Outcome of the discussion in Group 1 on estimates of mitigation impacts of PaMs, description of the target and use of units from MBMs by EU MS

6th BRs and NCs lead reviewers meeting

11–12 March 2019

Bonn

Co-facilitators: Amr Abdel-Aziz, Hans Kolshus

12 March 2019

Transparency

RPG Update: 2019 RPG

- The suggested cases for review of estimates of mitigation impacts of PaMs as proposed in the RPG were further refined by the LRs and mostly agreed with Group 2

- One additional case was included in the RPG:

    Notation key "NE" is reported in the CTF table 3 for year 20XX for mitigation action that was adopted but starts with the implementation after 20XX. The ERT should take note that the transparency of reporting could be further improved by using notation key "NA" (not applicable) with explanation instead of "NE".

Transparency

RPG Update: 2019 RPG

- The suggested approach for review of the use of MBMs by the EU MS as proposed in the RPG was further refined by the LRs:

For BRs of EU member States:

The ERT should assess whether the information reported by the EU member States in its BR covers the units from MBMs used under the ESD and the explanation provided for the use of units from MBMs by installations under the EU ETS.

If the data reported by the EU member State are not consistent or do not cover the units used under the ESD and the explanation was not provided for the use of units from MBMs by installations under the EU ETS, the ERT should provide in the TRR a recommendation on transparency.

- The suggested approach for review of the base year for GHGs for EU MS was accepted as proposed in the RPG was further refined by the LRs:

Experience using the tools (checklist/projections graph/report template)

What worked well and what can be improved?

- ✓ Report template improvements: login period should be extended; instructions for non-highlighted parts (is it allowed to change); user-friendliness for MAC users

- ✓ Checklist: ok

- ✓ Projection graph: ok

Experience doing case-studies

What worked well and what can be improved?

- ✓ Case study was relevant

- ✓ More time allocated for case study

- ✓ Use updated background paper to identify issues for the next case studies