



INTERNAL INDUSTRY BRIEFING

GLADs 2016 #2: DAKAR

The International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) is running a series of Global Aviation Dialogues (GLADs) as part of its outreach to member states on the process to develop a global market-based measure (GMBM) set to be agreed at the 2016 ICAO Assembly. The second round of GLADs is taking place across the ICAO regions in Cairo, Dakar, Denpasar, Utrecht and Mexico City throughout March and April 2016.

The West African nation of Senegal was the scene of 2016's second GLAD, held at the regional ICAO headquarters at Dakar International Airport. A strong attendance of around 70 delegates from South Africa, Equatorial Guinea, Kenya, Cameroon, Nigeria, Sudan, Togo, Sao Tome, Senegal, Gabon and Tanzania were joined by colleagues from Switzerland, the USA, Canada, France and the United Kingdom. The meeting was chaired by the ICAO Council member from Burkina Faso. Industry had ten delegates and ICSA was well represented with six.

Generally, the Dakar meeting was somewhat livelier than in Cairo, with more active participation from delegates, encouraged by an enthusiastic and professional Chair.

Before the ICAO presentations even began, one State delegate raised a query on the way in which the breakout session questions had been framed, noting that the way they are written supposes that the proposal's elements are a fait accompli and there is no way to provide critical feedback. He mentioned the need to address responsibility for

historical emissions and noted that the differentiation of emissions should more closely resemble the UNFCCC's traditional approach of developed and developing countries. There was even a comment that there should be a blanket exemption for Africa as a whole.

Resonating one of the key points raised at the Cairo GLAD, a number of delegates questioned the use of the World Bank GNI-per-capita rankings as part of the phase-in process, with a preference for concentrating on the emissions metrics.

- » All documents are available on the ICAO website: www.icao.int/Meetings/GLADs-2016/Pages/default.aspx

BREAKOUT SESSIONS

A number of delegates' understanding of the subject matter did not seem to be improved by the ICAO presentations. The breakout sessions were not as productive as they may otherwise have been (which was also not helped by a lack of planning to take into account language differences across the delegates). The unfamiliarity with carbon offsetting also appeared to be a potential obstacle to an agreement





at the Assembly, with some delegates indicating that they will need to have better understanding of the scheme before signing up to it.

ICAO has formulated a series of questions as part of the two breakout discussion sessions at each of the GLADs. Once again, these were criticized by a number of the delegates as not providing adequate scope for genuine feedback on the larger questions of the proposal’s design elements.

One part of the discussion does provide an interesting insight into the thinking of some governments on the issue of the eligibility of offset criteria, bearing in mind that this is being addressed at the CAEP level). Below is a table of the preferences of each group reporting back at the two GLADs so far (this should be seen as indicative, not scientific).

One breakout group emphasised the fact that the development of harmonised and mandatory rules by ICAO would play a key role in ensuring States are engaged in the process and take on the responsibility for implementation of the

scheme. They also reiterated the need for technical assistance, noting that it should not just be a one-time training opportunity but a more continuous process with follow-up.

CLOSING PANEL

Representatives from Kenya and Gabon joined ICSA and industry on the closing panel. Kenya mentioned that they supported the proposed draft resolution and that the GLADs will help ICAO to “create a more rounded system that has everyone’s input”. Gabon commented that they would like to see ICAO extend its assistance programme of capacity building to more states and that the current proposal was good, but will need some changes in the detail.

The ICSA representative (from WWF UK) said that they welcomed the fact that civil society had been included in these talks and it would come as no surprise that their main objective was environmental integrity. It was not their place as observers to say what was fair or unfair distribution, but they were able to provide support on technical issues

(such as MRV and EUC). He noted the importance of historical responsibility and the vulnerability of countries to climate impacts and that this needed to be taken into account. He would also like to see changes to Paragraphs 15 and 16 to address upward ambition.

Michael Gill representing industry again noted our general support for the ICAO process and the broad terms of the current proposal. He stressed the importance of achieving agreement at the ICAO Assembly in order to avoid the potential patchwork of overlapping or contradictory national and regional measures, as well as noting industry’s commitment to future capacity building in support of the MBM scheme. This was a theme taken up by the Chair.

The Chair also spent some time talking about the importance of building consensus in this process and that no multilateral agreement would ever be perfect, but as long as everyone was ‘equally disappointed and equally happy’, the agreement would fulfil its function. One state raised once again the need to address historical responsibility and the vulnerability of states to climate change - echoing very closely the position of the NGOs.

The need for African countries to influence the ICAO process with a common position was brought up, while also noting that some of the leading African States need to reach out to the countries not present at the meeting to ensure support for the GMBM.

BALI, HI!

The next stop on the GLADs global tour is Denpasar in Indonesia for the Asia-Pacific region on 29-30 March.

Question	# of groups prioritising
1 Operators should be free to choose the offsets that are more cost effective as far as they comply with agreed quality requirements	10
2 Operators should be encouraged to purchase emissions units that comply with agreed quality requirements, prior to 2020 for use in the GMBM	3
3 There should be a preference for units under the current and new UNFCCC mechanisms (i.e. CDM)	3
4 There should be a link to the protection of forests (from forestry projects i.e. REDD+)	2
5 There should be a preference for offsets from aviation projects	2
6 There should be a preference for projects located in developing/least developed States	8
7 There should be a preference for offsets generated by projects in the State where the operators is registered	3
8 There should be a link to sustainable alternative fuels	0