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1. In addition to the 19 submissions contained in document FCCC/SBSTA/2003/MISC.5, one further submission has been received.

2. In accordance with the procedure for miscellaneous documents, this submission is attached and reproduced in the language in which it was received and without formal editing.

* This submission has been electronically imported in order to make it available on electronic systems, including the World Wide Web. The secretariat has made every effort to ensure the correct reproduction of the text as submitted.

FCCC/SBSTA/2003/MISC.5/Add.1

GE.04-60193
With respect to the draft decision SBSTA/2003/L.27, approved by the 19th Session of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technical Advice on December 10, 2003 under Agenda item 4(c) (“Land-use, land-use change and forestry: Definitions and modalities for including afforestation and reforestation activities under article 12”), the United States notes that, even though this decision falls under the Conference of the Parties to the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change, the decision relates solely to the Kyoto Protocol, which the United States does not intend to ratify.

After careful review, we have allowed this decision to go forward on the understanding that the decision does not establish any precedent in the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change or for the United States generally.

The United States wishes to draw particular attention in this regard to the eighth and ninth paragraphs in the preamble to the decision, addressing evaluation of risks associated with alien invasive species and genetically modified organisms.

The United States supports the idea that those involved in activities under the Clean Development Mechanism should take into account environmental impacts associated with project activities.

However, we do not consider it appropriate to highlight genetically modified organisms in this context. Genetically modified organisms do not present unique risks that would warrant specific mention in the preamble to a decision on Clean Development Mechanism activities. Therefore, we would not accept the kind of undue highlighting that is reflected in this paragraph in an agreement that we had an intention to join.

We also note that the eighth and ninth paragraphs of the preamble do not impose new requirements on host Parties or Parties in Annex 1 to conduct evaluations. The preambular paragraphs simply note that, if host Parties already have such a requirement, by virtue of existing national law and/or international obligation, they will conduct such an evaluation.

Finally, the United States notes that evaluations, like all activities under this decision, would need to be undertaken in a manner consistent with existing international obligations that a Party may have, including obligations under international trade agreements.