

Session SBI41 (2014)

Session started at 01-09-2014 00:00:00 [GMT+1]

Session closed at 28-11-2014 23:59:59 [GMT+1]



A compilation of questions to - and answers by – The Netherlands
Exported 29/11-2014 by the
UNITED NATIONS FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE

Question from: United States of America at Tuesday, 30 September 2014

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

Title: Double counting prevention

How do you plan to prevent double counting with the host countries of projects that generated CERs that your country plans to use towards meeting its pledge in the pre-2020 period?

If a host country refuses to adjust its reporting towards its progress to its targets to reflect CERs it exported, do you still plan to count them?

Answered by: Netherlands at Thursday, 27 November 2014

Net international transfers from market based mechanisms should be appropriately deducted from or added to a pledge. That is, when a Party acquires mitigation outcomes from another Party to meet its commitments, these should be credited to the acquiring Party (additions) and debited from the originating Party (subtractions). At the moment (under Kyoto) we only use CERs that are approved by the Executive Board. And we assume (based on the Letter of Approval) that the Party that sold the emissions reductions will not count these in their reports. So in the commitment period up to 2020 the reporting on registry information provides transparent information while the measurement, reporting, review, recording and tracking of this information is in accordance with UNFCCC agreed rules undertaken in UNFCCC certified registry systems.

Question from: Saudi Arabia at Tuesday, 30 September 2014

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

Title: Assessment of the economic and social consequences of response measures-NC6

On the other hand, Could the Netherlands clarify if any of the funding, reported under NC 4.5.3, used to support activities that will assist developing countries, in meeting their needs to adapt to, in particular, the adverse impact of the implementation of response measures especially least developed Parties and those facing poverty eradication challenges?

Answered by: Netherlands at Thursday, 27 November 2014

We consider that the question is not within the scope of the multilateral assessment in Decision 2.CP17.

Nonetheless we want to refer to the review report para 122 and 123 reporting on the additional information provided and our intention to implement the recommendation to incorporate such information in the next submission.

Question from: Saudi Arabia at Tuesday, 30 September 2014

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

Title: Assessment of the economic and social consequences of response measures, assisting non-AnX1

Based in the significant analysis of policies that has the Netherland is employing, has it considered how it will promote investment in, support and cooperate with, developing country Parties who has less capacities/ capabilities in the development, production, distribution and transport of indigenous, less greenhouse gas-emitting, environmentally sound, energy sources according to the national circumstances of each of these Parties?

Answered by: Netherlands at Thursday, 27 November 2014

We consider that the question is not within the scope of the multilateral assessment in Decision 2.CP17.

Nonetheless we refer to the NC6, section 7.2 where we present information on the assistance to developing country parties that are particularly vulnerable to climate change. A number of CDM projects in that we are involved are in the field of renewables (wind, hydro, biomass) and fuel switch

Question from: Egypt at Monday, 29 September 2014

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

Title: Reliable mitigation models

kindly specify and tell me about the reliable mitigation models which were used in building your mitigation scenarios in your national communication or BUR submissions ?

Answered by: Netherlands at Thursday, 27 November 2014

The models are developed for the Dutch situation. These are documented in several reports. The main references to reports are presented in the BR on page 57 and 58 holding links or references to the reports. These reports are in the Dutch language.

Information about the energy-modelling can be found on the website of ECN (in English):

<https://www.ecn.nl/publicaties/PDFfetch.aspx?nr=ECN-F--13-046>

Question from: Brazil at Monday, 29 September 2014

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

Title: Transfer and deployment of technologies in CDM projects

Page 80:

"CDM- and JI-projects have stimulated the transfer and deployment of technologies in these projects, for example on high-efficiency power plants, cogeneration, renewable energy, harnessing of landfill waste gases, etc".

Please, specify how the transfer and deployment of technologies has taken place. In the total number of CDM project activities, how many presented transfer and deployment of technologies?

Answered by: Netherlands at Thursday, 27 November 2014

Within the Dutch CDM/JI purchase programs technology transfer was not a specific selection criteria.

According to a UNFCCC study of 2010 30% of all projects in the pipeline, accounting for 48% of estimated emission reductions, involve technology transfer. The involvement may be as high as 44% of all projects, given that 24% of the PDDs do not specify whether technology transfer occurs and survey results suggest that 60% of these may in fact involve technology transfer.

<http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Reports/TTreport/TTrep10.pdf>

Question from: Brazil at Monday, 29 September 2014

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

Title: CDM (Netherlands as project participant)

Page 74:

"The EU ETS, linked to the CDM and JI markets, is designed specifically to provoke private sector actors to take action, including through the development and transfer of climate technologies".

Please specify, in the total of CDM projects supported by Netherlands, in how many the country is project participant.

Answered by: Netherlands at Thursday, 27 November 2014

In the NC op page 129 we present some numbers on projects. More detailed information was presented during the in-country review to the expert review team.

To summarise:

JI: 28 projects in 9 countries

CDM: 108 projects with regional distribution:

- 35 in Latin America
- 63 in Asia (of this 15 in China and 17 in India)
- 10 Africa

and related to technologies/sector:

- 20 biomass
- 2 fuel switch
- 4 geothermal
- 3 HFC-23
- 28 hydro
- 14 landfill
- 3 transport
- 26 wind
- 26 other

Question from: Brazil at Monday, 29 September 2014

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

Title: Climate Finance 3

Table 6.4 (a) includes Montreal Protocol. Please explain the need for the reference to the Montreal Protocol, since it is under another Convention and is not climate change finance.

It is not clear what is related to Climate Change (Table 6.4 (a))

Table 6.5 and 6.6: please specify the projects related to Brazil.

Answered by: Netherlands at Thursday, 27 November 2014

We consider that the question is not within the scope of the multilateral assessment in Decision 2.CP17.

Nonetheless, as the Montreal Protocol deals with substances that deplete the ozone layer, we feel the reported money is related to climate change and reported it.

Question from: Brazil at Monday, 29 September 2014

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

Title: Montreal Protocol & New and additional resources

Page 63:

"The Montreal Protocol received financial contributions directly (2011) and through UNEP (2012)".

Why is there a reference to the Montreal Protocol, since it is under another Convention? The reference seems vague.

"On average total spending in 2010 – 2012 still exceeds the 0.7 %".

The indication of what is new and additional financial resources is not clear. Please, clarify how the Netherlands determined that such resources are new and additional. The Documentation box 1 is not sufficient nor clear enough.

Answered by: Netherlands at Thursday, 27 November 2014

We consider that the question is not within the scope of the multilateral assessment in Decision 2.CP17.

Nonetheless, as the Montreal Protocol deals with substances that deplete the ozone layer, we feel the reported money is related to climate change and reported it.

In the NC6 and in the BR1 we presented the amount of money for the fast start: The Netherlands also regularly reports to the European Union on its Fast Start Finance, and this information is available

at: http://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/finance/international/faststart/index_en.htm

This information is also used in the UNFCCC website on Finance:

<http://www3.unfccc.int/pls/apex/f?p=116:1:6066751719300189::NO::>

Question from: Brazil at Monday, 29 September 2014

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

Title: "Principal" and "significant" activities

Page 61: **"The marker data does not enable the exact quantification of financial support targeting Climate Change. It provides an indication of the policy objectives of aid (best estimate).** Activities marked as 'principal' can be considered as

contributing to the **climate objective in full**. Activities marked as **‘significant’** target the climate objective but **cannot be counted in full**; only a proportion may actually target Climate Change. The Netherlands uses several internationally agreed percentages (see table 7a) and 40% for projects scoring ‘1’ (‘significant’) in its bilateral project portfolio".

Please, clarify the highlighted text regarding assumptions in order to classify "principal" and "significant" activities.

Answered by: Netherlands at Thursday, 27 November 2014

We consider that the question is not within the scope of the multilateral assessment in Decision 2.CP17.

Nonetheless, we want to refer to the NC6 page 118 where we provided following information: The environmental sustainability marker – ‘principal’ or ‘significant’ objective - identifies activities that would not have been undertaken without this objective or activities, which includes such objectives but are not one of the principal reasons for undertaking the activity.

Please also see the definitions used by the OECD-DAC Rio marker system on what ‘significant’ and ‘principal’ entails.

Question from: China at Monday, 29 September 2014

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

Title: LULUCF

According to the BR, there is a conflict in CTF 2(b) and 2(d) regarding the inclusion of LULUCF into the target. Further information on this issue is needed.

Answered by: Netherlands at Thursday, 27 November 2014

This topic was also raised during the technical review and The Netherlands confirmed that LULUCF is NOT included in the target. In para 28 of the BR review report the exclusion of LULUCF is clearly stated.

Question from: China at Monday, 29 September 2014

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

Title: NF3

According to the BR, it is not clear whether the Netherlands has included NF3 in its target or not. Further information on this issue is needed.

Answered by: Netherlands at Thursday, 27 November 2014

NF3 is excluded, as this is not incorporated in the coverage of gasses as included in document FCCC/AWGLCA/2012/Misc.1 that provides for among others the additional information related to the target for the EU and its Member States

Question from: China at Monday, 29 September 2014

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

Title: clarification on national target

As an EU member, the Netherlands has not pledged a national mitigation target under the UNFCCC. According to the BR1 and TRR, for sectors not covered by the EU-ETS, the emission reduction target for the Netherlands is 16% decrease compared with 2005. However, it is not clear how much effort Netherlands is going to make on sectors covered by the EU-ETS, nor the efforts as a whole, compared with its base year level. Additional information is needed in order to make its effort transparent.

Answered by: Netherlands at Thursday, 27 November 2014

Chapter 4 of the BR holds information on the Policies and Measures and provides information on policies and measures outside the EU ETS system. These are among others the Long Term Agreements with industries outside the ETS, all policies and measures in the transport sector, the agricultural sector, in households and other buildings. A number of policies for industries are also relevant for ETS companies. In this chapter we also present information on related budgets.

While the expected impacts of policies are related to 2005, the overall impacts compared to 1990 are presented in the reported projections. Para 34 of the BR review report concludes related to this: "For non-EU ETS emissions, the projected emissions in 2020 will be 99.4 Mt CO₂ eq, below the target level of 104 Mt CO₂ eq."

Question from: Brazil at Monday, 29 September 2014

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

Title: Pre 2020 ambition

Page 56: "For 2020, the emission levels are expected reach levels similar to those of 1990. Although emissions from transport, buildings and agriculture are generally in decline, this decline is more or less cancelled out by increasing emissions from industry and the energy sector. Emissions from industry and the energy sector are expected to start decreasing between 2020 and 2030. These trends will result in national emissions below 1990 levels by 2030".

According to IPCC AR4, Annex I Parties should promote a reduction of GHG emissions from 25% to 40% by 2020 compared to 1990. Please, explain the reasons for not complying with the need that has been pointed out by IPCC, taking in to account that "for 2020, the emission levels are expected reach levels similar to those of 1990". Can you explain the reasons why even with additional measures you are not able to curb down the emissions?

Answered by: Netherlands at Thursday, 27 November 2014

We continue our efforts to increase reductions and decouple the economic growth with energy use and GHG emissions.

As presented in the BR1 in among others figure 5.1 the updated policies (current policies and Lenteakoord; current and planned policies) show lowering projected emissions

As reported on page 6 of the BR1 the policy letter "Green Growth: for a strong, sustainable economy", submitted to parliament by the Dutch government in March 2013, contains the outline of the Dutch Sustainability policy. Green growth is one of the priority themes for the Dutch Government.

As reported (e.g. page 38 of the BR1) we have policies in place to improve energy efficiency in all economic sectors (and so using less energy for the same output) and to increase the share of renewable energy sources. The National Energy Agreement for the period 2014 to 2020 has the following goals: a 1.5% energy saving in the national final use, resulting in final savings of 100 Petajoules in 2020. A higher share of renewable energy, now 4.4%, increasing to 14% in 2020 and 16% in 2023.

Question from: Brazil at Monday, 29 September 2014

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

Title: Expected significant increase of GHG emissions until 2020

Page 51: "Emissions from the energy and industry sector are expected to increase significantly until 2020. With the current policies, emissions will increase from 100 Mt CO₂ to 118 Mt CO₂. This can be explained by the increasing net capacity of

power production and higher energy demands from industrial sectors and refineries".

What is the period of increasing emissions of CO₂? What base-year has been used for comparison?

Under the UNFCCC, Parties recognized that all countries, especially developing countries, need access to resources required to achieve sustainable social and economic development and that, **in order for developing countries to progress towards that goal, their energy consumption will need to grow**. In addition, they noted that the largest share of historical and current global emissions of greenhouse gases has originated in developed countries, that per capita emissions in developing countries are still relatively low and that the share of global emissions originating in developing countries will grow to meet their social and development needs. Finally, in IPCC AR4 there is an information that Annex I Parties should promote a reduction of GHG emissions from 25% to 40% by 2020 compared to 1990.

Please, explain the contradiction between the expected significant increase of GHG emissions until 2020 and the information above. Can it be explained the reasons why, even with additional measures, the Netherlands is not able to curb down its emissions?

Answered by: Netherlands at Thursday, 27 November 2014

The base year for the projections is 2010 and the projected years are 2020 and 2030; the mentioned increase is in the period 2010-2020.

Increase of emissions is projected in energy and industry sector, but in other sectors (i.e. buildings, transport, agriculture) emissions decrease. On a national level, emissions in 2020 are on 1990-levels. After 2020, national emissions are projected to decline, also in the energy and industry sector.

We continue our efforts to increase reductions and decouple the economic growth with energy use and GHG emissions.

As presented in the BR1 in among others figure 5.1 the updated policies (current policies and Lenteakkoord; current and planned policies) show lowering projected emissions

As reported on page 6 of the BR1 the policy letter "Green Growth: for a strong, sustainable economy", submitted to parliament by the Dutch government in March 2013, contains the outline of the Dutch Sustainability policy. Green growth is one of the priority themes for the Dutch Government.

Question from: Brazil at Monday, 29 September 2014

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

Title: Policies directly related to climate change

Page 24:

"This section describes policies and measures implemented since 1990 that have had, or are expected to have, a significant impact on greenhouse gas emissions in the Netherlands, even if the primary objective of the policy is (or was) not directly related to climate change. It also describes cross- sectoral policies and measures". Please, provide information on what policies are (or were) directly related to climate change. These Differentiation must be fully reflected on the report.

"only the most important measures are described in detail": What are the criteria used to consider the importance of measures?

Please be also aware of the fact that some level of double counting can not be avoided as the policies and measures are not implemented in isolation, but in combination with others. Does Netherlands agree that this recognition must be applied to BRs?

Answered by: Netherlands at Thursday, 27 November 2014

Especially policies targeted to improve energy efficiency or stimulate more efficient energy conversion (e.g. combined heat and power plants) will result in lower GHG emissions.

Examples of policies directly related to climate change are:

- The emissions trading systems
- The Reduction Programme Non- CO2 gases
- Covenant Clean & efficient Agrosectors
- The use of biofuels
- Emission regulation CH4 emission gas engines"
- Landfill policy

The estimated impacts were used to consider the importance of measures.

We agree that in general some level of double counting can not be avoided.

Question from: Brazil at Monday, 29 September 2014

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

Title: LULUCF & EU pledge

Page 22: "Emissions not covered under EU pledge are those resulting from land use, land-use change and forestry".

Please, provide reasons for why LULUCF is not being covered under EU pledge. More detailed information is needed.

Answered by: Netherlands at Thursday, 27 November 2014

During the assessment of the EU pledge among others it became obvious that there would be a high uncertainty on the level of GHG mitigation that could be expected from the LULUCF sector in the EU by 2020 and so it was opted not to include the LULUCF sector.

Question from: Brazil at Monday, 29 September 2014

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

Title: Climate Finance

Page 7: "During the period under review, climate finance has generally been additional to the 0.7 % ODA spending for the MDG's".

What does "generally" mean in this case? Could the information be more precise? What is the amount related to ODA? What is the amount related to MDG's? What is the amount related to climate finance?

Answered by: Netherlands at Thursday, 27 November 2014

We consider that the question is not within the scope of the multilateral assessment in Decision 2.CP17.

Nonetheless, general in this case means on average over the reporting period. In 2011 ODA spending was 0,75 % over GDP, in 2012 total ODA spending (including Fast Start Finance) was 0,7% of GDP. All projects for Fast Start Finance met the ODA criteria and were therefor reported as ODA. The total amounts of Climate Finance are in the report. The specification which was spent on which MDG has not been tracked in this context and can therefore not be provided.

Question from: Brazil at Monday, 29 September 2014

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

Title: Actions details

Page 6: "The Netherlands supports a second commitment period of the Kyoto protocol, contributes to the development of the Green Climate Fund, and is committed to providing climate finance to support developing countries in their mitigation and adaptation activities".

Please, provide details on each of the three areas raised in the information above.

Answered by: Netherlands at Thursday, 27 November 2014

We consider that the question is not within the scope of the multilateral assessment in Decision 2.CP17.

Nonetheless we confirm that we continue to provide climate finance to support developing countries, using different instrument and institution and report on this in the agreed reports as NC and BR

Question from: Brazil at Monday, 29 September 2014

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

Title: Relevance of CDM

Page 5: "The Netherlands has now acquired sufficient credits to comply with the Kyoto target".

Does the Netherlands recognize the relevance of CDM? In case of positive answer, how could the relevance of CDM be more emphasized in the BR?

Answered by: Netherlands at Thursday, 27 November 2014

The CDM has made a major contribution to the development of an international carbon Market. Nevertheless we have made clear in our/EU submissions to the UNFCCC that the market cannot develop further on the basis of offsetting alone and needs therefore to incorporate alternative approaches. It is also plain that the CDM has not worked for every party, and efforts to reform the mechanism have not adequately addressed the different capacities and circumstances of participants.

Question from: Brazil at Monday, 29 September 2014

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

Title: Emission of CO₂ – Increase

According to page 6, "the government aims to strengthen the competitiveness of the Netherlands while **reducing** the burden on the environment and **the dependence on fossil fuels**". **But according to page 4, "over the 1990-2011 period, emissions of carbon dioxide (CO2) increased by 5.3%** (excluding LULUCF).

Please, explain the contradiction between the affirmation that the dependence on fossil fuels is going to be reduced and the fact that **emission of CO2 increased by 5.3% over the 1990 - 2011 period**. In addition, regarding page 10, "**the Energy sector is by far the largest contributor to CO2 emissions in the Netherlands (96%),** with the categories 1A1 Energy industries (39 %), 1A4 Other sectors (23 %) and 1A3 Transport (22 %) as the largest contributors in 2011", which also emphasizes the referred contradiction.

Answered by: Netherlands at Thursday, 27 November 2014

As reported on page 6 of the BR1 the policy letter "Green Growth: for a strong, sustainable economy", submitted to parliament by the Dutch government in March 2013, contains the outline of the Dutch Sustainability policy. Green growth is one of the priority themes for the Dutch Government.

As reported (e.g. page 38 of the BR1) we have policies in place to improve energy efficiency in all economic sectors (and so using less energy for the same output) and to increase the share of renewable energy sources. The National Energy Agreement for the period 2014 to 2020 has the following goals: a 1.5% energy saving in the national final use, resulting in final savings of 100 Petajoules in 2020. A higher share of renewable energy, now 4.4%, increasing to 14% in 2020 and 16% in 2023.

Question from: Brazil at Monday, 29 September 2014

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

Title: Climate finance 2

Page 8: "The Netherlands contributes to a variety of multilateral and intergovernmental institutions – including the Global Environment Facility – that assist developing countries. Between 2009 and 2012, the Global Environment Facility (GEF) received, on average, € 26.6 million (ODA and non-ODA) per year, 32% of which is dedicated to climate change (i.e. an average of € 8.5 million)".

Could it be more precise? What amount is related to ODA? What amount is related to non-ODA? What amount from ODA is related to climate change? What amount from non-ODA is related to climate change?

All the questions related to pages from 1 to 8 as well as the respective answers must be fully reflected in the total report.

Answered by: Netherlands at Friday, 28 November 2014

We consider that the question is not within the scope of the multilateral assessment in Decision 2.CP17.

Nonetheless, we want to refer to the BR1, Chapter 6, and more specific paragraph 6.3 as well as to NC6, chapter 7 and more specific paragraph 7.3 where more detailed information is provided. E.g. NC6 table 7.6: in this table we present the ODA and non-ODA money for the GEF. The percentage is based on the OECD Rio marker system. The OECD advised in 2011 and 2012 based on an analysis of the GEF portfolio to include 32 % of the GEF contribution in the climate finance report.

	Expenditures (x 1,000)			
	2009	2010	2011	2012
Global Environment Facility (47044)				
ODA	2,062	20,400	40,160	38,820
Non-ODA (HGIS)	-	816	816	3,282
Total	2,062	21,216	40,976	42,102