The Co-Chairs will make a factual, informal report, with no recom-

mandations, on this workshop. The JWG urged all Parties in a position
to facilitate developing country participation to make voluntary contributions. The JWG also agreed that a workshop is needed after COP-5 and between SB-11 and SB-12.

SBSTA

Chair Chow invited Parties to consider guidelines for the prepa-
ration of national communications (FCCC/SBSTA/1999/L.5 and Add.1). He informed delegates that discussion on the non-inven-
tory part of the guidelines relating to projections, policies and measures, financial resources and transfer of technology, and other matters, was not concluded in the contact group convened at this session, and will continue at SBSTA-11.

In a section of the draft conclusions requesting Parties not using the common reporting format for certain sectoral background data tables on LULUCF to specify alternative formats, CHINA added a specific reference noting that this request included Annex I Parties. On the proposed title for the non-inventory part of the guidelines, the EU suggested shortening it to read “UNFCCC reporting guide-
lines on national reports,” as agreed in the contact group.

ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA said the title should not be amended until consideration of the content had been completed. Delegates agreed to retain the current title but with a note that it will be subject to further discussion at SB-11. In addition, CHINA deleted reference to an instruction that a document reflecting the status of discussions on the non-inventory part of the guidelines be produced “in English only.” Delegates adopted the documents as amended. Chair Chow noted that they will be forwarded to SBI for its conside-
ration.

On the draft conclusions on cooperation with relevant interna-
tional organizations, (FCCC/SBSTA/1999/L.7), the EU and ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA inquired about the joint project on capacity building between the UN agencies and the Secretariat, noting that Parties were not aware of the details. The EU deleted text that she said implied approval by Parties of the joint project. She suggested referring to “the development of a joint project” and proposed that SBSTA request the Secretariat to provide further information for consideration by Parties no later than SB-11.

ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA, supported by the EU, deleted references to “within available resources” and “resources permitting.”

Regarding cooperation with other conventions, SWITZER-
LAND said cooperation should not only be limited to the secretar-
iat. CANADA, with ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA, stated that whereas broad cooperation between the conventions was desirable,
it is still unclear how it would work, and preferred retaining the current language. Delegates adopted the draft conclusions as amended.

On the draft conclusions on LULUCF (FCCC/SBSTA/1999/L.9), ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA questioned a sentence he said could be interpreted as signaling that substantive decision-making on LULUCF will take place at SBSTA-11. After lengthy discussions, delegates agreed to delete the text that some delegations said was ambiguous. The draft conclusions were adopted as amended.

SBT

Delegates met in an evening session to consider draft conclusions on aspects of national communications from non-Annex I Parties. On the input from Parties to the GEF review of enabling activities, delegates adopted conclusions requiring: the GEF to include in its annual reports to the COP information about progress made on the GEF review; and the Secretariat to prepare a report on efforts to assist developing countries in the implementation of enabling activities. The PHILIPPINES deleted a reference to the scope of enabling activities, including various activities that facilitate the implementation of Convention Articles 4.1 (national inventories) and 12.1 (national communications).

On the provision of financial and technical support, delegates adopted conclusions asking the Secretariat to request GEF to provide dates of disbursement of funds for enabling-activity projects for preparation of non-Annex I initial national communications. The PHILIPPINES, with the EU, suggested continuing consideration of this issue at the next session. The conclusions also suggested that the list of projects submitted by non-Annex I Parties be brought to the attention of GEF and “as appropriate” other financing agencies, and required the contact group’s Co-Chairs to prepare a framework on elements of a draft decision, based on proposals by the G-77/CHINA and the EU. Debates centered on the positioning of the words “as appropriate,” whether it should be before or after “GEF” and the nature of information the Secretariat should require of the GEF, whether it should be “dates of disbursement of funds” or “the status and factors of implementation of” enabling activity projects.

On timing for non-Annex I national communications, the SBI considered draft conclusions by the Co-Chairs of the contact group, including proposed draft decisions by the G-77/CHINA and the EU as annexes. An amendment was proposed by the PHILIPPINES requesting the Co-Chairs of the contact group on non-Annex I communications to prepare a document providing a framework for “elements for draft decisions,” based on the G-77/CHINA and the EU proposals contained in the annexes. The EU requested that the annexes reflect the proposals as originally submitted. The conclusions were adopted as amended.

Delegates also considered draft conclusions on different aspects of national communications by Annex I Parties. Conclusions were adopted on annual inventories of national greenhouse gas data for 1996 and on a future review process, including that under Articles 7 and 8 (communication and review of information) of the Kyoto Protocol. Conclusions referred by SBSTA to SBI were also considered. On FCCC reporting guidelines on projections, policies and measures, financial resources, transfer of technology and other matters, CANADA noted SBSTA’s agreement to hold further discussion. Conclusions referred by SBSTA on review processes for GHG inventories of Annex I Parties and a work programme on methodological issues relating to Articles 5 (methodological issues), 7 and 8 of the Protocol were adopted.