







# Training Workshop for the countries of Eurasia, Central Asia and the Caucasus: Deep dive into tracking NDC mitigation commitments under the Paris Agreement

Presentation: Elements on mitigation tracking

Fernando Farias

Senior Advisor

UNEP Copenhagen Climate Centre







# Tracking Progress and Ex-post Assessment of Mitigation Impacts

A system of tracking progress is useful to identify whether a mitigation initiative is on track and being implemented as planned, and any gaps that will need to be addressed to deliver the expected results.

Tracking progress needs to cover three main steps:

Definition and application of progress indicators

Estimation ex-post of the actions, policies and measures in terms of avoiding GHG emissions)

Monitoring of key performance indicators



### Tracking Progress and Ex-post Assessment of Mitigation Impacts

#### **Quantitative Progress Indicators**

Based on quantitative measurements or statistics of a certain condition tracked over time. These often relate to the inputs for the mitigation initiatives, the activities carried out, and their intermediate or along the way effects.

- Measuring aggregate emissions reduction from mitigation actions;
- Identifying co-benefits of mitigation actions, policies and measures for sustainable development and for economic and social growth.

#### **Qualitative Progress Indicators**

Qualitative indicators can also be used to track the progress of mitigation initiatives. These include non-numerical or subjective assessments of progress towards a specific impact goal. They tend to be useful where parameters are difficult to quantify, often the case for non-GHG effects.



#### Assessing and tracking progress following the MPG

To track properly progress of mitigation of the actions, policies, plans and measures it is needed not only a characterization of the actions, policies and measures, but also an assessment of the expected reduction in GHG emissions or enhancing achieved of sinks and reservoirs.

To track progress of NDC targets, it is simpler and the main tool is the National GHG Inventory of the country



# Selection and coverage of mitigation initiatives for assessment and reporting following the MPG

To choose which mitigation initiatives to track, it is **useful to establish common criteria for the evaluation of initiatives**. These could include, for instance, GHG emissions profile, national development priorities, and the policy context of the initiative of interest.

When selecting the mitigation initiatives for assessment and reporting, it is more important to identify a sub-set of key mitigation initiatives that can be easily reported instead of identifying the entire set of mitigation initiatives undertaken in a country.

When choosing these subsets, it is also important to identify those **initiatives that have a more significant and observable impact on GHG emissions reductions in sectors of relevance**, or key categories in the National GHG inventories. This is also echoed in the MPGs of the ETF.



# Selection and coverage of mitigation initiatives for assessment and reporting following the MPG

Baseline: fixed and dynamic updated in time Base year, target

Different IPCC methodologies yield different results: LULUCF / AFOLU Sector

Global Warming potentials (GWP) specified in the IPCC reports (AR5)

Conditional/Unconditional Targets
Conditional upon the provision of international support



# Common barriers in assessing progress of mitigation initiatives

Mitigation and scenario assessments are usually performed by different teams or sectoral teams at Government level.

**Heterogeneous** information for reporting can be found, which is difficult to present combined:

#### Complexity of formats

Complicated formats to gather the data used to define the progress of implementation Different degrees of description, level of depth among mitigations actions Data provided in different formats



# Common barriers in assessing progress of mitigation initiatives

Additionally, a number of factors make the assessment of the progress of mitigation initiatives difficult in practice.

- Lack of robust MRV systems allowing the data not to be fluently transferred along the system, or different MRV systems, not necessarily compatible
- Lack of clarity on requirements
   Lack of clarity on when, who, what to report progressing data to fill reports and indicators
- Lack of commitment to the supply of data



# Overcoming barriers in assessing progress of mitigation initiatives

- Simplify the process of progress reporting
- Design feasible MRV systems and tools that can be easily employed given the level of information available.
- Design a multi-stage process of data provision depending upon the sources of reporting
- Differentiate between data more and less readily available to avoid blocking the reporting and collection process
- Define and maintain channels for the reporting flows



# Overcoming barriers in assessing progress of mitigation initiatives

Work on setting a common criteria for the process of progress reporting

Define the use of a common basis for instance, then decide which mitigation initiatives to report

#### Some criteria to choose:

- GHG emission profile
- Country development priorities
- Policy context
- Future expectations
- Links with long term- strategies



# Overcoming barriers in assessing progress of mitigation initiatives

#### Some final practical advice:

- Develop common trainings for the Government staff in charge of the preparation of the information to conduct the mitigation assessments
- Encourage homogeneity in the use of technical language
- Define a set of common templates to collect information and conduct mitigation exercises and distribute to the different ministries
- Use of compatible or even the same computing tools as far as possible (an example could be the
  joint use of spreadsheets with common formats)
- Implementation and application of compatible MRV systems.







#### Thank you for your attention!

**Fernando FARIAS** | Fernando.farias@un.org UNEP-CCC

