

Workshop Report

Expert Workshop on NAMAs: National mitigation planning and implementation in agriculture¹

16-17 July 2012

Co-organized by the Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS) Research Program of the CGIAR and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN

Key messages resulting from the workshop

1. Agricultural NAMAs can be a pathway to green growth, food security and sustainable development.
2. Several Non-Annex 1 countries are developing agriculture sector NAMAs, including Brazil, Indonesia, Costa Rica, Mexico, Vietnam, Malawi, Kenya, and Mongolia.
3. There is a need for Annex 1 countries to support NAMA development to enhance Non-Annex 1 countries' contribution to the reduction of GHG emissions.
4. NAMAs can provide additional resources for climate smart agriculture, where multiple benefits, including mitigation benefits, are generated alongside adaptation.
5. Adaptation and mitigation are inseparable and complementary in meeting multiple goals.
 - a. There should be synergies between NAMAs and national adaptation programs of action (NAPAs) at the national level
 - b. Land-based (AFOLU) mitigation and adaptation practices should be integrated for implementation at sub-national levels.
6. A common methodology for developing NAMAs—including legal, institutional, financial, capacity building, and data collection frameworks—would support countries to implement agricultural NAMAs more readily. These should build on existing planning processes, tools, and technologies.
7. NAMAs require a proactive approach by countries. The climate convention should continue to encourage and enable a country-driven process for mitigation in agriculture for developing countries.
8. Capacity building on adaptation and mitigation in agriculture is needed to support the planning and implementation of national policy.

¹ For more information, contact Lini Wollenberg at Lini.Wollenberg@uvm.edu or Christina Seeberg-Elverfeldt at Christina.SeebergElverfeldt@fao.org.

Workshop purpose and objectives

Purpose: To support the development of national mitigation planning to advance climate smart agriculture

Objectives: To advance understanding and practice on

- The nature and role of NAMAs:² how can national and subnational policy best advance climate smart agriculture?
- Planning NAMAs: identifying, assessing and prioritizing options
- Implementing NAMAs: what is needed to secure investments and finance, policies, technical support, MRV?

Agenda and list of participants: See attachments

Presentations available at: <http://www.fao.org/climatechange/micca/72532/en/>

See also hyperlinks below by session.

Summary of presentations and discussion

Session I. Review and analysis of NAMA concept and experiences

Why NAMAs? Christina Seeberg-Elverfeldt, *FAO* and Lini Wollenberg, *CCAFS*, presented an overview of the workshop objectives, the rationale for national mitigation policy, agricultural NAMAs to date, and examples of a framework for planning and implementation of NAMAs. A NAMA is presently any government action that reduces GHG emissions. National mitigation policy can support agriculture that is more efficient and productive, help meet GHG mitigation targets and act as a vehicle for coordination of mitigation actions and funding. All Non-Annex I countries have commitments to “substantially deviate” from baseline emissions by 2050, and parties in Latin America have commitments to do this by 2020.

About 44 NAMA submissions have been made to the UNFCCC, with 18 in agriculture and 29 in forestry, both mostly from African nations. The UNFCCC NAMA is only one policy tool however. Multiple policy channels for mitigation are possible, via the agricultural sector, planning agencies, climate policy and subnational policy. See:

http://foris.fao.org/meetings/download/_2012/workshop_on_namas_national_mitigation_planning_and/presentations/wollenberg_seeberg_intro_expertworkshopnamas.pdf

Claudio Forner, *UNFCCC*, and George Wamukoya, *COMESA*³, presented on NAMA policy development at the international and regional levels. They emphasized that the purpose of NAMAs is first about sustainable development, and then about mitigation. Countries should be proactive and take the opportunity to define NAMAs and propose scope of

² The term “nationally appropriate mitigation actions” (NAMAs) is used in the workshop to refer both to the formal NAMA instrument, whether voluntary, supported or credited NAMA, and as a shorthand for other national or subnational policies intended to support mitigation outside of the UNFCCC framework.

³ Verbal presentation only.

mitigation actions at national level according to national interests and seek to engage donors to secure finance and agree on reporting issues. For some countries, there is an interest to move away from a project by project approach, towards a national framework to guide the preparation and implementation of NAMAs. The UNFCCC has set up a registry to record information on NAMAs and sources of support with the objective of facilitating the matching of these two.. See:

http://foris.fao.org/meetings/download/2012/workshop_on_namas_national_mitigation_planning_and_presentations/forner_namasoverview.pdf

Scope of NAMAs Forner explained that NAMAs are defined at the country level. Parties are free to define the criteria for NAMAs. Countries have interpreted NAMAs in different ways. Some have proposed national or sectoral targets. Others have formulated projects on investments or to implement a set of practices (for example, the reduction of nitrogen fertilizer, use of a cover crop to conserve soil and others). As regards reporting, for internationally financed NAMAs, specific criteria for MRV will likely result from conversations with the provider of support (for example, donors).

Country experiences Highlighting an example of a well-developed agricultural NAMA, experience in facilitating a coffee NAMA from **Costa Rica** was presented by Daniela Medina Hidalgo, *IICA*, and Luiz Zamora Quiroz, *Ministry of Agriculture, Costa Rica*. The presenters showed efforts to scale up a coffee agroforestry project to the national level. In addition to the need for a pilot project to demonstrate feasibility, and the need for knowledge sharing and MRV, the presenters discussed the need for institutional articulation. In particular, there is a need to better integrate climate change policy in agriculture, including by supporting climate change planning, a sectoral plan for agriculture, a climate change commission in the agricultural sector, and a liaison between the Agriculture Ministry and climate change unit. A lack of technical and financial support were major constraints. NAMAs will require political will and strategies that can survive political change.

http://foris.fao.org/meetings/download/2012/workshop_on_namas_national_mitigation_planning_and_presentations/medina_zamora_agriculturalnama_costarica.pdf

The **Kenya** case was presented by Michael Makhoka Odera, *Ministry of Environment and Mineral Resources, Kenya*, and Esther Magambo, *Climate Change Unit, Ministry of Agriculture, Kenya*. Technical priorities for mitigation in Kenya include reducing emissions from enteric fermentation and manure, burning, nitrogen fertilizers, and flooded rice. Carbon sequestration options include agroforestry, afforestation/reforestation, conservation tillage, sustainable agricultural land management (SALM), and limiting use of burning. They have analyzed options using scenarios, mitigation potentials, costs and benefits, climate resilience of options (defined as water retention in soil and reducing soil erosion) and feasibility of implementation. Expert assessment is being used to assess options based on poverty impact, market size of targeted commodity and climate-smartness. Public and private sector assessments ranked options differently. Now there is a need to develop consensus, determine feasibilities, understand regional conditions and identify investments.

http://foris.fao.org/meetings/download/2012/workshop_on_namas_national_mitigation_planning_and_presentations/makhoka_namas_kenya.pdf

http://foris.fao.org/meetings/download/2012/workshop_on_namas_national_mitigati_on_planning_and/presentations/magambo_developing_nama_kenya_agriculture.pdf

According to Luis Gustavo Barioni, *Embrapa*, **Brazil** has a plan for low emissions agriculture as of 2012 that includes pasture recovery, crop livestock systems, no till, nitrogen fixation, planted forests and animal residue treatment. There is a need in planning to consider questions such as trade-offs in sinks and sources resulting from different practices, what happens if productivity increases and there is no demand, whether there is enough low-value land for improvement, and negotiation with government regarding how much money should be invested. Needs for further refinement of plans include refining regional costs, reducing uncertainties in life cycle analysis, and systematic evaluation on impacts of land use change.

http://foris.fao.org/meetings/download/2012/workshop_on_namas_national_mitigati_on_planning_and/presentations/barioni_mitigation_options_actions_brazil_agriculture.pdf

Mongolia, Vietnam, Ecuador and Indonesia participants added comments on their country policies. Mongolia has submitted NAMAs, has a framework for integrating adaptation and mitigation and identified 6 priority areas. NAMAs in agriculture are not seen as a high priority though. Vietnam is focusing on rice and fisheries and developing a measurement framework. Ecuador has started with livestock and has been working on mitigation and adaptation for one year now. Indonesia is focusing on no burning, good farming practices, organic fertilizer and biopesticides, optimization of land use, use of organic wastes, peatland management and rehabilitation of degraded lands and is starting to implement actions at the provincial and district levels. See:

http://foris.fao.org/meetings/download/2012/workshop_on_namas_national_mitigati_on_planning_and/presentations/setyanto_indonesia.pdf

Points raised in discussion:

Institutional questions

- How are agricultural NAMAs different from other NAMAs? Agriculture's special features include the need for future increases in production, yet need for mitigation to not compromise food security or adaptation to climate change, the high transactions costs of dealing with many farmers, complexity and impermanence of agriculture, linkages to land use change and deforestation, relatively low returns and high risk compared to mitigation options in other sectors.
- How to mainstream NAMAs into development planning and decision making?
- We need to explore how to be efficient by building on what exists. NAMAs are not necessarily new actions or institutions.
- Sectors take different approaches: forestry and environment more focused on land use, while agriculture is focused on a commodity approach. How can these be reconciled for a coherent approach and consistency with national inventories and accounting?
- MRV for each NAMA so far tied to the interests of that donor. How to harmonize MRV? Should countries be proactive in suggesting a harmonized approach?

- Coordination between agriculture and environment sectors has been difficult and there are often too many institutions involved to effectively coordinate. There is a need for proactively building linkages between the agriculture and environmental sectors. The institutions that are the most active in mitigation and climate change in agriculture are not necessarily those with authority.
- How will we manage mitigation actions that occur outside of the UNFCCC NAMA framework?

Adaptation and mitigation

- It is not feasible to separate adaptation and mitigation as separate programs
- Need for more good examples demonstrating adaptation and mitigation. The Kenya Agricultural Carbon Project is the one example that most people point to.

Analysis of NAMAs

- In economic assessments, there is a need to consider trade scenarios including international demand.
- How to reconcile NAMAs organized according to life cycle analysis versus area based or production systems based?
- Baselines should include multiple outcomes (social, economic, biophysical)

Funding

- Is there really going to be funding by donors? What will motivate private sectors, since countries are to receive credits under NAMAs? Agricultural NAMAs should be able to leverage private sector as you are “stacking values.”
- Realism is needed. NAMAs may not provide significant funds, but may help jumpstart a transition to new agricultural practices.
- How can funding be designed such that it creates incentives to change the path of agricultural development?
- Commitment phobia: country does not want to commit to reductions, nor donor to paying, so there is a tendency for both countries and donors to shy away from NAMAs.
- Should investment proposals go into the agricultural sector or climate change?

Impacts

- There is a need for caution in assuming that “triple wins” and “synergies” are always possible. We need to show examples where the links between adaptation and mitigation work and where they do not.
- Are better-off countries better able to access NAMAS because of access to information and better capacities, leading potentially to increasing inequities in climate finance among countries?

Session II. Steps and decision making for NAMAs

Participants identified the steps involved in NAMA planning. Groups were formed to represent Latin America, Asia, Africa and global contexts. Decision making about NAMAs has followed a similar idealized pattern in most countries and regions:

- Guidance based on a development vision and national climate change plan
- Agricultural sectoral planning involving assessment, feasibility studies and prioritization of options. As appropriate, review of investment projects for “climate proofing.”

- Development of a formal mitigation program plan within and across sectors
- Development of MRV methodologies
- Local projects and technical support to test and demonstrate technical options. Innovation centers and research may contribute
- Discussions with donors and private sector.
- Learning on the ground feeding back to policy.
- Monitoring and auditing of mitigation actions.

This process may be more detailed (as developed by the Latin American group), for example:

1. Consultations, stakeholder engagement and selection of “champion” organization to lead the NAMA development process. The activity should involve the national committee for climate change and should consider the priorities outlined in the country’s climate change action plan (or related document). Other sectoral national institutions, relevant stakeholders and CSOs should participate in this process. (It is important at this level of the process to clearly define and specify the responsibilities of each national institution).
2. Identify and secure financing for the readiness plan.
3. Identify a broad range of implementation options through technical discussions and expert reviews, taking into account the GHG inventories, mitigation potentials and cost efficiency for the whole process.
4. Prioritize and select options by means of a pre-feasibility study.
5. Prepare the MRV Plan and engage organizations with relevant MRV and technical experience.
6. Identify sources of NAMA financing. This includes donors, multilateral organizations, central and local governments, and the private sector.
7. Prepare and submit a NAMA proposal to the UNFCCC.
8. Discuss concept note with donors and financing institutions. Negotiate financing. Review proposed activities as required.
9. Implement mitigation activities through engagement with relevant stakeholders and implementing agencies.
10. Implement MRV activities; review and realign project implementation actions.

Other points made in the presentations included that the determination of agricultural mitigation activities may depend on the role of agriculture in the national emissions baseline and mitigation potential in the sector, but could feed into the planning process at any time.

Entities that need to be involved include ministries of agriculture, natural resources, and planning; national climate coordination bodies; and donors. Appointment of a lead agency and formation of a working group across ministries can help implementation plans. Continuous stakeholder engagement is needed.

Data needs include baseline data, climate data, socioeconomic context and impacts of proposed mitigation action, emissions reduction or carbon sequestration potential of

proposed actions, co-benefit potential of actions, clear articulation of assumptions, calibration of models with case study data, data for funding needs of each action.

It may be useful to distinguish among (a) the political or governance process of identifying development pathways, building institutional arrangements and coherence across sectors, and getting stakeholder input, versus (b) the analytical process of developing the baseline and future scenarios and identifying trade-offs among impacts, and (c) technical and institutional arrangements for MRV.

Points raised in discussion:

- What are the messy realities of producing NAMAs versus idealized theory of how decisions should be made?
- What should the role of stakeholders be and where is input most needed?

Day II

Pre- session discussion

Participant thoughts on “What would make your life easier” to support NAMAs

- Common vision of national mitigation policy
- Commitment and ownership
- Regional planning/platforms for exchange
- Institutional articulation, e.g. between agriculture and climate change entities in environmental ministries
- Coherent planning and nesting within development goals
- Decision tools: scenarios, criteria for climate smart agriculture, data, production systems
- To know where the authority is
- Funding

Concrete activities to address these needs:

- Identify and harmonize best practices (Vietnam)
- Inclusive planning process, local and national
- Sensitization and awareness building for donors of benefits inherent to Climate Smart Agriculture
- Better institutional coordination and articulation: bring groups together to clarify roles, gaps; analyze issues, identify who gets resources. May need external facilitator.
- Information flows and capacity building to local levels (national coordination already good, need now to work more at provincial and district levels in Indonesia).
- Need for a national plan to which ministers agree (e.g. Ecuador)
- Need for coordination and clarity at international level post 2012-2020.

Session III Tools and resources for planning

Sonya Dewi, *ICRAF, Indonesia*, presented LUWES, the Land Use Planning for Low Emissions Strategy Tool, which is a spatially explicit program that supports bottom-up

mitigation planning through identification of a baseline, scenarios for reducing the baseline, analysis of trade-offs with opportunities foregone and creating an action plan. 33 provinces in Indonesia are using LUWES.

<http://www.asb.cgiar.org/PDFwebdocs/LUWES%202012%20V1.pdf>

http://foris.fao.org/meetings/download/2012/workshop_on_namas_national_mitigation_planning_and/presentations/dewi_luwes_for_lama.pdf

Jeimar Tapasco, *CIAT, Colombia*, analyzed the application of marginal abatement cost curves (MACC) for Colombia, and the limits to this analysis. He showed that the win-win options may not result in the optimal level of carbon sequestered and that multiple criteria, not just cost efficiency, should be considered in setting priorities. He also found that a number of costs had not been included in the MACC analysis, including social and environmental costs; the relationships among technical options were not considered, and that the data used were highly sensitive to baseline assumptions. Jeimar urged that clear goals should be set and that the prioritization process requires caution

http://foris.fao.org/meetings/download/2012/workshop_on_namas_national_mitigation_planning_and/presentations/tapasco_maccs.pdf

Moses Masiga, *ENR Africa Associates*, discussed a process for evaluation of conventional economic costs as well as social costs, in terms of the social returns to investment and the aggregation of stakeholders' values assigned to different mitigation options and applied this to Uganda, Kenya and Ethiopia. Moses will be producing an agricultural sector model to examine mitigation.

http://foris.fao.org/meetings/download/2012/workshop_on_namas_national_mitigation_planning_and/presentations/masiga_economic_social_evaluation_nationalghgmitigation.pdf

Francesco Tubiello, *FAO*, reported on a project that establishes a database for comparative assessment of GHG emissions in AFOLU within FAOSTAT. The tool is based on FAOSTAT activity data and Tier I emissions factors. The tool will enable calculation of annual emissions for reporting and capacity building. He is comparing these results with the national communications and Tier II and III results, and finds that the results are close for the most part. The tool was seen as a potential way to check country consistency in reporting, but in the future would need to include Tier II and III figures to cross-check country reports based on these levels of accounting.

http://foris.fao.org/meetings/download/2012/workshop_on_namas_national_mitigation_planning_and/presentations/tubiello_estimatingghgemissions_fao.pdf

Pablo Benítez, *World Bank*, reported on lessons learned from World Bank projects and presented elements of the World Bank Institute's (WBI) capacity building program. The Bank has supported a range of agricultural mitigation activities in Latin America (e.g. Mexico and Costa Rica), Africa (e.g. Ethiopia, Kenya, Niger) and Asia (e.g. Vietnam and India). There is increasing interest to move away from projects to programs and to focus on landscapes and integrated planning. The WBI offers E-courses and webinar series, and has sponsored regional NAMA dialogues. Dialogues have focused on energy and transport but are now turning to agriculture. Countries may make requests for training

programs. It was noted that incoming secretaries of agriculture would benefit from training.

http://foris.fao.org/meetings/download/2012/workshop_on_namas_national_mitigati_on_planning_and_presentations/benitez_csapanning_wb.pdf

Other tools:

Low emissions development planning tool, based on IMPACT model at IFPRI to project land use decisions into the future (Alex De Pinto, *IFPRI*)

<http://www.ifpri.org/book-751/ourwork/program/impact-model>

Ex-ACT tool at FAO- to assess land use impacts for projects (Louis Bockel, *FAO*)

<http://www.fao.org/tc/exact/ex-act-home/en/>

World Bank has tools and framework for LED planning

Commentary on submissions to UNFCCC: on participant made the point was made that the real effort should be to influence negotiators. Submissions are only paper. It is most important for countries to make submissions and for there to be an expressed view among the parties than for other organizations to make submissions.

Discussion:

- These are examples of tools, many tools exist and each country has its own approach.
- There is a need for a general framework integrating adaptation and mitigation, as well as modeling.
- There is a need for data to support planning.

Session IV Action plans

Four groups produced action plans for addressing issues related to (1) Finance and Donors, (2) Practical examples of adaptation and mitigation, (3) Drilling down in the agricultural sector, and (4) Harmonizing Tools.

(1) Finance and Donors

Problem Identify financing sources for (1) NAMA Readiness and (2) implementing NAMA's.

What to do in the next 6-12 months

1. National governments to develop priority actions
2. Present opportunity to donors: mitigation benefits as a consequences of agriculture investments that increase productivity
3. Conversation with private sector:
 - a. e.g. the voluntary carbon market, corporate social responsibility, national programs, international carbon markets.
 - b. Agro industry investors.
4. Advocate for investments in MRV:
 - a. Public sector to address food security issues
 - b. Private/public sector to look at mitigation impacts
5. Capacity building
 - a. Awareness raising at country level

- b. Knowledge, MRV systems
- c. Understand finance opportunities at the moment
- 6. Technical assistance for NAMA proposals, feasibility studies
- 7. Keep the possibility of carbon market on the radar, even though transaction costs are 1/3 of costs.
- 8. Need a 2-day finance NAMA/climate smart agriculture workshop

(2) Integrated Adaptation and Mitigation in Agriculture; including best mitigation actions, e.g. livestock practices

Problem: Need for a mitigation strategy that maximizes food security and revenue from GHG mitigation.

General actions required

1. Develop a framework of analysis for adaptation and mitigation; Identify indicators of impact of adaptation (income, vulnerability) and synergies and trade-offs for ecosystems;
2. Identify major production systems
3. Identify set of practices that optimize climate smart agriculture;
4. Identify social aspects, what are the needs of the people in the area/ participatory sub-national planning
5. Examine a portfolio of practices/options using a landscape approach;
6. Highlight promising examples of integrated practices in Asia (e.g., Indonesia & Vietnam)
7. Develop the policy & institutional capacity to undertake landscape activities;
8. Need to do scenario analyses to project changes for the future;
9. Build capacity within education institutions

What to do in the next 6-12 months

1. Identify good examples of adaptation and mitigation for ongoing negotiations. CCAFS will help to scope. Case studies should demonstrate
 - a. the relationship between adaptation and mitigation
 - b. positive impacts
 - c. scale and measurability
2. Develop framework for analysis of adaptation and mitigation (options) – CCAFS/IFPRI;
3. Case studies, source book and database on GHG mitigation at country level – FAO;
4. Platforms for regional exchange:
 - In Africa - COMESA and international forum for negotiators.
 - Sponsor presentations of best case examples (e.g. Indonesia & Vietnam) to international forum of negotiators.
 - Capacity building at regional level & countries.
 - Share outcomes of workshop at regional meetings such as Global Research Alliance meeting on GHG mitigation for livestock (Nairobi, Kenya).

(3) Drilling down in the agricultural sector (elaborating on Session II on planning steps)

Problem: (a) Planning agriculture to lead to transformation in terms of food security and GHG reductions; engage donors to help

(b) Mainstreaming NAMAs into broader policy context (NAMAs are an opportunity for embedding mitigation in national instruments, but there is a low appetite of donors for funding NAMAs)

General actions required

1. Support international UNFCCC processes post 2012 for agriculture, especially by providing technical support and data
2. To facilitate better coordination among agencies at national levels, need external moderators, not necessarily a government agency
3. Give attention to how to increase private sector engagement
4. Increase consumer awareness to buy low carbon agricultural products
5. Create legal mandate for climate change actions
6. Identify sets of climate smart practices for key production systems
7. Organize a national data warehouse
8. Coordinate national plans for climate change across sectors.
9. Harmonize best practices in agriculture and farming systems for mitigation and adaptation across regions.
10. Secure better data via FAOSTAT for national planning purposes
11. Integrate climate change policy into agricultural sector planning, policy and implementation
12. Assess food security, mitigation and adaptation synergies and trade offs of NAMAs in Colombia
13. Try to persuade Malawian government of co-benefits of NAMA
14. Enable information flow and capacity building on climate change to district and province levels
15. Support planning from national (NAMA) to local (LAMA) levels through inclusive planning process and integrated into development
16. Sensitize and build awareness among high level political actors and other stakeholders about benefit opportunities.
17. Formally and informally convene institutions to clarify roles, fill in gaps and costs, and to support research on experiences

(4) How can tools help harmonize accounting approaches?

Problem: Due to the lack of specific guidance, NAMAs can be selected using different criteria by donors and designed according to different accounting standards, which makes them difficult to manage and compare with each other or with national communications to the UNFCCC.

This problem is exacerbated by the following issues:

- No or insufficient GHG and activity data to inform decisions, e.g. in Indonesia 11% of the land is peatland, but data do not exist to quantify their GHGs.
- Few data on economic costs to assess and prioritize options, including data on environmental costs. The quantity of fertilizers

used, for example in Colombia, is reported in gross terms for the whole country. No region specific or crop specific data is available.

- Need to quantify uncertainty to support interpretation of data in the prioritization process.
- Lack of institutional arrangements, e.g. there is no MRV system in place and no standard.
- Political issues (such as land tenure status) also need a harmonized approach.

General actions required

- Report to UNFCCC according to specified principles and guidelines
- Countries could proactively identify shared prioritization criteria
- Based on identification of decision points, use appropriate tools and analysis

Criteria to support harmonization at the national and international level:

- International criteria for emissions reduction targets, e.g. Indonesia has selected 26+15%. The target is influenced by the international climate policy. Only 1.5% of the 26% in Indonesia will come from agriculture, 15% comes from REDD activities.
- Use of a national AFOLU strategy
- Integration of mitigation and adaptation policy and practice.
- IPCC guidelines for data comparability - Different tools can be used at the country level; however, as long as IPCC guidelines are applied when applying the tools, the data from different countries should be comparable. FAO statistics are useful for countries with no other capacity; other countries can use their own statistics.

What to do in the next 6-12 months

The group focused on issues and actions in the countries in which they worked, especially Indonesia and Colombia.

- Indonesia: Speed up development and deployment of AFOLU analysis tools at regional to local levels to inform action, bring together stakeholders and identify options, targets and bottlenecks, including a discourse on land tenure.
- Colombia: Improve national and regional level GHG and socio-economic data specific to AFOLU to advance NAMA development within the country.

Session V Key messages

Participants developed key messages as summary points to take from the workshop to policy decision makers, donors, project managers and others. See summary at beginning of this report.

Proposed further work

- Workshop report and one-page policy brief with main messages and examples, ready for September.
- Framework for linking and assessing mitigation and adaptation; identify how different countries are approaching integration (Alex De Pinto, Moses Masiga, James Kinyangi, George Wamukoya).
- Case studies (needed by November for George Wamukoya) provided by Prihasto Setyanto and FAO.
- Resource page on website with background resources on NAMAS
- Webinars, discussion groups (Ecofys, World Bank Institute)
- Capacity building by World Bank Institute (needs requests from countries)
- Input a review paper by Timm Tennigkeit and Andy Wilkes for national policy makers and others working with them in the agricultural sector (e.g. NGOs, farmers organizations) to inform national mitigation planning and recommendations to CCAFS and FAO for a guide and priority actions

Timeline of upcoming activities for targeting messages

Month	What and Where
July	Montevideo Latin America NAMA Agricultural Meeting 26 th -27 th July
August / September	Bangkok, UNFCCC LCA, KP, ADP 30 th August – 5 th September
September	Vietnam Climate Change + Agriculture + Food Security 3 rd - 9 th September
October	Rome (Meridian Institute) 18 th – 20 th October
November / December	Doha UNFCCC 26 th November – 7 th December

Acknowledgements

The CGIAR Research Program on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS) is a strategic partnership of the Consortium of

International Agricultural Research Centers (CGIAR) and the Earth System Science Partnership (ESSP). The program is supported by the European Union, the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, the Danish International Development Agency (Danida), the UK Department for International Development (DFID), Irish Aid, and Instituto de Investigação Científica Tropical, Portugal (IICT) with technical support from IFAD.

The views expressed in this document cannot be taken to reflect the official opinions of these agencies, nor the official position of the CGIAR, ESSP or FAO.

Expert Workshop on NAMAs: national mitigation planning and implementation in agriculture

Dates: 16-17 July 2012

Location: FAO, Rome - Ground Floor, A Building, Library, Facilitation Room

Purpose: Support the development of national mitigation planning to advance climate smart agriculture

Sponsoring and hosting organizations: Climate Change Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS) Research Program of the CGIAR and FAO

Workshop Objectives

Advance understanding and practice on

- The nature and role of NAMAs:⁴ how can national and subnational policy best advance climate smart agriculture?
- Planning NAMAs: identifying, assessing and prioritizing options
- Implementing NAMAs: what is needed to secure investments and finance, policies, technical support, MRV?

Proposed outputs

- Input to a publication reviewing NAMA experiences to demonstrate examples and accelerate learning
- Decision trees for planning and implementing NAMAs
- Enhanced knowledge on tools and resources for NAMA decision making and implementation
- Ways forward for effective NAMA planning and implementation
- Identification of research and capacity development needs for effective planning of agricultural mitigation policies.

⁴ Nationally appropriate mitigation actions (NAMAs) is used in the workshop to refer both to the formal NAMA instrument, whether voluntary, supported or credited NAMA, as well as a shorthand for other national or subnational policies intended to support mitigation outside of the UNFCCC framework.

Agenda

Day 1

- 9.00 – 9.30** **Welcome** (Maisa Tapio-Biström, *FAO*)
Introductions (Constance Neely, *FAO*)
- 9.30 - 9.45** **Workshop objectives and rationale** (Christina Seeberg-Elverfeldt, *FAO* and Lini Wollenberg, *CCAFS*)
- 9.45 - 10.00** **Review and analysis of agricultural NAMA experiences and trends and developments:** How can NAMAs support agricultural policy and vice versa? (10 minute presentations, 5 minutes questions each)
Moderator: James Kinyangi, CCAFS
- Overview of NAMA origins and experience - Claudio Forner, *UNFCCC*
- 10.00 – 10.30** **Coffee Break**
- 10.30- 11.00** *Presentations continued:*
- Mobilizing national mitigation action for agriculture in East Africa - George Wamukoya, *COMESA*
 - Designing agricultural NAMAs in Colombia: a) the regulatory platform, b) the institutional architecture and c) sector proposal - Juan Gallego, *Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development*
- 11.00 – 12.00** **Discussion:** Other countries to share experiences and status of planning
- 12.00-13.00** **Lunch**
- 13.00 – 14.30** **Country experiences with national planning for mitigation in agriculture** (10 minute presentations, 5 minutes questions each)
Moderator: Maisa Tapio-Biström, FAO
- Developing NAMAS in Kenya: The case of the KCCAP; the agriculture example
 - (i) Michael Makhoka Odera, *Ministry of Environment and Mineral Resources; Kenya*
 - (ii) Esther Magambo, *Climate Change Unit, Ministry of Agriculture, Kenya*
 - Agricultural NAMA: in the context of the Costa Rican Climate Change Strategy and the Hemispheric Cooperation – Daniela Medina Hidalgo, *IICA*, and Luiz Zamora Quiroz, *Ministry of Agriculture, Costa Rica*
 - Brazil - Development of mitigation planning for agriculture– Luis Gustavo Barioni, *Embrapa*

Discussants (3 minutes each)
Timm Tennigkeit (Unique)
Gesine Haensel (EcoFys)

14.30 -15.30 **Working groups:** Identify steps and make a decision tree for establishing effective country processes

15.30-16.00 **Coffee break**

16.00 - 17.00 **Report back and discussion**

17.00 **Aperitivo** (8th floor)

Day 2

9.00 – 9.30 **Summary of previous day**

9.30- 10.15 **Tools and resources for planning** (10 minute presentations, 5 minutes questions) *Moderator: Andreas Wilkes*

- Developing Local Action Plans for land-based NAMA in Indonesia with LUWES - Sonya Dewi, *CIFOR, Indonesia*
- Economic evaluation- limits of MACCs -Jeimar Tapasco *CIAT, Colombia*
- Economic and social evaluation of national GHG mitigation options for agricultural landscapes in East Africa - Moses Masiga, *ENR Africa Associates*

10.15 – 10.45 **Coffee**

10.45 – 11.15 *presentations continued*

- Estimating GHG emissions in AFOLU within FAOSTAT: a tool for reporting and capacity building- Francesco Tubiello, *FAO*
- Strategic Planning for Climate Mitigation in Agriculture: Learning from Recent Experiences - Pablo Benítez, *World Bank*

11.15-12.00 **Discussion:** Identification of other tools and resources

12.00 – 13.00 **Lunch**

13.00 – 15.00 **Working groups:** Refine NAMA modalities and identify ways forward for effective mitigation planning

15.00 – 15.30 **Coffee Break**

15.30 - 16.30 **Reporting back and discussion of actions**

Attachment 2: List of Participants

First	Last	Affiliation
Irina	Arakelyan	Scottish Agricultural College
Luis Gustavo	Barioni	Embrapa, Brazil
María	Belén Rivadeneyra	Adviser of the Secretariat of Livestock Development, Ministry of Agriculture, Ecuador
Pablo	Benitez	World Bank Institute
Andrea	Cattaneo	FAO
Damdin	Dagvadorj	Ministry of Nature, Env and Tourism, Mongolia Special Envoy for Climate Change
Alex	DePinto	IFPRI
Sonya	Dewi	World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF) Southeast Asia Regional Office
Claudio	Forner	UNFCCC
Gesine	Haensel	Ecofys
Fatuma	Hussein	Ministry of Environment and Mineral Resources, Kenya
James	Kinyangi	CCAFS
Donna	Lee	Independent consultant
Esther	Magambo	Coordinator/Climate Change Unit Ministry of Agriculture, Kenya
Michael	Makhoka Odera	Ministry of Environment and Mineral Resources, Kenya
Wendy	Mann	FAO
Moses	Masiga	ENR Africa Associates
Daniela	Medina	IICA
Constance	Neely	FAO
Christina	Seeberg-Elverfeldt	FAO
Prihasto	Setyanto	Indonesian Agricultural Environment Research Institute (IAERI)
Jeimar	Tapasco	CIAT
Maisa	TapioBistrom	FAO
Timm	Tennigkeit	UNIQUE forestry and land use
Francesco	Tubiello	FAO
Tran	Van The	Institute of Agricultural Environment, Vietnam
George	Wamukoya	UNFCCC negotiator; chair of the Ag LCA negotiations; COMESA + delegation of Kenya
Andreas	Wilkes	ICRAF
Lini	Wollenberg	CCAFS
Luis	Zamora Quiroz	Ministry of Agriculture, Costa Rica