

In considering an approach to the analysis or assessment, it is important also to consider how the more formal negotiations would proceed, taking into account the number of meetings available to the parties and the issues to be addressed. The attached outline provides:

- (1) some background on the process;
- (2) an initial list of issues and approaches that should be addressed by the analysis and assessment in order to ensure informed decisions; and
- (3) a discussion of the specific steps involved in completing the process.

In the U.S. view, the process for formal negotiations would likely proceed much as did the negotiations that led to adoption of the convention itself. The steps envisioned for the formal negotiations thus follow the pattern already established among the parties. Again, however, just as "negotiations" will begin even at the August meeting, the "analysis and assessment" may not end categorically in July 1996. Instead, we envision that the more formal effort at analysis and assessment will conclude in July 1996 and that the more formal negotiating process would begin thereafter.

Analytically, the analysis and assessment should assist the parties in addressing a fundamental issue: as the ultimate objective of the Convention is to stabilize atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system -- recognizing that the next step alone is unlikely to yield that result -- how can we best determine how much can be accomplished by the new protocol/other legal instrument? While solutions to this are complex, some analysis on the impacts of near-term versus longer-term actions (e.g., in five or ten-year increments) may help to resolve some of the issues.

The approach contemplated in the attached outline would obviate the need to establish formal subgroups under the AG/BM and side-step the inevitable difficulties involved in such an effort (e.g., on what basis would subgroups be formed, how would their work be coordinated, who would chair them, would they have their own bureaus and what basis would be used to select them, etc.?) Instead, under this approach, all Parties would be able to engage fully in the process, and early analysis and assessment would better inform all negotiators.