

## Session SBI42 (2015)

Session started at 01-03-2015 00:00:00 [GMT+1]

Session closed at 31-3-2015 23:59:59 [GMT+1]



A compilation of questions to - Australia  
*Exported 1 April 2015 by the*  
*UNITED NATIONS FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE*

[Question by](#) United States of America at Tuesday, 31 March 2015

[Category:](#) Progress towards the achievement of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

[Type:](#) Before 31 of March

[Title:](#) Limits on International Units

The Biennial Report states that under Australia's emissions trading scheme there are quantitative and qualitative limits on the use of international units. In the absence of this emissions trading scheme, are there other limits?

[Answer by](#) Australia

Not answered

---

[Question by](#) United States of America at Tuesday, 31 March 2015

[Category:](#) Progress towards the achievement of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

[Type:](#) Before 31 of March

[Title:](#) Emissions Reduction Fund

Will the Emissions Reduction Fund constitute the primary measure implemented to replace the ETS, or are other significant Policies and Measures being contemplated?

[Answer by](#) Australia

Not answered

---

[Question by](#) Saudi Arabia at Tuesday, 31 March 2015

[Category:](#) Progress towards the achievement of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

[Type:](#) Before 31 of March

[Title:](#) The assessment of the economic and social consequences of response measures

Q1: Did Australia encounter difficulty in reporting on its assessment of the economic and social consequences of response measures in the BR, especially that it was able to provide information on its National Communication? Will Australia be providing information in the next BR?

Q2: Could Australia provide details on its initiative to support sustainable development and how can that help developing countries adapt to the social and economic consequences of response measures (reported in the National Communication, but not on the BR)?

[Answer by](#) Australia

Not answered

---

**Question by** United States of America at Tuesday, 31 March 2015

**Category:** Progress towards the achievement of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 31 of March

**Title:** Surplus AAUs

The Technical Review of the Biennial Report stated that Australia has not decided how to use the carry-over of surplus assigned amount units (estimated to be 130,800 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq) from the first commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol. Has there been a decision on this question?

**Answer by** Australia  
Not answered

---

**Question by** United States of America at Tuesday, 31 March 2015

**Category:** Progress towards the achievement of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 31 of March

**Title:** Market Mechanisms

The Biennial Report states that Australia's targets represent net emissions and include credible Kyoto-compliant units from emission reduction activities overseas as to be reflected in the Australian National Registry of Emissions Units. Could Australia clarify current expectations regarding the use of market mechanisms for achieving its 2020 target?

**Answer by** Australia  
Not answered

---

**Question by** Brazil at Tuesday, 31 March 2015

**Category:** Progress towards the achievement of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 31 of March

**Title:** Mitigation actions

In "CTF Table 3 Progress in achievement of the quantified economy-wide emission reduction target: information on mitigation actions and their effects" are listed only 6 mitigation actions. These may be too few considering the needs of GHG emissions reduction. Are there additional actions to be presented?

**Answer by** Australia  
Not answered

---

**Question by** Brazil at Tuesday, 31 March 2015

**Category:** Progress towards the achievement of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 31 of March

**Title:** Level of ambition 2

Considering the low level of ambition presented until now, as well as the historical data, does Australia intend to change its unconditional target in order to increase its level of ambition?

**Answer by** Australia  
Not answered

---

**Question by** Brazil at Tuesday, 31 March 2015

**Category:** Progress towards the achievement of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 31 of March

**Title:** Use of market based mechanisms

In “CTF Table 3 Progress in achievement of the quantified economy-wide emission reduction target: information on mitigation actions and their effects” are listed some activities related to Emissions Trading Scheme from 2015-16 as well as to a credit scheme that allows farmers and landholders who take steps to reduce carbon pollution to generate carbon credits. Credits can be traded into the emissions trading scheme. In addition, Table 2 (e) informs possible scale of contributions from CERS, ERUs, AAUs, carry-over unities and other mechanism units under the Convention. But, at the same time, CTF Table 4 does not include quantity of units from market based mechanisms under the Convention nor quantity of units from other market based mechanisms. Please consider the contradiction between the information.

**Answer by** Australia  
Not answered

---

**Question by** United States of America at Tuesday, 31 March 2015

**Category:** Progress towards the achievement of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 31 of March

**Title:** Voluntary Cancellations

Does Australia plan to follow the Expert Review Team recommendation to report on the emission reductions achieved through the National Carbon Offset Standard Carbon Neutral Program in its next BR submission, and on the cancelation of Kyoto

Protocol units where Australian carbon credit units, generated by the Carbon Farming Initiative (CFI) or ERF projects, are voluntarily cancelled by participants in the National Carbon Offset Standard Carbon Neutral Program?

[Answer by Australia](#)  
Not answered

---

[Question by Brazil](#) at Tuesday, 31 March 2015

**Category:** Progress towards the achievement of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 31 of March

**Title:** Level of ambition

“In May 2013, Australia also announced its decision to further broaden coverage of the land sector to include net emissions from cropland management, grazing land management and revegetation activities within its second commitment period target. These changes will be incorporated in the 2013 Australia’s Emissions projections expected to be released in late 2013”. This kind of action seems to make the level of ambition lower, not higher. How will this contribute to meeting Australia's target?

[Answer by Australia](#)  
Not answered

---

[Question by Brazil](#) at Tuesday, 31 March 2015

**Category:** Progress towards the achievement of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 31 of March

**Title:** Ambition towards 5% reduction target

Australia’s total greenhouse gas emissions (excluding the LULUCF sector) increased by 32 per cent between 1990 and 2011. When the LULUCF sector emissions and removals are included, Australia’s net greenhouse gas emissions in 2011 decreased by 2 per cent compared with 1990 levels. The Australian Government has committed to a quantified economy-wide emission reduction target of 5 per cent on 2000 levels by 2020. But based in Table 6 (a) (Information on updated greenhouse gas projections Under a ‘With Measures’ Scenario), the GHG emission increase from 529 644 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq in the base year to 613 535 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq in 2020. Please, explain this difference. How Australia is planning to achieve the referred target of 5% (Additional policies and measures, KP mechanisms or account for other LULUCF activities not included up to now)?

[Answer by Australia](#)  
Not answered

---

**Question by** Brazil at Tuesday, 31 March 2015

**Category:** Progress towards the achievement of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 31 of March

**Title:** Discrepancy in information

Page 5-47 contains the following information: "Australia's Emissions Projections 2012 shows that the emissions trading scheme, the CFI and Australia's existing suite of policy measures including the Renewable Energy Target and energy efficiency measures are projected to limit Australia's net emissions to 537 Mt CO<sub>2</sub>-e in 2020, consistent with Australia's unconditional commitment to reduce emissions by 5 per cent below 2000 levels in 2020". But based in Table 6 (a) ("Information on updated greenhouse gas projections Under a 'With Measures' Scenario"), the GHG emission increase from 529 644 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq in the base year to 613 535 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq in 2020. Please, explain this different information.

**Answer by** Australia

Not answered

---

**Question by** New Zealand at Monday, 30 March 2015

**Category:** Progress towards the achievement of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 31 of March

**Title:** Policies and measures in relation to 2020 target

What has been the impact of recent changes in Australia's policies and measures with respect to meeting its 2020 target?

**Answer by** Australia

Not answered

---

**Question by** New Zealand at Monday, 30 March 2015

**Category:** Assumptions, conditions and methodologies related to the attainment of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 31 of March

**Title:** LULUCF projections

Since preparing the projections presented in the BR, Australia has elected to broaden its coverage of the land sector by including cropland management, grazing land management and revegetation activities. What impact will these changes make to Australia's emissions projections for LULUCF, on a Kyoto Protocol accounting basis, in relation to its 2020 target?

**Answer by** Australia  
Not answered

---

**Question by** China at Monday, 30 March 2015

**Category:** Progress towards the achievement of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 31 of March

**Title:** drivers of emission increase

The emission level increased by 31% in 2012, compared to that in 1990, excluding the LULUCF sector. Please provide further information regarding the major contributing sectors and corresponding regulation measures.

**Answer by** Australia  
Not answered

---

**Question by** China at Monday, 30 March 2015

**Category:** Progress towards the achievement of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 31 of March

**Title:** Market mechanism

If Australia intends to use international credits to achieve the target, please provide further information on its plan to use market based mechanisms and carry-overs.

**Answer by** Australia  
Not answered

---

**Question by** China at Monday, 30 March 2015

**Category:** Progress towards the achievement of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 31 of March

**Title:** LULUCF sector

The LULUCF sector accounts for a large share in the base year emissions, while emission reduction from LULUCF has been significant over the years. Considering the huge uncertainty in the accounting of LULUCF emissions, as well as that a project-based methodology was applied, how can Australia guarantee its LULUCF data comparability with other sources and countries?

**Answer by** Australia  
Not answered

---

**Question by** China at Monday, 30 March 2015

**Category:** Progress towards the achievement of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 31 of March

**Title:** Agriculture

The CTF Table 3 only covers mitigation actions that are quantifiable and have already been implemented by the time this BR was compiled. What about PaMs that are adopted or planned and not quantifiable?

**Answer by** Australia  
Not answered

---

**Question by** China at Monday, 30 March 2015

**Category:** Progress towards the achievement of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 31 of March

**Title:** adopted or planned PaMs

The CTF Table 3 only covers mitigation actions that are quantifiable and have already been implemented by the time this BR was compiled. What about PaMs that are adopted or planned and not quantifiable?

**Answer by** Australia  
Not answered



---

**Question by** China at Monday, 30 March 2015

**Category:** Progress towards the achievement of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 31 of March

**Title:** Clean Energy Future Plan

Clean Energy Future Plan set out a number of PaMs to achieve the 5% emission reduction target in 2020. However, ETS and CFI, as two core elements of this plan, have been replaced by the Emission Reduction Fund (ERF). What is the expected mitigation potential of this fund? Will it be enough to compensate for what was included in ETS and CFI?

**Answer by** Australia  
Not answered

---

**Question by** China at Monday, 30 March 2015

**Category:** Progress towards the achievement of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 31 of March

**Title:** progress towards the achievement of its QEWERT

In the WM scenario, the GHG emissions (incl. LULUCF) of Australia will reach 613 536ktCO<sub>2</sub>. This equals to an increase of 10.3% and is far beyond the target of 5% reduction. How would Australia achieve its QEWERT?

**Answer by** Australia  
Not answered

---

**Question by** China at Monday, 30 March 2015

**Category:** Assumptions, conditions and methodologies related to the attainment of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 31 of March

**Title:** ambition level

The emission reduction level of -5%, -15% and -25% based on 2000 correspond to +0.9%, -9.7% and 20% (incl. LULUCF) OR +12.2%, +0.3% and -11%(excl. LULUCF), which is different from 4%, 14% and 24% provided in table 2(a). Please double check the accuracy of this information or provide detailed explanation on this figure.

**Answer by** Australia  
Not answered

---

**Question by** China at Monday, 30 March 2015

**Category:** Assumptions, conditions and methodologies related to the attainment of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 31 of March

**Title:** market mechanisms

There is no clear evidence in the CTF regarding the use of market-based mechanisms. While figure 1 in BR clearly indicates that 5% at most of the 25% conditional target will come from the purchase of international units. Meanwhile, according to the CTF table 2(e) I, the amount of units equivalent to 100 Mt CO<sub>2</sub> will be used without specific requirements or restrictions. Please provide further information on this regard. In addition, 100 Mt CO<sub>2</sub> accounts for 18% of the total emission in 2000, far above 5%, is it possible to provide a more detailed plan regarding the use of proposed units?

**Answer by** Australia

Not answered

---

**Question by** China at Monday, 30 March 2015

**Category:** Assumptions, conditions and methodologies related to the attainment of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 31 of March

**Title:** conditional target

Australia proposed a conditional target of 15% or 25% based on the level of international action. Please define the term “international action” specifically.

**Answer by** Australia

Not answered

---

**Question by** China at Monday, 30 March 2015

**Category:** Assumptions, conditions and methodologies related to the attainment of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 31 of March

**Title:** Base year

1990 is an internationally common choice for base year of 2020 targets, but Australia choose 2000 instead. Australia further indicated that the 15% and 25% conditional targets are based on the level of international action, especially from advanced economies. The 15% or 25% emission reduction targets compared to the level of 2000 can be translated to a respective reduction by -9.7% or - 20%(incl. LULUCF) compared to the level of 1990, or a +0.3% emission control target or a reduction

target of -11% (incl. LULUCF) compared to the level of 1990. This ambition level is far below the requirement that Australia set out for advanced economies. Please clarify the fairness of such requirements.

[Answer by Australia](#)  
Not answered

---

[Question by China](#) at Monday, 30 March 2015

[Category:](#) All emissions and removals related to its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

[Type:](#) Before 31 of March

[Title:](#) LULUCF sector

In ARR2014, the ERT identified issues which suggest that tier 1 QC procedures are not always appropriately implemented, especially in the LULUCF sector. In particular, the ERT identified the following: inconsistencies between the NIR and CRF summary table 3 (e.g. N<sub>2</sub>O emission from agricultural soils and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from forest land), inconsistencies in AD between the CRF tables and the NIR (e.g. cropland remaining cropland and grassland remaining grassland), use of incorrect notation keys (e.g. Australia reports “NA” for HFC production after 1995, whereas the Party indicates that emissions from production did not occur after 1995, and reports “NO” for wetlands, settlements and other land converted to grasslands when the correct notation key should be “IE”), please clarify.

[Answer by Australia](#)  
Not answered

---

[Question by China](#) at Monday, 30 March 2015

[Category:](#) All emissions and removals related to its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

[Type:](#) Before 31 of March

[Title:](#) NF3

NF3 is included in the 2020 target, but no information on the historical emissions of NF3 is reported in the current version of inventory. How can Australia calculate the base year of NF3 emissions?

[Answer by Australia](#)  
Not answered

---

**Question by** China at Monday, 30 March 2015

**Category:** All emissions and removals related to its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 31 of March

**Title:** recalculations

In ARR2013, the ERT pointed out that Australia did not transparently describe the recalculations performed in the industrial processing sector. Further clarifications regarding this issue is needed.

**Answer by** Australia  
Not answered

---

**Question by** Switzerland at Monday, 30 March 2015

**Category:** Progress towards the achievement of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 31 of March

**Title:** Measures with a view to longer term emission reductions

What additional PaMs are taken into consideration by the Party in light of longer term requirements to substantially lower per capita GHG emissions as recommended by science and thus contribute to the collective achievement of the 2 degree warming limit?

**Answer by** Australia  
Not answered

---

**Question by** Switzerland at Monday, 30 March 2015

**Category:** Progress towards the achievement of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 31 of March

**Title:** Use of renewable energy sources

To what extent are renewable energy sources (RES) being used by the Party at present and how is the potential for replacing conventional fuels for power generation by RES estimated for 2020 and beyond? What share of RES in total national power generation is expected to be achievable by 2020 and 2030, respectively?

**Answer by** Australia  
Not answered

---

**Question by** European Union at Monday, 30 March 2015

**Category:** Progress towards the achievement of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 31 of March

**Title:** LULUCF contribution

"Australia's abatement task and 2013 emissions projections" document is referred in Australia's BR1 technical review report as the source of updated projections used for the review (<http://www.environment.gov.au/climate-change/publications/australias-abatementtask-and-2013-emissions-projections>). In that document, Australia announced the election of three additional LULUCF activities under the Kyoto Protocol. Further, Australia anticipates that harvesting rates in natural forest is declining so resulting in a net sink to be accounted under forest management. Could Australia provide update information on progress in achieving the quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets taking into consideration the contribution of additional elected LULUCF activities under KP, the current trend in forest harvesting and, if any technical correction to the FMRL, its impact on accounted quantities?

**Answer by** Australia  
Not answered

---

**Question by** European Union at Monday, 30 March 2015

**Category:** Progress towards the achievement of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 31 of March

**Title:** Projections

During the review, Australia provided updated information on projections under a 2013 scenario, which did not include the mitigation effect of the new measures under the Direct Action Plan, and announced that updated projections would be released. Could Australia provide such updated information regarding its projections to 2020, including assumptions, conditions and methodologies used? Could Australia provide information regarding the estimated abatement for the period 2013-2020 of the policies under the DAP and how this differs from the estimates reported in its BR1?

**Answer by** Australia  
Not answered

---

**Question by** European Union at Monday, 30 March 2015

**Category:** Progress towards the achievement of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 31 of March

**Title:** Mitigation effects of the Emissions Reduction Fund

During the review, Australia informed the ERT that the ETS, which was reported in its NC6/BR1 as the primary means by which Australia will meet its targets, has been repealed. An Emissions Reduction Fund (ERF) is now the centrepiece of the Australian Government's policy suite to reduce emissions. Could Australia provide information on the anticipated mitigation effects of the ERF for the years 2013–2020 including the mitigation potential and costs for each economic sector participating in the ERF?

Could Australia provide information on the anticipated mitigation potential of the ERF to meet the two conditional more ambitious emission reduction targets?

**Answer by** Australia

Not answered

---

**Question by** European Union at Wednesday, 25 March 2015

**Category:** Assumptions, conditions and methodologies related to the attainment of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 31 of March

**Title:** Use of market mechanisms

Does Australia intend to use market mechanisms to achieve the targets? If yes, to which extent and what is the associated effect on the emission level projections for the period up to 2020? Is use of international credits foreseen and if so, to what extent?

**Answer by** Australia

Not answered

---

**Question by** European Union at Wednesday, 25 March 2015

**Category:** Assumptions, conditions and methodologies related to the attainment of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 31 of March

**Title:** Estimation of LULUCF emissions and removals

How does Australia estimate its LULUCF emissions and removals in its emission levels' projections over the period? What are the methodological approaches used and how do they impact on the assessment of the progress to the QEWERT?

**Answer by** Australia

Not answered

---

**Question by** European Union at Wednesday, 11 March 2015

**Category:** Progress towards the achievement of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 31 of March

**Title:** Decoupling of economic growth from GHG emissions

To what extent is economic growth decoupled from GHG emissions?

What have been the main effects of the existing policies and measures on the emission trends?

What have been the main deviations from expected results and what in your view has caused this?

**Answer by** Australia

Not answered

---