

Experiences in implementing MRV system (land-use perspective)

Giacomo Grassi

European Commission, Joint Research Centre

Experiences in implementing MRV system, COP22, Marrakech, 9 November 2016

The views expressed are purely those of the writers and may not in any circumstances be regarded as stating an official position of the European Commission

Joint Research Centre



Experience and challenges in existing reporting

CONVENTION



- <u>Challenges</u>
 Al: land representation (land
 - AI: land representation (land matrix), soil C, verification (sensu IPCC), consistency with FAO
 - NAI: lack of detailed reporting guidance, national system, weak review process
 - **KP**: improved, but new provisions (FM Reference Level, Harvested Wood Products, natural disturbances) pose new challenges

REDD+: success story. Reporting guidelines and step-wise approach are key.

Challenges: land representation, carbon density

Reporting is a learning-by-doing process → CONTINUOS IMPROVEMENT → review process, commitments

→ review process, incentives



How existing reporting could be the basis for the new transparency data availability/reporting capacity

We don't need to reinvent the wheel.... ... but maybe we need a more '**flexible** wheel'

other national circumstances



GST -

- Common reporting guidelines, CRF tables and IPCC guidance
- → Flexible application (yrs, coverage → "REDD-like" prioritization of most significant sources, conservativeness) and focus on transparency, consistency and verification
- → Add "continuous improvement" explicitly in the future guidelines ? capacity building + constructive review pre-conditions for improvement → flexibility should be dynamic
- → How to incorporate some KP elements (FMRL, HWP, nat. disturb.) in future reporting?
- \rightarrow Avoid duplications, focus on user-friendliness and accessibility for non-specialists.





To roll down, a snowball does not need to be perfectly round (Jim Penman)



