

30 September 2002

ENGLISH ONLY

UNITED NATIONS FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE

SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE

Seventeenth session

New Delhi, 23–29 October 2002

Item 7 of the provisional agenda

**“GOOD PRACTICES” IN POLICIES AND MEASURES AMONG PARTIES INCLUDED IN
ANNEX I TO THE CONVENTION**

Submissions from Parties

1. The Subsidiary Body for Scientific Advice, at its sixteenth session, invited Parties to submit their views on initial results obtained from the activities undertaken on “good and best” practices in policies and measures in implementing the relevant elements of the Buenos Aires Plan of Action and decision 13/CP.7 (FCCC/SBSTA/2002/6, para. 45 (c) and (h)). It also invited Parties to submit, by 18 August 2002, their views on a frame for defining the further steps to be taken in implementing decision 13/CP.7 (FCCC/SBSTA/2002/6, para. 45 (e) and (h)).
2. The secretariat has received six submissions. In accordance with the procedure for miscellaneous documents, these submissions are attached and reproduced* in the language in which they were received and without formal editing.

* These submissions have been electronically imported in order to make them available on electronic systems, including the World Wide Web. The secretariat has made every effort to ensure the correct reproduction of the texts as submitted.

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1. AUSTRALIA (Submission received 9 August 2002)	3
2. CANADA (Submission received 26 August 2002)	6
3. DENMARK ON BEHALF OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY AND ITS MEMBER STATES AND OF CROATIA, CZECH REPUBLIC, HUNGARY, LITHUANIA, SLOVAKIA AND SLOVENIA (Submission received 16 August 2002)	9
4. IRAN (Submission received 12 August 2002)	13
5. JAPAN (Submission received 19 September 2002)	14
6. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (Submission received 26 August 2002)	15

PAPER NO. 1: AUSTRALIA

**Submission of Australia to the UNFCCC on
“Good Practices” in Policies and Measures**
August 2002

Introduction

The conclusions of the sixteenth session of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice invite Parties to submit their views on the elements identified in paragraphs 2 and 4 of document FCCC/SBSTA/2002/L.10. Australia welcomes the opportunity to provide its views on the nature of the work undertaken and planning for future activities under this agenda item.

Australia considers that it is timely to take stock of these activities to assess how what has been delivered to date has created value; whether circumstances have changed regarding the context for the discussion on policies and measures; and whether an opportunity exists for a new focus and direction in regard to the work under policies and measures to compliment the existing information sharing role of this agenda item.

In our view, circumstances have in recent times fundamentally altered regarding the context for a discussion of policies and measures. Australia, with a number of Annex I Parties, is committed to meeting its Kyoto Protocol target, and the rules regarding the means to achieve this have in large part been settled at COP7. These rules limit the explicit international role for rules relating to policies and measures to issues such as supplementarity, review, compliance and demonstrable progress. Further, almost all Annex I Parties now have in place broad ranging policies and measures. Thus the aims that have in the past characterised the approach of some Parties to the policies and measures agenda item – particularly, of seeking a harmonised or internationally specified approach to policies and measures – are no longer relevant.

What is now relevant is to move the policies and measures item to a stage involving the consideration of actions and obligations by all Parties to limit emissions. Australia considers that directions established to date under the policies and measures agenda item should be evaluated in this light. In our view, decisions taken to date, including decision 13.CP/7, warrant scrutiny in terms of these circumstances.

Australia would wish to see the policies and measures agenda item develop as follows:

- The *aim* of providing information to assist all Parties to enhance the effectiveness of current actions, and to prepare for or assist in meeting obligations to limit emissions
 - but not of specifying what the nature of these policies and measures might be
- The *role* of the COP and SBSTA being confined to providing a forum for the discussion of work undertaken elsewhere
 - actively using of the benefits of research and activities undertaken in relevant international and intergovernmental organisations
 - but avoiding duplicating this work, as has taken place in the past
- The *process* involving streamlined and efficient use of time in meetings of the COP and SBSTA, rather than – at least at this stage – further intersessional consultation

The remainder of our comments address the issues raised in the SBSTA conclusions.

- (a) Reports prepared by the secretariat on policies and measures of Annex I Parties, including compilation and synthesis reports of the national communications of Annex I Parties**

In Australia's view, reports prepared by the Secretariat to date have been of high value, particularly through assisting the formation of a comparative view of the growing suite of available policies and measures. We would be keen to see the Secretariat's role in the compilation and synthesis of reports of the national communications of Annex I Parties continue along established lines. We do not see any need for this role, or the number or type of reports produced, to increase.

(b) Content and scope of presentations at the workshops

Past Workshops have had a sectoral focus, which has been useful in highlighting both specific measures and also the national circumstances which have led to the adoption of such measures. They have also attempted to take on a broader, cross-cutting focus, although this has proven more challenging. The experience with workshops to date indicates that it has been difficult to generalise the experiences of a Party with its policies and measures beyond the circumstances of the Party concerned.

This is, in part, a result of the broad focus of the COP and the SBSTA, as well as its negotiating context. In other forums beyond the UNFCCC, which have more targeted mandates and are less focussed upon negotiating rules, an approach has evolved which has been conducive to pursuing specific sectoral and cross-cutting issues.

Accordingly, at this point, Australia does not see the need for further workshops in the near future. In the longer term, there might be value in any future workshops along the lines articulated in a previous Australian submission on policies and measures (FCCC/SBSTA/2002/MISC.7).

(c) Activities undertaken as compared with the relevant decisions of the Conference of the Parties and conclusions of the SBSTA

To date, three aspects in the consideration of P&Ms have emerged:

- 1) Agreement on new rules – Decision 13/CP.7 and associated SBSTA conclusions
- 2) Sharing of information – through past workshops and submissions from Parties
- 3) Coordination of information exchange – for example, the positive step agreed to at SBSTA 16 for a stocktake and to receive input from relevant international and intergovernmental organisations.

1) Agreement on new rules - The needs of the Convention and the Protocol

The relevant decisions by the COP and the conclusions of SBSTA have had a distinct focus in the last 4 years on finalising the rules for the Kyoto Protocol which culminated with COP7 and decision 13/CP.7. The context for this discussion has dealt with issues such as supplementarity, review, compliance and demonstrable progress.

In light of the altered circumstances as outlined above, there is a need for the dialogue on policies and measures to return to its basic foundations and take on a broader focus under the auspices of UNFCCC, notably via Article 4 and 7, paragraph 2(b) of the Convention. This work would involve all Parties in a discussion of policies and measures to assist all Parties to enhance the effectiveness of current actions, and to prepare for or assist in meeting obligations to limit emissions.

2) Sharing of information by all Parties- the need for a conceptual framework

The sharing of information through the existing channels such as the reports prepared by the secretariat on policies and measures of Annex I Parties and the compilation and synthesis reports of the national communications of Annex I Parties has served an important function to date. The compilation and synthesis reports, in particular, form a very useful record of the comparative efforts of Parties.

The last four years have also witnessed a growing suite of available information on policies and measures, particularly through two workshops. It has however been difficult to assimilate this work, and to extend its utility beyond the short duration and limited participation of the particular workshop.

3) Coordination of information exchange – policies and measures in other forums

This strand of work has, in Australia's view, contributed positively to the needs of Parties. As outlined below, we welcome its continuation and enhancement – in a focussed manner.

(d) Means and tools to share experiences

The COP has before it a model of an efficient means to share information on policies and measures. Informal round tables – similar to that used by the Ad hoc Group on the Berlin Mandate (eg at AGBM3 – see document FCCC/AGBM/1996/8) have been used to supplement formal discussions in plenary or contact groups. The informality of these round tables has led to a franker and freer exchange of views, while their scheduling as part of a contact group treatment of the issue ensures maximum participation by Parties, observers and non-governmental organisations. This participation is much greater than can be the case for a stand-alone workshop, where participants have to specifically travel for the workshop. Parties might in the future find creative ways to use forums such as side events in ways that allow Parties to discuss issues related to choices of policy measures and respective decision-making frameworks.

Paragraph 4 (Elements of a frame)

(a) General information sharing

Australia supports the continuation of general information sharing through targeted products and processes. Written products produced by the secretariat to date have been of high quality, and will continue to have an important role.

(b) Information-sharing in specific areas encompassing all relevant sectors and cross-cutting and methodological issues

Australia does not see a specific need for work of this sort to continue in the direction taken to date. While there has been value in some work of this sort, it is limited to providing for a broad discussion of policies and measures in the context of actions and obligations by all Parties to limit emissions.

(c) Information from relevant international and intergovernmental organisations active in the area of Policies and Measures relevant to the Convention

Australia considers that considerably greater use could be made of information held by and developed in relevant international and intergovernmental organisations. This has been an occasional feature of this agenda item in the past – for example in the AGBM context as cited above – and could be used to greater benefit in the future.

The COP can add value to the very considerable body of work being undertaken elsewhere by offering a forum where the results of this work can be brought together and discussed in the one location, and in the context of efforts by all Parties. It should not in the future be the role of the COP, with its limited resources and focus upon other issues, to attempt to supplement this work.

PAPER NO. 2: CANADA

‘Good Practices’ in Policies and Measures - Views on the Elements of a Frame for Defining Further Steps to Advance the Work on ‘Good Practices’ in Policies and Measures of Annex I Parties and Views on the Initial Results Obtained from Activities Undertaken on ‘Good Practices’ by Annex I Parties

**Submission by the Government of Canada
August 2002**

Introduction

The Government of Canada welcomes the opportunity to provide views on the elements of a frame for defining further steps required to advance the work on ‘good practices’ in Policies and Measures (P&Ms) and on the initial results vis-à-vis the work undertaken on ‘good practices’.

Canada recognizes the effort of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) secretariat for the quality of the work that has been accomplished. Learning through the exchange of information among Parties constitutes, from Canada’s point of view, the key objective that should be pursued. Allowing such information exchanges and consequential learning should, in the long run, assist Parties in selecting, developing and implementing good practices in P&Ms based on each country’s specific national circumstances.

Views on the Elements of a Frame for Defining Further Steps to Advance the Work on ‘Good Practices’ in P&Ms of Annex I Parties

The three elements that have been identified in the frame should set the stage for Parties to continue the work on P&Ms and help to ensure that a more streamlined process for disseminating general and specific information is discussed.

The frame should also provide the opportunities to focus on specific areas of interest. Canada has indicated in previous submissions that Parties should concentrate discussion on certain aspects of ‘good practices’ in P&Ms such as the methodologies to evaluate their suitability, the effectiveness of P&Ms, the cross-cutting issues that are common to a number of sectors, the uptake of technologies and voluntary measures.

An important issue which has not received significant attention in the past is related to the approach/steps taken by Parties in developing an overall strategy to address climate change. In a number of instances Parties have developed strategies, including mixes of different P&Ms for addressing climate change.

However, it would be worthwhile for Parties to focus at the elements that support the elaboration of a national strategy (e.g. process used to arrive at a strategy, involvement of stakeholders) and how decisions are made to include specific P&Ms. Finally, there is also a need to evaluate the effectiveness of P&Ms and therefore a special attention should also be placed on the methodologies available to Parties in conducting such assessment/evaluation.

Another key area where Parties should dedicate some time, is the importance of implementing P&Ms in such a manner so as to minimize the impact of adverse effects. Canada believes that future work could complement the relevant ongoing CoP activities on the impact of response measures. Future work could include identifying the *positive* impacts of response measures on developing countries in

fields such as measuring the induced co-benefits through the availability of improved technologies, and the reduced cost of adaptation or industrial leakage.

Canada also recognizes the important broad contribution of technology in an overall national climate change response strategy. An effort should be made by Parties to initiate an exchange of views on the role of technology, including basic and applied research and development, in a national response strategy. It would be useful for Parties to indicate how the uptake of existing and advanced technologies could help Parties meet greenhouse gas reductions in the short-term and beyond the first commitment period.

Finally, Canada recognizes the added benefit of coordinating information-sharing with relevant international and intergovernmental organizations active in the area of P&Ms. This is an excellent opportunity to expand the resources for sharing information on P&Ms. However, duplication should be avoided, and simplicity in methods of information-exchange should be maximized.

Views on the Initial Results Obtained from Activities Undertaken on ‘Good Practices’ by Annex I Parties: Reports prepared by the secretariat; Content and Scope of presentations at the workshops; Activities undertaken as compared with relevant decisions of the Conference of the Parties and conclusions of SBSTA; Means and tools to share information

Canada considers that it is important at this juncture to assess the work that has been conducted over the last two years on ‘good practices’ in P&Ms. Such an assessment should help Parties in determining the usefulness of what has been accomplished over the last few years and assist in advancing the future work on ‘good practices’ in P&Ms.

A number of activities that were initiated by the secretariat to disseminate information related to P&Ms should be seen as initial steps vis-à-vis the implementation of Article 2.1 (b) of the Protocol. Reports such as the synthesis report of the national communications of Annex I Parties and their reviews (FCCC/SBSTA/1999/8) constitute a good vehicle to compile, in a concise manner, information that has been filed by Parties. Such an approach provides an opportunity to strengthen the sharing of experience and exchange of information.

In a similar manner, the workshops that took place in 2000 and 2001 reinforced the underlying objectives of Article 2.1 (b). As Canada has indicated in the past, a workshop is a valuable tool that could be used to share information and learning on P&Ms based on national circumstances. However, it should not be seen as the only effective mechanism, and should be part of a set of tools available to Parties that could interact with other methods of information sharing.

Canada would like to note that the format of the workshops - content, scope, number of presentations including concurrent sessions – were useful to determine areas of interest, but resulted in a situation where a number of Parties could not take advantage of the workshops.

While Canada acknowledges the efforts made by the secretariat to share information on P&Ms, the utility and practicality of other less-conventional methods of information-sharing, such as web-based tools, should be explored.

Conclusions

Canada believes that sharing information on P&Ms, based on the principle of national circumstances, is an excellent opportunity for cooperation amongst parties to improve the effectiveness of P&Ms (Article 2.1(b) of the Protocol). Certainly, as Canada has explained in previous submissions to

the “Workshop on Good Practices in Policies and Measures”, there are considerable benefits attributed with shaping a domestic portfolio of P&Ms based on the principle of national circumstances.

Sharing information on domestic P&Ms would give other countries an opportunity to assess their relevance and applicability, based on national circumstances, in the selection, development and implementation of its own domestic P&Ms portfolio.

Furthermore, the effectiveness and value of information sharing of P&Ms amongst Parties could be greatly enhanced if accompanied by an explanation on why and how a country chose the selected P&Ms in its portfolio of domestically implemented P&Ms. Having access to information on the P&Ms of other countries is useful, but knowing why and how a certain policy or measure was chosen and implemented, based on national circumstances, would serve a greater purpose to the fulfillment of the Protocol’s Article 2.1(b).

Canada believes that while there are a number of methods for sharing information on P&Ms, a web-based format would probably be an effective tool. Simplicity and accessibility are two strong advantages of sharing P&Ms information through the UNFCCC website. This would be advantageous to non-Annex B countries. Also, an internet-based approach allows information to be updated more easily and regularly.

By creating a repository of the relevant information on P&Ms from Parties, i.e. via a link to specific governmental websites, under the auspices of the UNFCCC website, the secretariat could provide the opportunities for Parties to access the available information at their own discretion and pace. This would allow countries to reflect and analyze the relevance of their national circumstances with respect to other members’ P&Ms.

PAPER NO. 3: DENMARK ON BEHALF OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY AND ITS
MEMBER STATES AND OF CROATIA, CZECH REPUBLIC, HUNGARY, LITHUANIA,
SLOVAKIA AND SLOVENIA

COPENHAGEN, 16 AUGUST 2002

**VIEWS ON “GOOD PRACTICES” IN POLICIES AND MEASURES.
ASSESSMENT OF PAST WORK AND FRAMEWORK FOR FURTHER ACTIVITIES**

On behalf of the European Community and its Member States, and Croatia, Czech Republic, Hungary, Lithuania, Slovakia and Slovenia, Denmark welcomes the opportunity to submit its views on the initial results obtained from activities undertaken on “good and best practices” by Annex I Parties, and views on the elements of a framework for defining further steps to advance the work on “good practices” as requested by the SBSTA at its 16th session, where it was agreed to undertake a stocktaking exercise and implement a framework for further activities on policies and measures. We consider the elements reflecting an evaluation of initial results and framework for defining further steps to be clearly interlinked, and therefore submit views on both elements in this submission.

Introduction

The EU and other Parties mentioned above would like to reiterate that the development and implementation of national, regional and international policies and measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, including the assessment of their concrete results taking national circumstances into account, are the cornerstone in the achievement of Annex I Parties’ commitments under the Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Kyoto Protocol. We also consider that early and substantial progress on effective policies and measures is essential in order to assist Annex I Parties in meeting their emissions reduction targets.

The exchange of information and experience from different Parties are crucial tools in order to achieve the central objectives of both the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol. Therefore it is useful for all Parties to participate actively, where appropriate in the international cooperation and information sharing on policies and measures. Within their selected framework for combating climate change all Parties will benefit from sharing their experience with other countries. This will strengthen their ability to choose cost-effective tools based on the best scientific, technical, and socio-economic information available. It is therefore essential to develop further and strengthen international information exchange of policies and measures in order to ensure that countries, citizens, and stakeholders are informed about a broad range of policy options. The EU and other Parties mentioned above also see this further development in the light of the approaching COP/MOP1.

Objectives and assessment

This section will briefly evaluate some of the main past activities, means and tools. However as a basis for assessing the activities undertaken and commenting on the further work that needs to be done, the central objectives and focus areas should be borne in mind.

a) Objectives and focus areas

According to the EU and other Parties mentioned above, the work done under the UNFCCC and the Kyoto Protocol, in particular Decision 13/CP.7, should aim at reaching the objectives mentioned in our previous submission (FCCC/SBSTA/2002/MISC.7):

- (i) Contributing to the sharing of experiences on “good practices” and the portfolio selection of policies and measures taking account of national circumstances
- (ii) Facilitating the cooperation among Annex I Parties to enhance the individual and combined effectiveness of their policies and measures
- (iii) Developing and exchange of information on methodologies to assess the cost-effectiveness, social, environmental and economic effects of policies and measures
- (iv) Contributing to the improvement of transparency, effectiveness and comparability of the quantitative and qualitative information regarding the impacts of implemented policies and measures
- (v) Contributing to the elaboration of information on demonstrable progress
- (vi) Supporting the improvement of public awareness about the negative impacts of climate change and the benefits of an early response to the threat

b) Past activities, means and tools

The EU and other Parties mentioned above appreciate the work done by the secretariat and regard this work as a central element in the attempt to promote information exchange and cooperation on policies and measures. The “Compilation and Synthesis Reports” of the national communications of Annex I Parties give a good and accessible introduction to the policies and measures of Parties, and thereby provide learning from the experience of others. However, all Parties could benefit from more detailed reports from the secretariat on “good practices”.

The two workshops on policies and measures held in Copenhagen have been of central importance to promoting discussions on policies and measures. The workshops underlined several key factors, such as the value of sharing information; the need to find cost-effective solutions; the importance of national circumstances and the need to improve data quality. The workshops had a general scope and gave valuable information on several general aspects of policies and measures, but they did not give the basis for analysing more concrete activities, and limited time was devoted to discussions at expert level. This pointed to the need for further concrete actions. The future intersessional consultations, workshops, side events and expert meetings should be prepared and arranged in a way that further promotes both broad participation of all interested parties and effective organisation of these events.

The relevant decisions of the Conference of the Parties and conclusions of the SBSTA have given a good basis for the work on policies and measures. These decisions clearly point to the importance of several key aspects on policies and measures and have thereby promoted central aspects such as information sharing. In particular, Decision 13/CP.7 represents the basis for analysis of what further action should be taken. However, to implement more fully Decision 13/CP.7 there is still a need to increase information exchange and where appropriate cooperation between Parties on how they design, implement, and evaluate their policies and measures, and tools should be found to achieve this end.

The EU and other Parties mentioned above welcome the agreement reached at SBSTA 16 on draft decision -/CP.8 on demonstrable progress under Article 3, paragraph 2, of the Kyoto Protocol (FCCC/SBSTA/2002/L.6/Add.1). The reports on demonstrable progress prepared by Annex I Parties that are also a Party to the Kyoto Protocol, will be an important input to the information exchange and learning process concerning policies and measures.

The EU and other Parties mentioned above welcome the intersessional consultations to exchange views on the results obtained in the work undertaken on “good and best practices” to be held back to back with the 17th session of the SBSTA. On the basis of the intersessional consultation the EU and other Parties mentioned above suggest that the secretariat prepares a status report that reviews past activities with the purpose of informing all countries, citizens, and stakeholders of the work done, results achieved and

concrete guidance on further work on “good practices”. Such a note could also be part of the consideration in Decision 13/CP.7 (para 7) of the initial results obtained on “good practices”.

Framework for further work

Based on the assessment of the past work the EU and other Parties mentioned above would like to indicate some ideas on how to proceed with the work on “good practices”. The future discussions at SBSTA 17 and beyond should focus on how to further develop a framework for further action.

a) General information sharing

The EU and other Parties mentioned above are looking forward to the report from the secretariat on the information on the policies and measures by Parties included in Annex I to the Convention in their third national communications as requested by SBSTA 15 (FCCC/SBSTA/2001/L.18). We also appreciate the “Compilation and Synthesis Report” to be elaborated on the basis of the third national communications of Annex I Parties and the summary information on policies and measures included in this report.

Added value could be obtained by asking the secretariat, in cooperation with IPCC and other relevant organisations, to make separate and more detailed reports on policies and measures, including reflections on: the influence of national circumstances on the choice of policies and measures; national and/or regional experience with evaluation of the effects of these policies, including information on methodologies used for such evaluation. Such reports might also increase the possibility of establishing framework criteria to define and evaluate “good practices” to be used at national and regional levels, for example in the evaluation process to be carried out as part of the report on demonstrable progress (FCCC/SBSTA/2002/L.6/Add.1, paragraph 1, (c)).

To improve data availability and promote discussions, establishing UNFCCC specific web pages providing information on policies and measures could be considered. This could be supplemented by setting up a “bulletin-board” type discussion forum to challenge interested organisations and individuals to exchange information on policies and measures issues that they consider relevant. We believe the secretariat should initiate this work after SBSTA 17 and report back at SBSTA 18 on the initial results achieved.

In addition to facilitating exchange of experience and information, the EU and other Parties mentioned above believe that there is a need to further enhance the individual and combined effectiveness of policies and measures by:

- (i) Further assessment of ancillary effects of policies and measures adopted by Annex I Parties, including the effects related to other conventions;
- (ii) Identification of areas for further cooperation among Annex I Parties and analysis on ways to facilitate such cooperation;
- (iii) Activities that demonstrate how joint and/or coordinated initiatives and actions, such as the Energy Star agreement between the EU and the US, the negotiated agreement between the EU and the European, Japanese and Korean car manufactures (ACEA, JAMA, KAMA) or the European Climate Change Programme (ECCP) can lead to a more effective emissions reduction;
- (iv) Further exchange of information on methodologies on how countries design and evaluate packages of policies and measures.

b) Information sharing in specific areas

As indicated, the EU and other Parties mentioned above find meetings (inter alia: workshops, intersessional consultations, side events and expert meetings) that convene relevant experts to exchange information and learn from each other’s experience very valuable. We would like to state the following concerning such future meetings:

- The EU and other Parties mentioned above believe that the international work on policies and measures should encompass all interested Parties under the UNFCCC framework. Therefore we welcome continued and increasing involvement from developing country parties in the work on “good practices”, as we believe that future work would benefit from the presentation of more examples of policies and measures from non-Annex I Parties.
- To maximise possible participation in these meetings, it is important to limit the number of these events to a level where in-depth preparation can be ensured. At the same time, all meetings should have clear and precise terms of reference.
- The concrete arrangements and preparations of the meetings must be as cost-effective as possible e.g. by organising these events in connection with SB meetings or other relevant intergovernmental or international conferences to cut back travel expenses.
- To maximise the learning from the different experiences, the participation of national experts working on national programmes for climate change or on evaluative methodologies used by different Parties should be encouraged.

The EU and other Parties mentioned above suggest that future meetings should be focused and also tackle issues of a specific nature, giving opportunities for in-depth presentation and more priority to the discussion among participants focusing on, for example:

- (i) sector-specific, subsector and intersectoral activities in sectors such as industry, transport, housing, and the end-use equipment markets;
- (ii) the design of and experience with specific policies and measures such as labelling schemes, renewable energy certificates, public procurement programmes, education, training and public awareness raising, taxation schemes, green pricing and other demand side initiatives;
- (iii) how different policy instruments interact and may complement each other (e.g. the interrelationships between taxes, voluntary agreements, and emission trading schemes);
- (iv) information exchange on methodologies used by the Parties for the ex-ante and ex-post evaluation of their policies and measures, including their cost-effectiveness and their impact on economic development;
- (v) how to evaluate national circumstances, barriers for implementation, and to what extent there is scope for replication of policies and measures between countries.

c) Information from relevant international and intergovernmental organisations active in the area of policies and measures relevant to the Convention

The EU and other Parties mentioned above find it very important to draw on all relevant data and information from other organisations working in the area of policies and measures (inter alia relevant UN agencies, OECD, IEA, IPCC, the European Conference of Ministers of Transport, the Energy Charter Secretariat and the World Energy Council). We call upon all Parties and the secretariat to continue and strengthen cooperation with these organisations thereby further promoting the implementation of Decision 13/CP.7, para 5. We suggest that the Secretariat contact such organisations with the aim of exploring possibilities of organising joint events and activities on policies and measures and/or establishing joint fora for facilitating cooperation. Regarding the idea to establish UNFCCC specific web pages providing accessible information on policies and measures, input from other relevant international and intergovernmental organisations could be valuable. If Parties could agree on setting up such web pages, a consultation process should be initiated to make sure that all relevant information, both from the UNFCCC and other relevant fora are available. The setting up of a “bulletin-board” type discussion would also benefit from active participation by other organisations, thereby drawing on the knowledge base of these organisations.

PAPER NO. 4: IRAN

1- Proposal of The Islamic Republic of Iran on Good Practices in Policy & Measures

* The Islamic Republic of Iran is of the opinion that due to the complicated nature of the Annex-1 P&M and unclear degree of their effectiveness on emissions reduction and climate mitigation, it is essential that elaboration to be made in a timely and efficient manner.

* Accordingly, it is worthwhile that information sharing and discussions on P&M as well as the ways and means of removing uncertainties on the impacts of those P&M, to be continued in the form of workshops and informal roundtables.

* Elaboration of the following issues in the above mentioned gatherings is of high importance:

1- Examination of ways of cooperation among the developed and developing countries in the assessment of the effectiveness of implementation of P&M and elimination of market imperfections in Annex-1 countries;

2- Identification of the P&M at the Annex-1 national and regional level, and the analysis of the activities done at this level, so far and their consequences;

3- Assessment of the individual and combined effectiveness of planned or implemented P&M in Annex-1 countries;

4- Evaluation and analysis of the possible impacts of implementation of one piece of P&M on:
- implementation of other sets of P&M;
- health and the promotion of economic competitiveness;

5- Assessment of the impacts of the Annex-1 national and regional programmes on promotion of sustainable development and economic growth in developing countries;

6- The role of cost and benefit element in the assessment of effectiveness of P&M;

7- The role of applying discrimination in regulatory as well as fiscal instruments, on the effectiveness of P&M;

8- examination of possible ways and means to avoid market distortions and economic competitiveness in the application of various national and regional programmes and the policy instruments;

9- Undertaking a comparative study on the Annex-1 P&M implemented at the national and regional level, so far and determining the similarities and differences of between the criteria, ways and means of implementation and their consequences.

* It should also be noted that participants in this negotiating process (delegates, IGOs and NGOs) should be invited in a fair and balanced manner.

* The terms of reference for each of the said meetings should be decided prior to its meeting.

* Given the importance of minimization of adverse impacts of implementation of the Annex-1 P&M on the developing countries particularly those whose economy are highly dependent on the production and export of fossil fuels, this group of countries should be represented in the workshops in a fair and equitable manner. However, such representation and participation in this process should not imply any commitment for developing countries to share information or take policy.

PAPER NO. 5: JAPAN

Japan's Comments on "Good Practices" in Policies and Measures

Japan welcomes the opportunity to submit its views on the initial results obtained from the activities undertaken on "good and best practices", and on the further steps to be taken in advancing the work on "good practices" in policies and measures. Although information sharing in the form of seminars or workshops is quite useful to deepen the understanding, or to exchange views on other countries' policies and measures, Japan is of the view that we should make the best use of information on the website, such as national communications, as a tool of information sharing so that limited resources (such as time and budget) can be used effectively.

While Japan generally supports information sharing on "good practices" in policies and measures, it should be noted that an appropriate mix of policies and measures could differ from one country to another depending on each country's specific circumstances. Therefore, utmost prudence would be necessary as to a simplistic argument on "multilateral policy coordination".

PAPER NO. 6: UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

U.S. Submission Policies and Measures

The United States welcomes the opportunity to provide its views, as requested in UNFCCC/SBSTA/2002/L.10, on initial results obtained from the activities undertaken by Parties in implementing relevant elements of the Buenos Aires Plan of Action and Decision 13/CP.7. This submission also provides views on the three-element frame agreed upon at Bonn to advance the work on “good practices” in policies and measures.

We believe that much positive work has been done over the past several years regarding the core information sharing aspect of our collaborative work on policies and measures. Specifically, we strengthened the guidelines for reporting on policies and measures in national communications (FCCC/CP/1999/7, Part II, Section V), and held two successful workshops in Copenhagen (2000 & 2001) that explored a wide range of topics, including policy design and implementation, national programs and evaluation techniques, and sectoral approaches. We also have benefited greatly from the ongoing work being done on these issues in other fora (OECD, IPCC, IEA, UNEP, etc).

A fundamental result of our work has been a shared realization that the enormous differences in national circumstances preclude the development of effective common indicators or identification of “best practices.” In fact, one of the conclusions from the 2000 Copenhagen workshop was that a discussion of good practices would prove more useful and workable -- given the differences in national circumstances -- than trying to identify best practices. This conclusion gave rise to our successful 2001 Copenhagen workshop on “good practices.”

In turn the 2001 Copenhagen workshop allowed us to examine national programs and the range of policy instruments developed by Parties to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. A key workshop finding was that Parties’ portfolio choices of policies and measures were determined by domestic conditions ranging from political decision-making structures (national, regional and local), to geographic and climatological realities, and levels of economic development. The types of policy instruments discussed ranged from regulatory and fiscal to market-based and voluntary agreements.

We believe the FCCC process can continue to play a useful role in drawing Parties’ attention to innovative approaches taken by all stakeholders in the development, implementation, and evaluation of policy instruments. However, we need to insure that FCCC resources are not over-taxed by ever increasing requests for workshops, information compilation exercises, web-sites, etc. Parties themselves must take the lead in developing internal priorities, either sectoral, thematic or by type of policy instrument, that can then be used to engage other stakeholders, either through the FCCC process, or on a bilateral or multilateral level.

This establishment of priorities is already ongoing throughout our FCCC activities, be it through Technology Transfer needs assessments, the preparation of National Communications, and the various other formalized and informal efforts at developing national approaches. For example, FCCC/CP/1999/7, Part II, Section III, calls for a detailed description of national circumstances and their affect on underlying trends in greenhouse gas emissions and removal. Once Parties have identified their areas of greatest interest – be it urban transportation systems, electricity regulation, etc -- they can take advantage of the information sharing approach highlighted in the forward-looking frame for further steps we developed at SBSTA 16.

For instance, an examination of how Parties evaluate their policies and measures could generate cross cutting discussion on the impacts and benefits of policy portfolio choices. The examination could be sector specific or involve an overall examination of how, or even whether, Parties are able to effectively analyze their policy choices.

We look forward to further exploring the information-sharing frame developed at our most recent meeting in Bonn during the upcoming intersessional activity planned for New Delhi.

- - - - -