

Outcome of the discussion group on PaMs, Projections and KP elements

3rd BRs and NCs lead reviewers meeting

3-4 March, 2016



Co-facilitators: Brian mantlana and Dylan Muggeridge

Bonn, 4 March 2016

The approaches supported by the LRs as they are in the RPG

- SEVEN issues in the RPG
- Proposed approached for FIVE issues supported by LRs
 - a) Review of reporting on CTF table 3 – estimates of effects of individual PaMs
 - b) Review of reporting on how Parties believe their PaMs are modifying longer term emission trends
 - c) Review of complementarity relating to KP mechanisms
 - d) Review of PaMs in accordance with Article 2 of the KP on steps taken to implement the decisions of ICAO and IMO
 - e) Review of domestic and regional programmes and/or legislative arrangements and enforcement and administrative procedures



ISSUE:

How to review GHG emission projections of EU member States? Are GHG emissions covered by the EU ETS and the Effort Sharing Decision (ESD) to be reported separately?

CONCERNS

- Consideration of progress in meeting renewable energy target by the ERT should be cautioned due to the difference in national circumstances

PROPOSAL

- Adjust the approach slightly by removing the consideration of progress in meeting renewable energy target by the ERT during the assessment



The issue that need further consideration by the LRs

ISSUE:

GHG emissions trend (historical) – which data to use in the TRR/ IDR? (e.g. for BR2, 2015 submission or 2016 submission)

CONCERNS

- Inconsistency if 2016 submission is used
 - ✓ inconsistency between data used in BR2 and TRR;
 - ✓ inconsistency between Parties;
 - ✓ recalculation issues due to inventory reviews
- Timing issue/ sequencing of reviews, i.e. March vs May/ June

PROPOSAL

- Use the latest information available, without specifying which submissions in the RPG?
- Is the current footnote in the TRR/IDR (that clarifies the use of the latest inventory submission has not been reviewed) sufficient to address the concern?

