

RPG 2020: Review issues related to policies and measures

7th BRs and NCs lead reviewers meeting

9–10 June 2020

Virtual meeting



Jamie Howland, Programme Officer, Transparency Division, UNFCCC Secretariat



List of review issues for the session



1. PaMs reported as planned for purpose of projections

2. Do Parties need to report all PaMs in the textual portion of the BR or CTF table 3?

3. Do Parties need to report PaMs that impact sectors not in their target?

4. How to assess reporting on grouped PaMs



1. PaMs reported as planned for the purposes of projections, but have since been implemented or adopted



Reporting requirement(s)

According to the CTF reporting guidelines: Start year of implementation is a reporting requirement for CTF table 3. Status of PaMs is also a reporting requirement, with a footnote: To the extent possible, the following descriptive terms should be used to report on the status of implementation: implemented, adopted, planned.

Review challenge:

How to assess the reporting of PaMs as planned for the purposes of projections, but have since been implemented or adopted?

Example: Party in its BR4 reports a PaM as planned, but with an implementation date of 2019. The Party has chosen Jan 1, 2018 as the cutoff date for PaMs included in the WEM scenario. The planned PaM in question is included in the WAM scenario.



1. PaMs reported as planned for the purposes of projections, but have since been implemented or adopted

Suggested approach

- When a Party has reported a PaM as planned for the purposes of projections that has since been implemented, it should both identify that this has been done and provide an explanation regarding the purpose. This could be done in either the textual portion of the BR or a footnote to CTF table 3.
- In cases where the explanation is missing or not sufficient, ERTs should raise a transparency recommendation.
- Inconsistencies in reporting the status of a PaM between the textual portion of the BR and CTF table 3 are already addressed in the RPG under general issues of inconsistency between the textual portion of the BR and CTF tables.



2. Do Parties need to report all PaMs in the textual portion of the BR or CTF table 3?



Reporting requirement(s)

Para 6: Each Annex I Party shall provide information on its mitigation actions, including on the policies and measures it has implemented or plans to implement since its last national communication or biennial report to achieve its economy-wide emission reduction target.

NC para 14: The national communication does not have to report every policy and measure which affects GHG emissions.

Review challenge:

How to assess the completeness of reporting of PaMs when all PaMs are not reported?

Example: A Party states in its BR that it has not reported on all PaMs or a reviewer recognizes that some PaMs have not been reported.



2. Do Parties need to report all PaMs in the textual portion of the BR or CTF table 3?

Suggested approach

- **Parties do not need to report every PaM that impacts GHG emissions in the BR and CTF table 3.**
- At a minimum, PaMs that have the most significant impact on emissions reductions should be reported. ERTs could ask Parties how they decided which PaMs to report to help inform their evaluation of the completeness of the reporting.
- Inconsistencies in reporting the information related to a PaM between the PaMs chapter in the textual portion of the BR and CTF table 3 should be addressed as described in III.C.3, **noting that a more extensive list of PaMs in CTF table 3 should not be considered an inconsistency if it is explained in the report.**



3. Do Parties need to report PaMs that impact sectors not in their target?



Reporting requirement(s)

Para 6: Each Annex I Party shall provide information on its mitigation actions, including on the policies and measures it has implemented or plans to implement since its last national communication or biennial report **to achieve its economy-wide emission reduction target.**

Review challenge:

Do Parties need to report PaMs that impact sectors (i.e. LULUCF) not in their target?

Example: Party in its BR4 does not report any LULUCF PaMs, but the ERT becomes aware of them during the review, for example in response to a question in the VTR.



3. Do Parties need to report PaMs that impact sectors not in their target?

Suggested approach

- Parties that do not report PaMs related to a sector not included in their target (i.e. LULUCF) should not receive recommendations or encouragements related to this.
- ERTs could consider commending Parties that report on PaMs related to a sector not included in their target.



4. How to assess reporting on grouped PaMs



Reporting requirement(s)

According to the CTF reporting guidelines: Estimated mitigation impact is a reporting requirement for CTF table 3.

Review challenge:

How to assess the estimated impacts of PaMs reported as a group when the hierarchy is not clearly defined?

Example: Party in its CTF table 3 reports the estimated impact of a PaM identified as a group (for example, “All energy efficiency actions”), but it is not clear which individual PaMs (if any) are included in that group.



4. How to assess reporting on grouped PaMs

Suggested approach

- Clarify that the hierarchy of grouped PaMs should be identified, but still does not result in a recommendation. Proposed revision to current RPG language:
- An estimate of mitigation impact is reported in CTF table 3 for a group of mitigation actions, but the Party did not provide an adequate explanation in the custom footnote to CTF table 3 or in the textual part of the BR as to **which individual PaMs are included in the group and** why mitigation impacts are estimated only for a group of mitigation actions and not for each individual mitigation action. The ERT should take note that the transparency of reporting could be further improved by providing an explanation as to why mitigation impacts could be estimated only for a group of mitigation actions and not for each individual mitigation action;



Thank you!!



Transparency