

ADP: Call for balanced progress in workstreams

Bonn, 14 June (Hilary Chiew and Meena Raman) Developing countries called for balance in the progress of issues under the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Actions (ADP) for the realisation of the 2015 agreement.

The ADP process under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) is being conducted in two workstreams, with workstream 1 (WS1) focusing on the agreement to be concluded by 2015, and workstream 2 (WS2) addressing the pre-2020 ambition.

Developing countries said that a successful outcome in WS2 in addressing the implementation gaps and increasing the pre-2020 ambition lays the basis for achieving future success under WS1 under the new agreement. This was viewed as being absolutely essential to build trust in the negotiations for the WS1 outcome.

These views were expressed by developing countries in a stock-taking informal plenary of the ADP held on 12 June, where the Co-chairs invited Parties to share their reflections on progress made under the two workstream round tables and workshops during the ongoing Bonn session.

During the session, in relation to discussions under WS2, as regards the process, India did not want to see concrete decisions in Warsaw without a structured and Party-driven negotiations, which it said has not started yet. (The 19th meeting of the UNFCCC Conference of Parties will take place at the end of this year in Warsaw, Poland.)

India, China and Saudi Arabia also registered strong objections to the proposed transfer of hydrofluorocarbon (HFCs) – which is a greenhouse gas (GHG) – to the Montreal Protocol on ozone depleting substances. India,

using a rich analogy, said it did not want other organisations to pluck ‘low hanging fruits’ from the UNFCCC, saying that one can pluck low-hanging fruits if it is in one’s garden; but if we do that in someone else’s, it’s called theft and if others start plucking from our garden, that is also theft. China questioned if Parties are going to be left with no GHGs to mitigate.

(A major concern is that the UNFCCC fundamental principle of common but differentiated responsibilities is not in the Montreal Protocol.)

Chairing the first session first, Co-chair of the ADP, Harald Dovland (Norway) said insights from Parties will help him and his other co-chair, Jayant Mauskar (India) in preparing a report under their own responsibilities. Parties had requested the Co-chairs to prepare handover notes for in-coming co-chairs, capturing the work done during this second part of the second session of the ADP.

The informal plenary began by collecting views on the progress of WS1.

Reflections on Workstream 1 (WS1)

Speaking for the LMDC (Like-Minded Developing Countries in Climate Change), the Philippines called for the launch of a more formal and focused process on the mandate of Durban and Doha (the 2011 and 2012 UNFCCC COP meetings). It emphasised that the group had engaged in the ADP roundtables and workshops in the April and June sessions in the belief that these would assist Parties in exchanging important views analytically and conceptually so as to advance mutual understanding and clarify issues mandated by (decisions) 1/CP17 and 2/CP18.

It called for focus on these existing and agreed “common ground” elements from Durban and Doha and to strike a balanced treatment among

and between these elements - mitigation, adaptation, financing, technology transfer, capacity building, transparency of support and action, and an emphasis on ensuring that adaptation is a core area. Parties should continue to build on these as integral, comprehensive, holistic, and interlinked components of the outcome of the ADP by 2015. However, the roundtables and workshops have not always focused on the core issues and have in fact dealt with new concepts and models for multilateral climate change actions that take us farther than the issues identified in Durban and Doha. They move us away from the Convention and what we need in 2015, said the Philippines.

It added that these informal roundtables may have been useful in fostering informal dialogue and discussion among Parties but they cannot be the means through which conclusions from the ADP Co-chairs that shape the form or content of the 2015 agreement can be derived for use as the basis for our future negotiations. It also did not see the need for the technical paper by the secretariat (produced for WS2) to be further revised.

The Philippines proposed a new call for submissions from Parties be made on the elements and key issues to be focused on by the ADP in 2014 in relation to the pillars of the Convention, and that all submissions are then made into a compilation for the consideration of the Parties. It also strongly supported a status note on 'linkages' (referring to linkages with the on-going processes under the various institutional arrangements and subsidiary bodies on the various pillars).

In this context, it suggested to structure the negotiations based on the four pillars of the Convention and focusing on how to enhance action on these pillars for the pre- and post-2020 periods. A formal, structured, open, participatory, and Party-driven negotiating process is needed in order for the ADP to be able to capture its conclusions from the discussions of this (Bonn) session. The negotiating approach, pace, and procedural and substantive progress of all issues and their elements must be appropriately sequenced and balanced, based on the four pillars of the Convention. It stressed that there must also be balance in the progress between WS1 and WS2, as the success of the work in WS 1 depends on the increased ambition that should be the result in WS2. Nevertheless, it believed that progress of

the work should be captured. In this regard, it requested the Co-chairs to ensure that the progress over the last several months is captured.

On how to proceed from Bonn to Warsaw and beyond, and in the light of the difficult situation we have found ourselves in the Subsidiary Body on Implementation (SBI) (referring to the failure of the SBI to adopt its agenda and proceed with work, following an agenda fight over a proposal by the Russian Federation, Belarus and Ukraine), it wished to seek the assurance regarding the preservation of the agenda of the ADP as Parties move from this session to the next, and from the current Co-chairs to the incoming Co-chairs.

China said its position is very clear in that the work of the ADP, including WS1 and WS2, is to achieve balance on the four pillars of the ADP and stressed that Parties are not here to rewrite or to reinterpret but to implement the Convention with clear mandate from the Doha and Durban decisions.

India agreed that there is need to move to a more focused and structured work of the ADP and build on the round tables and workshops. The mandates of Durban and Doha provides the context and the pillars for such a focused discussion namely mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology development and transfer, capacity building and transparency of actions and support. It underlined the need to balance work between the WS1 and WS2. Such a balance is inherent in the overall balance. On WS1, India said that the more it heard, the more it was convinced that if we truly need both work streams and the 2015 structure to take off in a manner which truly reflects CBDR (common but differentiated responsibilities), much more needs to be done in the pre-2020 period by way of Annex I ambition. If not, work stream I will merely become a vehicle for transferring Annex I commitments to developing countries. We need higher ambition under the KP (Kyoto Protocol) and comparable targets for non-KP Annex I Parties and call on them to show leadership.

India is convinced that the 2015 structure cannot be based solely on respective capabilities. Much of the discussions here seem to be veering towards this aspect and we cannot subscribe to it. We need to underline the UNFCCC principles, it stressed.

It also heard suggestions of a two-step process or a hybrid approach etc. It did not share these views. In fact, such approaches go against the

Convention. It militates against a common but differentiated structure we are building for the future. Article 3 (of the UNFCCC) provides the responsibilities from which commitments flow in Article 4. It underlined the need to focus on means of implementation and the importance of 'scaled up, new and additional and adequate and predictable provision of finance to developing countries' rather than invent new words for financing.

On transfer of technology, we need to access technology and address barriers to transfer of technology including IPRs (intellectual property rights) and work out innovative approaches for technology transfer and payment of royalties probably under the GCF.

India said that SBI's inability to start work has seriously impacted the future work of our Convention, including for the Warsaw COP. It further said the GCF (Green Climate Fund), the Adaptation Framework and the Technology Mechanism work had not reached the level expected and this reflects the limited and absence of actions. We do not want a low threshold for increasing actions but we need one that we can be proud of in the pre-2020 period, it said.

Saudi Arabia said it looked forward to an agreement that builds on the Convention's principles and provisions, stressing that this platform must assure a balanced outcome taking into account the over-riding needs of developing countries to achieve sustainable development in accordance to their national circumstances.

Singapore referred to three clusters of commonality: The first cluster - the importance of acknowledging national circumstances; that actions will have to be nationally determined; and that these would exist in a broader framework of international rules that strengthen the multilateral system. The second cluster - the new 2015 agreement which is applicable to all; every Party would make contributions to the global effort in accordance with Article 4.1; universal participation that is supported by all. The third cluster – give balanced treatment to mitigation and adaptation, also finance, technology transfer and capacity building.

It outlined areas for further work: (i) how to reflect and address the leadership role of developed countries in the new agreement, which developed countries have acknowledged; (ii) how do we enhance the importance of

existing institutions and strengthen linkages between new institutions and the new agreement such that there is no duplication; (iii) how do we capture modalities that will provide ground rules on which Parties can formulate their own contribution. Need for clarity on modalities and ground rules before they can come forward on their global effort with the clear understanding with the modalities; (iv) on the notion of *ex ante* clarity, which is supposed to accompany actions by Parties, it said several ideas were floated on processes, procedures or steps. Singapore asked how do we ensure rules that facilitate universal application in incentivizing national action rather than penalizing participation in the process.

Cuba wanted to see the ADP moving into a formal negotiating setting soon and reminded that the work is operating under the mandate of the Convention's principles and provisions and national circumstances will be respected.

Malaysia believed that conceptual and analytical discussions have been useful. Through these discussions, it noted that there is general concurrence that the 2015 agreement should be based on the principles, provisions and annexes of the Convention and that no further reinterpretation is needed. We have also heard how in furthering our discussions, we should be strictly guided by the elements contained in decisions from Durban and Doha, it said.

It also noted strong views that the process proceeds in a balanced and comprehensive manner across both workstreams and across all elements, adding that it will be critical that the ADP agenda that has served us well during these two sessions remain unchanged as we continue our work under the new Co-chairs in Warsaw.

Nicaragua asserted that there will only be progress in the ADP if the principles of the Convention, in particular equity and CBDR, are respected and guide the process. It said there must be a complete balance of the enhanced actions of the four pillars. Financial provision, it added, is a must, otherwise the work of the ADP is just a conversation. It called for balance between the two workstreams and the process to proceed in a formal manner.

Nepal for the Least Developed Countries (LDCs) said there is need to ensure that the work of the ADP should be guided by science to achieve the objectives of the Convention. The discussion in Warsaw should begin compiling the views of the 2015 agreement.

Nauru for the **Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS)** said there is need to discuss the key pillars of mitigation, adaptation, finance and technology transfer as well as the linkages between existing institutions and the work in the workstreams.

Australia said we need a collaborative approach and the responsibilities must be based on science and hoped that the application of the CBDR and equity principles will advance and not hold back the work. It understood the characteristics of the 2015 agreement to be one of global participation, is fair and dynamic. Mitigation is key and adaptation will have its place. It would like to see the idea of a hybrid approach (in addressing mitigation actions) to be elaborated further.

The **European Union** noted the importance of upfront clarification of mitigation commitments and whether the pledges are fair and collectively ambitious enough. It suggested that the Co-chairs prioritise issues based on what they had heard and welcomed submissions on adaptation and the means of implementation. Parties must be specific in what they are asking as these will feed into the ministerial dialogue at Warsaw.

Japan stressed the importance of the agreement to apply to all and contribution of Parties should be considered fair by others; mitigation and transparency should be the elements of the agreement as well as *ex ante* clarification, common accounting rules and *ex post* review.

Norway said Parties need to build on existing institutions and how the new agreement can add value to them. It said progress was made on how mitigation commitments can be approached based on national circumstances and be explored through an international consultative process with transparency. There is need to define the timeframe of the commitment and how to frame adaptation in a more concrete way.

Switzerland reckoned that common understanding was emerging on the need for broad participation, fair differentiation and benefits of a rules-based approach. While Parties may not be able to arrive at a formula, it was helpful to understand each other and what others see as indicators of fair differentiation.

Turkey said the design of the climate change regime for post-2020 should be based on the three pillars of ambition, participation and implementation. It said while the principles of the Convention must be fully and correctly

applied, they should change with time, adding that emissions cap should consider the dynamism and differences of responsibilities.

Chile for the **Independent Alliance of Latin American and the Caribbean (AILAC)** said balance is needed for broad consensus and can be reached with striking balance between national circumstances, a rules-based regime and comparability of efforts.

The United States said the mode of work was useful to formulate key ideas. On substance, it wanted an agreement, which is ambitious, dictated by science, is applicable to all, and will last for a long time. Mitigation is the core of the agreement and adaptation needs to have an anchor. On mitigation, it reiterated the need for nationally determined actions with rules, transparency in accounting and an MRV (measurement, reporting and verification) system which is flexible. It said that the application of principles of the Convention must evolve over time and be current.

Among the suggestions for further work, it proposed the following: (i) on the different aspects of the outcome, some could be reflected in the agreement and others in implementing decisions; (ii) the timing for putting forward contributions to make the agreement effective; and (iii) the exploration of rules that are applicable to all.

The **Republic of Korea** said for mitigation, the guiding principles are to ensure broad and universal participation within a rules-based regime. At Warsaw, Parties should discuss the type of commitments, commitment period and nature of commitments. It said there must be clear strategy on low emissions development and addressing the insufficient means of implementation. The operationalisation of the GCF will give positive signal and be a test of the seriousness of the 2015 agreement.

New Zealand said there were potential areas of common ground. Parties were not renegotiating the Convention but there is difference of view about what we are reinterpreting. We are not reinterpreting the principles but about how we give effect to them in the new agreement. That is an important distinction, it said. Mitigation is a critical part of the agreement. While adaptation is important, mitigation and adaptation are likely to be reflected differently. Finance will continue to flow, it added.

On the design of the new agreement, there were many common ideas on a hybrid approach, combining a top down and a bottom up approach. There were, however, different concepts on what such a hybrid approach means. In reference to nationally determined commitments or actions, it said there would be a process for consultation before inscription. Parties need to understand and compare commitments with upfront information, which are rules-based.

New Zealand said that there should also be flexibility in the new agreement to deal with particular national circumstances. It was of the view that flexibility should not be without constraints and a rules-based framework is needed. On what the agreement should seek to do, universal participation is the first and foremost priority. It heard many views on Parties contributing with their capabilities and national circumstances.

Ambition, said New Zealand, was a common theme to give effect to the objective of the Convention. The agreement should set the direction of travel and is not a two way street. There needed to be a process to update and improve contribution over time.

It said Parties differed on how fairness is to be achieved in the new agreement. There is disagreement if fairness should be defined in advance. On the form of the agreement, it must be durable, and evolve over time. An emerging commonality was for a core legal agreement that is supported by implementing decisions. There should not be a duplication of existing arrangements. Further work was needed on what the linkages to the existing arrangements looks like. It said that Parties had not addressed mechanisms needed to deliver undertakings and there is need for an incentive based approach rather than one that is punitive, said New Zealand.

Reflections on Workstream (WS2)

This session was chaired by Mauskar (India) and he invited Parties to indicate progress and where work is needed and what are the actions to be taken in Warsaw and beyond.

Venezuela for the LMDC said increasing the mitigation ambition in the pre-2020 period is an extremely important component of the work of the ADP. A successful outcome in WS2 in fulfilling the implementation gaps and increasing

pre-2020 ambition lays the basis for achieving future success in WS1. Increasing the pre-2020 ambition shall primarily be achieved through the implementation of the second commitment period (CP2) of the Kyoto Protocol and the outcome of the Bali Action Plan. The pre-2020 ambition must be addressed in a comprehensive manner, covering mitigation, adaptation and finance, technology transfer, and capacity building.

It regretted that Annex1 Parties did not show the high ambition in terms of their emission reduction targets that science requires of them. The follow-up from Doha in this regard is most critical for ramping up the targets both under the KP and for comparability of efforts for the non-KP Annex 1 Parties. This clearly highlights the importance of the linkage between the work of the subsidiary bodies and the ADP, said Venezuela.

It expressed concerns and found unacceptable proposals, which sought to discuss a selective list of issues as sectoral activities under WS2, some of which imply imposing additional burdens on developing countries, contrary to the Convention. Developed countries must increase their mitigation ambition mainly through their domestic efforts. Any international or regional initiatives must not introduce any new or additional commitments for developing countries.

Venezuela said that for developing countries, their contribution to global mitigation efforts is now far greater than that of developed countries. However, such efforts have been largely self-funded. In this regard, there should be a clear roadmap for developed countries to fulfil their financial support in the period of 2013 to 2020 in order to meet the goal of providing US\$100 billion per year by 2020, and barriers to technology transfer, especially IPRs, must be addressed. The early and full operationalisation, during the pre-2020 period, of the mechanisms for the provision of support including particularly the actual delivery of such support to developing countries in measurable, reportable, and verifiable ways, will be essential. It is important to recognise that WS 2 is not about shifting the responsibility of the developed countries to the developing countries and from Annex 1 to Non-Annex 1.

Venezuela stressed that it is equally important to understand that if the developed countries had

lived up to their commitments under the Convention, we would not need to discuss any action under WS2 since the ambition gap would have been closed, not just in mitigation but also in adaptation and means of implementation. If the Annex 1 countries had lived up to the requirement of pledges of 40% emission reduction as required for by science, the mitigation gap would have been closed. This discussion is not taking place in a vacuum. It is taking place in the back drop of the fact that developing countries are doing more than developed countries in the pre-2020 period. Consequently, any attempt to ask greater mitigation action by developing countries should be preceded by the developed countries meeting their commitments and bridging the gap.

For a 'practical and result-oriented' approach, the Annex 1 Parties should immediately ratchet up their ambition and conditionalities on their pledges removed. Annex 1 Parties in the CP2 of KP are urged to ramp up their ambitions as well. There have been suggestions on some specific sectors for raising this ambition gap. At the outset, it should be in conformity with CBDR. Further, Venezuela called for sensitivity when sectors especially HFCs, agriculture and energy are selected.

On why proposals are made to remove HFCs from the UNFCCC to the Montreal Protocol, Venezuela said that it was so because the CBDR principle does not apply to the Montreal Protocol. Consequently, developing countries would be forced to take phasing out targets affecting our industry adversely. Further, there is no commercially reliable technology available. It could not accept this proposal. It also called for caution on mitigation issues dealing with agriculture and energy, where we should be sensitive to the vulnerabilities of countries as recognised in the Convention about countries dependent on fossil fuels, as well as the millions who depend on agriculture for their livelihood and undertake subsistence farming.

China said WS2 was useful to discuss the mitigation gap and means of implementation and it is where developed countries can show their leadership. In response to the suggestion to seek external assistance, it asserted that the Convention covers every aspect of climate change and in that sense, everything related to climate change is covered and 'nothing is outside'. In the KP, it said there is language defining issues that can be handled by other

international bodies. It was deeply concerned that some GHGs may be dealt with by other international bodies. It questioned if this had to do with a lack of a financial mechanism. It was worried that while Parties are talking about enhancing actions but things are happening in the opposite direction.

India underlined the need for balance between WS1 and WS2 and the need for greater effort by Annex I countries under pre-2020 for a meaningful launch of the post-2020 arrangements. For India, WS2 is about fulfilment of the commitments of the developed countries, of raising ambitions under the KP and for comparable efforts for Annex 1 Parties outside of the KP. It called for the leadership of developed countries.

On the process, it did not want to see concrete decisions on WS2 issues in Warsaw without structured and Party-driven negotiations. This, it said, has not started yet.

India also did not want other organisations to pluck low hanging fruits from the UNFCCC, referring to the proposal by developed countries to transfer HFCs to the Montreal Protocol. It said one can pluck low-hanging fruits if it is in one's garden but if we do that in someone else's, it's called theft and if others start plucking from our garden, that is also theft. It reminded Parties that UNFCCC is about integrity and we have to abide by high ethics and make sure that theft is not committed in the developing countries' 'garden'.

HFCs are ironically to replace HCFCs; they are not ozone depleting substances. It has an impact on industries and has socio-economic impacts, used in air-conditioners, used in treatment of asthma and other diseases. It asked why HFCs cannot be phased out under the UNFCCC. India expressed appreciation on the clarification of China on the recent China-US agreement and the reassurance that it is being dealt with under the Convention. It is strange to say that do it under the Montreal Protocol and account for it in the UNFCCC as this only serves the interest of Annex 1 Parties. When there are no commercially viable alternatives, we still do this under the UNFCCC or we cannot come to conclusions in Warsaw.

On energy and agriculture too, it agreed with the LMDC. In respect of agriculture we should be careful not to ignore the millions in all developing countries, who depend on it for their

livelihood and living and undertake subsistence agriculture. India said there was a suggestion having a technical paper on sectoral ambition and this is premature. Greater clarity is first needed on the context to be addressed before there is a technical paper. It said Parties have to cooperate on this subject, otherwise, it is extremely unrealistic to think that it can be resolved in Warsaw.

Brazil said WS2 is absolutely key to build trust for the negotiation we are going to have in WS1. It said there is some truth in that the UNFCCC Parties are equipped to negotiate but not to implement as shown by the poor mitigation, adaptation, finance and technology transfer.

It agreed that WS2 is not an exercise to transfer additional responsibilities to developing countries, stressing that the solution is not what developing countries are going to do but developed countries have to take the lead. But this is something we do not see at the level that is essential to build the trust to lead us to do our enhanced actions and it is better to incentivise than to penalise. It expressed concerns that many developing countries are not ready for some of the ideas raised regarding WS1 because we do not see progress in WS2. It further said Warsaw should show important progress in the trust-building process and should not rush on WS1 if we are not capable of doing what is needed in WS2.

Echoing Brazil, **Saudi Arabia** said the work here should not be a negotiation exercise but is about implementation and enhancement of what we already have and it is tied closely to the urgent implementation of the CP2, no later than 2014. It said actions in WS2 should be Party-driven and not sector-driven with regards to agriculture and energy. It felt that there are still lots of discussion to be had and therefore it is premature to take a decision in Warsaw on WS2.

Indonesia said there are compelling views from developing countries calling for enhancement and urgent implementation of actions with leadership of developed countries which is not only needed for trust-building for the pre-2020 agreement but also for integrity.

Nepal for the LDCs said closing the 8 to 13 gigatonne gap is still possible using current technology; hence, all countries have an important role in this but the developed countries have the critical leadership role.

Nauru for AOSIS said Parties spent too much time exploring the options instead of implementing them. Referring to its proposal on focusing mitigation in the field of energy efficiency, renewable energy and carbon capture and storage, it said the model can be used to review mitigation in other areas as well. It recognised that energy alone cannot address the mitigation gap but it is a good start.

The Philippines stressed that WS2 is the basis for whatever new agreement that we will have. It is not a new Convention but it is implementation of the Convention itself at last. It pointed out that Article 4.1 of the Convention which laid out the commitment did not mention 'respective capabilities' but only CBDR and the only thing we need to do is to finance adaptation and not to put new responsibilities on adaptation on developing countries, and expressed concern that the GCF is forcing through private sector involvement to profit from investment in developing countries. It sees the means of implementation as fully integrated in the core of the agreement and not a side decoration.

Malaysia noted that first of all, time is not on our side. Enhancing ambition during the pre-2020 period is grounded in the work under the second commitment period of the KP, and the as-yet incomplete work under the Bali Action Plan. On the former, ratification, leadership by developed countries is needed. On the latter, Malaysia is of the view that the informal and conceptual mode of work employed thus far should give way to more structured formal discussions on how to enhance mitigation action in developing countries through the provision of finance and the transfer of technology in accordance with the principle of CBDR under the Convention. We have heard that while developing countries are already implementing actions on a voluntary basis, even more could be accomplished through the provision of much needed means of implementation. It noted the hopeful and constructive paper put forward by AOSIS and the technical and high-level approach that has been proposed.

The work under WS2 will send a strong signal to the work under WS1, Malaysia said. Urgency is needed to ensure that the CP2 targets of the KP and comparable emissions reductions by non-KP parties contribute significantly to closing the emissions gap, and reassure developing countries that any pledges they make will be backed by

sufficient, predictable and additional finance and access to relevant mitigation technologies.

Iran said the WS2 work must capture the principle of CBDR of the Convention and the ADP should pave the way for the implementation of these elements and the balance between mitigation and adaptation actions. It further said the adverse effect of unilateral measures from the implementation of response measures by developed countries on developing countries and the problem of IPR as a barrier to technology transfer should be addressed in the new agreement.

Argentina expressed concern over the sectoral issues. For example, it said the energy sector is essential to development and poverty eradication. It needs to assure access to energy service where 1.4 billion people do not have access, therefore, mitigation in sectoral issues will be premature at this stage. On unilateral measures, it said we are here to enhance implementation of Article 3.5 of the Convention, which eschewed the use of trade protectionism disguised as mitigation measures.

The **European Union** supported the AOSIS proposal on the theme and technical paper leading to its being updated for a technology workshop in Warsaw and the ministerial dialogue to provide clear direction for 2015. On the CP2 of the KP, it said the EU is already working intensely to ratify as soon as the legislative processes allow it. It said the group exceeded its target in the first commitment period and will raise its commitment but it is not enough and will have to find ways for all Parties to reduce their emissions.

Japan said there are many ideas and a number of initiatives inside and outside of the UNFCCC and Parties should therefore focus on concrete actions so that we will be able to have concrete outcomes in Warsaw. On the issue of HFCs, renewable energy and energy efficiency, Parties should present submissions on best practices and elaborate their proposal for COP 19 and the Secretariat should provide a technical paper on them.

Australia realised that closing the gap required all to collaborate not only on existing sources but also those that will lock us in a dangerous pathway.

Switzerland said it is clear that WS2 will only deliver if we engaged in a constructive and cooperative manner but taking a finger-pointing approach of the shortcomings of others will not bring us forward. It wanted a technical paper to help focus on the work. It said developing common understanding of mitigation potential is the best basis for ministerial dialogue at COP19.

In conclusion, Co-chair Dovland said the outgoing co-chairs will prepare a note on ideas and views expressed at the informal plenary. He said there seems to be a lot of misunderstanding on the HFCs issue and recommended Parties to discuss this matter in their bilateral contacts, which could pave the road for a constructive way forward. In reference to views on ratification of the CP2 of the KP, he said 140 ratifications are needed for the CP2 to enter into force.