



SUMMARY OF THE TWENTIETH SESSIONS OF THE SUBSIDIARY BODIES OF THE UN FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE: 16-25 JUNE 2004

The twentieth sessions of the Subsidiary Bodies (SB-20) to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) took place at the Maritim Hotel in Bonn, Germany, from 16-25 June 2004. Approximately 1,350 participants from 161 governments, one observer State, and 134 intergovernmental, non-governmental and other observer organizations and media outlets were in attendance. Throughout the meeting, Parties convened in plenary sessions of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) and the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI), as well as in several contact groups and informal consultations. At SB-20, Parties adopted numerous conclusions and forwarded draft decisions for deliberation at COP-10. In particular, SBSTA considered methodological issues, including: small-scale afforestation and reforestation project activities under the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM); good practice guidance on land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF); greenhouse gas inventories; emissions from fuel used for international aviation and maritime transport; and issues relating to Protocol Articles 7 (communication of information) and 8 (review of information). Parties also discussed scientific, technical and socioeconomic aspects of impacts of, and vulnerability and adaptation to, climate change, and scientific, technical and socioeconomic aspects of mitigation.

SBI addressed non-Annex I national communications, capacity building, implementation of UNFCCC Article 4.8 (adverse effects) and 4.9 (least developed countries), the UNFCCC's financial mechanism, arrangements for intergovernmental meetings, and administrative and financial matters.

Two in-session workshops mandated by SBSTA-19 also took place. These dealt with the scientific, technical and socioeconomic aspects of impacts of, and vulnerability and adaptation to, climate change, and the scientific, technical, and socioeconomic aspects of mitigation. The workshop on adaptation was held on Friday, 18 June, while the one on mitigation took place on Saturday, 19 June. Both were chaired by SBSTA Chair Abdullatif Benrageb (Libya). Two other SBSTA events took place on Monday, 21 June: on research in response to the Third Assessment Report of the Inter-

governmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), and on the Brazilian Proposal for differentiated emissions reduction targets for Parties based on the impact of their historic emissions on temperature rise.

While SB-20 was generally a low-key affair that saw little serious conflict, the meeting was not without incident. In particular, several new innovations and some increased technical complexities emerged in the process. Delegates will now be looking ahead to COP-10, and news of Russia's intentions towards the Kyoto Protocol.

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 human health, food security, economic activity, water and other natural resources, and physical infrastructure. Global climate varies naturally, but scientists agree that rising concentrations of anthropogenically-emitted greenhouse gases in the Earth's atmosphere are leading to changes in the climate. According to the IPCC, the effects of climate change have already been observed, and a majority of scientists believe that precautionary and prompt action is necessary.

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 in order to avoid "dangerous anthropo-

IN THIS ISSUE

A Brief History of the UNFCCC and the Kyoto Protocol . . .	1
SB-20 Report	3
Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice . .	3
Subsidiary Body for Implementation	9
A Brief Analysis of SB-20	12
Things to Look For Before COP-10	14

This issue of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* © <enb@iisd.org> is written and edited by Emily Boyd, Ph.D.; María Gutiérrez; Dagmar Lohan, Ph.D.; Lisa Schipper; and Anju Sharma. The Digital Editors are Francis Dejon and Leila Mead. The Team Leader is Lisa Schipper <lisa@iisd.org>. 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 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 Swiss Agency for Environment, Forests and Landscape (SAEFL), the United Kingdom (through the Department for International Development - DFID), the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Government of Germany (through the German Federal Ministry of Environment - BMU, and the German Federal Ministry of Development Cooperation - BMZ), and the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs. General Support for the *Bulletin* during 2004 is provided by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the Government of Australia, Austrian Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management, the Ministry of Environment and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Sweden, the Ministry of Environment and Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Norway, Swan International, the Japanese Ministry of Environment (through the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies - IGES) and the Japanese Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (through the Global Industrial and Social Progress Research Institute - GISPRI). Funding for translation of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* in French has been provided by the International Organization of the Francophonie (IOF) and the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The opinions expressed in the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of IISD or other donors. Excerpts from the *Earth Negotiations 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>, +1-212-644-0217 or 212 East 47th St. #21F, New York, NY 10017, USA.



genic interference” with the climate system. Controlled gases include methane, nitrous oxide, and, in particular, carbon dioxide. The UNFCCC entered into force on 21 March 1994. With the recent accession of Turkey, the UNFCCC now has 189 Parties.

KYOTO PROTOCOL: In 1995, the first meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP-1) to the UNFCCC established the *Ad Hoc* Group on the Berlin Mandate to negotiate an agreement on strengthening efforts to combat climate change. Following intense negotiations culminating at COP-3 in Kyoto, Japan, in December 1997, delegates agreed to a Protocol to the UNFCCC that commits developed countries and countries with economies in transition (EITs) to achieve quantified emissions reduction targets. These countries, known under the UNFCCC as Annex I Parties, agreed to reduce their overall emissions of six greenhouse gases by at least 5% below 1990 levels between 2008 and 2012 (the first commitment period), with specific targets varying from country to country. The Protocol also established three mechanisms to assist Annex I Parties in meeting their national targets cost-effectively: an emissions trading system; joint implementation (JI) of emissions-reduction projects between Annex I Parties; and a Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) that allows for projects to be implemented in non-Annex I (developing country) Parties.

At subsequent meetings, Parties negotiated most of the rules and operational details determining how countries will cut emissions and measure and assess their emissions reductions. To enter into force, the Protocol must be ratified by 55 Parties to the UNFCCC, and by Annex I Parties representing at least 55% of their total carbon dioxide emissions for 1990. To date, 122 Parties have ratified the Protocol, including 32 Annex I Parties representing 44.2% of the emissions required for entry into force.

BUENOS AIRES PLAN OF ACTION: In November 1998, Parties met at COP-4 in Buenos Aires, Argentina, and agreed on a set of decisions known as the Buenos Aires Plan of Action (BAPA). The BAPA set COP-6 as the deadline for reaching agreement on the operational details of the Protocol and on strengthening implementation of the UNFCCC. Issues to be addressed included rules relating to the mechanisms, a regime for assessing Parties’ compliance, accounting methods for national emissions and emissions reductions, and rules on crediting countries for carbon sinks. Issues under the UNFCCC that required resolution included questions of capacity building, the development and transfer of technology, and assistance to those developing countries particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change or to actions taken by industrialized countries to combat climate change.

COP-6 PART I: COP-6 was held in The Hague, the Netherlands, from 13-25 November 2000. During the second week of negotiations, COP-6 President Jan Pronk of the Netherlands attempted to facilitate negotiations on the many disputed political and technical issues by convening high-level informal Plenary sessions. After almost 36 hours of intense talks in the final two days, negotiators could not agree on a range of topics, particularly financial issues, supplementarity in the use of the mechanisms, compliance with the Protocol, and LULUCF. On Saturday afternoon, 25 November, President Pronk announced that agreement had not been reached, and Parties decided to suspend COP-6 and resume negotiations in 2001.

COP-6 PART II: In March 2001, the US administration repudiated the agreement reached in Kyoto, stating that it considered the Protocol to be “fatally flawed,” as it would damage the US economy and exempt key developing countries from emissions reduction targets. Parties reconvened at COP-6 Part II from 16-27 July 2001, in Bonn. After protracted consultations, President Pronk presented his proposal for a draft political decision. Despite support from several Parties, disagreements surfaced over the nature of the compliance regime. After several days of consultations, ministers agreed to adopt President Pronk’s political decision, with a revised section on compliance. The political decision – or “Bonn Agreements” – needed to be operationalized through COP decisions. These decisions were considered a “package,” and since no agreement was reached on the mechanisms, compliance and LULUCF, all draft decisions were forwarded to COP-7.

COP-7: Delegates continued discussions on the “Bonn Agreements” at COP-7 in Marrakesh, Morocco, from 29 October to 10 November 2001. After lengthy negotiations, a package deal on LULUCF, mechanisms, Protocol Articles 5 (methodological issues), 7 and 8, and input to the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) was proposed. Although the deal was accepted by most regional groups, some Annex I Parties, including Australia, Canada, Japan, New Zealand, and the Russian Federation, did not join the consensus, disputing, among other things, eligibility requirements and credit banking under the mechanisms. However, following extensive negotiations, the “Marrakesh Accords” were agreed.

COP-8: Delegates to COP-8 met from 23 October to 1 November 2002, in New Delhi, India. Parties considered institutional and procedural issues under the Protocol and adopted several decisions, including on the rules and procedures for the Executive Board of the CDM. On the final day of COP-8, they adopted the *Delhi Declaration on Climate Change and Sustainable Development*. The Declaration reaffirms development and poverty eradication as overriding priorities in developing countries, and recognizes Parties’ common but differentiated responsibilities and national development priorities and circumstances in the implementation of UNFCCC commitments.

SB-18: Delegates to SB-18 met in Bonn from 4-13 June 2003. Parties continued to address issues under negotiation since COP-8 and prepare for the Protocol’s entry into force. Conclusions were agreed on a number of agenda items, including on Protocol Articles 5, 7 and 8. The issue of the Secretariat’s programme budget for 2004-5 and the Special Climate Change Fund proved to be particularly difficult, and discussions were left unfinished until COP-9.

COP-9: From 1-12 December 2003, Parties met at COP-9 and SB-19, in Milan, Italy, to adopt 22 decisions and several conclusions. The last outstanding detail of the BAPA was finalized when Parties agreed on modalities and procedures for afforestation and reforestation project activities under the CDM. Concluding discussions on the Secretariat’s programme budget for 2004-5 from SB-18, Parties agreed to a 9% budget increase. Negotiations on the operation of the Special Climate Change Fund and the Least Developed Countries’ (LDC) Fund proved to be challenging, with protracted discussions on the LDC Fund postponing the closing of the COP. Negotiations on good practice guidance for LULUCF were also lengthy, and left for consideration by SB-20.



SB-20 REPORT

The Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) met five times during SB-20. As well as the Plenary sessions, contact groups were also formed and informal consultations were arranged to help prepare draft conclusions for consideration by SBSTA, as well as draft COP decisions and conclusions, and draft decisions for the COP serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (COP/MOP). Parties addressed various methodological issues during these meetings, including: good practice guidance for LULUCF activities under the Protocol, harvested wood products and other issues relating to LULUCF; simplified modalities and procedures for small-scale afforestation and reforestation project activities under the CDM; emissions resulting from fuel used in international aviation and maritime transport; issues relating to greenhouse gas inventories; issues relating to Protocol Articles 7 and 8; and issues relating to registry systems under Protocol Article 7.4. Parties also addressed: the development and transfer of technology; "good practices" in policies and measures among Annex I Parties; research and systematic observation; scientific, technical and socioeconomic aspects of the impacts of, and vulnerability and adaptation to, climate change (adaptation); scientific, technical and socioeconomic aspects of mitigation; and cooperation with relevant international organizations. Other matters addressed included issues relating to cleaner or less greenhouse gas-emitting energy, and the implementation of Protocol Article 2.3 (adverse effects of policies and measures).

The Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) also met five times during SB-20. As with SBSTA, the SBI Plenary sessions were complemented by contact groups and informal consultations, which were arranged to prepare draft conclusions for consideration by SBI, as well as to negotiate draft COP decisions. SBI addressed a variety of issues, including Annex I national communications, as well as various aspects of non-Annex I national communications, such as the submission of second, and where appropriate, third national communications, the work of the Consultative Group of Experts on non-Annex I national communications, and the provision of financial and technical support. Parties also addressed a number of other issues, including: the UNFCCC's financial mechanism and matters relating to the implementation of decision 5/CP.8 (review of the financial mechanism); UNFCCC Article 6 (education, training and public awareness); capacity building; implementation of UNFCCC Articles 4.8 and 4.9, including progress on the implementation of activities under decision 5/CP.7 (implementation of UNFCCC Articles 4.8 and 4.9) and matters relating to LDCs. Parties also considered arrangements for intergovernmental meetings, including arrangements for COP-10, future sessional periods, the organization of the intergovernmental process, effective participation in the UNFCCC process, and arrangements for COP/MOP-1. In addition, the SBI examined various administrative and financial matters, including budget performance for the biennium 2004-2005, and implementation of paragraph 7(c) of the financial procedures of the UNFCCC concerning the financial support for participation in the UNFCCC process. Implementation of the Headquarters Agreement, and the continuing review of the functions and operations of the Secretariat, were also considered.

SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE

OPENING OF THE SESSION: SBSTA Chair Abdullatif Benrageb (Libya) opened SBSTA-20 on Wednesday morning, 16 June. Joke Waller-Hunter, UNFCCC Executive Secretary, welcomed Turkey as the 189th UNFCCC Party. Delegates then adopted the agenda (FCCC/SBSTA/2004/1) without amendment.

METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES: Good practice guidance for LULUCF: This issue was first addressed in the SBSTA Plenary on Wednesday, 16 June, and subsequently in a contact group. The contact group, which met five times from 18-24 June, was co-chaired by Audun Rosland (Norway) and William Kojo Agyemang-Bonsu (Ghana). Informal consultations were also held in an effort to draft conclusions and negotiate a draft decision for adoption at COP-10. On Friday, 25 June, SBSTA adopted conclusions on this matter.

The contact group addressed good practice guidance activities under the Protocol, the issue of harvested wood products, and other matters relating to LULUCF. A drafting group, chaired by Maria José Sanz (Spain), was organized to complete the common reporting format tables for reporting annual greenhouse gas inventories from LULUCF activities under the Protocol.

IPCC good practice guidance experts were invited to the first contact group meeting to present and answer questions on reporting LULUCF activities under the Protocol.

On the good practice guidance common reporting format, debate focused on two methods for identifying the geographical location of reported LULUCF activities. The Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS) supported using the more detailed method of land identification, whereas the EU and most other Parties supported administrative units for land identification. Following intensive discussions in the drafting group, common reporting format tables were finally agreed on, except in regards to the identification of LULUCF activities in relation to Protocol Article 6 (joint implementation). Parties disagreed on the coding system to be used for identifying activities in relation to joint implementation projects.

On the issue of harvested wood products, delegates discussed the scope and terms of reference for a workshop scheduled to be held in Lillehammer, Norway, in August/September 2004.

On other LULUCF issues, delegates discussed definitions and methodological options relating to degradation of forests and devegetation of other vegetation types, and the issue of factoring out direct-human induced effects from the indirect and natural effects of LULUCF activities. Australia, with the US, Canada, Japan and New Zealand, supported a broad approach to LULUCF issues, namely an open-ended policy dialogue. The EU, AOSIS, and the G-77/China preferred a focused approach, and suggested holding a technical workshop after COP-10, which would consider submissions by Parties. There was discussion on how to refer to factoring out, with the G-77/China suggesting specific reference to the Marrakesh Accords, while others preferred more general references, including to submissions by Parties. The G-77/China said it would present a concept paper on factoring out at SBSTA-21.

On Friday 25 June, SBSTA adopted conclusions on good practice guidance, harvested wood products, and various other LULUCF issues. Parties also adopted conclusions containing a



bracketed draft COP decision that includes the common reporting format tables, and a bracketed draft COP/MOP decision (FCCC/SBSTA/2004/L.15/Add.1) for consideration at SBSTA-21.

SBSTA conclusions: In the conclusions on LULUCF (FCCC/SBSTA/2004/L.15), SBSTA takes note of the methodological guidance included in the IPCC's good practice guidance, and elaborates the common reporting format tables for reporting greenhouse gas inventories for LULUCF activities under Protocol Article 3.3 (afforestation, reforestation and deforestation) and 3.4 (additional LULUCF activities). The conclusions do not finalize how identification codes in the common reporting format tables may refer to LULUCF projects under Protocol Article 6, or make any final determination on information related to reporting on forest management under Article 3.4. These matters will instead be taken up again at SBSTA-21, with a view to recommending a draft decision on good practice guidance to COP-10. The conclusions also request the UNFCCC Secretariat to prepare a note including a proposal for technical guidance on methodologies for adjustments under Protocol Article 5.2 (adjustments) of estimates of emissions and removals from LULUCF, in order to recommend a decision to COP-11. SBSTA-22 will discuss the criteria to be used for cases where there is a failure to submit information on emissions and removals from LULUCF activities under Article 3.3 and 3.4, for consideration and adoption by the COP/MOP.

On harvested wood products, the SBSTA conclusions state that the upcoming workshop on the issue will address: definitions and scope of estimation, reporting and accounting of harvested wood products; approaches for accounting for harvested wood products, including socioeconomic and environmental implications; and methods for estimating and reporting wood products. The workshop should include presentations, group work and plenary discussions.

On other LULUCF issues, SBSTA takes note of the IPCC report on degradation and devegetation, and decides to consider the issue at future sessions, and to consider submissions by Parties on other LULUCF issues at SBSTA-21.

Small-scale afforestation and reforestation project activities under the CDM: This issue was first addressed by SBSTA in Plenary on Wednesday, 16 June, and subsequently in a contact group, which met four times from Thursday, 17 June through Wednesday, 23 June, and was chaired by Thelma Krug (Brazil). The contact group considered a technical paper and draft conclusions on simplified modalities and procedures for small-scale afforestation and reforestation project activities under the CDM. SBSTA adopted conclusions in Plenary on Friday, 25 June. Simplified modalities and procedures for small-scale afforestation and reforestation project activities under the CDM are contained in a bracketed Annex to the draft conclusions.

Parties were unable to resolve issues of bundling (clustering small projects to decrease transaction costs), leakage (unintended consequences of activities leading to increasing emissions in an area outside the project boundary), definitions of low-income communities, and monitoring. On bundling, Bolivia, opposed by AOSIS, Brazil, the EU and China, suggested consolidating various small-scale projects. The issue was forwarded to SBSTA-21 for further discussion. On leakage, Japan, supported by Canada and India, but opposed by AOSIS, Brazil and the EU, preferred exempting leakage due to high monitoring costs and the fact that

major impacts were unlikely, given the projects' small size. The EU suggested the option of an extra percentage of additional removals to account for leakage. After several rounds of informal consultations, Parties agreed to address leakage by applying a discount factor under certain circumstances, while assuming non-leakage under others. Delegates also agreed that quality assurance and quality control in monitoring would fall under the CDM Executive Board's responsibility. Delegates discussed validation procedures for project activities by the designated operational entities. Discussions on this issue, and on simplified baseline and monitoring methodologies, were not completed, and will be taken up again at SBSTA-21.

SBSTA conclusions: In the conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2004/L.9), SBSTA welcomes information provided in submissions from Parties on simplified modalities and procedures for small-scale afforestation and reforestation project activities under the CDM and on measures to facilitate implementation of such activities. It also takes note of a technical paper on the issue. SBSTA requests the preparation of draft text for a decision on simplified modalities and procedures for small-scale afforestation and reforestation CDM project activities and on measures to facilitate the implementation of these project activities, for consideration by SBSTA-21. SBSTA also agrees to continue this work at SBSTA-21, with a view to recommending a decision for adoption by COP-10.

Emissions from fuel used for international aviation and maritime transport: This issue was first addressed by SBSTA in Plenary on Thursday, 17 June. Parties met in informal consultations, facilitated by Greg Terrill (Australia), to consider draft conclusions.

A number of Parties emphasized the importance of cooperation between the UNFCCC, IPCC, International Civil Aviation Organization and International Maritime Organization. Several developing country Parties stressed the need to develop reporting methodologies. Tuvalu and Kenya, opposed by Canada, said SBSTA should broaden further guidance on the matter.

In the SBSTA Plenary on Friday, 25 June, facilitator Greg Terrill reported that agreement had not been reached on forwarding a document to the IPCC on methodological issues relating to emissions from international aviation and maritime transport (FCCC/SBSTA/2004/INF.5). In the ensuing discussion, Saudi Arabia, on behalf of the G-77/China, and supported by Oman, emphasized the responsibilities of Annex I Parties regarding methodologies and reporting. He stressed the importance of common but differentiated responsibilities. Argentina, supported by AOSIS, emphasized the importance of information gathering and maintaining this issue on the agenda. Chair Benrageb proposed considering the document paragraph-by-paragraph. Argentina, supported by the EU, and opposed by Kuwait and Saudi Arabia, proposed reflecting in the conclusions that emissions from international aviation and maritime transport would be addressed by SBSTA-21. Following informal consultations, facilitator Terrill reported that Parties were unable to reach agreement on holding a workshop or side-event aimed at sharing information on emissions from international aviation and maritime transport, and the draft conclusions were adopted as amended to reflect the lack of agreement.

SBSTA conclusions: In the conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2004/L.12), SBSTA notes that it did not complete its consideration of this agenda item, and states that discussions will resume at SBSTA-21.



Issues relating to greenhouse gas inventories: This issue was first addressed by SBSTA in Plenary on Wednesday, 16 June, and subsequently in informal consultations co-facilitated by Helen Plume (New Zealand) and Branca Americano (Brazil). The consultations sought to address the Secretariat's report on activities relating to the technical review of greenhouse gas inventories for Annex I Parties, including the resulting information on greenhouse gas emissions and trends. The consultations also sought to provide additional guidance on these matters.

In Plenary on Friday, 25 June, SBSTA adopted conclusions without amendment. The agreement for expert review services is contained in an Annex to the draft conclusions.

SBSTA conclusions: In the conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2004/L.6), SBSTA welcomes the report on activities relating to the technical review on greenhouse gas inventories of Annex I Parties, and notes that these activities, including meetings of inventory lead reviewers and the training programme for review experts, have contributed to improvements in the effectiveness and efficiency of the review process, the quality of inventories and the reliability of information available to the COP. SBSTA requests the Secretariat to continue these activities, further improving the annual report on Annex I greenhouse gas emissions and trends to the COP, and including data from current year inventories in the report on activities relating to the technical review on greenhouse gas inventories of Annex-I Parties, if those inventories have been subject to the Secretariat's quality control procedures. SBSTA invites Annex I Parties to use the new common reporting format software for inventory submissions in 2005. SBSTA also requests Annex I Parties to submit inventory information on the LULUCF sector for 2005, using provisional electronic spreadsheets.

Issues relating to Protocol Articles 7 and 8: This issue was first addressed by SBSTA in Plenary on Wednesday, 16 June. Informal consultations were co-facilitated by Helen Plume (New Zealand) and Branca Americano (Brazil), in conjunction with informal consultations on issues relating to greenhouse gas inventories (see previous section). On Friday, 25 June, Parties adopted SBSTA conclusions containing draft COP and COP/MOP decisions. Commenting on this issue, the EU noted the importance of access to all necessary information by expert review teams undertaking annual reviews of greenhouse gas inventories, including information deemed confidential by Parties, while the US stressed the importance of protecting confidential information.

SBSTA conclusions: In the conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2004/L.7), SBSTA decides to recommend a decision to COP-10, which includes a draft COP/MOP decision, on ways of providing expert review teams with access to the confidential inventory information of Annex I Parties. SBSTA also recommends a decision to COP-10 on incorporating modalities and procedures for afforestation and reforestation project activities under the CDM into relevant sections of the guidelines under Protocol Articles 7 and 8.

COP draft decisions: In the draft decision on issues relating to the technical review of greenhouse gas inventories and implementation of Article 8 (FCCC/SBSTA/2004/L.7/Add.1), the COP requests Annex I Parties whose inventories contain information that is designated as confidential to provide this information during centralized and in-country reviews, at the request of the expert review team, in accordance with the code of practice for the treatment of confidential information adopted by decision 12/CP.9

(issues relating to the technical review of greenhouse gas inventories from Annex I Parties). Under the draft decision, the COP would also agree that an Annex I Party may, at its discretion and in cooperation with the UNFCCC Secretariat, make confidential inventory information available to expert review teams through appropriate procedures when experts are not present either in the country under review or at the UNFCCC Secretariat's offices. The decision would have the COP also requesting the Secretariat to avoid organizing desk reviews for those Annex I Parties where it is known that the expert review team could not access confidential information during the review, and to instead subject them to centralized or in-country reviews.

In the attached draft COP/MOP decision, the COP/MOP decides that: the previous draft COP decision will apply; the expert review team shall note the relevant requested information that was designated as confidential by the Annex I Party to which the team did not have access; an expert review team may recommend the retroactive application of an adjustment for the relevant years of the commitment period for which the team was not given opportunities to access confidential information; with respect to retroactive adjustments, only the adjustment for the current inventory year under review shall be relevant for eligibility requirements related to Article 7; and for the inventory submitted for the final years of the commitment period, all Annex I Parties shall be subject to in-country or centralized reviews.

The draft decision (FCCC/SBSTA/2004/L.7/Add.2) on incorporating the modalities and procedures for afforestation and reforestation project activities under the CDM into the guidelines under Protocol Articles 7 and 8 contains four Annexes, which deal with: reporting of supplementary information under Protocol Article 7.1; reporting of supplementary information under Protocol Article 7.2; review of information on assigned amounts pursuant to Protocol Article 3.7 and 3.8 (emission reduction units, certified emission reductions, temporary certified emission reductions, long-term certified emission reductions, assigned amount units and removal units); and review of national registries.

Issues relating to registry systems under Protocol Article 7.4: This matter was first addressed by SBSTA in Plenary on Wednesday, 16 June, and subsequently in informal consultations facilitated by Murray Ward (New Zealand). On Friday, 25 June Parties adopted conclusions on the issue.

SBSTA conclusions: In the conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2004/L.8), SBSTA, *inter alia*: welcomes the progress made by the Secretariat on the specifications of the technical standards for data exchange between registry systems; stresses the need to ensure, by SBSTA-21, that the 1.0 version of these specifications is in accordance with the general design requirements of the data exchange standards recommended by decision 24/CP.8 (technical standards for data exchange between registry systems under the Protocol), for adoption by COP/MOP-1; reaffirms the importance of making progress on the development of the independent transaction log, and notes that the log is currently expected to be established by mid-2005, subject to the timely availability of funding and the extent of modification required to be made to the programme code provided as an in-kind contribution to the Secretariat. SBSTA also stresses the need to ensure effective, long-term cooperation among



administrators of national registries, the CDM registry, the independent transaction log and any supplementary transaction logs established by Parties.

DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGIES: This issue was first addressed by SBSTA in Plenary on Wednesday, 16 June. A contact group co-chaired by Andrej Kranjc (Slovenia) and Kishan Kumarsingh (Trinidad and Tobago) met four times between Thursday, 17 June and Tuesday, 22 June, to draft conclusions based on information provided by the Expert Group on Technology Transfer (EGTT). Parties adopted the conclusions in SBSTA Plenary on Friday, 25 June. Delegates discussed, among other things: how and whether the results of the survey on the effectiveness of the use of the UNFCCC technology information clearing house (TT:CLEAR) should be reflected in the conclusions; the EGTT's 2005 work programme; a workshop on innovative options for financing development and transfer of technologies; and possible elements of a decision on enhancing the implementation of the framework for technology transfer, to be negotiated at SBSTA-21.

SBSTA conclusions: In the conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2004/L.2), SBSTA encourages business and industry, non-governmental organizations and relevant international organizations, to organize sector-specific workshops and other activities relevant to enabling environments for technology transfer. SBSTA notes the results of the TT:CLEAR survey, and endorses an EGTT recommendation that a workshop on innovative options for financing the development and transfer of technologies should have a practical focus, and be built around case studies. SBSTA urges Annex I Parties, and organizations in a position to do so, to provide technical support to developing country Parties undertaking technology needs assessments. It also invites UNDP, UNEP, other relevant organizations, as well as the Climate Technology Initiative, to hold additional regional workshops to finalize the technology needs assessments. SBSTA urges Parties to consider taking a decision at COP-10 reflecting on progress and next steps to enhance the implementation of UNFCCC Article 4.5 (technology transfer).

The SBSTA conclusions invite UNDP, with UNEP and the GEF, to: collect reports of technology needs assessments and prepare an analysis of the technology needs identified by developing countries, and report the findings to the EGTT; make available at SBSTA-21 the most recent version of the handbook for conducting technology needs assessments for climate change; and analyze options for providing further technical support to Parties completing their initial technology needs assessments, or updating their needs assessments.

SBSTA requests the EGTT to consider the outcomes of the workshop on innovative options for financing the development and transfer of technologies. It also asks the EGTT to: explore possible ways to enhance synergies with other global conventions and processes where technology transfer and capacity building for technology transfer are considered, and report on progress at SBSTA-22; consider for its work programme for 2005 activities relating to the identification of possible joint research programmes between Annex I and non-Annex I Parties for the development of environmentally sound technologies, and ways to enhance access to scholarships and fellowships for non-Annex I Parties to build capacity for the development and transfer of environmentally sound technologies.

Finally, the SBSTA conclusions also request the Secretariat to organize a special meeting of the EGTT in conjunction with the workshop on innovative financing, and to organize a seminar on technology transfer for adaptation to climate change in order to discuss case studies. The Secretariat is asked to prepare a technical paper on the applications of environmentally sound technologies for adaptation to climate change, and to continue its work on maintaining and improving TT:CLEAR.

“GOOD PRACTICES” IN POLICIES AND MEASURES: This issue was first addressed by SBSTA in Plenary on Wednesday, 16 June. Co-chaired by Anders Turesson (Sweden) and Tony Surridge (South Africa), a contact group met three times from 21-23 June to draft conclusions. SBSTA adopted the conclusions on Friday, 25 June.

During the discussions, debate centered on how to refer to decision 13/CP.7 (policies and measures). The EU and other Parties preferred to refer to the entire decision, while Saudi Arabia, for the G-77/China, favored referring to sections of it, in particular to the adverse effects of the implementation of policies and measures. Tanzania, speaking for the Least Developed Countries, stated that the G-77/China did not have a consensus position on policies and measures. As an initial basis for discussion, delegates used the latest version of a non-paper from COP-9. Based on this, and on proposals made by the EU, G-77/China, and US, the Co-Chairs prepared draft conclusions.

SBSTA conclusions: In the conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2004/L.5), SBSTA agrees to next steps in implementing decision 13/CP.7, recalling that steps should: facilitate cooperation among Annex I Parties by sharing experiences and exchanging information at the technical level; involve all Parties and, as appropriate, environmental and business NGOs, and include the exchange of information on policies and measures undertaken by Annex I Parties in all relevant sectors; and contribute to the improvement of transparency, effectiveness, and comparability of policies and measures. SBSTA also notes that these steps should take into account considerations such as environmental effectiveness, cost-effectiveness, social and economic impacts and ancillary benefits. In addition, SBSTA invites Annex I Parties to make available information on their experiences in implementing policies and measures to all Parties at a technical roundtable discussion at SBSTA-22. SBSTA also requests the UNFCCC Secretariat to provide information on options for using, *inter alia*, Internet-based approaches to sharing experiences and exchanging information on “good practices” in policies and measures.

RESEARCH AND SYSTEMATIC OBSERVATION: This issue was first addressed by SBSTA in Plenary on Wednesday, 16 June. Parties convened in a contact group, co-chaired by Stefan Rösner (Germany) and Sok Appadu (Mauritius), on Tuesday, 22 June and Wednesday, 23 June, to discuss draft conclusions. In discussing this issue, several Parties noted a lack of available funding to improve climate observation. The Global Climate Observing System (GCOS) Secretariat and WMO reported on relevant work. In the contact group meetings, delegates debated reporting by the GCOS Secretariat on support received by the GEF and other financial mechanisms. Parties discussed timing for the GCOS report on implementing regional action plans relating to



global observing, and submissions by Parties for consideration by SBSTA-21. SBSTA adopted the conclusions on Friday, 25 June, without amendment.

SBSTA conclusions: In the conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2004/L.4), SBSTA, *inter alia*: recognizes progress made by the GCOS Secretariat in developing the 5-10 year implementation plan for the integrated global observing systems for climate, in particular the publication of the draft implementation plan for open review; urges the GCOS Secretariat, in finalizing this plan, to clearly identify priorities for actions, taking into account the views expressed by Parties and relevant international programmes and bodies; welcomes the collaboration between GCOS and the *ad hoc* Group on Earth Observations in developing their respective implementation plans, and urges both bodies to integrate them to the extent possible; emphasizes the need to treat global climate monitoring as a priority within the Global Earth Observation System of Systems; encourages Parties to continue pursuing the implementation of elements of the regional action plans developed under the GCOS regional workshop programme; and invites the GCOS Secretariat to report on progress made in implementing the regional action plans in relation to global observing systems for climate, including support from the UNFCCC's financial mechanism and other bilateral and multilateral agencies and mechanisms, for consideration by SBSTA-21 and subsequent sessions, as appropriate.

The SBSTA conclusions note the ongoing development of the GCOS Cooperation Mechanism to address priority needs for improvements in global observing systems for climate in developing countries, and in particular the plans to develop an inventory of donor activities relating to global observing systems for climate. SBSTA invites the GCOS Secretariat, in consultation with the WMO, to provide its full report on data exchange problems for consideration by SBSTA-22. In particular, SBSTA encourages the inclusion of options to remedy existing data exchange problems and advice on problems associated with the accessibility of data by and from global data centers.

SBSTA welcomes the exchange of views during the SBSTA-20 event on research in response to the IPCC Third Assessment Report. The following are noted as requiring further consideration:

- the need to assess the adequacy of research activities and their international coordination to meet the needs of the UNFCCC;
- the importance of social, as well as natural, sciences, and the interaction between the two, in responding to the research needs arising from the assessment reports of the IPCC; and
- the enhancement of the capacity of developing countries to contribute to, and participate in, global climate change research efforts.

SBSTA requests Parties to submit to the Secretariat, by 15 September 2004, their views on how to address the main issues from the SBSTA-20 event adequately, for consideration by SBSTA-21. SBSTA requests Parties to submit to the Secretariat additional views on this subject by 24 January 2005 for consideration by SBSTA-22. It requests the Secretariat to compile both sets of submissions into miscellaneous documents and to prepare a synthesis of Parties' views for consideration by SBSTA-22.

ADAPTATION AND MITIGATION: This issue was first addressed on 18 and 19 June, in two in-session workshops. The first addressed the scientific, technical and socioeconomic aspects of impacts of, and vulnerability and adaptation to, climate change.

The second dealt with the scientific, technical and socioeconomic aspects of mitigation. Parties then addressed these items in Plenary on Monday, 21 June. Delegates met three times in a contact group co-chaired by David Warrilow (UK) and Kok Seng Yap (Malaysia), to discuss draft conclusions. Informal consultations were also held. SBSTA adopted conclusions on these matters on Friday, 25 June.

In the initial Plenary discussion on 21 June, several delegates suggested holding future in-session workshops. Many Parties stressed regional modeling, and noted the importance of integrating sustainable development policies with adaptation measures. Delegates also underscored the importance of addressing innovative technologies, increasing the adaptive capacity of vulnerable Parties, and separating short-term needs from the long-term effects of climate change. South Africa, for the Africa Group, supported by the G-77/China, AOSIS, and the Russian Federation, called for separate contact groups on adaptation and mitigation. Japan, Australia, Canada, the US and EU supported one contact group. Chair Benrageb proposed having one contact group with separate draft conclusions for each item.

In the contact group meetings, delegates considered draft conclusions and discussed the format and content of future workshops and activities. Parties debated ways of ensuring high participation at workshops while avoiding overlap with negotiations, and identified possible topics for discussion at future workshops. Delegates disagreed over the number of topics and themes to be considered. They also discussed the use and potential resource implications of requesting the Secretariat to compile background information on specific topics, and Parties' submissions and workshop reports.

In the closing Plenary, China expressed hope that the establishment of one contact group to address adaptation and mitigation at SBSTA-20 would not set a precedent for future decisions on the matter.

SBSTA conclusions on adaptation: In the conclusions on adaptation (FCCC/SBSTA/2004/L.13), SBSTA welcomes the exchange of views during the in-session workshop and requests the Secretariat to post the text of the Chair's oral report from the workshop on the UNFCCC Internet site. SBSTA agrees to continue focusing its work on exchanging information and sharing experiences and views among Parties on practical opportunities and solutions to facilitate the UNFCCC's implementation. SBSTA agrees that at SBSTA-21 it will focus on exchanging information and sharing experiences, views and lessons learned, taking into account different national circumstances, on the application of methods and tools, including regional models, for assessing impacts and vulnerability and adaptation, and linkages between adaptation and sustainable development.

The SBSTA conclusions request the Secretariat to:

- organize a workshop during SBSTA-21, under the guidance of the SBSTA Chair, allowing for in-depth discussion to exchange information and share experiences and views on the topics identified above;
- prepare a background paper on the application of methods and tools, including regional models, for assessing impacts and vulnerability and developing adaptation responses, drawing on the practices of relevant expert communities; and
- make available through the UNFCCC Internet site any published papers related to the linkages between adaptation



and sustainable development.

In order to facilitate discussion at the SBSTA-21 workshop, SBSTA invites Parties to submit views on the topics referred to above and on the SBSTA-20 workshop, for compilation into a miscellaneous document. SBSTA requests the SBSTA Chair to prepare a summary of the workshop, and asks the Secretariat to make this summary, and workshop presentations and abstracts, available on the UNFCCC Internet site as soon as possible after the workshop. SBSTA agrees to determine next steps on this agenda item at SBSTA-21.

SBSTA conclusions on mitigation: In the conclusions on mitigation (FCCC/SBSTA/2004/L.14), SBSTA welcomes the exchange of views during the in-session workshop and requests the Secretariat to post the text of Chair Benrageb's oral report from the workshop on the UNFCCC Internet site. SBSTA agrees to continue focusing its work on exchanging information and sharing experiences and views among Parties on practical opportunities and solutions to facilitate the UNFCCC's implementation. SBSTA further agrees that it will focus at SBSTA-21 on exchanging information and experiences, views and lessons learned on mitigation technology innovation, deployment and diffusion (including identification and removal of barriers), and practical opportunities and solutions for mitigation that contribute to sustainable development, taking into account different national circumstances.

The SBSTA conclusions request the Secretariat to organize a workshop during SBSTA-21, under the guidance of the SBSTA Chair, allowing for in-depth discussion to exchange information and share experiences and views on the topics identified above. They also ask the Secretariat make available the SBSTA Chair's summary of the workshop, and the workshop presentations and abstracts, on the UNFCCC Internet site, as soon as possible after the workshop. SBSTA agrees to determine next steps on this agenda item at SBSTA-21.

COOPERATION WITH RELEVANT INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS: This issue was first addressed by SBSTA in Plenary on Wednesday, 16 June. Parties met in informal consultations held throughout the session to discuss draft conclusions and a draft COP-10 decision. The consultations were facilitated by Outi Berghäll (Finland) and Marcela Main (Chile). On Friday, 25 June, Parties adopted conclusions and agreed to forward the draft COP decision to COP-10.

In the opening SBSTA Plenary, delegates heard statements from the IPCC, UN Convention to Combat Desertification, Ramsar Convention on Wetlands, UN Food and Agriculture Organization and International Strategy for Disaster Reduction. Switzerland suggested granting the Ramsar Convention permanent observer status, while Palau said Ramsar should have full membership of the Joint Liaison Group. Several Parties emphasized coordination among national focal points. On Friday, 25 June, contact group Co-Chair Berghäll emphasized that additional work was necessary to enhance practical cooperation between the Rio Conventions.

SBSTA conclusions: In the conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2004/L.3), SBSTA notes the important contribution that the Ramsar Secretariat can make to the work of the Joint Liaison Group and encourages its continued involvement. SBSTA notes the Joint Liaison Group's plan to prepare a paper on options for enhanced cooperation among the Rio Conventions, and requests the Secretariat to present this paper for consideration by SBSTA as soon as it

is available. SBSTA invites the Secretariat to continue exchanging information with the Secretariats of the Convention on Biological Diversity and Convention to Combat Desertification, via the Joint Liaison Group, and to improve inter-accessibility of available data, including through better Internet-based access, within existing resources. In response to the invitation from COP-7 of the Convention on Biological Diversity to the UNFCCC COP, SBSTA decides to recommend a draft conclusion on the issue of biodiversity and climate change for adoption by UNFCCC COP-10.

Draft COP conclusions: In the draft COP conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2004/L.3/Add.1), the COP requests the Secretariat, within existing resources, to provide information to the Joint Liaison Group on relevant activities that are mutually supportive of the objectives of the Rio Conventions, based on existing information publicly available and already provided by Parties under the UNFCCC. The COP also encourages Parties to enhance coordination under the Rio Conventions at the national level by facilitating the involvement of national experts, and by sharing relevant information at local and national levels, where possible and appropriate.

OTHER MATTERS: Issues relating to cleaner or less greenhouse gas-emitting energy: This issue was addressed by SBSTA in Plenary on Thursday, 17 June. Chair Benrageb facilitated informal consultations on the matter, and SBSTA adopted conclusions on Friday, 25 June. Chair Benrageb expressed disappointment that Parties were unable to reach agreement, and urged delegates to advise him on how to make progress at SBSTA-21. Nigeria said a new approach was needed, and suggested that the issue be handled bilaterally.

SBSTA conclusions: In the conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2004/L.10), SBSTA agrees to continue consideration of the matter at SBSTA-21, as consideration at SBSTA-20 was not completed.

Issues relating to the implementation of Protocol Article 2.3: This issue was addressed by SBSTA in Plenary on Thursday, 17 June. Chair Benrageb conducted informal consultations, and SBSTA adopted conclusions on Friday, 25 June.

SBSTA conclusions: In the conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2004/L.11), SBSTA agrees to continue consideration of the matter at SBSTA-21, as consideration at SBSTA-20 was not completed.

IN-SESSION WORKSHOPS: Scientific, technical and socioeconomic aspects of impacts of, and vulnerability and adaptation to, climate change: On Friday, 18 June, Parties convened in an in-session workshop to hear presentations and engage in discussions on climate change risk assessment and perception, adaptation and sustainable development, and solutions and opportunities. A summary of the in-session workshop is available at: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12236e.html>.

Scientific, technical and socioeconomic aspects of mitigation: On Saturday, 19 June, delegates convened in an in-session workshop to hear presentations and engage in discussions on the relationship between climate change mitigation and other policy and development objectives, case studies of mitigation, and climate mitigation technologies. A summary of the in-session workshop is available at: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12237e.html>.

SBSTA EVENTS: Research in response to the IPCC Third Assessment Report: This event was held on Monday, 21 June, and was chaired by Pier Vellinga, University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands. Delegates heard presentations on key research recommendations of the Third Assessment Report, research initiatives by



governments, and the activities of international programmes and bodies. A summary of these presentations and the ensuing discussion is available at: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12238e.html>.

Brazilian Proposal: This event took place on Monday, 21 June, and was chaired by Murray Ward (New Zealand). The event included presentations on modeling and assessment of contributions to climate change (MATCH), and on policy options under the Brazilian Proposal. A summary of these discussions is available at: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12238e.html>.

REPORT ON THE SBSTA SESSION: In closing SBSTA-20, the UNFCCC Executive Secretary commented on the preliminary evaluation of the financial implications of the conclusions adopted at SB-20, as mandated by decision 16/CP.9 (programme budget for the biennium 2004-2005). She indicated that SB-20 had generated additional demands on the Trust Fund for Supplemental Activities at a time when numerous activities remain unfunded, and that funding is low for the participation of delegates from LDCs and small island developing States (SIDS). She noted that SBSTA and SBI have mandated eight additional meetings. She also observed that the request for a workshop on the intergovernmental process indicated room for improving the process.

SBSTA Rapporteur Ibrahim Bin Ahmed Al-Ajmi (Oman) introduced the draft report on SBSTA-20 (FCCC/SBSTA/2004/L.1), which was adopted without amendment. Parties expressed their appreciation to Chair Benrageb, delegates and the UNFCCC Secretariat. Thanking Parties for their hard work, Chair Benrageb gavelled the meeting to a close at 1:40 pm.

SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR IMPLEMENTATION

OPENING OF THE SESSION: SBI Chair Daniela Stoycheva (Bulgaria) opened SBI-20 on Wednesday morning, 16 June. Qatar, for the G-77/China, requested SBI-20 to consider arrangements for COP/MOP-1, given the possibility that the Protocol could enter into force before the next session.

Parties adopted the SBI agenda as amended by the G-77/China (FCCC/SBI/2004/1). Regarding the election of officers, Chair Stoycheva said Fadhel Lari (Kuwait) would continue to serve as SBI Vice-Chair, and Gonzalo Menéndez (Panama) would be the Rapporteur.

ANNEX I NATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS: Status report on the review of third national communications: This issue was addressed by SBI in Plenary on Wednesday, 16 June. The EU expressed satisfaction that the majority of Annex I reviews had been completed and posted on the UNFCCC Internet site. SBI took note of the issue.

NON-ANNEX I NATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS: This issue was first raised in the SBI Plenary on Wednesday, 16 June, and subsequently in a contact group chaired by Sok Appadu (Mauritius), which met five times between Saturday, 19 June and Wednesday, 23 June. In the contact group, Parties discussed the submission of second and, where appropriate, third national communications, the work of the Consultative Group of Experts on non-Annex I national communications, and the provision of financial and technical support. Parties then adopted three sets of conclusions in SBI Plenary, on Friday, 25 June.

Discussions on the timing of non-Annex I national communications, and on funding for the national communications, proved to be the most challenging. On the submission of second and third national communications, delegates discussed timing of submis-

sions. The US, opposed by the G-77/China, proposed that non-Annex I Parties should submit greenhouse gas inventories every two years. On the timing of non-Annex I national communications, the EU suggested three years. The G-77/China proposed six years.

The EU, opposed by the G-77/China, also proposed text requesting non-Annex I Parties to submit funding proposals for national communications even in advance of substantial completion of previous national communications, but not later than one year after the submission of their previous national communications. The G-77/China expressed concern that the reference to one year could be interpreted as a deadline by the GEF.

On Friday, 25 June, Chair Stoycheva announced that the G-77/China had submitted a package proposal earlier that day on the paragraphs addressing timing of submission (FCCC/SBI/2004/MISC.3). The proposal, *inter alia*, invited non-Annex I Parties that have not submitted project proposals for second and, where appropriate, third national communications to do so even in advance of substantially completing previously-funded activities. It also called on non-Annex I Parties to submit their second, and where appropriate, third national communications within five years of the initial disbursement of financial resources for the actual preparation of the national communication. Chair Stoycheva said that as there was no time to discuss the document, it would be forwarded to SBI-21. The US noted that the document contained interesting proposals, and asked that it be left open for additional views from Parties.

SBI conclusions: In the conclusions on submission of second and, where appropriate, third national communications (FCCC/SBI/2004/L.10), the SBI decides to continue deliberations on an attached bracketed draft COP decision at SBI-21.

In the conclusions on the work of the Consultative Group of Experts on non-Annex I communications (FCCC/SBI/2004/L.8), SBI welcomes the efforts of the Group in prioritizing activities within its multi-year programme of work. It invites Annex II (industrialized country) Parties, and other Parties in a position to do so, to provide financial and technical support for these activities. SBI welcomes efforts to cooperate with the LDC Expert Group and the Expert Group on Technology Transfer, as well as the offer by Panama to host the first hands-on training workshop on greenhouse gas inventories. SBI calls for closer cooperation between the Consultative Group of Experts and the UNDP/GEF National Communications Support Programme.

In the conclusions on financial and technical support (FCCC/SBI/2004/L.9), SBI welcomes the submission by 115 non-Annex I Parties of their initial national communications and the submission of three second national communications. SBI takes note of the needs and concerns of non-Annex I Parties relating to specific capacity building and training, and reiterates the need to strengthen national institutions, regional and sub-regional climate change centers and centers of excellence, especially in LDCs and SIDS.

FINANCIAL MECHANISM OF THE CONVENTION: Matters relating to the implementation of decision 5/CP.8: This issue was first addressed by SBI in Plenary on Wednesday, 16 June. Chair Stoycheva requested Andrea Albán (Colombia) and Sarah Hendry (UK) to co-facilitate informal consultations on the issue, with the aim of drafting conclusions.

Discussions focused on a request to the Secretariat to prepare a report for COP-10 on the assessment of funding necessary to assist developing countries in fulfilling their UNFCCC commitments,



and on the data to be contained in the report. Parties adopted the conclusions. The UNFCCC Executive Secretary expressed her understanding that, when preparing the report, the Secretariat should use information from, *inter alia*, the GEF documents, information on multilateral sources of funding, and national communications. Japan recalled the distinct roles of the GEF and COP in jointly determining the amount of available funding. He noted reservations against the report going beyond the mandate of the Memorandum of Understanding between the GEF and the COP. Argentina said the third GEF replenishment was limited and lower than previous cycles, and cautioned against the decreasing amount of funding. He expressed hope that consultations on the matter in future UNFCCC sessions would be more successful.

SBI conclusions: In the conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2004/CRP.1), SBI welcomes the successful and substantial third replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund. It notes that inputs by the COP to discussions on the fourth replenishment should be consistent with provisions of the UNFCCC and the annex to the Memorandum of Understanding between the COP and GEF Council on the determination of funding necessary and available for the implementation of the UNFCCC. SBI requests the UNFCCC Secretariat, in collaboration with the GEF Secretariat, to prepare a report for COP-10 on the assessment of funding necessary to assist developing country Parties in fulfilling their commitments that will assist in determining jointly with the GEF Council the amount of funding necessary and available for the implementation of the UNFCCC as defined in the Memorandum of Understanding between the COP and the GEF Council. The report should be based on information and data identified in the Memorandum of Understanding on the determination of the level of funding necessary and available for UNFCCC implementation, in accordance with guidance provided by the COP. It should also contain the data and methodology used by the Secretariat to prepare the report, in order to enable the results' verification at a later stage. The conclusions agree that deliberations should continue at SBI-21, with a view to preparing a draft decision for adoption by COP-10.

UNFCCC ARTICLE 6: UNFCCC Article 6 (education, training and public awareness) was first raised by SBI in Plenary on Wednesday, 16 June. A contact group, chaired by Markus Nauser (Switzerland), convened four times from 18-23 June, to prepare draft conclusions and consider input to further develop the information network clearing house. In the SBI Plenary on Thursday, 24 June, Parties adopted the relevant SBI conclusions on the matter.

Discussions sought to provide guidance to the Secretariat for elaboration of the UNFCCC information network clearing house for Article 6 activities. Debates focused on timing and funding for the development of the clearing house. Parties also deliberated the date for submission and content of the reports on implementing the New Delhi work programme on Article 6. Delegates considered how the information in the reports would relate to information provided in national communications, and discussed the elements of the first phase of work on the clearing house.

SBI conclusions: In the conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2004/L.6), SBI encourages Parties to cooperate in the key areas identified at the African regional workshop held in January 2004. SBI requests the Secretariat to prepare an intermediate review report on progress in implementing Article 6, based on information contained in national communications and other information received by the

Secretariat, by 15 August 2004. The report of the submissions will form the basis for a draft COP-10 decision. Regarding the small-scale model of the Article 6 information network clearing house, SBI requests the Secretariat to report to SBI-21 on progress of work, including: detailed technical specifications for the development and implementation of the clearing house; a profile for an institutional home for the clearing house; a tentative time frame for implementation; and options, and their estimated financial implications, for developing and implementing the clearing house.

SBI invites Parties, and others in a position to do so, to contribute to financing the remaining regional workshops. The annex to the conclusions contains consolidated views of Parties and guidance to the Secretariat on the further development of the Article 6 information network clearing house.

CAPACITY BUILDING: This issue was first addressed by SBI in Plenary on Wednesday, 16 June, and subsequently in a contact group chaired by Dechen Tsering (Bhutan). The contact group met four times from 18-22 June. On Thursday, 24 June, Parties adopted SBI conclusions on the issue.

Discussions in the contact group centered on, *inter alia*: elements of a technical paper on the range and effectiveness of capacity building, including indicators for capacity-building projects; the need for a technical workshop to contribute to the review; and the relevance of National Capacity Self Assessments in assessing capacity needs for climate change.

Tanzania, on behalf of the G-77/China, along with the US and Romania, speaking for the economies in transition, expressed concerns at insufficient information provided for the comprehensive review of the implementation of the framework for capacity building in developing countries, and for the compilation and synthesis of capacity-building activities in economies in transition (EITs). They argued that further work is needed on the comprehensive review. The EU and Japan did not agree with this position. Several Parties welcomed a substantive discussion to identify gaps. Parties agreed to a meeting of practitioners to contribute to the comprehensive review.

SBI conclusions: In the conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2004/L.5), SBI decides to, *inter alia*: complete a draft decision at SBI-21 on the range and effectiveness of capacity-building activities in developing countries aimed at implementing decision 2/CP.7 (capacity building in developing countries); request the Secretariat to convene a meeting of practitioners with the aim of contributing to the comprehensive review at COP-10, and to present the outcome to SBI-21; invite additional information on the effectiveness of capacity-building activities in EITs; and request the Secretariat to prepare an analytical paper on the effectiveness of the implementation of the framework for capacity building in EITs.

IMPLEMENTATION OF UNFCCC ARTICLE 4.8 AND 4.9: Progress on the implementation of activities under decision 5/CP.7: This issue was first discussed by SBI in Plenary on Wednesday, 16 June, and subsequently in a contact group co-chaired by Mohamed Mahmoud Ould El Ghaouth (Mauritania) and Paul Watkinson (France). In the contact group, which met five times between Thursday, 17 June and Wednesday, 23 June, delegates negotiated text forwarded from SBI-19. Parties adopted conclusions in the SBI Plenary on Friday, 25 June.



Parties discussed the structure of the document. Kenya, for the G-77/China, suggested re-organizing the document under sub-headings, and circulated proposed changes and additions.

Delegates worked to remove brackets, and presented changes and additions on, *inter alia*: a synthesis document on submissions on activities to meet the specific needs and circumstances of developing country Parties arising from the adverse effects of climate change and response measures; a call for submissions of views on insurance and risk measures; regional workshops; and mobilization of technical and financial resources.

Delegates also discussed alternative textual proposals on whether, how or when to consider the outcomes of the workshop on the status of modeling activities and action on these outcomes. Parties discussed options for text on impacts of response measures, and text on addressing and promoting economic diversification.

Peru highlighted difficulties in proving global benefits of adaptation projects for accessing GEF funds. Micronesia, for AOSIS, emphasized data collection and technologies for adaptation. Delegates discussed the Special Climate Change Fund, and the frequency and format of feedback from the GEF on activities undertaken in response to decision 5/CP.7, including efforts to address or mainstream adaptation within climate change and other GEF focal areas.

On Friday, 25 June, contact group Co-Chair Paul Watkinson reported that although significant progress had been made, no decision had been reached. Argentina called for adaptation to be addressed at joint meetings of the SBI and SBSTA. Chair Stoycheva responded that the issue would be brought to the attention of the COP Bureau at its next meeting.

SBI conclusions: In the conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2004/L.11), the SBI decides to continue consideration of issues under this item at its next session.

Matters relating to the least developed countries (LDCs):

This issue was first addressed by SBI in Plenary on Wednesday, 16 June, where LDC Expert Group Chair La'avasa Malua (Samoa) reported on the meeting of the Group in March 2004. The Gambia offered to host the next Expert Group meeting. On Thursday, 24 June, SBI adopted conclusions on the matter, without amendment. Tanzania informed Parties of a proposed LDCs meeting prior to COP-10, inviting Parties to contribute financial resources.

SBI conclusions: In the conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2004/L.4), SBI endorses the proposed work programme of the LDC Expert Group for its second term (2004-2005), and invites the Chair to update SBI-21 on progress.

ARRANGEMENTS FOR INTERGOVERNMENTAL

MEETINGS: This issue was first addressed by SBI in Plenary on Thursday, 17 June, and subsequently in a contact group charged with drafting conclusions on the subject, and chaired by Karsten Sach (Germany). The contact group considered: arrangements for COP-10; future sessional periods; organization of the intergovernmental process; effective participation in the UNFCCC process; and an additional sub-item on arrangements for COP/MOP-1 proposed by the G-77/China. The contact group met three times between Friday, 18 June and Wednesday, 23 June. Parties adopted conclusions in the SBI Plenary held on Thursday, 24 June.

On arrangements for COP-10, discussions centered around the timing, structure and themes of the high-level segment. Several Parties, including Norway, Iceland, the EU, South Africa, AOSIS,

Burkina Faso and Canada, urged discussions on energy. Saudi Arabia opposed this idea. On future sessional periods and organization of the intergovernmental process, Parties discussed the possibility of extending the period between COPs, and rationalizing the workload of the negotiating process.

On effective participation in the UNFCCC process, debates focused on the participation and admission of observers, and on responding to a request by the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues to establish an *ad hoc* open-ended working group on indigenous peoples and climate change. While some Parties supported exploring opportunities for participation by indigenous peoples, others felt representation on national delegations would be sufficient.

Regarding the participation of observers, the US said his delegation was seeking to have a physical presence during meetings of the CDM Executive Board. Chair Sach said the issue of observer status to the CDM Executive Board was regulated by an existing COP decision (decision 21/CP.8 on the CDM Executive Board). Opposed by the EU, the US called for text clarifying that participation includes a physical presence, and suggested reviewing the issue at SBI-22. Parties deliberated over whether to include a paragraph taking note of the concern expressed by the US with respect to the interpretation of the Rules of Procedure on transparency and attendance of the CDM Executive Board. In the end, Parties agreed to reflect the concern of the US in the conclusions.

On the membership of constituencies involved in the climate change process, the US raised concerns regarding the criteria for membership of the Research and Independent NGOs (RINGOs). RINGOs indicated that the intention of membership criteria was simply to clarify how members are distinguished from other constituencies. The US, supported by the G-77/China but opposed by the EU, called for a review of the approach for selecting membership of constituencies.

SBI conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2004/L.7), SBI addresses a variety of issues relating to arrangements for intergovernmental meetings. Regarding COP-10, SBI recognizes that 2004 is the tenth anniversary of the entry into force of the UNFCCC, and that this will serve as the central theme for COP-10. It endorses the dates of 15-17 December 2004 for the high-level segment. SBI also recommends panel discussions during the high-level segment, on four themes: The UNFCCC after 10 years – accomplishments and future challenges; Impacts of climate change, adaptation measures and sustainable development; Technology and climate change; and Mitigation of climate change – policies and their impacts. On the organization of the intergovernmental process, the SBI conclusions request the Secretariat to convene a workshop in conjunction with SBI-21, and to prepare a background paper taking into account relevant experience in other multilateral processes.

On effective participation in the UNFCCC process, SBI takes note of a concern expressed with respect to the interpretation of the Rules of Procedure of the CDM Executive Board as it relates to transparency and attendance. It agrees to continue consideration of effective participation at SBI-22, on the basis of submissions received by 31 January 2005. Regarding participation of observer organizations, SBI takes note of the Secretariat's current approach, and agrees to continue consideration of the matter. SBI agrees that requests for the submission of information and views could be



extended to NGOs, on the understanding that such submissions would not be issued as official documents, but would be made available on the Secretariat website. Regarding the participation of indigenous peoples, SBI encourages Indigenous Peoples' Organizations to make use of the existing bodies and opportunities available to them under the UNFCCC, and acknowledges the importance of enhanced participation by such organizations in the UNFCCC process.

ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL MATTERS:

Budget performance for the biennium 2004-2005: This issue was first addressed by SBI in Plenary on Wednesday, 16 June, when Chair Stoycheva said she would prepare draft conclusions on the issue. In the SBI Plenary on Thursday, 24 June, Chair Stoycheva presented the conclusions, which Parties adopted without amendment.

SBI conclusions: In the conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2004/L.2), SBI takes note of the information of the work programme for 2004-2005 relating to UNFCCC Article 4.8. SBI also takes note of the status of contributions as of 31 May 2004. SBI expresses appreciation to the Parties that have made their contributions to the core budget in time and in full, and particularly to those Parties that have made contributions to the Trust Fund for Participation and the Trust Fund for Supplementary Activities. It urges Parties that have not yet made their contributions to the core budget to do so as soon as possible. SBI stresses the importance of maintaining a high level of contributions to the Trust Fund for Participation in the UNFCCC Process to ensure effective participation at UNFCCC sessions by developing countries, especially least developed countries and small island developing States.

Implementation of paragraph 7(c) of the financial procedures of the UNFCCC concerning financial support for participation in the UNFCCC process: This issue was addressed by the SBI Plenary on Wednesday, 16 June. The Secretariat outlined the impacts of the practice of not funding the participation of Parties whose contributions are outstanding. Argentina and Colombia said outstanding contributions by developing countries should not be interpreted as a lack of willingness to pay. The SBI took note of the issue.

Implementation of the Headquarters Agreement: This issue was first addressed by SBI in Plenary on Wednesday, 16 June. Germany, as host government, briefed participants on progress in creating a UN campus for convention secretariats based in Bonn. On Thursday, 24 June, SBI adopted conclusions on the matter, without amendment.

SBI conclusions: In the conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2004/L.3), SBI takes note of the statement by Germany regarding the UN campus and international conference center in Bonn.

CONTINUING REVIEW OF THE FUNCTIONS AND OPERATIONS OF THE SECRETARIAT: SBI first addressed this issue in Plenary on Thursday, 17 June. Chair Stoycheva carried out informal consultations on the matter. Conclusions were adopted by SBI on Friday, 25 June.

India, for the G-77/China, called for balanced geographical representation in the UNFCCC Secretariat, neutrality in preparing documents, and equity in the allocation of resources for issues concerning developing and developed countries. The EU and Canada expressed their satisfaction with the functioning of the Secretariat. Saudi Arabia requested the Secretariat to ensure that

the views of all Parties are adequately reflected when making statements on behalf of the UNFCCC. The UNFCCC Executive Secretary stressed that the Secretariat is committed to transparency and equal representation, and welcomed feedback on its functioning.

SBI conclusions: In the conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2004/L.12), SBI agrees to continue consideration of this item at SBI-21, and requests the Secretariat to provide information on the arrangements for UNFCCC workshops, including such issues as criteria, scheduling and managing with limited funds.

REPORT ON THE SESSION: In closing, the UNFCCC Executive Secretary repeated comments made in SBSTA regarding the financial implications of conclusions adopted at SB-20. On behalf of SBI Rapporteur Gonzalo Menéndez, Chair Stoycheva invited Parties to consider the report on the session (FCCC/SBI/2004/L.1), which Parties adopted without amendment.

The US expressed gratitude to the Executive Secretary for her comments on the financial implications of the adopted conclusions. Qatar, for the G-77/China, looked forward to COP-10. The EU said negotiations had provided a clearer picture and expressed hope for discussions at SBI-21. Chair Stoycheva closed SBI-20 at 4:25 pm.

A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF SB-20

In the war to save the world from climate change, SB-20 turned out to be just a minor skirmish, with only sporadic shots fired. But although it was generally a quiet event that saw little serious conflict, the meeting was not totally without incident. In particular, several new innovations and some increased technical complexities emerged in the process. This analysis reviews the state of play in the climate negotiations, focusing on those new complexities and innovations that came to the fore at SB-20, and on hopes for COP-10 and beyond.

TIME TO TALK

A relatively relaxed pace at SB-20 allowed delegates to make notable progress on aspects that had been sidelined until now, such as "good practices" in policies and measures. It also gave them the chance to explore some innovation in their negotiations. For instance, not all the contact groups immediately started work on negotiating text. On some traditionally controversial issues such as the timing of submissions of non-Annex I national communications, Chairs chose to facilitate an open exchange of ideas on how progress could be made, instead of putting pressure on delegates to deliver agreed text.

The in-session workshops, a new addition to the UNFCCC process, were a further step in exploring ways to encourage discussion and exchange information without having to state entrenched national positions. The workshops were well attended, and most participants felt they provided a helpful forum to make progress on controversial issues. Delegates observed that the discussion on adaptation and mitigation, for instance, allowed for a broader dialogue on the future of the climate negotiations and a more candid discussion on North-South differences. On the other hand, some observers did feel that future topics should be more focused, and presentations and discussions more result-oriented, so as to be relevant to policy makers. Some concerns were also expressed that the workshops took delegates away from important negotiations.

There were other suggestions made during negotiations at SB-20 to make the format more interactive. Drawing attention to their difficulties in interacting with the UNFCCC financial mechanism,



some developing countries suggested holding in-session question-and-answer meetings with the GEF. Meanwhile, delegates also spent considerable time discussing the format of the high-level segment at COP-10, to ensure that interventions by ministers and heads of states at COP-10 go beyond the simple delivery of pre-written statements.

These new innovations were aimed at making the process more open and interactive, and are similar to attempts in the CSD process to promote genuine dialogue and discussion. However, there were some concerns that in other areas the negotiations may be taking a step backwards when it comes to stakeholder participation. Observers expressed concerns on discussions calling for a review of the process for accrediting and recognizing observers and constituencies, at the behest of the US and Saudi Arabia, fearing that this could be used to restrict or limit participation.

ANGELS ON PINHEADS...

As the negotiations under the UNFCCC hit their ten-year mark, an element of repetition or *déjà vu* seems to have crept in. In several discussions, such as those on non-Annex I national communications, previously agreed text made a reappearance, sometimes in what seemed like attempts by some countries to re-open discussions on agreements that they felt did not adequately address their concerns. In such cases, there were often complaints that text was repeated selectively, to highlight the priorities of one group (such as on adaptation and vulnerability), while deliberately underplaying others (for instance, greenhouse gas inventories).

In other cases, such as the discussions on the common reporting format in the IPCC Good Practice Guidance, the negotiations turned increasingly complex, and were likened by one delegate to "medieval philosophers arguing about angels on the heads of pins." Delegates spent hours negotiating methods for identifying units to measure changes in land use, in order to balance concerns about the level of detail required to ensure the integrity of the process, and its practical implementation. Meanwhile, on the question of simplifying modalities and procedures for small-scale afforestation and reforestation projects under the CDM, some developing countries pushed for consideration of "bundling" small projects together to cut transaction costs, while others, including AOSIS and Brazil, feared that this would encourage foul play, with small-scale projects being combined to take advantage of simpler procedures. With many issues still outstanding, several African countries were frustrated by the process, which seemed to be torn between the need for complicated, technical procedures to ensure environmental integrity on the one hand, and a desire for simplicity to encourage community-level implementation on the other.

Negotiators arguing the finer details of LULUCF and CDM in SBSTA seemed unaware of the practical difficulties of implementation being discussed in SBI, where many developing countries were already voicing concerns over their inability to keep up with existing technical requirements, such as the greenhouse gas inventories, and were calling for assistance to improve capacity. The complicated rules being discussed for small-scale CDM projects, for instance, are bound to create difficulties in implementation (with communities having, for example, to be aware of complex rules, such as in monitoring procedures). Concerns were expressed about the level of access and transparency in these discussions,

particularly for many developing countries, not just because of the complexity of negotiations but also because most of the discussions were held in a small "friends of the chair" group.

As negotiations became bogged down in the minutiae of issues such as tracking Annex I emissions from harvested wood products, observers commented that a simpler way to deal with climate mitigation might be to focus on renewable sources of energy, and avoid the traps of overly complex accounting, which ultimately could contribute very little to mitigating climate change. Before the negotiations proceed to higher levels of complexity, they said, it could be worthwhile taking advantage of the new innovations in the UNFCCC format, and engaging in an open dialogue to assess compatibility between science and the practical difficulties of implementation.

...AND DEVILS IN THE DETAILS

The SBI discussions were generally concerned with more practical matters, such as addressing continuing problems with lack of capacity to implement agreements, difficulties in accessing financial and technical resources, the frequency of national communications, and addressing the adverse impacts of climate change. In the discussions on capacity building, developing countries and economies in transition felt the ongoing review of capacity-building activities did not adequately reflect their concerns. In several SBI contact groups, ongoing frustrations with the UNFCCC's financial mechanism were expressed. For instance, developing countries articulated the difficulties in proving the "global benefit" of adaptation projects to access funds from the GEF. Concern was also expressed with the ongoing discussions in the GEF Council on linking financial assistance to performance-based assessments.

Talks on the implementation of Articles 4.8 and 4.9 continued to be weighed down by disagreement on the need to address the impacts of mitigation measures. There appeared to be an attempt from within the G-77/China to dissolve the unhappy marriage of impacts of response measures with adverse impacts of climate change, but with little success due to opposition from oil-producing countries. There did seem to be some movement, however, on the timing of non-Annex I national communications. Although no agreement was reached, the G-77/China introduced a proposal on the last day of the negotiations, expressing a willingness to submit second and, where appropriate, third national communications within five years of receiving the funds for their preparation, instead of the six years suggested by the EU. It appears likely that progress will be made when this proposal is discussed at the next session, although the issue of applying for funds before completion of previous national communications still remains controversial.

SBI discussions on intergovernmental arrangements attracted considerable interest, as delegates discussed a suitable platform for heads of state and ministers to express their views on the future of the negotiations. The relevant contact group also discussed a request from the US to gain access to the Executive Board of the Clean Development Mechanism, without being party to the Kyoto Protocol. Although it was pointed out that a COP decision already addressed this issue, some seemed in favor of allowing the US observer status, in what appeared to be an attempt to keep the door open for future US engagement. However, others felt that denying the US a role in the CDM Executive Board was one of the very few ways of putting them under pressure to reconsider their stand, as US industry is keen to keep engaged in the CDM process.



RUSSIAN ROULETTE

“A riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma,” is how Winston Churchill once described Russia. He was speaking in 1939, but his comments could easily apply today, especially when it comes to deciphering the country’s position on the Kyoto Protocol. Perhaps the relatively relaxed pace of negotiations at SB-20 can be attributed in part to the fact that delegates are still waiting on Russia’s all-important decision that will determine Kyoto’s fate. Some observers seemed impressed that negotiators at SB-20 were able to engage in such complex and intricate negotiations, let alone seek innovations to improve the process, when the future of the Protocol remains in such doubt. Although the issue of Russian ratification was not mentioned too often at SB-20 – perhaps because participants are tired of the news networks having cried wolf too often in the past – it must have been ever-present in the minds of the delegates. Many secretly seem to be hoping that Russian ratification will be announced in Buenos Aires in December. If this happens, the tenth Conference of the Parties (and tenth anniversary celebrations) will without doubt mark the end of the “quiet” times experienced lately, and the beginning of an exciting new stage in the ongoing fight to save the world from climate change.

THINGS TO LOOK FOR BEFORE COP-10

CONFERENCE ON CLIMATE CHANGE AND AQUATIC SYSTEMS - PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE:

This conference will take place from 21-23 July 2004, at the University of Plymouth, UK. For more information, contact: University of Plymouth; tel: +44-17-5223-3304; fax: +44-17-5223-3310; e-mail: climate@plymouth.ac.uk; Internet: <http://www.biology.plymouth.ac.uk/climate/climate.htm>

13TH WORLD CLEAN AIR AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION CONGRESS AND EXHIBITION: This congress and exhibition will be held from 22-27 August 2004, in London, UK. For more information, contact: Congress Secretariat; tel: +972-3-972-7500; fax: +972-3-972-7555; e-mail: cleanair@kenes.com; Internet: <http://www.kenes.com/cleanair>

ANKARA CLIMATE CHANGE CONFERENCE: This conference will be held from 1-3 September 2004 in Ankara, Turkey. For more information, contact: Conference Secretariat, National Programme on Environment and Development; tel: +90-312-287-67-21; fax: +90-312-285-58-75; e-mail: envir@ttnet.net.tr; Internet: <http://www.cevreorman.gov.tr>

SEVENTH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON GREENHOUSE GAS CONTROL TECHNOLOGIES: This conference will take place from 5-9 September 2004, in Vancouver, Canada. For more information, contact: Ted Morris, Conference Secretariat; tel: +1-306-337-2290; fax: +1-306-337-2301; e-mail: Ted.Morris@uregina.ca; Internet: <http://www.ghgt7.ca/main.html>

19TH WORLD ENERGY CONGRESS: This congress will convene from 5-9 September 2004, in Sydney, Australia. For more information, contact: 19th World Energy Congress Managers; tel: +61-2-9248-0800; fax: +61-2-9248-0894; e-mail: energy2004@tourhosts.com.au; Internet: <http://www.tourhosts.com.au/energy2004>

EMISSIONS MARKETING ASSOCIATION’S EIGHTH ANNUAL FALL MEETING AND CONFERENCE: This conference will take place from 19-22 September 2004, in Toronto, Canada. For more information, contact: David Feldner, EMA

Executive Director; tel: +1-414-276-3819; fax: +1-414-276-3349; e-mail: dfeldner@emissions.org; Internet: <http://www.emissions.org/conferences/fallconference04/>

IPCC EXPERT MEETING ON INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT, TRANSFER AND DIFFUSION: This meeting will take place from 21-23 September 2004, in Tokyo, Japan. For more information, contact: IPCC Secretariat; tel: +41-22-730-8208; fax: +41-22-730-8025; e-mail: IPCC-Sec@wmo.int; Internet: <http://www.ipcc.ch/othernews/itdt.htm>

THIRD INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM - ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT 2004: This symposium will be held from 30 September to 2 October 2004, in Sorrento, Italy. For more information, contact: Megalia Foundation; tel: +39-81-665-815; fax: +39-81-240-4219; e-mail: megalia.eco@tiscali.it; Internet: <http://www.megaliafoundation.it/Sorrento/>

SECOND SESSION OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE FOR THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON DISASTER REDUCTION: The preparatory committee for the World Conference on Disaster Reduction, which is scheduled to take place in January 2005 in Kobe-Hyogo, Japan, will convene for its second session from 11-12 October 2004, in Geneva, Switzerland. For more information, contact: UN/ISDR; tel: +41-22-917-2529; fax: +41-22-917-0563; e-mail: isdr@un.org; Internet: <http://www.unisdr.org/eng/wcdr/wcdr-index.htm>

CLIMATE CHANGE AND BUSINESS CONFERENCE AND EXPO 2004: This conference will be held from 3-5 November 2004, in Auckland, New Zealand. For more information, contact: The Conference Company Ltd; tel: +64-9-360-1240; fax: +64-9-360-1242; e-mail: secretariat@climateandbusiness.com; Internet: <http://www.climateandbusiness.com>

22ND SESSION OF THE IPCC: This meeting of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change will take place from 8-11 November 2004, in New Delhi, India. For more information, contact: IPCC Secretariat; tel: +41-22-730-8208; fax: +41-22-730-8025; e-mail: IPCC-Sec@wmo.int; Internet: <http://www.ipcc.ch/calendar.htm>

GEF NGO CONSULTATION AND COUNCIL MEETING: This meeting will take place from 16-19 November 2004, in Washington, DC, US. For more information, contact: the GEF Secretariat; tel: +1-202-473-0508; fax: +1-202-522-3240; e-mail: secretariat@TheGEF.org; Internet: http://gefweb.org/participants/Council/Meeting_Schedule/meeting_schedule.html

16TH MEETING OF PARTIES TO THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL (MOP-16): MOP-16 to the Montreal Protocol will convene from 22-26 November 2004, in Prague, the Czech Republic. For more information contact: Ozone Secretariat, UNEP; tel: +254-2-62-3850; fax: +254-2-62-3601; e-mail: ozoneinfo@unep.org; Internet: <http://www.unep.org/ozone>

TENTH CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE UNFCCC (COP-10): UNFCCC COP-10 will be held from 6-17 December 2004, in Buenos Aires, Argentina. For more information, contact: UNFCCC Secretariat; tel: +49-228-815-1000; fax: +49-228-815-1999; email: secretariat@unfccc.int; Internet: <http://www.unfccc.int>