MRV for Wetlands.
• By way of introduction we will learn what Monitoring, Reporting and Verification or MRV is
• Then we will see the scope of each element of MRV
• Having learned that it is also important to know what monitoring, reporting and verification is intended for
• Since the most recent debate on Monitoring, Reporting and Verification is focused on Reducing Emission from Deforestation and Forest Degradation we will discuss how it is framed in national and sub national contexts
• Before summarizing, we will see the possible direction of Monitoring, Reporting and Verification in Wetlands
• MRV is an important procedure which one can use to appear more transparent and trustable; using MRV can help one to decide what to expect from a particular action.

• It can be used to estimate emission and emission reduction, provided that a reference level, as discussed in the previous topic, is available. Therefore, it can improve mitigation policy and measures to improve further actions; it can be used to estimate financial-related matters.

• In short, it is almost impossible to find markets without a robust MRV system.
• MRV has three different elements (monitoring, reporting and verification) but they are related, and we examine the scope of each element.

• First, let’s look at measurement.

• This cuts across various levels and
institutions when the expected data quality is controlled and assured.

• In general, measurements are expected to generate activity data (AD) involving land-use change over a period of time, and emission factors (EF) indicating change in greenhouse gas emission per unit mass of carbon per unit area concerned.

• By multiplying AD and EF, one can estimate emissions at the level under consideration.
• The scope of reporting follows the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)‘s Conference of the Parties (COP) decisions concerning: National Greenhouse Gas Inventory, National Communication, Biennial Update Reports (BURs), and
Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs)

• The activities reported follow the sectoral approach and type of gas in the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)

• The reports strictly follow the methodologies outlined in the IPCC guidelines
• While robust verification is implemented to control and assure data quality, the process is not intended to control countries

• It is expected to eventually improve the performance of the responsible national entity
•While the guidelines for a national greenhouse gas inventory is improving, MRV for National Communication, normally based on the inventory, has also considerably improved over time.

•The ‘common but differentiated
responsibility principle’ is demonstrated here. Developed countries report more frequently than developing countries that have more limited resources and capacity
• COP16 decision suggests that developing countries should submit their national communications (which include national greenhouse gas inventories) every 4 years.
• Biennial Update Report is a new reporting system intended for developing countries.

• At COP17, it was decided that they will submit the first reports by December 2014 and subsequent ones every 2 years thereafter.
• It contains updates of national greenhouse gas inventories, and information on mitigation actions.

• The least developed country (LDC) parties and Small Island Developing States (SIDS) may submit biennial update reports at their discretion.
• Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions or NAMA was conceptually introduced in the Bali Action Plan 2007.
• MRV helps identify national priorities as well as challenges and opportunities, policy planning and prioritization.
• It is also useful for internal national record, tracking progress e.g. emission reductions and to demonstrate to donors the emission reduction and impacts of NAMAs.
• Like Biennial Update Reports, Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) are implemented by developing country Parties.

• There are Unilateral NAMAs and Supported NAMAs that are enabled by technology, financing
and capacity building, in a measurable, reportable and verifiable manner.

• The role of carbon markets in financing NAMAs is under discussion among various stakeholders and includes the concept of credited NAMAs.
• For Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation Plus, the MRV system and process is still at the capacity development stage.

• To speed up the process, early actions will need to deal with partial MRV but leakage need to
be assessed nationally.

• Links with evolving benefit-sharing mechanisms is encouraged and there should be synergy of national and local monitoring.
To frame the monitoring element, we could start from the experience in national communication using IPCC guidelines, particularly in the land-use sector that can be improved in the future.
Based on the national REDD strategy, the land-used involved may be broadened to allow potential leakages to be taken care of.
In the meantime, a reference level may be developed using existing and best available data.
Then the integration with REDD mechanisms may be performed at national and subnational or local levels.
Finally, performing National REDD implementation may be internationally verified.
• While promoting a subnational and local MRV process, countries could adopt low cost and robust participatory MRV to implement safeguards (social and environment) at the same level.

• Capacity building should be part of the feedback loop between national and local processes.
• Use international verification to anticipate participation in results-based schemes.
• Adopt 2013 Supplement of 2006 IPCC Guidelines for greenhouse gas national inventories for wetlands.
• Take advantage of existing national forest monitoring and inventory systems, including FAO Global Forest Resources Assessment (FRA).
• Consistently cover emissions and removals estimates, with reference levels.
• Interim performance reporting including biennial update report (BUR) or NAMA can catalyse progress on MRV and the broader climate change mitigation agenda.
• Continuous MRV improvements is important to encourage broad participation and step-wise progress (i.e. along REDD+ phases).
• National forest monitoring system is already in place.
• Linking data and estimates to financial incentives and benefit-sharing
• Reduce uncertainties by improving institutional and individual capacities at all levels
• Sustained support on the national and subnational processes at the international level.
• Developing countries, especially those with extensive wetlands, have opportunities to develop their MRV systems
Here are some key references, from which, this presentation is developed:
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