Организация Объединенных Наций FCCC/SB/2014/L.2

Рамочная Конвенция об изменении климата

Distr.: Limited
14 June 2014
Russian
Original: English

Вспомогательный орган для консультирования по научным и техническим аспектам
Сороковая сессия
Бонн, 4–15 июня 2014 года

Пункт 10 a) повестки дня
Воздействие осуществления мер реагирования
Форум и программа работы

Вспомогательный орган по осуществлению
Сороковая сессия
Бонн, 4–15 июня 2014 года

Пункт 15 a) повестки дня
Воздействие осуществления мер реагирования
Форум и программа работы

Форум и программа работы по воздействию осуществления мер реагирования

Проект выводов, предложенный Председателем

1. Вспомогательный орган для консультирования по научным и техническим аспектам (ВОКНТА) и Вспомогательный орган по осуществлению (ВОО) положительно оценили доклад[1] состоявшемуся в ходе форума рабочему совещанию по области b)[2] программы работы по воздействию осуществления мер реагирования.

2. ВОКНТА и ВОО отметили, что было получено большое число представлений Сторон, посвященных обзору работы форума по воздействию осуществления мер реагирования в соответствии с пунктом 5 решения 8/CP.17, и в качестве итогового документа данного обзора была подготовлена компиляция этих представлений[3].

[1] FCCC/SB/2014/INF.1.
[2] Сотрудничество по стратегиям реагирования.
[3] Компиляция мнений по обзору содержится в приложении I.

3. ВОКНТА и ВОО приветствовали конструктивные дискуссии и переговоры, состоявшиеся между Сторонами в рамках форума в ходе ВОКНТА 40 и ВОО 40. Они призвали Стороны продолжить данную плодотворную деятельность с целью активизации их работы по воздействию осуществления мер реагирования согласно Конвенции.

4. ВОКНТА и ВОО предложили Сторонам, экспертам, практикам и соответствующим организациям представить в секретариат к 22 сентября 2014 года свои мнения по вариантам расширения возможностей сотрудничества и взаимодействия между Сторонами в связи с данным подпунктом повестки дня и поручили секретариату подготовить при условии наличия финансовых ресурсов технический документ по точкам соприкосновения, касающимся областей сотрудничества, а также обобщающий документ, опирающийся одновременно на доклады о работе форума[4], представления, презентации и сделанные заявления, а также обзор работы форума, для рассмотрения на ВОКНТА 41 и ВОО 41 (декабрь 2014 года), не предвосхищая рассмотрение Конференцией Сторон (КС), о котором говорится ниже в пункте 5.

5. ВОКНТА и ВОО приняли к сведению представления Сторон в отношении предложений, касающихся проекта решения по продвижению работы[5], и постановили препроводить их для рассмотрения на ВОКНТА 41 и ВОО 41 с целью вынесения рекомендаций для рассмотрения на КС 20 (декабрь 2014 года).

6. ВОКНТА и ВОО также приняли к сведению сметные бюджетные последствия деятельности, которая должна быть осуществлена секретариатом согласно вышеприведенному пункту 4. Они просили, чтобы предусматриваемые в настоящих выводах действия секретариата осуществлялись при условии наличия финансовых ресурсов.

[4] FCCC/SB/2013/INF.2, FCCC/SB/2013/INF.3, FCCC/SB/2013/INF.4, FCCC/SB/2013/INF.8, FCCC/SB/2013/INF.9, FCCC/SB/2013/INF.10 и FCCC/SB/2013/INF.11.

[5] Представления содержатся в приложении II.

Annex I

[English only]

Review of the work of the forum on the impact of the implementation of response measures

Submission by the European Union

The EU welcomes the opportunity to submit its assessment of the work of the forum on the impacts of the implementation of response measures (RM), including recommendations on the way forward.

1. Assessment of the work of the forum

Our overall assessment of the work of the forum is that some aspects worked well, while other aspects could be improved upon.

What worked well:

- Moving from the procedural discussions to more substantive discussions.
- Having as single platform for all discussions and negotiations on the issue.
- Open exchanges that included experts, observer organisations and civil society.
- Presentations by experts and observer organisations, which highlighted both positive and negative impacts, including co-benefits, and provided many new insights.

What didn't work well and could be improved upon:

- Number of submissions was very low, with only 3 or 4 Parties contributing between sessions.
- Sharing of information was somewhat limited, in part due to a lack of concrete information, e.g. of impacts actually experienced and how the information provided by developed country Parties is being used by developing country Parties.
- There was a significant overlap in content between several of the items of the work programme. This led to repetitions.
- Some of the elements of the work programme were not sufficiently clear and therefore discussions at times provided little insight on the issue.
- Discussions at forum sessions during COPs, given the many other things going on, were somewhat rushed.
- Duplication with established international cooperation structures was also an issue. We learned that a lot of work is going on outside of the UNFCCC that covers many of the same issues discussed in the forum.

2. Recommendations

On the basis of the above assessment, we would like to recommend the following:

1) The question of an extension of the forum should be seen in the context of the work to be undertaken. A targeted work programme would enable us to bring the issue forward and allow Parties to engage in more in-depth exchanges on the issue, including on possible implementation;

2) With a targeted work programme in place, the forum should remain the single platform for discussions and negotiations of response measures under the Convention, hence avoiding duplication of efforts/exchanges.

3) We should streamline the areas of work, avoiding the overlap that was evident in the work programme as contained in decision 8/CP.17 and be more specific in the definition of the areas at the same time. Areas of work should be selected based on interests and concerns of all Parties, with a particular focus on interests and concerns of developing country Parties. They should focus on both positive and negative impacts.

4) To this end, we would suggest a more targeted work programme to focus on positive and negative impacts of response measures in the following three areas:

   a. Economic diversification, with a focus on:

      i. economic diversification in the context of low-emissions development including economic co-benefits;

      ii. development of the private sector in emerging economic segments in the economy, including creating an investment enabling environment;

      iii. development of sustainable industrial policy;

      iv. circular economy and resource demand management in the context of diversification of resources and resource scarcity;

   b. Promotion of just transition and decent work, with a focus on:

      i. development of employment policies in transition towards sustainable economy and promotion of decent work, incuding job creation through supporting private sector development;

      ii. education policy and measures in the context of economic transition and diversification;

   c. Food security, health and gender.

5) Given the success we have seen in bringing discussions under one roof, we think it would also be a good time to further streamline the agenda, replacing existing subitems with a single item “forum and work programme on the impacts of the implementation of response measures” under the agendas of SBI and SBSTA, respectively.

6) We should redouble our efforts to share substantive information and seek more interaction among Parties, including specific reinforcement of the role of experts in the respective fields.

7) The discussion should go more in depth (hence focussing on more technical aspects including how the respective concrete issues may be addressed) rather than broadening the spectrum of discussion with additional topics but staying on the surface of the problems.

8) We should avoid duplication by paying closer attention to what is happening elsewhere. To this end, we should invite to the appropriate workshops relevant international organisations with broad membership of both developed and developing countries such as ILO, WHO and WTO to regularly report to us on the state of their respective discussions and on respective activities.

9) We should meet once a year, during the June session of the SBs, similar to the Durban Forum on capacity building, as COPs are busy and discussions there tend to be rushed and procedural, not open and inquisitive.

Way forward

We look forward to constructive discussions and negotiations with Parties on the future of the forum and the work programme on the impact of the implementation of response measures, with a view to providing recommendations to the COP this year.

Submission by the G77 and China

The G77 and China reaffirms the need to explore ways to avoid and minimize negative economic and social consequences of response measures taken by developed countries on developing countries. This should be done in accordance with the principles and provisions of the Convention, in particular its articles 3.1, 3.4, 3.5., 4.1. g) and h) 4.3. 4.5, 4.7, 4.8, 4.9 and 4.10 of the Convention, and articles 2.3 and 3.14 of the Kyoto Protocol and in the broader context of the achievement of sustainable development in its economic, social and environmental dimensions, as well as well poverty eradication.

Based on the review of the work of the forum, the G77 and China notes the progress made in the forum, while recognizing that there are still implementation gaps to give full consideration to what actions are necessary under the Convention, including actions related to funding, insurance and the transfer of technology, to meet the specific needs and concerns of developing countries arising from the impact of the implementation of response measures. Moreover, developed countries are not fulfilling their obligations under the Convention and Kyoto Protocol in terms of minimizing the adverse effects of response measures on developing countries, particularly those under articles 4.8, and 4.9 under the Convention, and in line with relevant COP decisions. During the work programme of the forum, we had the opportunity to have a first exchange of general views, and the G77 and China made a lot of proposals in this regard that still merit attention and further discussion. Even if the forum has proved useful for exchange of experiences, it has been incapable of taking specific actions to address implementation gaps to avoid and minimize negative economic and social consequences of response measures.

The importance of this issue was proven by the great number of Parties that submitted their views, such as the G77 and China. The group engaged constructively in all the sessions of the forum, including through G77 and China presentations and statements in all the areas of the work program, supported by different G77 and China regional groupings and individual delegations. In addition to those presentations and statements, the reports of the workshops and expert meetings and discussions held during the forum[6] are also useful as a summary of the rich views and experiences presented by developing countries and were considered as part of the review.

Although there was participation from experts, civil society and international organizations, many of them were not focused sufficiently on specific needs of developing countries. Therefore, for future work there needs to be clear guidance and terms of reference in terms of invitation to organizations and experts whose work is related to the issue of economic and social consequences of response measures, in particular to the avoidance and minimization of adverse effects of response measures on developing countries.

In addition, considering the importance of the issue for all developing countries, there needs to be dedicated time to address the negative economic and social consequences of response measures on developing countries. Thus, the workstreams on the issue should continue to meet at least twice a year, in conjunction with Subsidiary Bodies and the COP.

[6] FCCC/SB/2013/INF.2, FCCC/SB/2013/INF.3, FCCC/SB/2013/INF.4, FCCC/SB/2013/INF.8, FCCC/SB/2013/INF.9, FCCC/SB/2013/INF.10, FCCC/SB/2013/INF.11, FCCC/SB/2013/MISC.2 and FCCC/SB/2013/MISC.4.

Finally, we would like to share our main proposals we made in each of the areas of the work programme, as part of the review of the work of the forum mandated by decision 8/CP. 17, review that was completed in Warsaw during the many sessions that were dedicated to the matter. In this way, the gaps of implementation identified on the basis of the review of the work of the forum by G77 & China are the following:

RESULTS OF THE REVIEW OF THE WORK OF THE AREAS OF THE WORK PROGRAM OF THE FORUM

AREA A: Sharing of information and expertise, including reporting and promoting understanding of positive and negative impacts of response measures

The G77 and China expressed that there is a lack of clear reporting guidelines. We showed that in the national communications of Annex I (AI) Parties, few of those Parties reported, and of those that reported, some reported purely domestic efforts as technology cooperation, and others only described their measures. Particularly, there is a lack of reporting guidelines for Annex I Parties on how they "…shall strive to implement policies and measures in such a way as to minimize adverse effects on developing country Parties…" (art.2.3 and 3.14 of the Kyoto Protocol –KP-).

Therefore, it is crucial to elaborate specific reporting guidelines for AI Parties on this issue.

AREA B: Cooperation on response strategies

The issue of economic and social consequences of response measures, and in particular, of cooperation strategies, has to be seen in the broader context of the achievement of sustainable development (in its economic, social and environmental dimensions) and poverty eradication, in accordance with nationally defined priorities

Cooperation on response strategies needs to be done in accordance with the principles and provisions of the UNFCCC, in particular preambular paragraphs 3, 17, 21, 22, and articles 3.1, 3.4, 3.5., 4.1. g) and h) 4.3. 4.5, 4.7, 4.8 of the Convention, and articles 2.3 and 3.14 of KP.

What actions could help to foster this cooperation on response strategies?

- Exchange of views, sharing information and expertise to inform policy choices of response measures taken by developed country Parties (and which ones would avoid and minimize economic and social consequences of response measures on developing countries)

- Facilitation of technical collaboration among Parties and experts on tools, including studies, modeling and methodologies, to assist developing country Parties in addressing economic and social consequences of response measures

- Cooperation of modeling teams among Parties, to seek consensus on methodology development and scenarios setting and for models to take into account the specific national economic and social conditions of developing countries

- Partnership with organizations in the research and assessment of developing countries' concerns and needs rising from the impacts of the implementation of response measures

- Cooperation under the Convention to enhance the reporting of Annex I countries of the impacts of their response measures on developing countries, and how they are minimizing the adverse effects on developing countries.

Finally, it is important to ensure capacity building for developing countries as well as to strengthen multilateralism, in opposition to unilateral measures that undermine the spirit of cooperation and dialogue.

AREA C: Assessment and analysis of impacts

There is a need to research and assess the economic and social impacts of response measures, including unilateral ones. In this context, there is a need for developed countries to undertake an assessment in the design and implementation of their response measures, including unilateral ones, on the economic and social consequences of those measures on developing countries, in order to strive to minimize these impacts on, inter alia, employment, income, economic growth rates, and living standards in developing countries.

The assessment should include

- if the measure is consistent with UNFCCC principles and provisions

- if there has been consultation to potentially affected developing country Parties and if their special conditions have been duly taken into account

- if the measure is based on scientific evidence

- if the measures has a legitimate objective, like combating climate change

- if the measure is the most effective means to achieve the objective of combating climate change and the less trade restrictive

- if there is a fulfillment of developed countries' obligations related to the provision of specific support to developing countries (transfer of technology, financial resources and capacity building)

- the assessment should be undertaken both in quantitative and qualitative terms and ex ante and ex post and take into account the specific national conditions of developing countries and their priorities, needs and circumstances

AREA D: Exchanging experience and discussion of opportunities for economic diversification and transformation

Economic transformation and diversification entail high adjustment costs for developing countries, as their economies are generally characterized by a low economic diversification. They have traditionally relied heavily on the production and exports of commodities whose production is particularly vulnerable to climate change.

Also, the costs of clean technologies remain prohibitive for those countries.

In consequence, this area is an opportunity to exchange views, experiences, lessons learned on national cases and for specific action for economic transformation and diversification in the context of nationally defined priorities, circumstances and needs.

Moreover, developed countries obligations' in terms of support of financial resources, transfer of technology and capacity building to developing countries need to be fulfilled in order to assist developing countries in that economic diversification.

AREA E: Economic Modeling and Socio-economic Trends

Economic modeling can provide accurate and objective assessment of the observed and potential economic and social consequences of response measures taken by developed country Parties on developing country Parties and it can produce quantitative assessment which will be complemented by qualitative assessment.

Modeling is useful to produce specific assessment on different sectors of the economy such as tourism, industry, agriculture, etc., and on consequences of response measures of developed country Parties` on, inter alia, trade, investment, income, employment, economic growth rates of developing countries.

Therefore, it is essential to elaborate models that reflect the circumstances and contexts of developing countries, by accommodating variables that capture the uniqueness of national characteristics, taking into account their social and socio-economic factors and specific national priorities, conditions and needs.

Activities that could be carried out:

- Dissemination of modeling tools

- Ensuring increased collaboration on modeling developments on an ongoing basis

- Identify vulnerable sectors and needs in terms of technology transfer and funding (related to for example, articles 4.3., 4.5, 4.7, and 4.8 of UNFCCC)

AREA F: The relevant aspects relating to the implementation of decisions 1/CP.10, 1/CP.13 and 1/CP.16 and Article 2, paragraph 3, and Article 3, paragraph 14, of the Kyoto Protocol

There are implementation gaps in relation to these articles and decisions, in order to address the specific needs and concerns of developing countries related to the impact of the implementation of response measures.

There is a need to focus on these gaps in the implementation in order to give full consideration to what actions are necessary under the Convention, including action related to funding, insurance and transfer of technology, to meet the specific needs and concerns of developing countries arising from the impact of the implementation of response measures.

Therefore, there is a need for a structured follow-up of the implementation gaps and concrete actions to ensure full implementation of, inter alia, the decisions mentioned in area F, that is,1/CP.10, 1/CP.13 and 1/CP.16 and Article 2, paragraph 3, and Article 3, paragraph 14, of the Kyoto Protocol. In addition, there is a need to ensure the

implementation of decisions 5/CP.7, 2/CP.17, 1/CP.18 and 31/CMP.1, and the relevant principles and provisions of the Convention, in particular its Articles 3, paragraphs 1 and 5, and 4, paragraphs 1(g) and (h), 8, 9 and 10,

AREA G: Just Transition of the workforce and the creation of decent work and quality jobs

What actions are needed?

- Minimize hardships for workers ensuring them the continuation of their employment and building capacities for their integration in the context of the structural transformation derived from action related to climate change.

- Development of mechanisms for a just transition and creation of decent work through a consultation process involving the relevant stakeholders.

AREA H: Building collective and individual learning towards a transition to a low greenhouse gas emitting society

Any transition needs to be understood in the broader context of the transition towards sustainable development and Parties` different national socio-economic contexts, specific conditions and unique circumstances. It has also to be consistent with the principles and provisions of the Convention, in particular the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities.

Moreover, any transition should take into account the overriding priorities of developing countries in terms of the achievement of economic and social development and poverty eradication.

What actions are needed?

- Capacity-building, transfer of technologies and financial resources for learning and for development of endogenous capacities in developing countries, in order for them to meet the agreed full incremental costs of implementing measures (relation to articles 4.3, 4.5 and 4.7 of the Convention)

- Exchange of experiences, information, knowledge-sharing and know-how, and of ensuring access to affordable technologies for developing countries for implementation of NAMAs and NAPAs.

- Assessment of the role of the protection of intellectual property rights (IPR) in terms of transfer of technology.

Based on the review of the work of the forum completed in Warsaw, we clearly note there is much work still to be done to meet the needs and concerns of developing countries in terms of negative economic and social consequences of response measures taken by developed countries on developing countries.

To sum up, on the basis of the review, it is clear there are gaps of implementation in terms of, inter alia, reporting by AI Parties on response measures; technical collaboration on modeling and methodologies; ways to strengthen multilateralism, in opposition to unilateral measures; assessment in the design and implementation of the response measures of developed countries of the economic and social consequences of those measures on developing countries, in order to strive to minimize adverse impacts; support to developing countries for economic diversification and in terms of transfer of technology, funding and capacity building; and the development of mechanisms for a just transition and creation of decent work .

Therefore, we propose the continuation of the forum, in terms of sharing experiences, information and lessons learned on areas to address the needs of developing countries, at the same time that there is a need for specific action through the establishment of a Mechanism for Enhanced Action on Response Measures under the COP. This Mechanism will facilitate implementation of enhanced action to address the negative social and economic consequences of response measures taken by developed country Parties on developing country Parties and to recommend specific actions, including in terms of support to developing countries, to avoid and minimize those consequences, and to deliver the functions as contained in the G77 and China submission.

Submission by the United States

The United States is pleased to submit its views on the Forum and work programme on the impact of the implementation of response measures and specifically on the United States' assessment of the Forum and the steps needed to complete the Parties' collective review of its work. The United States looks forward to a timely conclusion of the review after Parties have been able to exchange their views and have agreed on conclusions related to their review of the Forum.

At SB39, Parties were allowed only a brief discussion of their individual reviews of the Forum. During that initial discussion, Parties expressed significantly different views on the gaps and positive and negative aspects of the Forum, as well as ways to improve upon the structure and mode of work. The time provided did not allow Parties to fully discuss and come to agreement on a collective assessment. It is the view of the United States that, had Parties been given more time for a thorough and systematic review, they would have been able to reach agreement on a way forward on this issue in Warsaw. The United States hopes that Parties will be able to exchange views and come to agreement on their assessment in a timely manner in order to continue to make progress on this issue.

The United States thinks the Forum was a useful exercise; the dynamic of our discussions on this issue has improved over the past few years. The United States believes that the decision in Durban to be practical in how we addressed response measures, in particular by consolidating all discussions in one place, contributed to this improvement. The agenda items that are now being held in abeyance should be permanently closed in order to lock in this new dynamic.

Parties should conclude, as part of the review, what mode of work might best allow us to fulfill our mandate under this agenda item. We think that working under a joint agenda item of the Subsidiary Bodies, and operating in accordance with the procedures applicable to contact groups, has served us well, because it allows for us to move from workshops to discussions, and then on to negotiations, according to the agreed timeline established for our work in relevant COP decisions.

We should not, however, assume that a Forum is the best mode of work available to enhance our collective understanding of this issue. Other UNFCCC modes of work offer options that could fulfill the functions that Parties have requested as well. The United States believes that a dialogue process is a good model to consider as it could help us focus on the substance of the issue. The dialogue format promotes more presentations by issue experts and then allows for discussion among Parties. This would help us move away from repetitions of well-known country positions. The mode of work that Parties identify to continue our work should entail greater input from experts, relevant organizations, and practitioners, including from the private sector, and should focus on the presentation of case studies, concrete examples, and recommendations on best practices.

Whatever mode is chosen, our work on response measures should continue to be reviewed regularly, and Parties should not hesitate to make adjustments to improve

the effectiveness and efficiency of our work so that we can better achieve our objective of improving the understanding of the positive and negative impacts of the implementation of response measures, particularly with respect to maximizing the positive and minimizing the negative impacts of the implementation of response measures.

The consolidation of all discussions and negotiations on response measures in one place was the first step in allowing us to better focus on subjects that we all agree deserve our time and attention. Over the past two years, the Forum has discussed a wide range of topics, which allowed Parties to identify the issues that lend themselves to substantive, productive conversations. Going forward, however, we should narrow and more carefully select the issues we include in our program of work. We should place greater emphasis on issues related to the positive impacts of the implementation of response measures. We should also recognize that there have been areas of convergence and divergence in Forum discussions to date, and that future work will need to focus on areas of convergence in order to maximize the benefit of the Forum to all Parties. Doing so would mean addressing topics in which many Parties have expressed the need for more information, such as economic diversification, just transition, and health.

We should also reduce the number of topics we discuss at each meeting in order to better focus our attention. Each meeting should discuss a single issue, which will provide for a focused and in-depth presentation of facts, followed by a thorough discussion where all Parties can react and express areas of concern.

The United States believes that holding meetings in conjunction with the COP also significantly impedes our ability to focus. The extreme time pressure does not allow for productive, effective discussions. Going forward, the Dialogue should meet once a year, in conjunction with the intercessional meeting of the Subsidiary Bodies.

In addition to the above assessment and recommendations for future work, the United States would like to put forward suggestions for issues that could be included on a new joint work programme on the impact of the implementation of response measures under the Subsidiary Bodies.

1. Gender
    a. Positive impacts of climate change response measures on women and girls
    b. Gender-sensitive climate policies, with a particular focus on cleaner cookstoves
2. Economic diversification and transformation
    a. Case studies
    b. Multilateral and bilateral assistance
    c. Best practices
    d. Benefits to workers

e. Private sector engagement (focus on small and medium enterprises)

3. Health

a. Health Impacts on Improved Ambient Air quality

b. Health Impacts on of Green Urban Transport

c. Health Impacts of Climate Smart Agriculture

d. Health Impacts of Cleaner Household Energy

4. Just Transition of the Workforce

a. Country Case Studies

b. Existing International Processes and Bilateral and Multilateral Assistance

c. Best Practices

d. Worker Training Programs – Domestic Case Studies

5. Environmental co-benefits

a. Bio-diversity Preservation

b. Ocean Health, including, inter alia, prevention of ocean acidification

c. Potential improvements to soil fertility, reductions in soil degradation, and improved water infiltration

d. Improved Water Quality

6. Economic Benefits

Annex II

[English only]

Submissions made by the European Union, the G77 and China and the United States

Submission by the European Union

Decision _/CP.20

Forum and work programme on the impact of the implementation of response measures

The Conference of the Parties,

Recalling the ultimate objective of the Convention,

Also recalling decision 8/CP.17,

Welcoming the constructive discussions and negotiations that took place during meetings of the forum on the impact of implementation of response measures, as mandated by decision 8/CP.17, in particular the progress made on positive impacts and co-benefits of addressing climate change,

Recalling the results of the review of the work of the forum conducted at the thirty-ninth and fortieth sessions of the subsidiary bodies, as mandated by decision 8/CP.17,

Noting that giving full consideration to what actions are necessary under the Convention arising from the impact of the implementation of response measures requires consideration of both positive and negative impacts,

Reaffirming the principle of sovereignty of States in international cooperation to address climate change,

1. *Urges* all Parties to consider what actions are necessary under the Convention to maximize positive and minimise negative impacts of response measures;

2. *Adopts* a revised work programme on the impact of the implementation of response measures under the subsidiary bodies, with the objective of improving the understanding of the positive and negative impacts, including co-benefits, of the implementation of response measures in the following areas, to address remaining gaps in the work programme as mandated by decision 8/CP.17:

    a. Economic diversification, with a focus on:

        i. economic diversification in the context of low-emissions development;

ii. development of the private sector in emerging economic segments in the economy including creating investment enabling environment;

iii. development of sustainable industrial policy;

iv. circular economy and resource demand management in the context of diversification of resources and resource scarcity;

b. Just transition and decent work, with a focus on:

i. development of employment policies in transition towards sustainable economy and promotion of decent work, incuding job creation through supporting private sector development;

ii. education policy and measures in the context of economic transition and diversification;

c. Food security, health and gender.

3. *Also adopts* modalities for the operationalization of the revised work programme on the impact of the implementation of response measures, which could include, subject to the availability of financial resources, convening in-forum workshops and meetings; receiving input from experts, practitioners and relevant organisations; and preparing reports;

4. *Decides* to extend the mandate of the forum on the impact of the implementation of response measures, as established by decision 8/CP.17;

5. *Decides* that the forum will meet once a year in conjunction with the sessions of the subsidiary bodies, beginning with their forty-second sessions;

6. *Further decides,* in line with decision 2/CP.17, to consolidate all agenda items and sub-items of the SBI and the SBSTA relating to the impact of the implementation of response measures under a single agenda item on the respective agendas entitled “Forum and work programme on the impact of the implementation of response measures”, so that all discussions and negotiations on the impact of the implementation of response measures continue to take place in one space;

7. *Requests* the subsidiary bodies to review at their [xx] sessions the work of the forum, including the need for its continuation, with a view to providing recommendations to the Conference of the Parties at its [xx] session.

Submission by the G77 and China on a draft decision on the impact of the implementation of response measures (agenda item SBSTA 10.a and SBI 15.a)

The Conference of the Parties,

Recalling decisions 5/CP.7, 1/CP.10, 1/CP.13, 1/CP.16, 2/CP.17, 8/CP.17, 1/CP.18 and 31/CMP.1, the objective, principles and provisions of the Convention, in particular Articles 3, paragraphs 1 and 5, and 4, paragraphs 1(g) and (h), 8, 9 and 10, of the Convention, and Articles 2, paragraph 3, and 3, paragraph 14, of the Kyoto Protocol,

Reaffirming that economic and social development and poverty eradication are the first and overriding priorities of developing countries, and that developing country Parties face economic and social consequences of response measures to climate change

Stressing the need for an effective mechanism for enhanced action to address the social and economic consequences of the implementation of response measures,

Acknowledging that the objective of enhanced action to deal with the social and economic consequences of the implementation of response measures is to address the negative social and economic consequences of response measures taken by developed country Parties on developing country Parties,

Affirming that Parties should cooperate fully to enhance understanding of the economic and social consequences of response measures, and further reaffirming the need to consider how existing channels, such as national communications and biennial reports by developed country Parties, could be improved and built upon,

Recalling the constructive discussions that took place during the meetings under the work programme on the impact of the implementation of response measures held in conjunction with the thirty-sixth, thirty-seventh, thirty-eighth and thirty-ninth sessions of the subsidiary bodies

Acknowledging that the work of the forum on the impact of the implementation of response measures has provided opportunities to engage in in-forum workshops, an expert meeting and valuable initial discussions by Parties, in order to improve the understanding of the impact of the implementation of response measures in the areas of the work programme referred to in decision 8/CP.17, paragraph 1.

Noting that Parties concluded the review pursuant to decision 8/CP.17, paragraph 5, and that this review indicated that it is important to improve the need for a more focused consideration of the effectiveness of the process and the substantive consideration of the issues in terms of addressing the specific needs and concerns of developing countries in relation to the impact of the implementation of response measures,

Recognizing the need to focus future work under the forum on the impact of the implementation of response measures on expert input, the provision of concrete examples, case studies and practices, in order to enhance the capacity of developing

country Parties to deal with the negative impacts of the implementation of response measures,

Welcoming the progress made in the work of the forum on the impact of the implementation of response measures convened under the Subsidiary Body for Implementation and the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice, and recognizing the need for Parties to continue to participate in the forum, including the sharing of views on policy issues of concern, such as unilateral measures,

Recognizing the need to give full consideration to what actions are necessary under the Convention, including actions related to funding, insurance and the transfer of technology, to meet the specific needs and concerns of developing country Parties arising from the impact of the implementation of response measures,

Affirming that there are still gaps in implementation related to how developed country Parties are implementing their policies and measures to respond to climate change in such a way as to avoid negative social and economic consequences for developing country Parties and that there is a need for further work and specific action, building on the forum on the impact of the implementation of response measures and its work programme,

1. Decides to hereby continue the forum on the impact of the implementation of response measures in order for it to provide a platform allowing Parties to share, in an interactive manner, information, experiences, case studies, best practices and views.

2. Decides that the forum shall be convened by the Chairs of the subsidiary bodies to implement the work programme included in the Annex A and meet twice a year in conjunction with the sessions of the subsidiary bodies.

3. Reiterates that the forum will be convened under a joint agenda item of the subsidiary bodies and will operate in accordance with the procedures applicable to contact groups.

4. Requests the subsidiary bodies to review, at their forty-fifth sessions (December 2016), the work of the forum, with a view to providing recommendations to the Conference of the Parties at its twenty-second session.

5. Adopts the modalities for the operationalization of the work programme on the impact of the implementation of response measures, which could include, as appropriate and subject to the availability of financial resources, convening workshops and meetings, receiving inputs from experts, practitioners and relevant organizations, and preparing reports and technical papers.

6. Requests participants in the forum to focus on enhancing understanding and building the capacity of developing countries to deal with the negative economic and social consequences of response measures on those countries through the provision of support and discussion of concrete examples, case studies and practices.

7. Decides to establish a Mechanism for Enhanced Action on Response Measures under the Conference of the Parties to facilitate implementation of enhanced action to address the negative social and economic consequences of response measures taken by developed country Parties on developing country Parties and to recommend specific actions, including in terms of support to developing countries, to avoid and minimize those consequences, and to deliver the functions as included in Annex B.

8. Decides that the forum will report to the Mechanism and that the Mechanism will make recommendations and report to the Conference of the Parties annually on its work with a view for adopting relevant decisions.

9. Further decides that the Mechanism will report to the Conference of Parties on its review of its work, including functions and further actions that may be required, starting in COP 25 and every five years thereafter, with a view to provide recommendations and adopt relevant decisions.

10. Decides that the Mechanism will meet for the first time in the first half of 2015 and shall continue to meet at least twice a year, in conjunction with Subsidiary Bodies and the COP

11. Decides that the Mechanism will engage and develop linkages and synergies with relevant work programmes, bodies and institutions under the Convention.

12. Further decides that the Mechanism will collaborate with relevant intergovernmental, regional, national, and subnational level institutions, organizations, networks and centers.

13. Requests Parties to undertake the necessary arrangements at the fortieth-first sessions of the Subsidiary Bodies (December 2014) to finalize the development of the terms of reference of the Mechanism, including its membership and participation as contained in Annex C below, and its modalities of operationalization, with the view to providing recommendations to the Conference of the Parties.

Annex A: Elements to be included in the new work programme of the forum

- Dialogue on assessment and analysis of adverse impacts of response measures, including unilateral ones, in terms of their consequences for, inter alia, employment, income, economic growth rates and living standards in developing countries; and explore ways to minimize adverse impacts of response measures

- Ways to strengthen multilateral cooperation, in opposition to unilateral measures

- Overview of progress on activities to address adverse economic and social consequences of response measures on developing countries made at various levels, including bilateral, regional and multilateral;

- Economic diversification and resilience-building in developing country Parties, to deal with the adverse impacts of response measures;

- Exchange of views on just transition and creation of decent work, in accordance with nationally defined development priorities and strategies;

- Dialogue on how developed countries report on actions and impacts related to the implementation of response measures, in such a way as to minimize adverse impacts;

Annex B: Functions of the Mechanism (to be further elaborated in TORs)

- Development of methodologies and tools for the assessment and analysis of adverse impacts of response measures, including unilateral ones, in terms of their consequences for, inter alia, employment, income, economic growth rates and living standards in developing countries; and explore ways to minimize adverse impacts of response measures;

- Provision of specific support by developed country Parties to developing country Parties in terms of transfer of technology, financial resources and capacity-building, in order for the latter to be able to deal with the adverse economic and social effects of response measures;

- Capacity building and support for developing countries for economic diversification and resilience-building to deal with the adverse impacts of response measures;

- Capacity building and assessments on ways to ensuring a just transition and creation of decent work, in accordance with nationally defined priorities;

- Capacity-building related to economic modelling, studies, methodology development, scenario-setting and technology transfer to assist developing country Parties in addressing the negative economic and social consequences of response measures;

- Development of specific guidelines for developed countries on how to report on actions and impacts related to the implementation of response measures, in such a way as to minimize adverse impacts;

- Cooperation at various levels, including at bilateral level, with regional and multilateral organizations, experts and institutions, to address adverse economic and social consequences of response measures on developing countries;

- Secretariat to develop a structured and user friendly repository of information on response measures.

Annex C: Membership and participation

1. The Mechanism shall comprise 16 members, who shall serve in their personal capacity, as follows:
   - 2 members from each of the 5 United Nations regional groups (Africa, Asia Pacific, Latin America and Caribbean, Eastern European group, Western European and Other Groups)
   - 1 member from a Small Island Developing State

- 1 member from a Least Developed Country Party
- 2 members from Parties included in Annex I to the Convention
- 2 members from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention

2. The Mechanism shall elect annually a Chair and a Vice-Chair from among its members for a term of one year each, with one being a member from an Annex I Party and the other being a member from a non-Annex I Party. The positions of the Chair and Vice-Chair shall alternate annually between a member from an Annex I Party and a member from a non-Annex I Party.

3. Each member shall be elected by their regional groups to serve for two years.

4. Meetings shall be open to all Parties in character of observers.

5. Meetings shall be open to attendance by accredited observer organizations, except where otherwise decided by the Mechanism by consensus.

Submission of the United States on the review of the Forum and work programme on the impact of the implementation of response measures

The United States is pleased to submit its views on the Forum and work programme on the impact of the implementation of response measures and specifically on the United States' assessment of the Forum and the steps needed to complete the Parties' collective review of its work. The United States looks forward to a timely conclusion of the review after Parties have been able to exchange their views and have agreed on conclusions related to their review of the Forum.

At SB39, Parties were allowed only a brief discussion of their individual reviews of the Forum. During that initial discussion, Parties expressed significantly different views on the gaps and positive and negative aspects of the Forum, as well as ways to improve upon the structure and mode of work. The time provided did not allow Parties to fully discuss and come to agreement on a collective assessment. It is the view of the United States that, had Parties been given more time for a thorough and systematic review, they would have been able to reach agreement on a way forward on this issue in Warsaw. The United States hopes that Parties will be able to exchange views and come to agreement on their assessment in a timely manner in order to continue to make progress on this issue.

The United States thinks the Forum was a useful exercise; the dynamic of our discussions on this issue has improved over the past few years. The United States believes that the decision in Durban to be practical in how we addressed response measures, in particular by consolidating all discussions in one place, contributed to this improvement. The agenda items that are now being held in abeyance should be permanently closed in order to lock in this new dynamic.

Parties should conclude, as part of the review, what mode of work might best allow us to fulfill our mandate under this agenda item. We think that working under a joint agenda item of the Subsidiary Bodies, and operating in accordance with the procedures applicable to contact groups, has served us well, because it allows for us to move from workshops to discussions, and then on to negotiations, according to the agreed timeline established for our work in relevant COP decisions.

We should not, however, assume that a Forum is the best mode of work available to enhance our collective understanding of this issue. Other UNFCCC modes of work offer options that could fulfill the functions that Parties have requested as well. The United States believes that a dialogue process is a good model to consider as it could help us focus on the substance of the issue. The dialogue format promotes more presentations by issue experts and then allows for discussion among Parties. This would help us move away from repetitions of well-known country positions. The mode of work that Parties identify to continue our work should entail greater input from experts, relevant organizations, and practitioners, including from the private sector, and should focus on the presentation of case studies, concrete examples, and recommendations on best practices.

Whatever mode is chosen, our work on response measures should continue to be reviewed regularly, and Parties should not hesitate to make adjustments to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of our work so that we can better achieve our objective of improving the understanding of the positive and negative impacts of the implementation of response measures, particularly with respect to maximizing the positive and minimizing the negative impacts of the implementation of response measures.

The consolidation of all discussions and negotiations on response measures in one place was the first step in allowing us to better focus on subjects that we all agree deserve our time and attention. Over the past two years, the Forum has discussed a wide range of topics, which allowed Parties to identify the issues that lend themselves to substantive, productive conversations. Going forward, however, we should narrow and more carefully select the issues we include in our program of work. We should place greater emphasis on issues related to the positive impacts of the implementation of response measures. We should also recognize that there have been areas of convergence and divergence in Forum discussions to date, and that future work will need to focus on areas of convergence in order to maximize the benefit of the Forum to all Parties. Doing so would mean addressing topics in which many Parties have expressed the need for more information, such as economic diversification, just transition, and health.

We should also reduce the number of topics we discuss at each meeting in order to better focus our attention. Each meeting should discuss a single issue, which will provide for a focused and in-depth presentation of facts, followed by a thorough discussion where all Parties can react and express areas of concern.

The United States believes that holding meetings in conjunction with the COP also significantly impedes our ability to focus. The extreme time pressure does not allow for productive, effective discussions. Going forward, the Dialogue should meet once a year, in conjunction with the intercessional meeting of the Subsidiary Bodies.

In addition to the above assessment and recommendations for future work, the United States would like to put forward suggestions for issues that could be included on a new joint work programme on the impact of the implementation of response measures under the Subsidiary Bodies.

1. Gender
    a. Positive impacts of climate change response measures on women and girls
    b. Gender-sensitive climate policies, with a particular focus on cleaner cookstoves
2. Economic diversification and transformation
    a. Case studies
    b. Multilateral and bilateral assistance
    c. Best practices

   d. Benefits to workers

   e. Private sector engagement (focus on small and medium enterprises)

3. Health

   a. Health Impacts on Improved Ambient Air quality

   b. Health Impacts on of Green Urban Transport

   c. Health Impacts of Climate Smart Agriculture

   d. Health Impacts of Cleaner Household Energy

4. Just Transition of the Workforce

   a. Country Case Studies

   b. Existing International Processes and Bilateral and Multilateral Assistance

   c. Best Practices

   d. Worker Training Programs – Domestic Case Studies

5. Environmental co-benefits

   a. Bio-diversity Preservation

   b. Ocean Health, including, inter alia, prevention of ocean acidification

   c. Potential improvements to soil fertility, reductions in soil degradation, and improved water infiltration

   d. Improved Water Quality

6. Economic Benefits