Delegates to the Seventh Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC met in the SBSTA to consider UNFCCC Article 6 (education, training and public awareness), activities implemented jointly (AJ), and other matters. Negotiating groups on compliance and Protocol Articles 5 (methodological issues), 7 (communication of information) and 8 (review of information) continued their work. In addition, informal consultations were held on LDCs, the CDM, JI, the Consultative Group of Experts (CGE) on non-Annex I communications, late payments of contributions to the UNFCCC, and a letter from the Central Asia, Caucasus and Moldova Group on their status under the UNFCCC.

SBSTA

UNFCCC ARTICLE 6: On Article 6, MALAYSIA and CHINA stressed the importance of a concrete implementation work programme. The US suggested that a workshop be held on the prioritization of activities and on setting a work programme. SENEGAL and CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC called for a Climate Change Day. CHINA suggested that each Party should focus on promoting public awareness on the IPCC TAR, and MAURITIUS said Article 6 implementation should take place at the grassroots level in both developed and developing countries. The IUCN offered to contribute to carrying out the necessary work through its Commission on Education and Communication, a global network of experts. Chair Dovland said Parties were clearly calling for more action and noted that informal consultations would be held on the elaboration of draft conclusions.

ACTIVITIES IMPLEMENTED JOINTLY: On the fifth synthesis report of AJ under the pilot phase, the US provided proposals aimed at capturing the ongoing review of the pilot phase through continuing annual reports, revisiting elements for improvements, and looking at host party experiences of the pilot phase. He suggested that a decision for long-term review be made at the current COP, recommending that Parties submit comments by March 2002. Chair Dovland said informal consultations would be held.

OTHER MATTERS: CANADA reported on a recent meeting in Calgary on the “cleaner or less greenhouse-gas-emitting energy trade,” highlighting, inter alia, conclusions that: optimal uptake of cleaner or less greenhouse-gas-emitting energy depends not only on domestic emissions reduction strategies, but also on international trade; and that such trade under the Protocol could encourage significant barriers limiting emissions reduction opportunities and could even lead to increased emissions. Supported by other Parties, he proposed a follow-up workshop on methodological issues. Chair Dovland referred the matter to informal consultations.

On UNFCCC Article 4.6 (flexibility for EITs), CROATIA stressed the importance of utilizing this Article. Chair Dovland suggested that SBSTA-16 consider this issue, that Parties views could be sent to the Secretariat by 1 February 2002, and that the Secretariat undertake a review of Croatia’s national communication.

On a previous COP decision on the relationship between efforts to protect the stratospheric ozone layer and efforts to safeguard the global climate system, the EU suggested it should be a substantive agenda item at SBSTA-16. Chair Dovland said he would prepare draft conclusions.

NEGOTIATING GROUPS

PROTOCOL ARTICLES 5, 7 AND 8: This group took up the draft guidelines for the preparation of the information required under Article 7. On the reporting of supplementary information under Article 7.2 (inclusion of supplementary information in national communications), delegates disagreed over whether Parties should be “required” or “requested” to provide information on the use of mechanisms to supplement domestic action. The matter will be referred to the COP.

Regarding the paragraph on general information to be reported for activities under Protocol Article 3.3 (afforestation, reforestation), SAUDI ARABIA proposed introducing additional subparagraphs requiring Parties to submit information on, inter alia, how the reported activities exclude carbon dioxide removals due to indirect human-induced effects. TUVALU stressed the need to reflect the Bonn Agreements, and not “pick and choose” what to retain in the guidelines. A drafting group on the guideline paragraphs dealing with LULUCF will be convened.

Delegates then turned to the issue of thresholds for non-compliance/mechanisms eligibility. The Secretariat presented an analysis on the matter based on Parties’ national communications submitted in 2000/2001. He noted that the thresholds proposed in the draft would ensure that major source categories and the sums of national adjustments are not omitted. Delegates responded positively, and expressed the hope that the text could be cleared of brackets on Thursday.
On the draft COP/MOP-1 decision on Article 7 guidelines, Chair Dovland proposed that the chapeau related to the subpar- 
graphs on non-compliance/mechanisms eligibility be considered in a 
drafting group. Delegates then approved an EU proposal related 
to timing of review of national systems, and agreed on the para- 
graphs on financial resources in the section relating to reporting of 
supplementary information under Article 7.2.

**COMPLIANCE:** Delegates resumed consideration of the Co- 
Chairs’ non-paper on the status of negotiation, referring the 
matter of outstanding issues to a drafting group. On the facilita- 
tive branch, JAPAN put forward a proposal intended to reflect the 
language in the Bonn Agreements on the type of questions of 
implementation to be addressed. The G-77/CHINA said the 
proposal required further clarification. On the enforcement branch, 
delegates discussed the need to specify which commitment under 
Protocol Article 7.4 (establishment of guidelines and modalities for 
the accounting of assigned amounts) would fall within its mandate.

On submissions, AUSTRALIA, supported by the RUSSIAN 
FEDERATION and opposed by a number of Parties, suggested the 
deletion of the possibility for a Party to submit a question of imple- 
mentation with respect to another Party, explaining that it had the 
potential to create rifts among Parties or could eventually be used for 
“other reasons,” and that the reports from expert review teams 
(ERTs) provided a thorough triggering process. The EU high- 
lighted that the Party-to-Party triggering option was useful for the 
effectiveness and balance of the compliance procedures. With 
IRAN, he said that if questions could be indicated in the reports of 
ERTs, sovereign states should also have the possibility to make 
submissions against another Party. SAMOA stressed that procedures 
are non-adversarial, multilateral in nature and include due- 
process provisions. JAPAN, opposed by CHINA, suggested that 
triggering against another Party could be limited to the facilitative 
branch. Co-Chair Dovland said this issue was not of a drafting 
nature and would thus be forwarded to the Plenary.

On general procedures, the G-77/CHINA suggested that the 
ERT reports not be made publicly available before the Party 
concerned had the opportunity to respond in writing to the relevant 
branch. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION suggested that the informa- 
tion considered by the branch be made available to the public after 
the conclusion of the process. SWITZERLAND and NORWAY 
highlighted the existence of due process provisions in, and the need 
to be consistent with, the text on Protocol Articles 5, 7 and 8.

On the procedures for the enforcement branch, the RUSSIAN 
FEDERATION, opposed by the EU, suggested text reflecting the 
right for the Party concerned to have a closed hearing. SAMOA 
expressed concern about upsetting the balance between access to 
information, transparency and public participation, and safe- 
guarding the sovereign rights of the Party.

On expedited procedures, JAPAN said it would submit a 
proposal on the procedure for reinstalling mechanisms’ eligibility. 
On consequences applied by the enforcement branch, the RUSSIAN 
FEDERATION, opposed by the EU, suggested text reflecting the 
right for the Party concerned to have a closed hearing. SAMOA 
expressed concern about upsetting the balance between access to 
information, transparency and public participation, and safe- 
guarding the sovereign rights of the Party.

On the procedures for the enforcement branch, JAPAN, 
opposed by the EU, proposed deleting the paragraphs providing for 
consequences in case of non-compliance with Protocol Article 5.1 
(national systems), 5.2 (adjustments), 7.1 (annual inventories) and 
7.4 (establishment of guidelines and modalities for the accounting 
of assigned amounts).

**INFORMAL GROUPS**

**CGE:** The informal contact group on the Consultative Group of 
Experts (CGE) on national communications of non-Annex I 
Parties, chaired by Emily Ojoo-Massawa (Kenya), considered the 
revision of guidelines for the preparation of national communica- 
tions and terms of reference for the CGE, and NAPAs from LDCs. 
Divergent views between Parties resulted in Chair Ojoo-Massawa 
proposing to draft text on the issues and reconvene the group on 
Thursday.

**CDM:** Informal consultations on the CDM were held in the 
afternoon chaired by José Miguez (Brazil). Delegates considered 
project design of the CDM, focusing on the issues of validation, 
monitoring, and accreditation, with some progress reported on the 
draft texts. Informal meetings resumed late Wednesday evening on 
various technical issues.

**JOINT IMPLEMENTATION:** The informal group on joint 
implementation reportedly made some progress on technical 
details of draft text on JI in a meeting held late afternoon.

**LATE PAYMENTS:** Philip Weech (The Bahamas) chaired 
informal consultations on possible options to respond to late 
payment of contributions. The group considered the text 
outstanding from SB-12, including problems and inconveniences 
that could be faced by the UNFCCC as a result of late payments to 
the core budget, and additional options the SBI may wish to 
consider as a basis for recommendations to the COP. The text was 
deferred for further informal discussions on Thursday afternoon.

**PARTIES’ STATUS UNDER THE CONVENTION:** These 
informal consultations, chaired by John Ashe, addressed a letter 
from the Central Asia, Caucasus and Moldova Group of Parties on 
their status under the UNFCCC. Participants considered a proposal 
from relevant Parties seeking a clear definition of the term “develop- 
ing countries” as used by the UNFCCC. Following concerns 
expressed by the G-77/CHINA, Chair Ashe suggested deferring 
consideration of this issue to SB-16 and COP-8. Further informal 
consultations may take place Thursday.

**LDCs:** The informal group on matters relating to LDCs met in 
the evening to begin discussions on NAPA guidelines, the LDC 
Expert Group, and guidance on the LDC Fund. MALAWI intro- 
duced a new proposal containing guidelines for preparing NAPAs, 
which delegates then examined.

**IN THE CORRIDORS**

A number of participants have been commenting on the consid- 
erable workload at COP-7, pointing to the numerous issues taken 
up by the subsidiary bodies and the many informal groups formed 
to address them, all of which is additional to the remaining work of 
the negotiating groups on the various draft decisions under the 
Bonn Agreements. While some seemed concerned at the lost 
opportunity to make significant progress on subsidiary body 
matters, others said work under the Bonn Agreements must be the 
priority, especially given the lack of progress so far in the negoti- 
atting groups.

In other news, rumors were circulating late Wednesday that 
work was being undertaken on a Marrakesh Declaration for consid- 
eration at next year’s World Summit on Sustainable Development in 
Johannesburg. Meanwhile, some delegates were expressing 
confusion and concerns over the process for deciding the composi- 
tion of the CDM Executive Board.

**THINGS TO LOOK FOR TODAY**

**NEGOTIATING GROUPS:** Articles 5, 7 and 8: This group 
will convene at 10:00 am in Fez I to continue its work.

**Mechanisms:** This group will resume at 10:00 am and continue 
throughout the day in an attempt to make further progress on its 
work.

**Compliance:** This group will convene at 5:00 pm in Plenary II.

**INFORMAL GROUPS:** Informal groups are expected to meet on 
the CGE (12:00-1:00 pm and 4:00-5:00 pm in Fez I) and on 
LDCs (5:00 pm in Plenary II). Drafting groups will also convene to 
address issues that the negotiating groups were unable to resolve. 
Consult the monitors for further details.