الأمم المتحدة

الاتفاقية الإطارية
بشأن تغير المناخ

Distr.
GENERAL

FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/5
13 May 2009

ARABIC
Original: ENGLISH

الفريق العامل المخصص للنظر في الالتزامات الإضافية للأطراف المدرجة في المرفق الأول بموجب بروتوكول كيوتو

تقرير الفريق العامل المخصص للنظر في الالتزامات الإضافية للأطراف المدرجة في المرفق الأول بموجب بروتوكول كيوتو عن دورته السابعة المعقودة في بون في الفترة من ٢٩ آذار/مارس إلى ٨ نيسان/أبريل ٢٠٠٩

المحتويات

المحتويات (*تابع*)

المحتويات (تابع)

Page

Annexes

أولاً – افتتاح الدورة

(البند ١ من جدول الأعمال)

ألف – حفل الترحيب

١- سبق الافتتاح الرسمي للدورة حفل ترحيب للاحتفاء بافتتاح الدورة السابعة للفريق العامل المخصص للنظر في الالتزامات الإضافية للأطراف المدرجة في المرفق الأول بموجب بروتوكول كيوتو والدورة الخامسة للفريق العامل المخصص المعني بالعمل التعاوني الطويل الأجل بموجب الاتفاقية.

٢- وأدلى ببيانات صاحب السعادة السيد ماتياس ماشنيغ، وزير الدولة لشؤون البيئة والمحافظة على الطبيعة والسلامة النووية في ألمانيا، والسيد إيفو دي بوير، الأمين التنفيذي لاتفاقية الأمم المتحدة الإطارية بشأن تغير المناخ، اللذان شكرا الحكومة الألمانية على دعمها المالي السخي لهذه الدورة.

باء – افتتاح الدورة

٣- عُقدت الدورة السابعة للفريق العامل المخصص للنظر في الالتزامات الإضافية للأطراف المدرجة في المرفق الأول بموجب بروتوكول كيوتو في فندق ماريتيم في بون، بألمانيا، في الفترة من ٢٩ آذار/مارس إلى ٨ نيسان/أبريل ٢٠٠٩.

٤- وافتتح رئيس الفريق العامل المخصص السيد هارلد دوفلان (النرويج) الدورة ورحب بجميع الأطراف والمراقبين. ورحب أيضاً بالسيد ماما كوناتي (مالي) نائباً لرئيس الفريق العامل المخصص.

٥- وأشار السيد دوفلان إلى أن الفريق العامل المخصص للنظر في الالتزامات الإضافية كان قد وضع، في دورته السادسة المستأنفة، برنامج عمل طموحاً لعام ٢٠٠٩، شمل بالأساس الانتقال إلى أسلوب التفاوض الكامل. وذكر الوفود بما تم في بوزنان من اتفاق على أن يسعى الفريق العامل المخصص للنظر في الالتزامات الإضافية في دورته السابعة إلى اعتماد استنتاجات بشأن حجم تخفيض الانبعاثات الذي يتعين أن تحققه الأطراف المدرجة في المرفق الأول بصورة إجمالية والتوصل إلى استنتاج بشأن نص مشروع التعديل[(١)].

٦- وأدلى ببيانات ممثلو ثمانية أطراف، تحدث أحدهم باسم مجموعة الـ ٧٧ والصين، وتحدث آخر باسم مجموعة المظلة، وآخر باسم تحالف الدول الجزرية الصغيرة، وآخر باسم المجموعة الأفريقية، وآخر باسم الجماعة الأوروبية

---

(١) FCCC/KP/AWG/2008/8، الفقرة ٦٠(أ).

والدول الأعضاء فيها[٢]، وآخر باسم مجموعة السلامة البيئية، وآخر باسم أقل البلدان نمواً، وآخر باسم مجموعة دول أمريكا اللاتينية ومنطقة البحر الكاريبي.

ثانياً – المسائل التنظيمية

(البند ٢ من جدول الأعمال)

ألف – إقرار جدول الأعمال

(البند ٢(أ) من جدول الأعمال)

٧- في الجلسة الأولى المعقودة في ٢٩ آذار/مارس، نظر الفريق العامل المخصص في مذكرة من الأمين التنفيذي تتضمن جدول الأعمال المؤقت وشروحه (FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/1).

٨- وفي الجلسة نفسها، أُقر جدول الأعمال على النحو التالي:

١- افتتاح الدورة.

٢- مسائل تنظيمية:

(أ) إقرار جدول الأعمال؛

(ب) تنظيم أعمال الدورة؛

(ج) انتخاب أعضاء المكتب.

٣- النظر في حجم تخفيض الانبعاثات الذي يتعين أن تحققه الدول الأطراف المدرجة في المرفق الأول بصورة إجمالية.

٤- إسهام الدول الأطراف المدرجة في المرفق الأول، بشكل فردي أو جماعي، في حجم تخفيض الانبعاثات الذي يتعين أن تحققه هذه الدول بصورة إجمالية.

٥- المسائل الأخرى الناشئة عن تنفيذ برنامج عمل الفريق العامل المخصص للنظر في الالتزامات الإضافية للأطراف المدرجة في المرفق الأول بموجب بروتوكول كيوتو:

(أ) الاتجار بالانبعاثات، والآليات القائمة على مشاريع؛

(ب) استخدام الأراضي، وتغيير استخدام الأراضي والحراجة؛

---

(٢) حظي الموقف المعبر عنه في هذا البيان بتأييد البوسنة والهرسك، وجمهورية مقدونيا اليوغوسلافية السابقة، وصربيا، وكرواتيا.

(ج) النظر في المعلومات المتعلقة بالآثار البيئية والاقتصادية والاجتماعية، بما في ذلك الآثار التبعية، التي يمكن أن تترتب على الأدوات والسياسات والتدابير والمنهجيات المتاحة للأطراف المدرجة في المرفق الأول.

(د) غازات الدفيئة، والقطاعات، وفئات المصادر؛

(هـ) القياسات العامة المستخدمة لحساب كمية ثاني أكسيد الكربون في الانبعاثات التي يسببها الإنسان بحسب المصادر وإزالتها عن طريق البالوعات؛

(و) النُّهُج التي يمكن اتباعها لاستهداف الانبعاثات القطاعية؛

(ز) المسائل القانونية الناشئة عن ولاية الفريق العامل المخصص للنظر في الالتزامات الإضافية للأطراف المدرجة في المرفق الأول بموجب بروتوكول كيوتو؛

(ح) قضايا أخرى.

٦- مسائل أخرى.

٧- التقرير المتعلق بالدورة.

باء - تنظيم أعمال الدورة

(البند ٢(ب) من جدول الأعمال)

٩- نظر الفريق العامل المخصص في هذا البند الفرعي في جلسته الثانية المعقودة في ٣٠ آذار/مارس. وقدم الرئيس اقتراحاً لتنظيم أعمال الدورة السابعة، على النحو المبين في مذكرة السيناريو[٣] وتقدم ممثل جنوب أفريقيا، متحدثاً باسم مجموعة الـ ٧٧ والصين، باقتراح بديل.

١٠- وبعد المشاورات، اتفق الفريق العامل المخصص على مقترح بشأن تنظيم الأعمال تقدم به الرئيس، استناداً إلى البديل الذي قدمه ممثل جنوب أفريقيا، باسم مجموعة الـ ٧٧ والصين. واتفق الفريق العامل المخصص على تركيز أعماله على البندين ٣ و٤ معاً من جدول الأعمال، وكذا على البند ٥(ز) من جدول الأعمال.

١١- واقترح الرئيس إنشاء أفرقة الاتصال التالية:

(أ) فريق لتناول البندين ٣ و٤ معاً من جدول الأعمال؛

(ب) فريق لتناول البند ٥(ز) من جدول الأعمال؛

---

(٣) FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/2.

(ج) فريق لتناول البند ٥(ج) من جدول الأعمال؛

(د) فريق لتناول البند ٥(أ) من جدول الأعمال؛

(هـ) فريق لتناول البند ٥(ب) من جدول الأعمال.

١٢- واقترح أيضاً المضي في مشاورات غير رسمية بشأن الأعمال المتعلقة ببنود جدول الأعمال ٥(د) و٥(هـ) و٥(و)، و٥(ح).

١٣- وفي الجلسة ذاتها، أطلع الرئيس المندوبين على الأحداث السابقة للدورة التي جرت في أثناء الأسبوع السابق، وهي:

(أ) المشاورات المعمقة بشأن الاتجار بالانبعاثات والآليات القائمة على مشاريع - التي عُقدت في ٢٦ آذار/مارس؛

(ب) المشاورات المعمقة بشأن استخدام الأراضي، وتغيير استخدام الأراضي والحراجة - التي عُقدت في ٢٦ آذار/مارس؛

(ج) عرض غير رسمي للمذكرات التي أعدها الرئيس للدورة السابعة - الذي قُدم في ٢٧ آذار/مارس؛

(د) حلقة عمل بشأن القضايا المتعلقة بحجم تخفيض الانبعاثات التي يتعين أن تحققها الأطراف المدرجة في المرفق الأول - التي عُقدت في ٢٧ آذار/مارس.

١٤- وأدلى ببيانات ممثلو ١٨ طرفاً، منهم ممثل تحدث باسم مجموعة الـ ٧٧ والصين وآخر باسم الجماعة الأوروبية والدول الأعضاء فيها[٤].

جيم - انتخاب أعضاء المكتب

(البند ٢(ج) من جدول الأعمال)

١٥- نظر الفريق العامل المخصص في هذا البند الفرعي في جلسته الأولى، المعقودة في ٢٩ آذار/مارس، وفي جلسته الثانية، المعقودة في ٣٠ آذار/مارس، وفي جلسته الثالثة، المعقودة في ٣١ آذار/مارس، وفي جلسته الرابعة، المعقودة في ٨ نيسان/أبريل.

---

(٤) حظي الموقف الذي عبر عنه هذا البيان بتأييد البوسنة والهرسك، وجمهورية مقدونيا اليوغوسلافية السابقة، وصربيا، وكرواتيا.

١٦- وفي الجلسة الأولى، أبلغ الرئيس الفريق العامل المخصص بأن رئيس الدورة الرابعة لمؤتمر الأطراف العامل بوصفه اجتماع الأطراف في بروتوكول كيوتو، السيد ماسيج نويسكي (بولندا)، قد دعا السيد إريك موغوروسي (جمهورية تترانيا المتحدة)، ونائب رئيس الدورة الرابعة لاجتماع الأطراف، إلى إجراء مشاورات بشأن تعيين أعضاء مكتب الفريق العامل المخصص باسمه. وقدم السيد موغوروسي آخر المستجدات بشأن المشاورات في الجلسات الأولى والثانية والثالثة، حيث أبلغ المندوبين بأن المشاورات ما تزال جارية.

١٧- وفي الجلسة الرابعة، أبلغ السيد موغوروسي الفريق العامل المخصص بأن اتفاقاً قد تم التوصل إليه بين المجموعات الإقليمية بشأن المعينين لمنصب الرئيس، ونائب الرئيس والمقرر للفريق العامل المخصص. وانتخب الفريق العامل المخصص، بناء على اقتراح من الرئيس، بالتزكية السيد جون و. آشي (أنتيغوا وبربودا) رئيساً للفريق، والسيد هرالد دوفلان (النرويج) نائباً للرئيس، والسيد ميروسلاف سباسوييفيتش (صربيا) مقرراً للفريق. وأُبلغ الفريق العامل المخصص بأن الأعضاء المنتخبين سيتولون منصبهم ابتداء من نهاية الدورة السابعة.

١٨- وفي الجلسة ذاتها، أحال السيد موغوروسي أيضاً طلب منسق المجموعة الأفريقية، بإدراج النقطتين التاليتين في تقرير هذه الدورة:

(أ) لا ينبغي النظر إلى قرار المجموعة الأفريقية بسحب ترشيحها لمنصب رئيس الفريق العامل المخصص على أنه سابقة فيما يتعلق بتعيين المرشحين لانتخابهم في الهيئات المنشأة بموجب الاتفاقية وبروتوكول كيوتو في الدورات المقبلة؛

(ب) تحتفظ المجموعة الأفريقية بحقها في تعيين مرشحين لأي منصب في الهيئات المنشأة بموجب الاتفاقية وبروتوكول كيوتو وفقاً لمشروع النظام الداخلي الجاري به العمل.

ثالثاً - النظر في حجم تخفيض الانبعاثات الذي يتعين أن تحققه الدول الأطراف المدرجة في المرفق الأول بصورة إجمالية

(البند ٣ من جدول الأعمال)

رابعاً - إسهام الدول الأطراف المدرجة في المرفق الأول، بشكل فردي أو جماعي، في حجم تخفيض الانبعاثات الذي يتعين أن تحققه هذه الدول بصورة إجمالية

(البند ٤ من جدول الأعمال)

١- المداولات

١٩- نظر الفريق العامل المخصص في هذين البندين في جلستيه الثانية والرابعة. وكان معروضاً عليه الوثائق FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/3، وFCCC/KP/AWG/2009/4، وFCCC/KP/AWG/2009/Misc.1، وAdd.1 وAdd.2.

٢٠- وفي الجلسة الثانية، قدم رئيس الفريق العامل المخصص موجزاً لحلقة العمل السابقة للدورة فيما يخص المسائل المتعلقة بحجم خفض الانبعاثات التي يتعين أن تحققها الأطراف المدرجة في المرفق الأول المشار إليها في الفقرة ١٣(د) أعلاه.

٢١- وفي الجلسة الثانية، اتفق الفريق العامل المخصص على إنشاء فريق اتصال، يرأسه رئيس الفريق العامل المخصص، من أجل النظر في هذين البندين معاً. وأدلى ببيانات ممثلو ١٠ أطراف، تحدث ممثل منهم باسم مجموعة الـ ٧٧ والصين، وآخر باسم الجماعة الأوروبية والدول الأعضاء فيها[٥]، وآخر باسم تحالف الدول الجزرية الصغيرة. وأدلى ببيانات أيضاً ممثلو كيانات الأمم المتحدة وباسم المنظمات غير الحكومية لقطاعي الأعمال والصناعة. وفي الجلسة الرابعة، أُدلي ببيان باسم المنظمات غير الحكومية البيئية.

٢٢- وفي الجلسة الرابعة، قدم الرئيس تقريراً عن عمل فريق الاتصال المشار إليه في الفقرة ٢١ أعلاه. ونظر الفريق العامل المخصص في الاستنتاجات التي اقترحها الرئيس واعتمد الفريق هذه الاستنتاجات[٦].

٢- الاستنتاجات

٢٣- وفقاً لبرنامج عمل الفريق العامل المخصص وللاستنتاجات التي اعتمدها في دورته السادسة المستأنفة، نظر الفريق العامل المخصص في حجم تخفيض الانبعاثات التي يتعين أن تحققها الأطراف المدرجة في المرفق الأول بصيغة إجمالية.

٢٤- وأشار الفريق العامل المخصص إلى أن عمله ينبغي أن يسترشد برؤية مشتركة للتحدي الذي رسمه الهدف الأسمى للاتفاقية استناداً إلى المبادئ وغيرها من الأحكام ذات الصلة للاتفاقية وبروتوكول كيوتو. وأكد من جديد أن عملية إكمال برنامج عمله ستمضي قدما بفضل أعمال الأطراف في المقام الأول، وأنه سيواصل تنسيق عمله مع الهيئات والعمليات الأخرى بموجب الاتفاقية، لا سيما بروتوكول كيوتو، وسيستند إلى النتائج الوجيهة المتوصل إليها في هذه الهيئات والعمليات وإلى الأعمال الجارية في إطارها، بقصد تحاشي الازدواجية. وأشار الفريق العامل المخصص إلى أنه سيحافظ على نهج يوفق بين الاتفاقية وبروتوكول كيوتو فيما يتصل بالتزامات الأطراف المدرجة في المرفق الأول.

٢٥- وأحاط الفريق العامل المخصص علماً بالمعلومات، بما فيها المعلومات العلمية، والآراء التي قدمتها الأطراف بشأن حجم تخفيض الانبعاثات التي يتعين أن تحققها الأطراف المدرجة في المرفق الأول بصفة إجمالية، وبإسهام

---

(٥) حظي الموقف الذي عُبر عنه في هذا البيان بتأييد البوسنة والهرسك، وجمهورية مقدونيا اليوغوسلافية السابقة، وصربيا، وكرواتيا.

(٦) اعتُمدت بوصفها الوثيقة FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/L.6.

الدول الأطراف المدرجة في المرفق الأول، بشكل فردي أو جماعي، في حجم تخفيض الانبعاثات الذي يتعين أن تحققه هذه الدول بصورة إجمالية، بما يتفق وأحكام المادة ٤ من بروتوكول كيوتو، وبقضايا أخرى ذات صلة[٧]. وأحاط علماً أيضاً بالآراء الإضافية بشأن هذا الحجم، على نحو ما قدمته الأطراف في المناقشات التي جرت بشأن البندين ٣ و٤ من جدول الأعمال، وكذا في إطار البند ٥(ز).

٢٦- وفي ٢٧ آذار/مارس ٢٠٠٩، عقد الفريق العامل المخصص حلقة عمل بشأن القضايا المتعلقة بحجم تخفيض الانبعاثات التي يتعين أن تحققها الأطراف المدرجة في المرفق الأول. وترأس حلقة العمل السيد هرالد دوفلان، رئيس الفريق العامل المخصص. وأحاط الفريق العامل المخصص علماً بالآراء والمعلومات التي قُدمت في حلقة العمل وبتقرير الرئيس[٨].

٢٧- وأحاط الفريق العامل المخصص علماً بتبادل المعلومات بشأن إمكانية التخفيف ومقارنة الجهود المبذولة فيما بين الأطراف المدرجة في المرفق الأول عبر تقديم ورقات طوعية وتنظيم حلقات عمل تستضيفها الأطراف. وشجع الأطراف على مواصلة تبادل المعلومات بشأن هذه المسائل في أشكال مشابهة.

٢٨- وبدأ الفريق العامل المخصص نظره في مساهمة الأطراف المدرجة في المرفق الأول، بشكل فردي أو جماعي، بما يتفق وأحكام المادة ٤ من بروتوكول كيوتو، في حجم تخفيض الانبعاثات التي يتعين أن تحققها الأطراف المدرجة في المرفق الأول بصورة إجمالية.

٢٩- وأحاط الفريق العامل المخصص مع التقدير علماً بالمعلومات المتعلقة بإمكانية وضع أهداف لتحديد حجم الانبعاثات وتخفيضها على نحو ما قدمه بعض الأطراف المدرجة في المرفق الأول. وأكد من جديد دعوته إلى الأطراف المدرجة في المرفق الأول ذات الاستطاعة إلى تقديم مزيد من المعلومات بشأن إمكانية وضع هذه الأهداف قبل الدورة الثامنة للفريق العامل المخصص بهدف إكمال عمله بحلول الدورة الخامسة لاجتماع الأطراف في بروتوكول كيوتو.

٣٠- وذكر الفريق العامل المخصص باستنتاجاته الواردة في الفقرتين ١٦ و١٧ من الوثيقة FCCC/KP/AWG/2007/5، والفقرتين ١٨ و١٩ من الوثيقة FCCC/KP/AWG/2008/8.

---

(٧) FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/Misc.1 وAdd.1 وAdd.2، وFCCC/KP/AWG/2009/CRP.3 و FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/Misc.7.

(٨) انظر المرفق الأول.

٣١- وأحاط الفريق العامل المخصص علماً بالمعلومات التي قدمها بعض الأطراف في أثناء الدورة السابعة للفريق[٩] بشأن التحليل العلمي الأخير المتعلق بتثبيت تركيزات غازات الدفيئة في الغلاف الجوي في مستويات دون المستويات التي حددها الفريق الحكومي الدولي المعني بتغير المناخ في تقريره التقييمي الرابع، مما يجعل ضرورة التصدي لتغير المناخ أكثر استعجالاً.

٣٢- واتفق الفريق العامل المخصص على مواصلة مداولاته بشأن حجم تخفيض الانبعاثات التي يتعين أن تحققها الأطراف المدرجة في المرفق الأول بصورة إجمالية مركزاً عليها بصورة رئيسية في دورته الثامنة.

خامساً - المسائل الأخرى الناشئة عن تنفيذ برنامج عمل الفريق العامل المخصص للنظر في الالتزامات الإضافية للأطراف المدرجة في المرفق الأول بموجب بروتوكول كيوتو

(البند ٥ من جدول الأعمال)

ألف - الاتجار بالانبعاثات، والآليات القائمة على مشاريع

(البند ٥(أ) من جدول الأعمال)

١- المداولات

٣٣- نظر الفريق العامل المخصص في هذا البند في جلستيه الثالثة والرابعة. وكان معروضاً عليه الوثائق FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/4، وFCCC/KP/AWG/2009/INF.2 وFCCC/KP/AWG/2009/Misc.3 وAdd.1 وAdd.2.

٣٤- وفي الجلسة الثالثة، دعا السيد دوفلان السيدة غيرترود فولانسكي (النمسا) إلى تقديم موجز عن المشاورات المعمقة السابقة للدورة المشار إليها في الفقرة ١٣ أعلاه.

٣٥- وفي الجلسة الثالثة أيضاً، اتفق الفريق العامل المخصص على إنشاء فريق اتصال للنظر في هذا البند، يشترك في رئاسته كل من السيدة كريستيانا فيغوريس أولسن (كوستاريكا) والسيدة غيرترود فولانسكي (النمسا). وأدلى ببيانات ممثلو أربعة أطراف. وأُدلي ببيان أيضاً باسم المنظمات غير الحكومية لقطاعي الأعمال التجارية والصناعة.

٣٦- وفي الجلسة الرابعة، قدم الرئيس تقريراً عن عمل فريق الاتصال المشار إليه في الفقرة ٣٥ أعلاه. ونظر الفريق العامل المخصص في الاستنتاجات التي اقترحها الرئيس[١٠] واعتمد الفريق هذه الاستنتاجات.

---

(٩) كما الحاشية ٧ أعلاه.

(١٠) اعتُمدت بوصفها الوثيقة FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/L.2.

٢- الاستنتاجات

٣٧- وفقاً لبرنامج عمل الفريق العامل المخصص والاستنتاجات التي اعتمدها في دورته السادسة المستأنفة، واصل الفريق العامل مداولاته، بما في ذلك عَبر مشاورات معمقة بشأن التحسينات الممكن إجراؤها على الاتجار بالانبعاثات والآليات القائمة على مشاريع المحددة في المرفقين الأول والثاني للتقرير المتعلق بالجزء الأول من الدورة السادسة للفريق العامل المخصص[١١]. ويُورد المرفق الثالث بهذه الوثيقة التقدم المحرز أثناء هذه المداولات. ولا يزال المرفق الرابع بهذه الوثيقة قيد النظر.

٣٨- وأحاط الفريق العامل المخصص علماً بالمساهمات الإضافية التي قدمتها الأطراف بشأن كيفية عمل التحسينات الممكن إجراؤها على الاتجار بالانبعاثات[١٢]، والآليات القائمة على مشاريع[١٣]. ودعا الأطراف إلى أن تقدم إلى الأمانة، بحلول ٢٤ نيسان/أبريل ٢٠٠٩، آراء بشأن المرفقين الثالث والرابع بهذا التقرير لتجميعها في وثيقة متفرقات يُنظر فيها في الدورة الثامنة للفريق العامل.

٣٩- ووافق الفريق العامل المخصص على مواصلة مداولاته بشأن المسائل المشار إليها في الفقرة ٣٧ أعلاه في دورته الثامنة، في سياق مداولاته بشأن نص الرئيس المشار إليه في الفقرة ٧٤(ب)، مراعياً في ذلك المرفقين الثالث والرابع، والورقات السابقة التي قدمتها الأطراف وتقديم الآراء المشار إليها في الفقرة ٣٨ أعلاه.

باء - استخدام الأراضي، وتغيير استخدام الأراضي والحراجة

(البند ٥ من جدول الأعمال)

١- المداولات

٤٠- نظر الفريق العامل المخصص في هذا البند في جلسته الثالثة والرابعة، وكان معروضاً عليه الوثائق FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/4، وFCCC/KP/AWG/2009/INF.1، وFCCC/KP/AWG/2009/Misc.5 وAdd.1 وCorr.1.

٤١- وفي الجلسة الثالثة، دعا السيد دوفلان السيد برايان سميث (نيوزيلندا) إلى تقديم موجز قصير بشأن المشاورات المعمقة السابقة للدورة المشار إليها في الفقرة ١٣(ب).

---

(١١) FCCC/KP/AWG/2008/5.

(١٢) FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/Misc.3، وAdd.1 وAdd.2.

(١٣) FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/INF.2.

٤٢- وفي الجلسة الثالثة أيضاً، اتفق الفريق العامل المخصص على إطلاق فريق اتصال لينظر في هذا البند، يرأسه السيد برايان سميث (نيوزيلندا) والسيد مارسيلو روشا (البرازيل). وأدلى ببيانات ممثلو ثلاثة أطراف. وأُدلي ببيان أيضاً باسم المنظمات غير الحكومية البيئية.

٤٣- وفي الجلسة الرابعة، قدم السيد روشا تقريراً عن عمل فريق الاتصال المشار إليه في الفقرة ٤٢ أعلاه. ونظر الفريق العامل المخصص في الاستنتاجات التي اقترحها الرئيس[١٤]. واعتمد الفريق هذه الاستنتاجات.

٢- الاستنتاجات

٤٤- وفقاً لبرنامج عمل الفريق العامل المخصص والاستنتاجات التي اعتمدها في دورته السادسة المستأنفة، واصل الفريق العامل مداولاته، بما فيها المشاورات المعمقة، بشأن كيفية النظر عند الاقتضاء في التعريفات والطرائق والقواعد والمبادئ التوجيهية لمعالجة مسألة استخدام الأراضي وتغيير استخدام الأراضي والحراجة.

٤٥- وأحاط الفريق العامل المخصص علماً بالآراء والمقترحات الإضافية التي قدمها الأطراف لمزيد من التوسع في الخيارات، والعناصر والقضايا الواردة في المرفق الثالث لتقرير الفريق العامل المخصص عن الجزء الأول من دورته السادسة والمرفق الرابع بتقرير الفريق العامل المخصص عن دورته الخامسة المستأنفة[١٥]. وأحاط الفريق العامل المخصص علماً أيضاً بالدراسة الموسعة الإضافية التي أعدها رئيس الفريق العامل المخصص[١٦].

٤٦- وأشار الفريق العامل المخصص إلى أن التقدم المحرز في دورته السابعة بشأن المسائل المشار إليها في الفقرة ٤٤ أعلاه، على نحو ما ورد في المرفق الخامس، من شأنها أن تيسِّر مداولاته في دورته الثامنة. ولاحظ أن المرفق الخامس لا يتضمن جميع المقترحات والخيارات التي تقدمت بها الأطراف في ورقاتها وفي أثناء المناقشات الجارية في هذه الدورة. ودعا الأطراف إلى أن تقدم إلى الأمانة، بحلول ٢٤ نيسان/أبريل ٢٠٠٩، آراءها بشأن المرفق الخامس لتجميعها في وثيقة متفرقات يُنظر فيها في الدورة الثامنة للفريق العامل.

٤٧- ووافق الفريق العامل المخصص على مواصلة مداولاته بشأن المسائل المشار إليها في الفقرة ٤٤ أعلاه في دورته الثامنة، في سياق مداولاته بشأن نص الرئيس المشار إليه في الفقرة ٧٤(ب) أدناه مراعياً في ذلك المرفق الخامس، والرسائل السابقة التي قدمتها الأطراف والمشار إليها في الفقرة ٤٥ أعلاه، والآراء المقدمة المشار إليها في الفقرة ٤٦ أعلاه.

---

(١٤) اعتُمدت بوصفها الوثيقة FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/L.3.

(١٥) FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/Misc.5 وAdd.1 وCorr.1.

(١٦) FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/INF.1.

٤٨- وطلب الفريق العامل المخصص أن يكون المرفق الخامس أساس نص الرئيس المشار إليه في الفقرة ٤٧ أعلاه، لدى النظر، عند الاقتضاء، في التعريفات والطرائق والقواعد والمبادئ التوجيهية لمعالجة مسألة استخدام الأراضي وتغيير استخدام الأراضي والحراجة.

٤٩- وشجع الفريق العامل المخصص الأطراف على تبادل المعلومات، لا سيما البيانات عند الاقتضاء، قبل موعد الدورة الثامنة للفريق العامل، من أجل تعزيز فهم الآثار المترتبة عن الخيارات والمقترحات لمعالجة مسألة استخدام الأراضي وتغيير استخدام الأراضي والحراجة. ولتيسير تبادل هذه المعلومات، دعا الفريق العامل المخصص الأطراف إلى تقديم معلومات وجيهة إلى الأمانة على أساس طوعي وغير رسمي. وطلب إلى الأمانة أن تتيح هذه المعلومات على موقع اتفاقية الأمم المتحدة الإطارية بشأن تغير المناخ.

جيم - النظر في المعلومات المتعلقة بالآثار البيئية والاقتصادية والاجتماعية، بما في ذلك آثار التبعية، التي يمكن أن تترتب على الأدوات والسياسات والتدابير والمنهجيات المتاحة للأطراف المدرجة في المرفق الأول

(البند ٥(ج) من جدول الأعمال)

١- المداولات

٥٠- نظر الفريق العامل المخصص في هذا البند في جلستيه الثالثة والرابعة. وكان معروضاً عليه الوثيقان FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/INF.3 وFCCC/KP/AWG/2009/Misc.4.

٥١- واتفق الفريق العامل المخصص على إنشاء فريق اتصال يرأسه نائب رئيس الفريق العامل المخصص، السيد ماما كوناتي (مالي)، والسيد بول واتكينسون (فرنسا)، من أجل النظر في هذا البند. وأدلى ببيانات ممثلو تسعة أطراف، تحدث أحدهم باسم مجموعة الـ ٧٧ والصين، وآخر باسم الجماعة الأوروبية والدول الأعضاء فيها[١٧]. وأُدلي ببيان باسم المنظمات غير الحكومية للنقابات العمالية.

٥٢- وفي الجلسة الرابعة، قدم نائب الرئيس تقريراً عن عمل فريق الاتصال المشار إليه في الفقرة ٥١ أعلاه. ونظر الفريق العامل المخصص في الاستنتاجات التي اقترحها الرئيس[١٨] واعتمد الفريق هذه الاستنتاجات.

---

(١٧) حظي الموقف المُعبَّر عنه في هذا البيان بتأييد البوسنة والهرسك، وجمهورية مقدونيا اليوغوسلافية السابقة، وصربيا، وكرواتيا.

(١٨) اعتُمدت بوصفها الوثيقة FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/L.4.

٢- الاستنتاجات

٥٣- وفقاً لبرنامج عمل الفريق العامل المخصص والاستنتاجات التي اعتمدها في دورته السادسة المستأنفة، واصل الفريق العامل المخصص عمله بشأن النظر في المعلومات المتعلقة بالآثار البيئية والاقتصادية والاجتماعية المحتملة بما في ذلك الآثار الطبيعية، التي يمكن أن تترتب على الأدوات والسياسات والتدابير والمنهجيات المتاحة للأطراف المدرجة في المرفق الأول (المشار إليها فيما بعد بالآثار المحتملة).

٥٤- وفي ٣٠ آذار/مارس ٢٠٠٩، عقد الفريق العامل المخصص حلقة عمل أثناء الدورة بشأن الآثار المحتملة، ترأسها نائب رئيس الفريق العامل المخصص. وأحاط الفريق العامل المخصص علماً بالآراء والمعلومات المقدمة في حلقة العمل وبموجز التقرير الذي قدمه الرئيس[١٩].

٥٥- وكان للفريق العامل المخصص تبادل بنّاء للآراء بشأن الجوانب المتعلقة بالآثار المحتملة على النحو المبيَّن في المرفق السادس.

٥٦- ودعا الفريق العامل المخصص الأطراف إلى أن تقدم إلى الأمانة، بحلول ٤ أيار/مايو ٢٠٠٩، آراءها الإضافية بشأن القضايا الواردة في المرفق السادس. وطلب إلى الأمانة أن تجمِّع هذه الآراء في وثيقة متفرقات.

٥٧- واتفق الفريق العامل على استئناف النظر في الآثار المحتملة في دورته الثامنة، استناداً إلى المرفق السادس والورقات المقدمة من الأطراف المشار إليها في الفقرة ٥٦ أعلاه بهدف إحالة نتائج عمل الفريق لكي ينظر فيها اجتماع الأطراف في بروتوكول كيوتو في دورته الخامسة، وفقاً لبرنامج عمله.

دال - نطاق غازات الدفيئة والقطاعات، وفئات المصادر

(البند ٥(د) من جدول الأعمال)

هاء - القياسات العامة المستخدَمة لحساب كمية ثاني أكسيد الكربون في الانبعاثات التي يسببها الإنسان بحسب المصادر وإزالتها عن طريق البالوعات

(البند ٥(هـ) من جدول الأعمال)

---

(١٩) انظر المرفق الثاني.

واو – النُهج التي يمكن اتباعها لاستهداف الانبعاثات القطاعية

(البند ٥(و) من جدول الأعمال)

١- المداولات

٥٨- نظر الفريق العامل المخصص في هذه البنود في جلستيه الثالثة والرابعة. وكان معروضاً عليه الوثائق FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/4 وFCCC/KP/AWG/2009/Misc.1 وAdd.1 وAdd.2.

٥٩- وفي الجلسة الثالثة، أطلع ممثل للفريق الحكومي الدولي المعني بتغير المناخ المندوبين على الأنشطة التي سبق للفريق الحكومي الدولي أن اضطلع بها أو خطط لها فيما يتعلق بمواصلة التقييم التقني للقياسات العامة البديلة.

٦٠- واتفق الفريق العامل المخصص على اقتراح قدمه الرئيس لإجراء مشاورة غير رسمية مع الأطراف بشأن الاستنتاجات المتعلقة بهذه البنود، وكذا بشأن البند ٥(ح) من جدول الأعمال. وفي هذه الجلسة، أدلى ببيان ممثل لأحد الأطراف.

٦١- وفي الجلسة الرابعة، قدم الرئيس تقريراً عن المشاورات المشار إليها في الفقرة ٦٠ أعلاه. ونظر الفريق العامل المخصص في الاستنتاجات التي اقترحها الرئيس[٢٠]. واعتمد الفريق هذه الاستنتاجات.

٢- الاستنتاجات

٦٢- وفقاً لبرنامج عمل الفريق العامل المخصص والاستنتاجات التي اعتمدها في دورته السادسة المستأنفة، نظر الفريق العامل المخصص في نطاق غازات الدفيئة، والقطاعات وفئات المصادر، والقياسات العامة المستخدَمة لحساب كمية ثاني أكسيد الكربون في الانبعاثات التي يسببها الإنسان بحسب المصادر وإزالتها عن طريق البالوعات، وفي النُهج التي يمكن اتباعها لاستهداف الانبعاثات القطاعية والقضايا الجاري النظر فيها في إطار البند ٥(ح) من جدول الأعمال.

٦٣- وأحاط الفريق العامل المخصص علماً مع التقدير بالمعلومات والآراء التي قدمتها الأطراف بشأن المسائل المشار إليها في الفقرة ٦٢ أعلاه وبالمعلومات التقنية[٢١] التي جمعتها الأمانة بشأن الغازات الواردة في الوثيقة FCCC/KP/AWG/2008/5. وطلبت إلى الأمانة أن تحدِّث المعلومات التقنية بشأن هذه الغازات حسب الاقتضاء، مراعية في ذلك المعلومات التي قدمتها الأطراف في الورقات المشار إليها في الفقرة ٦٥ أدناه.

---

(٢٠) اعتُمدت بوصفها الوثيقة FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/L.7/Rev.1.

(٢١) <http://unfccc.int/national_reports/annex_i_ghg_inventories/items/4624.php>.

٦٤- وأحاط الفريق العامل المخصص أيضاً علماً بالإجراء الذي اتخذه الفريق الحكومي الدولي المعني بتغير المناخ لدى الاضطلاع بمزيد من التقييم التقني للقياسات العامة البديلة، استجابة لدعوة من الفريق العامل المخصص في الجزء الأول من دورته السادسة. وأشار إلى أن الفريق الحكومي الدولي المعني بتغير المناخ سيقدم تقريراً عن هذه المسألة قبل عقد الدورة الثامنة للفريق الحكومي الدولي المخصص وفي خلالها.

٦٥- ودعا الفريق العامل المخصص الأطراف إلى أن تقدم إلى الأمانة، بحلول ٢٤ نيسان/أبريل ٢٠٠٩، آراءها بشأن المسائل المشار إليها في الفقرة ٦٢ أعلاه، لتجميعها في وثيقة متنوعة لكي ينظر فيها الفريق في دورته الثامنة.

٦٦- واتفق الفريق العامل المخصص على مواصلة مداولاته بشأن المسائل المشار إليها في الفقرة ٦٢ أعلاه في دورته الثامنة، في سياق مداولاته بشأن نص الرئيس المشار إليه في الفقرة ٧٤(ب) أدناه، مراعياً في ذلك ورقات الآراء المشار إليها في الفقرة ٦٥ أعلاه.

زاي - المسائل القانونية الناشئة عن ولاية الفريق العامل المخصص للنظر في الالتزامات الإضافية للأطراف المدرجة في المرفق الأول بموجب بروتوكول كيوتو

(البند ٥(ز) من جدول الأعمال)

١- المداولات

٦٧- نظر الفريق العامل المخصص في هذا البند في جلستيه الثالثة والرابعة. وكان معروضاً عليه الوثائق FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/3، وFCCC/KP/AWG/2009/4 وFCCC/KP/AWG/2009/Misc.6 وAdd.1 وAdd.2.

٦٨- وفي الجلسة الثالثة أيضاً، اتفق الفريق العامل المخصص على إنشاء فريق اتصال، يترأسه رئيس الفريق العامل المخصص، من أجل النظر في هذا البند. وأدلى ببيانات ممثلون عن عشرة أطراف، تحدث أحدهم باسم مجموعة الـ ٧٧ والصين، وآخر باسم الجماعة الأوروبية والدول الأعضاء فيها[٢٢]. وأُدلي ببيان أيضاً باسم المنظمات غير الحكومية البيئية.

٦٩- وفي الجلسة الرابعة، قدم الرئيس تقريراً عن عمل فريق الاتصال المشار إليه في الفقرة ٦٨ أعلاه. ونظر الفريق العامل المخصص في الاستنتاجات التي اقترحها الرئيس[٢٣] واعتمد هذه الاستنتاجات.

٧٠- وعقب إتمام النظر في هذا البند، لاحظت بوليفيا ضرورة وضع تمييز واضح بين النص الصادر به تكليف قانوني بشأن التعديلات التي تجرى على بروتوكول كيوتو عملاً بأحكام الفقرة ٩ من المادة ٣ من البروتوكول،

---

(٢٢) حظي الموقف المُعبَّر عنه في هذا البيان بتأييد البوسنة والهرسك، وجمهورية مقدونيا اليوغوسلافية السابقة، وصربيا، وكرواتيا.

(٢٣) اعتُمدت بوصفها الوثيقة FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/L.5.

ونص متعلق بقضايا أخرى، لا ينبغي أن يُعامَل معاملة مشروع نص قانوني يقترح تعديلات على بروتوكول كيوتو. وفي رأي بوليفيا، ينبغي لاجتماع الأطراف في بروتوكول كيوتو تناول هذه القضايا في دورته الخامسة في كوبنهاغن، بالدانمرك. وأعربت عن قلقها أيضاً لأن الآراء والمقترحات الواردة من الأطراف والتي طُلبت في الفقرة ٧٥ أدناه، لا ينبغي لها أن تُضر بقرار تعديل المرفق باء لبروتوكول كيوتو بالنسبة لفترات الالتزام اللاحقة للأطراف المدرجة في المرفق الأول في الدورة الخامسة لاجتماع الأطراف في بروتوكول كيوتو.

٢- الاستنتاجات

٧١- رحب الفريق العامل المخصص بالتقدم المحرز في دورته السابعة، حيث انتقلت الأطراف إلى النظر بمزيد من التعمّق في تعديلات بروتوكول كيوتو وفقاً للفقرة ٩ من مادته ٣.

٧٢- وإذ أقر الفريق العامل المخصص بالطابع العاجل لأعماله، ووفقاً للطبيعة التكرارية لبرنامج عمله، أعاد التأكيد على أنه سيركز في عام ٢٠٠٩ على بلوغ اتفاق بشأن التزامات إضافية للأطراف المدرجة في المرفق الأول بموجب بروتوكول كيوتو. وأشار إلى أن الأمانة ينبغي أن تبلغ الأطراف بنص أي تعديلات يُقترح إدخالها على البروتوكول قبل الموعد المقترح لاعتمادها بمدة لا تقل عن ستة أشهر. وأكد الفريق العامل أيضاً أنه سيحيل إلى مؤتمر الأطراف العامل بوصفه اجتماع الأطراف في بروتوكول كيوتو في دورته الخامسة نتائج عمله وفقاً للمقرر ١/م أإ-١ بهدف اعتمادها.

٧٣- وأحاط الفريق العامل المخصص علماً بالآراء التي قدمتها الأطراف بشأن الآثار القانونية الناشئة عن عمل الفريق العامل المخصص وفقاً للفقرة ٩ من المادة ٣ من بروتوكول كيوتو[٢٤]. وأحاط الفريق العامل المخصص علماً أيضاً بالوثيقتين FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/3 FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/4، اللتين تتضمنان، على التوالي، العناصر الممكنة لتعديلات بروتوكول كيوتو عملاً بالفقرة ٩ من المادة ٣، والعناصر الممكنة لوضع نص يتعلق بالمسائل الواردة في الفقرة ٤٩ من الوثيقة FCCC/KP/AWG/2008/L.8. وأحاط الفريق علماً كذلك بالورقات[٢٥] والآراء التي قدمتها الأطراف في إطار البندين ٣ و٤ من جدول الأعمال.

٧٤- وتطلّع الفريق العامل المخصص إلى تكثيف أعماله في دورته الثامنة. وطلب إلى رئيسه أن يُعد ما يلي:

(أ) مقترحاً يتضمن تعديلات لبروتوكول كيوتو عملاً بالفقرة ٩ من مادته ٣؛

(ب) نصاً بشأن المسائل الأخرى التي وردت في تقرير الدورة السادسة المستأنفة للفريق[٢٦].

---

(٢٤) FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/Misc.6 وAdd.1 وAdd.2.

(٢٥) FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/Misc.7 وFCCC/KP/AWG/2009/CRP.3.

(٢٦) FCCC/KP/AWG/2008/8، الفقرة ٤٩.

٧٥- ودعا الفريق العامل المخصص الأطراف إلى أن تقدم إلى الأمانة، في موعد أقصاه ٢٤ نيسان/أبريل ٢٠٠٩، مزيداً من الآراء والمقترحات بشأن المسائل المتصلة بالطلب المشار إليه في الفقرة ٧٤(أ) و(ب) أعلاه، لتجميعها في وثيقة متفرقات.

٧٦- وطلب الفريق العامل المخصص إلى رئيسه أن يراعي الورقات المشار إليها في الفقرة ٧٥ أعلاه، وكذلك العمل المضطلع به والورقات التي دُعي إلى تقديمها، خلال الدورة السابعة للفريق العامل المخصص في سياق إعداد الوثائق المشار إليها في الفقرة ٧٤(أ) و(ب) أعلاه؛ وأن يعمل على إتاحة هذه الوثائق أسبوعين على الأقل قبل الدورة الثامنة للفريق.

٧٧- وأعاد الفريق العامل المخصص التأكيد أن عملية إكمال برنامج عمله ستمضي قُدماً بفضل أعمال الأطراف في المقام الأول، وأنه سينسق عمله مع سائر هيئات الاتفاقية وعملياتها، لا سيما بروتوكول كيوتو، مستنداً في ذلك إلى النتائج الوجيهة المتوصَّل إليها في هذه الهيئات والعمليات وإلى الأعمال الجارية في إطارها، بقصد تحاشي الازدواجية. وأشار الفريق العامل المخصص إلى أنه سيحافظ على نهج يوفِّق بين الاتفاقية وبروتوكول كيوتو فيما يتصل بالتزامات الأطراف المدرجة في المرفق الأول.

حاء - قضايا أخرى

(البند ٥(ح) من جدول الأعمال)

٧٨- نُظر في هذا البند إلى جانب البنود ٥(د) و٥(هـ) و٥(و) من جدول الأعمال (انظر الفصل خامساً أعلاه).

سادساً - مسائل أخرى

(البند ٦ من جدول الأعمال)

١- المداولات

٧٩- نظر الفريق العامل المخصص في ضرورة عقد اجتماع إضافي في ٢٠٠٩ في إطار هذا البند في جلستيه الثالثة والرابعة.

٨٠- وفي الجلسة الثالثة، أبلغ رئيس الفريق العامل المخصص المندوبين أن مشاورات غير رسمية ستُعقد بالأساس تحت رعاية الفريق العامل المخصص المعني بالعمل التعاوني الطويل الأجل، كما سيُجرى عدد من المشاورات غير الرسمية المشتركة للفريق العامل المعني بالعمل التعاوني الطويل الأجل والفريق العامل المخصص بشأن هذه المسألة.

٨١- وفي الجلسة الرابعة، قدم الرئيس تقريراً عن عمل المشاورات غير الرسمية المشتركة المشار إليها في الفقرة ٨٠ أعلاه. ونظر الفريق العامل المخصص في الاستنتاجات التي اقترحها الرئيس على النحو المعدَّل في معرض الاجتماع[٢٧] واعتمد هذه الاستنتاجات. وأحال المندوبين أيضاً إلى استنتاجات الفريق العامل المعني بالعمل التعاوني الطويل الأجل، على النحو الوارد في الوثيقة FCCC/AWGLCA/2009/5.

---

(٢٧) اعتُمدت بوصفها الوثيقة FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/L.8.

٢- الاستنتاجات

٨٢- اتفق الفريق العامل المخصص على أن يجتمع بصفة غير رسمية في الفترة من ١٠ إلى ١٤ آب/أغسطس ٢٠٠٩ في بون، بألمانيا. واتفق أيضاً على استئناف دورته التاسعة[٢٨] في الفترة من ٢ إلى ٦ تشرين الثاني/نوفمبر ٢٠٠٩.

٨٣- واتفق الفريق العامل المخصص على النظر في تنظيم أعمال الاجتماع والدورة المشار إليها في الفقرة ٨٢ أعلاه في دورته الثامنة.

سابعاً - التقرير المتعلق بالدورة

(البند ٧ من جدول الأعمال)

٨٤- في الجلسة الرابعة، نظر الفريق العامل المخصص في مشروع التقرير المتعلق بأعمال دورته السابعة (FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/L.1). وفي الجلسة ذاتها، أذِن الفريق العامل المخصص للمقرر، بناءً على اقتراح من الرئيس، بأن يكمل التقرير المتعلق بالدورة، بمساعدة الأمانة.

٨٥- وفي الجلسة الرابعة أيضاً، أشار وفد اليابان إلى أنه يرغب في تسجيل رأيه فيما يخص ضرورة عمل الفريق العامل المخصص على ضمان التماسك والتنسيق مع عمل الفريق العامل المعني بالعمل التعاوني الطويل من أجل وضع إطار عمل منصف وفعال لما بعد ٢٠١٢.

ثامناً - اختتام الدورة

٨٦- في الجلسة الرابعة، المعقودة في ٨ نيسان/أبريل، شكر الرئيس الوفود على مساهماتها وشكر الأمانة على دعمها. وأدلى ببيانات ممثلون عن ٢٢ طرفاً، تحدث ممثل منهم باسم مجموعة الـ ٧٧ والصين، وآخر باسم الجماعة الأوروبية والدول الأعضاء فيها[٢٩].وآخر باسم فريق السلامة البيئية، وآخر باسم تحالف الدول الجزرية الصغيرة. وأدلى ببيان أيضاً ممثل عن دولة مراقِبة.

---

(٢٨) سيُعقد الجزء الأول من الدورة التاسعة للفريق العامل المخصص في الفترة من ٢٨ أيلول/سبتمبر إلى ٩ تشرين الأول/أكتوبر ٢٠٠٩ في بانكوك، تايلند.

(٢٩) حظي الموقف المُعبَّر عنه في هذا البيان بتأييد البوسنة والهرسك، وجمهورية مقدونيا اليوغوسلافية السابقة، وصربيا، وكرواتيا.

Annex I

[ENGLISH ONLY]

Workshop on issues relating to the scale of emission reductions to be achieved by Annex I Parties

Report by the chair of the workshop

I. Introduction

1. At its resumed sixth session, the Ad Hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP) requested the secretariat to organize before or during its seventh session, under the guidance of its Chair, a workshop on the issues relating to the scale of emission reductions to be achieved by Annex I Parties[1].

2. The approach and objectives of the workshop are clarified in the scenario note on the seventh session of the AWG-KP.[2]

3. The workshop was held in Bonn, Germany, on 27 March 2009, and was chaired by Mr. Harald Dovland, Chair of the AWG-KP. It provided an opportunity for Parties to share their views on: (a) approaches to identify the scale of emission reductions to be achieved by Annex I Parties in aggregate, as well as individual or joint contributions to this scale; and (b) implications of issues such as the duration of the commitment period(s), how quantified emission limitation and reduction objectives (QELROs) could be expressed including the base year, and mitigation potential. The workshop also provided an opportunity for leading international experts to share results of recent studies on these matters. It was open to all Parties and observers.

4. In the scenario note referred to in paragraph 2 above, the Chair of the AWG-KP invited interested Parties to make presentations at the workshop. The following Parties or groups of Parties made presentations: the European Community (EC), Japan, China, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Belarus, Iceland and the Alliance of Small Island States. Leading international experts and research institutes presented results from relevant technical analysis.[3]

5. Question and answer sessions were held after the presentations. The following Parties made interventions and participated in the discussions: Argentina, Brazil, Gambia, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, the Czech Republic, Kuwait, the Marshall Islands, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation and Switzerland.

6. At the closing of the workshop, the chair summarized the main points presented during the workshop.

---

[1] FCCC/KP/AWG/2008/8, paragraphs 49 and 50.

[2] FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/2, paragraphs 20–24.

[3] Mr. Markus Amann from the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, Ms. Miyuki Nagashima from the Research Institute of Innovative Technology for the Earth, Mr. Tatsuya Hanaoka from the National Institute for Environmental Studies and Mr. Niklas Hoehne from Ecofys.

II. Summary of discussions

7. The presentations and discussion during the workshop covered a number of issues relating to the scale of emission reductions to be achieved by Annex I Parties, which could be summarized under two main themes:

(a) Approaches to identify the scale of emission reductions to be achieved by Annex I Parties in aggregate, as well as individual or joint contributions to this scale;

(b) Implications of other issues, such as the duration of the commitment period(s), how QELROs could be expressed including the base year, and mitigation potential.

A. Approaches to identify the scale of emission reductions to be achieved by Annex I Parties in aggregate, as well as individual or joint contributions to this scale

8. On the approaches to identify the scale of emission reductions to be achieved by Annex I Parties in aggregate, many Parties reiterated the need for Annex I Parties to take on ambitious emission reduction targets and to achieve deep cuts in emissions in order to attain the ultimate objective of the Convention. A global pathway to limit the increase in global mean surface temperature to less than 2 ºC above pre-industrial levels, as presented in the Fourth Assessment Report (AR4) of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), was often referred to in this context. Reference was made to the IPCC scenario of atmospheric greenhouse gas (GHG) concentrations at levels of 450 ppm carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2 eq), which will require global emissions to be reduced by 50 per cent of 1990 levels by 2050, and aggregate emissions from Annex I Parties by 80–95 per cent.

9. Under the medium-term perspective until 2020, the range of emission reductions by Annex I Parties, referred to in the conclusions of the AWG-KP at its resumed sixth session[4], namely, a reduction of 25–40 per cent below 1990 levels by 2020, was acknowledged. The urgent need for developed countries to continue to take the lead by committing to reducing their emissions of GHGs by around 30 per cent of 1990 levels by 2020, which is consistent with the 25–40 per cent range mentioned above, was also acknowledged. A number of Parties and experts emphasized that such ambitious emission reductions were necessary and feasible and could be achieved at low cost. The need to set an even more ambitious level of emission reductions by Annex I Parties of more than 40 per cent below 1990 levels by 2020 was emphasized by some Parties.

10. Based on more recent scientific information that has been made available since the publication of the IPCC AR4, some Parties expressed the view that the increase in global mean surface temperature should be limited to well below 1.5 ºC above pre-industrial levels, and that atmospheric GHG concentrations should be stabilized at levels well below 350 ppm CO_2 eq. To achieve this limit, global GHG emissions must peak by 2015 and must be reduced by more than 85 per cent by 2050. This will require Annex I Parties to reduce their aggregate emissions by more than 40 per cent of their 1990 levels by 2020; and by more than 95 per cent by 2050. To that end, the AWG-KP should take into account this recent scientific information, in particular information on acceleration of climate change and its adverse impacts, in particular its effect on sea level rise, which is of concern to small island States.

---

[4] FCCC/KP/AWG/2008/8, paragraph 18.

11. On the approaches to identify the scale of emission reductions to be achieved by Annex I Parties individually or jointly, a number of Parties emphasized that while some common principles could be applied (see para. 13 below), individual or joint targets should be differentiated to take into account differences in national circumstances. In this context, Australia mentioned that its mitigation costs are higher than those of other industrialized countries, and pledged to reduce its GHG emissions by 5 per cent below 2000 levels by 2020. However, it recognized that the cost of inaction will be greater than the cost of action. Australia also stated its intention to do more and reduce emissions by up to 15 per cent below 2000 levels by 2020 if other Parties join the mitigation effort and all developed countries take on comparable ambitious targets. Japan noted that its domestic mitigation potential is limited, because of the high level of efficiency in its economy, and presented six options for a medium-term reduction target currently under consideration, ranging from an increase of 4 per cent to a decrease of 25 per cent from 1990 levels by 2020. It indicated its intention to announce its medium-term target by June 2009.

12. Belarus noted the limited access to financial resources for domestic mitigation actions and stated its intention to consider the option of taking on a reduction target of 5–10 per cent below 1990 levels by 2020 if flexible mechanisms are available. Iceland noted that in small countries, single projects have a considerable effect on total GHG emissions, and referred to the need for flexibility in achieving reduction targets, for example through joint commitments with other Parties. In the context of the existing pledges from Annex I Parties, one Party noted that these pledges fall well short of the IPCC range for GHG emission reductions of 25–40 per cent of 1990 levels by 2020. Many Parties called upon all developed countries to indicate ambitious targets as soon as possible. Some acknowledged that any delay in taking action to mitigate climate change will increase the risk of surpassing critical thresholds and will involve higher economic costs.

B. Implications of other issues, such as the duration of the commitment period(s), how QELROs could be expressed including the base year, and mitigation potential

13. Many Parties reiterated their view that comparable efforts should be made by all Annex I Parties and that the allocation of commitments among these Parties should be made taking into account several principles and considerations, such as capability, responsibility, total GHG emission levels, potential for and cost of emission reduction, and differences in national circumstances. Some Parties emphasized the importance of transparency in the allocation process. Parties interpreted comparability in different ways: for example, as comparable emission reductions in 2020 below the baseline or as comparable costs involved. One Party suggested that when commitments are allocated, consideration be given to the need to ensure a gradual convergence of per capita emissions among developed and developing countries in the long term. Another Party acknowledged that even a 25–40 per cent reduction would keep the per capita emissions of Annex I Parties several times higher than those of developing countries. It further noted the need for developed countries to reduce their per capita emissions on a large scale, in accordance with the principle of equity.

14. An analysis of global mitigation potentials was presented by several experts at the workshop, which suggests that a large mitigation potential is available at negative or low cost in both developed and developing countries. In this context, the need for enhanced financial support and support to facilitate technology transfer was noted. Sector-specific analysis was deemed useful by some Parties; most of the scientific models presented at the workshop used sector-specific approaches to a certain extent. Sectors that were frequently mentioned included power generation (emissions from fuel combustion), industry, transport, and residential and commercial. Other sectors mentioned include the energy sector (fugitive emissions), agriculture, waste and industrial processes (fluorinated gases). Energy efficiency and the shift to low-carbon fuels were identified as the key areas where mitigation potential could be realized at low cost, including through cooperative action.

15. An overview of scientific models for assessment and comparison of the level of effort in reducing GHG emissions was presented by the experts. A number of principles proposed by several Parties on the

allocation of commitments were transformed into indicators serving as the input data to these models. These indicators include gross domestic product per capita and the Human Development Index (for capability), GHG emissions intensity of the economy (for overall mitigation potential), percentage change in emissions between 1990 and 2006 (early action), and population growth (for national circumstances). In the context of responsibility, the need to consider cumulative emissions since 1850 was acknowledged by some Parties. The presentations also included indicators for mitigation potential by sector, including CO_2 per kilowatt-hour (energy industry), energy intensity index (industry) and GHG emissions per capita (commercial and residential sectors, and transport).

16. Experts noted that results from the application of scientific models for the allocation of commitments are sensitive to input data and model assumptions. This includes: the starting point (recent emission levels, economic structure and energy efficiency levels), future development (economic development and level of interest rates, and dynamics of technology development and deployment and availability of key mitigation technologies) and marginal abatement cost curves. They also noted that results are more sensitive to cost information than the other input data.

17. A framework for assessing comparability of efforts was presented by one Party. In accordance with this framework, the economic cost faced by a country in meeting a target is important information that should be taken into account when allocating commitments among Annex I Parties. This cost is a function of the baseline ('business-as-usual') emission scenario, cost estimates for reducing emissions below this baseline and other indicators reflecting the principles of responsibility and capability.

18. The year 2020 was frequently referred to as the year to be used for setting the medium-term targets by most Parties and experts. The period 2013–2017 was stated by one Party as an appropriate second commitment period in order to enable prompt further adjustments and any necessary responses to new scientific information on climate change becoming available. Emphasis was put on the need to ensure that there is no gap between the first and the second commitment periods. It was proposed that the base year could remain 1990 to ensure continuity, consistency and transparency, or 2006 to reflect recent GHG trends. While most Parties envisaged QELROs taking the form of a percentage change of emissions from the base year similar to the QELROs for the first commitment period, one Party made a proposal to express the QELROs in Gg CO_2 eq and to subsequently present them as a reduction in emissions from 1990, 2000, 2005 and 2007 levels, expressed as a percentage.

C. Other issues

19. The outcome of a joint workshop on mitigation potential, comparability of effort and sectoral approaches was presented by representatives of the EC and Japan. This workshop provided an opportunity for an informal exchange of views among representatives of governments, academia and the private sector on the analysis of mitigation potentials and comparability of efforts in emission reduction conducted using different models and modelling approaches. This exchange of views suggests that Parties and research institutions are using different approaches, models and assumptions when considering emissions levels, mitigation potentials and GHG reduction targets, which inevitably leads to differences in the results obtained. Sectoral approaches to emission reduction were discussed in detail in the context of setting targets and developing indicators, as well as enhancing cooperation and sharing best practices and best available technologies.

20. The workshop referred to in paragraph 19 above contributed to improving transparency in the approaches used and to facilitating an understanding of how to arrive at fair and effective GHG reduction targets for developed countries. The informal exchange of views and modelling experiences was deemed very useful by the participants, and it was suggested that such exchanges could be continued in future, with a view to supporting the decision-making process for setting ambitious and feasible medium-term targets in a transparent way.

Annex II

[ENGLISH ONLY]

Workshop on potential environmental, economic and social consequences, including spillover effects, of tools, policies, measures and methodologies available to Annex I Parties

Report by the chair of the workshop

I. Introduction

1. At its resumed sixth session, the Ad Hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP) requested the secretariat to organize, under the guidance of the Chair of the AWG-KP, an in-session workshop for the consideration of information on potential environmental, economic and social consequences, including spillover effects, of tools, policies, measures and methodologies available to Annex I Parties (hereinafter referred to as potential consequences).[1]

2. The approach and objectives of the workshop have been outlined in the scenario note on the seventh session of the AWG-KP.[2]

3. The workshop was held in Bonn, Germany, on 30 March 2009, during the seventh session of the AWG-KP, and was chaired by Mr. Mama Konaté, Vice-Chair of the AWG-KP. It allowed for an exchange of information on issues identified at the resumed sixth session, including: evidence of actual impacts and consequences of tools, policies, measures and methodologies available to Annex I Parties; positive and negative potential consequences; how the causes and effects of potential consequences can be assessed; and possible approaches to grouping actions that lead to these potential consequences. The workshop was open to all Parties and observers.

4. As requested by the AWG-KP at its resumed sixth session,[3] the secretariat prepared an information note[4] to facilitate considerations at this workshop.

5. In the scenario note referred to in paragraph 2 above, the Chair of the AWG-KP invited interested Parties to make presentations at the workshop. The following Parties or groups of Parties made presentations: South Africa on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, Algeria on behalf of the African Group, Saudi Arabia, Australia, Qatar and Kuwait. In addition, one presentation was made by the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries.

6. An exchange of views was held after the presentations. Statements and comments were made by Argentina, Canada, China, the Czech Republic on behalf of the European Community and its member

---

1 FCCC/KP/AWG/2008/8, paragraph 37.

2 FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/2.

3 FCCC/KP/AWG/2008/8, paragraph 38.

4 FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/INF.3.

States, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal and Switzerland. After this exchange of views, the chair invited observer organizations to take the floor. Two short interventions were made, one on behalf of the trade union non-governmental organizations and one on behalf of local government and municipal authorities.

II. Summary of discussions

7. Discussions centred on the following: deepening the understanding of potential consequences and assessing their causes and effects; the classification of tools, policies, measures and methodologies available to Annex I Parties; negative and positive potential consequences; and enhancing implementation of Article 2, paragraph 3, and Article 3, paragraph 14, of the Kyoto Protocol.

8. On the subject of **deepening the understanding of potential consequences and assessing their causes and effects**, Parties noted the need to move beyond conceptual discussions and focus on evidence of actual consequences, guided by common methodologies. In this context, several areas were addressed. In particular, Parties underlined the valuable contribution that regional assessments could make to the deepening of understanding of potential consequences. These regional assessments could be supported by relevant international organizations. Parties also explored the possibility of an international assessment of potential consequences, which could be complemented by regional assessments and could be carried out by an international organization.

9. Some Parties suggested that principles and guidelines could be developed to assist in the assessment of the impacts of potential consequences, based on sound science.

10. Furthermore, Parties underlined the need to exchange experiences and provide evidence of actual consequences. Some Parties stressed that given the difficulties in anticipating potential impacts, the assessment of potential consequences should be driven by information from those affected. Some Parties stated that national communications are a valuable channel to provide information about actual impacts and concerns, which enables these to be considered and addressed on an international platform. Other Parties underlined the need for enhanced reporting by Annex I Parties on their progress made in implementing Article 2, paragraph 3, and Article 3, paragraph 14. Some Parties voiced concern that existing reporting requirements are often not fully implemented and that a review of those requirements will therefore be necessary. Other Parties expressed the view that the existing reporting commitments by Annex I Parties are being met in accordance with the provisions of the reporting guidelines under the Kyoto Protocol.

11. Some Parties described difficulties in the quantification of potential consequences, owing to the large number of economic and social factors involved. Examples include factors that affect revenues generated from the export of fossil fuels and factors that affect food prices.

12. Some Parties underlined the need for a full assessment of the potential impact on developing country Parties of the proposed post-2012 policies and measures to be implemented by Annex I Parties, as well as a full assessment of alternative policies and measures available to Annex I Parties that would minimize the impact of potential consequences.

13. As regards **classification of tools, policies and measures available to Annex I Parties**, a number of Parties indicated that further efforts should be made to fully understand the complexity of this issue. One approach could be to identify potential consequences associated with certain measures, and ways and means to minimize their impact. Such an approach would ideally take into account the efforts of Parties in achieving sustainable development. Some Parties commented on the challenges involved in developing such an approach.

14. On **negative and positive potential consequences**, Parties generally agreed that the transition to a low-carbon economy presents major opportunities and challenges for all countries. Some Parties

expressed concern about reference to the concept of low-carbon development, given that certain aspects of its implementation may place a disproportionate or abnormal burden on their economies. Some Parties suggested that one way to minimize negative potential consequences could be through the further development and deployment of new and innovative technologies such as carbon dioxide capture and storage. Some Parties noted that the minimization of negative potential consequences should be the focus of further work, while others recognized the need to maximize positive consequences.

15. A number of Parties presented information on negative impacts on their economies. Several developing countries expressed the view that they will face the greatest impacts of response measures, with the most vulnerable and poorest countries facing considerably more challenges owing to the dual burden that the impacts of climate change and potential consequences will impose. One Party suggested that a mechanism should be created to provide support to least developed countries and voiced concern about potential technology dumping. It was also stated that the interrelationship between positive and negative potential consequences is further complicated by the fact that many Parties make use of the policies, tools and measures available to Annex I Parties while being exposed to their potential consequences.

16. A number of Parties mentioned the possible negative consequences on developing country Parties, and in particular the poorest and most vulnerable among them, of subsidies and eco-labelling, especially in the agricultural sector.

17. It was indicated that actions undertaken to minimize negative potential consequences should: complement and support efforts to mitigate climate change; benefit from experiences of Parties and lessons learned; flow from national policies and measures; be balanced; and take into account the special circumstances of the poorest and most vulnerable countries.

Some Parties also mentioned the need to enhance the implementation of **Article 2, paragraph 3, and Article 3, paragraph 14, of the Kyoto Protocol**. They reiterated the provisions of these Articles, relating to the minimization of adverse effects of international trade and social, environmental and economic impacts on developing country Parties, including spillover effects of response measures. Some Parties expressed the view that there is a need to establish funding, insurance and transfer of technology to help minimize the adverse impacts on developing countries.

Annex III

[ENGLISH ONLY]

Possible improvements to emissions trading and the project-based mechanisms under the Kyoto Protocol for the period after 2012 with potentially significant implications for the ability of Annex I Parties to achieve mitigation objectives

Note: Some Parties have expressed the view that the elements in sections I.D, I.E, I.H, II.A, III.A, III.B, III.C, IV.B and IV.C below would require an amendment to the Kyoto Protocol and would not be within the mandate of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP). Some other Parties have expressed the view that legal analysis is needed to determine which elements in this annex would require a decision of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP) or an amendment to the Kyoto Protocol and that such amendments would be within the mandate of the AWG-KP.

I. Clean development mechanism

A. Include other land use, land-use change and forestry activities[1]

Option A:

1. Status quo: The eligibility of land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF) activities under the clean development mechanism (CDM) for the first commitment period shall be maintained thereafter.[2]

Option B:

2. The eligibility of LULUCF activities under the CDM includes:

(a) [Afforestation and reforestation;]

(b) [Reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation;]

(c) [Restoration of wetlands;]

(d) [Sustainable forest management and other sustainable land management activities;]

(e) [Soil carbon management in agriculture;]

(f) [Revegetation, forest management, cropland management and grazing land management, as defined in decision 16/CMP.1.]

3. In relation to LULUCF activities under the CDM, the CMP shall adopt modalities and procedures for:

---

[1] Discussion to be informed by outcomes from the consideration of non-permanence and other methodological issues.

[2] Decision 17/CP.7, paragraph 7, as confirmed by decision 3/CMP.1; decision 16/CMP.1, annex, paragraphs 13–15.

(a) [Temporary certified emission reductions (tCERs) and long-term certified emission reductions (lCERs);]

(b) [Responsibility assumed on a voluntary basis by the host Party for the cancellation of permanent units in the event of a reversal of greenhouse gas (GHG) removals by sinks that had occurred through project activities;]

(c) [Insurance issued for project activities to cover the cancellation of permanent units in the event of a reversal of GHG removals by sinks that had occurred through these project activities;]

(d) [Buffers to ensure that quantities of credits for carbon stored through project activities are reserved for cancellation in the event of a reversal of GHG removals by sinks that had occurred through these project activities;]

(e) [Credit reserves to ensure that quantities of units that are not retired at the end of a commitment period are reserved for cancellation in the event of a reversal of GHG removals by sinks that had occurred through project activities;]

(f) [Exemptions from modalities and procedures for addressing potential non-permanence in the case of low-risk LULUCF project activities;]

(g) [Accounting for emissions from harvesting of forests established under the CDM when they occur.]

4. Option 1: There shall be no restrictions on the use of [tCERs and lCERs] [certified emission reductions (CERs)] issued for LULUCF project activities under the CDM by Annex I Parties to meet their emission commitments under Article 3, paragraph 1.

Option 2: For the second commitment period, the total of additions to a Party's assigned amount resulting from eligible LULUCF project activities under Article 12 shall not exceed one per cent of base year emissions of that Party, times [five].

Option 3: A Party may use [tCERs and lCERs] [CERs] issued for LULUCF project activities under the CDM for compliance with its emission commitment under Article 3, paragraph 1,[3] to a maximum of [x] per cent of its assigned amount pursuant to Article 3, paragraphs 7 and 8.

Note: Further issues that may need to be addressed include:

- *Whether combinations of the above options for eligible LULUCF activities should be included*
- *Whether project participants may choose from a menu of modalities and procedures for addressing potential non-permanence*

B. Include carbon dioxide capture and storage

Option A:

5. Status quo: Not provided for.

[3] In this annex, "Article" refers to an article of the Kyoto Protocol.

Option B:

6. Carbon dioxide capture and storage (CCS) activities are not eligible as CDM project activities.

Option C:

7. CCS activities may be registered under the CDM and Annex I Parties may use CERs issued for such project activities, on the basis of emission reductions achieved [during the second commitment period], to meet their emission commitments under Article 3, paragraph 1[, for the second commitment period].

Note: Further issues that may need to be addressed include:

- *The short- and long-term liability (e.g. in relation to leakage and non-permanence)*
- *The provisions for monitoring, reporting and verification, taking account of data availability*
- *The possible environmental impacts*
- *The definition of project boundaries*
- *The potential for perverse outcomes*

C. Include nuclear activities

Option A:

8. Status quo.[4]

Option B:

9. Activities relating to nuclear facilities are not eligible as CDM project activities.

Option C:

10. Activities relating to [new] nuclear facilities [constructed since […]] may be registered under the CDM, and Annex I Parties may use CERs issued for such project activities, on the basis of emission reductions achieved [during the second commitment period], to meet their emission commitments under Article 3, paragraph 1[, for the second commitment period].

Note: Further issues that may need to be addressed include:

- *Specific criteria or requirements for eligible nuclear activities*
- *Costs relating to access to the technology*
- *The direct contribution to emission reductions*
- *Issues relating to non-proliferation*
- *Issues relating to permanent disposal of nuclear waste*
- *Safety, security and safeguards*

---

[4] Decision 17/CP.7, as confirmed by decision 3/CMP.1.

D. Introduce sectoral crediting of emission reductions below a previously established [no-lose] target

Option A:

11. Status quo: Not provided for.

Option B:

12. A sectoral crediting mechanism is established. A non-Annex I Party may propose to the CMP a crediting target for emissions or removals within a defined sector to be achieved through national actions. Reductions in emissions by sources in the sector below the crediting target, or enhancements in removals by sinks in the sector above the crediting target, shall result in the generation of credits which may be used by Annex I Parties to meet their emission commitments under Article 3, paragraph 1.

13. The sectoral crediting mechanism shall be supervised by [a dedicated body constituted by the CMP and operating under its authority] [the CDM Executive Board]. Before the supervisory body registers a sectoral crediting activity, the crediting target shall be recommended to the CMP by the supervisory body and shall be approved by the CMP.

14. A crediting target shall be [set below the level of projected anthropogenic emissions by sources of GHGs within the sector boundary or above the sum of the projected changes in carbon stocks in the carbon pools within the sector boundary] [as a carbon intensity target below the level of the projected carbon intensity of emissions by sources of GHGs within the sector boundary].

15. The sector boundary for a sectoral crediting activity shall encompass all anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks of GHGs that are reasonably attributable to the defined sector.

16. CDM project activities, registered at the time a sectoral crediting activity is registered and falling within the sector boundary, may continue until the end of their current crediting periods. The quantity of CERs issued on the basis of such CDM project activities shall be deducted from the quantity of credits to be issued on the basis of the sectoral crediting activity. Once a sectoral crediting activity is registered for a sector, no further CDM project activities may be approved in relation to that sector.

17. There shall be no double-counting of emission reductions or removals between sectoral crediting activities.

18. The following LULUCF activities shall be eligible under the sectoral crediting mechanism: […]

19. The non-Annex I Party may receive financing and technology in advance of credits being generated for a crediting target.

20. No credits shall be generated for a sectoral crediting activity if a crediting target has not been met. [There shall be no other consequences for a Party that does not meet a crediting target.]

21. In relation to the sectoral crediting mechanism, the CMP shall adopt modalities and procedures for:

(a) The governance and administration of the sectoral crediting mechanism;

(b) The determination of a sector boundary;

(c) The determination and approval of crediting targets [on a country-by-country basis];

(d) The monitoring, reporting and verification of emissions, and of emission reductions and removals, within the sector boundary;

(e) The treatment of potential leakage from within the sector boundary;

(f) The issuance of credits.

Note: The following table is to clarify the terminology used in this section.

Mechanism under which the activity is undertaken	*Sectoral crediting mechanism*
What would be registered?	*Sectoral crediting activity*
What would be the scope?	*Defined sector*
What would be the reference level?	*Crediting target*
What would be issued?	*Credits*

Note: Further issues that may need to be addressed include:

- *The definition of a sector*
- *The degree to which a crediting target should be set below the projected level of emissions by sources, or above the projected level of removals by sinks within the sector boundary, taking into account national circumstances, capabilities and factors such as the homogeneity of products/processes, and the potential for efficiency and innovation in the sector*
- *The definition of the credit to be issued*
- *The potential for crediting cumulative emission reductions*
- *The roles and functions of the supervisory body*
- *Effectiveness of financing and technology, in advance of credits being generated, in promoting additional emission reductions*
- *Measures to be taken if a host country fails to achieve a target*

E. Introduce crediting on the basis of nationally appropriate mitigation actions

Option A:

22. Status quo: Not provided for.

Option B:

23. [Nationally appropriate mitigation actions (NAMAs), as referred to in decision 1/CP.13 (Bali Action Plan), paragraph 1 (b) (ii), may be registered under the CDM and shall be subject to all modalities and procedures for the CDM adopted by the CMP and all procedures and decisions issued by the CDM Executive Board, except where specific modalities, procedures or decisions are defined by the CMP or the Executive Board for NAMAs registered as CDM project activities.]

24. [The baseline for a NAMA registered as a CDM project activity shall be the scenario that reasonably represents the anthropogenic emissions by sources of GHGs within the NAMA boundary, or the sum of the changes in carbon stocks in the carbon pools within the NAMA boundary, that would occur in the absence of the project activity.] [A portion of verified emission reductions that result from a NAMA may generate NAMA credits.]

25. The NAMA boundary shall encompass all anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks of GHGs that are reasonably attributable to a defined NAMA.

26. [Individual CDM project activities, registered at the time a NAMA is registered as a CDM project activity and falling within the NAMA boundary, may continue until the end of their current crediting period. The quantity of CERs issued on the basis of such individual CDM project activities shall be deducted from the quantity of CERs to be issued on the basis of the NAMA registered as a CDM project activity. Once a NAMA is registered, no further CDM project activities may be approved in relation to activities within the NAMA boundary.]

27. There shall be no double counting of emission reductions or removals between [NAMAs] [NAMAs registered as CDM project activities].

28. NAMAs meeting the following criteria shall be eligible under the CDM:

(a) NAMAs not supported by financing and technology transfer by developed countries outside the context of the CDM;

(b) NAMAs with high costs;

(c) […]

29. [Types of NAMA that can generate NAMA credits include but are not limited to:

(a) Sustainable development policies and measures, economy- or sector-wide mitigation programmes, and mitigation activities and projects;

(b) Low-carbon development plans and programmes;

(c) Sector-based mitigation actions and standards;

(d) Actions under paragraph 1 (b) (iii) of the Bali Action Plan;

(e) Technology deployment programmes;

(f) Relevant standards, laws, regulations and targets at a national or sectoral level;

(g) Voluntary cap-and-trade schemes in non-Annex I Parties.]

30. In relation to [NAMAs] [NAMAs registered as CDM project activities], the CMP shall adopt modalities and procedures for:

(a) The scope of NAMAs qualifying for crediting [under the CDM];

(b) The determination of a NAMA boundary;

(c) The determination of additionality for [NAMAs] [NAMAs registered as CDM project activities];

(d) The determination of NAMA baselines;

(e) The discounting of credits to be issued;

(f) The monitoring, reporting [and verification] [, verification and certification] of emissions, and of emission reductions and removals, within the NAMA boundary;

(g) The treatment of potential leakage from within the NAMA boundary;

(h) [The governance and administration of the NAMA crediting mechanism;]

(i) [The issuance of NAMA credits.]

31. [The specific eligibility requirements for the credits issued from a NAMA shall be:

(a) Requirements relating to the quality of credits to ensure environmental integrity;

(b) Requirements relating to the avoidance of double counting with emission reductions under the CDM.]

Note: The following table is to clarify the terminology used in this section.

Mechanism under which the activity is undertaken	*[Clean development mechanism] [NAMA crediting mechanism]*
What would be registered?	*[NAMA as a CDM project activity] [NAMA crediting activity]*
What would be the scope?	*Defined NAMA*
What would be the reference level?	*Baseline*
What would be issued?	*[Certified emission reductions] [Credits generated from a NAMA]*

Note: Further issues that may need to be addressed include:

- *The nature of participation of Parties*
- *The definition of NAMAs and the attribution to them of emission reductions and removals*
- *The consequences if an emission reduction or removal goal is not achieved*
- *The potential for perverse outcomes*
- *The potential for crediting cumulative emission reductions*
- *[The nature of a NAMA registry]*
- *[The nature of NAMA credits]*

F. Encourage the development of standardized, multi-project baselines

Option A:

32. Status quo: Not excluded.

Option B:

33. [The CDM Executive Board] [A dedicated body constituted by the CMP and operating under its authority] [One or more dedicated bodies established by the CDM Executive Board and operating under its authority] shall define standardized baselines for specific project activity types and specific sectors or subsectors under the CDM by establishing parameters, including benchmarks, and procedures and making them available for [mandatory] [optional] use by project participants and designated operational entities (DOEs) in the determination of additionality and the application or development of baseline methodologies. Such standardized baselines [shall] [may] be established for types of project activities meeting the following criteria: […]

34. Option 1: Parameters and procedures shall be established on the basis of similar project activities undertaken in the previous five years, in similar social, economic, environmental and technological circumstances, whose performance is among the top [10] [20] per cent of their category. Such parameters and procedures shall reflect national circumstances and shall be periodically adjusted.

Option 2: Parameters and procedures shall be established on the basis of [top performing installations or processes in the relevant sector, based on, inter alia, the performance of key technologies that are beyond common practice and technology penetration rates] [[the top [x] per cent of] the current distribution of carbon intensity for specific types of project activities or within specific sectors]. [Such parameters and procedures shall reflect national circumstances and shall be periodically adjusted].

35. [In relation to standardized baselines, the CMP shall adopt modalities and procedures for:

(a) The determination of a standardized baseline, including the definition of a sector boundary as applicable;

(b) The determination of the applicability of a standardized baseline.]

36. There shall be no double counting of emission reductions or removals on the basis of the use of standardized, multi-project baselines.

Note: Further issues that may need to be addressed include:

- *The types of project activities for which standardized baselines may be approved*

G. Ensure environmental integrity and assess additionality through the development of positive or negative lists of project activity types

Option A:

37. Status quo: Not excluded.

Option B:

38. Reductions in anthropogenic emissions by sources or enhancements of anthropogenic removals by sinks achieved by the following categories of project activities are deemed to be [not] additional to any that would occur in the absence of the project activities:

(a) [Criteria based on the primary technology employed in the project activity;]

(b) [Criteria relating to the host Party of the project activity;]

(c) [Criteria based on the scale of the project activity (small-scale or large-scale).]

Note: Further issues that may need to be addressed include:

- *The categories of project activities to be included on a positive or negative list*
- *The process for periodic review of the positive or negative list*
- *The consequences for project activities registered without an additionality test if the project circumstances or the list change such that the project activities are no longer covered by the positive list*
- *The consequences for registered project activities if the project circumstances or the list change such that the project activities are now covered by the negative list*

H. Differentiate the eligibility of Parties through the use of indicators

Option A:

39. Status quo: Not provided for.

Option B:

40. Non-Annex I Parties meeting the following criteria shall [not] be eligible to host [particular types of] project activities [in specific sectors in specific countries] under the CDM: […]

41. Annex I Parties meeting the following criteria shall [not] be eligible to use CERs issued for [particular types of] project activities under the CDM for the purpose of compliance with commitments under Article 3, paragraph 1: […]

Note: Further issues that may need to be addressed include:

- *Appropriate criteria and thresholds, taking account of differing national circumstances*
- *The project activity categories affected by the eligibility determination*
- *The types of methodologies affected by the eligibility determination*
- *Transition issues*

I. Improve access to clean development mechanism project activities by specified host Parties

Option A:

42. Status quo.[5]

Option B:

43. For [specified host Parties] [least developed countries and small island developing States] [other categories of countries] the following provisions shall apply:

(a) The definition of a small-scale project activity is amended to […];

(b) Project activities that meet the requirements of small-scale project activities shall be [exempt from the requirement] [subject to further simplified requirements] to demonstrate additionality;

(c) The validation, verification and certification of project activities shall be funded through the [CDM management plan] [financial mechanism of the Convention];

(d) […].

Note: Further issues that may need to be addressed include:

- *The determination of the host Parties for which provisions are applicable or definition of criteria for subsequently determining the host Parties for which provisions are applicable*
- *The definition of regions*
- *The identification of further measures to improve access*
- *Potential measures to improve the enabling environment for CDM project activities*

J. Promote co-benefits for clean development mechanism projects by facilitative means

Option A:

44. Status quo.[6]

Option B:

45. Option 1: Project activities that demonstrate specific co-benefits shall be promoted through the following means:

---

[5] Decision 29/CMP.1; decision 1/CMP.2, paragraphs 31–42; decision 6/CMP.2, paragraphs 1–4.

[6] Decision 3/CMP.1, preamble; decision 3/CMP.1, annex, paragraph 40 (a).

(a) Exemption from payment of registration fees;

(b) Exemption from the share of proceeds to cover the administrative expenses of the CDM and/or assist with the costs of adaptation;

(c) Expedited time lines for the registration of project activities.

(d) Exemption from additionality criteria.

(e) […]

Option 2: Each project activity shall demonstrate specific co-benefits.

46. A DOE shall, as part of its validation of a project activity, confirm [that the designated national authority of the host Party has confirmed that its stipulated co-benefits are demonstrated by the project activity] [that the proposed project activity demonstrates one or more of the following co-benefits:

(a) Energy efficiency;

(b) Technology transfer;

(c) Environmental services such as air pollution reduction, improvement of water quality, proper treatment and reduction of waste, conservation of biodiversity, and management of hydrological resources;

(d) Poverty alleviation;

(e) Economic growth;

(f) Social benefits;

(g) Strengthening human and institutional capacity.]

Note: Further issues that may need to be addressed include:

- *Provisions for the measurement of co-benefits, including indicators*
- *The definition of a sufficient level of co-benefits*
- *The relationship to project scale*
- *The contribution to minimization of negative spillover effects*
- *The potential for perverse outcomes*

K. Introduce multiplication factors to increase or decrease the certified emission reductions issued for specific project activity types

Option A:

47. Status quo: Not provided for.

Option B:

48. Option 1: A CDM project activity shall receive CERs equal to the emission reductions that are certified by the DOE multiplied by a factor decided by the CMP. Multiplication factors may be greater or less than one. The total quantity of CERs issued for a commitment period shall not exceed the aggregate quantity of emission reductions or removals achieved by CDM project activities during the commitment period.

Option 2: Specific CDM project activities shall receive CERs equal to the emission reductions that are certified by the DOE multiplied by a discount factor decided by the CMP.

49. The CMP shall adopt, and periodically review, the [multiplication factors] [discount factors] on the basis of the following criteria:

(a) [Criteria based on environmental integrity;]

(b) [Criteria based on the primary sectoral scope of the project activity;[7]]

(c) [Criteria based on the primary technology employed in the project activity;]

(d) [Criteria based on the global warming potential of the gases whose emissions are reduced through the project activity;]

(e) [Criteria relating to the host Party of the project activity;]

(f) [Criteria based on the scale of the project activity (small-scale or large-scale).]

II. Joint implementation

A. Introduce modalities for treatment of clean development mechanism project activities upon graduation of host Parties

Option A:

50. Status quo: Not provided for.

Option B:

51. Where a Party becomes eligible to host joint implementation (JI) projects, any registered CDM project activities hosted by that Party shall continue to be subject to all rules and modalities governing CDM project activities until the end of the current crediting period of the activities and a quantity of assigned amount units (AAUs) equal to the CERs issued from the time of JI eligibility onwards shall be cancelled. [The provisions relating to the treatment of CERs generated by afforestation and reforestation project activities, as contained in decision 5/CMP.1 and other related decisions, shall apply mutatis mutandis in the second commitment period.]

Note: Further issues that may need to be addressed include provisions for the cancellation of AAUs.

Option C:

52. Where a Party becomes eligible to host JI projects, any registered CDM project activities hosted by that Party shall be converted to JI projects and shall be subject to provisions for JI.

Note: Further issues that may need to be addressed include:

- *Specific provisions for CDM afforestation and reforestation project activities*

---

[7] The sectoral scope of the project activity refers to the classification used under the CDM for the sector in which the project activity is located.

- *The provisions relating to the crediting period*
- *Transition issues*
- *The ability to select the JI Track 1 procedure if the relevant eligibility requirements are met by the host Party*
- *The consequences for registered CDM project activities that are not eligible to be registered JI project activities*

B. Include nuclear activities

Option A:

53. Status quo.[8]

Option B:

54. Activities relating to nuclear facilities are not eligible as JI projects.

Option C:

55. Activities relating to new nuclear facilities are eligible as JI projects and Annex I Parties may use emission reduction units issued for such projects, on the basis of emission reductions achieved [during the second commitment period], to meet their emission commitments under Article 3, paragraph 1[, for the second commitment period].

Note: Further issues that may need to be addressed include:

- *Specific criteria or requirements for eligible nuclear activities*
- *Costs relating to access to the technology*
- *The direct contribution to emission reductions*
- *Issues relating to non-proliferation*
- *Issues relating to permanent disposal of nuclear waste*
- *Safety, security and safeguards*

C. Promote co-benefits for joint implementation projects under Track 2 by facilitative means

Option A:

56. Status quo: Not provided for.

Option B:

57. Projects that demonstrate specific co-benefits shall be promoted through the following means: […]

58. An accredited independent entity shall, as part of its determination regarding a project, determine [that the designated focal point of the host Party has confirmed that its stipulated co-benefits are

[8] Decision 16/CP.7, as confirmed by decision 9/CMP.1.

demonstrated by the project] [that the proposed project demonstrates [any of] [all] the following co-benefits:

(a) Technology transfer;

(b) Environmental services such as air pollution reduction, improvement of water quality, proper treatment and reduction of waste, conservation of biodiversity, and management of hydrological resources.]

Note: Further issues that may need to be addressed include:

- *The determination of the means of promoting projects*
- *The provisions for the measurement of co-benefits*
- *The definition of a sufficient level of co-benefits*
- *The potential for perverse outcomes*

III. Emissions trading

A. Introduce emissions trading based on sectoral targets

Option A:

59. Status quo: Not provided for.

Option B:

60. Non-Annex I Parties may participate in emissions trading on the basis of agreed emission targets established for sectors. The emission target for a sector shall be set below the level of projected anthropogenic emissions by sources of GHGs within the sector boundary, or above the level of projected enhancements in removals by sinks of GHGs within the sector boundary, and shall be based on the most recent available data. The sector boundary shall encompass all anthropogenic emissions of GHGs that are reasonably attributable to the sector in question.

61. A participating non-Annex I Party shall be issued with emission allowances corresponding to its sectoral target. Parties may devolve emission targets and allowances to legal entities.

62. Once a participating Party has complied with modalities for monitoring, reporting and verification of sectoral emission levels, and accounting of emission allowances, the emission allowances may be transferred and acquired internationally and may be used by Annex I Parties to meet their emission commitments under Article 3, paragraph 1.

63. Registered CDM project activities in the sector in question may continue in parallel with sectoral emissions trading. A quantity of the emission allowances, issued for the host Party of the CDM project activity and equal to the CERs issued during the compliance period, shall be cancelled.

64. In relation to sectoral emissions trading, the CMP shall adopt modalities for:

(a) The governance of sectoral emissions trading and the means of reaching agreement on sectoral targets;

(b) The determination of a sector boundary;

(c) The monitoring, reporting and verification of emissions within the sector boundary;

(d) Accounting of emission allowances, including their issuance;

(e) The treatment of potential leakage from within the sector boundary;

(f) Consequences of not achieving the sectoral target.

Note: Further issues that may need to be addressed include:

- *The definition of a sector*
- *The form of the emission targets*
- *The definition of the tradable unit and its use for compliance*

B. Introduce emissions trading on the basis of nationally appropriate mitigation actions

Option A:

65. Status quo: Not provided for.

Option B:

66. [CERs] [Credits] that are generated on the basis of a [NAMA registered as a CDM project activity] [NAMA] may be transferred and acquired under international emissions trading pursuant to Article 17.[9]

67. [Emission reduction units that are generated on the basis of a NAMA in an Annex I Party, under the JI Track 1 procedure, may be transferred and acquired pursuant to Article 6.]

C. Introduce modalities and procedures for the recognition of units from voluntary emissions trading systems in non-Annex I Parties for trading and compliance purposes under the Kyoto Protocol

Option A:

68. Status quo: Not provided for.

Option B:

69. Where a national or regional emissions trading scheme implemented on a voluntary basis by a non-Annex I Party or non-Annex I Parties meets specific eligibility requirements, emission allowances [and other units] issued under the scheme may be transferred and acquired internationally, and may be used by Annex I Parties to meet their emission commitments under Article 3, paragraph 1.

70. The specific eligibility requirements shall be:

(a) [Requirements relating to the basis for establishing emission targets;]

(b) [Requirements relating to the monitoring, reporting and verification of emissions;]

(c) [Requirements relating to the accounting of emission allowances;]

(d) [Requirements relating to the avoidance of double-counting with emission reductions under the CDM.]

Note: Further issues that may need to be addressed include the relationship to voluntary projects.

---

[9] See section I.E. CERs issued on the basis of a NAMA registered as a CDM project activity would automatically be eligible for transfer and acquisition under emissions trading pursuant to Article 17.

IV. Cross-cutting issues

A. Relax or eliminate carry-over (banking) restrictions on Kyoto units

Option A:

71. Status quo.[10]

Option B:

72. There shall be no restrictions on the carry-over of Kyoto units to a subsequent commitment period.

Option C:

73. Limits on the carry-over of specific Kyoto units to a subsequent commitment period shall be as follows: […]

Note: Further issues that may need to be addressed include proposed limits on carry-over by Kyoto unit type.

B. Introduce borrowing of assigned amount from future commitment periods

Option A:

74. Status quo: Not provided for.

Option B:

75. An Annex I Party may borrow assigned amount from the subsequent commitment period [, excluding any portion of its own assigned amount,] and use it for the purpose of compliance with its emission commitment under Article 3, paragraph 1, in the current commitment period in accordance with the following provisions: […]

Note: Further issues that may need to be addressed include:

- *The timing of the 'repayment' of the assigned amount*
- *Limits on borrowing*
- *The cost of borrowing, including through an 'interest rate'*
- *The consequences for non-compliance in the subsequent commitment period*
- *The implications for the environmental integrity of the Kyoto Protocol*

---

[10] Decision 13/CMP.1, annex, paragraphs 15–16.

C. Extend the share of proceeds

Option A:

76. Status quo.[11]

Option B:

77. To assist developing country Parties that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change to meet the costs of adaptation, [x] per cent of AAUs and removal units for each Annex I Party shall be set aside when such units are issued. The international transaction log shall ensure that this share is issued and transferred to the specified account of the Adaptation Fund before the remaining units may be issued. The Adaptation Fund Board shall offer these units for sale by auction by an appropriate institution authorized by the Board.

Option C:

The share of proceeds to assist developing country Parties that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change to meet the costs of adaptation, as referred to in Article 12, paragraph 8, shall be [x] per cent of CERs issued for CDM project activities, with the exception of CERs issued for CDM project activities in least developed countries.

---

[11] Decision 17/CP.7, paragraph 15, as confirmed by decision 3/CMP.1; decision 2/CMP.3, paragraph 31.

Annex IV

[ENGLISH ONLY]

Other possible improvements to emissions trading and the project-based mechanisms under the Kyoto Protocol

Note: Some Parties have expressed the view that the elements in sections I.F, I.G, I.H, I.K, II.I, II.K, II.L and II.M below would require an amendment to the Kyoto Protocol and would not be within the mandate of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP). Some other Parties have expressed the view that legal analysis is needed to determine which elements in this annex would require a decision of the CMP or an amendment to the Kyoto Protocol and that such amendments would be within the mandate of the AWG-KP.

I. Clean development mechanism

A. Introduce a different supervisory structure and institutional arrangement in case of modification of the scope of the clean development mechanism

B. Change the composition of the Executive Board membership to ensure equitable representation of Parties

C. Move the secretariat's function of supporting the Executive Board to another organization

D. Introduce alternative institutional arrangements for validation, verification and certification

E. Broaden the role of host Party governments

F. Differentiate the treatment of types of project activities by Party

G. Allocate proportions of demand to project activity types that contribute more to the sustainable development of host Parties

H. Allocate proportions of demand to specific groups of host Parties to enhance their sustainable development

I. Introduce alternative accounting rules for afforestation and reforestation project activities in order to increase demand[1]

J. Restrict the clean development mechanism to bilateral project activities

K. Use global temperature potentials instead of global warming potentials[2]

---

[1] Discussion to be informed by outcomes from the consideration of non-permanence and other methodological issues.

[2] Global warming potentials are being considered by the AWG-KP under its work on greenhouse gases, sectors and source categories.

L. Include technology transfer as a criterion for the registration of project activities

M. Revise criteria for accreditation of designated operational entities, especially financial criteria, to enhance the accreditation of designated operational entities based in non-Annex I Parties

II. Joint implementation

A. Ensure that approaches for land use, land-use change and forestry projects under joint implementation are in line with the treatment of land use, land-use change and forestry under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol[3]

B. Introduce approaches for land use, land-use change and forestry projects under joint implementation that are parallel to the treatment of clean development mechanism afforestation and reforestation project activities[4]

1. The procedures for the development of project design documents set out in appendix B of the annex to decision 5/CMP.1 shall apply mutatis mutandis to land use, land-use change and forestry project activities under joint implementation.

C. Introduce crediting on the basis of nationally appropriate mitigation actions

D. Introduce a different supervisory structure and institutional arrangement in case of modification of the scope of joint implementation

E. Change the composition of the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee membership to ensure equitable representation of Parties

F. Move the secretariat's function of supporting the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee to another organization

G. Introduce alternative institutional arrangements for determination and verification

H. Broaden the role of host Party governments

I. Differentiate the eligibility of Parties through the use of indicators

Note: Issues that may need to be addressed include carbon accounting and related concepts, including additionality, project boundaries and land eligibility.

J. Improve access to joint implementation projects by certain host Parties

K. Differentiate the treatment of types of projects by Party

---

[3] Discussion to be informed by outcomes from the consideration of non-permanence and other methodological issues.

[4] Discussion to be informed by outcomes from the consideration of non-permanence and other methodological issues.

L. Allocate proportions of demand to project types that contribute more to the sustainable development of host Parties

M. Allocate proportions of demand to specific groups of host Parties to enhance their sustainable development

N. Restrict joint implementation to bilateral projects

O. Introduce multiplication factors to increase or decrease the emission reduction units issued for specific project types

P. Use global temperature potentials instead of global warming potentials [5]

Q. Include technology transfer as a criterion for the final determination for projects

III. Emissions trading

A. Eliminate restrictions on the trading and use of certain Kyoto unit types under national and regional emissions trading schemes

B. Enhance equivalence among Kyoto unit types

C. Reduce the commitment period reserve

2. Each Annex I Party shall maintain, in its national registry, a commitment period reserve (CPR) which should not drop below the lower of either:

(a) [x] per cent of the Party's assigned amount calculated pursuant to Article 3, paragraphs 7 and 8, of the Kyoto Protocol;

(b) The sum of the reviewed inventories reported thus far in that commitment period plus the most recently reviewed inventory multiplied by the number of years remaining in that commitment period.

Note: Further issues that may need to be addressed include the operation of the CPR during the transition between commitment periods.

D. Increase the commitment period reserve

E. Encourage disclosure of information on transactions of Kyoto units

F. Move the secretariat's function of maintaining and operating the international transaction log to another organization

---

[5] Global warming potentials are being considered by the AWG-KP under its work on greenhouse gases, sectors and source categories.

IV. Cross-cutting issues

A. Reduce the number of unit types under the Kyoto Protocol

B. Introduce a mid-commitment-period assessment and review process

3. The Parties to the Kyoto Protocol shall undertake an assessment and review of efforts made to meet quantified emission limitation and reduction commitments agreed for the second commitment period in order to assess progress and determine whether additional measures are needed, based on best available scientific assessment, to meet the ultimate objective of the Convention. This review shall be concluded no later than 31 December 2015 and shall enable a decision of the Parties specifying additional measures to be taken by Annex I Parties, which may include more stringent quantitative emission limitation and reduction commitments for adoption by the Parties.[6]

[6] The Party proposing this provision stated that it would be relevant in the case of commitment periods longer than five years.

Annex V

[ENGLISH ONLY]

Options and proposals on how to address definitions, modalities, rules and guidelines for the treatment of land use, land use change and forestry

Note: The proposals are at different level of development (from concrete textual proposals in bold to conceptual proposals in italics) for definitions, rules and modalities for land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF) using the present text of decision 16/CMP.1 for option 1 of document FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/INF.1, and could be further elaborated based on the submissions by Parties and the views expressed at the seventh session of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP).

Option 2 remains an explicit option and is noted at the end of the document, and could be further elaborated based on the submissions by Parties and the views expressed at the seventh session of the AWG-KP.

Option 1

A. Definitions

1. For land use, land-use change and forestry activities under Article 3,[1] paragraphs 3 and 4, the following definitions shall apply:

(a) "Forest" is a minimum area of land of 0.05–1.0 hectares with tree crown cover (or equivalent stocking level) of more than 10–30 per cent with trees with the potential to reach a minimum height of 2–5 metres at maturity *in situ*. A forest may consist either of closed forest formations where trees of various storeys and undergrowth cover a high proportion of the ground or open forest. Young natural stands and all plantations which have yet to reach a crown density of 10–30 per cent or tree height of 2–5 metres are included under forest, as are areas normally forming part of the forest area which are temporarily un-stocked as a result of human intervention such as harvesting or natural causes but which are expected to revert to forest;

(b) "Afforestation" is the direct human-induced conversion of land that has not been forested for a period of at least 50 years to forested land through planting, seeding and/or the human-induced promotion of natural seed sources;

(c) "Reforestation" is the direct human-induced conversion of non-forested land to forested land through planting, seeding and/or the human-induced promotion of natural seed sources, on land that was forested but that has been converted to non-forested land. For the first commitment period, reforestation activities will be limited to reforestation occurring on those lands that did not contain forest on 31 December 1989;

---

[1] "Article" in this annex refers to an Article of the Kyoto Protocol, unless otherwise specified.

(d) "Deforestation" is the direct human-induced conversion of forested land to non-forested land;

(e) "Re-vegetation" is a direct human-induced activity to increase carbon stocks on sites through the establishment of vegetation that covers a minimum area of 0.05 hectares and does not meet the definitions of afforestation and reforestation contained here;

[(e bis) Option 1 (insert): **"De-vegetation" is a human-induced loss of carbon stocks of vegetation that does not meet the definition of forests. It includes the loss of vegetation on land, whether covered by water or not, and shall includes areas of land or land covered by vegetation that is a minimum area of 0.05 hectares. De-vegetation includes both living and non-living biomass and includes aboveground and below ground biomass, including, *inter alia*, peat, swamp vegetation, shrubs, grasslands, sea grasses, mangroves, and sea weeds.**

Option 2: (*replace (e) above with*) **"Re-vegetation" is a direct human-induced activity to increase carbon stocks on sites through the establishment of vegetation that covers a minimum area of 0.05 hectares and does not meet the definitions of afforestation and reforestation above. If elected the activity includes accounting for direct human-induced activities that decreases carbon stocks on land which has been categorized as a re-vegetation area and does not met the definition of deforestation.]**

(f) "Forest management" is a system of practices for stewardship and use of forest land aimed at fulfilling relevant ecological (including biological diversity), economic and social functions of the forest in a sustainable manner. **[Human induced decrease in carbon stocks and/or increases in greenhouse gas emissions on forested land remaining forested land shall be included].**

(g) "Cropland management" is the system of practices on land on which agricultural crops are grown and on land that is set aside or temporarily not being used for crop production.

(h) "Grazing land management" is the system of practices on land used for livestock production aimed at manipulating the amount and type of vegetation and livestock produced.

[(h bis) Option 1: **"Wetland restoration" is a direct human-induced activity to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases and thus limiting carbon stock degradation by restoring degraded wetlands. If elected the activity include emissions of greenhouse gases and reduction of carbon stocks resulting from human-induced drainage of wetlands.]**

[(h ter) "Planted production forest" is a forest consisting of introduced species, which as at 1990 met all the following criteria: one or two species at plantation, even age class, and regular spacing. The "planted production forest" shall have been established by direct human-induced conversion of non-forest land to forest land by the planting and/or seeding provisions of an afforestation or reforestation activity;

(h qua) "Equivalent forest" means an area of forest that will achieve at least the same carbon stock over the same period as would have occurred had the area of harvested "planted production forest" been re-established;]

[(h quin) "Force majeure" means, for the purposes of this decision, an extraordinary event or circumstance that is beyond the control of Parties, and may include, wildfire,

severe pest outbreak, flooding, landslide, volcano, earthquake, or severe wind storm.

(h sex) "Time out" is a period of time where accounting for land has been suspended as a result of a force majeure.

(h sept) "Certified Sustainable Forest Management" is socially just and ecologically responsible management of forests that has been certified, and that such certification has been considered by Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) and subsequently approved by the Conference of Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP) and is based on the criteria provided for in this annex;

(h oct) "Harvested wood products" are carbon-based products derived from forests and include timber, wood, ply, chipboard, but do not include sawdust, cardboard, wood chips, paper or other short-lived wood based products. It does not include combustible products used as fuel, such as fuel wood or other fuel types such oils, hydrocarbons or alcohols derived from forest products.

(h nov) "Harvested wood product management" is the system of practices that result in the short term or long term storage of carbon stocks in harvested wood products within the country of origin of forests where the wood products were grown;

(h dec) "Importing harvested wood products" is the system of practices associated with importing harvested wood products from non Annex I Parties;

(h onc) "Non Annex I wood products" includes wood products originally grown in Parties not included in Annex I and shall include all carbon-based products derived from forests and shall include timber, wood, ply, chipboard, sawdust, cardboard, wood chips and paper. It shall include combustible products used as fuel, such as fuel wood or other fuel types such oils, hydrocarbons or alcohols derived from forest products.]

B. Article 3, paragraph 3

2. For the purposes of Article 3, paragraph 3, eligible activities are those direct human-induced afforestation, reforestation and/or deforestation activities that meet the requirements set forth in this annex and that started on or after 1 January 1990 and before 31 December of the last year of the commitment period.

3. For the purposes of determining the area of deforestation to come into the accounting system under Article 3, paragraph 3, each Party shall determine the forest area using the same spatial assessment unit as is used for the determination of afforestation and reforestation, but not larger than 1 hectare.

[3 bis In the case of "planted production forests" established before 1 January 1990 only, conversion of forested land to non-forest land shall be considered harvesting, and shall not be considered deforestation, where an "equivalent forest" is established elsewhere on non-forest land that would have qualified for afforestation or reforestation. "Equivalent forest" shall not be included in a Party's assessment of emissions and removals from afforestation and reforestation

activities and must be included in a Party's accounting of forest management under Article 3, paragraph 4, if elected.]

4. [Option 1: For the **second** commitment period, debits[2] resulting from harvesting during the second commitment period following afforestation and reforestation since 1990 shall not be greater than credits[3] accounted for on that unit of land.

Option 2: For the **second** commitment period, debits **arising from a unit of land, that was subject to afforestation and reforestation since 1990 and has not since been harvested, shall not be greater than credits accounted for in total on that unit of land**.

Option 3: *Delete the paragraph.*]

5. Each Party included in Annex I shall report, in accordance with Article 7, on how harvesting or forest disturbance that is followed by the re-establishment of a forest is distinguished from deforestation. This information will be subject to review in accordance with Article 8.

C. Article 3, paragraph 4

6. **[Prior to the start of the second commitment period]** a Party included in Annex I may choose to account for anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions by sources and removals by sinks resulting from any or all of the following human-induced activities, other than afforestation, reforestation, deforestation, **[and any activity under Article 3, paragraph 4 elected in the first commitment period** *(Note: if rules change substantially this may need to be reconsidered)***]**: **[**revegetation **[devegetation]]**, forest management, cropland management, grazing land management, **[wetland restoration]**.

[6 bis. All Parties included in Annex I shall account for anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions by sources and removals by sinks resulting from the activity under Article 3, paragraph 4 forest management in the second commitment period.] *(it implies deletion of forest management on paragraph 6 above)*

7. A Party included in Annex I wishing to account for activities under Article 3, paragraph 4, shall identify, in its report to enable the establishment of its assigned amount pursuant to Article 3, paragraph 7, and Article 3, paragraph 8, the activities under Article 3, paragraph 4, which it elects to include in its accounting for the **second** commitment period. Upon election, a decision by a Party will be fixed for the **second** commitment period.

8. During the **second** commitment period, a Party included in Annex I that selects any additional activity of the activities mentioned in paragraph 6 above **[, in addition to those already selected for the first commitment period,]** shall demonstrate that such activities have occurred since 1990 and are human-induced. A Party included in Annex I shall not account for emissions by sources and removals by sinks resulting from activities under Article 3, paragraph 4, if these are already accounted for under Article 3, paragraph 3.

---

[2] 'Debits': where emissions are larger than removals on a unit of land.

[3] 'Credits': where removals are larger than emissions on a unit of land.

9. For the **second** commitment period, accountable anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions by sources and removals by sinks resulting from re-vegetation**[, de-vegetation]**, cropland management, grazing land management, **[wetland restoration]** under Article 3, paragraph 4, shall be equal to anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions by sources and removals by sinks in the commitment period, less **[five][X]** times the anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions by sources and removals by sinks resulting from these eligible activities in the base year of that Party, while avoiding double accounting.

[9 bis. If a Party was a net sink in the base year for the elected activity of cropland management, grazing land management or re-vegetation, and it provides information that demonstrates that there is no net soil carbon stock change on land subject to the activity because the soil carbon has reached saturation, then the Party would report zero in its accounting. The Party would need to provide the information in its national inventory report. The information would be subject to expert review.]

10. **[**Option 1: For the **second** commitment period, a Party included in Annex I that incurs a net source of emissions under the provisions of Article 3, paragraph 3, may account for anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions by sources and removals by sinks in areas under forest management under Article 3, paragraph 4, up to a level that is equal to the net source of emissions under the provisions of Article 3, paragraph 3, but not greater than 9.0 megatons of carbon times five, if the total anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions by sources and removals by sinks in the managed forest since 1990 is equal to, or larger than, the net source of emissions incurred under Article 3, paragraph 3.

Option 2: *Delete the paragraph***]**

11. For the **second** commitment period **[**only**]**, additions to and subtractions from the assigned amount of a Party[4] resulting from forest management under Article 3, paragraph 4, **[**after the application of paragraph 10 above**]** and resulting from forest management project activities undertaken under Article 6, shall:

[Option 1: not exceed the value inscribed in the appendix **[**[5]**]** below, times **[**five**][x]**.

Option 2: **be subject to the application of a [Y] discount factor [as inscribed in the appendix below].**

Option 3: **be subject to the application of a bar as inscribed in the appendix below.** *The bar could be established considering:*

---

[4] In accordance with decision -/CMP.X (*Modalities for the accounting of assigned amounts*).

[5] [In arriving at the values in the appendix below, the Conference of the Parties was guided by the application of an 85 per cent discount factor to account for the removals identified in paragraph 1 (h) of decision 16/CMP.1 (*Land use, land-use change and forestry*) and a 3 per cent cap on forest management, using a combination of data provided by Parties and by the Food an Agriculture Organization.
Consideration was also given to national circumstances (including the degree of effort needed to meet Kyoto commitments and the forest management measures implemented). The accounting framework established in this paragraph shall not be construed as establishing any precedent for the second and subsequent commitment periods]

(a) Agreed levels could be set by using the average removals or emissions from forest management for agreed historical base year or period. Otherwise countries could propose an alternative removals or emissions level in the submission mentioned below and provide relevant elements in support.

(b) An alternative level could apply where national circumstances, particularly the legacy effects of age structure, lead to a declining sink in projected emissions even if the presence of sustainable forest management.

(c) Continuity of the provision for accounting in the first commitment period.

Option 4: *Accounting for forest management using a forward looking baseline. The elements that would need to be reflected in a legal text to implement the proposal are the following:*

(a) Accounting for forest management is defined as being based on estimated forest management emissions and removals in the commitment period less the forest management reference level emissions and removals for the commitment period (the forward-looking business-as-usual baseline).

(b) A Party that has elected to account for forest management would determine the forest management reference level emissions and removals considering current forest inventory information, actions already taken to reduce emissions and increase removals, historical data and forest management activities, business-as-usual forest management plans, and the relationship between historical and planned activity. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) could be asked to provide guidance in relation to methodological issues for establishment of the reference level.

(c) The Party would report a description and justification of the reference level and the information used to establish it. The reference level and the information would be subject to expert review. The mechanism and timing of the reporting and review, which would be prior to 2013, would need to be established.

(d) A Party could decide to exclude emissions and subsequent removals resulting from natural disturbance events from its estimate of forest management emissions and removals in the commitment period.

*(e) A Party that decided to exclude the emissions and removals resulting from natural disturbances would need to provide information on the natural disturbances in its national inventory report. This would include a demonstration that the natural disturbance events and the associated emissions and removals are non-anthropogenic and not direct human-induced. The information provided would be subject to review***]**

Note: The appendix to decision 16/CMP.1 would be revised/deleted in accordance with the provisions above for the accounting of forest management under Article 3, paragraph 4.

12. **[**A Party may request the Conference of the Parties (COP) to reconsider its numerical values as contained in paragraph 10 and in the appendix to paragraph 11, with a view to the COP recommending a decision for adoption by the CMP, no later than 2 years prior to the beginning of the first commitment period. Such a reconsideration shall be based upon country-specific data and the elements of guidance and consideration in footnote 4 to paragraph 11. These shall be submitted and reviewed in accordance with relevant decisions related to Articles 5, 7 and 8 of the Kyoto Protocol, and in accordance with the *Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*, any future elaboration of these guidelines, or parts of them, and any good practice guidance on LULUCF in accordance with the relevant decisions of the COP.**]***(consider deletion, due to specific need for the first commitment period)*

D. Article 12

Note: Further discussion on how to address non-permanence is need. Proposals under consideration are reflected in FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/INF.2.

13. The eligibility of LULUCF project activities under Article 12 is

[Option 1: limited to afforestation and reforestation.

Option 2: *Expand the list of activities (to be decided after)***]**

13 bis. [For afforestation and reforestation project activities to be eligible under Article 12 the land must be non forested in 1990 and remain non forested until the start of the second commitment period. Land that did not contain forest on 31 December 1989 and which has subsequently been allowed to re-vegetate or reforest prior to the start of the second commitment period and subsequently de-vegetated or deforested prior to the second commitment period shall not be eligible under Article 12.]

13 ter Land that was natural grassland or shrubland in 1990 shall not be eligible under Article 12.]

14. For the **second** commitment period, the total of additions to a Party's assigned amount resulting from eligible LULUCF project activities under Article 12 shall not exceed one per cent of base year emissions of that Party, times **[**five**][X]**.

15. **[**The treatment of LULUCF project activities under Article 12 in future commitment periods shall be decided as part of the negotiations on the **third** commitment period.**]** *(this paragraph could be further amended, proposal for 15 bis is related)*

[15 bis Accounting for afforestation and reforestation project activities under Article 12 as described in decision 19/CP.9 shall apply, *mutatis mutandis*, for the second and subsequent commitment periods.]

E. General

16. Each Party included in Annex I shall, for the purposes of applying the definition of "forest" as contained in paragraph 1(a) above, select a single minimum tree crown cover value between 10 and 30 per cent, a single minimum land area value between 0.05 and 1 hectare and a single minimum tree height value between 2 and 5 metres. The selection of a Party shall be fixed for the duration of the **second** commitment period. The selection shall be included as an integral part of its report to enable the calculation of its assigned amount pursuant to Article 3, paragraphs 7 and 8, in accordance with decision **19/CP.7**, and shall include the values for tree crown cover, tree height and the minimum land area. Each Party shall justify in its reporting that such values are consistent with the information that has historically been reported to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations or other international bodies, and if they differ, explain why and how such values were chosen.

17. For the **second** commitment period, and subject to other provisions in this annex, the additions to and subtractions from the assigned amount of a Party pursuant to Article 3, paragraphs 7 and 8, shall be equal to anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions by sources and removals by sinks measured as verifiable changes in carbon stocks, and non-carbon dioxide greenhouse gas emissions during the period **[1 January 2013 to] [31 December [YY]]** resulting from afforestation, reforestation and deforestation under Article 3, paragraph 3, and forest management under Article 3, paragraph 4, that have taken place since 1 January 1990. Where the result of this calculation is a net sink of greenhouse gases, this value shall be added to the assigned amount of that Party. Where the result of this calculation is a net source of greenhouse gas emissions, this value shall be subtracted from the assigned amount of that Party.

18. Accounting of anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions by sources and removals by sinks resulting from LULUCF activities under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, shall begin with the onset of the activity or the beginning of the commitment period, whichever comes later.

19. Once land is accounted for under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, all anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions by sources from and removals by sinks on this land must be accounted for throughout subsequent and contiguous commitment periods.

20. National inventory systems under Article 5, paragraph 1, shall ensure that **[information on the]** areas of land subject to LULUCF activities under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4 **[**are identifiable, and information about these areas**]** should be provided by each Party included in Annex I in their national inventories in accordance with Article 7. Such information will be reviewed in accordance with Article 8.

21. Each Party included in Annex I shall account for all changes in the following carbon pools: above-ground biomass, below-ground biomass, litter, dead wood, and soil organic carbon. A Party may choose not to account for a given pool in a commitment period, if transparent and verifiable information is provided that the pool is not a source.

With regards to adjusting for natural disturbances

21 bis [Option 1: *Removing natural disturbance impacts is optional, the information that needs to be provided about natural disturbance events, and the need for information demonstrating that the emissions and removals are non-anthropogenic and not direct human-induced. The following issues [could be][should be] considered in developing further the modalities:*

(i) A Party would have the option of excluding the impact of natural disturbances from its accounting. Text would be needed on how emissions and subsequent removals resulting from natural disturbances would be removed from the accounting.

(ii) Principles will be needed to guide Parties in reporting on emissions and subsequent removals resulting from natural disturbance events on Article 3, paragraph 3, or Article 3, paragraph 4, lands. This may include provision of information on the natural disturbances in its national inventory report including a demonstration that the natural disturbance events and the associated emissions and removals are non-anthropogenic and not direct human-induced. This may include, inter alia:

(a) Information that identifies the location, cause and scale of impact of the natural disturbance events.

(b) Information that demonstrates that no land-use change has followed the natural disturbance events.

(c) Information on the emissions and removals that would be excluded.

(d) Information that demonstrates that the excluded emissions and removals are non-anthropogenic.

(e) Information on the carbon stocks prior to the natural disturbance events

(f) Information on the monitoring and the recovery of the carbon stocks following the natural disturbance event.

(iii) The information provided would be subject to review. Guidance would need to be provided to support the review process.

(iv) Parties' may consider formulating a request to the IPCC to assist in defining methodological approaches related to how natural disturbance emissions and removals are excluded, and related to demonstrating that the natural disturbance events and the associated emissions and removals are non-anthropogenic and not direct human-induced. This would include methodological approaches already tabled.

Option 2: **A Party included in Annex I may choose to carry-over to the next commitment period(s) the non-anthropogenic emissions resulting from natural disturbances.**

Option 3: **A Party included in Annex I that has elected to account for any or all elected activities under Article 3, paragraph 4 and which has suffered a 'force majeure' during the second commitment period or subsequent commitment periods, may seek approval from the CMP to seek a time out and hence eliminate such land from the accounting system for a period of time until the carbon stocks on the explicitly geo-referenced land are returned to the state prior to the 'force majeure'.**

(bis) In making a decision whether to approve a time out for a Party, the CMP shall take into consideration the following aspects: whether the force majeure fits the definition as prescribed in this decision; how the 'force majeure' was not human induced; whether the Party can provide verifiable geo-referenced information on the land subject to the force majeure; whether the Party can provide a verifiable estimate of the carbon stocks on the affected land immediately prior to the force majeure; whether the Party has provided an estimate of the time for the time out; and whether the Party is able to maintain an ongoing inventory and assessment of the recovery of carbon stocks until the end of the time out period.

(ter) Once land has been timed out it shall continue to be reported and accounted for during and beyond the second commitment period until such time as the land has recovered the carbon stocks to the state prior to the 'force majeure'.]

With regards to harvested wood products

21 ter. [Option 1: **Carbon removed in wood and other biomass from forests accounted for under the Kyoto Protocol under Articles 3, 6 and 12, shall be accounted for on the basis of default instantaneous oxidation or on the basis of estimates as to when emissions occur provided verifiable data are available. Such carbon, including carbon in exported wood, may be transferred to a harvested wood products pool to be accounted for by the Party producing the wood.**

Option 2: **A Party included in Annex I shall account for importing of harvested wood products that have originated from a non Annex I Party in a manner prescribed in paragraphs below.**

(bis) A Party included in Annex I may chose to account for the use harvested wood products for harvested wood products derived from forests subject to reforestation activities since 1 January 1990 in that Party and which have subsequently been subject to forest biomass decline activities during the commitment period.

(ter) A Party included in Annex I may also chose to account for the use of harvested wood products for such products derived from elected forest management activities elected in the first commitment period or elected forest management activities in the second commitment period.

(qua) Notwithstanding the provisions included in paragraph x below, imported harvested wood products from another country shall not enter the accounting system.

(quin) The calculation of carbon stock changes for the purposes of accounting for harvested wood products, if so elected, on land that is to be accounted for under either, reforested land or elected forest management land shall be based on the total increment of carbon stock growth in the eligible forest minus any changes in soil carbon, *minus* carbon stocks left over from timber harvest activities, *minus* carbon stocks from any wood residues from wood mills *minus* carbon stocks from wood products used for the purposes of paper, wood chips or other short-lived wood products, *minus* a carbon release estimate of harvested wood products produced and then destroyed during the commitment period *times* a conversion factor from carbon to carbon dioxide equivalent.

(sex) Harvested wood products derived from deforestation shall be accounted for on the basis that all carbon biomass deforested is considered to have oxidized in the year when the deforestation took place and shall been accounted for as an emission. All other biomass emissions, such as loss of soil carbon, human induced fires etc., associated with the deforestation activity, shall be accounted for as an emission.

(sept) Once a harvested wood product leaves the country of the Party included in Annex I where the forest product was originally grown, the carbon stocks included in such a product shall be accounted for as an emission.

Option 3: *Include on a voluntary bases the harvest wood pool carbon stock changes from forests accounted for under the Kyoto Protocol, otherwise apply present provisions.* **]**

[21 qua. *Insert a provision to limit the use of the LULUCF sector for compliance with Annex I commitment.***]**

Note: The appendix to decision 16/CMP.1 would be revised/deleted in accordance with the provisions in paragraph 11 above for the accounting of forest management under Article 3, paragraph 4.

Note: The reporting and review guidelines need to be reviewed in accordance with the options chosen.

Note: Depending of the degree of detail on some proposals, it may be possible that SBSTA will need to be requested to develop further modalities, for example in the case of harvest wood products. This may include further consideration of the construct of "managed lands" as appears in 2003 IPCC GPG in light of the May 2009 IPCC workshop entitled "Revisiting the use of Managed Land as a Proxy for Anthropogenic Emissions and Removals".

Option 2

Option 2 is included in document FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/INF.1.

Annex VI

[ENGLISH ONLY]

Text on potential consequences for further consideration by the Ad Hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol at its eighth session

1. [The Ad Hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP) noted that further work on this issue should build on the relevant decisions of the Conference of the Parties and of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP), and work underway in other bodies and processes under the Convention and its Kyoto Protocol, with the view to maintain a coherent [and consistent] approach[, avoiding duplication,] with other work in the UNFCCC process, including through the possible use of joint groups.]

2. [Parties noted that work on this issue should be consolidated into a single stream with a view to avoiding duplication and maintaining a coherent approach with other work in the UNFCCC process].

3. The AWG-KP reiterated that its work on potential consequences should be guided and informed by [Article 4, paragraphs 8, 9 and 10, of the Convention,] Article 2, paragraph 3, and Article 3, paragraph 14, of the Kyoto Protocol, and by the best available scientific, social, environmental and economic information, [and be based on evidence of actual impacts and consequences] [and be based on negative consequences that developing country Parties are facing and/or will face].

4. [In noting that there could be both negative and positive potential consequences, the AWG-KP also recognized the need to broaden its understanding of aspects related to them.]

5. [The AWG-KP noted the complexity of this issue, including in the assessment of the consequences of tools, policies, measures and methodologies available to Annex I Parties. It further noted that there are difficulties in anticipating, attributing and quantifying potential consequences owing to the many economic and social factors and diverse policy objectives involved. It also noted that the potential consequences depend on the institutional capacity and regulatory framework in non-Annex I countries].

The AWG-KP [noted that there are both positive and negative consequences and] agreed that its work on this issue should focus on [minimizing negative potential consequences.] [deepening Parties understanding of potential consequences.]

It recognized that although potential negative consequences present challenges for all Parties, they will be most severe for:
Option 1: The most vulnerable and poorest developing country Parties[, that are least capable to address them].
Option 2: Developing countries, in particular the most vulnerable.
Option 3: Developing country Parties, particularly least developed countries (LDC's), Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS) and African countries.
Option 4: The most vulnerable and poorest developing country Parties, also taking into account the potential benefits of response measures.
Option 5: All developing country Parties and, in particular, for the most vulnerable and poorest developing country Parties.

Option 6: Developing country Parties, in particular for the poorest and most vulnerable developing country Parties.
Option 7: All Parties, especially developing country Parties, they will be most severe for the poorest and most vulnerable developing country Parties, who are the least capable to address them.
Option 8: Use what is in Article 2, paragraph 3, and Article 3, paragraph 14, of the Kyoto Protocol 'impact on developing country Parties', in particular those identified in Article 4, paragraphs 8 and 9 of the Convention.
Option 9: The AWG-KP recognized that the level of impact of potential consequences will vary among Parties and that attention should be given to the negative consequences on developing countries.

6.
First sentence
Option 1: The AWG-KP underlined the need for Annex I Parties to design policies and measures carefully, in order to minimize the negative potential consequences of mitigation actions as well as to [maximize][consider] positive potential consequences, taking into account possible interactions between different policies and measures.
Option 2: The AWG-KP underlined that there are both positive and negative consequences and that these should be carefully taken into account in the design of policies and measures.
Option 3: The AWG-KP underlined that Annex I Parties should [strive to] design policies and measures carefully, in order to [strive to] minimize negative potential consequences of mitigation actions as well as to maximize positive potential consequences, taking into account possible interactions between different policies and measures.
Option 4: The AWG-KP underlined the need for Annex I Parties to design policies and measures carefully, in order to minimize the negative potential consequences of mitigation actions. The AWG-KP also emphasized that these policies and measures should also maximize positive potential consequences.
Option 5: The AWG-KP underlined that there are both positive and negative consequences, and that Annex I Parties should strive to minimize negative consequences of design of policies and measures.

Second sentence
[*Option* 1: The AWG-KP noted that there is a need to develop guidelines to assist Annex I Parties in their assessment of potential consequences and agreed to further examine the possible development of such guidelines at its eighth session.
Option 2: The AWG-KP agreed to develop guidelines to assist Annex I Parties in their assessment of potential consequences and agreed to further examine possible elements of these guidelines at its eighth session.]
The AWG-KP further noted that [for the work mentioned in paragraph 5 above]
[Parties could take into consideration that actions to address][Parties' consideration of information on] potential consequences would need:

(a) To complement and support efforts to mitigate climate change;

(b) To benefit from experiences of Parties and lessons learned;

(c) To [be based on] [flow from] national policies and measures; {needs elaboration}

(d) To [balance the consideration of] [consider both] negative and positive potential consequences;

{needs elaboration}

(e) To [focus on] [take into account]

Option 1: The special circumstances of the poorest and most vulnerable developing country Parties [that are least capable to address potential consequences.]

Option 2: The special circumstances of developing countries, in particular the most vulnerable developing country Parties
Option 3: The national circumstances of developing country Parties, particularly LDCs, AOSIS and African countries.

7. [The AWG-KP noted that one way [for Parties] to facilitate the design and selection of mitigation actions [by Annex I Parties] is to identify potential consequences associated with specific tools, policies and measures
Option 1: That are considered or implemented by Annex I Parties and then to develop ways and means, including impact assessments, to minimize these consequences [on non Annex I Parties] [on all Parties]
Option 2: Including by the use of impact assessments]

8.
Option 1: The AWG-KP noted that there are difficulties in quantifying potential consequences owing to the many economic and social factors involved. In this regard it noted the need to deepen the understanding of potential consequences, giving priority to negative consequences on [the poorest] developing countries. [This could be achieved through various mechanisms, including regional assessments; a global assessment to be carried out by an international organization (such as the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change); and the regular and systematic provision by all Parties of information that is as complete as possible (including in national communications).]
Option 2: The AWG-KP noted that there is a need to improve the availability of evidence of actual impacts. This could be achieved through various [mechanisms] [means], including the regular and systematic provision by all Parties of information that is as complete as possible, [in particular] [including] through national communications and the regular review of this information.
Option 3: The AWG-KP noted that there is a need to deepen the understanding of potential consequences, giving priority to negative consequences on developing countries. This could be achieved through various mechanisms, including regional assessments; a global assessment to be carried out by a relevant international organization; and the regular and systematic provision by all Parties of information that is as complete as possible (including in national communications of Annex I Parties). The AWG-KP noted the need for [a channel] [an expeditious mechanism] through which non-Annex I Parties could report impacts and consequences from the policies and measures of Annex I Parties on non-Annex I Parties [and the need to establish a common space where this exchange of views can take place continuously].

(This sentence provides alternative text regarding provision of information by Parties and could be part of the options above): [Parties agreed on the need for impacted Parties to provide more information on potential consequences, to be supplied through national communications and other relevant documents.]

9. [The AWG-KP noted that according to Article 2, paragraph 3, of the Kyoto Protocol the CMP may take further action to promote the implementation of the commitments of Annex I Parties to minimize adverse social, environmental and economic impacts on other Parties of policies and measures implemented in accordance with Article 3.

10. The AWG-KP also noted that according to decision 27/CMP.1 the Compliance Committee shall receive questions of implementation submitted by any Party with respect to itself or any Party with respect to other Parties (decision 27/CMP.1, section VI of the annex, para. 1 (a) and (b)).

11. The AWG-KP further noted that the Facilitative Branch shall be responsible for promoting compliance by Parties with their commitments under the Protocol, taking into account their common but differentiated responsibilities, and respective capacities (decision 27/CMP.1, section IV of the annex, para. 4).

12. The AWG-KP noted that one way to facilitate compliance of Annex I Parties with commitments under Article 2, paragraph 3, is through the submission by affected Parties to the Facilitative Branch of the Compliance Committee of possible questions of implementation of response measures.]

13. [The AWG-KP recognized that cooperation among Parties on the further development [and application] of technologies could assist [in minimizing negative] [with regard to] potential consequences. [It also noted the need for technology [cooperation] [and transfer to developing countries] and enhancement of capacities of, developing countries [as well as finance and risk management tools] to assist them to assess and deal with potential consequences]].

Annex VII

Documents before the Ad Hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol on its seventh session

Documents prepared for the session

FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/1	Provisional agenda and annotations. Note by the Executive Secretary
FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/2	Scenario note on the seventh session. Note by the Chair
FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/3	Possible elements for amendments to the Kyoto Protocol, pursuant to its Article 3, paragraph 9. Note by the Chair
FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/4	Possible elements of a text relating to issues outlined in document FCCC/KP/AWG/2008/8, paragraph 49. Note by the Chair
FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/INF.1	Elaboration on how to address, where applicable, the definitions, modalities, rules and guidelines for the treatment of land use, land-use change and forestry. Note by the Chair
FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/INF.2	Further elaboration of possible improvements to emissions trading and the project-based mechanisms under the Kyoto Protocol. Note by the Chair
FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/INF.3	Information note to facilitate deliberations on potential environmental, economic and social consequences, including spillover effects, of implementing tools, policies, measures and methodologies available to Annex I Parties, taking into account the submissions and views contained in documents FCCC/KP/AWG/2008/MISC.5, FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/MISC.4 and other relevant documents. Note by the secretariat
FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/MISC.1 and Add.1 and 2	Consideration of the scale of emission reductions to be achieved by Annex I Parties in aggregate of the contribution of Annex I Parties individually or jointly, consistent with Article 4 of the Kyoto Protocol, to the scale of emission reductions to be achieved by Annex I Parties in aggregate, and of other relevant issues arising from the implementation of the work programme of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol as contained in document FCCC/KP/AWG/2008/8, paragraph 49 (c). Submissions from Parties
FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/MISC.2	Views on issues arising from the implementation of the work programme of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol, as contained in document FCCC/KP/AWG/2008/8,

	paragraph 49 (c), that are not covered in document FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/MISC.1. Submissions from Parties
FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/MISC.3 and Add.1 and 2	Further input on how the possible improvements to emissions trading and the project-based mechanisms, as contained in annexes I and II to document FCCC/KP/AWG/2008/5 and annexes I and II to document FCCC/KP/AWG/2008/INF.3, would function. Submissions from Parties
FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/MISC.4	Information on potential environmental, economic and social consequences, including spillover effects, of tools, policies, measures and methodologies available to Annex I Parties. Submissions from Parties
FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/MISC.5, Add.1 and Corr.1	Further elaboration of the options, elements and issues contained in annex IV to document FCCC/KP/AWG/2008/3 and annex III to document FCCC/KP/AWG/2008/5, including on which proposals could address cross-cutting issues, and how. Submissions from Parties
FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/MISC.6 and Add.1 and 2	Views on the legal implications arising from the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol pursuant to Article 3, paragraph 9, of the Kyoto Protocol. Submissions from Parties
FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/L.1	Draft report of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol on its seventh session
FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/L.2	Emissions trading and the project-based mechanisms. Draft conclusions proposed by the Chair
FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/L.3	Land use, land-use change and forestry. Draft conclusions proposed by the Chair
FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/L.4	Consideration of information on potential environmental, economic and social consequences, including spillover effects, of tools, policies, measures and methodologies available to Annex I Parties. Draft conclusions proposed by the Chair
FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/L.5	Legal matters. Draft conclusions proposed by the Chair
FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/L.6	Scale of emission reductions by Annex I Parties Draft conclusions proposed by the Chair
FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/L.7/Rev.1	Coverage of greenhouse gases, sectors and source categories, common metrics, possible approaches for targeting sectoral emissions and other issues considered under agenda item 5. Revised draft conclusions proposed by the Chair
FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/L.8	Other matters. Draft conclusions proposed by the Chair

FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/CRP.1	Workshop on issues relating to the scale of emission reductions to be achieved by Annex I Parties. Report by the chair of the workshop
FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/CRP.2	Workshop on potential environmental, economic and social consequences, including spillover effects, of tools, policies, measures and methodologies available to Annex I Parties. Report by the chair of the workshop
FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/CRP.3	Amendment to the Kyoto Protocol pursuant to its Article 3, paragraph 9. Proposal by South Africa

Other documents before the session

FCCC/KP/AWG/2008/3	Report of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol on its resumed fifth session, held in Bonn from 2 to 12 June 2008
FCCC/KP/AWG/2008/5	Report of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol on the first part of its sixth session, held in Accra from 21 to 27 August 2008
FCCC/KP/AWG/2008/8	Report of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol on its resumed sixth session, held in Poznan from 1 to 10 December 2008

- - - - -