

26 October 2000

ENGLISH ONLY

UNITED NATIONS FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE

SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE

Thirteenth session

Lyon, 11-15 September 2000

Agenda item 9 (a)

METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES

LAND-USE, LAND-USE CHANGE AND FORESTRY

Note by the secretariat

Addendum

1. At its thirteenth session, the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice invited Parties to submit, by 13 September 2000, comments on the annex to document FCCC/SBSTA/2000/L.6/Add.1. It requested the secretariat to compile these views into a miscellaneous document.
2. The secretariat has received one additional submission.* In accordance with the procedures for miscellaneous documents, this submission is attached and reproduced in the language in which it was received and without formal editing.

* In order to make this submission available on electronic systems, including the World Wide Web, it has been electronically scanned and/or retyped. The secretariat has made every effort to ensure its correct reproduction.

FCCC/SBSTA/2000/MISC.8/Add.1

GE.00-63941

**SUBMISSION TO SBSTA/UNFCCC ON LAND USE, LAND USE CHANGE,
AND FORESTRY FROM INDIA**

(Submission received on 10 October 2000)

In accordance with the decisions taken in the XIIth Session of the SBSTA , the following submissions are being made on land use, land use change and forestry:

1. Definition of forest, afforestation, reforestation and deforestation

- Operation of Article 3.3 of the Kyoto Protocol requires an agreed set of definitions of forests, afforestation, reforestation and deforestation. Different countries have their own definitions, with administrative and legal implications, in their jurisdictions. The implications of different definitions of forests under various international agreements also need to be considered and weighed in terms of their relevance to the decisions under the Kyoto Protocol.
- By and large, FAO definitions have been adopted by Parties not included in Annex-1. While the Special Report gives the implications of IPCC and FAO definitional scenarios, it is not clear which definition or definitional scenario contributes more to the objectives of the Convention.

2. Institutional Mechanism :

- Institutional mechanism for verifying uniform application of the definitions among Annex-I countries, to minimize mis-reporting land under Article 3.3 is required. Further, it is necessary to consider the cost, verifiability and institutional implications before agreement on definitions.

3. “Direct-Human-induced” activities:

There are difficulties in differentiating the impacts of ‘direct-human- induced’ and ‘indirect-human-induced’ activities even if one has control plots for comparison. The impact of “indirect human-induced” activities (such as carbon fertilization and nitrogen deposition) are susceptible to difficulties in verification.

4. Soil Carbon:

Soil is a larger pool of carbon than vegetation. It is difficult to measure the incremental aggradation or degradation of soil carbon during a shorter time such as the five-year period of first commitment period (2008 to 2012). Till methods are available to measure the changes in soil carbon accurately over shorter periods or for small changes in a large pool, inclusion of soil carbon pool or activities contributing to carbon sink creation in soil could be avoided for the Annex-I parties for the first commitment period.

5. Additional activities (Article 3.4)

Selection of additional activities may be determined by the twin objectives of the Convention (Article 2 of UNFCCC) and guidance is still needed on criteria for selection of additional activities. The global estimates of potential is supposed to include the potential for Parties not included in the Annex-I countries, is clearly an underestimate of the vast potential and is based on very limited data. A more realistic estimate of potential of different additional activities is critical to any future discussion on selection criteria for additional activities, in the long-term interests of the parties not included in the Annex-I countries under the convention.

6. Project based activities (Article 12)

There are uncertainties, lack of information on adequacy and the cost-effectiveness of scientific methods to monitor and verify carbon stock changes even for operationalizing Article 3.3 among Annex-I countries. Even selection of additional activities is yet to be completed by the Convention.

It is necessary for SBSTA/convention to come to agreement first on;

- definitions of forests, afforestation, reforestation and deforestation for Article 3.3 in Annex-I countries,
- the monitoring, measurement and verification techniques for operationalizing Article 3.3 in Annex-I countries,
- difference between direct and indirect human-induced activities, which have linkage with carbon stocks.

After coming to an agreement on Article 3.3, additional issues may have to be resolved for Article 3.4 activities such as: selection of additional activities, approach for baseline and additionality. Until all the issues relevant to Article 3.3, 3.4 and 6 with reference to Annex-I are resolved by the convention, any discussion on LULUCF activities under the provisions of Article 12 is premature.

Some additional considerations are:

- i. Developing an approach and methodology for development of baselines and additional assessment for project specific activities under Article 6 among Annex-I countries would be useful for considering LULUCF under Article 12.
- ii. Accounting and monitoring methods for assessing the leakage issue to be developed and used under Article 6.
- iii. Criteria and indicators for assessing sustainable development impacts of LULUCF activities are necessary.
- iv. Measurement, monitoring and verification of selected pools.

- v. Links to assign amounts-addressing questions of credit assignments.
- vi. Information on institutional and technical capacity is required and it's availability for implementing and monitoring LULUCF projects in parties not included in the Annex-I countries is necessary before considering LULUCF activities under Article 12.
- vii. Some of the major issues such as risks associated with projects, leakage, additionality, accounting and fate of GHG benefits after the project needs to be decided as they have major implications for parties not included in the Annex-I countries.
- viii. Reporting guidelines for LULUCF project activities: The IPCC special report clearly states that the Revised 1996 guidelines do not address reporting project activities. Thus, it is very important to prepare the reporting guidelines and parties not included in Annex-I countries are required to evaluate the feasibility before taking decisions on LULUCF activities under Article 12.

SBSTA may direct agencies such as UNFCCC secretariat and IPCC to generate information on above issues and report to the parties, to enable discussion in taking decisions on LULUCF activities under Article 12.

To conclude, decisions on LULUCF activities under Article 12 could be taken after decisions on operationalizing LULUCF project activities under Article 6, among Annex-I parties. Since project activities under Joint implementation (Article 6) may not materialize till 2008, convention process need not wait till many years beyond 2008 to learn from experience from JI, for consideration of LULUCF activities under Article 12. Instead, discussion on issues relevant to Article 12 could start, immediately after the convention decides procedures on project activities under Joint Implementation (Article 6).

The implications of definitions, monitoring and verification mechanisms, reporting guidelines etc. for parties not included in the Annex-I countries are yet to be disseminated in these countries. The large part of the Special Report is focussed on Annex-I countries. Thus, UNFCCC or GEF may organize regional workshops on the Special Report on LULUCF for the parties not included in the Annex-I countries to enable them to participate in the negotiations more effectively.