

Summary of the Bonn Climate Change Conference: 30 April – 10 May 2018

The Bonn Climate Change Conference convened all three of the subsidiary bodies of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). The conference included the 48th sessions of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI 48), and the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA 48), and the fifth session of the first meeting of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Paris Agreement (APA 1-5). The Conference brought together over 3400 participants, including nearly 2000 government officials, 1400 representatives from UN bodies and agencies, intergovernmental organizations and civil society organizations, and 38 members of the media.

The meeting was largely focused on advancing work on the Paris Agreement Work Programme (PAWP), a set of decisions that will operationalize the Paris Agreement and facilitate its implementation. All three subsidiary bodies that convened in Bonn are considering different PAWP issues. Many viewed progress as necessary because the deadline for the PAWP's completion is December 2018.

On the PAWP, many of the conclusions reached and decisions taken capture discussions, particularly parties' suggestions and inputs made at this session, and include agreements to continue parties' consideration of the issues. The key outcomes from the PAWP are the mandates given to further negotiations:

- the Co-Chairs of the SBSTA, SBI and APA will prepare a note that will consider all of the items and propose ways forward;
- the APA Co-Chairs will prepare "tools" that will help parties develop an "agreed basis for negotiations"; and
- there will be an additional negotiating session from 3-8 September 2018 in Bangkok, Thailand, which will comprise resumed sessions for each body: SBI 48-2, SBSTA 48-2, and APA 1-6.

A unique feature of this conference was the Talanoa Dialogue. In a process designed around the questions "Where are we?" "Where do we want to go?" and "How do we get there?" parties and stakeholders shared stories that will inform a synthesis report to be presented at the Katowice Climate Change Conference in December 2018.

The SBI and SBSTA continued to consider issues related to the ongoing implementation of the UNFCCC and the Kyoto Protocol. Key decisions on these issues include:

- the SBI and SBSTA adopted a decision on the Koronivia Joint Work on Agriculture that includes a roadmap for the issues, events, and inputs to the work;

- the SBI recommended a decision to the Conference of the Parties (COP) regarding the review of the effective implementation of the Climate Technology Centre and Network; and
- the SBI also recommended that the COP conclude consideration of coordination of support for the implementation of activities in relation to mitigation actions in the forest sector by developing countries, including institutional arrangements.

A Brief History of the UN Climate Change Process

The international political response to climate change began with the 1992 adoption of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, which sets out the basic legal framework and principles for international climate change cooperation with the aim of 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, has 197 parties.

In order to boost the effectiveness of the UNFCCC, the Kyoto Protocol was adopted in December 1997. It commits industrialized countries, and countries in transition to a market economy, to achieve quantified emissions reduction targets for a basket of six GHGs. The Kyoto Protocol entered into force

In this Issue

A Brief History of the UN Climate Change Process	1
Report of the Meetings	2
Subsidiary Body for Implementation	2
Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice	9
<i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group on the Paris Agreement	13
Closing Plenaries	16
A Brief Analysis of the Bonn Climate Change Conference	17
Upcoming Meetings	19
Glossary	19

on 16 February 2005 and has 192 parties. Its first commitment period took place from 2008 to 2012. The 2012 Doha Amendment established the second commitment period from 2013 to 2020. It will enter into force after reaching 144 ratifications. To date, 111 parties have ratified the Doha Amendment.

In December 2015, parties adopted the Paris Agreement. Under the terms of the Agreement, all countries will submit nationally determined contributions (NDCs), and aggregate progress on mitigation, adaptation, and means of implementation will be reviewed every five years through a global stocktake. The Paris Agreement entered into force on 4 November 2016 and, as of 29 April 2018, 175 parties had ratified the Agreement.

Key Turning Points

Durban Mandate: The negotiating mandate for the Paris Agreement was adopted at the UN Climate Change Conference in Durban, South Africa, in 2011. Parties agreed to launch the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (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” no later than 2015, to enter 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.

Lima: The UN Climate Change Conference in Lima, Peru, in 2014 adopted the “Lima Call for Climate Action,” which furthered progress on the negotiations towards the Paris Agreement. It elaborated the elements of a draft negotiating text and the process for submitting and synthesizing intended nationally determined contributions (INDCs), while also addressing pre-2020 ambition.

Paris: The 2015 UN Climate Change Conference convened in Paris, France, and culminated in the adoption of the Paris Agreement on 12 December. The Agreement includes the goal of limiting the global average temperature increase to well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels, and pursuing efforts to limit it to 1.5°C. It also aims to increase parties’ ability to adapt to the adverse impacts of climate change and make financial flows consistent with a pathway towards low GHG emissions and climate resilient development. The Agreement will be implemented to reflect equity and the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, in light of different national circumstances.

Under the Paris Agreement, each party shall communicate, at five-year intervals, successively more ambitious NDCs. By 2020, parties whose NDCs contain a time frame up to 2025 are requested to communicate a new NDC and parties with an NDC time frame up to 2030 are requested to communicate or update these contributions.

Key features of the Paris Agreement include a transparency framework, as well as a process known as the global stocktake. Starting in 2023, parties will convene this process at five-year intervals to review collective progress on mitigation, adaptation, and means of implementation. The Agreement also includes provisions on adaptation, finance, technology, loss and damage, and compliance.

When adopting the Paris Agreement, parties launched the PAWP to develop the Agreement’s operational details, including through the APA, SBI, and SBSTA. They agreed to convene in 2018 a facilitative dialogue to take stock of collective progress towards the Paris Agreement’s long-term goals. This process is now known as the Talanoa Dialogue.

In Paris, parties also agreed the need to mobilize stronger and more ambitious climate action by all parties and non-party stakeholders to achieve the Paris Agreement’s goals. Building on the Lima-Paris Action Agenda, several non-party stakeholders made unilateral mitigation pledges in Paris, with more than 10,000 registered actions. Attention to actions by non-party stakeholders continued through the Marrakech Partnership for Global Climate Action, launched in 2016.

Marrakech: The UN Climate Change Conference in Marrakech took place from 7-18 November 2016, and included the first Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA 1). Parties adopted several decisions related to the PAWP, including: that the work should conclude by 2018; the terms of reference for the Paris Committee on Capacity-building; and initiating a process to identify the information to be provided in accordance with Agreement Article 9.5 (*ex ante* biennial finance communications by developed countries). Other decisions adopted included approving the five-year workplan of the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage (WIM), enhancing the Technology Mechanism, and continuing and enhancing the Lima work programme on gender.

Fiji/Bonn: The Fiji/Bonn Climate Change Conference convened from 6-17 November 2017 in Bonn, Germany, under the COP Presidency of Fiji. The COP launched the Talanoa Dialogue and established the “Fiji Momentum for Implementation,” a decision that gives prominence to pre-2020 implementation and ambition. The COP also provided guidance on the completion of the PAWP and decided that the Adaptation Fund shall serve the Paris Agreement, subject to decisions to be taken by CMA 1-3. Parties also further developed, or gave guidance to, the Local Communities and Indigenous Peoples Platform, the Executive Committee of the WIM, the Standing Committee on Finance, and the Adaptation Fund.

Report of the Meetings

On Monday, 30 April, the Bonn Climate Change Conference convened opening plenaries for SBI 48, SBSTA 48, and APA 1-5. Parties also had the opportunity to give their opening statements in a joint plenary. Summaries of these statements can be found at <http://enb.iisd.org/vol12/enb12717e.html>

Subsidiary Body for Implementation

SBI Chair Emmanuel Dlamini (Swaziland) opened the session on Monday, 30 April. Parties agreed to change the title of an agenda item to “Scope and modalities of the periodic assessment of the Technology Mechanism in relation to supporting the implementation of the Paris Agreement” and adopted the agenda (FCCC/SBI/2018/1) as modified. Timor Leste expressed support for an agenda item on loss and damage.

Technical Expert Meetings: The SBI and SBSTA convened a Technical Expert Meeting on mitigation (TEM-M) on Tuesday and Wednesday, 2-3 May, on the theme of implementation of circular economies and industrial waste reuse and prevention solutions.

The Technical Expert Meeting on adaptation (TEM-A) met on Wednesday and Thursday, 9-10 May on the theme of adaptation planning for vulnerable groups, communities, and ecosystems.

Facilitative Sharing of Views: In the facilitative sharing of views—workshop where non-Annex I parties present their biennial update reports, with questions and answers among parties—Chile and Singapore presented on Saturday, 5 May.

Annex I Reporting: Status of Submission and Review of Seventh National Communications and Third Biennial Reports: The SBI took note of status of submission and review of seventh national communications and third biennial reports (FCCC/SBI/2018/INF.7).

Compilation and Synthesis of Second Biennial Reports: This item was first taken up in plenary, then in informal consultations co-facilitated by Helen Plume (New Zealand) and Anne Rasmussen (Samoa).

During its closing plenary, the SBI noted that consultations did not result in conclusions, meaning that in accordance with rules 10(c) and 16 of the draft rules of procedure, this matter will be forwarded to the provisional agenda of SBI 49. Gabon, for the African Group, expressed concern that rule 16 was being used to block progress.

Non-Annex I Reporting: Information Contained in National Communications: This item was held in abeyance.

Review of the Terms of Reference of the Consultative Group of Experts (CGE): This item was first taken up in plenary, then in informal consultations co-facilitated by Helen Plume (New Zealand) and Anne Rasmussen (Samoa).

The SBI adopted the draft conclusions. Egypt, for the Group of 77 and China (G-77/China), noted concern that no substantive conclusions were reached on the CGE, and highlighted the importance of renewing the Group's terms of reference at COP 24.

Gabon, for the African Group, supported by Saudi Arabia, China, India, Iran, Bangladesh, and Brazil, for Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay, expressed disappointment and concern that there was no agreement on the terms of reference for the CGE, noting its importance in building capacity for developing countries preparing their national communications and biennial update reports. Saudi Arabia pointed out that with no consensus in 2018, the CGE's mandate would come to an end by 2020. Several parties highlighted the links between technical support for reporting and the emerging transparency framework, with Iran asking for the SBI's pre-2020 transparency items and the APA's post-2020 items to be co-chaired by the relevant presiding officers.

SBI Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2018/L.14), the SBI agrees to continue its consideration of this matter at SBI 49.

Provision of Financial and Technical Support: This item was first taken up in plenary, then in informal consultations co-facilitated by Helen Plume (New Zealand) and Anne Rasmussen (Samoa).

The SBI adopted its conclusions. Egypt, for the G-77/China, called for a "satisfactory outcome" to ensure that developing countries are able to access support, including for national communications and biennial update reports.

SBI Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2018/L.10), the SBI agrees to continue its consideration of this matter at SBI 49.

Summary Reports of Biennial Update Reports: The SBI took note of the information.

Revision of Modalities and Guidelines of ICA: The SBI agreed to postpone its consideration of this matter until SBI 50.

Common Timeframes: Discussions on this item focus on the common frequency by which parties update or communicate their NDCs. Currently, those parties with a 5-year NDC are requested to communicate by 2020 a new NDC and those parties with a

10-year NDC are requested to communicate or update their NDC by 2020. Article 4.10 of the Paris Agreement requires common timeframes for NDCs to be considered.

This item was introduced during the opening plenary and subsequently addressed in informal consultations co-facilitated by Marianne Karlsen (Norway) and George Wamukoya (Kenya).

In discussions on draft conclusions, some expressed concerns about losing progress made during this session if it was not reflected in conclusions or an informal note, whereas others noted a desire to provide further input if views were to be included in an informal note or conference room papers (CRPs).

Parties eventually agreed to refer, in a footnote, to the SBI's welcoming of both submissions and CRPs from parties, following assurances that CRPs have no formal status and that this will not prejudice any discussions at the next session. Several parties called for the next session to better capture common ground between parties, and dedicate more time for substantive discussions. They did not agree to one party's proposal that the SBI make a recommendation for consideration and adoption by CMA 1.

On Thursday, 10 May, plenary adopted conclusions.

SBI Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2018/L.4), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- takes note of the rich and constructive exchange among parties on relevant issues, including but not limited to the time of applicability of, usefulness of, and options for common timeframes, as well as the advantages and disadvantages of those options; and
- agrees to continue its consideration of this matter at SB 48-2, with a view to making a recommendation for consideration and adoption by the CMA.

Development of Modalities and Procedures for the Operation and Use of a Public Registry Referred to in

Paris Agreement Article 4.12 (NDC Registry): This item was introduced in plenary on Monday, 30 April, and subsequently addressed in informal consultations co-facilitated by Madeleine Diouf Sarr (Senegal) and Peer Stiansen (Norway).

Parties considered the informal note from SBI 47. They agreed that the Co-Facilitators should prepare a draft informal note and draft conclusions after the second meeting.

On the interim NDC registry, some parties characterized the search function, with the possibility of searching keywords across countries' NDCs, as "intrusive" and going beyond the registry's mandate. Others disagreed, highlighting that it enhances the comparability of information.

Parties also diverged on whether to discuss the NDC registry jointly with the public registry under Agreement Article 7.12 (adaptation communication), with some developing countries highlighting technical similarities between the two items. In the final meeting, several developed countries expressed reservations about efforts to ensure draft conclusions showed parity with the adaptation communication public registry, with one noting this does not imply "additional affinity" between the two items.

On Thursday, 10 May, the SBI plenary adopted conclusions.

SBI Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2018/L.7), the SBI agrees to continue its consideration of this matter at SB 48-2.

Development of Modalities and Procedures for the Operation and use of a Public Registry Referred to in Paris Agreement Article 7.12 (Adaptation Communications Registry): This item was introduced in plenary and subsequently addressed in informal consultations co-facilitated by Madeleine Diouf Sarr (Senegal) and Peer Stiansen (Norway).

On Thursday, 10 May, the SBI plenary adopted conclusions, with an oral amendment that this item will be taken up at the resumed SBI 48 meeting.

SBI Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2018/L.8), the SBI agrees to continue its consideration of this matter at SB 48-2.

Review of Modalities and Procedures for the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM): In the opening plenary, the SBI Chair noted that the consideration of this item has been postponed until SBI 49.

Coordination of Support for the Implementation of Activities in Relation to Mitigation Actions in the Forest Sector by Developing Countries, including Institutional Arrangements: This item was first taken up by the SBI plenary and subsequently discussed in informal consultations co-facilitated by Keith Anderson (Switzerland) and Trevor Thompson (Grenada).

During the plenary, a number of countries lamented that the meeting of Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD+) experts, in accordance with decision 10/CP.19, did not take place this year. Others noted that there was no agreement to hold further meetings at COP 23, thereby precluding it from being organized. In informal consultations, parties diverged on the need for future meetings of REDD+ experts in accordance with decision 10/CP.19. A number of parties suggested continuing the meetings, in a time-bound manner, and recommending the COP revisit this issue at a later date. Other parties opposed.

In informal consultations, several parties proposed concluding the SBI's consideration of this matter. One group opposed.

The SBI adopted conclusions during the closing plenary.

SBI Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2018/L.9), the SBI, having considered existing institutional arrangements or the need for potential governance alternatives for the coordination of support for REDD+, agrees to conclude consideration of this item. The conclusions also recommend that the COP agree to end SBI's consideration of this matter.

Koronivia Joint Work on Agriculture: This item was first taken up in plenary, and forwarded to informal consultations co-facilitated by Heikki Granholm (Finland) and Milagros Sandoval (Peru).

In informal consultations, many parties called for the development, at SB 48, of a roadmap to guide the Koronivia joint work on agriculture. Many parties stressed the need to keep "farmers on the ground" at the center of the work.

A developed country party proposed a draft roadmap containing a timeline from SB 48 to SB 53, which, in addition to in-session workshops, contained workshops at non-UNFCCC international fora. A developing country group made a counter-proposal, which was used as the basis for discussions. The roadmap, as subsequently agreed upon, includes in-session workshops on each of the six topics listed in decision 4/CP.23, together with submissions by parties and observers and reports by the Secretariat on the outcomes of workshops. The roadmap also stipulated that SB 53 would report to the COP on the progress and outcomes of the work, including on potential future topics.

On Thursday, 10 May, the SBI and SBSTA adopted conclusions.

SBI/SBSTA Conclusions: In their conclusions (FCCC/SB/2018/L.1), the SBI and SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- request the Secretariat to organize workshops, referred to in the annex of the draft conclusions, in conjunction with the sessions also referred to in the annex, and encouraged admitted observers to participate in these workshops;
- take note of the importance of issues, including but not limited to farmers, gender, youth, local communities and indigenous peoples, and encouraged parties to take them into consideration when making submissions and during the workshops;
- request the Secretariat to prepare a report on each workshop referred to in the annex, for consideration at the sessions of the SBI and the SBSTA following the sessions in conjunction with which the workshops took place;
- request the Secretariat to invite representatives of the constituted bodies under the Convention to contribute to the work, and attend the workshops, in particular the first workshop on the modalities for implementation of the outcomes of the in-session workshops;
- invite parties and observers to submit, for each workshop referred to in the annex, their views on the subject of that workshop by the deadline specified in the annex; and
- agree to continue consideration of this agenda item at SBI 49 and SBSTA 49.

Report of the Adaptation Committee: Matters Related to Least Developed Countries (LDCs): These items were taken up together in joint SBI/SBSTA informal consultations on the report of the Adaptation Committee, co-facilitated by Patience Dampety (Ghana) and Gabriela Fischerova (Slovakia), and on matters relating to LDCs (FCCC/SBI/2018/4), co-facilitated by Mamadou Honadia (Burkina Faso) and Malcolm Ridout (UK).

During the SBI plenary, LDC Expert Group (LEG) Vice-Chair Fernandes Santana reported on progress since COP 23, and highlighted, *inter alia*, an expert meeting on national adaptation plans (NAPs), a successful NAP Expo, and two invitations to host future Expos.

In informal consultations on matters relating to LDCs, views diverged on whether draft conclusions, which were free of brackets, could be adopted pending further discussions on the decision text. Developed countries argued that procedurally the conclusions and decision could not be uncoupled, with developing countries arguing the conclusions could be adopted with the decision forwarded later.

On Thursday, 10 May, plenary adopted separate conclusions for the two items.

SBI and SBSTA Conclusions: In their conclusions (FCCC/SB/2018/L.2), the SBI and SBSTA:

- welcome the progress made in advancing deliberations on the work of the Adaptation Committee and the work of the LEG, as captured in the revised informal notes by the Co-Facilitators; and
- agree to continue their consideration of these matters on the basis of the revised informal notes at SB 48-2, with a view to making a recommendation to be forwarded by COP 24 for consideration and adoption by CMA 1.

SBI Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2018/L.17 and Add.1), the SBI:

- requests the LEG to consider elements in its report including the needs related to adaptation arising from the Paris

Agreement and decision 1/CP.21 that could be addressed in its future work programme;

- welcomes the information submitted by parties for use by the LEG in considering the need to update the LDC work programme; and
- agrees to continue its consideration of updating the LDC work programme at SBI 49 (December 2018).

National Adaptation Plans: This item was first taken up by the SBI plenary where they considered the reports on: progress, experience, best practices, lessons learned, gaps, needs and support provided and received in the process to formulate and implement NAPs (FCCC/SBI/2018/INF.1); Adaptation Committee workshop on accessing the Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme of the Green Climate Fund for adaptation (SB48.AC.1); and summary of progress made in the process to formulate and implement NAPs (FCCC/SBI/2018/6). It was considered then in informal consultations co-facilitated by Pepetua Latasi (Tuvalu) and Malcolm Ridout (UK).

Parties debated language reflecting if “some” or “noteworthy” progress has been made in formulating and implementing NAPs. Views diverged on whether to “note” or “welcome” reports on: progress in the formulation and implementation of NAPs; progress, experiences, lessons learned, gaps, needs, and support in the process; and the Adaptation Committee workshop on accessing the Green Climate Fund’s Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme

On Thursday, 10 May, the SBI adopted the conclusions.

SBI Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2018/L.16), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- welcomes the work of the LEG, the Adaptation Committee, and the Secretariat in preparing: the summary of progress in the process to formulate and implement NAPs; the report of progress, experience, best practices, lessons learned, gaps, needs, and support provided and received in the process to formulate and implement NAPs; and the report on the Adaptation Committee workshop on accessing the Readiness and Preparatory Support of the Green Climate Fund for adaptation;
- welcomes the work of the LEG in organizing side events during SBI sessions, and invited the LEG to consider extending an invitation to developing country parties to showcase their examples of national adaptation planning at COP 24; and
- agrees to continue consideration of this matter at SBI 49 on the basis of the draft decision text proposed by the Co-Facilitators of the informal consultations.

Development and Transfer of Technologies: Scope and Modalities for the Periodic Assessment of the Technology Mechanism in Relation to Supporting the Paris Agreement:

This item was first taken up in plenary to consider the report on the experience, lessons learned and best practices in conducting reviews of various arrangements under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol relevant to the periodic assessment of the Technology Mechanism and was subsequently discussed in joint informal consultations, co-facilitated by Ian Lloyd (US) and Claudia Octaviano (Mexico).

In informal consultations the Secretariat presented a technical paper on experience, lessons learned, and best practices in conducting reviews of various arrangements under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol relevant to the periodic assessment of the Technology Mechanism (FCCC/TP/2017/5). Parties agreed to base discussions on the Co-Facilitators’ informal note. Some developed country parties objected to discussions

on scope, noting that this had been settled at SB 44. Several developing country groups and parties responded that there was a need to revisit that understanding, given that the emphasis was too unbalanced, with too much focus on effectiveness of the mechanism and not enough on the related subject of adequacy of support.

In its closing plenary, on Thursday, 10 May, the SBI adopted conclusions.

SBI Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2018/L.2), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- welcomes the technical paper by the Secretariat on experience, lessons learned, and best practices in conducting reviews of various arrangements under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol relevant to the periodic assessment;
- takes into account decision 1/CP.23, paragraph 2 and Annex I, and accelerates its work on elaborating the scope of and modalities for the periodic assessment;
- notes that the Co-Facilitators of the informal consultations on this agenda sub-item prepared an informal note on the basis of the deliberations of parties at this and previous sessions of the SBI and their submitted views; and
- agrees to continue elaborating the scope of and modalities for the periodic assessment at the next SBI session, taking into account the informal note.

Review of the Effective Implementation of the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN):

This item was first taken up in plenary, and subsequently in informal consultations, co-facilitated by Stella Gama (Malawi) and Ian Lloyd (US).

In informal consultations, parties considered draft conclusions, based on both the independent review of the effective implementation of the CTCN, and the United Nations Environment Programme’s (UNEP) management response to that review (FCCC/SBI/2018/INF.5). Some developing country parties and groups stressed the recommendations point to the need to increase support for CTCN’s capacity building, and support for developing country national designated entities. Several developed countries appealed for balance, arguing that support was only one of the many elements of the recommendations from the independent review. One party objected to the recommendations of the independent review because it did not take into account the difficulties of economies in transition.

During its closing plenary, on Thursday, 10 May, the SBI adopted conclusions and a draft decision to be forwarded to the COP. Belarus made a statement about the case of economies in transition, which was formally attached to the SBI report.

SBI Conclusions: In its draft conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2018/L.15), the SBI considered the findings and recommendations of the independent review of the effective implementation of the CTCN and UNEP’s management response to these findings and recommendations, and recommended a draft decision on this matter for consideration and adoption at COP 24 (FCCC/SBI/2018/L.15/Add.1).

Matters Related to Climate Finance: Identification of the Information to be Provided by Parties in Accordance with Article 9.5 of the Paris Agreement: This item was first taken up in the SBI plenary, where the UNEP management response was introduced (FCCC/SBI/2018/INF.5). Discussions continued in informal consultations co-facilitated by Peter Horne (Australia) and Seyni Nafo (Mali).

In informal consultations, a group of developing countries, supported by others, introduced a CRP for discussion. It was agreed that the proposal would be taken into account, along

with other submissions, as the Co-Facilitators prepared a revised informal note. In the revised informal note, the Co-Facilitators proposed a structure with text under five sections on enhanced information: to increase clarity on the expected levels of provision and mobilization of climate finance from different sources; on policies, programmes, and priorities; on actions and plans to mobilize additional finance from a range of sources; on the balance between adaptation and mitigation; and on enabling environments. Some proposed short section headings to avoid prejudging the content, and a group suggested streamlining and identifying elements for a decision.

The Co-Facilitators produced a second iteration of the informal note that was welcomed by parties. Some parties suggested making clarifying edits that developed countries “shall” provide information while others are “encouraged” to do so. Others cautioned against making textual edits at this stage. Parties agreed to the draft conclusions and to continue deliberations on the basis of the informal note.

In plenary, the SBI adopted conclusions.

SBI Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2018/L.13), the SBI: welcomes the informal note produced by the Co-Facilitators; requests the SBI Chair to consult with the APA Co-Chairs to ensure coherence and coordination on this item; and agrees to continue its consideration of this matter at SB 48-2 on the basis of the informal note.

Matters Related to Capacity Building: These sub-items were first taken up by the SBI plenary, where a compilation and synthesis report on capacity-building work of bodies established under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol (FCCC/SBI/2018/3 and Add.1) and a synthesis report on the implementation of the framework for capacity building (FCCC/SBI/2018/5) were introduced. The SBI agreed to address both sub-items in informal discussions, co-facilitated by Jeniffer Collado (Dominican Republic) and Makoto Kato (Japan).

On Thursday, 3 May, the seventh meeting of the Durban Forum on Capacity-building convened. Its discussions are summarized at: <http://enb.iisd.org/vol12/enb12720e.html>

Paris Committee on Capacity-building: The second meeting of the Paris Committee on Capacity-building (PCCB) met Thursday through Saturday, 3-5 May. On Saturday, the PCCB adopted a set of outcomes.

PCCB Outcomes: During its second meeting, held from 3-5 May, the PCCB agrees on, *inter alia*:

- implementation of the rolling 2017-2019 workplan: to develop strategies for outreach, stakeholder engagement, and resource mobilization, to establish a vision and action plan for each working group within a well-defined timeframe, to continue collaboration with non-party stakeholders, and to make certain recommendations to the COP;
- the 2018 PCCB focus area/theme: to enhance the PCCB’s collaboration with the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism as well as the Convention’s constituted bodies, and other relevant organizations and initiatives; to continue to address capacity-building gaps related to cross-cutting issues; to organize activities at COP 24 on the issue of human rights and climate change; and to create an area in the capacity-building portal dedicated to the integration of cross-cutting issues in climate change plans;
- the 2019 PCCB focus area/theme to continue with the 2018 focus area or theme on capacity-building activities for the implementation of NDCs in the context of the Paris

Agreement, and on representatives to be invited to PCCB meetings; and

- the PCCB annual technical progress report to the COP on the report outline and to finalize the report by August 2018.

Capacity Building under the Convention: In the informal consultations on the proposed draft conclusions, parties debated progress in implementation how to refer to the work of the Durban Forum on Capacity-building, and how to characterize the importance of capacity building.

On progress, developing countries proposed reflecting in the draft conclusions that while progress had been made in the implementation of the framework for capacity building, this progress was qualified and gaps still existed, while developed countries argued that this qualification was unnecessary.

On the Durban Forum on Capacity-building, several developing countries said that although the Forum is providing a platform to exchange views, it is insufficient and should be allocated more time.

On the importance of capacity building to the implementation of the Convention, some parties proposed it was important in “enhancing” implementation, while others said it was important in “enabling the effective and sustained” implementation. Parties eventually agreed on the wording “enhancing the effective implementation of the Convention.”

On Thursday, 10 May, the SBI adopted conclusions.

SBI Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2018/L.5), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- welcomes the synthesis reports prepared by the Secretariat and the summary report on the sixth Durban Forum on Capacity-building;
- reiterates the value of the objective and scope of capacity building in developing countries as contained in decision 2/CP.7, and notes that some progress has been made in the implementation of the framework for capacity building in developing countries at the institutional, systematic, and individual level;
- notes the importance of capacity building in enhancing the effective implementation of the Convention, and that current and emerging areas in the context of the Convention and the Paris Agreement should also be taken into account in the further implementation of the capacity-building framework in developing countries;
- recognizes the value of the Durban Forum on Capacity-building and notes that the forum serves as a means for a continuous exchange of information, good practice and lessons learned among a wide spectrum of stakeholders under and outside the Convention, as well as for providing input to the monitoring and review of the effectiveness of capacity building;
- notes with appreciation the progress made to date by the PCCB;
- welcomes the shared theme of capacity building for the implementation of nationally determined contributions of the seventh Durban Forum on Capacity-building and the second meeting of the PCCB, which took place at this session;
- notes that there are emerging gaps, needs and constraints of capacity, for example with regard to NDCs, NAPs, measurement, reporting, and verification, access to climate finance, and others as outlined in the synthesis report, and welcomes the intensified efforts by parties and stakeholders to address these issues; and

- takes note of the usefulness and importance of engaging various stakeholders at the subnational, national, and regional levels in the continued implementation of the capacity-building framework in developing countries.

Capacity building under the Protocol: Discussions in the joint informal consultations are summarized under the sub-item on capacity building under the Convention above.

On Thursday, 10 May, the SBI adopted conclusions.

SBI Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2018/L.6), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- welcomes the synthesis reports prepared by the Secretariat and the summary report of the sixth Durban Forum on Capacity-building;
- reiterates the value of the objective and scope of capacity building in developing countries as contained in decision 2/CP.7 and reaffirmed in decision 29/CMP.1, and notes that some progress has been made in the implementation of the framework for capacity building in developing countries at the institutional, systematic, and individual level;
- notes the importance of capacity building in enhancing the effective implementation of the Kyoto Protocol, and that current and emerging areas in the context of the Kyoto Protocol should also be taken into account in the further implementation of the capacity-building framework in developing countries;
- recognizes the value of the Durban Forum on Capacity-building and notes that the forum serves as a means for a continuous exchange of information, good practice and lessons learned among a wide spectrum of stakeholders under and outside the Convention, as well as for providing input to the monitoring and review of the effectiveness of capacity building;
- takes note that there are emerging gaps, needs and constraints of capacity, for example with regard to NDCs, NAPs, measurement, reporting, and verification, access to climate finance, and others as outlined in the synthesis report, and welcomes the intensified efforts by parties and stakeholders to address these issues; and
- takes note of the usefulness and importance of engaging various stakeholders at the subnational, national, and regional levels in the continued implementation of the capacity-building framework in developing countries.

Impact of the Implementation of Response Measures:

Improved Forum and Work Programme: This item was first taken up in plenary and subsequently in a contact group and in joint informal consultations, co-facilitated by Andrei Marcu (Panama) and Nataliya Kushko (Ukraine). These informal consultations considered all of the sub-items, including matters relating to Article 3.14 of the Kyoto Protocol and progress on the implementation of decision 1/CP.10 (Buenos Aires Programme of Work on Adaptation and Response Measures).

From 30 April to 1 May, parties participated in an in-forum training workshop on the use of economic modelling tools related to the work programme of the improved forum. All parties expressed appreciation for the event, some highlighting take-aways including: data limitations are key; there is a disparity of expertise between developed and developing countries; qualitative assessment is also important; and there are few studies on cross-border effects. Some parties noted the workshop was too technical for many negotiators. In the informal consultations that followed, parties discussed the scope of the improved forum's review, mandated to wrap up by COP 24.

In its closing plenary, on Thursday, 10 May, the SBI adopted conclusions.

SBI/SBSTA Conclusions: In their conclusions (FCCC/SB/2018/L.4), the SBI and SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- request the Secretariat to prepare a report on the in-forum training workshop for consideration at SBSTA 49/SBI 49;
- agree on the scope of the review (as contained in the annex to the conclusions);
- invites parties and observers to submit via the submission portal, by 21 September, their views on the work of the improved forum, and requests the Secretariat to prepare a synthesis report based on the submissions;
- agree to conduct a one-day review of the work of the improved forum in conjunction with SBSTA 49/SBI 49 with a view to concluding the review;
- note that the decision on the forum serving the Paris Agreement will be taken at CMA 1-3 (December 2018) as part of the PAWP, at which time the forum will begin serving the Paris Agreement; and
- note that the outcome of the review of the improved forum will inform the work programme and modalities for the forum serving the Convention, the Kyoto Protocol, and the Paris Agreement.

Modalities, Work Programme and Functions under the Paris Agreement of the Forum on the Impact of the Implementation of Response Measures:

This item was first taken up in plenary and subsequently in a contact group and in joint informal consultations by the SBSTA and SBI Chairs, co-facilitated by Andrei Marcu (Panama) and Nataliya Kushko (Ukraine). The Co-Facilitators prepared an informal revision of the SBSTA and SBI Chairs' informal note of 16 March 2018, outlining draft elements of the modalities, work programme, and function of the forum. On functions, some parties preferred a detailed list, while others objected that such a list went beyond a work programme, and preferred more general guidance focused on economic diversification and just transition. Some developed countries objected to supervisory and monitoring tasks in the functions. Some developed countries, opposed by some developing countries and groups, advocated for the text to reflect that the work programme was dynamic.

In its closing plenary, on Thursday, 10 May, the SBI and SBSTA adopted conclusions.

SBI/SBSTA Conclusions: In their conclusions (FCCC/SB/2018/L.3), the SBI and SBSTA jointly, *inter alia*:

- agree to continue work on this matter at the resumed sessions, on the basis of the revised version of the SBSTA and the SBI Chairs' informal document as prepared by the Co-Chairs of the contact group;
- note that the content of the Co-Chairs' revised informal document does not represent consensus among parties; and
- agree that the recommendation being prepared under these agenda sub-items for consideration and adoption by CMA 1 will include language for the CMA to take the necessary procedural steps to enable the forum to serve the Paris Agreement as per decision 1/CP.21, paragraphs 33 and 34.

Ways of Enhancing the Implementation of Education, Training, Public Awareness, Public Participation and Public Access to Information so as to Enhance Actions under the Paris Agreement:

This item was first taken up by the SBI plenary and then in informal consultations, facilitated by Albert Magalang (Philippines).

The Action for Climate Empowerment (ACE) Workshop on Ways of Enhancing the Implementation of Education, Training, Public Awareness, Public Participation and Public Access to Information took place on Tuesday, 1 May, and is summarized here: <http://enb.iisd.org/vol12/enb12718e.html>

The sixth dialogue on Action for Climate Empowerment was held on Wednesday, 9 May, on opportunities to further enhance the engagement of non-party stakeholders, and is summarized here: <http://enb.iisd.org/vol12/enb12725e.html>

On Thursday, 10 May, the SBI adopted conclusions.

SBI Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2018/L.3), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- recognizes and welcomes the outcomes of the ACE youth forum and the ACE workshop;
- invited parties and observers to submit, by 10 March 2019, their views on the agenda for the seventh in-session ACE Dialogue;
- recommends draft conclusions on the process to develop the terms of reference for the review of the Doha work programme on Article 6 of the Convention for consideration and adoption at COP 24 (FCCC/SBI/2018/L.3/Add.1); and
- recommends a draft decision on ACE for consideration and adoption by CMA 1 (FCCC/SBI/2018/L.3/Add.2).

Gender: This item was first taken up by the SBI plenary. The SBI took note of the technical report prepared by the Secretariat on entry points for integrating gender considerations into UNFCCC workstreams (FCCC/TP/2018/1), and forwarded it for consideration by COP 24 along with reports of the gender-related mandated events at SB 48.

An in-session workshop on Gender and Climate Change took place in two parts. Part one was held on Wednesday, 2 May, with part two on Wednesday, 9 May. The summary of part one can be found here: <http://enb.iisd.org/vol12/enb12719e.html> and the summary of part two can be found here: <http://enb.iisd.org/vol12/enb12725e.html>

An in-session dialogue on constituted bodies and the integration of gender considerations was held on Saturday, 5 May, and is summarized here: <http://enb.iisd.org/vol12/enb12722e.html>

Intergovernmental Meetings: This issue (FCCC/SBI/2018/7) was first taken up by the SBI plenary and subsequently in informal consultations co-facilitated by Deo Saran (Fiji).

Two observer organizations called for conflict of interest policies that would deny observer status for entities with commercial interests at odds with the objectives of the UNFCCC and its related instruments. Another called for the continued inclusion of all non-party stakeholders, arguing that business has an important role to play in addressing climate change. Several parties agreed that while inclusiveness is valuable, observer participation should be restricted where there is conflict of interest. On the broader issue of engagement, one party suggested distinguishing between participation in implementation and participation in the rule-making processes, saying there should be limits concerning the latter.

Views diverged on the need to discuss the frequency of meetings after 2020. Some parties called for alignment of the meetings with key political moments, while others called such discussion premature. Others proposed considering meeting locations. While parties agreed to consider the issue at SBI 50, they disagreed on whether the Secretariat should prepare a technical paper beforehand, to inform discussions, or after, informed by SB 50 discussions. Parties also diverged on how

to best facilitate the participation of non-party stakeholders, with a number of parties cautioning that limiting access could discriminate among stakeholders.

On Thursday, 10 May, the SBI plenary adopted conclusions.

SBI Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2018/L.12), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- invites the government of Poland to regularly provide additional information regarding the preparations for COP 24;
- emphasizes the importance of following the principles of openness, transparency, and inclusiveness, and adhering to established procedures on decision-making in making arrangements for COP 24;
- underlines the importance at the conclusion of COP 24 of the political phase of the Talanoa Dialogue, the third high-level ministerial dialogue on climate finance, the high-level event on enhancing climate action, and the stocktake on pre-2020 implementation and ambition;
- invites parties to come forward with offers to host COP 25 and COP 26;
- takes note of the views expressed by parties at this session on the issue of frequency and location of sessions of the supreme bodies taking place after 2020, and agrees to consider this issue further at SBI 50;
- requests the Secretariat to prepare a synthesis report on parties' submissions and an information paper on the budgetary and other implications of different proposals contained in the submissions; and
- reiterates the importance of enhancing the engagement of non-party stakeholders in the intergovernmental process and takes note of the diverse views expressed by parties regarding their engagement.

Administrative, Financial and Institutional Matters:

Continuing Review of Functions and Operations of the Secretariat:

The Secretariat reported on two initiatives: a coordination of Secretariat services across the three subsidiary bodies, including physical integration of offices, and a recently-launched long-term structural review of the Secretariat. The SBI took note of the information.

Budgetary Matters: The opening plenary first considered this item, including: 2017 secretariat activities, programme delivery highlights and financial performance (FCCC/SBI/2018/INF.3); possible approaches to prioritization, and budgetary implications of decisions (FCCC/SBI/2018/INF.2); possible enhancements to the presentation of the budget and work programme for the biennium 2020-2021 (FCCC/SBI/2018/INF.4 and Add.1); status of contributions as at 13 April 2018 (FCCC/SBI/2018/INF.6); and report on the technical workshop on ways to increase the efficiency and transparency of the budget process (FCCC/SBI/2018/2).

The SBI adopted conclusions. Gabon, for the African Group, objected to the use in the documents on this item of the non-official name "UN Climate Change."

SBI Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2018/L.11), the SBI:

- expresses concern regarding the high level of outstanding contributions to the core budget for the current and previous bienniums and strongly urges the parties concerned to make their contributions without further delay;
- requests the Executive Secretary to raise awareness among party representatives in bilateral and multilateral forums of the issue of outstanding core budget contributions;

- notes the need to continue exploring options for enhancing the level of contributions at SBI 49;
- expresses appreciation to the parties that had made voluntary contributions to the Trust Fund for Participation in the UNFCCC Process and the Trust Fund for Supplementary Activities;
- urges parties to contribute to the Trust Fund for Participation in the UNFCCC Process to ensure the widest possible participation in 2018, and to contribute to the Trust Fund for Supplementary Activities to ensure a high level of implementation of the UNFCCC work programme; and
- takes note of the 2017 annual report, and notes that while the annual report attempted to respond to the mandate requested by COP 23, future reports require enhancements, to be considered at SBI 49.

Report of the Session: The SBI adopted its report (FCCC/SBI/2018/L.1).

Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice

The SBSTA opened on Monday, 30 April, adopted the agenda (FCCC/SBSTA/2018/1) and agreed to the organization of work.

SBSTA Chair Paul Watkinson (France) noted ongoing consultations on the SBSTA Vice-Chair and Rapporteur. Vice-Chair Annela Anger-Kraavi (Estonia) and Rapporteur Aderito Manuel Fernandes Santana (São Tomé and Príncipe) will remain in office until new nominations are received.

Nairobi Work Programme (NWP): This item was first taken up in plenary, where the SBSTA Chair introduced: Outcomes of work under the NWP since May 2016 (FCCC/SBSTA/2018.2); progress in implementing activities under the NWP (FCCC/SBSTA/2018/INF.1); and adaptation in human settlements, key findings and ways forward (FCCC/SBSTA/2018/3). Subsequent discussions were in informal consultations, co-facilitated by Julio Cordano (Chile) and Beth Lavender (Canada).

Discussions focused on the review of the NWP's effectiveness based on three questions agreed at SBSTA 47, on how to: enhance partner organizations' engagement to improve linkages of their workplans to the NWP's themes; ensure that the NWP has delivered on its mandate; and enhance the NWP's relevance for the work of the Adaptation Committee and LEG. A group of parties highlighted the importance of avoiding duplicating activities across adaptation workstreams.

Views diverged on the relationship between the Convention and the Paris Agreement. Some parties favored the phrasing "the Convention and its Paris Agreement," arguing that the Agreement is under the Convention, while others preferred "the Convention and the Paris Agreement."

On Thursday, 10 May, the SBSTA plenary adopted conclusions.

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2018/L.8), the SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- welcomes the mobilization of global and regional partners to identify, communicate, and bridge priority knowledge gaps in six sub-regions, as part of the pilot phase of the Lima Adaptation Knowledge Initiative;
- concludes that the NWP has successfully responded to its mandates, and encourages it to continue enhancing its role as a knowledge-for-action hub for adaptation and resilience, with a view to further improving the relevance and effectiveness of the NWP in light of the Paris Agreement;
- requests the Secretariat to further encourage the ongoing engagement of NWP partner organizations in key thematic

areas to drive forward activities that produce usable knowledge products, and catalyze action in response to identified knowledge needs;

- invites the Adaptation Committee to facilitate collaboration through modalities in accordance with decision 2/CP.17, to provide advice on the delivery of NWP mandates that relate to the work programmes of constituted bodies;
- requests the Secretariat to continue seeking opportunities for continuous engagement with relevant NWP partner organizations and other organizations in order to enable the provision of expert guidance;
- concludes that future NWP thematic areas should focus on emerging issues in relation to climate change, including, *inter alia*: extreme weather events; ocean, coastal areas, and ecosystems; agriculture and food security; slow onset events; rural systems and communities; and livelihood and socio-economic dimensions;
- concludes that henceforth it will consider matters related to the NWP at its first regular session of the year; and
- concludes that it will take stock of the operational and institutional modalities of the NWP at SBSTA 56, with a view to assessing the performance and effectiveness of the NWP at addressing knowledge needs relevant to the implementation of the Paris Agreement.

Report of the Adaptation Committee: This item is summarized under the SBI on page 4.

Development and Transfer of Technologies: Technology Framework Under Article 10.4 of the Paris Agreement: This item was first taken in plenary and subsequently addressed in informal consultations, co-facilitated by Carlos Fuller (Belize) and Mette Møglestue (Norway).

In informal consultations, parties considered a draft technology framework produced by the SBSTA Chair as requested by SBSTA 47. Some developing countries and parties argued the need for reflecting elements of Agreement Article 9.5, stressing the importance of adequate support for the successful transfer of technologies. Parties diverged on how to handle the links to other processes, in particular the transparency framework, given that the outcomes in those areas are not yet known. Two parties applauded the text's reference to support that takes into account "national circumstances, gender perspective, and endogenous and indigenous aspects." Some developing country parties requested more explicit text on institutional arrangements to operationalize the framework. The Co-Chairs were mandated to produce an updated draft of the framework as a basis for further discussions.

In its closing plenary, on Thursday, 10 May, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2018/L.7), the SBSTA welcomes with appreciation the initial draft of the technology framework prepared by the SBSTA Chair and notes the progress and discussions among parties at this session. It agrees to continue its elaboration of the technology framework, including its structure, at SBSTA 48-2.

Research and Systemic Observation: This item was first taken up in plenary and subsequently in informal consultations, co-facilitated by Fred Kossam (Malawi) and Christiane Textor (Germany).

In informal consultations, many developing and developed country parties and groups expressed their appreciation for the ongoing work of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), noting in particular that the upcoming Special Report on 1.5°C would be a useful input to the Talanoa Dialogue. One

developing country group, supported by other parties, argued against any explicit reference to the products of the sixth review cycle, including the Special Report on 1.5°C, given that they are not yet complete, and not accepted. Agreement was not possible within the informal consultations and the text was forwarded as such to the SBSTA plenary.

In its closing plenary, on Thursday, 10 May, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2018/L.11), the SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- acknowledges the ongoing efforts of the IPCC in the sixth assessment cycle (with footnoted reference to the Special Report on 1.5°C, the Sixth Assessment Report, and two other efforts);
- recognizes the importance of continued and enhanced support for climate change research, including enhancing research capacity, particularly in developing countries;
- notes the importance of indigenous and traditional knowledge in relevant aspects of scientific data and research, and in communication at the science-policy interface;
- welcomed the 10th Research Dialogue, held on 3 May 2018, its aim to promote discussion at the science-policy interface, and further noted the importance of the work of the scientific community and the IPCC under the themes of the Dialogue, encouraging parties and relevant organizations to address gaps and needs with regard to a number of research areas and requests its Chair to produce a summary report; and
- invites parties to submit their views on possible topics and considerations for the meetings of the research dialogue to be held in conjunction with SBSTA 50 and beyond.

Local Communities and Indigenous Peoples (LCIP)

Platform: This item was taken up in plenary and subsequently in informal consultations co-facilitated by Annela Anger-Kraavi (Estonia) and Carlos Fuller (Belize). A summary of the in-session workshop, which was held on Tuesday, 1 May, is at <http://enb.iisd.org/vol12/enb12718e.html>

During informal consultations, parties debated the facilitative working group, and the role of state sovereignty vis-à-vis indigenous peoples. There was also discussion over the meaning of “local communities.”

On the facilitative working group, consensus emerged that the working group’s objective would be to further operationalize the LCIP Platform and facilitate the implementation of its functions, although views diverged on whether these were two separate objectives or part of one linked objective. On the group’s mandate, views diverged on whether modalities would be developed under the COP decision establishing the facilitative working group, or by the working group itself. Parties, with input from indigenous peoples, debated how indigenous peoples representatives would be chosen for the working group, and the length of representatives’ terms, among other items.

There was extensive debate on one developing country’s proposal to specify that the LCIP Platform and activities of the working group could not be construed as authorizing or encouraging any action that would “dismember or impair” the territorial integrity or political unity of a state. Several developed and developing countries opposed.

In the closing SBSTA plenary, parties agreed to adopt conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2018/L.10). Chair Watkinson noted that parties would continue their consideration of this item at SBSTA 49 based on a draft decision text.

Egypt, for the G-77/China, with China and Ecuador, regretted the lack of consensus on this item. Australia urged “redoubling efforts” for agreement at COP 24. Canada stressed to need to carry forward momentum on this item. The European Union (EU) looked forward to the next steps. New Zealand urged “moving forward together.” Norway called for a “simple” governance structure and said local communities and indigenous peoples were not a “threat” to national sovereignty.

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2018/L.10), the SBSTA acknowledges the fruitful exchange during the in-session multi-stakeholder workshop. The SBSTA agreed to continue consideration of this matter at SBSTA 49 (December 2018) on the basis of the draft decision text proposed by the Co-Facilitators of the informal consultations.

Koronivia Joint Work on Agriculture: This item is summarized under the SBI on page 4.

Response Measures: This item is summarized under the SBI on page 7.

Methodological Issues under the Convention: Revision of the UNFCCC Reporting Guidelines on Annual Inventories for Annex I Parties: This issue was opened in plenary and subsequently discussed in informal consultations co-facilitated by Riitta Pipatti (Finland) and Washington Zhakata (Zimbabwe).

The SBSTA adopted conclusions during its closing plenary.

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2018/L.4), the SBSTA:

- welcomes the updates provided by parties on their experience of using the IPCC 2013 Supplement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National GHG Inventories: Wetlands for their GHG inventory reporting, and encouraged parties to continue gaining experience in using the Supplement;
- discusses the reporting of carbon dioxide emissions and removal estimates relating to harvested wood products, including parties’ experience of reporting those estimates and in linking them with forest land estimates, and noted the importance of the discussions to advancing understanding of the different approaches set out in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National GHG Inventories and the potential implications of the use of different approaches for overestimating or underestimating emissions and removals from harvested wood products; and
- agrees to continue its consideration of this matter at SBSTA 51 (November 2019).

Guidelines for the Technical Review of Information Reported Related to GHG Inventories, Biennial Reports and National Communications by Annex I Parties: This issue was opened in plenary and subsequently discussed in informal consultations co-facilitated by Riitta Pipatti (Finland) and Washington Zhakata (Zimbabwe).

The SBSTA adopted conclusions during its closing plenary.

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2018/L.5), the SBSTA:

- notes the conclusions from the 15th meeting of GHG inventory lead reviewers;
- welcomes the information on the improvements in conducting desk reviews and recognizes that ensuring a sufficient number of experts for desk reviews has been a challenge for the Secretariat;
- invites parties to encourage and facilitate the participation of their nominated experts in desk reviews;

- notes from the conclusions from the meetings of lead reviewers that the organization of desk reviews has benefited from the actions proposed in those conclusions and invites GHG inventory lead reviewers to continue considering at their meetings the experience of conducting desk reviews and suggesting how to improve the operationalization of the reviews, and
- agrees to continue its consideration of this matter at SBSTA 51 (November 2019).

Bunker Fuels: This item was opened in plenary and the SBSTA Chair conducted consultations.

In plenary, the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) reported on efforts to promote sustainable aviation fuels and highlighted the complementary roles of the UNFCCC and ICAO. The International Maritime Organization (IMO) reported on the “initial strategy” to reduce GHG emissions from international shipping by at least 50% by 2050 as compared to 2008.

Saudi Arabia emphasized that it did not join the consensus on the IMO strategy.

During the closing plenary, draft conclusions were presented for adoption (FCCC/SBSTA/2018/L.6). Many parties welcomed the reports from the ICAO and IMO.

Gabon, for the African Group, supported by India, proposed an oral amendment to add a reference requesting that ICAO and IMO report on support provided to developing countries. The EU, Chile, Australia, New Zealand, Japan, and the Russian Federation rejected the oral amendment.

The EU noted it anticipated receiving more informative and comprehensive reports from the ICAO and IMO. Chile and Switzerland, for the Environmental Integrity Group (EIG), stressed the need to improve coordination among the UNFCCC, ICAO, and IMO to avoid double counting and to safeguard environmental integrity.

Australia said the UNFCCC does not have a mandate to determine the content of the ICAO and IMO reports. The Russian Federation urged parties to respect parallel processes and not substitute for their work.

Noting a lack of consensus, SBSTA Chair Watkinson invoked rule 16 and forwarded the issue for consideration at SBSTA 49. SBSTA Chair Watkinson also proposed to convene an informal event at COP 24 to facilitate the exchange of views between interested parties and directly with the ICAO and IMO, but withdrew this proposal following objections from Saudi Arabia.

Methodological Issues under the Kyoto Protocol: Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry (LULUCF) under Articles 3.3 and 3.4 of the Protocol and under the CDM: This item was first taken up by plenary and subsequently in informal consultations, co-facilitated by Paula Perälä (Finland) and Walter Oyhantcabal (Uruguay). In its closing plenary, on Thursday, 10 May, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2018/L.2), the SBSTA agrees to continue its consideration of this agenda item at SBSTA 50 (June 2019) with a view to recommending draft decisions on this matter in relation to the work programmes referred to in decision 2/CMP.7, paragraphs 6 (modalities and procedures for possible additional LULUCF activities under the CDM; 7 (modalities and procedures for alternatives to address the risk of non-permanence); and 10 (modalities and procedures for applying the concept of additionality), for consideration and adoption by the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto

Protocol (CMP) 15 (November 2019), and to reporting to the CMP 15 on the outcomes of the work programme referred to in decision 2/CMP.7, paragraph 5 (work programme to explore more comprehensive accounting of anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by LULUCF activities).

Matters Relating to Article 6 under the Paris Agreement: This item was first taken up in the SBSTA plenary and subsequently in informal consultations co-facilitated by Kelley Kizzier (EU) and Hugh Sealy (Maldives).

Parties welcomed the SBSTA Chair’s informal document containing draft elements on all three items of Article 6, which was mandated at SBSTA 47. In the first read-through of the informal document, on all three items, the Co-Facilitators collected clarifying questions.

In the second read-through, the Co-Facilitators collected comments on mistakes, omissions and misrepresentations in the Chair’s informal document in reference to the content of the third iteration note from SBSTA 47. Specific issues pertaining to the three parts of Article 6 are discussed below under relevant sections.

The Co-Facilitators issued a revised informal note reflecting the questions posed and the comments made during the read-throughs. A number of parties expressed concern that their positions had not been duly reflected in the Co-Facilitators’ informal notes.

On the way forward, parties diverged on the need for: technical papers; submissions; and a mandate for the Co-Chairs to produce a new version of the text incorporating inputs.

Parties also disagreed on the need for a roundtable to be organized in conjunction with SBSTA 48-2. After extensive discussions, the SBSTA Chair proposed that the parties agree on the draft conclusions with the roundtable in brackets, with a mandate for him to adjust the text according to the mode of work as agreed to under the APA. A number of parties objected to such a link with the APA and said this item should be discussed independently. After further informal consultations, parties agreed to move forward without the roundtable.

Guidance on Cooperative Approaches referred to in Article 6.2 (ITMOs): Parties carried out two read-throughs of this section, raising issues including: the difference between overall mitigation and the environmental integrity of cooperative approaches; share of proceeds; and elements listed under multilateral governance and rules-based system. Parties discussed how best to reflect final accounting and linkages with Agreement Article 4.13 (mitigation accounting). On the structure of the document, the Co-Facilitators explained that the SBSTA Chair had restructured the third iteration note to put elements in chronological order: *ex-ante* party reporting and review; corresponding adjustment; and periodic and *ex-post* party reporting and review. Parties made comments on the note’s elements including principles, preamble, scope, and purpose. They diverged on the need for a section on principles.

The SBSTA plenary adopted its conclusions on Thursday, 10 May.

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2018/L.12), the SBSTA:

- notes that it continues to elaborate the guidance on cooperative approaches in Agreement Article 6.2;
- takes note of the informal document containing draft elements of the guidance on cooperative approaches prepared by the SBSTA Chair and the revised informal note prepared by the Co-Chairs of the contact group; and

- agrees to continue deliberations at SBSTA 48-2 on the basis of the revised informal note, noting that the note does not represent a consensus view.

Rules, Modalities and Procedures for the Mechanism

Established by Article 6.4: Parties conducted two read-throughs of this section. Parties discussed, among others: why the informal documents on Agreement Article 6.2 and Article 6.4 differ on elements such as principles, preambular text, participation requirements, and eligibility; the basis for elaborating on governance functions of the supervisory body; and differences between the third iteration of the Co-Facilitators' informal note and the SBSTA Chair's document. On the supervisory body, parties discussed, *inter alia*: using existing models such as the committee to facilitate implementation and compliance under Agreement Article 15, and the PCCB; alternative models of representation and how to include LDCs and small island developing states; rules of procedure, including using rules of the Clean Development Mechanism Executive Board and linkages with the CMA; and the arrangements for the transfer of share of proceeds. On eligible mitigation activities, parties discussed how the text should reflect the lack of agreement on the mechanism's scope. On participation, benefits, and responsibilities of host parties, parties exchanged views on the relationship between human rights and negative social and economic impacts, and links between Agreement Articles 6.2 and 6.4.

The SBSTA plenary adopted its conclusions on Thursday, 10 May.

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2018/L.13), the SBSTA:

- notes that it continues to elaborate the rules, modalities and procedures for the Agreement Article 6.4 mechanism;
- takes note of the informal document containing draft elements of the rules, modalities, and procedures for the mechanism prepared by the SBSTA Chair and the revised informal note prepared by the Co-Chairs of the contact group; and
- agrees to continue deliberations at SBSTA 48-2 on the basis of the revised informal note, noting that the note does not represent a consensus view.

Work Programme Under the Framework for Non-Market

Approaches Referred to in Article 6.8: Parties carried out two read-throughs of this section. They discussed, among other issues, whether a preamble is necessary, and whether principles are necessary. It was suggested to have a preamble that contains principles, which others opposed. Parties also debated the relevance of the negative social and economic impacts of response measures, and participation of public and private sector actors. On options for the governance framework, parties noted that a permanent forum may not be mutually exclusive with a task force and existing committees and structures. Parties also discussed the scope of the work programme for this sub-item.

The SBSTA plenary adopted its conclusions on Thursday, 10 May.

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2018/L.14), the SBSTA:

- notes that it continues to elaborate the draft decision on the work programme under the framework for non-market approaches referred to in Agreement Article 6.8;
- takes note of the informal document containing draft elements of the draft decision on the work programme prepared by the SBSTA Chair and the revised informal note prepared by the Co-Chairs of the contact group; and

- agrees to continue deliberations at SBSTA 48-2 on the basis of the revised informal note, noting that the note does not represent a consensus view.

Modalities for Accounting of Financial Resources Provided and Mobilized through Public Interventions under Article 9.7 of the Agreement:

This item was first taken up in plenary and then in informal consultations, co-facilitated by Delphine Eyraud (France) and Seyni Nafo (Mali).

In informal consultations, parties considered an informal note prepared by the Co-Facilitators. On the basis of in-session discussions, the Co-Facilitators also produced a second iteration note, structured around objectives and principles; general considerations; and cross-cutting considerations, with the latter consisting of suggested elements of a common tabular reporting format. Parties deliberated on how to define, *inter alia*, new and additional finance, and climate-specific finance. On outflows from multilateral funds, some suggested aggregated reporting in the biennial report of the Standing Committee on Finance since assigning individual shares to such outflows is problematic. Some suggested differentiating between flows to multilateral funds that provide direct climate finance, and those whose support results in climate co-benefits. Parties agreed on the need to deliver timely input to the transparency framework.

In its closing plenary, on Thursday, 10 May, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2018/L.9), the SBSTA:

- welcomes the work as reflected in the informal note by the Co-Chairs;
- agrees to continue its work on this matter at SBSTA 48-2 building on, but not limited to, the informal note, views and submissions made, and to forward the outcomes to COP 24 with a view to the COP making a recommendation for consideration and adoption by CMA 1; and
- requests its Chair to continue consultations with the APA Co-Chairs with a view to avoiding overlap and duplication and ensuring the timely incorporation of the modalities under the transparency framework.

Cooperation with other International Organizations: This item (FCCC/SBSTA/2018/INF.2) was considered in plenary on Monday, 30 April. SBSTA Chair Watkinson undertook consultations.

In plenary, the IPCC highlighted progress on its work programme, including on the forthcoming special reports. The World Meteorological Organization encouraged parties to establish national frameworks for climate services. The World Climate Research Programme shared information on its forthcoming ten-year strategic plan. The Global Climate Observing System highlighted a series of upcoming regional workshops.

The Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) noted the need to better understand changes occurring in ocean systems, and for more oceans research capacity in developing countries. UN Oceans stressed the importance of enhancing synergies between the oceans and climate change regimes, encouraging the UNFCCC to become a member.

The Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) applauded the adoption of the Koronivia joint work on agriculture.

In the closing plenary, the SBSTA adopted conclusions.

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2018/L.3), the SBSTA welcomes the summary of the Secretariat's cooperative activities with other intergovernmental organizations since SBSTA 46.

Report of the Session: The SBSTA adopted its report (FCCC/SBSTA/2018/L.1).

Ad Hoc Working Group on the Paris Agreement

On Monday, 30 April, APA Co-Chairs Jo Tyndall (New Zealand) and Sarah Baashan (Saudi Arabia) opened the session and parties agreed to continue with the APA 1 agenda (FCCC/APA/2018/1) and work in a single contact group that will conduct its work through informal consultations. During the first week, the APA also met in Heads of Delegation meetings. The APA also convened a joint "pilot" informal consultation session to discuss adaptation communication and transparency framework.

Further Guidance on the Mitigation Section of Decision 1/CP.21 (Paris Outcome): This item was first taken up in plenary in informal consultations co-facilitated by Sin Liang Cheah (Singapore) and Gertraud Wollansky (Austria). Parties considered the 180-page informal note prepared by the Co-Facilitators at APA 1-4, structured to address the three agenda sub-items: features of NDCs, information to facilitate clarity, transparency and understanding of NDCs, and accounting for parties' NDCs. A developing country group, supported by other groups and parties, suggested that:

- the guidance is not meant to be prescriptive;
- it should be bifurcated to reflect respective capabilities;
- it should cover mitigation, adaptation and means of implementation; and
- developing countries will need capacity building to help them undertake reporting.

A developed country party, supported by others, argued that the guidance should focus on mitigation only, and should be common to all parties, while having different applicability for those with less stringent NDC obligations. Another developed country party, opposed by some developing country parties, proposed differentiated guidance based on levels of gross domestic product (GDP) or emissions. Several parties suggested there might be a need for specific land use accounting guidance on harvested products and natural disturbances. Many stressed the need to coordinate with discussions on cooperative approaches, as well as with the development of the transparency framework. There was divergence on the level of specificity to be used, with some developing country parties noting the need to accommodate the nationally-driven character of NDCs and parties' respective capabilities, while others argued about the need for guidance detailed enough to allow them to understand the mitigation implications of NDCs even across a variety of types of commitments.

Based on discussions and submissions, the Co-Facilitators produced a 34-page "navigation tool" to supplement the informal note, which parties welcomed as an additional basis for discussions, stressing that it does not supersede or replace the informal note as a basis for discussions.

Adaptation Communication: This item was taken up in informal consultations co-facilitated by Julio Cordano (Chile) and Beth Lavender (Canada).

Discussions focused on the structure of draft decision text, with a group of developing countries proposing an organizing format. On the understanding that the proposal's suggested headings did not prejudice any outcome and that all substantive options will

be retained, delegates agreed to mandate the Co-Facilitators to migrate text from the APA 1-4 informal note into the proposed structure.

On the proposed annexes, a group of parties highlighted the need to maintain the division in Annex I between sections on common and optional elements of adaptation communications. Others supported merging these sections, noting that no guidance on adaptation communications will be mandatory. Parties also diverged on the need for a second annex on guidance for NDCs, with some arguing this question is part of the agenda item's mandate, while others stressed the importance of flexibility in choosing the vehicle for adaptation communications.

On the preamble, parties diverged over whether to differentiate between the overarching provisions of the UNFCCC and the Paris Agreement. They also discussed adding to the guidance's preambular references to other Agreement articles, including the global stocktake and transparency framework, as well as to national communications, biennial reports, and NAPs.

In the final informal consultations, parties discussed whether and how the second iteration of the Co-Facilitators' informal note could reflect inputs received from parties during the session. With some expressing concern that not all inputs had been discussed in the room, delegates were unable to agree on the way forward.

During the subsequent contact group on APA items 3-8, parties agreed to a proposal, made by APA Co-Chair Baashan, that the final iteration of the note would have an attachment including proposals and submissions from parties, to allow delegates to pick up this agenda item at the next session.

On Wednesday, 9 May, the Co-Facilitators issued the revised informal note.

Modalities, Procedures, and Guidelines for the Transparency Framework for Action and Support: This item was taken up in informal consultations co-facilitated by Xiang Gao (China) and Andrew Rakestraw (US). Parties discussed approaches to, *inter alia*:

- technical expert review;
- facilitative multilateral consideration of progress;
- information on means of implementation;
- national inventory report on anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks of GHGs;
- information on climate change impacts and adaptation; and
- overarching considerations and guiding principles.

On the technical expert review, some parties highlighted that the review's scope:

- should be limited to what is in the Agreement;
- should be considered together with "information to be reviewed";
- capacity-building needs should be determined together with the party in question; and
- "building on existing guidelines" should be included as an approach.

On the review's frequency, some said this should be flexible and linked to parties' capacity; reports should be submitted every two years, coinciding with biennial reports; and LDCs and small island developing states should be able to exercise discretion concerning frequency. Various parties noted the need to further clarify some of the approaches presented towards the review's format.

On facilitative multilateral consideration of progress, many parties expressed willingness to consider combining in-person meetings with an online component, but a few parties expressed concern about technical challenges and obstacles to participation.

Views diverged on the role of non-party stakeholders, with one party suggesting that they be permitted to attend the meetings but not to pose questions. Parties' views on the frequency of the process varied from two to five years.

On information on means of implementation, many parties supported incorporating the accounting of financial resources provided and mobilized through public interventions in accordance with Agreement Article 9.7, being developed under the SBSTA. One group, supported by a party, suggested continuing work while anticipating the SBSTA's outcome, while another group noted additional work would be needed to translate inputs from these financial accounting modalities into reporting guidelines.

On national inventory reports of anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks, parties expressed their preference for different approaches to: methodologies, parameters, and data; sectors and gases; and reporting formats. Many countries highlighted the need to ensure the reflection of the "no backsliding" principle for developed countries on these issues, while noting the need for flexibility for developing countries, or a subset thereof. Views differed on how to operationalize this flexibility.

On information on climate change impacts and adaptation, parties disagreed about whether information on loss and damage should be included, with developed countries arguing that this falls outside the scope of Article 13 (transparency framework), and developing countries characterizing loss and damage as an important element of "climate impacts." Some parties suggested adding information on loss and damage could be optional.

On overarching considerations and guiding principles, parties provided views on which elements are most appropriate for inclusion in: modalities, procedures and guidelines (MPGs); COP/CMA decisions; and overarching considerations to guide the development of MPGs. They discussed a list of possible elements for the COP and/or CMA decisions adopting the MPGs, with some countries characterizing this as premature.

On Wednesday, 9 May, the Co-Facilitators issued a revised informal note.

Matters Relating to the Global Stocktake: Informal consultations were co-facilitated by Outi Honkatukia (Finland) and Xolisa Ngwadla (South Africa). Parties identified elements missing from the APA 1-4 informal note, and sought additional clarification on: governance structure; the technical phase's three workstreams of mitigation, adaptation, and means of implementation and support; linkages to other elements of the Paris Agreement; and timing of the stocktake's three phases.

On activity A (preparatory phase), parties suggested that its timing take into consideration both the activity's nature and its relation to activity B (technical phase), and include a clear invitation for relevant bodies to prepare input "well in advance" of activity B. On activity B, parties suggested:

- technical dialogues under a joint SBSTA/SBI contact group;
- separate technical dialogues on each workstream under the responsibility of the SB chairs, with dedicated co-facilitators;
- an open forum format rather than parallel sessions, to increase transparency; and
- guidance from the Talanoa Dialogue.

On activity C (political phase), one group suggested a dedicated ministerial segment that would capture political commitments in the form of a declaration.

Parties agreed to the final iteration of the Co-Facilitators' note. Several parties sought confirmation that its annex, which lists specific guiding questions for the global stocktake, is non-exhaustive. The Co-Facilitators presented an "illustrative timeline" to chart progress to the first global stocktake, and parties shared views on when the stocktake should begin, to ensure adequate time to undertake the preparatory, technical, and political phases. Parties stressed that the stocktake process should: allow flexibility for stocktakes to differ over time; provide adequate time for synthesizing inputs; consider other potential inputs, such as IPCC reports; and pay attention to non-negotiated outputs. On timing, parties' suggestions included that the list of inputs should be completed in 2021 and institutional bodies should complete their inputs throughout 2022, and that the stocktake process should take at least one year.

The Co-Facilitators forwarded the preliminary material document to the APA contact group for consideration.

Modalities and Procedures for the Effective Operation of the Committee to Facilitate Implementation and Promote Compliance: This item was co-facilitated by Janine Coye-Felson (Belize) and Peter Horne (Australia). Consultations proceeded on the basis of an informal note provided by the Co-Facilitators at APA 1-4. Parties worked to elaborate the informal note with substantive textual elements, remove duplications, and synthesize similar options. Parties discussed: initiation, measures, and scope; action and outputs; and systemic issues.

On initiation, measures, and scope, some parties considered that measures and scope should be considered through the frame of initiation, while others suggested that they are separate elements of a package. On scope, parties' views diverged on whether to distinguish between legally-binding and non-legally binding provisions, and also between objectively verifiably (binary) and non-binary legally binding obligations. Parties further disagreed on whether scope needed to be addressed under its own section of the draft elements, as distinct from initiation.

Parties reflected on three questions provided by the Co-Facilitators: how a matter would reach the committee; the steps the committee would take in its consideration; and the actions and outputs the committee could take.

On modes of initiation, all parties agreed that self-referral should be an option, with some parties also supporting an "objective" trigger for binary legally binding obligations on the basis of information provided through linkages with, *inter alia*, the NDC registry. On the committee's process, views converged on, *inter alia*: the importance of dialogue with, and full participation of, the party concerned; and the need for the committee to take into account national capacities and circumstances.

On actions and outputs, views converged on a "toolbox" approach with a number of options for outputs and measures that the committee could take, and "bounded discretion" of the committee on the measures to be applied in a particular case. Many parties also stressed the importance for national capacities and circumstances to be taken into account in determining measures and outputs in a particular case.

On systemic issues, views converged on: that the process on systemic issues would be initiated by the CMA or by the committee itself, with one group also suggesting referral by a group of parties jointly; the committee would have a mandate to obtain information from other relevant bodies; and its output would be contained in the committee's annual report to the CMA.

In later informal consultations, parties welcomed a tool provided by the Co-Facilitators to streamline the informal note. Parties provided reflections on the tool, including on:

- quorum requirements;
- the personal and expert capacity of committee members;
- the definition of systemic issues;
- a deadline for the CMA to adopt the committee's rules of procedure;
- whether the committee should have a bureau; and
- electronic decision-making.

Views diverged on whether the scope of the committee's work and initiation of its proceedings should be grouped together, or whether there should be a distinct section on scope. Parties also diverged on whether facilitating access to finance should be an output of the committee, with some arguing that this could result in "perverse incentives."

Some parties suggested that the decision only needed to contain the bare minimum of text necessary for the committee to function, leaving its rules of procedure to be adopted by the committee itself.

The informal note was revised to include the results of the tool and the suggestions raised, and was forwarded to the APA contact group.

Further Matters Related to Implementation of the Paris Agreement: Adaptation Fund: Informal consultations were co-facilitated by Maria del Pilar Bueno (Argentina) and Pieter Terpstra (the Netherlands). Parties discussed whether there are additional matters related to Agreement Article 9.5 (*ex-ante* climate finance) that require the CMA's consideration, and what institutional arrangements are needed for the Adaptation Fund to serve the Paris Agreement.

On the institutional arrangements for the Adaptation Fund to serve the Agreement, the Secretariat provided clarification on transitional arrangements under the scenario in which the Fund serves both the CMP and CMA, and the scenario in which it exclusively serves the CMA. Parties sought additional clarification on:

- which body could mandate the Adaptation Fund Board (AFB) to adjust the institutional arrangements of the Secretariat and the trustee;
- whether the CMA can revise the authority of the CMP over the Fund;
- the status of the Fund as an operating entity of the financial mechanism of the Convention;
- mandates related to the composition of the AFB; and
- the timing of a decision to ensure the Fund does not cease to operate.

The Secretariat confirmed that the relevant CMP decisions have signaled preparation for the Fund to exclusively serve the CMA, and recommended an interim transitional period during which the AFB could adjust institutional arrangements.

Discussing the prioritization of work, some parties suggested that a COP 24 decision should address institutional arrangements, the start date for the Adaptation Fund to serve the CMA, and exclusivity.

The revised informal note was forwarded to the APA contact group.

Further Matters, except the Adaptation Fund: This item was discussed in informal consultations co-facilitated by APA Co-Chairs Baashan and Tyndall, focusing on the five additional possible matters not yet considered in previous SB meetings:

- Process for setting a new collective quantified goal on finance;

- Initial guidance by the CMA to the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism;
- Initial guidance by the CMA to the Least Developed Countries Fund and the Special Climate Change Fund;
- Guidance by the CMA on adjustment of existing NDCs; and
- Modalities for biennially communicating finance information on the provision of public financial resources to developing countries in accordance with Article 9.5 of the Paris Agreement.

On Agreement Article 9.5, parties disagreed on whether the Paris Agreement mandates the PAWP to expand on the modalities of the article. Two developing country groups drew a distinction between elaborating what information should be compiled, a task for the SBI, and operationalizing the obligation to communicate the information, a task that should be taken up by the CMA. Several developed countries argued that the SBI agenda item provides the necessary clarity on finance communications.

On setting a new quantified collective goal on finance, all parties acknowledged the importance of the mandate to set the goal "prior to 2025." There was divergence on whether to ask the CMA to begin work on this during CMA 1. Many developing country groups and parties argued the need for an inclusive process involving consultation and needs assessment, noting it would need to start soon if "last-minute arbitrary" targets are to be avoided. Several developed countries countered that it was too early, arguing the need to draw lessons from the 2020 goal and the ongoing process on long-term finance, and noting that the CMA 1 agenda was already ambitious.

On taking stock of progress by the subsidiary bodies in relation to their work on the PAWP, a party proposed, *inter alia*: including a joint reflection note by all relevant presiding officers; a joint stocktake by all relevant facilitators; and a report from the Secretariat on the time allotted to the various PAWP-related agenda items. Several parties felt the time allocation accounting would not be helpful, with one saying he was more interested in how much time each item needed.

A developing country party made an in-session submission that called for space to consider modalities, procedures, and guidelines for enhancing understanding, action and support for loss and damage in accordance with Agreement Articles 8.3 and 8.4.

The Co-Facilitators subsequently prepared a final informal note to which they annexed two party-submitted options for moving forward with one item: modalities for biennially communicating information in accordance with Agreement Article 9.5. The note also summarizes the progress made on item 8(b).

APA Contact Group: The APA contact group met twice, to establish its mode of work in informal consultations on Monday, 30 April, and on Wednesday, 9 May, to hear reports on each substantive agenda item and to adopt draft conclusions.

On the conclusions, Co-Chair Baashan provided an outline of the first iteration, which, *inter alia*, contained three options for a Co-Chairs' informal document, incorporating: Co-Chairs' proposals for streamlining the outcome of APA 1-5 (option 1); Co-Chairs' proposals for and examples of how parties could further progress toward the development of either draft elements of text or an agreed basis for negotiations (option 2); or, draft elements of text (option 3). She noted that the conclusions also invite parties to submit their views on areas that need attention, and to conduct a one-day roundtable before APA 1-6 with a focus on substantive linkages among APA items.

Parties first offered reflections on the draft conclusions, and then discussed textual proposals. Several groups welcomed the proposed joint reflections note by the APA, SBI, and SBSTA Chairs and Co-Chairs.

On options for an informal document, stressing that negotiations on the PAWP should remain party-driven, Iran, for the Like-Minded Group of Developing Countries (LMDCs), and Indonesia, supported option 1.

Preferring option 2, Gabon, for the African Group, and Argentina, for Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay, said the Co-Chairs' informal document could further progress towards the development of draft outcomes of text.

Maldives, for the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS), and Ethiopia, for the LDCs, supported option 3.

The EU noted the differences in quality among the three options and, with Switzerland, for the EIG, said the document could contain all the elements outlined in the options. Chile, for Independent Association of Latin America and the Caribbean (AILAC), expressed flexibility, suggesting option 1 with elements of option 3. Australia, for the Umbrella Group, preferred working from existing informal notes, saying that too few items are mature enough for a single progress document.

On the proposed roundtable, several groups expressed support. The EU and Umbrella Group supported the proposal to focus on linkages across several APA agenda items. The EIG suggested it should also address linkages to non-APA items such as cooperative approaches. AOSIS called for any roundtables to be focused. Saudi Arabia, for the Arab Group, and the African Group said the focus should be interlinkages among all PAWP items.

On time management, Egypt, for the G-77/China, expressed hope that the additional session would cover PAWP items under all three bodies. The African Group called for more time on finance and adaptation. China called for more time on, among other issues, technology development and transfer. EIG, the EU, and the Umbrella Group suggested more complex tasks be given more time.

On the call for submissions, several groups opposed, saying parties' views were clear and there was no need for additional inputs, with some noting that parties were free to send submissions at any time.

Seeking assurance that party submissions would be attached to the Co-Chairs' informal note, the African Group supported submissions. The LMDCs proposed that submissions prior to APA 1-6 be taken on board in the Co-Chairs' informal document, and that it must be prepared without omitting, reinterpreting, or prejudging parties' views and without prejudging the outcome of the PAWP. Brazil proposed the conclusions reflect the right of parties to make submissions.

The APA contact group agreed to draft conclusions that were adopted by the APA closing plenary on Thursday, 10 May.

APA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/APA/2018/L.2), the APA, *inter alia*: requests the APA Co-Chairs to:

- prepare additional tools, based on informal notes contained in the annex, under their own responsibility, with proposals for streamlining the APA outcome at this session and examples of how further progress could be made for an agreed basis for negotiations by 1 August 2018;
- consider preparing a joint reflections note on progress made and proposing ways forward in consultation with the Chairs of the SBI and SBSTA by mid-August;
- coordinate with the Chairs of the SBI and SBSTA for a comparable level of progress on all PAWP items; and

- take into account concerns about the insufficient amount of time for deliberations on adaptation communications, finance-related issues, and on the transparency framework for action and support.

The APA also agrees to conduct a one-day roundtable, in the pre-session period before APA 1-6, with a focus on substantive linkages. The APA further agrees that the scope of the roundtable will include matters linked to the PAWP that are outside the APA mandate and requests the APA Co-Chairs to consult with the Chairs of the SBSTA and the SBI on this matter. The APA also requests the Secretariat to update the online platform that provides an overview of the work under the PAWP.

Report of the Session: The APA adopted its report (FCCC/APA/2018.L.1)

Closing Plenaries

The SBI, SBSTA, and APA held a joint plenary to hear closing statements on Thursday, 10 May.

UNFCCC Executive Secretary Patricia Espinosa expressed appreciation to retiring UNFCCC Secretariat member Halldór Thorgeirsson, which was supported by many parties.

Many parties said that while progress had been made on the PAWP, much more remained to be done. Many also welcomed the roadmap for agriculture.

Egypt, for the G-77/China, called for balanced outcomes on the PAWP in future sessions, and underscored the need for pre-2020 enhanced ambition and provision of support. He highlighted the need for progress on finance-related issues, and called for more time allocated for transparency.

The EU said concluding the PAWP in Katowice is crucial for the credibility of the UNFCCC process. She underscored that the political phase of the Talanoa Dialogue should be informed by the IPCC Special Report on 1.5°C and should inform the preparation of NDCs by 2020.

Australia, for the Umbrella Group, called for, *inter alia*: an increased pace of work on the transparency framework; recognizing linkages between robust accounting for use of ITMOs; and more time allocated for more technically complex items.

Urging a focus on substance and enhancing common understanding, Switzerland, for the EIG, called for more time to consider: transparency of action and support; Agreement Article 6 (cooperative approaches); adaptation communication; and accounting under item 3 of the APA.

Republic of Korea, also for the EIG, said lessons learned through the facilitative sharing of views would help inform the transparency work under the Paris Agreement and encouraged parties to participate.

Ethiopia, for the LDCs, lamented that many issues were still in their "conceptual" stages and stressed greater urgency.

Maldives, for AOSIS, called for a dedicated space before the COP to discuss the IPCC's Special Report on 1.5°C and suggested concluding discussions on the Adaptation Fund at APA 1-6 in Bangkok for a decision at COP 24.

Iran, for the LMDCs, highlighted elements of importance for progress, including, *inter alia*: differentiated requirements for NDC reporting and transparency across mitigation, adaptation, and means of implementation; the need not to allow past approaches to limit future options for cooperative mechanisms; and the need to consider country-specific impacts of the implementation of response measures.

Gabon, for the African Group, looked forward to the tools developed by the APA Co-Chairs to further progress. He expressed concern about the unequal levels of progress across the varying negotiating items, citing as particularly lagging: adaptation communications, transparency framework, and Agreement Article 9.5.

Cuba, for the Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America (ALBA), expressed concern about lack of progress on finance-related issues, including the 2025 finance goal. She said success at COP 24 means achieving results under all items, not limited to the PAWP.

Saudi Arabia, for the Arab Group, called for: commitment to the Convention principles of equity and common but differentiated responsibilities; equal progress in drafting text on all items; and the final outcome at COP 24 to be a single package.

The Democratic Republic of the Congo, for the Coalition of Rainforest Nations, welcomed the decision on REDD+ and called for increased support for rainforest countries through public and private finance.

Argentina, for Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay, called for the roundtables at the Bangkok session to focus on linkages and urged balanced progress across all items of the PAWP.

South Africa, for BASIC (Brazil, South Africa, India and China), called for more time for deliberations on finance, adaptation, and transparency, and stressed the need for moving towards a comprehensive party-driven negotiating text, and for increasing pre-2020 ambition.

Chile, for AILAC, highlighted: the role of the Talanoa Dialogue in fostering a common understanding on ambition; the need for a system of rules consistent with scientific evidence; and the urgent need for coordination with ICAO on the Carbon Offsetting Scheme for International Aviation (CORSA).

Turkey welcomed progress achieved, but warned that there was still much work to do. Indonesia looked forward to the full implementation of REDD+ and, supported by YOUNGOs and Mexico, stressed the importance of the LCIP, with Mexico lamenting lack of progress. Philippines welcomed the ACE as the first decision to come out of the PAWP, and stressed the need for new financial resources.

Michal Kurtyka, COP 24 President, stressed the need to advance the work on the table to achieve success in Katowice, and praised the collaboration of the APA and SB Chairs in moving forward.

YOUNGOs and Climate Action Network called for strong conflict of interest policies, and Climate Justice Now! called for supply-side policies to end the use of fossil fuels, stressing the need to use the time between now and Bangkok to “clear blockages.”

Noting that indigenous peoples can contribute solutions to the climate crisis, Indigenous Peoples stressed the need to operationalize the LCIP Platform.

Local Governments and Municipal Authorities highlighted efforts by local governments to implement NDCs and NAPs and enhance transparency, and expressed appreciation for the PCCB.

Research and Independent NGOs noted various avenues through which its members can assist in addressing climate change and its impacts, including by highlighting voices from around the world.

Women and Gender highlighted the principles expressed in the Paris Agreement’s preamble, and stressed that gender equality means more than gender balance.

The SBI, SBSTA, and APA were all suspended at 7:41 pm.

A Brief Analysis of the Bonn Climate Change Conference

The Bonn Climate Change Conference was supposed to set the stage for success in Katowice, but that stage still may be far from ready for the big show—adoption of the Paris Agreement Work Programme (PAWP). While moving negotiations closer to the package deal to be adopted in Poland in December 2018, parties are yet to converge on a range of key issues.

Besides needing to progress on developing the “operating manual” of the landmark Paris Agreement, the Bonn conference also brought together UNFCCC stakeholders as part of the 2018 Talanoa Dialogue. Built on the Pacific storytelling tradition, the “inclusive, transparent, and participatory” Dialogue seeks to assess global efforts to meet the Agreement’s long-term mitigation goal and is intended to inform parties’ future nationally determined contributions (NDCs). The seven “Talanoas” that took place on Sunday in Bonn spotlighted stories from parties, UNFCCC constituencies, and intergovernmental organizations on addressing climate change and its effects.

Just as the “Sunday Talanoas” invited participants to consider global efforts to address climate change through guiding questions, the Dialogue’s three central questions—Where are we? Where do we want to go? How do we get there?—are also useful for understanding the progress achieved in Bonn and what remains to be resolved on the road to Katowice.

Where are we?

“We are all here on a common mission. Let’s stop finger pointing and share our stories.” – Fiji

Parties’ task in Bonn was to move open-ended discussions on key elements of the PAWP closer to draft negotiating text. Delegates picked up where they had left off in December 2017, resuming discussion of long and often unwieldy “informal notes” prepared by Co-Facilitators across the different agenda items.

Given the PAWP’s complexity and parties’ desire not to remove or consolidate any elements from the notes at this stage, many considered the Executive Secretary’s assessment of a “satisfactory” outcome in Bonn a fair evaluation. But while parties may leave Bonn satisfied, their decision to allocate additional time for negotiation in Bangkok in September illustrates an underlying sense of urgency. Veteran negotiators believe parties will need to emerge from Bangkok with a draft negotiating text if they are to remain on track for adoption of a package in Katowice.

Part of the challenge in moving the work on the PAWP forward is the need for fair progress across its many components. Throughout the opening plenaries parties echoed calls to deliver a “balanced and comprehensive package” to COP 24, but views differed on what this actually means in practice. For developing countries, who fear that mitigation has taken precedence over adaptation and finance, “no item left behind” emerged as a common refrain. Developed countries, conversely, argued that more technically complex issues, such as the transparency framework, naturally require more time, with the Environmental Integrity Group warning against pursuing a “mechanical parity between clauses.” In addition to needing to strike a balance between parties’ differing priorities, negotiators in Bangkok will also need to find a balance between technical detail and room for political maneuvering across items.

The interlinked nature of PAWP items represents another challenge. Developing guidelines for NDCs, adaptation

communication, transparency, and the global stocktake requires not just close attention to detail on each item, but also careful consideration of how they relate to one another. Timing becomes tricky as parties work in parallel negotiations; some are hesitant to flesh out detail on one item when they are unsure how related elements will take shape. In Bonn, the APA Co-Chairs made efforts to address these interlinkages, convening several Heads of Delegation meetings and a “pilot” joint consultation on adaptation communication and the enhanced transparency framework to consider the bigger picture. The mandate for a joint reflections note by the Chairs of the APA, SBI, and SBSTA in advance of the additional session in Bangkok also provides parties with an opportunity to enhance their understanding of the interlinkages among the PAWP elements, and how to move them forward.

These dynamics are heightened by a collective awareness that any package adopted in Katowice will be the last one for the foreseeable future. Parties fear that elements left out of the package could be sidelined in the operationalization of the Agreement, and that this could be the last significant opportunity to elevate concerns such as loss and damage and assurance that finance will flow in the future.

Where Do We Want to Go?

“We need to triple ambition to close the emissions gap by 2030. It is possible, but it is not possible to wait.” – United Nations Environment Programme

While the contributions of non-party stakeholders in the Talanoa Dialogue were welcomed by many, a key challenge for the Fijian and Polish Presidencies is to build a cohesive message about the state of progress out of this “orchestra” of 700 stories. While highlighting key messages in their report-backs, the rapporteurs were careful to emphasize they were not seeking to capture “consensus” from the stories. Such an exercise would arguably be impossible, and perhaps even undesirable, as the richness of experience on display speaks to the many-faceted realities of climate change and its impacts, and the ways these new realities are being addressed worldwide.

The Bonn Talanoa Dialogue also characterized a diversity of visions that the PAWP must take on board. In the interest of reaching global consensus, and buoyed by the political momentum of COP 21, parties meeting in Paris in 2015 “papered over” profound differences on such issues as mitigation, adaptation, differentiation, predictability of finance, technology, and loss and damage. The 2018 deadline for adoption of the PAWP requires parties to revisit these differences to find a “landing ground” where the Agreement’s overarching principles are translated into detailed guidance acceptable to all.

Still, finding that “middle ground” is no easy feat. One observer noted the Bonn Conference may have represented “the most difficult stage” of negotiations on the PAWP, given countries’ desire to keep all options on the table even as the contours of a possible compromise should begin to emerge. However, the format and atmosphere of the Talanoa Dialogue may offer inspiration. Many welcomed the Dialogue’s informal and non-adversarial configuration, which allowed participants to engage with each other “not as negotiators, but as human beings.” With its focus on values such as “mutual trust,” and “loyalty to the planet,” the conversation provided an opportunity, at a critical moment, to reorient countries towards the bigger picture on which nearly all agree: the need to achieve the vision set out in the Paris Agreement.

How Do We Get There?

“We either get there together or we get nowhere.” – Ireland

But how can this vision be achieved? During the Bonn Climate Change Conference, it became clear that certain issues would benefit from further technical consideration, with calls for the APA to dedicate more time to deliberations on adaptation communications, finance-related issues, and transparency when it reconvenes in Bangkok. With the prospect of complex discussions ahead, many welcomed the mandate to the APA Co-Chairs to prepare additional “tools” to facilitate countries’ work, including proposals to streamline the informal notes developed in Bonn and examples of how parties could progress towards the development of negotiating text.

In some cases, progress in the negotiations may require issues to be addressed at a higher political level. As at COP 23, finance emerged as a “possible make-or-break” political issue for any package deal in Katowice. Developing countries, led by the African Group, continued to push for modalities to enhance clarity on developed countries’ biennial indicative (*ex-ante*) communications of climate finance under Agreement Article 9.5; as well as more clarity regarding support provided and mobilized (*ex-post*) under Article 9.7 of the Agreement. Developed countries insisted modalities for Article 9.5 are “out of the question” given their electoral and budget cycles. Sensitivities around this issue were heightened by a perception among many developing countries that developed countries are not on track to deliver on their commitment to mobilize US\$100 billion by 2020. They insist that the trust necessary to move forward with PAWP cannot be realized until finance commitments are delivered.

The scope of, and information to be included in, NDCs may also require engagement that goes beyond the technical. Although a “navigation tool” agreed to in Bonn will help countries navigate the informal note that emerged from APA 1-4, the 180-page note remains on the table as countries grapple with the question of how to preserve these plans’ nationally determined nature, while ensuring a sufficient level of credibility and comparability to maintain trust in the Paris Agreement’s bottom-up “pledge and review” system, and build the necessary confidence to do more in subsequent NDCs. In Katowice, progress on mitigation, in particular, may need to take into account the importance many developing countries attach to ensuring comparable progress on adaptation and finance.

High-level engagement is also critical for moving the Talanoa Dialogue forward to its “political phase,” which commences at COP 24. Leaving Bonn, however, there were calls from parties and non-party stakeholders alike for more clarity on what this phase will look like, and how it can help enhance global ambition on climate action and scaled-up NDCs. Meanwhile, many stakeholders are also placing stock in the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’s Special Report on 1.5°C warming as an objective science-based input that will highlight the urgency of increased action. As one delegation highlighted, this impetus will be critical since this is the last opportunity for the international community to assess progress on climate action before the first global stocktake under the Paris Agreement takes place in 2023.

Who Leads on the Road to Katowice?

Leaving Bonn, it is increasingly clear where we are, where we want to go, and how we achieve success at COP 24. And yet, as Katowice approaches, some parties could be heard speculating on an additional question: who will take the lead to help deliver

a credible and balanced PAWP package, and the enhanced NDCs that the Talanoa Dialogue foresees? Past agreements in Kyoto, Cancun, Durban, and Paris benefited from clear leadership from key countries, such as the US, the EU, China, and coalitions like AOSIS and the LDCs, combined with a willingness to build alliances across traditional divides. A reconfiguration of the multilateral landscape since Paris leaves some questioning who will step up and assume leadership in Katowice. As delegates look ahead to their next stop in Bangkok, some hope the Talanoa Dialogue, with its emphasis on forging a shared and inclusive vision for climate action, will inspire key parties to “finish what was started in Paris.”

Upcoming Meetings

GEF Sixth Assembly and Associated Meetings: The Global Environment Facility (GEF) Assembly is the governing body of the GEF and is composed of all 183 member countries. It meets every four years at the ministerial level to: review general policies; review and evaluate the GEF’s operation based on reports submitted to Council; review the membership of the Facility; and consider, for approval by consensus, amendments to the Instrument for the Establishment of the Restructured GEF on the basis of recommendations by the Council. **dates:** 23-29 June 2018 **location:** Da Nang, Viet Nam **contact:** GEF Secretariat **phone:** +1-202-473-0508 **fax:** +1-202-522-3240/3245 **email:** secretariat@thegef.org **www:** <http://assembly.thegef.org/>

EU for Talanoa: As part of the EU’s contribution to the Talanoa Dialogue, the inter-institutional high-level event aims to: stimulate discussions related to the implementation of the Paris Agreement and the preparation of the next set of NDCs; show how the EU is delivering on its climate goals and accelerating the low-emission transition, building on the EU’s technical submission to the Talanoa Dialogue; and support the involvement of all public and private actors in the fight against climate change. **date:** 13 June 2018 **location:** Brussels, Belgium **www:** https://ec.europa.eu/clima/events/eu-talanoa_en

High-level Political Forum on Sustainable Development (HLPF) 2018: The theme of HLPF 2018 will be “Transformation towards sustainable and resilient societies.” The set of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) to be reviewed in depth are SDG 6 (water and sanitation), 7 (energy), 11 (sustainable cities), 12 (sustainable consumption and production patterns), 15 (life on land) and 17 (partnerships). **dates:** 9-18 July 2018 **location:** UN Headquarters, New York **contact:** UN Division for Sustainable Development **email:** <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/contact/> **www:** <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/hlpf/2018>

Bangkok Climate Change Conference: This conference will resume the work of the APA 1-5, SBSTA 48, and SBI 48 for issues related to the Paris Agreement Work Programme: **dates:** 3-8 September 2018 **location:** Bangkok, Thailand **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** <http://unfccc.int/>

Global Climate Action Summit: Convened by California Governor Jerry Brown and the US State of California, the Global Climate Action Summit will bring leaders from government, business, and the global community to inspire greater global ambition to act on climate change. The Summit will be co-chaired by Governor Brown, UNFCCC Executive Secretary Patricia Espinosa, the UN Secretary-General’s Special Envoy for Climate Action Michael Bloomberg, and Mahindra

Group Chairman Anand Mahindra. **dates:** 12-14 September 2018 **location:** San Francisco, California, US **www:** <https://globalclimateactions Summit.org/>

48th Session of the IPCC: The IPCC’s 48th session will meet to approve the Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5 °C. **dates:** 1-5 October 2018 **location:** Incheon, Republic of Korea **contact:** IPCC Secretariat **phone:** +41-22-730-8208/54/84 **fax:** +41-22-730-8025/13 **email:** IPCC-Sec@wmo.int **www:** <http://www.ipcc.ch>

Katowice Climate Change Conference: The Katowice Climate Change Conference will include the 24th session of the Conference of the Parties (COP 24) to the UNFCCC, along with meetings of the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol, the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice and the Subsidiary Body for Implementation, and the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement. **dates:** 3-14 December 2018 **location:** Katowice, Poland **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49- 228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** <http://unfccc.int/> and <http://cop24.katowice.eu/>

For additional meetings, see: <http://sdg.iisd.org/>

Glossary

ACE	Action for Climate Empowerment
AILAC	Independent Association of Latin America and the Caribbean
AOSIS	Alliance of Small Island States
APA	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group for the Paris Agreement
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CMA	Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement
CMP	Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol
COP	Conference of the Parties
CRP	Conference room paper
EIG	Environmental Integrity Group
GHG	Greenhouse gases
ICAO	International Civil Aviation Organization
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
ITMOs	Internationally Transferred Mitigation Outcomes
LCIP	Local Communities and Indigenous Peoples
LDCs	Least developed countries
LEG	LDC Expert Group
LMDCs	Like-Minded Group of Developing Countries
NAPs	National adaptation plans
NDCs	Nationally determined contributions
PAWP	Paris Agreement Work Programme
PCCB	Paris Committee on Capacity-building
REDD+	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation in developing countries
SB	Subsidiary Body
SBI	Subsidiary Body for Implementation
SBSTA	Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice
UNFCCC	UN Framework Convention on Climate Change