Climate finance negotiations at COP19 in Warsaw

1. Introduction

Many UNFCCC stakeholders see climate finance as one of the linchpins holding together the entire climate negotiation process, for several reasons. First, the provision of climate finance fulfils developed countries’ financial commitments to developing countries under UNFCCC obligations. Second, climate finance is key to closing gaps: delivering funds to implement mitigation and adaptation activities is required to ensure the highest possible efforts. For mitigation, this means keeping the planet on a pathway that limits global warming to 2°C or less; for adaptation, this means enabling climate-resilient development. Third, some stakeholders understand that developed countries that provide the means to implement climate change projects (finance, technology and capacity building) will determine developing countries’ level of commitment and buy-in to a new climate deal in 2015.

There are only two years left before the COP in Paris, where the Parties expect to adopt a protocol – another legal instrument or an agreed outcome with legal force under the UNFCCC – that is applicable to all Parties. There are few political openings left to reassure developing countries that their domestic climate actions will receive international support. In this context, the COP in Warsaw is a critical opportunity to provide the necessary assurance, which is currently missing in the negotiations.

2. The Work Programme on Long-Term Finance

At COP17, held in Durban in 2011, the Parties decided to undertake a Work Programme on Long-Term Finance in 2012. This aimed to make progress towards mobilising US$100 billion per year by 2020 to support mitigation and adaptation action in developing countries. At COP18 (held in Doha in 2012), the co-chairs of the Work Programme presented their report to the COP.¹ This contained points of convergence and recommended options – including sources of finance – to improve ongoing efforts to scale up the mobilisation of climate finance. However, decisions on the scaling up of climate finance were not adopted at COP18; instead, Parties decided to extend the Work Programme for one year to: i) inform “developed country Parties in their efforts to identify pathways for mobilising the scaling up of climate finance to US$100 billion per year by 2020”, and ii) inform “Parties in enhancing their enabling environments and policy frameworks to facilitate the mobilisation and effective deployment of climate finance in developing countries”.²

Through this extension, Parties hoped to gain more clarity on how climate finance will be scaled up to reach the US$100 billion goal by 2020, particularly following the end of the fast-start finance period in 2012.³ To achieve this, the co-chairs organised a series of events during the UNFCCC meetings in Bonn in April and June 2013. They also conducted webinars, held two experts meetings in Manila (July) and Bonn (August), and held a wrap-up meeting in Songdo in September.⁴
Most of the substantial work was done during the two expert meetings. Parties discussed: a) the identification of pathways for mobilising scaled-up climate finance from developed country Parties to developing countries (‘push’ factors); b) public policy and financial instruments that facilitate the mobilisation of climate finance (‘push and pull’ factors); and c) enabling environments and policy frameworks for the effective deployment of climate finance from developed countries for developing countries (‘pull’ factors).5

Pathways for scaling up climate finance
Developing countries need a clear roadmap or predictable pathway regarding the type and scale of climate finance they can expect to receive in the coming years. This will be crucial for planning and prioritising climate change projects and programmes. At the meetings in 2013, Parties discussed the impediments to longer-term budgetary planning for climate finance. They also shared experiences regarding budgeting processes, in terms of projecting options for national budgets, to determine when they are able to mobilise US$100 billion. This helped to identify barriers and challenges to projecting public financial expenditures, mainly annual budgeting processes that require parliamentary approval.

It was recognised that a comprehensive and detailed projection of finances is difficult, particularly since some challenges are beyond the control of an individual country. For example, private finance is not easily attributed to a specific country and there is uncertainty about the creation of alternative sources. In the wrap-up session in Songdo, participants agreed that although the pathway discussion is challenging in the midst of the current global economic downturn, there are options for developed countries to effectively meet their commitments, such as public, private, bilateral, multilateral and alternative sources of finance.

Enabling environments and a policy framework for deploying climate finance
Besides clarifying the pathway to increasing climate finance, Parties need to set up sound enabling environments to unlock climate finance and help attract and deploy climate investment at the scale needed. Creating enabling environments involves setting up legal and regulatory frameworks, and ensuring that relevant institutions are adequately staffed. This is needed in both developed and developing countries to attract and effectively deploy climate investments for decarbonising economies and building climate change resilience.

Enabling environments and policy frameworks for the effective deployment of climate finance are key elements in the Work Programme on Long-Term Finance. Discussions articulated the push and pull factors around climate finance. One push factor is the need for enabling environments in developed countries, meaning the policies and tools (e.g. disbursement capacity, dedicated budgets) to ‘push’ finance from developed to developing countries. For example, reviving the global carbon market and phasing out fossil fuel subsidies in developed countries could provide large volumes of funding for domestic renewable energy as well as resources for international climate finance.

Enabling environments in developing countries means policies that increase the capacity of that country to absorb funds and
improve the effective use of climate finance at the country level. These can include high fiduciary and transparency standards, and strong financial regulatory frameworks. This will ‘pull’ finance into the country. For example, the Government of Colombia has concentrated on establishing good general economic and fiscal policy settings to drive its broader economic development; these have created an attractive environment for climate investments.6

The goal of achieving greater transparency on climate finance was also discussed during the meetings. Parties echoed that to break the mistrust between developed and developing countries, they needed enhanced clarity on definitions, on how countries are meeting their financial commitments, and on how climate finance is allocated and deployed. For example, there is currently no agreed definition of climate finance. The question of transparency is linked to the monitoring, reporting and verification of support under the UNFCCC. Further, there is currently no streamlined approach for measuring the effectiveness of climate finance. During the discussion, several participants referred to the Standing Committee on Finance (see below) and there was hope that the upcoming biennial assessment of climate finance flows could be a starting point.7

At the wrap-up session in Songdo, Parties recognised that climate finance is of utmost importance to all the negotiations at COP19. Developing countries highlighted the need for discussions in Warsaw to clarify how developed countries expect to gradually scale up their climate support to developing countries. Looking beyond Warsaw, New Zealand suggested a voluntary ‘Warsaw Platform’ for effective climate finance (see Box 1).8 Depending on its potential design and use, this platform could increase efforts to establish enabling environments.9

The current co-chairs of the Work Programme on Long-Term Finance will prepare a report on this year’s discussions to inform the negotiations at COP19 in Warsaw.10 This will include findings and recommendations based on the discussions so far, with additional inputs from Parties’ submissions to the COP on strategies and approaches for mobilising scaled-up climate finance.11

3. Standing Committee on Finance

At COP16, the Parties decided to establish a Standing Committee – later renamed the Standing Committee on Finance – to support the COP in relation to the financial mechanism of the UNFCCC. This involves “improving coherence and coordination in the delivery of climate change financing, rationalisation of the financial mechanism, mobilisation of financial resources and measurement, reporting and verification of support provided to developing country Parties”.12 In Durban, the Parties specified the Committee’s tasks as:

i) the organisation of a forum for communication and the continued exchange of information among bodies and entities dealing with climate change finance
ii) maintaining links with the Subsidiary Body and the thematic bodies of the UNFCCC
iii) the provision of draft guidance to the operating entities of the financial mechanism
iv) the provision of expert input into the preparation and conduct of the periodic reviews of the financial mechanism
v) the preparation of a biennial assessment and overview of climate finance flows.14

At COP18 in Doha, the Parties endorsed the work programme of the Standing Committee on Finance for 2013–201515 and asked it to:

● consider ways to improve methodologies for climate finance reporting when preparing the first biennial assessment and overview of financial flows16
● amend the guidelines for reviewing the financial mechanism
● provide draft consolidated guidelines for consideration and adoption at COP19.17

The COP also asked the Standing Committee on Finance and the Board of the Green Climate Fund to develop arrangements between the COP and the Green Climate Fund.18 The Standing Committee on Finance met three times in 2013 to work on these tasks, as well as those mandated by COP18. The following sections provide an update on these tasks.

A forum to communicate and exchange information

The goal of this forum is to enable the continued exchange of information among bodies and entities dealing with climate change finance, in order to promote links and coherence. The first in-person forum of the Standing Committee on Finance took place in May 2013, after the Carbon Expo and in collaboration with the World Bank Institute.19 This involved the various bodies and entities dealing with climate change finance. The second in-person forum, which will probably focus on adaptation finance, will take place next year alongside the Climate Investment Funds Partnership Forum, co-hosted by the Inter-American Development Bank.

Box 1. A Warsaw Platform for effective climate finance

New Zealand’s proposal for a Warsaw Platform suggests that it should be based on five elements:

a) a definition of strategies and priorities by developing and developed countries: for developing countries, this would relate to their strategies and priorities on climate change plans in their countries; for developed countries, this would relate to their chosen channels of climate finance
b) the alignment of climate finance to those strategies and priorities
c) the coordinated delivery of climate finance with the leadership of the recipient country and the use of ‘country institutions’ where possible
d) a focus on outcomes to ensure climate finance is focused on delivering mitigation and adaptation results that are able to be tracked and reported
e) an assurance that climate finance does not outsource other private finance that would have taken place anyway.12
Consolidated guidelines for the Fifth Review of the UNFCCC financial mechanism

Every four years, the UNFCCC financial mechanism is reviewed to reassess its conformity with Article 11 of the UNFCCC and the effectiveness of the activities it funds in providing resources to developing countries. In Doha in 2012, the COP decided to initiate the Fifth Review of the Financial Mechanism, in accordance with the criteria in the guidelines as identified in Decisions 3/CP.4 and 6/CP.13. The COP also asked the Standing Committee on Finance to further amend the guidelines for the review, also considering submissions made by Parties on the matter. The Standing Committee on Finance was asked to provide a draft for consideration and adoption at COP19, in order to finalise the review by COP20 (to be held in Peru).

During the last Standing Committee on Finance meeting, members considered potential elements for the updated guidelines and to what extent the existing guidelines should be updated. Diverging views emerged: some developing country members saw this as an important opportunity to conduct a more comprehensive review of the whole financial mechanism; other members, primarily from developed countries, wanted to streamline the existing guidelines for the financial mechanism and cautioned against redundancy and duplication of work. This is related to the issue of the long-term financing of the financial mechanism, which is being addressed under the Work Programme on Long-Term Finance. Despite intense discussion, the Standing Committee on Finance was not able to agree on a draft of the consolidated guidelines.

Most of the new inputs to the last text (SCF/2013/S/3) need to be decided upon in Warsaw. When discussing the adoption of the updated guidelines, Parties will be invited to focus their negotiations on the following areas, where there was no agreement by the Standing Committee on Finance: issues relating to the accessibility to resources; the sustainability of the funding available; and the impacts of the projects financed through the financial mechanism.

Biennial assessment of financial flows

The Standing Committee on Finance will report on the first biennial assessment of financial flows at COP20. Further, it will submit recommendations to improve reporting on climate finance and take into account relevant work by other bodies and entities on the monitoring, reporting and verification of financial support. Throughout 2013, the Committee studied the best way to conduct this biennial assessment and, at its fourth meeting, invited members and stakeholders to provide inputs on this matter. The biennial assessment is important as it will inform ongoing negotiations under the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform, especially negotiations on pre-2020 ambitions, by identifying methodological issues, data gaps and potential areas for future research, as well as establishing a framework for future reports.

At its last meeting, the Standing Committee on Finance discussed modalities and an outline for the biennial assessment – the sources of information, methodologies and expert input needed – and how it could set a precedent and add value to UNFCCC processes. The biennial assessment will be one of the Committee’s main activities in 2014.

Monitoring, reporting and verification of support

The discussion about the biennial assessment is closely linked to the issue of monitoring, reporting and verification of support provided and received. The Standing Committee on Finance started exploring possible contributions to the ongoing debate about monitoring, reporting and verification under the UNFCCC. It became clear during discussions that a comprehensive assessment of the monitoring, reporting and verification of climate finance would require taking all types of finance flows, types of funds and sources of finance into account. It was also acknowledged that private finance is the weakest part of the current monitoring, reporting and verification knowledge base.

Committee members agreed that the initial biennial assessment of climate finance flows should focus on public finance, but that the report should be open to the inclusion of information from the research collaborative on private finance, recently launched by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. In the coming years, the Standing Committee on Finance is likely to provide guidance and information to all relevant discussions under the UNFCCC on the monitoring, reporting and verification of climate finance.

Arrangements between the COP and the Green Climate Fund

These arrangements will determine the working relationship between the COP and the Green Climate Fund, ensuring that the Fund is accountable to and functions under the guidance of the COP, in line with its governing instrument. Finalising this arrangement is one of the milestones for putting the Green Climate Fund into operation. In Doha, the COP requested the Standing Committee on Finance and the Board of the Green Climate Fund to develop these arrangements, based on the Doha decision.

This discussion was the Standing Committee on Finance’s most challenging task. At the UNFCCC Subsidiary Body’s session in June 2013, the co-chairs convened a series of informal meetings to initiate these discussions. During the last two informal meetings, some developing country representatives were uncomfortable with the idea of sending proposed language to the Green Climate Fund, because the text could be amended and lose some elements which are important to them. The main discussion points were: i) the reconsideration of funding decisions taken by the Green Climate Fund; and ii) the determination and periodic review of the funding needed and what is available.

With regard to reconsidering funding decisions, the Green Climate Fund is mandated, through its Governing Instrument, to establish an independent redress mechanism that will report to the Board, serve as a grievance mechanism to receive complaints related to the operation of the Fund, and conduct evaluations and make recommendations. To address the concerns of Parties, the draft arrangement states that “further modalities for the reconsideration of funding decisions as per Article 11, paragraph 3(b), of the Convention shall be developed appropriately once the independent redress mechanism is operational.”

Developed countries believe that no further modalities are needed, since the redress mechanism is open, transparent and...
privileges and immunities are granted to the Green Climate Fund. The necessary administrative arrangements for hosting the Green Climate Fund were adopted at the last meeting of the Standing Committee on Finance. These were sent to the Green Climate Fund to be discussed at its fifth meeting. At this meeting, the Green Climate Fund Board approved the draft arrangements.

On the issue of determination and the periodic review of funding, the draft agreements include the opportunity for the COP “to make assessments of the amount of funds necessary to assist developing countries in implementing the Convention, in order to help to inform resource mobilisation by the Green Climate Fund”. This is an important function that provides information for mobilising resources and replenishing the Green Climate Fund.

After long and controversial discussions on the above topics, the arrangements for how the COP will work with the Green Climate Fund were adopted at the last meeting of the Standing Committee on Finance. These were sent to the Green Climate Fund to be discussed at its fifth meeting. At this meeting, the Green Climate Fund Board approved the draft arrangements.

4. Green Climate Fund

Besides the agreement on the arrangements between the COP and the Green Climate Fund, described in the previous section, there are various items that will be considered at COP19 in Warsaw.

Host country arrangements

At COP18 in Doha, the COP endorsed the Board’s decision for the Republic of Korea to host the Green Climate Fund and noted its first annual report. Furthermore, the COP requested the Fund and the Republic of Korea “to conclude the legal and administrative arrangements for hosting the Green Climate Fund, and to ensure that juridical personality and legal capacity are conferred to the Green Climate Fund, and the necessary privileges and immunities are granted to the Green Climate Fund and its officials in an expedited manner.” In this regard, an official agreement between both parties was signed and came into effect in August.

Report to the COP

The Green Climate Fund will need to report to the COP on the implementation of the relevant Durban Decision. This includes: developing a no-objection procedure; establishing an independent secretariat; selecting a trustee; securing financial inputs; and putting the Green Climate Fund into operation swiftly, with the distribution of funding balanced between adaptation and mitigation.

Documents were prepared on financial inputs and the no-objection procedure, ahead of the fifth meeting. Decisions on the business model framework for putting the Fund into operation were also on the agenda. At the fifth meeting (held in Paris in October 2013), Board members requested the co-chairs, assisted by the Interim Secretariat, to finalise the draft report to the COP, taking into account the comments and amendment made during the meeting. This might include (as was included in the draft report) a list of Board members, all decisions taken by the Board in the course of 2013 as well as the Board’s work plan for 2014.

As of November 2013, the independent secretariat has not been established, but Ms. Héla Cheikhrouhou was selected as Executive Director of the Green Climate Fund.

COP guidance to the Green Climate Fund

The Green Climate Fund Board’s draft response to the guidance from COP18 is included in its draft annual report. In Warsaw, the COP will provide more guidance to the Fund, and Parties are invited to submit proposals on what this guidance should include no later than 10 weeks before the session. Currently, the COP has received five submissions, which differ strongly in their focus. For example, one looks at forestry and results-based finance, another at direct access. Other submissions highlight that the development of guidance to the financial mechanism should consider the different development stages of the Global Environmental Facility and the Green Climate Fund, and advise waiting for the outcomes of the fifth Green Climate Fund meeting to be formally published.

5. Finance issues on the COP agenda

At COP18 in Doha, several countries – including Denmark, France, Germany, Sweden and the UK – announced their climate finance plans for 2013 and, in some cases, up to 2015. Together, these totalled about US$5.5 billion. More statements have been made since; in June 2013, Belgium, Germany, Norway, Switzerland and the USA pledged US$198 million to the Least Developed Countries Fund and Special Climate Change Fund.

To clarify climate finance plans, in 2012 the COP invited developed country Parties to submit information on their strategies and approaches for mobilising scaled-up climate finance. The scale up of climate finance is important for developing countries. Since the fast-start finance period finished at the end of 2012, developing countries want to know how developed countries intend to scale up efforts to meet their collective commitment of providing US$100 billion annually by 2020.

Providing clarity on mid- and long-term finance should be one of the main issues to be discussed at COP19 in Warsaw – even though there is currently no finance contact group. The pre-COP meetings held in Warsaw (in early October) and the Copenhagen meeting on climate finance (held in October, and involving ministers from around 40 countries) could be critical in making progress on climate finance – one of the main deliverables of Warsaw. Furthermore, the in-session high-level ministerial dialogue on finance at COP19 could increase the efforts to scale up climate finance.

6. Subsidiary Body for Implementation

Until recently, the Subsidiary Body for Implementation was the only UNFCCC body dealing with the technical issues of financing climate change projects. Responsibility for several of these issues has been shifted to the Standing Committee on Finance since it was formed. However, the Subsidiary Body for Implementation will continue to play a key role at the COP, since all individual Parties can provide input to discussions on
finance, while the Standing Committee on Finance has limited membership.

The Subsidiary Body for Implementation was not able to adopt its agenda at the June 2013 meeting in Bonn, due to a disagreement about including an agenda item on meeting procedures brought forward by Belarus, the Russian Federation and Ukraine. This will make discussions on finance-related agenda items in Warsaw very difficult. The main challenge will be for Parties to focus on elements not addressed by the Standing Committee on Finance. These include the standard tasks of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation, such as providing guidance to the operating entities of financial mechanisms (e.g. the Global Environmental Facility and the Green Climate Fund) and to other financial instruments of the UNFCCC, such as the Adaptation Fund.

7. Adaptation Fund

The Adaptation Fund was established to finance the full costs of country-driven adaptation projects and programmes. These projects are in developing countries that are Parties to the Kyoto Protocol and that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change. The Adaptation Fund is receiving considerable attention from developing countries because of its unique features. These include direct access modalities, its partial funding through a 2% levy on the proceeds (Certified Emission Reductions) of the Clean Development Mechanism, and its north–south balanced governance system (the majority of its Board members come from developing countries).

Since coming into operation in 2010, the Adaptation Fund has accredited 15 National Implementing Entities to directly access the Fund’s resources. Furthermore, it has approved 29 adaptation projects in developing countries. Despite these achievements, it is facing serious financial constraints due to low current carbon prices: total revenues from sales of Certified Emission Reductions dropped from US$100 million in 2010 to US$18 million in 2012 and are still declining. This is due to the oversupplied market for Certified Emission Reductions as well as a lack of ambition. Forecasts based on the current market price of US$0.16 per tonne estimate the sales revenue will provide just US$8 million during the period 2013–2020.42

These financial constraints mean the Adaptation Fund will be a key discussion point in Warsaw. Developing countries are asking for financial pledges and the Fund’s Board has launched a formal appeal to raise US$100 million by the end of 2013.43 Parties will also discuss the Fund’s predictability and adequacy and how to secure sources of finance. At the Bonn session in June this year, some Parties suggested moving the Fund from the Kyoto Protocol and transforming it into an operating entity of the financial mechanism of the UNFCCC.

8. Conclusions

Progress on various aspects of climate finance will be needed in Warsaw in order to pave the way for the climate deal to be agreed in 2015 in Paris. These include new financial commitments until 2015, clarity on the pathway to the US$100 billion commitment by 2020, progress on accounting and reporting, and the finance architecture needed. The in-session high-level ministerial dialogue will hopefully break the deadlock on some of the issues that are affecting progress on other key climate negotiations, around mitigation targets in particular. Looking ahead to COP21 in Paris in 2015, negotiations in Warsaw should provide assurances on finance, while COP20 in Lima in 2014 will have to deliver on mitigation pledges.
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## Finance Agenda Items: COP19/CMP9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda items</th>
<th>Relevant COP mandates and decisions</th>
<th>Status update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COP19</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced action on finance</td>
<td>The COP has invited developed country Parties to submit, by COP19, information on their strategies and approaches for mobilising scaled-up climate finance to US$100 billion per year by 2020, in the context of meaningful mitigation actions and transparency on implementation. <em>Decision 1/CP.18, para 67</em></td>
<td>These documents were expected to be submitted to the COP at least 12 weeks before Warsaw (September 2013). There is no formal process for discussing the contents of these reports. However, it could be seen as an input on the pathways debate in Warsaw, which has been discussed under the extended Work Plan on Long-Term Financing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The COP has encouraged developed country Parties to further increase their efforts to provide resources of at least the average annual level of the fast-start finance period for 2013–2015. <em>Decision 1/CP.18, para 68</em></td>
<td>Assessment of the current levels will be addressed by the Standing Committee on Finance in its first biennial assessment in 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fifth Review of the Financial Mechanism</strong></td>
<td>The COP has requested the Standing Committee on Finance to further amend the guidelines for the review of the financial mechanism, and to provide draft updated guidelines for consideration and adoption by COP19, with a view to finalising the Fifth Review of the Financial Mechanism for consideration by COP20. <em>Decision 8/CP.18, para 2</em></td>
<td>The Standing Committee on Finance has discussed an initial draft of the guidelines. There is now a draft of the amended guidelines, which should be adopted in Warsaw. The COP needs to mandate either the Subsidiary Body on Implementation or the Standing Committee on Finance, or both jointly, to undertake the review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Work Programme on Long-Term Finance</td>
<td>The COP has requested the Standing Committee on Finance to provide periodic updates on the status of its work relating to the Fifth Review of the financial mechanism to the Subsidiary Body on Implementation for its consideration, beginning at its 35th session, with the aim of establishing an inclusive, transparent process. <em>Decision 8/CP.18, para 3</em></td>
<td>There will be a report of the Work Programme by the co-chairs, which will be an input to the pre-COP ministerial meeting. It is not clear how the report will be used in Warsaw, whether there will be an extension of the Work Programme, or whether the Standing Committee on Finance will be asked to take up this issue as part of its activity on mobilising climate finance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs</td>
<td>The COP has agreed to continue the existing processes within the UNFCCC for assessing and reviewing the needs of developing country Parties for financial resources to address climate change and its adverse effects. This includes identifying options to mobilise these resources, and the adequacy, predictability, sustainability and accessibility of these resources <em>Decision 4/CP.18, para 8</em></td>
<td>No clarity yet on the continuing of “processes within the Convention [UNFCCC] for assessing and reviewing the needs of developing country Parties.” ⁴⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex I tracking methodologies</td>
<td>The COP has invited developed country Parties to submit to the secretariat, by May 2014, information on the appropriate methodologies and systems used to measure and track climate finance. <em>Decision 5/CP.18, para 10</em></td>
<td>No action expected at COP19. The information from developed countries should inform the biennial assessment process as well as the design of the monitoring, reporting and verification regime on support. Some countries are arguing that the COP needs to put the Standing Committee on Finance’s mandate into operation to effectively monitor, report and verify their actions. There is likely to be another push from Parties in Warsaw for a specific mandate on this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda items</td>
<td>Relevant COP mandates and decisions</td>
<td>Status update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance to the Global Environmental Facility</td>
<td>Standard Subsidiary Body on Implementation agenda item.</td>
<td>To be submitted to the COP in the report of the Standing Committee on Finance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance to the Standing Committee on Finance</td>
<td>Standard Subsidiary Body on Implementation agenda item.</td>
<td>To be submitted to the COP in the report of the Standing Committee on Finance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance to the Least Developed Countries Group</td>
<td>Standard Subsidiary Body on Implementation agenda item.</td>
<td>To be submitted to the COP in the report of the Standing Committee on Finance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report of the Green Climate Fund to the COP</td>
<td>Standard COP agenda item.</td>
<td>To be submitted to the COP by the Green Climate Fund Board, tentatively in October 2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrangements between the COP and Green Climate Fund</td>
<td>The COP has requested the Standing Committee on Finance and the Green Climate Fund Board to develop arrangements between the COP and the Fund in accordance with the Governing Instrument of the Fund and Article 11, paragraph 3, for agreement by the Board and subsequent agreement by COP19. <em>Decision 7/CP.18, para 2</em></td>
<td>The Standing Committee on Finance forwarded a draft text to the Board for approval. This arrangement needs to be adopted by the COP in Warsaw.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance to the Green Climate Fund</td>
<td>Standard COP agenda item.</td>
<td>This is relevant for Green Climate Fund Board discussions on different issues, which could include approaches to mobilise resources. These discussions took place in October 2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report of the Standing Committee on Finance</td>
<td>Standard COP agenda item.</td>
<td>Actions covered in other decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biennium budget 2014–2016</td>
<td>Standard COP agenda item.</td>
<td>Need to make sure there is adequate allocation of resources for newly established bodies to fulfil their functions, including support to the Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions registry.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 9th Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP9)

<p>| Report of the Adaptation Fund (Decision 3/CMP.8)                            | The CMP has noted with concern issues related to the sustainability, adequacy and predictability of funding for the Adaptation Fund, based on the current uncertainty about the prices of certified emission reductions and the continuation of the Fund during and beyond the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol. <em>Decision 4/CMP.8, para 9</em>                                                                 | Issues related to finance of the Adaptation Fund. Warsaw will show how the Fund was successful in its fundraising campaign to mobilise US$100 million by COP19. Adoption of the report of the Adaptation Fund. |
|                                                                              | The CMP has requested the Adaptation Fund Board to report to the 38th meeting of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI38) on the status of resources for the Fund, trends in the flow of resources and any identifiable causes of these trends. <em>Decision 3/CMP.8, para 5</em> |
|                                                                              | The CMP has decided to consider, at its ninth session, means to enhance the sustainability, adequacy and predictability of these resources, including the potential to diversify revenue streams, taking into consideration the report of the Board as requested above. <em>Decision 3/CMP.8, para 6</em> |
|                                                                              | The CMP has requested the secretariat to prepare a technical paper, based on the experiences of bodies under the UNFCCC and the wider United Nations system on the process of selecting host institutions for entities, including the steps and timeframes required to conduct open and competitive bidding processes, for consideration by SBI38. <em>Decision 3/CMP.8, para 12</em> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda items</th>
<th>Relevant COP mandates and decisions</th>
<th>Status update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The CMP has requested the Board to consider how to further improve accessibility to funding from the Adaptation Fund, especially through its direct access modality, and to report on its conclusions to the COP, serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol at its ninth session. <em>Decision 4/CMP.8, para 8</em></td>
<td>The Standing Committee on Finance will play no role in this review as it falls under the CMP. Term of reference of the Second Review of the Adaptation Fund.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adaptation Fund under the Kyoto Protocol (Decision 3/CMP.8)</strong></td>
<td>The CMP has requested SBI38 to initiate the second review of the Adaptation Fund, in accordance with the terms of reference contained in the annex to Decision 6/CMP.6 or, as these guidelines may be subsequently amended, to report back to the COP serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol at its ninth session, with a view to the review being undertaken by CMP10. <em>Decision 4/CMP.8, para 10</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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