



U.S. Briefing of International NGOS: June 5

Subsidiary Bodies on Implementation (SBI) and Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA)

The next Subsidiary Body meetings will be at Copenhagen, so these meetings must focus on and decide meeting schedule, operations, etc. for the COP-15 now – without the benefit of knowing where the state of negotiations will be in December.

Ad-hoc Working Group on Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP)

The U.S. has been attending these meetings but not actively engaging, however it is still interested to follow the discussions and intervene more on some subjects as needed.

The U.S. does not have a lot to say about numbers (i.e. reduction commitments, targets, etc.), but other countries are interested in what we are thinking. More specifically – the Annex 1 parties that are negotiating new commitments are not ready to move under the KP until they know what the U.S. is going to do in the LCA track, and the US is not going to move until it knows what major developing countries are going to do and so on. Essentially it is a waiting game

The distinction between the two negotiating tracks (Kyoto Protocol and Long-term Cooperative Action) while legally constructed is somewhat arbitrary. Already see a convergence/overlap of issues between two tracks, within tracks – and that will need to be resolved.

What is being achieved overall is an emerging understanding of developed and developing countries' mutual positions. These talks in Bonn are the first time for some to review the U.S. submission. The U.S. delegation outreach efforts regarding their submission have included a public side event earlier in the week, bi-lateral discussions and briefings with environmental NGOs and business and industry NGOs.

The U.S. also hosted a dinner with the group of Least Developed Countries – their requests of both the US and global community were quite modest – as compared to the statements within the larger framework of the G-77, extremely concerned about capacity building.

Ad-hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action (AWG-LCA)

These negotiations are moving slowly. The informal plenary sessions of the AWG-LCA this week focused on the first reading of the negotiating text, allowing countries to make general statements and then more specific comments, suggestions and insertions of place-holders into specific pieces of the text. A second reading of a revised text is planned in the second week, if the first reading is completed and time permits.

The U.S. sees some room for convergence on the adaptation piece of the negotiating text, emerging clarity on country positions in other pieces.

On the structure of the text – the U.S. requests consolidation, reduction of duplication of topics – such as financing, obligations, etc. that are scattered several times throughout the text.

On financing – the U.S. delivered an intervention today and emphasized the need for a clear determination of how it will catalyze private sector investment, what can governments do with policy and limited public financing to leverage private financial flows.

From the Q&A

No legal difference between using the term “implementing agreement” or “protocol” – both are still legally binding and would still require Senate ratification. The choice of the terminology “implementing agreement” for the U.S. submission is in the spirit of deepening the implementation of the Convention and the Bali Action Plan, with the intention of setting forth a long-term framework.

Favors restrictions that ensure integrity of offsets, not quantity.

Not made a formal statement on counting forests – but are considering this, still shaping U.S. position for domestic use and on LUCUF for developed countries. The U.S. is beginning to intervene on this particular topic as their position develops.

Regarding offsets from avoided deforestation in developing countries – the U.S. is steering discussion to follow a strict level of integrity – one that will be similar to domestic approach so that the ability to potentially link the two will remain open.

The LCA held a briefing on historical responsibility on June 4 (the Council was hosting its luncheon at the same time but will find out exactly what was discussed). The U.S. was slightly taken aback from the discussion, but acknowledges that the conversation has gained enormous traction and it is not a constructive discussion. It will not be easy to resolve negotiations within this framework,

The U.S. notes that “historical responsibilities” change over time, citing China’s pre-Kyoto support of the “polluter pays” and its relative silence this time. Also, if cumulative emissions are looked at, the divergence is no longer so great between developed and developing.

On Technology – The U.S. has not yet looked at Japan’s proposal for regional technology centers. The U.S. is now focused on how to protect innovation, move investment forward, and provide access to market structures. The U.S. is interested in hearing from the business community as they formulate this position.