

the other part of the proposal, that which assigns responsibility for climate change mitigation on the relationship between historical emissions and temperature change, Parties recognized that there are a number of scientific and methodological issues outstanding and welcomed an offer by Brazil to hold a workshop on the subject and report back to SBSTA at its ninth session (BA). Note that while the Brazil proposal would postpone developing country responsibility until mid-next century, it does inject a basis for their ultimate assumption of responsibility for mitigation.

**ARTICLE 6: EDUCATION, TRAINING AND PUBLIC AWARENESS:** Canada's objectives were to support further international initiatives on the implementation of Article 6 of the Convention while ensuring that such initiatives respect the principle of efficiency and give priority to deepening understanding of the Kyoto Protocol's mechanisms for cooperative implementation. These objectives were reflected in a formal intervention which stressed, in particular, that the UNFCCC ensure that it does not duplicate climate change awareness activities being undertaken by other international organizations and instead concentrate on how those existing communication channels can be utilized in spreading the message of climate change.

Canada's interventions were successful as the chairman's conclusion noted interest in the activities of UNEP in supporting public education and national outreach strategies, the need to ensure the availability of information on the mechanisms defined in the Kyoto Protocol, as well as cautious language on the role of the GEF in guiding funding decisions on the implementation of Article 6. The conclusion called for future public awareness workshops and also called on parties to report their activities on Article 6 when submitting national communications. Furthermore, Parties agreed to submit to the secretariat, by December 14, 1998, their views on promoting the implementation of Article 6 for compilation into a secretariat document.

#### **AD HOC GROUP ON ARTICLE 13 (ELABORATION OF THE MULTILATERAL CONSULTATIVE PROCESS)**

The group created to develop the terms of reference for a Multilateral Consultative Process (MCP) in accordance with Article 13 of the Convention (AG13) made substantive progress in that direction, although it was unable to conclude its task, as had been hoped. A contact group of the AG13, chaired by Canada, was able to bring the number of outstanding issues down to two: a) the size of the Multilateral Consultative Committee (MCC) created under the MCP; and b) the distribution among Parties of the Committee's seats.

Regarding the two outstanding issues, it was broadly recognized that the question of the number of seats could hardly be resolved first but that it should not be difficult to address once the other question (distribution) is dealt with. On distribution, the G-77, with the support of the EU, was adamant that a system of