

## Session SBI43 (2015)

Session started at 01-09-2015 00:00:00 [GMT+1]

Session closed at 27-11-2015 23:59:59 [GMT+1]



A compilation of questions to - and answers by – Belarus  
Exported 25-11-2015 by the  
UNITED NATIONS FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE

**Question by** Brazil at Wednesday, 30 September 2015

**Category:** Assumptions, conditions and methodologies related to the attainment of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 30 September

**Title:** Methodology - IPCC SAR GWP

Table 2(c) is related to the reference for the GWP. Please present the reasons for adopting the GWP values from Second Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC).

**Answer by** Belarus

Tuesday, 17 November 2015

The First Biennial Report of the Republic of Belarus was submitted in January 2014 and therefore last available official data on GHG emission from 2011 GHG Inventory Report (Submitted in April 2013) were used. The 2011 GHG Inventory Report was prepared according to *Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*, *2000 Good Practice Guidance and Uncertainty Management in National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*, as well as *2003 Good Practice Guidance for Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry and using CRF Reporter software (version 3.6) which was eligible for 2011 GHG Inventory Submissions for UNFCCC Annex I Parties and therefore included GWP from 2nd AR.*

*At present, Belarus is adopting its GHG inventory according to 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories and updated web-based CRF Reporter which includes GWP from 4th AR. Therefore, at the end of this year GHG emissions will be recalculated using new UNFCCC reporting requirements and GWP from 4<sup>th</sup> AR for entire time series.*

---

**Question by** Brazil at Wednesday, 30 September 2015

**Category:** Assumptions, conditions and methodologies related to the attainment of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 30 September

**Title:** Report length

Please list the reasons for presenting a two pages report. What are the difficulties for presenting a more detailed report?

**Answer by** Belarus

Tuesday, 17 November 2015

There was a first experience in the preparation of the Biennial Reports. Also Guidelines for preparation of Biannual Reports don't provide requirements on the length of the reporting.

The First Biennial Report summaries required information on: Greenhouse gas (GHG) emission trends; Description of quantified economy-wide emission reduction target; Mitigation actions and their effects; GHG projections; and Provision of financial, technological and capacity building support.

More detailed information was provided in the 6th National Communication which was updated and resubmitted in 2015. We apologies for short information in the First Biennial Report. Belarus will provide detailed description on required updated information in a later stage with its Second Biennial Report in January 2016.

---

**Question by** Saudi Arabia at Wednesday, 30 September 2015

**Category:** Progress towards the achievement of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 30 September

**Title:** The assessment of the economic and social consequences of response measures

Did Belarus encounter difficulty in reporting on the assessment of economic and social consequences of its response measures or in providing information on what efforts Belarus is making to minimize adverse social, environmental and economic impacts on developing Parties, as it did not include any information in its Biennial report nor in its NC/supplementary information under Art 7.2 of KP, respectively?

**Answer by** Belarus  
Tuesday, 17 November 2015

During the in-country review the ERT noted that Belarus didn't provide information on the assessment of the economic and social consequences of response measures and impact on the developing countries. The Party explained to the ERT that the implementation of the Party's obligations under the Convention has mainly positive impacts in environmental, social and economic spheres. The aim of the governmental policy is to protect environment and improve standards of living. Belarus has no harmful effects on developing countries, especially small island states, etc.

Following the ERT recommendations Belarus will provide the required information in its next BR.

---

**Question by** Brazil at Wednesday, 30 September 2015

**Category:** Assumptions, conditions and methodologies related to the attainment of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 30 September

**Title:** Scenarios

Taking in to account the figure under item 5 "Projections", please elaborat on the similarities between "scenario with measures", "BAU scenario" and "scenario with additional measures".

**Answer by** Belarus

Tuesday, 17 November 2015

Scenario "BAU scenario since 1995" exclude all implemented, adopted or planned policies and measures on energy efficiency since 1995. In general this scenario should demonstrate what would happened if the energy efficiency would be "frozen" at 1995 level and no measures and policies had been implemented since 1995, but the economic growth rates are correspond to the real values. To tell the truth this scenario is unrealistic, but mainly should demonstrate the achievements of the Republic of Belarus in decreasing of GHG emission.

The Scenario "Development without changes" supposes that economy of Belarus and energy efficiency will develop according to the Governmental plans, no special measure and policies to reduce the GHG emission will be implemented. It is mainly concern of the energy industry.

The Scenario "With measures" supposes that measures to reduce electricity and heat consumption in industry and residential sectors will be implemented that result to decreasing the heat consumption by 3 mln. Gcal comparing to the "Development without changes" Scenario in 2020.

The Scenario "With additional measures" supposes that additional measures to reduce electricity and heat consumption in industry and residential sectors will be implemented that result to decreasing the heat consumption by 9 mln. Gcal. comparing to the "Development without changes" Scenario. In this Scenario it is suppose that in addition to the "Development without changes" Scenario 400 MW of the wind farm and 100 MW of hydro power plants will be put in operation till the 2020.

---

**Question by** Brazil at Wednesday, 30 September 2015

**Category:** Progress towards the achievement of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 30 September

**Title:** Mitigation actions

In Table 3 'Progress in achievement of the quantified economy-wide emission reduction target: information on mitigation actions and their effects', only three actions were listed, among a total of 16, with estimated impact of mitigation. Why Belarus is not presenting a more detailed quantified estimation related to the other 13 actions? Could Belarus present more details regarding the estimated impact of mitigation for the other 13 actions?

Attachment: [MA Belarus 16table.pdf](#)

**Answer by** Belarus  
Tuesday, 17 November 2015

We apologies for that. Please, see updated information on actions provided in the table 3 In Table 3 "Progress in achievement of the quantified economy-wide emission reduction target: information on mitigation actions and their effects".

Attachment: [MA Belarus 16table.pdf](#)

---

**Question by** Brazil at Wednesday, 30 September 2015

**Category:** Assumptions, conditions and methodologies related to the attainment of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 30 September

**Title:** Clarification

In item 2 "Information GHG emissions and trends", Belarus stated that "Net GHG emissions in 2011 excluding LULUCF were 87.3 Mt which are 37.3% lower compared to 1990 level (base year). This reduction is due to the changes in the economy, measures in the energy efficiency and environmental measures". Could Belarus clarify what "changes in the economy" as well as "environmental measures" mean?

Attachment: [There are several reasons for the reduction in emissions in the Republic of Belarus.pdf](#)

**Answer by** Belarus  
Tuesday, 17 November 2015

There are several reasons for the reduction in emissions in the Republic of Belarus.

The first reason is rapid fall in GHG emissions during 1990-1995 period due to economic recession and the subsequent decrease in production and fuel consumption after disintegration of Soviet Union in 1990.

However, from 1995, a period of economic growth commenced, in the course of which the per capita gross domestic product (with account of purchasing power parity) demonstrated a 4.5-time increase by 2012. GHG emissions also increased due to the growth of production, increased fuel consumption and increased volumes of landfilled waste. However, the emissions increase rate is significantly lower than the GDP growth rate (Figure below).

The average annual GDP growth during the 1995-2012 period was 7.9 per cent, while the average annual increase of greenhouse gas emissions during the same period was 0.4 per cent. The carbon intensity of the economy during the period 1995-2012 decreased 3.9 times; this is the fastest rate of progress towards achieving low-carbon development parameters in Europe.

The trend of emissions, in particular after 2000, along with GDP growth is fully depends on implementation of mitigation policy in Belarus that includes number of national strategies and programmes, and other legal acts in energy efficiency in all sectors of national economy, in promoting of renewable energy sources, so called “environmental measures” that includes resource saving technologies and recycling of second rural materials, as well as improving of waste management practice etc. One of the key legal act that describes main directions and targets of mitigation policy of the Republic of Belarus is State Programme on Mitigation Actions for 2013-2020. This programme was developed with referenced to the Programme on Mitigation Actions for 2008-2012 that have been already implemented. This programme envisages GHG emission reduction of not less than by 10 million tons in CO<sub>2</sub>eq for 2013 – 2020. In particular, this programme includes mitigation and adaptation component, measures to improve the monitoring system of the climate change, as well as international cooperation.

The full list of national policy and measures is provided in the 6th National Communication.

Attachment: [There are several reasons for the reduction in emissions in the Republic of Belarus.pdf](#)

---

**Question by** Brazil at Wednesday, 30 September 2015

**Category:** Progress towards the achievement of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 30 September

**Title:** Emissions reduction target

Belarus has specified its emission reduction target as 8 per cent of reduction by the year 2020 as compared to the 1990 emission level.

Table 6(a) BLR\_BR1\_v1.0 “Information on updated greenhouse gas projections under a “with measures scenario” shows that Belarus will be on track to meet its target under the Convention (based on the projections related to 2020, the GHG emission reduction, considering total with LULUCF contribution, is 27%, and without LULUCF is 22%). But comparing the projections by 2020 with emissions in 2011, there will be an emissions increase of 38% and 24%, respectively.

[Answer by Belarus](#)  
Tuesday, 17 November 2015

Belarus, the same way as other Annex 1 Parties, refers its emissions to the 1990 emission level (baseline level). Compared to this baseline data our projected emissions by 2020 demonstrate the said reduction of 8% compared to the emissions in the base year (1990). It should be noted here that in spite of the fact that the carbon intensity of the economy during the period 1995-2012 decreased 3.9 times (this is the fastest rate of progress towards achieving low-carbon development parameters in Europe), the trend of emission growth is still present since 2000 due to growing economy (approx. 7-8% annual growth rate) and to some other circumstances (see NC-6). It also should be admitted that projections are updated annually while using most recent data. The said target was communicated by Belarus prior to CMP in Doha.

---

[Question by Brazil at Wednesday, 30 September 2015](#)

[Category:](#) All emissions and removals related to its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

[Type:](#) Before 30 September

[Title:](#) Emissions details

In item 2 “Information GHG emissions and trends”, Belarus stated that “the main category is Energy sector (including transport) which provides with 61% of total emissions. The same share of CO<sub>2</sub> in the GHG distribution - 64%”. Could Belarus present more details on GHG emissions and trends, considering other sectors?

Attachment: [MA Belarus 16table.pdf](#)

[Answer by Belarus](#)  
Tuesday, 17 November 2015

Please, see updated information on actions provided in the table 3 In Table 3 “Progress in achievement of the quantified economy-wide emission reduction target: information on mitigation actions and their effects”.

---

**Question by** Brazil at Wednesday, 30 September 2015

**Category:** Progress towards the achievement of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 30 September

**Title:** Mitigation action results

Considering that the status of all actions presented in Table 3 have been pointed out as “implemented”, what are the difficulties in order to provide more quantitative details about the mitigation results already achieved?

Attachment: [MA Belarus 16table.pdf](#)

**Answer by** Belarus  
Tuesday, 17 November 2015

Please, see updated information on actions provided in the table 3 In Table 3 “Progress in achievement of the quantified economy-wide emission reduction target: information on mitigation actions and their effects”.

---

**Question by** Brazil at Wednesday, 30 September 2015

**Category:** Progress towards the achievement of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 30 September

**Title:** Quantified emission limitations

In item 3 “Economy-wide emission reduction targets”, Belarus stated that “Taking into account national circumstances and the commitments of the Republic of Belarus to prevent the climate change the quantified emission limitations of the Republic of Belarus for the second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol have been increased to 12 per cent as compared to the 1990 emission level”. Further clarification might be needed about this statement. Does this mean a back-track on previous commitment? Is it an increase on the quantified emission limitations, meaning lowering ambition? Please clarify what is the Belarus quantified emission limitations.

**Answer by** Belarus  
Tuesday, 17 November 2015

The only “Economy-wide emission reduction targets”, which Belarus officially committed in writing, are stipulated in Doha amendment to Kyoto Protocol. The related amendment to Annex B states as follows:

- Pledges for reduction of GHG emissions by 2020: -8% of Year 1990 level;



- Quantified emission limitation or reduction commitment for 2013-2020: 88% of Year 1990 level.

Perhaps, the phrase in item 3 was not correctly built. The meaning behind this phrase should be understood as follows:

“Taking into account national circumstances and the commitments of the Republic of Belarus to prevent the climate change, the quantified emission limitation **commitment** of the Republic of Belarus for the second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol have been **strengthened** increased to 12 per cent as compared to the 1990 emission level”.

---

[Question by Brazil](#) at Wednesday, 30 September 2015

**Category:** All emissions and removals related to its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 30 September

**Title:** LULUCF

Some required information on LULUCF under tables 4 and 4(a) are not presented. Could Belarus provide more information on LULUCF sector?

[Answer by Belarus](#)  
Tuesday, 17 November 2015

Land Use, Land use change and Forestry (LULUCF) is a net removal sector in the Republic of Belarus. During the reporting period 1990-2011 there was increasing of Net emissions/removals by 2.3% in the Republic of Belarus, mainly, due to increasing of absorption in forest lands remaining forest lands. Category 5 A Forest Lands, in particular sub-category 5 A 1 Forest Lands Remaining Forest Lands makes the greatest contribution to the GHG absorption. Croplands account for GHG emissions and absorption on lands under perennial crops, as well as emissions from liming application to soils. Wetlands are sources of emissions and account for emissions from lands used for peat mining. Emissions and removals in LULUCF sector were not considered and excluded from the calculation of the emission reduction target as there are high uncertainties of the GHG emission/removal estimates in this sector in Belarus.

---

[Question by Brazil](#) at Wednesday, 30 September 2015

**Category:** Progress towards the achievement of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 30 September

**Title:** Estimation of mitigation action impacts

Does Belarus plan to estimate the impact of mitigation actions that have not being estimated? If not, what are the main reasons? If possible, present an explanation by mitigation action or by cluster/sector.

Attachment: [MA Belarus 16table.pdf](#)

**Answer by Belarus**  
Tuesday, 17 November 2015

Please, see updated information on actions provided in the table 3 In Table 3 “Progress in achievement of the quantified economy-wide emission reduction target: information on mitigation actions and their effects”.

---

**Question by Saudi Arabia at Wednesday, 30 September 2015**

**Category:** Progress towards the achievement of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 30 September

**Title:** Methodologies used for assessment the impact of mitigation measures on developing countries

During the experts’ review of its BR, what were the methodologies used to make general assessment about the impact of Belarus mitigation measures on developing countries?

**Answer by Belarus**  
Tuesday, 17 November 2015

The Republic of Belarus is not a very huge GHG emitter in comparison with other countries, such as USA, China, India, Canada, European Union, etc. In 2012 emissions were 35,8% below the level of 1990. In spite this fact our country has done a lot in order to reduce GHG emissions, to develop and implement programs and strategies with a view of emissions reduction. In different sectors of the national economy programs aimed to increase energy efficiency, to introduce renewable energy sources and green technologies are being implemented.

The main purpose of the Governmental policy is to protect the environment and create favorable conditions of living for future generations in our country. So, the Republic of Belarus does not have any adverse impacts to the Parties which are developing countries in accordance with Article 3, paragraph 14 of the Kyoto Protocol. This conclusion was made on the basis of the analysis of the GHG emissions of Belarus, geographical location of the country and distance to the developing countries. While preparing BR 1 and NC 6 the Republic of Belarus did not use methodologies to make general assessment of the impact of Belarus mitigation measures on developing countries.

---

**Question by** Brazil at Wednesday, 30 September 2015

**Category:** Assumptions, conditions and methodologies related to the attainment of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 30 September

**Title:** Sectors

Is LULUCF sector included in the 2020 emission reduction target?

**Answer by** Belarus

Tuesday, 17 November 2015

Emissions and removals in LULUCF sector were not considered and excluded from the calculation of the emission reduction target as there are high uncertainties of the GHG emission/removal estimates in this sector in Belarus.

---

**Question by** New Zealand at Monday, 28 September 2015

**Category:** All emissions and removals related to its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 30 September

**Title:** Energy sector measures

The 1st Biennial Report states that energy efficiency measures have enabled greenhouse gas emissions to decrease since 1990. Can Belarus please provide further information on energy efficiency measures that have already been implemented? Also, what opportunities does Belarus have to reduce emissions from the Energy sector, and from transport?

Attachment: [The period of 1990.pdf](#)

**Answer by** Belarus

Tuesday, 17 November 2015

The period of 1990-1995 is characterized with economy recession and as a result with decreasing of production level and fuel consumption in the country after disintegration of the Soviet Union. However, from 1995, a period of economic growth commenced, in the course of which the per capita gross domestic product (with account of purchasing power parity) demonstrated a 4.5-time increase by 2012. GHG emissions also increased due to the growth of production, increased fuel consumption and increased volumes of landfilled waste. However, the emissions increase rate is significantly lower than the GDP growth rate (Figure below). Please find attached file.

---

**Question by** New Zealand at Monday, 28 September 2015

**Category:** Assumptions, conditions and methodologies related to the attainment of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 30 September

**Title:** Projections assumptions

Can Belarus please explain the differences in assumptions underlying the “with measures”, “BAU Scenario” and “with additional measures” projections as presented in its 6th National Communication and 1st Biennial Report?

**Answer by** Belarus

Tuesday, 17 November 2015

Scenario “BAU scenario since 1995” exclude all implemented, adopted or planned policies and measures on energy efficiency since 1995. In general this scenario should demonstrate what would happened if the energy efficiency would be “frozen” at 1995 level and no measures and policies had been implemented since 1995, but the economic growth rates are correspond to the real values. To tell the truth this scenario is unrealistic, but mainly should demonstrate the achievements of the Republic of Belarus in decreasing of GHG emission.

The Scenario “Development without changes” supposes that economy of Belarus and energy efficiency will develop according to the Governmental plans, no special measure and policies to reduce the GHG emission will be implemented. It is mainly concern of the energy industry.

The Scenario “With measures” supposes that measures to reduce electricity and heat consumption in industry and residential sectors will be implemented that result to decreasing the heat consumption by 3 mln. Gcal comparing to the “Development without changes” Scenario in 2020.

The Scenario “With additional measures” supposes that additional measures to reduce electricity and heat consumption in industry and residential sectors will be implemented that result to decreasing the heat consumption by 9 mln. Gcal. comparing to the “Development without changes” Scenario. In this Scenario it is suppose that in addition to the “Development without changes” Scenario 400 MW of the wind farm and 100 MW of hydro power plants will be put in operation till the 2020.

---

**Question by** European Union at Thursday, 24 September 2015

**Category:** Progress towards the achievement of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 30 September

**Title:** Decoupling of economic growth from GHG emissions

To what extent is economic growth decoupled from GHG emissions?

What have been the main effects of the existing policies and measures on the emission trends?

What have been the main deviations from expected results and what in your view has caused this?

**Answer by** Belarus

Tuesday, 17 November 2015

Belarus succeeded to decouple economy growth and GHG emissions. The average annual GDP growth during the 1995-2012 period was 7.9 per cent, while the average annual increase of greenhouse gas emissions during the same period was 0.4 per cent. The carbon intensity of the economy during the period 1995-2012 decreased 3.9 times; this is the fastest rate of progress towards achieving low-carbon development parameters in Europe.

This success is a result of policy and measures in energy sector, first of all. The country also managed to effectively implement measures with relatively low marginal costs. This made it possible to rapidly approximate to other developed countries with similar climates in terms, for example, of such indicator as GDP energy intensity. Belarus has one of the lowest values in Europe for the carbon intensity of its energy system – about 0.3 tons in CO<sub>2</sub>-eq. for the generation of one MWh of heat and electricity, thus approaching such countries as Japan and the USA regarding installed capacity utilization efficiency.

---

**Question by** European Union at Thursday, 24 September 2015

**Category:** Progress towards the achievement of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 30 September

**Title:** Policies and measures

Belarus reported a number of mitigation actions in CTF Table 3. However, the first biennial report of Belarus is very short and lacks clear descriptions of the required elements laid down in the guidelines for the preparation of biennial reports. It has been clarified during the technical review which policies are considered to be key policies delivering the highest mitigation impact.

Could Belarus provide more information on the status of implementation of the policies and measures reported in table 3 of the CTF of the first biennial report? Could Belarus provide further information on the main goals and activities implemented in the context of these policies, namely the state programme on mitigation actions in 2013-2020 which has the highest mitigation impact (according to the review report), but also the state programme on energy system development until 2016, the National Programme for the Development of Local and Renewable Energy Sources for 2011 – 2015 and the state energy saving programme for 2010-2015?

Attachment: [MA Belarus 16table.pdf](#)

Answer by Belarus

Tuesday, 17 November 2015

a) Please, see updated information on actions provided in the table 3. In Table 3 “Progress in achievement of the quantified economy-wide emission reduction target: information on mitigation actions and their effects”.

b) a) One of the key legal act that describes main directions and targets of mitigation policy of the Republic of Belarus is ***State Programme on Mitigation Actions for 2013-2020***. This programme was developed with referenced to the Programme on Mitigation Actions for 2008-2012 that have been already implemented. This programme envisages GHG emission reduction of not less than by 10 million tons in CO<sub>2</sub>eq for 2013 – 2020. In particular, this programme includes mitigation and adaptation component, measures to improve the monitoring system of the climate change, as well as international cooperation. The mitigation impact in this programme aggregate the impacts of individual cross-sectoral and sectoral PaMs, such as

- the Strategy on technological potential development until 2015;
- the State programme on construction of energy sources on local fuels in 2011–2015;
- the State programme on energy system development until 2016;
- the State energy saving programme for 2010–2015;
- the National Programme for the Development of Local and Renewable Energy Sources for 2011–2015;
- the programmes for the construction of biogas and hydropower plants;
- the State forestry development programme for 2011–2015;
- and other PaMs.

***The State Programme of Development of Energy System*** suggests continuing modernization of the power generation, transmission and distribution installations. The principal indices projected in the Programme for the 5-year period (2011-2015) are as follows:

- Commissioning of highly effective new capacities: 1.871,3 MW;
- Phase-out of operation of inefficient capacities: 906 MW;

- Energy saving of total fuel and energy resources: 1,265 million tonnes of coal equivalent;
- Reduction of specific fuel consumption for electricity generation: by 25-30 grams of coal equivalent per kWh compared to 2010;
- Reduction of energy losses in electricity and heat supply networks: by 2%;
- Decrease of accumulated depreciation of fixed assets: up to 40%;
- Use of local fuel and energy resources along with secondary energy resources: 1,10-1,29 million tonnes of coal equivalent;
- Reduction of natural gas consumption, to be achieved in the end of the Programme, in fuel and energy balance due to energy saving and use of other types of fuel: 1,26 billion cubic meters per year.

***National Programme for the Development of Local and Renewable Energy Sources for 2011 – 2015*** provides data about RES potential technically available for the developments in this energy sector. Estimated technical RES potential in Belarus accounts for around 80 million tonnes of oil equivalent, which notably exceeds the Belarus's total energy consumption. For different RES technologies, this potential is assessed as follows:

- Wind energy installed capacity potential: 1600 MW. Potential sites (1840 in number) were identified for deployment of wind farms with multiple grid connection points.

---

**Question by** European Union at Thursday, 24 September 2015

**Category:** Progress towards the achievement of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 30 September

**Title:** Quantified mitigation effects of policies and measures

Could Belarus provide information on the quantified mitigation effects of other policies as reported in its first biennial report and CTF table 3?

Attachment: [MA Belarus 16table.pdf](#)

**Answer by** Belarus  
Tuesday, 17 November 2015

- Hydroenergy installed capacity potential: 850 MW. The largest hydropower potential is concentrated in Grodno, Vitebsk and Mogilev regions in the river basins of Neman, Western Dvina and Dnepr;
- Installed capacity potential for biogas-fired power plants: 850 MW;
- Biomass energy installed capacity potential: 2-3 thousand MW;
- Solar energy potential: more than 50 thousand GWh.

In the ***Republican Energy Saving Programme for the Period of 2011-2015*** the country adopted an ambitious low-carbon energy roadmap to reduce GDP energy

intensity by 50% in 2015 compared to 2005 level. The expected average annual effect of the implemented energy saving measures only under this program is about 11 million tones of CO<sub>2</sub>eq of GHG emission reduction. The major measures are as follows:

- use of combine gas turbine cycle technologies in cogeneration scheme of energy production;
- use of mini-CHP for decentralization of heat supply in industrial enterprises and utilities of small towns;
- minimization of energy losses in electricity grid and heat supply network;
- energy efficiency in construction industries and buildings;
- energy saving in energy intensive industries;
- energy saving in housing and communal services;
- renewable energy.

Please, see updated information on actions provided in the table 3. In Table 3 “Progress in achievement of the quantified economy-wide emission reduction target: information on mitigation actions and their effects”. There are several reasons for the reduction in emissions in the Republic of Belarus.

---

**Question by** European Union at Thursday, 24 September 2015

**Category:** Assumptions, conditions and methodologies related to the attainment of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 30 September

**Title:** Assumptions in BAU 1995

Could Belarus provide more information regarding its projections of GHG emissions related to the BAU scenario since 1995? What are the assumptions (e.g. related to economic growth) that lead to the assumed trend in emissions? How would Belarus assess the reliability of these assumptions given the fact that since 1995 emissions as presented in the GHG inventory did not show such trend?

**Answer by** Belarus

Tuesday, 17 November 2015

Scenario “BAU scenario since 1995” exclude all implemented, adopted or planned policies and measures on energy efficiency since 1995. In general this scenario should demonstrate what would happened if the energy efficiency would be “frozen” at 1995 level and no measures and policies had been implemented since 1995, but the economic growth rates are correspond to the real values. To tell the truth this scenario is unrealistic, but mainly should demonstrate the achievements of the Republic of Belarus in decreasing of GHG emission.



---

**Question by** European Union at Thursday, 24 September 2015

**Category:** Assumptions, conditions and methodologies related to the attainment of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 30 September

**Title:** Clarification of the target

Under the UNFCCC (FCCC/SB/2011/INF.1/Rev.1), Belarus communicated a target of a 5–10 per cent emission reduction by 2020 compared with 1990 levels.

In its biennial report CTF (table 2), Belarus specified the target at 88% of the emission levels of 1990.

During the review of the first biennial report, as indicated in the technical review report, Belarus informed that the target for 2020 is a reduction by 8% on basis of 1990.

**Could Belarus clarify what is its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target?**

Could you explain the reasons the targets have been changed compared to the information on the economy-wide emission reduction targets as communicated in 2011 and included in FCCC/SB/2011/INF.1/Rev.1 ?

Could you explain the reasons why this target is less strict than the Kyoto target of Belarus for the second commitment period?

Does Belarus intend to use market mechanisms to achieve the target?

In its original submission of its 2020 target under the Convention, Belarus included the condition that the target depends on the presence and access of Belarus to the Kyoto flexible mechanisms; during the review of BR1, Belarus indicated it does not aim to make use of any market-based mechanisms in order to comply with its 2020 target(s). Is this condition related to Kyoto flexible mechanisms no longer relevant? How does Belarus estimate its LULUCF emissions and removals in its emission levels' projections over the period?

What are the methodological approaches used and how do they impact on the assessment of the progress to the target?

**Answer by** Belarus

Tuesday, 17 November 2015

a) Indeed, in the document FCCC/SB/2011/INF.1/Rev.1 (7 June 2011) Belarus communicated a target of a 5-10 per cent emission reduction by 2020 in comparison with 1990 level. As we can see in point 6 of the mentioned document one of the most important preconditions for achieving 5-10 % emission reduction in 2020 is access of Belarus to the Kyoto flexible mechanisms. But still Belarus can't participate in these mechanisms.

b) Really, in Table 2 (a) of the BR1 of the Republic of Belarus it is stated that emission reduction target by 2020 will constitute 88% of base year (1990).

But during the in-country review of the 6 NC and BR 1 we (the Party) clarified the target and confirmed that textual description of the quantified economy-wide emission reduction target in BR1 is correct: that is 8% in compare to the base year. In this target all GHG were included, including NF3. The GWP values of the second AR of the IPCC were used. All sectors except LULUCF were included.

a) According to last official document submitted to UNFCCC Secretariat on Intended Nationally Determined Contribution prepared pursuant to paragraph 13 and 14 of Decision 1/CP.20 in its efforts to prevent of climate change Belarus fully rely on policies and measures which are adopted and will be further developed to reduce GHG emissions, and don't include market instruments in its economy-wide emission reduction targets.

b) Emissions and removals in LULUCF sector were not considered and excluded from the calculation of the emission reduction target as there are high uncertainties of the GHG emission/removal estimates in this sector in Belarus. Approaches regarding the inclusion of the LULUCF sector into reduction target will be further determined after clarification of the methodological questions relating to the estimation of emissions and removals of GHG in this sector. No later than 2020, the Republic of Belarus will return to the question of including the potential of this sector in its reduction target.

---

**Question by** Pakistan at Wednesday, 23 September 2015

**Category:** Assumptions, conditions and methodologies related to the attainment of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 30 September

**Title:** Important policy measures

Belarus has adopted various policies and measures to reduce quantified economy-wide emission reductions. Which of these policies and measures can be attributed as the most effective in terms of reducing emissions, and which of these can be termed as efficient and effective (easier and simpler) ?

**Answer by** Belarus  
Tuesday, 17 November 2015

Energy Efficiency and energy saving measures in all economy sectors should be considered as most effective in terms of GHG emission reduction in Belarus. Since 1995 through implementing above said measures energy intensity of GDP in 2012 decreased by 2.7 times and the carbon intensity of the economy during the period 1995-2012 decreased 3.9 times; this is the fastest rate of progress towards achieving low-carbon development parameters in Europe.

---

**Question by** Pakistan at Wednesday, 23 September 2015

**Category:** All emissions and removals related to its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 30 September

**Title:** Higher target potential

The current projections for quantified economy-wide emission reductions level is 26.5% below the base year by 2020. Would it be possible for Belarus to achieve a higher target of emission reduction than committed when there is potential to do so, to help world community to achieve its targets of addressing the global warming?

**Answer by** Belarus

Tuesday, 17 November 2015

Yes, Belarus noted in its last official submission to the UNFCCC Secretariat on Intended Nationally Determined Contribution prepared pursuant to paragraph 13 and 14 of Decision 1/CP.20 that undertakes by 2030 to reduce GHG by at least 28 per cent of the 1990 level, excluding emissions and removals in the land use, land-use change and forestry sector and without any additional conditions (the commitments do not imply the use of the international carbon market mechanisms or mobilizing foreign financial resources for the implementation of best available technologies).

---

**Question by** Pakistan at Wednesday, 23 September 2015

**Category:** Progress towards the achievement of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 30 September

**Title:** Trend in emission reduction

Belarus has shown a major decrease in quantified economy-wide emission reductions due to economic recession, whereas lately, with improvement in economic growth, the emissions have shown an increasing trend in 2012. How Belarus expects to achieve the emission reduction targets of 8% below the base year by 2020 if they continue with the current trend of economic growth?

**Answer by** Belarus

Tuesday, 17 November 2015

Belarus already have good results in archiving GHG emission reductions in the past along with economic growth through implementing of energy efficiency and energy saving measures, promoting renewable energy sources, improving of waste management practice, etc. Since 1995 energy intensity of GDP in 2012 decreased by 2.7 times and the carbon intensity of the economy during the period 1995-2012 decreased 3.9 times; this is the fastest rate of progress towards achieving low-

carbon development parameters in Europe. However, there is a potential to reduce GHG emissions. Up to 2030 Belarus expects to decrease its emissions by at least 28% compared to 1990 level. This target will be achieved through implementation of measures that already have been adopted, as well as will be adopted after 2016.

---

**Question by** China at Monday, 21 September 2015

**Category:** Progress towards the achievement of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 30 September

**Title:** drivers for projected trends of GHG emission

Could Belarus further elaborate on the drivers for the projected increasing trends of GHG emission during 2011 to 2018, as well as the drivers for the decreasing trend after 2018?

**Answer by** Belarus

Tuesday, 17 November 2015

The main driver for the increasing of GHG from 2011 to 2018 is growth of economy. Despite the decreasing the energy intensity it will not compensate the increasing the GHG emission, because low cost-effective measures in Belarus almost fully implemented and further decreasing of the energy intensity will require more and more investments.

The main driver for decreasing the GHG emission after 2018 is putting in operation the Nuclear power plant (first unit with 1200 MW installed capacity in 2019, the second one – in 2020).

---

**Question by** China at Monday, 21 September 2015

**Category:** Assumptions, conditions and methodologies related to the attainment of its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target

**Type:** Before 30 September

**Title:** differences between KP CP2 target and Cancun target

Belarus adopted an economy-wide emission reduction target of 8% by 2020 as compared to 1990 level. Meanwhile, under KP-CP2, Belarus's target is to reduce its GHG emission by 12% compared to 1990 level. Could Belarus provide further clarification regarding the differences between the above mentioned targets, in terms of the coverage of GHG emissions, emission reductions, accounting rules and their implications?

**Answer by** Belarus

Tuesday, 17 November 2015

When Belarus stated the target under KP-CP2 to reduce emissions by 12% in 2020 compared to 1990, we have taken into account the possibility of country's participation in Kyoto market mechanisms. But as we could not participate in Kyoto mechanisms as a seller, so based on analysis of emission trends and emission projections for 2020 emission reduction target was clarified.

During the in-country review of the 6 NC and BR 1 we (the Party) clarified the target and confirmed that textual description of the quantified economy-wide emission reduction target in BR1 is correct: that is 8% in compare to the base year. In this target all GHG were included, including NF3. The GWP values of the second AR of the IPCC were used. All sectors except LULUCF were included.

---