

16 June 1997

CHINESE/ENGLISH/  
SPANISH ONLY

UNITED NATIONS FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE

SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR IMPLEMENTATION

Sixth session

Bonn, 28 July - 5 August 1997

Item 4 (b) of the provisional agenda

**COMMUNICATIONS FROM PARTIES NOT INCLUDED IN  
ANNEX I TO THE CONVENTION**

**Views of Parties on a process for considering non-Annex I communications**

**Note by the secretariat**

1. In accordance with Article 12.5 of the Convention, each Party not included in Annex I to the Convention shall make its initial communication within three years of the entry into force of the Convention for that Party, or of the availability of financial resources in accordance with Article 4.3. Parties that are least developed may make their initial communication at their discretion.
2. In anticipation of the imminent submission of these communications, one of which was received on 7 March 1997, and in order to provide for further discussion, the secretariat has invited Parties to provide views on the process of consideration of these communications.
3. Seven such submissions have been received. In accordance with the procedure for miscellaneous documents, these submissions are attached and reproduced in the language in which they were received and without formal editing.

**FCCC/SBI/1997/MISC.5**

**GE.97-**

## CONTENTS

Paper No.		Page
1.	Bolivia	3
2.	China	4
3.	Ethiopia	6
4.	Gambia	7
5.	Kenya	8
6.	Netherlands (on behalf of the European Community and its member States)	11
7.	Sri Lanka	13

## PAPER NO. 1: BOLIVIA

La Embajada de Bolivia ante la Republica Federal de Alemania saluda atentamente a la Secretaría de la Convención Marco de las Naciones Unidas sobre Cambios Climáticos (CMNUCC) y tiene el honor de adjuntar los comentarios del Gobierno de Bolivia sobre los Mecanismos de Financiamiento y las Consideraciones sobre las Comunicaciones Nacionales de los Países, solicitados por esa Secretaría.

### 1. MECANISMOS FINANCIEROS:

- Se ha podido establecer en principio que no existe una verdadera difusión de la existencia de recursos financieros a través del GEF para proyectos que se enmarquen dentro de la Convención Marco de las Naciones Unidas sobre el Cambio Climático.

- Tampoco se establecen los montos tope de los proyectos y los procedimientos que deben seguirse para acceder a dichos fondos, sumandose a ello los innumerables procedimientos administrativos que se debe cumplir que inciden directamente en los tiempos de aprobación de un determinado proyecto.

- Se ha podido establecer que se pone en un mismo paquete proyectos vinculados al protocolo de Montreal y a la CMNUCC, así como a proyectos binacionales medioambientales, debiéndose aprobar tan sólo uno de ellos, lo cual no permite acceder a recursos exclusivos para proyectos que se enmarquen en la CMNUCC.

- Se hace necesario mejorar dichos mecanismos y especialmente darle una mejor dinámica en sus procedimientos.

### 2. COMUNICACIONES NACIONALES:

- En relación a las comunicaciones nacionales debe quedar claramente establecido que no se ha determinado la asignación de fondos por parte del GEF para llevar adelante estas Comunicaciones, puesto que tan solo se espera el apoyo económico-financiero de algunos países del Anexo-1 que, en algunos casos, interponen exigencias no siempre al alcance de los países en vías de desarrollo. Es en este sentido que la Secretaría de la Convención debe disponer la asignación de fondos directos para el desarrollo de las Comunicaciones Nacionales de los Países en vías de desarrollo a la brevedad posible, toda vez que muchos deben cumplir con sus presentaciones en 1998.

La Embajada de Bolivia ante la República Fdeederal de Alemania hace propicia la oportunidad para renovar a la Secretaría de la Convención Marco de las Naciones Unidas sobre el Cambio Climático, las seguridades de su distinguida consideración.

**中国关于非附件一国家所通报信息“考虑进程”的意见**  
(China's Comments on the "Consideration Process"  
for Information Communicated by Non-Annex I Parties)

一、“考虑进程”的法律基础

“考虑进程”应严格以气候变化公约的有关规定为基础，特别是下列条款的规定：

- 第4条1款(j)项规定，缔约各方考虑到其共同但有区别的责任和其具体的国家或区域性的发展优先顺序、目标和情况应根据第十二条的规定向缔约方会议通报与履行有关的信息；
- 第12条1款规定，每一缔约方应通过秘书处向缔约方会议通报如下信息要素：a) 温室气体人为排放的源与汇清单；b) 关于缔约方所采取履行公约措施的一般性描述；c) 缔约方认为与实现公约目标有关的适于列入通报的任何其他信息；
- 第12条6款规定，缔约方依本条所通报信息应由秘书处尽速向缔约方会议和有关的附属机构转递；
- 第10条2款(a)项规定，附属履行机构将对根据第12条1款通报的信息予以考虑，以便根据关于气候变化的最新科学评估对所有缔约方所采取步骤的总体集合效果进行评估。

公约的上述规定将决定“考虑进程”的性质、指导原则、目的、操作的方式和方法以及公约各机构在进程中的作用和职能。

二、“考虑进程”的主要要素

根据公约的有关规定，“考虑进程”可以包括如下要素：

1、性质和目的：“考虑”的目的不是对信息通报本身是否符合公约或缔约方会议通过的通报指南作出任何性质的价值判断，也不涉及对某一单个国家履约情况的价值评判；其目的是通过对通报所载信息的考虑来就所有缔约方所采取步骤的总

体集合效果进行评估，是对有关步骤的效果作为整体而作出的评估。“考虑”的对象是所通报的信息，其结果是就措施的效果作出评价。非附件一缔约方信息通报的“考虑进程”与附件一缔约方依公约第 12 条 2 款所通报信息的“考虑进程”性质不同，后者根据公约的规定应由缔约方会议进行定期的审评。正是两者在内容、形式、目的、用途、提交的时间和间隔期间等诸方面的不同，其考虑进程也应有本质的区别。

## 2. “考虑”的操作方式

根据公约，通报由秘书处转交缔约方会议和任何有关的附属机构。转交的方式有二，一是将所收到的通报依样转交，一是对通报的信息进行汇编和综合。依样转交可以使各缔约方对其他缔约方所通报信息有更为全面的了解；汇编和综合可以便于有关附属机构和缔约方会议对通报所载信息依公约的有关规定进行考虑并据以对缔约方所采取措施的总体集合效果进行评估。

为了便于缔约方会议和附属履行机构执行其在对所通报信息进行“考虑”方面的职能，秘书处可以根据通报提交的情况分期分批地对收到的通报中所载与评估缔约方所采取措施的总体集合效果有关的信息进行汇编和综合。在这项工作中，秘书处的权限仅是将有关信息按照缔约方会议所确定的格式、按一定的逻辑顺序收集在一起。秘书处的工作应是纯编辑性的，不涉及对有关信息的任何价值判断。如果在汇编和综合过程中需要专家的技术性支持，则应保证来自对其信息进行汇编和综合的缔约方的专家充分和有效参与。对于有关信息的技术性疑问，秘书处可请求有关缔约方予以复核和确认。秘书处对有关信息的第一次汇编和综合应在收到至少 25 份来自非附件一缔约方的信息通报后进行，以保证秘书处所准备文件的可用性。

在对所通报的信息完成汇编和综合后，秘书处应先提交公约附属履行机构进行考虑。在此考虑的基础上，附属履行机构就缔约方所采取措施的总体集合效果提出评估意见。缔约方会议将根据评估意见完成评估程序。

PAPER NO. 3: ETHIOPIA

**Submission of Ethiopia**

13 April 1997

**1. Financial Mechanism: Review process Referred to in Decision 9/CP.1.**

Ethiopia has shown its commitment to protect the earth's climate by signing the United Nations Framework Convention (UNFCCC) at the Earth Summit and ratifying it on 05 April 1994.

It has gained initial useful experience in greenhouse gas inventory and climate change Vulnerability, Adaptation and Mitigation Assessments by participating in the US supported Climate Change Country Study Program.

As a developing country party to the UNFCCC, Ethiopia is eligible for financial support for preparing its national communication from the Global Environmental Facility (GEF). Accordingly in a letter sent to the UNDP-GEF in New York on 11 February 1997 through the National GEF operational focal point (Environmental Protection Authority), Ethiopia has expressed interest to get support for enabling activities to advance meeting its commitments under the Convention. So far we have received no information on the status of our request. Since our experience with the GEF with respect to financing activities related to meeting commitments in the UNFCCC is limited, it would be early for us to comment on the effectiveness of the GEF as an interim operating entity of the financial mechanisms of the Convention.

**2. Views for the process of consideration of non-Annex I communications**

Non-Annex I countries are expected to submit their initial national communications starting from 1997 using the guidelines adopted in Decision 10/CP.2.

We believe that the process of consideration of national communications from Non-Annex I countries has to be started using the existing review/assessment mechanisms in the Convention relating to the implementation of commitments but the adequacy of technical and financial support made available to each Non-Annex I parties has to be considered first. The experience gained from the in-depth review process of first National Communications of Annex I Countries may also be useful here

## **PAPER NO. 4: GAMBIA\***

### **Submission from The Gambia Government Relating to Discussions to be held During the UNFCCC - SBI Sixth Session in July/August 1997**

#### **1. Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI)- Financial Mechanism**

- a. The Gambia strongly believes that GEF's funding should be focused on assisting non-Annex I countries fulfill their obligations to the Convention especially where capacities are limited by inavailability of financial resources, expertise and appropriate technologies.
- b. It is The Gambia view that GEFs process of evaluating proposals takes a very long time. It often takes about half of the projects life spans. It is therefore worthwhile to curtail GEF's projects processing period.
- c. The Gambia also suggests that SBI provide the required funding through GEF to allow Parties and Observers to exchange information and views on the implementation aspects of Specific Policies and Measures (P & M) taken by the Parties included in Annex 1 to the Convention. This could be done through the convening of cost-effective and innovative workshops on specific topics on the climate agenda. This will increase understanding and develop capacities.

#### **2. Views on the Preparation of non-Annex 1 Communication**

- a. The Gambia, like other non-Annex 1 Parties, suggests that financial support be provided to enable Parties gather the required information, mobilize rapid expert assistance and exchange experience with other countries on the preparation of their national communications.

---

\* This contribution has been retyped. The secretariat has made every effort to ensure the correct reproduction of the text as submitted.

## PAPER NO. 5: KENYA

### SUBMISSIONS FROM PARTIES REQUESTED BY THE FIFTH SESSION OF THE SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR IMPLEMENTATION

#### 1. FINANCIAL MECHANISM: REVIEW PROCESS REFERRED TO IN DECISION 9/CP.1

##### TRANSPARENCY OF THE GEF'S DECISION MAKING PROCESS

The GEF still lacks transparency and balance in its decision making process. The level of participation at the GEF Council should therefore be reviewed. At the regional level, the focal points should be facilitated so as to discharge their duties. Facilitation would allow for more flow of information and consequently, views which would be more regional presented during the council meetings.

##### THE ADEQUACY, PREDICTABILITY AND TIMELY DISBURSEMENT OF FUNDS FOR ACTIVITIES IN DEVELOPING COUNTRY PARTIES

There seems to be a deliberate selectiveness in the way the GEF funds are allocated, with Africa so much at a disadvantage. The funds so far allocated for activities are not adequate and even when once allocated, are not predictable nor timely.

Responsiveness is poor - there are long periods of delay between the submission of programmes/project proposals and response and it seems that no effort is made to find out the level of finance needed for submitted projects. The project cycle is consequently undermined by lack of resources and their unpredictability.

##### CASE STUDY

Kenya is one of the four countries participating in the GEF Project "Building Capacity in Sub-Saharan Africa to Respond to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change". A project funded by GEF to the tune of USD2million. The aim the project is to create or strengthen national institutions, to give countries the capacity to respond to the Convention. These were projected to include the development of inventories of ghg emissions and their sinks, cost effective policy options based on these inventories, and the development of projects suitable for public or private funding. Activities are also to be organised at the regional level in cooperation with other related organisations and activities to help develop African positions on relevant issues. The implementation started in June 1996 and to date Kenya has accessed no more than USD20,000 from the project funds for 3



workshops which were mainly for sensitization and needs assessment. We cannot say with certainty when the next release of funds for the project activities will be. It has now been confirmed that this project will not last the projected two years.

In October 1996, the country submitted a proposal to the Climate Change Secretariat (then in Geneva) requesting for funds to carry out the 1st National Communication. It was not until the 2nd half of January that a response was received. The proposal had been forwarded to GEF.

When the GEF responded it was to say, that most of the activities proposed in the National Communication proposal were to be carried out in the Regional GEF Capacity Building Project.

It is now quite clear that the funds for the capacity building project we expect to receive will not be adequate to cover National Communications. The GEF in this instance has confused two projects; one on National Communications which is urgent, while the other is on capacity building that was projected to last two years and has hardly started. The GEF made an erroneous assumption in that the capacity building project could also cover national communications and therefore, rejected our proposal on communications.

The funds allocated to the Capacity Building project are not adequate even to satisfactorily undertake the core activities. From the experience gathered so far we can say with certainty that more funds would have gone to project activities if the funds were given directly to countries. Having many entities as the middlemen to supposedly coordinate, only proves expensive and derails these projects making them no longer country driven. The GEF should deal directly with countries not with intermediaries. In the case of the Capacity Building project, less than one third of the project funds will go into project implementation related activities in the four participating countries.

**AMOUNT OF RESOURCES PROVIDED TO DEVELOPING COUNTRIES PARTIES,  
INCLUDING FINANCING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND INVESTMENT  
PROJECTS**

There is need for the GEF to communicate with participating countries giving clear statements on the amount of resources provided to developing countries particularly Africa, including financing for technical assistance and investment projects.

Kenya has yet to benefit from the provision of finances for technical assistance and investment projects.

#### AMOUNT OF RESOURCES LEVERAGED

. US Country Study	-	USD198,000
. UNEP/CIRSNet	-	USD 20,000

#### THE SUSTAINABILITY OF FUNDED PROJECTS

The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change promises much in the way of both financial and technical assistance to the developing countries. The GEF on an interim basis is the financial mechanism for doing this. So far, none of these promises have been met.

The GEF projects when finally approved and are being implemented have no in-built sustainability and are therefore not providing much support to the implementation of the Convention. National Communication, for example, will be a continuous exercise and therefore sustainability should be provided for.

#### 2. VIEWS FOR THE PROCESS OF CONSIDERATION OF NON-ANNEX 1 COMMUNICATION

The timing of submission of these communication should be, according to Article 12.5; with three years of entry into force of the Convention for that Party, or availability of financial resources in accordance with Article 4 paragraphs 3.

The Review of these communications, which should be through correspondence should be:-

- based on the guidelines, facilitation and process for consideration as adopted by COP II in Geneva.
- carried out primarily by other non Annex 1 Parties with a few representatives from Annex 1.

**PAPER NO. 6: NETHERLANDS**  
(on behalf of the European Community and its member States)

**\* Views for the process of Consideration of Non-Annex I Communications  
(SBI-6)**

In order to contribute to the preparations of further discussions on this issue by SBI, the Netherlands, on behalf of the Community and its Member States would like to forward views of the EU on the process for consideration of the National Communications of Non Annex I Parties.

The CoP agreed in Decision 10/CP.2 on two objectives with regard to the process for consideration of the National Communications of Non Annex I Parties, taking into account Art 4.7: i.e. 'to facilitate the process of (...) consideration of the communications' (...) and 'to ensure that the CoP has sufficient information to carry out its responsibilities to assess the overall aggregated effects of the steps taken by the Parties in the light of the latest scientific assessment concerning climate change, and to assess the implementation of the Convention.'

In order to reach these objectives and learning from experiences with the process of consideration of national communications of Annex I Parties, in which experts of all parties participated, the EU finds the following elements essential for the discussion of such a process:

- the nature of the process should be facilitative and non-confrontational, as the review for Annex 1 countries has proved to be;
- the in depth review should be introduced along the lines of existing arrangements for Annex I;
- the use of country visits should be an integral part of the assessment. This is because it is difficult to gain full understanding of a national communication without face to face meeting with national experts who produced it. It would also be difficult to provide source data to cover every aspect of a national communication for consideration by a remote team;

**\* EU submission on the Review of the Financial Mechanism**

At its fifth session the Subsidiary Body for Implementation agreed upon guidelines for the review of the financial mechanism. This review would, inter alia, draw upon information submitted by Parties to the Secretariat on their experiences regarding the financial mechanism. It was agreed that Parties would submit information by 15 May and that the Secretariat would compile these submissions, preparing a synthesis report for the consideration of Parties at the sixth session of the SBI. Accordingly the EU would like to present the views of its member states, paying particular regard to the financial mechanism's capacity to meet our obligations under Article 4.3. of the Convention.

Essentially, this requires us to provide new and additional financial resources to meet the agreed full costs of developing country party's obligations under Article 12.1. and the agreed full incremental costs of meeting developing country Parties obligations under Article 4.1. In our view, the GEF has developed satisfactorily to the extent that it now has our full confidence as the means of effectively transferring these new and additional resources to developing country Parties. In broad terms, since its inception in 1991, the GEF has been restructured and replenished, it has developed an Operational Strategy and Programmes that directly follow the guidance of the CoP and it has completed agreement on its Memorandum of Understanding with the Convention,

These developments are a continuing process; they provided the necessary assurance for all donors to commit over \$2bn to the first replenishment and they have created a strong basis for future replenishments. Some \$523m have now been committed to projects that fulfil the requirements of Article 4.3. We see potential for the GEF's further improvement in its role as the Convention's financial mechanism and believe that the review process should be structured to monitor and influence this improvement.

We look forward to learning of the experiences of recipient countries during the review process and suggest that Secretariat should arrange for experts from the GEF and its implementing agencies to be available at the next meeting of the SBI to respond to any specific issues raised to our developing country partners.

Finally the EU would like to reiterate the proposal made in its statement to the fifth session of the SBI. We believe the financial mechanism should be appointed on a continuing basis, dependant on a regular review process. This would take into account the conformity of the financial mechanism with the guidance of the CoP and the reports to the CoP and the reports of the GEF's Monitoring and Evaluation programme. We believe a four year time span would be appropriate for this process and, as such, the GEF should henceforth have continuing status as the operating entity of the financial mechanism.

The EU would be pleased to provide further information on these issues.

## PAPER NO. 7: SRI LANKA

The comments of the Government of Sri Lanka on the Financial Mechanism and National Communications from non-Annex I Parties are given below.

### 1. Financial Mechanism

1.1 The Global Environmental Facility (GEF), as the key financial facility of the FCCC is inadequate. It serves three other areas than climate change. Sri Lanka is of the view that there should be a separate financial mechanism administered by the FCCC exclusively for meeting the needs of non-Annex I Parties in complying with the provisions of the FCCC.

1.2 Sri Lanka's experience with the GEF and its Implementing Agency operations is far from satisfactory. A project proposal prepared by an Implementing Agency consultant on Enabling Activities and submitted to GEF through the Implementing Agency in July 1995 has just been taken up by GEF, after a lapse of 22 months. The final project document prepared by the Implementing Agency has many inconsistencies and shortcomings for which no response has been received even after our pointing out them. Furthermore, the quantum of funding approved is totally inadequate to prepare the communication to comply with Decision 10/CP2.

1.3 A project for the development of Renewable Energy Resources already approved by GEF more than a year ago has yet to be implemented. The Implementing Agency is expected to prepare a detailed work-plan and this is still awaited.

1.4 Sri Lanka does not endorse two factors included among the criteria established by GEF Council for disbursement of funds. These are: duplication and cost-effectiveness.

The project proposals seeking funding from GEF are generally prepared by consultants engaged by the Implementing Agencies. It is very unlikely that they would incorporate any project for GEF funding which is already receiving funds from other sources. The cost-effectiveness is disadvantageous to low-emitting parties and should be given low priority. Furthermore, this concept applies only for Mitigation projects which are not the priority areas for developing countries including Sri Lanka.

## **2. Non-Annex I Communications**

2.1 The Convention provides for non-Annex I parties to submit their initial communication within 3 years of the Convention coming into force or 3 years of the availability of financial resources to prepare the communication. Sri Lanka opts for the latter. As mentioned in clause 1.2 above, a small grant for carrying out enabling activities has just been approved by GEF, but it is uncertain how long it will take for the Implementing Agency to remit money to the Government of Sri Lanka. Hence, the date for submission of Sri Lanka's Communication is uncertain to the same extent.

2.2 The Government of Sri Lanka is of the view that the proposed contents of the National Communications from non-Annex I Parties is quite comprehensive and the suggested process of consideration to be satisfactory maintaining transparency.

2.3 The Government of Sri Lanka, however, wishes to bring to the notice of the Conference of Parties that collection of information that should go into the Communication would involve much time and effort, and financial resources. Even the identification and describing the financial and technological needs and constraints as required in Clause 19 of Decision 10/CP.2 cannot be carried out within the national budget or the meagre grant given by GEF under Enabling Activities.

2.4 Even though the Articles 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5 of the Convention have made it obligatory for the developed country Parties to assist developing country Parties in the preparation of their National Communications, our experience in this regard has been a negative one. The missions of developed country Parties posted in developing countries, at least in Sri Lanka, do not seem to be aware of these obligations. For that matter, they hardly know what the FCCC is. Even the terms JI and AIJ are new to them. As a result, our proposal for assistance to prepare a National Action Plan on Climate Change forwarded to several local missions brought only a negative response.

I trust that you will find the above comment useful in compiling your synthesis report.