

FOIA MARKER

This is not a textual record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Collection/Record Group: Clinton Presidential Records
Subgroup/Office of Origin: Council on Environmental Quality
Series/Staff Member: Kathleen (Katie) McGinty
Subseries:

OA/ID Number: 2903
FolderID:

Folder Title:
UNCED [United Nations Conference on Environment and Development] Follow-up

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
S	61	6	4	1

SIGNATORIES OF THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Last Update: 8 June 1993

Page 1 of 8

NO.	COUNTRY (In Alphabetical Order)	Members of G-7	Biodiversity "Rich"	SIGNATURE DATE	RATIFICATION DATE
<i>The Convention—of which the Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish texts are equally authentic—was adopted by the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee for a Convention on Biological Diversity, during its Fifth session, held at Nairobi from 11 to 22 May 1992. The Convention was open for signature at Rio de Janeiro by All States and regional economic integration organizations from 5 June 1992 until 14 June 1992, and at the United Nations Headquarters in New York from 15 June 1992 to 4 June 1993.</i>					
1	Afghanistan			12 June 1992	
	Albania				
2	Algeria			13 June 1992	
	Andorra				
3	Angola			12 June 1992	
4	Antigua and Barbuda			5 June 1992	9 March 1993
5	Argentina			12 June 1992	
6	Armenia			13 June 1992	14 May 1993
7	Australia			5 June 1992	
8	Austria			13 June 1992	
9	Azberbaijan			12 June 1992	
10	Bahamas			12 June 1992	
11	Bahrain			9 June 1992	
12	Bangladesh			5 June 1992	
13	Barbados			12 June 1992	
14	Belarus (formerly Byelorussia)			11 June 1992	
15	Belgium			5 June 1992	
16	Belize			13 June 1992	
17	Benin			13 June 1992	
18	Bhutan			11 June 1992	
19	Bolivia			13 June 1992	
	Bosnia and Herzegovina (former Yugoslavia)			8 June 1992 (by Yugoslavia)	
20	Botswana			8 June 1992	
21	Brazil		Biorich	5 June 1992	
	Brunei Darussalam				

SIGNATORIES OF THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Last Update: 8 June 1993

Page 2 of 8

NO.	COUNTRY (In Alphabetical Order)	Members of G-7	Biodiversity "Rich"	SIGNATURE DATE	RATIFICATION DATE
22	Bulgaria			12 June 1992	
23	Burkina Faso			12 June 1992	
	Burma				
24	Burundi			11 June 1992	
	Cambodia (Kampuchea)				
25	Cameroon		Biorich	14 June 1992	
26	Canada	G-7		11 June 1992	4 December 1992
27	Cape verde			12 June 1992	
28	Central African Republic			13 June 1992	
29	Chad			12 June 1992	
30	Chile			13 June 1992	
31	China, People's Republic of			11 June 1992	5 January 1993
	China (Taiwan)				
32	Colombia		Biorich	12 June 1992	
33	Comoros			11 June 1992	
34	Congo			11 June 1992	
35	Cook Islands			12 June 1992	20 April 1993
36	Costa Rica			13 June 1992	
37	Cote d'Ivoire (ivory coast)			10 June 1992	
38	Croatia (former yugoslavia)			11 June 1992	
39	Cuba			12 June 1992	
40	Cyprus			12 June 1992	
41	Czech Republic			4 June 1993	
42	Denmark			12 June 1992	
43	Djibouti			13 June 1992	
	Dominica				
44	Dominican Republic			13 June 1992	
45	Ecuador		Biorich	9 June 1992	23 February 1993
46	Egypt			9 June 1992	

SIGNATORIES OF THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Last Update: 8 June 1993

Page 3 of 8

NO.	COUNTRY (In Alphabetical Order)	Members of G-7	Biodiversity "Rich"	SIGNATURE DATE	RATIFICATION DATE
47	El Salvador			13 June 1992	
	Equatorial Guinea				
48	Estonia			12 June 1992	
49	Ethiopia			10 June 1992	
50	European Economic Community			13 June 1992	
51	Fiji			9 October 1992	25 February 1993
52	Finland			5 June 1992	
53	France	G-7		13 June 1992	
	French Guiana				
	French Polynesia				
54	Gabon			12 June 1992	
55	Gambia			12 June 1992	
56	Germany	G-7		12 June 1992	
	Georgia				
57	Ghana			12 June 1992	
58	Greece			12 June 1992	
59	Grenada			3 Dec. 1992	
60	Guatemala			13 June 1992	
61	Guinea			12 June 1992	7 May 1993
62	Guinea-Bissau			12 June 1992	
63	Guyana			13 June 1992	
64	Haiti			13 June 1992	
65	Honduras			13 June 1992	
66	Hungary			13 June 1992	
67	Iceland			10 June 1992	
68	India		Biorich	5 June 1992	
69	Indonesia		Biorich	5 June 1992	
70	Iran, Islamic Republic of			14 June 1992	
	Iraq				

SIGNATORIES OF THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Last Update: 8 June 1993

Page 4 of 8

NO.	COUNTRY (In Alphabetical Order)	Members of G-7	Biodiversity "Rich"	SIGNATURE DATE	RATIFICATION DATE
71	Ireland			13 June 1992	
72	Israel			11 June 1992	
73	Italy	G-7		5 June 1992	
74	Jamaica			11 June 1992	
75	Japan	G-7		13 June 1992	28 May 1993 (acceptance)
76	Jordan			11 June 1992	
77	Kazakhstan			9 June 1992	
78	Kenya			11 June 1992	
	Kiribati				
79	Korea (Republic of—South)			13 June 1992	
80	Korea (Democratic People's Republic of—North)			11 June 1992	
81	Kuwait			9 June 1992	
	Kyrgyzstan (formerly Kirgizia)				
	Lao People's Democratic Republic				
82	Latvia			11 June 1992	
83	Lebanon			12 June 1992	
84	Lesotho			11 June 1992	
85	Liberia			12 June 1992	
86	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya			29 June 1992	
87	Liechtenstein			5 June 1992	
88	Lithuania			11 June 1992	
89	Luxembourg			9 June 1992	
	Macedonia (former Yugoslavia)			8 June 1992 (by Yugoslavia)	
90	Madagascar		Biorich	8 June 1992	
91	Malawi			10 June 1992	
92	Malaysia		Biorich	12 June 1992	
93	Maldives			12 June 1992	9 November 1992

SIGNATORIES OF THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Last Update: 8 June 1993

Page 5 of 8

NO.	COUNTRY (In Alphabetical Order)	Members of G-7	Biodiversity "Rich"	SIGNATURE DATE	RATIFICATION DATE
94	Mali			30 Sept. 1992	
95	Malta			12 June 1992	
96	Marshall Islands			12 June 1992	8 October 1992
97	Mauritania			12 June 1992	
98	Mauritius			10 June 1992	4 Sept. 1992
99	Mexico			13 June 1992	11 March 1993
100	Micronesia, Federated States of			12 June 1992	
101	Moldova, Republic of (formerly Moldavia)			5 June 1992	
102	Monaco			11 June 1992	20 November 1992
103	Mongolia			12 June 1992	
104	Morocco			13 June 1992	
105	Mozambique			12 June 1992	
106	Myanmar			11 June 1992	
107	Namibia			12 June 1992	
108	Nauru			5 June 1992	
109	Nepal			12 June 1992	
110	Netherlands, The			5 June 1992	
111	New Zealand			12 June 1992	
112	Nicaragua			13 June 1992	
113	Niger			11 June 1992	
114	Nigeria			13 June 1992	
115	Norway			9 June 1992	
116	Oman			10 June 1992	
117	Pakistan			5 June 1992	
118	Panama			13 June 1992	
119	Papua New Guinea			13 June 1992	16 March 1993
120	Paraguay			12 June 1992	
121	Peru		Biorich	12 June 1992	

SIGNATORIES OF THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Last Update: 8 June 1993

Page 6 of 8

NO.	COUNTRY (In Alphabetical Order)	Members of G-7	Biodiversity "Rich"	SIGNATURE DATE	RATIFICATION DATE
122	Philippines, The		Biorich	12 June 1992	
123	Poland			5 June 1992	
124	Portugal			13 June 1992	
125	Qatar			11 June 1992	
126	Romania			5 June 1992	
127	Russian Federation		Biorich	13 June 1992	
128	Rwanda			10 June 1992	
129	Samoa			12 June 1992	
130	San Marino			10 June 1992	
131	Sao Tome and Principe			12 June 1992	
	Saudi Arabia				
132	Senegal			13 June 1992	
	Serbia (former Yugoslavia)			8 June 1992 (by Yugoslavia)	
133	Seychelles			10 June 1992	22 September 1992
	Sierra Leone				
134	Singapore			10 March 1993	10 March 1993
135	Slovakia (Slovak Republic)			19 May 1993	
136	Slovenia			13 June 1992	
137	Solomon Islands			13 June 1992	
	Somalia				
	South Africa		Biorich		
138	Spain			13 June 1992	
139	Sri Lanka			10 June 1992	
140	St. Kitts and Nevis			12 June 1992	7 January 1993
	St. Lucia				
	St. Vincent and the Grenadines				
141	Sudan			9 June 1992	
142	Suriname			13 June 1992	

SIGNATORIES OF THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Last Update: 8 June 1993

Page 7 of 8

NO.	COUNTRY (In Alphabetical Order)	Members of G-7	Biodiversity "Rich"	SIGNATURE DATE	RATIFICATION DATE
143	Swaziland			12 June 1992	
144	Sweden			8 June 1992	
145	Switzerland			12 June 1992	
146	Syrian Arab Republic			3 May 1993	
	Tajikistan (formerly Tadzhikistan)				
147	Tanzania, United Republic of			12 June 1992	
148	Thailand			12 June 1992	
149	Togo			12 June 1992	
	Tonga				
150	Trinidad and Tobago			11 June 1992	
151	Tunisia			13 June 1992	
152	Turkey			11 June 1992	
	Turkmenistan (formerly Turkmenia)				
153	Tuvalu			8 June 1992	
154	Uganda			12 June 1992	
155	Ukraine			11 June 1992	
156	United Arab Emirates			11 June 1992	
157	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	G-7		12 June 1992	
158	United States	G-7		4 June 1993	
159	Uruguay			9 June 1992	
	Uzbekistan				
160	Vanuatu			9 June 1992	25 March 1993
	Vatican City State (the Holy See)				
161	Venezuela		Biorich	12 June 1992	
162	Viet Nam				
	Western Samoa				
163	Yemen, Republic of			12 June 1992	

SIGNATORIES OF THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Last Update: 8 June 1993

Page 8 of 8

NO.	COUNTRY (In Alphabetical Order)	Members of G-7	Biodiversity "Rich"	SIGNATURE DATE	RATIFICATION DATE
164	Yugoslavia. Serbia (capitol: Belgrade) and Montenegro are calling themselves "yugoslavia" along with Kosovo (broken off from Serbia, may become own republic). Other countries of former Yugoslavia: Bosnia and Herzegovina (Capitol: Sarajevo); Croatia (Capitol: Zagrab); Macedonia (Capitol: Skopje); Slovenia (Capitol: Ljubljana). Because the legally constituted government of Yugoslavia signed the Convention, the newly independent republics are considered signatories to the Convention and may "accede" to the Convention in place of beginning the signatory/ratification process anew.			8 June 1992	
165	Zaire		Biorich	11 June 1992	
166	Zambia			11 June 1992	28 May 1993
167	Zimbabwe		Biorich	12 June 1992	

Source: United Nations Treaties Office (212/963-3918)

PROGRESS REPORT
UNITED STATES FOLLOW-UP TO UNCED

The United States is committed to implementing the commitments made at the Rio Earth Summit in support of global sustainable development.

Climate Change: The United States, which ratified the climate convention last year, considers climate change to be a priority issue. On April 21, President Clinton announced that the U.S. is committed to reducing its greenhouse gas emissions to their 1990 levels by the year 2000. The United States intends to develop by August 1993 a detailed action plan outlining the specific steps that will be taken to achieve this target. The Administration's proposed 1994 budget contains proposals that begin to move in this direction, including enhanced programs for energy efficiency and renewable energy.

*Signed
CIA*
Biodiversity: On April 21, President Clinton announced that the United States intends to sign the biodiversity convention. He also directed the Department of State to work with like-minded donor nations to resolve concerns with convention provisions that do not adequately protect intellectual property rights. When it joins the convention the United States intends to issue, as many other countries have, a statement that provides its interpretation of these provisions. In support of convention objectives, the United States also intends to create a National Biological Survey to gather, analyze, and disseminate information on U.S. biological resources and to foster increased scientific understanding of those resources.

ITTA?
Forests: At the Earth Summit the U.S. proposed that all countries join in doubling international forest assistance. The Administration's 1994 budget request calls for investing \$30 million in 1994 and \$50 million in each of the next four years towards the goal of reducing world-wide deforestation.

U.N. Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD): The U.S. strongly supports the establishment of the CSD, as called for Agenda 21. The U.S. believes the CSD should monitor implementation of Agenda 21 at the local, regional, and global levels. The United States intends to submit a national sustainable development plan to the CSD. The President has announced the establishment of a ~~U.S. Committee~~^{Council} on Sustainable Development to, among other things, foster the implementation of Agenda 21 in the United States.

Desertification: The United States is committed to the early establishment of a convention to combat desertification and the effects of drought and will be an active participant in the ongoing negotiations to address this issue.

Global Environment Facility (GEF): The United States strongly supports efforts to restructure the GEF so it can serve as the financial mechanism for the climate and biodiversity conventions, and fund other agreed projects with global environmental benefits. In its 1994 budget, the Clinton Administration has requested \$31 million for direct contribution to the GEF core fund.

Post-UNCED Conferences: Agenda 21 calls for the U.N. General Assembly and the U.N. Environment Program to convene major global conferences to deal with the issues of land-based sources of marine pollution, the sustainable development of small island states, and the conservation of highly migratory and straddling fish stocks. The United States supports these efforts to address these important issues. The United States will host the conference on land-based sources of marine pollution in Washington in 1995.

UN Development Programme (UNDP) "Capacity 21": Agenda 21 endorses UNDP's Capacity 21, which is the centerpiece of UNDP's efforts to build, promote and expand institutional capacity building within developing countries, especially the least developed countries. The Administration has requested \$3 million for the UNDP Capacity 21 Trust Fund for FY 1994.

Consumer?
Population: The United States considers addressing population growth essential for the goal of sustainable development. President Clinton in January announced that the United States would reverse the so-called Mexico City policy. The Administration's 1994 budget proposal calls for an increase in the commitment of resources to population programs.

Global Environmental Change Report

POLICY, SCIENCE AND INDUSTRY NEWS WORLDWIDE, FROM CUTTER INFORMATION CORP.

Inside This Issue



POLICY TRENDS page 3

- UK Urges Local Planners to Curb Car Use
- Interest and Conflict over US Energy Tax Intensifies
- UK Appears Isolated in Opposing EC Carbon/Energy Tax
- EC Finalizes Energy Efficiency Standards
- Report Finds Federal Subsidies Favor Energy Supply over Efficiency
- Call for Long-Term CO₂ Reduction Targets Goes Unheeded at UK Conference
- Norway's CO₂ Emissions Are Down 5%



SCIENCE UPDATE page 5

- Scientists Report Record Low Ozone in 1992
- "Twilight Effect" of Volcanic Aerosols May Increase UV-B Levels
- Satellite Data Suggest Clouds Will Enhance Warming
- Dimming Sun May Reduce Global Temperatures Slightly
- ENSO, Pinatubo Strongly Influenced Climate in 1992



INDUSTRY WATCH page 7

- Building Codes Cause Problems for CFC Alternatives in US
- EC Refrigeration Industry Lags on CFCs
- New Renewable Energy Center to Open in Washington
- US DOE Announces Public-Private Partnerships in Renewable Energy

Focus Report

Integrated Transport Planning: Applying IRP to the Transport Sector

Over the past two decades, integrated resource planning (IRP) has moved from a fringe concept to a central paradigm for electric utilities and their regulators in the US. In the process, it may have done more than any other single measure to cost-effectively lower the future growth rate of US CO₂ emissions.

Essentially, utility IRP attempts to place energy efficiency on an equal footing with new supply, requiring utilities to evaluate both supply-side and demand-side options to determine how best to meet their future energy needs. In addition, IRP generally incorporates environmental and social costs in the planning process, so that options that are financially cheap but environmentally or socially costly become less attractive. It forces utilities to move from simple least-cost planning to least-social-cost planning.

The logic and success of the IRP concept have not gone unnoticed, and many people around the world have begun to envision IRP as a model for planning in general. IRP is already being applied to a number of natural gas utilities in the US, and we've heard about proposals for its use in a variety of other services, ranging from carbon emissions offsets to telecommunications.

In perhaps the most significant and far-reaching application, a number of transportation experts and environmental groups have started to look at IRP as a paradigm for transportation planning. The analogy is easy to see: just as utility planners used to think mainly about building more power plants, transportation planners think mainly in terms of building more roads. Where IRP creates a level playing field for energy efficiency, integrated transport planning (ITP) would require planners to compare the costs of road building with the costs of public transportation, nonmotorized transport, traffic management, and other more energy-efficient options.

Copy sent to Dave & Karl from the very interesting. I would like to have the discuss as part of plan. More let's discuss further. I'd like to include a book.

And just as utility IRP evolved in response to crises in the electric power industry (oil price shocks, popular opposition to nuclear power, and clean air regulations), ITP is being developed in the context of the worldwide urban crises of traffic congestion and pollution.

"Right now, transport is where the utilities were 10-15 years ago," said Mia Birk of the International Institute for Energy Conservation (IIEC) in Washington, DC. "We're at the stage where everyone agrees that we need to try something different with transport. We want to take the IRP concept, which has proven to be successful for utilities, and see in what form it can be adapted."

An Imperfect Model

Utility IRP methodologies cannot be simply transferred to transport planning, however. Birk noted that unlike utilities, "transport has no measurement unit, such as cost per kilowatt-hour, that you can compare between options. There is project cost, but you're not necessarily comparing projects in order to come up with a good transportation system. So there's a lack of a common denominator." Furthermore, while utility planning tends to be a rather centralized process, transportation planning is anything but. "There are decision makers at all levels," Birk said, "scattered throughout all departments." Bangkok, for example, has both a Public Works Department, which handles only roads that go in certain directions, and a Department of Public Works, which handles roads going in other directions. For ITP to work, Birk explained, "you not only need to create a planning methodology, but also an institutional structure to implement it. You have to look at both levels at once."

The needs of transportation "customers" are also more complex than those of utility customers. One of utility IRP's underlying philosophies is that electric utilities mustn't think of themselves as providing electricity, but rather electricity services.

People don't really want electricity; they want the things it can do — like powering toasters, televisions, or microwave ovens. "In transportation it's much more complicated than that," Birk said, "because the needs and desires are based on years of social norms and habits and land-use considerations and job locations. The actual goal in what people want to do with transport is not so much to get from Place A to Place B, but to achieve all of their daily needs through transportation services. It's difficult to quantify those things."

The Externality Problem

For better or for worse, utility IRP has opened a Pandora's box by attempting to incorporate environmental externalities into practical, real-world economic decision making. Assigning values to those externalities and determining how to incorporate them into the planning process have proven to be extremely controversial and difficult tasks. "In the transport field we're much further from being able to get any agreement on how to incorporate externalities," Birk observed. "But I don't see that as a barrier — if you look at the electricity comparison, nobody agrees on how to incorporate externalities in electricity either, but it's being done." Besides, she said, "we hope that [ITP] can move forward without being too hung up on incorporating prices, because that's something that trips everybody up all the time." The incorporation of environmental externalities is certainly going to help the effort to push things away from road building, but there's evidence that on a cost-per-person or cost-per-access type of calculation, most [non-road-building] options should come out ahead anyway, even without the environmental costs."

What's Happening Now?

According to Birk, ITP is still in the very early stages of development, but interest is growing rapidly. "We've pulled together a large group of people who want to work

on it," she said. "I think we'll move forward significantly in the next year or two in getting to a framework where the concept can be developed into a methodology that a city could actually apply. We've been having lots of discussions with EPA, the Department of Transportation, and the Department of Energy, as well as cities around the country, and we're working with the people who are implementing ISTEA [the 1991 Inter-Modal Surface Transport Efficiency Act] around the country, to see how we could team up with a couple of cities or NGOs [nongovernmental organizations] to apply a conceptual framework for ITP."

The US should serve as the logical testing ground for ITP, Birk said, "because there's more momentum here toward changing things, the policy framework has been altered to make it more favorable to this type of approach, and we're further ahead with technology." ISTEA now gives power to metropolitan planning organizations in the US to coordinate planning between cities and suburbs, something that no organization had jurisdiction over before. Cities like Portland, Oregon, and San Francisco, California, are revising their transportation plans to take environmental and social considerations into account. And the state of Maine recently passed a referendum requiring that all road building proposals must be compared with alternative options. All of these developments help to set the stage for the introduction of ITP in the US.

Ultimately, however, Birk hopes ITP can be used worldwide — especially in developing countries, which is her organization's normal focus. "The problems and framework are similar [between the US and developing countries]," Birk said. "We want to create a sustainable approach that many cities can use." She cautioned, however, that ITP requires a highly individual approach. "Transport more than anything else is city-specific — every city has its

own totally different systems, institutional structures, and technologies."

IIEC has just published a new report, entitled *Moving Toward Integrated Transport Planning: Energy, Environment, and Mobility in Four Asian Cities*, that details many of the features of ITP in detail. The report explores potential applications for ITP in cities in Thailand, Indonesia, India, and Pakistan, describing the current state of each city's transportation system, the associated environmental and energy issues, and options available for reducing the negative impacts of transportation growth — such as "land-use plan-

ning, switching to more-efficient forms of transport, transport system management measures, transport infrastructure measures, improving the efficiency of individual vehicles, and switching to cleaner-burning and alternative fuels." While acknowledging that the development of ITP will take time, the report calls on cities to begin the process by "drawing together the wide spectrum of options and considering them in a systematic manner; carrying out long-range social, environmental, and energy impact analyses for each option; putting in place a governmental body with broad authority to coordinate all involved

agencies and power to implement the chosen options; work with other cities around the world to create models of various options and exchange information; and begin systematic training of professionals to carry out land-use planning, emissions projecting, integrated modeling, and energy calculations."

For more information, contact Mia Birk or Chris Zegras at the International Institute for Energy Conservation, 750 First Street NE, Suite 940, Washington, DC 20002, USA. Tel: +1 202 842 3388; Fax: +1 202 842 1565.



Policy Trends

UK Urges Local Planners to Curb Car Use

The UK government has acknowledged the need to make the reduction of private car use one of the objectives of land-use planning, telling local authorities to reject developments that generate more traffic — such as out-of-town shopping centers.

In the future, all major development proposals must be assessed in terms of their potential to reduce the need to travel. Planners are expected to promote walking, cycling, and the use of public transport systems, and to encourage freight to go by rail or waterways rather than by road.

The government's "greening" of the planning system is buttressed by a newly published research report, *Reducing Transport Emissions Through Planning*. Jointly commissioned by the UK Departments of Transport and the Environment, the report says the UK could cut its CO₂ emissions by up to 15% over the next 25 years by curbing road traffic and improving the development of public transport systems. Without any changes in transport and planning policies, the report estimates, an increase in road traffic could lead

to a 60%-120% increase in CO₂ emissions by 2025.

Reducing Transport Emissions Through Planning is available from Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 49 High Holborn, London WC1V 6HB, UK. Tel: +44 71 873 9090; Fax: +44 71 873 8200.

Interest and Conflict over US Energy Tax Intensifies

With his energy tax proposal under fire, US President Clinton in recent weeks has acceded to calls for additional exemptions in the hopes that he can thereby secure enough support to pass it through Congress. In so doing, Clinton is walking a fine line. Exemptions may gain the support of specific legislators and their constituents, but can erode the support of others. Daniel Lashof, of the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), told *GECR's* sister publication, *Energy, Economics and Climate Change*, that "there is a point beyond which we would say this tax is so riddled with loopholes and exemptions that we cannot in good faith support it." At the time, Lashof indicated that the proposal had not yet reached that point, partly

because the NRDC and others were "opposing all exemptions as hard as we can."

The latest round of exemptions began when the Clinton administration sent a specific legislative proposal to Congress on 30 April. The proposal stated in legal terms many exemptions and other changes the administration had already announced in general language on 1 April (see *GECR*, 9 April 1993). But it did contain a few new additions. For example, while the administration had said earlier that "coal used in the production of synthetic natural gas" would be exempted, the legislative proposal added that coal used to produce "any other synthetic fuel specified in regulations prescribed by the Secretary [of Energy]" also would be exempt.

The proposal was delivered to the House of Representatives. Once in its hands, the activity surrounding the tax intensified. Although the proposal still had not emerged from the House Ways and Means Committee when we went to press, it was clear that additional exemptions and other changes would be made before

the committee completed its work and sent the bill to the full house for a vote. Among the changes expected were provisions that bring the collection points for the tax even closer to the final energy user, and which would ease the tax burden on aluminum producers and others.

To some important groups, amendments were insufficient; they instead called for the measure's defeat. Among the most recent additions to the growing list of opponents were the US Chamber of Commerce and the Affordable Energy Alliance, a coalition of companies and business organizations.

If the tax passes despite the opposition, it will have little direct and near-term impact on US CO₂ emissions. However, the tax collection system that it requires could be used in the future to impose heavier taxes and reduce CO₂ emissions by greater amounts. Even more important in the short term, imposing the tax will make it more difficult for members of the EC to further delay approval and implementation of the proposed EC carbon/energy tax.

A US tax also will put pressure on the Japanese to follow suit. As Masahisa Aoki, chairman of the Japanese House of Representatives Special Committee on Global Environmental Issues, said on 11 May at the *Second US-Japan Seminar on the Global Environment* in Washington, DC, if the US "does adopt a new energy tax, it will affect us in Japan; there is no question."

UK Appears Isolated in Opposing EC Carbon/Energy Tax

Depending on whom you listen to, the prospects for a carbon/energy tax in the EC grew either brighter or dimmer on 23 April when environment and energy ministers of all EC countries except Britain agreed that the tax should be adopted.

Proponents of the tax believe that with 11 countries now in favor of

the proposal, it is only a matter of time before the UK bows to the pressure. But there is no guarantee that this will happen. Skeptics emphasize that the tax proposal must be approved by all 12 member states, and it only takes one opposing country to sink it.

British officials said that "several" countries at the meeting were unwilling to commit themselves to the tax. That may be true, but it is not reflected in the meeting's official report, which represents the conclusions of Denmark (the current EC president). The report states pointedly that "a decision on [a fiscal] instrument at the Community level should be reached as soon as possible, and 11 delegations agree on the need for a positive decision."

While Greece, Ireland, Portugal, and Spain for the first time expressed clear support for the tax, they made their endorsement conditional on the receipt of special treatment (most likely a delay in the introduction of the tax) due to their relatively low CO₂ emissions.

The carbon/energy tax proposal will come up for discussion again next month, at a 7 June meeting of EC finance ministers. Although they are not expected to make any final decisions, the finance ministers' conclusions will give a good indication of the tax proposal's chances.

Environment ministers from all of Europe and their counterparts from the US and Canada, meanwhile, called for "timely decisions to introduce as soon as possible taxation that leads to an effective limitation in CO₂ emissions" at the second pan-European conference of environment ministers in Lucerne, Switzerland, on 28-30 April. The host country did not succeed, however, in pushing for binding decisions to develop and introduce a European energy tax within a certain time frame and to set up a cleanup fund for Central and Eastern Europe from the proceeds of such a tax.

EC Finalizes Energy Efficiency Standards

Mandatory EC standards for boosting the energy efficiency of refrigerators and freezers, under discussion for more than two years already, are being finalized by the European Commission and may be submitted by the summer for government approval. The Commission, the EC's executive, is also considering taking an initiative to improve the energy efficiency of office equipment similar to the US EPA's voluntary Energy Star program for computers and printers, a Commission official told *GEER's* sister publication *Environment Watch: Western Europe*. Fridges and freezers have been singled out for priority action because they are the single biggest energy users in the home.

The draft EC legislation would require manufacturers to achieve an energy efficiency improvement averaging around 10% by January 1997, with a second step — for which standards will be set nearer the time — to follow three or four years later. The proposal will complement an EC-wide energy use labeling system that will take effect next year for seven groups of household appliances. The Commission official said technical changes to fridges and freezers will be necessary in some cases as CFCs in cooling systems are replaced by substitutes. These changes will offer an opportunity to manufacturers to redesign their products for greater energy efficiency.

Report Finds Federal Subsidies Favor Energy Supply over Efficiency

A "damaging" pattern of federal energy subsidies that has favored energy supply resources over energy efficiency (by a 35-to-1 ratio in 1989) "continues to waste taxpayer dollars and contribute to environmental pollution" in the US, according to a new report from the Washington, DC-based Alliance to Save Energy.

Federal Energy Subsidies: Energy, Environmental and Fiscal Impacts provides high and low estimates for overall federal subsidies to the energy sector in 1989. The high estimate, US \$36 billion, reflects the value of each subsidy at market rates. The low estimate of \$20 billion reflects the government's cost of providing the subsidies. According to the Alliance, the difference can be accounted for both by the government's lower cost of borrowing funds and by different methods of calculating subsidy levels. The high estimate would drop by \$3.5 billion if today's energy statutes were in place in 1989.

According to the report, 58% (\$21 billion) of all subsidies directly promotes the use of fossil fuels, while 30% (\$11 billion) is earmarked for nuclear energy. End-use energy efficiency receives only 3% (\$983 million), and emerging renewable sources account for only 2% (\$900 million). The report terms the subsidies "environmentally perverse" even within the fossil fuel category. Relatively clean natural gas receives the lowest (\$4 billion) of the subsidies that promote fossil fuel use.

The report is available for \$20 per copy from: The Alliance to Save Energy, 1725 K Street NW, Suite 509, Washington, DC 20006-1401, USA. Tel: +1 202 857 0666; Fax: +1 202 331 9588.

Call for Long-Term CO₂ Reduction Targets Goes Unheeded at UK Conference

At a 7 May conference on the UK national program for reducing CO₂

emissions, the British government appeared unwilling to respond to a broad consensus among industry, environmentalists, and public sector representatives that the UK needed higher and longer-term reduction targets as well as tougher regulations and stronger fiscal incentives to cut greenhouse gas emissions.

Under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, Britain must stabilize its CO₂ emissions at 1990 levels (160 metric tons of carbon, or MtC) by 2000. At their current rate of increase, emissions would be around 10 MtC above that target. But even if the stabilization target can be met, forecasts suggest that without tougher and longer-term targets, emissions will inevitably continue to increase after the end of the decade. According to some estimates, they could rise by as much as 40% by 2020, with the largest increase coming from transport.

The British government recently proposed a number of fiscal measures designed to help meet the stabilization target — including the introduction of a value-added tax on household energy use (see *GECR*, 26 March 1993.) It also plans to tighten building regulations to improve the energy efficiency of new buildings (see *GECR*, 26 February 1993) and has formed an Energy Saving Trust that is now expected to achieve household energy savings of as much as 3.5 MtC this decade, compared with an original target of 1.6 MtC.

But the government continues to focus on short-term policies and "voluntary action taken without

government intervention." This approach is questioned even by the UK Advisory Committee on Business and the Environment, which brings together business and government and which will soon publish its own recommendations on CO₂ reduction.

Friends of the Earth (London, UK), meanwhile, called for a number of measures, largely aimed at reducing energy waste, that the group claims could result in emissions reductions of around 25-30 MtC by 2000 — almost three times the current target.

Norway's CO₂ Emissions Are Down 5%

Norway's CO₂ emissions in 1992 were 5% below their 1989 level, according to the Norwegian environment ministry. Hovard Toresen of the ministry told *GECR* that the reduction was partly due to a series of mild winters, an economic recession, and high precipitation levels that led to the greater use of cheap hydroelectric power. In addition, Toresen said, the reduction is partly due to the government's introduction in 1991 of a "relatively high tax" on CO₂ emissions.

Norway has pledged to stabilize its CO₂ emissions at 1989 levels by the year 2000, and it's off to a good start. "That doesn't mean that we don't expect a pressure for increased emissions in the years to come," Toresen said, "but for this first three-year period there has been a reduction." Toresen noted that the government believes additional measures will be needed to meet the stabilization target.



Science Update

Scientists Report Record Low Ozone in 1992

Last year, global average ozone fell to the lowest values ever recorded by the satellite-based Total Ozone Mapping Spectrometer, according to

a report in the 23 April issue of *Science* (vol. 260, pp. 523-526). Ozone levels in 1992 were 3%-4% below the average values measured during the previous 12 years and

2%-3% below the lowest values recorded during that period.

The low values have continued through the early months of 1993 (see *GECR*, 12 March, 26 March,

and 9 April 1993), although some scientists believe ozone levels may recover somewhat over the next year as sulfate aerosols from the 1991 eruption of Mt. Pinatubo fall out of the stratosphere.

Pinatubo is thought to be partly to blame for the record-low ozone last year, although the effect was not as strong as originally predicted. Because of this, according to an accompanying article by *Science* reporter Richard Kerr, some researchers now doubt whether sulfate aerosols play as strong a role in stratospheric chemistry as previously thought. Rather than facilitating chemical ozone depletion, they say, the aerosols may instead cause changes in atmospheric circulation, altering the wind patterns that transport ozone around the Earth. The stratospheric heating caused by the aerosols may also directly reduce the rate of ozone formation.

"Twilight Effect" of Volcanic Aerosols May Increase UV-B Levels

Under normal conditions, the maximum amount of UV radiation that reaches the Earth's surface under the Antarctic ozone hole is lower than the highest levels recorded in the tropics. But this may change when volcanic aerosols are present, according to a report in the 20 April *Journal of Geophysical Research* (vol. 948, no. D4, pp. 7,251-7,253).

UV-B naturally declines as one moves toward the poles, because sunlight arrives at a lower angle and must pass through more of the atmosphere (encountering more UV-absorbing ozone in the process) before reaching the surface. But according to Roger Davies of McGill University (Montreal, Quebec, Canada), when volcanic aerosols are present, they scatter "a significant amount" of the sunlight straight down. Because this scattered radiation travels through the ozone layer at a steeper angle than is normal for high latitudes, less of it gets absorbed and more of

it reaches the Earth. Davies refers to this as the "twilight effect," because the difference between downward-scattered radiation and unscattered direct radiation is greatest at sunrise or sunset.

When volcanic aerosols are present above the ozone layer over Antarctica and there's an ozone hole, UV radiation in the lower 25% of the UV-B scale (below 290 nanometers) can actually exceed maximum tropical levels, Davies reports.

GECR wonders whether this scattering effect might have anything to do with the recent flurry of anecdotal reports from southern South America linking unusual sunburns and skin lesions in humans (and temporary blindness in livestock and rabbits) to the thinning ozone layer. Ozone measurements from the region do show a decline, but apparently not nearly enough of a decline to account for such severe effects. But the heavy aerosol load contributed by the recent eruptions of Mt. Pinatubo and the Hudson volcano in the Chilean Andes may have caused larger increases in UV-B than one would predict by examining ozone trends alone.

Satellite Data Suggest Clouds Will Enhance Warming

Clouds may exert a "strongly positive" feedback on greenhouse warming, according to a new analysis of international satellite data on cloud cover and temperature.

The study, by George Tselioudis of Columbia University and William Rossow of the NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies (both in New York City), found that in most cases the data showed low clouds becoming optically thinner and high clouds becoming optically thicker as temperatures warmed. Low clouds have an overall cooling effect on climate, reflecting more heat back out to space than they trap from below. High cirrus clouds, on the other

hand, have an overall warming effect. Any effect that would make low clouds less reflective or high clouds more dense would lead to a warmer climate — and in this case, warmer temperatures appear to do both.

The effect on high clouds is most dramatic when temperatures warm from initially cold conditions; when temperatures are warm to begin with, the clouds' optical thickness grows more slowly.

Tselioudis and Rossow will present their findings at the American Geophysical Union's 1993 spring meeting, to be held in Baltimore, Maryland, from 24-28 May.

Dimming Sun May Reduce Global Temperatures Slightly

Solar irradiance is expected to decline by 1.4 watts per square meter over the 1990-1997 period, according to Robert B. Lee III of the NASA Langley Research Center (Hampton, Virginia), causing global atmospheric temperature to decline "a few tenths of a degree" below the 1989-1990 value by 1997.

According to Lee, solar irradiance declined by 1.7 watts per square meter between 1979 and 1986, and increased by 1.4 watts per square meter between 1986 and 1989.

Lee's findings and predictions are based on satellite data from the Earth Radiation Budget Satellite, the Solar Maximum Mission, and Nimbus 7. He will report on his research at the 1993 spring meeting of the American Geophysical Union in Baltimore, Maryland, from 24-28 May.

ENSO, Pinatubo Strongly Influenced Climate in 1992

The El Niño-Southern Oscillation (ENSO) and the sulfate aerosol cloud from Mt. Pinatubo had "major impacts" on climate in the Northern Hemisphere, according to an annual global climate assessment by the US National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

Temperature and precipitation anomalies around the world were linked to ENSO, the researchers said, with southeastern Africa experiencing its worst drought in 100 years and lighter-than-normal monsoons in India and Australia. In the US, ENSO was responsible for ending California's seven-year drought.

ENSO's influence led to warm temperatures in Asia, western Canada, and the US early in 1992, while cooler temperatures (presumably caused by Pinatubo's aerosol cloud) prevailed after April. In the end, 1992 was the eighth warmest year in the global land surface temperature record since 1951.

For a copy of the *Global Climate Assessment 1992*, write to the Climate Analysis Center, W/NMC 5, 5200 Auth Road, Washington, DC 20233, USA.



Industry Watch

Building Codes Cause Problems for CFC Alternatives in US

Local building codes in the US are delaying efforts to convert or install new CFC-free chillers and supermarket display cases, industry officials say. In Chicago, Illinois, according to Ed Dooley of the Air-Conditioning and Refrigeration Institute (ARI), contractors must apply for a specific exemption from the city's building and fire code office each time they want to use non-CFC refrigerants. Existing codes were established while CFCs were still plentiful, and so contain no provisions for using alternative fluorocarbons.

Last year, the American Society of Heating, Refrigerating, and Air-Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE) adopted a revised standard for refrigerant equipment installation procedures that includes safety procedures for equipment using HFC-134a and HCFC-123 (see *GECR*, 10 July 1992). Many local building codes refer to the ASHRAE standard, but apparently the existence of a revised standard is not enough for local authorities. "They need the language to be written out in a model code," Dooley told *GECR*. "Until model code language is available, [the industry] will continue to have to jump through these bureaucratic hurdles."

To identify the extent of this problem and to develop strategies to ad-

dress it, ARI, ASHRAE, the US EPA, and the Council of American Building Officials will hold a seminar next month on how building codes affect the installation of equipment using non-CFC refrigerants. Scheduled for 15 June in Arlington, Virginia, the seminar is open to local officials, chiller and commercial refrigeration manufacturers, state and local building code officials, building owners and managers, construction and contractor groups, refrigerant makers, and testing laboratories.

For more information on the seminar, contact Phil Squair, ARI, 4301 North Fairfax Drive, Suite 425, Arlington, VA 22203, USA. Tel: +1 703 524 8800; Fax: +1 703 528-3816

EC Refrigeration Industry Lags on CFCs

European refrigeration and air conditioning manufacturers have been slow to switch from CFCs, according to a 3 May report in *European Chemical News*. CFC consumption by the EC refrigeration industry last year remained at 104% of the 1986 level, unchanged from its consumption in 1991.

CFCs are being reduced more quickly in other sectors, such as solvents, foams, and aerosols, and total CFC consumption in the EC fell to 43% of the 1986 level in 1992, down from 51% in 1991.

CFCs will be phased out in the EC by 1 January 1995, and consumption

will be capped at 15% of the 1986 level by 31 December 1993. According to *European Chemical News*, this means the refrigeration industry will need to cut its CFC consumption "by around 50% this year" in order to meet the EC's requirements.

Fiona Weir of Friends of the Earth (London, UK) believes the industry has moved slowly to switch from CFCs for two main reasons: first, an attitude of "complacency" that developed in some countries (especially Britain) after the EC achieved large CFC reductions by banning their use in aerosols; and second, "the industry thought that because of the importance of refrigeration, they somehow were very unlikely to be faced with such sudden scenarios." "I think lots of people in the industry did not expect the phaseout dates to go forward so quickly," Weir said.

New Renewable Energy Center to Open in Washington

The Center for Renewable Energy and Sustainable Technology (CREST), a new museum, educational resource center, and training facility, will be housed in a retrofitted former bomb shelter and war veterans museum near Capitol Hill in Washington, DC.

The facility, dedicated on Earth Day (22 April) in Washington, will be open to the public in early 1994, and

will provide interactive exhibits for the general public and offer training courses for designers, engineers, and energy professionals from other countries. The building is being retrofitted with a photovoltaic lighting system, solar hot-water heating, and energy-efficient equipment throughout. The facility is being funded by both federal and private sources.

For more information, contact the Center for Renewable Energy and Sustainable Technology, c/o the Solar Energy Research and Education Foundation, Suite 805, 777 North Capitol Street NE, Washington, DC 20002, USA. Tel: +1 202 408 0660; Fax: +1 202 408 8536.

US DOE Announces Public-Private Partnerships in Renewable Energy

In late April, the US Department of Energy (DOE) announced a series of four public-private partnerships designed to advance the commercialization of renewable energy technologies. According to Secretary of Energy Hazel O'Leary, these collaborative efforts are "representative of the department's changing priorities." DOE's most recent budget request includes a 30% increase for research and development in renewable energy technologies.

One partnership involves a cooperative agreement between DOE and a consortium led by Southern California Edison Company to develop the world's most advanced central-receiver solar thermal power plant, "Solar Two" (see *GECR*, 23 April 1993). Another is a partnership to determine the feasibility of turning sugarcane residue and other biomass into energy.

Jointly funded by DOE and the US state of Hawaii, with contributions from industry, the project includes the construction of a biomass gasifier facility on the island of Maui. The first phase of the project will cost US \$9.2 million.

In a third project, DOE, the Edison Electric Institute, and the American Public Power Association will provide technical assistance to utility companies that intend to develop solar water heating programs for their customers. The fourth initiative is a \$40-million five-year program to develop solar cells that also serve as building components. DOE expects the program — dubbed Building Opportunities in the US for Photovoltaics (PV:BONUS) — to result in the "widespread use of solar cells in homes and businesses." DOE has selected five proposals for negotiation.

For more information, contact Larry Hart, US Department of Energy, Office of the Press Secretary, Washington, DC 20585, USA. Tel: +1 202 586 5806.

HOTLINE: In our most recent (Spring 1993) Meeting Planner, *GECR* listed a symposium on Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Mitigation Research, to be held from 18-20 August in Washington, DC. Readers should note that this listing was an accidental reprint of a meeting held in 1992. The symposium will not take place this year ...

GECR has heard that the revised US National Action Plan for Global Climate Change will project somewhat lower emissions reductions from the EPA's "green" programs (meaning that other measures will be needed to make up the difference) ... Russia's environment minister has said that his country will impose a carbon tax this year ...

The Royal Institute of International Affairs has just published three books of interest to *GECR* readers: *The Earth Summit Agreements: A Guide and Assessment*; *Environmental Profiles of European Business*; and *Climate Change Policy in the European Community: Report of a Workshop*. For more information, contact the Energy and Environmental Program, Royal Institute of International Affairs, Chatham House, 10 St. James's Square, London SW1Y

4LE, UK. Tel: +44 71 957 5711; Fax: +44 71 957 5710.

Contact the *GECR* Hotline for more information on any news item in this issue. We're here to answer your questions or direct you to the people who can. Tel: +1 802 463 9417; Fax: +1 802 463 9418. Eco-Net/GreenNet/Web/Pegasus/Alter-nex: en!gecr; Comlink (Germany): gecr%igc.org@apc.zer; Bitnet: gecr%igc.org@stanford; Internet: gecr@igc.org.

EDITOR: BRADFORD J. HURLEY

Publisher: Karen Fine Coburn

Contributing Editors:

Tony Carritt, Dagmar S. Etkin, Stephanie Gehlen, Jeff Stoub, Amy M. Stolls, Kate Victory

Correspondents:

Jane Gassko, Tom Gray, Nick Sundt, Yulin Yang

Meeting Planner Editor: Lorell Gifford

Document Listing Editor: Jeff Welch

Production Editor: Karen K. Pasley

List Mgr.: Doreen Evans

Subscription Mgr.: Karen Kurr

Editorial Office: Global Environmental Change Report, 31 Gage Street, Bellows Falls, VT 05101-1616, USA. Tel: +1 802 463 9417; Fax: +1 802 463 9418.

Global Environmental Change Report is published twice monthly by Cutter Information Corp., 37 Broadway, Arlington, MA 02174-5539, USA. Tel: +1 617 641 5118 or, in North America, +1 800 964 5118; Fax: +1 617 648 1950 or, in North America, +1 800 888 1816; Telex: 650 100 9891.

Subscriptions: \$447 per year; \$547 outside North America. University subscription rate: \$247 per year; \$287 outside North America. ISSN 1049-9083.

Unauthorized reproduction in any form, including photocopying, faxing, and image scanning, is against the law. Copyright © 1993 by Cutter Information Corp. All rights reserved. Authorization to photocopy for noncommercial internal or personal use is granted by Cutter Information Corp., provided that the fee of \$2.50 per page is paid directly to Copyright Clearance Center, 27 Congress Street, Salem, MA 01970, USA; +1 508 744 3350. The fee code is: 1049-9083/93 \$0 + \$2.50.

GECR is available electronically, online, on NewsNet® and Predicasts®. For access information, call NewsNet at +1 215 527 8030 or Predicasts at +1 216 795 3000.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

OFFICE OF
INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES

MEMORANDUM

TO: Clare Breidenich fax 456-6212

FROM: Franklin C. Moore, EPA *FCM*

SUBJECT: Forest responses to agenda 21 (Chapters 7 and 11)

Below, please find a number of examples of activities which have taken place recently which are responses to either the forest principles or combating deforestation. Unfortunately, the list is brief. I will attempt to think of some other examples for tomorrow.

- The strengthening of the Centre for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) and the designation of Jeffrey Sayer (formerly of IUCN) as the new Director-General.
- The Dutch program to do cooperative development with member countries of the G-77 has had an effect on the transfer of forest skills from the Netherlands to the countries involved (The African partner country is Niger; there is also a country in Asia and one in Latin America).
- The proposal (By U. Olsten) to establish a Commission on Forestry for Sustainable Development as a short term (3 year) advisory body to the Commission on Sustainable Development.
- The increasing trend among temperate and boreal forested countries to understand the need to consider the application of Target 2000 (ITTO target) to the management of their own temperate and boreal forests for the production of internationally traded timber.
- The work undertaken by UNSO to develop reforestation projects as a part of the response by UNSO to resource management and desertification (Two such projects have been accepted by the GEF for funding.).



Desertification: The United States is committed to the early establishment of a convention to combat desertification and the effects of drought and will be an active participant in the ongoing negotiations to address this issue.

Global Environment Facility (GEF): The United States strongly supports efforts to restructure the GEF so it can serve as the financial mechanism for the climate and biodiversity conventions, and fund other agreed projects with global environmental benefits. In its 1994 budget, the Clinton Administration has requested \$31 million for direct contribution to the GEF core fund.

Post-UNCED Conferences: Agenda 21 calls for the U.N. General Assembly and the U.N. Environment Program to convene major global conferences to deal with the issues of land-based sources of marine pollution, the sustainable development of small island states, and the conservation of highly migratory and straddling fish stocks. The United States supports these efforts to address these important issues. The United States will host the conference on land-based sources of marine pollution in Washington in 1995.

UN Development Programme (UNDP) "Capacity 21": Agenda 21 endorses UNDP's Capacity 21, which is the centerpiece of UNDP's efforts to build, promote and expand institutional capacity building within developing countries, especially the least developed countries. The Administration has requested \$3 million for the UNDP Capacity 21 Trust Fund for FY 1994.

Consumption?
Population: The United States considers addressing population growth essential for the goal of sustainable development. President Clinton in January announced that the United States would reverse the so-called Mexico City policy. The Administration's 1994 budget proposal calls for an increase in the commitment of resources to population programs.

PROGRESS REPORT
UNITED STATES FOLLOW-UP TO UNCED

The United States is committed to implementing the commitments made at the Rio Earth Summit in support of global sustainable development.

Climate Change: The United States, which ratified the climate convention last year, considers climate change to be a priority issue. On April 21, President Clinton announced that the U.S. is committed to reducing its greenhouse gas emissions to their 1990 levels by the year 2000. The United States intends to develop by August 1993 a detailed action plan outlining the specific steps that will be taken to achieve this target. The Administration's proposed 1994 budget contains proposals that begin to move in this direction, including enhanced programs for energy efficiency and renewable energy.

*Signed
G/A*
Biodiversity: On April 21, President Clinton announced that the United States intends to sign the biodiversity convention. He also directed the Department of State to work with like-minded donor nations to resolve concerns with convention provisions that do not adequately protect intellectual property rights. When it joins the convention the United States intends to issue, as many other countries have, a statement that provides its interpretation of these provisions. In support of convention objectives, the United States also intends to create a National Biological Survey to gather, analyze, and disseminate information on U.S. biological resources and to foster increased scientific understanding of those resources.

ITTA?
Forests: At the Earth Summit the U.S. proposed that all countries join in doubling international forest assistance. The Administration's 1994 budget request calls for investing \$30 million in 1994 and \$50 million in each of the next four years towards the goal of reducing world-wide deforestation.

U.N. Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD): The U.S. strongly supports the establishment of the CSD, as called for Agenda 21. The U.S. believes the CSD should monitor implementation of Agenda 21 at the local, regional, and global levels. The United States intends to submit a national sustainable development plan to the CSD. The President has announced the establishment of a ~~U.S. Committee~~ on Sustainable Development to, among other things, foster the implementation of Agenda 21 in the United States.

Council



United States Department of State

*Bureau of Oceans and International
Environmental and Scientific Affairs*

Washington, D.C. 20520

RAPIDFAX

CANON FAX-620
!!!URGENT!!!

Date: 6/1/93Time: 9:40TO: Clair Breidenrich

Tel. No: _____

Office: White HouseFax No: 456-6212Pages to follow: 2

FROM: Peter O. Thomas, Ph.D.TEL. No: 202 736-7113Office Symbol/Number: OES/EHCFax No: 736-7351

SEEHCB #2767

MESSAGE

The attached non-paper is for your use in
the "One year after Rio" document. I hope
this is useful.

Peter Thomas

Biodiversity

International activity on biodiversity in the year since UNCED has centered on the Convention on Biological Diversity.

The Convention on Biological Diversity was opened for signature in Rio on June 5, 1992. It has been signed by 163 countries to date. As of May 28, 1993 twenty countries, of the thirty required for the Convention to enter into force, had ratified. Several others are on the verge of ratification. With the prominent exceptions of Canada and China, early ratifications have been of small developing countries. This trend is beginning to change; Japan and Norway will ratify by June 5th, and the EC is committed to ratification as a group by the end of 1993. Entry into force, which occurs on the ninetieth day after the deposit of the thirtieth instrument of ratification is likely to occur early in 1994. The first meeting of the Conference of the Parties is to be convened not later than one year after entry into force.

UNEP has undertaken a series of activities designed to facilitate implementation of the Convention. The Executive Director of UNEP convened four Experts Panels to consider issues raised in Resolution 2 of the Final Act of the Convention, including priorities for action and scientific research, economic implications, technology transfer and financial issues, and the need for and modalities of a protocol on biosafety. A fifth group has met to revise the UNEP guidelines for conduct of country studies of biodiversity. The African Centre for Technology Studies also organized the International Conference on the Convention on Biological Diversity: National Interests and Global Imperatives held in January 1993, and Norway and UNEP cosponsored an Experts Meeting on scientific and technical issues in May.

The reports of these panels will be presented to the first meeting of the Inter-governmental Committee on the Convention on Biological Diversity (IGC), in Geneva on September 20 - 24, 1993. This meeting, open to all nations, will be the first formal inter-governmental meeting to consider Convention implementation issues.

Important issues relating to technology transfer, funding and biosafety have been discussed in these convention follow-up activities. In many cases the G-77 articulated a moderated view relative to pre-UNCED stances. There has been no inter-governmental meeting to carry issues forward from the conclusion of negotiations on May 22, 1992.

A major U.S. concern centers on the issue of a protocol on biosafety. This was the subject of Panel IV which produced a report divided into majority and minority positions on the question of the need for and modalities of a protocol on

- 2 -

biosafety. The strength of the mandate for a protocol perceived by the Panel IV chairs, makes this an issue to be watched closely in the coming months. The U.S. experts crafted the minority view that the need for a legally binding protocol on biosafety, particularly within the context of the Convention on Biological Diversity has not been established. There is already a wide body of existing agreements covering aspects of biosafety, and many other more pertinent fora where discussions of biosafety are underway.

Both the ACTS meeting and the Norway/UNEP Experts meetings included academic discussion of these issues which did little to clarify the intellectual property rights issues with regard to the Convention. UNEP intends to convene further meetings on these topics.

Financial issues as well have been largely left to the IGC. Panel III fleshed out issues of concern for the IGC, but did little to clarify the relationship of the Conference of Parties to the financial mechanism.

After a year, the Convention on Biological Diversity has remained alive in the eyes of the world. Progress toward entry into force has been rapid and there has been strong interest in national-level implementation measures such as country studies and country-level strategies as well as continued discussion of multilateral issues. The IGC in September will be crucial as the first opportunity to determine, in an intergovernmental context, whether the developing and developed countries will be able to enter into constructive dialogue on the contentious issues, or will merely return to the pre-Rio debates.

PROGRESS REPORT
UNITED STATES FOLLOW-UP TO UNCED

The United States is committed to implementing the commitments made at the Rio Earth Summit in support of global sustainable development.

Climate Change: The United States, which ratified the climate convention last year, considers climate change to be a priority issue. On April 21, President Clinton announced that the U.S. is committed to reducing its greenhouse gas emissions to their 1990 levels by the year 2000. The United States intends to develop by August 1993 a detailed action plan outlining the specific steps that will be taken to achieve this target. The Administration's proposed 1994 budget contains proposals that begin to move in this direction, including enhanced programs for energy efficiency and renewable energy.

*Signed
G/A*
Biodiversity: On April 21, President Clinton announced that the United States intends to sign the biodiversity convention. He also directed the Department of State to work with like-minded donor nations to resolve concerns with convention provisions that do not adequately protect intellectual property rights. When it joins the convention the United States intends to issue, as many other countries have, a statement that provides its interpretation of these provisions. In support of convention objectives, the United States also intends to create a National Biological Survey to gather, analyze, and disseminate information on U.S. biological resources and to foster increased scientific understanding of those resources.

ITTA?
Forests: At the Earth Summit the U.S. proposed that all countries join in doubling international forest assistance. The Administration's 1994 budget request calls for investing \$30 million in 1994 and \$50 million in each of the next four years towards the goal of reducing world-wide deforestation.

U.N. Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD): The U.S. strongly supports the establishment of the CSD, as called for Agenda 21. The U.S. believes the CSD should monitor implementation of Agenda 21 at the local, regional, and global levels. The United States intends to submit a national sustainable development plan to the CSD. The President has announced the establishment of a ~~U.S. Committee~~^{Council} on Sustainable Development to, among other things, foster the implementation of Agenda 21 in the United States.

Desertification: The United States is committed to the early establishment of a convention to combat desertification and the effects of drought and will be an active participant in the ongoing negotiations to address this issue.

Global Environment Facility (GEF): The United States strongly supports efforts to restructure the GEF so it can serve as the financial mechanism for the climate and biodiversity conventions, and fund other agreed projects with global environmental benefits. In its 1994 budget, the Clinton Administration has requested \$31 million for direct contribution to the GEF core fund.

Post-UNCED Conferences: Agenda 21 calls for the U.N. General Assembly and the U.N. Environment Program to convene major global conferences to deal with the issues of land-based sources of marine pollution, the sustainable development of small island states, and the conservation of highly migratory and straddling fish stocks. The United States supports these efforts to address these important issues. The United States will host the conference on land-based sources of marine pollution in Washington in 1995.

UN Development Programme (UNDP) "Capacity 21": Agenda 21 endorses UNDP's Capacity 21, which is the centerpiece of UNDP's efforts to build, promote and expand institutional capacity building within developing countries, especially the least developed countries. The Administration has requested \$3 million for the UNDP Capacity 21 Trust Fund for FY 1994.

Consumption
Population: The United States considers addressing population growth essential for the goal of sustainable development. President Clinton in January announced that the United States would reverse the so-called Mexico City policy. The Administration's 1994 budget proposal calls for an increase in the commitment of resources to population programs.



Office of
Resources, Trade,
and Technology

21 May

Claire.

Enclosed are the materials
you requested. Please call
if you need more.

Jade Schick
703-482-9682

UN/FCCC SIGNATURE & RATIFICATION STATUS: 07/05/93

STATUS OF SIGNATURE AND RATIFICATION OF THE
UNITED NATIONS FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE

TEXT ADOPTED AT NEW YORK ON 9 MAY 1992
OPENED FOR SIGNATURE AT RIO DE JANEIRO FROM 4 TO 14 JUNE 1992
AND THEREAFTER AT UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS, NEW YORK
FROM 20 JUNE 1992 TO 19 JUNE 1993

(as at 07/05/93)

THE CONVENTION HAS RECEIVED 161 SIGNATURES
AND 19 RATIFICATIONS

1. MAURITIUS
2. SEYCHELLES
3. MARSHALL ISLANDS
4. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
5. ZIMBABWE
6. MALDIVES
7. MONACO
8. CANADA
9. AUSTRALIA
10. CHINA
11. SAINT KITTS AND NEVIS
12. ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA
13. ECUADOR
14. FIJI
15. MEXICO
16. PAPUA NEW GUINEA
17. VANUATU
18. COOK ISLANDS
19. GUINEA

* * * *

extract of table Dates of Signature and Ratification
from document A/AC.237/INF.10/Rev.1, reflecting the
new status of Guinea

* * * *

COUNTRY	SIGNATURE	RATIFICATION	REMARKS
68. GUINEA	12/06/92	07/05/93	
* * * * * TOTAL * * * * *	161	19	



General Assembly

Distr.
GENERAL

A/AC.237/INF.10/Rev.1
12 March 1993

ORIGINAL:
ENGLISH/FRENCH

INTERGOVERNMENTAL NEGOTIATING COMMITTEE
FOR A FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE
Seventh session
New York, 15-19(20) March 1993
Item 4 of the provisional agenda

**DATES OF SIGNATURE AND RATIFICATION OF THE
UNITED NATIONS FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE**

*TEXT ADOPTED AT NEW YORK ON 9 MAY 1992
OPENED FOR SIGNATURE AT RIO DE JANEIRO FROM 4 TO 14 JUNE 1992
AND THEREAFTER AT UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS, NEW YORK
FROM 20 JUNE 1992 TO 19 JUNE 1993*

SUMMARY
(as at 11/03/93)

**THE CONVENTION HAS RECEIVED 160 SIGNATURES
AND 15 RATIFICATIONS:**

- | | |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. Mauritius | 9. Australia |
| 2. Seychelles | 10. China |
| 3. Marshall Islands | 11. Saint Kitts and
Nevis |
| 4. United States of
America | 12. Antigua and Barbuda |
| 5. Zimbabwe | 13. Ecuador |
| 6. Maldives | 14. Fiji |
| 7. Monaco | 15. Mexico |
| 8. Canada | |

Note: This document contains information concerning dates of signature and ratification received from the Depositary, United Nations Office of Legal Affairs, New York, as at 11 March 1993. The dates in the column on ratification are those of the receipt of the instrument of ratification by the Depositary.

UNITED NATIONS FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE

DATES OF SIGNATURE AND RATIFICATION

PAGE 3

COUNTRY	SIGNATURE	RATIFICATION	ACCEPTANCE (At) APPROVAL (Ap) ACCESSION (Ac)	REMARKS
1. AFGHANISTAN	12/06/92			
2. ALBANIA				
3. ALGERIA	13/06/92			
4. ANGOLA	14/06/92			
5. ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA	04/06/92	02/02/93		
6. ARGENTINA	12/06/92			
7. ARMENIA	13/06/92			
8. AUSTRALIA	04/06/92	30/12/92		
9. AUSTRIA	08/06/92			
10. AZERBAIJAN	12/06/92			
11. BAHAMAS (THE)	12/06/92			
12. BAHRAIN	08/06/92			
13. BANGLADESH	09/06/92			
14. BARBADOS	12/06/92			
15. BELARUS	11/06/92			
16. BELGIUM	04/06/92			

DATES OF SIGNATURE AND RATIFICATION

PAGE 4

COUNTRY	SIGNATURE	RATIFICATION	ACCEPTANCE (At) APPROVAL (Ap) ACCESSION (Ac)	REMARKS
17. BELIZE	13/06/29			
18. BENIN	13/06/92			
19. BHUTAN	11/06/92			
20. BOLIVIA	10/06/92			
21. BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA				
22. BOTSWANA	12/06/92			
23. BRAZIL	04/06/92			
24. BRUNEI DARUSSALAM				
25. BULGARIA	05/06/92			
26. BURKINA FASO	12/06/92			
27. BURUNDI	11/06/92			
28. CAMBODIA				
29. CAMEROON	14/06/92			
30. CANADA	12/06/92	04/12/92		
31. CAPE VERTE	12/06/92			
32. CENTRAL AFRICAN REP. (THE)	13/06/92			
33. CHAD	12/06/92			
34. CHILE	13/06/92			
35. CHINA	11/06/92	05/01/93		

DATES OF SIGNATURE AND RATIFICATION

PAGE 5

COUNTRY	SIGNATURE	RATIFICATION	ACCEPTANCE (At) APPROVAL (Ap) ACCESSION (Ac)	REMARKS
36. COLOMBIA	13/06/92			(1)
37. COMOROS (THE)	11/06/92			
38. CONGO (THE)	12/06/92			
39. COOK ISLANDS	12/06/92			(1)
40. COSTA RICA	13/06/92			(1)
41. COTE D'IVOIRE	10/06/92			
42. CROATIA	11/06/92			
43. CUBA	13/06/92			
44. CYPRUS	12/06/92			(1)
45. CZECH REPUBLIC				
46. DEM. PEOPLE'S REP. OF KOREA	11/06/92			
47. DENMARK	09/06/92			
48. DJIBOUTI	12/06/92			
49. DOMINICA				
50. DOMINICAN REPUBLIC (THE)	12/06/92			
51. ECUADOR	09/06/92	23/02/93		
52. EGYPT	09/06/92			
53. EL SALVADOR	13/06/92			
54. EQUATORIAL GUINEA				

DATES OF SIGNATURE AND RATIFICATION

PAGE 6

COUNTRY	SIGNATURE	RATIFICATION	ACCEPTANCE (At) APPROVAL (Ap) ACCESSION (Ac)	REMARKS
55. ESTONIA	12/06/92			
56. ETHIOPIA	10/06/92			
57. FIJI	09/10/92	25/02/93		(6)
58. FINLAND	04/06/92			(1)
59. FRANCE	13/06/92			
60. GABON	12/06/92			
61. GAMBIA (THE)	12/06/92			
62. GEORGIA				
63. GERMANY	12/06/92			
64. GHANA	12/06/92			
65. GREECE	12/06/92			
66. GRENADA	03/12/92			
67. GUATEMALA	13/06/92			
68. GUINEA	12/06/92			
69. GUINEA-BISSAU	12/06/92			
70. GUYANA	13/06/92			
71. HAITI	13/06/92			
72. HOLY SEE (THE)				
73. HONDURAS	13/06/92			

DATES OF SIGNATURE AND RATIFICATION

PAGE 7

COUNTRY	SIGNATURE	RATIFICATION	ACCEPTANCE (At) APPROVAL (Ap) ACCESSION (Ac)	REMARKS
74. HUNGARY	13/06/92			(1)
75. ICELAND	04/06/92			
76. INDIA	10/06/92			
77. INDONESIA	05/06/92			
78. IRAN (ISLAMIC REP. OF)	14/06/92			
79. IRAQ				
80. IRELAND	13/06/92			
81. ISRAEL	04/06/92			
82. ITALY	05/06/92			
83. JAMAICA	12/06/92			
84. JAPAN	13/06/92			
85. JORDAN	11/06/92			
86. KAZAKHSTAN	08/06/92			
87. KENYA	12/06/92			
88. KIRIBATI	13/06/92			(4)
89. KUWAIT				
90. KYRGYZSTAN				
91. LAO PEOPLE'S DEM. REP. (THE)				
92. LATVIA	11/06/92			

DATES OF SIGNATURE AND RATIFICATION

PAGE 8

COUNTRY	SIGNATURE	RATIFICATION	ACCEPTANCE (At) APPROVAL (Ap) ACCESSION (Ac)	REMARKS
93. LEBANON	12/06/92			
94. LESOTHO	11/06/92			
95. LIBERIA	12/06/92			
96. LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA (THE)	29/06/92			
97. LIECHTENSTEIN	04/06/92			(1)
98. LITHUANIA	11/06/92			
99. LUXEMBOURG	09/06/92			(1)
100. MADAGASCAR	10/06/92			
101. MALAWI	10/06/92			
102. MALAYSIA				
103. MALDIVES	12/06/92	09/11/92		
104. MALI	22/09/92			
105. MALTA	12/06/92			
106. MARSHALL ISLANDS	12/06/92	08/10/92		
107. MAURITANIA	12/06/92			
108. MAURITIUS	10/06/92	04/09/92		
109. MEXICO	13/06/92	11/03/93		(1)
110. MICRONESIA (FED. STATES OF)	12/06/92			

DATES OF SIGNATURE AND RATIFICATION

PAGE 9

COUNTRY	SIGNATURE	RATIFICATION	ACCEPTANCE (At) APPROVAL (Ap) ACCESSION (Ac)	REMARKS
111. MONACO	11/06/92	24/11/92		(7)
112. MONGOLIA	12/06/92			
113. MOROCCO	13/06/92			
114. MOZAMBIQUE	12/06/92			
115. MYANMAR	11/06/92			
116. NAMIBIA	12/06/92			
117. NAURU	08/06/92			(2)
118. NEPAL	12/06/92			
119. NETHERLANDS (THE)	04/06/92			
120. NEW ZEALAND	04/06/92			
121. NICARAGUA	13/06/92			
122. NIGER (THE)	11/06/92			
123. NIGERIA	13/06/92			
124. NORWAY	04/06/92			
125. OMAN	11/06/92			
126. PAKISTAN	13/06/92			
127. PANAMA				
128. PAPUA NEW GUINEA	13/06/92			
129. PARAGUAY	12/06/92			(1)

DATES OF SIGNATURE AND RATIFICATION

PAGE 10

COUNTRY	SIGNATURE	RATIFICATION	ACCEPTANCE (At) APPROVAL (Ap) ACCESSION (Ac)	REMARKS
130. PERU	12/06/92			
131. PHILIPPINES (THE)	12/06/92			(1)
132. POLAND	05/06/92			(1)
133. PORTUGAL	13/06/92			
134. QATAR				
135. REPUBLIC OF KOREA (THE)	13/06/92			
136. REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA (THE)	12/06/92			
137. ROMANIA	05/06/92			
138. RUSSIAN FEDERATION (THE)	13/06/92			
139. RWANDA	10/06/92			
140. SAINT KITTS AND NEVIS	12/06/92	07/01/93		
141. SAINT LUCIA				
142. ST. VINCENT AND THE GRENAD.				
143. SAMOA	12/06/92			
144. SAN MARINO	10/06/92			
145. SAO TOME AND PRINCIPE	12/06/92			
146. SAUDI ARABIA				
147. SENEGAL	13/06/92			
148. SEYCHELLES	10/06/92	22/09/92		

DATES OF SIGNATURE AND RATIFICATION

PAGE 11

COUNTRY	SIGNATURE	RATIFICATION	ACCEPTANCE (At) APPROVAL (Ap) ACCESSION (Ac)	REMARKS
149. SIERRA LEONE	11/02/93			
150. SINGAPORE	13/06/92			
151. SLOVAKIA				
152. SLOVENIA	13/06/92			
153. SOLOMON ISLANDS	13/06/92			
154. SOMALIA				
155. SOUTH AFRICA				
156. SPAIN	13/06/92			
157. SRI LANKA	10/06/92			
158. SUDAN (THE)	09/06/92			
159. SURINAME	13/06/92			
160. SWAZILAND	12/06/92			
161. SWEDEN	08/06/92			
162. SWITZERLAND	12/06/92			
163. SYRIAN ARAB REP. (THE)				
164. TAJIKISTAN				
165. THAILAND	12/06/92			
166. TOGO	12/06/92			

DATES OF SIGNATURE AND RATIFICATION

PAGE 12

COUNTRY	SIGNATURE	RATIFICATION	ACCEPTANCE (At) APPROVAL (Ap) ACCESSION (AC)	REMARKS
167. TONGA				
168. TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO	11/06/92			
169. TUNISIA	13/06/92			
170. TURKEY				
171. TURKMENISTAN				
172. TUVALU	08/06/92			(3)
173. UGANDA	13/06/92			
174. UKRAINE	11/06/92			
175. UNITED ARAB EMIRATES (THE)				
176. UNITED KINGDOM	12/06/92			
177. UNITED REP. OF TANZANIA	12/06/92			
178. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	12/06/92	15/10/92		
179. URUGUAY	04/06/92			
180. UZBEKISTAN				
181. VANUATU	09/06/92			(1)
182. VENEZUELA	12/06/92			
183. VIET NAM	11/06/92			
184. YEMEN	12/06/92			

DATES OF SIGNATURE AND RATIFICATION

PAGE 13

COUNTRY	SIGNATURE	RATIFICATION	ACCEPTANCE (At) APPROVAL (Ap) ACCESSION (Ac)	REMARKS
185. YUGOSLAVIA	08/06/92			
186. ZAIRE	11/06/92			
187. ZAMBIA	11/06/92			
188. ZIMBABWE	12/06/92	03/11/92		
***** ORGANIZATION *****	*****	*****	*****	*****
EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY	13/06/92			(5)
***** TOTAL *****	160	15		



INTERGOVERNMENTAL NEGOTIATING COMMITTEE
FOR A FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE

Seventh session

New York, 15-19(20) March 1993

Item 4 of the provisional agenda

**DATES OF SIGNATURE AND RATIFICATION OF THE
UNITED NATIONS FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE**

*TEXT ADOPTED AT NEW YORK ON 9 MAY 1992
OPENED FOR SIGNATURE AT RIO DE JANEIRO FROM 4 TO 14 JUNE 1992
AND THEREAFTER AT UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS, NEW YORK
FROM 20 JUNE 1992 TO 19 JUNE 1993*

SUMMARY
(as at 11/03/93)

**THE CONVENTION HAS RECEIVED 160 SIGNATURES
AND 15 RATIFICATIONS:**

- | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Mauritius | 9. Australia |
| 2. Seychelles | 10. China |
| 3. Marshall Islands | 11. Saint Kitts and Nevis |
| 4. United States of America | 12. Antigua and Barbuda |
| 5. Zimbabwe | 13. Ecuador |
| 6. Maldives | 14. Fiji |
| 7. Monaco | 15. Mexico |
| 8. Canada | |

Note: This document contains information concerning dates of signature and ratification received from the Depositary, United Nations Office of Legal Affairs, New York, as at 11 March 1993. The dates in the column on ratification are those of the receipt of the instrument of ratification by the Depositary.

Note to Katie from Dan and Clare
Re: Follow-up to Rio
Date: June 1, 1993

overall good,
but needs
periodic check.
What do I think
to find up
is there
or no?

Per your request, the following is a summary of where other countries stand "one year after Rio." More detailed information on the conventions is attached.

Biodiversity Convention

- * 170 countries have signed the convention.
- * As of May 28, 1993 20 countries have ratified the convention including China and Canada. (See attached list.)
- * Japan and Norway have committed to ratify by June 5, and the EC by the end of 1993.
- * It is likely that the 30 ratifications necessary for entry into force will be received by early 1994.

Climate Change Convention

- * 161 countries have signed the convention.
- * In addition to the U.S., 18 countries have ratified the Climate Change Convention. (See attached list.)
- * 49 countries are involved in national action to meet their obligations under the "Prompt Start" agreement to begin immediate action to implement the convention. 13 countries have drafted or are in the process of drafting national action plans, while 22 other countries are conducting preparatory emissions inventories and impact studies.
- * The EC is moving toward consensus on a carbon based energy tax. Only the UK opposed the tax in a recent vote.

- * The UK is not expected to stabilize its CO2 emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2000, but is expected to exceed this target by 10 metric tons annually.

Forests

- * The Netherlands have established a cooperative development program to transfer forestry skills to G-77 nations.
- * Sweden, backed by Canada, Germany and Finland, is proposing to establish a Commission of Forestry for Sustainable Development as a short-term advisory body to CSD.
- * Temperate and boreal forest countries, led by the U.S. and Japan, are generally beginning to understand and accept the need for application of Target 2000 (ITTO) for management of their own forests. The UK and France have opposed.

put this
in
England.
UK
expand
target
has?

publicly
reached
it??

spell out
remember, would
have background
here.

is this
overly
optimistic??
There is a
Joint
Minister
Meeting very
shortly.
Let's check
progress
there

Ratifications of Biodiversity Convention

Mauritius	September 4, 1992
Seychelles	September 22, 1992
Marshall Islands	October 8, 1992
Maldives	November 9, 1992
Monaco	November 20, 1992
Canada	December 4, 1992
China	January 5, 1993
Saint Kitts & Nevis	January 7, 1993
Ecuador	February 23, 1993
Fiji	February 25, 1993
Antigua & Barbuda	March 9, 1993
Mexico	March 11, 1993
Papua New Guinea	March 16, 1993
Vanuatu	March 25, 1993
Cook Islands	April 20, 1993
Guinea	May 7, 1993
Armenia	May 14, 1993