

establish formal sub-groups under the AG/BM and side-step the inevitable difficulties involved in such an effort, including such thorny issues as (a) under what basis would subgroups be formed? (b) how would their work be coordinated? (c) who would chair them? (c) would they have their own bureaus? and (e) what basis would be used to select them? Instead, under our proposed approach, all Parties would be able to engage fully in the process, and early analysis and assessment would better inform all negotiators.

In addition, our suggested approach takes into account the work that will be performed by SBSTA and SBI (e.g., on the review of national communications of Annex I Parties and in reviewing the results of the Second Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change). It seeks to avoid duplication with the work to be performed by those subsidiary bodies and to build upon it.

To do so, however, it may be necessary for subsequent meetings of the SBSTA and the SBI to precede meetings of the AG/BM -- for example, in March 1996 -- so that the AG/BM may benefit from earlier discussions in the SBSTA and SBI.

Certain of the many technical questions raised in our approach might be addressed in a series of expert meetings or technical workshops coordinated by the convention secretariat. The results of such meetings or workshops could in turn be fed into the AG/BM discussions. We would encourage further discussion of this possibility during this meeting.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to reiterate both the interest and the intention of the United States to move forward in this process. We urge all nations to join us in thinking creatively and acting aggressively to confront this major challenge in a manner that is fair and certain. This Convention has been a success; if we think and work together anew, we believe that we can make it more so.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SEEGC 8207