

Compilation of working documents for Workstream 2

Working document of 31 August 2015

Main observations:

- Parties shared their general views on the text.¹ Overall, Parties held that it provided a promising basis for a draft decision but was much too concise in its present form and needed to be further elaborated. All Parties offered views on the specific areas of the text that needed to be elaborated.
- Some Parties considered that the issue of implementation should be further explored, noting that the text could refer directly to existing commitments and offer clarity about how they would be achieved, and suggested concrete proposals. On this point, other Parties cautioned about potentially replicating work that was being conducted under other agenda items in the process.
- Some Parties held that greater specificity was needed in areas such as the existing technical examination process, the nature of high-level engagement, the role of multilateral cooperation and non-State actors, and the establishment of a new technical examination process on adaptation, and suggested concrete proposals.
- Parties made frequent mention of the importance of Workstream 2. They were generally satisfied with the number of meetings allocated to the subject at this session, and welcomed the announcement by the Co-Facilitators that additional informal consultations on specific topics would be convened so as to allow for greater exploration of specific topics that would then be brought back to the facilitated meeting.

Working document of 1 September 2015

Main observations:

- Parties continued sharing general views on the elements text.
- Parties generally held that the text provides a good basis for negotiations but needs strengthening in key areas. The focus of the facilitate group was primarily on the existing mitigation technical examination process, the role of non-State actors and high-level engagement.
- On the mitigation technical examination process, many Parties expressed the view that the current technical examination process, focusing on the identification of policy options, is meaningful, and some Parties emphasized the significance of the implementation of policy options identified through the technical examination process. Parties also offered views on the appropriate institutional home for the process after the Paris Conference. Many Parties noted the relationship between that process and other Convention processes, such as the Technology Executive Committee and the Climate Technology Centre and Network. Some Parties offered specific views on the topics that ought to be covered in future technical examination meetings and provided suggestions on how their role could be enhanced and how participation by non-State actors could be encouraged. Parties expressed various views on the application of a technical examination process to adaptation.
- On the role of non-State actors, many Parties urged that their role should be more prominently recognized, both as a means of providing greater visibility to their efforts as well as a means of further enhancing ambition and action. Some Parties cautioned against double counting the efforts of non-State actors and the efforts of national governments.

¹ ADP.2015.5.InformalNote (available at <http://unfccc.int/bodies/awg/items/9176.php>).

- On high-level engagement, many Parties held that a clear and concrete mandate should be elaborated. The link between this issue and other issues, most notably taking forward the results of the mitigation technical examination process and engaging with non-State actors, was also explored.
- An overall observation was offered that workstream 2 should tackle unexplored/unexploited mitigation opportunities. Such opportunities could be domestic, arising on account of a lack of finance, technology or capacity, or could reflect inadequate cooperative action. In this regard, future work to further elaborate the draft decision text should include how to address the implementation of opportunities that were identified in the technical examination process, including means to encourage greater cooperative action.
- To take work forward, it was agreed that informal consultations would be conducted on Wednesday, 2 September, with the results being communicated at a future facilitated meeting at this session.

Working document of 2 September 2015

Main observations:

- Parties advanced the process of sharing their general views on the elements text.
- The focus of today's meeting was on implementation matters regarding mitigation. The representative of a Party who had been asked to conduct informal consultations reported back to the group as follows:
 - Many Parties stressed the need to strengthen the language in order to better convey the sense of urgency that prompted the establishment of workstream 2;
 - Some Parties noted that work performed under workstream 2 should be enhanced in order to reinforce its focus on implementation, including the implementation of commitments under the Kyoto Protocol and the Bali Action Plan, and to set out concrete steps to ensure that all countries reach their highest possible mitigation efforts pre-2020;
 - Some Parties held that it was critical for developed countries to take the lead by fully implementing their mitigation commitments and targets, and by increasing these commitments and targets so they are in line with the levels required by science, and for developing countries to continue developing and implementing their nationally appropriate mitigation actions in conjunction with the delivery of support;
 - Some Parties suggested urging all Parties to consider opportunities for enhancing mitigation outcomes, rather than just those Parties with existing pledges, and that it would be useful to have a facilitative discussion on how Parties without pledges could consider making them;
 - Some Parties suggested urging all Parties to participate in agreed measurement, reporting and verification processes under the Convention and that clarity on the progress of all Parties in fulfilling their pledges was important so as to enable the highest possible mitigation efforts;
 - Some Parties called for the recognition of the social and economic value of voluntary mitigation actions and their co-benefits in adaptation, health and sustainable development;
 - Some Parties observed the need to prevent the double-counting of mitigation in the pre-2020 period, stating that this should be considered as an important opportunity to enhance ambition;
 - Some Parties asked that the text more strongly address the efforts of non-State actors, suggesting that their pledges and actions be recognized, referenced and welcomed in the strongest terms, with some Parties going one step further and proposing that non-State actors be invited to demonstrate their actions through mechanisms such as the Non-State Actor Zone for Climate Action platform.
- He also reported that some Parties suggested linking mitigation implementation with the development of financial instruments to mobilize additional finance in support of voluntary action, including by non-State actors, favouring a clearer transition from urgency in mitigation efforts with urgency in providing support.
- It was agreed that the Co-Facilitators would undertake bilateral meetings with interested groups/Parties, and that in parallel another representative of a Party would conduct informal consultations on the technical examination process, with a focus on adaptation matters, and that the outcomes of these activities would be

communicated to Parties at tomorrow evening's facilitated meeting (Thursday, 3 September from 19:00 to 21:00), at which time the Co-Facilitators would seek Parties' guidance on the way forward.

Working document of 3 September 2015

Main observations:

- Parties advanced the process of sharing their general views on the elements text.
- The focus of today's meeting was on implementation matters relating to mitigation. A representative of a Party who had been asked to conduct informal consultations reported back to the group as follows:
 - Constructive wide-ranging discussions were held among Parties, covering the scope, institutional arrangements and governance of the technical examination process (TEP). In this regard, some Parties referred to previously submitted proposals and submitted further specific proposals in writing, while others committed to submit proposals in the future in order to inform the process going forward.
 - There was emerging convergence on the following needs:
 - To continue the technical examination of mitigation options;
 - To strengthen and focus the TEP, particularly in relation to linkages with non-state actors, in an appropriate manner;
 - To improve political momentum and engagement with TEP outcomes;
 - To strengthen the participation of developing countries in the TEP.
 - There were divergent views on proposals to:
 - Establish further institutional arrangements, such as the proposed Accelerated Implementation Forum;
 - Expand the scope of the focus of workstream 2 to include adaptation or other elements;
 - Focus the TEP according to sectoral themes.
 - In terms of the way forward, Parties recommended that:
 - A dedicated meeting of adaptation experts be convened to discuss the G77 and Africa proposal and identified gaps for an adaptation TEP for the period 2016-2020, with a view to determining whether existing adaptation institutional arrangements can/should conduct this examination or whether there are some topics that could be addressed more effectively in workstream 2;
 - The Co-Chairs provide Parties with an opportunity to make submissions on improvements to the text of the current draft Decision;
 - On this basis, the Co-Chairs draft a revised version of the draft Decision for consideration by Parties in the October 2015 session of the ADP.
- Parties agreed on the above course of action, with the draft Decision taking into account all relevant submissions and inputs by Parties as well as the issues raised by Parties in their discussions on this matter.