

RESPONSES OF BELGIUM TO RAISED QUESTIONS DURING THE SBI MA SESSION

Part I – 2 June 2021

Webcast available at: [SBI - Multilateral Assessment working group session - Watch - YouTube](#)

11:56 min – begin of the recorded presentation of Belgium in Youtube

First round of questions - answers given on the spot

28:21 min

India : Thank you Belgium for a very good presentation, very comprehensive presentation and telling about how much reduction in emission you have achieved so far; My question is related to your target for 2030. You have so far achieved around 20% of emission reduction and there is a stip of requirement to go now to 55% in next 9 years. So how confident you are in achieving and what are the main difficulties specially in terms of reduction of emissions from your freight transport which is increasing trend. Are there new PAMs which is want to take from now onwards in reducing the contribution of the transport sector?

What are the measures you intend to take in the non-ETS sectors which are not covered by the European Emission Trading System. Do you intend to have any financial incentive or is there any law in making will contribute to overall emission reduction target. Thank you again.

30:13 min

Malaysia : Thank you very much Chair and thank you very much for the comprehensive presentation. I would like to ask you brief questions. The first one is that can Belgium share with us the challenge is faced during the preparation of the report with because to why a projection without mitigation measure is not constructed and also the absence of sensitivity analysis. Thank you.

⇒ Correction and additional information :

As already mentioned in BR1 (page 78) or in BR3 (page 87) : « Belgium did not establish a “without measures” scenario since its climate policy is in place for many years now and it has become difficult to assess the way energy use and greenhouse gas emissions would have evolved without this policy.”

No sensitivity analysis was performed for the projections under the National Energy and Climate Plan (December 2019). These are the same projections that were included in the BR4. In the meantime, sensitivity analyses were performed for the reporting to the European Commission under the EU Governance regulation (March 2021), which will be included in Belgium’s next Biennial Report.

Sensitivity analyses were performed for some important parameters such as number of degree-days and import of electricity in relation to nuclear phase-out (<https://reportnet.europa.eu/public/dataflow/113> > Belgium > Attachments.zip).

30:47 min

UK : Thank you very much Chair and thank you also to Belgium again for a wonderful presentation. We really understood to read and also to hear about today Belgium national Climate Commission. I'm wondering if Belgium can share some experience of ensuring effective climate governance structure that in place particularly when working in a situation where climate policy and energy policy often evolved. Thank you very much.

- ⇒ As promised during the session, the hyperlink to the analysis :
Analyse du rôle et du fonctionnement de la Commission Nationale Climat – Avril 2013 - https://climat.be/doc/130426_Evaluation_CNC_web.pdf (in French)

32:11 min

China: Thank you Chair, thank you Belgium for sharing your progress and determines. We have one question for Belgium. According to BR4 and with your presentation that mention that diesel and gasoline will be phasing out by 2030 and 2035 respectively and according to BR4 this will be promoted by Brussels Capital region, so is it a region known policy and how much what is contributed to the total emission reduction and was the measure implemented across the whole country. Thank you.

End of the answers first round: 42:36 min

Second round of questions – deadline 7/06 – answers will be posted on the MA page of Belgium and make them available during the MA session on 12 June

43:07 min

Australia : Thank you so much, Chair, and thank you as well to Belgium for a very engaging presentation. I have only one question to ask. Page 31 of the Belgium's BR4 states that projection in the electricity production sector considers the evolution of electricity demand only in some sectors. Could Belgium please elaborate on why all sectors are not considered? Thank you very much.

- ⇒ This is an editorial error in the report. Electricity demand in all sectors is properly modeled and included in the projection of electricity production.

43:47 min

New Zealand : Thank you very much Chair and thank you to Belgium for the presentation. I just have one curious question perhaps. When you describe the mid and long term targets for the different regional jurisdictions, do you attempt to add those into one? What does it mean collectively and what are the challenges in doing this?. I'll be grateful to know the answer. Thank you.

- ⇒ There is currently no sum of the regional targets into one common national objective for Belgium. However, there is a forecast in the Belgian Long Term Strategy of an aggregate reduction of -87% in non-ETS by 2050.

In addition to the differences in scope and base years of the various mid and long term targets, a common national objective requires the federal and regional governments to agree unanimously. So far this has not been achieved, although the governments have confirmed a common will to move towards carbon neutrality.

Yet when adopting the Belgian Long Term Strategy, the Consultation Committee (composed of representatives of the four governments) committed to regularly update this strategy, which corresponds to a minimal commitment, confirming the common will to tend towards carbon neutrality; the strategy will notably be updated following the evolution of the situation within each entity, in light of the European GHG emission reduction objectives.

The forthcoming negotiations on burden sharing for the period 2021-2030, the increase in ambition set at European level and the legislative “Fit for 55” package that will be proposed mid-July could move the lines.

44:30 min

Indonesia : Thank you Mr. Chair and also thank you well Belgium for your presentation. I have 2 questions. Belgium indicates in its BR4 that CO2 contributes in the largest proportion to total emissions, - I think 85%. For most other countries, CO2 emissions contributes by far to the majority of total emission. In fact the main sectors that contributed the largest emissions were transports, energy industries, and manufacturing industry. Are there any particular challenges or opportunities resulting from this national circumstances that Belgium has faced in addressing climate change and reducing its emissions . And has Belgium taken into account the potential removal from LULUCF after 2017 ? Thank you Mr. Chair.

- ⇒ The transport sector is the most challenging, especially for a country like Belgium which has long favored private car ownership, particularly via wage cars, and which is situated at the center of Europe for freight.

The recovery plan is a real opportunity for the major investments that need to be made to move towards carbon neutrality.

The upcoming action plan for phasing out fossil fuel subsidies should help to improve emission reductions, but it will require efforts to ensure that the burden of the measure does not fall on the most disadvantaged.

- ⇒ The results that we have presented in the slides do not consider the LULUCF sector.

The projections of the LULUCF sector in the CTF 6 tables are identical for the WEM and WAM scenarios.

LULUCF sector was not included in the EU commitments for 2020 as the EU pledge for 2020 does not include emissions/removals from Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry. Regarding the commitments under the 2nd commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol, Belgium submitted a technical correction of its Forest management Reference Level in its last National Inventory Report, but this has not been reviewed yet, so no assessment of the potential LULUCF removals is available for the time being.

For the period 2021-2030, Member States have to ensure that the LULUCF sector does not create debits according to the accounting rules set out in the LULUCF Regulation 2018/841. However Regulation 2018/841 could be revised in the framework of the European « fit for -55% » package.

46:40 min

Malawi : Thank you so much Chair for giving us the opportunity to ask those questions to Belgium and also thank you Belgium for the quite elaborated presentation . My just small question : I'm interested to understand the challenges which Belgium is facing in tracking the implementation as well the effectiveness of the policies and measures which they are currently implementing and also I'm aware as mentioned by Belgium that they are planning to implement additional measures. I also like to know if they have foreseen challenges which Belgium is likely to face, to track the progress in implementing this new and additional measures and what Belgium is planning now to tackle this challenges. Thank you so much.

⇒ The rate of emission reduction so far has been rather slow and an acceleration is really needed in view of the medium and long term objectives.

Many of the measures in the NECP fall under the responsibility of one specific entity (one of the regions or the federal state), making them solely responsible for the implementation. A Steering Committee, with representatives of each entity, was however established to prepare the NECP and to continuously monitor the progress of its implementation. For this purpose, the Steering Committee regularly meets to discuss the state of affairs. The implementation of the inter-federal measures will be coordinated politically via the existing structures for political dialogue, such as the National Climate Commission and the Energy Dialogue ENOVER/CONCERE. During the development of the NECP, the dialogue through these coordination structures has proven to be very important.

Many of the measures announced in the NECP require further development and operationalization. They need to be more properly implemented, including by better identifying the responsibilities of the actors within each entity who must implement them, establishing a realistic time schedule, setting possible order of priorities to maximize the effects, identifying where human or budgetary resources are lacking, etc.

At federal level, a recent decision by the Council of Ministers commit all ministers and their respective administrations to develop detailed roadmaps for implementing the policies and measures contained in the NECP and the recovery plan as well as to report back on the results achieved. Progress reports and impact assessments of policies and measures are published regularly online¹.

The government of the Flemish region designated the responsible department or agency for each measure of its part of the NECP in April 2020 and is currently working on a framework agreement that will include further practical arrangements regarding implementation, monitoring and reporting

Opportunities are not always evenly distributed across the country, so a balance needs to be found where all parties involved can benefit. Dialogue between federal and regional governments is crucial.

- - -

¹ <https://climat.be/politique-climatique/belge/federale/politique-climatiques-et-mesures-de-reduction-des-emissions>