

Convergence on pre-2020 climate actions still elusive

Bonn, 12 September (Hilary Chiew) – Divergence among Parties remained on the possible elements for a draft decision on workstream 2 (WS2) of the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP) that deals with pre-2020 climate actions.

Discussion on WS2 took place at the 10th meeting of the second session of the ADP held from 31 August to 4 September in Bonn.

Developing country Parties are disappointed with the ADP Co-Chairs' draft decision text which they felt would not result in a successful year-end Conference of the Parties (COP) to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in Paris. They stressed the need to close the implementation gaps which include not only mitigation but also adaptation and the means of implementation (finance, technology transfer and capacity building).

Developed country Parties maintained their positions from the June session of disregarding differentiation (between developing and developed countries) while acknowledged that enhancing pre-2020 mitigation ambition is an essential and integral part of the Durban Platform. They also insisted that there should not be duplication of efforts as there are already existing mechanisms and institutions taking care of implementation. They also felt the existing transparency system of the biennial update report and international consultation and analysis can be further improved to show where mitigation ambition can be increased among developing countries to enhance implementation without changing the character of WS2.

The European Union (EU) in a submission on 31 August said "We also welcome the invitation to

those Parties with existing mitigation commitments/pledges to consider opportunities for enhancing their efforts as identified through the technical examination process, **but believe that this invitation should also apply to Parties without existing mitigation pledges.**" (Emphasis added.)

The submission is available [here](http://www4.unfccc.int/submissions/Lists/OSPS_submissionUpload/75_99_130854828421341486-LU-08-31-%20EU%20Workstream%202%20mitigation%20a mb.pdf): http://www4.unfccc.int/submissions/Lists/OSPS_submissionUpload/75_99_130854828421341486-LU-08-31-%20EU%20Workstream%202%20mitigation%20a mb.pdf

Two informal meetings – implementation and Technical Examination Process – were held during the Bonn session. WS2 is co-facilitated by Aya Yoshida (Japan) and George Wamukoya (Kenya).

In general, developing countries called for a balanced text with their inputs reflected by the next session in October while developed countries could accept the text as a basis for negotiation.

At the last facilitated group meeting on 3 September, the Group of 77 and China informed that it would make a textual submission taking into account all the inputs, interventions and the co-facilitators' working documents well in advance of the next session.

Yoshida closed the meeting and announced that the next iteration will include all inputs and that the co-facilitators will produce the text.

Below are highlights from country groupings and country Parties on their views on the draft decision text.

Mali representing the Group of 77 and China (G77 and China) said the draft decision prepared

by the Co-Chairs for WS2 is a good start but “we are not there yet”. It said for WS2, developing countries are looking for an outcome that drives action on mitigation and action on adaptation in developing countries taking into account provision of finance, technology transfer and capacity building. It said as much as the draft touched on many key issues, it lacks specific actions and is insufficient to make a difference in increasing ambition on the ground.

“We have been in this for many years now and it is time to go beyond just asking United Nations body to enhance provision of finance but (we need) to give a specific goal. We need to keep focus on actions necessary to drive and help us get the ambitions,” the G77 and China statement stressed.

Providing specific comments on the preamble, Mali said the section should recall a number of key decisions: paragraphs 3 and 4 of COP decision 1/CP.17, paragraphs 17 and 18 of COP decision 1/CP.18 and the link between pre-2020 and post-2020 ambitions.

Referring to the synthesis paper to be prepared by the UNFCCC Secretariat on the aggregate effect of the Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDCs) communicated by Parties up to 1 October by 1 November, Mali said the synthesis paper on INDCs would present Parties with the post-2020 gap and this should stress the importance of early actions and the link for mitigation and greater adaptation.

On the objective section, it said there should be enhancement of mitigation and adaptation as well as providing specific guidance to the Convention bodies, in reference to the Technology Executive Committee (TEC) and Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN).

Mali further said the Group called for a process of accelerated implementation of actions as in reality the actions taken are simply not enough but it is disappointed that the call was not reflected whatsoever in the draft decision.

It also said Parties are expecting the decision (on WS2) to be taken in Paris to launch this process so we would need concrete activities to assist developing countries. Referring to the capitalisation of the Green Climate Fund (GCF), Mali pointed out that out of US\$10.3bil announced by Lima (venue of COP20), only

US\$2.5 bil are made available today. So it is back to the point that we have a gap and need additional resources and we need to launch a process to mobilise the resources.

On mitigation in developing countries, it noted that the Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Action (NAMA) registry is there and a number of pilot projects are also getting nowhere due to lack of funds.

Mali warned that the draft decision in its present form is not going to lead to a COP decision and developing country Parties would like to leave the Bonn session with a revised draft.

Concurring with the G77 and China statement, **Saudi Arabia speaking for the Like-Minded Developing Countries (LMDCs)** stressed that the text does not go far enough to strike the right balance essential for the success of WS2. Meeting existing commitments is essential but many would remain unfulfilled with the current text. We stand a chance of success if there are accelerated actions with developed countries taking the lead by achieving 45% emissions reduction by 2050 in accordance with science.

Supporting the G77 and China call for an accelerated implementation process, Saudi Arabia said mitigation by developing countries is best through the fulfilment of means of implementation such as a clear roadmap for the US\$100bil a year by 2020, and transfer of environmentally-sound technology by developed countries.

It said there is no need to remind Parties of the importance of WS2 for the success of Paris as ultimately WS2 is a crucial matter of trust.

China urged Parties to cooperate and create new momentum as there are only several days left before the Paris COP. It said WS2 should not be regarded as a burden but an opportunity to build trust to reach an agreement for post-2020 actions.

It also found the draft decision text far from being a balanced document to reflect the integrity of the Durban mandate and the subsequent decisions of Doha, Warsaw and Lima (COP decisions).

China sees WS2 as an opportunity to transfer science to a policy process where developed country Parties consider the higher mitigation level

of 25% to 40% from 1990 levels. It said although Parties have built mechanisms, they are tools for us to make tangible and substantial progress, adding that it is high time for WS2 to identify the substance and make those mechanisms work. For example, on finance, China said the US\$100bil was agreed in Cancun (COP16 in 2010) and it would be extremely helpful to ensure those financial resources are in place.

Through the G77 and China's proposal for an accelerated implementation mechanism, China said Parties can identify the gaps in the most pragmatic manner to move mitigation, adaptation, means of implementation in finance, technology transfer and capacity building forward. It said there can be a technical paper and thematic workshop to develop programmes under the current mechanisms or we can practise the transparency measures of the International Consultation and Analysis and International Assessment and Review with a view to improve the measuring, reporting and verification (MRV) to enhance actions.

Venezuela said more than innovation, Parties need to prioritise trust by addressing directly the implementation gap of Annex 1 Parties. It said the G77 and China proposal is on the table but it is not reflected in the draft decision text of the Co-Chairs. It further expressed concern over the emphasis on the role of non-state actors.

India said the draft decision text does not cover the entire range of issues. It stressed that there is an intrinsic link between WS1 (post-2020 actions) and WS2 and Parties need to see through the artificial time slices. It said paragraphs 17 and 18 of the Lima decision has clear elements of what needs to be done and Parties cannot be selective.

(Paragraph 17 reads: *Encourages all Parties to the Kyoto Protocol to ratify and implement the Doha Amendment to the Kyoto Protocol;*

Paragraph 18 reads: *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 and enhance ambition in the pre-2020 period in order to ensure the highest possible mitigation efforts under the Convention by all Parties.*)

India said we are aware of the aggregate gap and we know that the pre-2020 mitigation gap of 25% to 40% needs to be filled, and if we want to see

progression in post-2020, how can it be status quo in pre-2020.

On existing institutions, India said many are inadequate prompting G77 and China to put forward the idea of an accelerated implementation mechanism to take care of the range of implementation needed to address the pre-2020 gap. Citing the example of TEC and CTCN, it said the activities are confined to advice, guidance, planning and governing issues and no actual collaborative research. Similarly, in finance, with the Standing Committee on Finance and Long-term Finance, there is lack of clarity from these institutions if we are on track to reach the US\$100bil goal.

In terms of non-state actors, India said it is important that they bring additionality and not result in double-counting of efforts that are already accounted for in National Communications. On the technical review process, it said it has to be anchored in realism of what it is achieving and what it is likely to achieve.

Brazil said it is ready to engage in the WS2 discussion in building the missing elements identified by others. It reminded Parties that WS2 was negotiated under the ADP mandate precisely because there was acknowledgment that there is a gap in pre-2020 that needs to be addressed.

It said Parties have been discussing and considering options and had a series of technical expert meetings which identified policy options with high mitigation potential in the last four years and there are still 5 years to go. Brazil said it has yet to see evidence that work under WS2 would produce positive outcomes as mentioned by the EU (through its submission on 31 August); at least not at the level that can address the gap.

Brazil is also sceptical that providing more visibility on high-level engagement would be enough, adding that Parties need to take into account the scale of initiatives as not only would there be a pre-2020 gap but cautioned that the gap would remain when the (post-2020) agreement entered into force, stressing that the missing link is the implementation of financial commitments.

It said there are ways for us to identify instruments or create new instruments to provide guidance to investment funds worldwide to redirect capital into climate friendly actions and ideas conducive to

close the gap.

Brazil also stressed that WS2 is not about actions of developing country Parties but involved all countries and we expect developed countries to improve and enhance their actions in the pre-2020 period, reiterating the centrality of the UNFCCC as the multilateral process to combat climate change.

Maldives representing the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS) also emphasised the need of trust, noting that there should be a comprehensive commitment by developed country Parties as existing commitments cannot close the gap. It would like to see a better link between the technical examination process to the political level with COP presidencies organising annual high-level segments and appointment of champions to scale-up existing cooperative initiatives, mobilise resources and identification of new partners. It also wanted the technical examination process to be reviewed to make WS2 more effective.

Mexico concurred that WS2 should send out a signal that we are not going to wait for the new agreement before taking actions and it can be considered as early implementation. It noted the missing links with existing institutions to drive more implementation and would like to see clear links to the financial mechanism. It is also sceptical of high-level engagement and urged Parties to be frank and question whether this (approach) will catalyse actions, adding that while it is important, it should be improved by learning from past experiences. Mexico welcomed the launching of the technical examination process on adaptation.

Speaking for the Least Developed Countries (LDCs), Bangladesh said the technical examination process was useful and it understood that the exercise was to allow us to identify policy options and concrete actions of high mitigation potential, but it wanted to see concrete actions on the ground. It is happy with the EU's submission that the technical examination process is a supplementary effort that can help.

However, the LDCs noted that without a new initiative towards mobilising both financial resources and technological support that is needed, it would be impossible to implement the enhanced actions on the ground. On institutional arrangement, Bangladesh said it is looking for institutions or initiatives that can really make a

difference on the ground.

Colombia representing the Independent Alliance of Latin America and Caribbean (AILAC) said the draft decision text is a good start as a basis to build a consensus text to accelerate actions on the ground and close the pre-2020 gap. It said WS2 should reinforce acceleration and it is therefore crucial that developed country Parties take the lead and scale up support for developing countries. To strengthen the text, it suggested improving the technical examination process where it should be housed under the COP and requiring the GCF, CTCN and TEC to provide direct support to countries. After 2015, it said, the idea of regional technical expert meetings (TEMs) should be explored and a specific TEM session for Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions as put forward by developing countries.

South Africa urged Parties to focus on the problems we are trying to solve which is the gap. It said that there are two sources of mitigation potential – domestic and international, thus there is opportunity to create sub-regional markets.

The **European Union** introduced its latest submission at the first facilitated group meeting on 31 August and said the submission supports what it saw as an opportunity to inspire improvement by strengthening the architecture to ensure continuity of pre-2020 ambition. The EU recalled that it signalled at the June session (ADP2.9) that it would undertake mapping of on-going processes and a work plan that addressed this issue of pre-2020 actions but it was difficult to find that they are not already taking place.

It said it is interested to explore applying the technical examination process to adaptation. It stressed the importance of involvement of non-state actors to enhance pre-2020 actions and that the technical examination process is worth continuing as it is already showing results, citing the example of renewable energy in Africa that is now growing outside of the Convention. It believed that it is important to bring high-level attention to the technical examination process and link this with actors outside of the UNFCCC.

Japan said the technical examination process should focus on areas with high mitigation potential. On adaptation, it said it has to be kept in mind that the objective of the technical

examination process is on mitigation but it is open to conversation on adaptation, adding that it is critical to avoid duplicating the work of the Adaptation Committee. It said many existing initiatives are already working on strengthening implementation. On strengthening linkages to the financial mechanism, it said this is done in workstream 1 (post-2020 actions) and should not be duplicated by WS2.

South Korea said Parties need to bear in mind time constraints and be realistic of what can be done. It said WS2's focus is on mitigation but if all Parties can agree, then it can accept extending the effort to cover adaptation minimally. It said it supports adaptation only when it had direct implications for mitigation, noting that it has no appetite for adaptation as suggested in paragraph 14 though it could support paragraph 6.

(Paragraph 6 reads: *Agrees to further enhance the technical examination of opportunities with high mitigation potential, including those with adaptation, health and sustainable development co-benefits, in the period 2016–2020 with a focus on accelerating the implementation of actions.*)

Paragraph 14 reads: *Decides to conduct a technical examination of adaptation beginning in 2016, building on the lessons learned from the technical examination of opportunities with high mitigation potential, recognizing the unique characteristics, stakeholders, and needs of cooperative action on adaptation, and also recognizing the need to build on, without duplication, existing arrangements under the Convention.*)

South Korea supported engagement of non-state actors as important partners and regarded the technical examination process as the vehicle to implement WS2 and also support the development of regional TEMs. It also said ratification of the Doha Amendment to the Kyoto Protocol is important and entering into force (of the second commitment period for emissions reduction by

Annex I Parties) is a symbolic building block for trust-building.

Norway said a substantial decision in WS2 must be made in Paris but there are missing elements in the text. It said the technical examination process should focus on actions with high mitigation potential although it recognised the need for adaptation actions, noting that adaptation should be dealt with by existing institutions and WS2 could invite the Adaptation Committee to address the WS2. It further said the COP should identify suitable homes for the technical examination process i.e the Subsidiary Body for Implementation and the TEC.

The **United States (US)** said the technical examination process is a very well tailored tool which is still in its infancy and is exploring options and would continue to be improved. It sees the work ahead as conceptual discussion involving broad ideas focusing on areas of convergence such as high-level engagement to strengthen the technical examination process.

It said there is broad agreement that we should enhance involvement of non-state actors as critical allies to fight climate change. It said Parties should use this session to discuss the finance issue in depth. On inefficiencies of the Convention bodies, it said a number of them were newly created.

On adaptation, the US said the idea should be taken up in the appropriate fora like the adaptation committee and agreed with Norway that WS2 can invite representatives from the committee to inform Parties of their current work. On the role of champions, it said bringing in non-state actors into the process is a powerful way to help the TEM and it is important to hear them early in the process.