

view to taking decisions on all Mechanisms under Articles 6, 12 and 17 of the Kyoto Protocol at CoP6. In order to meet the objective of having decisions on the Kyoto Mechanisms in place by CoP 6, there will likely be two workshops held over the next year, in addition to the multiple subsidiary body sessions already being planned. In addition, the UG will likely convene on a number of occasions to discuss substance and tactics for the ongoing negotiations on the mechanisms.

5. Compliance: A second key Canadian objective for CoP5, was to identify and agree on a number of the elements that would be contained in a compliance system. A substantive discussion took place in the Joint Working Group on Compliance (JWGC) and co-operation on this issue was clearly strengthened both from a North-South point of view and between UG and EU Parties. The outcome of the work of the JWGC is significant in that the decision adopted contains a stronger commitment than previously agreed to resolve this issue at CoP6 and Parties (except OPEC countries) have shown a clear commitment to accelerate their work. A workshop related to a compliance system under the Protocol will be held in March 2000 and Parties agreed that a paper by the co-Chairs, setting out the "elements of procedures and mechanisms" will serve as a basis for the further negotiation on compliance issues at SBI/SBSTA 12.

6. Sinks: CoP5's sinks outcome was also positive for Canada with a somewhat stronger and clearer decision than that made in Buenos Aires. The decision agreed to by the CoP endorses a framework for decision-making and a work program for the next year to ensure that adequate consideration is given to the IPCC Special Report before any decisions are taken. It recommends that decisions be taken at CoP6 on both definitions related to article 3.3 activities, and on how and which additional activities might be included. This is in keeping with Canada's objective that a decision be taken on further activities (including agricultural soils) at CoP 6. Candel was also successful in highlighting the importance of guiding principles and criteria in making decisions and in ensuring that the provision of national data would not prejudge any decisions related to the inclusion of additional activities.

7. Much of the success for CoP5 is due to five factors: a) effective management of expectations by all parties prior to CoP5; b) early and effective signals by Annex 1 (developed countries) to the G-77 & China expressing interest in addressing their main issues; c) rapid isolation of Saudi Arabia-led OPEC which continues to do whatever it can to slow down the process of agreement on the Kyoto Protocol; d) the lack of prominence of divisive issues between EU and the Umbrella Group such as supplementarity; and e) the surprisingly effective High Level Segment (HLS), which gave needed political impetus to the meeting as an essential staging point for CoP6.

8. Managing expectations prior to CoP5: Coming into CoP5, a series of ministerial/high level meetings such as one held in Warsaw in September (Ref AEC ) as well as the Ministerial meeting on the Kyoto mechanisms held in Canada held 8-9 October had helped set the tone for CoP5. Thanks to these meetings, the agenda and the *enjeux* were clear. In addition most parties understood at the outset that CoP5 was not to be a high-profile decision-making session worthy of significant world media attention, but rather a workman-like (although essential) meeting of the parties to prepare the way for agreement on the basis for ratification of the Kyoto Protocol at