

## **UNFCCC 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting of the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform (\*ADP 2), Bonn Germany April 29-May 3 2013**

\*See attached glossary for definition of UNFCCC institutions and their acronyms

Brian P. Flannery, May 14, 2013 (supported by Resources for the Future and The Joint Global Change Research Institute of the University of Maryland and Battelle National Laboratories)

Approximately 800 delegates from national governments (620), intergovernmental (10) and non-governmental (150) organizations, and media (10) attended the second session of ADP and the first since CoP 18 in Doha. Participants met for the first time in the new World Conference Center in Bonn, which was barely large enough even for this small meeting.

### **Scene set**

In Doha last December the Conference of Parties (COP 18) concluded agreements for a 2<sup>nd</sup> Kyoto commitment period and transferred many of the unfinished tasks of AWG-LCA to the Subsidiary Bodies. Thus, it terminated two of three negotiating groups then in action: AWG-LCA and AWG-KP. Now ADP becomes the primary focal point for negotiation of a new legal agreement by 2015 to take effect in 2020.

As agreed, the program was devoted to numerous workshops and roundtables aimed at sharing information and ideas on the two ADP workstreams:

- WS 1: negotiation of a Post 2020 Agreement
- WS 2: raising the ambition of actions in the period till 2020.

The week provided opportunities for nations and regional groups to present views on possible ways forward before entering formal negotiations. At the start the Co-Chairs announced their intention at the end of the week: 1) to suspend ADP 2 and reconvene in Bonn in June without needing to agree on a new agenda; 2) to establish a single combined contact (drafting) group under their joint leadership for the two workstreams.

### **Discussions and Views**

The Group of 77 and China underscored that the new agreement *under the UNFCCC* must maintain its current principles without renegotiation or reinterpretation. In particular, they stressed the need to honor common but differentiated responsibilities (CBDR). They also called for a legally binding, rules-based regime with mitigation and financial commitments, transparent reporting, strong compliance measures and comparable efforts for all developed nations. They warned that progress in the two workstreams must be *linked* and that developed nations must establish trust *now* by increasing the ambition of their mitigation and financial commitments under WS 2. While calling for the agreement to limit warming to no more than 2 (or 1.5) °C, they stressed that developed nations must lead.

The EU continuously reiterated the need for the new agreement to achieve the 2 °C goal through strong commitments and broader participation.

The Umbrella Group (essentially the non-EU developed nations) stressed the need for participation and actions to mitigate emissions by all parties.

Top-down, Bottom-up and Hybrid approaches to mitigation: all nations recognize that Copenhagen signaled a move from the top-down, internationally negotiated (Kyoto)

approach to a bottom up approach based on essentially voluntary national pledges with reporting. The result leaves nations not *on track* to achieve their ambitious global goals (for mitigation or finance). Many indicated the need for a hybrid approach that included a top-down exercise to reconcile or at least to discuss gaps in mitigation and finance.

Means of Implementation (MOI): developing nations called for more focus on delivering MOI with particular reference to Finance, Technology and Capacity Building. 100 B\$/year by 2020 was mentioned often. The Umbrella Group welcomed discussion, but noted they had not yet agreed that MOI should become part of any new agreement.

The various workshops and roundtables did provide a forum for nations to describe their pledges and actions and to question one another on details. The USA proposed that the process should include a period of time (6 months) for nations to discuss and clarify their proposed commitments, and that this might provide an opportunity to enhance ambition among all parties in their final commitments. The Environmental Integrity Group (Mexico, Liechtenstein, Monaco, the Republic of Korea and Switzerland) called for an ongoing, evergreen process to discuss commitments and objectives with more involvement of civil society in discussions. While such approaches allow issues to be aired, no one has proposed means to reconcile national pledges with global goals.

At the start of the week Chairs of SBSTA and SBI described activities in their work that were relevant to ADP. Many of the unfinished items from AWG-LCA and KP, such as further definition of shared vision, New Market Mechanisms and methodologies for reporting and review of national actions, have a bearing on the work of ADP. How they will be coordinated (or taken hostage by negotiators) remains to be seen.

Next Steps: Parties meet again in Bonn June 3-14, and at COP 19 in Warsaw November 11-22, 2013. There remains limited discussion of another ADP intercessional before COP 19.

### **Glimpses at the next phase**

The co-chairs were unable to establish a contact group in May. Several nations felt it was premature; others wanted to see separate contact groups for the two workstreams.

Developing nations are committed to maintain strong forms of *equity* and *common but differentiated responsibilities* in ADP. Being part of a legal agreement does not imply taking comparable commitments: witness the *legally binding* Kyoto Protocol.

Major differences exist within G-77 and China. BASIC nations understand that demands by least developed nations and AOSIS for the 2 (or 1.5) °C goal require massive efforts by them soon that would threaten development in their rapidly growing economies. Splits exist on other contentious matters such as IPR, Carbon Capture and Storage, REDD+, etc.

UNFCCC participants seem unwilling to mention or discuss implications of the growing body of analysis indicating the impossibility of stabilizing GHG concentrations at 450 ppm CO<sub>2</sub>-equivalent, the benchmark to achieve 2 °C; rather, they argue to consider 1.5 °C.

The desire of many nations for strong, binding emissions targets and finance to meet the 2 (or 1.5) °C global goal does not work in harmony with the willingness of others only to participate based on national pledges. All of this suggests the enormous challenge of achieving an agreement by 2015 that meets the differing priority objectives of all Parties.