



SUMMARY OF THE LIMA CLIMATE CHANGE CONFERENCE: 1-14 DECEMBER 2014

The Lima Climate Change Conference convened from 1-14 December 2014, in Lima, Peru. It included the 20th session of the Conference of the Parties (COP 20) to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the 10th session of the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP 10). Three subsidiary bodies (SBs) also met: the 41st sessions of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA 41) and the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI 41), and the seventh part of the second session of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP 2-7).

The Lima Climate Change Conference brought together over 11,000 participants, including approximately 6,300 government officials, 4,000 representatives from UN bodies and agencies, intergovernmental organizations and civil society organizations, and 900 members of the media.

Negotiations in Lima focused on outcomes under the ADP necessary to advance towards an agreement in Paris at COP 21 in 2015, including elaboration of the information, and process, required for submission of intended nationally determined contributions (INDCs) as early as possible in 2015 and progress on elements of a draft negotiating text. Following lengthy negotiations on a draft decision for advancing the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action, COP 20 adopted the ‘Lima Call for Climate Action,’ which sets in motion the negotiations in the coming year towards a 2015 agreement, the process for submitting and reviewing INDCs, and enhancing pre-2020 ambition.

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

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE UNFCCC AND THE KYOTO PROTOCOL

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

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

IN THIS ISSUE

A Brief History of the UNFCCC and the Kyoto Protocol.	1
Lima Climate Change Conference Report.	3
Conference of the Parties	3
Conference of the Parties Serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol	8
COP 20 and CMP 10 Joint High-level Segment.	11
Subsidiary Body for Implementation	11
Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice	20
<i>Ad hoc</i> Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action	25
COP 20/CMP 10 Closing Plenaries	40
Lima Call for Climate Action	41
A Brief Analysis of the Lima Climate Conference	43
Upcoming Meetings	45
Glossary	46



LONG-TERM NEGOTIATIONS, 2005-2009: Convening in Montreal, Canada, in 2005, the first session of the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP 1) decided to establish the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Annex I Parties' Further Commitments under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP) in accordance with Protocol Article 3.9, which mandated consideration of Annex I parties' further commitments at least seven years before the end of the first commitment period.

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

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

CANCUN: The UN Climate Change Conference in Cancun, Mexico, took place in December 2010, where parties finalized the Cancun Agreements and extended the mandates of the two AWGs for another year. Under the Convention track, Decision 1/CP.16 recognized the need for deep cuts in global emissions in order to limit the global average temperature rise to 2°C above pre-industrial levels. Parties agreed to consider strengthening the global long-term goal during a review by 2015, including in relation to a proposed 1.5°C target. Decision 1/CP.16 also addressed other aspects of mitigation, such as: measuring, reporting and verification (MRV); and reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries, and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests, and enhancement of forest carbon stocks (REDD+).

The Cancun Agreements also established several new institutions and processes, including the Cancun Adaptation Framework, the Adaptation Committee and the Technology Mechanism, which includes the Technology Executive Committee and the Climate Technology Centre and Network. The Green Climate Fund (GCF) was created and designated as an operating entity of the Convention's financial mechanism.

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

DURBAN: The UN Climate Change Conference in Durban, South Africa, took place from 28 November to 11 December 2011. The Durban outcomes covered a wide range of topics,

notably the agreement to establish 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 ADP with a mandate "to develop a protocol, another legal instrument or an agreed outcome with legal force under the Convention applicable to all Parties." The ADP is scheduled to complete these negotiations by 2015, with the new instrument entering into force in 2020. In addition, the ADP was mandated to explore actions to close the pre-2020 ambition gap in relation to the 2°C target.

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

WARSAW: The Warsaw Climate Change Conference took place from 11-23 November 2013, in Warsaw, Poland. Negotiations focused on the implementation of agreements reached at previous meetings, including pursuing the work of the ADP. The meeting adopted an ADP decision that invites parties to initiate or intensify domestic preparations for their INDCs, and resolves to accelerate the full implementation of the BAP and pre-2020 ambition. Parties also adopted a decision establishing the Warsaw International Mechanism on Loss and Damage, and the Warsaw REDD+ Framework—a series of seven decisions on REDD+ finance, institutional arrangements and methodological issues.

ADP 2-4: The fourth meeting of ADP 2 (ADP 2-4) took place from 10-14 March 2014 in Bonn, Germany. Under workstream 1 (2015 agreement), the meeting convened in open-ended consultations on agenda item 3, which addressed: adaptation; INDCs; finance, technology and capacity building (means of implementation); ambition and equity; mitigation; transparency of action and support; and other issues related to elements. An in-session workshop addressed domestic preparations for INDCs. Under workstream 2 (pre-2020 ambition), technical expert meetings (TEMs) on renewable energy and energy efficiency convened.

BONN INTERSESSIONAL MEETINGS: The Bonn Climate Change Conference took place in Bonn, Germany, from 4-15 June 2014, and included the 40th sessions of the SBI and SBSTA, and the fifth meeting of the second session of the ADP (ADP 2-5). During the meeting, parties advanced negotiations on the ADP and prepared draft decisions to be submitted to the COP and CMP in Lima. Ministers participated in two high-level events, a High-Level Ministerial Roundtable under the Kyoto Protocol, which aimed to assess implementation of the Protocol and provide ministers with an opportunity to increase their countries' quantified emission limitation and reduction commitments, and a High-Level Ministerial Dialogue on the

Durban Platform for Enhanced Action aimed to raise pre-2020 ambition and provide momentum for negotiations on the 2015 agreement.

ADP 2-6: The sixth meeting of ADP 2 took place in Bonn from 20-25 October 2014. Under workstream 1, countries continued to elaborate the elements of a draft negotiating text, which will serve as the foundation for the final construction of the 2015 agreement, and considered a “non-paper” on parties’ views and proposals on the elements for a draft negotiating text. The ADP also worked on a draft decision that captures the type of information countries will provide when they communicate their INDCs and how these contributions will potentially be considered. Under workstream 2, TEMs focused on: opportunities for action on non-CO2 GHGs; carbon capture, use and storage; and follow-up to TEMs on unlocking mitigation opportunities through energy efficiency, renewable energy, urban environment and land use improvements in the pre-2020 period. Countries also addressed a draft decision on pre-2020 ambition.

LIMA CLIMATE CHANGE CONFERENCE REPORT

On Monday, 1 December, COP 19/CMP 9 President Marcin Korolec welcomed delegates to the joint COP/MOP opening ceremony highlighting several significant outcomes of COP 19 and lauding early engagement by Peru and France, which is allowing “the trio to make the road to Paris a smooth highway.”

Peru’s Minister of Environment Manuel Pulgar-Vidal said COP 20 should increase trust, create space for dialogue between state and non-state actors, and lay groundwork for a new climate agreement through a draft text balancing climate action and sustainable development.

Stressing the key role of large cities in combating climate change, Susana Villarán de la Puente, Mayor of Lima, Peru, highlighted the commitment of mayors worldwide to push for a new mobility paradigm, change the energy matrix and invest in green infrastructure.

Pointing to the lines and geoglyphs of Nazca, Peru, UNFCCC Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres encouraged parties to, *inter alia*: draft a new universal agreement; achieve progress on adaptation; and strengthen the financial capacity of the most vulnerable.

Via recorded video message, President of Peru Ollanta Humala lamented that humanity has “left behind the practice of sustainability” and said now is the time to return to the right path by taking action on climate change.

Presenting the key findings of the Synthesis Report (SYR) of the Fifth Assessment Report (AR5) of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), Rajendra Pachauri, IPCC Chair, stressed that remaining below the 2°C target will require that GHG emissions decline by 40-70% by 2050, relative to 2010 levels, and reach zero or negative levels by 2100.

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

CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES

On Monday, 1 December, Manuel Pulgar-Vidal, Minister of Environment, Peru, was elected as the COP 20/CMP 10 President by acclamation.

ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS: Parties agreed to apply the draft rules of procedure (FCCC/CP/1996/2) with the exception of draft rule 42 on voting.

The COP adopted the agenda as proposed (FCCC/CP/2014/1), with the agenda item on the second review of the adequacy of Convention Articles 4.2(a) and (b) (developed countries’ mitigation) held in abeyance. The COP also agreed to the organization of work. The COP referred to the SBI the agenda item on non-Annex I parties’ membership to the Consultative Group of Experts on National Communications from non-Annex I Parties (CGE). Parties agreed to the accreditation of observer organizations (FCCC/CP/2014/4).

Election of Officers Other than the President: COP President Pulgar-Vidal indicated that consultations on the election of officers would be conducted. On Saturday, 13 December, the COP closing plenary elected members of the COP Bureau: SBSTA Chair Tomasz Chruszczow (Poland); SBI Chair Amena Yauvoli (Fiji); COP Rapporteur Johanna Lissinger-Peitz (Sweden); Ismail Elgizouli (Sudan); Cheikh Ndiaye Sylla (Senegal); Ravi Shanker Prasad (India); Oleg Shamanov (Russian Federation); Jaime Hermida Castillo (Nicaragua); and Jo Tyndall (New Zealand). Su Wei (China) will remain in office pending election of his successor.

The COP also elected the SBSTA Bureau, with Carlos Fuller (Belize) as Vice-Chair, and the SBI Bureau, with Guoshun Sun (China) as Vice-Chair and Sidat Yaffa (the Gambia) as Rapporteur.

The COP also elected the members of the Adaptation Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (AFB), the Advisory Board of the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN), the Clean Development Mechanism Executive Board (CDM EB), the Consultative Group of Experts (CGE), the Compliance Committee, the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee (JISC), the Standing Committee on Finance (SCF), the Technology Executive Committee (TEC), and the Executive Committee of the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage. Consultations will continue on the outstanding nominations. The list is available on the UNFCCC website.

Dates and Venues of Future Sessions: On Friday, 12 December, the COP adopted a decision on future sessions (FCCC/CP/2014/L.8), noting the expression of interest from Morocco to host COP 22 and CMP 12 from 7-18 November 2016 and requesting the Secretariat to initiate a fact-finding mission to Morocco and to report to the COP/CMP Bureau by June 2015 on whether all logistical, technical, legal and financial elements for hosting the sessions are available. Minister Ouafae Dehmani (Morocco) stressed the importance of operationalizing the new agreement and said that Morocco will be “the COP for action.”

Adoption of the Report on Credentials: On Friday, 12 December, the COP adopted the report on credentials (FCCC/CP/2014/9-FCCC/KP/CMP/2014/8), with the Bahamas saying their credentials had been communicated electronically to the Secretariat, which was noted.

REPORT OF THE SUBSIDIARY BODIES: On Friday, 12 December, the COP adopted the reports of SBSTA 40 and SBSTA 41 (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/2 and Add.1, and FCCC/SBSTA/2014/L.20) and the reports of SBI 40 and SBI 41 (FCCC/SBI/2014/8 and Add.1, and FCCC/SBI/2014/L.25). The SBI recommended, and the COP agreed that the REDD information hub, established by Decision 9/CP.19 (Warsaw REDD+ Framework), be called the Lima Information Hub for REDD.

REPORT OF THE ADP: On Saturday, 13 December, the COP adopted the report of ADP 2-7 during the closing plenary.

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSALS BY PARTIES UNDER ARTICLE 17 OF THE CONVENTION: On Friday, 12 December, parties agreed that consideration of this item (FCCC/CP/2009/3-7 and FCCC/CP/2010/3) will continue at COP 21.

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSALS BY PARTIES FOR AMENDMENTS TO THE CONVENTION UNDER ARTICLE 15: Proposal from the Russian Federation: This item (FCCC/CP/2011/5) was first considered on Wednesday, 3 December. COP 20 President Pulgar-Vidal proposed, and parties agreed to, informal consultations co-facilitated by Antonio García (Peru) and Augusto Cabrera Rebaza (Peru).

On Friday, 12 December, parties agreed to continue consideration of this issue at COP 21.

Proposal from Papua New Guinea and Mexico: This item (FCCC/CP/2011/4/Rev.1) was first considered on Wednesday, 3 December. COP 20 President Pulgar-Vidal proposed, and parties agreed to, informal consultations co-facilitated by Antonio García and Augusto Cabrera Rebaza.

On Friday, 12 December, parties agreed to continue consideration of this issue at COP 21.

REPORT OF THE ADAPTATION COMMITTEE: These discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item on the Report of the Adaptation Committee (see page 14).

WARSAW INTERNATIONAL MECHANISM FOR LOSS AND DAMAGE ASSOCIATED WITH CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACTS: The discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item on the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage (see page 14).

DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGIES AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE TECHNOLOGY MECHANISM (TM): Joint Annual Report of the TEC and the CTCN: The discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item on the Joint Annual Report of the TEC and CTCN (see page 16).

Linkages between the TM and the Financial Mechanism of the Convention: This item (FCCC/CP/2014/6 and 8) was first addressed on Wednesday, 3 December. COP 20 President Pulgar-Vidal proposed, and parties agreed to, informal consultations co-facilitated by Carlos Fuller (Belize) and Elfriede-Anna More (Austria).

The co-facilitators reported to the COP that the parties were unable to reach agreement and the COP decided that this sub-item be included in the provisional agenda for COP 21.

Stressing the importance of this sub-item for the implementation of the Convention, China lamented the lack of agreement and called for clearly establishing the link between

the two mechanisms in order to support technical cooperation and open the way for climate technologies.

2013-2015 REVIEW: The discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item on the 2013-2015 Review (see page 17).

SECOND REVIEW OF THE ADEQUACY OF ARTICLE 4, PARAGRAPH 2(A) AND (B), OF THE CONVENTION: This item was held in abeyance.

MATTERS RELATING TO FINANCE: This item was first considered on Wednesday, 3 December. COP 20 President Pulgar-Vidal invited parties to address sub-items on long-term climate finance, reports of the SCF, the GCF and the Global Environment Facility (GEF), and the fifth review of the financial mechanism.

Pulgar-Vidal proposed, and parties agreed to, a contact group on long-term climate finance and the report of the SCF co-chaired by Tosi Mpanu Mpanu (Democratic Republic of the Congo) and Dany Drouin (Canada), and a contact group on the reports of and guidance to the GCF and GEF, and the fifth review of the financial mechanism co-chaired by Ayman Shasly (Saudi Arabia) and Stefan Schwager (Switzerland).

On the GCF, Zambia called for speeding up direct access modalities for disbursement of funds, and accreditation and support to national entities.

Climate Justice Now!, for Environmental NGOs (ENGOs), called for addressing developing countries' needs if the change from "brown to green" economies is to be achieved.

Business and Industry NGOs stressed the importance of establishing credible and transparent MRV systems and avoiding double counting.

Uruguay said the Inter-American Institute for Global Change Research is ready to cooperate with the UNFCCC.

Egypt, for the African Group, said long-term climate finance should not be confined to US\$100 billion annually and called for discussing a strategic approach to finance, including addressing sources, predictability, adequacy and stability, and ways to deliver the necessary scale of finance needed to stay below 2°C.

Panama suggested taking advantage of the Adaptation Fund.

On Thursday, 4 December, in the contact group on long-term climate finance and the report of the SCF, Co-Chairs Tosi Mpanu Mpanu and Dany Drouin introduced the report of the SCF (FCCC/CP/2014/5).

Bolivia, for the Group of 77 and China (G-77/China), said MRV of support is also being discussed in the ADP and called for: coherence and coordination; clarity on the level of financial support to developing countries; guidance on the third forum of the SCF; and finance for forests.

The US suggested addressing deliverables and, with the European Union (EU), highlighted the GCF's initial capitalization of US\$9.7 billion prior to Lima.

In the contact group on reports of and guidance to the GCF and GEF, and fifth review of the financial mechanism, Co-Chairs Ayman Shasly and Stefan Schwager introduced documents (FCCC/CP/2014/2 and Add.1, and FCCC/CP/2014/5 and 8).

Bolivia, for the G-77/China, noted the important work of the Adaptation Fund. The EU noted other agenda items have financial dimensions, including adaptation, and suggested discussing those in the contact group on climate finance.

Early on Saturday, 13 December, a contact group convened, chaired by Rosa Morales (Peru), on behalf of the COP 20 President. Edward Davey (UK) and Edna Molewa (South Africa) briefed parties on ministerial consultations, noting they had: met with parties on Thursday and produced draft text on this basis; undertaken another consultation process on Friday evening; and based the five draft decision documents on these consultations. The contact group was suspended early Saturday after addressing the report of the SCF, the report of and guidance to the GEF, and the fifth review of the financial mechanism. The contact group reconvened at 11:46 am on Saturday to consider long-term climate finance and the report of and guidance to the GCF, with Chair Morales noting the texts were the result of ministerial consultations. After some discussion, the rest of the decisions on long-term climate finance and report of and guidance to the GCF were forwarded to COP 20 for consideration by the contact group. The contact group closed at 2:08 pm.

Long-Term Climate Finance: On Wednesday, 3 December, COP 20 President Pulgar-Vidal invited parties to consider the summary of the in-session workshop on long-term climate finance in 2014 (FCCC/CP/2014/3) and provide guidance on organization of future workshops. On Saturday, 13 December, the contact group agreed to forward a draft decision, with minor amendments to reflect previously agreed language, to COP 20 for consideration.

During the COP closing plenary on Saturday, December 13, parties adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/CP/2014/L.13), the COP welcomes: the pledges to the GCF and to the sixth replenishment of the GEF, and contributions to the Least Developed Country (LDC) Fund (LDCF), the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF), and the Adaptation Fund; and the biennial submissions received to date from developed country parties on updated strategies and approaches for scaling up climate finance from 2014 to 2020, as contained in Decision 3/CP.19, paragraph 10, and urges those developed countries that have not yet done so, to do so.

The COP also, *inter alia*:

- calls on developed countries to channel a substantial share of public climate funds to adaptation activities;
- requests parties to continue to enhance their enabling environments and policy frameworks to facilitate the mobilization and effective deployment of climate finance, in accordance with decision 3/CP.19;
- recognizes that developed countries commit, in the context of meaningful mitigation actions and transparency on implementation, to a goal of mobilizing jointly US\$100 billion per year by 2020 to address the needs of developing countries;
- requests developed countries, in preparing their next round of updated biennial submissions on strategies and approaches for scaling up climate finance for the period 2016-2020, to enhance the available quantitative and qualitative elements of a pathway, placing greater emphasis on transparency and predictability of financial flows;
- requests the Secretariat to prepare a compilation and synthesis of the biennial submissions on the strategies and approaches, to inform the in-session workshops, and to organize annual in-session workshops through to 2020 and to prepare a

summary report of the workshops for annual consideration by the COP and the high-level ministerial dialogue on climate finance; and

- decides that the in-session workshops will, in 2015 and 2016, focus on the issues of adaptation finance, needs for support to developing countries, and cooperation on enhanced enabling environments and support for readiness activities.

Report of the Standing Committee on Finance: On Wednesday, 3 December, SCF Co-Chairs Stefan Schwager (Switzerland) and Diann Black-Layne (Antigua and Barbuda) introduced the report (FCCC/CP/2014/5 and Add.1). On Saturday, 13 December, the contact group agreed to forward a draft decision without amendments to COP 20 for consideration. During the COP closing plenary on Saturday, parties adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/CP/2014/L.10), the COP welcomes: the report of the SCF; the transparency and openness with which the SCF conducts its work; the successful completion of the 2014 biennial assessment and overview of climate finance flows, noting the related report; the 2014 SCF forum on the mobilization of adaptation finance, taking note of the related report; and the inputs of the TEC and the Adaptation Committee to the work of the SCF in preparing elements of draft guidance to the operating entities. The COP also, *inter alia*:

- endorses the SCF workplan for 2015, and the recommendations on the provision of guidance to the operating entities provided in paragraph 10 of the SCF report to the COP;
- decides to conduct the review of the functions of the SCF no later than COP 23;
- requests relevant technical bodies to consider the recommendations contained in the report of the 2014 biennial assessment of climate finance as part of their related deliberations; and
- looks forward to the third forum of the SCF, in 2015, focusing on issues related to finance for forests.

The COP furthermore requests the SCF to:

- consider the findings and recommendations of the biennial assessment in its annual report to the COP 21, with a view to recommending improvements to the methodologies for reporting financial information;
- further explore ways to enhance its work on the MRV of support, based on best available information on the mobilization of various resources, including private and alternative resources, through public interventions;
- include, in its report to COP 21, information on progress made in the implementation of its 2015 workplan; and
- consider issues related to possible future institutional linkages and relations between the Adaptation Fund and other institutions under the Convention, and guidance provided to it in other COP decisions.

Report of the GCF to the COP and Guidance to the GCF: On Wednesday, 3 December, GCF Board Co-Chair Ayman Shasly (Saudi Arabia) introduced the report (FCCC/CP/2014/18). On Saturday, 13 December, the contact group agreed to forward a draft decision, with an amendment to delete reference to the private sector facility from a paragraph requesting the GCF Board to accelerate the operationalization of the adaptation and

mitigation windows, to COP 20 for consideration. During the COP closing plenary on Saturday, 13 December, parties adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/CP/2014/L.12), the COP welcomes the successful and timely initial resource mobilization process of the GCF that led to the mobilization of US\$10.2 billion to date by contributing parties, enabling the GCF to start its activities to support developing country parties to the Convention, and making it the largest dedicated climate fund. The COP also, *inter alia*:

- requests the GCF to ensure that the ongoing resource mobilization efforts are commensurate with the ambitions of the Fund, and calls for contributions by other developed countries, and invites financial inputs from a variety of other sources, public and private, including alternative sources, throughout the initial resource mobilization process; and
- urges the GCF, the Interim Trustee, and contributors to confirm the pledges in the form of fully executed contribution agreements/arrangements, taking note that the commitment authority of the GCF will become effective when 50% of the contributions pledged by the November 2014 pledging session are reflected in fully executed contribution agreements/arrangements received by the Secretariat no later than 30 April 2015.

Moreover, the COP requests the GCF Board to:

- accelerate the operationalization of the adaptation and mitigation windows, and to ensure adequate resources for capacity building and technology development and transfer;
- accelerate the operationalization of the private sector facility by aiming to ensure that private sector entities and public entities with relevant experience in working with the private sector are accredited in 2015, expediting action to engage local private sector actors in developing countries, including small- and medium-sized enterprises in the LDCs, small island developing states (SIDS) and African states, emphasizing a country-driven approach, expediting action to mobilize resources at scale, and developing a strategic approach to engaging with the private sector;
- complete, in the implementation of its 2015 workplan, its work related to policies and procedures to accept financial inputs from non-public and alternative sources, the investment and risk management frameworks of the GCF, the impact analysis on its initial results areas, including options for determining the Board-level investment portfolios across the structure of the Fund, and the approval process of the Fund, including methodologies for selecting programmes and projects that best achieve its objectives;
- consider ways to further increase the transparency of its proceedings;
- accelerate the implementation of its work programme on readiness and preparatory support, ensuring that adequate resources are provided for its execution, including from the initial resource mobilization process, providing urgent support to developing countries, in particular LDCs, SIDS and African states, led by their national designated authorities or focal points to build institutional capacities;
- consider, when deciding its policies and programme priorities, the information and lessons learned through engagement with

other relevant bodies under the Convention, and other relevant international institutions;

- further enhance the participation of all stakeholders;
- develop a monitoring and accountability framework;
- consider decisions relevant to REDD+;
- make available its annual report in a timely manner, and no later than 12 weeks prior to a COP session; and
- report to COP 21 on progress made in the implementation of this decision.

The COP also:

- requests the GCF to enhance its collaboration with existing funds under the Convention and other climate relevant funds in order to enhance the complementarity and coherence of policies and programming at the national level;
- urges the GCF to ensure that staff selection is open, transparent and based on merit without discrimination, taking into account geographical and gender balance;
- urges developing countries to enter into bilateral agreements with the GCF based on the template to be approved by the GCF Board, in order to provide privileges and immunities for the Fund; and
- requests the GCF to include in its annual report to the COP the recommendations of its independent redress mechanism, if any, and any actions taken by the Board in response to those recommendations.

Report of the GEF to the COP and Guidance to the GEF:

On Wednesday, 3 December, Chizuru Aoki, GEF, introduced the report (FCCC/CP/2014/2 and Add.1). On Saturday, 13 December, the contact group agreed to forward a draft decision with minor amendments to COP 20 for consideration. During the COP closing plenary, parties adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/CP/2014/L.11), the COP welcomes: the sixth replenishment of the GEF, while urging countries that have not fulfilled their pledges for the fifth replenishment to do so as soon as possible; the pledges and contributions made to the LDCF and the SCCF, calling for continued support to these funds; and the GEF's gender mainstreaming policy. The COP also, *inter alia*:

- notes that the amount of funding available for the climate change focal area was reduced in the GEF's sixth replenishment period, and that the allocation of some countries, including some LDCs, SIDS, and African states, has decreased as a consequence;
- takes note of the GEF's policy on co-financing, and the concerns raised by some parties regarding its implementation;
- invites parties to submit annually to the Secretariat their views and recommendations on the elements to be taken into account in developing guidance to the GEF, and requests the SCF to take into consideration these submissions when providing draft guidance to the GEF for consideration by the COP; and
- encourages the GEF to, *inter alia*, continue work on improving its project cycle, increase the overall transparency and openness of its operations, and improve the communication of its co-financing policy.

The COP also requests the GEF to:

- ensure that gender mainstreaming is implemented both within its portfolio and its structure;

- continue to work with its implementing agencies to further simplify its procedures, and improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the process through which non-Annex I parties receive funding to meet their obligations under Convention Article 12.1 (communication of information related to implementation); and
- include in its annual report to the COP information on the steps it has taken to implement the guidance provided in the decision.

Fifth Review of the Financial Mechanism: On Wednesday, 3 December, COP 20 President Pulgar-Vidal introduced this item (FCCC/CP/2014/5 and FCCC/CP/2013/INF.1). On Saturday, 13 December, the contact group agreed to forward a draft decision without amendments to COP 20 for consideration. During the COP closing, parties adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/CP/2014/L.9), the COP welcomes the progress made by the GCF Board in operationalizing the GCF, and notes that the fifth review of the financial mechanism focused on the GEF, as the GCF is still developing its operations. The COP also, *inter alia*:

- welcomes the expert input to the fifth review of the financial mechanism provided by the SCF and encourages the SCF to build on the same methodology and criteria in future reviews of the mechanism;
- encourages the operating entities of the financial mechanism to address these recommendations in their future work;
- recognizes the general positive assessment of the performance of the GEF, but notes that the LDCs and SIDS still experience challenges in accessing GEF resources;
- decides to consider the timing of guidance provided by the COP to the operating entities of the financial mechanism in order to ensure that key guidance is fully considered in the programming strategies and policy recommendations associated with the replenishment cycles of these entities;
- decides to initiate the sixth review of the financial mechanism at COP 22 in accordance with the criteria contained in the guidelines annexed to Decision 8/CP.19 (fifth review of the financial mechanism), or as subsequently amended; and
- requests the SCF to provide expert input to the sixth review of the financial mechanism in 2017 with a view to the review being completed by COP 23.

Further Guidance to the LDCF: These discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item on further guidance to the LDCF (see page 16).

REPORTING FROM AND REVIEW OF PARTIES INCLUDED IN ANNEX I TO THE CONVENTION: These discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item on reporting from and review of Annex I parties (see page 12).

REPORTING FROM PARTIES NOT INCLUDED IN ANNEX I TO THE CONVENTION: These discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item on Reporting from Non-Annex I Parties (see page 12).

CAPACITY BUILDING UNDER THE CONVENTION: These discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item on capacity building under the Convention (see page 17).

IMPLEMENTATION OF ARTICLE 4, PARAGRAPHS 8 AND 9, OF THE CONVENTION: Implementation of the Buenos Aires Programme of Work on Adaptation and

Response Measures (Decision 1/CP.10): These discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item on Decision 1/CP.10 (see page 17).

Matters Relating to the LDCs: These discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item on matters relating to the LDCs (see page 14).

GENDER AND CLIMATE CHANGE: These discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item on Gender and Climate Change (see page 18).

OTHER MATTERS REFERRED TO THE COP BY THE SUBSIDIARY BODIES: IPCC Fifth Assessment Report: These discussions are summarized under the SBSTA agenda item on the IPCC AR5 (see page 21).

Work Programme on the Revision of the Guidelines for the Review of Biennial Reports and National Communications, including National Inventory Reviews, for Developed Country Parties: These discussions are summarized under the SBSTA agenda item on the Work programme on the revision of guidelines for the review of Biennial Reports and National Communications, including National Inventory Reviews, for Developed Country Parties (See page 22).

National Adaptation Plans (NAPs): These discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item on NAPs (see page 14).

ADMINISTRATIVE, FINANCIAL AND INSTITUTIONAL MATTERS: Audited Financial Statements for the Biennium 2012-2013: These discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item on administrative, financial and institutional matters (see page 19).

Budget Performance for the Biennium 2014-2015: The discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item on administrative, financial and institutional matters (see page 19).

Decision-Making in the UNFCCC Process: On Wednesday, 3 December, COP 20 Tomasz Chruszczow (Poland) reported on consultations on this issue during SB 40, saying the consultations were important to build trust. He said there was no common view on the need for a formal outcome.

COP 20 President Pulgar-Vidal proposed establishing a contact group. Saudi Arabia, the EU, India, Iraq and China, opposed by the Russian Federation, preferred informal consultations. The Russian Federation introduced a draft decision (FCCC/CP/2014/CRP.1), noting the critical juncture of the negotiations in the lead-up to Paris. Interested parties consulted informally on how to move forward. On Saturday, 13 December, parties adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/CP/2014/L.4), the COP, *inter alia*:

- decides to continue discussions on decision making in the UNFCCC process;
- requests the President, in collaboration with France as the host of COP 21, to undertake forward-looking, open-ended informal consultations on decision making in the UNFCCC process, in conjunction with SB 42, and to report to COP 21;
- agrees that sub-items under 2(b) (adoption of the rules of procedure) and 6(b) (proposal to amend Convention Articles 7 and 8) of the COP 20 agenda would continue to be considered under distinct and separate processes from this sub-item on decision-making in the UNFCCC process; and
- agrees to continue consideration of this sub-item at COP 21.

OTHER MATTERS: Education and Awareness Raising:

On Wednesday, 3 December, Poland outlined the joint Polish and Peruvian initiative for a Ministerial Declaration on Education and Awareness Raising at COP 20.

Mexico, the EU and the Dominican Republic welcomed the initiative. COP 20 President Pulgar-Vidal held consultations. On Saturday, 13 December, parties adopted the decision.

Highlighting the importance of educating societies on climate, COP 19/CMP 9 President Marcin Korolec (Poland) noted that he and the COP 20 Presidency promoted this ministerial declaration and “delivered something quite extraordinary.”

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/CP/2014/L.1/Rev.1), the COP reaffirms the importance of Convention Article 6 (education, training and public awareness) and Protocol Article 10 (e) (education and training programmes). The COP also, *inter alia*:

- stresses that education, training, public awareness, participation and access to information, knowledge, and international cooperation play a fundamental role in meeting the ultimate objective of the Convention and in promoting climate-resilient sustainable development;
- reaffirms its commitment to promote and facilitate the development and implementation of educational and public awareness programmes on, *inter alia*, climate change and its effects;
- encourages governments to develop education strategies incorporating the issue of climate change in curricula, and to include awareness raising on climate change in national development and climate change strategies and policies;
- urges all parties to give increased attention to education, training, and public awareness, participation and access to information on climate change;
- expresses its resolve to cooperate and engage through complementary initiatives that aim to increase awareness and enhance education on climate change; and
- reaffirms its commitment to the implementation of the Doha work programme on Article 6 of the Convention.

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

On Monday, 1 December, CMP 10 President Manuel Pulgar-Vidal opened CMP 10.

ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS: Parties adopted the agenda (FCCC/KP/CMP/2014/1) with minor changes.

On the election of replacement officers, CMP 10 President Pulgar-Vidal reported that he would undertake consultations on nominations. Parties also agreed to the organization of work.

On Saturday, 13 December, CMP 10 Vice-President Jorge Voto-Bernales (Peru) noted there is no need to elect replacement officers as all Bureau Members elected to the COP Bureau are parties to the Kyoto Protocol. The CMP also elected members and alternate members of AFB, CDM EB and JISC.

On Friday, 12 December, the CMP adopted the report on credentials (FCCC/CP/2014/9-FCCC/KP/CMP/2014/8), with the Bahamas saying their credentials had been communicated electronically to the Secretariat, which was noted.

Status of Ratification of the Doha Amendment to the Kyoto Protocol: This item was first considered in CMP plenary on Wednesday, 3 December.

UNFCCC Secretary Christiana Figueres noted that the Doha Amendment has only received 19 instruments of acceptance, saying it requires 125 more ratifications in order to enter into force. She called on those responsible for ratification of the amendment to speed up the process so that the only legally-binding instrument under the UNFCCC can continue.

Guyana and Palau announced that they ratified the Doha Amendment and will submit their instruments of acceptance shortly.

Bolivia, for the G-77/China, said the group expects Annex B parties to reconsider their commitments, making every effort to increase them with a view to eliminating the pre-2020 mitigation gap.

CMP 10 President Pulgar-Vidal announced he would conduct informal consultations with interested parties on acceleration of ratification.

During the CMP closing plenary on Friday, 12 December, CMP 10 Vice-President Voto-Bernales informed that two further instruments of acceptance have been received from Tuvalu and Nauru, and urged parties to accelerate ratification.

REPORTS OF THE SUBSIDIARY BODIES: Report of the SBSTA: On Friday, 12 December, the CMP adopted the reports of the SBSTA 40 and SBSTA 41 (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/2 and Add.1, and FCCC/SBSTA/2014/L.20) and SBI 41 (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.25) and SBI 40 (FCCC/SBI/2014/8 and Add.1), as amended.

ISSUES RELATING TO THE CLEAN DEVELOPMENT MECHANISM (CDM): This item (FCCC/KP/CMP/2014/5) was first considered on Wednesday, 3 December. Chair of the CDM EB Hugh Sealy (Barbados) called on parties to renew their commitment to the CDM by recognizing its strengths for results-based finance.

Zambia proposed continued reform of the operations of the CDM to achieve desired outcomes by addressing transparency, accountability and simplified project approval processes. The World Bank said the CDM is effectively channeling results-based climate finance and called on parties to use the CDM in the near term to help maintain the mechanism. Senegal said that CDM reform is critical for developing countries, particularly in Africa, noting that so far they have benefited very little from the mechanism.

CMP 10 President Pulgar-Vidal proposed, and parties agreed to, a contact group co-chaired by Jeffery Spooner (Jamaica) and Marko Berglund (Finland).

On Wednesday, 3 December, during the contact group delegates highlighted, *inter alia*, the need for: broader encouragement for parties and stakeholders to use the CDM; an analysis of the CDM as a useful mitigation tool; continuation of the CDM beyond 2020; standardized registration criteria; and enhancing the CDM to allow for voluntary cancellation.

ENGOs urged parties to address the fact that CDM projects still fail to fully respect human rights. Business and Industry NGOs called for, *inter alia*, progress on the review of modalities and procedures, continued development of standardized baselines, and a simplified accreditation process.

On Monday, 8 December, CMP informal consultations on this item were held throughout the day. In the afternoon, parties continued consideration of draft decision text prepared by the Co-Chairs paragraph by paragraph. Discussions focused on, *inter*

alia, interaction of the EB with Designated Operational Entities (DOEs) and DOEs' participation in the CDM, and requests to the EB to revise methodologies, prioritize work on simplifying methodologies and adjust crediting periods.

On Wednesday, 10 December, in the afternoon contact group, parties continued consideration of the draft decision text, but were unable to agree on items relating to, *inter alia*: baseline and monitoring methodologies and additionality; and registration of CDM project activities and issuance of certified emission reduction units (CERs), including the voluntary cancellation process. The contact group and informal consultations continued in the evening.

During the closing plenary on Friday, 12 December, parties adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/CP/CMP/2014/L.3), the CMP welcomes the CDM EB annual report for 2013-2014, expresses satisfaction with the progress of the CDM, and DOEs to carry out sector-specific validation and verification functions, as described in Annex I to the decision. The CMP also agrees to paragraphs on: baseline and monitoring methodologies and additionality; registration of CDM project activities and issuance of CERs; regional and subregional distribution; and resources for work on the CDM. On these, the CMP, *inter alia*:

- decides to allow the validation by a DOE and the submission for approval by the EB of a monitoring plan at any time up to the first request for issuance of CERs for all scales of project activities and programmes of activities (PoAs);
- requests the EB to further analyze options to allow the simplified registration of project activities and PoAs that qualify as automatically additional, and report back to CMP 11;
- requests the EB to analyze the implications, and possible provisions for ensuring environmental integrity, of allowing the same DOE to carry out validation and verification for the same project activity or PoA at all scales, and report back to CMP 11;
- requests the EB to consider adjusting and, if appropriate, implement the rules governing PoAs to reflect their special features in order to facilitate effective implementation and reduce associated transaction costs while ensuring environmental integrity, taking into account the implications for liability with regard to the issuance of CERs resulting from significant deficiencies in validation, verification and certification reports; and
- requests the EB to ensure prudent management of the resources of the CDM, and its ability to perform its duties in maintaining and developing the mechanism up to the end of the true-up period of the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol.

ISSUES RELATING TO JOINT IMPLEMENTATION

(JI): This item (FCCC/KP/CMP/2014/4) was first considered on Wednesday, 3 December.

JI Supervisory Committee Chair Piotr Dombrowicki (Poland) reported that activities under JI have been in severe decline, noting that mechanisms like JI will be critical to achieving more ambitious mitigation. He urged parties to take decisions in Lima to safeguard JI. CMP 10 President Pulgar-Vidal proposed, and parties agreed to, a contact group co-chaired by Yaw Osafo (Ghana) and Dimitar Nikov (France).

On Monday, 8 December, the CMP contact group met in the afternoon. Co-Chair Nikov introduced draft decision text revised on the basis of parties' submissions and inputs, which parties considered paragraph by paragraph.

Discussions focused on, *inter alia*: the need to ensure continued success of the mechanism in order to assist parties in meeting their commitments under the Kyoto Protocol's second commitment period; whether to request the Secretariat to prepare a technical paper on possible synergies between JI and the CDM; and options for incorporating mitigation beyond offsetting and considering transparent criteria for the application and quantification of such mitigation.

On Wednesday, 10 December, in the morning contact group, parties considered draft decision text paragraph by paragraph and exchanged views on, *inter alia*: the synthesis of voluntary technical approaches that could inform discussions under the SBI on review of JI guidelines; evaluation of national regulatory projects and related financial implications for the JISC; and collaboration between the CDM EB and the JISC on joint accreditation. Parties agreed to forward the draft decision, as amended, to the CMP for adoption.

During the CMP closing plenary on Friday, 12 December, parties adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/KP/CMP/2014/L.2), on guidance to the implementation of Protocol Article 6, the CMP, *inter alia*:

- takes note of the achievements of JI in 2006-2014, the JISC annual report for 2013-2014, and the ongoing work of the SBI on the review of the JI guidelines;
- reiterates its concern regarding the market situation faced by JI participants and the need to ensure the continued success of the mechanism in order to assist parties with commitments under the Doha Amendment in meeting them;
- requests the Secretariat to prepare a technical paper, for consideration at SBI 42, on the opportunities for cost savings and efficiencies for JI, and learning from the experiences of the CDM;
- invites parties to submit to the Secretariat, by 16 March 2015, examples of voluntary technical approaches that could assist the host parties in achieving their commitments under the Kyoto Protocol, and requests the Secretariat to synthesize these into a report for consideration at SBI 42;
- requests the JISC to submit elaborated recommendations, for consideration at SBI 42, on the review of the JI guidelines; and
- requests the JISC to ensure sufficient infrastructure and capacity for the mechanism's use by parties until at least the end of the additional period for fulfilling commitments under the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol, and to keep the JI management plan under review.

REPORT OF THE COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE:

This item was first considered on Wednesday, 3 December. Compliance Committee Chair Rueanna Haynes (Trinidad and Tobago) provided an update on the intersessional activities of the Committee, and the CMP took note of the report (FCCC/KP/CMP/2014/2).

ADAPTATION FUND: Report of the AFB: This item (FCCC/KP/CMP/2014/6) was first considered on Wednesday, 3 December.

AFB Chair Mamadou Honadia (Burkina Faso) outlined the activities of the Adaptation Fund and requested parties to provide guidance on options for mobilizing adequate, sustainable and predictable finance for the Fund.

Zambia noted that many countries are in the process of accrediting national implementing entities and called for a review of the requirements to make them simpler, yet robust. Uruguay stressed this is the only effective fund for adaptation finance and should not be overshadowed by new mechanisms.

CMP 10 Chair Pulgar-Vidal proposed, and parties agreed to a contact group co-chaired by Suzanty Sitorus (Indonesia) and Ana Fornells de Frutos (Spain).

On Wednesday, 10 December, the contact group considered text consolidated by the Co-Chairs based on parties' proposals.

Discussions focused on, *inter alia*: urging developed countries that have not completed the process of responding to the initial fundraising target to do so at the earliest opportunity; encouraging Annex I parties to provide funding to reach the target of US\$80 million per year in 2014-2015, and scale up funding from resources additional to the share of proceeds from CDM project activities, first international transfers of assigned amount units (AAUs) and the issuance of emission reduction units (ERUs); the bidding process for the selection of a permanent trustee for the Adaptation Fund; and to whom to direct the request for further support for the readiness programme.

A draft decision was forwarded to the CMP, which adopted it on Friday, 12 December.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/KP/CMP/2014/L.5), the CMP welcomes the report of the AFB, noting with concern the level of market prices for CERs and their impact on funding from the Adaptation Fund. The CMP also, *inter alia*:

- adopts the amendment to the terms and conditions of services to be provided by the World Bank as a trustee for the Adaptation Fund;
- notes cumulative receipts of US\$407.9 million into the Adaptation Fund Trust Fund;
- notes that pledges have surpassed the initial AFB fundraising target of US\$100 million for 2012-2013, and urges those developed countries that responded to the initial AFB fundraising target but have not completed the process to do so;
- welcomes the AFB resource mobilization strategy target of US\$80 million per year in 2014 and 2015, and continues to encourage Annex I parties to provide funding to support this target, and to scale up funding from additional sources;
- invites further support for the AFB readiness programme for direct access to climate finance in accordance with the decision on the second review of the Adaptation Fund; and
- requests the AFB, in its future reports to the CMP, to provide further clarity on the effect of the fluctuation of CERs, including on the resources available to the Fund, and to continue its work on options for permanent institutional arrangements for the secretariat and trustee.

Second Review of the Adaptation Fund: Discussions on this item are summarized under the SBI agenda item on the Second Review of the Adaptation Fund (see page 15).

REPORT ON THE HIGH-LEVEL MINISTERIAL ROUND TABLE ON INCREASED AMBITION OF THE KYOTO PROTOCOL COMMITMENTS: This item (FCCC/KP/CMP/2014/3) was first considered on Wednesday, 3 December.

Bolivia, for the G-77/China, with China, Cuba, South Africa, Egypt, India, Iraq and Saudi Arabia, proposed that a contact group consider how to follow up on the high-level roundtable that took place at SB 40.

China recalled that no commitments to increase ambition were made at the roundtable, stressing that increased ambition is critical for building trust.

Australia, New Zealand and the EU said they are not ready to agree to a contact group at this time.

The EU said it will complete ratification of the Doha Amendment as early in 2015 as possible.

Climate Action Network (CAN), for ENGOs, emphasized the importance of the Kyoto Protocol as a rules-based instrument, stressing that there should be no backsliding on commitments. Climate Justice Now!, for ENGOs, lamented that the EU has yet to ratify the Doha Amendment.

CMP 10 President Pulgar-Vidal said he will consult informally on how to proceed. On Saturday, 6 December, he reported that no agreement had been reached during informal consultations on whether to form a contact group on this issue.

A contact group was supported by Bolivia, for the G-77/China, and opposed by Australia, Switzerland, the EU and Norway. Informal consultations continued.

During the CMP closing plenary on Friday, 12 December, CMP 10 Vice-President Voto Bernales reported no agreement had been reached and that this item would be included in the provisional agenda of CMP 11.

REPORTING FROM AND REVIEW OF PARTIES INCLUDED IN ANNEX I: National Communications: These discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda items on Annex I National Communications and GHG Inventory Data (see page 12).

Date of the Completion of the Expert Review Process under Article 8 of the Kyoto Protocol for the First Commitment Period: The CMP considered the draft decision on this item recommended by SBI 40 (FCCC/SBI/2014/8/Add.1). During the CMP closing plenary on Friday, 12 December, the CMP adopted the decision.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/SBI/2014/8/Add.1), the CMP, *inter alia*:

- decides that the expert review process under Protocol Article 8 for the last year of the first commitment period shall be completed by 10 August 2015 and decides that, if the expert review process is not completed by this date, it shall continue, and the date of completion shall be the date of publication of the last inventory review report for the last year of the first commitment period;
- urges the Secretariat to expedite the review process to satisfy this deadline;
- decides that the report upon expiration of the additional period for fulfilling commitments for the first commitment period, covering the information required in Decision 13/CMP.1, annex, paragraph 49, using the standard electronic format tables as agreed in Decision 14/CMP.1, shall be submitted

as soon as practicable but not later than 45 days after the expiration of the additional period for fulfilling commitments for the first commitment period (hereinafter referred to as the true-up period);

- also decides that the Secretariat shall produce, in electronic format, on 30 September 2015 and every four weeks thereafter, until the month of the completion of the true-up period, the following information for each party with a commitment in Annex B for the first commitment period, indicating clearly the source of this information;
- further decides that this information should include the total quantity of aggregated holdings in the CDM registry; and
- decides that information on the review processes remaining to be completed should be provided by the Secretariat.

Annual Compilation and Accounting for Annex B Parties under the Kyoto Protocol: These discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item on the annual compilation and accounting for parties under the Kyoto Protocol (see page 12).

CLARIFICATION OF THE TEXT IN SECTION G (ARTICLE 3.7 TER) OF THE DOHA AMENDMENT TO THE KYOTO PROTOCOL, IN PARTICULAR THE INFORMATION TO BE USED TO DETERMINE THE “AVERAGE ANNUAL EMISSIONS FOR THE FIRST THREE YEARS OF THE PRECEDING COMMITMENT PERIOD”: These discussions are summarized under the SBSTA agenda item on clarification of the text in Section G (Article 3.7ter) of the Doha Amendment to the Kyoto Protocol (see page 24).

CAPACITY BUILDING UNDER THE KYOTO PROTOCOL: These discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item on capacity building under the Kyoto Protocol (see page 17).

MATTERS RELATING TO ARTICLE 2.3 AND ARTICLE 3.14 OF THE KYOTO PROTOCOL: These discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item on Article 3.14 (see page 17).

OTHER MATTERS REFERRED TO THE CMP BY THE SUBSIDIARY BODIES: Synergy Relating to Accreditation under the Mechanisms of the Kyoto Protocol: On Friday, 12 December, this draft decision (FCCC/SBI/2014/8/Add.1), forwarded to CMP 10 by SBI 40, was considered for adoption.

Highlighting “logical inconsistencies” between requesting the CDM EB and the JISC to “consider” the establishment of a joint accreditation mechanism and the mandate to “jointly develop and apply” the mechanism in the second paragraph, Brazil, initially opposed by the EU, asked the paragraph be deleted and brackets be removed from the first paragraph. The CMP adopted the draft decision as amended.

ADMINISTRATIVE, FINANCIAL AND INSTITUTIONAL MATTERS: Audited Financial Statements for the Biennium 2012-2013: These discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item on administrative, financial and institutional matters (see page 19).

Budget Performance for the Biennium 2014-2015: These discussions are summarized under the SBI agenda item on administrative, financial and institutional matters (see page 19).

COP 20 AND CMP 10 JOINT HIGH-LEVEL SEGMENT

On behalf of President of Peru Ollanta Humala, COP 20/CMP 10 President Manuel Pulgar-Vidal, Minister of Environment, Peru, opened the high-level segment on Tuesday, 9 December, noting the generation of a positive “Lima spirit” and stressing the need to “raise this spirit to achieve the outcome the world is expecting from us.”

UNFCCC Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres highlighted that “the Inca calendar says this is the season for planting and the science calendar warns us we are running out of time,” stressing “it is for us to plant here in Lima the seeds of a more secure, just and prosperous world for all.”

President of the 69th session of the UN General Assembly Sam Kutesa said “business as usual” is not an option and pointed to “a glimmer of hope” provided by the knowledge that taking action now and transforming to carbon-neutral, climate-resilient economies can reduce adaptation costs tomorrow.

Noting “this is not a time for tinkering – it is a time for transformation,” UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon stressed that in order to keep the global temperature rise under 2°C, “all parties must be part of the solution, and all societies must be engaged.” He called on parties to, *inter alia*: deliver a balanced and well-structured draft text as a solid foundation for negotiations in 2015; reach a common understanding on the scope of INDCs; and address climate finance.

The high-level segment then continued with statements from other heads and deputy heads of state and government, ministers, and other heads of delegations. A webcast of the statements is available at: <http://unfccc6.meta-fusion.com/cop20/events>

Ministerial Roundtable on Climate Finance: A ministerial roundtable on climate finance took place on Tuesday, 9 December. For a summary of statements made by ministers during the roundtable, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12616e.html>

Ministerial Dialogue on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action: A ministerial dialogue on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action took place on Wednesday, 10 December. For a summary of the statements made by ministers during the dialogue, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12617e.html>

SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR IMPLEMENTATION

On Monday, 1 December, SBI Chair Amena Yauvoli (Fiji) opened the session, urging parties to focus on finding consensus in an efficient manner. For a summary of the statements made during the opening plenary of the SBI, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12609e.html>

ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS: Parties adopted the agenda (FCCC/SBI/2014/9) with the item on information in non-Annex I national communications held in abeyance. The SBI also agreed to consider under “other matters” the item on non-Annex I parties’ CGE membership as referred to it by the COP.

Parties agreed to the organization of work as presented.

Election of Officers Other than the Chair: During the SBI opening plenary on Monday, 1 December, SBI Chair Yauvoli announced consultations would continue on this matter facilitated by Cheikh Ndiaye Sylla (Senegal). During the first part of the closing plenary on Friday, 5 December, SBI Chair Yauvoli informed that consultations on the SBI Vice Chair and

Rapporteur had not been completed. The SBI agreed to invite the COP to elect the Vice Chair and Rapporteur of the SBI. On Saturday, 13 December, officers other than the Chair were elected during the COP closing plenary.

MULTILATERAL ASSESSMENT WORKING GROUP SESSION UNDER THE INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT REPORT (IAR) PROCESS: This item was taken up during the SBI opening plenary on Monday, 1 December. SBI Chair Yauvoli explained that 17 developed countries' quantified economy-wide emission limitation and reduction targets, including progress toward their achievement, would be assessed during this SBI session, suggesting this would demonstrate that the SBI is at the heart of the implementation of the Convention.

The first round of the multilateral assessment working group session under the IAR was held in two parts, on Saturday, 6 December, and Monday, 8 December. The second and third rounds of the session, which will assess the remaining Annex I parties, will be held at SBI 42 and SBI 43, respectively.

Opening the multilateral assessment working group session, SBI Chair Yauvoli noted two new MRV processes established in Cancun—the IAR for developed countries, and international consultation and analysis (ICA) for developing countries. Parties delivered presentations on their progress towards the achievement of their quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets, followed by question and answers.

For a summary of the presentations and discussions held during the multilateral assessment working group session, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12614e.html> and <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12615e.html>

REPORTING FROM AND REVIEW OF ANNEX I PARTIES: This item (FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.19) was first considered on Monday, 1 December. SBI Chair Yauvoli proposed, and parties agreed, to informal consultations facilitated by Helen Plume (New Zealand) and Fatuma Mohamed Hussein (Kenya) on the three sub-items: compilation and synthesis of the sixth national communications and the first biennial reports from Annex I parties to the Convention; compilation and synthesis of supplementary information incorporated into the sixth national communications from Annex I parties that are also parties to the Kyoto Protocol; and revision of the guidelines for preparation of Annex I parties' national communications.

Compilation and Synthesis of 6th National Communications and 1st Biennial Reports from Annex I Parties to the Convention: This item (FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.20 and Add.1-2) was first considered on Monday, 1 December.

During the first part of the closing plenary on Friday, 5 December, SBI Chair Yauvoli reported that parties were unable to reach agreement on the issue and that the sub-item will be placed on the provisional agenda of SBI 42.

Compilation and Synthesis of Supplementary Information Incorporated in 6th National Communications from Annex I Parties that are also Parties to the Kyoto Protocol: This item (FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.21) was first considered on Monday, 1 December. During the first part of the SBI closing plenary on Friday, 5 December, the SBI adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.30), the SBI welcomes the compilation and synthesis, and took note thereof.

Revision of the 'Guidelines for the Preparation of National Communications by Annex I Parties, Part II: UNFCCC Reporting Guidelines on National Communications': This item (FCCC/TP/2014/5) was first considered on Monday, 1 December. During the SBI closing plenary on Friday, 5 December, SBI Chair Yauvoli reported that parties were unable to reach agreement and that the sub-item will be placed on the provisional agenda of SBI 42.

Report on National GHG Inventory Data from Annex I Parties for the Period 1990-2012: This item (FCCC/SBI/2014/20) was first considered on Monday, 1 December. The SBI took note of the report.

Annual Compilation and Accounting Report for Annex B Parties under the Kyoto Protocol: This item (FCCC/KP/CMP/2014/7 and Add.1) was first considered on Monday, 1 December. The SBI took note of the report.

REPORTING FROM NON-ANNEX I PARTIES: Information Contained in National Communications from Non-Annex I Parties: This item was held in abeyance.

Work of the CGE: This item (FCCC/SBI/2014/17-19 and INF.15-16) was first considered on Monday, 1 December. SBI Chair Yauvoli proposed, and parties agreed to, informal consultations facilitated by Helen Plume (New Zealand) and Lilian Portillo (Paraguay). Informal consultations took place on Tuesday and Wednesday, 2-3 December.

During the SBI closing plenary on Friday, 5 December, the SBI adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.26), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- welcomes the progress made by the CGE in implementing its activities, and the long-term strategy (2015-2018) of the CGE, which outlines strategies to enhance the provision of technical assistance to non-Annex I parties in a more effective, adequate and sustainable manner at regional, sub-regional and national levels;
- encourages parties to nominate, as early as possible, technical experts with relevant qualifications to the UNFCCC roster of experts, and the CGE to organize, as early as possible in 2015, training for them;
- urges developed country parties included in Annex II to the Convention and other developed country parties in a position to do so to provide financial resources to enable the CGE to implement the activities planned in its work programme; and
- invites multilateral programmes and organizations to collaborate with the CGE, as appropriate, in the provision of technical support to non-Annex I parties for preparing their national communications and biennial update reports (BURs).

Provision of Financial and Technical Support: This item (FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.12 and 22, and FCCC/CP/2014/2) was first considered on Monday, 1 December. SBI Chair Yauvoli proposed, and parties agreed to, informal consultations facilitated by Helen Plume and Lilian Portillo. Informal consultations took place three times during the week.

During the SBI closing plenary on Friday, 5 December, the SBI adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.29), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- invites the GEF to continue providing detailed, accurate, timely and complete information on its activities relating to

the preparation of national communications by non-Annex I parties, including information on the dates of approval of funding and disbursement of funds;

- invites the GEF to continue providing information on an approximate date of completion of the draft national communications and an approximate date of submission to the Secretariat of the national communications, for consideration by SBI 43.
- invites the GEF to continue providing detailed, accurate, timely and complete information on its activities relating to the preparation of BURs, including information on the dates of requests for funding, approval of funding and disbursement of funds, as well as an approximate date of submission to the Secretariat of the BURs, for consideration by SBI 42;
- notes the information provided by the GEF to the COP on the funding available to non-Annex I parties for the preparation of their national communications and BURs under its latest replenishment, and on the total amount of funding available in its climate change focal area;
- notes that, by 4 December 2014, one non-Annex I party had submitted its first BUR and that a further seven non-Annex I parties are expected to submit them by 31 December 2014;
- notes that, as of 1 December 2014, the GEF Secretariat had received 48 requests from non-Annex I parties for funds for the preparation of their BURs, and, that the GEF Council approved, in October 2014, a project for 35 SIDS and LDCs to complete their BURs;
- reiterates its urging of the non-Annex I parties that have yet to submit, as applicable, their requests to the GEF for support for the preparation of their first BURs to do so in a timely manner;
- encourages GEF agencies to continue to facilitate the preparation and submission of project proposals by non-Annex I parties for the preparation of their BURs;
- invites the GEF to provide, in its report to COP 21, information on the procedures available to facilitate access by non-Annex I parties to funding for the preparation of their national communications and multiple BURs with one application;
- notes the progress made by the GEF in the operationalization of its Global Support Programme (GSP), and encourages non-Annex I parties to take advantage of the opportunities for technical assistance and support available under the GSP; and
- notes with appreciation that, as of 4 December 2014, 147 initial, 105 second, nine third, one fourth and one fifth national communications from non-Annex I parties had been submitted. It also notes that, by the end of 2014, 20 second and 11 third national communications from non-Annex I parties are expected to have been submitted.

WORK PROGRAMME TO FURTHER

UNDERSTANDING OF THE DIVERSITY OF NATIONALLY APPROPRIATE MITIGATION ACTIONS (NAMAS):

This item (FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.11 and 24) was first considered on Monday, 1 December. SBI Chair Yauvoli proposed, and parties agreed to, informal consultations facilitated by Ann Gann (Singapore) and Dimitar Nikov (France). During the first part of the SBI closing plenary on Friday, 5 December, the SBI adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.36), the SBI notes it concluded the work programme to further the understanding of the diversity of NAMAs. The SBI also, *inter alia*:

- notes the activities implemented during the work programme;
- acknowledges that information and experiences shared under the work programme furthered the understanding of the diversity of NAMAs;
- recognizes the existence of needs for means of implementation support for the preparation and implementation of specific measurable, reportable and verifiable NAMAs, as well as of support available and provided;
- acknowledges that the matching of mitigation actions with MOI support in the NAMA registry has started to occur; and
- requests the Secretariat to ensure the sound operation of the NAMA registry.

MATTERS RELATING TO THE MECHANISMS

UNDER THE KYOTO PROTOCOL: Review of the Modalities and Procedures for the CDM: This item was first considered on Monday, 1 December. SBI Chair Yauvoli proposed, and parties agreed to, informal consultations facilitated by Jeffery Spooner (Jamaica).

During the SBI closing plenary on Friday, 5 December, the SBI adopted conclusions. Expressing disappointment with lack of progress made in SBI 41, Nauru, for the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS), said Lima should have identified how net mitigation can be built into the CDM, including through conservative baselines, shortened crediting periods and cancellations, and looked forward to continuing work on net mitigation in SBI 42.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.35), the SBI agrees to continue consideration of this matter at SBI 42.

Review of the JI Guidelines: This item was first considered on Monday, 1 December. SBI Chair Yauvoli proposed, and parties agreed to, informal consultations facilitated by Yaw Osafo (Ghana) and Dimitar Nikov (France).

During the SBI closing plenary on Friday, 5 December, the SBI adopted conclusions. Nauru, for AOSIS, said there is room for improving the environmental integrity of JI and looked forward to discussing, at SBI 42, how to ensure that JI delivers a net atmospheric benefit.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.34), the SBI agrees to continue consideration of this issue at SBI 42, on the basis of the draft decision text with a view to proposing a draft decision for consideration by CMP 11.

Modalities for Expediting the Continued Issuance, Transfer and Acquisition of JI ERUs: This item (FCCC/TP/2014/4) was first considered on Monday, 1 December. SBI Chair Yauvoli proposed, and parties agreed to, informal consultations facilitated by Yaw Osafo (Ghana) and Dimitar Nikov (France). During the SBI closing plenary on Friday, 5 December, the SBI adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.33), the SBI agrees to continue consideration of this issue at SBI 42.

Procedures, Mechanisms and Institutional Arrangements for Appeals against Decisions of the CDM EB: This item was first considered on Monday, 1 December. SBI Chair Yauvoli proposed, and parties agreed to, informal consultations facilitated by Yaw Osafo (Ghana) and Kunihiko Shimada (Japan). During

the SBI closing plenary on Friday, 5 December, the SBI adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.31), the SBI agrees to continue its consideration on the basis of the co-facilitators' draft text (FCCC/SBI/2012/33/Add.1) at SBI 42.

Report of the administrator of the international transaction log under the Kyoto Protocol: During the SBI opening plenary on Monday, 1 December, the SBI took note of the report (FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.18).

MATTERS RELATING TO THE LDCA: This item (FCCC/SBI/2014/13) was first considered on Monday, 1 December. SBI Chair Yauvoli proposed, and parties agreed to, informal consultations facilitated by Collin Beck (Solomon Islands). During the SBI closing plenary on Friday, 5 December, the SBI adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.24), the SBI:

- welcomes the report of the 26th meeting of the Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG) and the outcome of the National Adaptation Plan (NAP) Expo;
- acknowledges progress made by the LEG under its work programme for 2014-2015 and welcomes the launch of the regional training workshops on NAPs for LDCs for 2014-2015;
- expresses appreciation to Belgium, Canada, Finland, Ireland and Norway for providing financial support to the LEG;
- notes contributions made by parties to the LDCF and encourages other parties also to contribute;
- welcomes the submission of proposals to the LDCF for the funding of the implementation of National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPA) projects;
- invites the GEF to continue to explore ways of simplifying access to the LDCF;
- requests the LEG to keep it informed of the LEG's efforts in implementing its work programme for 2014-2015; and
- invites parties in a position to do so to continue providing support for the implementation of the LEG work programme.

REPORT OF THE ADAPTATION COMMITTEE: This item (FCCC/SB/2014/2) was first considered on Monday, 1 December. SBI Chair Yauvoli proposed, and parties agreed to, joint SBI/SBSTA informal consultations facilitated by Jimena Nieto Carrasco (Colombia) and Makoto Kato (Japan). During the SBI closing plenary on Friday, 5 December, the SBI adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SB/2014/L.7), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- welcomes the report of and progress made by the Adaptation Committee in the implementation of its three-year work plan;
- notes with appreciation the continued work of the Adaptation Committee on providing technical support and guidance to the parties on adaptation action, including through the work carried out by the Committee's task force on NAPs;
- requests parties, operating entities of the financial mechanism and other relevant entities working on adaptation to consider the recommendations contained in Chapter V of the report of the Adaptation Committee;
- reiterates its encouragement for parties to nominate experts to the Adaptation Committee with a diversity of experience and knowledge relevant to adaptation to climate change, while

also taking into account the need to achieve gender balance; and

- welcomes the initiation of consideration by the Adaptation Committee of its next work plan, starting in 2016.

NATIONAL ADAPTATION PLANS: This item (FCCC/SBI/2014/13, INF.14 and 15, FCCC/SB/2014/2 and FCCC/CP/2014/2) was first considered on Monday, 1 December. SBI Chair Yauvoli proposed, and parties agreed to, informal consultations facilitated by Collin Beck (Solomon Islands) and Tomasz Chruszczow (Poland).

During the SBI closing plenary on Friday, 5 December, the SBI adopted conclusions and forwarded a draft decision for consideration and adoption by COP 20.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.42), the SBI welcomes information submitted by parties, *inter alia*, on their experiences with the application of the initial guidelines for the formulation of NAPs and recommends a draft decision on NAPs.

In its decision (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.42/Add.1), the COP, *inter alia*:

- decides that a revision of the guidelines for the formulation of NAPs is not necessary at this time;
- recognizes that the process to formulate and implement NAPs is fundamental for building adaptive capacity and reducing vulnerability to the impacts of climate change;
- reiterates that the NAP process is, *inter alia*, a country-driven, gender-sensitive, participatory and fully transparent approach;
- recognizes the continuous, iterative and long-term nature of the NAP process;
- acknowledges the importance of communicating what the process to formulate and implement NAPs involves, as well as the outputs and outcomes of that process;
- decides there is a need to enhance the reporting on the process to formulate and implement NAPs;
- invites LDC parties and others, to forward outputs, including NAP documents, and outcomes related to the process to formulate and implement NAPs, to the NAP Central (an online tool, still under development, with interactive guidelines, case studies and related information to support the NAP process);
- decides to further consider how to enhance reporting related to the process to formulate and implement NAPs at SBI 42; and
- requests the Adaptation Committee and the LEG, in collaboration with the GCF, as an operating entity of the financial mechanism, to consider how to best support developing country parties in accessing funding from the GCF for the process to formulate and implement NAPs, and report thereon to SBI 42.

WARSAW INTERNATIONAL MECHANISM FOR LOSS AND DAMAGE ASSOCIATED WITH CLIMATE CHANGE

IMPACTS: This item (FCCC/SB/2014/4) was first considered on Monday, 1 December. SBI Chair Yauvoli proposed, and parties agreed to, joint SBI/SBSTA informal consultations facilitated by Beth Lavender (Canada) and Alf Wills (South Africa).

During the SBI closing plenary on Friday, 5 December, SBI Chair Yauvoli reported that parties were unable to reach agreement and that the sub-item will be placed on the provisional agenda of SBI 42.

However, on Saturday, 6 December, the SBSTA was able to adopt joint conclusions (FCCC/SB/2014/L.8), pending continued informal consultations co-facilitated by SBI Chair Yauvoli and SBSTA Chair Emmanuel Dumisani Dlamini (Swaziland), under the authority of the COP/CMP President Pulgar-Vidal on the composition of the Executive Committee of the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage.

On Saturday, 13 December, COP 20/CMP 10 Vice President Jorge Voto-Bernales reported that the informal consultations resulted in a draft decision (FCCC/CP/2014/L.2), but further consultations were required on the composition of the two non-Annex I Executive Committee members not affiliated with any specific regional group. He invited parties to continue intersessional consultations on the issue and once an agreement has been reached, for the Secretariat to request non-Annex I parties to submit their nominations. Executive Committee members will be deemed elected at COP 20 in accordance with established procedures. Parties agreed to this procedural decision to be reflected in the report of the session and adopted the substantive decision.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/CP/2014/L.2), the COP, *inter alia*:

- approves the initial two-year workplan of the Executive Committee of the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage;
- notes the useful inputs provided by parties, observers and other organizations as part of the transparent, inclusive and participatory process of developing the initial two-year workplan of the Executive Committee;
- reaffirms the establishment of the Executive Committee of the Warsaw International Mechanism, under the guidance of, and accountable to, the COP, to guide the implementation of the functions of the Warsaw International Mechanism;
- also reaffirms the request to the Executive Committee to report annually to the COP through the SBSTA and SBI and make recommendations, as appropriate;
- decides that the Executive Committee shall be composed of the following, taking into account the goal of gender balance, 10 members from Annex I parties and 10 members from non-Annex I parties, comprising two members each from the African, Asia-Pacific, and the Latin American and Caribbean States, one member from SIDS, one member from LDCs, and two additional non-Annex I members;
- encourages parties to nominate to the Executive Committee experts with a diversity of experience and knowledge relevant to loss and damage associated with climate change impacts;
- decides that the members shall serve for a two-year term and shall be eligible to serve a maximum of two consecutive terms of office, and that half of the members shall be elected initially for a term of three years and half for two years, thereafter the COP shall elect members for a term of two years, and the members shall remain in office until their successors have been elected;
- also decides that the Executive Committee may establish expert groups, subcommittees, panels, thematic advisory groups or task-focused *ad hoc* working groups, to help execute the work of the Executive Committee in guiding the implementation of the Warsaw International Mechanism,

as appropriate, in an advisory role, and that report to the Executive Committee;

- further decides that decisions of the Executive Committee shall be taken by consensus;
- decides that the Executive Committee shall elect annually co-chairs from among its members to serve for a term of one year, with one being from an Annex I party and the other being from a non-Annex I party;
- further decides that the Executive Committee shall meet at least twice per year, while retaining its flexibility to adjust the number of meetings, as appropriate;
- decides the Executive Committee shall convene its first meeting as soon as practical following the election of its members by COP 20, but no later than March 2015, and at its first meeting shall adopt its rules of procedure and begin implementing its workplan;
- also decides that the meetings of the Executive Committee shall be open to attendance by admitted observer organizations, except where otherwise decided by the Executive Committee, with a view to encouraging a balanced regional representation of observers; and
- further decides that the decisions and outputs of the Executive Committee shall be made publicly available on the UNFCCC website unless decided otherwise by the Executive Committee, that English shall be the working language, and that the Secretariat shall support and facilitate the work of the Executive Committee, subject to the availability of resources.

MATTERS RELATED TO FINANCE: Second Review of the Adaptation Fund: This item (FCCC/TP/2014/7 and FCCC/SBI/2014/MISC.4) was first considered on Monday, 1 December. SBI Chair Yauvoli proposed, and parties agreed to, informal consultations facilitated by Suzanty Sitorus (Indonesia) and Ana Fornells de Frutos (Spain). During the SBI closing plenary on Friday, 5 December, the SBI adopted conclusions forwarding a draft decision to CMP 10 for consideration.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.39), the CMP, *inter alia*:

- takes note of the report of the Adaptation Fund Board (AFB) and the technical paper on the second review of the Adaptation Fund;
- underlines the need for urgent implementation of the resource mobilization strategy of the AFB;
- encourages the AFB to consider the scale of resources, regular estimates of the resources needed and continuous review of the status of projects, for addressing the predictability of resources;
- requests the AFB to consider objects for addressing the diversification of revenue streams of the Adaptation Fund, in accordance with the mandate of the Fund;
- requests the AFB to consider, under its readiness programme, targeted institutional strengthening strategies to assist developing countries to accredit more national or regional implementing entities to the Adaptation Fund and ensuring the accredited national implementing entities have increased and facilitated access to the Adaptation Fund, in order to enhance the access modalities of the Adaptation Fund;
- requests the AFB to consider options for developing operational linkages between the Adaptation Fund and constituted bodies under the Convention;

- decides to extend to June 2017 the interim arrangements with the AFB Secretariat and the trustee of the Adaptation Fund;
- requests SBI 42 to initiate the third review of the Adaptation Fund and report back to CMP 12, with a view to the review design undertaken by CMP 13; and
- requests the AFB to include in its report to CMP 11 information on progress made in relation to the matters referred to above.

Further Guidance to the Least Developed Countries

Fund: This item (FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.17, MISC.3, and FCCC/CP/2014/2) was first considered on Monday, 1 December. SBI Chair Yauvoli proposed, and parties agreed to, informal consultations facilitated by Kamel Djemouai (Algeria) and Herman Sips (Netherlands). During the SBI closing plenary on Friday, 5 December, the SBI adopted conclusions and forwarded a draft decision for consideration by COP 20.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.38), the COP, *inter alia*:

- welcomes increased allocation and disbursement of funds to LDC parties under the LDCF;
- notes with appreciation additional contributions by parties to the LDCF;
- encourages developed country parties and other parties in a position to do so to continue contributing on a voluntary basis to the LDCF in order to support the implementation of the LDC work programme;
- invites the GEF to continue to support the remaining activities contained in the LDC work programme;
- requests the GEF to share, in its next report, lessons learned and progress made in its pilot accreditation of the GEF national project agencies;
- invites the GEF to include in its annual report to the COP, information on specific actions that it has undertaken to implement the remaining elements of the LDC work programme, including updating and implementation of National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPAs), with a view to COP 21 determining appropriate further guidance to be provided to the GEF; and
- requests the GEF to enhance communication with its implementing agencies and to encourage its implementing agencies to enhance their communication with countries to facilitate a timely implementation of other elements of the LDC work programme including NAPAs.

DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFER OF

TECHNOLOGIES AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE

TM: Joint Annual Report of the TEC and CTCN: This item (FCCC/SB/2014/3) was first considered on Monday, 1 December. SBI Chair Yauvoli proposed, and parties agreed to, joint informal consultations with SBSTA, facilitated by Elfriede More (Austria) and Carlos Fuller (Belize).

During the SBI closing plenary on Friday, 5 December, the SBI adopted conclusions and forwarded a draft decision for consideration by COP 20.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/SB/2014/L.5), the COP notes that through the work of the Technology Executive Committee (TEC) and the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN) in 2014, the TEC is progressing in an effective manner towards fulfilling its mandate, and decides that the

TEC and CTCN shall continue to prepare a joint annual report to the COP, through the SBs, on their respective activities and performance of their respective functions.

On activities and performance of the TEC in 2014, the COP, *inter alia*:

- welcomes the rolling workplan of the TEC for 2014-2015 and the progress made in advancing its implementation;
- recognizes the key messages on climate technology financing, technologies for adaptation and technology needs assessments, as contained in the TEC report;
- welcomes the work on technologies for adaptation and looks forward to the Committee's work on technologies for mitigation;
- requests the TEC to continue its work on enabling environments and barriers;
- encourages the TEC to continue to strengthen the linkages with organizations under and outside of the Convention in the implementation of its rolling workplan for 2014-2015; and
- requests the TEC to provide guidance on how the results of the technology needs assessments, in particular the technology action plans, can be developed into projects that can be ultimately implemented, and to provide an interim report on its preliminary findings to the subsidiary bodies at their forty-third sessions.

On activities and performance of the CTCN in 2014, the COP, *inter alia*:

- welcomes with appreciation the progress made by the CTCN in implementing its programme of work, including by: responding to requests from developing countries; fostering collaboration and access to information; and strengthening networks, partnerships and capacity building;
- welcomes the elaboration and approval by the CTCN's Advisory Board of the CTCN criteria and the CTCN prioritization criteria for national designated entity requests;
- encourages the CTCN to further elaborate its procedures for handling requests, and to inform parties and stakeholders of these activities in the joint annual report of the TEC and the CTCN; and
- notes the ongoing consultations between the GEF and the CTCN, and requests the CTCN to report on those consultations in future joint TEC/CTCN annual reports.

Poznan Strategic Programme on Technology Transfer:

This item (FCCC/CP/2014/2 and Add.1, and FCCC/SB/2014/3) was first considered on Monday, 1 December. SBI Chair Yauvoli proposed, and parties agreed to, informal consultations facilitated by Elfriede More and Carlos Fuller.

During the SBI closing plenary on Friday, 5 December, the SBI adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.32), the SBI:

- welcomes the GEF report on the progress made in carrying out the Poznan strategic programme on technology transfer;
- notes the consultations between the GEF and the Advisory Board of the CTCN and the progress made on aligning the implementation of the element of the Poznan strategic programme related to support for climate technology centres and a climate technology network with the operationalization and activities of the CTCN, which were carried out;

- notes the areas of collaboration between the regional technology transfer and finance centres supported by the GEF under the Poznan strategic programme and the CTCN, and invites the GEF to report on this collaboration as part of its future progress reports;
- notes that the TEC initiated its deliberations on evaluating the Poznan strategic programme in August 2014;
- notes that the TEC will undertake the evaluation of the Poznan strategic programme in 2015, guided by the terms of reference to be developed by its task force on this matter; and
- invites the TEC to provide an interim report on its preliminary findings to SBI 42 and a final report to the COP through SBI 43.

CAPACITY BUILDING: Capacity Building Under

the Convention: This item (FCCC/SBI/2014/14) was first considered on Monday, 1 December. SBI Chair Yauvoli proposed, and parties agreed to, informal back-to-back consultations with capacity building under the Kyoto Protocol facilitated by Ulrika Raab (Sweden) and Bubu Jallow (the Gambia). The group met four times but was unable to agree on a decision text to be forwarded to COP 20.

During the SBI closing plenary on Friday, 5 December, the SBI adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.40), the SBI:

- welcomes the summary report on the third meeting of the Durban Forum on capacity-building held at SBI 40;
- invites parties to submit, by 18 February 2015, their views on the organization of, and specific thematic issues relating to capacity building under the Convention to be considered at the fourth meeting of the Durban Forum to be held at SBI 42; and
- invites parties to submit, by 18 February 2015, their views on the terms of reference for the third comprehensive review of the implementation of the framework for capacity building in developing countries, to be initiated at SBI 42.

The conclusions note that the SBI agrees to continue consideration of the item at SBI 42, with a view to recommending a draft decision for consideration by COP 21.

Capacity Building under the Kyoto Protocol: This item (FCCC/SBI/2014/14) was first considered on Monday, 1 December. SBI Chair Yauvoli proposed, and parties agreed to, informal back-to-back consultations with capacity building under the Convention facilitated by Ulrika Raab and Bubu Jallow.

During the SBI closing plenary on Friday, 5 December, the SBI adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.41), the SBI: welcomes the summary report on the third meeting of the Durban Forum; invites parties to submit their views on the organization of, and specific thematic issues relating to capacity building under the Kyoto Protocol to be considered at the fourth meeting of the Durban Forum; and also invites parties to submit their views on the terms of reference for the third comprehensive review of the implementation of the framework for capacity building in developing countries. The conclusions note that the SBI agrees to continue its consideration of the item at SBI 42, with a view to recommending a draft decision for consideration of CMP 11.

IMPACT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF RESPONSE MEASURES: Forum and Work Programme: This item (FCCC/SB/2014/INF.4 and FCCC/TP/2014/12) was first considered during SBSTA and SBI opening plenaries on Monday, 1 December, where parties agreed to informal consultations co-facilitated by SBI Chair Yauvoli and SBSTA Chair Dlamini.

On Tuesday, 2 December, a joint contact group co-chaired by the SBSTA and SBI Chairs considered text forwarded by SBI and SBSTA 40 (FCCC/SB/2014/L.2) and the technical paper (FCCC/TP/2014/12). Discussions centered on, *inter alia*: continuation of the Forum on response measures and the G-77/China's call for the creation of a mechanism on response measures.

The issue was subsequently addressed during informal consultations on Wednesday, 3 December, and draft conclusions and a draft decision was considered in a joint contact group on Thursday, 4 December, both facilitated by Eduardo Calvo Buendía (Ecuador) and Delano Ruben Verwey (Netherlands). The African Group, the G-77/China, the Arab Group and the Like Minded Developing Countries (LMDCs) supported starting work on the draft decision. The US suggested considering the technical paper first. Australia said moving to textual discussions was preemptive. The EU expressed concern that the Co-Chairs' text contained no alternatives.

During a joint contact group on Friday, 5 December, SBSTA Chair Dlamini and SBI Chair Yauvoli said that, given the lack of consensus, they will consult on how to move forward.

During the SBI closing plenary on Friday, 5 December, SBI Chair Yauvoli reported that parties were unable to reach agreement.

This issue was further considered in consultations under the aegis of COP 20/CMP 10 President Pulgar-Vidal, by SBSTA Chair Dlamini on Monday, 8 December, and consultations by both SB Chairs throughout the second week of COP 20/CMP 10. No agreement on substantive issues could be reached, with institutional mechanisms proving to be the most challenging.

Final Outcome: During the COP and CMP closing plenaries on Friday, 12 December, parties adopted the decision (FCCC/CP/2014/L.5), which forwards the text of a draft decision contained in the annex for consideration by SB 42.

Matters Relating to Article 3.14 (implementation of response measures) of the Kyoto Protocol: During the SBI closing plenary on Friday, 5 December, SBI Chair Yauvoli informed parties that agreement could not be reached on this issue and that the sub-item will be placed on the provisional agenda of SBI 42.

Progress on the Implementation of Decision 1/CP.10: During the SBI closing plenary on Friday, 5 December, SBI Chair Yauvoli reported that parties were unable to reach agreement and that the sub-item will be placed on the provisional agenda of SBI 42.

2013-2015 REVIEW: This item (FCCC/SB/2014/1 and INF.3) was first considered on Monday, 1 December. SBI Chair Yauvoli proposed, and parties agreed to, a contact group co-chaired by Gertraud Wollansky (Austria) and Leon Charles (Grenada).

On Tuesday, 2 December, in the morning, the joint contact group discussed: additional inputs to the structured expert dialogue (SED), including the need for balanced consideration

of IPCC and non-IPCC information; how to conclude the SED, including when to close it, the format and content of its outcome, and who will synthesize it; conclusion of the 2013-2015 Review, and how to integrate the SED and Review outcomes into the ADP outcomes; and final reporting of the SBSTA and SBI to COP 21. The Co-Chairs then produced draft conclusions.

On Wednesday, 3 December, following the contact group, the Co-Chairs circulated a non-paper, including a new iteration of the draft conclusions taking on views from parties, which was considered in informal consultations.

On Friday, 5 December, parties continued consideration of the non-paper. Parties agreed to forward the joint SBI/SBSTA draft conclusions for adoption.

During the SBI closing plenary on Friday, 5 December, the SBI adopted the conclusions.

Final Outcome: In their joint conclusions (FCCC/SB/2014/L.9), the SBI/SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- welcomes the AR5 Synthesis Report of the IPCC and recognizes its usefulness for the 2013-2015 Review of the contributions of all IPCC working groups to the AR5;
- welcomes the first meeting of SED-4, held on 2-3 December 2014 in Lima, Peru, and looks forward to the resumed SED-4 session on 8-9 February 2015 in Geneva, Switzerland;
- takes note of the document on national information available for consideration by the SED;
- looks forward to the summary report on SED-4, to be made available no later than 20 March 2015;
- requests the SED co-facilitators to prepare, with the assistance of the Secretariat, a final factual report that includes a compilation and a technical summary of the summary reports on the SED meetings and to make it available no later than 3 April 2015; and
- invites parties to submit to the Secretariat, by 1 May 2015, any other information or gaps in information relevant to the 2013-2015 Review, and their views on the adequacy of the long-term global goal in the light of the ultimate objective of the Convention and the overall progress made towards achieving the long-term global goal, including consideration of implementation of the commitments under the Convention.

4th Meeting of the SED: The first meeting of SED-4 was held on Tuesday afternoon, 2 December. In his opening remarks, COP 20/CMP 10 President Pulgar-Vidal highlighted the SED as a very important component of COP 20, and a forum where science and decision-making are reconciled, given that COP 21 will need to take appropriate action based on the outcome of the 2013-2015 Review. Co-facilitator Andreas Fischlin (Switzerland) indicated that the goal of SED-4 is to “finish complementing and start summarizing” information. IPCC Secretary Renate Christ provided an introductory presentation on the AR5 SYR on behalf of IPCC Chair Rajendra Pachauri.

Presentations were made by IPCC experts on the adequacy of the long-term global goal in terms of: preventing unacceptable consequences for the adaptation of ecosystems and food production, and for economic development in a sustainable manner; risk management within planetary boundaries and progress towards the long-term global goal; and ethical and financial aspects of adaptation and mitigation. The ensuing question and answer session focused on how the AR5 contributes to operationalizing Convention Article 2 (objectives).

Presentations by experts from the UN Environment Programme (UNEP), the World Bank, the International Energy Agency (IEA), World Health Organization (WHO) and Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) continued during the second session of the SED-4 on Wednesday, 3 December. Discussions focused on, *inter alia*: the risks to human health, food production and other ecosystem services at a 1.5° or 2°C level of global warming compared to pre-industrial levels; policy options identified for decarbonization of the energy system called for by pathways consistent with limiting warming below 1.5° or 2°C; and policies and measures identified as effective to bridge the emissions and adaptation gap, and ways to emulate them.

GENDER AND CLIMATE CHANGE: This item (FCCC/CP/2014/7) was first considered on Monday, 1 December. SBI Chair Yauvoli proposed, and parties agreed to, informal consultations facilitated by Lilian Portillo (Paraguay) and Kunihiko Shimada (Japan).

After informal consultations in the SBI closing plenary on Friday, 5 December, resulting in two amendments in the text, the SBI adopted conclusions and forwarded a draft decision to COP 20. Malawi, for the LDCs, supported by Jamaica, proposed referring to the decision as the “Lima Work Programme on Gender.” Jamaica stated that the proposed actions should be guided by gender equality, not merely gender balance. Welcoming the decision, Mexico noted it attaches utmost importance to the issue.

Final Outcome: In its decision (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.43/Rev.1), the COP decides, *inter alia*:

- to enhance the implementation of Decisions 36/CP.7, 1/CP.16 and 23/CP.18 by inviting parties to advance gender balance, promote gender sensitivity in developing and implementing climate policy and achieve gender-responsive climate policy in all relevant activities under the Convention;
- that additional efforts need to be made by parties to improve participation of women in their delegations and in all of the bodies established under the Convention;
- to establish a two-year work programme (Lima Work Programme on Gender) for promoting gender balance and achieving gender-responsive climate policy, developed for the purpose of guiding the effective participation of women in the bodies established under the Convention;
- to strengthen the existing work on gender balance in thematic priority areas; and
- to clarify the meaning of the term “gender-responsive climate policy” from an implementation perspective and improve the development and effective implementation of gender-responsive climate policy.

The COP also requests the Secretariat: to include information regarding the implementation by the Secretariat of those decisions that include a gender approach in its next annual report; to organize in-session workshops on gender responsive climate policy with a focus on mitigation action and technology development and transfer, and a focus on adaptation and capacity building; and to prepare a technical paper on guidelines or other tools on integrating gender considerations into climate-change-related activities under the Convention for consideration at SBI 44.

ARRANGEMENTS FOR INTERGOVERNMENTAL MEETINGS: This item (FCCC/SBI/2014/11 and 12) was first considered on Monday, 1 December. SBI Chair Yauvoli proposed to facilitate informal consultations.

On Tuesday, 2 December, an afternoon contact group, chaired by SBI Chair Yauvoli, considered documents prepared by the Secretariat on the frequency and organization of future sessions of the COP and CMP, and their subsidiary bodies and high-level segments (FCCC/SBI/2014/11), including implications of biennial sessions, or annual sessions at venues alternating between a host country and the seat of the Secretariat, and on adjusting the timing of the election of the COP and CMP President (FCCC/SBI/2014/12).

During the SBI closing plenary on Friday, 5 December, the SBI adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.37), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- requests that the Secretariat provide further information and analysis on the options for the frequency and organization of sessions and recommended consideration of this information at SBI 42;
- recognizes the need to take into account the important role of implementation in work after 2015, and take into consideration the implications of hosting the COP and CMP sessions, noting that it is a major undertaking and also noting views that sessions held at the seat of the Secretariat could increase the opportunity for all parties to serve as COP/CMP President;
- proposes further consideration be given to the organization of high-level segments at future COP and CMP sessions and to alternative modes of ministerial engagement during the high-level segment;
- requests the Secretariat to provide further information on scenarios, including clarification on the budgetary implications of biennial sessions of the COP and the CMP, as well as meetings of their SBs and sessions alternating between a host country and the seat of the Secretariat, and the implications for the Headquarters Agreement of the Secretariat; and
- requests further information on and analysis of options for adjusting the timing of the election of the President, including on the rotation of the Presidencies when sessions alternate between a host country and the seat of the Secretariat and agreed to consider this information at SBI 42.

ADMINISTRATIVE, FINANCIAL AND

INSTITUTIONAL MATTERS: This item (FCCC/SBI/2014/10, 16 and Add. 1-2, and INF.23) was first considered on Monday, 1 December. SBI Chair Yauvoli proposed, and parties agreed, that SBI Chair Yauvoli would draft COP and CMP decisions in consultation with interested parties on both sub-items, the audited financial statements and budget performance. During the SBI closing plenary on Friday, 5 December, the SBI adopted two sets of conclusions addressing both sub-items that forwarded draft decisions to COP 20 and CMP 10, respectively, for consideration.

Final Outcome: In its decisions (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.27 and L.28), the COP and the CMP, on audited financial statements for the biennium 2012-2013, take note of the statements and urged

the Executive Secretary to implement the recommendations of the auditors. On the budget performance report for the biennium 2013-2015, the COP and the CMP, *inter alia*:

- express appreciation to parties that contributed to the core budget in a timely manner and call upon parties that have not yet made contributions to do so without delay, with the CMP additionally expressing appreciation for contributions to the international transaction log (ITL) and calling on parties that have not yet made contributions to the ITL to do so without delay;
- express appreciation for contributions received from parties to the Trust Fund for Participation in the UNFCCC Process and to the Trust Fund for Supplementary Activities, and urge parties to further contribute to the Trust Fund for Participation; and
- reiterate their appreciation to Germany for its annual voluntary contribution to the core budget and its special contribution as Host Government of the Secretariat.

On the programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017, the COP and CMP, *inter alia*:

- request the Executive Secretary to submit, for consideration by SB 42, a proposed programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017, including a contingency for funding conference services should this prove necessary in light of decisions taken by the 70th session of the UN General Assembly;
- request that SBI 42 recommend a programme budget for adoption by COP 21 and CMP 11; and
- authorize the Executive Secretary to notify parties of their indicative contributions for 2016 on the basis of the recommended budget.

REPORTS ON OTHER ACTIVITIES: On Monday, 1 December, the SBI noted the report on the expert meeting on an information hub for information on the results of activities referred to in decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 70 and results-based payments (FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.13), and the summary report on the 2nd dialogue on Article 6 of the Convention (FCCC/SBI/2014/15).

OTHER MATTERS: Membership of the CGE: This item was first considered on Monday, 1 December. SBI Chair Yauvoli proposed, and parties agreed that, he would consult bilaterally with interested parties.

During the SBI closing plenary on Friday, 5 December, SBI Chair Yauvoli reported that parties were unable to reach agreement and that the sub-item will be placed on the provisional agenda of SBI 42.

CLOSING PLENARY: During the first part of the SBI closing plenary on Friday, 5 December, UNFCCC Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres briefed the SBI on the administrative and financial implications of the decisions taken by SBI 41.

Noting the SBI had adopted all substantive conclusions and items, SBI Chair Yauvoli closed the first part of the SBI closing plenary at 10:26 pm.

On Monday, 8 December, SBI Chair Yauvoli opened the second part of the SBI closing plenary to take up closure and the report of the session. The SBI adopted the report of the session (FCCC/SBI/2014/L.25).

Bolivia, for the G-77/China, expressed concern over the lack of substantive conclusions adopted during the session and urged working towards the adoption of substantive conclusions at SBI 42. He called on developed countries to discuss the negative impacts of developed countries' mitigation measures on developing countries.

SBI Chair Yauvoli closed SBI 41 at 5:55 pm.

For a summary of the statements made during the closing plenary of the SBI, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12613e.html>

SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE

On Monday, 1 December, SBSTA Chair Emmanuel Dumisani Dlamini (Swaziland) opened the session. For a summary of the opening statements, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12609e.html>

ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS: Parties adopted the agenda and agreed to the organization of work of the session (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/3).

Election of Officers Other Than the Chair: On Monday, 1 December, SBSTA Chair Dlamini indicated that consultations on the nominations of the SBSTA Vice-Chair and Rapporteur would be conducted by the COP/CMP Presidency. During the SBSTA closing plenary on Saturday, 6 December, the SBSTA agreed to invite the COP to elect the Vice-Chair and Rapporteur of the SBSTA.

NAIROBI WORK PROGRAMME: This item (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/4, INF.15 and MISC.8) was first considered on Monday, 1 December. UNEP highlighted its Adaptation Knowledge Initiative, saying it: prioritizes and catalyzes responses to sub-regional and theme-specific adaptation knowledge needs; is consistent with the mandate of the Nairobi Work Programme (NWP); and builds on the infrastructure and resources of UNEP's Global Adaptation Network.

SBSTA Chair Dlamini proposed, and parties agreed to, informal consultations facilitated by Beth Lavender (Canada) and Juan Hoffmaister (Bolivia).

During the SBSTA closing plenary on Saturday, 6 December, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/L.23), the SBSTA recognizes the role of the NWP in addressing knowledge needs arising from the implementation of the Cancun Adaptation Framework, and welcomes the Adaptation Knowledge Initiative and its Andean subregional pilot, launched by UNEP. It further concludes that the Secretariat should, in response to the recommendations of the Adaptation Committee:

- support the expert meeting of the Adaptation Committee on promoting livelihoods and economic diversification to build resilience in the context of planning, prioritizing and implementing adaptation actions during the third quarter of 2015;
- disseminate existing and future relevant knowledge products produced by the Adaptation Committee in order to inform adaptation planning and actions at all levels;
- make publicly available a compilation of good practices and tools, and available data collection initiatives, for the use of local, indigenous and traditional knowledge and practices for adaptation, for consideration at SBSTA 44, building on existing knowledge-sharing platforms;

- engage relevant NWP partner organizations, including regional centres and networks, in strengthening communities of practice and networks at different levels, as well as in sharing good practices and tools at key meetings and events; and
- consider, in relevant knowledge products under the NWP, the importance of integrating gender-sensitive approaches and tools, and local, indigenous and traditional knowledge and practices into NAPs.

The SBSTA also decides to consider and elaborate, at SBSTA 44, relevant activities under the NWP that support the process to formulate and implement NAPs.

REPORT OF THE ADAPTATION COMMITTEE: This item (FCCC/SB/2014/2) was first considered on Monday, 1 December. SBSTA Chair Dlamini proposed, and parties agreed to, joint SBI/SBSTA informal consultations, facilitated by Makoto Kato (Japan) and Jimena Nieto Carrasco (Colombia).

During the SBSTA closing plenary on Saturday, 6 December, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: The SBI/SBSTA discussions and conclusions (FCCC/SB/2014/L.7) are summarized under the SBI agenda item on the report of the Adaptation Committee (see page 14).

DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGIES AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE

TM: Joint Annual Report of the TEC and CTCN: This item (FCCC/SB/2014/3) was first considered on Monday, 1 December. SBSTA Chair Dlamini proposed, and parties agreed to, joint SBI/SBSTA informal consultations facilitated by Carlos Fuller (Belize) and Elfriede More (Austria).

During the SBSTA closing plenary on Saturday, 6 December, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: The joint SBI/SBSTA conclusions (FCCC/SB/2014/L.5) are summarized under the SBI item on the Joint Annual Report of the TEC and CTCN (see page 16).

METHODOLOGICAL GUIDANCE FOR REDD+: This item (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/INF.13 and MISC.6 and 7) was first considered on Monday, 1 December. SBSTA Chair Dlamini proposed, and parties agreed to, a contact group co-chaired by Stephen Cornelius (UK) and Robert Bamfo (Ghana).

On Tuesday, 2 December, the contact group considered the need for further guidance on safeguards. Many, including the African Group, Guyana, the Coalition for Rainforest Nations (CfRN), India, Fiji, Indonesia, Brazil and China, stressed that additional guidance on safeguards is premature. The EU, with the US and Norway, proposed that the Co-Chairs work on specific decision language for consideration by the group.

On methodological guidance for non-market-based approaches, Bolivia presented a revised proposal on a joint mitigation and adaptation approach for sustainable management of forests (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/CRP.1).

During the SBSTA closing plenary on Saturday, 6 December, SBSTA Chair Dlamini reported that no agreement on this issue could be reached and that the item would be placed on the provisional agenda of SBSTA 42.

WARSAW INTERNATIONAL MECHANISM FOR LOSS AND DAMAGE ASSOCIATED WITH CLIMATE CHANGE

IMPACTS: This item (FCCC/SB/2014/4) was first considered on Monday, 1 December. SBSTA Chair Dlamini proposed,

and parties agreed to, joint SBI/SBSTA informal consultations facilitated by Beth Lavender (Canada) and Alf Wills (South Africa).

During the SBSTA closing plenary on Saturday, 6 December, SBSTA adopted joint SBI/SBSTA conclusions (FCCC/SB/2014/L.8), pending continued informal consultations co-facilitated by SBI Chair Yauvoli and SBSTA Chair Dlamini, under the authority of the COP/CMP President Pulgar-Vidal on the composition of the Executive Committee of the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage.

The joint SBI/SBSTA discussions and outcome are summarized under the SBI item on the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage (see page 14).

MATTERS RELATING TO SCIENCE AND REVIEW:

AR5 of the IPCC: This item was first considered on Monday, 1 December. SBSTA Chair Dlamini proposed, and parties agreed, that SBSTA Chair Dlamini hold informal consultations on this issue. IPCC Secretary Renate Christ provided an update on AR5 and recalled some of its key outcomes.

During the SBSTA closing plenary on Saturday, 6 December, the SBSTA adopted conclusions and forwarded a draft decision for consideration by COP 20.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/L.27), the SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- recognizes that it is important that the AR5 continue to be considered in depth by parties to the Convention and its Kyoto Protocol, so that all relevant agenda items are informed by the findings of the AR5 and requests the Secretariat, under the guidance of the SBSTA Chair, be prepared to invite the IPCC, in response to any request made by parties, to inform its consideration of relevant agenda items;
- notes that the AR5 identified some information gaps, including in developing countries, especially in Africa, and on some emerging issues, such as the links between climate change and desertification; and
- invites the IPCC and relevant international and regional research organizations to inform parties about efforts to address the information gaps identified in the AR5, for example, at the research dialogue meeting at SBSTA 42. In its decision (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/L.27/Add.1), the COP,

inter alia:

- welcomes the IPCC's AR5;
- recognizes that the AR5 represents the most comprehensive and robust assessment of climate change to date, providing an integrated scientific, technical and socioeconomic perspective on relevant issues;
- acknowledges that the AR5 provides the scientific foundation for the ADP;
- urges parties to make use of the information in the AR5 in their discussions under all relevant agenda items;
- invites the IPCC to continue to provide relevant information to parties on the scientific, technical and socioeconomic aspects of climate change, taking into account the work of the UNFCCC in determining its future products and assessment cycles; and
- encourages parties to continue to support the work of the IPCC.

Research and Systematic Observation (RSO): This item was first considered on Monday, 1 December. The World Meteorological Organization (WMO) provided an overview of the outcomes of the second meeting of the Intergovernmental Board on Climate Services of the Global Framework for Climate Services (GFCS).

The Global Climate Observing System (GCOS) and the Committee on Earth Observation Satellites provided progress reports on their activities.

SBSTA Chair Dlamini proposed, and parties agreed to, informal consultations facilitated by Chris Moseki (South Africa) and Stefan Roesner (Germany).

During the SBSTA closing plenary on Saturday, 6 December, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/L.19) the SBSTA:

- welcomes the IPCC's AR5 Synthesis Report and notes the continued importance of RSO to the work of the IPCC and the report by the GCOS Secretariat, including on the outcomes and recommendations of the GCOS programme review by its sponsors;
- notes the progress made by GCOS towards the development of a status report to be presented at SBSTA 43, and on the new implementation plan that will be presented at SBSTA 45;
- encourages parties to actively engage in the review of the status report and to support the development of the new implementation plan, including on aspects related to ocean observation and acidification;
- welcomes the plans of the GCOS Secretariat to organize, in collaboration with the IPCC and the Secretariat, a workshop to identify ways to enhance systematic observation and related capacity, especially in developing countries, to support preparedness and adaptation in a changing climate, proposed to be held in February 2015 in Bonn, Germany;
- expresses its appreciation to the Committee on Earth Observation Satellites (CEOS) and the Coordination Group for Meteorological Satellites (CGMS) for their updated report on the progress made by space agencies providing global observations in their coordinated response to relevant needs of the Convention, and welcomes the efforts to develop an architecture for climate monitoring from space; and
- notes the information provided by WMO on the developments regarding the implementation of the GFCS, and encourages parties to make use of the opportunities that GFCS provides to help to address climate variability and change at the national level, including to enhance climate observations and monitoring, and to support the formulation and implementation of national adaptation planning processes.

2013-2015 Review: This item (FCCC/SB/2014/1 and INF.3) was first considered on Monday, 1 December. SBSTA Chair Dlamini proposed, and parties agreed to, a joint SBI/SBSTA contact group co-chaired by Gertraude Wollansky (Austria) and Leon Charles (Grenada).

During the SBSTA closing plenary on Saturday, 6 December, SED Co-Facilitator Andreas Fischlin (Switzerland) reported on the fourth and fifth meetings of the SED, and highlighted that its meetings demonstrate that limiting global warming to below 2°C requires a long-term science-based approach.

Final Outcome: The joint SBI/SBSTA conclusions (FCCC/SB/2014/L.9) conclusions are summarized under the SBI item on the 2013-2015 Review (see page 17).

4th Meeting of the SED: This item is summarized under the SBI item on the 2013-2015 Review (see page 18).

IMPACT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF RESPONSE MEASURES: Forum and Work Programme and Matters Relating to Article 2.3 of the Kyoto Protocol: These items (FCCC/SB/2014/INF.4 and FCCC/TP/2014/12) was first considered on Monday, 1 December. SBSTA Chair Dlamini proposed, and parties agreed to, a joint SBI/SBSTA contact group, addressing both the Forum and work programme and matters relating to Kyoto Protocol Article 2.3 (adverse effects), co-chaired by SBI Chair Yauvoli and SBSTA Chair Dlamini. Discussions on this item are summarized under the SBI item on the impact of the implementation of response measures (see page 17).

During the SBSTA closing plenary on Saturday, 6 December, the SBSTA adopted conclusions as revised during the SBI closing plenary. Parties agreed to continue consultations on outstanding issues, including institutional mechanisms, throughout the second week of the conference, co-chaired by SBSTA Chair Dlamini and SBI Chair Yauvoli, under the authority of COP/CMP President Pulgar-Vidal. No agreement on institutional mechanisms could be reached, consideration of the issue will continue at SB 42.

Final Outcome: The conclusions (FCCC/SB/2014/L.6/Rev.1) are summarized under the SBI item on the Forum and work programme (see page 17).

METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES UNDER THE CONVENTION: Work Programme on the Revision of Guidelines for the Review of Biennial Reports and National Communications, Including National Inventory Reviews, for Developed Countries: This item (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/INF.14, 19, 22 and 23) was first considered on Monday, 1 December. SBSTA Chair Dlamini proposed, and parties agreed to informal consultations facilitated by Riitta Pipatti (Finland) and Samuel Adeoye Adejuwon (Nigeria).

During the closing plenary on Saturday, 6 December, the SBSTA adopted conclusions. Work continued in informal consultations during the second week of COP 20 on this item under the guidance of COP 20 President Pulgar-Vidal and facilitated by SBSTA Chair Dlamini. These informal consultations continued consideration of the draft decisions annexed to the SBSTA conclusions, on which parties had been unable to reach agreement before the closure of SBSTA 41.

During the COP closing plenary on Friday, 12 December, parties adopted three decisions on: 'Guidelines for the technical review of information reported under the Convention related to GHG inventories, biennial reports and national communications by Annex I parties; the training programme for review experts for the technical review of biennial reports and national communications of Annex I parties; and the training programme for review experts for the technical review of GHG inventories of Annex I parties.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/L.28), the SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- states that the SBSTA advanced its work on the UNFCCC Annex I inventory review guidelines but was not able to

conclude it, and agrees to forward to COP 20 the draft decision contained in Annex I for its consideration;

- recognizes the importance of implementing the training programme for review experts for the technical review of biennial reports and national communications, and of GHG inventories, of Annex I parties, and requested the Secretariat to make available online training courses of the training programme for review experts participating in reviews from 2015 onwards;
- states that the SBSTA advanced its work on the training programme for review experts but was not able to conclude it, and agrees to forward to COP 20 the draft decision contained in Annex II for its consideration; and
- agrees to assess the results of the training programme at SBSTA 44 and to make recommendations to COP 22 on the further development and enhancement of the training programme for review experts for the technical review of GHG inventories.

In its decision on guidelines for the technical review of information reported under the Convention related to GHG inventories, biennial reports and national communications by Annex I parties (FCCC/CP/2014/L.7/Add.1), the COP, *inter alia*:

- decides to revise the guidelines, adopted by decision 23/CP.19, to make the necessary changes to include 'Part III: UNFCCC guidelines for the technical review of GHG inventories from Annex I parties';
- also decides that the guidelines contained in the annex shall be used for the review of biennial reports, national communications and GHG inventories, effective immediately;
- requests the Secretariat to coordinate the technical review of GHG inventories from Annex I parties in accordance with the provisions of the guidelines contained in the annex;
- also requests the Secretariat to develop and implement a standardized set of data comparisons, and to select a group of experienced review experts from among the lead reviewers of the GHG inventories to conduct an assessment of those data comparisons every five years;
- decides that the group of experienced review experts, using the assessment described, should, for consideration at the next meeting of the lead reviewers for GHG inventories, explore additional standardized data comparisons, as well as the past experiences with the data comparisons carried out in previous review cycles, and consider whether the standardized set of data comparisons implemented remains useful;
- requests the Secretariat, in view of the adoption of 'Part III,' to modify the relevant information technology tools, as needed, to support the implementation of the review process, recognizing that the modification of those tools will require time and effort and that the implementation of the modifications will need to take place during the 2015-2016 review cycles;
- further requests the Secretariat to compile and tabulate information and trends concerning GHG emissions by sources and removals by sinks from the latest available GHG inventory submissions and to publish information on the UNFCCC website as well as in a stand-alone document;
- decides that a summary of the document will be published for consideration by the COP and the SBs, and that this summary will include trends in GHG emissions by sources

and removals by sinks and an assessment of the adherence of the reported inventory information to the ‘Guidelines for the preparation of national communications by Annex I parties, Part I’ and the provisions of relevant decisions of the COP, including information on any delays in submitting the annual information;

- recognizes that the deadline for providing the upgraded common reporting format (CRF) Reporter to Annex I parties, enabling them to submit their GHG inventories, was not met and reiterates that Annex I parties in 2015 may submit their CRF tables after 15 April, but no longer than the corresponding delay in the CRF Reporter availability; and
- requests SBSTA 48 to consider the experiences in conducting desk reviews, taking into consideration any relevant conclusions of the meetings of lead reviewers for GHG inventories up to 2017.

In its decision on the training programme for review experts for the technical review of biennial reports and national communications of Annex I parties (FCCC/CP/2014/L.7/Add.2), the COP *inter alia*:

- requests the Secretariat to develop and implement the training programme as outlined in the annex;
- encourages Annex I parties in a position to do so to provide financial support for the implementation of the training programme; and
- requests the Secretariat to include, in its annual report to the SBSTA on the composition of expert review teams, information on the training programme, in particular on examination procedures and the selection of trainees.

In its decision on the training programme for review experts for technical review of GHG inventories of Annex I parties (FCCC/CP/2014/L.7/Add.3), the COP, *inter alia*:

- requests the Secretariat to implement the training programme for review experts as outlined in the annex;
- encourages Annex I parties in a position to do so to provide financial support for the implementation of the training programme; and
- requests the Secretariat to include, in its annual report to the SBSTA on the composition of expert review teams, information on the training programme, in particular on examination procedures and the selection of trainees and instructors.

Methodologies for Reporting of Financial Information by Annex I Parties: This item was first considered on Monday, 1 December. SBSTA Chair Dlamini proposed, and parties agreed to, a contact group co-chaired by Seyni Nafoussi (Mali) and Roger Dungan (New Zealand).

On Tuesday, 2 December, the contact group discussed the need to clarify “who is doing work on reporting methods and based on what timeline.” They addressed, *inter alia*: the need for comparability; linkages to transparency; difficulties “translating” UNFCCC language for the finance sector; and the definition, range and scope of climate finance. China and Brazil underscored the importance of fulfilling the mandate from COP 17 to develop methodologies for reporting financial information with a view to recommending a decision to COP 20.

During the SBSTA closing plenary on Saturday, 6 December, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/L.26), the SBSTA recommends a draft decision for consideration by COP 20. In its decision, the COP, *inter alia*:

- decides to extend the deadline of the mandate given to the SBSTA by one year, with a view to recommending a decision on this issue to COP 21;
- invites parties and observer organizations to submit to the Secretariat, by 25 March 2015, views on this issue;
- requests the Secretariat to prepare a technical paper prior to SBSTA 42, summarizing existing international methodologies and drawing on information submitted by parties;
- requests the Secretariat to organize a joint in-session technical workshop in conjunction with SB 42 and decides the workshop shall be jointly organized by the SBSTA, the SBI and the SCF;
- requests the SCF, as part of its work on MRV of support beyond the biennial assessment and overview of climate finance flows, taking into consideration the outcomes of the joint in-session technical workshop, to include its recommendations in its annual report to COP 21; and
- also requests the SCF to present an update on its work to SBSTA 43.

Common Metrics to Calculate the CO₂ Equivalence of GHGs: This item was first considered on Monday, 1 December. SBSTA Chair Dlamini proposed, and parties agreed to, informal consultations facilitated by Takeshi Enoki (Japan).

During the SBSTA closing plenary on Saturday, 6 December, SBSTA Chair Dlamini said no agreement had been reached on this issue, and that it would be placed on the provisional agenda of SBSTA 42.

Emissions from Bunker Fuels: This item (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/MISC.9) was first considered on Monday, 1 December. The International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) reported on progress on its comprehensive strategy to address CO₂ emissions from international civil aviation, stressing agreement by governments to collectively improve fuel efficiency by 2% per year and to stabilize the sector’s net CO₂ emissions from 2020 onwards.

The International Maritime Organization (IMO) said it has been effectively addressing emissions from ships, noting the approval of the Third IMO GHG Study, which demonstrates steady improvement in shipping efficiency.

Singapore and Japan commended the progress made by ICAO and IMO. Argentina, on behalf of a group of developing countries, and China said measures taken on climate change under the IMO and ICAO should respect the principles and provisions of the Convention, in particular common but differentiated responsibilities (CBDR).

SBSTA Chair Dlamini proposed, and parties agreed, that he would conduct informal consultations on the issue.

During the SBSTA closing plenary on Saturday, 6 December, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/L.21), the SBSTA takes note of the information received from, and progress reported by, the IMO and ICAO on their ongoing work, notes the views expressed by parties, and invites the ICAO and IMO to continue to report, at future sessions of the SBSTA, on relevant work on this issue.

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

Decisions 2/CMP.7 to 4/CMP.7 and 1/CMP.8: This item (FCCC/TP/2014/6) was first considered on Monday, 1 December. SBSTA Chair Dlamini proposed, and parties agreed to, a contact group co-chaired by Anke Herold (Germany) and Maesela Kekana (South Africa).

During the contact group, on Friday, 5 December, Ukraine preferred one decision with five annexes. Co-Chair Herold clarified that the current format of two decisions was agreed at SBSTA 40. The EU called for recognizing that the deadline for the reporting of assigned amount units (AAUs) may be delayed if the CRF 3 Reporter software is not available in a timely manner or does not function properly.

On the draft conclusions, the Russian Federation lamented the firewall between methodological issues under SBSTA agenda items 11(a) and (b) on Protocol Articles 5, 7 and 8 (methodological issues under the Kyoto Protocol), and clarification of Section G (Article 3.7ter) of the Doha Amendment to the Kyoto Protocol.

Parties debated whether to “recommend” or “agree” that if an Annex I party applies provisions on the expert review team (ERT), that the ERT shall review that information. SBSTA Chair Dlamini admonished parties to agree on conclusions, saying no more extensions of the negotiations would be granted on this issue. Following revisions, parties agreed to forward draft conclusions to the SBSTA plenary for consideration.

During the SBSTA closing plenary on Saturday, 6 December, the SBSTA adopted conclusions, parties agreed to continue consultations on outstanding issues, in particular how to address issues related to economies in transition, throughout the second week of the conference, co-chaired by SBSTA Chair Dlamini, under the authority of COP/CMP President Pulgar-Vidal. No agreement could be reached and consideration of this issue will continue at SBSTA 42.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/L.29), the SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- requests the Secretariat to compile into a user-friendly document all reporting, review and accounting requirements relating to the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol as adopted by the CMP and that this document be made available by May 2015;
- agrees to consider, at SBSTA 42, the accounting, reporting and review requirements for Annex I parties to the Convention without a quantified emission limitation and reduction commitment for the second commitment period, along with the updated training programme for members of the expert review teams (ERTs) participating in annual reviews under Protocol Article 8 (ERTs);
- takes note that an Annex I party to the Kyoto Protocol with a commitment inscribed in the second column, but not in the third column, of the table contained in Annex B to the Doha Amendment may request the ERT to review, as part of the review of the ERT of that Party’s annual inventory for the first year of the second commitment period, information relating to that party’s base year;
- recommends that such a request should be carried out as part of the annual review for the first year of the second commitment period; and

- states that the SBSTA advanced its work on the issue but was not able to conclude it, and forwards the draft decisions, including their annexes, for consideration by CMP 10.

Clarification of Section G (Article 3.7ter) of the Doha Amendment to the Kyoto Protocol: This item was first considered on Monday, 1 December. SBSTA Chair Dlamini proposed, and parties agreed to a contact group co-chaired by Anke Herold and Maesela Kekana.

The contact group on Friday, 5 December, addressed options for a draft decision. Parties could not agree on how or whether Article 3.7ter, *inter alia*, applies to parties that did not take commitments under the first commitment period to the Kyoto Protocol but are taking commitments under the second commitment period.

During the SBSTA closing plenary, on Saturday, 6 December, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/L.25), the SBSTA agrees to recommend to the CMP that consideration of this issue continue at SBSTA 42, taking into account the elements for the text of a draft decision in the annex.

Land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF) under Article 3.3 and 3.4 of the Kyoto Protocol and under the CDM: This item was first considered on Monday, 1 December. SBSTA Chair Dlamini proposed, and parties agreed to, informal consultations facilitated by Marcelo Rocha (Brazil).

During the SBSTA closing plenary on Saturday, 6 December, the SBSTA adopted conclusions and forwarded a draft decision to CMP 10 for consideration.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/L.24), the SBSTA agrees to continue consideration of LULUCF activities at SBSTA 44 and recommends a draft decision for consideration by the CMP.

In its decision (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/L.24/Add.1), the CMP:

- requests the CDM Executive Board to assess the applicability of the modalities and procedures contained in decisions 5/CMP.1 and 6/CMP.1 to project activities involving revegetation, in the event that such project activities would be eligible under the CDM;
- requests the CDM Executive Board to report to CMP 11 on the outcome of this assessment; and
- requests SBSTA to continue its consideration of additional LULUCF activities under the CDM at SBSTA 44.

Implications of the Inclusion of Reforestation of Lands with Forest in Exhaustion as Afforestation and Reforestation CDM Project Activities: This item was first considered on Monday, 1 December. SBSTA Chair Dlamini proposed, and parties agreed to, informal consultations facilitated by Heikki Granholm (Finland) and Eduardo Sanhueza (Chile).

During the SBSTA closing plenary on Saturday, 6 December, SBSTA Chair Dlamini said no agreement had been reached on this issue and that the item would be added to the provisional agenda of SBSTA 42.

MARKET AND NON-MARKET MECHANISMS UNDER THE CONVENTION: Framework for Various Approaches: This item (FCCC/TP/2014/9) was first considered on Monday, 1 December. SBSTA Chair Dlamini proposed, and parties agreed to, informal consultations facilitated by Peer Stiansen (Norway) and Mandy Rambharos (South Africa).

During the SBSTA closing plenary on Saturday, 6 December, SBSTA Chair Dlamini said no agreement had been reached on this issue and that the item would be added to the provisional agenda of SBSTA 42.

Non-Market-Based Approaches: This item (FCCC/TP/2014/10) was first considered on Monday, 1 December. SBSTA Chair Dlamini proposed, and parties agreed to, informal consultations facilitated by Peer Stiansen and Mandy Rambharos.

During the SBSTA closing plenary on Saturday, 6 December, SBSTA Chair Dlamini said no agreement had been reached on this issue and that the item would be added to the provisional agenda of SBSTA 42.

New Market-Based Mechanism: This item (FCCC/TP/2014/11) was first considered on Monday, 1 December. SBSTA Chair Dlamini proposed, and parties agreed to, informal consultations facilitated by Peer Stiansen and Mandy Rambharos.

During the SBSTA closing plenary on Saturday, 6 December, SBSTA Chair Dlamini said no agreement had been reached on this issue and that the item would be added to the provisional agenda of SBSTA 42.

WORK PROGRAMME ON CLARIFICATION OF QUANTIFIED ECONOMY-WIDE EMISSION REDUCTION TARGETS OF DEVELOPED COUNTRY PARTIES:

This item (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/INF.16 and FCCC/TP/2014/8) was first considered on Monday, 1 December. SBSTA Chair Dlamini proposed, and parties agreed to, informal consultations facilitated by Cristina Carreiras (Portugal) and Brian Mantlana (South Africa).

During the SBSTA closing plenary on Saturday, 6 December, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

Final Outcome: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/L.22), the SBSTA concludes the work programme on clarification of quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets of developed country parties. The SBSTA recognizes the importance of shared information and transparency in the clarification of the quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets and noted that activities undertaken under the work programme since SBSTA 38 have provided a platform for parties to share information and have helped improve the transparency of developed country party targets. The SBSTA also, *inter alia*:

- acknowledges that there is a limited number of approaches among developed country parties for measuring the progress made towards the achievement of targets and the importance of convergence in the coverage of sectors and gases as well as the use of global warming potential values among developed country parties;
- acknowledges that the additional information provided by developed country parties increased the transparency of targets and helped to facilitate the consideration of the comparability of efforts among developed country parties;
- acknowledges the discussions on the transparency of, and reporting on, the use of carbon credits from market-based mechanisms; and
- notes that there is more than one approach to account for the role of LULUCF in achieving developed country party targets and acknowledged, regarding the comparability of efforts, that comprehensive, complete and consistent coverage of the reported information is more significant than the choice of approach.

REPORTS ON OTHER ACTIVITIES: On Monday, 1 December, the SBSTA took note of the ‘Annual Report on the Technical Review of Information Reported Under the Convention Related to Biennial Reports and National Communications by Annex I Parties to the Convention’ (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/INF.21), the ‘Annual Report on the Technical Review of GHG Inventories and Other Information Reported by Annex I Parties to the Convention’ (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/INF.17) and the ‘Annual Report on the Technical Review of GHG Inventories and Other Information Reported by Annex I Parties to the Convention that are also Parties to the Kyoto Protocol Under Article 7.1 of the Kyoto Protocol’ (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/INF.18).

CLOSING PLENARY: On Saturday afternoon, 6 December, UNFCCC Deputy Executive Secretary Richard Kinley informed parties of the administrative and budgetary implications of the conclusions adopted by the SBSTA.

Rapporteur Jurga Rabauskaite-Surville (Lithuania) presented, and the SBSTA adopted, the report of the session (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/L.20). SBSTA Chair Dlamini closed the SBSTA 42 at 5:03 pm.

For a summary of the statements made during the closing plenary of the SBSTA, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12614e.html>

AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON THE DURBAN PLATFORM FOR ENHANCED ACTION

On Tuesday, 2 December, ADP Co-Chair Kishan Kumarsingh (Trinidad and Tobago) opened ADP 2-7, welcoming delegates and stating that COP 20 is expected to provide a solid foundation for a new global climate agreement, noting that “this will signal to the world a successful outcome in Paris.” He introduced: the non-paper on elements for a draft negotiating text (ADP.2014.11. NonPaper); a single draft decision on advancing the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP.2014.12.DraftText), including information related to INDCs and enhanced pre-2020 climate action; updated technical papers compiling information on the mitigation benefits of actions, initiatives and options to enhance mitigation ambition (FCCC/TP/2014/13 and Add. 1-4); and the Co-Chairs’ scenario note for the session (ADP.2014.10. InformalNote). He informed delegates that consultations on the election of officers would be conducted.

Parties agreed to continue working under the ADP 2 agenda (ADP/2013/AGENDA) and the proposed organization of work, including focused negotiations on different elements in parallel meetings of the contact group, each facilitated by one of the Co-Chairs, and textual negotiations on the draft decision on advancing the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action. For a summary of the statements made during the opening plenary, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12610e.html>

ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS: Election of Officers:

On Saturday, 13 December, ADP elected, by acclamation, Daniel Reifsnnyder (US) and Ahmed Djoghlaif (Algeria) as ADP Co-Chairs and Yang Liu (China) as ADP Rapporteur.

ADP ITEM 3: DRAFT DECISION ON ADVANCING THE DURBAN PLATFORM FOR ENHANCED ACTION:

Procedural Summary: On Tuesday, 2 December, ADP Co-Chair Artur Runge-Metzger (EU) presented the ‘Draft Decision on Advancing the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action’

(ADP.2014.12.DraftText) issued by the Co-Chairs in advance of ADP 2-7, reminding parties that “positioning is not negotiating” and urging them to make precise and concise proposals that can bridge differences.

Many developing countries called for direct negotiations with parties’ proposals on the screen and cautioned against the Co-Chairs coming forward with their interpretation of the common ground in the form of a revised Co-Chairs’ text. Others preferred to work on the basis of the Co-Chairs’ text.

ADP Co-Chair Runge-Metzger proposed going “swiftly” through the Co-Chairs’ text while allowing all parties time to give their views in order to identify “sticking points.”

On Wednesday, 3 December, many developing countries continued to call for showing their proposals on the screen, while the US preferred to continue with a more general reading of the text to identify “the major issues in the negotiations.” Tuvalu suggested, and parties agreed to, establishing a Friends of the Chair group to reach agreement on the way forward.

The Friends of the Chair group convened in the evening to agree on how to move forward. They agreed: to conduct a first reading of the Co-Chairs’ draft text (ADP.2014.12.DraftText), allowing parties to introduce their proposals by displaying them on the screen; to hold dedicated meetings of the contact group on specific sections and paragraphs; and for the Co-Chairs to prepare a synthesis integrating parties’ proposals into a revised draft decision text.

On Saturday, 4 December, an informal ADP stocktaking meeting took place. COP 20/CMP 10 President Manuel Pulgar-Vidal described the first week as one of “proposals, explanations and clarifications,” and called for the second week to be one of “dialogue, flexibility and construction” in order to deliver, by Thursday evening, 11 December, “the outcome the world is expecting from us.” ADP Co-Chair Kumarsingh proposed, and parties agreed, that the Co-Chairs make available, by Monday morning, improved versions of the non-paper on elements and of the draft decision on advancing the ADP, based on input received from parties during the first week.

On Monday, 8 December, ADP Co-Chair Runge-Metzger introduced a revised version of the draft decision on advancing the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action, now called the ‘Draft COP decision proposed by the Co-Chairs.’ He noted it: is based on inputs provided by parties, explaining that all parties’ views were captured in a compilation published on the ADP website; presents a synthesis of the “core areas” introduced by parties; and addresses all aspects of “our mandate.” Many developing countries raised concerns over the legal status of the revised draft decision, with some stressing the document remains a non-paper. They also underscored that their concerns had not been captured in the text. Others expressed willingness to work on the basis of the revised draft decision.

Co-Chair Runge-Metzger assured parties that the documents had no legal status, noting that parties would have to give it legal status. He suggested dedicating time to the decision, which parties had agreed should be taken in Lima. Runge-Metzger urged parties to proceed “as we agreed last week” and consider the draft decision paragraph by paragraph to find compromise and consensus.

During the remaining negotiating time on Monday, 8 December, and throughout Tuesday and Wednesday, 9-10 December, the contact group on item 3 continued paragraph-by-paragraph negotiations on the draft COP decision proposed by the Co-Chairs, with parties proposing extensive alternative options within the text. On Wednesday evening the draft text stood at 58 pages. China proposed, and other parties agreed, to initiate the reading of the draft decision from the preamble.

On Thursday, 11 December, the contact group convened briefly and suspended so that negotiating groups could consult among themselves on how to proceed. The contact group convened briefly in the late afternoon, with parties disagreeing on whether to continue in a contact group or a Friends of the Chair format. In the evening, during a joint COP/CMP stocktaking plenary, COP 20/CMP 10 President Pulgar-Vidal exhorted parties to reach agreement and asked the ADP Co-Chairs to produce a revised draft decision text by 9:00 pm. Late in the evening the contact group resumed, with ADP Co-Chair Runge-Metzger presenting the revised seven-page, ‘Draft COP decision proposed by the Co-Chairs.’ He described the new version of the draft text as: “not a take it or leave it” text; not a suggested compromise text; but instead, a text that tries to capture where parties positioned themselves and identifies “negotiation space” for parties. The contact group was then suspended.

On Friday, 12 December, the contact group reconvened in the morning to consider the revised draft decision. Inviting parties to consult with him in his “open-door office,” COP 20/CMP 10 President Pulgar-Vidal stressed his responsibility to maintain confidence, inclusiveness and transparency in the process, noting this as necessary for a successful outcome in Lima and Paris. He explained that the new text by the Co-Chairs resulted from a previous “unworkable text” and calls for providing direction. He asked Minister Tine Sundtoft (Norway) and Minister Vivian Balakrishnan (Singapore) to facilitate consultations as well.

Substantive discussions on the text continued until 2:00 pm, when the contact group was suspended for an informal stocktaking plenary, where COP 20/CMP 10 President Pulgar-Vidal instructed the ADP to hear the remaining speakers and informed that he, and the ministers, would continue consultations. The contact group resumed shortly thereafter and continued until all speakers had been heard, and adjourned pending further guidance by the COP 20/CMP 10 President.

Throughout the evening, bilateral ministerial consultations and consultations with negotiating groups took place. The contact group resumed at 2:18 am, Saturday, 13 December. COP 20/CMP 10 President Pulgar-Vidal and ADP Co-Chair Runge-Metzger introduced a draft decision (FCCC/ADP/2014/L.5) proposed by the Co-Chairs, based on views presented during the contact group and in the informal consultations. Runge-Metzger proposed to adjourn the contact group and convene the ADP closing plenary.

Numerous interventions followed from the floor, during which parties and groups of parties requested further time to consider the text and expressed concerns that they had not been consulted either by the ministers or the COP President. Others, noting the time, called for agreement on moving forward as proposed. At 3:30 am the ADP contact group adjourned so that parties could further consider the text.

The closing plenary of the ADP began at 10:41 am on Saturday. Parties variously supported and opposed the revised draft decision. The ADP Co-Chairs submitted, under their authority, the draft decision to the COP 20/CMP 10 President Pulgar-Vidal for further consultations. After the suspension of ADP 2-7 at 1:31 pm, Pulgar-Vidal announced he would undertake consultations with groups of parties to find consensus on the text.

During the COP 20 closing plenary, which convened at 11:37 pm, on Saturday, 13 December, ADP Co-Chair Kumarsingh informed that the ADP concluded “its intensive work” by considering a draft decision (FCCC/ADP/2014/L.5). He said that, having listened to parties, the Co-Chairs forwarded, on their own authority, the draft decision to the COP president for further consultations.

COP 20/CMP 10 President Pulgar-Vidal then introduced the ‘Proposal by the President’ containing a draft decision on further advancing the Durban Platform (FCCC/CP/2014/L.14), saying it is a product of all parties’ work and “with it we all win.” At 11:53 pm he suspended the session for an hour to give parties time to consider the text.

When the COP 20 closing plenary resumed at 1:23 am, on Sunday, 14 December, COP 20 President Pulgar-Vidal noted the draft decision “moves us forward,” and requested parties “rise to the challenge of approving it.” The COP adopted the draft decision and agreed to call it the ‘Lima Call for Climate Action.’

Tuvalu, for the LDCs, stated their understanding of the decision, including that reference to the Warsaw Mechanism for Loss and Damage in the preambular paragraph, and the reference to “*inter alia*” in paragraph 2 of the decision, represented “a clear intention” that the 2015 agreement will “properly, effectively and progressively address loss and damage.”

Substantive Discussions—First Reading: On Tuesday and Wednesday, 2-3 December, substantive discussions on the draft decision on advancing the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action began, focusing on general reactions.

On recommending text of a protocol, another legal instrument or agreed outcome with legal force under the Convention, the Russian Federation, with the EU and Tuvalu, proposed including reference to Convention Article 17 (protocols) and applied rules of procedure, so that the six-month rule for introducing text can be adhered to. The US noted this only applies to a protocol, while the Durban Platform allows for several possibilities regarding the instrument under preparation.

Venezuela suggested addressing “the elephant in the room,” namely that one set of parties seeks a mitigation-based outcome and another feels it should be based on all the elements of the BAP.

On the completion of work of the ADP, India suggested removing “as early as possible.” Brazil proposed adding a reference to accompanying draft decisions after COP 21. Kenya opposed any text on accompanying decisions at this stage.

On parity between adaptation and mitigation, Australia and Norway proposed deletion of text relating to achieving political parity between mitigation and adaptation. India suggested referring to “full legal parity” instead. Brazil suggested “parity between the operational provisions regarding mitigation, adaptation and means of implementation (MOI).”

China suggested text on, *inter alia*, deciding to achieve the balanced and comprehensive treatment among the elements of mitigation, adaptation, MOI, and transparency of action and support in the negotiating text of the 2015 agreement.

While stressing that adaptation and mitigation should receive equal treatment and resources, India called for a shared understanding on “political parity.” Saying “parity” is vague, the US proposed “underscoring the importance of adaptation.”

On demonstrating implementation of existing actions and commitments, Australia suggested this text should be addressed in the preamble. Norway said reference to implementation of existing actions and commitments are not necessary. Brazil proposed adding references to the Doha Amendment and the annual US\$100 billion finance goal by 2020.

China called for underlining that the full and effective implementation of existing commitments and actions under the Convention, its Kyoto Protocol and the agreed outcome pursuant to the BAP, in particular for developed country parties, is essential for adoption of the 2015 agreement.

On links to the elements of the 2015 agreement, the US indicated openness to listing thematic areas identified in Decision 1/CP.17 (establishing the ADP), referring to these as “aspects of work,” if this helps provide assurances that these will be addressed in the 2015 agreement.

Focused discussions on specific sections of the text began on Thursday, 4 December.

On **paragraphs 1-6 (elements)**, Canada suggested that the ADP address “various topics” instead of “all elements,” and that “achieving political parity” between mitigation and adaptation be replaced with “elevating their critical importance.”

New Zealand advocated text signaling that the work of the ADP will result in “a package of different components.” Japan stressed the need to clarify that mitigation is the ultimate goal of the Convention.

Pakistan and South Africa called for treating all elements of Decision 1/CP.17 “in a balanced manner.” Mexico and Saudi Arabia stressed the equal importance of adaptation and mitigation. Pakistan and Egypt preferred “legal parity” between mitigation and adaptation. Ecuador called for deleting qualifiers when referring to parity between mitigation and adaptation.

South Africa called for strengthening paragraphs dealing with “assurances” in relation to the link between INDCs and the elements of the agreement, and the balance of support for mitigation and adaptation.

On the importance of transparency, Ecuador called for adopting an MRV mechanism as part of the 2015 agreement.

On **paragraphs 7-12 (INDCs)**, Japan said the text still did not provide clarity on the upfront information to be presented in INDCs.

South Africa said that, while INDCs are nationally determined, their scope should be determined internationally, and, with Brazil and others, that they should include mitigation, adaptation and MOI. Canada and the US stressed that INDCs relate to mitigation. Brazil and Tuvalu, for the LDCs, noted that the scope should not be limited to Convention Article 2 (objective).

Australia underscored that INDCs should reflect efforts parties are making unilaterally. The LDCs recommended inserting a caveat for LDCs and SIDS on the inclusion of mitigation in INDCs.

New Zealand said that, when reporting on INDCs, parties should quantify expected emission outcomes, levels of effort and accounting methodologies in the land sector. The EU urged transparency, quantifiability and comparability of INDC reporting.

Bolivia stressed the importance of enhancing the provision of MOI to developing countries. Cautioning against bias towards mitigation actions, Tuvalu, for the LDCs, suggested adding text on MRV of Annex I parties' support to developing countries for the achievement of the latter's INDCs. Thailand underscored equal treatment of mitigation and adaptation. The US said reporting requirements should apply equally to developed and developing countries.

On **paragraphs 13-16 (INDC communication)**, Argentina, Chile, for the Independent Alliance of Latin America and the Caribbean (AILAC), China, India, Algeria, for the Arab Group, South Africa, Tanzania and many others emphasized the relevance of the principles and provisions of the Convention. Switzerland opposed division between Annex I and non-Annex I countries. China said information on INDCs should enhance clarity of developed countries' ambition and reflect the diversity of, barriers to and needs for, developing countries' INDCs.

Brazil said INDCs: should not be interpreted as "an expectation of legal terms"; opposed self-differentiation; and, with Sudan, for the African Group, requested making reference to equity.

Switzerland called for references to underlying assumptions and efforts, and fairness considerations. The Marshall Islands proposed that the ADP develop rules relating to accounting assumptions and approaches, land use, and use of international markets and credits, with a view to their adoption by COP 21. Bolivia opposed reference to market tools and instruments.

Tanzania opposed prescriptive INDCs and any additional reporting requirements for developing countries. Singapore emphasized clarity of information provided.

Saudi Arabia suggested the INDCs' adaptation component should enhance efforts to achieve best-value outcomes through early and integrated planning, and action at all levels. South Africa urged communication in a tabular format of: the type of contribution for 2021-2025 and 2026-2030; information on adaptation plans, actions, costs and investments; and MOI support. Chile, for AILAC, proposed that parties provide information on mitigation for 2020-2025 and an indicative contribution for 2030, including information on ambition, equity and fairness.

On **paragraphs 17-22 (post-communication and support for INDCs)**, many parties, including China, India, Venezuela, Malaysia and Saudi Arabia, opposed consideration of INDCs post-communication.

The EU proposed establishing an international process for the consideration of INDCs from the first quarter of 2015, which would be related to mitigation INDCs only. The US emphasized upfront information and a consultative period as important for promoting ambition and clarity.

South Africa called for *ex ante* assessment of INDCs by the Secretariat through, *inter alia*, a technical paper on the aggregate effect of parties' contributions. The Marshall Islands called for a technical paper summarizing and synthesizing INDCs, and including an aggregation of the level of mitigation effort.

Japan and China called for a simple process through the publication of the INDCs on the UNFCCC website, with China objecting to compilation of INDCs by the Secretariat. The Russian Federation cautioned against the use of electronic means.

Jordan, with China and India, opposed any *ex ante* review processes. Tuvalu, for the LDCs, proposed that Annex I parties report on their provision of MOI.

Brazil stressed that consideration of INDCs is not a legally-binding process but a means to enhance the understanding of each other's intentions.

On **paragraphs 23-38 (guiding enhanced action on, and future work of, workstream 2 (pre-2020 ambition) and basis for dynamic high-level engagement)**, the EU, supported by the US and Switzerland, stressed that the focus of workstream 2 should remain on mitigation. Many developing countries emphasized the need to also address adaptation and MOI. China, with Jordan, suggested focusing on how to increase international support to enhance action. Australia called for recognizing support to developing countries from various sources.

Many parties described the Technical Expert Meetings (TEMs) as useful and supported their continuation. Nauru, for AOSIS, emphasized improving and extending TEMs until the mitigation ambition gap is closed, and indicated their outputs should include: updated technical papers; a dynamic online "menu" of policy options; focus on co-benefits of actions, barriers to implementation and strategies to overcome them; and a synthesis for policy makers.

With Jordan, El Salvador and China, he said TEMs should focus on mitigation and adaption opportunities. Norway, with Switzerland, supported TEMs' focus on mitigation, including fossil fuel subsidy reform, and, with Colombia, called for recognizing the work of the Global Commission on the Economy and Climate.

Japan, supported by New Zealand, suggested strengthening linkages with existing institutions, including the technology transfer information clearinghouse TT:CLEAR and the CTCN. Norway emphasized the role of the TEC and CTCN in organizing TEMs. El Salvador suggested closer links with the Adaptation Committee and Adaption Fund.

AOSIS called for the TEMs' review no sooner than 2017, with a view to their improvement. Canada supported review "at some point." Switzerland favored a review in 2016 or 2017.

Bolivia, India and others proposed increasing the scope of TEM topics, with Bolivia suggesting a focus on technology knowledge systems and practices of indigenous peoples and local communities. Colombia, for AILAC, called for engagement of indigenous peoples and academic institutions.

India, Saudi Arabia and Argentina called for technical papers. Mali, for the African Group, suggested work leading to a technical synthesis and a summary for policy makers to inform ministerials.

Many parties welcomed high-level engagement on the ADP. AOSIS, with China, Bangladesh, for the LDCs, and AILAC, called for annual high-level engagement. Brazil said ministerials should be held “sparingly,” when concrete policies can be proposed to them, and, with AOSIS and the EU, agreed to work on improving TEMs’ output. The US called for annual ministerials on pre-2020 ambition in conjunction with the COP. Brazil, Bolivia, Pakistan and India opposed contributions from sub-national authorities to high-level events.

On engagement of a broad range of actors for effective implementation of enhanced action, Switzerland said engagement with non-state actors should take place at the national level. Tanzania, supported by Mexico, suggested that subnational entities and local authorities act through their national governments.

Opposed by the EU and the US, Mexico, with Bangladesh, supported conducting, and offered to host, regional and sub-regional TEMs, with Brazil willing to explore this idea. Citing financial implications, Switzerland said such TEMs should be held back-to-back with other meetings.

The LDCs called for support to enable technical experts from developing countries to participate in TEMs.

Brazil, supported by Australia, the US and Switzerland, suggested noting health co-benefits of mitigation policies. The US proposed also adding economic co-benefits. Egypt proposed co-benefits “in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication.”

On **the annex (complementary information on INDCs)**, Sudan, for the African Group, suggested consideration of mitigation, adaptation and MOI options with and without differentiation. Colombia, for AILAC, called for inclusion of information on why parties perceive their contributions as equitable.

Panama, for the CfrN, requested that the role of forests be recognized and called for reference to considerations on bioenergy. Argentina, with Egypt, expressed concern over the inclusion of land sector emissions, noting that agriculture is not the main contributor to climate change.

Tuvalu, for the LDCs, proposed differentiated reporting for countries with economy-wide emission reduction targets and developing countries, emphasizing means of support.

On **preambular paragraphs**, the LDCs, opposed by the EU, requested deletion of reference to the global average temperature increase of 2°C.

Many developing countries, opposed by the US, supported references to the principles and provisions of the Convention. The US said annex-based differentiation is not a path to the new agreement and, with Japan, opposed “bifurcated language.”

China, with Pakistan and Argentina, requested references to the BAP and, with Algeria, for the Arab Group, and others, to previous COP decisions. Chile called for reference to intergenerational equity.

Jordan, India, China and Venezuela opposed reference to the catalyzing role of sub-national authorities in enhancing the impact of implementation of policies on reducing emissions and vulnerability, and building resilience.

Saudi Arabia proposed acknowledging, in line with the IPCC AR5 SYR, that effective adaptation and mitigation responses will depend on policies and measures across multiple scales.

The first reading of the draft decision on advancing the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action concluded on Saturday, 6 December.

First version of the ‘Draft COP decision proposed by the Co-Chairs’: On Monday, 8 December, parties began considering the newly introduced version of the draft COP decision proposed by the Co-Chairs. Several groups and delegates, including Malaysia, for the G-77/China, Iran, for the LMDCs, and Nauru, for AOSIS, expressed concern over: the lack of balance in the text; lack of adequate time for consideration of the text; and the danger of prejudging the outcome of the Paris agreement.

The entire text was bracketed, following a proposal by Tuvalu, for the LDCs.

On **preambular paragraphs**, Brazil, the US and others cautioned against extensive additions of text in the preambular paragraphs, and called for focusing on substance.

Parties’ views diverged on referencing: principles and provisions of the Convention; previous decisions; temperature goals; guidance by science; principles of equity, common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities (CBDRRC) and sustainable development; mitigation, adaptation, MOI, and transparency of action and support; loss and damage; differentiation of the “undertakings” by different parties under the Convention; and a global emissions budget.

Noting parties’ inability to move beyond “some bracketed preambular paragraphs” over a three-hour contact group session, ADP Co-Chair Kumarsingh emphasized that the remaining three days of negotiations “are counting down.”

On a preambular paragraph on strengthening and scaling up adaptation action, Sudan, for the African Group, supported by Egypt, suggested adding references to the elements of Decision 1/CP.17 (establishing the ADP) and vulnerability of developing countries. The Philippines called for referencing the ability to recover from extreme weather events, and biodiversity conservation. Pakistan called for a reference to water security.

Singapore, opposed by the LDCs, suggested deleting “scaling-up” of adaptation action, and the EU suggested replacing it with “enhancing.” Many preferred the original formulation. The US, with the Republic of Korea, Japan and New Zealand, suggested a shortened formulation making reference only to the 2015 agreement.

Brazil, supported by Singapore and the US, said a reference to sustainable development should remain in the paragraph. Brazil and India also said that food security and poverty eradication are important elements that should remain, and, with China, called for specifying that poverty eradication relates to developing countries.

On a preambular paragraph regarding the ultimate objective of the Convention requiring “strengthening the multilateral, rules-based regime” and implementation of existing commitments, the African Group, supported by Pakistan and opposed by the EU, preferred “multilateral, rules-based regime under the Convention.”

China, opposed by Australia, proposed a new preambular paragraph noting “the agreed outcome pursuant to the BAP and the Doha Amendment.”

On **paragraphs 1-7 (advancing the work of the ADP and elaboration of a negotiating text for the 2015 agreement)**, on a paragraph welcoming the progress by the ADP on the

implementation of all elements of Decision 1/CP.17, Saudi Arabia, with others, supported the Co-Chairs' text. Australia, supported by the US, New Zealand, Japan and others, proposed deletion of the reference to the implementation of all elements of Decision 1/CP.17, preferring progress by the ADP "to advance its work." The US, with Australia, the Philippines, Canada, the EU and others, opposed by the LDCs, proposed progress made "pursuant to Decision 1/CP.17."

On a paragraph on welcoming the further elaboration of elements for a draft negotiating text in response to previous COP decisions, the LDCs, opposed by the US, Australia and the EU, requested referencing Decision 2/CP.19 (Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage) and, opposed by Saudi Arabia and India, further elaboration of elements "as included in Annex I" to the decision.

On a paragraph on preparing a negotiating text on the basis of Annex I of the draft decision text, Cuba, supported by Malaysia, for the LMDCs, proposed "acknowledging" the work of the ADP and "deciding that the ADP continue its work in 2015 to finish the elaboration of the draft negotiating text."

Australia, supported by Switzerland, Japan, Norway and New Zealand, and opposed by the LDCs, suggested replacing "on the basis of" with "by furthering the consideration of" Annex I, and, supported by the LDCs and opposed by the LMDCs and Brazil, including reference to the ADP preparing "any related decisions." Switzerland and Norway proposed adding "without prejudice" to the "structure" or "content" of the final outcome. The African Group suggested "drawing on" Annex I and "submissions received from parties."

On a paragraph on preparation of a negotiating text by May 2015, the EU, supported by Switzerland and the Marshall Islands, and opposed by the LMDCs and Canada, supported maintaining a reference to Convention Article 17 (protocols). The LDCs proposed "noting, as appropriate, the requirements of Article 17." The LMDCs suggested that focusing on Article 17 could "align us with a position we should not take at this stage," and, with the US, proposed "noting any relevant timing requirements."

Canada, supported by the US, preferred deciding that the ADP "should aim to" prepare a negotiating text instead of "shall." This was opposed by the LDCs, who cautioned against "slippage in timing."

The Russian Federation, supported by Belarus, called for adding a reference to translating the text into all official UNFCCC languages.

Relating to a paragraph on the scope of the 2015 agreement, the LDCs, supported by Nauru, for AOSIS, stressed loss and damage as a fundamental element. The US, supported by Japan, called for excluding reference to loss and damage, saying this was not an aspect referred to in Decision 1/CP.17. The LMDCs called for adding references to addressing "in a balanced manner, with full legal parity" all elements of paragraph 5 of Decision 1/CP.17.

On a paragraph on the ADP producing the text of the 2015 agreement, elaborating any related decisions, for adoption by COP 21, and identifying the need for additional decisions at subsequent COP sessions, the EU welcomed the Co-Chairs' text. The LMDCs opposed reference to any COP decisions. South

Africa emphasized the need for the ADP to complete its mandate "as early as possible" and opposed elaborating decisions for adoption by COP 21.

On **paragraphs 7-23 (INDCs and their Communication and Annex II of the draft decision (Complementary information on INDCs of Parties))**, the US, supported by the Marshall Islands and opposed by the LDCs, proposed a new paragraph inviting parties to communicate their INDCs well in advance of COP 21, and those willing to do so by the first quarter of 2015. Brazil, with South Africa, said the addition of this paragraph was contingent on deletion of a paragraph inviting parties that are not ready to communicate their INDCs by the first quarter of 2015 to do so by 31 May 2015 or as soon as possible thereafter. Parties engaged in a lengthy debate on the time frame for communicating INDCs. Singapore, with Brazil, China, Egypt and many others, opposed by Switzerland, the LDCs, Canada, the US and others, requested deletion of "by 31 May 2015." Switzerland preferred "well before COP 21," with Turkey agreeing to "before" COP 21. The African Group, with China, for the LMDCs, and others, opposed by the EU and others, favored "by the first quarter of 2015 and endeavor to do so as soon as possible thereafter."

On a paragraph acknowledging the support being provided to developing countries for the preparation of INDCs, and the need for such support to be further enhanced, the African Group, opposed by the US, preferred "some developing countries." The US proposed "continuing need." The LDCs noted that some developing countries have not received any support and requested deleting "to be further enhanced."

The LMDCs proposed stressing the need for developed countries, the operating entities of the financial mechanism and any other organizations in a position to do so, to provide enhanced support.

In a paragraph on communication of the mitigation component of INDCs, Norway suggested: adding reference to unconditionality of efforts by all, while maintaining a reference to enhanced efforts by developing countries made possible with provision of support; and recognizing the special circumstances of LDCs and SIDS, with the latter proposal supported by the LDCs, with some amendments. Saudi Arabia suggested bracketing "a quantifiable mitigation component" and, with Turkey, opposed reference to "evolving" national circumstances. The Russian Federation requested clarification of the meaning of "actions" and "commitments." The EU insisted on "commitments" only.

In a paragraph on parties reflecting, in their INDCs, efforts that they are able to make unilaterally, parties discussed the conditionality of INDCs. Norway, opposed by Mexico, suggested its deletion, saying the issue was captured elsewhere. Switzerland, supported by the US, preferred replacing "unilateral" with "unconditional." Switzerland also suggested specifying that parties with less capability may also communicate enhanced efforts contingent on provision of support.

The EU, supported by Japan, preferred referring to efforts that parties are able to "undertake," instead of "make unilaterally." Noting potential use of quantitative or qualitative methodologies, Brazil supported "developing countries may also clarify the extent to which enhanced efforts are dependent upon the provision of support."

Sudan, for the African Group, supported by China and Chile, and opposed by the US, preferred restating the extent to which developing countries' implementation depends on the level of support. Chile suggested adding reference to "countries most vulnerable to climate change impacts." Emphasizing the need for a component of unconditionality in parties' mitigation contributions, the US recognized that the LDCs have specific constraints, but opposed referencing any other group. The LDCs, supported by the EU, suggested reference to paragraph 11(a) of the draft text (communication of INDCs' mitigation component).

In a paragraph on consideration by developed countries, starting in 2019, of annual quantitative contributions of MOI to support ambitious mitigation and adaptation action, particularly in those most vulnerable to climate change, delegates engaged in a lengthy discussion. Japan proposed deleting the paragraph, opposed by the African Group and Mexico, who underscored lack of agreement on the scope of INDCs.

India, for the LMDCs, with Saudi Arabia, for the Arab Group, suggested: replacing "starting in 2019, should consider quantitative considerations of MOI" with "shall provide, by the first quarter of 2015, information under Annex II," and referencing the provision of MOI to developing countries for a timely preparation of their INDCs. The LDCs preferred "shall communicate their INDCs on support."

The LMDCs proposed adding a paragraph specifying that developed countries shall also provide information on their annual quantitative provision of public financial resources for the post-2020 period for the implementation of developing countries' post-2020 enhanced actions.

Japan, with Australia, New Zealand and Canada, opposed including specific quantitative financial commitments, with Australia suggesting "enabling environments, and not quantitative targets, motivate private sector engagement." Brazil noted that including private sector involvement in the new agreement does not ensure climate finance.

The LDCs, with Brazil, China, the Arab Group, the African Group and the LMDCs, emphasized that submission of INDCs by developing countries is contingent on support.

Brazil, supported by Chile, for AILAC, suggested that developed countries "shall," in their INDCs, communicate their financial support targets, and policies and measures for technology development and transfer and capacity building, taking into account national circumstances.

He also suggested that developing countries be encouraged to communicate "South-South cooperation initiatives related to MOI" in their INDCs on the basis of solidarity, common sustainable development goals, and national circumstances.

The EU identified the elements text, rather than the decision on INDCs, as "the right place" to address climate finance.

Emphasizing the need to address a variety of actions by all parties in the 2015 agreement, the EU, Switzerland and the US opposed language applying only to developed countries.

Noting that the GCF capitalization resulted from the Cancun Agreements, the LDCs, with Malaysia, emphasized the need for a process on financial contributions beyond 2020.

On a paragraph regarding communication of INDCs, Bolivia called for a framework to define fairness and equity in parties' efforts that are in line with the global emissions budget. In the absence of these amendments, Bolivia, opposed by the EU and

the Philippines, urged deletion of paragraphs 15-23 (upfront information and review of INDCs). The EU noted that INDCs are nationally determined and called for a rules-based approach that is multilaterally determined. Noting the focus on mitigation, Turkey, supported by Brazil, asked for all components, including adaptation and MOI to be included under INDCs.

On paragraphs 24-36 (issues relating to workstream 2 (pre-2020 ambition)), Brazil proposed a new paragraph "recognizing the social and economic value of voluntary emission reduction activities and the need to consider them as units of convertible financial value," in the context of paragraph 4 of Decision 1/CP.19 (enhancing pre-2020 ambition). He explained this was intended: to create positive incentives for voluntary and collaborative action; to promote a "new standard of discussion"; to provide the political recognition necessary to develop related financial instruments; and not to relate to work under workstream 1 (the 2015 agreement).

The EU and Colombia, for AILAC, said the suggestion was useful but should be analyzed later. New Zealand queried what this recognition would entail. China, for the LMDCs, and the EU noted that the paragraph's placement could suggest that the focus of workstream 2 is only on voluntary activities.

On a paragraph urging all parties to the Kyoto Protocol to ratify and implement the Doha Amendment, Belarus suggested "calling upon" parties to consider the "possibility" of ratifying the amendment and to "clarify all existing ambiguities that might hamper its implementation." The EU said issues around Protocol Articles 5, 7 and 8 (methodological issues under the Protocol) should first be resolved.

New Zealand, the US, Australia and the EU proposed deleting paragraphs on a "Forum on Accelerated Implementation of Enhanced pre-2020 Climate Action."

On a paragraph on convening such a forum, to review progress made in the implementation of paragraphs 3 and 4 of Decision 1/CP.19 (implementation of BAP and enhancing pre-2020 ambition), in conjunction with SB 42, SB 44 and SB 46, South Africa preferred SB 43, SB 45 and SB 47. Bangladesh, for the LDCs, opposed holding it in conjunction with the COP. The LMDCs favored "in conjunction with each session of the ADP in 2015." Brazil said there may not be enough time to deliver "increased" results on pre-2020 ambition.

The LMDCs proposed launching an accelerated implementation "mechanism" and that it provide recommendations to COP 21 on how to further enhance pre-2020 ambition through the ADP.

On enhancing the understanding of the status of implementation of mitigation commitments to accelerate pre-2020 mitigation ambition, the LMDCs suggested text on facilitating: the increase in developed countries' quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol to 40% below 1990 by 2020; and the removal of conditionalities associated with such targets.

On a paragraph on accelerating activities under the ADP workplan on enhancing mitigation ambition by undertaking an in-depth technical examination process from 2015-2020, Canada preferred technical examination from 2015-2017. The LMDCs requested referencing the "workplan on adaptation with the leadership of developed countries."

The EU proposed adding a reference to limiting the global temperature increase to below 2° or 1.5°C, consistent with IPCC AR5. Nauru, for AOSIS, opposed 2°C.

The African Group, supported by the LMDCs, proposed that the technical examination process be facilitated by co-facilitators representing Annex I and non-Annex I parties, appointed by the ADP Co-Chairs for 2015-2017. AOSIS opposed a review of the ADP workplan that would allow for its curtailment in 2017.

The LMDCs and the African Group, opposed by AOSIS, called for identifying opportunities for actions with high adaptation potential, in addition to mitigation, and, opposed by Australia, for text differentiating between mitigation opportunities in developed and developing countries.

Bolivia, opposed by Australia, proposed adding reference to information sharing on the global emissions budget. South Africa, opposed by Australia, suggested developing reporting guidelines for initiatives and actors outside the Convention.

On a paragraph requesting the Secretariat to organize a series of in-session TEMs in 2015-2017, AOSIS, supported by many parties, called for the process to be organized “at least twice a year during the period 2015-2020 in areas with high mitigation potential.” Brazil suggested adding “options and instruments” to “areas.”

The LMDCs, opposed by the EU, suggested that a paragraph on identifying policy options differentiate between implementation in developed countries and support to overcome barriers to implementation in developing countries.

On engagement of experts, the African Group called for reference to observer organizations. The US, supported by Norway and Canada and opposed by Panama, for the CfRN, requested removing a reference to the Warsaw Framework for REDD+, saying it is not a body under the Convention.

Saudi Arabia, opposed by the EU, proposed that the TEMs also identify the negative impacts of response measures.

The LMDCs called for emphasizing that TEMs should stay under the ADP. The EU said it did not “imagine” the ADP continuing beyond Paris.

AOSIS proposed an additional paragraph on assessing the implementation of the TEMs and making recommendations on increasing their effectiveness at COP 23. The US called for the TEMs’ review in 2016. The LMDCs preferred 2015.

On a paragraph requesting the Secretariat to update a technical paper on mitigation benefits of actions, and develop a synthesis on thematic areas relating to mitigation opportunities and options for cooperation and accelerated action, Brazil suggested referring to “mitigation potential, opportunities, options and instruments.” Colombia, for AILAC, requested that a synthesis be “compiled into a summary and presented at the annual high-level forum.” AOSIS proposed disseminating the summary through a “web-based menu on policy options.”

The first reading of the first version of the ‘Draft COP decision proposed by the Co-Chairs’ finished on Wednesday, 10 December.

Second version of the ‘Draft COP decision proposed by the Co-Chairs’: Delegates began consideration of the second version of the ‘Draft COP decision proposed by the Co-Chairs’ on Friday, 12 December.

In general comments, Bolivia, for the G-77/China, supported by Guatemala for AILAC, Tuvalu, for LDCs, Malaysia for the LMDCs, and Egypt, called for clear reference in the preambular paragraphs to the principles and provisions of the Convention, in particular CBDRRC. He also expressed deep concern over the lack of differentiation between developing countries and developed countries, referring to Annex I and non-Annex I parties. He also lamented that the issue of MOI, in particular finance, is too general and implies uniformity, calling, with China, for specific reference of responsibilities for support from developed countries to developing countries. He also called for clear differentiation between adaptation and loss and damage, and for strengthening the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage. Algeria, for the Arab Group, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo called for references to principles and provisions of the Convention.

India lamented that the issue of strengthening the multilateral rules-based system and working with existing commitments is missing in the text. On upfront information for INDCs, Trinidad and Tobago suggested removing references to “equitable” from the text. Brazil, *inter alia*: described the text as the lowest common denominator; lamented it lacks ambition, finance, differentiation and a clear notion of no backsliding; and opposed the concept of self-differentiation implied in the text.

Malaysia, for the LMDCs, lamented the loss of text after the revision, suggesting “developed country parties, starting in 2019, should consider annual quantitative contributions on MOI to support ambitious mitigation and adaptation action, in particular for parties particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change.”

Nauru, for AOSIS, called for reference to the global temperature goal. Panama, for CfRN, called for references to the Warsaw Framework for REDD+. Bolivia opposed references to market-based mechanisms and the Warsaw Framework. Mali, for the African Group, requested new paragraphs: to address the lack of parties’ ownership of the TEMs’ preparation; requesting developed countries to present a roadmap to mobilize US\$100 billion per year by 2020; urging developed countries to include, in their financial INDCs the time frame and periods of disbursement of post-2020 finance; and publishing developed countries’ communications to ensure transparency. Bangladesh said elements for a draft negotiating text should be reflected in an annex to the decision. The United Arab Emirates called for focusing discussions on paragraphs on which there is no agreement.

On **preambular paragraphs**, on being guided by the Convention, recalling the objective of the Convention and also recalling all relevant COP decisions, India said the first sentence “shutters parties’ confidence.” India with China, Brazil, Fiji, the LMDCs, the Dominican Republic, Thailand and Venezuela, called for a clear reference that the work is not just “guided by” but is “in accordance with” the principle of CBDR and provisions under the Convention. He proposed an additional paragraph on consideration of economic and social issues, including just transition.

Trinidad and Tobago called for a reference to the long-term global goal to limit temperature to below 2° or 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels. Emphasizing as a “red line,” Sudan, for the African Group, called for both upfront information and

the post-2020 arrangement to be under the Convention. He suggested the preambular paragraph should recall the “principles and provisions of Convention “to provide assurance.” Ecuador stressed the importance of long-term finance in the context of the decision. Nicaragua and Viet Nam called for a preambular reference to the decision being under the Convention. Fiji and Thailand requested references to the principles of the Convention.

On the **operative paragraphs**, on a paragraph on the scope of the 2015 agreement, Nauru, for AOSIS, supported by Mexico, Bangladesh and the Dominican Republic, emphasized loss and damage as a separate element of the new agreement. The US and Canada opposed this, with the US saying they were prepared to accept the rest of the paragraph in light of assurances sought by a number of countries.

Australia cautioned parties against reopening, in the context of the new agreement, a “hard fought compromise on loss and damage” that was reached in Warsaw. He suggested deleting reference to loss and damage, and adding, after references to the elements, “reference to any associated institutional arrangement.” The Russian Federation and Switzerland also opposed reference to loss and damage.

Nicaragua, Solomon Islands, Ghana and Fiji called for having loss and damage as an element separate from adaptation.

The Philippines, with Nigeria, emphasized loss and damage as critical, and said it must stand alone in the text and not be considered as part of adaptation.

South Africa called for references to the 2°C and 1.5°C goals, and recognizing that the level of adaptation required depends on the level of mitigation.

On a paragraph on intensified consideration by the ADP of the elements for a draft negotiating text reflected in Annex I, with a view to making available a negotiating text for a protocol, another legal instrument or agreed outcome with legal force under the Convention applicable to all parties before May 2015, Venezuela, with Nicaragua, opposed including the elements text in an annex. She cautioned, with Algeria, for the Arab Group, against precluding the legal form of the new agreement. The US welcomed an annex. Malaysia, for the LMDCs, expressed concern that the annex will form the basis for the 2015 negotiations. To preserve the progress accomplished in Lima, he suggested the Co-Chairs reflect this in their report of the session.

On a paragraph noting that arrangements in the decision relating to INDCs are without prejudice to the legal nature of the INDCs or the content of the 2015 agreement, Sudan, for the African Group, stressed that both the legal form and the content of the Paris agreement should not be prejudged.

On a paragraph on provision of support by developed countries and other countries in a position to do so, Guatemala, for AILAC, lamented lack of assurance on means of implementation post-2020. Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates stressed the need for building trust and for greater clarity on scaling up finance by 2020. Marshall Islands said many developing countries see the scaling up of finance by developed countries as key to the Lima package. Saudi Arabia opposed the paragraph and suggested a spin-off group work on the issue.

China, Brazil, Pakistan, Malaysia, for the LMDCs, Sudan, for the African Group, South Africa, Nicaragua, Venezuela, Iran, Nigeria and Cuba called for deletion of reference to “other parties in a position to do so.” New Zealand and Japan supported the paragraph, opposing its amendment. Mexico interpreted “in a position to do so” not as an issue of differentiation, but as “opening the doors” for “countries like ours” to contribute, and urged parties to find a way to “keep those doors open.”

Given the concerns raised, the EU suggested deleting the paragraph. The US proposed taking the issue up next year. The Democratic Republic of the Congo said it prejudged the outcome of negotiations on finance.

Egypt, supported by Brazil, proposed an additional paragraph to capture the importance of an agreement on scaled-up, new and additional, predictable, adequate and improved access to finance for developing countries to enable and support enhanced action on mitigation, adaptation and MOI.

On a paragraph with three options relating to communication of INDCs, including their scope, Algeria, for the Arab Group, proposed its deletion. India, Bolivia, Nicaragua, Belarus, Cuba, Viet Nam, Iran and the Russian Federation favored the first option, in which the COP would reiterate its invitation to each party to communicate to the Secretariat its INDCs towards achieving the objective of the Convention.

Australia, Canada and Switzerland supported the second option, in which the COP: would reiterate its invitation to each party to communicate to the Secretariat its INDCs towards achieving the objective of the Convention and agrees that each party’s INDC will represent a progression beyond the current undertaking of that party. Saudi Arabia indicated support if mitigation and adaptation were at the same legal “level.” New Zealand said it could support the second option as a starting point, and could look into a proposal to add references to adaptation, noting such references should not define “contributions” nor be mandatory. Japan said it was open to addressing adaptation, but not MOI.

China indicated support for both the first and second options. The Democratic Republic of the Congo preferred the first option, but was ready to work with the second option by referencing contributions on adaptation and finance.

Mexico, the Philippines, Sudan, for the African Group, Nigeria, South Africa, Malawi, Solomon Islands, Bangladesh, the Dominican Republic, the Republic of Korea and Fiji supported the third option, in which the COP would agree that parties’ INDCs will include a mitigation contribution, and may also include contributions on adaptation and MOI, and that the INDCs of each party will represent a progression beyond the current undertaking of that party.

Nigeria suggested adding: “INDCs submitted by Annex I should be ambitious enough in accordance with IPCC AR5 to result in emission reductions of GHGs equivalent to their total share of global emissions and be made a condition for entry into force of the agreement to be adopted in Paris.” Brazil favored the proposal by the African Group.

The US preferred the third option, but was willing to consider the second option, strongly supporting each party’s INDCs representing a progression beyond their current undertaking.

Panama, for Cfrn, with the LMDCs, favored the second or third options, provided CBDR is recognized. The EU expressed preparedness for some trade-offs, including the possibility of including adaptation in the INDCs on a voluntary basis. Switzerland said it could consider adaptation in INDCs if other key elements were brought in, including unconditional INDCs with quantifiable mitigation information and information on accounting.

On a paragraph with three options relating to information to be provided in INDCs, Tuvalu, for the LDCs, called for referencing sections of the text on support. With India and Bolivia, he stressed the need to clearly indicate in the annex that MOI support is to be provided by developed countries to developing countries.

India, China, Bolivia, Nicaragua, Viet Nam, Belarus, Iran and Algeria, for the Arab Group, preferred the first option, in which the COP would decide that all parties, when communicating to the Secretariat their INDCs, will provide the information necessary to facilitate the clarity, transparency and understanding of their INDCs.

China suggested adding that the information parties communicate should be in accordance with Convention Article 12 (communication of information related to implementation) and relevant reporting decisions under the Convention.

Australia stressed the importance of the paragraph and supported, with the Philippines, the Republic of Korea and Switzerland, the second option, in which the COP would decide that all parties shall provide information on the reference point (including, as appropriate, a base year), time frames and/or periods for implementation, scope and coverage, expected level of effort, and how the party considers that its INDC is fair and equitable, ambitious and consistent with the objective of the Convention.

Australia suggested including reference to “any assumptions and methodologies.” New Zealand, supported by Japan, called for additional references to assumptions, methodologies, land use accounting approaches, and the use of market mechanisms.

The US expressed willingness to work with the second option with the addition of references to assumptions and methodologies, “fair” instead of “equitable,” and parties’ INDCs representing their best effort in light of national circumstances.

Sudan, for the African Group, said the second option could be considered, but required that all elements be covered and strengthened with a reference to the type and amount of MOI in order to establish parity with the required mitigation information.

The Philippines, supported by Mexico and Ghana, called for reflecting human rights, in particular the rights of indigenous peoples and women.

Mexico, South Africa, the Dominican Republic, Fiji, and Trinidad and Tobago supported the third option, in which the COP would decide that all parties shall provide information on the reference point (including, as appropriate, a base year or other reference values), time frames and periods for implementation, scope and coverage, expected quantified outcomes, any assumptions, methodologies, land-use accounting approaches and expected use of market mechanisms, undertakings in national adaptation planning processes, and if applicable, the provision of MOI support for ambitious mitigation and adaptation action in developing countries, with

special consideration for parties particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change and how the party considers that its INDC is fair and equitable, ambitious and consistent with the objective of the Convention, and decide that parties shall provide the information identified in Annex II, as appropriate, when communicating their INDC.

Brazil suggested replacing “methodologies, land-use accounting approaches” with “methodological approaches for establishing and accounting for anthropogenic GHG emissions by sources, and as appropriate.”

On a paragraph calling for developed countries, the operating entities of the financial mechanism and any organization in a position to do so to provide support for the preparation and communication of INDCs, Tanzania called for separating what is asked from parties from what is asked from operating entities.

On a paragraph with three options relating to actions by the Secretariat after the INDCs’ communication, including possible dialogues and an assessment of their aggregate effect, India, China, Brazil, Nicaragua, Cuba, Belarus, Saudi Arabia, Viet Nam and Bolivia favored the first option, requesting the Secretariat to publish the INDCs online, as communicated. The LMDCs expressed willingness to work on the language of other options.

New Zealand, Japan, Canada, the United Arab Emirates and the Republic of Korea supported the second option, which requests the Secretariat, to *inter alia*: organize a dialogue between June 2015 ADP session and COP 21 with the objective of facilitating the clarity, transparency and understanding of the communicated INDCs and prepare a technical paper in advance of the dialogue on the aggregate effect of the INDCs communicated by parties prior to 30 June 2015. Willing to work with the second option, the US requested the dialogue to occur at every ADP session.

The EU, supported by Tuvalu, for the LDCs, emphasized the need for a follow-up process to the communication of INDCs, and indicated, with Trinidad and Tobago, preference for the third option, which requests the Secretariat to: publish INDCs online as communicated; organize two in-session dialogues; and prepare a technical paper in advance of the dialogues, on the aggregate effect of INDCs communicated by parties prior to 30 May 2015. Mexico, Fiji, the Dominican Republic and Switzerland supported the third option, with South Africa calling for additional references to a compilation of, and workshops on, existing methodological provisions on LULUCF and REDD+.

On a paragraph encouraging parties to the Kyoto Protocol to ratify and implement its Doha Amendment, Cuba and Viet Nam, opposed by Belarus and Ukraine, called for “urging” instead of “encouraging” parties.

On a paragraph with three options relating to enhancing pre-2020 mitigation ambition, including a possible forum or mechanism to assess implementation, the EU, with the US, Canada, India, Australia, New Zealand, Iran, Algeria, for the Arab Group, Belarus, Japan and Switzerland, preferred the first option, suggesting the COP reiterates its resolve, as set out in Decision 1/CP.19, paragraphs 3 and 4, to accelerate the full implementation of the decisions constituting the agreed outcome pursuant to decision 1/CP.13 (Bali Action Plan) and enhance ambition in the pre-2020 period in order to ensure the highest possible mitigation efforts under the Convention by all parties.

The EU, Canada and the US disagreed, opposed by Tuvalu, for the LDCs, with including finance in the INDCs, noting this issue will not be resolved in Lima. The LDCs stressed the need for an indication of finance not just for the preparation of INDCs, but also for their implementation; and also called for a reference to special circumstances of LDCs in the preparation of the mitigation INDCs. Mexico stressed the need for financial and technical support.

India called for reflecting that elements for the draft negotiating text would be under the Convention.

Mexico, China, Marshall Islands, Cuba, Fiji, Viet Nam, Panama, for CfrN, Bolivia, Saudi Arabia and the Dominican Republic supported the third option, in which the COP would launch an accelerated implementation mechanism to assess progress made in the implementation of Decision 1/CP.19, paragraphs 3 and 4, by convening meetings in conjunction with SB 42, 44 and 46.

The United Arab Emirates preferred the second option, in which the COP would convene a forum to assess progress made in the implementation of Decision 1/CP.19, paragraphs 3 and 4, in conjunction with SB 42. The Democratic Republic of the Congo called for a hybrid option, preferring a forum that will take place not only in 2015, but also in 2016 and 2017. Brazil emphasized following a results-oriented approach.

On a paragraph on actions by the Secretariat to continue the technical examination of opportunities with high mitigation potential in the period 2015-2020, Iran said it should cover all elements, not only mitigation. Saudi Arabia said TEMs need to end by 2016 or include adaptation. The Dominican Republic and Bolivia called for inclusion of women and youth as experts. Bolivia emphasized meaningful participation of indigenous peoples in TEMs, and called for a new thematic area on sustainable management of ecosystems, and consideration of additional areas for discussion under adaptation.

On **Annex II (complementary information on INDCs)**, Tuvalu, for the LDCs noted, with India, Bolivia and China, the need to clearly indicate in the annex that MOI support is to be provided by developed countries to developing countries. China and Bolivia opposed reference to “fairness and ambition” under the subheading “other” in Annex II, which addresses to indicators relating to fairness and ambition and their application. Egypt, Cuba, Fiji, Viet Nam and Sudan, for the African Group, opposed the annex. The Russian Federation cautioned against the level of detail in the annex. Brazil opposed the concept of self-differentiation and, with Marshall Islands, called for a clear notion of no backsliding.

Venezuela stressed the need to reflect differentiation. Iran proposed deletion of the annex as it does not reference CBDR or a timeline on finance and MOI. Algeria, for the Arab Group, emphasized the need to refer to adaptation finance and expressed reservations on fairness indicators. The LMDCs preferred capturing it in the operative paragraphs.

ADP ITEM 3: ELEMENTS: This item was first considered on Tuesday, 2 December and continued through Saturday, 6 December. On 2 December, ADP Co-Chair Runge-Metzger

presented the non-paper on ‘Elements for a draft negotiating text’ (ADP.2014.11.NonPaper) issued by the Co-Chairs in advance of ADP 2-7.

On Saturday, 6 December, the first reading of all sections of the elements text was concluded. On Monday, 8 December, ADP Co-Chair Artur Runge-Metzger introduced a revised version, including a footnote to the title stating: “These elements for a draft negotiating text reflect work in progress. They neither indicate convergence on the proposals presented nor do they preclude new proposals from emerging in the course of the negotiations in 2015.” Many developing countries questioned the legal status of the new text, underscoring it remains a non-paper and that their concerns were not reflected in the text. ADP Co-Chair Runge-Metzger said it is up to parties to decide the legal status of the text. The elements text was not considered further during ADP 2-7 but is contained in the annex to the ‘Lima Call for Climate Action,’ for consideration at ADP 2-8.

Substantive negotiations took place on eight elements summarized below: finance; adaptation; mitigation; capacity building; technology; cooperation and support; transparency of action and support; and time frames and process related to commitments/contributions.

Finance: Nicaragua, with many developing countries, opposed the text as “a far cry from the Convention and previous decisions.”

On differentiation, Sudan, for the African Group, with Ecuador, for the LMDCs, and Bolivia, for the G-77/China, opposed text suggesting “all” parties mobilize climate finance through a diversity of actions. The African Group recalled differentiation between developed and developing countries under the Convention, and the responsibility of developed countries to provide finance.

The LMDCs, opposed by Japan, called for deleting references to provision of finance by “parties in a position to do so.” India and China called instead for a reference only to developed countries and those listed in Annex II of the Convention.

The LMDCs opposed reference to results-based adaptation finance. Mexico clarified “results-based” is not a precondition for access to finance, and stressed prioritizing both mitigation and adaptation finance. Indonesia highlighted the need to ensure adherence to the Convention principles in the entire agreement. Switzerland suggested including in the 2015 agreement: reference to “each party” rather than “all parties” mobilizing climate finance; some text on the purpose of financial resources; and applicable principles, such as being results-based, recognizing developing countries’ investment, and reflecting evolving capabilities and responsibilities.

Bolivia, for the G-77/China, highlighted gaps in the implementation of obligations under the Convention and called for enhancement of support. Colombia stressed referencing leadership of developed countries in the implementation of the Convention.

China and India called for deleting text suggesting that “parties mobilize and provide financial resources in a manner which is capable of adapting dynamically to changing realities and future developments and needs.”

The EU clarified that “evolving responsibilities and capabilities” captures the growth in the levels of prosperity and GHG emissions of developing countries, noting that some are currently more prosperous than some EU member states.

On policy signals and enabling environments, the US called for including text: encouraging parties to build effective enabling environments; calling for elimination of public incentives for high-carbon investment; and recognizing that climate finance flows in all directions. He suggested deleting reference to mobilization of climate finance “as a means to stay below the long-term temperature limit,” and, opposed by the African Group, to “adequate and predictable” funding for adaptation.

Malawi, for the LDCs, lamented that text on “encouraging policy signals by governments” does not address provision of climate finance. New Zealand described “right” policies and enabling environments as a prerequisite for more effective flows of climate finance.

On sources of finance, Norway, Switzerland, Canada and the US suggested highlighting a variety of sources. The Republic of Korea stressed the importance of operational guidelines, including: a balanced approach to finance, with equal footing for adaptation and mitigation; a practical approach for mobilizing finance from the public and private sectors; and creating synergies among different financial institutions.

On the scale of finance, Egypt, with Paraguay, emphasized that adequate and predictable finance should come mainly from public sources. Algeria suggested that “adequate and predictable funding for adaptation” also be “additional.” The EU and Japan, opposed by Ecuador, considered specifying finance as “adequate and predictable” problematic.

Egypt sought clarity on the scale of finance and supported quantified targets for finance to ensure predictability. Norway, the EU, Switzerland and Japan opposed an *ex ante* process to commit to quantified support commensurate with the ambition reflected in the adaptation and mitigation goals, with the EU signaling this as “a red line.” Colombia emphasized the need to capture predictability in the new agreement.

Japan proposed deleting text suggesting that mobilization of finance be “regularly scaled up.” The EU preferred regular “updating” rather than “upscaling.”

South Africa proposed to identify: how to anchor the existing finance mechanism and MRV system into the new agreement; the scale of resources required to keep temperature rise below “our goal”; who contributes and how; and sources of finance.

China called for acknowledging that South-South cooperation is not a commitment of parties and, with India and Algeria, suggested mobilization and provision of finance be enhanced not “in coordination with,” but rather as “additional to,” official development assistance.

On Thursday, 4 December, Sudan, for the African Group, supported by Bolivia, for the G-77/China, Saudi Arabia, Maldives, India, South Africa, Ecuador, Zambia, Pakistan, Argentina and others, introduced a conference room paper (CRP) containing draft elements on climate finance under the ADP, requesting that it replace the Co-Chairs’ non-paper as the basis for discussion.

New Zealand, with Switzerland, called for concluding the consideration of the Co-Chairs’ non-paper, noting it covers most of the elements of the CRP. The US emphasized work undertaken over the past two days on the Co-Chairs’ non-paper and progress already achieved.

The G-77/China stressed the legal standing of the CRP as opposed to the Co-Chairs’ non-paper. ADP Co-Chair Runge-Metzger invited parties to consult informally on the way forward. This issue was not further addressed during the session.

Adaptation: The US, Mexico, the Republic of Korea, Norway, Canada, Switzerland, the EU, Zambia, Japan and others provided comments on, *inter alia*: long-term and global aspects of adaptation; commitments and contributions; monitoring and evaluation; sharing information, knowledge and lessons learned; and institutional arrangements.

Saudi Arabia, for the LMDCs, Zambia, South Africa and others stressed the need to address differentiation. Switzerland said there is no need for differentiation on adaptation, noting that commitments are intended to facilitate preparation for adaptation actions without being burdensome. Australia and New Zealand opposed a “bifurcated” approach.

Tuvalu, for the LDCs, cautioned against referring to “contributions” or “commitments.” The US proposed referring to “actions.” Brazil said work that has been done under the Cancun Adaptation Framework and Nairobi Work Programme should be recognized. The LMDCs favored the terms “commitments” and “actions.” India emphasized that determination of contributions should be country-driven.

The Republic of Korea supported a global adaptation goal that is general enough to be applicable to all and specific enough to inspire action on the ground. Norway requested that an option for no global adaptation goal be reflected. Japan expressed doubt over a quantitative goal on adaptation. The US, Norway, Canada and the EU supported broadening the scope of national adaptation planning processes.

New Zealand opposed a global goal on adaptation. The LDCs supported a long-term goal, noting that action on adaptation is dependent on mitigation and the global temperature limit. Ghana, for the African Group, said dimensions of the adaptation goal should be both quantitative and qualitative. The US clarified that “universal individual commitments” imply that each party will undertake enhanced adaptation actions to be included in national planning processes.

Mexico said inter-linkages between adaptation and mitigation, renewed and reinforced collective commitments, national commitments, and adaptation finance should be reflected in the new “protocol.” She said monitoring and evaluation, and, with Norway, institutional arrangements should be addressed in COP decisions. Emphasizing that adaptation cannot be measured and quantified, Canada, New Zealand and Australia did not support linkages between the long-term temperature limit, the need for support and adaptation.

Australia and New Zealand also did not support linkages between mitigation ambition, adaptation needs, the global temperature goal, and finance. Saudi Arabia, for the LMDCs, and Argentina stressed the need to link adaptation to MOI.

On institutional arrangements, the US, Canada, Japan and others saw no need for new institutional arrangements for adaptation. Switzerland opposed singling out loss and damage in the new agreement.

The LDCs proposed establishing: a clearinghouse to help those lacking capacity and access to the best adaptation technologies; a roster of international adaptation experts; and, with Timor Leste, regional adaptation centers.

On MRV, Nauru, for AOSIS, supported reference to national communications and biennial update reports for communicating commitments, stressing the need to build on existing reporting modalities. Chile, for AILAC, preferred existing reporting vehicles that would not burden any country and facilitate North-South and South-South cooperation.

The LDCs favored an MRV mechanism to ensure a level of support commensurate with adaptation needs. The LMDCs and South Africa cautioned against placing additional burdens on developing countries. China and Iran emphasized the knowledge gap on the implementation of adaptation.

On loss and damage, AOSIS, the LDCs, AILAC, the African Group and others, opposed by Australia, emphasized that it should become a stand-alone element in the new agreement. New Zealand opposed any reinterpretation of Decision 2/CP.19 (Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage).

The LDCs proposed a climate change displacement coordination unit, and a mechanism to deal with slow-onset events, including a compensation regime. The LMDCs said discussions on loss and damage are premature pending outcomes on the Executive Committee.

Mitigation: On differentiation, Kenya, for the African Group, lamented the overall lack of reference to equity, CBDR, mitigation obligations of developed countries, and specific national and regional development priorities. India, Argentina, Venezuela, Jordan, Cuba and Bolivia called for reference to CBDR, principles and provisions of the Convention, or its Article 4 (commitments). Japan, New Zealand, the US, Australia, Switzerland and Canada opposed creating binary divisions on commitments, based on annexes or the distinction between developed and developing countries.

The EU said the text should reflect that all parties will eventually take quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets. The US called for an option in the text to update the Convention's annexes to reflect parties' changing economic and emissions trends.

The United Arab Emirates proposed recognizing actions by "early movers."

Saudi Arabia, for the LMDCs, described other parties' comments on the evolution of CBDR, updated annexes or elimination of differentiation as "illegal," emphasizing that the future agreement cannot be built on that basis. Supporting Brazil, China opposed the introduction of new concepts, saying diverting from the principles and provisions of the Convention makes progress difficult.

On long-term and global aspects, Nauru, for AOSIS, suggested a regular review of the elements under the section on the basis of science. Saudi Arabia suggested using agreed language, for example from Cancun, and including references

to, *inter alia*, sustainable development and developing countries' vulnerabilities. China called for reflecting the linkages between the collective aspects of mitigation, adaptation and MOI.

South Africa stressed a long-term goal should be consistent with what is required by science, and Tuvalu, for the LDCs, said the goal should be to keep the temperature increase below 1.5°C. New Zealand suggested "net zero CO2 emissions by 2100" in line with the latest science. The EU called for explicit reference to the 2°C goal.

Algeria, for the Arab Group, reminded parties that Decision 1/CP.16 (Cancun Agreements) recognizes the need for a longer time frame for the peaking of GHG emissions in developing countries.

On mitigation contributions or commitments, Saudi Arabia said the subsection title should include "actions." China suggested structuring the subsection so as to differentiate enhanced mitigation action by developed and developing countries. Chile, for AILAC, among others, supported the principle of "no backsliding." Norway said elements on accounting and periodicity should be part of the mitigation section.

The EU said all parties should submit unconditional commitments, with the possibility for the most vulnerable to also submit actions conditional on support. The US, with Australia, said each country should maintain a schedule of actions they intend to take to meet their commitments, with periodic reporting on implementation and revisions to enhance commitments.

Bolivia, opposed by Australia and New Zealand, called for commitments based on an "indexed" global carbon budget divided among all parties according to historical responsibility, ecological footprint, state of development and capabilities. Brazil said agreement on criteria for carbon budgeting was difficult to foresee.

Panama, for the CfRN, said that the global carbon budget should be informed by national estimates. Ukraine opposed considering a global carbon budget, preferring a bottom-up approach to long-term emission reductions.

The LDCs called for two annexes, one for parties taking quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets and the other for parties that take other forms of commitments.

The Republic of Korea supported reference to market mechanisms. Mexico preferred "commitments" according to CBDRRC and supported schedules as an anchoring mechanism for contributions. Ethiopia emphasized MOI for developing countries.

The EU called for a commitment cycle of 10 years and, supported by the US, for a five-year cycle of review and revision. The EU said this should be elaborated further in the text. The Russian Federation cautioned that a review process in the middle of the commitment period could make ratification challenging, as legislators require a clear understanding of what they are agreeing to.

On response measures, the LDCs, Venezuela, Argentina, Egypt and the United Arab Emirates, opposed by New Zealand, Japan and Canada, variously supported a mechanism, institution or permanent forum. Ukraine preferred the option of no new arrangements, or a permanent forum as an alternative.

Saudi Arabia said his country will not support the new agreement if it does not adequately address the issue.

Cooperation and Support: China and Saudi Arabia said discussion on cooperation and support for implementation was not mandated by Decision 1/CP.17 (establishing the ADP). ADP Co-Chair Runge-Metzger explained that headings were only included for the parties' convenience.

Many parties supported consolidating the section on cooperation and support with sections on other elements. Algeria, for the Arab Group, and China said sections on market and non-market approaches, and new market-based mechanisms could prejudice discussions under the SBs.

Australia, New Zealand, the US, Canada and others said all parties in a position to do so should provide support for the implementation of the new agreement. The EU and Switzerland supported describing the purpose of MOI. Japan said parties who provide and receive support should work together to mobilize private finance.

On differentiation, Singapore expressed concern over "evolving responsibilities" and "parties in a position to do so," and cautioned against rewriting the Convention. The Arab Group opposed reference to "evolving" CBDRRC. China said only developed countries have the responsibility to provide support to developing countries, and cautioned against introducing new principles.

On institutional arrangements, the Arab Group, with China, called for deletion of reference to sub-national, national and regional emissions trading schemes. Australia, the EU, New Zealand, Switzerland, the US, Canada, Japan and others expressed reservations about this sub-section. Panama stressed the importance of referring to the accounting and conformity functions of cooperative arrangements.

Transparency of Action and Support: South Africa, supported by Mexico, proposed launching a process for discussing transparency rules during 2015, with South Africa saying this should be reflected in the ADP conclusions from Lima.

On the scope of MRV, Argentina, with Tuvalu, for the LDCs, cautioned against bias towards mitigation. The LDCs called for greater parity between mitigation and support. New Zealand and Japan urged referring to transparency of support provided and received. Switzerland highlighted the need for adaptation reporting.

Brazil said transparency cannot substitute accountability, and is linked not only to mitigation, but also adaptation and MOI. Turkey said the scope of contributions should remain at parties' discretion.

On the MRV framework, the African Group, warned against backsliding from the current framework. The African Group, South Africa, Chile, for AILAC, Panama, for CfRN, Nauru, for AOSIS, Brazil and Mexico called for building on the existing MRV framework, with some suggesting it could evolve over time. Nauru, for AOSIS, said the framework should measure progress toward a global goal of 1.5° or 2°C and promote participation of all countries. The African Group cautioned against placing additional burdens on developing countries.

Argentina, the LDCs, the African Group, Saudi Arabia and China, for the LMDCs, emphasized differentiation, with many calling for maintaining the existing "two-track" approach to MRV. Brazil called for a transparency framework that reflects differentiation. Ecuador requested a reference to CBDR.

Norway emphasized universality and, with Switzerland, flexibility to accommodate parties' different capabilities. Australia, Japan and the US called for a single transparency system applicable to all. The US said the system should enable verification of efforts, which could include tiers and opt-out provisions based on parties' circumstances.

Turkey opposed, calling for a common framework with common MRV provisions applicable to all parties, with flexibility for developing countries on the level and depth of the application of the common MRV provisions.

On rules and modalities, the EU, with New Zealand, suggested that the new agreement contain high-level MRV and accounting principles, with guidelines and modalities elaborated in COP decisions.

Argentina cautioned against prejudging SBSTA discussions on LULUCF and requested that various approaches be referenced in addition to markets. Jordan objected to references to market mechanisms. The African Group emphasized gaps in developed countries' MRV frameworks on markets and LULUCF.

South Africa highlighted the importance of LULUCF accounting, calling for consolidating detailed rules under the Convention. AILAC called for stronger language on developing rules for markets, land-use and forestry sectors. CfRN called for references to REDD+ and coastal ecosystems.

AOSIS and AILAC called for a clear definition of climate finance, with AILAC stressing this will help avoid double-counting.

The LMDCs called for text on, *inter alia*: a common methodology for MRV of support by developed countries; a strengthened review of MOI support; and a financial channel under the GCF for MRV-related capacity building in developing countries.

Technology: On commitments, Swaziland, for the African Group, Argentina and China called for differentiated obligations for developed and developing countries. Swaziland, for the African Group, said that commitments should not shift responsibility from developed to developing countries, nor encourage private over public support. China emphasized the need for developed countries to provide support to implement technology needs assessments in developing countries.

On institutional arrangements, Swaziland, for the African Group, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Algeria and Argentina preferred anchoring institutional arrangements in the TEC and CTCN. China urged further guidance to strengthen the Technology Mechanism (TM), noting such guidance is complementary to anchoring the mechanism in the TEC and CTCN.

Iran, Argentina and Algeria said that technology transfer should proceed under the principles and provisions of the Convention. The US said cooperative action to promote and enhance technology development and transfer should include existing technology and financial mechanisms. Ukraine requested inclusion of economies in transition in the development and transfer of technologies.

Capacity Building: Canada and Japan said capacity building must be "country-driven," and not "demand-driven." Tanzania, with Tuvalu, for the LDCs, urged enhancing capacities of

national governments to absorb financial and technological resources, and opposed reference to “clear and predictable targets and outcomes.”

On commitments, South Africa and India emphasized developed countries’ obligation to provide capacity-building support to developing countries. Ethiopia emphasized “glaring” differences in needs for capacity building in developing countries and, opposed by the US, called for commitments on capacity building.

Algeria, for the Arab Group, stressed that developing countries able to provide capacity can do so voluntarily. Argentina said parties should identify their own capacity gaps. The US said all parties in a position to do so should be invited to support others with lower capabilities.

On institutional arrangements, South Africa, China, India, Iran, Tanzania, Tuvalu, for the LDCs, and others, opposed by Canada, Japan, the EU, the US and others, supported the establishment of an international capacity-building mechanism. India noted that mobilization of private capital cannot be one of its essential elements.

Argentina said private funding should be complementary to public funding. China cautioned against “board-shifting behaviors” in reference to the potential role of the private sector in supporting capacity building. Stating that capacity development should apply to all parties, not only developing countries, the EU called for improving and strengthening existing mechanisms and arrangements under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol that address capacity building.

Time Frames and Process Related to Commitments/

Contributions: China stressed the importance of the timing of the agreement, including precise dates for the starting and ending of its implementation, and a time frame related to commitments.

On commitments/contributions, Turkey preferred “contributions.” South Africa favored commitments with a legal character. Chile, for AILAC, said that “contributions” should be communicated every five years, with an indication of contributions for the subsequent five-year period, as well as the five-year period following that.

Indicating flexibility on period length, Switzerland, with Norway, emphasized that all parties should communicate their commitments at the same time. Turkey preferred a 10-year period with a mid-term review.

On *ex ante* consideration, AILAC called for a robust process. Switzerland urged *ex ante* consideration of aggregate commitments. Turkey said the process should not be prescriptive. Norway said commitments should become legally-binding obligations once they are put forward through an annex or schedule.

On formalization/finalization, AILAC said contributions should be inscribed in a document and cautioned against backsliding. Turkey and Tuvalu, for the LDCs, said contributions could be revised on a voluntary basis. The LDCs called for two annexes for: quantified emission reduction commitments; and emission limitation commitments and strategies. Australia said parties should be allowed to adjust their commitment/contribution on an exceptional basis.

On strategic review of implementation, AILAC supported a five-year cycle and, with Switzerland, Turkey and the Republic of Korea, and opposed by China, said it should be applicable to all parties. Norway said review should harness unrealized opportunities.

CLOSING PLENARY: On Saturday, 13 December, COP 20 President Manuel Pulgar-Vidal indicated that “we are very close” to building the basis of a successful outcome in Paris, expressing hope and trust that parties will work together to find the balance needed for moving the process forward.

ADP Co-Chair Artur Runge-Metzger noted that the objective of the meeting was to adopt “results” of the hard work, engagement and progress over the past two weeks reflected in the revised draft decision (FCCC/ADP/2014/L.5).

Singapore reported on Friday’s ministerial consultations, emphasizing a shared sense of urgency for progress and the need for trust in five areas:

- the need for the Lima outcome to be under the Convention;
- the need for balance in the scope of INDCs, which can include but cannot be confined to mitigation;
- financial support needs to be available without backsliding on developed countries’ prior commitments;
- the scale of ambition needs to be able to keep the global temperature rise under 2° or 1.5°C; and
- Lima’s outcome should not prejudice the legal form of the Paris agreement or affect the Convention’s firewall between developed and developing countries.

Switzerland, for the Environmental Integrity Group, the EU, Belize, Chile, for AILAC, Australia, New Zealand, Japan, Belarus, the Russian Federation, and Turkey endorsed the Co-Chairs’ text.

Highlighting their willingness to move forward despite the lack of language on how INDCs would be on track towards the long-term goal, the Marshall Islands proposed forwarding the text to the COP for adoption.

Urging parties to “make progress now,” the US said failure in Lima will put Paris as well as the future of UNFCCC at risk. He looked forward to an agreement that: is more ambitious than ever before; is built to last; applies to all parties in a genuine manner; is fully differentiated in terms of CBDRRC expressed in light of national circumstances; is built on the basis of rules-based accountability; and encompasses commitments to financial assistance.

Sudan, for the African Group, Malaysia, for the LMDCs, Saudi Arabia, Argentina, India, Uganda, Paraguay, Pakistan and others opposed the text.

The African Group stressed the importance of: the principles of the Convention; the concept of differentiation, cautioning against undermining it implicitly or explicitly; adaptation and MOI as Africa’s priorities; and equal and balanced treatment of these elements alongside mitigation and transparency. Noting that “the gap is closing little by little,” Nigeria asked parties to address issues raised by the African Group.

Calling the text “unacceptable as it stands,” the Democratic Republic of the Congo identified areas not addressed, including: parity among elements; differentiation; scope of INDCs “beyond” mitigation; and workstream 2 (pre-2020 ambition).

The LMDCs expressed disappointment that the text: does not recognize CBDR, and differentiation in INDCs and information to be submitted; introduces “parties in a position to do so”; does not adequately address finance; is mitigation-centered; and prejudices the Paris agreement. Noting that the ADP text had “divided the house,” Egypt supported the LMDCs on addressing issues such as differentiation.

El Salvador asked for “one final effort” to address CBDR in the text. Oman requested an amendment to the draft decision to reflect concerns of vulnerable states. South Africa, for Brazil, South Africa, India and China (BASIC), urged more time to address the balance between different elements, differentiation, and the assessment process for INDCs.

Venezuela said the text has not achieved the necessary objective set for Lima and cautioned against renegotiating the principles of the Convention.

Tuvalu, for the LDCs, said the text needed “a surgery” so that some “vital organs,” such as loss and damage, could be inserted. Uganda, Paraguay and the Solomon Islands emphasized that loss and damage must be an essential part of the decision and the future agreement.

The Cook Islands expressed support for the draft decision. Asking for his proposals on loss and damage and human rights to be attached in the annex, the Philippines supported adoption of the draft decision.

Singapore, China, Cuba and Nicaragua urged the Presidency to help find consensus in Lima. Algeria, for the Arab Group, called for a new text to be proposed by the COP President.

Bangladesh asked the Co-Chairs to reflect specific concerns expressed by parties before adopting the text. Senegal asked for a more balanced text.

Noting the lack of consensus on the draft decision, the ADP Co-Chairs forwarded the draft decision to the COP President under their own authority. ADP Co-Chair Runge-Metzger remarked that while some speak of a divide, in the Co-Chairs’ view, parties are united in the battle against climate change, but with different perceptions on how to move forward.

ADP Rapporteur Anna Serzysko presented, and parties adopted, the report of the session (FCCC/ADP/2014/L.4).

Parties gave ADP Co-Chairs Runge-Metzger and Kumarsingh a standing ovation in recognition of their hard work.

Pulgar-Vidal thanked the ADP Co-Chairs and announced that he would consult with parties to discuss possible solutions, and provide text to the COP closing plenary. ADP Co-Chair Runge-Metzger suspended the second session of the ADP at 1:31 pm.

COP 20 / CMP 10 CLOSING PLENARIES

COP 20 CLOSING PLENARY: On Friday, 12 December, the COP 20 closing plenary convened in the morning to adopt agreed items. The closing plenary was suspended at 1:18 pm.

On Saturday, 13 December, the closing plenary resumed at 5:20 pm to consider the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage and matters related to finance. The closing plenary was suspended at 5:50 pm. At 11:37 pm the closing plenary briefly resumed for the introduction of the draft decision on advancing the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (FCCC/CP/2014/L.14). The session was suspended at 11:53 pm for parties to review the text.

On Sunday, 14 December, the closing plenary resumed and adopted the decision on advancing the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action, renamed the ‘Lima Call for Climate Action’ at 1:23 am.

Parties and civil society then delivered joint COP/CMP closing statements. On the Lima Call for Climate Action, India underscored the importance of clear references to “under the Convention” and CBDR, noting “there will always be differences,” and suggesting “not leaving contentious issues to the end.”

Noting that the text “manages to strike a delicate balance between very difficult issues,” South Africa, for BASIC, said the outcome provides a solid foundation for work in 2015.

Underlining work achieved in Lima as essential for the adoption of the 2015 agreement in Paris, Bolivia, for the G-77/China, stated the agreement must treat the elements of mitigation, adaptation, MOI, and transparency of action and support, in a balanced manner and on an equal footing. He outlined as five key issues for the 2015 agreement: the principles and provisions of the Convention, in particular equity and CBDRRC, and that the agreement be under the Convention; consistency with the Convention, including differentiation between developed and developing countries; adaptation and loss and damage; provision of MOI by developed countries; and consistency with achieving sustainable development and poverty eradication.

Noting it had sought “considerable flexibility” and recognizing flexibility by other parties, the EU suggested that the initial capitalization of the GCF and the Lima Call for Climate Action provide a good direction towards an ambitious agreement in Paris.

Saying that the decisions taken in Lima had set the stage for negotiations in 2015, Mexico, for the Environmental Integrity Group: highlighted decisions on guidance to the GCF and on long-term climate finance; noted that more work remained on market mechanisms and the implementation of the Kyoto Protocol; and expressed appreciation to the organization of the first session of the multilateral assessment, noting that the Independent Assessment Report and international consultation and analysis are important processes for promoting transparency and enhancing understanding of respective national processes.

Many, including Australia, Nauru, for AOSIS, and Nepal, for the LDCs, expressed gratitude to the COP president, the people of Peru, and the ADP Co-Chairs for a successful conference.

Incoming COP 21 President, Minister Laurent Fabius, France, congratulated Minister Pulgar-Vidal for “setting an example of a great COP president with ambition, a listening ear and a spirit of compromise” and for “putting to rest the haunting ghost of Copenhagen.”

Brazil emphasized that a robust and ambitious agreement in 2015 requires continuous work, including on the nature and scope of INDCs and how they are to be incorporated in the Paris agreement, and prevention of backtracking.

Observing a “Latin American style of respectful multilateral diplomacy,” Venezuela, for the Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America (ALBA), lauded COP 20 and noted, besides Peru as its host, Bolivia’s presidency of the G-77/China, and Venezuela’s hosting the Social Pre-COP.

China expressed gratitude for COP 20/CMP 10 President Pulgar-Vidal's leadership and expressed confidence in parties to show ambition, confidence and flexibility in 2015 to ensure success in Paris. Panama, for CfRN, expressed appreciation for the inclusion of REDD+ in the outcome.

The US thanked COP 20/CMP 10 President Pulgar-Vidal for his "leadership, commitment and generous spirit," and emphasized the need for parties: to put forward their INDCs "well before Paris" and in a clear, transparent and understandable manner; and, to make progress on developing the elements of the 2015 agreement based on the "working document" coming out of Lima.

Emphasizing the solidarity among developing countries, Malaysia, for the LMDCs, said "we worked hard to recapture a lost balance in the text." He lauded as "the spirit of Lima" a "restored" transparent and inclusive multilateral process of negotiations. Chile, for AILAC, called for a collective commitment towards low-carbon growth.

Lamenting the outcome as just another one of a series of decisions failing people and the planet, Climate Justice Now!, for ENGOs, called for climate targets within the global carbon budget and on the basis of CBDR. She declared: "we are seeds and we are growing into a forest of resistance."

Indigenous Peoples stressed the Paris 2015 agreement must contain operative language fulfilling the mandate from Cancun to fully respect human rights, including the rights of indigenous peoples, in all decisions relating to climate change, and called for direct access to indigenous peoples to financing through dedicated funds, including the GCF, and an active observer status in the GCF.

Suggesting that "the door to Paris is now open," Local Governments and Municipal Authorities said local governments need to be involved in the preparation of INDCs.

Women and Gender called for a binding, ambitious and transformative 2015 agreement that upholds human rights, gender equality and the rights of future generations.

Youth made a plea, on behalf of Pacific youth, for parties to help Pacific islands survive, stressing strong and effective loss and damage measures as "non-negotiable."

The Secretariat reported on the budgetary implications of the decisions taken at COP 20. The COP adopted the report of the meeting (FCCC/CP/2014/L.3) and a decision expressing gratitude to Peru and the people of the city of Lima for hosting the conference (FCCC/CP/2014/L.6-FCCC/KP/CMP/2014/L.4). COP 20 Vice-President Voto-Bernaes gavelled the meeting to a close at 3:04 am, on Sunday, 14 December 2014.

CMP 10 CLOSING PLENARY: On Friday, 12 December, the closing day of the Lima Climate Change Conference, the closing plenary of CMP 10 convened in the morning to adopt agreed items, following the first part of the COP 20 closing plenary. The closing plenary was then suspended at 1:18 pm.

On Saturday, 13 December, the closing plenary resumed at 5:50 pm to consider the election of officers and was suspended at 5:53 pm. On Sunday, 14 December, the closing plenary resumed at 3:04 am to close the session. The Secretariat reported on the budgetary implications of the decisions taken at CMP 10. The CMP adopted the report of the meeting (FCCC/KP/CMP/2014/L.1) and took note of a resolution expressing gratitude to Peru and the people of the city of Lima for hosting

the conference (FCCC/CP/2014/L.6-FCCC/KP/CMP/2014/L.4). CMP 10 Vice-President Voto-Bernaes gavelled the meeting to a close at 3:07 am, on Sunday, 14 December 2014.

LIMA CALL FOR CLIMATE ACTION

In its decision, the Lima Call for Climate Action (FCCC/CP/2014/L.14), the COP:

- reiterates that the work of the ADP shall be under the Convention and guided by its principles;
- recalls the objective of the Convention;
- recalls all the relevant decisions of the COP, particularly Decisions 1/CP.17, 2/CP.18 and 1/CP.19;
- affirms its determination to strengthen adaptation action through the protocol, another legal instrument or agreed outcome with legal force under the Convention to be adopted at COP 21;
- recalls Decisions 2/CP.19 and X/CP.20 and welcomes the progress made in Lima, Peru, towards the implementation of the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage; and
- notes with grave concern the significant gap between the aggregate effect of parties' mitigation pledges in terms of global annual emissions of GHGs by 2020 and aggregate emission pathways consistent with having a likely chance of holding the increase in global average temperature below 2°C or 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels.

In paragraphs on **advancing the work of the ADP and elaborating a negotiating text for the 2015 agreement**, the COP:

- confirms that the ADP shall complete the work referred to in Decision 1/CP.17, paragraph 2, as early as possible in order for COP 21 to adopt a protocol, another legal instrument or an agreed outcome with legal force under the Convention applicable to all parties;
- decides that the protocol, another legal instrument or agreed outcome with legal force under the Convention applicable to all parties shall address in a balanced manner, *inter alia*, mitigation, adaptation, MOI and transparency of action and support;
- underscores its commitment to reaching an ambitious agreement in 2015 that reflects the principle of CBDRRC, in light of different national circumstances;
- urges developed country parties to provide and mobilize enhanced financial support to developing country parties for ambitious mitigation and adaptation actions, especially to parties that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change, and recognizes complementary support by other parties;
- acknowledges the progress made in Lima in elaborating the elements for a draft negotiating text as contained in the annex to the decision, including a footnote that states: "These elements for a draft negotiating text reflect work in progress. They neither indicate convergence on the proposals presented nor do they preclude new proposals from emerging in the course of the negotiations in 2015;"
- decides that the ADP will intensify its work, with a view to making available a negotiating text for a protocol, other legal instrument or an agreed outcome with legal force under the Convention applicable to all parties before May 2015; and

- requests the Secretariat to communicate the negotiating text, referred to above, to parties in accordance with provisions of the Convention and the applied rules of procedure, while noting that such communication will not prejudice whether the outcome will be a protocol, another legal instrument or an agreed outcome with legal force under the Convention applicable to all parties.
In paragraphs on **INDCs and their communication**, the COP:
- notes that the arrangements specified in this decision in relation to INDCs are without prejudice to the legal nature and content of the INDCs of parties or to the content of the protocol, another legal instrument or agreed outcome with legal force under the Convention applicable to all parties;
- reiterates its invitation to each party to communicate to the Secretariat its INDC towards achieving the objective of the Convention;
- agrees that each party's INDC towards achieving the objective of the Convention will represent a progression beyond the current undertaking of that party;
- also agrees that the LDCs and SIDS may communicate information on strategies, plans and actions for low GHG emission development reflecting their special circumstances in the context of INDCs;
- invites all parties to consider communicating their undertakings in adaptation planning or consider including an adaptation component in their INDCs;
- reiterates its invitation to all parties to communicate their INDCs well in advance of COP 21 (by the first quarter of 2015 by those parties ready to do so) in a manner that facilitates the clarity, transparency and understanding of the INDCs;
- agrees that the information to be provided by parties communicating their INDCs, may include, as appropriate, *inter alia*, quantifiable information on the reference point (including, as appropriate, a base year), time frames and/or periods for implementation, scope and coverage, planning processes, assumptions and methodological approaches including those for estimating and accounting for anthropogenic GHG emissions and, as appropriate, removals, and how the party considers that its INDC is fair and ambitious, in light of its national circumstances, and how it contributes towards achieving the objective of the Convention;
- reiterates its call to developed country parties, the operating entities of the financial mechanism and any other organizations in a position to do so to provide support for the preparation and communication of the INDCs of parties that may need such support; and
- requests the Secretariat to publish the INDCs as communicated on the UNFCCC website and prepare by 1 November 2015 a synthesis report on the aggregate effect of the INDCs communicated by parties by 1 October 2015.

In paragraphs **guiding enhanced action on, and future work of, workstream 2 (pre-2020 ambition) and basis for dynamic high-level engagement**, the COP encourages all parties to the Kyoto Protocol to ratify and implement the Doha Amendment to the Kyoto Protocol and reiterates its resolve as set out in decision 1/CP.19 (BAP), paragraphs 3 and 4, to accelerate the full implementation of the decisions constituting the agreed outcome

pursuant to decision 1/CP.13 and enhance ambition in the pre-2020 period in order to ensure the highest possible mitigation efforts under the Convention by all parties.

The COP also decides to continue the technical examination of opportunities with high mitigation potential, including those with adaptation, health and sustainable development co-benefits, in the period 2015-2020, by requesting the Secretariat to organize a series of in-session TEMs that:

- facilitate parties in the identification of policy options, practices and technologies and in planning for their implementation in accordance with nationally-defined development priorities;
- build on and utilize the related activities of, and further enhance collaboration and synergies among, the TEC, the CTCN, the Durban Forum on capacity-building, the CDM EB and the operating entities of the financial mechanism;
- build on previous TEMs in order to hone and focus on actionable policy options;
- provide meaningful and regular opportunities for the effective engagement of experts from parties, relevant international organizations, civil society, indigenous peoples, women, youth, academic institutions, the private sector, and subnational authorities nominated by their respective countries;
- support the accelerated implementation of policy options and enhanced mitigation action, including through international cooperation; and
- facilitate the enhanced engagement of all parties through the announcement of topics to be addressed, agendas and related materials at least two months in advance of TEMs.

The COP also requests the Secretariat to update, following the TEMs, the technical paper on the mitigation benefits of actions, and on initiatives and options to enhance mitigation ambition, compiling information provided in submissions from parties and observer organizations and the discussions held at the TEMs and drawing on other relevant information on the implementation of policy options at all levels, including through multilateral cooperation, and to disseminate the information, including by publishing a summary for policy makers.

The COP additionally:

- requests the ADP to make recommendations in relation to further advancing the technical examination process, including the periodic assessment of the TEMs, to COP 21;
- welcomes the Lima Climate Action High-Level Meeting convened by the COP President on 11 December 2014 and encourages the Executive Secretary and the COP President to convene an annual high-level event on enhancing implementation of climate action; and
- notes the estimated budgetary implications of the activities to be undertaken by the Secretariat.

A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF THE LIMA CLIMATE CONFERENCE

“Brick by brick my citizens, brick by brick.”

– Attributed to Roman Emperor Hadrian

Arriving in Peru, delegates were welcomed by a decidedly positive spirit. As COP 20/CMP 10 President Manuel Pulgar-Vidal observed in his opening speech, prior to the Lima Conference, the world had received a number of “good signals” from the UN Secretary-General’s Climate Summit, the initial resource mobilization of the Green Climate Fund (GCF), “historic” announcements by several major greenhouse gas emitting countries, including the EU, the US and China, as well as momentum generated from the IPCC’s Fifth Assessment Report. This spirit of “unprecedented optimism and achievement,” as described by UNFCCC Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres, was expected to help advance work on a number of key deliverables intended to provide what ADP Co-Chair Kishan Kumarsingh referred to as a “solid foundation” upon which to build a new agreement to be adopted in Paris.

In October, in an address to the ADP, Pulgar-Vidal indicated the outcomes he expected in Lima, including: a clear, structured and substantive text on the elements of the new agreement; defining the information to be submitted in 2015 as part of parties’ intended nationally determined contributions (INDCs); and a concrete plan for the pre-2020 period, including actions to ensure compliance with existing obligations, and the implementation of policy options with the greatest mitigation potential. He also emphasized the importance of confidence and trust in the process, as well as among parties. As many have learned from previous climate change meetings, no foundation for the future can be built without confidence and trust.

This brief analysis will assess to what extent these outcomes expected from Lima have been delivered, the implications of the ‘Lima Call for Climate Action’ for the negotiations towards the new climate agreement, and whether the Lima Conference succeeded in laying a solid foundation for constructing an ambitious global climate agreement in Paris, under which each country is able to find a “room.”

LAYING BRICKS

A fervent facilitator and an invisible enabler, the Peruvian Presidency spared no effort in ensuring that time during the Lima Conference was managed effectively. With most formal negotiating sessions scarcely going over the 6:00 pm mark and the Subsidiary Bodies concluding their work unprecedentedly early, delegates were able to roll up their sleeves and get down to work on the building blocks for the new agreement, the draft decision text on INDCs, and enhanced pre-2020 climate action.

Over six days, parties exchanged views on the Co-Chairs’ non-paper containing the elements for a draft negotiating text and made various proposals, which were all reflected in a revised document published on the UNFCCC website early in the morning on Monday, 8 December, by which time the text had swollen from 23 to 33 pages. Some worried that a proliferation of options, while indicating that the negotiating process is clearly party-driven, did not add to the draft negotiating text’s clarity and structure, and could complicate future work.

In the end, delegates agreed to annex this text to the COP decision on further advancing the Durban Platform with a disclaimer contained in a footnote stating that the elements for a draft negotiating text reflect “work in progress” and “neither indicate convergence on the proposals presented, nor do they preclude new proposals from emerging in the course of negotiations in 2015.” This disclaimer addressed concerns raised by many developing countries that annexing the elements text to the COP decision might preempt the legal form, structure or content of the Paris agreement and were therefore against “formalizing” any language that could potentially exclude some options from consideration in 2015, while locking in others. Limited substantive progress on the elements will no doubt put pressure on ADP negotiators meeting in Geneva in February 2015, which is expected to deliver a draft negotiating text for parties’ consideration later in the year.

MOVING WALLS IN A “DIVIDED” HOUSE

Discussions on elements for a draft negotiating text and on the draft decision advancing the Durban Platform were both underpinned by a number of broad political issues. These included differentiation, the role of the Convention and its principles and provisions in the future agreement, and the issue of legal parity between mitigation and adaptation, on the one hand, and mitigation and financial and other means of support, on the other. Many delegates pointed out that on those issues the ADP had a distinctly “divided house”—to the point that some felt trust among parties dissipating.

The question of how differentiation will be reflected in the Paris agreement permeated the ADP negotiations. For example, most developing countries, in particular the LMDCs, maintained that there should be differentiation, both in the 2015 agreement and the INDCs, in accordance with parties’ obligations under the Convention, and reflecting the principles of CBDR and equity. On the other side, the US advocated differentiation in accordance with CBDR and respective capabilities in line with varying national circumstances. The LMDCs also strongly opposed the formulation “parties in a position to do so” in relation to providing support to developing countries for the preparation and implementation of their INDCs, and to providing additional resources to the GCF, the GEF, the Technology Mechanism and the Adaptation Fund, arguing that such language disrupted Convention-based bifurcation, effectively dismantling the wall between Annex I and non-Annex I parties.

A related issue, namely that of legal parity between different components of the 2015 agreement, was also the subject of heated debate. Developing countries repeatedly cautioned against a “mitigation-centric” approach to INDCs, and urged for a balanced reflection of adaptation and means of implementation, with provision of finance taking the center stage. Of particular importance to AOSIS and the LDCs was that loss and damage be reflected as a separate element of the future agreement not only in the elements text, but also in the decision on the ADP.

Parties’ inability to reach consensus led to the adoption of a three-pronged approach, including continued negotiations under the ADP, ministerial consultations, and consultations by the COP President. After the Presidency’s consultations with negotiating groups that continued late into Saturday night—many hours after the Conference was supposed to conclude

at 6:00 pm on Friday, the ‘Lima Call for Climate Action’ was concluded. This outcome document, arguably, shifts the wall of differentiation. Although the work of the ADP “shall be under the Convention and guided by its principles” and the new agreement “shall address in a balanced manner” not only mitigation, but also adaptation, finance, technology development and transfer, capacity building, and transparency of action and support, the ADP’s commitment to reaching an ambitious agreement in 2015 is nevertheless described as reflecting CBDR and respective capabilities “in light of different national circumstances.” This formulation appears to open the door to a subjective interpretation of differentiation. Some also wondered if it modifies the interpretation of CBDR as reflecting historical responsibility, even if it avoids using the controversial terms “dynamic” or “evolving.” On the issue of parity, however, the final text provides some assurances to developing countries by giving adaptation a more prominent role in the future agreement and parties’ INDCs, as well as, and in relation to, provision of support.

The Lima Call for Climate Action also refers to the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage in the preamble. Following the adoption of the decision by the COP, Tuvalu, for the LDCs, made a statement requesting that it be recorded in the report of the meeting. He stressed that the preambular text on the Warsaw International Mechanism, in conjunction with “*inter alia*” in the operative paragraph listing INDCs components, is, in the LDCs’ understanding, a “clear intention” that the new agreement will “properly, effectively and progressively” address loss and damage. While legally redundant, such declarations reaffirm parties’ positions and interpretations of agreed text, maintaining their relevance and visibility.

During the negotiations, an additional concern expressed by developing countries, similar to the one raised in relation to the elements text, was that a COP 20 decision on advancing the Durban Platform could be prejudicial to the outcome in Paris. In this regard, the Lima Call for Climate Action explicitly states that the INDCs-related arrangements specified in it “are without prejudice to the legal nature and content” of parties’ INDCs, or to the content of the future agreement.

TEARING DOWN THE WALL?

COP 20 was generally expected to help strengthen INDCs as a core component of the new agreement by clarifying their scope and specifying information required to facilitate their clarity, transparency and understanding. However, parties were also divided on their expectations for the text on INDCs, relating to information-related requirements, scope and communication. While the Lima Conference fulfilled these expectations to some extent, many parties and observers felt the decision has important shortcomings.

The Lima Call for Climate Action succeeds in delivering on a mandate from Warsaw to identify the “information that parties will provide when putting forward their contributions,” by referring to quantifiable information, time frames, coverage, methodological assumptions, and a subjective evaluation of fairness and ambitiousness. However, by stating that INDCs “may include, as appropriate, *inter alia*,” these various aspects, the text fails to set a minimum level of common types of information to be communicated by all parties, thus significantly

weakening the prospects of comparability across, and a meaningful aggregation of, contributions.

A major area of divergence of views related to the scope of INDCs. This debate centered on the interpretation of the Warsaw decision, which states that INDCs should be aimed “at achieving the objective of the Convention as set out in its Article 2.” Developed countries interpreted this as referring to mitigation being the only component of INDCs, while developing countries insisted on the need to include adaptation and means of implementation as well, with developing countries providing information on their means of implementation needs and developed countries providing information on their financial contributions, as a precondition of enhanced action by developing countries. As a compromise between these two views, the Lima Call for Climate Action invites parties to “consider including” an adaptation component in their INDCs, which reflects broad agreement that adaptation action requires strengthening alongside mitigation. Parties were also able to agree on recognizing the special circumstances of LDCs and SIDS by allowing them to present “strategies, plans and actions” for low-emission development. Meanwhile, all other countries are implicitly expected to do something more. This latter aspect is yet another example of built-in flexibility, which translates into a lack of a clear requirement for parties to prepare a strong, quantitative mitigation component in their INDCs. Furthermore, in relation to the scope of INDCs, parties were unable to agree on any language on finance or other means of implementation, which left developing countries disappointed. Issues related to finance, therefore, remain a fundamental area for further trust building in 2015.

Another issue on which parties disagreed was how INDCs would be communicated and what their possible *ex ante* consideration or review might look like. Many developing countries insisted that Lima should only focus on the process of communication. Some delegations, including the US, preferred a “consultative” process or period. Others, such as the EU and AOSIS, demanded a strong review that would assess the aggregate effect of INDCs against the latest climate science and what is deemed necessary to avoid dangerous climate change. Considered by some the weakest link of the Lima outcome, the decision text simply requests that the Secretariat publish the communicated INDCs on the UNFCCC website and prepare, by 1 November 2015, a synthesis report on their aggregate effect. This translates into an absence of any kind of *ex ante* review of individual contributions in 2015. Further, it also leaves parties with less than a month for possible upward adjustment prior to COP 21 in Paris in December 2015. Resulting from strong opposition by some, such as the LMDCs, to a review of their INDCs, this outcome left many disappointed. Some disenchanted observers, however, felt that, irrespective of its content, the decision would not have strong implications for global climate action, suggesting that the major factors driving the level of ambition of national contributions are in any event external to the UNFCCC process.

RAISING THE CEILING

With regard to enhancing pre-2020 ambition (ADP workstream 2), the technical expert meetings (TEMs) emerged as an area where countries could find a common cause. Relating to

the key question of how to carry work forward under workstream 2 beyond Paris, there was broad agreement that the TEMs, which have created a technical and less political space for discussions around scaling up implementation and which allow for “bringing down the brick wall of the UNFCCC” by engaging non-state actors, would be the proper vehicle. The Lima outcome sets out a clear process for building on the TEMs’ experience by providing guidance on their purpose, organization and follow-up, and seeking to further engage key institutions and mechanisms under the Convention. Views still diverged, however, on how to ensure the implementation of the Bali Action Plan, in particular with regard to the provision of means of implementation to developing countries, and enhancing mitigation efforts by all parties under the Convention. As a result, the final text does not include a proposed ‘Accelerated Implementation Mechanism’ to assess progress made in these areas—an idea originating in the conviction of developing countries that developed countries’ leadership pre-2020, which currently remains insufficient, will be essential for both addressing climate change and ensuring a successful 2015 agreement.

Discussions under the COP on long-term finance, which developing countries wanted to result in further assurances—such as quantitative milestones—on scaling up of climate finance by developed countries to US\$100 billion annually by 2020, and beyond, were also disappointing to developing countries. Yet, an undeniable success was the initial resource mobilization of the GCF, which reached its target of US\$10 billion, collecting a total of US\$10.2 billion in pledges by the end of the Lima Conference from both Annex I and non-Annex I countries. While developed countries considered it a show of commitment and something they should be recognized for, developing countries felt GCF capitalization, together with the first biennial ministerial dialogue on climate finance organized during the second week as well as biennial submissions by developed countries on scaling up climate finance, were still insufficient. Some suggested that before celebrating the GCF pledges, they would first need to see how and whether they would translate into resources for the Fund.

The first session of the multilateral assessment of developed countries’ mitigation targets, organized as part of SBI 41, reflected a similar divergence in views. Annex I countries celebrated the event for “going beyond simple reporting,” and increasing transparency and building trust, while some developing countries felt the process required further strengthening in the form of a clear “follow-up,” such as substantive conclusions for the SBI’s consideration. Notwithstanding these differences and given the positive “Lima Spirit” characterized by an open exchange of views and transparency that persisted throughout the conference, these developments may have succeeded in “raising the ceiling” of pre-2020 ambition, and thus rebuilding some of the confidence and trust for the tough year ahead.

ENABLING CONSTRUCTION

Many expected that momentum created by the political events of the previous months would contribute to an atmosphere of trust in Lima. These events included the GCF initial capitalization, the EU’s announcement of its 2030 mitigation target and, in particular, the bilateral announcements by the US

and China, on their respective mitigation targets for 2025 and 2030, as well as by the US and India, on expanded cooperation on climate change, including on phasing down HFCs. However, it soon became evident that too little time had passed for these external political events and high-level signals of change to translate into cardinal shifts in negotiating positions. Yet, some found discernible indications of a more immediate impact. For example, how CBDR and respective capabilities are defined in the Lima Call for Climate Action decision “in light of different national circumstances,” is a near-verbatim citation from the November joint announcement by the US and China. It remains to be seen if the ADP session in February will see further shifts in negotiating positions when parties have had the time to reflect on these events.

In spite of parties arriving in Peru with different expectations and widely diverging views, at the end most felt that, in the words of the South African Minister of Environmental Affairs Edna Molewa, the Lima Conference managed to strike a “delicate balance between very difficult issues” and laid “a solid foundation” for work towards Paris.

But did it really? The two key outcomes from Lima, the decision on Advancing the Durban Platform and its annex containing elements for a draft negotiating text, may have served to move the process forward and create a shared feeling of achievement and confidence in the process. However, given that key political issues, including differentiation and finance, remain unresolved, many parties are unwilling to declare the Lima outcome an absolute success.

The year of 2015 will be one that defines the true significance of the Lima Climate Conference. Many wonder if the positive “Lima Spirit” can continue in the run-up to Paris. But perhaps more importantly, the question may be if the Lima outcome can enable the construction in Paris of a “house” where all parties can coexist, while keeping in mind that in this process there is one party that does not negotiate—nature.

UPCOMING MEETINGS

5th Session of the IRENA Assembly: The fifth session of the Assembly of the International Renewable Energy Agency will discuss and decide upon issues such as the work programme, the budget, the adoption of reports, applications for membership and potential amendments to Agency activities. **date:** 17-18 January 2015 **location:** Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates **contact:** IRENA Secretariat **phone:** +971-2-417-9000 **email:** info@irena.org **www:** <http://www.irena.org>

ADP 2-8: The eighth meeting of the second session of the ADP will convene in February. **dates:** 8-13 February 2015 **location:** Geneva, Switzerland **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228 815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** <http://www.unfccc.int>

41st Session of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change: This session will meet in February to discuss, *inter alia*, future work of the IPCC and lessons from the AR5. **dates:** 24-27 February 2015 **location:** Nairobi, Kenya **contact:** IPCC Secretariat **phone:** +41-22-730-8208 **fax:** +41-22-730-8025 **email:** ipcc-sec@wmo.int **www:** <http://www.ipcc.ch>

36th Meeting of the JISC: The 36th meeting of the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee (JISC) under the UNFCCC Kyoto Protocol is expected to take place in March. **date:** 12-13 March 2015 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228 815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** <http://www.unfccc.int>

World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction 2015: The World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction will be hosted by the Government of Japan and organized by the UN International Strategy for Disaster Reduction, and is expected to agree on a post-2015 disaster risk reduction framework. **date:** 14-18 March 2015 **location:** Sendai, Japan **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +41-22-91-78861 **fax:** +41-22-73-39531 **email:** wcdrr2015@un.org **www:** <http://www.wcdrr.org>

2015 Arctic Council Ministerial Meeting: This Arctic Council Ministerial Meeting will bring together ministers of the Arctic states and high-level representatives of the indigenous permanent participant organizations to set the Council's objectives for the next two years. The 2015 Ministerial Meeting will mark the conclusion of Canada's and the beginning of the United States' chairmanship, which will last from 2015-2017. The April 2015 meeting will be preceded by an event in Ottawa, Canada, on 23 April 2015 to showcase the Council's accomplishments during Canada's chairmanship. **dates:** 24-25 April 2015 **location:** Iqaluit, Canada **contact:** Arctic Council Secretariat **phone:** +47-77-75-01-40 **email:** acs@arctic-council.org **www:** <http://www.arctic-council.org>

42nd Sessions of the UNFCCC Subsidiary Bodies: The 42nd sessions of the Subsidiary Bodies to the UNFCCC and the ninth meeting of the second session of the ADP are expected to take place in June 2015. **dates:** 3-14 June 2015 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228 815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** <http://www.unfccc.int>

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

ADP 2-10: The tenth meeting of the second session of the ADP is expected to convene in the second half of 2015. **dates:** TBC **location:** TBC **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228 815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** <http://www.unfccc.int>

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

GLOSSARY

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
AR5	IPCC Fifth Assessment Report
BAP	Bali Action Plan
BASIC	Brazil, South Africa, India and China
CBDR	Common but differentiated responsibilities
CBDRRC	Common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CERs	Certified Emission Reductions
CfRN	Coalition for Rainforest Nations
CGE	Consultative Group of Experts
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
EB	Executive Board
ENGOs	Environmental NGOs
ERUs	Emission reduction units
GCF	Green Climate Fund
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GHG	Greenhouse gas
INDCs	Intended nationally determined contributions
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
JI	Joint Implementation
JISC	Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee
LDCs	Least Developed Countries
LDCF	Least Developed Country Fund
LEG	LDC Expert Group
LMDCs	Like Minded Developing Countries
LULUCF	Land use, land-use change, and forestry
MRV	Measuring, reporting and verification
NAPs	National adaptation plans
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
SCF	Standing Committee on Finance
SED	Structured expert dialogue
SIDS	Small island developing states
SYR	IPCC Synthesis Report
TEC	Technology Executive Committee
TEM	Technical Expert Meeting
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change