

## Subsidiary Body on Implementation resumes work

Bonn, 15 May (Meena Raman and Fauwaz Abdul Aziz) – The 36th session of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change's Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI 36) began its work in Bonn on 14 May with a wide range of issues under its consideration.

These include national communications of developed and developing countries, national adaptation plans (NAPs), approaches to address loss and damage associated with climate change impacts, initial review of the Adaptation Fund, selection of the host of the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN), as well as the Forum on the impact of the implementation of response measures.

In the course of the SBI plenary, the Russian Federation raised the issue of the “legal foundation” for nominations by Parties to bodies that are being created such as the Standing Committee (on finance) and other bodies. It wanted the SBI to create a contact group to discuss and clarify openly the legal and procedural issues as regards the nomination procedures as this was a matter of importance for all countries.

[It seems that the Russian “question” was prompted by the “wrangling” going on among member states of the European Union and the European Commission (EC) over the latter wanting a seat on the Board of the Green Climate Fund.]

The United States supported Russia's call for a contact group to discuss this but the EU opposed this, saying that informal consultations could be held on the matter within the groups.

The newly appointed SBI Chair for this year, Mr. Tomasz Chruszczow of Poland proposed to hold informal consultations on how to address this matter further and to reconvene the SBI plenary

once a conclusion is reached in this regard. This was agreed to by Parties.

Apart from the SBI, the first day of the Bonn climate talks also saw the opening of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA). The talks are scheduled to end on 25 May.

At the SBI opening plenary, referring to the review of the fifth national communications of Annex 1 Parties, **Ambassador Mourad Benmehidi of Algeria**, as Chair of the **G77 and China** expressed concern over the increasing emissions of some of the Annex 1 countries (developed countries and countries with economies in transition).

The G77 called on the Annex 1 Parties to intensify their efforts in reducing their greenhouse gas emissions in accordance with provisions of the Convention and its Kyoto Protocol.

The Group, in their statement, also stressed the need for adequate, stable and predictable funding to support developing countries to ensure the full preparation of their national communications.

Benmehidi recalled that since Cancun, additional reporting obligations for developing countries were established, which represent a new burden for developing countries. He stressed that international consultations and analysis (ICA) (on the nationally appropriate mitigation actions of developing countries) should be conducted in a non-intrusive manner.

On the registry to record the nationally appropriate mitigation actions (NAMAs) of developing countries seeking international support, in the elaboration of the prototype registry, the G77 called for the taking into account of the diversity of the NAMAs and the need to provide some guidance to Parties on how best to facilitate the

matching of these NAMAs with the necessary support.

On the Forum on the impact of the implementation of the response measures (which was agreed to be established through decisions at the Durban Conference last year), the G77 wanted to see real and concrete progress (on the operationalization of the modalities and work programme).

(Parties were informed by the SBI Chair that the Forum will meet twice a year in conjunction with the meetings of the subsidiary bodies. The Forum will be convened by the Chairs of the SBI and SBSTA to discuss and agree on the operationalization of the modalities and areas of the work programme).

The G77 also stressed the importance of the work programme on loss and damage towards the full implementation of adaption actions to address the adverse effects of climate change in developing countries.

It called for more resources to the Adaptation Fund and the Least Developed Countries Fund.

On the Technology Executive Committee, the G77 and China said valuable progress was made but there were two “serious hurdles” in their process; one being the issue of intellectual property rights and the other relating to the hosting of the Technology Mechanism.

[During the SBI session, Parties were informed by the Executive Secretary of the UNFCCC, Ms. Christiana Figueres that the secretariat received 9 proposals to host the CTCN. The Technology Executive Committee’s evaluation panel conducted an assessment of the proposals received and proposed three proponents for the consideration of the SBI. The three proponents to be considered are a consortium led by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and a Norwegian company called Det Norske Veritas.]

**Swaziland**, speaking for the **African Group** said that the mitigation of developing countries should not be the focus of the SBI. It added that developing country mitigation actions are purely voluntary, and all work around them must be non-intrusive, non-punitive and must respect national sovereignty with appropriate focus on the means of implementation.

On the registry for NAMAs, it expressed disappointment that there has not been as much

work on assessing the provision of the means of implementation – such as technology transfer and finance – as there has been on developing country mitigation actions.

On the ICA, Swaziland noted that it was neither a review nor a compliance process, and as such is distinct from the international assessment and review (IAR) for developed country Parties. Technical experts for the ICA process should be nominated by Parties based on their expertise, while ensuring the balance between Non-Annex I Parties and Annex I Parties, it added.

Swaziland said that the Adaptation Fund played an important role in supporting adaptation policies and actions in developing countries. It noted that twice as much funds have come from the sale of Certified Emissions Reduction (CERs) (generated from Clean Development Mechanism projects) than in grants, suggesting a lack of commitment from developed country parties to meet their obligations. More is required in this instance to bridge this gap, it added further.

On the GEF, Swaziland expressed concerns over the GEF’s priorities as there had been very few projects focused on adaptation, and not a significant amount is in Africa. Since co-financing requirements continue to present a significant obstacle to developing countries in Africa, the African Group called for equal balance of adaptation projects and the removal of co-financing requirements.

It also called on the SBI to recommend to the Conference of Parties a decision urging the GEF to make available support to LDCs for the formulation of NAPs as early as possible and on the basis of agreed full cost funding.

(The 18<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Conference of Parties or COP18 will be in Doha, Qatar at the end of the year.)

On the Work Programme on Loss and Damage, Swaziland said there is need to further elaborate details of the work programme and a clear work plan for next year to enable decision at COP18. It called for measures to expedite work on strengthening international cooperation and expertise in order to understand, reduce and compensate loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change, including impacts on agriculture, water, human health and other areas related to extreme weather events and slow onset events particularly in Africa.

On the Technology Executive Committee, Swaziland said that modalities that are adopted to allow for observers and expert advisers to the TEC must undergo due process and allow for balanced representation geographically, across constituent groups, and among the type of international institutions. There should be no prioritization of development banks, it said.

**Gambia**, speaking for the **Least Developed Countries (LDCs)** emphasised the importance of support for the implementation of national adaptation plans, including that of financial arrangements. On the issue of technical experts for the ICA process, the LDCs called for fair and equitable representation, including experts from LDCs.

**Nauru**, for the **Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS)** expressed concern that Parties were not closer to the stabilisation of GHGs and said that since the Convention was adopted, GHGs (emissions) were 33% higher. It called for the enhancing of the mitigation ambition, with developed countries needing to take the lead. Nauru called for the establishment of an international mechanism to address loss and damage, which was also supported by the LDCs.

The **European Union** stressed the need to promote and put in practice the monitoring and evaluation of the effectiveness of capacity-building activities, as well as further discussions on the design of the registry (for NAMAs) and modalities of the ICA as an important element of the new measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) system (for mitigation actions).

**Australia**, speaking for the **Umbrella Group** stressed the importance of the SBI's role in

relation to transparency of mitigation actions to better understand global mitigation efforts and greater ambition. It also supported the work programme on loss and damage and the need for recommendations to the COP in this regard.

On the initial review of the Adaptation Fund (AF), the **Philippines**, speaking for the **G77 and China** stressed the importance of the AF for adaptation activities and which has demonstrated the possibility of developing countries to direct access the funds needed. There was need to look at the interim arrangements of the AF and information on the performance of the trustee (the GEF) and the status of its resources. The fate of the AF was linked to the fate of the Kyoto Protocol, stressed Philippines. The call by the Philippines was echoed by Bangladesh and Malawi.

Parties were also provided information about matters relating to the Green Climate Fund (GCF). The interim secretariat of the GCF said that there were five offers to host the Fund which were from Germany, Namibia, Poland, South Korea and Switzerland.

The GCF Board will consider this issue at its first meeting to be held in Geneva. On the status of the nominations for the GCF Board (which is supposed to have 12 members from developed and 12 members from developing countries), the secretariat informed Parties that nominations have been received only from the African region, AOSIS and LDCs as well as from Eastern Europe.

(It is learnt that nominations to the GCF Board from the developed countries, the Asian group and Latin American region are pending.)