

## Session SBI45 (2016)

Session starts: 01-08-2016 00:00:00 [GMT+1]

Session ends: 28-10-2016 23:59:59 [GMT+1]



Exported from Session final result section

Question by Japan at Wednesday, 31 August 2016

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

Type: Before 31 August

Title: Questions about process for estimating mitigation impacts of policies and measures

Could you tell us about the institutional arrangement (role of each stakeholder, preparation process) for estimating mitigation impacts of individual policies and measures? Are any adjustments made to estimated values for avoiding double counting of mitigation impacts between policies and measures? In addition, are there any official processes to approve the estimation results? How long does the estimation process take and how often the estimation is conducted?

Answer by Netherlands, Tuesday, 25 October 2016

There are two relevant processes in place in the Netherlands, one for ex-ante projections and one for ex-post assessments. The ex-ante projections process is conducted and coordinated by independent planning bureaus ECN (Energy research Centre of the Netherlands) and PBL (Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency). These projections are basically made when significant changes are being made in policies, e.g. as a result of governmental changes. Since 2013 for energy policies this process is done each year, in order to be able to annually assess and update expected progress towards achieving targets of UN, EU and national policy. The ex-ante projection process consists basically of following steps: identifying with ministries the status of the policies to be included in the scenarios under study and, for these policies, the relevant quantitative indicators. Together with the actual developments in economy and society (contextual indicators) the planning agencies subsequently use this information in their estimations of developments in relevant input parameters in their evaluation and projection modelling tools. The projections may distinguish only to a limited extent between the expected effects of individual policies, since many PAMs interact. For packages of strongly interacting PAMs the effects are assessed in conjunction, thus also avoiding double counting between PAM's.

Ex-post evaluations are conducted in a different way. There is a general agreement between government and parliament that the more significant PAMs (in terms of e.g. budget) have to be evaluated once about every five years. These evaluations are usually implemented by consultancy agencies at the request of the involved ministries. They assess the contribution of the PAM; also here in various cases, the consultancy agencies conclude that it is not practically possible to single out each and every effect of every PAM from an interacting package. E.g. for industry there is a strong interaction between covenants and fiscal support measures. The effects of these together are then used, also to avoid double counting. The results of the evaluations studies, together with results of monitoring reports that are annually made for most PAMs, are inputs in the reporting on PAMs and assessments of total realized progress.

The realized progress/reductions in general are also assessed by the planning agencies (ECN/PBL) using their models and as inputs the results from aforementioned evaluation studies of PAMs. With the modelling techniques, total measured energy data and greenhouse gas emission data per sector are peeled down by ECN/PBL models into volume effects (reflecting economic developments), structural effects (reflecting shifts

in/between economic sectors) and reductions/savings. Within the latter subsequently the experts of ECN/PBL when needed assess the autonomous versus the additional policy induced reductions. Further break down into PAMs or packages of PAMs is done where and when needed and possible.

---

**Question by** Japan at Wednesday, 31 August 2016

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

**Type:** Before 31 August

**Title:** Stakeholder coordination for projections

For preparation of projections, are the coordination with stakeholders (business communities, relevant ministries and NGO) carried out? If so, could you tell us the contents of the coordination?

**Answer by** Netherlands, Tuesday, 25 October 2016

Before every new projection the status of each PAM as well as the significant developments in indicators in the relevant context are assessed. These are inputs to the projection model and the used input parameters. This process is coordinated by the planning agencies ECN (Energy research Centre of the Netherlands) and PBL (Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency) and implemented with the relevant ministries and, for PAMs where other stakeholders are involved (e.g. covenants), also with the other involved stakeholders. The relevant context indicators are identified by ECN/PBL in consultation with other bureaus, e.g. Statistics Netherlands (CBS), economic planning agencies etc.

---

**Question by** Brazil at Wednesday, 31 August 2016

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

**Type:** Before 31 August

**Title:** Emissions projections

Regarding table 6(a) and 6(b), the GHG emissions projected for 2020 with LULUCF are much lower than those projections without LULUCF. Could the Netherlands please explain the significant difference between the projections without LULUCF and with LULUCF?

Answer by Netherlands, Tuesday, 25 October 2016

In table 6(a) and 6(b) we used the notation key NE for LULUCF in projected GHG emissions 2020 and 2030. The reason for this notation key is that the projections reported are those as incorporated in the National Energy Outlook 2015, and these projections do not include the LULUCF sector.

In the BR on page 63 we present the information on projected emissions and removals for afforestation and reforestation, deforestation and forest management by 2020.

The table that was uploaded into the BR CTF system (table 6) did NOT contain lines with total GHG emissions including and excluding LULUCF. These lines were calculated by the CTF system itself. Because of missing LULUCF projection, the lines including LULUCF should have been filled with the Notation Key NE (Not Estimated) for 2020 and 2030 instead of the (wrong) numbers presented.

We noted the ERT recommendation "that the Netherlands improve the completeness of its reporting by including the projections for the LULUCF sector in its next BR submission".

---

Question by Brazil at Wednesday, 31 August 2016

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

Type: Before 31 August

Title: CTF Table 3

Regarding mitigation actions referred to in "CTF Table 3 Progress in achievement of the quantified economy-wide emission reduction target: information on mitigation actions and their effects", are there any current estimates of mitigation impacts since the respective years of implementation?

Answer by Netherlands, Tuesday, 25 October 2016

For the major part of PAMs (the energy related PAMs) annually realized and projected progress are re-assessed and reported in the National Energy Outlook. These reports may be found on the internet, see e.g. <https://www.ecn.nl/publicaties/O/2015/ECN-O--15-040>. In addition, periodically studies are made available on evaluations of PAMs. The Netherlands will try to mention the most recent relevant reports in the next BR and NC.

---

Question by Brazil at Wednesday, 31 August 2016

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

Type: Before 31 August

Title: BR1-BR2 differences

In regards to table 3, and considering mitigation actions with similar names, the starting year of implementation as well as the estimate of mitigation impact (not cumulative, in ktCO<sub>2</sub> eq) have changed in BR2 in comparison to BR1. Please explain the referred changes.

Answer by Netherlands, Tuesday, 25 October 2016

The reason that similar or same PAMs have been given different names is partially due to the fact that these are reported by different organisations in different reports with slightly different names. Usually there are 'official' Dutch names for the PAMs, but no 'official' English translations, leading to differences in 'translation'. This unfortunately also has led to changes in names in the subsequent BRs'. This may indeed cause confusion and will be improved to the extent possible in future reporting.

A second problem herein is that PAMs are often continued over a period of many years, but with changes in scope or content. The Energy Agreement for instance has included a series of small and medium changes in various instruments. The PAMs have not changed name however. Also these changes lead to differences in emission reductions. For the BR2 a re-assessment has been made together with the planning agency ECN of the data in table 3, using the most recent insights of ECN on the consequences of the actual implementation of the actions of the Energy Agreement and the changes they bring about in estimates on effects of individual other (packages of) PAMs.

PAMs are intended to last for a series of years, but actual budgets and implementing provisions may be adapted from year to year based on experiences in the previous period. This also leads to differences in used 'starting year' in different reports (e.g. covenants with industry are regularly updated)

In the official projections all these changes are tackled, since each projection starts with a re-assessment of the likely influences and effects of the PAM as is at that moment. This also applies for evaluations ex-post.

In the BR reports this leads to differences in reporting. The Netherlands aims to improve on consistency in names and packages and where changes as indicated above cannot be avoided, improve transparency in future reporting on these changes.

---

[Question by Brazil](#) at Wednesday, 31 August 2016

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

[Type:](#) Before 31 August

[Title:](#) BR1-BR2 differences

The actions reported in Table 3 are considerably different, considering a comparative analysis between BR1 and BR2.

Are the mitigation actions reported in BR2 CTF new ones? What are the differences between actions reported in BR1 and BR2? Were the actions reported in BR1 revised and renamed in BR2?

Finally, considering the questions have been made above, how can the BR1 CTF report be compared with BR2 CTF report on the differences noted?

[Answer by Netherlands](#), Tuesday, 25 October 2016

The overall projections and reported realized progress per sector and per gas are leading and may be easily compared between the BR's. The effects of packages of PAMs have been updated in the BR2 reflecting changes within PAMs (e.g. intensification etc.) and to some extent some alterations in composition of the packages, needed to better adapt to the analyses methods of ECN. This may lead to some re-allocations between packages of PAMs. The BR2 was the first report using the assessments based on the annual Energy Outlook process that was started in the Netherlands in 2013. We expect that this process will continue coming years and that upcoming BR's will not need as many changes. The Netherlands also aims to improve on consistency in names and packages and where changes as indicated above cannot be avoided, improve transparency in future reporting on these changes.

---

[Question by New Zealand](#) at Wednesday, 31 August 2016

[Category:](#) Assumptions, conditions and methodologies related to the attainment of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

[Type:](#) Before 31 August

[Title:](#) LULUCF projections

Have the Netherlands undertaken projections of emission and removals from the LULUCF sector since the publication of its BR2? If so, what are they for 2020 and 2030?

[Answer by Netherlands](#), Tuesday, 25 October 2016

No projections were undertaken for LULUCF since BR2.

The projections reported are those as incorporated in the National Energy Outlook 2015, and these projections do not include the LULUCF sector. The projections of the National Energy Outlook 2016 also do not contain projections for the LULUCF sector.

In the BR2 on page 63 we present the information on projected emissions and removals for afforestation and reforestation, deforestation and forest management by 2020.

---

[Question by China](#) at Monday, 29 August 2016

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

**Type:** Before 31 August

**Title:** enhanced ambition

Is there any follow-up on the Dutch court ruling, requesting the government to reduce national greenhouse gas emissions by 25% in 2020 compared to 1990 emissions? If this target were adopted, does Netherlands intend to use international credits for compliance purposes?

[Answer by Netherlands](#), Tuesday, 25 October 2016

Following the ruling of the court of the Hague in the climate case, the Dutch government has filed an appeal indicating in detail which elements of the ruling it contests. The court of justice will hear the case in due course, once Urgenda has submitted its response to the appeal. In the meantime, the Dutch government has declared it is intending to comply with the court ruling. While the ruling obligates the State to reduce its emissions domestically, international credits will not be used to comply with the verdict.

---

[Question by China](#) at Monday, 29 August 2016

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

**Type:** Before 31 August

**Title:** CCS

According to the BR2, large-scale CCS demonstration project ROAD has been implemented since 2010 and Netherlands will produce a long-term strategy regarding the role of CCS in the transition to an entirely sustainable energy system. Does the energy sector model consider the role of CCS technology in its projection? If so, what is the expected mitigation impact?

**Answer by** Netherlands, Tuesday, 25 October 2016

The ROAD project is ongoing, but not operational yet. Expectations are that FID will be taken early 2017 and that the project will capture and store 1 Mton CO<sub>2</sub> per year by 2020. The long-term strategy regarding the role of CCS is published January 2016 as part of the Energy report

<https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten/rapporten/2016/01/18/energie-rapport-transitie-naar-duurzaam>. This report defines potential ranges of contributions of the various technologies in 2050, and CCS will have a relevant share. Besides the subsidy for the ROAD project and support for R&D, there is no specific support for CCS – ETS should be stimulating CCS, but the price level is insufficient to achieve this at this moment. In autumn 2016, the Energy report will be followed by an Energy agenda, that will be more specific on expected Dutch policies.

The energy sector model does not yet include any contribution of CCS for the year 2020, as reported in the National Energy Outlook 2015

---

**Question by** China at Monday, 29 August 2016

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

**Type:** Before 31 August

**Title:** metrics

The EU allocates AEAs for its member states using GWP values from IPCC AR4 for non-CO<sub>2</sub> gases, while the decomposed sectoral goals by 2020 under ESD set by Dutch government in 2011 were using GWPs from SAR. Does Netherlands plan to synchronize these metrics? What decomposition criteria or approach did Netherlands apply to set sectoral goals?

**Answer by** Netherlands, Tuesday, 25 October 2016

The sectoral goals were decided on in 2011 when the SAR was in use. Most of the sectoral goals for 2020 as presented in Table 3.3 of the BR2 are on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions (74 Mton CO<sub>2</sub>) and these are not influenced by the change of GWPs values. We do not plan to synchronize the metrics on the non-CO<sub>2</sub> GHG in the agricultural and other sectors (24,8 Mton CO<sub>2</sub>eq) as this would need a new decision making process. As reported in the BR2, the Dutch emissions reduction target of 16% and the resulting cap on Annual Emission Allocations are leading for the Dutch contribution to the EU target for 2020 under the Convention

When these sectoral goals were decided on in 2011 (Kabinetsaanpak Klimaatbeleid op weg naar 2020), the planning bureau PBL (Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency) projected the emissions in the non-ETS sector, taken into consideration the policies in place and the new planned policies by the Cabinet. The overview of the policies and measure by sector that was used by PBL was used to set the sectoral goals.

---

**Session SBI45 (2016)**  
Session closes at 28-10-2016  
UNFCCC - LAST PAGE OF EXPORT