
Reporting back from the breakout groups: review issues related to projections and PaMs

8th BR/NC lead reviewers meeting
24–26 February 2021

Facilitator: Ole-Kenneth Nielsen



United Nations
Climate Change Secretariat



Suggested approach:

The following cases could occur:

- a) Party did not provide WOM projection in CTF table 6(b) and/or in tabular format in the textual part of the BR or NC. Also, Party did not provide any explanation for not preparing WOM projection in the textual part of the BR or NC or during the review. This is a completeness issue that leads to an encouragement. **The ERT should in its encouragement ask Party to provide WOM projection or an adequate explanation for not preparing a WOM projection in its next submission.**
- b) Party did not provide WOM projection in CTF table 6(b) and/or in tabular format in the textual part of the BR or NC and:
 - i. Party provided an explanation in the textual part of the BR or NC that the ERT finds inadequate, or;
 - ii. Party provided an explanation for not preparing WOM projections during the review.

These are transparency issues that lead to an encouragement. **The ERT should in its encouragement ask Party to provide an explanation for not preparing a WOM projection in its next submission.**

Suggested approach:

The following cases could occur (cont.):

- c) Party did not provide WOM projection in CTF table 6(b) and/or in tabular format in the textual part of the BR or NC but explained the reasons for not preparing WOM projection which the ERT considers adequate. This case should not lead to an encouragement. The ERT should take note in the TRRs/BRs or IDRs/NCs on the Party's explanation for not providing the WOM projection.

Suggested approach:

While reviewing BRs, the ERTs should check whether all reporting elements stipulated by paragraph 12 of the BR reporting guidelines and paragraph 45 of the NC reporting guidelines were provided. **For overlapping reporting elements, the ERTs should** formulate a single encouragement in TRRs covering those missing and/or not adequately explained reporting elements with a reference to both paragraphs in the TRR's assessment table.

An encouragement should not be raised in case the Party reported that there are no changes or differences in models, methodologies, methods, etc. in comparison to the previous NC, and the ERT checked and confirmed that this is the case during the review.

Suggested approach:

In case Party includes information on expected use of units from MBMs in GHG emission projections as a separate item (e.g., under category Other) in CTF table 6 and/or in tabular format in the textual part of the BR or NC, the ERT should determine whether this amount was included in projections' totals.

If this is the case, the ERT should:

- (i) recommend Party to improve the transparency of reporting on GHG emission projections by **separately reporting** expected use of units from MBMs from projection's totals in CTF table (6) and/or in tabular format in the textual part of the BR or NC and
- (ii) technically assess the results of projections in TRRs/BRs or IDRs/NCs by excluding expected use of MBM units from GHG emission projections' totals.

Specification of the current approach:

How should the ERT formulate its findings when the estimate of mitigation impact is not reported in CTF table 3? (RPG 2020, page 20, bullet (c))

- c) Notation keys, e.g., “NE”, “IE”, or the value “0” are reported in CTF table 3 for mitigation actions, but the Party did not provide an adequate explanation or justification for its use (e.g., in case of “NE” reasons for not estimating mitigation impact or in case of “IE” clear linkage with another individual mitigation action or a group of mitigation actions) in the relevant cell and/or custom footnote to CTF table 3 or in the textual part of the BR. This is a transparency issue that leads to a recommendation.

Thank you!



United Nations
Climate Change Secretariat

