

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 - Canada
Exported 1 April 2015 by the
UNITED NATIONS FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE

[Question by China](#) at Wednesday, 01 April 2015

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

Type: Before 31 of March

Title: mitigation effects of PaMs

What are the mitigation effects of additional PaMs? Since they were not assessed in the report, it is strongly recommended that the next BR should include detailed and clear description on this issue.

[Answer by Canada](#)

Not answered

[Question by Brazil](#) at Wednesday, 01 April 2015

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

Type: Before 31 of March

Title: Mitigation actions

Regarding Table 3, does Canada plans to estimate the impact of mitigation actions that have not being estimated (NE)? If not, what are the main reasons? If possible, give the explanation by mitigation action or by cluster/sector.

[Answer by Canada](#)

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

Did Canada encounter difficulty in reporting on its assessment of the economic and Social consequences of response measures in the BR and the National Communication? Will Canada be providing information on this assessment in the next BR?

[Answer by Canada](#)

Not answered

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

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

[Type](#): Before 31 of March

[Title](#): Oil sands extraction

The majority of emissions from Canada's oil and gas sector stem from oil sands extraction. While a large number of policy measures have been implemented in other sectors of the economy, but the focus on oil sands extraction is low. Projected emissions for 2030 assume that no further government policies are introduced and also assume constant emission intensities of oil sands extraction. As a result, crude oil production from oil sands is expected to double until 2030, resulting in significantly emission increases from oil sands extraction.

Question: Could Canada please elaborate on envisaged policies for reducing emissions from oil sands extraction?

[Answer by Canada](#)

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

Since 2005, total Canadian GHG emissions have decreased by 35.7 Mt (4.8%), but if the emissions related to 2011 are compared to the emissions in 1990, they have increased by 33%. Emission reduction target is 17% below 2005 by 2020. If the target is compared to 1990, there will be an emissions increase of 25%. Considering the low level of ambition presented until now, does Canada intend to change the target in order to increase the level of ambition?

[Answer by Canada](#)

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: Emission reduction target

Emission reduction target is 17% below 2005 by 2020. However, based in Table 6 (a) "Information on updated greenhouse gas projections Under a 'With Measures' Scenario", the GHG emission reduction, considering the total with LULUCF contribution, is only 0.4%. Please explain possible actions being taken in order to close this gap between the target and projections. How is Canada planning to achieve the referred target of 17% (Additional policies and measures, KP mechanisms or account for other LULUCF activities not included up to now)?

[Answer by Canada](#)

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: Descriptions of Policies and Measures

The Expert Review Team noted that Canada's NC6 does not include some information required by the UNFCCC reporting guidelines on National Communications, specifically textual descriptions of the principal federal policies and measures for the waste or agriculture sectors, and recommended that Canada provide, as applicable, descriptions of the principal federal policies and measures in the agriculture and the waste sectors. Could Canada briefly describe these policies and measures?

[Answer by Canada](#)

Not answered

Question by Brazil at Tuesday, 31 March 2015

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

Type: Before 31 of March

Title: Emissions from “natural disturbances”

“In a spring 2012 submission to the UNFCCC, Canada stated its intent to include the LULUCF sector in its accounting of GHG emissions towards its 2020 target, noting that emissions and related removals resulting from natural disturbances would be excluded from the accounting”. Please, describe what Canada has considered “natural disturbances” and “anthropogenic emissions”.

Answer by Canada
Not answered

Question by Brazil at Tuesday, 31 March 2015

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

Type: Before 31 of March

Title: Market based mechanisms

Under the session on “Estimates of Emission Reductions and Removals and the Use of Units from the Markets-Based Mechanisms and Land Use, Land-use Change and Forestry Activities” only LULUCF activities are considered. Please, provide details on the use of units from Markets-Based Mechanisms.

Answer by Canada
Not answered

Question by Brazil at Tuesday, 31 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: Scenarios

In page 246, there is a description of progress in reducing GHG emissions measured against a “without measures” scenario. This BAU approach should not be applied to Annex I Parties. Please provide the reasons for presenting this kind of approach.

Answer by Canada
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: Progress towards 2020 target

New Zealand notes that based on the recently published 1BR review report, Canada may face a shortfall in meeting its domestic target of -17% below 2005 levels by 2020. If this is the case, will Canada consider using international offsets to fill the gap?

Answer by Canada
Not answered

Question by New Zealand 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 emissions

Natural disturbance emissions have dominated Canada's emissions profile for the LULUCF sector since 1990. The projections in the 6NC and 1BR do not include emissions from natural disturbances above a low level of background fire expected to occur every year. Does Canada have policies and measures in place to reduce the incidence of natural disturbance events or limit their impacts on greenhouse gas emissions from the LULUCF sector?

Answer by Canada
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: mitigation in LULUCF sector

According to the report, the projected emissions including the contribution of LULUCF by 2020 are 0.3% below the base year, while the target is 17.0% below the base year (2005). How will Canada be confident in achieving the target while lacking an estimation of mitigation effects of additional planned PaMs?

Answer by Canada
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: PaMs for transportation and electricity sectors

Robust description of mitigation PaMs is presented in BR, particularly regarding transportation and electricity sectors. However, mitigation effects of other sectors, such as oil and gas and other emission-intensive sectors, are not estimated and elaborated. Mitigation in these sectors shall be equally considered and elaborated. Shall Canada provide more detailed information?

Answer by Canada
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: FLRFL

The contribution of FLRFL is separately determined using the Reference Level approach. Does any inconsistency occur when integrating the FLRFL contribution with that from other sectors? Also, the Reference Level is technically corrected for estimation. As the ERT mentioned, comparing the corrected reference level values to the actual values to determine the contribution of FLRFL is concerned. Please further elaborate the methodology on Reference Level and the determination of FLRFL contribution?

Answer by Canada
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: projection for LULUCF

The current emissions projection of LULUCF is solely estimated for the year of 2020. Is there any information on projections of LULUCF to increase its transparency?

Answer by Canada
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

Since emissions and removals from LULUCF are extremely critical for Canada, more detailed information regarding contributions from LULUCF shall be provided for the purpose of transparency. Can Canada provide more information on how the LULUCF contribution has been determined?

Answer by Canada
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: uncertainties in estimation of emission from LULUCF

Considering the large uncertainties in the accounting for emissions from LULUCF sector and the large inter-annual deviation, e.g. in WM scenario in 1990 emission/sink of LULUCF sector is -158Mt, in 1995 is +130 Mt, in 2000 is -120 Mt, in 2005 is -7Mt, in 2010 is +71Mt, and in 2020 is -128 Mt, how could Canada ensure the robustness of the data? And how would policy makers use these data for decision-making?

Answer by Canada
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's contribution to achieving the target

In WM scenario, GHG emission (incl. LULUCF) of Canada in 2020 is 24% lower than level of 20005, which indicates an overachievement of the target of 17%emission reduction. However, in fact GHG emissions from all other sectors except LULUCF have been increased. Does that mean Canada will achieve its QEWERT purely by using the carbon sink from land sector?

[Answer by Canada](#)
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: projections for inventory sectors

Emissions projection is estimated by economic sectors rather than inventory sectors. Are there any lessons learnt when projecting emissions by economic sectors?

[Answer by Canada](#)
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

Is market-based mechanism included to achieve its target?

[Answer by Canada](#)
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: LULUCF sector

LULUCF sector is excluded in its base year in BR1 Table 2(b), but at meantime LULUCF contribution is included. LULUCF contribution is included in Table 2(d) as well. Therefore, is LULUCF contribution in its base year and its target year? How to estimate LULUCF contribution?

Answer by Canada
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: completeness of GHG emission information

As the ERT noted, information about five categories of mandatory reporting information in the LULUCF sector is missing in the Inventory. Please clarify.

Answer by Canada
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 Canada
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 to reverse emission trends

What potentials and associated measures in the most relevant GHG emitting sectors have been identified by the Party to address the need to reverse emission trends with a view to reaching the 2020 target?

Answer by Canada

Not answered

Question by European Union 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: Reference level

Canada provides in section 4.C of its first biennial report rationales and numerical values of the technical correction of its reference level (FMRL). When applying a technical correction to the FMRL with HWP contribution as reported in the appendix to decision 2/CMP.7 , and the applied reference level for the year 2011 (cf BR table 4(a)I), there is a big difference from the values of the technical correction reported in BR1. Could you please explain the reasons behind such discrepancy?

Answer by Canada

Not answered

Question by European Union 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 accounting approaches

In Canada's national communication (Annex 2, p. 104) it is stated related to the contribution of the LULUCF sector to the target: "Canada's work to analyze alternative accounting approaches is ongoing, and changes to the accounting approach may be made in future." Does this mean that Canada has not yet fully decided on the accounting approach for the LULUCF sector as part of its 2020 target? When does Canada expect to finalize its accounting approach?

[Answer by Canada](#)
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: Additional measures

The biennial report shows that in the current 'with measures' projections, neither the projected emissions with or without LULUCF will achieve Canada's 2020 target of an emission reduction by 17% below 2005. What additional measures are planned to meet the 2020 target? What is their status of adoption and implementation and their expected emission reduction effects?

[Answer by Canada](#)
Not answered

Question by European Union 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: Forest reference levels

The biennial report informs that the reference level for forest remaining forestland was technically corrected to reflect data and methodological changes. Can you explain where Canada provided estimates of the entire reference level time series for 2010-2020 (original) as well as of the estimates of the technical corrected time series including the corrections applied in 2014?

[Answer by Canada](#)
Not answered

Question by European Union 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 approaches

Does Canada confirm that its approach chosen intends to comply with decision 2/CMP.6 (Guidelines on forest management reference levels) and the related chapter of the 2013 revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance

Arising from the Kyoto Protocol? Will Canada comply with the reporting obligations as outlined in Annex II to decision 2/CMP.8, paragraph 2(f) and provide information similar to the natural disturbance tables under the Kyoto Protocol?
Are there any areas in which Canada will not account in according with the guidance under the Kyoto Protocol?
According to which review guidelines does Canada expect that this information on forest reference levels and natural disturbances to be reviewed in the future?

[Answer by Canada](#)
Not answered

[Question by European Union](#) at Wednesday, 25 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 Canada](#)
Not answered

[Question by European Union](#) at Wednesday, 11 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

The ERT stated in the review report of the BR that the approach to account for the LULUCF sector is not transparent and that the required information to understand the methodology for estimating the LULUCF contribution to the target is not transparent (paragraph 17). While additional information was provided to the ERT, this information is not available to the public or to other Parties.

How does Canada 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?

When and where will Canada make transparent information available for the general public that allows a complete understanding of the approach chosen? What improvements will be made in the next biennial report to enhance transparency?

[Answer by Canada](#)
Not answered

Question by European Union at Wednesday, 11 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 Canada 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 Canada](#)
Not answered
