

for AIJ under the pilot phase, for consideration at its second session. It also asked the secretariat to prepare proposals on such framework for future SBSTA sessions, in order for COP 2 to review the progress of the pilot phase as required under the COP 1 decision.

13. Possible contributions to the Berlin Mandate process: The SBSTA took note of the requests for input from the AGBM, both in the short and longer term, and these items were included as priority items. Request from the AGBM includes: 1) for the third AGBM session (4-8 March 1996) - views on the IPCC Second Assessment Report (SAR); views on national communications; a report on innovative, efficient, and state-of-the-art technologies and know-how that could advance the implementation of the Berlin Mandate; 2) for the fifth AGBM session (October 1996) the SBSTA is to provide input and advise on the second compilation and synthesis of national communications from Annex 1 parties.

14. Technology Transfer: The SBSTA endorsed the division of labour with the SBI and will consider this item at its future sessions. In this regard, the secretariat was requested to prepare, for consideration at its second session, an initial progress report relating to technology identification, assessment and development, as well as an inventory of state-of-the-art, environmentally sound, and economically viable technologies conducive to mitigating and adapting to climate change.

15. Allocation and control of emissions from international bunker fuels: The SBSTA requested the secretariat to prepare a paper on this item, for consideration at a future session.

16. Technical Advisory Panels: As requested by COP 1, in its decision on the role of the subsidiary bodies, the SBSTA took steps to initiate the establishment of the two intergovernmental technical advisory panels on methodologies (TAP-M) and on technology (TAP-T). These panels will have the role of identifying and assessing technologies, and providing methodological information and technical analysis to the COP and AGBM through the SBSTA. No formal agreement could be reached on this agenda item. This was due to the fundamental differences in the positions of the Annex 1 and non Annex 1 Parties over the composition of these panels, in particular on the selection process, the number of members, the length of their terms, and the funding for participation of experts. One critical issue for all Parties related to the balance between Annex 1 and non-Annex 1 representation. Annex 1 Parties were concerned that technical advisory panels should not solely be determined by geographic/regional considerations but should also be sufficiently flexible to allow for relevant technical expertise. G-77 was insistent that representation on the technical panels should primarily be driven by regional considerations. At one point G-77 countries proposed the establishment of the panels on a provisional basis until the second SBSTA. However, Annex 1 Parties opposed the interim type arrangements because decisions taken for one convention become a precedent for the other conventions and it would be difficult to propose experts to serve