



Problem-solving session

Problem-solving session

- **Discussion on problems and issues raised by participants.**
- **The goal is to discuss as many issues as possible.**

Questions from MS

Bulgaria

Difficulties to fulfill correctly the table NIR-2.

In general, the total area at the end of current inventory year reported in CRF table NIR-2 for a year $t-1$ should be consistent with the total area at the end of the previous inventory year reported in CRF table NIR-2 in a year t . The consistency need to be ensured for individual KP activities and individual years.

We have filled the individual KP activities according to the AD for the area, but still areas reported by Bulgaria for AR and FM are slightly different through the years.

For example: In 2015 year the CRF reporter take the Afforestation and reforestation area in the row "Total area at the end of the current inventory year" reported in 2014 (250,47 kha) then add the area reported as AR to D in 2015 (0,04 kha) and then this area is listed in the next year table (2015) as "Total area at the end of the previous inventory year" (250,51 kha).

Questions from MS

Bulgaria

Difficulties to fulfill correctly the table NIR-2. (continue)

Situation in the FM areas is similar, except that AR to D area which is subtracted from FM area.

We fill the table according to the footnotes in the CRF, also according to the ERT recommendations from in country review last year, but the inconsistencies in the AR and FM areas still exist.

Questions from MS

Bulgaria

Forest management cap

Bulgaria calculated the FM Cap in accordance with paragraph 13 of the annex to decision 2/CMP.7 - 3.5% of base year emissions, excluding LULUCF and including indirect CO₂ emissions, times 8 years. In our case, deforestation net GHG emissions are included in the assigned amount of the country, although they are not included in the base year GHG emissions used to calculate the cap.

Shall we include the emission from D in the base year (1990 for KP) for the estimation of the cap?

Questions from MS

Czech Republic

- **Handling of “Other land” category (possible to merge with Settlements or not)?**
- **How to merge data of Forest Management Plans (FMP) and statistical National Forest Inventory (NFI)?**

As NFI data have just become available, we are pressed to use them, but there are, as you can imagine, many methodological issues that needs to be solved (differences in quantity between FMP and NFI, inadequate time period of NFI – not since 1990..., change from default method to the stock change method etc...).

Questions from MS

Denmark

Topics for discussions:

A: Accounting and Reference Level – the use of stock change approach, data and uncertainty and prognosis of development

B: Accounting and Reference Level - how the transfer of afforestation over 20 years of age influences the results

Questions from MS

Estonia

Applying remote sensing data to get the spatially explicit information that is required for the Approach 3. **How to fix/get the data retrospectively up to 1990 when using for example Sentinel data?**

HWP under deforestation have to be accounted on the bases of instantaneous oxidation (NO), but **wouldn't it be more transparent to just show (not to add it to the final accounting tables) the data, and not hide it behind the "NO", if we have that kind of data?**

Questions from MS

Lithuania

Initial land-use data for GHG inventory in LULUCF. Lithuania is using sampling method (National forest inventory) to obtain data of land-use type areas for Convention reporting while for A/R/D activities in Kyoto Protocol reporting we are using wall-to-wall method to obtain initial data. There is a preliminary requirement in the LULUCF regulation proposal to use “spatially-explicit land-use conversion data for the identification and tracking of land-use categories and conversions between land-use categories”, which, to our understanding, would become mandatory for post 2020 reporting after the LULUCF regulation is adopted.

Could you provide some explanations on what are the possibilities to report under this requirement of “spatially-explicit data”, what does this requirement mean, more precisely?

Questions from MS

United Kingdom

During the UK's ESD review in March, one of the review queries was:

"Please note that for whole time series and individual land use categories the final area reported in CRF table 4.1 in a year $t-1$ should be consistent with the initial area reported in CRF table 4.1 in a year t . The areas reported by GBE are slightly different in individual land use categories and years. Could you please check this issue to ensure that no inconsistencies have been introduced in the land use matrix?"

Our response was:

"The land use change matrices have been resolved to minimise inconsistencies as far as they can with the available datasets. Because several different data sources have been combined it is not possible to reduce all inconsistencies to zero, but the variation is very small, between -1.1% and +1.2% difference between the sum of all changes and the overall category totals to ensure that the sum of categories consistently adds up to the total area of the UK."

Questions from MS

United Kingdom

The UK's approach has been to use the best available dataset to estimate carbon stock changes and emissions, and then compile the land use change matrix afterwards.

Should we reverse the order (compile the matrix first)? Given the unavoidable uncertainties in combining different land use data sources, is it ever possible to produce a wholly internally-consistent land use change matrix, or are small uncertainties acceptable?

Questions from MS

Turkey

How it possible to gathered different land use definitions of the member states for Lulucf NIR of the EU by the Ispra?

Questions from MS

Spain

1. $GL_{\text{remaining}}$ /Grazing Land Management (GM): When estimating the emissions/removals associated with soil organic carbon stock change in managed grasslands, which value should be used for the Input factor (F_I) in managed unimproved grasslands. The 2006 IPCC Guidelines (table 6.2, Chapter 6, Volume 4) only provide default values for improved grasslands.
2. Data entry grid - CRF tables: We want to clarify whether the indirect N_2O emissions from leaching/runoff (CRF table 4(IV)) should also be noted in line 23, "N₂O", of data entry grid: [Sectors/Totals][4. Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry]; relating to "Indirect emissions".
3. KP reporting: We want to clarify whether lands subject to Articles 3.3 and 3.4 activities and associated emissions/removals in the first commitment period should continue to be reported during the second commitment period of the KP.

Croatia

CL-CL: pCl-pCL and pCL-aCl

- Main key categories (FL-FL, L-FL, L-SE) according 4 approaches
- CL-CL is key according 3 approaches
- Default value pCL AGB= 63 t dm/ha (unc 75%) for losses
- IPCC2006 took it from sci paper, authored by Schroeder (1994) - about agroforestry systems in temperate zone
- Resulting CL-CL as key category - need to apply Tier 2
- What is possibility not to use default IPCC2006 value for agb pCl and still stay on Tier1?

ND: Correction of BL and ML

- No info in NIR2016
- During revision of the NIR2016, review team insisted on providing BL and ML
- In Initial report BL and ML reported only for Wildfires
- In meantime ND project finished
- New BL and ML values (included windthrows, icebreaks and mine polluted areas)
- What is correct further procedure? Report new values in NIR2017 and CRF, or something else like "BL TC" and "ML TC"?

Decision 529/2013 GM and CM

- Filling tables manually
- Each year more demanding
- Possibility to develop system at EU level for this purpose?

France

Natural Disturbances: If a country applies for these disturbances:

- storms and windthrows
- climate events (droughts, icebreak)
- pests

does it lead to the accounting of total overall tree mortality?

Without other data from the NFI than total overall mortality, how can we distinguish among factors of mortality for calculating the BL ?

Therefore, it would be only possible to apply for all these disturbances taken together, without distinguishing them or selecting only ones of them ?

How could it be possible to deal with natural disturbances that have a continuous effect (multi-year droughts for example), without corresponding to current provisions based on probability thresholds ?