

**Second Workshop on the Revision of the UNFCCC Annex I Reporting Guidelines for Reporting of Inventories under the Convention**

3–4 November 2010  
Langer Eugen, 1916  
Bonn, Germany

**AGENDA**

| <b><u>DAY 1: Wednesday, 3 November</u></b> |  |
|--|--|
| 08:30 – 09:30                              | <b>Registration</b>  |
| 9:30 – 9:45                                | <b>Welcome and Opening</b><br><i>Welcome</i> (Mr. Mama Konaté, SBSTA Chair)<br><i>Mandate, objectives and agenda</i> (Ms. Helen Plume, Chair of the workshop)  |
| 9:45 – 10:00                               | <i>SBSTA 32 and Workshop 1</i> (Ms Katia Simeonova, UNFCCC secretariat)  |
| 10:00 – 11:15                              | <b>Methodological issues related to LULUCF</b><br><i>Revisiting the Use of Managed Land as a Proxy for Estimating National Anthropogenic Emissions and Removals</i> (Mr. Simon Eggleston, IPCC-TSU)<br><br><i>Discussion</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What from this report can be recommended to the SBSTA at its 33<sup>rd</sup> session for consideration in the work on revising the UNFCCC Annex I reporting guidelines? Discussion points:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Any conclusions and/or recommendations or guidance from the IPCC report that can be used in the UNFCCC Annex I reporting guidelines?</li> <li>○ Which changes in the national inventory report (NIR) and/or the common reporting format (CRF) tables would improve transparency in the reporting of emissions/ removals from managed land in the AFOLU sector?</li> <li>○ Any other related information from other process under the Convention bodies that could be considered in the revision of the UNFCCC Annex I reporting guidelines?</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |
| 11:15 – 11:30                              | <b>Coffee break</b>  |
| 11:30 – 13:00                              | <b>Methodological issues related to LULUCF (continued)</b><br><i>Harvested wood products, wetlands and nitrous oxide emissions from soils</i> (Mr. Taka Hirashi, Co-chair, IPCC Task Force on Inventories)<br><br><i>Discussion</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What from this report can be recommended to the SBSTA at its 33<sup>rd</sup> session for consideration in the work on revising the UNFCCC Annex I reporting guidelines? Discussion points:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Which changes in the national inventory report (NIR) and/or the common reporting format (CRF) tables would improve transparency in the reporting of emissions/ removals from harvested wood products and wetlands in the AFOLU sector and nitrous oxide emissions from soil in the AFOLU sector?</li> <li>○ What additional guidance on reporting can be provided in the revised UNFCCC Annex I reporting guidelines?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>  |

|               |   |
|---------------|---|
| 11:30 – 13:00 | <p><b>Methodological issues related to non-LULUCF</b></p> <p><i>Tier 3 Approaches, Complex Models or Direct Measurements, in Greenhouse Gas Inventories</i> (Mr. Simon Eggleston, IPCC-TSU)</p> <p><i>Discussion</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What from this report can be recommended to the SBSTA at its 33<sup>rd</sup> session for consideration in the work on revising the UNFCCC Annex I reporting guidelines? Discussion points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Should the revised UNFCCC Annex I reporting guidelines consider comparability in the context of the effects of using high-tier methods and models on emissions?</li> <li>○ Should the revised UNFCCC Annex I reporting guidelines provide guidance on what to report in the NIR when using higher tier methods and models, especially in relation to information on plant-specific data and quality assurance of these data and/or use of these data for verification purposes, calibration, validation, etc. to improve transparency?</li> <li>○ What other guidance could be considered?</li> <li>○ Are changes to CRF table summary 3 required with respect to attribution of specific method and emission factor (EF) information? (i.e. at the level in which the activity occurs instead of current aggregation of this information).</li> <li>○ Are changes to the notation keys used in CRF table summary 3 for methods and EFs in CRF table summary 3 necessary?</li> <li>○ Can method and EF information be included in the CRF sectoral background data tables in addition to, or without, a CRF table summary 3?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>   |
| 13:00 – 14:30 | <p><b>Lunch</b></p>   |
| 14:30 – 15:45 | <p><b>Methodological issues related to non-LULUCF (continued)</b></p> <p><i>Time series consistency and recalculations</i> (Ms. Astrid Olsson, UNFCCC secretariat)</p> <p><i>Discussion</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What can be recommended to the SBSTA at its 33<sup>rd</sup> session for consideration in the work on revising the UNFCCC Annex I reporting guidelines? Discussion points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Can current techniques contained in the IPCC good practice guidance be applicable for back-casting new methods to earlier years of the time series when there is either a paucity of or no data available?</li> <li>○ What other techniques could be considered?</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><i>The IPCC Emission factor database and options for updating or adding default parameters</i> (Mr Simon Eggleston, IPCC-TSU; Ms Astrid Olsson, UNFCCC secretariat)</p> <p><i>Discussion</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What can be recommended to the SBSTA at its 33<sup>rd</sup> session for consideration in the work on revising the UNFCCC Annex I reporting guidelines? Discussion points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ What could be the role for the IPCC EFDB to update and add default parameters of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines?</li> <li>○ Should the EFs in the EFDB have the same status as default emission factors in the IPCC GL/GPG approved by governments (no justification needed for using the EF)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ If so, how?</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Editorial Board provides enough assurance that the EFs can be used (without justification)?</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |
| 15:45 – 16:00 | <p><b>Coffee break</b></p>  |

|                      |  |
|----------------------|--|
| <p>16:00 – 18:00</p> | <p><b>Methodological issues related to reporting when using the 2006 IPCC Guidelines</b></p> <p><i>AFOLU – reporting implications</i> (Mr. Matthew Dudley, UNFCCC secretariat)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What can be recommended to the SBSTA at its 33<sup>rd</sup> session for consideration in the work on revising the UNFCCC Annex I reporting guidelines? Discussion points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ What guidance needs to be provided on the changes in reporting introduced by the AFOLU construct, especially: new categorization; shifting of categories from agriculture to LULUCF and the impact on defining what is mandatory reporting under AFOLU; guidance on mapping from agriculture and LULUCF to the AFOLU construct, etc.</li> <li>○ Are Annex I Parties to continue reporting agriculture and LULUCF separately in the CRF tables (sectoral background data tables) as per FCCC/SBSTA/2006/9, but include an AFOLU summary report table?</li> <li>○ Should CRF sectoral report tables exist for agriculture and LULUCF in addition to a corresponding CRF table for AFOLU?</li> <li>○ Related to the above, are changes required to either the agriculture or LULUCF sectoral background and report tables to reflect the AFOLU construct?</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><i>Discussion</i></p> <p><i>Other reporting implications</i> (Mr. Matthew Dudley, UNFCCC secretariat)</p> <p><i>Discussion</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What can be recommended to the SBSTA at its 33<sup>rd</sup> session for consideration in the work on revising the UNFCCC Annex I reporting guidelines? Discussion points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ What additional guidance on the reporting of indirect emissions can be included in the UNFCCC Annex I reporting guidelines in relation to indirect CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and indirect N<sub>2</sub>O emissions?</li> <li>○ In which CRF table(s) should indirect CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and indirect N<sub>2</sub>O emissions be reported, if at all? Or should a separate CRF table be established for reporting of these emissions?</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |
| <p>18:00</p>         | <p><b>End day 1</b></p>  |

**DAY 2: Thursday, 4 November**

|               |  |
|---------------|--|
| 09:00 – 11:00 | <p><b>Implications on current UNFCCC Annex I reporting guidelines</b></p> <p><i>Implications on UNFCCC Annex I reporting guidelines</i> (Mr. Matthew Dudley, UNFCCC secretariat)</p> <p><i>Discussion</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• What can be recommended to the SBSTA at its 33<sup>rd</sup> session for consideration in the work on revising the UNFCCC Annex I reporting guidelines? Discussion points:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ How prescriptive should the revised UNFCCC Annex I reporting guidelines be?</li><li>○ Total GHG emissions – how is this to be defined? (noting AFOLU, indirect emissions, etc).</li><li>○ What guidance is required on incorporating AFOLU and <b>related matters</b> and indirect emissions in inventory reporting (NIR/CRF)?</li><li>○ What are the issues concerning the development of new CRF tables – what changes are required, what is necessary to retain from current CRF templates?</li><li>○ Any other related information from other processes under the Convention bodies that could be considered?</li></ul></li></ul> |
| 11:00 – 11:15 | <b>Coffee break</b>  |
| 11:15 – 12:45 | <p><b>What lies ahead...</b></p> <p><i>SBSTA 33 and Workshop 3</i> (Ms. Astrid Olsson, UNFCCC secretariat)</p> <p><i>Discussion</i></p>  |
| 12:45 – 14:30 | <b>Lunch</b>   |
| 14:30 – 16:30 | <p><b>Conclusions and recommendations</b></p> <p><i>Discussion</i></p>   |
| 16:15 – 16:45 | <b>Coffee break</b>  |
| 16:45 – 17:15 | <p><b>Conclusions and recommendations</b></p> <p><i>Final draft</i></p>  |
| 17:30 – 17:45 | <b>Wrap-up by the Chair</b>  |