

**SUMMARY OF THE THIRD SESSION OF THE  
AD HOC WORKING GROUP UNDER THE  
CONVENTION AND SIXTH SESSION (PART  
ONE) OF THE AD HOC WORKING GROUP  
UNDER THE KYOTO PROTOCOL:  
21-27 AUGUST 2008**

Delegates convened in Accra, Ghana, from 21-27 August 2008 for the third session of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action (AWG-LCA 3) and the first part of the sixth session of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (AWG-KP 6). The climate talks in Accra were part of an ongoing series of meetings leading up to Copenhagen in December 2009 – the deadline for an agreement on a post-2012 framework.

Approximately 1600 participants, representing governments, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, academia and the private sector, attended the meetings.

The AWG-LCA was established in 2007 at the 13th Conference of the Parties (COP 13), in Bali, Indonesia, and is mandated to launch a comprehensive process to enable the full, effective and sustained implementation of the Convention through long-term cooperative action up to and beyond 2012. The AWG-LCA, which was set up as a follow up to the “Dialogue on long-term cooperative action to address climate change by enhancing implementation of the Convention,” must complete its work by COP 15 in Copenhagen in 2009.

The main focus of AWG-LCA 3 in Accra was to continue to exchange ideas and clarify key elements of the Bali Action Plan (decision 1/CP.13), including a “shared vision for long-term cooperative action,” mitigation, adaptation, technology and finance. Two in-session workshops were held on: cooperative sectoral approaches and sector-specific actions, and policy approaches; and on policy incentives on issues relating to reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries (REDD), and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries.

The AWG-KP, which was established in 2005 to consider Annex I parties’ commitments under the Protocol after 2012, focused on the means for Annex I countries to reach emission reduction targets, with delegates addressing the flexible mechanisms and land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF). Parties also are to consider an agenda item on “other issues” comprising greenhouse gases, sectors and source categories; approaches targeting sectoral emissions; methodological issues; and spillover effects.

The Accra climate change talks resulted in the adoption of conclusions on long-term cooperative action and on the 2009 work programme under the AWG-LCA. Parties also adopted conclusions on: spillover effects; LULUCF; the flexible mechanisms; methodological issues; greenhouse gases, sectors and source categories; and means to reach emission reduction targets under the AWG-KP. Parties agreed to compile ideas and proposals on the elements contained in paragraph 1 of the Bali Action Plan for discussion at COP 14 in December 2008 in Poznan, Poland.

**A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE UNFCCC AND THE  
KYOTO PROTOCOL**

Climate change is considered one of the most serious threats to sustainable development, with adverse impacts expected on the environment, human health, food security,

**IN THIS ISSUE**

A Brief History of the UNFCCC and the Kyoto Protocol . 1

Report of the Meetings . . . . . 3  
*Ad Hoc* Working Group on Long-Term Cooperative  
 Action under the Convention (AWG-LCA) . . . . . 3  
*Ad Hoc* Working Group under the Kyoto  
 Protocol (AWG-KP) . . . . . 5

A Brief Analysis of the Meetings . . . . . 9

Upcoming Meetings . . . . . 10

Glossary . . . . . 11

This issue of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* © <enb@iisd.org> is written and edited by Tomilola “Tomi” Akanle, Asheline Appleton, Douglas Bushey, Kelly Levin, Richard Sherman, and Yulia Yamineva. The Digital Editor is Leila Mead. The Editor is Pamela S. Chasek, Ph.D. <pam@iisd.org> and the Director of IISD Reporting Services is Langston James “Kimo” Goree VI <kimo@iisd.org>. The Sustaining Donors of the *Bulletin* are the United Kingdom (through the Department for International Development – DFID), the Government of the United States of America (through the Department of State Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs), the Government of Canada (through CIDA), the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMU), the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the European Commission (DG-ENV) and the Italian Ministry for the Environment, Land and Sea. General Support for the *Bulletin* during 2008 is provided by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Government of Australia, the Austrian Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management, the Ministry of Environment of Sweden, the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, SWAN International, Swiss Federal Office for the Environment (FOEN), the Finnish Ministry for Foreign Affairs, the Japanese Ministry of Environment (through the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies - IGES), the Japanese Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (through the Global Industrial and Social Progress Research Institute - GISPRI) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). Funding for translation of the *Bulletin* into French has been provided by the International Organization of the Francophonie (IOF). Funding for the translation of the *Bulletin* into Spanish has been provided by the Ministry of Environment of Spain. The opinions expressed in the *Bulletin* are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of IISD or other donors. Excerpts from the *Bulletin* may be used in non-commercial publications with appropriate academic citation. For information on the *Bulletin*, including requests to provide reporting services, contact the Director of IISD Reporting Services at <kimo@iisd.org>, +1-646-536-7556 or 300 East 56th St., 11A, New York, NY 10022, USA.

economic activity, natural resources and physical infrastructure. Scientists agree that rising concentrations of anthropogenic greenhouse gases in the Earth's atmosphere are leading to changes in the climate. The Fourth Assessment Report (AR4) of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), completed in November 2007, finds with more than 90% probability that human action has contributed to recent climate change and emphasizes the already observed and projected impacts of climate change.

The international political response to climate change began with the adoption of the UNFCCC in 1992. The UNFCCC sets out a framework for action aimed at stabilizing atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases to avoid "dangerous anthropogenic interference" with the climate system. The UNFCCC entered into force on 21 March 1994, and now has 192 parties. These parties continue to adopt decisions, review progress and consider further action through meetings of the Conference of the Parties (COP), which are usually held annually. Since 1995, the COP has been supported in its work by the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) and the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI).

**KYOTO PROTOCOL:** In December 1997, delegates at COP 3 in Kyoto, Japan, agreed to a Protocol to the UNFCCC that commits developed countries and countries in transition to a market economy to achieve emission reduction targets. These countries, known under the UNFCCC as Annex I parties, agreed to reduce their overall emissions of six greenhouse gases by an average of 5.2% below 1990 levels between 2008-2012 (the first commitment period), with specific targets varying from country to country.

Following COP 3, parties began negotiating many of the rules and operational details governing how countries will reduce emissions and measure their emission reductions. The process was finalized in November 2001 at COP 7 in Marrakesh, Morocco, when delegates reached agreement on the Marrakesh Accords, which establish detailed rules on the Protocol's three flexible mechanisms, reporting, methodologies, and other elements of the treaty. The Kyoto Protocol entered into force on 16 February 2005, and now has 182 parties.

**COP 11 AND COP/MOP 1:** COP 11 and the first Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (COP/MOP 1) took place in Montreal, Canada, from 28 November to 10 December 2005. At COP/MOP 1, parties took decisions on the outstanding operational details of the Kyoto Protocol, including formally adopting the Marrakesh Accords.

Delegates in Montreal also engaged in negotiations on long-term international cooperation on climate change, including possible processes to consider the post-2012 period. These negotiations resulted in a COP/MOP 1 decision to establish a new subsidiary body, the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP). In addition, COP 11 agreed to consider long-term cooperation also under the UNFCCC "without prejudice to any future negotiations, commitments, process, framework or mandate under the Convention" through a series of four workshops constituting a "Dialogue" that would continue until COP 13.

**AWG-KP AND CONVENTION DIALOGUE:** Between COP 11 and COP 13 in December 2007, the AWG-KP and Convention Dialogue each convened four times. The AWG-KP focused on finalizing its work programme and analyzing mitigation potentials and ranges of emission reductions. At its meeting in Vienna, Austria, in August 2007, the AWG-KP discussed possible ranges of emission reductions for Annex I parties. Parties adopted conclusions referring to some of the key findings of IPCC Working Group III, including that global greenhouse gas emissions need to peak in the next 10-15 years and then be reduced to well below half of 2000 levels by the middle of the 21st century in order to stabilize atmospheric concentrations to the lowest level assessed by the IPCC. The AWG-KP's conclusions recognized that to achieve this level, Annex I parties as a group would be required to reduce emissions by a range of 25-40% below 1990 levels by 2020.

During its four workshops, the Convention Dialogue focused on development goals, adaptation, technology, and market-based opportunities. At the final workshop, held in Vienna in August 2007, delegates focused on bringing together ideas from the previous workshops and addressing overarching and cross-cutting issues, including financing. Parties also considered next steps after COP 13, with parties expressing a willingness to continue discussions under the Convention "track" beyond COP 13.

In addition to the AWG-KP and Convention Dialogue, post-2012 issues were also considered under the first review of the Protocol under Article 9, held at COP/MOP 2 in Nairobi, Kenya, in 2006, and in discussions on a proposal by the Russian Federation on procedures to approve voluntary commitments for developing countries.

**BALI CLIMATE CONFERENCE:** COP 13 and COP/MOP 3 took place from 3-15 December 2007, in Bali, Indonesia, alongside the resumed fourth session of the AWG-KP. The focus of the Bali conference was on post-2012 issues, and negotiators spent much of their time seeking agreement on a two-year process, or "Bali roadmap," to finalize a post-2012 regime by COP 15 in December 2009. This roadmap sets out "tracks" under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol.

Under the Convention, negotiations on the follow up to the Convention Dialogue resulted in agreement on a Bali Action Plan that established the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention (AWG-LCA), with a view to launching a comprehensive process on long-term cooperative action, to be completed in 2009. The Bali Action Plan identifies four key elements: mitigation, adaptation, finance and technology. The Plan also contains a non-exhaustive list of issues to be considered under each of these areas and calls for addressing a "shared vision for long-term cooperative action."

Under the Kyoto Protocol, the AWG-KP agreed in Bali on a plan for its activities and meetings for 2008-2009. In addition, COP/MOP 3 considered preparations for a second review of the Protocol under Article 9, which will take place at COP/MOP 4 in December 2008. Delegates identified a number of issues to be addressed during this review, including the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM), IPCC AR4, adaptation, effectiveness, implementation and compliance.

**AWG-LCA 1 AND AWG-KP 5:** The first session of the AWG-LCA and first part of the fifth session of the AWG-KP took place from 31 March to 4 April 2008 in Bangkok, Thailand. The main focus of AWG-LCA 1 was on developing its work programme for 2008. The work programme, adopted at the end of the meeting, aims to further discussions on all elements of the Bali Action Plan at every session of the AWG-LCA in a “coherent, integrated and transparent manner.” It establishes a detailed work programme, including a timetable for eight in-session workshops to be held during 2008.

The AWG-KP convened an in-session workshop on analyzing the means for Annex I parties to reach their emission reduction targets. In its conclusions, AWG-KP 5 indicated that the flexible mechanisms under the Protocol should continue in the post-2012 period, and be supplemental to domestic actions in Annex I countries.

**SB 28, AWG-LCA 2 AND AWG KP 5:** During the first two weeks of June 2008, delegates convened in Bonn, Germany, to participate in four meetings as part of ongoing negotiations under the UNFCCC and the Kyoto Protocol. At its second session, the AWG-LCA shifted its focus towards more substantive topics, with three workshops to help delegates consider adaptation, finance, and technology. Parties also started discussions on a “shared vision for long-term cooperative action,” climate change mitigation, and the AWG-LCA’s work programme for 2009.

The fifth session of the AWG-KP focused on the means for Annex I countries to reach emission reduction targets, with delegates addressing four specific issues: the flexible mechanisms; land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF); greenhouse gases, sectors and source categories; and possible approaches targeting sectoral emissions. Parties also considered relevant methodological issues.

The SBI and SBSTA took up a range of issues, some related to their regular, ongoing work under the UNFCCC and Kyoto Protocol, and some more closely connected to the post-2012 discussions. The SBI examined subjects such as capacity building, technology transfer and preparations for the second review of the Protocol under Article 9. SBSTA’s agenda included items on technology transfer and reducing emissions from deforestation in developing countries.

## REPORT OF THE MEETINGS

The third session of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change and first part of the sixth session of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol opened on Thursday, 21 August 2008. During the welcoming ceremony, Kwadwo Adjei-Darko, Minister of Local Government, Rural Development and Environment, Ghana, welcomed delegates to Accra, describing the talks as an important milestone on the path to Copenhagen and an opportunity to demonstrate the seriousness of current efforts to address climate change. Connie Hedegaard, Minister of Climate and Energy, Denmark, called on delegates to advance negotiations and to establish a mid-term target for emission reductions in addition to ambitious targets to halve emissions by 2050. She also urged for concrete results on the flexible mechanisms and forestry, and for further elaboration of the Bali

building blocks. COP 13 President Rachmat Witoelar, State Minister of Environment, Indonesia, emphasized commitments and actions by all nations based on the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities. He also urged progress on negotiations to facilitate an ambitious and effective agreement by COP 15 in December 2009.

Yvo de Boer, UNFCCC Executive Secretary, highlighted that Africa is one of the continents most affected by climate change and noted that a future climate change regime should address the adaptation needs of African countries and help them achieve clean economic growth. He informed delegates that funding had been received to enhance participation of developing countries in climate change negotiations. Ghanaian President John Agyekum Kufuor welcomed progress made since COP 13, highlighting the operationalization of the Adaptation Fund. He emphasized the need for an agreement in which developing countries commit to climate-resilient development facilitated by financial and technological support from developed countries.

This report summarizes the discussions and outcomes based on the agendas of the AWG-KP and AWG-LCA.

## AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON LONG-TERM COOPERATIVE ACTION UNDER THE CONVENTION (AWG-LCA)

AWG-LCA Chair Luiz Machado (Brazil) opened the session, emphasizing the need for parties to focus on concrete ideas and proposals, and to identify common views. Chair Machado introduced documents on the summary of views expressed at AWG-LCA 2 (FCCC/AWGLCA/2008/11) and a scenario note on the third session (FCCC/AWGLCA/2008/10). Parties then adopted the agenda (FCCC/AWGLCA/2008/9).

### ENABLING THE FULL, EFFECTIVE AND SUSTAINED IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION THROUGH LONG-TERM COOPERATIVE ACTION

Discussions on this agenda item focused on the key elements outlined in the Bali Action Plan (decision 1/ CP.13), including a “shared vision for long-term cooperative action,” mitigation, adaptation, technology and financing. These issues were first taken up in plenary on Thursday, 21 August. This was followed by two in-session workshops on cooperative sectoral approaches and sector-specific actions, and on policy incentives on issues relating to REDD and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancements of forest carbon stocks in developing countries.

During the AWG-LCA plenary on Saturday, 23 August, parties discussed the number and titles of contact groups and exchanged their general views on long-term cooperative action. On contact groups, Chair Machado proposed the establishment of three contact groups to consider enhanced action on adaptation, enhanced action on mitigation, and institutional arrangements for delivering enhanced cooperation on technology and financing for adaptation and mitigation. Many party groupings supported the Chair’s proposal, while Australia, for the Umbrella Group, objected to the creation of the contact group on institutional arrangements, stating that the first two contact groups would sufficiently deal with this matter. Antigua and Barbuda, for the Group of 77 and China (G-77/China), proposed changing the

title of the third contact group to “delivering on technology and financing, including consideration of institutional arrangements.” After informal consultations, parties agreed to the establishment of three contact groups on: “enhanced action on adaptation and its associated means of implementation,” “enhanced action on mitigation and its associated means of implementation,” and “delivering on technology and finance, including consideration of institutional arrangements.”

On long-term cooperative action, several delegates expressed concern with the slow progress of the AWG-LCA in light of the challenging programme in the lead up to COP 15. Japan proposed that parties adopt a shared vision of reducing global emissions by 50% by 2050 in line with the goal supported by the 2008 G8 Summit. New Zealand called for greater emphasis on a shared vision, and said there cannot be two separate and distinct visions under the AWG-KP and AWG-LCA tracks. The Russian Federation called for all major emitting countries to participate in a future global agreement. India and China stressed the need to address all elements of the Bali Action Plan equally. Turkey called for flexibility in a future regime to account for the dynamic nature of national circumstances.

France, for the European Union (EU), highlighted the potential for using a levy on aviation revenue to combat climate change and, with Australia, the use of carbon markets to achieve cost-effective mitigation. On mitigation in the agriculture sector, Uruguay, supported by New Zealand, called for increased action, and proposed a workshop on this topic in Poznan. On REDD, New Zealand suggested elaborating both market and non-market approaches to enable an informed decision on the issue.

Maldives, on behalf of the least developed countries (LDCs), proposed the establishment of an institutional structure on adaptation to help ensure food, energy and water security and the protection of health and livelihoods. Grenada, for the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS), underscored adaptation as a major priority, and proposed the establishment of an adaptation fund under the Convention. Bangladesh proposed the establishment of an international adaptation research and technology support center in his country.

The International Civil Aviation Organization noted that it is in the best position to ensure optimum compatibility between environmental sustainability and the safety of the global aviation system. She offered to assist the AWG-LCA in its efforts to address international aviation emissions. Global Business and Industry noted that the private sector has a major role to play in providing investment for mitigation and adaptation actions, and highlighted the importance of creating frameworks and institutional structures to attract the necessary resources. The Indigenous Peoples Forum on Climate Change said a future agreement should recognize and implement the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and also provide for official participation of the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues in the UNFCCC process.

#### **MITIGATION AND MEANS OF IMPLEMENTATION:**

Issues related to mitigation and associated means of implementation were introduced in plenary on 21 August, and discussed in two in-session workshops, on sectoral approaches and sector-specific actions and on REDD, conservation and sustainable forest management, on 21-22 August (for more

details on these workshops, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12378e.html> and <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12379e.html>). They were then taken up in a contact group chaired by AWG-LCA Chair Machado.

The G-77/China underlined the distinction between mitigation commitments of developed countries and mitigation actions of developing countries. Pakistan, Mexico, the Republic of Korea and China highlighted historical responsibility and noted different capacities of developed and developing countries to address climate change. Many parties called for developed countries to lead in emission reductions, and many developing countries, including South Africa, India, Brazil and China, said that existing mitigation actions in developing countries must be recognized.

The issue of differentiation among non-Annex I countries proved to be contentious. Developed countries called for differentiation, and Australia and Japan suggested that non-Annex I parties with a high gross domestic product (GDP) should join Annex I. The G-77/China and the African Group strongly opposed any differentiation of parties beyond that of the Convention. The Bahamas, with Singapore, highlighted that per capita criteria disadvantage small countries, while other countries noted that GDP is not the only criterion of development.

On the related issue of the mandate of the group, the Umbrella Group stated that the AWG-LCA discussions should lead to new legal obligations for parties, while many developing countries said the group does not have a mandate to make amendments to the Convention or the Protocol and called for focusing on the implementation of the Convention.

Japan highlighted the relevance of sectoral approaches, while India said global sectoral approaches are not appropriate for developing countries.

#### **ADAPTATION AND MEANS OF IMPLEMENTATION:**

This item was introduced in plenary on Saturday, 23 August. It was then discussed in contact group chaired by AWG-LCA Vice-Chair Michael Zammit Cutajar (Malta). The aim of the contact group was to facilitate the exchange of ideas and proposals among parties.

Several proposals were made during the contact group. Bangladesh proposed the establishment of a regional research center on adaptation, situated in Bangladesh. AOSIS proposed an adaptation framework, containing mechanisms on financial resources and on building resilience and adapting to the impacts of climate change. The EU outlined possible elements of a Copenhagen agreement on adaptation, which would provide for the scaling up of financial resources and investment for adaptation, integration of adaptation into national planning, and support for vulnerable countries to formulate adaptation plans and programmes. The African Group proposed an African regional implementation initiative to involve a network of African centers of excellence and implementation of pilot projects. Several developing country parties highlighted the fact that although many national adaptation programmes of action had been prepared and priorities for action had been identified, very few had been implemented due to lack of adequate financial resources.

**DELIVERING ON TECHNOLOGY AND FINANCE:**

Issues related to this item were introduced in plenary on Thursday, 21 August, and discussed in a contact group chaired by AWG-LCA Chair Machado. Several countries elaborated on their earlier proposals on financing, in particular Norway, Mexico, Switzerland and the Republic of Korea. New proposals for finance and technology, such as a Convention financial mechanism and a technology transfer mechanism, were introduced by the G-77/China, in addition to the EU proposal on technology transfer.

On finance, parties discussed principles, sources of funding, mechanisms and criteria for financing, as well as specific proposals. With regard to sources of funding, developing countries noted financing should come from Annex I countries, while developed countries, such as the US and EU, highlighted the importance of the private sector. The EU underlined the need for using carbon markets and innovative financial instruments. Australia noted that relevant activities outside of the Convention should be recognized.

Parties also discussed the issue of conditionality, and New Zealand suggested this should be considered taking into account the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, a suggestion which was strongly opposed by developing countries. On technology transfer, parties noted the relevance of the work by Expert Group on Technology Transfer and need for research collaboration between developed and developing countries. India and Pakistan highlighted the intellectual property rights regime as a barrier to technology transfer. Several countries suggested the creation of a specialized body on technology transfer.

**AWG-LCA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/AWGLCA/2008/L.7) on the agenda item on long-term cooperative action, the AWG-LCA invites its Chair to prepare a document assembling the ideas and proposals presented by parties on the elements contained in paragraph 1 of decision 1/CP.13 (the Bali Action Plan). The ideas and proposals will include those received by 30 September 2008. The AWG-LCA further requests the Secretariat to make the compilation document available before Poznan. The AWG-LCA invites the Chair to update this document before the closure of the fourth session of the AWG-LCA based on submissions received after 30 September 2008.

**2009 WORK PROGRAMME**

This issue was first introduced in plenary on Thursday, 21 August, and discussed in informal consultations chaired by AWG-LCA Chair Machado. The discussions focused on the contents of the work programme for 2009, including the number and subjects of workshops to be held. In addition the AWG-LCA had to consider the request by COP 13 for it to report to COP 14 on progress made.

Many parties stressed the need to limit the number of workshops to be held in 2009. Parties said workshops should be held during the first session of the AWG-LCA in 2009, to enable parties to focus on actual negotiations during subsequent sessions.

**AWG-LCA Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/AWGLCA/2008/L.8), the AWG-LCA determines that it will shift into full negotiating mode in 2009, advancing negotiation on all elements of the Bali Action Plan; and calls on parties to

put forward proposals on the content and form of the outcome to be agreed at COP 15, to enable parties to review and assess the scope and progress of negotiations at AWG-LCA 6 in June 2009. The AWG-LCA also requests the Secretariat to organize three workshops at its fifth session, on: developed country mitigation commitments and developing country mitigation actions; economic and social consequences of response measures; and opportunities and challenges for mitigation in the agriculture sector. Regarding the calendar of meetings for 2009, the AWG-LCA emphasizes that there should be sufficient time between sessions to allow party groupings to consider and coordinate their positions.

**CLOSING PLENARY**

The AWG-LCA closing plenary was convened on Wednesday afternoon, 27 August, at 4:00 pm by AWG-LCA Chair Machado, who reported on deliberations of the contact groups on mitigation and associated means of implementation and on delivering on technology and financing, including consideration of institutional arrangements. AWG-LCA Vice-Chair Cutajar presented on the outcomes of the contact group on adaptation and associated means of implementation. Parties adopted the draft report of the session (FCCC/AWGLCA/2008/L.6) after agreeing that it would be completed by the Secretariat.

Antigua and Barbuda, on behalf of the G-77/China, said that discussions in Accra had been more productive than at earlier sessions and expressed hope that parties would build on this momentum. Australia, for the Umbrella Group, underscored the important and vital mandate of the Bali Action Plan and welcomed the robust discussions in Accra. The Indigenous Peoples Forum on Climate Change underscored recognition and respect for the rights of indigenous peoples, and emphasized that any future mechanism on REDD should include free prior informed consent and complete and timely access to information. Climate Action Network expressed concern with the slow pace of negotiations. A representative from the Trade Union NGOs underscored that the social basis for a post-2012 agreement remains uncertain, highlighting the need to discuss a transition to a low carbon economy. AWG-LCA Chair Machado adjourned the AWG-LCA plenary at 5:31pm.

**AD HOC WORKING GROUP UNDER THE KYOTO PROTOCOL (AWG-KP)**

AWG-KP Chair Harald Dovland (Norway) convened the opening plenary of AWG-KP 6 on Thursday, 21 August, and parties adopted the agenda (FCCC/KP/AWG/2008/4).

Dovland introduced the technical paper on the analysis of possible means to reach emission reduction targets and relevant methodological issues (FCCC/TP/2008/2 and Corr.1), the report of AWG-KP 5 (FCCC/KP/AWG/2008/3), and party submissions on relevant methodological issues (FCCC/KP/AWG/2008/INF.2), and established three contact groups on: emissions trading and the project-based mechanisms; LULUCF; and "other issues" to consider greenhouse gases, sectors and source categories, possible approaches targeting sectoral emissions, and consideration of relevant methodological issues.

Antigua and Barbuda, for the G-77/China, stressed the importance of limiting discussions to issues related to further quantified commitments for Annex I countries. Algeria, for the

African Group, urged Annex I countries to adopt ambitious targets. He called for improved rules and methodologies that ensure equitable geographic distribution of Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) projects; stated that land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF) issues are a high priority; and requested clarity regarding the implications of the inclusion of emissions from international transportation. France, on behalf of the EU, said Annex I countries should take the lead on reduction commitments, and called for a global market with liquidity, clear price signals, and cost-effective means to reduce emissions. Grenada, for AOSIS, emphasized the need for discussion regarding the share of proceeds for adaptation under the AWG-KP, maintaining that few changes are needed to the rules governing the flexible mechanisms and LULUCF.

**ANALYSIS OF MEANS TO REACH EMISSION REDUCTION TARGETS AND IDENTIFICATION OF WAYS TO ENHANCE THEIR EFFECTIVENESS AND CONTRIBUTION TO SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**

This agenda item was introduced in plenary on Thursday, 21 August, and then taken up in the aforementioned contact groups and informal consultations. Concerning the general conclusions, discussion throughout the meeting focused on how to incorporate language on the issue of possible approaches targeting sectoral emissions, which was not included in the agenda for AWG-KP 6 due to time constraints. Developing country parties objected to the inclusion of reference to possible approaches targeting sectoral emissions. The AWG-KP plenary adopted conclusions on Wednesday, 27 August.

**AWG-KP Conclusions:** In its general conclusions on the means to reach emission reduction targets (FCCC/KP/AWG/2008/L.13), the AWG-KP notes the iterative nature of its work programme, and agrees to continue its work in Poznan and, as appropriate, in its work programme for 2009, on the agenda item and all sub-items, including the flexible mechanisms, LULUCF, greenhouse gases sectors, and source categories, and possible approaches targeting sectoral emissions.

**EMISSIONS TRADING AND THE PROJECT-BASED MECHANISMS:** This sub-item was introduced in plenary on 21 August and then taken up in contact groups and "Friends of the Chair" consultations, co-chaired by Christiana Figueres (Costa Rica) and Nuno Lacasta (Portugal).

The group focused on Annex II of document FCCC/KP/AWG/2008/3, containing parties' views on means available to Annex I Parties to meet their emission reduction targets. The Co-Chairs proposed that the group focus on those items in Annex II that could have a significant impact on Annex I parties' ability to meet their reduction targets. Two classification approaches were proposed by parties. One approach proposed by the Co-Chairs, and supported by most parties, was to classify items on the list into "big ticket" and "non-big ticket" items, distinguishing between those items that could have a significant impact, and those that may not. The second classification, suggested by the G-77/China, was to classify items into those that require amending the Kyoto Protocol and those that do not. The G-77/China said those items requiring amendments to the Kyoto Protocol are outside the group's mandate. Parties could not agree on which classification to apply and both were eventually accepted. Parties did not go into substantive

discussions on the possible improvements to the flexible mechanisms, but agreed that further elaboration on the items was necessary, in order to foster a common understanding. During the closing AWG-KP plenary, the G-77/China again expressed concern that some options introduced in the mechanisms group were outside the mandate of the group, and the EU urged that mandate issues be resolved.

**AWG-KP Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/KP/AWG/2008/L.12), the AWG-KP notes the importance of further assessing possible improvements to the mechanisms and clarifying any implications for the ability of Annex I parties to achieve their mitigation objectives; agrees to continue consideration of these possible improvements in Poznan; and requests the Chair to elaborate on the elements in Annexes I and II based on views submitted previously by parties and the new submissions requested. The AWG-KP also invites parties to submit their views on the potential need to amend the Kyoto Protocol.

The conclusions contain two annexes, and the AWG-KP also invites parties to submit their views on the elements contained in these annexes. Annex I contains a list of possible improvements to the mechanisms that have a potentially significant implication for the ability of Annex I parties to achieve mitigation objectives. Annex II to the conclusions contains other possible improvements to the mechanisms, referring to those elements which, according to some parties' views, may not have a significant implication on Annex I parties' mitigation ability. The two annexes also identify those elements that some parties suggest require amendments to the Kyoto Protocol.

**LAND USE, LAND-USE CHANGE AND FORESTRY:** Issues related to LULUCF were introduced in plenary on Thursday, 21 August, and discussed in contact groups and informal consultations co-chaired by Bryan Smith (New Zealand) and Marcelo Rocha (Brazil).

In the contact group and informal consultations, parties focused primarily on accounting methodologies for forest management under Article 3.4 (additional activities), with an agreement that other non-forest-management activities would be taken up in due course. Parties made explanatory presentations on different methodological options and began to explore their strengths and weaknesses before drafting an annex elaborating four "possible options for consideration."

In the discussions, the G-77/China stressed that the principles of decision 16/CMP.1 on LULUCF be retained without amendment. Although some parties expressed preference to remove certain options, the Co-Chairs preferred not to remove options at this point so that each one could be more fully elaborated for discussion in Poznan.

In discussions on forest management accounting, Canada and others highlighted the ability of forward-looking baselines to factor out natural disturbances, age-class legacies, and indirect human-induced impacts. Japan sought inclusion of "land temporarily out of accounting," and unsuccessfully proposed removal of text specifying that activities under Article 3.4 be compulsory if they were accounted for in the first commitment period.

On harvested wood products (HWP), New Zealand proposed an “emissions to atmosphere” approach that would spread out HWP emissions accounting beyond the time of harvest.

After agreeing on the conclusions, the Co-Chairs held discussions on non-permanence and other methodological issues under the CDM, with the purpose of facilitating discussions in Poznan.

In these discussions, the G-77/China stated that afforestation and reforestation project activities should remain eligible, and that means to enhance implementation of these activities should be addressed. Bolivia, supported by Colombia and the Democratic Republic of the Congo, proposed maintaining temporary credits for forests that are intact and monitored. Brazil expressed concerns about the vulnerability of forests, suggesting defining a timeframe for non-permanence.

The EU stressed that non-permanence reversals require compensation, while Tuvalu suggested that current rules may be functioning and the lack of projects may reflect unwillingness of credit purchasers to bear the risk of reversals.

New Zealand, supported by Chile, suggested that responsibility for non-permanence be taken by host-country governments, and noted that accounting for timing of emissions from HWP may reduce non-permanence risks and make CDM LULUCF projects more attractive.

**AWG-KP Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/KP/ AWG/2008/L.11), the AWG-KP decides to continue its consideration at its resumed sixth session, taking into account the information contained in an annex to the conclusions, and noting Annex IV to the report of the AWG-KP at its resumed fifth session (FCCC/KP/AWG/2008/3).

The annex contains four “possible options for consideration,” each with different versions of forest management accounting under Article 3.4:

- gross-net;
- net-net with base year or base period;
- forward-looking baselines; and
- land-based accounting

Other items for consideration, within the larger options include, *inter alia*:

- alteration of the definition of “deforestation” to provide for land-use flexibility;
- extension or deletion of the afforestation and reforestation credit and debit rule;
- possible inclusion of caps and/or discount factors for Article 3.4 activities;
- voluntary versus compulsory accounting for forest management and other Article 3.4 activities;
- creation of provisions for including HWP;
- temporary removal from accounting and other options for addressing natural disturbances; and
- a possible decision by the COP/MOP to include provisions for land-based activities being incorporated into Annex A to the Kyoto Protocol.

**OTHER ISSUES:** Issues related to greenhouse gases, sectors and source categories, possible approaches targeting sectoral emissions, consideration of relevant methodological issues, and spillover effects were introduced in plenary on Thursday, 21 August, and discussed in a contact group on “other issues”

chaired by AWG-KP Chair Dovland. The contact group was convened in several sessions, as well as informal consultations and “Friends of the Chair” meetings throughout the week.

**Greenhouse gases, sectors and source categories:** In the contact group, parties agreed on a “basket approach” to use aggregate carbon dioxide equivalent treatment of greenhouse gases provided for in Article 3 of the Protocol in the second commitment period. Australia suggested the following differentiation among gases: those with sufficient information to warrant inclusion; those still requiring additional information; and those included under the Montreal Protocol. South Africa and Japan highlighted the need for a scientific assessment of new gases. The EU and Norway supported inclusion of hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) and perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and the Russian Federation cautioned against inclusion of insignificant gases. The US called for comprehensive coverage and consistency between the Protocol and the Convention.

During informal consultations, some developing country parties sought deletion of text calling for consistency between the Convention and the Protocol, preferring text referring to Annex I obligations under each. After extensive consultations, the group agreed to include the need to maintain a coherent approach in relation to Annex I party commitments. No consensus was reached on the inclusion of new HFCs and PFCs in Annex A of the Protocol. Parties decided to request more information on the gases, but differed on whether or not to include the study of sources in non-Annex I countries.

During the closing plenary, the G-77/China called for further work on scientific, technical and methodological aspects of new gases, while the EU noted that substantial analysis has already been conducted and stated that resolving this issue quickly should be a priority.

**AWG-KP Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/KP/ AWG/2008/L.15), the AWG-KP agrees to continue the use of aggregate carbon dioxide equivalent treatment of greenhouse gases provided for in Article 3 of the Kyoto Protocol (“basket approach”) in the second commitment period, and notes the need to maintain a coherent approach between the Convention and Protocol in relation to Annex I parties commitments. The AWG-KP notes the new HFCs and PFCs developed since the adoption of the Protocol, as well as new gases and groups of gases included in the IPCC Fourth Assessment Report. The AWG-KP agrees to further consider in Poznan, *inter alia*, scientific, technical, methodological and legal aspects of possible inclusion in the second commitment period of new gases. The conclusions also note that the Montreal Protocol is aimed at phasing out chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) and hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs), but does not address their emissions. The AWG-KP requests the Secretariat to compile technical information on the new gases and on existing stocks and potential emissions of CFCs and HCFCs in advance of Poznan.

**Spillover effects:** In a contact group meeting focusing on spillover effects, the G-77/China stated that consideration of spillover effects should focus on non-Annex I parties. Tuvalu, with New Zealand, the African Group and others, said greatest consideration should be paid to spillover effects on poorer countries. The Russian Federation, with Croatia, said spillover effects on all parties, particularly developing country parties,

should be considered. Canada noted the relevance of spillover effects to all parties, but suggested priority consideration for poorer countries.

Discussion also focused on boundaries and assessment methodologies for spillover effects. Japan, with Mexico, requested that boundaries be defined for spillover effects, and Australia suggested that these could relate to programmes and measures taken by parties in relation to obligations. The G-77/China urged discussion of methodologies. Mexico suggested the development of assessment criteria, and, opposed by Uganda, suggested a step-by-step process for identifying spillover effects. The EU noted the need for quick action and urged caution and pragmatism, stating that otherwise "analysis paralysis" could occur, given the complexities inherent in anticipating all effects.

In addition, the group emphasized a number of specific spillover effects. The G-77/China, with Australia and New Zealand, highlighted non-tariff trade barriers. Tuvalu noted the negative impacts of some biofuels, and the Gambia drew attention to the current food crisis. The EU explained its exploration of sustainability criteria for biofuels to address these concerns. Egypt made the distinction between biofuels produced from crops and those from waste. Brazil argued that biofuel production resulted from energy security efforts rather than Annex I mitigation measures, and highlighted its achievements in enhancing biofuel production efficiency.

Chair Dovland called for follow-up in Poznan and suggested submissions from parties to explore the issues raised. In the closing plenary, a representative from the trade union NGOs called for a methodology to measure the impacts of mitigation activities on jobs, competitiveness, and poverty, as well as for greater understanding of positive spillover effects.

**AWG-KP Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/KP/ AWG/2008/L.10), the AWG-KP notes the deliberations on the matter, as well as party submissions. The AWG-KP invites parties and relevant organizations to submit further information on the topic by 3 October 2008, which will be compiled into a document for consideration in Poznan. In addition, the conclusions state that the AWG-KP agrees to consider the topic further in Poznan, and requests the Secretariat to organize a workshop on the matter in 2009.

**Consideration of relevant methodological issues:** On this agenda sub-item, discussions in the contact group and in consultations were dedicated for the most part to discussing the use of global warming potentials (GWPs) versus global temperature potentials (GTPs). Parties considered the continued use of GWPs with a 100-year time horizon, but did not reach agreement, instead requesting further work on appropriate metrics. Brazil pointed out that the IPCC does not prescribe the use of GWPs. The EU, Australia, Norway and Japan supported the continued use of GWPs, and Norway proposed that the IPCC provide additional information on other metrics. The group decided to invite the IPCC to undertake further assessment of alternative common metrics, and noted the need for work to be carried out by the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technical Advice (SBSTA), while further considering the topic in Poznan.

Consultations also focused on language related to coherence between the Convention and the Protocol, and the group eventually agreed to include the need to maintain a coherent

approach in relation to Annex I Parties' commitments. In the last meeting of the contact group, the US expressed concern with consideration of GTPs, and objected to not being included in the "Friends of the Chair" meeting, given issues of coherence between the Convention and Protocol.

**AWG-KP Conclusions:** In its conclusions (FCCC/ AWG/2008/L.14), the AWG-KP notes the need to maintain a coherent approach between the Convention and the Protocol, where appropriate, when considering relevant methodological issues in relation to Annex I party commitments. The AWG-KP acknowledges the application of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories* for the purpose of providing information for the second commitment period should be subject to decisions of the COP and the COP/MOP. The conclusions take note of new information on GWPs in the Fourth Assessment Report, and acknowledge the common metrics other than GWPs that could be used to calculate the carbon dioxide equivalence of emissions, including GTPs. The AWG-KP invites the IPCC to undertake further technical assessment of alternative common metrics, noting the need for work to be carried out by the SBSTA. The AWG-KP agrees to further consider GWPs and alternative common metrics in Poznan.

#### CLOSING PLENARY

AWG-KP Chair Dovland convened the AWG-KP closing plenary at 5:38 pm on Wednesday, 27 August. Bryan Smith, Christiana Figueres and Chair Dovland reported on deliberations of their respective contact groups on LULUCF, flexible mechanisms, and "other issues." Parties adopted the report of the session (FCCC/KP/ AWG/2008/L.9) and the conclusions.

During closing statements, Burkina Faso, for the LDCs, and Grenada, on behalf of AOSIS, urged developed country parties to come to Poznan ready to make quantitative reduction commitments.

Climate Action Network International called for a reduction of emissions by 80% to 95% below 1990 levels by 2050, and for deep domestic reductions that lead to a transformation to a low-carbon economy. He called for discarding the option to use nuclear power under the CDM, expressed concern that bunker fuel emissions had yet to be controlled, and urged parties to bring their targets to Poznan.

UNFCCC Executive Secretary Yvo de Boer announced that AWG-LCA 5 and AWG-KP 7 would take place from 30 March to 9 April 2009 in Bonn, Germany. He urged parties to come forward with contributions, because future sessions remained unfunded.

AWG-KP Chair Dovland concluded the session by acknowledging the tremendous amount of work achieved in Accra, but noted that parties still need to enhance understanding of the implications of the options proposed during the meeting. He warned that the group would not be able to agree on final commitments before the rules were established, and urged parties to focus on essential issues. He expressed concern about the anticipated workload for Poznan. Identifying the need to circulate draft text to parties at least six months before the COP/MOP, Chair Dovland pointed out that draft text would have to be received by June 2009. He urged parties to work intensively on outstanding issues and adjourned the meeting at 6:37 pm.

## A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF THE MEETINGS

Delegates arriving in Accra had mixed hopes for what the week's negotiations would hold. While some expressed hopes for substantive outcomes and a narrowing of possible options for a future agreement, many described Accra as a major "collecting and clarifying" event for the two negotiating tracks.

After agreeing on the AWG-LCA 2008 work programme in Bangkok in April, parties set out in Bonn in June to begin an exchange of ideas and opinions on the elements of the Bali Action Plan. Discussions, therefore, remained at a general level, focused on fostering understanding of issues to be considered by the AWG-LCA (a shared vision, adaptation, mitigation and financing and technology). In Accra, more detailed and substantive discussions began in contact groups. It was not anticipated that there would be agreement on items or issues, rather a continuation of the exchange of ideas, this time coupled with concrete proposals for action. This process of "putting all cards on the table" is expected to continue through Poznan, which should mark the end of the pre-negotiation phase and open the door to formal negotiations in 2009.

In the AWG-KP, delegates arrived to take up specific issues that they had begun to discuss in Bonn. For example, where Bonn had resulted in lists of options in the flexible mechanisms and LULUCF contact groups, work in Accra further elaborated the options so parties could return home and analyze how the different options affect their national circumstances and arrive in Poznan ready to narrow down the lists of options.

This brief analysis aims to situate the Accra talks along the long and complicated road to Copenhagen by analyzing: the strategic timing of decision making (when to talk); the positioning of items within and between the two negotiating tracks (where to talk); and the status of a few contentious items in future discussions (what to talk about).

### WHEN TO TALK

With parties, observers, and the press carefully watching the climate negotiations as they progress from Bali to Copenhagen, there has been a focus on the pace of the negotiations. While the seemingly slow pace of the negotiations is due in part to technical complexity and a lack of political will, in another sense it has become a "waiting game." Discussions with delegates across the two processes reveal three different things that delegates may be waiting for.

First, developing countries are waiting for developed countries to "lead" in the AWG-KP by specifying quantitative targets. This sentiment – that discussing developing country commitments is premature until such a step is taken – is widespread in the G-77/China. At the same time, developed countries are waiting to see how talks under the AWG-LCA shape up, particularly in terms of nationally appropriate mitigation actions by developing countries, before specifying their further commitments under the AWG-KP. In this respect, developed countries are keeping their cards close to their chest, until they know what kind of commitments developing countries will take on.

Second, in the discussions surrounding comparability of efforts among developed countries, parties are waiting for clarity on what positions major developed country parties are likely to take in 2009. In this context, parties are looking towards the US

presidential election in November and are reticent to "lay their cards on the table" before they have an idea as to how the US may engage in the process in 2009.

Finally, upon arrival in Accra, some parties expected to begin to narrow the lists of options on LULUCF and the flexible mechanisms under the AWG-KP. Instead, after debates, parties decided to wait for a more concrete understanding of the options on the table before going forward. In this context, the work done in Accra to further specify and clarify options may allow parties to go home and "crunch numbers" on the implications of the various options for their national circumstances, and arrive in Poznan ready to move from "collecting and clarifying" to negotiating.

### WHERE TO TALK

As parties prepare for more substantive negotiations over the next year, defining the appropriate forum for discussing key issues has become a hotly contested process. In the AWG-LCA, delegates moved from plenary discussions to more focused contact groups. Controversy arose during the process of forming the contact groups when the Umbrella Group and the G-77/China disagreed on how these groups should be structured. The Umbrella Group sought contact groups on mitigation and adaptation only, arguing that enhanced provision of financial resources and action on technology development and transfer could be adequately dealt with in these two groups. The G-77/China, consistent with its long-held position advocating separate discussions of technology transfer and finance, insisted upon a third contact group, resulting in the formation of the contact group on "delivering on technology and finance, including institutional arrangements." In particular, their concern is that subsuming the items on finance and technology into the other two contact groups would not only result in these items not being given sufficient attention, but also result in linking the issues in such a way that access to finance and technology transfer would be conditional on mitigation commitments.

In the AWG-KP flexible mechanisms contact group, debates about the appropriate forum for discussions took the form of mandate issues, which arose in the form of disagreement as to whether the mandate of the AWG-KP allowed for discussion of many of the options on the list of possible improvements to the mechanisms. The mandate of the AWG-KP (decision 1/CMP.1) is to work in accordance with Article 3.9 of the Kyoto Protocol, which states that "commitments for subsequent periods for Parties included in Annex I shall be established in amendments to Annex B to this Protocol." Some parties expressed that inclusion of certain activities would require amendment to more than Annex B. They argued that these items were thus outside the mandate of the AWG-KP and refused to prioritize them. "Friends of the Chair" meetings on this issue consumed much of this contact group's meeting time in Accra, and parties have been invited to submit their views on the potential need to amend the Protocol. In their closing statements, the EU and G-77/China stressed the need to resolve this issue.

Further, issues such as carbon capture and storage, which are already under consideration by the SBSTA, were flagged in the group's conclusions due to concerns about duplication of effort.

Additionally, one party reportedly objected to discussion of sectoral CDM in the AWG-KP, preferring that discussion of the subject be limited to the AWG-LCA.

### WHAT TO TALK ABOUT

Workshops on cooperative sectoral approaches and sector-specific actions, and on policy approaches and positive incentives on issues relating to REDD in developing countries, and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries, served as significant milestones in consideration of both of these issues, according to many close to the process.

The inclusion of REDD and other forest-carbon activities in developing countries into a possible future agreement has been uncertain. Many participants observed that the tone of the REDD workshop in Accra was notably different from past REDD discussions, pointing most significantly to increased engagement by Brazil, and a wider agreement on the inclusion of conservation. Although some parties expressed frustration that there were not sufficient opportunities to discuss REDD issues after the workshop, it seems certain that future REDD discussions will feature more prominently on the agenda of the AWG-LCA.

The workshop on cooperative sectoral approaches and sector-specific actions may have also advanced discussions on this contentious issue. UNFCCC Executive Secretary Yvo de Boer said that this workshop deepened understanding of sectoral approaches, stating that it "made clear that sectoral approaches are not about imposing targets on developing countries." He added that parties emphasized that it is up to a country to decide if it wants to put sectoral policies in place or not. In spite of this progress, many parties remain frustrated with the lack of a clear definition of sectoral approaches. "It's an important discussion to have, but as of now we're boxing at shadows," noted one long-time delegate.

### TALKING OUR WAY FROM ACCRA TO COPENHAGEN

Just as delegates expressed mixed hopes upon arrival in Accra, it is no surprise that they expressed mixed opinions about the week upon departure. Looking ahead, some are optimistic, notably about the compilation of views on all elements discussed under the AWG-LCA, to be prepared by Chair Luiz Machado, with hope that it may eventually evolve into a first negotiating text. Others see the debates raging on when to talk, where to talk and what to talk about and wonder how it could possibly add up to an agreement in just over a year's time. While some may characterize these clashes as slowing down the process, others admit that this is simply an unavoidable part of a process tasked with such complicated international coordination. Indeed, the very act of waiting is also part of the process. Though some expressed concern with the lack of substantive outcomes from Accra, others suggested that preparation and learning to communicate are essential parts of building a stable long-term agreement. "These delegates are tough," said one long-time observer. "But if you cook them all together in a pot for the next fifteen months I think you'll find they'll be done when we get to Copenhagen."

## UPCOMING MEETINGS

**29TH SESSION OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE (IPCC-29):** IPCC-29 is scheduled to take place in Geneva, Switzerland, from 1-4 September 2008. The meeting will celebrate the IPCC's 20th anniversary. For more information, contact: IPCC Secretariat; tel: +41-22-730-8208; fax: +41-22-730-8025/13; e-mail: IPCC-Sec@wmo.int; internet: <http://www.ipcc.ch/>

**CLIMATE CHANGE AND DEVELOPMENT SHORT COURSE:** This course will be held from 1-12 September 2008, at the University of East Anglia, Norwich, United Kingdom. For more information, contact: Overseas Development Group; tel: +44 (0)1603-592813; fax: +44 (0)1603-591170; e-mail: [odg.gen@uea.ac.uk](mailto:odg.gen@uea.ac.uk); internet: <http://www1.uea.ac.uk/cm/home/schools/ssf/dev/odg/prodev/ccd>

**ITTO AFRICAN REGIONAL FORUM ON PROMOTING WOOD-BASED BIOENERGY:** This African Regional Forum of the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO) will be held from 3-5 September 2008, in Douala, Cameroon. For more information, contact: Tetra Yanuariadi, ITTO; tel: +81-45-223-1110; fax: +81-45-223-1111; e-mail: [tetra@itto.or.jp](mailto:tetra@itto.or.jp); internet: <http://www.itto.or.jp>

**FIRST AFRICA CARBON FORUM:** The Forum, sponsored by the International Emissions Trading Association, UNFCCC, UNEP, UNDP and the World Bank, will take place from 3-5 September 2008, in Dakar, Senegal. For more information, contact: Lisa Spafford, IETA, tel: +41-22-737-05-02; fax: +41-22-737-05-08; e-mail: [spafford@ieta.org](mailto:spafford@ieta.org); internet: <http://www.ieta.org/ieta/www/pages/index.php?IdSitePage=1548>

**UNFF INTERNATIONAL DIALOGUE ON FINANCING SUSTAINABLE FOREST MANAGEMENT:** The United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF) Dialogue will take place from 8-12 September 2008, in Paramaribo, Suriname. For more information, contact: Permanent Mission of Suriname to the United Nations; tel: +1-212-826-0660; fax: +1-212-980-7029; e-mail: [suriname@un.int](mailto:suriname@un.int); internet: <http://www.clisuriname.com/smartcms/default.asp>

**KYOTO PROTOCOL JI TECHNICAL WORKSHOP:** The Joint Implementation (JI) Workshop will be held from 9-10 September 2008, in Bonn, Germany. The workshop is intended to allow the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee (JISC) to consider its experiences in supervising the verification procedure under the JISC (JI Track 2 procedure). For more information, contact the UNFCCC Secretariat; tel: +49-228-815-1000; fax: +49-228-815-1999; e-mail: [secretariat@unfccc.int](mailto:secretariat@unfccc.int); internet: <http://unfccc.int/2860.php>

**WORKSHOP ON HARVESTED WOOD PRODUCTS IN THE CONTEXT OF CLIMATE CHANGE POLICIES:** This workshop will be held from 9-10 September 2008, in Geneva, Switzerland. Organized by the UN Economic Commission for Europe, Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe and Switzerland, the event will aim to: provide information on carbon storage and the substitution effects of harvested wood products (HWP); present core principles of HWP accounting and national experiences; and consider the opportunities and impacts of HWP accounting for different stakeholders. For more information, contact: Sebastian Hetsch, UNECE/FAO Timber Section; tel: +41-22-917-4170; fax: +41-

22-917-0041; e-mail: [sebastian.hetsch@unece.org](mailto:sebastian.hetsch@unece.org); internet: <http://www.unece.org/trade/timber/workshops/2008/hwp/>

**KYOTO PROTOCOL 12TH MEETING OF THE JI SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE:** The Committee will meet from 11-12 September 2008, in Bonn, Germany. For more information, contact: the UNFCCC Secretariat; tel: +49-228-815-1000; fax: +49-228-815-1999; e-mail: [secretariat@unfccc.int](mailto:secretariat@unfccc.int); internet: [http://ji.unfccc.int/Sup\\_Committee/Meetings/012/index.html](http://ji.unfccc.int/Sup_Committee/Meetings/012/index.html)

**WTO 2008 PUBLIC FORUM TO DISCUSS MUTUAL SUPPORTIVENESS OF TRADE, CLIMATE AND DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES:** The World Trade Organization (WTO) Public Forum will meet from 24-25 September 2008, in Geneva, Switzerland. For more information, contact the WTO Public Forum: tel: +41-22-739-5677; fax: +41-22-739-5777; e-mail: [Publicforum2008@wto.org](mailto:Publicforum2008@wto.org); internet: <http://www.wto.org>

**FORTY-SECOND MEETING OF THE CDM EXECUTIVE BOARD:** The meeting of the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) Executive Board will take place from 24-26 September 2008, in Bonn, Germany. For more information, contact the UNFCCC Secretariat; tel: +49-228-815-1000; fax: +49-228-815-1999; e-mail: [secretariat@unfccc.int](mailto:secretariat@unfccc.int); internet: [http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc\\_calendar/items/2655.php](http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php)

**UNFCCC FOURTEENTH MEETING OF THE LDC EXPERT GROUP:** The meeting of the Least Developed Countries (LDC) Expert Group will take place from 29 September to 1 October 2008, in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. For more information, contact: the UNFCCC Secretariat; tel: +49-228-815-1000; fax: +49-228-815-1999; e-mail: [secretariat@unfccc.int](mailto:secretariat@unfccc.int); internet: <http://unfccc.int>

**KYOTO PROTOCOL FORTY-THIRD MEETING OF THE CDM EXECUTIVE BOARD:** The CDM Executive Board will meet from 22-24 October 2008, in Santiago, Chile. For more information, contact: the UNFCCC Secretariat; tel: +49-228-815-1000; fax: +49-228-815-1999; e-mail: [secretariat@unfccc.int](mailto:secretariat@unfccc.int); internet: <http://unfccc.int>

**KYOTO PROTOCOL SIXTH MEETING OF THE DNA FORUM:** The meeting of the Designated National Authorities (DNA) Forum will take place from 27-28 October 2008, in Santiago, Chile. For more information, contact UN ECLAC: tel: +56-2-210-2000, +56-2-471-2000; fax: +56-2-208-0252, +56-2-208-1946; e-mail: [secepal@cepal.org](mailto:secepal@cepal.org); internet: <http://cdm.unfccc.int/DNA/DNAForum/index.html>

**20TH MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL:** This meeting is scheduled to take place from 16-20 November 2008, in Doha, Qatar, in conjunction with the 8th Conference of the Parties to the Vienna Convention. For more information, contact: Ozone Secretariat; tel: +254-20-762-3850/1; fax: +254-20-762-4691; e-mail: [ozoneinfo@unep.org](mailto:ozoneinfo@unep.org); internet: <http://www.unep.org/ozone/>

**KYOTO PROTOCOL FORTY-FOURTH MEETING OF THE CDM EXECUTIVE BOARD:** The meeting of the CDM Executive Board will take place from 26-28 November 2008, in Poznan, Poland. For more information, contact the UNFCCC Secretariat; tel: +49-228-815-1000; fax: +49-228-815-1999; e-mail: [secretariat@unfccc.int](mailto:secretariat@unfccc.int); internet: [http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc\\_calendar/items/2655.php?year=2008](http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php?year=2008)

**KYOTO PROTOCOL THIRTEENTH MEETING OF THE JI SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE:** The JI Supervisory Committee will meet from 26-28 November 2008, in Poznan, Poland. For more information, contact the UNFCCC Secretariat; tel: +49-228-815-1000; fax: +49-228-815-1999; e-mail: [secretariat@unfccc.int](mailto:secretariat@unfccc.int); internet: [http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc\\_calendar/items/2655.php?year=2008](http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php?year=2008)

**FOURTEENTH CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE UNFCCC (COP 14) AND FOURTH MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE KYOTO PROTOCOL (COP/MOP 4):** UNFCCC COP 14 and Kyoto Protocol COP/MOP 4 are scheduled to take place from 1-12 December 2008 in Poznan, Poland. These meetings will coincide with the 29th meetings of the UNFCCC's subsidiary bodies and the fourth meeting of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Long-Term Cooperative Action (AWG-LCA) and the resumed sixth session of the AWG on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Protocol (AWG-KP). For more information, contact: UNFCCC Secretariat; tel: +49-228-815-1000; fax: +49-228-815-1999; e-mail: [secretariat@unfccc.int](mailto:secretariat@unfccc.int); internet: <http://unfccc.int>

**FOREST DAY 2:** Forest Day 2 is scheduled for 6 December 2008, in Poznan, Poland. The Center for International Forestry Research is co-hosting Forest Day 2 in collaboration with partner organizations in the Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF), coinciding with UNFCCC COP14. For more information, contact CIFOR headquarters; tel: +62-251-8622-622; fax: +62-251-8622-100; e-mail: [Cifor-forestday@cgiar.org](mailto:Cifor-forestday@cgiar.org); internet: [http://www.cifor.cgiar.org/Events/CIFOR/forest\\_day2.htm](http://www.cifor.cgiar.org/Events/CIFOR/forest_day2.htm)

**AWG-LCA 5 and AWG-KP 7:** The fifth meeting of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Long-Term Cooperative Action and the seventh session of the AWG on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Protocol are scheduled to take place from 30 March to 9 April 2009 in Bonn, Germany. For more information, contact: UNFCCC Secretariat; tel: +49-228-815-1000; fax: +49-228-815-1999; e-mail: [secretariat@unfccc.int](mailto:secretariat@unfccc.int); internet: <http://unfccc.int>

## GLOSSARY

AOSIS	Alliance of Small Island States
AWG-LCA	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol
AWG-KP	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
COP	Conference of the Parties
COP/MOP	Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties
GTP	Global temperature potential
GWP	Global warming potential
HFCs	Hydrofluorocarbons
HWP	Harvested wood products
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
LDCs	Least developed countries
LULUCF	Land use, land-use change and forestry
PFCs	Perfluorocarbons
REDD	Reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries