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**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This report relates to one form of human mobility arising in the context of disasters and climate change. It seeks to build the case for the development of regionally harmonised approaches in the Pacific to allowing the entry and/or stay of non-nationals on humanitarian grounds when disaster strikes, including in the context of climate change.

By harmonisation, we do mean standardisation. Immigration laws and policies need not be identical in all respects in each country, but they should include a *pathway* for entry and/or stay on humanitarian grounds, underpinned by a common understanding of need. Nor do we mean to imply that harmonisation can only be achieved through some legally binding international agreement.

We recognise that, mirroring global trends, current mobility in the Pacific in the context of disasters and climate change is mostly internal in nature. While this is likely to remain the case at a regional level, given climate change trends, it cannot be assumed that cross-border movement will remain at existing levels in the coming decades in terms of mitigating a need to develop harmonised approaches for entry to another country on humanitarian grounds. Further, our analysis of regional mobility demonstrates that in relation to the issue of stay, the need arises because cross-border movement between PICTs is an existing reality.

*Regional anchoring points for a framework*

**Key Point 1: There are multiple anchoring points in the Pacific region for the development of harmonised policy and practice in relation to humanitarian entry and stay.**

Regional anchoring points for the development of harmonised policy and practice in relation to humanitarian entry and stay include:

* The 2000 *Biketawa Declaration –* at <https://www.forumsec.org/2000/10/28/biketawa-declaration> *–* which emphasises the need for collaborative action by states, upon request, to deal with or avert crises or to deal with threats to their security “on the basis of all members of the Forum being part of the Pacific Islands extended family.”
* The2008 *Niue Declaration on Climate Change –* at[https://www.forumsec.org/2008/02/21/the-niue-declaration-on-climate-change](https://www.forumsec.org/2008/02/21/the-niue-declaration-on-climate-change/)/ *–* in which Pacific leaders expressed their deep concern over the ‘serious current impacts of and growing threat posed by climate change to the economic, social, cultural and environmental wellbeing and security of Pacific Island countries’ and recognised ‘the importance of retaining the Pacific’s social and cultural identity, and the desire of Pacific peoples to continue to live in their own countries, where possible’.
* The2015 *Hiri Declaration “Strengthening Connections to Enhance Pacific Regionalism* – at <https://www.forumsec.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/2015-Hiri-Declaration.pdf> – in which Pacific leaders recognised the regional history of intra- and inter-island mobility.
* The 2016 *Framework for Resilient Development in the Pacific 2017-2030* – at <https://www.forumsec.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/Framework-for-Pacific-Regionalism_booklet.pdf> – which calls for the integration of human mobility into resilient development processes to protect individuals and communities that are vulnerable to climate change and disaster displacement and migration.
* The2018 *Boe Declaration on Regional Security* – at <https://www.forumsec.org/2018/09/05/boe-declaration-on-regional-security/> – which reaffirms that “climate change remains the single greatest threat to the livelihoods, security and wellbeing of the peoples of the Pacific”, and which emphasises ‘human security, including humanitarian assistance, to protect the rights, health and prosperity of Pacific people’ as an essential component of regional security.
* The development process for the 2050 Strategy for the Blue Pacific Continent – <https://www.forumsec.org/pacific-regionalism/> has already climate change as a key driver of change in the Pacific.

**Key Point 2: A regional guide for facilitating harmonisation in the Pacific would complement similar developments in other regions and reflect increased recognition at the international level of the need for policy/practice coherence.**

Developments at the regional level include:

* The 2016 Regional Conference on Migration, (North and Central America) Guide: *Protection for Persons Moving Across Borders in the Context of Disaster: a Guide to Effective Practices for RCM Member States* – at <https://disasterdisplacement.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/PROTECTION-FOR-PERSONS-MOVING-IN-THE-CONTEXT-OF-DISASTERS.pdf>.
* The 2018 South American Conference on Migration *Regional Guidelines on Protection and Assistance for Persons Displaced across Borders and Migrants in Countries affected by Disasters of Natural Origin* – at (in Spanish) <https://disasterdisplacement.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/CSM-Lineamientos-regionales-personas-desplazadas-por-desastres_compressed.pdf>
* The 2019 consultations in Port-of-Spain, Trinidad and Tobago under the Caribbean Migration Consultations (CMC) to enhance regional cooperation in addressing human mobility in contexts of disasters and climate change.
* The 2020 Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) (East Africa) *Free Movement Protocol*, which allows citizens of IGAD Member States to cross borders ‘in anticipation of, during or in the aftermath of disaster’, and enables disaster-affected people to remain in another country as long as return to their country of origin ‘is not possible or reasonable’. The Protocol is not yet loaded onto the IGAD website but the communique is at: <https://igad.int/divisions/health-and-social-development/2016-05-24-03-16-37/2373-protocol-on-free-movement-of-persons-endorse-at-ministerial-meeting>

Developments at the global level include:

* The 2015 *Nansen Initiative Agenda for the Protection of Cross-Border Displaced Persons in the Context of Disasters and Climate Change* (Protection Agenda), which identifies ‘Enhancing the Use of Humanitarian Protection Measures for Cross-Border Disaster-Displaced Persons” as a ‘priority area of future action’ – at <https://nanseninitiative.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/PROTECTION-AGENDA-VOLUME-1.pdf> .
* The 2015 Paris Agreement under the *United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change*. The recommendations of the Taskforce on Displacement, established under the auspices of the UNFCCC, were welcomed by the parties at COP 24. These recommendations included that Parties ‘consider formulating laws, policies and strategies, as appropriate, that reflect the importance of integrated approaches to avert, minimize and address displacement related to the adverse impacts of climate change’ – at <https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/10a1.pdf>.
* *The Global Compact on Migration*,which recognises ‘necessary actions’ to meeting Objective 2 the harmonising and development of approaches and mechanisms at subregional and regional levels. Objective 5 of the Compact relates to “Enhance availability and flexibility of pathways for regular migration” – at <https://undocs.org/A/CONF.231/3>.

*The Pacific as a ‘Sea of Islands’: a specific policy context*

**Key Point 3: Immigration policy settings in the Pacific will be determinative of whether a person can seek protection from disasters and climate change by physically moving across an international border.**

Epeli Hau’ofa’s descriptor of the Pacific neighbourhood as “our sea of islands” captures an important point in this regard: that while they are home to relatively small populations, frequently inhabiting limited total land areas, the islands of the Pacific are spread out over many millions of square kilometres of ocean. What this means is that persons seeking entry abroad in the context of a disaster will need to travel by boat or by air, often for great distances. Consequently, more than most other regions, immigration policy settings will be determinative of whether a person can seek protection from disasters and climate change by physically moving across an international border.

That the region’s immigration systems may be increasingly required to address the entry and/or stay of nationals from other Pacific countries due to the impacts of disasters and climate change stems from: (a) the region’s worsening hazard profile and (b) levels of intra-island mobility.

The Pacific region is prone to disasters linked to geo-physical and hydrometeorological hazards in relation to both sudden events and slow-onset processes – whether on a stand-alone basis or, as is often the case, as linked phenomena. Climate change will increase the frequency and/or intensity of these events and processes. Disaster risks are increasing as disasters increase in frequency, magnitude and complexity. This includes not just an increased risk of displacement, but also increased risk of disruption to work and education in counties of origin, transit and destination. It can be reasonably anticipated that in the coming, increasingly climate-change affected decades, these increased risks render it more likely that immigration (and related) systems in Pacific Island countries and territories (PICTs) will be called upon to respond to the predicament of persons impacted by a disaster.

There is a clear trend towards the modernisation of immigration systems in the region. The harmonisation of policy and practice on entry and stay would further render regional immigration systems ‘fit-for-purpose’, by future-proofing them for a world where disasters and climate change impacts increasingly affect the immigration needs of regionally mobile populations.

*The Mobility Context*

**Key Point 4: Data on intra-Pacific in-migrant and out-migrant stocks provide clear empirical evidence of the widespread extent of migration between PICTs as well as to the more familiar hub-state destinations on the Pacific rim. If a disaster was to make it impossible for people to return to a particular PICT for some time (such as the current COVID-19 pandemic), there is a high probability that temporary migrants from that PICT would be located in other parts of the region, and they may need some support before they can return to the country where they have full residence rights.**

There is a distinctive structure to the architecture of contemporary voluntary migration in the Pacific that privileges a small number of sources and destinations or “hubs” in the region (Fiji), on the Pacific rim (especially Australia, New Zealand, the United States and Canada) and in Europe (UK, France) for movers from specific groups of PICTs (“clusters”). Most of these hubs and clusters have links with the region’s colonial heritage and the associated post-colonial connections with the four Pacific rim countries mentioned above as well as with France, the one country in Europe that remains a colonial power in the region.

There is also considerable intra-Pacific mobility that has been greatly facilitated by reciprocal visa-waiver provisions between PICTs for short-term visits, usually for a maximum of three months. Movement of Pacific peoples for social visits, business activities, and to access professional services that are not available in their home country, has never been actively discouraged by post-colonial governments in the Pacific. Navigating the “bloodlines” of culture, history and tradition, far more than seeking permission to cross the invisible international borders that are a legacy of colonialism, lies at the heart of much short-term population mobility within the region.

A contemporary manifestation of these bloodlines is the presence in any particular PICT of residents born in many of the other PICTs, especially those in the same Pacific sub-region (see Tables 1 and 2, pp. 38 and 40). Our analysis of the stocks of in-migrants in each PICT around 2019 shows that other Pacific Islands account for 71,780 migrants born overseas while countries in Asia account for a further 103,030 migrants. While Asian countries have provided the largest global sub-regional stocks of in-migrants in Pacific countries, *the most consistent sources of in-migrants across the 21 PICTs are other Pacific countries*. It is also apparent that the primary sources of Pacific-born in-migrants in most PICTs are other countries in their Pacific sub-region, reflecting an important sub-regional clustering element in the regional mobility architecture.

Our analysis of estimated stocks of out-migrants born in the 21 PICTs, by global sub-region of usual residence in 2019, confirms that the dominant destinations remain the Pacific rim ‘hub states’ of Australia, New Zealand, the United States and Canada. Eighty-eight percent of the 742,920 Pacific-born out-migrants were estimated to be usually resident in these four countries (see Table 3, p. 42). However, other Pacific countries have the third largest aggregate stock of Pacific-born migrants (71,350). While countries in Asia have become much more important sources of migrants to many PICTs in recent years, this does not seem to have been the case in terms of destinations for Pacific-born migrants.

As regards intra-Pacific out-migration stocks, again we see sub-regional variation (see Table 4, p. 44). Around 2019, PICTs in Polynesia had almost three times as many Pacific-born migrants living in other parts of the Pacific region (35,210) than the much larger Melanesian countries and populations (12,830). Only six of the 21 PICTs had people born in their country living in all the three subregions: Fiji, Solomon Islands, Kiribati, Samoa, Tonga and Tuvalu. We suspect there are more PICTs with migrant stocks in the three subregions because there has been a trend in recent Pacific censuses to grouping birthplaces with small numbers into the general category “other countries”.

The significance of these data on intra-Pacific and extra-Pacific in-migrant and out-migrant stocks in the context of the harmonisation of policy and practice relating to entry and stay is that they provide clear empirical evidence of the widespread extent of migration between PICTs as well as to the more familiar hub-state destinations on the Pacific rim. In every country, except Papua New Guinea and French Polynesia, more than 10 percent of their in-migrant stocks had been born in other Pacific countries. In eight of the PICTs more than 30 percent of their in-migrant stocks were from other parts of the region.

If a disaster was to make return to a particular PICT impossible for some time, *there is a high probability that temporary migrants from that PICT would be located in other parts of the region*, and they may need some support before they can return to the country where they have full residence rights. Harmonising policy and practice relating to provisions for visa extensions and, possibly, some subsistence support during an extended period of forced stay by Pacific migrants because of highly destructive environmental events linked with climate change, thus has real relevance in the context of intra-Pacific migration.

The largest documented flows of people into, out of and between countries in the Pacific travel on short-term visas, usually for three months or less, as visitors, tourists, entrepreneurs, consultants, members of sports teams or church groups or for a host of other reasons for wanting to spend time in a Pacific country where they do not have rights of residence, employment or citizenship. These short-term flows dwarf the annual flows of temporary labour migrants and long-term residents. In several PICTs the annual number of short-term arrivals is equivalent to more than their total usually resident population and in five countries visitor numbers exceed the resident population by more than five times (see Table 7, p. 52).

The great majority of short-term arrivals in PICTs come from countries outside the region, with major source areas varying depending on transport links with tourist source countries on the Pacific rim and in Europe. Tourists from many of the main sources of short-term migrants, including most Pacific States, will have visa-waiver status for stays of three months or less in most PICTs. The large flows of short-term visitors in the region are not subject to the same visa requirements as those seeking approval for work or residence. There is little documentation on these visitors in their host countries and, in this regard, they are in somewhat more vulnerable positions than temporary migrants with specific visas in the event of a disaster that does not allow them to return home within the timeframe of their visa-waiver visit.

While the intra-Pacific component of the total visitor arrivals in PICTs is small, data from three of the major tourist destinations (Fiji, Samoa and Vanuatu) revealed a surprisingly consistent share of their short-term arrivals (5-7 percent) were citizens of other Pacific countries (see Table 8, p. 53) Again, this is significant in that should a disaster occur on one of these three counties, there is every likelihood of their being citizens of other PICTs in the country at the time.

Three key dimensions of the contemporary Pacific migration system that have emerged from a systematic analysis of available data on migrant stocks and flows, and that have relevance for dealing with humanitarian responses to disaster, are summarised below.

1. Intra-Pacific mobility tends to be ignored in much research on population movement in the region, but it is very significant and is responsible for the presence of resident Pacific migrant communities in all PICTs. These resident Pacific communities play a major role in assisting people from their countries who are on a range of short-term visas, or who are visiting under visa-waiver provisions. This assistance is especially important when disasters make it impossible for them to return home – a condition that has applied in all PICTs following the closing of borders as a response to the COVID-19 pandemic (see Part 4).

2. All PICTs have diasporas in countries on the Pacific rim or in the countries of their former (and, for some, present) colonial rulers. These Pacific diasporas have been a major source of money and material goods that are used to sustain and develop the livelihoods of their kin in the islands. Remittances from overseas relatives and friends have long played a critically important part in responses to disaster in Pacific countries. In addition, Pacific diasporas and their institutions (especially their churches) provide considerable support to their fellow country men and women who are overseas on temporary visas. This support was readily apparent when Pacific temporary migrants could not get home from New Zealand and Australia after borders closed in March 2020.

3. The Asian dimension to the Pacific migration system has changed significantly in recent years with China especially assuming an increasing role as a major aid donor and provider of technical assistance. This has been very apparent in some countries that regularly experience devastating weather events especially during the ‘wet’ or cyclone season. The increasing involvement of China in the development of infrastructure in Pacific countries has been accompanied by a growing presence of Chinese residents and a gradual increase in temporary flows of Pacific peoples into China and other Asia-Pacific rim countries in recent years. These more recent flows need to be factored into consideration of harmonised approaches to entry and/or stay of non-nationals both in the PICTs as well as in the new destinations for Pacific migrants.

Addressing issues of entry and/or stay of non-nationals when disaster strikes has relevance for all Pacific governments. Of primary concern are short-term migrants within their countries, as well as migrants from their countries on temporary visas in other parts of the world. In contexts where there is an increasing incidence of extreme weather events (e.g. cyclones, droughts) as well as oceanic storm surges, the need for some harmonisation in humanitarian approaches to dealing with entry and/or stay of non-nationals when disaster strikes is logical. As the COVID-19 pandemic has shown, disasters are not always specific to particular countries or communities. They can affect temporary migrants everywhere who cannot get home before their visas expire.

*The regional legal and regulatory landscape*

**Key Point 5: Provision for the entry and stay of non-nationals in some humanitarian contexts already features in some immigration systems in the Pacific. This suggests that a process led by the Governments of the Pacific aimed at recognising disasters and climate change as another immigration-relevant humanitarian context is best regarded as one of extending existing forms of State practice rather than a leap into the policy/practice unknown.**

**Key Point 6: There are existing administrative and Executive discretionary powers within some immigration systems which provide flexibility to allow the entry and stay of persons impacted by a disaster in countries of origin, transit and/or destination and which can be replicated.**

**Key Point 7: The development of a regional guide and associated legislative/regulatory development must be accompanied by the development of procedural or operational guidance to immigration officials to ensure effective and consistent implementation.**

**Key Point 8: Immigration responses may need to be accompanied by responses in other policy domains to ensure that disaster-affected non-nationals are adequately supported pending return home. The immigration response must confer sufficient legal status to allow access to essential support.**

The regional immigration legal landscape is one which promotes temporary migration patterns: all countries in the region provide for some form of temporary entry and stay on familiar grounds, such as visiting for the purposes of tourism, to visit friends and family, or to attend conferences and meetings; to work in the labour market of the destination state; or to study at one of its educational facilities.

Our analysis of the regional legal and regulatory landscape reveals that within existing immigration legislation in Australia and New Zealand there is already some accommodation given to some matters of humanitarian concern. Examples include allowing the entry of distressed vessels as an exception to ordinary entry requirements, entry for the purposes of accessing essential medical treatment or allowing the stay of persons who have been the victims of trafficking or domestic violence. Our review of immigration responses to the COVID-19 pandemic demonstrates a willingness by States to use existing migration tools to provide at least a degree of legal protection to those impacted and, in the case of New Zealand, an awareness that new class-based tools were needed.

Further, there are existing flexibilities of varying degrees across national immigration systems in the Pacific which can be drawn upon to create a harmonised regional approach (see Table 10, p. 76). At the narrowest, these comprise refugee and protection mechanisms grounded in international law, which are mainly present in the more sophisticated systems in Australia and New Zealand. Notwithstanding legal developments in this area in recent years, which make it clear that refugee and protection law can apply, the reality is that few Pacific people are likely to be able to meet the relevant criteria at present.

While refugee and protection mechanisms must be part of the overall framework for those countries in the region where such mechanisms exist, more broadly distributed immigration tools provide more widely applicable building blocks for the process of harmonisation at the regional level. These include the ability to issue limited or special purpose visas, the ability to issue new classes of visa, and the existence of Executive (Ministerial) discretion (see Table 10, p. 76). Each of these mechanisms are capable of being utilised to provide for the entry and stay of persons impacted by, or at risk of being impacted by, a disaster.

Given that many of the flexibilities currently existing domestically involve the exercise of administrative or executive discretion, ensuring transparent and consistent application within national jurisdictions will be important. Therefore, alongside regional harmonisation at the policy and practice level, there is an accompanying need for predictability and certainty at the domestic operational level to avoid implementation gaps. This need is shared by both temporary migrants and immigration officials alike when confronted by the impacts of a disaster, particularly one at scale. Procedural guidance manuals, such as exists in Australia, offer greater predictability than more *ad hoc* approaches, such as the operational guidance notes issued by Immigration New Zealand following a disaster.

*Other necessary tools*

**Key Point 10: Humanitarian entry and stay measures are but one of a range of tools necessary to meet the human mobility challenges of disasters and climate change in the Pacific in the coming decades.**

The cross-border movement and stay of persons is but one form of mobility arising in the context of disasters and climate change. It is widely recognised that most mobility is likely to be internal in nature, although internal displacement can be a precursor to cross-border movement.

Ensuring regionally harmonised approaches for regulating entry and stay on humanitarian grounds, while important, is best regarded as but one tool in the tool-box States in the Pacific will need to meet the human mobility challenges posed by climate change in coming decades. Policy and practice development in relation this particular from of mobility will need to be complemented by similar developments dealing with internal displacement, voluntary adaptive migration, immobility (both voluntary and involuntary) and planned relocation.

**Recommendations**

**Arising from the migration mapping work**

1. A key problem facing policy makers and researchers attempting to document migrant stocks by birthplace is a trend in Pacific censuses towards aggregating data on the birthplaces of their resident population in ways which make it very difficult to produce source-destination migration matrices of the kind that UN DESA and the World Bank have been developing and using to obtain reasonably consistent estimates of migrant stocks at a national scale.

*It is recommended that in the 2020/2021 round of national censuses in the Pacific, Statistics Offices are encouraged to produce detailed tables showing the countries of birth for their populations.*

It is appreciated that there are limits imposed by confidentiality requirements to the levels of disaggregation that can be achieved. But it is possible to disaggregate the data on birthplace much more than is done in many Pacific censuses without breaching confidentiality requirements.

2. In their recent report on labour migration in the Pacific, the International Labour Organisation (ILO) (2019) made reference to regional interest in exploring opportunities for greater intra-Pacific mobility of skilled and semi-skilled labour.

*It is recommended that all PICTs contribute information on labour migration into and out of their countries regularly to the ILO for inclusion in the ILOSTAT database, as well as to the SPC for inclusion in the Pacific Data Hub.*

3. Because of the very significant contributions Pacific communities resident in the four major Pacific rim destinations for migrants make to support their island-based kin at times of disaster, their governments should be included in discussions about regional harmonisation of policies relating to entry and stay.

*It is recommended that Australia, New Zealand, the United States and Canada are included in high-level consultations about regional harmonisation of policies relating to entry and stay.*

**Arising from the legislative/regulatory mapping work**

 **- At the national level**

4*.* It remains a problem that relevant immigration law, regulation and policy across the region is difficult to locate. It can be hard to find on government websites. There is no one single database which holds all relevant immigration legislation and regulations.

*It is recommended that all PICTs take steps to ensure that immigration legislation and regulations are easily publicly accessible and contribute all relevant immigration-related legislation and regulations to the Pacific Immigration Development Community database, USP’s PaclII database and other relevant databases.*

5. While there is potential flexibility within some immigration systems, where this exists it is typically not currently expressly configured to take account of the impacts of disasters and climate change.

*It is recommended that:*

* *those countries which currently have provision in their immigration legislation/regulations for the issue of limited or special visas for specified purposes consider extending this to enable the person to enter and/or stay until it is safe to return home following a disaster in the list of specified purposes.*
* *those counties which currently have provision to add new classes of visa consider adding a visa to allow entry and/or stay of disaster-affected persons.*
* *all countries consider making express provision in their immigration legislation for the extension of existing temporary visas or transition to another visa type where the visa holder’s ability to meet a current visa condition is compromised by the impact of a disaster.*
* *all countries publish guidance to immigration officers on:*
	+ *how to exercise discretionary power to issue visas, including specifying the relevant criteria, in relation to persons seeking entry and/or stay in the context of disaster.*
	+ *how existing immigration processes may need to be expedited.*
* *those countries which confer a discretion on specified Executive Office holders to grant entry and stay outside ordinary immigration requirements consider publishing guidelines on how that discretion will be exercised in the context of disasters and climate change.*
* *all countries ensure that relevant policy and guidance is accessible to the regional public by placing on government websites as well as on relevant regional databases such as the Pacific Immigration Development Community.*

**- at the bilateral level**

6. Both Tropical Cyclone Pam and the COVID-19 pandemic have revealed that, at scale, disasters may impact upon countries of origin and destination of migrants. Even if temporary migrants are able to maintain a lawful immigration status they may require ongoing financial and other support.

*It is recommended that where there are temporary migration flows between PICTs, the countries of origin, transit and destination enter into bi-lateral (or tri-lateral as required) discussions about providing necessary financial and social support to temporary visa holders impacted by a disaster.*

 **- at the regional level**

7. There are existing policies and practices within the region which are amenable to replication and which provide a basis for beginning a process of regional harmonisation. There are also good practices relating to humanitarian entry and stay in other regions which can be brought into the process of regional harmonisation.

*It is recommended that* *with a view to the development of a Guide to Effective Practices, the Platform on Disaster Displacement, together with other relevant United Nations agency and regional partners*

* *convene a workshop (or series of workshops as required) of senior immigration officials from each PICT, Australia and New Zealand, plus Canada and the United States as key Pacific Island Forum dialogue partners;*
* *facilitate a dialogue between senior immigration officials in the Pacific with their counterparts in the Caribbean to exchange best practice ideas and lessons learned.*
* **at the global level**

*It is recommended that all countries feed policy and practice developments:*

* *into the Asia-Pacific Regional Review of Implementation of the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration.*
* *into Activity 7 ‘Raise awareness on integrating displacement in the context of climate change into national laws, policies and strategies, including on disaster response, building on mappings and lessons learned” of the 2019 – 2021 Action Plan of the Taskforce on Displacement – at* [*https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/sb2019\_05\_add1.pdf*](https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/sb2019_05_add1.pdf)