

GENEVA HIGHLIGHTS: MONDAY, 9 FEBRUARY 2015

On Monday morning and afternoon, the ADP contact group on item 3 (implementation of all the elements of Decision 1/CP.17) convened.

ADP CONTACT GROUP

ADP Co-Chair Reifsnnyder invited parties to propose new text only for sections not yet discussed and emphasized that parties will be given the opportunity to ensure that the revised text reflects their views.

ADAPTATION, AND LOSS AND DAMAGE: On Section E, Chile, for AILAC, MEXICO and the DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, suggested the inclusion of a global adaptation goal. SOUTH AFRICA proposed a global goal for adaptation that would include both quantitative and qualitative aspects.

Ghana, for the AFRICAN GROUP, called for an *ex ante* assessment of adaptation action, and for finance commensurate with adaptation needs. The EU suggested that all parties commit to adapt to climate change and cooperate to achieve climate resilient development. CANADA suggested all parties adapt to the adverse effects of climate change, recognizing “its global and transnational effects.” SWITZERLAND emphasized the need to share best practices. BRAZIL encouraged parties to include an adaptation component into their nationally determined contributions and developing countries to include assessment of vulnerabilities and MOI needs. Saudi Arabia, for the ARAB GROUP, said adaptation action should contribute to economic diversification.

NORWAY emphasized using the best available science and knowledge, including traditional and indigenous knowledge, as a basis for parties’ adaptation efforts. The Maldives, for AOSIS, emphasized that the Adaption Committee should be the lead body on adaptation under the new protocol. The REPUBLIC OF KOREA emphasized the need to avoid duplication of efforts. Tuvalu, for the LDCs, proposed regional adaptation centers and encouraging financial institutions to provide information to an international clearinghouse and registry on adaptation. The EU suggested promoting synergies with national, regional and international organizations to support adaptation action. CHINA suggested the establishment of a mechanism integrating existing arrangements on adaptation.

Chile, for AILAC, MEXICO and the DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, suggested nationally determined adaptation commitments, considering: the dynamic nature of action;

maladaptation; avoiding additional burdens on developing countries; building on existing tools; promoting human rights; as well as science- and traditional knowledge-based adaptation. The AFRICAN GROUP, with BOLIVIA, highlighted traditional knowledge. He also called for text on gender sensitivity. EGYPT proposed that commitments, contributions and actions be country-driven, gender-sensitive and focused on vulnerable groups, such as women and children. The DOMINICAN REPUBLIC emphasized gender-sensitive and community-based adaptation.

On monitoring and evaluation, Mexico, for AILAC and the DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, suggested launching a party-driven process on metrics. JAPAN proposed that all parties report their adaptation actions through a common reporting system.

On loss and damage, Saint Lucia, for AOSIS, with the LDCs, proposed moving text on loss and damage to a new section. Saudi Arabia, for the LMDCs, agreed that loss and damage should be addressed separately. He proposed that the Loss and Damage Executive Committee establish a compensation regime at its first session.

Saint Lucia, for AOSIS, submitted text to elaborate the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage, proposing, *inter alia*: further developing the modalities and procedures for the mechanism’s operation; involving existing bodies and expert groups under the Convention, as well as relevant organizations and expert bodies outside the Convention; and considering relevant precedents under international law.

The LDCs called for a compensation scheme for countries affected by slow onset events and for a climate change displacement co-ordination facility to deal with relocation and population displacement. Mexico, for AILAC and the DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, suggested that financial and technical support be made available to both countries and communities.

FINANCE: On Section G, Bolivia, for the G-77/CHINA, supported by Egypt, for the AFRICAN GROUP, suggested that the agreement be arranged in clusters on, *inter alia*: scale of resources; assessment and review; and sources of finance. The G-77/CHINA proposed that the Convention’s financial mechanism serve the 2015 agreement along with the Kyoto Protocol’s financial bodies, and with the GCF as the main operating entity. She called for strengthening the GCF through predictable resources and regular replenishments.

The AFRICAN GROUP called for a clear link between a quantitative financial goal and temperature goal. CHINA urged a clear road map with targets for public funding from developed



countries and progressively scaled up finance. Saudi Arabia, for the ARAB GROUP, asked that financing be primarily public, including grant-based finance. On scale of resources, EGYPT proposed that developed countries' financial contributions be based on a percentage of Gross Domestic Product.

The EU proposed that all parties individually and collectively mobilize climate finance with developed country leadership. JAPAN opposed limiting the requirement to provide finance to Annex II parties. AUSTRALIA suggested replacing reference to countries in annexes with language on "all parties in a position to do so," and encouraged the mobilization of finance from a variety of sources.

NORWAY proposed maximizing and incentivizing ambitious mitigation actions, including through payments based on verified results. The US stressed the need to strengthen recipient country reporting of financial flows. Highlighting fossil fuel subsidies, she stressed the importance of phasing out high-carbon investment. NEW ZEALAND stressed the need to ensure that climate finance and investments deliver effective outcomes.

The LDCs suggested that half of adaptation finance be allocated to SIDS and LDCs. He called for: a loss and damage finance window; a replenishment cycle for the GCF; financial support to be periodically reviewed and scaled up; an ICAO/IMO levy for adaptation finance; and new sources of finance. Panama, for Cfrn, suggested separate finance windows for REDD+, and loss and damage.

SWITZERLAND proposed a common transparency framework, which would evolve over time and be applicable to all parties, encompassing delivery, use and impact of support. Ecuador, for LMDCs, said developed countries should submit information on their financial contributions and developing countries on their needs.

Chile, for AILAC, suggested a new guiding principle that all investments become low-emission and resilient to climate impacts in the context of the mitigation goal. BOLIVIA suggested establishing a "climate resilience and sustainable development mechanism." KIRIBATI suggested recognizing the need for a special mechanism to fast-track action to assist the most vulnerable countries.

The G-77/CHINA called for developed countries and Annex II parties to provide finance in line with developing country needs, with references to Convention Article 4 and CBDR. She underscored: equal allocation between adaptation and mitigation; equitable distribution amongst developing countries; and MRV of support. On REDD+, she emphasized alternative approaches to results-based actions for the integral and sustainable management of forests.

TECHNOLOGY: On section H, BRAZIL proposed that parties include a technology component in their national contributions. EGYPT suggested assessing the effectiveness and adequacy of GCF technology funding. INDIA proposed that the GCF allocate funds to meet the full costs of developing country access to environmentally sound technologies. Saudi Arabia, for the ARAB GROUP, called for linking technology to the effective implementation of developing country INDCs. CHINA proposed a long-term technology goal and that developed countries regularly assess and prepare a list of technologies "ready for transfer."

Sudan, for the AFRICAN GROUP, called for a technology framework to consider technology needs assessments, research and development and enabling environments. BOLIVIA emphasized technology originating from indigenous peoples and local communities.

CAPACITY BUILDING: Many developing country parties underscored that their enhanced climate change actions will depend on MOI provided by developed countries.

Maldives, for AOSIS, proposed an international capacity-building mechanism, comprised of a coordination center that compiles information; analyzes gaps and trends; develops tools and methodologies; matches available support with identified needs; and coordinates and cooperates with UNFCCC bodies and other relevant entities.

Egypt, for the LMDCs, and INDONESIA emphasized that a capacity-building mechanism should be based on experience-sharing, lessons learned and best practices. Saudi Arabia, for the ARAB GROUP, stressed that any support coming from developing country parties should not interfere with the nature, scope or substance of developing parties' INDCs.

TRANSPARENCY OF ACTION AND SUPPORT: NEW ZEALAND suggested bringing together all text on mitigation. The EU proposed moving accounting rules concerning mitigation to the mitigation section. He called for common methodologies and metrics and guidelines on MRV; and for land-uses to be reported consistently. JAPAN proposed removing references to monitoring and evaluation of adaptation.

Jordan, for the LMDCs, called for a finance registry and for reporting on finance using a common format. CHINA proposed that information on MOI by developed countries be verified through a technical review process, followed by a multilateral assessment process and conclusions with compliance consequences. He suggested that developing countries report on their climate action consistent with the level of support received and that the information be subject to a "technical analysis" followed by a facilitative sharing of views among parties, on the basis of a non-intrusive, non-punitive process that is respectful of national sovereignty.

SWITZERLAND proposed a common accounting and tracking system to safeguard environmental integrity and avoid double counting of internationally transferable mitigation outcomes from cooperative arrangements.

IN THE CORRIDORS

On Monday, the ADP contact group continued considering new textual proposals added to the draft negotiating text. As discussions finished at 5:30 pm, delegates had managed to cover four new sections, with five remaining. Some expressed appreciation for the Co-Chairs' efforts to keep delegates focused on the task at hand, with frequent reminders to stick to the agreed mode of work.

The length of the final text was also subject to some speculation, as the revised mitigation section had grown from 4 to 12 pages. This caused some to worry that the text might swell considerably by the end of the session. Some were also wondering whether parties would actually refrain from adding text at a later stage of the negotiations.

In the evening, many delegates stayed in the meeting room for a briefing on support for INDCs. The event consisted of several presentations and parties exchanging views on the INDC process. Many developing countries stressed the importance of comprehensive support for all INDC components, not only mitigation. Developed countries highlighted various support activities, such as France's new INDC Support Facility.