



SUMMARY OF DURBAN OUTCOMES OF THE 17TH SESSION OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES (COP 17/CMP 7)

Contributors: Gebru Jember, Climate Change Forum – Ethiopia (CCF-E)
 Mahlet Eyassu, Forum for Environment (FfE)
 Mahlet Tadesse, Forum for Environment (FfE)
 Alebachew Adem, Forum for Social Studies (FSS)
 Rahel Belete, Action for Development (AfD)

Compiled and Edited by: Kibrom Tadesse, Forum for Environment (FfE)



2011



ECSNCC

Hosted by



Forum for Environment

Acronyms

| | |
|---------|--|
| AAUs | Assigned Amount Units |
| AOSIS | Alliance of Small Island States |
| AWG-DP | Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action |
| AWG-LCA | Ad hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention |
| AWG-KP | Ad hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol |
| BAU | Business as Usual |
| CDM | Clean Development Mechanism |
| CMP | Meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of Parties to the Kyoto Protocol |
| COP | Conference of the Parties |
| CTCN | Climate Technology Center and Networks |
| EU | European Union |
| FAB | Fair, Ambitious and Binding |
| GCF | Green Climate Fund |
| GEF | Global Environment Facility |
| IAR | International Assessment & Review |
| ICA | International Consultation and Analysis |
| IPCC | Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change |
| KP | Kyoto Protocol |
| LDCs | Least Developed Countries |
| MRV | Measuring Reporting and Verification |
| NAMAs | Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions |
| NAPs | National Adaptation Plans |
| NWP | Nairobi Work Program |
| QELROs | Quantified Emission Limitation and Reduction Objectives |
| SBI | Subsidiary Body for Implementation |
| SBSTA | Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice |
| TEC | Technology Executive Committee |
| TM | Technology Mechanism |
| TT | Technology Transfer |
| UNFCCC | United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change |
| US | United States |
| USD | United States Dollar |

Table of Contents

| | | | |
|---|---|---|----|
| 1. INTRODUCTION _____ | 1 | 5.3 Economic and social consequences of response measures __ | 7 |
| 2. AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON THE DURBAN PLATFORM FOR ENHANCED ACTION (AWG-DP) _____ | 1 | 5.4 Loss and Damage _____ | 7 |
| 3. KYOTO PROTOCOL _____ | 2 | 5.5 Nairobi Work Program (NWP) __ | 7 |
| 3.1 Quantified Emission Limitation and Reduction Objectives (QELROs) __ | 2 | 6. FINANCE _____ | 7 |
| 3.2 Decisions Under the Kyoto Protocol _____ | 2 | 6.1 Green Climate Fund _____ | 8 |
| 3.3 Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) 3 | | 6.1.1 Legal Status _____ | 8 |
| 3.4 Outstanding Issues _____ | 3 | 6.1.2 Role of Private Sector Financing | 8 |
| 4. MITIGATION _____ | 3 | 6.1.3 Relationship of the GCF with the COP 8 | |
| 4.1 Introduction _____ | 3 | 6.1.4 Interim Secretariat _____ | 9 |
| 4.2 Enhanced Mitigation Actions by Developed Countries _____ | 4 | 6.1.5 GCF Board _____ | 9 |
| 4.3 Enhanced Mitigation Action by Developing Countries _____ | 4 | 6.1.6 Other Decisions on the GCF ____ | 9 |
| 4.3.1 Deviation from Business as Usual (BAU) 4 | | 6.2 Long-Term Finance _____ | 10 |
| 4.3.2 Registry _____ | 4 | 6.3 Standing Committee _____ | 10 |
| 4.3.3 Biennial update reports by developing countries _____ | 5 | 7. TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER _____ | 10 |
| 4.3.4 International Consultation and Analysis (ICA) _____ | 5 | 7.1 Technology Mechanism (TM) _ | 10 |
| 4.4 Outstanding Issues _____ | 5 | 7.2 Operationalization of the Technology Mechanism _____ | 11 |
| 5. ADAPTATION _____ | 6 | 7.3 Sources of Finance for the TM __ | 11 |
| 5.1 National Adaptation Plans (NAPs) 6 | | 7.4 Links and Reporting _____ | 11 |
| 5.2 Establishment of Adaptation Committee _____ | 6 | 7.5 Outstanding Issues _____ | 11 |
| | | 8. CONCLUSION _____ | 12 |

1. INTRODUCTION

The United Nations Climate Change Conference in Durban, South Africa, was held from 28 November - 11 December 2011. The conference involved a series of events, including the seventeenth session of the Conference of the Parties (COP 17) to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP 7).

In support of these two main bodies, four other bodies convened: the resumed 14th session of the *Ad hoc* Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention (AWG-LCA); the resumed 16th session of the *Ad hoc* Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP); and the 35th sessions of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) and the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA).

The Conference drew over 12,480 participants, including over 5400 government officials, 5800 representatives of UN bodies and agencies, intergovernmental organizations and civil society organizations, and more than 1200 members of the media.

An Ethiopian delegation comprising of government, civil society and few private sector actors were part of the negotiation. On the international level, diverse civil society

members attended, following up the negotiations closely. There were rallies, marches and standoffs during different parts of the negotiations where the civil society tried to influence the outcomes as best as it can.

Though there is still a long way to go to reach a Fair, Ambitious and Binding (FAB) deal, the negotiations ended with some progress in sight. Some of the major outcomes were that governments, including 35 industrialised countries, agreed a second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol from January 1, 2013 and end either on December 31, 2017 or December 31, 2020. In addition, a decision to launch a process to develop a protocol, an agreed outcome with legal force under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change applicable to all Parties, through a subsidiary body under the Convention and established with the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (AWG-DP) launching the process.

This brief summarized the outcomes of the COP 17 in the different areas and topics of the negotiation.

2. AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON THE DURBAN PLATFORM FOR ENHANCED ACTION (AWG-DP)

This decision on the Establishment of an *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action, is part of the Durban Package, and launches a process to develop a protocol, another legal instrument or an agreed outcome with legal force under the Convention applicable to all parties, through a

new subsidiary body under the Convention known as the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action, starting its work in the first half of 2012.

The decision also:

- Extends the AWG-LCA for one year in order for it to continue its work;
- Decides the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (AWG-DP) shall plan its work in the first half of 2012 drawing upon submissions by parties and the work of the SBs;
- Decides the AWG-DP shall complete its work as early as possible, but no later than 2015, in order to adopt this protocol, legal instrument or agreed outcome with legal force at COP 21 for it to come into effect and be implemented from 2020;
- Decides that the process shall raise the level of ambition and shall be informed, *inter alia*, by the Fifth Assessment Report of the IPCC, the outcomes of the 2013-2015 Review and the work of the subsidiary bodies;
- Launches a work plan on enhancing mitigation ambition to identify and explore options for a range of actions that can close the ambition gap with a view to ensuring the highest possible mitigation efforts by all parties; and
- Decides to hold an in session workshop at the first negotiating session in 2012 to consider options and ways for increasing ambition and possible further actions.

3. KYOTO PROTOCOL

3.1 Quantified Emission Limitation and Reduction Objectives (QELROs)

In Durban early informal consultations helped to clarify the technicalities of the second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol, especially the two-stage approach that defers the definition of quantified emission limitation and reduction objectives (QELROs). Unlike the Kyoto Protocol which was driven by an overall target, the new approach is based on Parties submitting their voluntary QELROs by May 1, 2012 in a “pledge and translate” exercise. Then, Parties’ unilateral pledges will be converted to QELROs without reference to an overall global mitigation target, not to mention one that is evidence-based. This approach cannot be accepted without skepticism regarding the prospect for the ambitious effort required to stay within the global temperature range of 1.5 to 2.0 degrees Celsius.

3.2 Decisions Under the Kyoto Protocol

The decisions made under the KP:

- Decides that the second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol shall begin on 1 January 2013 and end either on 31 December 2017 or 31 December 2020, to be decided by the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol at its seventeenth session;
- Proposed amendments to Annex B to the Kyoto Protocol (Annex I);
- Proposed amendments to the Kyoto Protocol (Annex III);
- An aim to ensure the aggregate emissions of greenhouse gases by parties included in Annex I are reduced by at least 25-40 percent below 1990 levels by 2020;
- Notes the quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets to be implemented

by parties included in Annex I as communicated by them, and presented in Annex I to the decision, and of the intention to convert these targets to QELROs for the second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol;

- An invitation to parties listed in Annex I to the decision to submit information on their QELROs for the second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol by 1 May 2012; and
- A request to the AWG-KP to assess the implications of the carryover of Assigned Amount Units (AAUs) to the second commitment period.

3.3 Clean Development Mechanism (CDM)

Regarding the CDM, the decision notes the annual report for 2010-2011 of the CDM Executive Board. It also welcomes the launch of the CDM policy dialogue; designates operational entities to carry out sector-specific validation specified in an annex; and requests the Executive Board to develop appropriate voluntary measures, and to continue its work to improve the procedures on programs of activities.

3.4 Outstanding Issues

The Durban outcome was acceptable in terms of avoiding the possibility of occurrence of a gap between the first and second commitment period. There are, however, outstanding issues which need further consideration like:

- Currently, parties ready for the second commitment period cover less than 20% of the global emission;

- Besides, their pledges are far from what has been recommended by science;
- The pledges are also accompanied by loopholes (hot air);
- With these limitations, if the commitment period is to be eight years, their commitment will add very little for the integrity of the environment; and
- Annex I Parties, which are escaping the second commitment period, and not party to the Kyoto need to come on board or need to have comparable effort to limit their emission.

4. MITIGATION

4.1 Introduction

Enhanced action on mitigation is essential to meet the global goal of holding temperature rise below 2 degrees Celsius. A legal agreement with binding mitigation commitments by both developed and developing countries, especially from major economies, provides the strongest basis for global mitigation action and increases Parties' confidence that they are part of a committed international effort. This need not include mitigation obligations for the least developed countries.

Developed countries should set ambitious emission reduction targets clearly indicating their emission reduction targets domestically and should not shift their burden to developing countries through a market mechanism.

In Durban, countries have not adequately addressed the need for mitigation and it was clear that there was a lack of mitigation

ambition. According to experts, the current scenario is leading us to a path of a 4°C global temperature rise which is going to be a threat for LDCs & Small Island States.

Countries like the EU, Australia and Switzerland were pushing for the establishment of a common rule based accounting system to narrow the ambition gap. On the other hand, the US was saying the development of common accounting rules was not mandated by Cancun Agreement and suggested using IPCC methodologies.

4.2 Enhanced Mitigation Actions by Developed Countries

The concept of International Assessment & Review (IAR) initiated with the intention of developed countries to provide better information on their progress in fulfilling their respective reduction commitments. On the IAR informal session, Bolivia called for a compliance system and a set of penalties. Mali, for the African Group, suggested a robust compliance mechanism, while China stated that discussions on developed and developing countries mitigation efforts should remain separate.

Modalities and procedures of IAR agreed in Durban and mentioned that it will be revised on the basis of experience gained on the first IAR, no later than 2016. This multilateral assessment will comprise an in depth review, for each party, which is going to be recorded by the secretariat of UNFCCC.

The first IAR should commence two months after the submission of the 1st round of biennial reports by developed countries in January of 2014. The biennial reports shall take

into account the national circumstance of each country submitting their report

4.3 Enhanced Mitigation Action by Developing Countries

4.3.1 Deviation from Business as Usual (BAU)

There is no common view on what deviation means, whether it relates to the ambitions or diversity of mitigation actions. In addition, the diversity of mitigation actions – how and where to inform on updated NAMAs, whether informing should be on a voluntary basis or not, and whether it should be in the UNFCCC document or only in the registry are not clear.

In the final decision, developing countries are invited to submit more information relating to NAMAs, including underlying assumptions, methodologies and support needed for implementation of NAMAs and estimated mitigation outcomes. Discussions will continue in 2012 sessions, to further the understanding of the diversity of mitigation actions and any support needed for the implementation of these actions.

4.3.2 Registry

The main function of the registry is recording of NAMAs seeking international support and facilitating matching NAMAs with support available by providing and directing information to parties. Domestically implemented NAMAs should also be recorded separately. The Registry is suggested to be developed as a dynamic, web-based platform managed by a dedicated team in the Secretariat.

Parties, the entity or entities entrusted with the operation of the financial mechanism, including the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and the Green Climate Fund (GCF), multilateral, bilateral and other public donors, and private and non-governmental organizations that are in a position to do so, are invited to submit to the Secretariat, as appropriate, information on financial, technological and capacity-building support available and/or provided for the preparation and/or implementation of NAMAs.

4.3.3 Biennial update reports by developing countries

Guidelines adopted for the preparation of biennial update reports by non-Annex I or developing country parties affirms that the guidelines shall respect the diversity of mitigation actions and provide flexibility for non-Annex I parties to report information, while providing an understanding of actions taken. Non-Annex I parties, consistent with their capabilities and level of support provided for reporting, should submit their first biennial update report by December 2014.

4.3.4 International Consultation and Analysis (ICA)

The objective of ICA is to have improved transparency of mitigation actions and effects by developing countries. Countries like India, Brazil and Indonesia stressed that ICA should be less burdensome than IAR by developed countries. Capacity building and learning-by-doing are important aspects of ICA, but there are capacity constraints at present and building capacity takes time. It is decided that the first round of ICA to be conducted for developing countries, commencing within six

months of the submission of the first round of biennial update reports by December 2014.

4.4 Outstanding Issues

Despite progresses during the negotiations regarding mitigation, the following issues are still to be dealt with in upcoming sessions.

- Clear, complete and standardized information on all pledges for mitigation actions and targets;
- Establish international guidelines and rules for accounting of quantified emission reduction targets and actions;
- Quantify emission outcomes, based on additional information in the first biennial reports including quantified emissions outcomes for developed countries and estimated emission outcomes for developing countries; and
- Adopt legally-binding commitments in relation to emission reduction outcomes for developed country Parties and implementation of mitigation actions by developing country Parties.

As it clearly shown in the above statements, most of the issues have been left for further clarification in the upcoming workshops and negotiations. There is still no clear understanding of the major issues in the emission reduction targets (assumptions & conditions related to the ambition of the pledges by each of the countries). Rather, it is decided to continue in 2012 the process of clarifying the developed country Parties' quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets. Delivering a clear framework for emission reduction target should involve a process of learning and capacity building for

all countries, but especially for developing countries.

5. ADAPTATION

5.1 National Adaptation Plans (NAPs)

One major expectation for Durban was the crafting of a decision on National Adaptation Plans (NAPs). Durban needed to deliver a decision that formalizes and elaborates this process and outlines the guidelines and modalities for Least Developed Countries and other developing countries to benefit from the process, clearly articulating the role, responsibility, and functions that the UNFCCC will offer, support, and facilitate. Such decision was expected to ensure a process entailing such efforts as workshops, forums and expert meetings to facilitate south-south learning. The expectation with regard to the specific form and format of national adaptation plans and strategies was that they should be decided by each country, including whether to create a stand-alone plan or to incorporate adaptation needs and actions into existing strategic climate change or poverty alleviation and development plans. The global process was expected to ensure a non-prescriptive and supportive of a country-driven, flexible, and iterative national-level planning and implementation.

The COP decision states, inter alia, that the national adaptation plan process should not be prescriptive, nor result in the duplication of in-country efforts, but should rather facilitate country-owned, country-driven action. The second section outlines the process to enable

LDCs to formulate and implement national adaptation plans, and has subsections on guidelines, modalities, and financial arrangements for the formulation and implementation of national adaptation plans. The decision requests the Adaptation Committee to consider in its work plan the relevant modalities for supporting interested developing countries that are not LDCs to plan, prioritize and implement their national adaptation planning measures, and invites operating entities of, inter alia, the financial mechanism of the Convention to provide financial and technical support.

5.2 Establishment of Adaptation Committee

Regarding composition, the COP decides the Committee shall comprise 16 members to be elected by the COP as follows:

- Two members for each of the five UN regional groups;
- One member from a small island developing state;
- One member from an LDC;
- Two Annex I party members; and
- Two non-Annex I party members.

The COP also decides that the Adaptation Committee shall operate under the authority of, and be accountable to, the COP, and requests the Committee to report annually to the COP, develop a three-year plan for its work in its first year of operation, engage and develop linkages with all adaptation-related work programs, bodies and institutions under the Convention and engage with relevant institutions, organizations, frameworks,

networks and centers outside of the Convention.

5.3 Economic and social consequences of response measures

COP decision recognizes that social and economic development and poverty eradication are the first and overriding priorities of developing countries and thus a forum *and work program on unintended consequences of climate change actions and policies were established. The COP decision further:*

- Urges parties in implementing policies to promote a just transition of the workforce;
- Urges developed country parties to assist developing country parties to promote economic diversification in the context of sustainable development;
- Urges parties to give full consideration to the positive and negative impacts of the implementation of response measures on society; and
- Recognizes the decision that establishes the Forum to Implement the Work Program on the Impact of the Implementation of Response Measures, and consolidates all progressive discussions related to response measures under the Convention.

5.4 Loss and Damage

The decision on approaches to address loss and damage associated with climate change impacts in developing countries that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change to enhance adaptive capacity sets out a work program on loss and damage. The decision requests SBI to continue the implementation of the work

program on loss and damage and take into account the questions mentioned in the annex to the decision on risk assessment, and approaches to, loss and damage. The COP further invites parties and relevant organizations to, *inter alia*, engage a large and diverse representation of experts in undertaking work under the thematic areas. The decision also recognizes the need to explore a range of possible approaches and potential mechanisms, including an international mechanism, to address loss and damage.

5.5 Nairobi Work Program (NWP)

Delegates were briefed on the recent IPCC Special Report on Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change Adaptation. The issue was referred to an informal group, during which Bolivia supported future work on vulnerable stakeholder groups, including women, and highlighted indigenous knowledge and key sectors, such as water. The decision invites parties and relevant organizations to submit to the Secretariat by September 17, 2012 their views on potential areas of future work under the NWP, and requests the Secretariat to compile those submissions.

6. FINANCE

In the Cancun agreement (COP16), a decision of collective commitment by developed countries to provide new and additional resources for adaptation and mitigation actions of developing countries of USD 30 billion for the years 2010-2012 and a goal of mobilizing jointly USD 100 billion per year by 2020 to address the needs of developing countries was passed.

The three major elements on Finance that were discussed in detail in Durban were the Green Climate Fund, Long Term Finance and the Standing Committee.

6.1 Green Climate Fund

It is to be recalled that one of the biggest achievements of the 16th session of the Conference of Parties (COP 16) was a decision to establish the Green Climate Fund to be designed by the Transitional Committee. The Transitional Committee comprised of 40 members, 25 from developing countries and 15 from developed countries. The Transitional Committee met four times in 2011 working with the Technical Support Unit that was set up in the United Nations Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) secretariat to design the governing instrument of the Green Climate Fund. The draft report of the work of the Transitional Committee was presented to the Conference of Parties (COP) for consideration but not for adoption as a consensus could not be reached in the last meeting mainly due to reservations from the US and Saudi Arabia.

In Durban other Parties such as the ALBA group (Bolivia, Cuba and Nicaragua) were asking to open the instrument as they had some concerns while other groups such as Africa, AOSIS, LDC and EU asked the report to be adopted as it is. Following with continuous dialogue with Parties and the COP presidency, it was decided to have a covering decision to the governing instrument to resolve some of the issues. The main contentious issues were legal status, relationship to the COP, the role of private sector financing, establishing the Board and establishing an interim secretariat.

6.1.1 Legal Status

All developing countries have been pushing for an international legal personality of the fund so that it can ensure direct access. In the covering decision it was decided the fund to have juridical personality and legal capacity through the host country. Parties are also invited to express their interest to host the GCF by April 15, 2012. The host country will then be selected by the board with an open and transparent process to be endorsed by the COP at COP18.

6.1.2 Role of Private Sector Financing

One of the major concerns of most developing countries has been the role of the private sector. The covering decision requests the Board to develop a transparent no-objection procedure to be conducted through Designated National Authorities, in order to ensure consistency with national climate strategies and plans and a country-driven approach and to provide for effective direct and indirect public and private sector financing by the Green Climate Fund.

6.1.3 Relationship of the GCF with the COP

While developing countries felt that the fund has a weak relationship with the COP, developed countries were concerned that it has a stronger relationship. Finally it was decided that the GCF serve as an operating entity of the Financial Mechanism of the Convention with its arrangements to be finalized by COP18 to ensure that it is accountable to and functions under the guidance of the COP to support projects, programs, policies and other activities in developing countries. Additionally the GCF will be guided by the principles and provisions of the Convention.

6.1.4 Interim Secretariat

This was the major contentious issue that was resolved only the last day of the COP. Until the independent secretariat comes to force, there was a need to have an interim secretariat. Three options were presented to the host of the interim secretariat (the UNFCCC Secretariat, GEF Secretariat and the UN Office in Geneva). Developed countries contested the idea of having the UNFCCC secretariat to host the interim secretariat saying it does not have the capacity while developing countries were against the idea of having GEF as an interim secretariat. After a very long discussion and negotiation it was decided to have the UNFCCC secretariat working jointly with the GEF secretariat to take administrative steps to set up an interim secretariat within the UNFCCC secretariat. The interim secretariat will be fully accountable to the Board and function under its guidance and authority and serve until no later than COP 19 till the Independent Secretariat is established by the board in the host country.

Additionally, the interim secretariat is responsible to make arrangements for convening the first board meeting by April 30, 2012.

6.1.5 GCF Board

In the Cancun agreement, it was decided to have 24 board members (12 from developing and 12 developed countries). In the governing instrument of the GCF, it was also decided to have two active observers each from civil society and private sector representatives (one from developing and one from developed country). Through their regional groupings and constituencies, parties have been asked to submit their nominations for members of the Board to the interim

secretariat by March 31, 2012. Members of the Board will need to have the necessary experience and skills in the areas of climate change and development finance, with due consideration given to gender balance.

The COP will provide guidance to the Board including on matters related to policies, program priorities and also eligibility criteria. The board will appoint head of the interim secretariat based on expertise in the design or management of funds, relevant administrative and management experience, experience in or working with developing countries, and policy expertise. Additionally the Board is invited to select the permanent trustee of the GCF through an open, transparent and competitive bidding process in a timely manner to ensure there is no discontinuity in trustee services (the interim trustee is the World Bank to serve for three years). The Board will also initiate a process to collaborate with the Adaptation Committee and the Technology Executive Committee as well as other relevant bodies under the Convention and define linkages between the fund and these bodies.

6.1.6 Other Decisions on the GCF

Other issues mentioned in the covering decision of the GCF included an invitation to parties to submit to the Board expressions of interest for hosting the GCF by 15 April 2012; balance the allocation of resources between adaptation and mitigation; and Switzerland and Republic of Korea to host the first and second board meetings. Additionally the decision has invited Parties to make financial contributions for the start-up of the GCF (including administrative costs of board and interim secretariat).

6.2 Long-Term Finance

With the Fast Start Finance ending on December 2012, there will be a possible financial gap for the years 2013-2020. By taking this into consideration developing countries have been stressing on this. In the final decision the importance of continuing to provide ongoing support beyond 2012 is mentioned without a pledge or commitment from developed countries. On capitalization of the GCF, some developing countries emphasized the need to clarify what was pledged in terms of long-term financing, so that the GCF will not be an empty fund; however, other parties were not in its favor, as it was still under negotiation by the COP. In the final days of the meeting South Korea (non-Annex I country), Denmark and Germany pledged some money for the GCF.

On sources of finance developed countries pushed for an option whereby each country will determine the mode and source of its contributions in support of the goal of mobilizing USD 100 billion while developing countries (especially Africa and AOSIS) were pushing for a clear work plan on sources of finance to get a concrete decision on sources of finance by COP 18. However, the final decision is very weak only undertaking a Work Program on long-term finance in 2012, including workshops with the aim of contributing to the on-going efforts to scale up the mobilization of climate change finance after 2012 by analyzing options for consideration by COP 18.

The decision does not mention any sources of finance (bunkers from maritime, which was there till the last day was taken out in the final text) and with its reports only to be considered, but not adopted which does not

guarantee a concrete decision by COP 18. Additionally, there is no link between GCF and Long Term Finance.

6.3 Standing Committee

The Cancun agreement has also decided to establish a Standing Committee under the Conference of Parties and parties have been defining the roles and functions of the Standing Committee in the year 2011. Parties were considering whether it should be a subsidiary body of the Convention and make recommendations directly to the COP (developing countries) or it should report to the Subsidiary Bodies for Implementation (developed countries).

It was then finally decided the Standing Committee to report and make recommendations to the COP for its consideration. It will also assist the COP in exercising its functions with respect to the financial mechanism of the Convention in terms of improving coherence and coordination in the delivery of climate change financing, rationalization of the financial mechanism, mobilization of financial resources, and Measuring Reporting and Verification (MRV) of support provided to developing countries. Additionally, it will perform any other functions that may be assigned to it by the COP and develop a work program to be presented to COP 18.

7. TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER

7.1 Technology Mechanism (TM)

The agreement reached during COP 16 held in Cancun regarding Technology Transfer (TT) is considered as a significant progress in the

negotiations as it has resulted in the Technology Mechanism(TM). The Mechanism has two components namely, the Technology Executive Committee (TEC) and Climate Technology Center and Networks (CTCN). The TM is expected to facilitate the implementation of enhanced action on technology development and transfer in order to support action on mitigation and adaptation to climate change.

7.2 Operationalization of the Technology Mechanism

The platform signifies the task of operationalizing the TM in 2012 where the decision clearly indicates that the Technology Mechanism become fully operational in 2012. The decision also made significant move by adopting the terms of reference for the Climate Technology Centre and Network. In addition, it demonstrated an aggressive schedule for getting the request for proposal and requests the secretariat to prepare and issue the call for proposals by January 16, 2012. It is also commendable that the decision considered transparency in evaluation of the proposals where it will make them available on the UNFCCC website.

7.3 Sources of Finance for the TM

The decision stated that the costs associated with the Climate Technology Centre and the mobilization of the services of the Network should be funded from various sources, including the financial mechanism of the Convention, bilateral, multilateral and private sector channels, philanthropic sources as well as financial and in-kind contributions from the host of organization and participants in the Network.

7.4 Links and Reporting

The decision also considers establishment of Advisory Board at its 36th session that will serve as a link between the COP and the CTCN. Though not directly the decision addressed the concerns of many actors in ensuring accountability of CTCN and TEC under the COP than the SBIs which were rejected for lacking compliance mechanisms. The decision also potentially facilitated coordination between TEC and CTCN where these two bodies are to establish procedures for preparing a joint annual report.

7.5 Outstanding Issues

These being important progresses, there are still issues to be dealt in ensuring that the Technology Mechanism be effective in delivering its purposes and addressing needs of the developing countries. The decision leaves room for concerns on:

- The issues of Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) where the text fails to be explicit;
- Ensuring balance of expertise in both adaptation and mitigation technologies;
- Priorities in the allocation of resources for adaptation vs. mitigation, and for the most vulnerable;
- Grievance procedure (procedures for countries, groups of countries, regions or even populations to get redress if they felt that they were not receiving appropriate resources from the TM); and
- Environmental integrity (from optimizing mitigation to technology assessments).

8. CONCLUSION

The Durban summit has saved the Kyoto Protocol and has also promised a world where all Parties will take responsibility to cut their emissions. However, time is not on our side and the global temperature is continually increasing while we are still talking about how to clarify terminologies in the negotiations and so on. We as a civil society believe that urgent actions should be taken in the emission reduction targets in order to save the planet and people in developing countries who are getting the worse end of climate change especially the most vulnerable such as Africa, Small Island States and Least Developed Countries.

The long-term collective action by countries to fight climate change has taken another step through the Durban package. Though the world is still aiming at a comprehensive deal for 2020, at least the process towards an all-inclusive legally binding deal seems to be in the horizon. However, the Durban package lacks mitigation ambition i.e. a clear mitigation pathway and also a clear work plan on long-term finance. This is not an end by itself rather a beginning of lots of hard work in the years ahead.