



Government of Tuvalu

## *The Permanent Mission of Tuvalu to the United Nations*

800 Second Avenue, 400B

New York, NY 10017

Ph: 1 212 490 0534

Fx: 1 212 808 4975

New York, 13<sup>th</sup> June 2005

### **AOSIS Report** **of the 22nd Sessions of the Subsidiary Bodies** **of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.**

#### **1. Introduction**

1.1 The twenty-second sessions of the Subsidiary Bodies (SB 22) of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) took place from 19-27 May 2005, at the Maritim Hotel in Bonn, Germany. Approximately 1600 participants attended the meeting.

1.2 As Vice-Chairman of the AOSIS coordinating for the AOSIS group at the SB sessions in Bonn, the Tuvalu Delegation is honoured to prepare and circulate this AOSIS Report of the subsidiary bodies' sessions in Bonn.

#### **2. General Overview**

2.1 SB -22 was preceded by the Seminar of Government Experts on future actions on climate change. There were a number of interesting presentations at this meeting. It was evident that a number of developing countries are willing to consider some sort of obligation in the second commitment period. What this obligation may look like remains to be seen. My delegation gave a presentation on future actions relating to both mitigation and adaptation. The paper was a presentation of ideas and hopefully will generate further thinking within AOSIS and outside as well. If you would like a copy of our presentation, just send Ian an email <ianfry@ozemail.com.au> and he will forward a copy to you.

2.2 The most disappointing aspect of SB-22 was the treatment of the Mauritius Strategy. The approach taken by the US and other Umbrella Group countries is extremely disappointing. There can be no denying that there are many strong links between the outcomes of the International Meeting in Mauritius and ongoing work under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Kyoto Protocol. But the distasteful approach taken by the US and others clearly marks the divide in world politics in relation to climate change. It is apparent that the US and some others are concerned about their obligations to meet the costs of adaptation (and may also fear litigation action by SIDS with respect to damage from climate

change). This fear played out at COP 10, Mauritius and now SBSTA. We need to hold strong on this issue and highlight the extreme vulnerability of SIDS.

2.3 I am grateful to the EU for their support and to Sok Appadu of Mauritius for his tireless efforts to hold the G-77/China together despite some strong misgivings coming especially from China and India. It would also appear that we have some work to do to ensure that SIDS specific elements are encapsulated in the 5 year work programme on adaptation. I would like to thank all the AOSIS representatives for their efforts regarding the work programme on adaptation. Finally it is very good to see that we have AOSIS representatives in influential positions. I would like to pass on my personal congratulations to the Jamaican delegation for their excellent work in chairing the G-77/China. It is very refreshing to have an AOSIS representative rather than someone from OPEC chairing this gathering. It was also very pleasing to see Amjad Abdulla (Maldives) chairing the SBSTA meeting until Chair Benrageb arrived later in the session.

2.4 The following is a run through of the Subsidiary Bodies Agenda with the key conclusions and some comments from me.

### **Subsidiary Body on Scientific and Technical Advice**

**Agenda Item 3: The scientific, technical and socioeconomic aspects of impacts of, and vulnerability and adaptation to, climate change.**

**Outcome:** After lengthy consultations and an in-session workshop SBSTA did not finalize the programme, and a draft decision and an annex on the SBSTA programme remain bracketed.

**Comment:** It would appear that this agenda item has a number of complexities: First we have reluctance by some key countries to support immediate action on adaptation. Those that want a sectoral approach seem to fit within this camp. Then we have the OPEC countries who want to include response measures within the work programme (with no legal mandate to do so) and finally we have a group of developing countries who do not wish to acknowledge the particular vulnerabilities of SIDS. Adaptation is a very important issue for AOSIS countries and this is reflected in the strong involvement of AOSIS countries during the SBSTA.

As homework for the next session we need to clearly spell out a timeframe of activities for the 5 year work programme, terms of reference for an ad hoc working group and a special work sub-programme for SIDS that have been identified in the Mauritius Strategy and other fora. It would be useful if we produced a paper on this before the next SBSTA and I will be chasing people to help me with this paper, later this year.

**Agenda Item 4: Scientific, technical and socioeconomic aspects of mitigation of climate change**

**Outcome:** Discussions focused on two main areas: reporting by the Secretariat on lessons learned from previous mitigation workshops; and the holding of a pre-session workshop on mitigation at SBSTA 23. SBSTA took note of the submissions from Parties contained in document FCCC/SBSTA/2005/MISC.2 and Add.1-2 and requested the Secretariat to prepare, by 15 July 2005, a concise report on the topics presented at the in-session workshops held to date.

**Comment:** It appears that a number of Annex I countries are playing a two pronged approach to discussions on mitigation. First they are pursuing the issue through the Seminar of Government Experts and secondly through the SBSTA agenda item on Mitigation. The SBSTA agenda item predates the SOGE and may be seen by some as an insurance policy for discussions on future actions if further discussions under the concept of the SOGE fail to continue. This agenda item did not spark a great deal of interest among AOSIS member countries. Maybe we need to rethink this approach and start a two-pronged approach ourselves (see also later discussion on future actions).

**Agenda Item 5(a): Emissions from fuel used for international aviation and maritime transport.**

**Outcome:** SBSTA adopted brief conclusion (FCCC/SBSTA/2005/L.11/Rev.1), noting that SBSTA 22 did not complete its consideration of this issue, and will resume discussions at SBSTA 23. This is despite the fact that EU, US, Canada, Australia, Russian Federation, Argentina, Bulgaria, New Zealand, Ukraine, Japan, Norway, AOSIS and the Environmental Integrity Group support a more detailed conclusion which requested an inter-sessional workshop, in early 2007, to discuss inventory issues, including improving the quality of reporting on emissions estimates for aviation and maritime transport. Only the OPEC countries blocked this compromise conclusion (with a little help from India).

**Comment:** This continues to be a very thorny issue. Emissions from bunker fuels are an import source of greenhouse gas emissions which is not properly captured in the Kyoto Protocol and should be included in some future regime. Nevertheless, the topic does create some issues for AOSIS countries due to the fact that a number of AOSIS countries hold shipping registries and own or partly own airlines. I am sure that it is possible to develop a regime for getting emissions reductions from these sectors without necessarily harming AOSIS countries. We clearly need to explore this further and I would like to establish an AOSIS Bunker Fuel Discussion Group to work on developing such a regime.

**Agenda Item 5b: Implications of Project Activities under the CDM for Achieving the Aims of Other Environmental Treaties:**

**Outcome:** SBSTA invited Parties and admitted observers and relevant intergovernmental organizations to submit to the Secretariat, by 5 August 2005, their inputs on the implications for the achievement of the objective of the Montreal Protocol of the establishment of new HCFC-22 facilities to obtain credits for HFC-23 burning, and on the means to address such implications. SBSTA further requested the Secretariat to compile the submissions and inputs by the CDM EB for consideration at SB 23.

**Comment:** This is very technical issue and I thank those AOSIS members that participated in this discussion. We need to prepare a submission on this issue by the prescribed deadline.

**5(c) Completion of Technical Guidance on Methodologies for Adjustments under the Kyoto Protocol**

**Outcome:** This item involved a technical review of the procedures and methods for use by expert review teams to calculate adjustments, including tables of "conservativeness factors" for LULUCF activities in Annex B countries. SBSTA

recommended a draft COP decision (FCCC/SBSTA/2005/L.2/Add.1), which includes a draft COP/MOP decision and an annex containing the technical guidance on methodologies for adjustments under LULUCF. It requested the Secretariat to establish a process to allow expert review teams to gain experience with adjustments for LULUCF during the inventory review process in 2007-2008.

**Comment:** This again was a very technical issue and I thank Mr Ian Fry of the Tuvalu Delegation and those AOSIS representatives who participated in these discussions. It is important that we continue to ensure that Annex B countries do use sinks as means of escaping their emissions reductions commitments.

#### **5(d) Registry Systems under the Kyoto Protocol**

**Outcome:** SBSTA also commended the work of the Secretariat in identifying checks to be performed by the international transaction log (ITL) as contained in document FCCC/SBSTA/2005/INF.3 and noted that the Secretariat expects the ITL to be ready for the initialization of communications by other registry systems in the third quarter of 2006.

**Comment:** While this is yet another one of those technical issues, it is interesting to note that CDM projects cannot participate in the EU carbon market until the ITL is up and running. For those countries wishing to seek EU CDM projects a greater interest in this agenda item may be necessary.

#### **Agenda Item 6: Development and Transfer of Technologies**

**Outcome:** SBSTA agreed on terms of reference to guide the Expert Group on Technology Transfer in preparing recommendations for enhancing the implementation of UNFCCC Article 4.5 (technology transfer). The SBSTA welcomed the report of the EGTT Chair and collaboration between UNEP and UNDP on the analysis of the technology needs assessments (TNAs). The SBSTA also took note of the workshop for innovative financing of development and transfer of technologies, planned for October 2005. It also noted the adaptation technologies seminar to be held in Trinidad and Tobago from 14-16 June 2005 and encouraged the EGTT to continue to consider issues relating to diffusion and transfer of advanced, cleaner and more efficient, affordable and cost-effective energy technologies.

**Comment:** There appears to be good work coming out of the EGTT and I would like to thank Kishan for his hard work in this area. We need to consider a replacement for Kishan as his term of office has come to an end.

#### **Agenda Item 7: “Good practices” in Policies and Measures among Parties included in Annex I to the Convention**

**Outcomes:** SBSTA noted options for using web-based approaches for sharing information and experiences on “good practices” among Annex I Parties. SBSTA also welcomed the round-table discussion, recalled the upcoming Secretariat report on “good practices” and agreed to consider next steps at SBSTA 24.

**Comment:** The agenda item seems to grind along without making any substantial progress, thanks to the blocking action of OPEC countries and the US. We missed our expert input from the Marshall Islands. Hopefully Yumi will be ready to take on this challenge at COP 11.

**Agenda Item 8: Research Needs Relating to the Convention**

**Outcomes:** SBSTA invited submissions by Parties on research needs and priorities; requested the Secretariat to prepare a synthesis report of research needs and requested the Secretariat to organize a side event at SB 24 to enhance communication between climate change research organizations and SBSTA. In the draft COP decision, the COP recognized the pre-eminent and independent role of the IPCC and urged Annex I Parties to further strengthen the engagement of research institutions from developing countries.

**Comment:** This is an important area for AOSIS countries particular in relation to global observation systems and making them relevant for SIDS. I want to thank Carlos and others for their work on this agenda item.

**9 (a) Cooperation with Relevant International Organizations: Special Report of the IPCC on Safeguarding the Ozone Layer and Global Climate System: Hydrofluorocarbons and Perfluorocarbons.**

**Outcomes:** SBSTA encouraged Parties to use the information in the 'Special Report on Safeguarding the Ozone Layer and the Global Climate System: Issues Related to Hydrofluorocarbons and Perfluorocarbons' when developing and implementing national climate change strategies. SBSTA invited Parties to submit to the UNFCCC Secretariat, by 13 February 2006, their views on aspects of the report relevant to the UNFCCC's objective.

**Comment:** While there was a last minute attempt to derail this agenda item by our good colleagues from OPEC, it managed to get through unscathed.

**Agenda Item 9(b)(i) International Meeting to Review the Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States**

**Outcome:** This was one of the last agenda items considered in the whole SB meeting and reflects the tenacity of our AOSIS colleagues and the irresponsibility of the US and others of the Umbrella Group in trying to block any progress on this issue. In the end, there was no conclusion on this Agenda item. In fact there was no conclusion at all from the SBSTA Chair.

**Comment:** I am very disappointed with the UNFCCC Secretariat (absolutely no reflection on Phillip Weech who did a sterling job) for providing the advice to the SBSTA Chair to place the issue in limbo. Old Umbrella Group delegates who now work in senior Secretariat positions appear to be having difficulty in swapping roles. We are now left in a procedural dilemma regarding how this agenda item will continue. I will write to the Executive Secretary indicating our understanding that this agenda item will be taken up at SB23. I will also try and contact other key Parties, primarily the EU to do the same.

**Agenda Item 9(b)(ii) Global Climate Observing Systems:**

**Outcomes:** SBSTA agreed to consider the report on progress towards implementing the initial ocean climate observing system, prepared by the GCOS Secretariat and the report on analysis of data exchange issues in global atmospheric and hydrological networks (WMO/DT 1255 GCOS96) and agreed to consider these reports in the context of consideration of the Implementation Plan for the Global Observing System for Climate in Support of the UNFCCC at SBSTA

23. Parties are also invited to submit their views on these reports by 15 September 2005.

**Comment:** I will be chasing up colleagues to make sure we have an AOSIS submission on this important topic.

**10(a) Other Matters: Issues Relating to the Implementation of Article 2, paragraph 3 of the Kyoto Protocol**

**Outcome:** SBSTA noted that it did not complete its consideration of issues relating to Protocol Article 2.3, and agreed to continue consideration of these issues at SBSTA 23.

**Subsidiary Body for Implementation**

**Agenda Item 3(a): National Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention**

**Outcome:** The SBI agreed to include a draft decision recommended for adoption by COP 11, stating that non-Annex I Parties shall make all efforts to submit second and, where appropriate, third national communications, within four years of initial disbursement for the actual preparation of the national communication, on an agreed full-cost basis. The COP decision noted that Parties may use an extension of up to one year for submission, after informing the Secretariat; and that any extensions shall not imply additional financial resources from the GEF. LDCs may submit their second national communications at their discretion.

**Comment:** This has been a long fought out battle. I extend many thanks to our AOSIS colleagues who worked on this and a special thanks to Sok Appadu of Mauritius who co-chaired this discussion (and managed to successfully juggle time commitments with other agenda items).

**Agenda Item 3(b) Work of the Consultative Group of Experts on National Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention**

**Outcome:** The SBI noted recommendations in the CGE report (FCCC/SBI/2005/7) on further improvement of training materials and on future training workshops. SBSTA also noted that the CGE's meetings are critical. A CGE workshop on mitigation is tentatively scheduled to be held in the Republic of Korea from 26-30 September 2005.

**Comment:** The meeting in Korea, if it happens, could be quite important in the context of discussions on future actions on climate change. The nature of invitation to these meeting is quite haphazard. If AOSIS members are invited, please let me know so that we can coordinate our response to this issue. We also need to make sure that the CGE has good representation from AOSIS members.

**Agenda Item 3(c) Compilation and Synthesis and Initial National Communications**

**Outcome:** SBI recommendation to COP 11 requests the GEF, in accordance with Article 12.4 and decision 11/CP.1 (funding for adaptation), to assist, if requested, non-Annex I Parties in formulating and developing project proposals identified in their national communications, when Parties are formulating national programmes

to address climate change issues. Bilateral and multilateral assistance programmes are invited to offer similar assistance.

**Comment:** You may note that the recommended decision refers to helping Non-Annex I countries develop proposals rather than implement projects. We still seem to be facing ongoing procedural blockages for funding adaptation projects. Nevertheless the presentation by Boni Biagini, Program Manager, Climate Change, the Global Environment Facility helped in resolving some of our difficulties, though we are still faced with problems with respect to showing global benefits with adaptation projects. If you were not present during Boni's presentation at the AOSIS morning meeting in the last week, send a note to Ian <ianfry@ozemail.com.au> and he will send you a copy of her Powerpoint presentation which she circulated recently.

#### **Agenda Item 3(d) Provision of Financial and Technical Support**

**Outcome:** The SBI requested Parties that have not submitted initial national communications to do so as soon as possible.

#### **Agenda Item 4(a) Financial Mechanism: Special Climate Change Fund**

**Outcome:** SBI was not able to reach an agreement, and the draft COP decision (FCCC/SBI/2005/L.13) was forwarded to SB 23 for further consideration. Much of the text remains bracketed, particularly the paragraphs that identify priority areas for the Fund.

**Comment:** As colleagues are aware this agenda item refers to items 2(c) and 2(d) of Decision 7/CP.7 relating to 2(c) energy, transport, agriculture forestry and waste management and 2(d) diversifying economies. Needless to say the issue of whether the SCCF should pay to assist countries to diversify their economies (i.e. supporting OPEC) is highly contentious and needless to say somewhat ridiculous. We will need to watch this carefully so that priority actions for adaptation to the impacts of climate change are not undermined by the necessity to consider economic diversification.

#### **Agenda Item 5(a) Implementation of Article 4, paragraphs 8 and 9, of the Convention: Matters relating to Least Developed Countries**

**Outcome:** SBI concluded with a draft COP Decision with the key elements referring to a decision that full-cost funding shall be provided by the LDC Fund to meet the additional costs – defined as “the costs imposed on vulnerable countries to meet their immediate adaptation need” – of activities to adopt to the adverse effects of climate change as identified and prioritized in the NAPAs. The draft decision also requests that the GEF develop a co-financing scale for supporting activities identified in the NAPAs, taking into account the circumstances of LDCs.

**Comment:** This decision was a spill over from COP 10 and marked a low point of the meeting in Buenos Aires. I am pleased to see that a draft decision has been made and I thank all those LDC/AOSIS countries that participated in this discussion. In the end I think it was text that came from LDC/AOSIS that found the right compromise to allow Parties to agree on a draft decision.

#### **Agenda Item 6(a): Arrangements for Intergovernmental Meetings: Eleventh Session of the Conference of Parties**

**Outcome:** SBI thanked the Government of Canada for offering to host COP 11 and COP/MOP 1 and requested the host country to facilitate the issuance of visas to ensure Parties' effective participation. SBI endorsed the dates of 7-9 December, 2005, for the high-level segment of COP 11 and COP/MOP 1

**Comment:** Please remember to bring very warm clothing with you to Montreal.

**Agenda Item 6(b) First session of the Conference of Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol:**

**Outcome:** SBI asked the Executive Secretary to take note of Parties' views on possible elements for the provisional agendas of COP 11 and COP/MOP 1.

**Comment:** I will make sure I will contact the Executive Secretary to ensure that the Mauritius Strategy is included in the agenda. It may also be useful to request to have another Seminar of Government Experts or similar process. If you have thoughts on this please let me know.

**Agenda Item 6(c) Future Sessional Periods**

**Outcome:** SBI recommended changing the dates of COP 13 from November 2007 to 3-14 December 2007 to allow for the IPCC to finish its Fourth Assessment Report.

**Comment:** I am pleased to see that COP 13 has been delayed to allow the IPCC to finish its FAR.

**Agenda Item 6(d) Organization of the Intergovernmental Process**

**Outcome:** SBI took note of the workshop held during SBI 21 and noted the increasing difficulties facing the intergovernmental process in terms of extensive agendas and other problems, and invited Parties to submit their views on options for further improvements by 15 November 2005.

**Comment:** I will write to the Executive Secretary expressing our concern about the number of in-session workshops which are run parallel with contact groups and informal consultations, making it difficult for small delegations to cover all issues.

**Agenda Item 6(e) Observer organizations in the Convention process**

**Outcome:** The SBI asked the UNFCCC Secretariat to identify ways to enhance further the participation of observer organizations, drawing on outcomes of the wider UN process.

**Agenda Item 7(a) Administrative and Financial Matters: Budget Performance for the Biennium 2004-2005**

**Outcome:** The SBI noted with concern the shortfall in supplementary funding in comparison with requirements, which have led to delays in implementation of key activities, and decides to discuss this matter further at SB 23.

**Comment:** Through pressure from the US, matters relating to the Kyoto Protocol are now being funded by supplementary funding. This is creating difficulties with the operation of the CDM Executive Board and will create further difficulties when the two compliance committees and the Supervisory Committee to Joint Implementation projects are established.



**Agenda Item 7(b) Programme Budget for the Biennium 2006-2007**

**Outcome:** SBI decided to recommend that COP 11 approve the core programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007 (US\$53,501,583, which includes US\$2,037,020 in contributions from the host country and US\$2,000,000 in carry-over.)

**Comment:** The final agreed budget represents a US\$1.75 million reduction from the original proposal. It is very disappointing to see the US and Japan drive down the budget. I want to personally thank Ambassador John Ashe for taking on the impossible task of negotiating the budget.

**Agenda Item 7(c) Implementation of Paragraph 7(c) of the Financial Procedures of the Convention Concerning the Financial Support for Participation in the UNFCCC Process**

**Outcome:** SBI took note of the document regarding the suspension of the practice of withdrawing funding to Parties to participate in the UNFCCC process if they had outstanding contributions to the core budget. It decided that more time is required to determine the financial implications of the suspension and decided to maintain the status quo until 31 December 2007. The SBI also expressed concern over the continued shortfall in contributions to the Trust Fund for Participation in the UNFCCC process

**Comment:** Lack of contributions to the Trust Fund explains our difficulty in getting delegations to the meeting. It is important that we continue to push for more contributions from Annex I Parties.

**Agenda Item 7(d) Implementation of the Headquarters Agreement**

**Outcome:** SBI requested the Executive Secretary to inform SBI of any new developments, and invited the host government to report on further progress with implementing the Headquarters Agreement at SBI 24.

**Agenda Item 7(e) Internal Review of the Activities of the Secretariat**

**Outcome:** SBI recommended a draft decision to the COP which invited expert groups' chairs to ensure that their requests to the Secretariat are within their mandates and resources available for such activities.

**Comment:** It would appear that the US again used this agenda item to question linkages with other international institutions. This is a worrying trend. Unfortunately I'm not sure that we had any AOSIS representatives covering this issue to defend the importance of linkages, particularly the outcomes of the International Meeting on SIDS in Mauritius. We will need to follow this next time.

**Agenda Item 8(a): Other Matters: Level of Emissions from the Base Year of Croatia**

**Outcome:** The SBI recommended a draft decision for the COP which confirms that Croatia shall be allowed a certain degree of flexibility with regard to its historical level of greenhouse gas emissions, and decided that SBI will consider the level of emissions for Croatia's base year at a future session.

**Agenda Item 8(b): Any other matters**

**Outcome:** SBI welcomed Canada's statement that it intends to make COP 11 and COP/MOP 1 climate neutral.

**Comment:** This is a disappointing outcome despite the efforts of AOSIS members to make this a more meaningful conclusion. The usual suspects, Saudi Arabia and the US managed to block this new initiative.

### **3. Follow Up**

3.1 The fact that COP 11 and COP/MOP will be held together means that the next meeting will be extremely busy. We need to ensure that we have as many AOSIS representatives at this meeting, as is humanly possible. Furthermore, there will be a need to be properly prepared for the meeting well in advance. I would encourage all regional members of AOSIS to try and find opportunities to meet before COP 11 so that we are well prepared.

3.2 I will try and organise a review of all draft decisions that will need to be agreed upon at COP/MOP 1 so that we are ready and prepared. Following from this there are some key issues that we need to be mindful of:

### **4. Montreal mandate:**

4.1 It is important that we keep the momentum generated by the Seminar of Government Experts moving forward. Firstly we need to establish a dialogue process among ourselves to develop a vision of what we think should happen next on climate change. As a starting point I would refer you to the paper presented by Tuvalu at the SOGE. I would be grateful to hear from people who would be interested in participating in an email dialogue so that we can develop a complete AOSIS position on this issue.

4.2 AOSIS was instrumental in proposing an additional agreement to the Convention. Many countries and NGOs are looking to us to continue this ground breaking role. As a starting point, I will write to the Canadian Presidency of COP 11 and request that an item be placed on the agenda relating to future actions on climate change.

### **5. Submissions**

5.1 Apart from the request for submissions that came out of the recent SB meeting (which are mentioned in the overview of SB-22), a general notice transmitted by the Secretariat at the beginning of the year includes some additional submission requests. I will be chasing up people to ensure we have an AOSIS submission on each of these. The following are still current:

- Harvested wood products and other issues relating to LULUCF, due 1 August 2004
- Scientific, technical and socio-economic aspects of mitigation of climate change, due 5 August 2005
- Financial mechanism of the Convention, due 15 October 2005
- Cooperation with relevant international organizations, no date specified

### **6. Compliance Regime**

6.1 At SB-22 Saudi Arabia circulated a paper indicating their belief that an amendment to the Kyoto Protocol was required to establish the two branches of the Compliance Committee. This is a legally complicated issue as described by MJ at SB-22. Nevertheless, it would appear that the best approach may be to establish the Compliance Committee by a decision of the COP/MOP rather than

opening up the Kyoto Protocol for amendment as this may open up other issues as well. Those interested in this topic please contact me so that we can form a discussion group with the aim of developing a position on this issue prior to COP/MOP 1.

## **7. Sinks discussion**

7.1 I understand that the Canadian government in collaboration with the New Zealand government is planning to hold an 'informal' inter-sessional workshop on future actions on LULUCF (sinks). We have followed this issue closely and will need to monitor this workshop, though I am very reluctant to formerly participate in discussions on one agenda item for consideration on future actions, ahead of other important issues. We need to look at all issues as a package.

## **8. AOSIS Brief**

8.1 I would personally like to thank MJ and her FIELD support staff (if there is such a thing) for preparing the brief for SB-22. I know this is an enormous burden on her time which FIELD does without payment. I am trying to find funding arrangements that may help recompense FIELD for its work, and ensure continuation of this invaluable support to AOSIS. I would also like to encourage all AOSIS colleagues to help out in the preparation of the AOSIS brief. This should be a joint effort building on the expertise and experience of all those that have participated in negotiations. If you can help write the brief for just one agenda item it would be greatly appreciated. For the COP11 in Montreal AOSIS delegations would also need to have this level of support from FIELD in their preparations.

## **9. AOSIS Representation**

9.1 As was discussed at our AOSIS meetings at SB-22, there are a number of AOSIS positions that need to be filled at COP 11. As a reminder I have attached a list of those positions. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you are interested in any of these positions (noting that a final decision will not be made until we meet again in Montreal).

## **10. AOSIS Positions that need to be filled**

10.1 As you may recall we have a standing agreement to fill positions on a regional distribution arrangement. I outlined this at the SB-22 AOSIS meeting. While I would generally like to keep to this arrangement to ensure we have a good regional spread of AOSIS members, we should also allow for some flexibility. Many of these positions require a high level of technical understanding or require a reasonable understanding and knowledge of UNFCCC and Kyoto processes. Hence it would seem appropriate that we find the most suitable people for these positions. In other words, it may be possible to find people outside the arrangement and exchange positions between regional groupings to ensure a good representation from all AOSIS regions. I look forward to final discussions on this before we finalise our nominations at COP 11.

10.2 While preparing for our final consultations on these positions in Montreal, please feel free to contact me directly in the Tuvalu UN Mission in New York.

<b>Position</b>	<b>Currently holder</b>	<b>Expiry</b>	<b>Action needed</b>
COP Bureau	Ambassador Masao Nakayama (Federated States	Expires at COP 11	May be elected for another term or a new nominee

	of Micronesia)		found
SBSTA Vice Chair	Amjad Abdulla (The Maldives)	Expires by SBSTA 23	Can be renominated or a new nominee found
CDM Executive Board	Ambassador John Ashe (Antigua and Barbuda)	Expires at the first meeting of the Board in Jan 2006	Cannot be renominated. New nominee to be found
CDM Executive Board	Desna Solofa (Samoa)	Expires first meeting of the Board in Jan 2006	As she is a direct replacement for Amb Slade, it is unclear whether she can be renominated
Kyoto Protocol Article 6 Supervisory Committee (Joint Implementation)	New position		Need new nominee
Expert Group on Technology Transfer	Kishan Kumarsingh	Expires 2005	Need new nominee
Consultative Group of Experts for Non Annex I Communications (Not formerly an AOSIS position and filled by regional groups)	Arther Rolle (The Bahamas) Luis Paz Castro (Cuba) Carlos Fuller (Belize)	Expires COP 11  Expires COP 11  Expires COP 12	Can be renominated by GRULAC Can be renominated by GRULAC
Compliance Committee (Enforcement Branch)	New Position		Need nominee
Compliance Committee (Facilitative Branch)	New Position		Need nominee

## Conclusion

Finally let me once again thank all of you the AOSIS delegates who were present throughout the heat of negotiations at the sessions of the two subsidiary bodies in Bonn last month. Through this report, it is my sincere hope that the respective AOSIS delegations in Capitals and in other chapters will take note of the significant role played by the AOSIS delegations in the climate change process, and that their work is given as strong support as possible.

My special thanks go out also to the AOSIS technical advisers MJ Mace from the FIELD Office in London and also of the FSM Delegation, and Mr Ian Fry of the Tuvalu Delegation. In the absence of technical regional bodies of the AOSIS in the Bonn meetings, the support from the two advisers was most appreciated.

-----