

CHAPTER 12

HARVESTED WOOD PRODUCTS

Contents

12	Harvested Wood Products (HWP)	5
12.1	Introduction	5
12.2	Terms and definitions	6
12.3	Approaches to estimating emissions and removals of CO ₂ due to HWP	7
12.3.1	Estimating emissions and removals of CO ₂ due to HWP on the basis of carbon stock changes	7
12.3.2	Estimating actual CO ₂ -fluxes from woody biomass – the ‘atmospheric flow’ approach	9
12.4	Harvested wood biomass used for energy purposes	10
12.5	Choice of method for wood products in use	11
12.5.1	Initial steps to estimate emissions and removals of CO ₂ due to HWP	11
12.5.2	Tier 1: “first order decay” method	16
12.5.3	Tier 2 method using country-specific data	26
12.5.4	Tier 3 country-specific methods	29
12.6	Clarification of the treatment of “wood in SWDS” in this guidance	31
12.6.1	Reporting of CO ₂ emissions from HWP in SWDS	31
12.6.2	Reporting of non-CO ₂ (methane) emissions from HWP in SWDS	32
12.7	Uncertainty assessment	32
12.8	QA/QC	34
12.9	Completeness	34
	References	35

Tables

TABLE 12X	5
COMPARISON OF THE STRUCTURES IN THE 2019 REFINEMENT AND THE 2006 IPCC GUIDELINES	5
Table 12.1 Default conversion factors for the semi-finished HWP categories and their subcategories	21
Table 12.2 Default conversion factors for the HWP feedstock categories serving as fuel wood and raw material for manufacturing of semi-finished HWP	23
Table 12.3 Tier 2 Default half-lives of HWP categories	26
Table 12.4 Example on how to derive country-specific half-life for HWP categories as a function of information on market share, estimated service life (ESL) and obsolescence	29

Equations

Equation 12.1 Estimation of Total emissions and removals from the HWP pool in use of the reporting country	16
Equation 12.2 Estimation of carbon stocks and annual carbon stock changes in HWP pool in use	17
Equation 12.3 Selection of carbon inflow for estimating the carbon stock in the HWP pool in use depending on the Chosen approach	17
Equation 12.4 Approximation of the carbon stocks in HWP pools in use at initial time, i.e. since when activity data are available	18
Equation 12.5 Estimation of Total biogenic CO ₂ -emissions from woody biomass within the reporting country	20
Equation 12.6 calculation of carbon inflow in the particular semi-finished HWP category following the stock-change approach	23

47	Equation 12.7	24
48	calculation of carbon inflow in the particular semi-finished HWP category following the production approach	24
49	Equation 12.8	24
50	Estimation of annual fraction of the relevant domestically produced feedstock for production of semi-finished	
51	HWP originating from domestic harvest.....	24
52	Equation 12.9	25
53	calculation of carbon inflow in the particular semi-finished HWP category following the stock-changes of	
54	domestic origin approach	25
55	Equation 12.10	25
56	calculation of carbon in traded HWP feedstock categories serving as wood fuel and raw material for subsequent	
57	processing of semi-finished HWP.....	25
58		

Figures

60	Figure 12.1	Scheme of the ‘stock-change’ approach, estimating emissions and removals of CO ₂ associated with the carbon stock in the HWP pool in use on the basis of calculated HWP consumption data	12.7
61			
62	Figure 12.2	Scheme of the ‘production’ approach, estimating emissions and removals of CO ₂ associated with the carbon stock in the HWP pool in use on the basis of data on HWP production originating from domestic harvest	9
63			
64			
65	Figure 12.3	Scheme of the ‘atmospheric flow’ approach, estimating emissions and removals of CO ₂ due to HWP on the basis of data on the carbon stock in the HWP pool in use and traded woody biomass	10
66			
67	Figure 12.4	Decision tree for choosing the relevant tier method for estimating emissions and removals of CO ₂ due to HWP	12
68			
69	Figure 12.5	Simplified classification of wood products based on FAO forest products definitions	13
70	Figure 12.6	Examples of different processing stages of wood products along the process and value chain....	14
71			

12 HARVESTED WOOD PRODUCTS (HWP)

12.1 INTRODUCTION

TABLE 12.X COMPARISON OF THE STRUCTURES IN THE 2019 REFINEMENT AND THE 2006 IPCC GUIDELINES		
Subject	Sections presenting refinements	Relevant sections in 2006 Guidelines
Introduction	12.1 Introduction Provide overview of the HWP chapter in the 2019 Refinement. Updated explanation of some key concepts relevant to presentation of updated parameters.	12.1 Introduction A number of key concepts described in the 2006 Guidelines are still relevant.
Terms, definitions and concepts	12.2 Terms, definitions and concepts Updated description of some existing terms, definitions and concepts. Clarification of the implications of selecting HWP approaches relevant to presentation of updated technical parameters.	12.2 Terms, definitions and concepts A number of terms, definitions and concepts in the 2006 Guidelines are still relevant.
Approaches to estimating emissions and removals of CO ₂ associated with HWP	12.3 Approaches to estimating emissions and removals of CO ₂ associated with HWP Clarification of HWP calculation and updating to include technical parameters relevant to calculations for the approach of stock-changes of domestic origin.	12.2.1.1 Tier 1 Annex 12. A.1
Clarification of the reporting of emissions from harvested wood biomass used for energy purposes	12.4 Harvested wood biomass used for energy purposes Updated discussion to clarify where CO ₂ and non-CO ₂ emissions from harvested wood used for energy are reported, in particular where CO ₂ emissions are reported when HWP are used in the Energy sector and imports and exports are involved.	12.2 Methodological issues
Choice of method for wood products in use	12.5 Choice of method for wood products in use Updated methodological guidance for estimating the approaches, including updated guidance for applying technical parameters for the calculation of initial stock establishment and updated technical parameters including HWP carbon conversion factors.	12.2 Methodological issues
Clarification of the treatment of “wood in SWDS” in this guidance	12.6 Clarification of the treatment of “wood in SWDS” in this guidance	12.2 Methodological issues
Uncertainty Assessment	12.7 Uncertainty assessment Updated discussion of uncertainty assessment allowing for updated description of application of technical parameters for Tiers 1 to 3.	12.3 Uncertainty Assessment
QA/QC	12.8 QA/QC Updated discussion of QA/QC allowing for updated description of application of technical parameters.	12.4 QA/QC
Completeness	12.9 Completeness	12.5 Completeness
Reporting and Documentation	No update	12.6 Reporting and Documentation
Reporting Tables and Worksheet	No update	12.7 Reporting Tables and Worksheet

First Order Draft

The purpose of this chapter is to update technical parameters for estimating emissions and removals of CO₂ in the AFOLU Sector associated with HWP (hereafter called “emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP”). In doing so, existing approaches discussed in IPCC 2006 GL are maintained. The guidance takes account of new relevant scientific information, including methodological information contained in IPCC KP Supplement (e.g. including parameters such as carbon conversion factors).

The structure of this chapter aims to clarify the relationships between new information and the IPCC 2006 GL and to allow for inclusion and updating of new parameters where appropriate.

The description of the application of methodologies in the light of the inclusion of updated parameters has been clarified. In particular Section 12.2 includes a refined and elaborated description of some existing terms, definitions and concepts, including a clarification of the implications of different HWP approaches for reporting.

Section 12.3 provides guidance on available HWP approaches, describing and clarifying the options for defining a conceptual framework for estimating emissions and removals associated with HWP.

The guidance in this chapter is structured to consider three distinct subject areas relevant to harvested wood biomass: i) wood biomass used for energy purposes ii) wood products in use (i.e. wood utilised as a material) and iii) wood biomass in solid waste disposal sites (SWDS). Section 12.4 addresses wood biomass used for energy purposes, whilst Section 12.5 gives detailed guidance on wood products in use, specifically providing *good practice* guidance on the choice of method for wood products in use including improved methodological guidance for estimating emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP following different approaches, including refined guidance for calculation of initial stock establishment and parameters including HWP carbon conversion factors. Section 12.6 provides clarification of the treatment of “wood in SWDS” in this guidance (cf. Table 12.1 on variables in the *IPCC 2006 GL*).

12.2 TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

This section provides some terms and definitions with specific meaning in the context of estimating and reporting emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP.

Approach: The term “approach” has a particular meaning in the context of emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP. An ‘approach’ is a conceptual framework for the estimation of emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP (cf. *inter alia* Brown *et al.*, 1998; UNFCCC, 2003; Cowie *et al.*, 2006). An approach defines the particular system boundary referred to when calculating quantities of carbon entering, retained in and lost from the HWP pool, that is, system boundary, defining which emissions and removals are to be included in the estimate and finally reported (cf. Cowie *et al.* 2006). Approaches need to be defined for the estimation and reporting of emissions and removals associated with HWP in order to ensure transparency, completeness and consistency in calculations and reported estimates, in particular to avoid double-counting or non-counting of emissions and removals. As such, approaches are concerned with ensuring the accuracy and internal consistency of calculations and results relevant to emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP and, in a strict sense, approaches do not represent accounting¹ rules.

Further guidance on available approaches is provided in Section 12.3.

Method: The term “method” refers to the set of calculations needed to implement a particular approach for estimating emissions and removals associated with HWP (cf. UNFCCC, 2003; Cowie *et al.*, 2006). Thus, whilst an approach defines WHAT is to be estimated and reported in an inventory for emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP (as determined by a system boundary), a method defines HOW to calculate the emissions and removals to be reported, that is, the calculation techniques used in estimation (cf. Cowie *et al.*, 2006). It follows that different methods could be applied to implement a particular approach and that more than one method may be involved in the implementation of an approach.

When considering methods to estimate emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP, both inventory-based and flux data-based methods can be used.

Inventory-based methods involve direct assessment of the HWP carbon pool at two or more points in time, then estimating carbon pool changes from the difference between sequential assessments.

Flux data-based methods on the other hand involve:

- Either measuring fluxes of CO₂ between the atmosphere and the reservoir of carbon contained in harvested biomass;

¹ In the context of emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP, the term “accounting” refers strictly to the application of accounting rules to estimated emissions and removals associated with the HWP pool, in order to calculate ‘debits’ and ‘credits’ attributable to HWP, with reference to agreed emissions reduction targets (cf. Cowie *et al.*, 2006).

- Or tracking flows of carbon contained in wood biomass that is harvested from forests throughout the stages of the wood processing chain for the purpose of estimating the magnitude of the HWP carbon pool and its change over time.

In practice (i.e. scientific literature), most of the flux data-based method are of the latter type (see Sections 12.5, 12.6 and 12.7).

12.3 APPROACHES TO ESTIMATING EMISSIONS AND REMOVALS OF CO₂ DUE TO HWP

This section describes in detail the different approaches for estimating and reporting emissions and removals associated with HWP. Essentially, four approaches have been defined for the calculation of emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP, known as the ‘**stock-change**’ approach, ‘**production**’ approach, ‘**stock-change of domestic origin**’ approach and the ‘**atmospheric flow**’ approach. Each of these approaches involves the adoption of a particular system boundary for estimating emissions and removals associated with HWP. The first three of the aforementioned approaches are based on the estimation of carbon stock changes in the HWP pool and are described in Section 12.4.1.1. The atmospheric flow approach is intended to estimate all CO₂ emissions from woody biomass to the atmosphere within a country and is presented in Section 12.4.2. As the so-called ‘simple decay’ approach corresponds to the system boundaries of the production approach and only differs in the theoretically applied methodological pathway on how to calculate the associated emissions and removals (cf. Section 12.5 and IPCC 2006 GL) it is not separately discussed.

It must be stressed that the choice of approach has implications for the calculation and reporting of emissions and removals across the AFOLU sector (Cowie *et al.*, 2006) and even across other sectors of inventories (e.g. the reporting of CO₂ emissions due to wood biomass burnt in the Energy sector, see Section 12.4).

In the following, Section 12.3.1 described carbon pool-based approaches and Section 12.3.2 describes the available approach estimates actual CO₂-fluxes to the atmosphere.

12.3.1 Estimating emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP on the basis of carbon stock changes

The existing practice to estimate emissions and removals of CO₂ is to consider carbon stock changes in defined biomass pools, to sum up these changes and define the negative change multiplied by 44/12. (cf. Cowie *et al.* 2006).

In order to implement one of the three available carbon pool-based approaches using a flux data method as suggested for Tier 1 (cf. Section 12.5.2), the annual carbon flux into the HWP pool (i.e. *Inflow*, cf. Equation 12.2 in Section 12.3.2) is calculated from the varying combination of the following statistical elements which can be simplified as:

1. ‘Stock-change’ approach → *Inflow* = calculated consumption = domestic production + imports – exports
2. ‘Production’ approach → *Inflow* = domestic production
3. ‘Stock-changes of domestic origin’ approach → *Inflow* = domestic production – exports

Section 12.5.2 includes the detailed methodological guidance on how to implement these available pool-oriented approaches, whereas their conceptual differences are described in the following.

12.3.1.1 THE ‘STOCK-CHANGE’ APPROACH


The ‘stock-change’ approach estimates the net change in carbon stocks in the HWP pool within national boundaries (cf. e.g. Brown *et al.* 1998, Lim *et al.* 1999, UNFCCC 2003) and supplements the estimation of emissions and removals from changes in wood carbon stocks in the forest pool within the same system boundaries (cf. Chapter 4 and IPCC 2006 GL, Vol. 4., Annex 12.A.1). In the case that this approach is used to estimate the annual change in carbon stock in “products in use” in the reporting country; it corresponds to Variable 1a in *IPCC 2006 GL*.

Changes in the products pool are reported by the country where the products are used, referred to as the consuming country. Because the stock changes actually occur in the reporting country the reported emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP indicate *when* and *where* the stock changes occur (IPCC 2006).

First Order Draft

In the case that a flux data method is applied to determine the amount of carbon stored in the HWP pool in use within a country, the carbon flux into the pool (i.e. Inflow) is thus to be quantified by means of the calculated consumption of HWP. The calculated consumption of HWP reflects the annual additions to the carbon pool in HWP in use within a country and it is calculated from the data on domestic production, plus imports and minus exports of HWP (cf. Section 12.5.1.1, Equation 12.4). Exported HWP are outside the system boundary, while imported HWP are included in the activity data to estimate the magnitude of the HWP carbon pool in a specific year (see Figure 12.1).

Figure 12.1 Scheme of the ‘stock-change’ approach, estimating emissions and removals of CO₂ associated with the carbon stock in the HWP pool in use on the basis of calculated HWP consumption data



Source: cf. Rüter 2017

Further details on how this approach is implemented by using a flux data method through the compilation of the relevant elements of statistical data of semi-finished wood commodities is described in Section 12.5.2.1.

Other data reflecting the utilization of HWP in use within a country could be derived from information e. g. on the use of wood within that category, for instance the national building stock (cf. Section 12.5.3.1). In the case of the use of such inventory information, the amount of carbon stored in HWP within a country would need to be quantified at least at two points in time, similar as repeated forest inventories referring to the stock-difference method (see IPCC 2006, p. 2.10).


12.3.1.2 THE ‘PRODUCTION’ APPROACH

Similar to the ‘stock-change’ approach, the ‘production’ approach determines emissions and removals on the basis of net changes in carbon stocks in the HWP pool. In the case that the annual change in carbon stock in ‘products in use’ are estimated where wood came from harvest in the reporting country (including exports), this corresponds to Variable 2A in *IPCC 2006 GL*. This approach takes into account carbon in wood products from domestically harvested wood only and does thus not provide a complete inventory of wood carbon in national stocks.

In contrast to the ‘stock-change’ approach described above, the estimation of the carbon flux into the carbon pool of HWP in use is not based on the calculated consumption of HWP, but solely on the domestic production from domestic harvest. Thus, the carbon in exported wood products is implicitly included in the estimates of the emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP of the producing country, even though the stock changes reported by a country occur in other countries (where exports are held). On the other hand, imports of wood are excluded from the calculation – not the least in order to avoid double counting in the case the exporting country use another approach. The system boundary therefore does not correspond to the national boundaries in which the emissions and removals of the HWP pool in use take place (Figure 12.2).

Because stock changes reported by a country associated with exported HWP occur in other countries, the stock change report indicates *when* changes occur but not where they occur.

Figure 12.2 Scheme of the ‘production’ approach, estimating emissions and removals of CO₂ associated with the carbon stock in the HWP pool in use on the basis of data on HWP production originating from domestic harvest



Source: cf. Rüter 2017

12.3.1.3 THE ‘STOCK-CHANGES OF DOMESTIC ORIGIN’ APPROACH

This approach is a hybrid between the ‘stock-change’ and ‘production’ approaches (Cowie *et al.*, 2006), which involves excluding all traded HWP commodities (i.e. imports and exports) from the estimation. Only the annual change in the carbon stock of HWP in use in the reporting country that was produced from domestic harvest and subsequently consumed within the country of their origin is estimated.

The detailed way in which this approach is implemented through the compilation of the relevant elements of statistical data of HWP is described in Section 12.5.2.1.

12.3.2 Estimating actual CO₂-fluxes from woody biomass – the ‘atmospheric flow’ approach”


The ‘atmospheric flow’ approach intends to estimate actual fluxes of carbon to/from the atmosphere within national boundaries, and reports where and when these emissions and removals occur. The implementation of this approach is based on all the variables as suggested in Table 12.1 of IPCC 2006 GL.

In theory, the exclusive alternative to the approaches estimating emissions and removals based on changes of defined carbon pools (i.e. ‘stock-change’ and ‘production’ approaches as described in Section 12.4.1) would be to consider instead atmospheric fluxes within national borders. For implementing this approach, a country would need to include in its estimates of emissions and removals the gross removals of carbon from the atmosphere due to tree biomass growth in forests and other wood producing land categories (net of decay within forests), and the carbon release to the atmosphere from oxidation of HWP that are consumed in their country. The carbon release to the atmosphere from HWP also includes the carbon release from imports of wood to the reporting country.” (IPCC 2006)

Carbon fluxes into the atmosphere are, however, difficult to estimate directly, which is why, in practice, an accurate and consistent application of the ‘atmospheric flow’ approach to estimate the HWP relies on the availability of relevant data and needs to take into account existing and applied methodologies for estimating emissions and removals associated with the forest carbon pools (cf. IPCC 2006 GL, Ch. 4). It does require, in addition to estimates of the carbon stock changes within the HWP pool in use within the reporting country (i.e. ‘stock-change’ approach), the estimation of all additional cross-border carbon fluxes in woody biomass feedstock and wood fuel (cf. Cowie *et al.* 2006).

First Order Draft

Figure 12.3 Scheme of the ‘atmospheric flow’ approach, estimating emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP on the basis of data on the carbon stock in the HWP pool in use and traded woody biomass



Source: cf. Rüter 2017

The system boundary of the ‘atmospheric flow’ approach and the carbon pools under consideration are shown in Figure 12.3. The pools are the same as in the ‘stock-change’ approach. The difference is that the consistent implementation of the ‘atmospheric flow’ approach for HWP estimates the atmospheric carbon exchange of the timber processing and wood utilization chain of the reporting country rather than stock changes within the country. Further information on the implementation of the ‘atmospheric flow’ approach on the basis on available statistical data is included in Section 12.5.2. 1..

12.4 HARVESTED WOOD BIOMASS USED FOR ENERGY PURPOSES

This section clarifies how and where wood biomass that is harvested and extracted from the forest or other land categories, and then burnt at some point in time, is considered in GHG inventories. This includes explaining where this activity is represented in different inventory sectors and where to find relevant guidance.

Harvested wood biomass may be burnt at different stages in the utilisation of harvested wood and for different purposes, including:

- Wood biomass burnt directly as fuel wood, on a residential, commercial or industrial scale
- Wood biomass generated as industrial residues and burnt along the process chain in the manufacture of semi-finished wood products (e.g. sawnwood, wood-based panels)
- Wood biomass generated as industrial residues and burnt along the subsequent process chain in the manufacture of finished wood products (e.g. wooden windows and furniture)
- Wood biomass collected and burnt as post-consumer wood (i.e. recovered wood), including industrial-scale incineration, with or without energy recovery
- Wood biomass used as a feedstock for biofuels.

These different ways in which wood biomass may be burnt are covered in several inventory sectors, specifically in the AFOLU, Energy and Waste sectors. Guidance on emissions factors for CO₂ and non-CO₂ GHG emissions resulting from the burning of wood biomass can be found in IPCC 2006 GL Vol 2, Ch 2 Section 2.3.2. Guidance on how to derive activity data in the case that wood biomass is burnt for energy generation purposes is given in IPCC 2006 GL Vol 2, Ch 2 Section 2.3.3. Where wood biomass is incinerated as waste (i.e. without energy

recovery), guidance is provided in IPCC 2006 GL Vol 5, Ch 2. In the case that wood biomass is used as feedstock for biofuels, guidance is provided in IPCC 2006 GL Vol 2, Ch 3. There are three important points to note regarding the reporting of CO₂ emissions from the burning of wood biomass:

- Firstly, to avoid double counting, the CO₂ emissions from biomass burnt are reported in the AFOLU sector and are not reported in either the Energy or Waste sectors. However, estimates of the CO₂ emissions from burning wood biomass may be included in the reports for these sectors as information items.
- Secondly, although these CO₂ emissions are supposed to be estimated and reported in the AFOLU sector, issues may arise with the completeness of reporting, depending on the approaches applied for estimating emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP (cf. Section 12.3). In particular, depending on the choice of approach, there may be double-counting and/or non-counting of emissions and/or removals, related to the time *when* emissions and removals and/or *where* they occur. This is especially relevant in situations where woody biomass is traded between countries.
- Thirdly, also depending on the approaches applied for estimating emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP, CO₂ and non-CO₂ emissions from burning the same unit of biomass may be reported by different countries. Specifically, non-CO₂ emissions from burning a unit of biomass will always be reported by the consuming country, whilst the CO₂ emissions from burning the same unit of biomass may be reported by the producing country and/or the consuming country, depending on the approaches applied by the countries.

It should also be noted that CO₂ emissions from burning wood for energy are reported by a consuming country as an information item under the Energy sector. These emissions are calculated consistently with the reporting of non-CO₂ emissions from biomass burnt for energy in the consuming country (see IPCC 2006 GL Vol 2, Chapter 2 Section 2.3.3.4).

12.5 CHOICE OF METHOD FOR WOOD PRODUCTS IN USE

This section provides guidance for the choice of method following the available approaches described in Section 12.3. As the chosen calculation method (i.e. inventory or flux data methods) and the applied data that are used for estimating the emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP have implicit impact on the calculated system boundaries and in consequence on whether the estimated emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP correspond to the national borders or not, any method to be applied needs to be cross-checked against whether and how it corresponds and relates to the selected approach.

12.5.1 Initial steps to estimate emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP

To estimate HWP emissions and removals, it is good practice to follow the decision tree (Figure 12.4) and the steps described below.

STEP 1: Check the availability of activity data on HWP in order to clarify the option of not reporting emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP

In order to apply provided guidance for estimating emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP, information on the utilization of wood as material needs to be available. In the case that no such information is available, countries might need to decide not to report on HWP.

STEP 1.1: Check the availability of the three default HWP categories sawnwood, wood-based panels and paper and paperboard. Detailed guidance is provided in Section 12.5.1.1. If such information is available, skip the next step and go to STEP 2.

STEP 1.2: Follow the guidance provided in Section 12.5.1.2.

STEP 2: Check the availability of country-specific methods and apply Tier 3

STEP 2.1: Check whether country-specific methods are available that could be used to estimate emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP. For this purpose, follow the guidance provided in Section 12.5.4. If this is the case go to the next step, otherwise go to STEP 3.

STEP 2.2: Check that the methodologies used are at least as detailed and accurate as under the Tier 1 approach. If this is the case go to the next step, otherwise go to STEP 3.

STEP 2.3: Clarify which approach is to be chosen by the country (cf. Section 12.3) and follow the guidance provided in Section 12.5.4 to apply Tier 3 for estimating emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP.

First Order Draft

STEP 3: Check the availability of country-specific data and apply Tier 2

STEP 3.1: Check whether country-specific activity data and/or emission factors are available that could be used to estimate emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP. Guidance is provided in Sections 12.5.1.1 and 12.5.3. If this is the case go to the next step, otherwise go to STEP 4.


STEP 3.2: Check whether the country-specific activity data meet the requirement to match with the provided default method and whether they are as accurate as under the Tier 1 approach. Further guidance is provided in Section 12.5.3.1. In the case that country-specific emission factors should be used, follow the guidance provided in Section 12.5.3.2 and clarify, whether such information fits to the activity data that is to be applied for the estimation. If the completion of this step is successful, go to the next step, otherwise go to STEP 4.

STEP 3.3: Clarify which approach is to be chosen by the country (Section 12.3), follow the guidance provided in Section 12.5.3 and apply Tier 2 for estimating emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP.

STEP 4: Clarify which approach is to be chosen to estimate emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP and apply Tier 1

Clarify which approach is to be chosen by the country (Section 12.3) and follow the guidance provided in Section 12.5.2 in order to apply Tier 1 for estimating emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP.

Figure 12.4 Decision tree for choosing the relevant tier method for estimating emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP




12.5.1.1 AVAILABILITY OF ACTIVITY DATA

A prerequisite for estimating emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP is the availability of transparent and verifiable activity data, e. g. for the three HWP categories representing the material use of wood (i.e. sawnwood, wood-based panels, and paper and paperboards) to estimate the carbon stock in the HWP pool in use. This section gives guidance on when available data is to be considered transparent and verifiable for estimating emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP.

Whereas the term “harvested wood products” is based on a concept containing the two separate elements “forest harvesting” and “wood products” (Brown *et al.*, 1998; UNFCCC, 2003), the categories sawnwood, wood-based panels and paper and paperboard refer to the definitions of semi-finished wood products of the international classification system of forest products.² Other terms commonly used include “removals” (i.e. roundwood) are a subset of “forest harvesting” of biomass (i.e. fellings) at the beginning of the forest-wood chain (see definitions below). Following the forest products definitions of the FAO, Figure 12.5 furthermore shows the relevance of the aggregate commodity “industrial roundwood”. Its subcategories provide the feedstock for the subsequent processing of the three named semi-finished HWP commodities along the value chain (cf. FAO 2017). The international classification system for forest products can be related to the Harmonized Commodity Description and Coding System (HS) of tariff nomenclature provided by the World Customs Organization (WCO).³

Figure 12.5 Simplified classification of wood products based on FAO forest products definitions



Source: IPCC 2014

Definitions of wood product commodities, which are relevant for the application of the guidance on estimating emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP as described in Section 12.5.2 (Tier 1), are listed below (cf. Figure 12.5). They are drawn from the definitions of the Joint Forest Sector Questionnaire (JFSQ) as established by the Intersecretariat Working Group on Forest Sector Statistics⁴ and form the basis for the forest products statistics e.g. provided by FAO. The JFSQ also includes conversion factors to be used for converting e.g. from nominal to solid volume in the compilation of statistics if required.⁴ Datasets for these aggregate product categories are freely and easily accessible, are updated on at least an annual basis with a 6-month or one year reporting lag, and time series are available for most countries worldwide.⁵ The following three aggregate commodities of semi-finished wood products, by definition, represent data on wood being processed with the intention to be used as material.

SAWNWOOD: “Wood that has been produced from both domestic and imported roundwood, either by sawing lengthways or by a profile-chipping process and that exceeds 6 mm in thickness. It includes planks, beams, joists, boards, rafters, scantlings, laths, boxboards and “lumber”, etc., in the following forms: unplanned, planned, end-jointed, etc. It excludes sleepers, wooden flooring, mouldings (sawnwood continuously shaped along any of its

² <http://www.fao.org/forestry/statistics/80572/en/> (2017/10/18)

³ <http://www.wcoomd.org/en/topics/nomenclature/instrument-and-tools.aspx> (2017/10/18)

⁴ Comprising the Forestry Department of FAO, the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), the Statistical Office of the European Communities (EUROSTAT) and the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO)

⁵ <http://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/FO> (2017/10/18)

First Order Draft


edges or faces, like tongued, grooved, rebated, V-jointed, beaded, moulded, rounded or the like) and sawnwood produced by resawing previously sawn pieces. It is reported in cubic metres solid volume.”¹

WOOD-BASED PANELS: “This product category is an aggregate comprising veneer sheets, plywood, particle board, and fibreboard. It is reported in cubic metres solid volume.”¹ For the definitions of these subcategories please see FAO.

PAPER AND PAPERBOARD: “The paper and paperboard category is an aggregate category. In the production and trade statistics, it represents the sum of graphic papers; sanitary and household papers; packaging materials and other paper and paperboard. It excludes manufactured paper products such as boxes, cartons, books and magazines, etc. It is reported in metric tonnes.”¹

All datasets are reported in cubic metres solid volume or metric tonnes, which is information that enables countries to convert the data given into carbon units. Commodities which are excluded from the definitions above (e.g. V-jointed sawnwood or laminated veneer lumber (LVL)) may be the result of subsequent processing and therefore fall under the category of finished wood products as illustrated in Figure 12.6. This also applies e.g. to wooden flooring that is produced from sawnwood and/or hardboard which belongs to the category of wood-based panels; wooden flooring in this case is therefore implicitly covered by the semi-finished HWP categories sawnwood and wood-based panels and included in the estimates for emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP. Thus, using statistical data both for sawnwood and for wooden flooring would result in double counting.

Figure 12.6 Examples of different processing stages of wood products along the process and value chain



Source: IPCC 2014

To avoid potential double counting, countries are encouraged to consult e.g. FAO for further clarification on the mass flows along the forest wood processing chain depending on the classification and definition of the relevant commodities.¹ The inclusion of the commodity wood pulp under the HWP category “paper” would for example result in double counting, as wood pulp by definition constitutes the feedstock for the production of paper and paperboard (cf. definition below and Figure 12.6). The application of information on wood pulp does, however, enter the default Tier 1 method in order to calculate the share of HWP coming from domestic forests in the case that the ‘production’ or ‘stock-changes of domestic origin’ approaches are applied (cf. Equations 12.5 and 12.6). Wood pulp data may also be used in higher tier methods provided that double counting is avoided.

In order to implement the ‘production’ or ‘stock-changes of domestic origin’ approaches, further information is needed on commodities representing the raw materials eventually used as feedstock for the production of the semi-finished HWP categories listed above (cf. Section 12.3 and Figure 12.6). Some possible feedstock commodities are not included in the default method for those approaches to allocate HWP to the domestic forest sources as described in Section 12.3.2, due to difficulties in determining sources and multiple uses, e.g. wood chips used in wood-based panel and wood pulp production as some chips come from industry co-products, others could be recycled products and others go to energy use (see Figure 12.6). Definitions of some key feedstocks used are provided below.

According to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, “**WOOD-REMOVALS** are generally a subset of fellings”.

ROUNDWOOD: “All roundwood felled or otherwise harvested and removed. It comprises all wood obtained from removals, i.e. the quantities removed from forests and from trees outside the forest, including wood recovered from natural, felling and logging losses during the period, calendar year or forest year. It includes all wood removed

with or without bark, including wood removed in its round form, or split, roughly squared or in other form (e.g. branches, roots, stumps and burls (where these are harvested) and wood that is roughly shaped or pointed. It is an aggregate comprising wood fuel, including wood for charcoal and industrial roundwood (wood in the rough). It is reported in cubic metres solid volume underbark (i.e. excluding bark).”⁴

INDUSTRIAL ROUNDWOOD (WOOD IN THE ROUGH): “All roundwood except wood fuel. In production, it is an aggregate comprising sawlogs and veneer logs; pulpwood, round and split; and other industrial roundwood. It is reported in cubic metres solid volume underbark (i.e. excluding bark). The customs classification systems used by most countries do not allow the division of Industrial Roundwood trade statistics into the different end-use categories that have long been recognized in production statistics (i.e. sawlogs and veneer logs, pulpwood and other industrial roundwood). Thus, these components do not appear in trade. It excludes: telephone poles.”⁴

WOOD PULP: “Fibrous material prepared from pulpwood, wood chips, particles or residues by mechanical and/or chemical process for further manufacture into paper, paperboard, fibreboard or other cellulose products. It is an aggregate comprising mechanical wood pulp; semi-chemical wood pulp; chemical wood pulp; and dissolving wood pulp.”⁴

RECOVERED PAPER: “Waste and scraps of paper or paperboard that have been collected for re-use or trade. It includes paper and paperboard that has been used for its original purpose and residues from paper and paperboard production. It is reported in metric tonnes.”⁴

In order to implement the ‘atmospheric flow’ approach, besides data on trade of the above described commodities, further activity data representing both feedstocks for processing wood for its use as material as well as wood biomass burnt is needed which allows estimating actual fluxes of carbon from woody biomass from and to the atmosphere within the country and the reporting year (cf. IPCC 2006 and Sections 12.3.2 and 12.5.2.1). This includes the following commodities:

WOOD FUEL: “Roundwood that will be used as fuel for purposes such as cooking, heating or power production. It includes wood harvested from main stems, branches and other parts of trees (where these are harvested for fuel) and wood that will be used for the production of charcoal (e.g. in pit kilns and portable ovens), wood pellets and other agglomerates. The volume of roundwood used in charcoal production is estimated by using a factor of 6.0 to convert from the weight (wt) of charcoal produced to the solid volume (m³) of roundwood used in production. It also includes wood chips to be used for fuel that are made directly (i.e. in the forest) from roundwood. It excludes wood charcoal, pellets and other agglomerates. It is reported in cubic metres solid volume underbark (i.e. excluding bark).”¹

WOOD CHARCOAL: “Wood carbonised by partial combustion or the application of heat from external sources. It includes charcoal used as a fuel or for other uses, e.g. as a reduction agent in metallurgy or as an absorption or filtration medium. It is reported in metric tonnes.”¹

WOOD CHIPS AND PARTICLES: “Wood that has been reduced to small pieces and is suitable for pulping, for particle board and/or fibreboard production, for use as a fuel, or for other purposes. It excludes wood chips made directly in the forest from roundwood (i.e. already counted as pulpwood or wood fuel). It is reported in cubic metres solid volume excluding bark.”¹

WOOD RESIDUES: “Other wood processing co-products. It includes wood waste and scrap not useable as timber such as sawmill rejects, slabs, edgings and trimmings, veneer log cores, veneer rejects, sawdust, residues from carpentry and joinery production, and wood residues that will be used for production of pellets and other agglomerated products. It excludes wood chips, made either directly in the forest from roundwood or made in the wood processing industry (i.e. already counted as pulpwood or wood chips and particles), and agglomerated products such as logs, briquettes, pellets or similar forms as well as post-consumer wood. It is reported in cubic metres solid volume excluding bark.”¹

Production data on finished wood products processed from the three aggregate semi-finished product categories sawnwood, wood-based panels and paper and paperboard (see Figure 12.6) are not included in international databases. However, the WCO HS tariff nomenclature (see above) also includes some commodities for finished HWP (e.g. furniture, builders' joinery and carpentry of wood). Accordingly, information on such commodities could be available in national production and trade statistics (see Section 2.8.4.1). Consequently, *good practice* in providing [transparent and verifiable] activity data for HWP, which qualifies for estimating emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP on the basis of the *production* or the *stock-change approaches*, is achieved by the availability of data for the three aggregate HWP commodities sawnwood, wood-based panels and paper and paperboard in publicly available databases of international organizations, such as FAOSTAT (cf. IPCC 2006 Guidelines). It is *good practice* to report on uncertainties related to these datasets (see Section 12.6).

In addition, countries with available data on finished wood products produced from the default HWP categories may consider using these data following the guidance given in Section 12.5.3.1.

12.5.1.2 OPTION OF NOT REPORTING (“INSTANTANEOUS OXIDATION”)

This section provides guidance on when it is in line with good practice to not report emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP.

The default assumption for the material use of wood is that the annual carbon inflow to the carbon pool in HWP in use is of the same magnitude as the annual amount of carbon leaving this pool. In consequence, this steady-state of the carbon pool corresponds to an estimate of no change in this carbon pool in HWP. This “no change” assumption equals the assumption that all carbon in the biomass harvested is oxidised in the removal year (i.e. leaves the pool immediately the year of harvest) which is why not reporting is also referred to as “instantaneous oxidation” (cf. IPCC 1997, IPCC 2006, IPCC 2014).

As the use of harvested woody biomass for energy purposes does not belong to a defined and reported carbon pool, any emissions due to such utilization of biomass will be recognized and reported as stock-changes in the living biomass or dead wood pools.

As the availability of activity data constitutes a prerequisite to estimate emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP, countries might furthermore decide not to report on HWP if no activity data as suggested for Tier 1 are available. Further guidance is provided in Section 12.5.1.1.

The emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP are not reported if in line with the guidance provided in Sections 12.5.1.1, 12.5.2.1 and 12.5.3.1, no HWP activity data are available.

Further guidance on when and how to apply the assumption that HWP is not to be reported can be found in *IPCC 2006 GL*, Section 12.2.1, and IPCC 2014, Section 2.8.2 referred to as instantaneous oxidation.

12.5.2 Tier 1: “first order decay” method

Provided that transparent and verifiable activity data are available for the three HWP categories of semi-finished wood product commodities sawnwood, wood-based panels and paper and paperboard, as defined in Section 12.5.1.1, and no country-specific activity data required to apply Tier 2 are available (see Section 12.5.3), estimates of emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP should be obtained by application of the Tier 1 method as outlined in this section.

The annual emissions and removals from the HWP pool in use ($\Delta CO_{2TOTAL}(i)$) are calculated from the sum of net changes of the carbon stocks in the defined HWP product categories by means of the Equation 12.1.

EQUATION 12.1 ESTIMATION OF TOTAL EMISSIONS AND REMOVALS FROM THE HWP POOL IN USE OF THE REPORTING COUNTRY

$$\Delta CO_{2TOTAL}(i) = -44/12 \cdot \sum_{l=1}^n \Delta C_l(i)$$

Sources: Pingoud and Wagner 2006; IPCC 2006; IPCC 2014; Rüter 2017

Where:

i = year

$\Delta CO_{2TOTAL}(i)$ = total CO₂ emissions and removals from net changes of the carbon stock in HWP in use during year i , in Mt CO₂

C = carbon stock in HWP, in Mt C

$\Delta C_l(i)$ = changes of the carbon stock C in the particular HWP category l during the year i , in Mt C

l = index number of the semi-finished HWP category (cf. Table 12.2, Section 12.5.2.1)

n = number of selected HWP categories of the semi-finished HWP commodities sawnwood, wood-based panels, paper and paperboard

The general method to estimate the magnitude of the defined carbon stock in the HWP pool in use and its net changes (i.e. by means of approaches as described in Section 12.4) is the first-order decay (FOD) function as

presented in Equation 12.2. It represents a flux data method that corresponds to Equation 12.1, Chapter 12, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* and Equation 2.8.5, Chapter 2 in IPCC 2014:

EQUATION 12.2
ESTIMATION OF CARBON STOCKS AND ANNUAL CARBON STOCK CHANGES IN HWP POOL IN USE

$$C_l(i+1) = e^{-k} \cdot C_l(i) + \left[\frac{(1 - e^{-k})}{k} \right] \cdot Inflow_l(i)$$

$$\Delta C_l(i) = C_l(i+1) - C_l(i)$$

Sources: Pingoud and Wagner 2006; IPCC 2006; IPCC 2014; Rüter 2017

Where:

i = year

$C_l(i)$ = the carbon stock in the particular HWP category at the beginning of year i , Mt C

k = decay constant of FOD for each HWP category (HWP_j) given in units yr^{-1} ($k = \ln(2)/HL$, where HL is half-life of the HWP pool in years (see Box 12.1 and Section 12.3.2.2).

$Inflow_l(i)$ = the carbon inflow to the particular HWP category (HWP_j) during year i , Mt C yr^{-1} → Equation 12.3

$\Delta C_l(i)$ = carbon stock change of the HWP category during year i , Mt C yr^{-1}

Depending on the choice of the approach for estimating emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP, which implicitly determines the system boundaries of the underlying estimated carbon stock in HWP in use, the annual carbon inflow to the carbon stock of the respective HWP category is calculated from different elements of HWP time series according to Equation 12.3 (cf. also Section 12.4).

EQUATION 12.3
SELECTION OF CARBON INFLOW FOR ESTIMATING THE CARBON STOCK IN THE HWP POOL IN USE DEPENDING ON THE CHOSEN APPROACH

$$Inflow_l(i) = \begin{cases} Inflow_{SCA_l}(i) & \text{for the stock – change approach} \\ Inflow_{PA_l}(i) & \text{for the production approach} \\ Inflow_{SCAD_l}(i) & \text{for the stock – changes of domestic origin approach} \end{cases}$$

Source: Rüter 2017

Where:

$Inflow_{SCA_l}(i)$ = Carbon inflow in HWP from the calculated domestic consumption of the respective HWP category in year i , in Mt → Equation 12.6

$Inflow_{PA_l}(i)$ = Carbon inflow in HWP from the production of the respective HWP category originating from domestic harvest in year i , in Mt → Equation 12.7

$Inflow_{SCAD_l}(i)$ = Carbon inflow in HWP from the calculated domestic consumption of the respective HWP category originating from domestic harvest i , in Mt → Equation 12.9

Further guidance on the statistical elements for calculating the relevant carbon flux into the HWP pool in use according to the different approaches ($Inflow_l(i)$), including the associated Equations, provides Section 12.5.2.1.

In order to produce an estimate of the existing carbon stock in HWP in use for the application in Equation 12.2, and based on the subsequent changes of this stock to produce an estimate of the current emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP, the historical wood use (i.e. the accumulation of the historic Inflow to the HWP pool) has to be included. This procedure is needed as this also includes the historic and current discard from the HWP pool, which is also termed “inherited emissions” (IPCC 2006).

First Order Draft

However, the availability of the activity data series, which are described in Section 12.5.2.1, varies. For most countries, the FAO statistics provide data on the HWP commodity categories since 1961.⁶ But for some countries activity data are available only from a later year (often 1991). As this has implications on the estimated steady state of the initial carbon stock in HWP in use and in consequence on the uncertainties associated with the estimated emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP, as a proxy in the Tier 1 method it is thus assumed that the HWP pools are in steady state at the initial time t_0 from which the activity data start. This means that as a proxy $\Delta C(t_0)$ is assumed to be equal to 0. This steady state carbon stock $C(t_0)$ for each HWP commodity category is approximated by means of Equation 12.4 based on the average of $Inflow_l(i)$ during the first 5 years of which statistical data are available.

Not least thanks to changing data quality due to increasing milling capacities and industry structures in many countries in combination with rather rarely changing thresholds for the statistical registration the time series of HWP commodities e.g. since 1961, might indicate increasing production volumes (cf. Palma et al. 2016). In consequence, their use in Equation 12.4 might thus result in a biased result and even further potentiate the calculated effect of an assumed increasing carbon stock in HWP (Palma et al. 2016). In order to further reduce uncertainties associated with the estimate of the existing carbon pool in HWP in use, Equation 12.4 could also be based on the average of $Inflow_l(i)$ during the first 5 years since 1990.

By substituting $C_l(t_0)$ in Equation 12.2, the $C_l(i)$ and $\Delta C_l(i)$ in the sequential time instants can be calculated. In the Tier 2 method, it is *good practice* to use Equation 12.4 for estimating the carbon stock at $t = t_0$.

EQUATION 12.4
APPROXIMATION OF THE CARBON STOCKS IN HWP POOLS IN USE AT INITIAL TIME, I.E. SINCE
WHEN ACTIVITY DATA ARE AVAILABLE

$$C_l(t_0) = \frac{Inflow_{l_{average}}}{k}$$

$$\text{With: } Inflow_{l_{average}} = \left(\sum_{i=t_0}^{t_4} Inflow_l(i) \right) / 5$$

Source: IPCC 2014; Rüter 2017

An example on how to implement Equations 12.2 and 12.4 in a spreadsheet, e.g. with MS EXCEL, is provided in the below Example Box 12.1

⁶ <http://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/FO> (2017/10/18)

Box 12.1				
EXAMPLE ON IMPLEMENTING EQUATIONS 12.2 AND 12.4 IN A SPREADSHEET (E.G. MS EXCEL)				
	A	B	C	D
1		half-life (hl)	35	
2		decay constant k	=LN(2)/C1	
3		term ' e^{-k} ' of Eq. 12.2	=EXP(-C2)	
4		term ' $[1 - e^{-k}]/k$ ' of Eq. 12.2	=(1-EXP(-C2))/C2	
5				
6	years	Inflow	HWPj carbon stock	stock-change
7	1990	100,00	=AVERAGE(B7:B11)/C2	=C8-C7
8	1991	101,00	=\$C\$3*C7+\$C\$4*A7	=C9-C8
9	1992	150,00	=\$C\$3*C8+\$C\$4*A8	=C10-C9
10	1993	103,00	=\$C\$3*C9+\$C\$4*A9	=C11-C10
11	1994	95,00	=\$C\$3*C10+\$C\$4*A10	=C12-C11
12	1995	105,00	=\$C\$3*C11+\$C\$4*A11	=C13-C12
13	1996	100,00	=\$C\$3*C12+\$C\$4*A12	=C14-C13
14

The initial carbon stock for the year 1990 calculated by means of Equation 12.4 is calculated in cell C7. The FOD function as shown in Equation 12.2 is implemented in cells C8:C13. Based on the development of the carbon stock of the particular HWP category, the stock-changes (i.e. carbon pool changes) are calculated in the cells of column D.

It is furthermore *good practice* to apply Equations 12.2 and 12.4 with activity data for the semi-finished wood product categories sawnwood, wood-based panels and paper and paperboard, either as *aggregates* or for each of their subcategories as listed in Table 12.1 in Section 12.4.2.1. Further guidance on how to compile those relevant activity data in accordance with the respective approaches is also provided in Section 12.5.2.1.

In combination with those semi-finished wood product commodities to be used under the Tier 1 method (cf. Section 12.5.2.1), FOD implicitly includes finished HWP in the carbon stock estimates, and it is assumed that “immediate losses of the HWP pool due to final processing [of wood] along the processing chain (cf. Figure 12.4) are described realistically by the exponential decay pattern” (Pingoud and Wagner 2006). The timing of emissions from wood processing residues used for energy purposes along the process chain of HWP are also well described by FOD (cf. Rüter and Diederichs 2012).

In the case that the ‘atmospheric flow’ approach is applied for estimating emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP, it is *good practice* to estimate the annual carbon fluxes into the atmosphere along the timber processing and wood utilization chain within the reporting country following Equation 12.5. The Equation reflects two components to be considered for a consistent implementation of this approach.

Firstly, it is assumed that the calculated annual gains of carbon in the HWP pool in use (i.e. $Inflow_{C_i}(i)$) following the ‘stock-change’ approach, see Equations 12.2 and 12.3) are not available for oxidation into the atmosphere in the relevant year. At the same time, it is assumed that the calculated annual carbon losses from this HWP pool in use by means of Equation 12.2, which do not enter the carbon stock in HWP in use again due to material recycling (and which would implicitly be included in the annual production data, e.g. of particle board) and which are not exported, are available for oxidation into the atmosphere in the reporting year (e.g. through combustion) (cf. IPCC 2006).

Secondly, an estimation of emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP following the ‘atmospheric flow’ approach consistent with the estimation results for emissions and removals from the forest carbon pools (cf. Chapter xxx) is based on the assumption that only carbon in woody biomass that becomes and/or remains available within the reporting country and which remains not fixed in a carbon pool could eventually also oxidize into the atmosphere in the reporting year (cf. IPCC 2006 GL, Chapter 12). In consequence, all carbon in harvested woody biomass from domestic forests (i.e. “roundwood production”, by then implicitly included in the forest carbon estimates of emissions and removals as forest carbon pool losses) that is exported in the reporting year is to be subtracted from the countries’ remaining carbon amounts in woody biomass available for oxidation. On the other hand, all imported carbon in woody biomass that becomes available within the country as wood fuel or feedstock for further processing and wood utilization along the value chain becomes available for oxidation (cf. Figure 12.3 in Section 12.3.2).

First Order Draft

As compared to the estimates on the impact of the carbon stock in the HWP pool in use (cf. Equations 12.1 to 20.4), these estimates of carbon in annual imports and exports of woody biomass to be used as wood fuel or feedstock ($RC(i)$) are needed for the reporting year or period only (see Equation 12.10).

EQUATION 12.5
ESTIMATION OF TOTAL BIOGENIC CO₂-EMISSIONS FROM WOODY BIOMASS WITHIN THE REPORTING COUNTRY

$$\Delta CO_{2AF A}(i) = -44/12 \cdot \left(\sum_{l=1}^n \Delta C_{SCA_l}(i) + \sum_{j=1}^m RC_{EX_j}(i) - \sum_{j=1}^m RC_{IM_j}(i) \right)$$

Sources: IPCC 2006; Rüter 2017

Where:

$\Delta CO_{2AF A}(i)$ = emissions and removals of CO₂ following the ‘atmospheric flow’ approach, including emissions and removals associated with the carbon storage in the HWP pool in use due to the utilization of wood as material in the reporting country (i.e. ‘stock-change’ approach) during the year i , in Mt

$C_{SCA_l}(i)$ = Changes of the carbon stock C in the particular semi-finished HWP category l during the year i , calculated from domestic consumption (i.e. ‘stock-change’ approach), in Mt → Equations 12.2 and 12.3

$RC_{EX_j}(i)$ = Exported carbon in the relevant HWP feedstock category serving as wood fuel and/or raw material for the manufacturing of semi-finished HWP, in Mt → Equation 12.10

j = index number of the HWP feedstock category

m = number of included HWP feedstock categories → Table 12.2

$RC_{IM_j}(i)$ = Imported carbon in the relevant HWP feedstock category serving as wood fuel and/or feedstock for the manufacturing of semi-finished HWP, in Mt → Equation 12.10

12.5.2.1 ACTIVITY DATA

Depending on the chosen approach (cf. Section 12.3), activity data include both the carbon stock of the HWP pool in use at the beginning of each year ($C(i)$) and the carbon inflow to the HWP pool during each year for each HWP category ($Inflow_l(i)$) as well as data on the remaining woody biomass within a country which does not enter the carbon stock in the HWP pool in use (as material) each year. The latter data are required when implementing the atmospheric flow approach. Table 12.1 provides both an overview on the particular semi-finished HWP categories to be used for the Tier 1 estimation of the carbon stock of the HWP pool in use and their associated carbon conversion factors cf to be applied in Equations 12.6, 12.7 and 12.9.

TABLE 12.1 DEFAULT CONVERSION FACTORS FOR THE SEMI-FINISHED HWP CATEGORIES AND THEIR SUBCATEGORIES				
Semi-finished HWP categories (I)	Density (oven dry mass over air dry volume) [Mg / m³]	Carbon fraction	C conversion factor <i>cf</i> (per air dry volume) [Mg C / m³]	Source
Sawn wood (<i>aggregate</i>)	0.458	0.5	0.229	1
Coniferous sawnwood	0.45	0.5	0.225	2
Non-coniferous sawnwood	0.56	0.5	0.28	2
Wood-based panels (<i>aggregate</i>)	0.595	0.454	0.269	3
Hardboard (HDF)	0.788	0.425	0.335	4
Insulating board (Other board, LDF)	0.159	0.474	0.075	5
Fibreboard compressed	0.739	0.426	0.315	6
Medium-density fibreboard (MDF)	0.691	0.427	0.295	4
Particle board	0.596	0.451	0.269	4
Plywood	0.542	0.493	0.267	7
Veneer sheets	0.505	0.5	0.253	8
	(oven dry mass over air dry mass) [Mg / Mg]		(per air dry mass) [Mg C / Mg]	
Paper and paperboard (<i>aggregate</i>)	0.9		0.386	9
¹ Calculated from the weighted average of coniferous and non-coniferous sawnwood production volumes (FAOSTAT average of the years 2006-2010) of the countries as listed in Appendix of the Annex of Decision 2/CMP.7 ² IPCC 2003, Appendix 3a.1 ³ Calculated from the weighted average of included subcategories of the production volumes (FAOSTAT average of the years 2006-2010) of the countries as listed in Appendix of the Annex of Decision 2/CMP.7 ⁴ Rüter and Diederichs (2012) ⁵ Derived from Environmental product declarations EPD-GTX-2011111-E, EPD-KRO-2009212-E and EPD-GTX-2011211-E provided by IBU e.V. (http://bau-umwelt.de/hp550/Insulating-materials.htm) ⁶ Calculated from 50% of HDF and 50% of MDF ⁷ Derived from Wilson and Sakimoto (2005) and basic density for non-coniferous species listed in the table above ⁸ Calculated from 50% sawnwood (Coniferous) and 50% of sawnwood (Non-Coniferous) ⁹ Calculated from the weighted average of included subcategories of the production volumes (FAOSTAT average of the years 2006-2010) of the countries as listed in Appendix of the Annex of Decision 2/CMP.7, including information derived from Fengel and Wegener (1984), Paulapuro (2000), Grönfors (2010) and industry information.				

Source: IPCC 2014

For estimating the carbon stock in the HWP pool, Tier 1 uses forest products data for semi-finished HWP commodities from FAO as set out in Section 12.5.1.1. As a default, the annual *Inflow(i)* to the HWP pool comprises of the three default HWP commodity categories, i.e. sawnwood, wood-based panels, paper and paperboard).

In order to estimate carbon amounts in the semi-finished HWP categories representing the material use of wood biomass, also default conversion factors are provided in Table 12.1. In fact, the conversion factors for the HWP default commodities (i.e. aggregates) are largely dependent on the composition of countries' production amounts of the particular subcategories (e.g. particle board). If countries have disaggregated data on subcategories of semi-finished HWP as listed in Table 12.1, it is thus *good practice* to apply Equations 12.2 and 12.4 to the disaggregated subcategories.

In order to reduce uncertainties associated with assumptions on the conversion factors of activity data (i.e. data on semi-finished wood product commodities derived from statistics) (see Section 12.5.1.1), countries may consider using country-specific activity data comprising further items of the HWP subcategories as listed in Table 12.1. More information can be obtained in Section 12.5.3.1.

Depending on which approach is to be applied by the country, different elements of the annual statistics on the above listed HWP categories are to be used for calculating the HWP activity data representing the use of wood as

First Order Draft

material that are used in Equations 12.2 and 12.4 (cf. Section 12.3.2). Depending on the chosen approach (cf. Equation 12.3), these data either represent

- (i) the calculated consumption of HWP within the reporting country ('stock-change' approach), or
- (ii) the production of HWP originating from the forests of the reporting country ('production' approach), or
- (iii) the domestically produced and consumed HWP originating from the forests of the reporting country ('stock-changes of domestic origin' approach)

For the latter two approaches, the HWP activity data could furthermore be also assigned to the particular type of domestic forest land within the reporting country (see below).

In the case that the 'atmospheric flow' approach is applied, in addition to data on semi-finished HWP for estimating Emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP from the HWP pool in use following the 'stock-change' approach, data on carbon in the imports and exports of woody biomass serving as wood fuel and/or raw material (*RC*) for the subsequent manufacturing of semi-finished HWP are required (cf. Sections 12.3.2 and 12.5.2). Table 12.2 includes those relevant wood product commodities including their carbon conversion factors *cf* to be applied in Equations 12.5 and 12.10. It is *good practice* to consider the relevant definitions provided in Section 12.5.1.1 as well as the classification of wood products (cf. Figures 12.5 and 12.6) in order to avoid double counting.

697

TABLE 12.2 DEFAULT CONVERSION FACTORS FOR THE HWP FEEDSTOCK CATEGORIES SERVING AS FUEL WOOD AND RAW MATERIAL FOR MANUFACTURING OF SEMI-FINISHED HWP				
HWP feedstock categories (<i>f</i>)	Density (oven dry mass over air dry volume) [Mg / m ³]	Carbon fraction	C conversion factor <i>cf</i> (per air dry volume) [Mg C / m ³]	Source
Industrial roundwood (<i>aggregate</i>)	0.458	0.5	0.229	1
Coniferous industrial roundwood	0.45	0.5	0.225	1 & 2
Non-coniferous industrial roundwood	0.56	0.5	0.28	1 & 2
Wood fuel	0.458	0.5	0.229	1
Wood chips and particles	0.458	0.5	0.229	1
Wood residues	0.458	0.5	0.229	1
	(oven dry mass over air dry mass) [Mg / Mg]		(per air dry mass) [Mg C / Mg]	
Wood charcoal	0.9	0.85	0.765	3
Wood pulp	0.9	0.5	0.386	1
Recovered paper	0.9	0.5	0.386	1
¹ IPCC 2014 ² IPCC 2003, Appendix 3a.1 ³ IPCC 2006				

698

699 **COMPILATION OF ACTIVITY DATA FOR THE ‘STOCK-CHANGE’**

700 **APPROACH**

701 For calculating the annual carbon inflow to the respective HWP category pool for the stock-change approach (i.e.

702 $Inflow_{C_i}(i)$, see Equation 12.3), countries should apply Equation 12.6.

703 **EQUATION 12.6**

704 **CALCULATION OF CARBON INFLOW IN THE PARTICULAR SEMI-FINISHED HWP CATEGORY**

705 **FOLLOWING THE STOCK-CHANGE APPROACH**

$$Inflow_{SCA_i}(i) = HWP_{C_i}(i) \cdot cf_i$$

$$HWP_{C_i}(i) = HWP_{P_i}(i) + HWP_{IM_i}(i) - HWP_{EX_i}(i)$$

$$\text{With: } HWP_{C_i}(i) = 0, \text{ if } HWP_{C_i}(i) < 0 \text{ or } HWP_{EX_i}(i) > HWP_{P_i}(i)$$

711 Source: Rüter 2017; IPCC 2006

712 Where:

713 $HWP_{C_i}(i)$ = calculated domestic consumption of the particular semi-finished HWP category in year i , in

714 m³

715 cf_i = carbon conversion factor of the particular semi-finished HWP category (cf. Table 12.1)

716 $HWP_{P_i}(i)$ = production of the particular semi-finished HWP category in year i , in m³

717 $HWP_{IM_i}(i)$ = import of the particular semi-finished HWP category in year i , in m³

718 $HWP_{EX_i}(i)$ = export of the particular semi-finished HWP category in year i , in m³

First Order Draft

COMPILATION OF ACTIVITY DATA FOR THE ‘PRODUCTION’ APPROACH

Analogously, Equation 12.7 allows calculating the carbon inflow to the HWP pool of the particular semi-finished HWP category for the ‘production’ approach (i.e. $Inflow_{PA_i}(i)$, see Equation 12.3).

EQUATION 12.7**CALCULATION OF CARBON INFLOW IN THE PARTICULAR SEMI-FINISHED HWP CATEGORY FOLLOWING THE PRODUCTION APPROACH**

$$Inflow_{PA_i}(i) = HWP_{DP_i}(i) \cdot cf_i$$

$$HWP_{DP_i}(i) = HWP_{P_i}(i) \cdot f_R(i)$$

With: $f_R(i) := f_{IRW}(i)$ for HWP categories ‘sawnwood’ and ‘wood-based panels’,
and $((f_{IRW}(i) \cdot (1 - q) \cdot f_{PULP}(i)) + q \cdot f_{RecP}(i))$ for HWP category ‘paper and paperboard’

With: $f_{IRW}(i) := 0$ if $f_{IRW}(i) < 0$ and $f_{PULP}(i) := 0$ if $f_{PULP}(i) < 0$ and $f_{RecP}(i) := 0$ if $f_{RecP}(i) < 0$

Source: Rüter 2017; IPCC 2014

Where:

$HWP_{DP_i}(i)$ = production of the particular semi-finished HWP category originating from domestic harvest in year i , in m^3

$f_R(i)$ = Share of woody feedstock category R (IRW , $PULP$ or $RecP$) for the production of the particular semi-finished HWP category originating from domestic harvest in year $i \rightarrow$ Equation 12.8

IRW = HWP feedstock category *industrial roundwood*

q = recovered paper utilization rate

$PULP$ = HWP feedstock category *wood pulp*

$RecP$ = HWP feedstock category *recovered paper*

Equation 12.8 implements the calculation of the share of the particular feedstock category R originating from domestic harvest in its total calculated consumption for the manufacturing the relevant subsequent products in the year i , which is represented by the feedstock factor $f_R(i)$.

EQUATION 12.8**ESTIMATION OF ANNUAL FRACTION OF THE RELEVANT DOMESTICALLY PRODUCED FEEDSTOCK FOR PRODUCTION OF SEMI-FINISHED HWP ORIGINATING FROM DOMESTIC HARVEST**

$$f_R(i) = \frac{R_P(i) - R_{EX}(i)}{R_P(i) + R_{IM}(i) - R_{EX}(i)}$$

With: $R := \begin{cases} IRW & \text{for HWP feedstock category 'industrial roundwood'} \\ PULP & \text{for HWP feedstock category 'wood pulp'} \\ RecP & \text{for HWP feedstock category 'recovered paper'} \end{cases}$

Source: Rüter 2017; cf. IPCC 2014

Where:

$R_P(i)$ = Production of the particular HWP feedstock category in year i , in m^3 or Mt

$R_{IM}(i)$ = Import of the particular HWP feedstock category in year i , in m^3 or Mt

$R_P(i)$ = Export of the particular HWP feedstock category in year i , in m^3 or Mt

COMPILATION OF ACTIVITY DATA FOR THE ‘STOCK-CHANGES OF DOMESTIC ORIGIN’ APPROACH

In order to implement the ‘stock-changes of domestic origin’ approach, the carbon inflow to the HWP pool of the particular HWP category is to be calculated by means of Equation 12.9.

EQUATION 12.9

CALCULATION OF CARBON INFLOW IN THE PARTICULAR SEMI-FINISHED HWP CATEGORY FOLLOWING THE STOCK-CHANGES OF DOMESTIC ORIGIN APPROACH

$$Inflow_{SCAD_l}(i) = HWP_{DC_l}(i) \cdot cf_l$$

$$HWP_{DC_l}(i) = HWP_{DP_l}(i) - (HWP_{EX_l}(i) \cdot f_R(i))$$

$$\text{With: } HWP_{DC_l}(i) = 0, \text{ if } HWP_{EX_l}(i) \cdot f_R(i) > HWP_{DP_l}(i)$$

Source: Rüter 2017

Where:

$HWP_{DC_l}(i)$ = domestically produced and consumed HWP of the particular semi-finished HWP category originating from domestic harvest in year i , in m^3

COMPILATION OF ADDITIONAL ACTIVITY DATA REQUIRED FOR THE ‘ATMOSPHERIC FLOW’ APPROACH

In order to implement the ‘atmospheric flow’ approach, additional to the activity data calculated by means of Equation 12.6, the sum of all exported and all imported carbon in woody biomass serving as wood fuel and/or feedstock the manufacturing of semi-finished HWP is to be calculated for the use in Equation 12.5.

EQUATION 12.10

CALCULATION OF CARBON IN TRADED HWP FEEDSTOCK CATEGORIES SERVING AS WOOD FUEL AND RAW MATERIAL FOR SUBSEQUENT PROCESSING OF SEMI-FINISHED HWP

$$RC_{TRADE_j}(i) = R_{TRADE_j}(i) \cdot cf_j$$

$$\text{With: } TRADE = \begin{cases} IM & \text{for imports of the relevant feedstock category } j \\ EX & \text{for exports of the relevant feedstock category } j \end{cases}$$

Source: cf. Rüter 2017, IPCC 2006

Where:

$RC_{TRADE_j}(i)$ = Carbon in the relevant traded HWP feedstock category R serving as wood fuel and/or raw material for the manufacturing of semi-finished HWP, in Mt → Table 12.2

cf_j = carbon conversion factor of the particular HWP feedstock category → Table 12.2

In the case that the ‘atmospheric flow’ approach is chosen, it is *good practice* to apply Equation 12.10 to all HWP feedstock commodities listed in Table 12.3, in order to cover all relevant carbon fluxes in traded woody biomass and thus also into the atmosphere in the year of reporting.

First Order Draft

12.5.2.2 EMISSION FACTORS

The rate at which carbon in the Tier 1 default HWP categories is removed from the HWP pool in service in a given year is specified by a constant decay rate (k) expressed as half-life in years (cf. Equation 12.2 and Box 12.1). The 2006 IPCC Guidelines define the half-life as “the number of years it takes to lose one-half of the material currently in the pool”. As the half-life in this context refers to HWP in use (i.e. Section 12.3), the half-life to be applied is a function of the adjusted estimated service life (ESL) of the particular HWP commodities (with $HL = \text{Adjusted ESL} * \ln(2)$, see Section 12.5.3.2).

The Tier 1 method involves applying the default half-lives of the three semi-finished HWP categories based on information provided in IPCC 2003, 2006 and 2014, as given in Table 12.3. The same half-lives apply for the particular subcategories of these aggregate categories of semi-finished HWP as specified in Table 12.1 (Section 12.5.2.1).

TABLE 12.3 TIER 1 DEFAULT HALF-LIVES ⁷ OF HWP CATEGORIES	
HWP categories ⁸	Default half-lives (years)
Paper and paperboard	2
Wood-based panels	25
Sawn wood	35

Source: IPCC 2014

In the case that a ‘production’ approach is applied, it is good practice to report emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP of domestically consumed and exported wood separately in order to increase transparency.

12.5.3 Tier 2 method using country-specific data

Under Tier 2, estimates of the annual emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP are derived using the same Equations as provided for Tier 1 in Section 12.5.2. In following a Tier 2 method, either country-specific activity data and/or country-specific emission factors are to be applied.

This section provides *good practice* guidance on the use of country-specific

- i) Activity data that is consistent with the Tier 2 method (Section 12.5.3.1) as appropriate for each approach as described in Section 12.5.2.1, and
- ii) Emission factors following the concept of service life and half-life information to estimate emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP by means of the first order decay function (Equation 12.2) as provided for Tier 1 (Section 12.5.3.2).

12.5.3.1 COUNTRY-SPECIFIC ACTIVITY DATA

This section provides guidance on how to derive country-specific activity data that is consistent with the application of the first order decay function.

For this purpose, it is *good practice* for activity data to follow the international classification system for forest products consistent with the Harmonized Commodity Description and Coding System (HS) of tariff nomenclature but in more detail than implemented in FAOSTAT (see Section 12.5.1.1).

In order to calculate the annual carbon inflow ($Inflow_i(i)$) required for Equation 12.2 and subsequent Equations in Section 12.5.1.2, carbon conversion factors that reflect the commodity definitions should be applied (e.g. density, woody biomass content, tree species).

⁷ Half-lives are based on Table 3a.1.3 of the *GPG-LULUCF*.

⁸ HWP categories refer to the commodities sawnwood, wood-based panels, paper and paperboard, acc. to the international classification system for forest products (see guidance in Section 12.5.1.1)

12.5.3.2 COUNTRY-SPECIFIC EMISSION FACTORS

In order to reduce uncertainties associated with the assumptions behind the default Tier 1 half-lives of the HWP commodities (see Section 12.7), countries may consider using Tier 2 country-specific half-lives, both for the domestic use of HWP categories, as well as country-specific half-lives as being applied by the importing country in the case of exported HWP categories (where relevant). Further guidance on how to use and obtain country-specific half-life information (i.e. Tier 2) for the relevant HWP categories is available in Section 12.5.3.2.

This section gives guidance on how to derive country-specific service- and half-life information to estimate emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP on the basis of the first order decay function as included in Equation 12.2 (see Section 12.5.2).

In the following, guidance is provided on how to derive country-specific half-life values that can be used for that purpose, following the ISO 15686 standard series approach, since this is an already established system for service life estimation on a national (not case specific) level in combination with obsolescence on national level (see Box 12.2).

It contains an example on how to improve service life estimates and subsequent HWP half-life calculation for the HWP categories based on the ISO 15686 series in combination with an obsolescence factor and information on its market share.

In order to adequately apply the flux data method as suggested for Tier 1 based on information on country-specific HWP service life (i.e. time carbon is held in HWP pool in use before they are disposed or recycled), apart from the concept of half-life (see Section 12.5.2.2), the following terms and concepts are to be distinguished:

- ISO 15686-1:2011 defines the reference service life (RSL) as the service life of a product, component, assembly or system which is known to be expected under a particular set, i.e. a reference set of in-use conditions;
- The estimated service life (ESL) on the other hand is the service life that a wooden or wood based component would be expected to have in a set of specific in-use conditions. It is determined from RSL data after taking into account any differences from the reference in-use conditions (ISO 15686-1:2011);
- The factor method is used to calculate the ESL. It is a modification of RSL by seven factors to take account of the specific in-use conditions (ISO 15686-8:2008); and
- Obsolescence arises (according to ISO 15686-1:2011) when a facility no longer can be adapted to satisfy changing requirements. Obsolescence tends to result from unexpected changes, often unrelated to the construction, and includes:
 - (i) Functional obsolescence: function no longer required.
 - (ii) Technological obsolescence: new alternatives can offer better performance, change the pattern of use.
 - (iii) Economic obsolescence: Fully functional but less efficient, more expensive than alternatives. This includes also replacement due to changing fashion or taste.

ISO 2011 states that estimates of obsolescence should be based on the designer's and clients experience, and, if possible, documented feedback from practice. In order to estimate the carbon storage of HWP in use and its impact on emissions/removals by means of flux data methods using country-specific service life information, it is thus *good practice* to take into account obsolescence and to distinguish replacement of HWP in use due to e.g. a defective performance from obsolescence (cf. ISO 2011).

For example:

In northern Europe, a wooden decking can last for 50 years or more given proper construction and choice of material. But the same decking is likely to be replaced already after 20 years (or less) e.g. due to aesthetical reasons. Hence, for calculating country-specific ESL or half-life values an obsolescence factor is needed in Tier 3 estimates of emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP to reflect the time actually spent in the HWP carbon pool, not the potential full-service life of a wooden component given by ESL.

In this guidance document, the ESL is applied for estimates on a national level and not for a specific case as suggested in the ISO 15686 standard series. To include the effect of obsolescence:

- Either an additional obsolescence factor (O) is included, with
 - (i) Obsolescence = 1 when there is considered to be no significant effect of obsolescence compared to RSL
 - (ii) Obsolescence is given a value < 1 based on the intensity of obsolescence

First Order Draft

(iii) Obsolescence can never be larger than 1.

- Or a decay function to be assigned that uses the service life data to estimate the decay profile (based on products leaving the pool, not only biological decay and not a biological decay profile) or the actual time path that products take to go out-of-use.⁹

An example of how to derive national service life estimates by means of the factor method is given in the box 12.2 below.

Box 12.2**EXAMPLE ON THE CALCULATION OF NATIONAL ESL BY MEANS OF FACTOR METHOD**

A theoretical example with wooden claddings in Norway is given based on ISO 15686-8:2008, but elevated from the case specific level given in the standard to a national level. Details about RSL and service life estimation are in ISO 15686-8:2008.

A factor of “1” is used when the factor does not deviate from the RSL conditions. A higher value ($x > 1$) is given if the national performance is better than RSL conditions; a lower value ($x < 1$) is given if the national performance is lower than the RSL conditions. Non-relevant factors are excluded from the equation.

The RSL is based on accelerated field trials and the threshold for failure was defined when the mean decay rating reached 2 (on a scale from 0–4 where 0 is no decay and 4 is failure).

$$\text{National ESL} = 55(\text{RSL}) * 1(\text{A}) * 1(\text{B}) * 1(\text{C}) * 1.2(\text{E}) * 1(\text{F}) * 0.9(\text{G}) = 59.4 \text{ years}$$

Factor D ‘indoor environment’ is excluded because it is not relevant. It is good practice to include factors that do not deviate from the RSL even if they do not contribute in changing the RSL since they are given the value 1. A more detailed explanation for the choice of factors used is to be provided in the countries’ annual reporting.

A = Inherent performance level represents the grade of the component as supplied.

- Here equals the RSL.

B = Design level reflects the component’s installation in the building/constructed asset and is typically based on the level of shelter and protection from agents provided by the design of the building/constructed asset.

- Here equals the RSL.

C = Work execution level considers the level of skill and control in sitework.

- Here equals the RSL.

D = Indoor environment considers the exposure of the object to indoor agents of degradation and their severity.

- Not relevant in this example.

E = Outdoor environment considers exposure to outdoor agents of degradation and their severity. - In this example, the climate on a national level is less harsh than at the test sites included in RSL.

F = Usage conditions reflects the effect of the use of the building/constructed asset.

- Here equals the RSL.

G = Maintenance level reflects the level of maintenance assumed. For certain components that are inaccessible or require special equipment for access, a particularly low maintenance level should be considered.

- Here slightly lower than RSL intervals.

Another example in Table 12.4 shows how to derive country-specific half-life values for the three default HWP categories (see Section 12.5.2.1) as a function of information on market share of the use of wood (see above), ESL and obsolescence. The use of composed HWP categories in different markets, such as in the construction sector, can be divided further into different segments (e.g. wall systems, flooring, and roof construction). These different segments normally have different service lives and obsolescence factors. Hence, countries are encouraged to

⁹ For more information see IPCC FAQ, Q4-29 (<http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/faq/faq.html>)

allocate the contribution of the different HWP categories or subcategories (e.g. coniferous sawnwood) to markets and their segments in order to obtain improved service life estimates for the particular HWP categories. Thereby, it is important to note that the assumed service life is driven by the products technical properties and, depending on this, its particular application area (e.g. load-bearing beam or wood panelling, both made of sawnwood). Thus, in order to calculate a country-specific emission factor (i.e. service- or half-life), different sources of information, e.g. on the market use of different HWP categories, could be combined as illustrated in Table 12.4.

The definition of half-life and also guidance on how to calculate half-life for Tier 1 is provided in Section 12.5.2.2.

TABLE 12.4 EXAMPLE ON HOW TO DERIVE COUNTRY-SPECIFIC HALF-LIFE FOR HWP CATEGORIES AS A FUNCTION OF INFORMATION ON MARKET SHARE, ESTIMATED SERVICE LIFE (ESL) AND OBSOLESCENCE						
HWP categories (here: aggregates)	Markets*	Market share of HWP category	National estimated service life (ESL), years	National obsolescenc e factor (O)	Adjusted ESL of HWP category (=ESL*O* market share adjustment)	Half-life (=Adjusted ESL* ln(2))
Sawn wood	construction	60%	70	0.9	41.0	28.4
	furniture	10%	45	0.6		
	packaging	30%	6	0.3		
	paper	0%	-	-		
Wood-based panels	construction	50%	60	0.7	30.5	21.2
	furniture	45%	35	0.6		
	packaging	5%	6	0.3		
	paper	0%	-	-		
Paper and paperboard	construction	0%	-	-	1.5	1
	furniture	0%	-	-		
	packaging	50%	3	0.3		
	paper	50%	10	0.2		

* As the use of the HWP categories in different markets, such as the construction sector, consists of different end uses (e.g. wall systems, flooring, roof construction), countries are encouraged to allocate the contribution of the different end uses to the relevant HWP category or subcategory (e.g. non-coniferous sawnwood used for windows).

COUNTRY-SPECIFIC HALF-LIFE DATA TO BE USED FOR EXPORTED HWP UNDER A PRODUCTION APPROACH

In the case that emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP are estimated on the basis of the production approach (Section 12.4.2.1) and country specific half-life information should be used also for the exported HWP, it is *good practice* to use the half-life information from the importing country. For this purpose, it is necessary to quantify export activity data within the HWP categories and/or sub categories (cf. Section 12.5.1.1). Furthermore, in order to ensure that the country-specific half-life information from the importing country complies with the categories of the activity data for the exported HWP, it is *good practice* to only apply country-specific half-life information in case the same categories of activity data for the exported HWP both in the exporting and importing country are used. Otherwise the default values from Tier 1 are to be used (Section 12.5.2.2).

When transparent and verifiable activity data are available, the categories should be broad enough to capture significant volumes contributing to the pool.

In order to increase transparency, it is *good practice* to report emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP of domestically consumed and exported wood separately.

12.5.4 Tier 3 country-specific methods

12.5.4.1 FLUX DATA METHODS

In theory, also other decay functions could be used to apply a flux data method.

First Order Draft

However, it should be noted, that depending on the selected approach it is “more difficult to develop Tier 3 methods”, especially in the case a production approach is selected “which requires data on the lifecycle of exported HWP for countries where most of its products are exported.” (IPCC 2006)

ACTIVITY DATA USED IN COUNTRY-SPECIFIC FLUX DATA METHODS

In general, also activity data different from the HWP categories as suggested in Section 12.5.1.1 could be established and combined with suitable service life information.

This could include e.g. statistics on finished products. However, it should be noted that in many cases such information is provided only in units per piece which makes it difficult to convert such data to carbon amounts.

However, in order to ensure that the methodology used is at least as accurate as the one described in Sections 12.5.2 and 12.5.3, it is *good practice* to ensure that the proposed HWP categories cover the volumes as described by the HWP categories following the international classification system following the approach (i.e. system boundary) chosen by the country (cf. Section 12.3).

In the case that the country does provide data in FAOSTAT following the international classification system (see Section 12.5.1.1), it is *good practice* to explain the relation of the country-specific HWP categories to the FAOSTAT data to ensure that the data relates to the approach selected by the country.

In the case that the country-specific categories representing the carbon flux into the HWP carbon pool do not cover all the relevant HWP elements reflecting the material use of HWP in the selected approach (cf. Section 12.3 and 12.5.2.1), it is *good practice* to combine the country-specific flux data method with other suitable methodologies (cf. Section 12.5.4.3).

Furthermore, countries are encouraged to make the country-specific HWP categories broad enough to capture significant carbon volumes contributing to the HWP pool. As a guide, the volumes of these categories are deemed significant if they represent at least 5% of the total HWP volumes as described by the particular approach selected by the country.

EMISSION FACTORS USED IN COUNTRY-SPECIFIC FLUX DATA METHODS

In order to derive country-specific service- and half-life information to be used in combination with activity data used in country-specific flux data methods, it is *good practice* to ensure that the proposed parameters match with the HWP activity data applied under the selected Tier 3 method.

It is furthermore important to note that service- and half-life values representing the material use of wood can differ notably among and within countries depending on factors such as construction practices, culture, fashion, and climate. Thus, in case such country-specific information is used, a national quality control system is encouraged in order to provide transparent and verifiable data.

Potential sources that could be used to derive country-specific service-life values e.g. for combination with data on finished wood products are e.g. national surveys on the final market use of wood.

12.5.4.2 INVENTORY METHODS

HWP stock inventory methods use HWP carbon pool data for two or preferably more separate points in time to estimate changes in the pool. Its application is basically relevant for HWP pools in the reporting country alone (see Section 2.8.4.1) and could be used to estimate the annual change in carbon stock of some specific finished HWP pools (cf. Figure 2.8.3) such as buildings. The HWP pool of products in use in building structures is frequently a major part of the total HWP pool. The amount of HWP carbon can be estimated, for example, by multiplying the average HWP content per square meter of floor space times the total floor space for relevant building types that use wood taking into account when the buildings were constructed and changes in wood use per square meter over time. Annual change in carbon stock could be estimated by noting the change between inventories estimated at different points in time. Examples of such inventories are reported in Gjesdal et al., (1996) for Norway, in Pingoud et al., (2001) and Statistics Finland (2011) for Finland.

In the case of inventory methods, no procedure for adding up wood use data from historical data is needed to estimate the existing HWP stock or annual change in stock, which is an advantage compared to the flux methods (IPCC 2006).

Depending on the selected approach by the country and the availability of activity data other than described in Section 12.5.1.1., there might be the need combine inventory information with estimates derived by means of flux data methods (see Section 12.5.4.3).

Especially in the case that the estimates follow a ‘production’ approach (Section 12.3.1.2), the application of inventory methods does not allow the identification of the proportion of the HWP carbon stock originated from domestic forests and being thus accountable (see Section 12.5.2.1). It is also hardly possible to estimate the carbon stock in the exported share of domestically produced HWP by means of inventories. Following this approach furthermore requires excluding imported HWP from the estimated HWP pool, therefore increasing the uncertainties.

Since in practice inventory data are not available for all finished HWP for domestic and export markets covering the default HWP categories sawnwood, wood-based panels, paper and paperboard (e.g. wooden houses, furniture, newspaper), it is *good practice* to apply inventory methods only in combination with flux data methods.

In cases where a country applies inventory methods for specific HWP end uses (e.g. the housing sector), it is *good practice* to estimate emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP for the remaining fraction of the three HWP default commodities representing the material use of wood in combination with the flux-data method under Tier 2 or 3.

12.5.4.3 COMBINED HWP STOCK INVENTORY AND FLUX DATA METHODS

The application of this method is specifically relevant in the case that stock inventory information should be used in combination with the ‘production’ approach. For this purpose, the three semi-finished HWP categories being used in the housing sector need to be factored out from the flux-data calculation to avoid double-counting (see Section 12.5.1.1).

12.6 CLARIFICATION OF THE TREATMENT OF “WOOD IN SWDS” IN THIS GUIDANCE

Currently there are no new sources of information available to permit the updating of technical parameters for calculating the contribution of GHG emissions from HWP in SWDS. However, this section provides clarification of where the best available current guidance may be found for the reporting of emissions from HWP in SWDS.

Great care is needed when interpreting and using activity data derived from waste statistics on the one hand and national and international forest products statistics on HWP production and consumption on the other hand, which follow the international classification system for wood commodities. For example, significant quantities of HWP may be burnt for energy or recycled at end of life, whilst waste statistics relating to biomass generally include biomass from sources other than HWP (e.g. garden waste). As a consequence, generally wood production and consumption statistics cannot be used simply to estimate quantities of HWP in SWDS and it may be difficult to relate estimates of HWP in SWDS derived from waste statistics to estimates of HWP in use. Hence, there may be some inconsistency in results reported for emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP in the AFOLU sector and results reported for HWP in SWDS in the Waste sector.

12.6.1 Reporting of CO₂ emissions from HWP in SWDS

Currently (Decision 24/CP.19 Annex II), losses of HWP in use are assumed to result in CO₂ emissions to the atmosphere, with no explicit representation of the subsequent retention of disposed HWP in SWDS and eventual CO₂ emissions from this pool. Hence, CO₂ emissions from HWP in SWDS are included implicitly in the CO₂ emissions due to losses of carbon from the HWP pool in use as reported in the AFOLU sector. However, these emissions may also be reported separately as an “information item” under the AFOLU sector. The CO₂ emissions from HWP in SWDS may also be reported as a “memo item” under the Waste sector and as such are not included in the reported total emissions from the Waste sector. The facility to report these emissions as information/memo items is intended to assist with checks on consistency in estimation of emissions in the Waste and AFOLU sectors.

It should be noted that, if reporting CO₂ emissions from HWP in SWDS as an information item in the AFOLU sector, the results will only be consistent with results reported in the Waste sector (including for methane emissions) if calculated by applying a consistent approach (which, in this specific context, is the ‘stock-change’ approach). For the estimation of these emissions, the IPCC 2006 GL for HWP advise inventory compilers to apply either the Tier 1 method with default parameter values described in guidance for the Waste sector, or a Tier 2 method for the

First Order Draft

Waste sector, with country-specific parameter values. If the ‘stock-change’ approach is applied, the inflow to the Tier 1 or Tier 2 calculation consists of the calculated domestic consumption of HWP discarded to SWDS, whilst the outflow is calculated based on a first order decay function (see IPCC 2006 GL, Volume 5, Annex 3A.1). The Waste Sector guidelines explain how to use Waste Sector default data and parameters to estimate the amount of solid wood and paper carbon that accumulates in SWDS in the reporting country. When applying the Waste Sector Tier 1 method, estimates of carbon stock changes in SWDS are calculated by identifying the portion of carbon discarded to SWDS in the current year which is judged to have originated as harvested wood biomass.

12.6.2 Reporting of non-CO₂ (methane) emissions from HWP in SWDS

According to guidelines for the Waste sector (IPCC 2006 GL, Volume 5, Chapter 3, Section 3.1), methane emissions from HWP in SWDS are reported under the Waste sector in the country where the SWDS are situated, regardless of the national origin of the waste.

12.7 UNCERTAINTY ASSESSMENT

This section provides information on potential sources of uncertainty associated with the estimates of emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP. The uncertainties can be divided into uncertainties associated with the methods as well as parameter uncertainties.

METHOD UNCERTAINTIES

In the flux data method to be used under Tier 1 and Tier 2, the basic model uncertainties are related to the assumption of FOD (Equation 12.2). A model is always a simplification of real world inducing method based uncertainties. The reason for using decay models instead of just counting the inflow minus outflow from the HWP pools is that there are no extensive and reliable statistics on the real discard flows (unlike on the inflows of semi-finished products), but some knowledge on the service life of wood products. Although FOD decay is assumed to be a good proxy for the decay of semi-finished products, other types of distributions could also be used to describe the true decay process. However, the real world is even more complex. The service life and decay pattern of wood products are not just a technical issue, but are also related to socio-economic factors (see Section 12.5.3.2). For instance, the demand for wood products is likely to grow in economic booms resulting simultaneously in increasing replacement of old HWP with new ones. Thus, also discards of HWP correlate with their increasing consumption. This is not reflected in the FOD pattern, where the discard rate is a constant fraction of the HWP pools in use over time. As a result of FOD the annual change of carbon stock in HWP is steered too strongly by the instantaneous production rate of HWP of domestic origin.

In the Tier 1 method another uncertainty is associated with the initialisation of the FOD model. Due to lack of long historical data series on semi-finished HWP – for some countries data series are only available since the early 1990s – the initial stocks of the HWP categories (C (t₀)) are approximated by assuming that the stock change was zero at the initial time. This proxy might slightly overestimate the inherited emissions from the long-lived HWP categories sawnwood (with half-life of 35 years) and wood based panels in case their stock in reality was growing at initial time, particularly when the calculation in Equation 12.4 is started only from the early 1990s. This could thus potentially increase the uncertainties of emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP provided especially from products with high half-life values.

Another model uncertainty is related to the number of HWP categories in the model. In the simplest Tier 1 method there are three HWP sub-pools for the main categories: sawnwood, wood-based panels and paper and paperboard, each of which follows the FOD pattern but with different half-lives. The uncertainty could basically be lowered by introducing disaggregated sub-pools (e.g. for sawnwood) with differing half-lives based on their end-use (cf. Table 12.2) or based on subcategories (e.g. wood-based panels disaggregated to particle board, fibreboard etc., see Table 12.2).

In Tier 3, direct inventories of HWP in service (e.g. in the construction sector) could also be used to reduce the uncertainties associated with the flux data based method of Tier 2. The advantage of direct inventories is that they remove the need for idealised models with uncertain assumptions on decay pattern and whose verification and validation could be questioned. The inventory method could in principle provide more robust and less uncertain estimates for the carbon stock changes of the included HWP pools. Sequential direct inventories could also be applied in the calibration of the flux-data models and their half-life parameters (see Box 12.2) and thus reducing their uncertainties. However, the limitation of the method is that the statistics, if available, contains only some major pools such as the housing sector of the reporting country: but there is no information e.g. on the use of wood

for furniture or packaging. Inventory methods cannot be applied for HWP in export markets by the reporting country either. Thus, it must always be combined with flux data methods, inducing double-counting risks of semi-finished and final products. Furthermore, it is applicable only in those few countries from which relevant and sequential statistics are available.

UNCERTAINTIES OF ACTIVITY DATA

Uncertainties related to activity data on HWP from international databases (e.g. FAO) and associated uncertainties of the estimates of the level of emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP could arise due to:

- Lack of time series: some Annex I countries were founded in the early 1990s and thus older activity data might not be available (see above).
- Definitional uncertainties (i.e. data provided do not conform to what has been requested). Removals data e.g. tend in fact to be only commercial forestry operations or planned cuts, sawnwood production is being provided in nominal, not solid m³, and pulp is only market (commercially sold) pulp.
- The scope of data collection, as not all information is collected, particularly in the informal sector and from small operators. This tends to affect especially the sawmilling industries, as limits to collect statistical data might be linked to business volume or number of employees.
- Double counting (e.g. final products counted in semi-finished commodities, such as cut paper being added to paper in rolls).
- Reporting errors in providing correct data; that is numbers are put into the wrong category or incorrectly processed by reporter or collecting agency.
- Uncertainties associated with aggregate HWP commodities (e.g. wood-based panels): in general, the sum of the subcategories accords with the value for the aggregate commodities, but some categories may underreport because of missing subcategories (e.g. missing data on veneer sheets result in an underestimate for wood-based panels).

Concerning data on the feedstock of production of semi-finished HWP categories (i.e. industrial roundwood and wood pulp as proposed in Equations 12.7 and 12.8), uncertainty could be caused by unreported sources, by-product use or trade data.

The semi-finished HWP categories (i.e. sawnwood, wood-based panels and paper and paperboard) are also subject to the above-mentioned conditions. An overall estimate of these factors results in an estimated uncertainty of the reported values between -25% to +5% (based on the authors' expert judgement).

All of these sources of uncertainty together tend to result in an under-reporting of HWP commodity data in international databases, that is, actual figures are usually higher. This is particularly the case in the reported amounts of roundwood production (i.e. wood-removals, see Figure 12.5).

Further uncertainties associated with activity data are caused by conversion factors. Especially the provided conversion factors for sawnwood (cf. Table 12.2) reflect averages which may not correct for species and specific items.

In order to reduce uncertainties around conversion factors for carbon, countries may consider using country-specific activity data under Tier 2 where they can make use of commodity specific conversion factors linked e.g. to various wood species of the particular items (see Section 12.5.3.1).

Aside from reviewing the data to check if it fits with a general understanding of the forest products supply in a country, it is most useful for reducing the uncertainties relating to activity data to cross-check if the amount of domestic production of HWP categories balances with the available supply of wood. Other validation methods could include a review of trade unit values and determination of per capita apparent consumption.

UNCERTAINTIES ASSOCIATED WITH EMISSION FACTORS (SERVICE- AND HALF-LIFE ESTIMATES)

The half-life parameters are in general the most uncertain part of the Tier 1 and Tier 2 calculation method. The scientific evidence behind the default values given in Table 12.3 is not robust. Nor do they present a conservative estimate that would rather lead to underestimation than overestimation of the carbon stock changes in HWP. For decreasing uncertainty, countries are strongly encouraged to adjust the Tier 1 half-life parameters by calibrating the FOD model either a) with direct inventories of HWP in use (cf. Section 12.5.4), or b) with market information as shown in Table 12.4 (cf. Section 12.5.3.2). The application of stock inventory information, however, due to the lack of appropriate statistics is not practical for most countries. Furthermore, it does not cover export markets of the reporting country (i.e. relevant in the case a 'production' approach is applied). Whereas a study for Germany including a calibration of the provided default half-lives by means of market information (Rüter 2017) confirms

First Order Draft

the three values in relation to the countries' total product portfolio, two specific calibration studies (Pingoud, *et al.* 2001, Statistics Finland 2011) indicate that the true half-life of sawnwood and wood-based panels in Finland is likely to be much shorter than the default half-lives (Table 12.3). Thus, in this latter case the use of default half-lives would substantially overestimate the HWP pool in use.

Even though the uncertainty associated with Tier 1 estimates using default data could be high, working through such estimates can be the first step in identifying ways to improve them. Initial improvements can be made using country-specific data with country-specific half-lives instead of the default half-lives in Tier 2.

To decrease uncertainties in Tier 3 countries may consider using direct inventories of HWP in use, to develop more realistic decay patterns for HWP and use more sub-pools in case transparent information is available. However, the model calibration procedure to direct HWP inventories requires in practice a model with very few adjustable parameters.

12.8 QA/QC

This section suggests steps to improve estimates of emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP including checking and revising data for the Tier 1 method and improvements for Tier 2 estimates.

1. Check that country data in the FAO database¹⁰ agree with best available country sources of data on production and trade, or use detailed country-specific data in place of FAO data.
2. Check for country sources for densities, especially for sawnwood and HWP feedstock categories to improve the values in Tables 12.2 and 12.3.

12.9 COMPLETENESS

Tiers 1 and 2 methods, for estimating emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP of the HWP pool in use by means of the 'stock-change' approach (annual change in HWP carbon in products in use in the reporting country), include carbon additions in the form of all semi-finished wood and paper products that are consumed. By doing so, they include carbon in any finished wood products made in the country from those semi-finished products. If the country is a notable exporter or importer of finished wood products, such as furniture or wooden crafts, then methods may need to be adapted to adjust HWP consumption to exclude exports of finished products and/ or include imports of finished products.

Tiers 1 and 2 methods to estimate emissions and removals of CO₂ due to HWP of the HWP pool in use by means of the 'production' approach (annual change in HWP carbon in products in use from domestic harvest) are likely to include all carbon in semi-finished and finished products from domestic harvest (sawnwood, wood-based panels and paper and paperboard) unless some wood is used directly for finished products not included first in semi-finished product amounts reported in the HWP statistics (cf. Section 12.5.1.1). In such cases, the Tier 1 and 2 methods could underestimate the inflow of carbon to the HWP pool in use.

The methods provided in these guidelines do not include estimates of HWP carbon storage associated with CO₂ that is captured after biomass burning and held as part of a solid chemical or as a gas.

¹⁰ <http://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/FO> (2017/10/18)

References

- Brown, S., Lim, B. und Schlamadinger, B. (1998) Evaluating Approaches for Estimating Net Emissions of Carbon Dioxide from Forest Harvesting and Wood Products. IPCC/OECD/IEA Programme on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, 20 p.
- Cowie, A., Pingoud, K. und Schlamadinger, B. (2006) Stock changes or fluxes? Resolving terminological confusion in the debate on land-use change and forestry. *Climate Policy* 6: 161-179.
- FAO (2017). FAOSTAT-Forestry Database [online]. Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations. <http://www.fao.org/forestry/statistics/en/>
- Fengel, D. and Wegener, G. (1984). Wood – chemistry, ultrastructure, reactions. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 613 p.
- Gjesdal, S.F.T., Flugsrud, K., Mykkelbost, T.C., and Rypdal, K. (1996). A balance of use of wood products in Norway. Norwegian Pollution Control Authority SFT, Report 96:04, 54 p.
- Grönfors, J. (2010). Use of fillers in paper and paperboard grades. Tampere University of Applied Sciences, International Pulp and Paper Technology. Final Thesis, 36 p. http://publications.theseus.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/16226/Gronfors_Jarkko.pdf?sequence=1
- IPCC (2014) 2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol. In: Hiraishi T., Krug T., Tanabe K., Srivastava N., Baasansuren J., Fukuda M., Troxler T.G. (Eds) IPCC, Switzerland, 268 S.
- ISO (2008). Buildings and constructed assets – Service life planning – Part 8: Reference service life and service life estimation. ISO 15686-8:2008(E).
- ISO (2011). Buildings and constructed assets – Service life planning – Part 1: General Principles. ISO 15686-1:2011(E).
- Karjalainen, T., Kellomäki, S. und Pussinen, A. (1994) Role of wood-based products in absorbing atmospheric carbon. *Silva Fennica* 28(2): 67–80.
- Lim, B., Brown, S. und Schlamadinger, B. (1999) Carbon accounting for forest harvesting and wood products: review and evaluation of different approaches. *Environmental Science & Policy* 2(2): 207-216.
- Palma, V., Rüter, S. & Federici, S. (2016) Research Case 2: Trend in quantity and carbon pool of three major HWP commodities. In Background papers on forests for a low-carbon future. Rome, FAO (in press).
- Paulopuro, H. (Ed.) (2000). Papermaking Science and Technology, Book 18: Paper and Board Grades. TAPPI Press. Atlanta.
- Pingoud, K., Perälä, A.L. and Pussinen, A. (2001). Carbon dynamics in wood products. Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change 6(2): 91-111.
- Pingoud, K. and Wagner, F. (2006) Methane Emissions from Landfills and Carbon Dynamics of Harvested Wood Products: The First-Order Decay Revisited. *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change* 11(5): 961-978.
- Rüter, S. (2017) Der Beitrag der stofflichen Nutzung von Holz zum Klimaschutz – Das Modell WoodCarbonMonitor. Technische Universität München, Wissenschaftszentrum Weihenstephan für Ernährung, Landnutzung und Umwelt, Doctoral thesis, 270 p.
- Rüter, S. and Diederichs, S. (2012). Ökobilanz-Basisdaten für Bauprodukte aus Holz. Thünen-Institute of Wood Research, Report No: 2012/01, 316 p. http://literatur.thuenen.de/digbib_extern/dn050490.pdf
- Statistics Finland (2010). Greenhouse gas emissions in Finland 1990-2008: National Inventory Report under the UNFCCC and the Kyoto Protocol. 470 p. http://www.stat.fi/tup/khkinv/fin_nir_20100525.pdf
- UNFCCC (2003) Estimation, Reporting and Accounting of Harvested Wood Products. Technical Paper, FCCC/TP/2003/7.