




Report back on requests from the second BTR LRs meeting:
**Knowledge Hubs: Substantive discussions
on BTR review issues, including discussion
of LRs working groups**


**Team leads and technical review officers, MRV and ETF
Reporting and Review subdivision
UNFCCC secretariat**



For EU member States, how to report national institutional arrangements and projections of key indicators

Issue description


- The EU and its member states have a joint NDC target
- How should the requirements for the following be reviewed for EU member States?
 - National institutional arrangements
 - Projections of key indicators



For EU member States, how to report national institutional arrangements and projections of key indicators

Proposed solution

- Member State's BTRs should contain:
 - Information on national arrangements for domestic implementation
 - Information on or references to the EU's institutional arrangements
- If the domestic institutional arrangements are not provided in the BTR, the TERT should raise a recommendation on paragraph 61



For EU member States, how to report national institutional arrangements and projections of key indicators

Proposed solution

- For the EU joint target, there is a single indicator based on the EUs economy-wide emissions
- Projections of the key indicator reported by an EU member state should be for the indicator of the EU
- For an EU member State, the BTR and CTF table 10 should contain information on the indicator of the EU or provide references to it
- If CTF table 10 contains projections of the member State's emissions, the TERT should raise a recommendation on paragraph 97



Clarifying that projections of key indicators is not to be used for tracking progress of NDCs (MPGs para. 97 in conjunction with para. 93)

Issue description


- Paragraph 93 of the MPGs states that “Projections...shall not be used to assess progress towards the implementation and achievement of a Party’s NDC under Article 4 of the Paris Agreement unless the Party has identified a reported projection as its baseline”
- Paragraph 97 states that “Each Party shall also provide projections of key indicators to determine progress towards its NDC under Article 4 of the Paris Agreement.”
- Are these two requirements in conflict with respect to whether projections should be used in assessing progress in achievement of the target?



Clarifying that projections of key indicators is not to be used for tracking progress of NDCs (MPGs para. 97 in conjunction with para. 93)

Proposed solution

- Paragraph 97 is describing for which key indicators (those used to determine progress towards the NDC target) projections should be provided, not what the projections should be used for
- Therefore, projections should not be used to assess progress towards the NDC target.
- A BAU or baseline projection may be used as the basis for tracking progress, but it should be compared to actual, not projected, indicator data.




Guidance for interpreting references to inventory data in the projections provision

Issue description

The MPGs refer to inventory years with respect to projections in:


- Paragraph 95, “Projections shall begin from the most recent year in the Party’s national inventory report...”
- Paragraph 99 “Projections shall be presented relative to actual inventory data for the preceding years.”
- How should TERTs assess these two provisions?



Guidance for interpreting references to inventory data in the projections provision

Proposed solution

- Paragraph 95:
 - Most recent inventory year should be assessed only in the context of calculating the minimum year to extend projections
 - It should not be interpreted as a restriction on the inventory data used to produce the projections
- Paragraph 99:
 - Only requires inventory data and projections results to be presented together in graphical and tabular formats, as appropriate



Review of grant-equivalent values for bilateral and multilateral financial support provided

Issue description


According to paragraph 118 of the MPGs, the reporting of FTC support provided is a “shall” requirement for developed country Parties.*

All reporting provisions that follow in that chapter (paragraphs 119-125) are therefore of a mandatory nature – with the exception of the reporting of grant-equivalent values for bilateral and multilateral support, which are to be reported *on a voluntary basis*.

In general, reporting provisions that of non-mandatory nature (“should” requirements) invite an encouragement to the Party to report such information.

How should the TERT assess the lack of reporting of grant-equivalent values?

*For other Parties that provide support the reporting of FTC support provided and mobilized is a “should” requirement.



Review of grant-equivalent values for bilateral and multilateral financial support provided

Proposed solution

If grant-equivalent values have not been reported and...

- ...the Party has clearly documented in the BTR that such information was not available → the TERT should not raise an encouragement.
- ...the Party provides clear documentation during the review that such information was not available → the TERT should encourage the Party to include an explanation in the BTR as to why the information on grant-equivalent values was not available.
- ...no additional information is provided during the review indicating such information is not available → the TERT should encourage the Party to report grant-equivalent values or include an explanation in the BTR why the information on grant-equivalent values was not available.