

Outcome of the discussion group 2 on GHG trends, projections and target

4th BRs and NCs lead reviewers meeting

6-7 March, 2017



Co-facilitators: Harry Vreuls and Yang Hongwei

Bonn, 6 March 2017



Transparency

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

Contribution of LULUCF units for achievement of the target

Suggested approach:

- For all Parties that include LULUCF in their target under the Convention, the ERT should include the information reported (either in the BR CTF tables or during the review) on “LULUCF emissions/removals” in the table of the TRR on progress. *Calculation check: “Emissions including LULUCF” should be the sum of “Emissions excluding LULUCF” and “LULUCF emissions/removals”.*
- For all Parties that do not include LULUCF in their target under the Convention, the ERT should use the notation key “NA” (not applicable) for “LULUCF emissions/removals” and “Emissions including LULUCF” in the table of the TRR on progress (this applies to all EU MS).



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

Projections of maritime and aviation emissions

Suggested approach –agreed by the Group 2:

- As this pertains to mandatory reporting requirement, recommendation should be made to report projections separately, to the extent possible.
- Check how the projections of international aviation and maritime transport are reported in the BR/NC, and CTF tables



The improved by the LRs

Consistency between trends, projections and target – add footnote which refers to NF3 and new NC reporting guidelines

Suggested approach:

- Complete reporting on projections **does not depend** on whether particular sector or gas is included or excluded in the target or what kind of accounting approach is applied → **Parties must include in their GHG inventory and projections all gases and sectors (to the extent possible only for projections)**
- However, if certain gas or sector is included in a target and is not included in projections, ERT could not completely assess progress towards target → **this is relevant for the assessment of progress**
- **The ERT should recommend that the Party include projections for missing gas or sector, to the extent possible (e.g. LULUCF) – in footnote [(e.g. NF₃) upon adoption of the revised NC reporting guidelines]**



Not agreed during group work – for further discussion

Requirement to present on gas-by-gas basis in ‘with additional measures’ projections

- **Discussion points**
 - WAM -> may requirement. Methodological guidance to WAM should be the same level with the WM? Leads to the discouragement for the continuous improvement.
 - Recommendation or encouragement

Use of latest available GHG inventory

- **Discussion points**
 - Used for BR+CTF are always outdated
 - April 15 submission may not be better than the reviewed inventories.
 - The updated data/information should be “noted”, but the basis is on the original BR+CTF submission, not the latest GHG inventory data.



New issues and their solutions suggested (if any)

Use of MBM units in the progress – completeness or transparency issue?

