

Session SBI41 (2014)

Session started at 01-09-2014 00:00:00 [GMT+1]

Session closed at 28-11-2014 23:59:59 [GMT+1]



A compilation of questions to - and answers by – Finland
Exported 29/11-2014 by the
UNITED NATIONS FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE

Question from: Egypt at Tuesday, 30 September 2014

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

Title: GHG inventory assumption

what are the normal assumptions in transport and agricultural sector related to GHG inventory related to ipcc 1996 guidelines or 2006 guidelines ?

Answered by: Finland at Friday, 28 November 2014

We consider that the question is not within the scope of the multilateral assessment in Decision 2.CP17. Nonetheless, please find our answer below.

The trends in Finland's greenhouse gas emissions included in the first biennial report have been estimated consistent with the methodologies in the 1996 IPCC guidelines as elaborated by the IPCC good practice guidance and uncertainty management (IPCC 2000) for both the transport and agriculture sectors. For transport, Finland uses a country-specific Tier 3 model (LIPASTO) to estimate the emissions. The agricultural emissions are estimated using the both Tier 1 (IPCC default parameters and emissions factors) and Tier 2 (country-specific parameters and emission factors) methods.

Question from: Saudi Arabia at Tuesday, 30 September 2014

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

Title: Minimization and assessment of the economic and social consequences of response measures

What's Finland's experience in reporting in the BR on its assessment of the social and economic effects of response measures, especially that it had provided information on its significant efforts to minimize the adverse impacts of response measures under the Convention and KP in the sixth NC? Will Finland be reporting on its assessment of the social and economic effects of response measures in the next BR?

Answered by: Finland at Friday, 28 November 2014

We consider that the question is not within the scope of the multilateral assessment in Decision 2.CP17. Nonetheless, please find our answer below.

Finland did not include information on the assessment of effects on response measures in the BR as this information was presented in the NC. The biennial report included a reference to the text in the national communication. Each year, Finland assesses whether there is a need to update the related information in the national inventory report, and updates are made accordingly. The same procedure will be

followed for reporting in the next BR, in which we intend to include the latest information available on this issue.

Question from: China at Monday, 29 September 2014

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

Title: clarification on national target

As an EU member, Finland has not pledged a national mitigation target under the UNFCCC. According to the TRR, for sectors not covered by the EU-ETS, the emission reduction target for Finland is 16% decrease compared with 2005. However, it is not clear how much effort Finland is going to make on sectors covered by the EU-ETS, nor the efforts as a whole, compared with its base year level. Additional information is needed in order to make its effort transparent.

Answered by: Finland at Friday, 28 November 2014

The EU joint target/pledge defined in the EU Climate and Energy Package sets a 20% GHG emission reduction target for EU-28 by 2020 compared to 1990. This is equivalent to a -14% target compared to 2005. This effort is divided between EU ETS and non-ETS sectors as follows:

- 21% reduction in EU ETS sector emissions by 2020 compared to 2005 (representing approximately 40% of emissions); and
- Under the Effort Sharing Decision (406/2009/EC, 'ESD'), a reduction of around 10% by 2020 compared to 2005 for the sectors that are not covered by the EU ETS.

For the ETS sector, EU legislation provides an EU-wide cap which is determined jointly for all EU Member States and the three EEA EFTA States (Iceland, Norway and Liechtenstein) and does not reflect a specific share for each Member State.

The allocation of allowances takes place through auctions and free allocation. The share of allowances auctioned on behalf of each Member State in each year is public and can be obtained from the relevant auction platforms.

However, free allocation is provided on the basis of EU-wide rules to installation operators within a certain limit. For each of the nearly 12.000 installations in the EU ETS, the allocation has been calculated based on the common rules. A breakdown of the amounts per Member State is not available.

As Parties to the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol, EU Member States may use international credits to help them meet their obligations. The EU Climate and Energy package places restrictions on the use of international credits for compliance purposes. (see FCCC/AWGLCA/2012/MISC.1 for details). According to Finland's climate and energy strategy assessment, Finland could meet its emission reduction target/obligations for the non-ETS sector for 2020 with existing policies and measures.

Finland's ETS sector obligations follow the overall reduction target and rules for the EU ETS sector. The GHG emissions from Finland's ETS sector represent about 50 % of the total so a larger share of the Finland's emissions come under the – 21 % reduction target than in the EU on average.

Based on the latest published inventory submission and EU ETS data, Finland is on track to meet its obligations under the EU climate and energy package. The total emissions in 2013 were 60.6 milj. tonnes CO₂ eq, which is about 14 per cent below the 1990 level emissions. The non-ETS emissions were 29.1 milj. tonnes – more than 2 milj. t CO₂ eq (7 per cent) below the target set for the year.

http://www.stat.fi/til/khki/2013/khki_2013_2014-05-22_tie_001_en.html

Question from: United States of America at Tuesday, 28 October 2014

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

Title: Double counting prevention

Status: Question after 30 September

How do you plan to prevent double counting with the host countries of projects that generated CERs that your country plans to use towards meeting its pledge in the pre-2020 period?

If a host country refuses to adjust its reporting towards its progress to its targets to reflect CERs it exported, do you still plan to count them?

Answered by: Finland

Not answered