



I N S E A
P A R T N E R S

- # INSEA and the AFOLU sector
- Review of AFOLU policies under the Kyoto Protocol
 - Options of the AFOLU sector for Post-2012 regimes



Bernhard Schlamadinger

Joanneum Research, Austria

bernhard.schlamadinger@joanneum.at



Goal and Main Questions

- Highlight policy, legislative and regulatory developments since Kyoto
- Monitor progress of implementation
- Link to IPCC Guidelines development
- Recommend future improvements for AFOLU

Results

- ❑ Support for countries in implementing Kyoto Protocol Articles 3.3 and 3.4 (Workshop)
- ❑ Work on EU ETS Linking of LULUCF: Technical options; impacts on linking with other ETS
- ❑ Process with intl. Experts on post 2012 AFOLU options
 - Workshop with 80 participants
 - Journal Special Issue
 - Includes „Factoring Out“ and „De-Linking“
- ❑ Meth. and policy options of reducing deforestation in developing countries (workshop)
- ❑ Multiple COP and SBSTA side events

Conclusions

- ❑ Kyoto LULUCF approach is not optimal, but was critical to get agreement
- ❑ Improvements are possible and have been proposed
- ❑ Need better incentives for improved land management.
- ❑ Need better consideration of LULUCF / bioenergy link
- ❑ Dialogue with other Annex I countries works well (review NZ, Japan), should be enhanced
- ❑ Take AFOLU serious if non KP parties and developing countries are to be engaged post 2012
- ❑ Science / Policy interface has been important element in both directions

INSEA and the AFOLU sector

Degree of De-Linking

		Degree of De-Linking		
		0%		100%
Type of target	Quantitative 100%	Actual system KP 1CP Common targets	Separate but linked targets	Separate 100% delinked targets
		Targets / Policies & Measures Common FW	Targets / Policies & Measures linked FWs	Targets / Policies & Measures separate FWs
	Qualitative 100%	Policies & Measures For both (GHG ER & LULUCF) / Common FW Any FW		

ACTUAL

UNLIKELY