

31 October 1995

ENGLISH ONLY

**UNITED NATIONS FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE**

Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice

Second session

Geneva, 26 February - 1 March 1996

**ESTABLISHMENT OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL TECHNICAL ADVISORY PANELS**

**Comments from Parties**

**Note by the secretariat**

**Addendum**

In addition to the submissions already received and contained in FCCC/SBSTA/1995/MISC.3, the secretariat has received contributions from Kuwait and the United States of America.

These submissions are attached and, in accordance with the procedure for miscellaneous documents, are reproduced in the language in which they were received and without formal editing. Any further submissions will be issued in a second addendum.

**FCCC/SBSTA/1995/MISC.3/Add.1**

GE.95-64121

**CONTENTS**

<b>Paper No.</b>		<b>Page</b>
1.	Kuwait (Letter dated 28 October 1995, received on 30 October 1995)	3
2.	United States of America (Letter dated 27 October 1995, received on 30 October 1995)	4

PAPER NO. 1: KUWAIT

Letter dated 28 October 1995 from the Secretary General of the  
Environment Protection Council of Kuwait  
to the Executive Secretary

Sub: Submissions from Parties related to  
October/November 1995 meetings.

Reference to your letter dated 18 September 1995, following are some of the comments of the State of Kuwait regarding item (c) on the establishment of Intergovernmental Technical Advisory Panels (TAPS).

**Terms of Reference:**

Terms of reference should be left open for negotiation. New proposals will be presented in due time.

**Membership:**

- a) Should be intergovernmental technical panels nominated by governments.
- b) Representation should be balanced and fair. Equal representation for north and south geographical regions should be ensured and countries that are likely to be affected by climate change, such as small states as well as economies dependent on fossil fuel production and/or consumption which would be affected by policies and measures to mitigate climate changes, should be duly represented.

**Duration:**

The arrangement to be decided should be on a temporary basis, to be reviewed after a certain period and adjusted as needed.

Also the State of Kuwait is of the view that all Advisory Panels (TAP-T and TAP-M) should be dealt with on equal terms.

\*\*\*\*\*

(signed)  
Dr. Mahmood Y. Abdulraheem  
Secretary General  
Environment Protection Council

PAPER NO. 2: UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Letter dated 27 October 1995 from the Special Negotiator for Climate Change  
of the United States Department of State to the Executive Secretary

In response to the call at the first session of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific and Technological Advice for comments by October 30 concerning the Technical Advisory Panels (TAPs) to facilitate the consultations that the Chairman will undertake on the margins of the forthcoming second session of the Ad Hoc Group on the Berlin Mandate (AGBM), we offer the following additional views.

First, we regret that the SBSTA was not able to establish the Technical Advisory Panels at its first session, and we believe that it is important to do so as quickly as possible.

In our intervention last August (copy enclosed), we suggested taking an approach to each panel that would be consistent with the different work and considerations involved. We noted that the work of the TAP on methodologies (TAP-M) would largely be conducted within the panel itself, and therefore proposed that it consist of about 20 experts.

We also noted that the TAP on technologies (TAP-T) would need to draw upon a broad range of expertise across a wide range of sectors. We therefore proposed that TAP-T consist of about 10 experts who would serve as a steering group for activities that would actually be undertaken by a significantly greater number of experts.

We continue to believe that the TAP-T must draw upon a broad range of expertise across a wide range of sectors. How best to draw upon this broad range of expertise across the various sectors and how best to organize it to serve the needs of the convention will require considerably more thought and discussion. In our view, this issue might usefully be taken up at the workshop on NGO participation that will take place in February 1996.

Meanwhile, however, if agreement can be reached that the TAP-T will function essentially as a steering group for activities that will actually be undertaken by a significantly greater number of experts, the actual size of the TAP-T (i.e., between 10 and 20 experts) is less important and we are prepared to be flexible.

We continue to believe that experts on both TAPs should be drawn equally from Annex I and non-Annex I Parties. How the two groups choose the Parties that will nominate experts might best be left to each group. To ensure the necessary breadth of expertise on each TAP, we suggest that the Parties chosen by each group (Annex I and non-Annex I) to nominate experts meet to discuss this issue before deciding specifically which of their experts to put forward.

We continue to believe that experts should be nominated by governments, but that governments should be free to propose the appropriate experts either inside or outside government. We also continue to believe that the meetings of the TAPs (or their subgroups, if any) should be open to all interested Parties as well as to representatives of intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations accredited to the COP.

We look forward to discussing these issues further with Chairman Farago and other colleagues on the margins of the AGBM session next week. If a document is circulated containing the additional views of governments on these issues, we request that this letter, as well as our intervention last August, be included in it.

\*\*\*\*\*

(signed)  
Mark G. Hambley  
Special Negotiator for Climate Change

Statement of the U.S. Delegation  
on the Technical Advisory Panels  
on Methodologies and Technologies  
First Session of the Subsidiary Body on  
Scientific and Technological Advice  
Geneva, August 28-31, 1995

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We deeply appreciate the work of the Secretariat for this session, particularly its efforts in document FCCC/SBSTA/1995/2 and its appendix to provide suggestions on the establishment of the technical advisory panels pursuant to decision 6/CP.1 of the Conference of the Parties. As we suggested yesterday, however, it is not clear that it is necessary or desirable to adopt a parallel approach to each of these panels. In our view, their work will be very different and it will be important to take an approach to each panel that is consistent with the different considerations involved.

With regard first to the technical advisory panel on methodologies, we believe that it will be important to establish a panel that adequately embraces the different perspectives of the parties on critical methodological issues. We believe that experts should be nominated by governments but that governments should be free to find the appropriate experts either inside or outside government. Since most of the methodological issues that will be dealt with by this panel arise in connection with the national communications of Annex I Parties and the efforts of these parties to meet their commitments, we believe that at least half of the experts nominated to serve on this panel should come from Annex I Parties.

While we are largely in agreement with the proposed functions of the technical advisory panel on methodologies that is contained in the appendix to document FCCC/SBSTA/1995/2, we seriously question the proposal in paragraph 10(c) of this appendix that would require this panel to take up the issue of guidelines in the application of the concept of "agreed full incremental costs." In our view, this is a policy issue more appropriate to the Subsidiary Body on Implementation.

In paragraph 10(d) of the document, we are quite sure that the drafters meant to refer not only to "protocols" but also to "other legal instruments" as is contemplated by the Berlin Mandate.

We believe that it is critical to establish this technical advisory panel as soon as possible and have it begin its work immediately thereafter. Also in our view, this panel might consist of about twenty experts in order to reflect sufficiently the different perspectives of the parties and ensure the

necessary expertise. We also strongly support having meetings of the panel open to all parties and to representatives of intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations that have been accredited to the meetings of the Conference of the Parties.

With respect to the technical advisory panel on technologies, we believe it will be useful to consider an entirely different structure. While the work of the TAP on methodologies will largely be conducted within the panel itself, we believe that the TAP on technologies will need to involve a significantly greater number of experts. For this reason, the members of the TAP will essentially form a kind of organizational or managerial superstructure -- a steering group -- for a wide range of activities that will actually be conducted by a significantly greater number of experts who will form the vital substructure for this panel.

Mr. Chairman, while we may be able at this meeting to agree on the composition of the superstructure or steering group for the TAP on technologies, we are aware that many ideas have been circulating with respect to how the substructure might be organized. Some have suggested that the substructure consist of experts called to specific seminars or workshops to consider specific technological issues or technologies. Others have suggested that we consider forming specific subpanels in various sectors. My delegation has listened with interest to these proposals and has actively been discussing them in the hallways with other delegates and participants in this meeting. However, we have not yet been able to decide how best to organize the substructure for this panel. In our view, we will all need to give this issue further thought prior to our next session and we will need to consult, in particular, with those from the private sector that we hope most to involve in this work.

For this reason, Mr. Chairman, my delegation proposes that we limit our effort at this session to considering the appropriate superstructure or steering group for the TAP on technologies. In our view, such a steering group might consist of about ten experts nominated by governments -- again, however, we believe that governments should be free to find the appropriate experts either inside or outside government. And again, we believe that meetings of the steering group should be open to any interested party as well as intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations accredited to the COP.

In further consideration of the substructure for this TAP, we believe that the workshop for the non-governmental organizations that may be held in the first part of next year may provide a useful opportunity to discuss the various approaches and their pros and cons.

Mr. Chairman, as I indicated yesterday, we do not consider that providing all Parties with a bit more time to consider the optimum substructure for the TAP and technological needs to delay the work of this body in responding to the request of the AGBM for a preliminary inventory of technologies for its meeting in March 1996. In our view, this preliminary inventory should be prepared by the secretariat in response to a specific request from the SBSTA at this meeting. Once we have agreed on an appropriate substructure for the TAP on technologies, this TAP could seek to prepare periodic updates of the inventory also called by the AGBM. In fact, given the short time involved between now and March, this may be the only effective way to meet the request of the AGBM.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, let me say that as anxious as we are to build, we are aware that we must build carefully for the future. And particularly in the case of the TAP on technologies, we must build in full consultation with those we hope to involve centrally in its work -- namely, the experts from the private sector where the kind of expertise we are seeking largely resides. In general, Mr. Chairman, we concur with the proposed functions of this Panel contained in the appendix to document FCCC/SBSTA/1995/2.

-----