

The analyses carried out after Kyoto show that the clear **definition** of terms is crucial. Clear definitions with thorough analyses of their implications are prerequisites for clear decisions. In some countries the Art 3.3 activities can constitute either a sink or a source depending on the choice of the definitions. In-depth analysis of different definitions and their implications is being carried out by the IPCC. The EU has always supported greater consistency in the use of different definitions as well as streamlining different reporting frameworks. There are also benefits related to cost-efficiency and accuracy if existing forest inventories can be used.

The EU notes that the determination of 'human induced' ought to be clarified and defined. The IPCC Special Report is expected to provide valuable information on this difficult issue.

Preliminary discussion on the **eligibility of additional activities** started in Indianapolis, and it should be part of the work between now and COP 6. Criteria for eligibility should be established taking into consideration inter alia the following issues:

- The linkage to national commitments - the incentive for emission limitations and reductions should be maintained.
- The permanency of stocks - sinks are vulnerable to climate change and can reverse in sign. The perspective has to be far beyond one commitment period. Parties should have long-term accountability for increases in carbon stocks they use to meet their commitments during a commitment period. Long-term monitoring of enhanced stocks plays a key role here.
- Linkages to changes in the full carbon stock - it is important to guarantee that sink enhancement resulting from an activity will not lead to depletion of other carbon pools. Similarly, stock changes resulting from Art. 3.4 as well as from Art. 3.3 activities should adequately reflect the direction of changes in all carbon stocks. These are some of the reasons why the EU has emphasized the importance of reporting on all carbon stocks in 1990 and why the EU also welcomes the full carbon stock accounting will be analyzed in the Special Report.
- The associated relative uncertainties should not exceed those related to Art. 3.3 activities.
- Verifiability of data - the EU views that verification relates primarily to changes in carbon stocks. Policies and programmes which lead to changes in carbon stocks should not be accounted for as such. In this regard it would be useful to take experiences with regard to related inventory systems into account.
- Consistency with the other Articles of the Protocol and with the Climate Convention is also important.
- Compatibility with the objectives and implementation of other environmental conventions and the UN forest principles is very important. It also helps guarantee multiple environmental benefits. In this context, the EU recalls its Resolution on a Forestry Strategy and underlines that the role of forests as carbon sinks and reservoirs can be best ensured through sustainable forest management.