Dear Participants;

I regret that I am unable to attend the second workshop on methodologies for adjustment under Article 5.2 of the Protocol. In my absence, Mr. Audun Rosland of Norway and Mr. Newton Paciornik of Brazil, who chaired the first workshop on adjustments in Athens and who have been involved in the negotiations on guidelines under Articles 5, 7 and 8 of the Kyoto Protocol since the beginning, have kindly accepted my request to serve as co-chairs of your workshop. I am certain that in their capable hands, your work will proceed smoothly.

I’d like to extend my gratitude to the Government of Portugal for their financial support and for hosting the workshop in such a lovely setting, and the governments of Canada and New Zealand for their financial support. Without the contributions of these Parties, this workshop would not be able to take place.

I’d also like to thank the secretariat and all the expert consultants who were involved in preparing case studies and working papers for this meeting. It is clear that a great deal of time and high-quality work went into preparing these materials.

Finally, I thank these Parties that provided useful views on the results of the case studies and the draft technical guidance and all of you for participating in this workshop. Your collective technical skills and your previous involvement in the negotiations on this matter is the foundation for the success of this workshop.

With respect to the work before you, may I remind you that according to Decision 21/CP.7, SBSTA is requested to complete the technical guidance on methodologies for adjustment to enable its adoption at COP9. Because of the excellent work done at the first workshop on adjustments, and the further work done to develop the case studies and working papers, I am very confident that SBSTA can complete the technical guidance at its 18th session. Given that this matter is of a highly technical character, I urge you to complete a revised version of the draft guidance in order to expedite the SBSTA’s consideration of the guidance. I believe that the proposal prepared by the secretariat, taking into account the results of the case studies and views from Parties, is a good starting point for your considerations.

The draft guidance produced at the first workshop on adjustments, contained in FCCC/SBSTA/2002/INF.5 provides a very good basis for your work. It is clear from the experience with the case studies that there are many useful elements in the draft guidance, and these elements should be kept in the final text. However, it is also clear from the case studies that further improvements/revisions of the draft technical guidance is necessary to enable consistent application of adjustments by expert review teams.

Keep in mind, however, that completion of the draft technical guidance does not mean that work on adjustments must end. As the secretariat has suggested in Working Paper No. 1, the technical guidance may be supplemented by the development of further practical recommendations for expert review teams on how to apply the technical guidance. These recommendations could be developed through a technically rigorous process involving lead reviewers, and based on the experience of expert review teams in applying the technical guidance to real inventory data. I ask participant to also consider the possible need for such process and identify any necessary steps for the SBSTA to enable such a process to occur.
Thank you again for your active participation in this workshop, and I look forward to the SBSTA’s consideration of the fruits of your work at the 18th session.

Sincerely,

Halldor Thorgeirsson