

Summary of the round tables under workstream 1 ADP 2, part 2 Bonn, Germany, 4–13 June 2013

Note by the Co-Chairs

25 July 2013

I. Introduction

1. At the second part of its second session, held in Bonn, Germany, from 4 to 13 June 2013, the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP) convened workshops and continued its round-table discussions on workstream 1, addressing matters related to paragraphs 2–6 of decision 1/CP.17 (relating to a process to develop a protocol, another legal instrument or an agreed outcome with legal force under the Convention applicable to all Parties (hereinafter referred to as the 2015 agreement)), and on workstream 2, on matters related to paragraphs 7 and 8 of the same decision (relating to pre-2020 ambition).¹

2. Under workstream 1 the ADP convened round-table discussions on a variety of enhanced actions, complemented by a workshop on enhancing adaptation through the 2015 agreement, and a round table on linkages with existing arrangements. In addition, briefings were organized to inform the ADP on on-going work under various bodies and arrangements relevant to the work under both workstream 1 and workstream 2.²

3. The objective of the round tables and the workshop under workstream 1 was to exchange further views, ideas and proposals regarding the contours and elements of the 2015 agreement, in an interactive manner.

4. This note summarizes the round-table discussions under workstream 1 held during the second part of the second session of the ADP.³ In addition, a summary report on the workshop on enhancing adaptation through the 2015 agreement has been prepared by the facilitator of the workshop.⁴

5. The round-table discussions under workstream 1 were dedicated to the broad topic of a variety of enhanced actions, encompassing enhanced actions in the areas of mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology and capacity-building, as well as transparency of action and support. The question of linkages with existing arrangements was also explored. For the purpose of focusing the discussions the round tables were structured according to the following themes:

- A variety of enhanced actions, including commitments, under international rules guided by the principles of the Convention: round table held on 4 June 2013;
- Transparency and accountability for delivery: round table held on 5 and 6 June 2013;
- Managing ambition in accordance with science and equity: round table held in the fore-noon of 8 June 2013;
- Enablement of and support for enhanced actions: round table held in the afternoon of 8 June 2013;
- Linkages with existing arrangements: round table held on 10 June 2013.⁵

¹ Summaries of previous round tables organized under workstream 1 in 2012 and 2013 can be found at <<http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2012/adp1/eng/2infsum.pdf>>, <<http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2012/adp1/eng/6infsum.pdf>> and <<http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2013/adp2/eng/5infsum.pdf>>.

² Information on the briefings is available at <<http://unfccc.int/7695>>.

³ A summary of the round tables under workstream 2 is contained in document ADP.2013.12.InformalSummary, which is available at UNFCCC website.

⁴ The summary of the workshop, held on 6 June 2013, is contained in document ADP.2013.11.InformalSummary. Further information on the workshop is available at <<http://unfccc.int/7644>>.

⁵ In addition, Parties were invited to exchange views on the progress made under workstream 1 in an informal plenary held on 12 June 2013. Furthermore, the ADP has invited the Co-Chairs to prepare a note on progress, which is contained document ADP.2013.14.InformalSummary.

6. At the beginning of the round-table meetings, some Parties were invited to make short and focused interventions exploring and elaborating on specific proposals and ideas, in order to start off the discussions. Recognizing that the various topics are interlinked and overlapping, the Co-Chairs clarified at the outset that the themes were not meant to limit the discussions in any way, but rather to give structure and focus and to allow the Parties to prepare accordingly. Parties made interventions on the various themes at different times. This summary is structured according to the main themes that Parties discussed, rather than following in chronological order the flow of interventions as they occurred.

II. Variety of enhanced actions

7. Parties engaged in constructive and rich discussions on the possible variety of enhanced actions, including commitments, and how these actions could be stimulated and strengthened through international rules to ensure a robust 2015 agreement, guided by the principles of the Convention.

8. A number of Parties called for a comprehensive and holistic approach, stressing the need for enhanced ambition on all fronts, including mitigation as well as adaptation and the means of implementation – finance, technology and capacity-building. With regard to mitigation, Parties presented and discussed a number of specific proposals as to how enhanced actions, including commitments, should be addressed in the 2015 agreement. Parties explored aspects of differentiation, a range of approaches, including bottom-up, top-down and hybrid approaches, possible processes, steps and time frames, and ways to ensure transparency as well as ambition in accordance with science and equity. The discussions on these aspects are summarized in greater detail below.

9. Regarding adaptation, there was a broad understanding among Parties that adaptation should be an integral part of the new agreement. Several Parties called for an integrated approach to addressing mitigation and adaptation in a balanced manner, considering the link between the levels of effort required for both. One Party presented its proposal for individual as well as common commitments, reflecting global goals in relation to mitigation and adaptation. It was pointed out that an adaptation goal would need to be established, since the level of adaptation ambition will need to increase if the established temperature goal will not be met. Several Parties held that support for adaptation action needs greater attention. Further proposals and ideas regarding adaptation were explored in detail at the workshop on enhancing adaptation through the 2015 agreement.⁶

10. With regard to finance, technology and capacity-building, many Parties highlighted that these should equally be an integral part of the 2015 agreement. Some Parties stated that existing institutions need to provide the basis for discussions, noting the need for the further development of the existing institutional arrangements for support. Other Parties called for adequate tools that would enhance transparency, consistency and accountability regarding the provision of finance, technology and capacity-building and allow for the assessment of their effectiveness and efficiency and the identification of potential gaps. Further proposals and discussions are summarized in detail below (see parts IV –VI below).

11. Parties explored enhanced actions in the context of the application of the principles of the Convention, differentiation and participation. In this regard, several Parties stressed that, as the 2015 agreement is under the Convention, enhanced actions by Parties under the agreement need to adhere to the principles of the Convention, its provisions and annexes. One Party stated that the variety of actions should not be used to dilute from the commitments under the Convention.

12. A number of Parties noted that the Kyoto Protocol should be used as a reference for developed countries to take the lead, while developing countries should have different ways to present their contributions. Any criteria for differentiation and comparability of commitments could be applicable only to developed country Parties, while actions by developing country Parties could remain voluntary and conditional upon the provision of means of implementation.

13. Other Parties emphasized that the 2015 agreement will be applicable to all and therefore will require enhanced actions by all Parties. In this context, some Parties further explored proposals for different types of commitments. For example, Parties with the greatest responsibility and capacity to act should take on quantified emission reduction targets (including all Parties that already assumed such targets in the pre-2020 period), while other types of commitment may include intensity targets, sectorial targets or deviations from ‘business as usual’. A set of such commitment types should be determined in advance. This would enable the formulation of common

⁶ See the summary report on the workshop referred to in footnote 4 above.

expectations for commitments, while allowing for deviations from an expected type if a Party can show that it can better achieve the required objective in another way. Furthermore, means of implementation would have to be provided to those in need.

14. One Party noted the need for an outcome that is based on a shared vision and recognizes the needs of present and future generations as well as the protection of nature. Furthermore, some Parties called for consumption patterns to be addressed in the 2015 agreement.

15. Parties explored both top-down and bottom-up approaches to determining the contributions of Parties, as well as possible ways of combining elements of both approaches.

16. Regarding a bottom-up approach, several Parties pointed to the advantages of an approach by which actions would be primarily nationally determined. Among other things, Parties would be more likely to implement actions that they themselves determined and national determination would enable broad participation, which is in turn key for ambition. However, a number of Parties expressed concerns about purely self-determined contributions. Some Parties stated that experience so far has shown that bottom-up approaches do not work and that only science- and convention-based targets that are determined top-down will ensure that the global temperature rise is kept below 2 °C.

17. Several Parties explored specific ideas for top-down approaches and their respective elements. In this regard Parties explored both elements in relation to the determination of the contributions of Parties as well as elements regarding rules that would apply to activities such as the reporting and accounting of contributions.

18. One Party presented a proposal for addressing the relationship between the greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions of Parties over a period of time and the climate change effects of such emissions by creating a methodology for determining the relative share of emission reductions based on each country's contribution to the global temperature increase. The Party pointed out that the proposal, originally made in 1997,⁷ was of new relevance in the light of the agreed 2 °C temperature goal and the negotiations under the ADP on an agreement applicable to all. The proposal, according to the presenting Party, aims to illustrate the importance of historical responsibility and the need to focus on the "whole movie" of temperature increase, rather than on the "snapshot" of annual emissions of a country. The Party also proposed that the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) should invite the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) to engage in further work in this regard.

19. In reaction, some Parties indicated that one should not look only to the past. Rather, it is important to look at present as well as projected future emissions, particularly given that decisions being made today lock in emission pathways for decades, and to recognize that history and countries' circumstances evolve. One Party was also interested in the possibility of integrating criteria other than historical responsibility into the proposal, such as capacity, mitigation potential and vulnerability, so as to accommodate others Parties' views. In response, the Party presenting the proposal agreed that other factors such as those mentioned are also important and have to be taken into account together with the consideration of global temperature increase. Further, the Party pointed to the importance of both the historic dimension and the contemporary context, including the recent agreement to use global temperature increase as the main point of reference. Generally, Parties acknowledged that the past, present and future are all relevant to the discussion on emission reductions.

20. A majority of Parties considered that a combination of bottom-up and top-down approaches would be needed and explored possible elements of a hybrid approach. Such a hybrid approach would include the determination of contributions initially at the national level, which would be informed by rules and guidance at the international level. Parties presented a range of views on what such internationally agreed rules and guidance should cover.

21. Several Parties recommended quantitative approaches which would inform bottom-up targets guided by a top-down target. One Party elaborated on a method to calculate such mitigation and financial targets, which would take into account various factors, including a country's historical share of GHG emissions, population, gross domestic product (GDP) and GDP per capita. Using a formula and such indicators, each Party's right to use atmospheric space could be identified and emission rights could be apportioned.

⁷ The proposal (generally referred to as the Brazilian proposal) was originally contained in document FCCC/AGBM/1997/MISC.1/Add.3 Information on subsequent work undertaken by SBSTA on the proposal is available at: <http://unfccc.int/methods_and_science/other_methodological_issues/items/1038.php>. See also FCCC/SBSTA/2008/6, paragraphs 106-113.

22. Other Parties suggested that Parties' contributions should be agreed through a process. In this regard, a number of Parties expressed interest in exploring a step-wise approach to defining commitments, including what the different steps may entail and what timelines would be envisaged. Several Parties proposed a process for Parties to come forward with proposed commitments, which would then be reviewed and adjusted, as necessary, and eventually inscribed in the 2015 agreement. Internationally agreed rules would be needed to frame and guide this process.

23. In this context, some Parties called for clear time frames for actions and various Parties felt that the timing of the development of the necessary international rules would need to fit in with the timing of defining national commitments, pointing out that it would be preferable to start discussing the rules early in order to improve predictability and enable early communication of commitments. Some Parties called for both incentivizing early action as well as encouraging Parties to adopt longer-term targets (e.g. for 2050).

24. In addition, Parties made concrete proposals for approaches to reconcile national circumstances with science and equity, in particular how the overall effort and the contribution of each Party could be assessed in the light of science and equity (see part III below). Several Parties concurred, in general, with the need to assess whether contributions are individually fair and whether they are collectively sufficient to keep global temperature rise below 2 °C. This should be done by way of a regular assessment of commitments, informed by scientific data.

25. A number of Parties felt that, for the purpose of assessment and in order to compare across countries, various factors would need to be considered, which could include national circumstances, historical, current and future emissions, capacity to act, cost of action, effect of climate impacts, access to international markets, and natural resources. Several Parties considered that such factors could be expressed in the form of non-binding indicators and criteria, as long as they are not used in a mechanical fashion and not limited to prescribing one single indicator. In this context, one Party emphasized the importance of using scientific guidance (in particular the IPCC Fifth Assessment Report) in conducting further work on combining nationally determined contributions with a common framework for assessing such contributions.

26. One Party proposed an equity reference framework, which would also bring adaptation to the centre of the climate policy dialogue, recognizing that inadequate mitigation efforts result in the increased cost of and need for adaptation. The characteristics of the proposed framework include an ex ante non-binding assessment of enhanced actions, with the agreed temperature goal as a basis and using an envelope of metrics, such as historical responsibility, current capability and future development needs, to determine fairly the efforts to be made by each Party. Such an ex ante multilateral process could be placed within the ambit of the subsidiary bodies and use minimum thresholds with flexibility for Parties to define their level of contribution. In support of this approach, a few Parties called for the development of an envelope of responsibilities, as well as an envelope of adaptation costs and needs, and suggested that such an equity review should complement the scientific 2013–2015 review currently being undertaken by the subsidiary bodies.

27. However, other Parties expressed concerns over the development of common indicators to determine the ambition and fairness of contributions, noting that this may be a divisive exercise and an issue upon which it would be impossible to agree. In their view, such indicators tend to ignore the cost of action and could even undermine universal ambitious participation, because indicators could be used to argue that one is expected to do less rather than more. Technical work would not be useful because the sense of fairness is a subjective value judgment.

28. Some Parties noted that the Convention itself has already established the ultimate framework for equity through its principles, provisions and annexes. One Party cautioned, in particular, against using indicators as a means to differentiate between developing countries and warned that such criteria should be used neither to pick and choose Parties for funding nor as conditionalities for support.

29. Rather than developing objective criteria or indicators, several Parties suggested a process of a consultative nature which would make contributions subject to ex ante consultation and intensive international scrutiny, thereby in itself acting as an incentive for making ambitious contributions at the outset. It was suggested that during the consultations, Parties would have an opportunity to cooperate in order to further enhance their contributions as necessary (i.e. if the overall effect and/or individual contributions were found not to be sufficient). This cooperation could include bilateral interaction, transparency and review among Parties, as well as the exposure of Parties' envisaged contributions to the public at large. Such ex ante open and transparent consultations among Parties could also make use of the experience and knowledge of international organizations and other institutions as objective criteria.

30. It was further suggested by some Parties that as part of this process each country making a contribution should explain why its contribution is fair. There should be time and space for exchange of information and explanation by Parties of their national actions, which would provide assurance and ensure confidence that every country is doing its fair share. Each country should be able to demonstrate that it is making a transformation domestically to shift away from 'business as usual', balancing the challenges of sustainable development and the need to address climate change.

31. Many Parties reiterated that the 2015 agreement needs to set up a dynamic framework to allow for increasing ambition over time. Parties' contributions should function as a floor, rather than a ceiling. In this context, some form of regular review of contributions may prove effective in encouraging all Parties to enhance their commitments over time, considering that, among other things, the cost of taking action tends to go down and new opportunities tend to arise.

III. Science and equity

32. Parties generally agreed on the central importance of science and equity in framing the 2015 agreement, in order for it to be sufficiently ambitious to meet the global temperature goal as well as to ensure equitable and fair contributions among Parties. In concrete terms, Parties presented a broad range of views and proposals regarding how to address these central elements in the agreement.

33. Many Parties stressed that science should guide all efforts to achieve the ultimate objective of the Convention. In particular, the work of the IPCC needs to feed into the ADP process. One Party emphasized that temperature changes differ across the globe and called for better reference levels.

34. Highlighting that science is key to taking climate change action, some Parties said that science also includes social sciences and humanities. Further, science cannot be taken out of the context of sustainable development and the respective components of the Convention, such as social and economic impacts, vulnerability, adaptation and economic diversification. Applying science in the new agreement would also need to take into account the uncertainties that science entails.

35. Several Parties highlighted that the principle of equity is the basis of the Convention and must be an integral part of 2015 agreement. In this regard, some Parties pointed out that equity requires finance, technology and capacity-building to be made available on a scale that ensures that Parties meet the ultimate objective of the Convention. Other Parties highlighted that equity and fair differentiation also mean that all Parties should contribute in terms of means of implementation, in accordance with their respective responsibilities and capabilities, and that efforts in this regard should be acknowledged.

36. Some Parties suggested to specifically consider the ethical dimension of equity, including the needs of future generations and the current generation (in terms of poverty reduction, vulnerability and the right to sustainable development), as well as the need to take into account different stages of development. In this context, one Party pointed to the importance of reshaping development pathways around the world and stated that science and equity consideration could be combined with the shared vision of a low-carbon development pathway.

37. Furthermore, one Party expressed the view that post-2020 equity can only be achieved if Parties included in Annex I to the Convention (Annex I Parties) meet their commitments in the pre-2020 period, and that a dynamic interpretation of equity and common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities could not mean that contributions can be based solely on capabilities. Another Party stated that equity includes equality in the use of atmospheric space.

38. Parties explored a number of specific proposals as to how to ensure that the ambition of individual and collective efforts is in accordance with science and equity (see paras. 20–31 above).

IV. Transparency and accountability

39. Building on previous discussions, including the round table on the transparency of action and support, held in April/May, Parties elaborated more specifically on how transparency and accountability should be incorporated and reflected in the 2015 agreement. Parties broadly acknowledged that internationally agreed rules are necessary to ensure the transparency of enhanced actions. Many Parties elaborated that such transparency is needed in terms of ex ante clarity when commitments and contributions are prepared and proposed as well as ex post when

commitments are being reviewed in the light of science and equity. Furthermore, ex post transparency and accountability are necessary to see whether commitments have been met.

40. Most Parties were of the view that the development of the measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) framework for the 2015 agreement needs to build on existing work, such as international assessment and review and international consultation and analysis, as well as the on-going processes under the SBSTA and the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) on reporting and review issues. In addition, a few Parties suggested that, in order to define and understand commitments, apart from the GHG inventory information currently provided by Parties following relevant guidelines agreed by the Conference of the Parties (COP), additional information and guidance is needed for accounting, for example, regarding the use of units from market mechanisms and rules related to the land-use sector. There may be a need for the development of fresh guidance in some areas, in line with the structure of a 2015 agreement which would be applicable to all, in order to accommodate a greater number of Parties.

41. One Party pointed to lessons to be learned from the United Nations Climate Change Conferences in Copenhagen and Cancun, namely the difficulty of quantifying mitigation pledges, in terms of understanding metrics and assumptions, and in assessing fairness, and called for developing and agreeing on clear MRV rules early on. This was echoed by a group of Parties pointing out that the MRV rules should be developed in advance of the adoption of the 2015 agreement.

42. Several Parties highlighted that the relevant rules for transparency and MRV would need to take into account the variety of enhanced actions. Some expressed the view that these rules should be tailored to the different types of commitment, identifying the necessary ex ante information and accounting framework for each type. In this context it was suggested that Parties should present more concrete views on how various types of commitment could be accounted for, after which common elements could be identified. Others expressed, more generally, that the MRV framework for the 2015 agreement should be designed to support a spectrum of efforts, under a common platform but with built-in flexibilities to take into account national circumstances and to allow for development over time.

43. A number of Parties stressed the importance of common rules on transparency, in order to be able to understand the commitments and contributions of Parties and to compare them. In particular, common accounting rules in the 2015 agreement would be important in order to avoid double counting and to ensure the environmental integrity of the overall system. A group of Parties pointed out that the MRV framework for the 2015 agreement should be at least as robust as that under the Kyoto Protocol. One Party suggested that the current reporting system under the Kyoto Protocol be applied to developing countries.

44. Several Parties emphasized that transparency for the 2015 agreement should be based on the principles of the Convention. One group of Parties stated that common accounting rules should be differentiated on the basis of Parties' capacities. Other Parties emphasized that common accounting rules are needed only for Annex I Parties, in order to ensure comparability among them.

45. Some Parties suggested a process to be established under the SBI to review the policies and measures of developed country Parties, especially one to review the modification of developed countries' consumption patterns in order to increase the level of ambition.

46. Regarding the transparency of the provision of support, many Parties emphasized the need to strengthen MRV of support in the new agreement, and highlighted the importance of differentiating between MRV of mitigation action and MRV of support in the new agreement.

47. Some Parties suggested that enhanced MRV of support could be achieved through the use of common tabular formats for biennial reporting on finance and the development of specific methodologies for financial reporting. In this regard, the Standing Committee on Finance was seen as the body that could assume specific tasks.

48. Other Parties called for MRV of support to be considered in greater detail (e.g. which funds and sources qualify as climate finance) and made specific proposals, including for a Finance Support Registry or a process of third-party assessment of financial support. In addition, one Party emphasized that transparency should be enhanced regarding social and economic impacts on developing countries.

49. With regard to accountability, one Party suggested that various measures would need to be put in place to motivate and support implementation and also to provide for the consequences of non-compliance. Another Party proposed the establishment of an International Court on Climate Justice.

V. Enablement and support

50. There was a broad understanding among Parties that finance, technology development and transfer and capacity-building are equally important elements that need to be addressed in the context of the 2015 agreement. Many Parties pointed out that a holistic approach in this regard needs to address support both for mitigation and for adaptation in a balanced and integrated manner. Several Parties emphasized that support and action have to be considered together and that finance, technology and capacity-building have to be tailored to action. One Party suggested that adaptation and gender need to be mainstreamed in the discussion on finance, technology and capacity-building.

51. Many Parties stressed the importance of delivering finance, technology and capacity-building through already established institutions and processes, on which the 2015 agreement should build and which should be further strengthened where needed (see part VI below). A number of Parties emphasized that the delivery by the existing institutions was key and that the 2015 agreement would need to fill any remaining gaps.

52. Several Parties recognized that massive changes are needed in order to achieve the objective of the Convention, and that it is critical that the 2015 agreement contains elements to enable and promote such transformations. Some Parties called for new, bold and innovative proposals for the 2015 agreement. Elements to be explored should include: how all Parties could contribute to the means of implementation, with net benefits; the recognition of investments already put in place by developing countries without financial support from developed countries; the need for clear commitments on finance, technology and capacity-building in the new agreement, as there are under the Convention, as well as a dynamic character that allows commitments and actions to evolve over time, including possibilities for adjustment.

53. One Party pointed out that burden-sharing is envisaged in the Convention only in the context of the provision of support by developed countries to developing countries (according to Article 4, paragraph 3). Another Party specifically highlighted the need to support the vulnerable and those in need of economic diversification.

54. With regard to finance, many Parties stressed the importance of the operationalization and capitalization of the Green Climate Fund (GCF), and several Parties expressed their disappointment that there is, as of now, no road map or pathway regarding how to achieve the goal of mobilizing USD 100 billion of climate financing annually by 2020.

55. Several Parties stressed that further clarity is needed on financial commitments, especially through the GCF. A number of Parties assured that financial support is already being delivered, and that the ADP should be more focused on a green-growth strategy and partnership-building rather than on discussing upfront pledges.

56. Some Parties suggested that the 2015 agreement should include a definition of climate finance and one Party was of the view that there should be a ratio of public to private finance. Other Parties proposed using public finance to leverage private finance, and reiterated the importance of enabling environments to attract climate-friendly investments. Some Parties mentioned that the new agreement should include ways to revive the falling carbon prices.

57. Some Parties made concrete proposals as to how to improve the collaboration and synergy between existing bodies under and outside of the Convention, for example between the GCF, the Global Green Growth Institute (GGGI) and the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN), through the new agreement. It was also stated that the GCF would need to be a central pillar of the new agreement.

58. Many Parties reiterated that a strong system for MRV of support should be part of the 2015 agreement, and several Parties suggested that the agreement should also include processes to regularly review commitments related to finance, technology and capacity-building.

59. Regarding technology, many Parties called for the development and transfer of technology to developing countries to be scaled up, including capacity and know-how, with a few Parties mentioning that it should not only cover the late stages of development and transfer.

60. One Party suggested that there should be a dedicated window under the GCF for technology. Another Party pointed out that many developing countries have identified their technology needs, through their technology needs assessment reports, and that they now need financial support to implement concrete projects.

61. Furthermore, a number of Parties stated that the removal of barriers to the development and transfer of technologies, including the intellectual property rights (IPRs), should be addressed in the 2015 agreement. One Party suggested that the GCF should have a dedicated funding window in this regard. Other Parties expressed the view that IPRs could be addressed by existing institutions (e.g. the CTCN).

62. Many Parties mentioned that hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) should be handled under the Convention, and not the Montreal Protocol, and a few Parties stated that the lack of alternative technologies prevents the phasing out of HFCs.

63. Many Parties emphasized the need to enhance the implementation of capacity-building, and one Party suggested a comprehensive list of specific capacity-building needs for inclusion in the new agreement. Another Party stated that capacity-building support needs to be provided on the basis of national priorities.

64. Some Parties suggested that the 2015 agreement should contain a robust capacity-building mechanism, while one Party emphasized that the creation of enabling environments should be the focus of the work of the ADP. One Party called for the establishment of a dedicated window for capacity-building under the GCF.

65. Several Parties emphasized the need to enhance MRV of capacity-building and one Party suggested developing relevant guidelines.

VI. Linkages with existing arrangements

66. In their introductory remarks to the round table on linkages, the Co-Chairs recalled the relevant on-going work in various areas, including the work, highlighted in the briefings held on 6 June 2013, of institutions and arrangements relevant to finance, technology and capacity-building under the Convention, as well as in the briefings held as part of the workshop on enhancing adaptation.⁸ The Co-Chairs invited Parties to focus on how the existing institutional arrangements and bodies could be brought into, anchored or referenced in the 2015 agreement, and how the 2015 agreement would substantively build on, add value to and strengthen the on-going work, where necessary. The Co-Chairs also made reference to their attempt to visualize the broader context of the 2015 agreement in a simplified way in their reflection note.⁹

67. Many Parties stressed the importance of ensuring that the 2015 agreement does not operate in a vacuum but rather takes into account existing arrangements, institutions and processes under the Convention. In designing the 2015 agreement, Parties should avoid duplication and need not reinvent the wheel. Rather, Parties should consider where and how best to build on, add value to, strengthen or enhance existing arrangements and institutions, where necessary. This would include building on the existing institutional structure, including the subsidiary bodies as well as the constituted bodies established under the Bali Action Plan process. Furthermore, institutions and arrangements under the Kyoto Protocol could also be useful, such as the Kyoto Protocol's accounting rules and Compliance Committee, underlining a need to explore means to make use and improve upon them in the new agreement.

68. Many Parties highlighted the fact that many institutions and arrangements are still new and evolving (e.g. the Adaptation Committee and the national adaptation plan process, the various financial mechanisms and bodies, the Technology Mechanism, the various market- and non-market-based approaches, as well as the evolving MRV framework and rules). Therefore, the consideration of linkages also needs to be evolving. The agreement could link to such existing institutions and processes by way of reference and by creating effective working arrangements.

69. Several Parties noted that the full implementation of the Convention needs to be ensured and that in the future agreement all gaps should be addressed. The 2015 agreement, therefore, should concentrate on where gaps need to be filled, particularly areas in which institutions, frameworks and mechanisms are notably absent, such as loss and damage.

70. Several Parties recalled that the ADP is to be informed by input from the IPCC and by the 2013–2015 review in accordance with decision 1/CP.17, paragraph 6. Therefore, there is a need for dedicated discussions on how the work of and insights from the IPCC and the 2013–2015 review will shape the design of the 2015

⁸ Information on the briefings provided at ADP 2 is available at <<http://unfccc.int/7695>>.

⁹ See paragraph 6 of document ADP.2013.8.InformalNote (issued on 22 May 2013), available at <<http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2013/adp2/eng/8infnot.pdf>>.

agreement. A group of Parties stated that a review under Article 4.2(d) of the Convention regarding the adequacy of developed country Parties' commitments under Article 4.2(a) and (b) should be undertaken by the ADP; a Party suggested that such review should be included as part of the 2013-2015 review. Many Parties stressed that will also be important to be kept informed of relevant on-going work under the subsidiary bodies.

71. Some Parties emphasized the link between the two workstreams under the ADP, stressing that pre-2020 ambition will affect post-2020 ambition and that there is a need to strike a balance between the two workstreams.

72. Several Parties highlighted the need to better link to processes and arrangements outside of the Convention and to explore how they would relate to the agreement post 2020. There is a need for effective integration and dialogue with such processes and to strengthen the catalytic role that the Convention can play in climate change. As an example, one Party mentioned the area of adaptation and finance, where, in order to ensure a constant stream of funding for adaptation, a look across all kinds of existing institutions is needed in this respect.

73. A number of Parties pointed out that the design of linkages would depend on the overall structure of the 2015 agreement, which could have overarching commitments as well as a range of supporting rules, methodologies and institutions comprising the working mechanics of the post-2020 structure. The latter could be comprised of rules to be developed through the ADP as well as elements that build on the existing rules and infrastructure.

74. Several Parties said that, in broader terms, the 2015 agreement could be thought of as a package consisting of the agreement itself, the decisions that implement elements of the agreement and the decisions that contain other important elements. While all of these should build substantially on experiences, existing decisions and practices under the Convention, it may be useful to further explore what would need to be contained in the core of the 2015 agreement and what would form part of a broader package, particularly in consideration of those details or aspects that will need regular updating and be more appropriately captured in decisions.

VII. Further steps under workstream 1

75. In relation to the various themes discussed at the round tables, several Parties made proposals for specific requests, steps and processes, including for the period prior to the next session, for the time after the United Nations Climate Change Conference in Warsaw and up to 2015.

76. Several Parties proposed to move to a more formal mode. Other Parties stated that round tables and workshops could also continue as a setting to explore ideas and proposals in an interactive manner. Some Parties stated that work should be structured along the pillars of mitigation, adaptation, finance and technology, with capacity-building and transparency also being areas of focus.

77. A number of Parties highlighted the need to capture progress in Warsaw in a textual form which should reflect the emerging understandings on the contours or preliminary elements of the 2015 agreement. A few Parties also called for a plan of work for next year.

78. Furthermore, some Parties suggested timelines for steps to be taken regarding the determination of contributions, namely: (a) by the end of 2013, clarity on basic elements, expectations and criteria for quantification of pledges and discussions on the adequacy of relative contributions; (b) by the end of 2014, initial contributions; and (c) by the end of 2015, the conclusion of a consultative assessment process.

79. A group of Parties called for submissions before the Warsaw conference on relevant rules for transparency and considered that MRV rules should be tailored to the different types of commitment, including the necessary ex ante information and accounting framework that should be developed.

80. Another Party suggested holding a workshop on ex ante clarity in order to gain a better understanding of mitigation actions and their implications.

81. Further suggestions from some Parties included a process for discussions on equity, which would comprise: (a) the submission of Parties' views and a report compiled by the secretariat in order to inform an equity round-table discussion at the Warsaw conference and to help define indicators; (b) a decision to be taken by the COP at the Warsaw conference on a process in 2014, involving experts, for developing an equity reference framework and to enable Parties to announce commitments in 2014; as well as (c) conducting an equity review process in 2015.

82. Some Parties suggested some form of stocktaking exercise or overview of relevant arrangements, institutions and mechanisms that already exist.¹⁰

¹⁰ In this regard, the ADP requested the secretariat to prepare an overview paper, which Parties may wish to consider once it becomes available. See FCCC/ADP/2013/2, paragraph 37.