/GMEF) is scheduled to convene in February. The Governing Council constitutes the annual ministerial-level global environmental forum in which participants gather to review important and emerging environmental policy issues. **dates:** 18-22 February 2013 **location:** Nairobi, Kenya **contact:** Secretary, Governing Bodies,

UNEP **phone:** +254-20-7623431 **fax:** +254-20-7623929 **email:** [sgc.sgb@unep.org](mailto:sgc.sgb@unep.org) **www:** <http://www.unep.org/resources/gov/overview.asp>

**UNECE Meeting of the Core Group of Pilot Projects on Climate Change:** This meeting will discuss pilot water adaptation projects launched by the UN Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes (Watercourses Convention) Task Force on Water and Climate. **dates:** 20-21 February 2013 **location:** Geneva, Switzerland **contact:** Cammile Marcelo **phone:** +41-22- 917-1606 **fax:** +41-22-917-0621 **email:** [cammile.marcelo@unece.org](mailto:cammile.marcelo@unece.org) **www:** [http://www.unece.org/env/water/core\\_group\\_pilot\\_projects\\_climate\\_change\\_2013.html](http://www.unece.org/env/water/core_group_pilot_projects_climate_change_2013.html)

**Latin American Carbon Forum 2013:** The Seventh Latin American and Caribbean Carbon Forum will discuss prospects for carbon projects in Latin America. The Forum is co-organized by the Inter-American Development Bank, the Latin American Development Bank, World Bank, International Emissions Trading Association, Latin American Energy Organization, UN Environment Programme (UNEP) Risø Centre and UNFCCC. **dates:** 25-27 March 2013 **location:** Rio de Janeiro, Brazil **contact:** Miriam Hinostroza, UNEP Risø Centre **phone:** +45-4677-5180 **email:** [mihl@dtu.dk](mailto:mihl@dtu.dk) **www:** <http://www.latincarbon.com>

**Energy Training Week 2013:** The International Energy Agency will host an Energy Training Week, specifically targeting emerging economies and developing countries, and focusing on latest trends and developments in various energy sectors. The courses to be covered during the training include: energy essentials for decision-makers; energy markets and security; energy efficiency policy and measures; renewable and low-carbon energy technologies; energy analysis and modeling; and sustainable energy. **dates:** 8-12 April 2013 **location:** Paris, France **contact:** International Energy Agency **phone:** +33-1-40-57-65-00 **fax:** +33-1 40-57-65-09 **email:** [training.programme@iea.org](mailto:training.programme@iea.org) **www:** <http://www.iea.org/training/etw2013/#d.en.15745>

**Fourth Clean Energy Ministerial:** CEM4 will bring together ministers from more than 20 participating countries under the theme of “Technology and Business Innovation.” Topics that will be discussed include: progress by the 13 clean energy initiatives of CEM; enhancing cooperation between CEM governments; and the development of public-private partnerships to support clean energy development. **dates:** 17-18 April 2013 **location:** New Delhi, India **contact:** CEM Secretariat **www:** <http://www.cleanenergyministerial.org/events/cem4/index.html>

**Clean Energy Financing Forum for Central America and the Caribbean:** This meeting is sponsored by the Climate Technology Initiative (CTI), a multilateral initiative operating as an implementing agreement under the International Energy Agency, and the CTI’s Private Financing Advisory Network, the US Agency for International Development (USAID) and the International Center for Environmental Technology Transfer. **date:** 26 April 2013 **location:** San Pedro Sula, Honduras **contact:** Fernando Alvarado **email:** [fernando.alvarado@flexenergygroup.com](mailto:fernando.alvarado@flexenergygroup.com) **www:** [http://cti-pfan.net/events\\_detail.php?eventsid=43](http://cti-pfan.net/events_detail.php?eventsid=43)

**Carbon Expo:** Global Carbon Market Fair and Conference: This meeting is sponsored by Fira Barcelona, the International Emissions Trading Association and the World Bank. **dates:** 29-31 May 2013 **location:** Barcelona, Spain **contact:** Lisa Spafford, IETA **phone:** +41-22-737-0502 **email:** spafford@ieta.org **www:** <http://www.carbonexpo.com/>

**UNFCCC Subsidiary Bodies:** The next session of the UNFCCC subsidiary bodies will take place in June 2013 **dates:** 3-14 June 2013 **location:** Bonn, Germany (tentative) **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** <http://unfccc.int>

**GEF 44th Council Meeting:** The GEF Council meets twice per 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/events/gef-44th-council-meeting>

**IPCC WGI Session and IPCC-36:** The IPCC WGI plenary session for endorsement of the 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/>

**IPCC-37:** The 37th session of the IPCC will approve two methodology reports: the "2013 Supplement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: Wetlands" and the good practice guidance on estimating greenhouse gas emissions and removals from land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF) under the Kyoto Protocol. **dates:** 14-18 October 2013 **location:** Georgia (TBC) **contact:** IPCC Secretariat **phone:** +41-22-730-8208 **fax:** +41-22-730-8025 **email:** IPCC-Sec@wmo.int **www:** <http://www.ipcc.ch/>

**19th Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC:** UNFCCC COP 19 and CMP 9 and the subsidiary bodies 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

AAUs	Assigned Amount Units
ADP	<i>Ad hoc</i> Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action
AFB	Adaptation Fund Board
AILAC	Association of Independent Latin American and Caribbean States
AOSIS	Alliance of Small Island States
AWG-KP	<i>Ad hoc</i> Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol
AWG-LCA	<i>Ad hoc</i> Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention
BASIC	Brazil, South Africa, India and China
CBDR	Common but differentiated responsibilities
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CERs	Certified Emission Reductions
CMP	Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties of the Kyoto Protocol
COP	Conference of the Parties
CTC	Climate Technology Centre
CTCN	Climate Technology Centre and Network
EIG	Environmental Integrity Group
EIT	Countries in transition to a market economy
GCF	Green Climate Fund
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GHG	Greenhouse gas
ICAO	International Civil Aviation Organization
IMO	International Maritime Organization
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IPRs	Intellectual property rights
JI	Joint Implementation
LDCs	Least Developed Countries
LEG	LDC Expert Group
LULUCF	Land use, land-use change, and forestry
MRV	Measuring, reporting and verification
NAMAs	Nationally appropriate mitigation actions
QELRCs	Quantified emissions limitation or reduction commitments
QELROs	Quantified emission limitation or reduction objectives
REDD+	Reducing emissions from deforestation and degradation in developing countries, including conservation
SB	Subsidiary Body
SBI	Subsidiary Body for Implementation
SBSTA	Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice
TEC	Technology Executive Committee
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change