

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](#) United States of America at Wednesday, 31 August 2016

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

[Type:](#) Before 31 August

[Title:](#) Policies for CCS

Norway has identified carbon capture and storage as one of its five prioritized areas of enhanced national climate policy, and aims to realize at least one large-scale project by 2020. As part of its planning for CCS, does Norway have policies and regulations in place (or plans for such policies and regulations) to ensure adequate baseline and post-injection CO₂ emissions monitoring at potential CCS sites, consistent with the guidance in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National GHG Inventories, Volume 2, Chapter 5?

[Answer by](#) Norway, Friday, 28 October 2016

Yes, Norway has experience in applying the 2006 IPCC guidelines referred to. Please see chapter 3.5 in the 2016 NIR pages 159-173, and Annex IV to the 2016 NIR for our reporting on the two existing facilities for CCS in place, Sleipner (start up 1996) and Snøhvit (start up 2008).

[Question by](#) United States of America 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:](#) Tracking units

Does Norway have in place any specific accounting provisions to track units that flow back and forth from the other countries that participate in the EU ETS, so that Norway may demonstrate that it has met, but not exceeded, its emission cap for a specified reporting period? How do these accounting provisions differ, if at all, from those used by the EU member states?

[Answer by](#) Norway, Friday, 28 October 2016

All units (EUAs) in the European ETS are tracked through the European registry system. There is no difference and full integration between the Norwegian registry and those of EU member states. Ultimately the flow of EUAs will result in a corresponding net transfer of Kyoto Protocol units between the participating states.

The registry system also performs the issuance and tracking of Kyoto units. Since Norway has made its target for 2020 operational through the commitment we have taken for 2013-2020 under the Kyoto Protocol, Norway will use Kyoto units to demonstrate that we have also met our target for 2020.

The situation for 2013-2020 will be similar to the situation for 2008-2012, where the tracking functions were used and we demonstrated compliance with and even 10 % overachievement of our target. These processes are documented in the report upon expiration of the additional period for fulfilling commitments by Norway^[1] and in the review report (FCCC/KP/CMP/2016/TPR/NOR)

[1] See http://unfccc.int/files/kyoto_protocol/reporting/true-up_period_reports_under_the_kyoto_protocol/application/pdf/true-up_period_report_norway_2015.pdf

Question by United States of America 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: Source of units from market based mechanisms

Norway has indicated its intent to purchase approximately 60 million units from market-based mechanisms in the 2013-2020 period. What sorts of activities does Norway foresee these units will come from? Does the country anticipate that some of these units will result from REDD+ programs?

Answer by Norway, Friday, 28 October 2016

Norway currently expects to have a gap of approximately 80 million tonnes CO₂ equivalents between actual emissions and the commitment for 2013-2020 under the Kyoto Protocol. This estimate is 10 million tonnes lower than the estimate in the BR2, owing to more updated inventory information including preliminary figures for 2015, indicating at least in part, the progress in implementation of policies and measures not included in the projections. The commitment under the Kyoto Protocol also makes our 2020 target operational. The foreseen gap will be closed by additional domestic measures and by using units from the Kyoto mechanisms; International Emissions trading, which will reflect the net flows of allowances under the European Emissions Trading scheme, and the Clean Development Mechanism acquired through the Carbon Credit Procurement Program. The volume of the net

contribution through European ETS is uncertain.

Future emissions are uncertain and the estimated gap might change as we gain more information on actual emissions. Currently, The Norwegian Carbon Credit Procurement Program aims to acquire 60 million CERs through the CDM (see www.carbonneutralnorway.no). These CERs will come from two main categories; vulnerable projects and new projects. All project types are eligible, except major industrial projects involving HFC-23 as byproduct, N₂O from adipic acid, and coal based energy production without CCS. REDD+ units are not eligible under CDM and thus will not be relevant for the procurement program. Norway's current engagement in cooperation under REDD+, which yields substantial emission reductions, will consequently not result in credits that can be used against our 2020/2013-2020 target.

Question by Switzerland 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 targets for Norway

In Chapter 3 of Norway's 2nd BR, the long-term objective for Norway to become a low-emission society by 2050 is mentioned. This statement has gained in pertinence with the adoption of the Paris Agreement in December 2015 and mid-term targets can be seen as important milestones on the way to achieving the 2050 vision.

Could Norway elaborate on its understanding of a low-emission society? What are the main threats and opportunities perceived by Norway in relation to its transition to a low-emission society?

How does Norway see this transition impact its status as a fossil fuel-exporting country?

Answer by Norway, Friday, 28 October 2016

This question goes well beyond progress on our economy wide target for 2020/2013-2020, but we will respond briefly.

Norway is a small, open economy, highly dependent on the technological development globally. It would thus be difficult to become a low emission society without other countries moving in the same direction. When formulating domestic climate policies, a country has to take in to account climate

policies abroad and consequences for domestic businesses and the economy, ie an ambitious policy to reduce domestic emissions must make sense in a global context where the overarching goal is to reduce global emissions. Therefore, the implications of the emissions trading system, the risk of carbon leakage and the competitiveness of industries are important elements to consider when formulating domestic policies. At the same time it is important to make Norwegian business and industry prepared for a tighter global climate policy, and avoid investments and decisions that lock in infrastructure and systems that are not compatible with the two degree target enshrined in the Paris Agreement. The ambition level and content of a low emission society has to develop gradually. A proposal to write into law that Norway is aiming to become a low emission society by 2050 has been circulated for public comment.

The Norwegian petroleum extraction industry is part of the EU ETS and will thus contribute in line with other industry in Europe, and in line with EU policy for a low carbon society in 2050. In addition the industry pays a national CO2 tax.

[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 Norway](#), Friday, 28 October 2016

We do currently not have estimates of mitigation impacts of the updates to previously reported policies and measures other than those reported in CTF Table 3 of the BR2. Any available estimates will be reported in our seventh National Communication/third Biennial Report.

[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: Estimation of mitigation impact

In “CTF Table 3 Progress in achievement of the quantified economy-wide emission reduction target: information on mitigation actions and their effects” a significant number of mitigation actions was listed. Congratulations for that. However, only a very few mitigation impact was estimated. Please, inform the reasons for not reporting mitigation impacts for the majority of mitigation actions. What are the difficulties?

Answer by Norway, Friday, 28 October 2016

We acknowledge that the impact in terms of GHG reductions have not been estimated for the majority of the updates to the policies and measures that are listed in CTF table 3, but we have in the BR2 attempted to explain the difficulties in estimating impacts.

Our interpretation of the biennial reporting guidelines has been that the reporting should focus on policies and measures that have been implemented or are planned to be implemented since the last National Communication or Biennial Report. In CTF table 3, we therefore identified important mitigation actions that were new or changed since our sixth National Communication and first Biennial Report were reported in 2014. Our main challenge is that there are methodological difficulties in isolating the mitigation effect of a change or adjustment in a policy and measure. Among others it is difficulty to isolate the mitigation effect from one policy and measure to other policies and measures. Second round effects also complicates estimating impacts. Finally, for mitigation actions resulting from increased funds or budgets, the effects will depend on the measures taken. These will be subject to further reporting during and after implementation.

Our reporting of the greenhouse gas inventory follows agreed reporting guidelines, but there are no such agreed reporting guidelines for quantifying the impacts of policies and measures (PaMs). Our experience is that there are good reasons for this since PaMs will vary by nature. Some are introduced with a primary objective to reduce emissions whereas others are introduced with other primary objectives and reduction in emissions will be an indirect effect. PaMs can be technical, economic, regulatory, informative etc. Setting a baseline against which to assess the effect of a PaM can also be challenging. The investments in railway infrastructure can be used as an example. Estimating the GHG impact of improved passenger rail network around the big cities and improved capacity for freight transport needs to take into account that at the same time roads are improved, the population grows, the economy changes etc.

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: Quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

Taking into account that the GHG emission projections with LULUCF for 2020 in BR2, under a 'with measures' scenario, are above to those projections contained in BR1, could this increase be indicating additional challenges for Norway to meet its Quantified economy-wide emission reduction (QEWER) target?

Answer by Norway, Friday, 28 October 2016

The development in the LULUCF sector as it is reported under the Convention is for all practical purposes not relevant for accounting towards the achievement of Norway's 2020 target. This is because the 2020 target is made operational through the 2013-2020 commitment under the Kyoto Protocol. Consequently, the accounting rules for LULUCF under the Kyoto Protocol apply to the target. These accounting rules are expected to result in a contribution from the LULUCF sector of about zero Kyoto units, even if the actual net uptake in the LULUCF sector corresponds to about half of Norway's gross emissions.

Projections are uncertain and changes in economic development, technology and policies and measures have impacts on emissions over time. Actual emissions have been lower than projected, indicating progress towards the target. The gap between the commitment and the actual emissions is therefore adjusted downwards since the BR, contrary to what might be assumed in the question.

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: Differences in projections

Regarding BR1, in table 6(a) "Information on updated greenhouse gas projections under a 'with measures' scenario", the GHG emissions projected by 2020 were 23,800.00 kt CO₂ eq (with LULUCF). In regards to BR2, the GHG emissions projected by 2020 were 31,386.55 kt CO₂ eq (with LULUCF).

Could Norway please explain why the projections with LULUCF in BR2 are above to those projections contained in BR1?

Answer by Norway, Friday, 28 October 2016

According to Table 6(a) 'Information on updated greenhouse gas projections under a 'with measures' scenario', the total GHG projections with LULUCF in 2020 is respectively 30 500 and 31 387 kt CO₂-eq in BR1 and BR2.

The projections for 2020 were updated between the submission of BR1 and BR2. Higher projected emissions in 2020 in BR2 (887 kt CO₂-eq) compared to those in BR1 is the result of the following two factors: 1) reduced removals from the LULUCF-sector (334 kt CO₂-eq) mainly due to changes in the underlying assumptions and methodologies, and 2) increased emissions in the remaining sectors (553 kt CO₂-eq.), mainly due to methodological changes and transition to other GWP-100 values in the most recent projections.

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: Norwegian-Swedish market-based support system for electricity certificates

What impact is this Norwegian-Swedish market-based support system for electricity certificates expected to have on renewable electricity generation levels in Norway, noting that renewable electricity generation levels are already very high?

Answer by Norway, Friday, 28 October 2016

98 per cent of total electricity production in Norway (141,5 of total 145 tWh) in 2015 was based on renewable sources. Today there is a surplus of electricity in the Nordic market.

Norway and Sweden have had a joint market for electricity certificates since 1 January 2012. The electricity certificate system is set up with a target to increase renewable electricity production in the two countries by 28.4 TWh in 2020. The system will hence increase the total level of renewable electricity production in Norway. Increased production of electricity from renewable sources can cover electricity demand in Norway or be exported to neighbouring countries. The joint electricity certificate market contributes to the achievement of national targets for renewable electricity production in Norway and Sweden in 2020 pursuant to the EU Renewables Directive (Directive 2009/28/EC).

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: Norwegian-Swedish market-based support system

Could Norway please provide more information on the common Norwegian–Swedish market-based support system for electricity certificates, which, as the review report suggests, aims at increasing renewable energy electricity production in both countries?

Answer by Norway, Friday, 28 October 2016

Norway and Sweden have had a joint market for electricity certificates since 1 January 2012. The electricity certificate system is set up with a target to increase renewable electricity production in the two countries by 28.4 TWh in 2020. Sweden will finance 15.2 TWh and Norway 13.2 TWh. The market will determine when and where this new production will take place. The electricity certificate scheme is governed by an agreement between Norway and Sweden of 29 June 2011 (as amended in 2015). The joint electricity certificate market contributes to the achievement of national targets for renewable electricity production in Norway and Sweden in 2020 pursuant to the EU Renewables Directive (Directive 2009/28/EC).

An electricity certificate constitutes a proof of having produced one MWh electricity based on renewable energy sources. The producers receive one electricity certificate for each MWh electricity produced, over a maximum of 15 years. In Norway, the power plants have to start generation no later than 31 December 2021 in order to qualify for receiving electricity certificates. Demand for electricity certificates arises in that electricity suppliers and some end-users of electricity have an obligation by law to annul certificates annually corresponding to a certain proportion (quota) of their electricity sales or use. The electricity suppliers' costs of procuring the necessary amount of electricity certificates are included in the electricity bill to end users. The prices of electricity certificates are determined in the market based on trade between buyers and sellers. The income from selling certificates constitutes an extra income for the electricity producers in addition to the income from selling electricity.

A common market for electricity certificates in Norway and Sweden will result in a greater volume and more market participants than national markets. The target for increased renewable energy production can thereby be achieved in a more cost-effective manner, in that investment will be directed to where conditions are most favourable.

The Norwegian Government has decided not to prolong or extend the electricity certificate system after the target is reached in 2020. The Norwegian government wants mature renewable production technologies to compete on market conditions without subsidies.

Question by France at Monday, 29 August 2016

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

Type: Before 31 August

Title: Long-term carbon neutrality

In the section about the quantified economy-wide emission reduction target of its BR2, Norway indicates that it plans to be carbon neutral and to become a low-emission society in 2050. Could you please elaborate on how does Norway intend to reach this long-term objective?

Answer by Norway, Friday, 28 October 2016

Regarding how to become a low emissions society, please see our response to question 4, which raises the same issue. Carbon neutrality will be achieved by using mechanisms to offset remaining emissions after domestic emissions and removals are accounted for.

Question by France at Monday, 29 August 2016

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

Type: Before 31 August

Title: Electric vehicles

BR2 highlights that electric vehicles have a high market share of new cars sold in Norway, due to strong tax and user subsidies. How many new electric vehicles are expected in Norway in 2020 and 2030 as a result of policies encouraging the uptake of electric vehicles (in proportion of the car fleet and in absolute)? What are the projected effects of these policies?

Answer by Norway, Friday, 28 October 2016

The projections presented in BR2 were finalised in 2014. Hence, they are based on policies and status

of the technology and knowledge at the time, and do not reflect later technological shifts or policy changes. Since 2014 battery prices for electric vehicles have been reduced and reach of the vehicles before recharging has been increased. Moreover, the government has decided to prolong the favorable policies that was assumed to be faced out at the time the projections were made. Currently, electric vehicles are exempted from purchase tax, value added tax and taxes related to road use creating very strong incentives. In addition, electric vehicles have free parking and free passing in tolls and on ferries.

By 1 September 2016 there were about 90 000 electric vehicles on Norwegian roads compared to a total of 2.6 million private vehicles. The projections in BR2 assumed only 85 000 electric vehicles by 2030.

If electric vehicles are selling at present rates until 2020, the isolated emission effect compared to the projections in BR2 can be estimated to about ¼ mill. ton CO₂ in 2020. New projections are planned to be presented in the spring of 2017.

Question by France at Monday, 29 August 2016

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

Type: Before 31 August

Title: Sensitivity analysis of projections

Considering the importance of the emissions from the oil sector, did Norway conduct sensitivity analysis of its projections to oil price or other parameters?

Answer by Norway, Friday, 28 October 2016

The companies on the Norwegian Continental Shelf ultimately make the investment decisions. Our estimates for future production are the aggregate of company reports, as well as our own outlook for future developments and discoveries.

In the short and medium perspective, Norwegian production of petroleum and respective emissions have limited sensitivity to changes in the oil price owing to long leads and lags in the upstream sector. For the 2020 target variations in the oil price would thus have limited effects.

In the longer term, oil prices could impact production if they significantly change the profitability of individual

developments. However, future oil price levels are highly related to future cost levels for field developments. This makes it hard to conduct such static sensitivity analysis.

Question by France at Monday, 29 August 2016

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

Type: Before 31 August

Title: Evaluation of policies and measures

For most of the policies and measures in CTF table 3, the impacts in terms of GHG reductions have not been estimated. Norway states in its BR2 that “there are methodological difficulties in isolating the mitigation effect from one policy to another, or from other factors that may influence emissions”. How do you plan to overcome these difficulties? What are Norwegian plans for BR3 regarding the evaluation of policies and measures?

Answer by Norway, Friday, 28 October 2016

Our interpretation of the biennial reporting guidelines has been that the reporting should focus on policies and measures that have been implemented or are planned to be implemented since the last National Communication or Biennial Report. In CTF Table 3, we therefore identified important mitigation actions that were new or changed since our sixth National Communication and first Biennial Report were reported in 2014.

In the BR3, we are likely to report on the effects of mitigations actions in the same way as we will report in our seventh National Communication. In other words, we will not try to isolate the mitigation effect of a change or adjustment in a policy and measure. For mitigation actions that have increased funds or budgets, we might in time for reporting the BR3 have more information on how increased funds or budgets will translate into actual mitigation actions.

See also the last paragraph in our answer to question 6.

Question by France at Monday, 29 August 2016

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

Type: Before 31 August

Title: Additional policies and measures

The ERT noted that “the 2020 projections suggest that Norway cannot be expected to achieve its 2020 target under the Convention without the acquisition of units through the market-based mechanisms and the expected contribution of the LULUCF sector”. Is Norway considering implementing additional policies and measures to achieve further emission reductions? What are the opportunities and challenges identified in implementation of policies which would reverse trends in emissions?

Answer by Norway, Friday, 28 October 2016

When Norway set the target for 2020, as well as when it was made operational through the 2013-2020 commitment, it was based on the assumption that achievement of the target would also imply acquiring of units through the market based mechanisms. The mechanisms made it possible to assume a more ambitious target than if all reductions had to be achieved domestically. The major elements of the Norwegian climate policy like taxes and the emissions trading scheme have been in place for many years. Still it can also be said that the policies are under continuous scrutiny and that changes to some of them are introduced every year, as the BR illustrates.

Since the target was set, emissions have been consistently lower than projected, indicating at least in part the progress in implementation of policies and measures not included in the projections – see for example the answer to question 12. Consequently, the estimate for the volume of units necessary is now of about 80 million, compared to 90 million in BR2.

Question by European Union 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: Projections

Table 6a in Chapter 5 of Norway's BR2 (page 40) presents the projected totals for emissions and removals up to 2030. Projections are presented under a 'with existing measures' scenario. Norway states in its biennial report that total greenhouse gas emissions excluding LULUCF are projected to remain relatively stable during the period up to 2020, before declining somewhat by 2030.

- Could Norway provide some more insight into the sensitivity of its WEM projections to the underlying assumptions on economy and technology?

Norway is a small, open economy and we are thus sensitive to changes globally. Emissions are particularly sensitive to economic growth, migration and the international development of new technologies.

Strong population growth, mainly caused by labor immigration from Europe, and strong economic growth in Norway has put upward pressure on emissions after 2004. Since immigration recently has been the main driver of population growth in Norway, the importance of the uncertainty attached to population projections has increased. For example, the estimated population in 2020 has been revised upward by more than 8 per cent. For 2030, the increase has been more than an 11 per cent.

In the transport sector, as noted in the answer questions 12, sales of electric vehicles (EV) has been much stronger than projected. Favorable incentives have been in place for a long time, but had limited effect on car sales until EV became more user friendly.

For a discussion of sensitivity of the WEM projections in the offshore sector we refer to answer 13.

The European emissions trading system is the main instrument regulating emissions from the offshore sector, electricity production and industry. Thus, the expected price of European Allowances (EUA) will be an important driver for the development and implementation of technologies in these sectors. In addition, the offshore sector pays a CO₂-tax. Norway's electricity supply is already almost fully renewable, so the global development of renewable technologies in this sector will have limited impact on the emissions from electricity production in Norway. Large scale implementation of new production technologies, and/or carbon capture and storage, in major industries is dependent on technological development.

For some end of pipe solutions (example catalysts for N₂O) and changes in operational procedures (aluminum smelters) implementation can come faster. However, such known cost effective measures have already been implemented in relevant Norwegian facilities.

Question by European Union at Monday, 29 August 2016

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

Type: Before 31 August

Title: Development of CCS projects

In the BR2 page 25 section 4.1.2.15, Norway has indicated that one of its five priority areas is carbon capture and storage (CCS). However it is indicated in paragraph 21 of the BR2 review report that Norway has not included information on CCS in its BR2 CTF table 3 because the investment decision had not been made.

Could Norway provide an update on progress with the implementation of policies and measures on CCS and on whether this measure is likely to have an impact on GHG emissions reductions?

[Answer by Norway](#), Friday, 28 October 2016

The Norwegian government puts great importance to Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS). Historical efforts over the last two decades are documented in the National Communications. The main goal of the government's CCS policy is to identify measures that can contribute to technology development and cost reductions. Realising a full-scale demonstration facility for CCS in Norway is challenging, not least as there are few big and suitable single sources of emissions.

The possibilities for full scale CCS in Norway have been mapped in a feasibility study presented on 4 July 2016. The aim of the feasibility study is to identify at least one technically feasible CCS chain with corresponding cost estimates. Such a chain includes capture, transport and storage of CO₂. The results show that it is technically feasible to realize several alternatives in Norway, at a lower cost than for projects considered in Norway earlier. The costs are still considerable.

In the national budget, presented October 6, 2016, the Government proposes to grant 360 million Norwegian kroner for the continued planning of a full-scale CCS demonstration facility in Norway.

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

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

[Type](#): Before 31 August

[Title](#): Use of market mechanisms

- On page 36 of its BR2 Norway states that it is targeting delivery of 60 million CERs for the period 2013-2020. Could Norway provide further details of its efforts to acquire units from market based mechanisms in the period 2013 – 2020 and how these would enable reaching the emission reduction target?

Currently the estimated need for acquisition of Kyoto units to comply with the commitment for 2013-2020 under the Kyoto Protocol is about 80 million, which is revised from 90 millions in BR2 since domestic emissions have been lower than projected.

The acquisition will partly come from the Carbon Credit Procurement Program, partly from the cooperation within Europe under the Emissions Trading System. The numerical implications of the latter cooperation have not yet been settled between the Parties. For an illustration of how this cooperation works, we would refer to the report upon expiration of the additional period for fulfilling commitments by Norway and in the review report (FCCC/KP/CMP/2016/TPR/NOR), where participation in the ETS also led to Norwegian net acquisition of units from Europe.

The purchase programme for CERs under the Clean Development Mechanism is progressing in a difficult market – see further details and updates on www.carbonneutralnorway.no. Contracts are made for more than 50 million CERs and about 10 million are delivered to the state's holding account in the Norwegian registry. Delivered volume would normally be somewhat lower than the volume contracted, adding to the need to contract additional CERs.

Question by European Union at Monday, 29 August 2016

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

Type: Before 31 August

Title: Completeness and transparency of Mitigation Actions

In the biennial report CTF table 3 Norway included information on only those policies and measures that are new or changed since its submission of the first biennial report.

For transparency on the complete set of policies and measures that valid at the time of BR2, could Norway provide information on the entire scope of its mitigation actions that were in place in the country at the time of publication of the BR2 including those that are under implementation, those that are planned to be implemented?

In biennial report CTF table 3, Norway did not provide much information regarding the quantification of the effects (GHG reduction) of its policies and measures. Estimated savings have only been reported for 4 of the 20 reported policies and measures.

Could Norway provide additional information on the effects of its policies and measures, highlighting the policies that are expected to provide the largest reductions in GHG emissions or highest removals?

[Answer by Norway](#), Friday, 28 October 2016

Our interpretation of the biennial reporting guidelines has been that the reporting should focus on policies and measures that have been implemented or are planned to be implemented since the last National Communication or Biennial Report. In CTF Table 3, we therefore identified important policies and measures that were new or changed since our sixth National Communication and first Biennial Report were reported in 2014. In the BR3, we are likely to report on all mitigation actions in the same way as we will report in our seventh National Communication.

In the BR2, we reported that Norway over the years has introduced several policies and measures that have reduced the GHG emissions. Chapter 4 and section 5.3 of Norway's sixth National Communication describe these policies and measures and estimate the effect these have had on the historical and projected emissions. According to the estimates, the GHG emissions in 2010 would have been 12.6-15.2 million tonnes of CO₂ equivalents (25-30%) higher than observed, if these policies and measures had not been implemented. In addition, without measures GHG emissions is estimated to be 17.1-20.1 million tonnes of CO₂ equivalents higher in 2020 and 17.8-20.5 million tonnes CO₂ equivalents higher in 2030 than projected. Thus, information on the entire scope of our mitigation actions that were in place at the time of publication of our BR2 can be found by reading both our BR2 and our sixth National Communication.

[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: compliance

Under the WEM scenario, Norway is not on track to achieve the target of 30% emission reduction by 2020. Given that Norway does not report projections for WAM scenario; could Norway provide information on its plan on strengthening its domestic mitigation actions and/or using international market-based credits for compliance?

Norway considers that we are on track to meeting the 2020 target. The WEM scenario indicates a need for acquisition of units. Being "on track" here means that we believe that relevant measures are taken that will deliver in time. They will, however, require sustained efforts for several years. We refer also to our response to question 2, 3, 7, 15 and 18.

Actual emissions through 2015 have been consistently lower than projected, and the corresponding need for acquisitions is therefore lower than indicated earlier, including in BR2. Norway has made the 2030 target operational through the commitment it has taken for the period 2013-2020 under the Kyoto Protocol. Norway has always assumed use of units from flexible mechanisms when setting these targets, which could then be more ambitious than if all reductions were to be taken domestically.

We would refer to the answer to question 18 on acquisitions. The Carbon Credit Procurement Program will be an ongoing effort for several years. Contracting an expected delivery of 60 Mt will require additional efforts, and seeing these contracts for acquisitions through entails a follow up that will last through 2021.

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