

GHG Inventories - Insights from negotiations on Enhanced Transparency Framework

Vaibhav Gupta

Senior Programme Lead

Annual Partnership Retreat, Seoul, Republic of Korea 15 October 2018

© Council on Energy, Environment and Water, 2018

CEEW – Among South Asia's leading policy research institutions

Energy Access

Renewables

Power Sector

Industrial Sustainability & Competitiveness

Low-Carbon Pathways

Risks & Adaptation

Technology, Finance & Trade



A brief overview

Guiding Principles

Structure/Design of MPGs

Facilitating improved reporting

Flexibility

Constraints and capacity needs

APA
Item 5
tool

National GHG Inventory

NDC

Adaptation

Support – provided & mobilized

Support – needed and received

Technical Expert review

Facilitative, multilateral consideration of progress

Perceived concerns:

- Intrusive
- Burdensome/duplicity
- Imbalance between action and support
- Against Nationally determined nature?
- Flexibility blanket cover vs selective
- MPGs common or differentiated



GHG Inventories – At a glance

Institutional Prerequisites

Defined roles and responsibility

Data
management or
data sharing
capability across
institutions

Inter-ministerial and cross sector coordination

Accuracy and Reliability

QA & QC, Uncertainty analysis

Sensitivity Analysis for NDCs

Verification approaches towards Mitigations (MRV)

Methodology

Use of higher tiers or IPCC guidelines

Methodology towards NDCs progress

Approach towards deciding finance needs

Serviceability

Periodicity of updating emission factors/activity data

Periodicity towards stakeholder consultation

Adherence to timeliness of NATCOM

Completeness

Coverage of all GHG emission gases

Reduction from each mitigation action

Disclosure on break up of finance received from different sources



APA item 5 - Unpacking the options (1/3)

Fulfilling Article 13 obligations

- Continuing with the MRV requirements
- MRV as a starting point, moving to elaborated MPGs later on (when?)
- Common modalities for issues applicable to each party; else, separate placement of provisions for developing and developed country Parties

Handling Conditionalities? What are the challenges?

- Objective of MPGs assisting parties in ensuring and improving the quality, coverage, and transparency over time – contingent on availability of support for the developing countries
- Choice of flexibility To be always supported by barriers and gap analysis in addition to the national improvement plan
 - Example: For inventories Info on planning, preparation, management, compilation, reporting measures, and what would be needed for TACCC

Lack of support related assurance – failed progress Lack of gap analysis – slow pace of progress



APA item 5 - Unpacking the options (2/3)

Flexibilities with application of IPCC guidelines

Includes: Definitions; Methodology, parameters and data; Uncertainty analysis; assessment of completeness, etc.

Challenge: Encouraged vis-à-vis mandated flexibility (& condition of improvement plan)

Other flexibilities

- Use of notation keys Here, flexibility on defining insignificant categories is based on certain % of overall emissions
- Reporting time-series: Flexibility to be limited to X-4 years only
- Submission process, frequency, and reporting formats and tables
 - Form of NIR submission flexibility on CTF/CRF using inventory IPCC tables;
 and, choice of electronic reporting system versus conventional submission
 - Frequency Annual/Biennial/at discretion of LDC and SIDS
 - Vehicle/format
 - as per Kyoto protocol formats;
 - Standalone report or as part of BTR flexibility sought for initial reporting



APA item 5 - Unpacking the options (3/3)

Some Open questions?

- Objective Facilitate the identification and prioritization of domestic mitigation measures. Could be seen as intrusive! How to handle that?
- Choice of GWP/GTP values are debatable. Not linked to capacity/flexibility, but purely on choice of a country. Why difference of opinion?



How Flexibilities can/should be operationalised? (1/2)

Perspective of Parties in their latest submissions (not exhaustive)

Suggestions 1: Mixed approach (common + differentiated)

- <u>For common MPGs</u> Flexibility linked to improvement plans and gap analysis
- <u>Distinguished MPGs</u> Partied to decide flexibility as per capacity and improvement plans
- <u>Prioritisation</u> into short term and long-term actions through technical reviews
- <u>Promote compliance</u> under article 15 if recurrent recommendations not implemented



Suggestions 2: Not every MPG requirement need same capacity (Retional property ach

- GHG reporting No flexibility needed for reporting requirements
- Methodologies Already embedded in form of older IPCC guidelines. Information on barriers and constraints in using new guidelines must be reported with a timeline
- Metrics, sectors and gases Flexibility related to availability of data
- <u>Key category analysis</u> Flexibility to use lower threshold those using latest IPCC
- <u>Time series consistency and recalculations</u> Already embedded in IPCC in form of choice of year. Further provided as reporting period (x-2/x-4)
- QA/QC: Not needed

More rationale Required



How Flexibilities can/should be operationalised? (2/2)

Reflections from the APA item 5.0 tool (latest revision)

Application

- At discretion of a Party
- Already built into IPCC guidelines say, in the form of tiers

Regulation

- Facilitate improved reporting over time (Relaxed)
- Establish a transition period with 'no backsliding' (Controlled)

Approach

- Layered approach Menu of option (methodology, reporting, approach) to choose (opt-in/opt-out)
- 3 step analysis:
 - Does it depend on technical or institutional capacity?

 [Y/N]
 - Do parties have sufficient discretion with fulfilling provision? [Y/N]
 - What specific flexibility needed? [identify/opt]



Expectations from Katowice

- Understanding rationale behind each perspective and hence minimizing options in the text in a facilitative manner
 - Deadlock based on conflicting arguments should settle with simpler entry points
- Operationalising para 98 (Decision 1/CP.21)
 - Considering that parties are at various starting point. A few have submitted I/II BURs, majority of them don't even have an MRV to supersede
 - MPGs shall be revised based on experience with initial operational features
- Strengthening Capacity-building mechanism
 - 15 priority areas (CB framework) lacks depth in view of enhanced transparency
 - More granular framework + preliminary assessment of capacity
 - Revamping CB portal as a mandate given to the PCCB. Brings comparability from both ends (quantitative or qualitative)
 - CB portal as a registry for capacity needs of developing countries –
 identification of priority areas (pragmatically) and committing support





Thank you

Download publications at: https://www.ceew.in



@CEEWIndia | @VGtweets_

