



January 2012

COP-17 De-briefing:

*Enhancements, Decisions, and the
Durban Package*

About Climatico

Climatico is an independent network of researchers and climate change experts that analyze and report on the latest developments in climate change policy around the world. The group assesses government policies addressing mitigation and adaptation to climate change, including the underlying rationale and drivers of action and non-action. In addition, Climatico focuses on the most important international issues under discussion at high-level climate policy forums and venues (G8, UNFCCC, G-20, etc.) by monitoring policy trends and developments regarding such topics as adaptation, capacity building, technology transfer, CDM, JI, emissions trading, finance, and emissions targets.

Climatico is a 501(c) 3 non-profit organization and relies on public and private donations in order to provide high-quality independent analysis. To find out more about becoming a Climatico Partner on a future publication or to make a donation, please contact the Fundraising Director at: donations@climaticoanalysis.org.

For further queries please contact our press office at: press@climaticoanalysis.org, or visit us online at: www.climaticoanalysis.org.

We would like to thank the following organization for their support of Climatico's COP-17 coverage:



Editor: Paige Andrews

Contributors: Paige Andrews, Rodney Boyd, Jean-Benoit Fournier, Shira Honig, Sabina Manea, Nick Oakes, Takashi Sagara

Adaptation: Jean-Benoit Fournier, Paige Andrews

Mitigation: Paige Andrews

Capacity Building: Jean-Benoit Fournier, Paige Andrews

Bloc Status: Positions, Emission Reduction Proposals, and Financial Pledges: Shira Honig

CDM and Joint Implementation: Rodney Boyd

Emissions Trading: Sabina Manea

REDD+ and Forests: Nick Oakes, Paige Andrews

Technology: Takashi Sagara

Finance: Paige Andrews

Images: All images in this report are attributable to IISD.

Suggested Citation: Andrews, Paige et al. "COP-17 De-briefing: Enhancements, Decisions and the Durban Package." Climatico Analysis (January 2012).

Introduction

From November 28 to December 11, 2011, nearly 12,500 participants took part in the United Nations Climate Change Conference in Durban, South Africa. This conference included the twin-track Convention and Protocol negotiations entitled the 17th Conference of Parties (COP-17), and the 7th Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP-7), respectively.

Over the course of the two weeks, the COP and CMP sessions convened, along with four subsidiary bodies: the Ad-Hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the UNFCCC (AWG-LCA), the Ad-Hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP), the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) and the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA). Included among the Durban participants were 5,400 government officials, 1,200 members of the press, and 5,800 representatives of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), intergovernmental organizations (IGOs), and United Nations bodies and agencies.

Last year’s climate conference resulted in the adoption of the Cancun Agreements which recognized the need for deep cuts in greenhouse gas emissions in order to limit a global temperature rise to 2° and also saw the establishment of several new institutions and processes including the Adaptation Committee, Technology Mechanism, and Green Climate Fund. However, questions remained unanswered on the future of the Kyoto Protocol, whose first commitment period expires in 2012, or the possibility of a new legally-binding international treaty.

Expectations leading into Durban remained modest, with many delegates anticipating only an operationalization of the Cancun Agreements. UNFCCC Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres emphasized the need to complete the tasks established in Cancun and to resolve unanswered questions. She highlighted the importance of approving the Green Climate Fund, launching the Adaptation Committee, operationalizing the Technology Mechanism in 2012, providing more clarity on fast-start finance, and reaching a fair and responsible process towards a multilateral rules-based system under the Convention.

Following two weeks of negotiations, the conference in Durban concluded with the finalization of key outcomes from the COP and CMP in a set of agreements called the Durban Package that exceeded many expectations. Most notably, outcomes from the negotiations included the establishment of a second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol, an agreement on long-term cooperative action under the convention, the operationalization of the Green Climate Fund, and a launch of a new subsidiary body under the convention called the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action.

Within this report, we summarize some of the key subjects under discussion in the COP and CMP meetings: adaptation, mitigation, capacity building, technology, finance, REDD+, and the flexibility mechanisms: CDM, JI, and emissions trading. Within these sections, we make note of the background of these areas leading into Durban, discuss some of the issues under debate, and discuss their subsequent outcomes. In addition, we have included a compilation of negotiating positions, emission reduction proposals or commitments, and financial pledges. We then turn our attention to other notable conclusions contained or missing from the Durban Package and look to the road ahead in 2012 as Parties prepare for next year’s COP and CMP conference in Qatar.

REPORT CONTENTS	
Adaptation	2
Mitigation.....	3
Bloc Status: Positions, Emission Reduction Proposals, and Financial Pledges.....	5
Capacity Building	7
Technology	8
Finance	9
REDD+ and Forests	10
Flexibility Mechanisms and Post-2012	11
The Durban Package & the Year Ahead	14
References	15
Acronyms	17

Adaptation

The Bali Action Plan (BAP), adopted in 2007 at COP-13 in Bali, recognizes adaptation as one of the key building blocks required for a strengthened future response to climate change. Adaptation to the adverse climate change effects is essential to reduce current impacts and increase resilience to future impacts. This includes initiatives and measures that aim to reduce the vulnerability of human and natural systems against climate change effects as well as utilizing a cross-section of relevant stakeholders from governments to non-governmental organizations and members of local societies.

Within the COP and CMP negotiations, several issues related to adaptation were discussed, particularly new institutions and mechanisms created at COP-16 in Cancun that have a strong potential impact on adaptation activities and strategies, such as the Cancun Adaptation Framework and the Adaptation Committee. In addition, Parties focused on issues of importance to implementing adaptation including the Nairobi work programme on impacts, vulnerability and adaptation to climate (NWP), national adaptation plans (NAPs), and support for adaptation through finance, technology and capacity-building (discussed separately in this report).

Cancun Adaptation Framework

Adopted at COP-16 in Cancun, the Cancun Adaptation Framework holds the objective of enhancing action on adaptation, including through international cooperation, as well as consideration of matters under the Convention relating to adaptation. In Durban, Parties focused on advancing the implementation of this Framework by focusing on: the modalities, procedures of the Adaptation Committee, activities to be undertaken under the work programme on loss and damage, and modalities and guidelines for the national adaptation plans.



Consulting on national adaptation plans.

The Adaptation Committee was established as part of the Cancun Adaptation Framework to promote the implementation of enhanced action on adaptation. In Durban, Parties agreed upon the composition of, and modalities and procedures for, the Adaptation Committee. The composition of the Committee will total 16 members consisting of two members from each of the five UN regional groups, one member from an LDC, one from a small island developing state, two Annex I party members, as well as two non-Annex I party members. The Adaptation Committee shall operate under the authority of - and be accountable to - the COP. Parties further defined linkages with other institutions and agreed on a list of Committee activities for consideration when developing its work plan.

Recognizing the need to understand and reduce loss and damage associated with the impacts of climate change in particularly vulnerable developing countries, COP-16 in Cancun further established the work programme on loss and damage as part of the Cancun Adaptation Framework. In Durban, Parties briefly discussed the work programme within the SBI in informal meetings. The decision by the COP requests that the SBI agree on activities to be undertaken under the work programme and to make recommendations on loss and damage to the COP for consideration at COP-18.

Parties further gave attention to the operationalization of adaptation in developing countries and LDCs in SBI meetings. The G-77/China said that national adaptation plans (NAPs) should recognize that adaptation occurs at the local level, and should thus be flexible and country-driven. LDCs argued that the national adaptation plan process was distinct and separate from the NAPA process and discussions ensued as to whether to broaden NAPs to include other vulnerable developing countries. Parties further discussed reporting, monitoring and evaluation as well as the role of the GEF. Within the final decision, the COP agreed that the national adaptation plan process should facilitate country-owned, country-driven action. The decision further outlines the NAP process for LDCs and invites parties that are not LDCs to employ modalities for national adaptation plans.

Nairobi Work Programme

The SBSTA welcomed documents prepared for the conference on the Nairobi Work Programme (NWP), including a report on the joint SBSTA/SBI in-session workshop that considered relevant NWP outcomes. Delegates discussed vulnerable stakeholder groups, taking advantage of the knowledge and expertise of partners, coherence of action on adaptation under the Convention, and linkages between the NWP and the Adaptation Committee. The decision by the COP requests that the SBSTA reconsider the NWP work areas at its 38th session, with a view to making recommendations to COP-19 on how objectives of the NWP should be best supported, and to consider at its 39th session relevant information and advice on the scientific, technical and socio-economic aspects of impacts, vulnerability and adaptation to climate change arising from NWP implementation.

Adaptation Fund

The Adaptation Fund, established under the Kyoto Protocol, provides funding for adaptation projects and programs in developing countries. Taken up within the CMP, Parties discussed a report from the Adaptation Fund Board (AFB) and the low price of Certified Emission Reductions (CERs), from which a levy is applied to generate resources for the Adaptation Fund. On the report, Parties noted progress in the operationalization of the Adaptation Fund. The CMP adopted a decision that requests the AFB to submit to the Secretariat its views on the Review of the Interim Arrangements of the Adaptation Fund, requests SBI-36 to consider the initial review, and decides to complete the initial review of the Adaptation Fund at CMP-8.

Mitigation

Stabilizing concentrations of greenhouse gas emissions to prevent dangerous climatic impacts is the ultimate objective of the Convention, which uses two fundamental response strategies: adaptation and mitigation. While adaptation measures help reduce vulnerability of human and natural systems against climate change effects, mitigation measures utilize human interventions to reduce emissions and enhance greenhouse gas removal through the use of carbon sinks, such as forests, vegetation, and soils.

Mitigation measures encompass a number of agenda items under the Convention. Efforts to reduce emissions through the use of carbon sinks can be found in detail within the REDD+ and CDM sections of this report. In this section, we cover issues particular to developing and developed country mitigation efforts within the discussions followed by an outline of bloc positions, emission reduction targets, and financial commitments.



**Tosi Mpanu Mpanu, Democratic Republic of Congo,
Chair of the African Group.**

Developing and developed country mitigation measures

Parties to the Convention have agreed to a number of commitments to address climate change including the development and submission of national reports which contain their greenhouse gas emissions data, steps taken, and plans to implement the Convention. They are required to put in place national programmes and measures to control emissions and adapt to climate change impacts. In addition, Parties are to promote the sustainable management of forests and other ecosystems as well as the development and use of climate-friendly technologies.

Based upon the principle of “common but differentiated responsibilities”, developing countries are not bound to greenhouse gas emission reduction commitments. As a result, industrialized (Annex I) countries have additional requirements to undertake policies and measures to reduce their emissions, to promote and facilitate the transfer of climate-friendly technologies to developing countries and countries with economies in transition, and to provide more frequent and detailed national reports as well as emissions data. The Kyoto Protocol builds upon and enhances the commitments under the Convention with specific binding emissions targets for the 2008-2012 commitment period which can be achieved through domestic action and the use of international market mechanisms.

Within informal consultations, Parties discussed agenda items related to developed and developing country mitigation, respectively. Both groups discussed issues related to ambition levels and biennial reports. In addition, developed country mitigation consultations included the subject of international assessment and review (IAR), while developing country mitigation consultations considered the issue of international consultation and analysis (ICA) and the Registry. Earlier meetings in Panama produced non-papers which several Parties supported as a basis for further discussions.

Developed Country Mitigation

Within developed country mitigation consultations, the EU recommended that the decision should concentrate on establishing a process to narrow the ambition gap, a common rules-based accounting system, and a process to understand the assumptions underlying current pledges.

The COP decided to continue the process of clarifying Annex I economy-wide emission reduction targets in 2012 to better understand assumptions and conditions related to individual targets. Workshops will be held to explore target assumptions and conditions, resulting in a technical paper by the Secretariat exploring commonalities and differences of approaches. The COP adopted guidelines on the preparation of biennial reports by developed countries to be used for the preparation of their first biennial reports, due by January 1, 2014 and every two years following the due date of their full national communications. The IAR process will be conducted by way of a technical review of information and through a multilateral assessment of the implementation of emission reduction targets. In addition, the COP adopted modalities and procedures for IAR, with revisions based upon first round experiences due by 2016.

Developing Country Mitigation

Countries expressed a variety of concerns within discussions focused on developing country mitigation. Bolivia expressed concern about the similarities in requirements imposed on developed and developing countries while the EU reiterated that progress on these issues is important to a Durban package. Switzerland, on behalf of the EIG, emphasized a need to focus on ambition and information on the ambition gap along with common accounting rules.

The COP decided to continue workshops in 2012 to further understand the diversity of mitigation actions, underlying assumptions, and any implementation support, with respect to varying national circumstances and capabilities. The COP determined that the Registry is to be developed as a dynamic, web-based platform to facilitate the matching of actions seeking international support with support available. Parties are invited to submit information on individual NAMAs seeking support, and Parties and entities in a position to do so are invited to submit information on support available to the Secretariat for the preparation or implementation of NAMAs. The COP further adopted guidelines for the preparation of biennial reports by non-Annex I parties, with first biennial update reports due December 2014 (allowing LDCs and SIDs to update at their discretion), and decided that the first ICA round will be conducted for developing countries within six months of the submission of the first round of biennial update reports.

Bloc Status: Positions, Emission Reduction Proposals, and Financial Pledges

As of December 2011

COUNTRY/BLOC	Proposals: Emission Reductions				Unconfirmed Proposals: Emission Reductions				Financial Pledges and Commitments, 2010-2012.		Other
	2020		2050		2020		2050		<i>All figures USD.</i>		
	%	Base	%	Base	%	Base	%	Base			
Central Asia, Caucasus, Albania & Moldova Group (CACAM)											
Kazakhstan	15%	1992									
Moldova ¹	≥25%	1990									
Eastern European Group	Many Eastern European countries argued for smaller EU funding to developing nations, preferring to base contributions on economic output rather than emissions amounts as their economies are coal-intensive.										
Belarus	5%	1990			10%	1990					
Environmental Integrity Group											
Mexico					30%	BAU ²	50%	2000			Mexico's post-2012 pledges are conditional on financial support.
South Korea	30%	BAU									
Switzerland	20%	1990			30%	1990			\$162 million		Proposed: Carbon neutral by 2030.
EU27	<p>Position: Willing to consider an extension of current Kyoto commitments only in exchange for a broader treaty that includes emerging economies to begin in 2015 or 2020.</p> <p>Parallel financial discussions in Brussels saw EU leaders consider a global tax on financial transactions to reduce the risks of a further financial crisis and raise funding for tackling climate change.</p>										
	20%	1990	80%	1990	30%	1990	95%	1990	EC: \$214 million		
Belgium									\$214 million		
Denmark									\$230 million		
Finland									\$157 million		
France									\$1.8 billion		
Germany									\$1.8 billion		
Ireland									\$143 million		
Luxembourg									\$13 million		
Malta									\$1 million		
Netherlands									\$443 million		
Portugal									\$51 million		
Slovenia									\$11 million		
Spain									\$536 million		
Sweden									\$1.143 billion		
UK									\$2.471 billion		Proposed: 50% below 1990 by 2025.
Remaining EU member states									\$1.055 billion		
EU Aggregate									\$10.283 billion		
G-77 + CHINA	<p>Position: There must be a second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol and ongoing efforts by Annex I countries to reduce emissions.</p> <p>China's Position: Called for non-Annex I countries to join Annex I efforts with their own comparable commitments in the next commitment period. Also announced it is open to a legally binding agreement in 2020.</p> <p>India's Position: Refused to commit to participating in a future legally binding agreement, but agreed in a final "huddle" on December 11 to participate in a new agreement in 2015-2020, accepting the wording "agreed outcome with legal force" rather than "legal outcome." Also called for inclusion of the "common but differentiated responsibilities" issue.</p>										
African UN regional Group	<p>Financial demands: Called for operationalization of the Green Climate Fund and assurance of long-term funding.</p> <p>Position: At the closing plenary, the group expressed support for the outcome.</p>										
Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS)	<p>Financial demands: Called for operationalization of the Green Climate Fund and assurance of long-term funding.</p> <p>Position: On December 9, the group supported the EU proposal linking a second commitment period to a new agreement. Yet it expressed opposition to the implementation year 2020, worried the measure will be too little, too late. At the closing plenary, the group expressed support for the outcome.</p>										
Antigua and Barbuda	25%	1990									
Marshall Islands					40%	2009					

Continued on next page...

¹ Moldova also negotiates in the Eastern European Group

² BAU stands for "Business as usual"

...Continued from previous page

COUNTRY/BLOC	2020		2050		2020		2050		Financial Pledges and Commitments, 2010-2012.	Other
	%	Base	%	Base	%	Base	%	Base		
Least Developed Countries	Financial demands: Called for operationalization of the Green Climate Fund and assurance of long-term funding. Position: On December 9, the group supported the EU proposal linking a second commitment period to a new agreement. Yet like AOSIS, the group expressed opposition to the implementation year 2020, worried the measure will be too little, too late.									
Argentina										Proposed: Zero deforestation by 2020.
Bhutan										Bhutan is carbon neutral and pledges to stay carbon neutral. (Emission values for 1990 and 1994 are unavailable and unverified.)
Brazil	36.1%	BAU			38.9%	BAU				Amazon deforestation rate 70% below 2009 levels by 2017. Zero deforestation by 2020. Brazil's BAU pledges (by 2020) are conditional on financial support.
China	45% <i>CI</i> ³	2005								Proposed: Emissions peak in 2030 and fall to 2005 levels by 2050; increase forest coverage by 40 million hectares by 2020; increase non-fossil fuel energy sources to 11.4% by 2015; cap on energy consumption in 2015 at 4 billion tons of coal equivalent. Non-binding commitments.
Chile					20%	BAU				Chile's BAU pledge (by 2020) will require financial support.
Costa Rica										Zero emissions by 2021.
India	20% <i>CI</i>	2005			25% <i>CI</i>	2005				Keep emissions per capita below those of developed countries. Voluntary. Proposed: 20% of electricity from renewable energy by 2020
Indonesia	26%	BAU			41%	BAU				Proposed: 40% below 2005 by 2030; Change forest to net sink by 2030. Conditional on international funding and technology transfer.
Maldives										Carbon neutral by 2020.
Papua New Guinea					≥ 50% (by 2030)	BAU	100%	BAU		
Singapore	7-11%	BAU			16%	BAU				
South Africa					34%	BAU				Emissions peak in 2025, stabilize for 10 years and decline. Proposed: 42% below BAU* by 2025.
Umbrella Group	Position: Unwilling to consider a second commitment period without participation of emerging economies such as China and India.									
Australia	5%	2000	60%	2000	25%	2000	80%	2000	\$641 million	
Canada			60%	2006	17%	2005	70%	2006	\$409 million	
Iceland			50%	1990	30%	1990	75%	1990	\$1 million	
Japan					25% (37%)	1990 (2005)	60- 80%	2005	\$15 billion	
New Zealand			50%	1990	20%	1990			\$74 million	
Norway	30%	1990			40%	1990			\$1 billion	Proposed: Carbon neutral by 2030.
Russian Federation	15%	1990	50%	1990	25%	1990				
Ukraine			50%	1990	20%	1990				
USA					17%	2005	75%	2005	\$1.704 billion	
Western European and Other Group										
Israel	20%	BAU								
Liechtenstein	20%	1990			30%	1990			\$820,000	
Monaco	30%	1990								Carbon neutral by 2050.
Not Members of a Negotiating Group										
Croatia	5%	1990								

³ CI stands for "Carbon intensity"

Capacity Building

Capacity building encompasses the development of a country's human, organizational, institutional, scientific, technological, and resource capabilities. According to the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, the goal of capacity building is the enhancement of a nation's ability to "evaluate and address the crucial questions related to policy choices and modes of implementation among development options, based on an understanding of environmental potentials and limits and of needs as perceived by the people of the country concerned."

During the negotiations in Durban, capacity building was discussed under both the Convention and the Protocol in SBI meetings. It was further addressed by the Ad-hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action (AWG-LCA) under the Convention.

Within SBI meetings under the Convention, Parties addressed the issue of capacity building with a goal of finalizing the review of the framework in Durban. Following discussions, the SBI submitted a draft COP decision on Dec. 3rd that was subsequently adopted by the COP on Dec. 9th. This decision invites continued support by UN agencies and intergovernmental organizations for capacity-building activities and invites parties to enhance reporting best practices. The COP decision further suggests ways to improve implementation of the capacity-building framework in developing countries.



Using a flow chart, delegates from the US and Japan try to facilitate the discussions.

Under the Protocol, the SBI addressed the importance of taking into account gender aspects as well as the role and needs of youth and persons with disabilities in capacity-building activities. The discussions additionally focused on financial and technical resource needs for the support of capacity-building activities for the implementation of the Kyoto Protocol. These issues were acknowledged within the final COP/MOP decision.

The subject of capacity building was further addressed by the AWG-LCA, during which time Parties resumed deliberations over institutional arrangements and discussed enhancing monitoring and review of capacity building effectiveness. The topic of institutional arrangements centered on questions of whether capacity

building is better supported as a stand-alone activity or as an issue area integrated within mitigation and adaptation efforts. While some NGOs such as the Climate Action Network supported the idea, Australia led other countries in cautioning against creating stand-alone capacity-building institutions as it is a transversal issue that would have to be included in several activities having mitigation and/or adaptation objectives.

Outstanding issues regarding clarity of institutional arrangements and references to performance indicators remained unresolved in the final informal group session. Therefore, Part VI of the AWG-LCA decision requested that the SBI organize an annual in-session Durban Forum for an in-depth discussion on capacity building and implementation activities, beginning next year with SBI-36.

Technology

The technology transfer concept has been embodied in the UNFCCC's goals since it came into force in 1994. Several initiatives and mechanisms are already in place to deploy climate technologies in the developing world. Included within the Marrakesh Accords at COP-7, technology transfer activities were grouped under a framework for meaningful and effective actions in order to enhance the implementation of Article 4.5 of the Convention. The Marrakesh Accords further called for the establishment of an Expert Group on Technology Transfer (EGTT) to be nominated by the Parties. Actions for enhancing the technology transfer framework implementation were adopted at COP-13 in Bali with funding to be deployed through the GEF.

Following three years of intensive negotiations since Bali, COP-16 in Cancun reached an agreement upon the preliminary structure of the Technology Mechanism, creating a Technology Executive Committee (TEC) and a Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN). The Technology Mechanism is to become operational in 2012.

The Technology Executive Committee (TEC) provides advice to the COP and sets overall policy directives for technology development and transfer. Within a contact group under the Convention, Parties considered modalities and procedures of the TEC along with a report from the first meeting of the TEC held earlier in November. Discussions in the contact group focused on pending issues related to the timeline for elaborating or concluding TEC modalities and its linkages with other institutions. India, for the G-77+China bloc, called for a one year extension of the TEC term and for quick adoption of modalities and procedures.



A solar powered vendor stand in Durban.

The COP adopted the modalities and rules of procedures as contained in Annexes 1 and 2 of the TEC report. These modalities include: analysis and synthesis, facilitation, linkages with other institutional arrangements, engagement with stakeholders, information and knowledge sharing, and policy recommendations. The decision also requests that the TEC further elaborate on its modalities on linkage with other institutions for consideration by COP-18.

The Climate Technology Center and Network (CTCN), consisting of both a center and a larger network, will serve an operative role in technology transfer on an international to regional scale. It will function mainly to carry out the TEC's directives, as well as to facilitate and improve upon existing initiatives. Within the AWG-LCA, Parties discussed possible gaps on the call for proposals and selection process for hosting the CTCN, including eligibility criteria and financial arrangements, as well as potential gaps within evaluation criteria and information requirements. Parties also addressed criteria to evaluate and select the host of the Climate Technology Center (CTC). On this agenda item, Parties discussed the selection timeline, finance, the role of the GEF, governance, and the possible involvement of an intermediary body.

The COP decision requests for the CTCN to elaborate on its modalities and procedures based on the terms of reference once it becomes operational. Parties decided that in order to make the Technology Mechanism operational in 2012, the selection process for the host of the CTC will be launched upon the conclusion of COP-17. In addition, the COP outlined CTC host section procedures for approval at COP-18 and decided that various sources, including the private sector, philanthropic sources, and the financial mechanism, should fund the CTC and the Network service mobilization. The GEF is requested to support the operationalization and activities of the CTCN whereas the TEC and CTC are requested to establish procedures for preparing a joint annual report.

Issues that remain outstanding include intellectual property rights related to the development and transfer of technologies as well as the composition of a CTCN board or advisory committee. These unresolved issues are to be addressed at a later stage.

Finance

While the negotiation of targets to mitigate climate change sets a regulatory framework, financing is crucial to realize emission reductions and to adapt to impending climatic changes. Without the financial support for the implementation of adaptation projects, the developing countries cannot achieve their Millennium Development Goals. Developed countries are committed to providing \$30 billion (USD) of fast-start finance for the years 2010-2012, and further committed to jointly mobilize \$100 billion per year by 2020.

COP-16 in Cancun created the Green Climate Fund (GCF), establishing it as the new operating entity of the Convention's financial mechanism, to be governed by a board of 24 members. A Transitional Committee was set up and tasked with designing the Fund, and a Standing Committee was established to assist the COP on issues related to the financial mechanism. With the Transitional Committee set to formally introduce GCF text at COP-17, significant attention was paid to the Fund in Durban as Parties sought its operationalization.

Additional issues related to finance, including the Standing Committee of the financial mechanism and on fast-start and long-term finance, were considered within informal consultations under the AWG-LCA.

Green Climate Fund

On November 30th, the GCF's Transitional Committee Co-Chair Trevor Manuel (South Africa) presented the Committee's report, which included draft guidelines for the GCF. According to Manuel, the report aimed to be a middle ground as a basis for launching the GCF in Durban. This item was considered in open-ended informal consultations and in high-level ministerial consultations.



Civil Society intervenes during Green Climate Fund discussions.

Japan, Colombia, and Australia, favored the adoption of the draft "as is", sparing Parties from the "reopening" of the draft document. However, other Parties were strongly in favor of revisiting the draft before submitting it, such as Venezuela and Egypt, for whom the international legal personality of the fund was an issue to be resolved beforehand. The COP Presidency decided to undertake informal consultations based on the draft recommendations within the report. Discussions within consultations focused on the fund's legal status, its relationship to the COP, the role of private sector financing, the establishment of its Board, and the elaboration of a process to establish an interim secretariat to support the Board.

Within the final COP decision, the COP confirmed the GCF as an operating entity of the financial mechanism to the Convention, with arrangements between the COP and the Fund to be concluded at COP-18. Parties reached an agreement on a process for conferring legal personality on the Fund as well as the host country selection process. The interim secretariat shall be fully accountable to the Board and function under its guidance and authority. Parties further agreed that the secretariat should have experience working with developing countries. However, parties were unable to agree on the host of the interim secretariat.

Standing Committee

Within consultations under the AWG-LCA, Parties considered whether the Standing Committee should be a subsidiary body of the Convention, with recommendations made directly to the COP, or whether it is better for the committee to report to the SBI. Standing Committee functions regarding assistance to the COP were also addressed. Proposals included developing recommendations to rationalize the financial mechanism, improving coherence and coordination in climate financing delivery, and MRV of support provided to developing countries.

The COP decided that the Standing Committee will report and make recommendations to the COP, assist the COP in functions related to the financial mechanism of the Convention, and develop a work programme for presentation to COP-18 in Qatar. The composition and working modalities of the Standing Committee is included in Annex VI of the decision.

Fast-start finance

On the issue of fast-start finance, Parties debated transparency in reporting. One developing country pressed for total transparency, while another noted that new and additional criteria for finance were not clarified. Developed countries felt that they should receive more credit for efforts towards fast-start finance and thought text referencing a need to enhance transparency should be deleted. They further wanted acknowledgement for other sources of information for support provided beyond just the UNFCCC finance route. The COP decision urges developed countries to continue to enhance their reporting transparency and fulfillment of their fast-start finance commitments, while noting information provided by developed countries, thus far.

Long-term finance

Delegates considered text on long-term finance within informal discussions, including a schedule of activities on sources of long-term financing. Parties discussed streamlining the text, although some feared that this would mean going back on Cancun agreements such as on a burden-sharing mechanism to identify flows of financial support. Delegates eventually agreed upon an option allowing countries to determine the mode and source of its contributions toward mobilizing long-term finance of \$100 billion.

Several developing countries stressed the need to focus on ground-based adaptation, such as grants and direct access to overcome barriers to investments in adaptation, and considered whether or not public sources should constitute the main source of funding. Parties proposed new and innovative sources of finance such carbon pricing of maritime transportation and global aviation which could generate significant funds while setting a price signal necessary to achieve emission reductions within these sectors.

Parties looked at capitalization of the GCF, with some countries emphasizing the need to clarify long-term financing pledges. They further looked at the feasibility of convening workshops on sources of long-term finance, options for adequacy and predictability, and on scaling up and continuity of financing. A work programme on long-term finance will be undertaken in 2012, as decided upon by the COP. This work programme will contribute to on-going efforts to scale up finance mobilization after 2012.

REDD+ and Forests

Reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, conservation, sustainable forest management, and forest carbon stock enhancement (REDD+) has moved increasingly to the forefront in recent conferences. This is partly due to the huge volume of carbon that will cease to be released in the atmosphere if forests are protected, and partly due to a concerted effort to demonstrate progress in the UN process, diverting attention away from the usual deadlock encountered on emissions targets and/or the Kyoto Protocol.

REDD+ has developed as a separate mitigation action outside of the standard national appropriate mitigation action (NAMA) discussions. Negotiations thus far have focused on the technicalities associated with measurement, reporting, and verification (MRV) and the livelihoods of forest communities due to the very unique problems encountered when monitoring REDD+ emissions and protecting forests. Finance discussions have also been on-going, where there has remained an overarching partition – although not as divisive as previous negotiations in Durban – between those in favor of market-based mechanisms and those in favor of non-market-based mechanisms, fuelled by ideological arguments in the case of the latter and often presented as a matter of pragmatism in the case of the former.

Safeguards

Safeguards for REDD+ refers to measures that ensure environmental and social integrity during the course of a REDD+ project. Discussions in Durban focused on how the information on safeguards provided by countries would be used and whether or not to specify the type of information to be provided. The final decision stipulates that forest countries will need to report on how they are implementing the safeguards. However, these are only requirements for the reporting of how safeguards are implemented; there is no requirement for the reporting on the success (or otherwise) of the implementation of safeguards and, if necessary, penalization if safeguards are violated. This has been a cause of concern for many observers worried about the protection of local communities

as it risks exposing communities to those implementers that pay only lip-service to safeguards, with no real accountability for the communities, should safeguards be violated.

Reference levels

The second major talking point of discussions focussed on reference levels used to calculate baselines and emissions paths, known as Reference Emission Levels (RELs) or Reference Levels (RLs). RELs refer to an emissions path as it is generally understood; RLs were later created following concerns that RELs may not account for the “+” in REDD+. Discussions in the context of reference levels focused on consideration of historical deforestation, projections, and national circumstances.

There was very little to add to this discussion from Durban, other than to say that countries can still choose whether to use RELs or RLs – the choice of which would be dependent on the activities undertaken in the country – and forest countries can now summate separate sub-national RELs or RLs from different regions up to a national level.

REDD+ finance

On the more widely debated and highly anticipated subject of finance for REDD+, there was slight movement in a positive direction in the final week, despite low expectations. Negotiators discussed sources of financing for REDD+, the role of market and non-market based approaches, and the potential for using offsets.

On sources of REDD+ financing, Parties emphasized a need for flexibility in financial sources, with the sources at the discretion of each party. While some were proponents of private and public funding, others wanted to link public sources to phases one and two of REDD+, and phase three to private sources, as well. There were additional arguments for the development of market-based approaches and others seeking results-based finance provided to developing countries from a variety of sources including the consideration of appropriate market and non-market based approaches under the Convention. Further disagreement ensued by some developing countries as to whether “appropriate” meant the exclusion of offsetting mechanisms and/or carbon markets.

The final decision compromises on the divisive issue of market versus non-market based approaches, recognizing both approaches may be appropriate, dependent on the country’s circumstances. Market based approaches would likely mean the sale of rights to carbon stored in or sequestered by the forest, whereas non-market based approaches are more ambiguous. At the moment, non-market refers to grant-based finance for REDD+ readiness. However, it could come to include mechanisms that focus on the implementation phase, as well.

There still remains much outstanding on REDD+ for further consideration. This includes several options on REDD+ financing, different approaches to the use of market and non-market based approaches, as well as the possibility of considering offsetting within REDD+ activities.

Flexibility Mechanisms and Post-2012

The Kyoto Protocol established three flexible mechanisms to help industrialized nations meet their emission reduction targets: Emissions Trading (the “carbon market”), the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) and Joint Implementation (JI). During the first commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol (2008-2012) Annex B Parties have committed to reducing emissions to certain permitted levels, which are quantified in assigned amount units (AAUs).

Both CDM and JI are project-based mechanisms in which individual projects are financed with the goal of mitigating GHG emissions. These project mechanisms earn credits for their emission reduction activities: JI projects earn emissions reduction units, or ERUs, whereas CDM projects earn certified emission reduction units, or CERs. These credits can be traded and sold in the carbon market or be used to help countries reach their emission reduction targets. With the approach of 2012, the continued viability of the international emissions market is dependent upon a seamless transition to a second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol.

Emissions Trading (“Carbon Market”)

Under the Kyoto Protocol, countries with spare AAUs may sell this surplus to countries which have exceeded their targets, thereby creating an international emissions market. This market-based mechanism is intended to deliver a cost-effective way of reducing emissions and encourage investment in greener technologies. However, there is uncertainty over the extent to which surplus AAUs should be available for banking into a second commitment period.

The emissions trading mechanism was discussed in Durban during CMP, AWG-KP and AWG-LCA meetings. The CMP considered the results of the work of the AWG-KP, which covered the issue of further commitments for Annex I Parties for the period beyond 2012. The AWG-LCA considered opportunities to use markets to enhance cost-effectiveness and promote climate change mitigation actions. Discussions on the surplus of AAUs and their carry-over into the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol took place in the AWG-KP spin-off group on numbers.

LDCs and AOSIS highlighted the importance of reaching a decision on the treatment of surplus AAUs and their carry-over into a second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol. The EU and Australia, among others, supported reaching a firm agreement over the treatment of surplus AAUs. Co-facilitator Leon Charles also noted that the AWG-KP’s work should focus on, among other issues, the carry-over of surplus AAUs. Separately from the main AWG-KP negotiations, in an informal spin-off group on numbers, the negotiating countries assessed various draft texts on the surplus and carry-over of AAUs and discussed the various options available for action. The final CMP decision set out a request to the AWG-KP to assess the implications of the carry-over of AAUs for the projected levels of emissions reductions in the second commitment period. This assessment is scheduled to be completed by AWG-KP 17.

CDM

Several CDM agenda items were considered in Durban under the Protocol including efforts to improve the CDM Executive Board’s work, establishing a process for appeals against CDM Executive Board decisions, ensuring a clear market signal for the future of the CDM, methodology monitoring and additionality assessment, materiality, and issues related to carbon capture and storage (CCS) inclusion within the CDM. Some Parties sought to specifically link participation in the CDM after 2012 with accepting a target under the Kyoto Protocol, whereas others felt these issues were better dealt within the AWG-KP. This issue proved to be a major point of contention. Parties also disagreed over a mandate to establish an appeals process and whether or not to have a specific reference to public and/or private sector CDM projects within the final text.

Several clauses remained in brackets following SBSTA deliberations including: the CDM beyond the first commitment period, guidelines on stakeholder consultation, improvements on the assessment of additionality, and the first review of the CDM modalities and procedures. In the final CMP plenary, parties agreed to delete bracketed text and adopt the decision as amended.

Decisions eventually agreed to by the CMP included the launch of a CDM policy dialogue by the CDM Executive Board, voluntary measures, operational entities carrying out sector-specific validation, and programmes of action. The CMP requests continued work by the Executive Board to improve governance and monitoring methodologies while ensuring environmental integrity. In addition, the decision contains provisions on CDM project registration and CER issuance, capacity building, and regional and sub-regional distribution.

The subject of carbon capture and storage (CCS) inclusion within the CDM was taken up as a separate agenda item under the Protocol. Negotiations in Cancun at last year’s COP accepted carbon capture and storage (CCS) into the CDM, on the condition that a list of modalities and implementation issues were addressed. The inclusion of CCS in



Approving a document section during a CDM contact group.

the CDM is largely seen as a technological success, which could bring many benefits to the fledgling industry. However, the decision was six years in the making and not without controversy. CCS is thought to be against the principle of the CDM: allowing carbon intensive industry and power sectors to continue.

Compromise on CCS in the CDM was reached during SBSTA consultations in Durban, adopting modalities and procedures to be reviewed periodically, and clearing the way for the first methodologies to emerge as early as next year. Project-specific reserve and trans-boundary issues will be taken up in SBSTA-36, for consideration at CMP-8 in Qatar.

Joint Implementation

In Durban, negotiators hoped to breathe new life into the Joint Implementation (JI) mechanism by determining whether to allow JI emission reduction projects to earn carbon credits beyond 2012. Considered under the Protocol in the CMP plenary, the Chair of the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee (JISC) noted significant progress since Cancun and said that the JISC recommends replacing the current two-track approach with a single, unified verification process, establishing a new governing body for verification oversight, and providing clarity on how JI should continue after 2012.

Delegates eventually decided to delay a decision on whether to decouple the future of JI from the Kyoto Protocol until Qatar. The talks also failed to reach consensus on a recommendation by the JISC to merge the scheme's two tracks, a move it hoped would increase the JI's environmental integrity. Instead, the CMP decision encourages further work on the issues with a view to look at the issuance of ERUs for projects considered by the JISC at CMP-8 and to adopt revised joint implementation guidelines for adoption at CMP-9.

Market and Non-Market Approaches – Potential for a New Mechanism

During last year's negotiations, Parties were asked to submit ideas on how new market or non-market mechanisms might look in a future agreement. Undertaken in informal group meetings of the AWG-LCA, Parties discussed the role of the Convention in the development of a work programme to address various approaches. Many developed countries expressed a desire for the establishment of a new market mechanism. However, some developing countries wished for consideration of other non-market approaches.

While the new mechanisms received a fair amount of discussion time in the AWG-LCA, negotiation texts were bogged down in procedural divides between countries that felt it too early for new mechanism substance discussions (e.g. US), to those who felt the discussions are necessary before gaining any second commitment period (e.g. EU). The EU wanted to avoid potential fragmentation of the international carbon market by having any new market mechanisms to cut emissions outside of the Protocol, which is anchored in international law.

Parties eventually agreed to define new market mechanisms under a successor treaty to the Kyoto Protocol, but delayed a decision to develop the underlying framework until next year in Qatar. Negotiators further decided that the mechanisms will operate under the COP and "bear in mind different circumstances of developed and developing countries." Rules for the new mechanisms must ensure environmental integrity of new markets, avoid double counting, and ensure that a net decrease in emissions is achieved. This last point is a contrast to the CDM and JI in which carbon offsets can be used by polluters in other countries.

Transition to the second commitment period

With the conclusion of the first commitment period for the Kyoto Protocol quickly approaching, negotiators needed to decide upon a second commitment period or determine how to manage a potential gap that could emerge and its subsequent impact on the international emissions market. The EU highlighted the importance of a smooth transition to a second commitment period, stating that it was necessary to avoid a gap between commitment periods in order to give certainty to the emissions markets. Furthermore, a number of delegates expressed concern that uncertainty over a possible gap between the Kyoto Protocol and any future agreement would cause damaging instability in the emissions markets. The CMP finally agreed that the Kyoto Protocol would continue seamlessly beyond 31 December 2012 with a second commitment period. This begins on January 1, 2013 and is scheduled to end either on December 31, 2017 or December 31, 2020, to be decided in Qatar.

The Durban Package and the year ahead

The conference in Durban concluded with the finalization of key outcomes from the COP and CMP in a set of agreements called the Durban Package. This Package encompasses a set of decisions under the Convention and Protocol negotiating tracks as highlighted throughout this report, including the operationalization of key outcomes from Cancun, answers to questions on the future of the Kyoto Protocol, and the establishment of a path for the development of a new universal legally-binding treaty.

Under the AWG-LCA, Parties decided to launch a process to develop a universal legal agreement on climate change as soon as possible, and no later than 2015, for implementation from 2020. A new subsidiary body to the Convention called the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action will begin work on this universal agreement immediately. This process is to raise the level of ambition based upon the outcomes of the subsidiary bodies and a 2013-2015 Review. A work plan will be launched on enhancing mitigation ambition to explore options to close the ambition gap, as will an in-session workshop in 2012. This decision further extends the AWG-LCA for one year so that it may continue its work.

Within the decisions of the AWG-KP, governments agreed to a second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol to begin January 1, 2013, immediately following the conclusion of the first commitment period and thus allowing no gap in reporting periods. This decision aims to ensure that aggregate greenhouse gas emissions of Annex I Parties are reduced by at least 25-40% below 1990 levels by 2020. Parties to this second commitment period will turn their economy-wide targets into quantified emission limitation and reduction objectives (QELROs), to be submitted for review by May 1, 2012, with the view of their adoption as amendments to Annex B of the Kyoto Protocol at CMP-8. The second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol will end either on December 31, 2017 or December 31, 2020, to be decided at AWG-KP 17.



President Zuma with COP President Maite Nkoana-Mashabane.

Other key decisions emerged from Durban, as detailed in this report. These include the operationalization of the Technology Mechanism in 2012, approval of the Green Climate Fund, and the launch of the Adaptation Committee. In addition, Parties adopted procedures to allow carbon capture and storage projects under the Clean Development Mechanism and agreed on the development of a new market-based mechanism to help developed countries achieve a portion of their commitments or targets under the Convention.

Following years of struggle to rescue the international climate regime, from disappointments over transparency and the North-South divide in Copenhagen to tepid expectations and uncertainties over the effectiveness of the UNFCCC's role within international climate policy and long-term cooperative action, negotiators appeared to turn a corner in Durban with decisions that will lead to a more inclusive climate regime with more symmetrical mitigation reporting systems. Many Parties felt that these decisions signaled a restored momentum to move beyond traditional North-South lines. However, there were others who expressed disappointment that the decisions failed to sufficiently strengthen mitigation commitments recommended by science and delayed a universal regime for another eight years.

Next year's twin-track climate change conference, COP-18/CMP-8, will take place from November 26 – December 7 2012 in Qatar and will operate in close cooperation with the Republic of Korea. Several work programmes are set to take place over the coming year, as will the establishment of new bodies of the UNFCCC. This year is therefore likely see an increased emphasis on transparency and implementation along with an emergence of new strategies for the development of an ambitious universal climate change agreement over the next four years.

References

- Andrews, Paige et al. (2010). "Copenhagen De-briefing: An Analysis of COP15 for Long-term Cooperation". Climatico Analysis. January 2010. Date of Access: 16 December 2011. <http://www.climaticoanalysis.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/01/climatico-cop15-analysis.pdf>.
- Andrews, Paige et al. (2011). "Cancún De-briefing: An Analysis of the Cancún Agreements". Climatico Analysis. February 2011. Date of Access: 16 December 2011. <http://www.climaticoanalysis.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/01/climatico-cop15-analysis.pdf>.
- Climate Action Tracker. (2011). *All Countries*. Date of Access: 17 December 2011. <http://climateactiontracker.org/countries.html>.
- Climate Interactive. (2011). *Current Climate Proposals*. 9 December 2011. Date of Access: 17 December 2011. <http://climateinteractive.org/scoreboard/scoreboard-science-and-data/current-climate-proposals-1>.
- Guardian. (2011). "Durban climate conference agrees deal to do a deal – now comes the hard part". 12 December 2011. Date of Access: 14 December 2011. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2011/dec/12/durban-climate-change-conference-2011-southafrica>.
- ICTSD (2011). "The Climate Technology Mechanism: Issue and Challenges, Information Note Number 18". International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development. March 2011. Date of Access: 14 December 2011. <http://ictsd.org/downloads/2011/04/technologymechanism.pdf>.
- IISD. (2011). *Earth Negotiations Bulletin: COP17 #1, Vol.12 No.523*. International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD). 28 November 2011. Date of Access: 14 December 2011. <http://www.iisd.ca/climate/cop17/compilation.pdf>.
- IISD. (2011). *Earth Negotiations Bulletin: COP17#3, Vol. 12 No. 525*. International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD). 30 November 2011. Date of Access: 15 December 2011. <http://www.iisd.ca/download/pdf/enb12525e.pdf>.
- IISD. (2011). *Earth Negotiations Bulletin: COP17 #7, Vol. 12 No. 529*. International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD). 5 December 2011. Date of Access: 15 December 2011. <http://www.iisd.ca/download/pdf/enb12529e.pdf>.
- IISD. (2011). *Earth Negotiations Bulletin: COP17 Final, Vol.12 No.534*. International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD). 13 December 2011. Date of Access: 14 December 2011. <http://www.iisd.ca/download/pdf/enb12534e.pdf>.
- Norton Rose LLP. (2011). "Blog: UN climate change negotiations, November-December 2011". December 2011. Date of Access: 17 December 2011. <http://www.nortonrose.com/knowledge/publications/58837/blog-un-climate-change-negotiations-durban-november-2011>.
- Reuters. (2011). "What U.N. climate talks agreed in Durban". 11 December 2011. Date of Access: 17 December 2011. <http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/12/11/us-climate-deal-idUSTRE7BA07F20111211>.
- United Nations Climate Change Secretariat. (2011). "Durban conference delivers breakthrough in international community's response to climate change." 11 December 2011. Date of Access: 17 December 2011. http://unfccc.int/files/press/press_releases_advisories/application/pdf/pr20111112cop17final.pdf.
- UNFCCC. (2011). *Consideration of further commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol – Draft conclusions proposed by the Chair, Addendum: Recommendation of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol*. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, Ad Hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol (FCCC/KP/AWG/2011/L.3/Add.1). 10 December 2011. Date of Access: 14 December 2011. <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2011/awg16/eng/l03a01.pdf>.

- UNFCCC. (2011). *Development and transfer of technologies - Draft conclusions proposed by the Chair*. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, Subsidiary Body for Implementation (FCCC/SBSTA/2011/L.22). 3 December 2012. Date of Access: 14 December 2011. <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2011/sbsta/eng/l22.pdf>.
- UNFCCC. (2011). *Draft decision on guidance on systems for providing information on how safeguards are addressed and respected and modalities relating to forest reference emission levels and forest reference levels as referred to in decision 1/CP.16, appendix I*. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, Conference of the Parties. 11 December 2011. Date of Access: 15 December 2011. http://unfccc.int/files/meetings/durban_nov_2011/decisions/application/pdf/cop17_safeguards.pdf.
- UNFCCC. (2011). *Outcome of the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention*. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, Conference of the Parties (FCCC/AWGLCA/2011/L.4). 9 December 2011. Date of Access: 11 December 2011. http://unfccc.int/files/meetings/durban_nov_2011/decisions/application/pdf/cop17_lcaoutcome.pdf.
- UNFCCC. (2011). *Report on modalities and procedures of the Technology Executive Committee*. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, Technology Executive Committee (FCCC/CP/2011/8). 30 September 2011. Date of Access: 14 December 2011. <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2011/cop17/eng/08.pdf>.
- UNFCCC. (2011). *Technology Executive Committee - modalities and procedures - Proposal by the President*. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, Conference of the Parties (FCCC/CP/2011/L.3). 8 December 2011. Date of Access: 14 December 2011. <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2011/cop17/eng/l03.pdf>.
- UNFCCC. (2011). *Views on the composition of, and modalities and procedures for, the Adaptation Committee, including linkages with other relevant institutional arrangements*. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention (FCCC/AWGLCA/2011/MISC.1). 11 March 2011. Date of Access: 15 December 2011. <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2011/awglca14/eng/misc01.pdf>.
- World Resources Institute. (2011). *Summary of Developed Country 'Fast-Start' Climate Finance Pledges*. 18 November 2011. Date of Access: 17 December 2011. http://pdf.wri.org/climate_finance_pledges_2011-11-18.pdf.

Acronyms

AAUs:	Assigned Amount Units
AFB:	Adaptation Fund Board
AOSIS:	Alliance of Small Island States
AWG-KP:	Ad-hoc Working Group on further commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol
AWG-LCA:	Ad-hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention
CCS:	Carbon Capture and Storage/Sequestration
CDM:	Clean Development Mechanism
CERs:	Certified Emission Reductions
COP:	The Conference of Parties
CMP:	The Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol
CTC:	Climate Technology Center
CTCN:	Climate Technology Center and Network
EITs:	Economies in Transition
EGTT:	Expert Group on Technology Transfer
ERUs:	Emission Reduction Units
GCF:	Green Climate Fund
GDP:	Gross Domestic Product
GEF:	Global Environment Facility
GHG:	Greenhouse Gas
IAR:	International Assessment and Review
ICA:	International Consultation and Analysis
IGOs:	Intergovernmental Organizations
IPRs:	Intellectual Property Rights
JI:	Joint Implementation
JISC:	Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee
LDCs:	Least Developed Countries
MRV:	Measurement, Reporting, and Verification
NAPs:	National Adaptation Plans
NAPAs:	National Adaptation Programmes of Action
NGO:	Non-Governmental Organization
NWP:	Nairobi Work Programme
QELRO:	Quantified Emission Limitation and Reduction Objective
REDD:	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation
RELS:	Reference Emission Levels
RLs:	Reference Levels
SBSTA:	The Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice
SBI:	Subsidiary Body for Implementation
SIDs:	Small Island Developing States
TEC:	Technology Executive Committee
UNFCCC:	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change