

11 September 2003

ENGLISH ONLY

UNITED NATIONS FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE

SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE

Nineteenth session

Milan, 1–9 December 2003

Item 4 (a) of the provisional agenda

METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES

REVIEW OF METHODOLOGICAL WORK UNDER THE CONVENTION AND THE KYOTO PROTOCOL

Further views on elements of a possible future work programme

Submissions from Parties

1. The Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA), at its eighteenth session, decided to continue consideration of a possible future work programme on methodological issues at its nineteenth session.
2. The SBSTA invited Parties to submit to the secretariat, by 15 August 2003, further views on elements of a possible future work programme, taking into account the considerations referred to in document FCCC/SBSTA/2003/10, paragraph 13 (b).
3. The secretariat has received eight submissions from Parties. In accordance with the procedure for miscellaneous documents, these submissions are attached and reproduced* in the language in which they were received and without formal editing.

* These submissions have been electronically imported in order to make them available on electronic systems, including the World Wide Web. The secretariat has made every effort to ensure the correct reproduction of the texts as submitted.

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1. ARGENTINA (Submission received 13 August 2003)	3
2. AUSTRALIA (Submission received 4 September 2003)	4
3. CHINA (Submission received 18 August 2003)	8
4. ITALY ON BEHALF OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY AND ITS MEMBER STATES (Submission received 27 August 2003)	10
5. JAPAN (Submission received 5 September 2003)	14
6. NEW ZEALAND (Submission received 18 August 2003)	16
7. SUDAN (Submission received 13 August 2003)	18
8. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (Submission received 5 September 2003)	19

PAPER NO. 1: ARGENTINA

“During the period 1990-2000, international aviation emissions from Annex I Parties increased at an average annual rate of 4%. This growth rate resulted in 2000 emissions being about 48% higher than those in 1990. This is by far the largest increase observed for any sector for this period”¹

Since the beginning of the UNFCCC negotiations, different criteria have been proposed for the inclusion of these emissions in national GHG inventories of the Parties to the Convention and the simplest solution was adopted: emissions are reported by each Party, but not added to their inventories.

The debate and work on this issue should gain momentum. Building upon the criteria already proposed and on the information already available from the National Communications presented by UNFCCC Parties, the Secretariat could be asked to design simple arithmetical models of attribution following each of the different criteria proposed. For this endeavour the Secretariat could use statistical information existing in ICAO and IATA.

The different models designed could be run in a test study so that UNFCCC Parties may assess the possible impact of the use of each criteria on their national GHG inventories. This could eventually lead to an agreement on this important issue, since the present trend in GHG emissions derived from the use of international bunker fuels must be controlled and reversed.

Additionally, synergies could be enhanced between any such effort and other objectives in the field of energy efficiency and traffic control in transport by air and sea as well as in the field of airport and/or harbour management. For this purpose, options to reduce fuel burn through improved operational measures should be explored.

1 FCCC/SBSTA/2003/INF.3. See also FCCC/SBI/2003/7/Add.1

PAPER NO. 2: AUSTRALIA

Introduction

At its eighteenth session the subsidiary body for scientific and technical advice invited Parties to submit further views on elements of a possible future work programme of methodological work. Australia welcomes the opportunity to submit its views on these matters.

Australia's proposal for the development of a Data Interface to improve access to data by Parties

SBSTA 18 noted the importance of reliable information, and in that context agreed to consider Australia's proposal for the development of a Data Interface to improve access to data by Parties. Australia looks forward to a fruitful discussion of the information being prepared by the secretariat regarding this proposal, and to SBSTA taking timely action to improve Parties' ability to access and analyse data.

To assist in the SBSTA's consideration of the best approach for developing a Data Interface, we would like to draw the attention of Parties and the secretariat to a database and analysis tool being developed by the World Resources Institute (WRI). The WRI's *Climate Indicators Analysis Tool*, which Australia has been fortunate to be able to trial in its draft form, is both useful and highly relevant to the SBSTA's work on data and information needs, including both of the tasks requested of the secretariat in paragraph 3 of the SBSTA 18 conclusions on this agenda item.* Australia understands that WRI intends to have a revised version of the tool ready for public release in late in 2003.

While the draft *Climate Indicators Analysis Tool* trialled by Australia differs in many respects to the Data Interface proposed by Australia at SBSTA 18, core elements of it are consistent with SBSTA's aim of making existing data readily available to Parties through a user-friendly interface. Assessing the utility of different elements of the *Climate Indicators Analysis Tool* would effectively enable the SBSTA to gain from WRI's experience in developing the tool. With that in mind, consideration of the ability of the *Climate Indicators Analysis Tool*, or elements of it, to be adapted or serve as a model, should be part of the SBSTA's consideration of options for the development and hosting of a Data Interface for the use of Parties.

* Footnote by the secretariat. See FCCC/SBSTA/2003/10, paragraph 13 (c).

Australia's views on the table annexed to the SBSTA 18 conclusions on agenda item 4(a)

Australia regards the SBSTA agenda item *Review of methodological work under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol* as a useful forum for the discussion of methodological work, including work to develop and disseminate methodologies and work related to the accumulation and dissemination of information. This discussion should encompass the elements of a strategic approach listed in paragraph 2 of the SBSTA 18 conclusions on this agenda item.** While this agenda item is also a valuable forum for launching work of a cross-cutting and strategic nature that does not readily fit under any other agenda item, it should not be used to initiate work that would be better carried out under another agenda item.

Australia sees the table annexed to the SBSTA 18 conclusions on agenda item 4(a)*** primarily as a tool to inform the discussion referred to above. While this agenda item may serve as a central forum for the discussion, the table may also be of value in strategic discussions under other agenda items where methodological work is ongoing or proposed, as it would enable the identification of potential linkages or overlap between work programs under different agenda items.

In this context, the table provides a useful format for Parties to follow in proposing new methodological work and analysing proposals by other Parties. Use of this format would increase the transparency of processes for considering new work and enable workload and budget to be more readily taken into account. Australia's suggested version of the format is used below to convey Australia's indicative priorities for future methodological work.

To enable identification of synergies and avoid duplication, it would be helpful if existing methodological work under all agenda items was included in the table. For existing work, it would be useful if the 'background' column included a reference to recent decisions or conclusions providing a mandate or direction for the work.

The clear separation of existing and proposed work is important for the easy use of the table. Thematic grouping of work would also be beneficial. Australia proposes four clusters: inventories and projections; mitigation; adaptation; and other work (ie cross-cutting work or work that does not fit into any of the other categories).

Prioritisation of areas of possible new work

The table below elaborates on proposals drawn from the Annex to the SBSTA 18 conclusions that Australia regards as indicative priorities for future methodological work.

** Footnote by the secretariat. See FCCC/SBSTA/2003/10, paragraph 13 (b).

*** Footnote by the secretariat. See FCCC/SBSTA/2003/10/Add.1, chapter I.

Table: Australia's priorities for possible future methodological work
 NB: Elements are not listed in order of importance

Background information	Proposed work relating to methodologies	Proposed work relating to information	How should the work be done?	Who should undertake the work?	Proposed timeframe for the work
Work related to inventories and projections					
	Dissemination of methodologies used by Parties and other organisations to assist Parties with developing or improving their own methodologies for projections of greenhouse gas emissions	Compilation of information on assumptions and indicators used by Parties in developing their projections	Electronic publication of compilations of methodologies and assumptions and indicators; and papers summarizing this information.	An organisation with expertise in emissions projections.	By COP 10
Work related to mitigation					
		Exchange and collation of information on experiences, including from clean development mechanism projects, that may contribute to greater awareness of the mitigation policies and measures being implemented by non-Annex I countries and assist in designing future CDM projects	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A background paper on existing sources of information (eg information available from the CDM EB; the GEF; UNDP etc) 2. A workshop to discuss experiences with CDM projects. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The secretariat 2. The secretariat to organize workshop for Parties to attend 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. By SB 20 2. Before COP 10

Background information	Proposed work relating to methodologies	Proposed work relating to information	How should the work be done?	Who should undertake the work?	Proposed timeframe for the work
Work related to adaptation					
	Methods and tools for vulnerability and adaptive capacity assessment.		<p>1. A background paper on methodologies and tools used by Parties and other organisations.</p> <p>2. A workshop to share information on methods and tools for vulnerability and adaptive capacity assessment.</p>	<p>1. The secretariat</p> <p>2. The secretariat to organize a workshop for Parties and relevant organisations to attend.</p>	<p>1. In time for the workshop referred to below.</p> <p>2. Before COP 10.</p>
Cross-cutting and other work					
Paragraph 3 of SBSTA conclusions on agenda item 4(a) requested the secretariat to prepare a paper taking stock of availability, accessibility and comparability of existing data sources and develop options for the development, hosting and management of a data interface for consideration at SBSTA 19, at which time SBSTA will further consider the proposal contained in document FCCC/SBSTA/2003/Misc.3/Add.1.		Improvement of availability of data to Parties through the development of a Data Interface	Development, hosting and management of a data interface. The initial phase could cover a limited range of data, with further development as Parties gained experience in using the interface and new data needs became evident.	Could be carried out in-house by the secretariat or outsourced to an appropriate organisation (to be determined by discussion at SBSTA 19 of the information provided by the secretariat).	A pilot phase to be commenced following a decision at COP 9.

PAPER NO. 3: CHINA

At its eighteenth session in June 2003 the Subsidiary Body of Scientific and Technological Advice invites Parties to submit, by 15 August 2003, their further views on elements of a possible future work programme of methodological work under the Convention and Kyoto Protocol. China welcomes the opportunity to submit its views on this matter. With regard to the strategic approach of methodological work in the future, China believes that it ought to benefit the implementation of the objective, principle and commitment of UNFCCC, inter alia, the implementation of Kyoto Protocol. Each specific methodological issue should be based on the deepening scientific understanding. More attention should be given to the impact of Climate Change on developing countries and its urgent and practical need for adaptation policy. The top priority of future work programme and its relevant elements are given below.

1. Develop assessment methodologies of environmental, economic and social effects of implementation of KP, should be developed based upon the scenarios:
 - full implementation of KP, namely, carrying out the 5.2% mitigation target by Annex I Parties collectively;
 - KP's entry into force without US;
 - KP fails to entry into force.
2. Issues related to adaptation and vulnerability
 - Develop the methodologies for assessing the adaptation technologies for climate change;
 - Develop methodologies for accounting the cost and benefit of adaptation technologies;
 - Develop methodologies for assessing the impacts of newly developed, environmentally sound technologies and their transfer on the adaptive capacity of developing countries;
 - Develop methodologies of assessment on the inter-comparison of various impact models and their applicability;
 - Develop methodologies for integrated impact assessment of climate change.
3. Issues related to the guidelines under Articles 5, 7, 8 of Kyoto Protocol
 - Establish the standards used by experts to identify the problems within National Greenhouse Gas Inventories;
 - Provide the complementary methodologies related to LULUCF under 5, 7, 8.articles;
4. Issues related to national communications from Annex I Parties
 - Improve the uncertainty assessment for GHG inventories of Annex I Parties;
 - Improve the reporting guidelines and formats on projections to enhance transparency and comparability.
5. Issues related policies and measuring
 - Establish methodologies to assess the environmental effects of mitigation policies and measures already implemented by Annex I Parties;
 - Methodologies to assess the adverse impacts of polices measures implemented by Annex I parties on the developing countries and assess the efforts made by Annex I Parties that try to minimize the adverse impacts on developing countries.
6. Issues related to consumption pattern
 - Establish methodologies to identify the sustainable consumption pattern;
 - Develop methodologies for assessment of the impacts of the unsustainable consumption pattern in Annex I Parties on climate change.
7. Issues related to technology transfer
 - Develop methodologies for technology assessment and identification, including that of both publicly owned and private technologies and know-how.
 - Develop tools for technology information exchange and dissemination, with the aim of providing fast and one-stop databases relating to state-of-art, environmentally sound and economically feasible technology and know-how that would be readily accessible to developing countries.
 - Develop approaches for the establishment of innovative mechanism for technology transfer.

8. IPCC Good practice Guidance for Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry
--Edit a concise handbook of GPG-LULUCF for those with less LULUCF knowledge.
9. Issues related to capacity building
-- Develop approaches for the comprehensive review of the implementation of relevant COP decisions.

PAPER NO. 4: ITALY ON BEHALF OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY
AND ITS MEMBER STATES

**THE SUBMISSION IS SUPPORTED BY THE FOLLOWING ACCEDING STATES: CYPRUS,
CZECH REPUBLIC, ESTONIA, HUNGARY, SLOVAKIA, SLOVENIA**

**REVIEW OF METHODOLOGICAL WORK UNDER THE CONVENTION
AND THE KYOTO PROTOCOL**

FURTHER VIEWS ON ELEMENTS OF A POSSIBLE FUTURE WORK PROGRAMME

The EU believes that the development of a work programme on future methodological work under SBSTA will help to further improve the efficiency of the work under the SBSTA and facilitates the delivery of the objectives as defined by the Convention in Article 9. In the SBSTA conclusions adopted in June 2003 (FCCC/SBSTA/2003/L.8),* Parties were requested to submit their further views on elements of a possible future work programme, taking into account the efficient and effective organization of work and the need for prioritisation of methodological work.

The EU thinks that the structure of the tables annexed to conclusions FCCC/SBSTA/2003/L.8* is very helpful. Table A provides a useful overview of work already on-going or planned and Table B contains new proposals for future methodological work.

To enhance efficiency and promote synergies, the EU proposes that the elements included in Table B should not duplicate elements contained in Table A and issues that are or could be considered under existing agenda items.

The new proposals in Table B could be divided into two categories: (i) those elements of relevance to existing thematic agenda items, and (ii) those elements that are completely new. The EU believes that, to organize work in an efficient and effective manner, new elements that fall under category (i) should not be considered under the methodological agenda item for consideration but under the appropriate thematic agenda item, and elements that fall under (ii) should continue to be considered under the SBSTA agenda item on methodological work.

Parties should also consider whether any of the proposals in Table B that cover ostensibly the same issue can be combined.

The EU believes there is considerable scope for rationalisation and thinks that budget and resource constraints should be taken into account: i.e. the propagation of issues already included and discussed in the SBSTA agenda to a larger number of agenda items should be avoided.

* Footnote by the secretariat. This document is superseded by FCCC/SBSTA/2003/10, paragraph 13.

Priority setting should guide the implementation of the work programme in case of limited resources. To this regard, the EU suggests prioritisation on the basis of the following criteria:

- a) Whether the proposed work can help to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of existing rules, guidance and methodologies in future;
- b) Whether the proposed work is necessary for the implementation of agreed commitments of Parties under the UNFCCC and the Kyoto Protocol;
- c) Whether the proposed work will advance technical understanding of issues related to post-2012 developments under the UNFCCC;
- d) Urgency of the work in relation to the entry into force of the Kyoto Protocol.

In its proposals regarding elements for future methodological work, the EU has focused on the period up to the end of 2007. The uncertainty appears too great to anticipate and identify methodological needs relating to a longer time horizon.

In general, the EU believes that the work programme still to be elaborated should be open and flexible enough to take into account additional needs not anticipated now but identified in future discussions.

Table A: Work based on current and planned activities

In the views of the EU, Table A should represent methodological work that has already been identified and agreed under thematic Subsidiary Body agenda items. In the following sections the EU elaborates on some of the elements of Table A where they seem to be incomplete or not sufficiently comprehensive:

2. *IPCC Good Practice Guidance for land-use, land-use change and forestry*

Similar to the modalities for adjustments under Article 5.2 of the Protocol for LULUCF activities, the time-frame for the work on common reporting format tables for land-use, land-use change and forestry should be between COP 9 and COP 10.

SBSTA will also need to consider and decide additional issues related to the use of IPCC Good Practice Guidance for land-use, land-use change and forestry for the reporting of greenhouse gas inventory information such as the starting dates when the new IPCC Good Practice Guidance should be implemented by Annex I Parties or issues related to recalculation of time series of LUCF data.

4 *Exploration of opportunities for examining and improving the quality of data reporting and comparability of GHG emissions from international aviation and maritime transport under the relevant provisions of the Convention, the Kyoto Protocol, ICAO and IMO.*

The table should be updated to reflect conclusions from SBSTA 18 on this issue.

5. *Issues relating to guidelines under Articles 5, 7 and 8 of the Kyoto Protocol, and issues relating to registries under Article 7, paragraph 4.*

The table should be updated to reflect conclusions from SBSTA 18 on this issue.

10. *Compilation of methodological information relevant to the implementation of the guidelines by the CGE with regard to the improvement of the guidelines for the preparation of national communications by non-Annex I Parties*

With regard to methodologies, the mandate for the CGE requests the identification and assessment of the difficulties encountered by Non-Annex I Parties in the use of the guidelines and methodologies for the preparation of national communications and recommendations for their improvement (Annex to decision 3/CP.8). In addition, it requests the improvement of the consistency of the information provided, data collection, the use of local and regional emission factors and activity data and the development of methodologies. With regard to the CGE's work, Table A should more clearly refer to the specific issues covered by mandate which focuses on the compilation of methodological information provided by Non-Annex I Parties in either their national communications or through their contributions during CGE workshops and which focuses on the assessment of difficulties with the use of guidelines and the improvement of consistency.

15. *In accordance with decision 16/CP.7 and the annex on guidelines for the implementation of Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol, the Article 6 supervisory committee is to be established at COP/MOP 1 to supervise, inter alia, the verification of the emission reduction units generated by Article 6 projects. Table A proposes to work on the review and revision of reporting guidelines and criteria for baselines and monitoring, and the elaboration of the project design document. Consideration of relevant work by the Executive Board of the CDM, as appropriate.*

The Article 6 Supervisory Committee should carry out its activities in accordance with previous decisions. No specific work under the SBSTA has to be addressed.

Additional issues for table A:

The conclusions from SBSTA 18 highlight a number of additional issues in relation to future work under Article 5, 7 and 8 of the Protocol (e.g. confidentiality issues to be discussed by SBSTA 20) which should be included in the table of agreed work. . In addition IPCC is working on F gases on request of SBSTA, and will report thereon at the 22nd session of SBSTA. That should also be included in Table A.

Table B. Initial proposals by Parties on possible new elements

In the EU's view new and additional elements of the work programme should include technical work to support the effective implementation of the UNFCCC and Kyoto Protocol as well as technical work to inform consideration about the development of the international architecture for action on climate change and the continued and advanced effectiveness of the UNFCCC. More specifically these objectives require:

- a) continued work to assess the efficiency and effectiveness of agreed rules, guidance and methodologies; and
- b) work to increase the technical analysis of different issues relevant to decision making on action post-2012, thereby ensuring that all Parties can access such analytical work.

On the basis of the objectives described above, the EU would like the following proposals to be reflected in Table B:

- Methodologies for determining Parties' contributions to controlling emissions;
- Methodologies for assessing adaptation strategies;
- Methodologies for producing emission scenarios, including stabilisation scenarios;
- Methodologies for assessing underlying factors which determine greenhouse gas emissions in different sectors.

As concerns the development of improvement of availability of data to Parties through development of a data interface, the EU's further views will be provided after we have received and considered the Secretariat's paper about feasibility and costs of such a data interface.

The EU believes that, in establishing its priorities for new work, the SBSTA should take into account budget and resource constraints as well as urgency with regard to the implementation of the Kyoto Protocol.

PAPER NO. 5: JAPAN

Japan welcomes the opportunity to submit its views on the review of methodological work, as invited by the SBSTA at its eighteenth session. Since methodological work is fundamental to the implementation of the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol, this review will contribute to pursuing the ultimate objective of the Convention if carried out from a comprehensive and strategic perspective.

General Comment

The review of methodological work aims at developing a comprehensive and strategic work plan from a long-term perspective. Hence, areas discussed under this item should be chosen so as to produce universal guidance which is available to any Party. The review of methodological work should not only result in analytical work, but should produce output in the form of guidelines and modalities. In this regard, new elements to be discussed under this agenda should be further clarified. (e.g., No.16 and No.17 of possible new elements (FCCC/ SBSTA/2003/L.8 Annex Table B)).* It is from this point of view that Japan submits its views on elements of a possible future work programme.

Priorities for the future work programme

Current and planned activities

Current and planned activities for the review of methodological work should be conducted as scheduled. Those activities should not be discussed again under this item in order to avoid duplication and confusion, unless entities proceeding with those activities hope to do so.

Possible new elements

Japan stresses that in giving priority to possible new elements the priority should be consistent with future discussions under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol. Bearing that in mind, Japan gives high priority to three topics: GHG inventories, projections of GHG emissions and removals by sinks as well as assessing mitigation and adaptation technologies, as commented in the previous submission (FCCC/SBSTA/2003/MISC.3).

Among possible new elements, it seems that GHG projections which could be dealt with strategically (FCCC/SBSTA/2003/L.8 Annex Table B* No.2, 3, 4) should be prioritized. Japan thinks it significant to develop a work plan for the GHG projection methodologies. Assessing mitigation and adaptation technologies (No.13, 14, 15), including CO₂ capture and storage technologies, also has high priority. As for elements related to adaptation, the review of methodological work should be implemented after thorough discussion on what types of adaptation can be targeted in terms of assessing for measures to address climate change and availability to many Parties. In addition, it seems difficult to develop and review methodologies for assessing terms of trade and socio-economic impacts on individual developing country Parties (No.18), because assessment of those impacts by comprehensive methodologies is rather complicated.

The testing of the transaction log and registry systems (No.1) should be discussed under the existing agenda "Issues relating to Articles 5, 7 and 8 of the Kyoto Protocol."

* Footnote by the secretariat. This document is superseded by FCCC/SBSTA/2003/10/Add.1, chapter I, table B.

Given the fact that the SBSTA agenda already has an item “Good Practices in Policies and Measures,” it seems appropriate to discuss elements related to policies and measures (No.5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12) under the existing item of the agenda, if necessary, because there is difficulty in separating methodological work on policies and measures from discussion on the existing item. Since policies and measures are usually implemented depending on national circumstances, it will probably not be easy to establish general and comprehensive methodologies for developing policies and measures.

Development of the data interface

Adequate collection and dissemination of information is vital to methodological work. Therefore, development of a data interface, the importance of which was discussed at SBSTA18, should be advanced.

PAPER NO. 6: NEW ZEALAND

This submission responds to the invitation to Parties in paragraphs 2 and 4 of the conclusions of SBSTA 18 (FCCC/SBSTA/2003/L.8)* to provide further views on elements of a possible future work programme, taking into account priorities, synergies, and organising the work in an effective and efficient manner.

Overview

New Zealand appreciates the opportunity for providing its further views on elements of a possible future work programme, and on priorities and synergies between elements. We welcome the efforts of the Parties enabling progress at SBSTA18, in particular the development of the Tables in the Annex to the conclusions from SBSTA 18 (FCCC/SBSTA/2003/L.8, Tables A, B and C).** We believe that the structure and content of these Tables, including any further elements that may be added, provide a useful starting point for identifying key elements and priorities of the future work programme.

We reaffirm the central importance of the points made in paragraph 2*** of the Conclusions, in particular the need to organise the work in an effective and efficient manner and to prioritise the work, recognising synergies with other agenda items and work carried out by other relevant bodies. The importance of the need to be efficient and to prioritise work is immediately made relevant when reading and thinking over the existing 21 elements in Tables A and B. In this respect the effort put into producing Table C is helpful in that it identifies possible groupings and synergies. But this does not yet allow an easy identification of priorities, or where work is currently underway outside of SBSTA, or is yet to be started.

Our submission therefore focuses on ways in which the listed elements could be prioritised and put into a time frame that allows their treatment in an efficient manner that ensures the outcomes are beneficial to all Parties.

Organising and prioritising work elements

We recommend the following steps as useful to organise and then prioritise the elements of a possible future work programme:

- 1) **Removal of redundancies and overlaps.** The elements listed in Tables A and B are currently drawn directly from Party submissions, without detailed checking for duplication and synergies with work going on under other SBSTA and SBI agenda items. As a first step, taking into account any additional submissions from Parties received, efforts should be made to reduce duplication and overlaps between elements listed in Tables A and B, and agree on the scope of each individual possible element (without regard at this stage to its priority).
- 2) **Cross-check with other agenda items.** The revised list of elements needs to be checked against work agreed under other SBSTA or SBI agenda items. This is particularly important because the two new agenda items on scientific, technological and socio-economic aspects of adaptation and mitigation will also receive submissions on new work to be carried out. Parties need to gain clarity whether the work described under the agenda item on methodological issues would include work to be carried out under other agenda items, in particular the two new agenda items. New Zealand is of the view that the agenda item on methodological issues should, at a high level, incorporate

* Footnote by the secretariat. This document is superseded by FCCC/SBSTA/2003/10, paragraphs 13 (b) and (d).

** Footnote by the secretariat. This document is superseded by FCCC/SBSTA/2003/10/Add.1, chapter I.

*** Footnote by the secretariat. This document is superseded by FCCC/SBSTA/2003/10, paragraph 13 (b).

methodological work that will be carried out under other SBSTA agenda items, but not work carried out under SBI agenda items.

- 3) **Production of a clean list of possible elements.** Having followed steps (1) and (2), Parties would have a list of possible elements for a future work programme that is largely free of duplication, overlaps, and does not double-count work between different SBSTA agenda items. The list would therefore cover the entirety of possible future work across the range of issues covered by SBSTA in the foreseeable future, recognising that some concrete and detailed decisions about future work will be made within other agenda items (such as the two new agenda items on adaptation and mitigation).
- 4) **Identification of priority and resource requirements.** The elements for a possible future work programme should then be assigned priorities (for example 1 (highest) to 3 (lowest)), and be clearly identified whether work is Currently Addressed (CA) in the SBSTA or any other bodies' work programme (but needs to be carried forward), or whether New and Additional work would be Necessary (NAN). Every possible element could thus for example be labelled as "2-NAN", or "1-CA" etc. This labelling would allow attention to be focused on urgency (priority) as well as resource requirement to carry out the work.

Options to identify elements with the highest priority

It will be critical that Parties can agree on at least the elements which have highest (number 1) priority.

New Zealand places priority on work necessary to ensure that the information base necessary to "supporting the needs of the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol for future decision-making and elaborating the future climate change process" (FCCC/SBSTA/2003/L.8, paragraph 2)^{****} is comprehensive, robust and available at the required time where there is a clear deadline. In our view, work elements that are necessary to achieve these three objectives would by default be given priority 1.

We recognise that there exist other criteria which may equally result in a work element being given a high priority. We believe that at SBSTA 19 it may be useful early in our work on this agenda item to dedicate sufficient time to determine a limited list of key criteria for assigning priority to individual work elements, based on submissions by Parties and further discussion.

We suggest that further key criteria to determine priorities of possible work elements could include: the ability of Parties to undertake the work on their own as compared with only through the help of SBSTA or other relevant bodies, the existence of clear time frames which are central to the Convention process, and the need to encourage experts to undertake conceptually or technically new or difficult work to ensure the needs of the Parties to the Convention can be met at a later stage.

^{****} Footnote by the secretariat. This document is superseded by FCCC/SBSTA/2003/10, paragraph 13 (b).

PAPER NO. 7: SUDAN

In the intended future methodological work programme by SBSTA, priorities should be given to methodologies for assessing impacts and adaptation to climate change particularly to those issues related to Article (4.9). Also, the elements of this future work programme should include work on methodologies and guidelines (as appropriate) on integration of adaptation, mitigation and other climate change issues into national planning and development.

PAPER NO. 8: UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

FCCC/SBSTA/2003/10, 2003/10/Add.1
VIEWS ON METHODOLOGICAL WORK UNDER THE CONVENTION

The United States welcomes the opportunity to provide views on the work of the SBSTA on “Review of Methodological Work under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol” as reflected in documents FCCC/SBSTA/2003/10 and FCCC/SBSTA/2003/10.Add 1.

The United States considers the discussions of this item at SBSTA 18 to have been informative in highlighting the current breadth and scope of methodological work underway under the Convention. However, the discussion strengthened our view that decisions to prioritize and undertake work of a methodological nature should arise from discussions in a thematic context, rather than through a broad and eclectic review of methodological work under the Convention.

For example, we believe that a discussion of methodological work relating to vulnerability assessment should be undertaken in the context of agenda items relating specifically to vulnerability, rather than out of an agenda item broadly focused on methodological work. We believe that the same holds true in other thematic areas, such as technology transfer, adaptation, policies and measures, sinks, and so forth. Those working in thematic areas are best placed to identify work needed and to determine the appropriate manner in which any such work would be undertaken and the appropriate prioritization of methodological activities relative to other activities in a given thematic area.

The United States considers the table contained in FCCC/SBSTA/2003/10/Add.1 (“Draft Decisions Forwarded for Adoption by the Conference of the Parties and Other Information”) to have assisted in clarifying the scope of ongoing work. However, we want to reiterate our view that we do not see such a table as providing the basis for recasting current and planned activities, negotiating priorities, or identifying new methodological work under this current agenda item. The United States believes that with the cataloging of existing activities, the goals of this agenda item have been achieved.

We note that a number of proposed items envisage a role for SBSTA or the secretariat. We would like to reiterate our view that there is a crucial distinction between those areas where uniform methodologies are needed to implement the Convention, and those areas where methodological work would be useful to Parties as they work to address a broader array of technical and national issues associated with climate change. This is true both in terms of identifying and prioritizing future work and defining the role for the SBSTA and Secretariat in such work. As an example, some methodologies are only applicable in specific national circumstances (as in the case of PAMs or vulnerability assessment); others are for activities for which there is not a specific need for uniform approaches (as is the case with projections). We note that most items listed in the table under “possible elements for development of methodologies” involve activities that, if undertaken, would be more appropriately handled by other bodies than SBSTA or the Secretariat.

Specific comments on items included in the table:

- "Methodologies for Annex I Parties on implementing win/win PAMS to reduce emissions and minimize adverse impacts on developing country Parties." It is unclear how this work would fit into discussions under the Policies and Measures agenda item, and we consider this a matter that is best considered in a broader discussion in that item.
- "Assessment of scientific knowledge on mitigation and adaptation pathways by the IPCC. Methodologies for assessing adaptive, and mitigative capacity and mitigation and adaptation pathways." This item was brought up for the first time in FCCC/SBSTA/2002/INF.12 and was not a proposal by Parties. We consider this to be a proposal that would emanate from discussions under mitigation and adaptation, if the Parties consider this work to be appropriate.
- "Methods for assessing mitigation technologies including socio-economic costs and...social acceptability." Our view is that consideration of this item should emanate from discussions under technology transfer. We note that this is an example where methodologies will differ according to national circumstances, and will be useful largely at the national level.
- "Analysis of the role of trade in cleaner or less greenhouse gas emitting energy in meeting the objective of the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol." This issue is already being taken up in its own agenda item, and any methodological work should be considered there.
- Other items listed in the table are currently under active discussion in other thematic areas (e.g., less GHG emitting energy, assessment of PAMS). As noted above, we believe that such issues should be dealt with in thematic discussions and not duplicated under this agenda item. Others (e.g., consumption and production, socio-economic scenarios) are not a central focus of current work, and we do not believe they merit SBSTA or Secretariat resources.
- Additional input by Parties to the IPCC inventory revision process (as suggested in the table) beyond that which has previously been agreed upon would possibly complicate or constrain the work of the IPCC. In addition, it is up to the IPCC to establish time frames for work, not for Parties. We do not see a role for other conventions regarding GHG Inventories.
