

The role of LULUCF in the Kyoto Protocol, in countries' mitigation efforts, and in post-2012 climate policy

Hans Nilsagård,
Ministry of Industry,
Div for sustainable development and primary industries

Outline:

- 1. Land use, land-use change and forestry**
(overview Kyoto Protocol and decisions by parties on activities)
- 2. Harvested Wood Products**
- 3. CDM AR**
- 4. Reduced emissions from avoided deforestation**
- 5. Outlook on post 2012**

Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry in the Kyoto Protocol

Three different mandatory
land use *changes* (art.
3.3):

- Deforestation
- Afforestation
- Reforestation

Four different voluntary
land
uses (art. 3.4):

- Forest Management
- Cropland Management
- Grazingland Management
- Revegetation

Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry (cont.)

Forest Management has some special features

- **Net change each year without subtraction of the a base year change (gross-net accounting), and**
- **national cap based on the lowest value of**
 - 15% of 1990 year stock change, or
 - 3% of total base year emission
- **Construction due to technical restrictions and timing of negotiations**
- **Some countries negotiated higher caps (Canada, Japan, Russia, USA, Australia)**
- **For many countries the cap reduces the incentive to increase net uptake in the Forest Management sink**

Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry (cont.)

How have different countries chosen to account activities under art. 3.4:

	FM	CLM	GLM	RV
UK	+	-	-	-
Sweden	+	-	-	-
Finland	-	-	-	-
Belgium	pending	-	-	-
France	+	-	-	-
Netherlands	-	-	-	-
Portugal	+	+	+	-
Germany	pending	pending	pending	pending
Irland	-	-	-	-
Denmark	(+)	(+)	(-)	(-)

Harvested Wood Products

- **Rational: to introduce incentive to maintain carbon stock in wood products, thereby reducing emissions**
- **Reporting within the Convention reporting voluntary**
- **Accounting of HWP will not be included in national commitments until after 2012**
- **Alternative reporting methodologies included in IPCC 2006 Guidelines**
- **Common accounting principle still to be agreed, will affect the numerical value of future national commitments**

Harvested Wood Products (cont.)

- **Different approaches to account for national carbon stock:**
 - **Stock-change approach**, the carbon credit and the liability stays with the importing country when products are exported
 - **Production approach**, the carbon credit and the liability to the exporting country with the product
 - **Atmosphere flow approach**, the carbon credit stays in the exporting country - the liability to the importing country with the product
- **May cause different type of trade distortions,**
(e.g. the atmospheric flow approach favours exports from Annex1 country **to a country without commitments** as compared to exports **to another Annex1 country**)
- **The issue of biofuel needs to be especially addressed in this context**

Reduced Emissions from Deforestation in Developing countries (REDD)

- This is a significant problem or possibility, depending on view
- Not included in KP, due to hot air discussions and technical difficulties in reporting (baseline, inter-annual variation)
- Strong interest from several non-Annex1 parties (Rainforest Alliance), others such as China and Brazil less keen
- Discussions aimed at 2013-
- Trading solution or not?
- Emission reductions directly linked to other commitments - linkages to other carbon markets?

CDM AR – why is so little happening?

(Afforestation/Reforestation)

- **Sinks credits not allowed in the ETS at this point**
- **Methodologies complicated and not accepted by the CDM executive board**
- **Temporary credits seemed as extremely complicated**
- **CERs are to be paid on delivery, upfront financing less probable**
- **Profitability difficult in competition with energy projects**

Biofuel incentives affects Swedish forestry and forest industries

- **Sweden is a strong proponent of the UNFCCC and the Kyoto-protocol**
- **Reducing emissions through fossil fuel taxes and incentives to convert to biofuel**
- **Forest industries negatively affected by higher costs for electricity and transports, and by competition in the raw supply market from bio- energy producers.**
- **But some positively affected by higher demand for energy production as a secondary products from harvesting activities and pulp production**
- **In the future policies addressing the carbon sink in forest may be introduced affecting forest industry raw supply**