

## **Land Use in the Post-2020 Agreement, Informal Workshop Summary**

On Saturday, November 29, 2014, approximately thirty individuals from Parties and civil society gathered in Lima for a discussion on “Positioning the land-use sector to contribute to post-2020 climate mitigation.” The workshop focused on two overarching themes: (1) the potential roles of principles/parameters in informing Parties’ consideration of the land-use sector, and (2) options for accounting for Parties’ mitigation efforts in the land-use sector.

The first presentation of the day invited workshop participants to discuss eight potentially applicable principles and parameters for the land use sector, labeled as follows:

- consistency with the Articles of the Convention;
- continuous improvement;
- use of IPCC principles and guidance;
- “once in, always in;”
- pathway to complete coverage;
- focus on measurable effects of policies and measures;
- promote social and environmental governance; and
- technical facilitation of reporting and assessment.

As an initial matter, participants noted that many of these principles and parameters are also more generally applicable under the ADP. While participants agreed that consideration of the land-use sector should be guided by common principles, they expressed a range of views on the nature and extent of the set of land use specific principles and parameters in the post-2020 agreement. Several participants also noted that land use is not currently a distinct element of the post-2020 agreement, resulting in a lack of clarity about how and where such a list would fit in the broader ADP framework, especially the draft text on elements of the ADP that will be discussed here in Lima. This led to a broader discussion of whether and how the land-use sector requires “special” consideration under the ADP.

Although participants had different views about the set of land-use principles and parameters that should be considered for the post-2020 agreement, the majority agreed that some principles that are important for other sectors may require special consideration in the land-use context. Workshop participants examined and offered suggestions on the eight principles and parameters listed above, and also proposed the following for consideration: common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capacities; transparency; flexibility; simplicity; comprehensiveness; consistency; environmental integrity; safeguards; conservativeness; review; replicability; addressing leakage; incentives; step-wise approach; no backsliding; cost-effectiveness; use of existing rules, terms, and definitions; and multi-functionality.

The workshop’s second half addressed how to account for mitigation in the land-use sector under the ADP. The presentation introduced the concept of “accounting frameworks” that would allow for the possibility of different accounting “rules” applying to different contexts. Four potential options for structuring accounting frameworks for the land-use sector under the ADP were presented:

- (1) a set of single, common accounting rules;
- (2) Parties choose from a set of differentiated accounting modalities with common elements;

- (3) Parties choose one of the three existing modalities (REDD+, LULUCF, or CDM); and
- (4) Parties account using self-defined approaches, with no common elements.

The presentation highlighted the role the principles discussed above could play in shaping Parties' land-use accounting framework. In the discussion that followed, workshop participants expressed wide-ranging views on which accounting approach could yield the best outcome post-2020. Most workshop participants felt that a single set of rules or self-defined approaches with no common rules would not be the best way forward

Instead, participants gravitated toward existing modalities (option 3) or some limited set of differentiated modalities (option 2). Many workshop participants saw value and ease in using already-defined rules and modalities for the land-use sector moving forward.. Several participants thought that the framework could integrate options 2 and 3, starting with existing modalities and building additional, common elements over time. It was also noted that existing rules do not currently address all potentially relevant aspects of agriculture, and that improvements could be made to existing accounting approaches to facilitate step-wise improvement in Parties' collective and individual approaches to the land-use sector. This led some participants to express support for option 2.

Participants touched upon a number of considerations in discussing which of the accounting approaches would be "best" under the ADP, many of which focused on the interaction of the accounting approach with Parties' INDCs. Given the general uncertainty regarding what INDCs will contain, some participants raised questions about how Parties' land-use contributions could address adaptation and means of implementation in addition to mitigation, and what that would mean in terms of selecting an accounting approach for the sector. Additionally, many participants mentioned that the timeline for proposing INDCs (by March 2015) presents a dilemma for Parties that may want clarity on the land-use accounting rules before submitting their contributions. This led several participants to stress the need for transparency regarding Parties' INDCs, particularly with regard to how the land-use sector is addressed.

Participants did not reach a consensus on what is needed in the current negotiating process to address the land-use sector in the post-2020 agreement. A majority expressed support for a pathway by which Parties would identify common elements in Lima and work toward a basic agreement in Paris, with specific rules to be finalized after 2015. Notably, many felt this path would require additional meetings late in 2015. Nevertheless, many expressed doubts that such a path could be completed on time, and many expressed concerns about modifying accounting rules after INDCs had been announced. Although views differed on how the sector could and should fit into the broader ADP structure, most workshop participants emphasized that Lima will be a critical juncture for the land-use sector moving forward.

Most of the participants expressed appreciation for the event and said their views had changed as a result of the dialogue. A substantial number requested further dialogues as a complement to the negotiations, citing the need to address complexity of the sector and reach understanding about the wide variety of national circumstances and goals for the land-use sector.