

CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED

Page 1 of 3

From: SMART Archive  
 Sent: 9/24/2015 2:33:26 PM  
 To: SMART Core  
 Subject: Aug-Sept Bonn Climate Change Negotiations Leaves U.S. Reasonably Optimistic

RELEASE IN PART  
 B1,1.4(D)

UNCLASSIFIED  
 SBU

Classified by Director A/GIS/IPS, DoS on  
 08/18/2017 ~ Class: CONFIDENTIAL ~  
 Reason: 1.4(D), B1 ~ Declassify on: 09/23/2030

DECONTROLLED



REVIEW AUTHORITY: David Van  
 Valkenburg, Senior Reviewer

MRN: 15 STATE 112082  
 Date/DTG: Sep 24, 2015 / 241829Z SEP 15  
 From: SECSTATE WASHDC  
 Action: ENVIRONMENT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY COLLECTIVE ROUTINE  
 E.O.: 13526  
 TAGS: SENV, KSCA, ECON, UNFCCC, KGHG  
 Captions: SENSITIVE  
 Reference: A) 15 STATE 74418  
 B) 15 STATE 26614  
 C) 14 STATE 145562  
 D) 14 STATE 76344  
 Subject: Aug-Sept Bonn Climate Change Negotiations Leaves U.S. Reasonably Optimistic

1. (SBU) SUMMARY: Parties to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) met in Bonn, Germany from June 1-11, 2015 for a meeting of the Ad-hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP), which aims to finalize an international climate agreement at the Conference of the Parties (COP) meeting in Paris this December. While Parties made important progress toward conceptual agreement on several key negotiations issues, this progress was difficult to capture given the unwieldy draft negotiating text and co-chairs' "tool," which formed the basis for discussions in Bonn. Recognizing the dearth of negotiation time between now and the Paris COP, the Parties agreed at this meeting to give the ADP co-chairs a mandate to develop a new, much shorter negotiating text by early October for consideration at the next negotiation session, scheduled from October 19-23 in Bonn. The United States strongly supported this agreement and is cautiously optimistic about the negotiations going forward. END SUMMARY.

#### Discussions focused on major concepts and Agreement structure

2. (SBU) Parties spent five days reacting to some 80 pages of compiled Party proposals in a document that ADP co-chairs Dan Reifsnnyder of the United States and Ahmed Djogloff of Algeria termed a "tool." The co-chairs' tool moved beyond the "Geneva Negotiating Text" (GNT) developed by Parties in Geneva in February by streamlining and consolidating similar proposals and restructuring the GNT into three baskets— elements that are more appropriate for the agreement itself, elements that are more appropriate for accompanying decisions, and elements on which they felt more discussion of placement was required. To reiterate an important point, none of the co-chairs' tool (or the GNT) is agreed text.
3. (SBU) Delegates addressed specific issues in facilitated sub-groups covering mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology, capacity building, transparency, and "timeframes" - i.e. how successive rounds of contributions will be structured. The discussions did not seek to take proposals of Parties off the table but they did signal, in some cases, a subtle but significant narrowing of views, most notably on the issue of differentiation in the context of mitigation contributions and the transparency system.
4. (SBU) On loss and damage (L/D), a critical issue for island states, the United States tabled a proposal to mandate the

CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED  
 Page 1 of 3

CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED

Page 2 of 3

continuation of the Warsaw International Mechanism ("WIM") for Loss and Damage, in a COP decision in Paris, in order to address concerns that islands and others have that some Parties may try to sunset the WIM when it is under review in 2016. While there is not currently agreement on the U.S. proposal, it received a positive reaction. The WIM was established as a body under the current UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, and the United States believes this issue should continue to be addressed under the existing Convention, rather than under the 2015 Agreement.

5. (SBU) A significant amount of time at the meeting was spent clarifying Parties' ideas for the "storyline" of each section of the Agreement. To that end, the United States highlighted the need for the Agreement to group related provisions together in order to be crystal clear on exactly what each Party is expected or obligated to do with respect to each element of the Agreement. We emphasized that the structure used in the co-chairs' tool does not enable the required level of clarity. Our proposals to restructure the text to ensure clarity were supported by many developed and developing country Parties but was opposed by the like-minded developing countries (LMDC) negotiation bloc – led by China, India and Saudi Arabia – [REDACTED]

#### Co-Chairs given a mandate to draft a real negotiating text

6. (SBU) [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] The co-chairs did not face such resistance, however, when they announced to broad vocal support (and no opposition) that they will release a real draft negotiating text (termed a "non-paper") of manageable size around the first week of October. The text will consist of a draft agreement and accompanying decisions.

#### Enhancing pre-2020 ambition

10. (SBU) On enhancing mitigation ambition before 2020 - the period before the new agreement is to take effect – Parties continued to discuss elements for a decision in Paris. The United States and other developed countries supported the existing mandate of Workstream 2 to focus on mitigation ambition, including furthering the technical examination process to explore mitigation opportunities, while the G-77, and particularly LMDCs, supported broadening Workstream 2 to include work on financial support, technology, and adaptation. Parties agreed to ask the Co-Facilitators for this issue to produce new draft decision text for further work in October.

#### Process through Paris

6. (SBU) There is one more formal negotiation session planned before Paris. It will take place in Bonn, Germany from October 19-23. Discussions at that session will focus on the draft text expected to be put forward by the co-chairs in early October. There is some talk of potentially adding additional days to that session, or inviting ministers to attend part of it, in order to make more progress before Paris. No such decisions have been taken yet. The French are expected to host a pre-COP ministerial in November of several days, which will also aim to reduce differences among Parties on key issues.

7. (U) Parties will also continue to meet informally. The United States will convene the Major Economies Forum on Energy and Climate (MEF) in the margins of the United Nations General Assembly meeting in New York on September 29-30 and may host another MEF meeting in November to bring together developed and developing countries to focus on landing zones for the key issues in the negotiations.

#### Status of INDC Submissions

8. (U) As of September 15, 2015, 32 countries and the EU (representing its 28 member States) have formally submitted INDCs to the UNFCCC. Most members of the Major Economies Forum have submitted, including the United States, China, Russia, Japan, South Korea, Canada, Mexico, and Australia, as have a diverse group of countries from Central and South America, Africa, Asia, Oceania, and the Middle East. INDCs on the table account for approximately 60% of all global greenhouse gas emissions, and approximately 70% of energy-related CO<sub>2</sub>. We expect many more countries to come forward with INDCs before Paris.

#### Talking Points

- The recent negotiation session in Bonn gave Parties the time to discuss the core aspects of the Agreement through facilitated sessions on all major issues, including mitigation, adaptation and support.
- While we continue to be concerned with the pace of progress, we were grateful for the open and pragmatic manner in which most delegates approached the session. We were able to build valuable understanding that helped us narrow divides on most issues, which is key to reaching an agreement in Paris.
- The decision to give the co-chairs the mandate to draft a negotiating text that reflects areas of convergence and potential landing zones was also a critical step forward. We look forward to reviewing the co-chairs' text when it

1.4(D)  
B1

CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED

Page 2 of 3

**CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED**

**Page 3 of 3**

is released next month.

- Overall, we believe that the most recent negotiations were a necessary step forward, and we are reasonably optimistic that Parties are beginning to make the progress needed to reach Agreement in Paris.

**Signature:** Kerry

---

**Drafted By:** OES\_EGC:Camahan, Kimberly C

**Cleared By:** S/SECC:Talley, Trigg

**Approved By:** OES/EGC:Camahan, Kimberly C

**Released By:** OES\_EGC:Camahan, Kimberly C

**Info:** Sanchez, Lauren K *ROUTINE* ; petersstanley@state.gov *ROUTINE*

---

**Dissemination Rule:** Archive Copy

**UNCLASSIFIED**

SBU

**CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED**

**Page 3 of 3**