

IPCC Side Event

Refinement of 2006 IPCC Guidelines

**Perspectives and Potential impact on ongoing
joint activities undertaken with the UNFCCC
Secretariat**



PERSPECTIVES



Methodological guidance for the new elements in the UNFCCC reporting/review GLs- justification of “NE” for insignificant emissions

- **Background:** Para. 37 (b) of UNFCCC reporting GLs (24/CP.19): An emission should only be considered insignificant if the likely level of emissions is below 0.05 per cent of the national total GHG emissions,⁸ and does not exceed 500 kt CO₂ eq. The total national aggregate of estimated emissions for all gases and categories considered insignificant shall remain below 0.1 per cent of the national total GHG emissions. Parties should use approximated AD and default IPCC EFs to derive a likely level of emissions for the respective category.
- The rationale behind is to support efficient use of resource to improve the inventory quality by priorities limited resources.

Example 1

- Some Parties are reporting “NE” indicating the emission is insignificant, but the ERTs approach to assess insignificance may not always consistent.
- Any specific guidance on the Parties and reviewers what “approximated AD”?
- Any consideration of other requirements in the existing GLs necessary? For example,
 - Existing GPG on key category analysis on trend:
 - domestically and internationally rapidly increasing emissions from such insignificant categories



More guidance on the time series consistency

Background:

- Requirements of historical data before 1990 for LULUCF and waste sector
- Parties may need to use more than one source of data to complete the time series of activity data and EFs for changing situation in these 15 years:
 - Technological advancement, e.g., the combustion technologies, new abatement technologies
 - New policy arrangements, e.g., the EU ETS
- More descriptive guidance on the time series consistency would be helpful.

Example 2:

- The Party is using three different EFs from three different sources for different period of time, for public electricity and heat production (1A1a).
- Due to EU ETS data available after the introduction of EU ETS, the Party indicates the shift from the use of its data based on plant-specific technologies to EU-ETS data.
- What is the criteria or the GPG for the decision making? Basically plant-specific data should be considered more reliable? Any guidance by the Guidelines?



Guidance on reviewing carbon balance in fuel use for the verification purpose

Background: Para. 40 in UNFCCC reporting GLs: “For the purposes of verification, Annex I Parties should compare their national estimates of CO₂ emissions from fuel combustion with those estimates obtained using the IPCC reference approach, as contained in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, and report the results of this comparison in the NIR.”

Example 3: Some Parties can have challenges in justifying why there are large differences between the sectoral and reference approaches for many years.

- Any specific guidance on how to check national energy statistics, including definitions and units for energy/fuels, conversion factors with specific numbers to check reconciliation of different units that can be for verification purpose would be helpful.
- Depend on the reasons, difference itself is not an issue. Any guidance to analyse the reason of difference and how to assess them?



Background: In 2006 GLs, basic principle is to report non-energy use (NEU) emissions under IPPU. However, some Parties have difficulties to separate data.

Example 4: Some Parties have challenges in reporting natural gas used as fuel in coke plants in the iron and steel production process because its energy statistics data do not clearly show carbon balance for the coke production and iron and steel production to present the carbon inputs (e.g. coking coal, fuel oil, other oils, natural gas) and the carbon outputs.

Consequently, the estimation of emissions from natural gas use is omitted from the inventory.

- Any additional guidance for the NEU in order to allow Parties to collect data and report them under the IPPU may be useful
-



Use-friendly way to present guidance

Suggestion to consider editorial tweaks

- by updating the template and
- using more graphics, tables and charts, than narrative description.
- consistency and clarification of wordings e.g. the use of “should” “good practice”
- → in order to highlight the basic/important points of each information;
- → present the basic points as checklists.

Can it be more simplified, and distinguish basic requirements and additional guidance part?

Step 1: Determine the categories or Cropland types and manage the representative area. An

Step 2: Determine the ne
scientific studies for the av
use locally available data fo

Current guidelines maybe sometimes too wordy...

	Action	Methodological guidance
Step 1:	Determine the following <ul style="list-style-type: none">• categories or cropland types• management systems• representative area	Refer the methods in Chapter 3, section XX
Step 2:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Identify the average inputs and outputs of dead wood or litter for each category, and• Estimate the net change in DOM stocks	Net change = C inputs to the DOM pools – C outputs <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Negative values indicate a net decrease in the stock.• Identify values from inventories or scientific studies



Potential Impact on Current Joint UNFCCC-IPCC TFI Collaboration



SBI 42 Conclusions on Financial and Technical Support *(FCCC/SBI/2015/10, paragraph 29)*

“The SBI noted the requests from non-Annex I Parties for... **training on the use of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories...**”

See <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2015/sbi/eng/10.pdf>




Memorandum of Understanding between UNFCCC and IPCC

- **MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING** between the UNFCCC secretariat and the secretariat of the IPCC was signed on **22 January 2016** to, among other things, **collaborate in responding to the mandate given to the UNFCCC secretariat by the SBI at its forty-second session.**
- **Enhanced collaboration** between the UNFCCC and IPCC in supporting the use of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines by non-Annex I Parties.



UNFCCC Regional Hands-on Training Workshops (2015 - 2016) in collaboration with the IPCC TFI TSU

- The **UNFCCC regional hands-on training workshops** were conducted in **collaboration** with partner organization (**IPCC**) and the **CGE**, using **IPCC** and **CGE** training materials.



- Primary objective:** providing tools to establish or strengthen national institutional arrangements to support **enhanced reporting of national GHG inventories**, and provide training on the **2006 IPCC Guidelines**.



- Plan** to continue, subject to availability of funding, similar training for non-Annex I Parties **until 2021**.

Possible add-on to the IPCC software to facilitate the work of non-Annex I Parties

- Feedback received from participants to the 2016 round of regional training workshops on 2006 GLs, allowed to identify the following **possible elements** of an **add-on to the software** aimed at facilitating the future work of non-Annex I GHG inventory experts:

1 – Availability of the software in **French** and **Spanish**

2 – Development of an **import/export function** (using XML format) aimed at facilitating exchange/import from other specialized tools, such as ALU

3 – Improving the time series management

4 – Improving the user interface



General impacts of the refinement of 2006 IPCC Guidelines

- ✓ Need to adjust the format/content of the **hands-on training workshops** organized in collaboration between the two Secretariats;
- ✓ Need to have the **possible future add-on to the IPCC software** for non-Annex I Parties revised to incorporate the changes introduced in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines;
- ✓ Need for the UNFCCC Secretariat to ensure **that e-learning courses** on 2006 IPCC Guidelines (**English, French, Spanish**) are revised to incorporate the changes introduced in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, which entails potentially significant amount of work, time and funding.



Thank You!

