Session SB64 (2026)

Session starts: 08-03-2026

Facilitative, Multilateral Consideration of Progress

A compilation of questions to – and answers by – **Japan**
Exported on 27-05-2026 by the UNFCCC secretariat

Title: Experience with Nuclear Energy Deployment and Public Acceptability, p.91

Question From Party: Republic of Korea

Question raised on: 08.04.2026 CEST

Question Category: Mitigation actions, policies and measures supporting NDC implementation

Question: Thank you for the information provided in the CTF. The policy “Reduction of CO_2 emission intensity in the power sector” shows a notable gap between the emission reductions achieved in 2022 and the expected emission reductions in 2030, suggesting that it will play a key role in future mitigation efforts. In particular, the expected emission reductions in 2030 appear to be approximately three times higher than those achieved in 2022. Could the Party provide further information on how safety considerations and public acceptability are being addressed in relation to increased nuclear energy deployment? In addition, does the Party plan to expand nuclear capacity beyond the restart of existing facilities?

Answer:

Based on the “The Seventh Strategic Energy Plan,” decided in February 2025, the Government of Japan intends to make maximum use of nuclear power under the “S+3E” principle, which places Safety as the foremost priority while simultaneously pursuing Energy Security, Economic Efficiency, and Environmental Suitability.
With regard to safety, the Nuclear Regulation Authority—an organization with a high degree of independence—conducts examinations to determine compliance with the new regulatory standards established after the Great East Japan Earthquake and the accident at TEPCO’s Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Station. Only when a facility is recognized as meeting these standards will the government proceed with the restart of reactor operations, while gaining the understanding of the local communities. The government is also working to carefully explain the necessity of nuclear power and to enhance nuclear disaster-prevention measures.

Title: Legal Basis for Collecting and Disclosing Corporate Emissions Data, p.98~108

Question From Party: Republic of Korea

Question raised on: 08.04.2026 CEST

Question Category: Mitigation actions, policies and measures supporting NDC implementation

Question: We appreciate the information provided in Table II-10. The table includes detailed data on carbon emissions and emission intensity from private sector companies across various industrial subsectors. Could the Party provide further information on whether any legal or regulatory frameworks support the collection of such corporate data, and how this information is used for international reporting?

Answer:

The data in Table II-10 is compiled by industry associations from the data of participating companies within the framework of voluntary action plans and does not have legal backing. This data is used when each industry communicates its initiatives. Moreover, companies above a certain level of emissions are legally required to calculate and report their own emissions to the government.

Title: Renewable Energy Expansion and the FIT Scheme, p.93

Question From Party: Republic of Korea

Question raised on: 08.04.2026 CEST

Question Category: Mitigation actions, policies and measures supporting NDC implementation

Question: We note the information provided on the policy “Maximum introduction of renewable energy.” This policy shows the highest level of achieved and expected emission reductions in 2022. Could the Party provide examples of successful implementation of this policy? In addition, could the Party elaborate on the design and operation of incentive schemes, such as the Feed-in Tariff (FIT) scheme?

Answer:

Renewable energy is becoming a cost-competitive power source with its rapidly decreasing power generation costs worldwide, and the deployment of renewable energy is rapidly increasing. In Japan, since the introduction of the feed-in tariff (FIT) scheme in July 2012, the share of renewable energy in the country's power generation mix has expanded from 10% at the time to approximately 23% by FY2024. In particular, despite geographical constraints such as Japan's small flat land area and steep seafloor topography offshore, Japan has steadily expanded its use of renewable energy.
With the principle of S+3E as the major premise of our energy policy, we will actively promote renewable energy as a major power source for the decarbonization of the power sector and strengthen measures in cooperation with related ministries and agencies and local governments to encourage the maximum introduction of renewable energy while promoting coexistence with local communities and minimizing the public burden.
FIT scheme is a system under which the government guarantees that electric power companies will purchase electricity generated from renewable energy sources at a certain price for a certain period of time. A portion of the costs that the companies pay to purchase electricity is collected from the electricity users in the form of a surcharge, and this helps support the introduction of renewable energy. Thanks to the scheme, it becomes easier to establish a clear outlook for recovering costs such as the construction costs of power generation facilities, which is expected to promote further adoption of renewable energy.
For the integration of renewable energy into the electricity market, the feed-in premium (FIP) scheme linked to market prices (https://www.meti.go.jp/english/press/2025/0321_001.html) has been introduced since FY2022 in addition to the FIT scheme.

Title: Question to Japan on their capacity building workshops

Question From Party: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Question raised on: 08.04.2026 CEST

Question Category: Financial, technological development and transfer, and capacity-building support

Question: Thank you Japan for the opportunity to comment on your first Biennial Transparency Report. You shared in your report that you have led workshops to build capacity on the article 6 market mechanism. Can you please share how this was received and any lessons learned?

Answer:

The mutual learning programme for enhancing transparency was conducted by Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES) with financial support from Ministry of the Environment Japan (MOEJ). This programme provided the practical exercise how to prepare Article 6.2 reporting. MOEJ also initiated the launch

of the Paris Agreement Article 6 Implementation Partnership (A6IP) center in 2023 and continuously provides hands-on training tailored to each country for authorization, reporting, and tracking consistent with Article 6 of the Paris Agreement.
Lessons learned from this programme were as follows.
• Participating countries had limited understanding of Article 6 guidance (e.g. ITMOs and corresponding adjustment methods) and reporting requirements including draft AEF
• Practical exercise such drafting reports was helpful to understand the Article 6 guidance and identify gaps on reporting requirements and data collection.
• Participating countries needed the support on domestic arrangements on ITMOs authorization and developing registry systems for tracking ITMOs
• Support and capacity building should be flexible and meet the needs of countries (e.g. program schedule, topics, informal discussion).

Title: F-gases data collection

Question From Party: Canada

Question raised on: 08.04.2026 CEST

Question Category: National inventory report

Question: Could you please share any best practices or lessons learned from your experience in collecting data from industry associations or industry members (e.g. companies involved in industrial processes, suppliers of F-gases or F-gas-containing products, equipment service providers, etc.) for preparing Industrial Processes and Product Use (IPPU) sector estimates, including voluntary data collection?

Answer:

Data collection through industry associations and industry members enables the gathering of the most appropriate data for emissions estimation, since they have the most knowledge of the industry. Data collection that is not based on legal regulations can sometimes pose issues, such as preventing the timely acquisition of necessary data. However, cooperation has been received, due to the recognized benefits of maintaining consistency between data related to the industry's voluntary goals and the national inventory.

Title: Third-party quality assurance for Industrial Processes and Product Use Sector

Question From Party: Canada

Question raised on: 08.04.2026 CEST

Question Category: National inventory report

Question: Could you please share some examples of quality assurance (QA) or verification work conducted for Industrial Processes and Product Use (IPPU) categories with the support of third-parties not directly involved in the inventory compilation or development? Please indicate who was involved, why they were selected, how they contributed to the QA/verification process, and what outcomes were achieved.

Answer:

The IPPU sector QA has been implemented by appointing two academic experts in related fields, based on the following criteria. They have:
a. no direct involvement in the inventory preparation process for estimating emissions/ removals from the sectors/categories to be reviewed (i.e., no involvement in the Committee for the Greenhouse Gas Emissions Estimation Methods, the data creation and the data provision for those sectors/categories);
b. no specific interests related to the inventory and the capability to judge objectively without being affected by any specific organizations and/or stakeholders;
c. sufficient skills, knowledge and experience to assure the quality of the inventory.

The two experts shared the review task by 1) categories unrelated to F-gases and 2) categories related to F-gases. They each mainly focused on their categories and confirmed the appropriateness of estimation methods, activity data, emission factors, and other items, and the reported content. Between the two experts, all categories were covered, not only the ones with larger emissions or categories that underwent methodological change. Their findings lead to improved transparency of descriptions in the inventory report.

Title: GHG Inventory methodologies and mitigation measures

Question From Party: Canada

Question raised on: 08.04.2026 CEST

Question Category: National inventory report

Question: What processes do you have in place to ensure inventory methodologies effectively reflect changes in activities/practices resulting from mitigation measures?

Answer:

The Committee for the Greenhouse Gas Emissions Estimation Methods considers the methods for calculating inventory emissions and removals, and the selection of parameters such as activity data (AD) and emission factors (EFs).
Some methodologies reflect mitigation measures through consideration by the Committee.
An example is that the recovery amount of HFCs from refrigeration and air conditioning equipment is subtracted from the emissions (cf. NID2024 section 4.7.1 and BTR1 section II.D.3.2).
Another example is that AD and EFs of the CH4 emissions from rice cultivation are disaggregated regarding whether the prolonged mid-season drainage is implemented or not (cf. NID2024 section 5.4.1 and BTR1 section II.D.4.1).

Title: New technologies in GHG Inventory development

Question From Party: Canada

Question raised on: 08.04.2026 CEST

Question Category: National inventory report

Question: How have you been able to leverage new technologies such as artificial intelligence to improve GHG inventory development?

Answer:

Some examples of using conversational artificial intelligence (AI) by the inventory compilers are as follows: (1) Translate between Japanese and English. (Japan publishes national inventory documents in Japanese as well as English at the same time.); (2) Let AI read long documents such as the IPCC Guidelines and ask general questions to find exact sections to reference; (3) Gain assistance in improving macro codes to speed up processing.
However, since we cannot say that we have fully utilized AI’s potential, we need to further look into what AI can do, especially to reduce routine work. For example, converting a complicated table in a statistical publication to a spreadsheet file.

Title: Fluorinated gas production

Question From Party: Canada

Question raised on: 08.04.2026 CEST

Question Category: National inventory report

Question: With regards to CRT 2.B.9.b, how does your country identify F-gas producers, determine the types of F-gases being produced, and track their production?

Answer:

The production amounts, F-gas species, emissions data are gathered through an industry association.

Title: Methane emissions from rice cultivation and bioplastics

Question From Party: Canada

Question raised on: 08.04.2026 CEST

Question Category: Mitigation actions, policies and measures supporting NDC implementation

Question: Japan has highlighted efforts to reduce methane emissions from rice cultivation. How does the government plan to ensure that increased rice production for bioplastics does not offset these mitigation gains?

Answer:

At present, bioplastic production in Japan is not predicated on increased rice cultivation as a primary feedstock source. Where domestic agricultural resources are utilized, the emphasis is placed on the use of residues, such as rice straw and husks, rather than on additional rice production. Accordingly, current practices are not expected to incentivize the expansion of paddy cultivation or to undermine ongoing efforts to mitigate methane emissions from rice agriculture.

Title: Low carbon technology adoption in IPPU sectors

Question From Party: Canada

Question raised on: 08.04.2026 CEST

Question Category: Mitigation actions, policies and measures supporting NDC implementation

Question: How is Japan supporting domestic industries (e.g., steel, cement) in adopting low-carbon production processes and technology?

Answer:

In industrial sectors including iron and steel and cement, Japan provides continuous support for innovative technologies that contribute to the achievement of carbon neutrality by 2050, by utilizing the Green Innovation Fund, from R&D to demonstration and social implementation. In addition, through upfront investment support utilizing Green Transformation（GX） Economy Transition Bonds, Japan is supporting large-scale capital investment associated with the conversion of manufacturing processes. Furthermore, Japan is promoting both the “visualization” of GX value and the proactive procurement of GX products and services in order to create demand for GX products, namely products that contribute to simultaneously ensuring energy security, economic growth, and decarbonization.

Title: Progress towards 2030 NDC target

Question From Party: European Union

Question raised on: 08.04.2026 CEST

Question Category: Progress towards/achievement of the NDC

Question: In its updated NDC, Japan presents its economy-wide single year target of 46% GHG reduction by 2030 (from a 2013 baseline). However, we noted that in Table 5 of Japan's 'Report on the technical expert review of the first biennial transparency report of Japan' – the NDC target level for 2030 of 760,000 kt CO2 eq is lower than its projected 'with measures' scenario presented in Table 7 of the same document (776,000 kt CO2 eq) meaning there is a small gap between projection and target. In its updated NDC, Japan presents its economy-wide single year target of 46% GHG reduction by 2030 (from a 2013 baseline). However, we note that in Table 5 of Japan's 'Report on the technical expert review of the first biennial transparency report of Japan' – the NDC target level for 2030 of 760,000 kt CO2 eq is lower than its projected 'with measures' scenario presented in Table 7 of the same document (776,000 kt CO2 eq) meaning there is a small gap between projection and target. In addition, a slow down / plateauing of Japan's total GHG trend is visible for the inventory years 2021 and 2022 following a consistent declining trend between 2013 and 2020. Could Japan elaborate on its current status towards achieving its NDC target, the current challenges and obstacles hindering progress, particularly towards the target in relation to the slowdown of progress observed in the 2021-2022 GHG trend?

Answer:

The projection values for the "with measures" scenario (776,000 kt CO2 eq) shown in Table 7 of the "Report on the technical expert review of the first biennial transparency report of Japan" are based on the GHG inventory-based emissions and removals. This differs from the accounting methodology used for Japan's NDC target, in which the contributions from LULUCF are estimated using an activity-based approach. The projected total GHG emissions (excluding the GHG removals by the LULUCF sector) in FY 2030 under a with measures scenario are approximately 813 Mt CO2 eq., which is a decrease of 42% from FY 2013. Considering the projections for the GHG removals contribution of the LULUCF (removals by forest carbon sinks [approximately 38 Mt CO2], carbon sinks in agricultural soils [approximately 8.5 Mt CO2] and urban greening [approximately 1.2 Mt CO2]) and the JCM in FY 2030, the projected total GHG emissions and removals for FY 2030 will be a reduction of 46% from FY 2013, thereby achieving the level of Japan's FY2030 target.
Emissions in FY2021 increased from the previous year due to higher energy consumption associated with the economic recovery following the COVID-19 pandemic. In FY2022, however, emissions declined compared with the previous year, reflecting factors such as a decrease in iron and steel production and improvements in energy efficiency across various sectors. At the same time, the post-pandemic recovery of economic activity continued in FY 2022, particularly in the transport sector, exerting upward pressure on emissions. In FY 2023 and FY 2024, emissions have continued to decline against the backdrop of the decarbonization of the power sector and reduced production levels in manufacturing industries.

Title: Sensitivity analysis for projections

Question From Party: European Union

Question raised on: 08.04.2026 CEST

Question Category: Progress towards/achievement of the NDC

Question: As identified in Japan's Report on the technical expert review of the first biennial transparency report of Japan addendum3 Issue #13.3, Japan stated that a sensitivity analysis was not performed on its projections because the appropriate methodology for a sensitivity analysis had not been considered. Could Japan please share any challenges and potential progress in developing and performing a sensitivity analysis in its projections ? Additionally, could Japan explain how it anticipates using such analysis in its projection or planning processes?

Answer:

At present, work is underway to examine the methodology and indicators for sensitivity analysis in preparation for BTR2. In BTR2, Japan intends to report projected values for 2035 and 2040, which could not be reported in BTR1, and also plans to present the results of sensitivity analysis alongside these projections.

Sensitivity analysis is intended to examine the impact of external factors on future GHG emissions and to quantitatively assess the likelihood of achieving emission reduction targets. Japan conducts an annual assessment of progress under the Plan for Global Warming Countermeasures, which serves as the domestic plan for achieving its NDCs. In this process, the likelihood of achieving the NDC is comprehensively assessed by analyzing the factors driving recent GHG emission trends and evaluating progress in the implementation of individual policies and measures. The results of the sensitivity analysis could be utilized as additional information within this process to assess progress under the Plan for Global Warming Countermeasures.

Title: Emissions projections

Question From Party: New Zealand

Question raised on: 08.04.2026 CEST

Question Category: Mitigation actions, policies and measures supporting NDC implementation

Question: New Zealand would like to congratulate Japan on being one of the first Parties to submit their BTR. As noted in Japan's first BTR and its technical expert review, Japan reported greenhouse gas emission projections out to 2030. Could Japan elaborate on the challenges it faced in reporting out at least 15 years into the future? Is Japan planning to submit projections that extend at least 15 years into the future in its second BTR?

Answer:

In Japan, projections of future GHG emissions are developed in the process of formulating the NDCs. At the time of preparing the BTR1, projections for 2035 and 2040 had been developed for the consideration of the NDC to be submitted in February 2025. However, because the submission of the BTR1 (October 2024) took place well ahead of the submission of the NDC (February 2025), it was not possible to include projections for 2035 and 2040 in BTR1.
Projections for 2035 and 2040 are planned to be reported in the BTR2, scheduled for submission in 2026.
