

CANADIAN STATEMENT ON LULUCF

SBSTA 11

Bonn, 25 Oct 1999

Thank you Mr. Chairman:

Canada is pleased to take this opportunity to share its views on a number of challenging issues concerning land-use, land-use change and forestry.

In Kyoto, Canada sought clarity on what, when and how sinks would be included. With a certain understanding of what was and would likely be included, we agreed to a legally binding commitment with real and environmentally responsible targets. Sinks, particularly those resulting from good practices in agriculture, are fundamental to achieving our target.

It is also the understanding of Canada, and many Parties that the IPCC SR will not answer for us all policy and procedural questions. While the report is being prepared, it is therefore necessary that Parties reach a **common understanding** at COP5, on a decision making framework related to LULUCF matters within the Kyoto Protocol in order to facilitate **taking decisions at COP6**. Canada is of the view that along with containing specific timelines for submissions, discussion, and decisions, a decision-making framework should be based on broad underlying principles. Canada believes that there are two fundamental principles upon which all decisions related to LULUCF should be based:

1. **Consistency between provisions of the protocol), and**
2. **Accounting & Definitions based on sound science.**

Let me elaborate on these principles.

The **first principle** is a requirement that **decisions be based on consistency**. The land use, land-use change and forestry provisions of the protocol cannot be operationalised if consistency is not secured throughout the Protocol. As noted in previous submissions by Canada, there are a number of inconsistencies in the Protocol, with respect to LULUCF. There are inconsistencies within Article 3, as well as between Articles 3, 5, 6, and 12. Two examples of note include the higher standards of measurement for which LULUCF are likely to be subjected, and the fact that for agricultural soils, sources are included, whereas sinks are not. Any agreement on definitions of activities and terms in Article 3.3 and 3.4 should be consistent with terminology used in forestry, both within and outside the UNFCCC, sustainable land use practices and in keeping with the spirit under which targets were negotiated.

The **second principle** is that any decisions taken on **accounting and definitions** should be based on **sound science**. It is our view that to ensure the integrity of the Convention, decisions should be based on the most recent and accepted scientific and technical literature. Countries should employ the best practical technical methods for measuring carbon and other greenhouse gas emissions and removals related to land uses and land-use changes, and ensure that the emissions and removals reported can be monitored, measured and verified. While Canada notes that verifiability has to be addressed for sinks activities, as specified in articles 3.3. and 3.4, it must also be dealt with for all sources, consistent with the IPCC good practice guidance now being developed.

SBSTA's role is to ensure that appropriate guidance is provided. In particular, Canada believes SBSTA must define verifiable in the context of Article 3.

In our view, changes in carbon stocks from the LULUCF activities cannot be verified without quantifying the uncertainty. While we **do not see uncertainty being a criteria for including, or excluding an additional activity**, its estimate will contribute to transparent land use, land use change and forestry reporting and will help address the various levels of uncertainties.

As such, Canada proposes the following:

- **SBSTA should agree that uncertainties should be quantified,**