

## 1. Cairo GLADs (20 and 21 March 2016) – Summary of Dialogues

### Day 1 – Small Group Dialogue on Design elements

**Question 1: During the 2015 GLADs, “administrative simplicity”, “environmental integrity” and “cost effectiveness”, among others, were identified as the most important considerations for the design of a global MBM scheme for international aviation. What are the 3 design elements (specific paragraphs) in the current GMBM proposal that address these considerations?**

The small groups identified that the following paragraphs in the current GMBM proposal address the 3 considerations (administrative simplicity, environmental integrity, and cost effectiveness):

Paragraphs 4, 5, 6, 7 (by 2 groups), 8 (by 2 groups), 9 (by 2 groups), 10, 11 (by 2 groups), 12, 13, 15, 16 (by 2 groups), 18

Other issues raised were:

- All 3 elements should be considered together (not in silos) as they affect each other
- Flexibility should also be considered to take into account different circumstances
- Open markets contribute to the simplicity of the scheme
- Some participants were not comfortable with how details were proposed (e.g., use of data in 2018 – preference for having different opinions)
- Differentiation/exemptions add to complexity but necessary elements of the scheme
- Global scheme is most cost effective
- Market distortions could arise from the size of operators
- Need to ensure the quality of offsets

**Question 2: What are the 3 design elements (specific paragraphs) in the current GMBM proposal that address differentiation in a practical way without impacting the non-discrimination principle?**

The groups identified the following paragraphs that addressed differentiation/non-discrimination:

Paragraphs 4, 6, 7 (by 2 groups), 8 (by 2 groups), 9, 10, 17 c) and 17 d)

Other issues raised:

- Exemptions could raise concerns regarding environmental integrity
- Concerns expressed regarding the use of GNI per capita (which is not relevant to emissions) and RTKs could consider historical responsibility
- Developing countries should be excluded from the scheme
- Para 10 for a new entrant is good but the definition is ambiguous

- Assistance to developing countries is crucial (particularly technical and financial support)
- Consider the establishment of a trial period before full implementation

**Question 3: The current GMBM proposal includes the approach of using 100% sectoral growth rate for the distribution of offsetting requirements. Does this address the simplicity of the scheme? What are the advantages of this approach?**

All groups agreed that the use of the 100% sectoral growth contributes to the simplicity of the scheme.

Advantages identified was:

- The approach includes everyone, good for fast growers, and fair for a global scheme

Concerns raised were:

- The approach is unfair for operators that reduce emissions or grow slower
- 100% sectoral growth rate is not necessarily equitable
- Not clear how to work with cycles

### **Day 2 – Small Group Dialogue on Implementation Challenges**

**Question 1: The current GMBM proposal requests that CO<sub>2</sub> emissions data be collected, verified and reported by all ICAO member States. There are nevertheless different roles and responsibilities for operators, States and ICAO in fulfilling this requirement. Using the table below, can you describe these roles and responsibilities?**

All groups identified roles and responsibilities for operators, States and ICAO regarding MRV for the global MBM. In addition to the specific roles listed in the question, some groups identified other roles including for ICAO to report back to States on compiled data.

- **Is there a Monitoring, Reporting and Verification (MRV) system in your State?**

All groups reported that MRV systems exist in some form but not clear if they are suitable for the MBM purposes.

- **Did your State focal points receive training from ICAO for the preparation of your State's Action Plan?**

All participating States had attended ICAO training activities for the preparation of their State Action Plans.

- **Do you need further assistance for the reporting of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions?**

All groups reported that States need further assistance. Some groups mentioned that ICAO could provide assistance/guidance on specific areas such as on monitoring and verification of emissions.

**Question 2: Emissions units can be purchased from different sources. Identify your 3 top priorities from the list below.**

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

**Question 3: Registries are needed to record the transactions of emissions units. Identify the roles and responsibilities of operators, States and ICAO to implement a registry for the transactions of emissions units, using the table below.**

Four groups identified roles and responsibilities for operators, States and ICAO regarding registry systems for the global MBM. One group considered that this question is too detailed at this point as the registry systems depends on the design elements.

- **Is there an offset registry in your State?**

In the States of the region there is no experience with a registry system.

- **Do you need assistance to implement a registry?**

All groups reported that States need further assistance to implement a registry.

## 2. Dakar GLAD (23 and 24 March 2016) – Summary of Dialogues

### Day 1 – Small Group Dialogue on Design elements

**Question 1: During the 2015 GLADs, “administrative simplicity”, “environmental integrity” and “cost effectiveness”, among others, were identified as the most important considerations for the design of a global MBM scheme for international aviation. What are the 3 design elements (specific paragraphs) in the current GMBM proposal that address these considerations?**

The small groups identified that the following paragraphs in the current GMBM proposal address the 3 considerations (administrative simplicity, environmental integrity, and cost effectiveness):

- Paragraph 7 (by 6 groups)
- Paragraph 4 (by 5 groups)
- Paragraphs 9, 11 (by 4 groups)
- Paragraph 12, 15, 17 (by 3 groups)
- Paragraph 8 (by 2 groups)
- Paragraphs 1, 3, 5, 10, 13, 14, 16 (by 1 group)

Other issues raised:

- Environmental integrity, simplicity and cost effectiveness are important, but also fairness and continuity should be considered
- All 3 elements should be considered when developing MRV requirements
- Need for RTK to be referred as total global RTK for clarity
- Need to review the scheme to ensure cost effectiveness

**Question 2: What are the 3 design elements (specific paragraphs) in the current GMBM proposal that address differentiation in a practical way without impacting the non-discrimination principle?**

The groups identified the following paragraphs that addressed differentiation/non-discrimination:

- Paragraphs 7, 8 (by 6 groups)
- Paragraph 17 (by 4 groups)
- Paragraphs 9 (by 3 groups)
- Paragraphs 6, 10, 12 (by 2 groups)
- Paragraphs 4, 11, 18 (by 1 group)

Other issues raised:

- GNI per capita should be revisited (and use aviation-related metric)
- Could introduce a vulnerability criterion
- Paragraph 9 introduces discrimination for those that have already made efforts

**Question 3: The current GMBM proposal includes the approach of using 100% sectoral growth rate for the distribution of offsetting requirements. Does this address the simplicity of the scheme? What are the advantages of this approach?**

All groups agreed that the use of the 100% sectoral growth contributes to the simplicity of the scheme.

Advantages identified were:

- The approach includes everyone
- Takes into account the growing and emerging markets and no additional adjustment for fast growers is necessary

Concerns raised were:

- The approach is unfair (discriminatory) for operators that reduce emissions or grow slower (balance between individual/collective responsibility)
- 100% sectoral growth rate is not necessarily equitable

## **Day 2 – Small Group Dialogue on Implementation Challenges**

**Question 1: The current GMBM proposal requests that CO<sub>2</sub> emissions data be collected, verified and reported by all ICAO member States. There are nevertheless different roles and responsibilities for operators, States and ICAO in fulfilling this requirement. Using the table below, can you describe these roles and responsibilities?**

All groups identified roles and responsibilities for operators, States and ICAO regarding MRV for the global MBM. In addition to the specific roles listed in the question, some groups identified other roles including for ICAO to report compiled data back to States, and to report data to the UNFCCC. ANSPs should play a role in the MRV system.

- **Is there a Monitoring, Reporting and Verification (MRV) system in your State?**

All groups reported that MRV systems exist in some States in the region.

- **Did your State focal points receive training from ICAO for the preparation of your State's Action Plan?**

All participating States had attended ICAO training activities for the preparation of their State Action Plans.

- **Do you need further assistance for the reporting of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions?**

All groups reported that States need further assistance. Some groups indicated that, as part of the ICAO States Action Plan assistance, further support from ICAO is required to assist States fulfill their MRV role. This would include: guidance, templates, software and related training; and assistance on the establishment of a national regulatory framework.

**Question 2: Emissions units can be purchased from different sources. Identify your 3 top priorities from the list below.**

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

**Question 3: Registries are needed to record the transactions of emissions units. Identify the roles and responsibilities of operators, States and ICAO to implement a registry for the transactions of emissions units, using the table below.**

Five groups identified roles and responsibilities for operators, States and ICAO regarding registry systems for the global MBM. One group considered that this question could be answered after they had a better understanding of the Registry details.

Some groups mentioned that other actors would also have a role in the Registry implementation including a registry administrator and project developers.

- **Is there an offset registry in your State?**

In the States of the region there is no experience with a registry system.

- **Do you need assistance to implement a registry?**

All groups reported that States need further assistance to implement a registry. One group indicated that the registry should be based on regional cooperation.

### 3. Bali GLAD (29 and 30 March 2016) – Summary of Dialogues

#### Day 1 – Small Group Dialogue on Design elements

**Question 1: During the 2015 GLADs, “administrative simplicity”, “environmental integrity” and “cost effectiveness”, among others, were identified as the most important considerations for the design of a global MBM scheme for international aviation. What are the 3 design elements (specific paragraphs) in the current GMBM proposal that address these considerations?**

The small groups identified that the following operative paragraphs in the current GMBM proposal address the 3 considerations (administrative simplicity, environmental integrity, and cost effectiveness):

- Administrative simplicity:
  - Paragraphs 7 and 9 (5 groups)
  - Paragraph 11 (4 groups)
  - Paragraph 12 (3 groups)
  - Paragraphs 10 and 17 (2 groups)
  - Paragraphs 8 and 15 and preamble paragraph 8 (1 group)
- Environmental integrity:
  - Paragraph 7 (6 groups)
  - Paragraphs 4 and 12 (3 groups)
  - Paragraph 17 (2 groups)
  - Paragraphs 3 and 9 (1 group)
- Cost effectiveness:
  - Paragraph 15 (4 groups)
  - Paragraph 8 (2 groups)
  - Paragraphs 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 11, 17 (1 group)

Other issues raised:

- Two groups indicated that in principle they agree with the draft AR
- The proposed GMBM is not perfect scheme but States need a global scheme rather than a patchwork of measures to avoid higher costs
- The three considerations (“administrative simplicity”, “environmental integrity” and “cost effectiveness”) are interlinked
- Exclusions make the scheme simpler for smaller States and operators, but its implementation is a challenge as multiple criteria can be confusing
- Simplicity may have a negative impact on environmental integrity; the scheme should balance environmental integrity with developing country considerations
- Pre-2020 non-MBM measures are important for environmental integrity and cost effectiveness
- Condition of States’ economy should be considered to avoid negative economic impacts

**Question 2: What are the 3 design elements (specific paragraphs) in the current GMBM proposal that address differentiation in a practical way without impacting the non-discrimination principle?**

The groups identified the following operative paragraphs that addressed differentiation/non-discrimination:

- Paragraph 7 (6 groups)
- Paragraph 8 (4 groups)
- Paragraph 10 (3 groups)
- Paragraphs 9 and 17 (2 groups)
- Paragraphs 6 and 12 (1 group)

Other issues raised:

- ICAO-specific definitions for categorizing its Member States for differentiation could be developed, instead of using LDCs, SIDS and LLDCs or the WB/UNFCCC definitions

**Question 3: The current GMBM proposal includes the approach of using 100% sectoral growth rate for the distribution of offsetting requirements. Does this address the simplicity of the scheme? What are the advantages of this approach?**

Six groups agreed that the use of the 100% sectoral growth contributes to the simplicity of the scheme.

One group indicated that there is no real advantage in this approach.

Advantages identified were:

- The approach includes everyone
- Takes into account the growing and emerging markets and no additional adjustment for fast growers is necessary

Concerns raised were:

- Although simple, the approach is not easy to understand how it works
- The approach is unfair for operators that reduce emissions or grow slower; it does not promote early action (could consider a 50/50 scheme for individual/collective responsibility)
- 100% sectoral emission growth rate is not necessarily equitable

## **Day 2 – Small Group Dialogue on Implementation Challenges**

**Question 1: The current GMBM proposal requests that CO<sub>2</sub> emissions data be collected, verified and reported by all ICAO member States. There are nevertheless different roles and responsibilities for operators, States and ICAO in fulfilling this requirement. Using the table below, can you describe these roles and responsibilities?**

All groups identified roles and responsibilities for operators, States and ICAO regarding MRV for the global MBM. In addition to the specific roles listed in the question, some groups identified other roles including for ICAO to report compiled data back to States to improve transparency and the need for 3<sup>rd</sup> party verification.

- **Is there a Monitoring, Reporting and Verification (MRV) system in your State?**

All groups reported that MRV systems exist in some States in the region. However, it was not clear if these MRV systems are suitable for the MBM purposes.

- **Did your State focal points receive training from ICAO for the preparation of your State's Action Plan?**

Most States had attended ICAO training activities for the preparation of their State Action Plans.

- **What kind of assistance do you need for the reporting of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions?**

All groups reported that States need further assistance. Some groups indicated that the Buddy Programme could be expanded to facilitate partnerships between States. ICAO could provide guidance, templates and tools (including software) and help build capacity through training working together with IATA and ICAO regional offices.

**Question 2: Emissions units can be purchased from different sources. Identify your 3 top priorities from the list below.**

[7/7 groups] Operators should be free to choose the offsets that are more cost effective as far as they comply with agreed quality requirements

[6/7 groups] There should be a preference for projects located in developing/least developed States

[4/7 groups] There should be a preference for units under the current and new UNFCCC mechanisms (i.e. CDM)

[3/7 groups] There should be a preference for offsets generated by projects in the State where the operators is registered

[3/7 groups] There should be a link to the protection of forests (from forestry projects i.e. REDD+)

[3/7 groups] There should be a link to sustainable alternative fuels

[2/7 groups] There should be a preference for offsets from aviation projects

[2/7 groups] Operators should be encouraged to purchase emissions units that comply with agreed quality requirements, prior to 2020 for use in the GMBM

**Question 3: Registries are needed to record the transactions of emissions units. Identify the roles and responsibilities of operators, States and ICAO to implement a registry for the transactions of emissions units, using the table below.**

All groups identified roles and responsibilities for operators, States and ICAO regarding registry systems for the global MBM.

- **Is there an offset registry in your State?**

In some States of the region there is experience with a registry system.

- **What kind of assistance do you need to implement a registry?**

All groups reported that States need further assistance to implement a registry. ICAO could provide guidance, tools and capacity building through training and IT support on how to implement a registry.

#### 4. Utrecht GLAD (4 and 5 April 2016) – Summary of Dialogues

##### **Day 1 – Small Group Dialogue on Design elements**

**Question 1: During the 2015 GLADs, “administrative simplicity”, “environmental integrity” and “cost effectiveness”, among others, were identified as the most important considerations for the design of a global MBM scheme for international aviation. What are the 3 design elements (specific paragraphs) in the current GMBM proposal that address these considerations?**

The small groups identified that the following operative paragraphs in the current GMBM proposal address the 3 considerations:

- Administrative simplicity:
  - Paragraphs 9 and 11 (7 groups)
  - Paragraphs 4, 7 and 17 (3 groups)
  - Paragraphs 8 and 14 (2 groups)
  - Paragraphs 10 and 12 (1 group)
- Environmental integrity:
  - Paragraph 17 (8 groups)
  - Paragraph 4 (6 groups)
  - Paragraph 16 (4 groups)
  - Paragraphs 7 and 12 (3 groups)
  - Paragraphs 13, 18 and 19 (2 groups)
  - Paragraphs 3, 8, 9 and 15 (1 group)
- Cost effectiveness:
  - Paragraphs 4 and 11 (5 groups)
  - Paragraph 15 (4 groups)
  - Paragraph 17 (3 groups)
  - Paragraph 16 (2 groups)
  - Paragraphs 3, 7, 8, 12 and 14 (1 group)

Other issues raised:

- The proposed GMBM is not perfect scheme but States need a global scheme rather than a patchwork of measures
- Exclusions make the scheme simpler for smaller States and operators, but its implementation is a challenge as multiple criteria can be confusing
- Simplicity may have a negative impact on environmental integrity

**Question 2: What are the 3 design elements (specific paragraphs) in the current GMBM proposal that address differentiation in a practical way without impacting the non-discrimination principle?**

The groups identified the following operative paragraphs that addressed differentiation/non-discrimination:

- Paragraph 7 (11 groups)
- Paragraph 8 and 9 (10 groups)
- Paragraph 17 (4 groups)
- Paragraphs 6 and 18 (3 group)

Other issues raised:

- The definition of RTKs for each State (AOC-based, or route-based such as departing flights from each State) in paragraph 7 needs to be clarified

**Question 3: The current GMBM proposal includes the approach of using 100% sectoral growth rate for the distribution of offsetting requirements. Does this address the simplicity of the scheme? What are the advantages of this approach?**

Nine groups indicated that the use of the 100% sectoral growth contributes to the simplicity of the scheme.

Advantages identified were:

- The approach includes everyone
- Takes into account the growing and emerging markets and no additional adjustment for fast growers is necessary

Concerns raised were:

- Although simple, the approach is not easy to understand how it works. The wording “growth rate” and “total emissions” in paragraph 9 need to be clarified, and the proportionality could be a better way to explain.
- The approach is unfair for operators that reduce emissions or grow slower
- The approach may not provide incentives for operators to reduce emissions
- 100% sectoral emission growth rate is not necessarily equitable

## **Day 2 – Small Group Dialogue on Implementation Challenges**

**Question 1: The current GMBM proposal requests that CO<sub>2</sub> emissions data be collected, verified and reported by all ICAO member States. There are nevertheless different roles and responsibilities for operators, States and ICAO in fulfilling this requirement. Using the table below, can you describe these roles and responsibilities?**

All groups identified roles and responsibilities for operators, States and ICAO regarding MRV for the global MBM. In addition to the specific roles listed in the question, some groups identified other roles including for ICAO to report compiled data back to States to improve transparency and the need for 3<sup>rd</sup> party verification.

- **Is there a Monitoring, Reporting and Verification (MRV) system in your State?**

All groups reported that MRV systems exist in all EU Member States and other States that participate in emission trading schemes.

- **Did your State focal points receive training from ICAO for the preparation of your State's Action Plan?**

Most States had attended ICAO training activities for the preparation of their State Action Plans.

- **What kind of assistance do you need for the reporting of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions?**

Most groups reported that States could receive further assistance. ICAO could provide guidance, templates and tools, simplified procedures for small operators, and help build capacity through training and partnerships. It was also indicated that States can learn from the EU/ICAO assistance project.

**Question 2: Emissions units can be purchased from different sources. Identify your 3 top priorities from the list below.**

[12/12 groups] Operators should be free to choose the offsets that are more cost effective as far as they comply with agreed quality requirements

[9/12 groups] There should be a preference for projects located in developing/least developed States

[6/12 groups] There should be a preference for units under the current and new UNFCCC mechanisms (i.e. CDM)

[5/12 groups] Operators should be encouraged to purchase emissions units that comply with agreed quality requirements, prior to 2020 for use in the GMBM

[4/12 groups] There should be a link to the protection of forests (from forestry projects i.e. REDD+)

[1/12 groups] There should be a preference for offsets generated by projects in the State where the operators is registered

[1/12 groups] There should be a link to sustainable alternative fuels

[1/12 groups] There should be a preference for offsets from aviation projects

**Question 3: Registries are needed to record the transactions of emissions units. Identify the roles and responsibilities of operators, States and ICAO to implement a registry for the transactions of emissions units, using the table below.**

All groups identified roles and responsibilities for operators, States and ICAO regarding registry systems for the global MBM.

- **Is there an offset registry in your State?**

The majority of States have experience with a registry system.

- **What kind of assistance do you need to implement a registry?**

All groups reported that States could receive further assistance. ICAO could provide standards, guidance, tools and capacity building through training on how to implement a registry for the global MBM.

## 5. Mexico GLAD (7 and 8 April 2016) – Summary of Dialogues

### Day 1 – Small Group Dialogue on Design elements

**Question 1: During the 2015 GLADs, “administrative simplicity”, “environmental integrity” and “cost effectiveness”, among others, were identified as the most important considerations for the design of a global MBM scheme for international aviation. What are the 3 design elements (specific paragraphs) in the current GMBM proposal that address these considerations?**

The small groups identified that the following operative paragraphs in the current GMBM proposal address the 3 considerations:

- Administrative simplicity:
  - Paragraphs 4, 9, 11 and 17 (3 groups)
  - Paragraphs 7 and 14 (2 groups)
  - Paragraphs 8 and 16 (1 group)
- Environmental integrity:
  - Paragraph 7 (4 groups)
  - Paragraph 17 (3 groups)
  - Paragraphs 4 and 9 (2 groups)
  - Paragraphs 5, 11, 14, 16 and 18 (1 group)
- Cost effectiveness:
  - Paragraphs 7 and 15 (3 groups)
  - Paragraphs 4, 16 and 17 (2 groups)
  - Paragraphs 9, 11, 14 and 19 (1 group)

Other issues raised:

- Exemptions should be clarified; some exemptions may be too broad and may affect the environmental integrity and the cost effectiveness of the scheme
- Could consider the possibility of States opting-out of the scheme instead of exempting them
- There is need for robust emission unit criteria to ensure environmental integrity

**Question 2: What are the 3 design elements (specific paragraphs) in the current GMBM proposal that address differentiation in a practical way without impacting the non-discrimination principle?**

The groups identified the following operative paragraphs that addressed differentiation/non-discrimination:

- Paragraph 7 (6 groups)
- Paragraph 8 (4 groups)
- Paragraphs 6 and 9 (3 groups)
- Paragraphs 10 and 17 (2 groups)
- Paragraphs 12 and 18 (1 group)

**Question 3: The current GMBM proposal includes the approach of using 100% sectoral growth rate for the distribution of offsetting requirements. Does this address the simplicity of the scheme? What are the advantages of this approach?**

Four groups indicated that the use of the 100% sectoral growth contributes to the simplicity of the scheme.

Advantages identified were:

- The approach includes everyone
- Takes into account the growing markets and no additional adjustment for fast growers is necessary

Concerns raised were:

- Although simple, the approach is not easy to understand how it works.
- The approach is not necessarily equitable and is unfair for operators that reduce emissions or grow slower
- The approach may not provide incentives for operators to reduce emissions
- The approach does not reflect regional differences or differences in the growth among operators in the same State
- The approach could also account for the individual responsibility of operators

## **Day 2 – Small Group Dialogue on Implementation Challenges**

**Question 1: The current GMBM proposal requests that CO<sub>2</sub> emissions data be collected, verified and reported by all ICAO member States. There are nevertheless different roles and responsibilities for operators, States and ICAO in fulfilling this requirement. Using the table below, can you describe these roles and responsibilities?**

All groups identified roles and responsibilities for operators, States and ICAO regarding MRV for the global MBM. In addition to the specific roles listed in the question, some groups identified other roles including for ICAO to report compiled data back to States to improve transparency and the need for 3<sup>rd</sup> party verification. Some groups also identified the need for States to develop necessary regulation in accordance with ICAO SARPs.

- **Is there a Monitoring, Reporting and Verification (MRV) system in your State?**  
MRV systems exist in some of the States in the region, but they may not be suitable for the global MBM scheme.

- **Did your State focal points receive training from ICAO for the preparation of your State's Action Plan?**

Most States had attended ICAO training activities for the preparation of their State Action Plans, but more training would be required to develop/update action plans.

- **What kind of assistance do you need for the reporting of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions?**

All groups reported that States could receive further assistance. ICAO could provide technical and financial assistance, and training to build capacity on the use of tools building upon existing systems such as the Aviation Environmental System in the EU project. Cooperation could be sought between ICAO, States and IATA.

**Question 2: Emissions units can be purchased from different sources. Identify your 3 top priorities from the list below.**

[6/6 groups] Operators should be free to choose the offsets that are more cost effective as far as they comply with agreed quality requirements

[4/6 groups] There should be a preference for projects located in developing/least developed States

[3/6 groups] There should be a preference for units under the current and new UNFCCC mechanisms (i.e. CDM)

[3/6 groups] There should be a link to the protection of forests (from forestry projects i.e. REDD+)

[2/6 groups] Operators should be encouraged to purchase emissions units that comply with agreed quality requirements, prior to 2020 for use in the GMBM

[1/6 groups] There should be a preference for offsets generated by projects in the State where the operators is registered

[1/6 groups] There should be a link to sustainable alternative fuels

[1/6 groups] There should be a preference for offsets from aviation projects

**Question 3: Registries are needed to record the transactions of emissions units. Identify the roles and responsibilities of operators, States and ICAO to implement a registry for the transactions of emissions units, using the table below.**

All groups identified roles and responsibilities for operators, States and ICAO regarding registry systems for the global MBM.

- **Is there an offset registry in your State?**

Some States have experience with a registry system.

- **What kind of assistance do you need to implement a registry?**

All groups reported that States need further assistance. ICAO could provide technical and financial assistance, and capacity building through training on how to implement a registry for the global MBM. Two groups indicated that they needed more information on the specific requirements for the registry before they can specify assistance needs.