

Unclassified

ENV/EPOC(99)22/FINAL



Organisation de Coopération et de Développement Economiques
Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

OLIS : 07-Jun-1999
Dist. : 07-Jun-1999

Or. Eng.

PARIS

ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE
ENVIRONMENT POLICY COMMITTEE

ENV/EPOC(99)22/FINAL
Unclassified

BEYOND BUENOS AIRES

**1999 Forum on Climate Change
supported by the OECD and the IEA
held on 9-10 March 1999, in Paris**

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

For more information contact: Jan Corfee-Morlot, Tel: (33) 1 45 24 79 24;
Fax: (33) 1 45 24 78 76; Email: jan.corfee-morlot@oecd.org; Website:
www.oecd.org/env/cc/forum.htm

78864

Document complet disponible sur OLIS dans son format d'origine
Complete document available on OLIS in its original format

Or. Eng.

FOREWORD

The OECD and the IEA Secretariats would like to thank Forum participants for their active contributions to the discussions in the Forum. Particular thanks are also extended to this year's Chair, Bert Metz, as well as to the speakers, all of whom donated their time and their ideas to help make the meeting a success.

Copies of this document are available on request from the OECD. The document is also available on the internet along with a number of the presentations and papers from the meeting:

<http://www.oecd.org/env/cc>

Inquiries about the Forum can be sent to the OECD:

Jan Corfee Morlot, Principal Administrator -- Climate Change
OECD Environment Directorate
2, rue Andre Pascal
Paris 75775 CEDEX 16
France
email: jan.corfee-morlot@oecd.org

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD 1

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING 5

 Highlights..... 5

 Introduction..... 6

 Outcomes of COP-4..... 6

 Key Elements of the Buenos Aires Action Plan 7

 Recent OECD and IEA work 9

 Strengthening Commitments for Non-Annex I Parties 11

AGENDA 15

..... 17

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS 19

BEYOND BUENOS AIRES

1999 Forum on Climate Change

supported by the OECD and the IEA
held on 9-10 March 1999, in Paris

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

Highlights

This year's Forum focused on the results of COP4 and in particular on the Buenos Aires Action Plan. The Action Plan was designed to pave the way to clarify the Protocol, and in doing so, to help instil confidence in the Protocol and speed its entry into force. The Action Plan focuses largely on process, identifying a range of necessary technical work for completion by COP6. However, while adopting a plan of action, COP4 also provided a number of mixed signals. In particular, there was an impasse over the issue of new commitments for developing countries. In addition many at the session, including many in the private sector began to show signs of impatience. This implies that the credibility of the Protocol could hinge upon the timely completion of the Action Plan.

The Forum touched on key elements of the Buenos Aires Plan. On the **Clean Development Mechanism**, discussion pointed to the general link between clarification of the CDM and equity issues, as well as to a vision for evolution of world-wide markets for emission reduction over the longer term. Forum participants noted that **technology transfer** remains one of the most contentious issues under the Convention and the Protocol. The Action Plan calls for regional workshops to establish better networking and to begin to understand and act upon host country priorities. It was also noted that training and other forms of capacity building remain a priority. On **international emission trading**, discussion pointed to the need for incremental progress, focusing initially on a number of the most technical issues (e.g. units for trading; eligibility criteria; reporting and tracking requirements; and liability). On **policies and measures**, national performance indicators were suggested as an approach to assess progress under this part of the Protocol.

The Forum also addressed **approaches to strengthen commitments of non-Annex I countries**. Discussion was constructive and concrete leading to a number of conclusions. First, the current form of Annex I Party commitments, with an absolute emissions cap relative to a fixed historical base year, was broadly seen as inappropriate for most non-Annex I countries. Alternative, although still meaningful targets could take a variety of forms including those set relative to economic performance. Non-quantitative approaches were also suggested as a possibility that might include policies and measures targeting energy efficiency or other combined economic and environmental objectives. Discussion also considered a two-part approach. Unilateral initiatives, such as those announced by Argentina and Kazakhstan, are likely to proceed and they are likely to provide valuable experience. However, in parallel, progress should be made on a multilateral framework under the Convention that would aim to strengthen commitments, recognising early action and covering all Parties over the long term.

OECD and IEA analyses are addressing many of these Buenos Aires Action Plan issues. Recognising this work, participants urged greater openness and early sharing of relevant results to the wide UNFCCC audience.

Introduction

Chaired by Bert Metz of the Netherlands,¹ this year's Forum aimed to:

- deepen the understanding of the outcomes of the fourth Conference of the Parties, and in particular, the Buenos Aires Action Plan;
- indicate the priorities of governments and focus on the many products outlined in the Plan;
- consider the role of the OECD and IEA in undertaking some of the work to benefit the wide UNFCCC audience;
- consider how commitments under the Convention and the Protocol might evolve over time for developing countries and other countries.

The Forum on Climate Change is an annual event, sponsored by the OECD and the IEA, to discuss new and emerging issues in climate change policy. A unique gathering, it brings together representatives from industrialised and developing country governments, representatives of other multilateral organisations, environmental non-governmental organisations, trade union and industry experts. Participants attending the Forum speak in their personal capacity to allow an open and frank exchange. Approximately 150 persons attended the Forum, including participants from about 40 different countries.

Robert Priddle, Executive Director of the IEA, and Joke Waller-Hunter, Director of the Environment Directorate, opened the Forum. They called for realism to address the key issues under the Kyoto Protocol and urged countries to work together to implement its provisions. Governments need to act now at home to bring new policies forward. At the same time there is a need to make progress on the many outstanding issues outlined in the Buenos Aires Action Plan, including monitoring, verification and compliance; the Kyoto mechanisms; and assisting developing countries to implement their obligations under the Convention and the Protocol. The OECD and the IEA are ready to assist countries to accomplish these tasks.

Outcomes of COP-4

Minister Alsogaray - Chair of the fourth Conference of the Parties, Michael Zammit Cutajar - Executive Secretary of the UNFCCC, and Bakary Kante - Chair of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, reported on COP-4 and the resulting Buenos Aires Plan of Action. Looking back, and now forward, it is clear that COP-4 provided mixed signals. There were no major breakthroughs on North-North issues (e.g., supplementarity), though it is clear that climate change remains high on industrialised countries' agenda. Along the North-South axis, there were signs of a growing mobilisation by countries vulnerable to climate change. There was also clear recognition of the need to build capacity in countries from the South to respond to climate change. Finally, COP-4 also resulted in a procedural impasse on the topic of new commitments for developing countries.

The Action Plan is strong on process and sets deadlines for a range of important technical work needed to clarify the Kyoto Protocol. It leans heavily on COP-6 in 2000 as the year for major decisions. Meeting the

¹ Bert Metz is presently Head of the Global Environmental Assessment Division of the National Institute of Public Health and the Environment (RIVM) and co-chair of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Working Group III on Mitigation of Climate Change.

deadlines laid out in the Plan will facilitate ratification of the Kyoto Protocol and help to maintain continued interest and support from the private sector.

A number of new developments also emerged in Buenos Aires. First the Action Plan expands the coverage of the financial mechanism to cover funding in developing and transition countries for: climatic observation; vulnerability assessment; national communications; public awareness programmes; and capacity building. Second, it asks developing countries to identify their technology needs, a move that should help to advance implementation of the technology transfer provisions of the Convention and the Protocol. Third, regarding the Kyoto mechanisms, the Plan sets out a long list of relevant work to be completed by COP-6. Finally, it demonstrates a consensus reached at COP-4 that responses to non-compliance should be put in place under the Protocol.

Calling for workshops to advance agreement on key issues, the Action Plan moves Parties into a new technical phase of work. In 1999 alone, the UNFCCC secretariat will hold six technical workshops: on methodologies for national communications; other aspects of national communications; the Kyoto mechanisms; land use change and forestry; Articles 4.8 and 4.9 (of the Convention); and on technology transfer. A key issue is whether these technical workshops can remain technical and not turn into negotiating fora. The workshops will need to show sufficient progress to deliver results at COP-6.

Key Elements of the Buenos Aires Action Plan

Several different elements of the Buenos Aires Action Plan were covered in some detail in a panel discussion. Panel members shared views on how to advance the different elements at COP-5, including Youba Sokona on the clean development mechanism and equity; Harald Dovland on international emission trading; Jean-Jacques Becker on policies and measures; José Romero on compliance; and Ambassador Hambley on technology transfer.

Implementation of CDM

Discussion of the Clean Development Mechanism linked its implementation to equity issues, including the long term development of markets for emission reduction, the evolution of mitigation commitments and access to broad economic benefits that might result from the Kyoto mechanisms more generally.

Lack of capacity and time to hinders action

Discussion raised concern about the lack of capacity and time available in developing countries (and elsewhere) to do necessary groundwork to fully implement obligations and to participate effectively in climate change negotiations. For example, time is required to assess needs, such as technology needs, and to develop information upon which to base implementation. Annual meetings of the COP may detract valuable time from work and capacity building at home -- especially in developing countries. In industrialised countries, time is also needed to develop and strengthen domestic programmes to bring the Kyoto targets into reach.

would appear to give those who owe an environmental debt (industrialised countries), a property right and

the ability to sell that right. This is a model that does not work for the South. So there will need to be a way to open the market for emission reduction to developing countries. Discussion of this point indicated that, in turn, this is linked to how mitigation commitments should evolve in the longer term.

Discussion on the Kyoto mechanisms, and in particular on the CDM, highlighted the connection to economic development issues. In particular, COP-4 was the first time that African countries had a strong voice within the Group of 77 in climate change negotiations. They argue for recognition of their "special needs." Like small island states, African countries are particularly vulnerable to climate change, they are interested to see a fund for adaptation be supported by fees on emission trading and joint implementation transactions as well as on the clean development mechanism. One important problem is that there is no quantification of costs for adaptation available. African countries also want to attract concrete projects through the CDM. For developing countries as a whole, there is a concern that all countries should have access to the Kyoto mechanisms and to their economic benefits. Linking work on Kyoto mechanisms to capacity building efforts might help to accelerate decision making in these areas.

On international emission trading, Harald Dovland of Norway pointed out that even within industrialised countries, there is disagreement on some important design issues. A strategy for advancing discussions may be to focus on areas where agreement may come relatively easily. This might include agreement on: the units for trading; eligibility criteria; who can trade (e.g. legal entities); how to report or record transactions, such as through national registry systems; and liability. Once approaches to these issues are agreed, remaining issues will be limited and it will be easier to tackle them.

Another element of the Buenos Aires Action Plan is on policies and measures, where one of the tasks assigned to the first session of the COP/MOP to the Kyoto Protocol will be:

to consider ways to facilitate co-operation to enhance the individual and combined effectiveness of policies and measures under Article 2.1(b) of the Protocol.

Jean-Jacques Becker of France commented that work on policies and measures under the Action Plan could help to address competitiveness concerns. Policy action in both developing and industrialised groups of countries will set the stage for technology change and transfer. It is also important to address inefficient policies or those detrimental to climate change. But how should progress be assessed or measured? Article 2 of the Protocol calls for co-operation, appraisal and co-ordination. One approach might be to develop performance indicators.

On compliance, José Romero pointed out that the basis for compliance as provided for by the Kyoto Protocol is the measurement, reporting and verification of national greenhouse gas emissions. He suggested that countries should work towards establishing an international legal measurement system for greenhouse gas emissions. Going beyond Kyoto, one might aim at certification of national greenhouse gas inventories, as will be the case for emission reductions from joint implementation and CDM projects. Avoiding non-compliance will require using all possible approaches ranging from 'soft' to 'hard'. Concrete penalties for non-compliance may prove to be difficult to implement at the international level. Other options include rigorous liability options associated with implementation of the mechanisms, especially international GHG emission trading. "Post-verification" trading of available assigned amounts, as reported in the national inventories, would be another option that would potentially avoid liability problems.

Ambassador Hambley of the United States spoke on technology transfer issues and noted that there are a number of practical actions that industrialised countries can and are taking in this area. The Climate Technology Initiative is a multilateral effort to provide support to the technology transfer provisions of the Convention. It is undertaking regional workshops to provide and gather information, to facilitate

networking among relevant stakeholders and to conduct relevant training. Tapping into the private sector is essential, as is building markets and removing barriers to technology transfer. Progress will be country specific. Identifying and understanding host country priorities is central to success and the Buenos Aires Action Plan lays out a process for countries to work together on this.

Discussion of these elements of future work under the Action Plan identified a number of issues that may be ready for decision at COP5. This includes a push to clarify technology transfer obligations and requirements. It also includes consideration of information from non-Annex I national communications. An expansion of capacity building efforts to benefit developing countries is foreseen by the Plan, partly through a clearer link with the financial mechanism (GEF). On the work foreseen on the Kyoto mechanisms, and on the related topic of activities implemented jointly, participants felt that COP5 might choose to bring AIJ to a close. This could provide new impetus for the clean development mechanism (CDM). Perhaps it will also be possible to enhance the understanding of "supplementarity" at COP5, based on learning by doing, as industrialised countries move forward to establish initial domestic trading systems to limit greenhouse gas emissions. Use of the Kyoto mechanisms will require phasing-in and capacity building and this takes time. It is also likely that the mechanisms will need to advance as a package, rather than through individual decisions. Concerned that the Action Plan risks compartmentalising work on mechanisms, some participants noted the need to carefully consider inter-relationships among the mechanisms.

As COP-6 has been identified as a target date for key decisions, it is not likely that COP-5 will bring major new breakthroughs on the Kyoto mechanisms. However, action on compliance (both the technical and legal aspects) may move ahead at COP-5, as well as on how to approach the issue of adequacy of Article 4 commitments to achieve the overall objective of the Convention.

COP5: possible action items

- Clarification of technology transfer needs and obligations
- Provide new impetus for CDM and other Kyoto mechanisms by bringing AIJ to a close
- Advance compliance (both legal and technical aspects)

Recent OECD and IEA work

In a special session of the Forum, co-chaired by Thorvald Moe, Deputy Secretary-General of the OECD, participants heard from staff of the OECD and the IEA on recent work. The various elements presented during this session are part of a wider OECD effort exploring sustainable development. Climate change is a cross-cutting problem where many of the policy recommendations for sustainable development will need to be tested.

OECD economic analysis of the Kyoto Protocol:

Most of the economic gains from trading in the OECD region go to EU Member states. Russia and the Ukraine are also important economic "winners" even without the trade of "hot air."

Paul O'Brien of the OECD Economics Department; opened by outlining the results of an economic assessment of the Kyoto Protocol. This includes an assessment of the cost of implementing Kyoto targets, with and without international emission trading. Simulations conducted with the OECD's GREEN model, indicate that compared to a business-as-usual scenario, achieving the targets through domestic action alone would cost the OECD region less than 1% of gross domestic product in a given year. The average cost in the region is estimated at about ½% per year. The use of the international emission trading within the Annex I region is estimated to lower

the costs, by 20% to 30%, depending on whether there are restrictions on the trading of "hot air." While GREEN does not include endogenous technology innovation, it does suggest that early, gradual

implementation is cheaper than delayed but rapid action. This is because the former allows smooth adjustment of the capital stock to carbon constraints. A preliminary assessment of options for moving beyond Kyoto, to extend an agreement to developing countries, again shows that trading buys more abatement for the same cost. Equity is a key issue that must be addressed in allocating emission “rights,” for example on a per capita basis. Combining this concept with emission trading should allow more ambitious stabilisation targets to be achieved than would be the case without trading. Impacts and adaptation will also be important in future economic analyses, but for now the understanding of the link between global climate and local climate and impacts is weak making it difficult to assess economic consequences. Even if estimates of the direct benefits of limiting climate change are low, the precautionary principle and ancillary benefits argue for emission reduction action.

Rémy Paris, of the OECD Development Co-operation Directorate, presented initial results from work presently conducted by the Development Assistance Committee’s Working Party on Development Co-operation and Environment. This work aims to identify concrete means to advance donor support for developing countries in the implementation of the climate change and other global environmental conventions including the biodiversity and desertification conventions. He reviewed some of the key linkages between the objectives of the three Conventions and the scope for addressing them jointly. Among the key implementation challenges, he also pointed to a lack of awareness of the conventions and a failure to mainstream convention objectives within national policy-making mechanisms. He also highlighted some of the areas where future efforts will need to concentrate, in order to assist developing countries to build the necessary capacity for implementing the conventions. Finally, he pointed to some of the short-term measures which donors could take to facilitate this process (see box).

Donor action to facilitate implementation of global environmental conventions

A number of actions may be taken by donors in the near term to help developing countries build capacity and improve implementation of global environmental conventions. These include:

- harmonising the reporting of donor’s efforts towards implementation of the conventions;
- review of ongoing projects and programmes with partners to identify potential synergy;
- raising awareness of the stakes and objectives of the conventions; and
- support of participation by developing countries in expert-level discussions to clarify the key technical and scientific issues relevant to the implementation of the conventions.

Jan Corfee Morlot drawing from a forthcoming publication of the Environment Directorate, provided an overview of domestic climate policy trends and opportunities in OECD countries,. Key findings show that while many countries have in place a significant number of policies to tackle climate change, much more will need to be done to achieve Kyoto targets. Emissions in most countries continue to rise, implying a need for strengthened policy frameworks. Low cost mitigation action should begin with policies to “get prices right,” including the reform of environmentally harmful subsidies (e.g. to coal and other forms of fossil fuels and to agriculture), other fiscal reform and establishment of green taxes. Countries may also “put markets to work” by creating markets for emission reduction through domestic trading programmes. In addition to helping to achieve mitigation at lowest cost, these programmes may also prove invaluable to provide practical experience with emission trading prior to implementation of the Protocol. Other instruments are also likely to be necessary, especially where there are clear market failures. These include, *inter alia*, voluntary agreements, regulations (e.g. energy efficiency and eco-labels), and government purchasing strategies as well as technology research and development. Recent experience shows that

OECD governments are still on the learning curve -- domestic policies are still relatively new and experimentation is necessary.

Jonathan Pershing briefly presented the range of analyses undertaken by the IEA on the energy and climate change issue. He covered studies on domestic policies (e.g. the Kyoto gap analysis based on energy indicators), work on flexibility mechanisms including liability rules and the clean development mechanism and other non-Member country studies (e.g. energy subsidies). On the technology side, he described efforts such as the IEA/OECD Climate Technology Initiative and the international action to reduce leaking electricity. He also stressed the role of good energy and CO₂ statistics as a contribution to the implementation of the climate change commitments.

The OECD and the IEA plan to work together to facilitate information exchange and learning among countries, as well as to assess and promote good practice to achieve cost-effective implementation of the Protocol. Recognising this work, participants urged greater openness and early sharing of relevant analytical results to the wide UNFCCC audience.

Strengthening Commitments for Non-Annex I Parties

This session featured presentations from Minister Alsogaray of Argentina, from Rae-Kwon Chung of Korea, and Fernando Tudela of Mexico. In addition, Cornelia Quennet Thielen of Germany and Rob Sturgiss of Australia commented on possible ways forward. Presentations addressed several main themes:

- the nature of the engagement for developing countries, possible forms for targets or other meaningful mitigation obligations;
- the need for a transition period between present obligations under the Convention and more stringent mitigation obligations; and
- a framework for the engagement of all countries in mitigation efforts.

Minister Alsogaray highlighted the problems of bringing developing countries into a framework to achieve mitigation in a fair and meaningful way. Both she and Rae-Kwon Chung noted the linkage between economic growth, energy use and greenhouse gas emissions, concluding that the formula currently used for developed countries under the Kyoto Protocol, where emission limitation targets are quantitative and fixed, is probably inappropriate for other countries. This is because economies and emissions are growing more rapidly in developing countries than in their industrialised counterparts. Emission growth (and economic growth) in developing countries is also characterised by significant uncertainty. In addition to practical difficulties, developing countries find it difficult to mobilise political support for mitigation action, as the costs of such action may be immediate and the benefits are long term. Minister Alsogaray indicated that emission trading may help to motivate developing countries to participate in the agreement, especially if there is a link to technology change, improved energy efficiency and economic performance.

Fernando Tudela outlined a hierarchy of engagement that could provide a basis for discussions on how to further mitigation commitments for all countries. For example, richer countries may be expected to take on more significant commitments in shorter time frames. In this model, engaging the poorest countries would come last and they would only be expected to contribute to mitigation after wealthier countries had acted. Countries could be categorised into several groups according to economic wealth, and in this way, engagement of each group could progressively come into play over time.

Several speakers indicated that the engagement of developing countries might also take forms other than quantitative targets, including commitments to take policy action. For example, countries might commit to take mitigation action or to implement policies resulting in benefits that are consistent with economic development priorities. A key step in considering the form and level of commitments may be careful assessment of other ancillary benefits of greenhouse gas mitigation. This might document multiple benefits of mitigation action, which could encourage more significant engagement of developing countries.

Rae-Kwon Chung pointed to the link between greenhouse gas reduction and existing energy efficiency policies and goals. Strengthening the link may be one possible approach that has multiple benefits for both the economy and climate change mitigation. He identified the challenge to change the perception from burden to opportunity in achieving greenhouse gas reductions, thus turning what is perceived to be a “vicious circle” into a “virtuous circle.”

Discussion covered a wide range of alternatives for the development of quantitative targets (see box). Rob Sturgiss explained that differentiation was a key issue in the lead up to Kyoto and would continue to be central in the discussion on how to engage developing countries. Each country’s commitments must be seen in the context of commitments taken on by others. He stated that targets need to be tailored to individual circumstances taking into account key differences such as expected business as usual emissions.

Quantitative targets: alternative options

Some participants suggested that an equity-ecological perspective would argue for long-term convergence of per capita emissions targets for every country. Baselines allowing some growth in emissions might be a more realistic approach for developing countries in the nearer term. Emissions per unit of economic output are yet another possibility or, alternatively, targets that cover specific sectors within a country rather than economy-wide targets. All different forms are potentially valid and should be explored.

Several participants noted that the present form of target for Annex I countries, where a future period emission target is measured against a historical base year or period, is too rigid for developing countries. This is due to uncertainty about economic growth, its rate, and its link to emission growth. Such uncertainty could render any given target either too stringent or too loose. The implications of target setting in the context of the Kyoto mechanisms are different than in a binding agreement without such mechanisms. Uncertainty in emission pathways for developing countries could lead to “tropical hot air” if emission targets are set too high and emission trading is allowed amongst all Parties with targets. Targets, or what one participant termed “budgets” for developing countries might also be non-binding, where emissions below an agreed budget level could be sold in an international trading system, but emissions above the budget would not be subject to non-compliance responses.

There is also a need to consider a transition period for non-Annex I countries moving towards the establishment of targets. This period would precede the use of legally binding targets in these countries and serve as an interim step. Some countries (Argentina and Kazakhstan) indicated, during COP-4, their interest to move forward soon to adopt voluntary targets. Unilateral initiatives such as these could provide valuable experience to assist the international community to “learn by doing.” In parallel, international work could develop a multilateral framework for systematic engagement of all major emitting countries.

Cornelia Quennet Thielen indicated that a possible framework discussion, on how to engage all countries in mitigation commitments, could be initiated in the review by Parties of adequacy of existing commitments. To date, review of adequacy discussions under the Convention pertained to specific Article 4.2 commitments. A similar, broad-based discussion of commitments should be initiated under Article 7.2. Article 7.2 calls on the Conference of the Parties to promote effective implementation of the Convention and to this end to:

periodically examine the obligations of the Parties and the institutional arrangements under the Convention, in the light of the objective of the Convention, the experience gained in its implementation and the evolution of scientific and technical knowledge.

This approach would require careful assessment of the concentration levels and time frames needed to achieve the ultimate objective in Article 2 of the FCCC, and the implications for global emissions. It would build in particular on the Third Assessment Report from the IPCC. At the end of the examination, there would be a better basis for understanding and for decisions on a framework for the evolution of national commitments.

In summary, unilateral initiatives are likely to proceed and they would potentially provide valuable experience on alternative approaches to develop mitigation commitments for non-Annex I countries. Meanwhile, Parties should make progress on a multilateral framework to build a process for decision-making to strengthen commitments towards achieving the objective of the Convention. Such a framework should recognise early mitigation action, so as to encourage countries to work towards increasing mitigation obligations. A framework should also aim to achieve comprehensive coverage over time.

**Forum on Climate Change
Supported by the OECD and IEA**

AGENDA

**9-10 March 1999 at IEA Headquarters
9 rue de la Fédération
75015 Paris**

Overall Objective: To deepen the understanding of the Buenos Aires Action Plan; to stimulate discussion on the many products envisaged under the Action Plan; to consider the role of the OECD and IEA, in the context of the wide UNFCCC audience, in undertaking some of the work; and to consider the role and priorities of governments in moving the Action Plan forward.

9 March, Day 1

Session 1. Welcome and Introduction

Chair: **Bert Metz**, *Co-Chair of the IPCC Working Group III*

The session speakers will frame the broad discussion on the outcomes from Buenos Aires, focusing on issues that need to be resolved by governments, including potential analytical work that the OECD and IEA can provide in supporting the resolution of these issues.

9:30 *Introductory remarks by the Chair, Bert Metz*

9:45 *Robert Priddle, Executive Director of the IEA*

10:00 *Joke Waller-Hunter, Director of the OECD Environment Directorate*

Session 2. COP4 Outcomes

This session will provide for perspectives from COP officials -- the President, Executive Secretary and the Chair of the Subsidiary Body for implementation -- on the outcomes from COP 4, including their views on key issues that governments need to resolve by COP 5 and COP 6 under the Buenos Aires Action Plan.

10:15 Keynote Address: Minister Alsogaray, Argentina, Chair of COP4

10:30 Coffee break

11:00-11:20 *Bakary Kante, Chairman of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation*

11:20-11:40 *Michael Zammit Cutajar, Executive Secretary of the UN FCCC*

11:40-12:30 Discussion

12:30 -14:30 Lunch

Session 3 Perspectives on Climate Change Policy from the OECD and the IEA

Chair: **Mr. Moe**, *Deputy Secretary General of the OECD*

Presenters in this session will speak to activities underway in the OECD and IEA, linking back to the Buenos Aires Action Plan. Discussion should elicit comments on the work proposed, its relevance to the Action Plan and any new work that countries may want to recommend. This is intended as a brainstorming session and is not intended to develop consensus recommendations.

14:30 *Introductory remarks by the Chair, Mr. Moe, Deputy Secretary General of the OECD*

14:40-15:30 Paul O'Brien, *OECD, Economics Department* -- Taking Action Against Climate Change: The Kyoto Protocol (Presentation and discussion)

15:30-16:10 Rémy Paris, *OECD Development Co-operation Directorate* -- Capacity Building: climate change and other multilateral environmental agreements (Presentation and discussion)

16:10-16:30 **Coffee break**

16:30-17:15 Jan Corfee-Morlot, *OECD, Environment Directorate* -- OECD and Climate Change: Domestic Policies (Presentation and Discussion)

17:15-18:00 Jonathan Pershing, *IEA, Energy and Environment* -- IEA Activities on Climate Change Policy Issues (Presentation and Discussion)

18:00 **Cocktail**

10 March, Day 2

Session 4. Towards Global Participation

Chair: **Bert Metz**, *Co-Chair of the IPCC Working Group III*

The panellists will present experiences and ideas on future avenues to global participation. The Forum participants can discuss the technical and political implications of moving towards global participation. The Chair will set the stage with an introduction to the session looking at IPCC long term emission trends and options for changing these trends at the international level.

9:30-10:00 Presentation by the Chair, Bert Metz, followed by questions and answers

10:00-10:10 Minister Alsogaray, Argentina

10:10-10:20 Mr. Chung, *Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Korea*

10:20-10:30 Mr. Tudela, *Ministry of Environment, Mexico*

10:30-11:00 Coffee break

11:00-11:10 Ms. Quennet-Thielen, *Germany*

11:10-11:20 Mr. Sturgiss, *Australia*

11:20-12:30 Discussion

12:30-14:30 LUNCH

Session 5. Some elements of the Buenos Aires Action Plan --

Chair: **Bert Metz**, *Co-Chair of the IPCC Working Group III*

Panellists are asked to provide their viewpoint on how to advance the implementation on selected issues under the Buenos Aires Action Plan for COP 5.

14:30 Introduction by the Chair, Bert Metz

14:40 Clean Development Mechanism -- Mr. Youba Sokona, *Environmental Development Action in the Third World (ENDA), Senegal*

14:50 Technology Transfer – Ambassador Mark G. Hambley, *United States*

15:00 Emissions Trading -- Mr. Harald Dovland, *Ministry of Environment, Norway*

15:10 Policies and Measures -- Mr. Jean-Jacques Becker, *Mission interministérielle de l'effet de serre, Ministère de l'aménagement du territoire et de l'environnement, France*

15:20 Compliance -- Mr. José Romero, *Département fédéral de l'environnement, des transports, de l'énergie et de la communication, Switzerland*

15:30 Perspectives on Equity -- Youba Sokona, *Environmental Development Action in the Third World (ENDA), Senegal*

15:40 Discussion

16:30 Close of Forum

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

GOVERNMENT PARTICIPANTS

ARGENTINA	Minister M.J. ALSOGARAY <i>(Speaker)</i> S.E. Sra. E. KELLY Sra Maria SIBONI DE KIKUCHI Mr. F. A. GARDELLA	Secretariat of Natural Resources and Sustainable Development Ambassador Director General of Environmental Affairs Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores, Comercio Internacional y Culto Asesora de la Secretaria de Recursos Naturales y Medio Ambiente Humano Conseiller d' Ambassade Ambassade de la République d' Argentine en France
AUSTRALIA	Ms. S. THOMPSON Mr. R. STURGISS <i>(Speaker)</i>	Manager Climate Change Team Australian Greenhouse Office First Secretary Australian Mission to the OECD
AUSTRIA	Mrs. FREUDENSCHUSS- REICHL Ms. S. FASCHING	Permanent mission of Austria to the United Nations, Permanent Delegation to the OECD
BELGIUM	Mr. G. MICHAUX	Belgian Ministry for Economy, Energy Administration
CANADA	Ms. Jean COOPER Mrs. Y. BALTACIOGLU Mr. D. DRAKE Ms. G. MILLER	Senior Director Environment Division Energy Policy Branch Natural Resources Canada Director General International Relations Environment Canada Department of Foreign Affairs Permanent Delegation to the OECD
CZECH REPUBLIC	Mr. E. LIPPERT Mr. J. REITINGER Mr. J. SVOBODA	Senior Expert Dept. of Strategy & Environmental Statistics Ministry of Environment Ministry of Industry and Trade of the Czech Republic Permanent Delegation to the OECD
DENMARK	Mr. T. CHRISTIANSEN Mr. M. RASK Mrs. P. SØRENSEN	Head of Section Secretariat for Environment Ministry of Foreign Affairs Head of Section Danish Energy Agency Head of Section Danish Energy Agency

EGYPT	Mr. E. ABDELGHAFAR	Minister Plenipotentiary Department of Environment and Sustainable Development Ministry of Foreign Affairs
EUROPEAN COMMISSION	Mr. J. DELBEKE	Head of Climate Unit DGXI
FINLAND	Mr. J. KUUSI	Counsellor Ministry for Foreign Affairs
	Ms. A. SILVENNOINEN	Ministry of Trade and Industry
	Mr. H. SISULA	Environmental Counsellor Ministry of the Environment
	Mr. M. LEHTONEN	Senior Advisor Ministry of the Environment
	Mr. J. PYYKKÖ	Permanent Delegation of Finland to OECD
FRANCE	M. J.-J. BECKER <i>(Speaker)</i>	Mission interministérielle de l'effet de serre Ministère de l'aménagement du territoire et de l'environnement
	Mme. F. LOISEAU	Chef de la Division développement international Ministère de l'économie des finances et de l'industrie
	Mme. A. MATHIS	Mission interministérielle de l'effet de serre Ministère de l'aménagement du territoire et de l'environnement
	M. A. RIEDACKER	Mission interministérielle de l'effet de serre Ministère de l'aménagement du territoire et de l'environnement
	M. M. VEDELE	Ministère de l'aménagement du territoire et de l'environnement Direction générale de l'administration et du développementService des affaires internationales
	Mme. M. TANG	Direction des affaires économiques et financières Ministère des affaires étrangères
	M. H. HANNE	Chargé de Mission Observatoire de l'énergie Ministère de l'économie, des finances et de l'industrie Direction générale de l'énergie et des matières premières Secrétariat d'Etat à l'industrie
	Mme. D. LIFFARD	Responsable de la Division Utilisation rationnelle de l'énergie Service des Energies renouvelables et de l'utilisation rationnelle de l'énergie Direction générale de l'énergie et des matières premières Ministère de l'économie, des finances et de l'industrie
	M. L. RENOUIL	Direction du Trésor Aide au Développement Institutions multilatérales de développement Ministère de l'économie, des finances et de l'industrie

GERMANY	Mrs. C. QUENNET-THIELEN <i>(Speaker)</i>	Head of Division GII 1 (Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Reactor Safety) Bundesministerium für Umwelt, Naturschutz und Reaktorsicherheit (BMU)
	Dr. M. SCHULZ	Deputy Head of Division Federal Ministry of Economics and Technology
GREECE	Mrs. O. DRITSA-DOSHORI	Head of Division Ministry of National Economy
	Dr. E. GEORGOPOULOU	Research Associate National Observatory of Athens
	Mr. Y. KLIDONAS	Counselor on Environment Permanent Delegation of Greece to the OECD
HUNGARY	Dr. T. PÁLVOGYI	Director General, Ministry for Environment
ITALY	Dr. A. COLOSIMO	ENEA - Italian Agency for Energy, New Technologies and Environment
	DR. G. DI PALMA	Ministry of Industry
	Ms. A. MIGNONE	Attachée scientifique Délégation d'Italie auprès de l'OCDE
	Mr. A. CARDELLI Dr. G. TOSATO	Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Italy ENEA - Italian Agency for Energy, New Technologies and Environment
JAPAN	Mr. K. AKASAKA	Deputy Director-General Multilateral Co-operation Department Foreign Policy Bureau Ministry of Foreign Affairs
	Mr. Y. HOSOYA	Director, Environment Research & Development Tokyo Electric Power Company
	Mr. J. ARIMA	Counsellor Delegation of Japan to the OECD
	Mrs. K. SEGAWA	Second Secretary Permanent Delegation of Japan to the OECD
	Mr. T. SEKIYA	Assistant Director Control and Co-operation Division Global Environmental Department Environment Agency
KAZAKHSTAN	Mr. G. N. CHICHASOV	Doctor of science, professor Kazakh Scientific and Research Institute for Environment and Climate Monitoring (Kaznimosk)
KOREA	Mr. R.-K. CHUNG <i>(Speaker)</i>	Deputy Director-General for Science and Environment Affairs Ministry of Foreign Affairs
	Ms. P.-J. LEE	Director Global Environment Division Ministry of Environment
	Mr. C-W. KIM	Deputy Director Environment and Science Division Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade

	Mr. M.-Y. JUN	Assistant Director Energy and Resources Policy Division Ministry of Commerce, Industry and Energy
	Dr. Y.-S. CHO	Research Associate Center for Climate Change Studies Korea Energy Economics Institute
	Dr. S.-I. KANG	Associate Fellow Research Division Korea Environment Institute
	Ms. H.-A PARK	Manager Center for Climate Change Mitigation Project Korea Energy Management Corporation
	Mr. YUN Hyun-Soo	Assistant Director Environment and Science Division Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade
LATVIA	Mrs. I. APENE	Senior Official Environmental Protection Dept. Ministry of Environmental Protection & Regional Development
MEXICO	Dr. F. TUDELA (<i>Speaker</i>)	Co-ordinator of Advisors to the Minister SEMARNAP (Ministry of Environment, Renewable Resources and Fisheries)
	Mr. G. GONZÁLEZ-DÁVILA	Minister Permanent Representative to the OECD Ministry of Environment, Natural Resources and Fisheries, France
	Mr. B. P. HENRIQUEZ	c/o University of California, Berkeley Goldman School of Public Policy
	Ms. S. LEAL	Conseiller Commerce et Industrie Délégation permanente du Mexique auprès de l'OCDE
NETHERLANDS	Mr. Y. de BOER	Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment
	Mr. H. HAANSTRA	Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment
	Mr. A. GIELEN	Ministry of Economic Affairs
	Ms. M. ALLBERSBERG	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
	Mr. J. W. Van DEDEM	Permanent Delegation to the OECD
NEW ZEALAND	Ms. J. KEMPKERS	Second Secretary (Environment) Permanent Delegation of New Zealand to the OECD
	Ms. S. MACFARLANE	Energy Advisor Permanent Delegation of New Zealand to the OECD / IEA
NORWAY	Mrs. T. SKOGEN	Deputy Director General Ministry of Petroleum and Energy
	Mr. H. TORESEN	Deputy Director General Ministry of the Environment
	Mr. H. DOVLAND (<i>Speaker</i>)	Ministry of the Environment

	Ambassador O. K. HOLTHE	Special Adviser Royal Ministry of Foreign Affairs
PHILIPPINES	Ms. B. MÜLLER	Division II (MEAs), UNIO Department of Foreign Affairs
POLAND	Mr. M. MROZ	Head of Minister's Political Cabinet Ministry of Environmental Protection, Natural Resources and Forestry
	Mr. R. PURSKI	Expert, Ministry of Environmental Protection, Natural Resources and Forestry
	Mr. W. ANTCZAK	First Secretary, Permanent Delegation of Poland to the OECD
PORTUGAL	Mr. J. VILA LOBOS,	Senior Officer General Directorate of Environment Ministry of Environment
	Mr. M. GARCIA	Directorate General of Energy Ministry of Economy
RUSSIAN FEDERATION	Mr. V. K. BERDIN	Chief, Division on Global Ecological Agreements State Committee of the Russian Federation on Environment Protection
	Mr. O. PLOUJNIKOV	Ministry of Fuel and Energy
SLOVAK REPUBLIC	Mr. D. BELLA	Embassy of the Slovak Republic OECD Section
SLOVENIA	Mr. A. KRANJC	Adviser, International Contacts Hydrometeorological Institute
SOUTH AFRICA	Mr. F. LUBOYERA	South African Weather Bureau
SPAIN	Mr. G. MAGANTO FERNANDEZ	Ministerio de Industria y Energia
	Mr. L. H. ALONSO MIJARES	Expert Ministère de l'Industrie et de l'Energie
	Ms. A. CRISTOBAL	Ministerio de Medio Ambiente Jefe de Servicio Dirección General de Calidad y Evaluacion Ambiental
SWEDEN	Mr. A. TURESSON	Ministry of the Environment
SWITZERLAND	Mme J. VOÏNOV	Office fédéral des affaires économiques extérieures Questions industrielles et technologiques internationales Département fédéral de l'économie
	M. J. ROMERO (<i>Speaker</i>)	Office fédéral de l'environnement, des forêts et des paysages Département fédéral de l'environnement, des transports, de l'énergie et de la communication

	M. A. HILBER	Office fédéral de l'environnement, des forêts et des paysages
	M. B. PERRIN	Département fédéral de l'environnement, des transports, de l'énergie et de la communication
	M. P. FONTANA	Office fédéral de l'énergie
	M. G. KESSLER	Département fédéral de l'environnement, des transports, de l'énergie et de la communication
TURKEY	Mr. O. GÜLÇAT	Permanent Delegation to OECD
	Ms. Y. GÜNDÜZ-ÖZCERI	Permanent Delegation to OECD
UKRAINE	Mr. V. DEMKIN	Director of Environment Dept. General Directorate of Energy Affairs Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources Third Secretary Permanent Delegation of Turkey to the OECD
UNITED KINGDOM	Mr. J. ASHTON	Expert to the Ministry for Environmental Protection & Nuclear Safety
	Mr. P. BETTS	Head, Environment, Science and Energy Department Foreign and Commonwealth Office
	Mr. D. CALPIN	Head of Global Atmosphere Division Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions Global Atmosphere Division
	Mr. S. CLEARY	Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions Permanent Delegation to the OECD
UNITED STATES	Mr. J. MIOTKE	Deputy Director US Department of State Bureau of Oceans & International Environment & Scientific Affairs Office of Global Change
	Ambassador M. G. HAMBLEY	Special Negotiator for Climate Change Bureau of Oceans & International Environmental & Scientific Affairs US Department of State
	Mr. D. DONIGER	Counsel to the Assistant Administrator for Air & Radiation US EPA

INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATIONS

IPCC	Mr. Bert METZ Chair	Co-Chair, Working Group III on Mitigation of Climate Change and Head, Global Environment Assessment Division of the National Institute of Public Health and the Environment (RIVM), NL
	Ms. R. CHRIST	Deputy Secretary
UNDP	Ms. A. BONNIN RONCEREL	Senior Programme Officer Energy and Atmosphere Programme Bureau for Development Policy
	UN FCCC	Mr. M. ZAMMIT CUTAJAR (<i>Speaker</i>)
UNEP	Mr. B. KANTE (<i>Speaker</i>)	Chair of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation Ministry of Environment and Protection of Nature, Senegal
	Ms C. PARKER	Coordinator, Implementation Programme
	M. C. PHILIBERT	Senior Consultant Economics and Trade Unit Technology, Industry and Economics Division UNEP Collaborating Centre Risø National Laboratory
Ms. F. MISSFELDT		
GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL FACILITY	Mr. A. MILLER	Acting Team Leader for Climate Change
IFC/GEF Efficient Lighting Initiative (ELI)	Ms. Sabrina BIRNER	
INTERNATIONAL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE	Mr. M. KOHN	Chairman, Institute for Capital and Economy
WORLD BANK	C. S. SINHA	Environment Department,

NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATIONS

BIAC	Mr. K. R. KOHLHASE	(Co-Chairman of the BIAC Working Group on Climate Change)
	Mr. P. CICIO	Senior Environmental Adviser Global Issues Manager/Government Relations Hydrocarbon & Energy The Dow Chemical Company
	Mr. D. F. LEWIS	Vice President Government Affairs
	Mr. J. PALMISANO	Director, Environmental Policy and Compliance Enron International
	Mr. R. LAFFITTE	Director, Energy Policy and Planning Eastman Chemical Company
	Mr. J. NOVAK	Director, Environmental Activities Edison Electric Institute
	Mr. T. VANT	Executive Secretary Syncrude Canada
	Mr. D. S. CAHN	Sr. Vice President – Corporate Services California Portland Cement Co.

CLIMATE NETWORK EUROPE	Ms. D. VILLAGRASA	Director
BANGLADESH CENTRE FOR ADVANCED STUDIES	Dr. A. RAHMAN	Director
CARL DUISBERG GESELLSCHAFT	Mr. K. KNECHT	Dipl. Volkswirt Gruppe Umwelt und Ressourcenschutz
ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE FUND	Ms. A. PETSONK	International Counsel
ENVIRONMENTAL DEVELOPMENT ACTION IN THE THIRD WORLD	Mr. Y. SOKONA (<i>Speaker</i>)	Deputy Executive Secretary
FIELD	Mr. J. D. WERKSMAN	Senior Lawyer
FRIENDS OF THE EARTH	Dr. F. MACGUIRE	Climate Change Policy Coordinator
GREENPEACE INTERNATIONAL	Mr. B. HARE	Climate Change Policy Advisor
IUCN - THE WORLD CONSERVATION UNION	Mr. B. M. ORLANDO	Climate Change Program Officer Washington Office
TUAC	Mr. W. BUSCHAK	Confederal Secretary European Trade Union Confederation (ETUC)
	Mr. L. POWELL	Director, Health & Safety IMF – International Metalworkers’ Federation
	Mr. B. FOLLIARD	Confédération Force Ouvrière (Cgt-FO)
WORLD BUSINESS COUNCIL FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT (WBCSD)	Mr. L. SOLSBERY	Director, Energy and Climate Change Foundation for Business and Sustainable Development
	Mr. A. J. MURPHY	Vice President, Global Climate Change Shell International Ltd
	Mr. D. MOORCROFT	Program Manager
	Mr. C. NICHOLSON	BP-Amoco, London
WORLD WILDLIFE FUND	Dr. U. COLLIER	Climate Change Policy Officer Panda House
	Ms. J. MORGAN	Senior Program Associate WWF – US
WUPPERTAL INSTITUTE FOR CLIMATE, ENVIRONMENT AND ENERGY	Mr. Hermann OTT	Acting Head, Climate Policy Division

OECD SECRETARIAT
2, rue André Pascal, 75775 Paris Cedex 16

Mr. T. MOE	Deputy Secretary-General of the OECD	
ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE	Ms. J. WALLER-HUNTER	Director
	Mr. J. CINQ-MARS	Head of Division
	Ms. J. CORFEE MORLOT	Principal Administrator
	Ms. J. ELLIS	Administrator
	Mr. S. WILLEMS	Administrator
	Ms. C. CERREDO	Secretariat
	Ms. L. LEVASSEUR	Secretariat
	Ms. C. STURGEON	Secretariat
ECONOMICS DEPARTMENT	Mr. P. O'BRIEN	Principal Administrator
	Mr. J. ELMESKOV	Counsellor
DIRECTORATE FOR DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION	Mr. R. PARIS	Administrator, Security and Development
TRADE DIRECTORATE	Mr. D. ANDREW	Principal Administrator

INTERNATIONAL ENERGY AGENCY
9, rue de la Fédération, 75739 Paris CEDEX 15

Mr. R. PRIDDLE	Executive Director
Mr. J. P. FERRITER	Deputy Executive Director
Mr. J.-M. BOURDAIRE	Director, Office of Long Term Co-operation and Policy Analysis
Mr. H. J. KOCH	Director, Office of Energy Technology, Efficiency and R&D
Mr. W. C. RAMSAY	Director, Office of Non-Member Countries
Mr. H.-J. NEEF	Head, Energy Technology Collaboration Division
Mr. J. PERSHING	Head, Energy and Environment Division
Mr. A. LANZA	Principal Administrator, Energy and Environment Division
Ms. K. VARANGU	Principal Administrator
Mr. R. BARON	Administrator, Energy and Environment Division
Mrs. J. Gell	Energy and Environment Division
Ms. M. MADDEN	Energy and Environment Division

BIAC Secretariat

Ms. H. ROSENBAUM	Manager
------------------	---------