

## **SUBMISSION BY NORWAY ON THE COMMON TABULAR FORMAT FOR ANNEX I COUNTRIES' BIENNIAL REPORTS**

Norway appreciates the opportunity to submit its views on the common tabular format for the Annex I countries' biennial reports. SBSTA 36 has identified the paragraphs in the reporting guidelines for which common tabular format will be needed, and Norway agrees that some of these paragraphs will also need information to be submitted in textual form. The non-paper by the co-chairs is a useful starting point for our further considerations of this matter.

### Paragraph 2, greenhouse gas emissions and trends

Norway prefers proposal 2 with existing summary tables from the NIR to be used for this purpose. Two tables are foreseen:

- Total emissions by sectors and totals, with and without LULUCF; and
- Total emissions by the various gases in CO<sub>2</sub>-equivalents, excluding LULUCF. For the PFCs and HFCs, only totals for each group of gases are needed.

The level of details required by proposals 1 and 3 are reported in the Annex I countries' annual inventory reporting, and is not suited for being incorporated in the biennial report itself. If such detailed information on emissions will also be required in the biennial report, this should be included in an annex.

### Paragraph 5, economy-wide emission reduction target

The table for this paragraph will be important in order to understand the Parties' economy-wide emission reduction targets. Norway believes that proposal 2 is a useful starting point, but sees some necessary modifications:

- The row now named "Period for Reaching Target" should be renamed as "Target year(s)"
- The row for Assigned Amount should be deleted as no agreement has yet been reached on this issue
- The row named "role of LULUCF" should be seen in conjunction with the row "coverage of sectors". Parties should also be able to specify which activities are included in the base year and in the target year, and how they are accounted for.
- The last row concerning the contribution from mechanisms should be renamed as "The possible scale of the contributions from mechanisms used (% of overall target)".
- Include a row at the end named "Other relevant information"

### Paragraph 6, mitigation actions

A simple table similar to table 1 in the national communication guidelines as outlined in proposal 2 is preferred. The mitigation impact should be estimated for 2020, but Parties may add columns for additional years. The mitigation actions should not be described in the table itself, as is suggested in proposal 1. The table should rather be supplemented by a brief description of the mitigation action in textual form.

#### Paragraph 9, LULUCF in the base year and paragraph 10, units from market-based mechanisms

The required information for these two paragraphs may be combined in one table and could build on the table in proposal 4 for paragraph 6. Some further discussions among Parties are however needed in order to understand what paragraph 10 of the guidelines means with "information on the use of units from market-based mechanisms". This information is not relevant for the base year. The last column with total emissions, including LULUCF and international units, also needs some further discussions among Parties as this will depend on the chosen accounting approach.

#### Paragraph 11, projections

Parties should report information on key underlying assumptions and values of variables for the projections using table 2 in the national communication guidelines. Parties should then provide projections in million tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>-equivalents for 2020 and 2030 in a "with measures" projection-scenario, along with historic emissions for some years, for instance 1990, 2000 and 2010. One such table should be completed for emissions and projections broken down by sectors and a similar table should be completed for the gases. Similar tables may be reported for the "with additional measures" projections and the "without measures" projections, if available.

#### Paragraph 17 and 18, financial support to non-Annex I Parties and summary information

One of the lessons learnt from the fast start reports submitted to UNFCCC is a need for more coherent reporting. Another lesson from the fast start reports is that a lot of efforts have been made to increase the quality of climate finance reporting. Standard tabular formats for climate finance flows will increase transparency, and make it easier to get an overview over Parties' climate finance. It is important, however, to avoid double counting and to increase the precision of calculating the climate change portion of multi-purpose funds and organizations. Multilateral funds and organizations should provide such estimates to avoid each donor country having their own (and possibly different) estimates of climate change support. This is especially important for core funding of funds and organizations.

In Norway's view, there is a risk of double counting if capacity building and technology transfer are singled out as separate categories. Capacity building and technology transfer are typically linked to either adaptation or mitigation, and should be covered by the reporting of these categories. Still, reporting on capacity building and technology transfer are important, and the reporting under paragraph 22 and 23 should give a good overview of such support

When using categories for type of support in the suggested table 4 below, there would be a need to add categories to capture cross sectoral initiatives, such as planning for mitigation or adaptation and climate research, observation and information, including modeling and projections. Further, some initiatives cover more than one sector but without separate funding streams. This will lead to a risk of double counting with regard to sectors. Hence, we have added a category labeled "Multi-sectoral", where the relevant sectors should be specified.

Norway prefers proposal 1 under paragraph 17, but we suggest some modifications. On the first two tables of this proposal we see a need to slightly restructure the tables, in order to separate between funds and organizations/institutions in two different tables. Regarding the third table of proposal 1, we do not think it is wise to specify the names of programmes in the table formats. Programmes are in nature temporary, and the tables may be outdated as new programmes are established and old ones are phased out. Possible new programmes can be more efficient and more directed to present needs that change over time. A dynamic approach is preferred, where Parties can be encouraged to specify the programmes they are supporting.

In our view paragraph 17 and 18 are so tightly linked that we propose that table 3 contains elements from both paragraphs. It is important to note that table 4 is just another way of presenting the same figures that are included in tables 1-3. We therefore suggest the following tables under paragraph 17 and 18

**Table 1. Financial contribution to the financial mechanism of the Convention, funds under the Kyoto Protocol and other multilateral climate change funds (§ 17 a) b))**

Fund	Contributions				
		year x-2		year x-3	
		Original currency	US\$/international currency	Original currency	US\$/international currency
The <i>Global</i> Environmental Facility (other than LDCF/SCCF)					
Least Developed Country Fund for climate change					
Special Climate Change Fund					
Green Climate Fund					
Trust Fund for Supplementary Activities					
CGIAR					
Other multilateral climate change funds, please specify					

**Table 2. Financial contribution not mentioned above to multilateral institutions, including regional development banks, specialized UN Bodies - § 17 c) and d)**

Institution/organization/UN Bodies	Contributions				
		year x-2		year x-3	
		Original currency	US\$/international currency	Original currency	US\$/international currency
The World Bank					
African Development Bank					
Asian Development Bank					
Inter American Development Bank					
International Finance Cooperation					
ISDR					
UNDP					
UNEP					
UNESCO					
FAO					
UNICEF					
WHO					
WMO					
WFP					
Other; please specify					

**Table 3. Financial contribution trough bilateral, regional and other channels § 17 e), § 18 a), b), c), d),**

			Contributions											
			year x-2						year x-3					
			Original currency			US\$/international currency			Original currency			US\$/international currency		
Type of support		Mitigation	Adaptation	Mitigation and adaptation	Mitigation	Adaptation	Mitigation and adaptation	Mitigation	Adaptation	Mitigation and adaptation	Mitigation	Adaptation	Mitigation and adaptation	
Total														
Channel	Bilateral													
	Multi-bi													
	Multilateral													
Financial Instrument	Loan													
	Grant													

**Table 4. Financial contributions to mitigation and adaptation by sector 18 a), b), e)**

Type of support by sector	Contributions							
	year x-2				year x-3			
	Original currency		US\$/international currency		Original currency		US\$/international currency	
	Mitigation	Adaptation	Mitigation	Adaptation	Mitigation	Adaptation	Mitigation	Adaptation
Energy								
Industry								
Agriculture								
Forestry								
Water and sanitation								
Transport								
Waste								
Health								
Other, please specify:								
Multi-sectoral, please specify:								

In writing: § 18 f) Description of what new and additional resources have been provided and how new and additional resources have been determined

## Paragraph 22

Technology development and transfer is essential to both adaptation and mitigation efforts. Tabular formats on technology development and transfer should therefore give a comprehensive overview of measures and activities. As technology transfer in most cases is an integrated part of actions on mitigation and adaptation, it may prove difficult to separate the technology transfer elements from the overall measure and/or activity and it may also result in measures and efforts being reported in more than one table, e.g. tables for mitigation, adaptation, capacity building and the finance flow tables and technology development and transfer table. Thus, reporting on amounts in the technology development and transfer table may increase the risk of double counting. However, some measures and/or activities can more easily be accounted for with amounts as appropriate. If reported in more than one table, it should be made clear which other tables the measure and/or activity is reported. This could be done textually in the form of footnotes. Norway supports proposal 3 under paragraph 22.

## Paragraph 23

Similar to technology transfer, capacity building is typically linked to adaptation or mitigation and/or technology transfer. It may prove difficult to separate the capacity building elements from the overall measure and/or activity. It may also result in measures and efforts being reported in more than one table, e.g. the mitigation table, the adaptation table and the finance flow tables adaptation and technology development and transfer table. However, as capacity building is essential to actions on mitigation and adaptation, Norway believes that tabular formats can and shall give a comprehensive overview of measures and activities related to this matter. In our view the format of the table in proposal 3 under paragraph 22 can also be used for paragraph 23, when replacing “technology transfer” with “capacity building”