

**Audun Rosland
21 April 2006**

Simplification and Comprehensiveness, questions to be discussed:

- Is comprehensive accounting the way to achieve simplification?
- Should the accounting distinguish between managed and unmanaged?
- How in practice can anthropogenic effects be identified and/or accounted for?
- How to measure the effectiveness of policies and incentives?

A comprehensive accounting system encompass many dimensions, with different monitoring methods, such as:

- All land areas and land uses
- All activities
- All pools
- All gases

Hence, it is a challenge to achieve a consistent monitoring.

There is a need for simplicity to make the system more:

- Transparent and cost efficient
- Without losing the ability to measure effect of policy

The draft IPCC 2006 GHG inventory guideline will serve a good basis:

- Comprehensive approach (all emissions from managed land)
- Includes agriculture sector (AFOLU)

Uncertainty is still higher for LULUCF compared to other sectors:

- A challenge for monitoring and forest experts
- An element to take into account for policy makers

But: High uncertainty should not be an excuse for not implementing policy if we know the direction of the effects.

Should we differ between managed and unmanaged land?

Not discussed in detail, but some views were tabled:

- Difficult to monitor and draw the line between natural and anthropogenic effects in the LULUCF sector.
- Differentiating between managed and unmanaged land gives focus on the effects of mitigation
- The draft 2006 GL gives a good basis for focusing on managed land.

How can we identify anthropogenic effects?

- Averaging over time periods (5 years or more) instead of annual inventorying may factor out some of the natural variation.
- Averaging is also logic because:
 - Traditional inventories are based on 5 years cycles or more
 - Management in the LULUCF should have a long term focus
- The differentiation between natural and anthropogenic effects maybe better addressed when setting the countries commitments, rather than being included in the monitoring system.

How to measure the effectiveness of policies and incentives?

- We need a long term crediting system
- Important to address the linkage between Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) and climate mitigation regimes:
 - The management of biodiversity and other functions of forests could be in conflict with a policy to enhance the carbon sink
 - Could be addressed by integrate criteria for SFM, or
 - by improving the corporation and coordination of work between UNFCCC and UNFF

How to measure the effectiveness of policies and incentives?

- LULUCF sector is closely linked to bio-energy.
- The potential of bio-energy is significant
- Bio-energy is CO₂-neutral, given that increased bio-energy activity is balanced by LULUCF activities to enhance the re-growth
- High oil prices is already a strong incentive for increased bio-energy use

How to measure the effectiveness of policies and incentives?

- The policy system for the LULUCF sector should focus on the international level and establish the overall incentives.
- Should not give details on how regulations on national and local community levels should be implemented
- The presentation from Sudan gives a very good example on how important it is to acknowledge the country specific circumstances:
 - In the case of Sudan local allocation of ownership and responsibility for land management can play an important role for establishing an effective national LULUCF policy

Conclusion:

- We need measurable outcomes and a system that able us to identify the effects of the policy
- Good governance is policy that can be monitored.