



Alianza para la Transparencia
en el Acuerdo de París
Grupo Regional de América Latina y el Caribe



REPÚBLICA DE PANAMÁ
— GOBIERNO NACIONAL —



CBIT-GSP
CLIMATE TRANSPARENCY

Workshop on monitoring the progress of nationally determined contribution mitigation commitments

23 - 25 October 2023
Panama City



copenhagen climate centre





Alianza para la Transparencia
en el Acuerdo de París
Grupo Regional de América Latina y el Caribe



REPÚBLICA DE PANAMÁ
— GOBIERNO NACIONAL —



CBIT-GSP
CLIMATE TRANSPARENCY

Presentation : Mitigation monitoring elements

Fernando Farías

Senior Advisor

UNEP - Copenhagen Climate Center

Fernando.farias@un.org



copenhagen
climate centre



Monitoring of progress and ex-post assessment of mitigation impacts

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

The monitoring of progress should cover three main steps:

Definition and implementation of indicators of achievement

Ex-post estimation of actions, policies and measures to avoid GHG emissions

Monitoring of key performance indicators

Monitoring of progress and ex-post assessment of mitigation impacts

Quantitative indicators of achievement

Based on **quantitative or statistical measurements** of a given condition over time. These are often related to inputs to mitigation efforts, activities undertaken and their intermediate or process impacts.

- Measure aggregate emission reductions from mitigation actions;
- Identify the co-benefits of mitigation actions, policies and measures for sustainable development and economic and social growth.

Qualitative indicators of achievement

Qualitative indicators can also be used to track the progress of mitigation efforts. These include **subjective or non-numerical assessments** of progress towards a specific impact objective. They are often useful when parameters are difficult to quantify, as is often the case for non-GHG effects.

Assessment and monitoring of progress following the BPM

Adequate monitoring of progress in the mitigation of actions, policies, plans and measures requires not only a characterization of actions, policies and measures, but also an assessment of the expected reduction of GHG emissions or the improvement achieved in sinks and reservoirs.

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

Selection and coverage of mitigation initiatives for assessment and reporting under GMPs

In choosing which mitigation initiatives to pursue, it is useful to establish common criteria for the **assessment of the initiatives**. These could include, for example, the GHG emissions profile, national development priorities and the policy context of the initiative of interest.

In selecting mitigation initiatives for assessment and reporting, it is more important to **identify a subset of key mitigation initiatives** that can be easily reported rather than the full set of mitigation initiatives undertaken in a country.

In choosing these subsets, it is also important to identify **initiatives that have a more significant and observable impact on GHG emission reductions in relevant sectors** or key categories in national GHG inventories. This is also reflected in the ETF BPMs.

Selection and coverage of mitigation initiatives for assessment and reporting under GMPs

Baseline: fixed and dynamic updated over 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 objectives
Conditional on international support

Common barriers in assessing the progress of mitigation initiatives

Scenario and mitigation assessments are often conducted by **different** sectoral **teams** or teams at the government level, which creates difficulties in integrating data into a single set of reporting results.

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

Differences in **results** of mitigation potential calculations.

Different **reporting deadlines and frequency** (annualized, specific period or number of years)

Differences in **Reference Considerations**

Differences in **measures and units**, for example, costs.

- **Format Complexity**

Complicated formats for collecting the data used to define deployment progress.

Different degrees of description, depth level between mitigation actions.

Data provided in different formats.

Common barriers in assessing the progress of mitigation initiatives

In addition, a number of factors make it difficult in practice to assess the progress of mitigation efforts.

- **Lack of robust MRV systems** that allow data not to be transferred smoothly throughout the system, or different MRV systems, not necessarily compatible
- **Lack of clarity on requirements.**
Lack of clarity on when, who and what to report; progress data to complete reports and indicators.
- **Lack of commitment in data provision**

Overcoming barriers in assessing the progress of mitigation initiatives

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

Overcoming barriers in assessing the progress of mitigation initiatives

Work to establish **common criteria** for the progress reporting process.

- Define the use of a common foundation, for example, and then decide **which mitigation initiatives to report**

Some **criteria** to choose from:

- GHG emissions profile
- Country development priorities
- Political context
- Future Expectations
- Links to long-term strategies

Overcoming barriers in assessing the progress of mitigation initiatives

Some final practical tips:

- Develop **common training** for government personnel in charge of preparing information for conducting mitigation assessments.
- Promote homogeneity in the use of **technical language**.
- Define a set of **common templates** to collect information and conduct mitigation exercises and distribute them to different ministries.
- compatible or even identical **computing tools**. as far as possible (an example might be the use of common formatted spreadsheets together)
- Implementation and application of **compatible MRV systems** .



Alianza para la Transparencia
en el Acuerdo de París
Grupo Regional de América Latina y el Caribe



REPÚBLICA DE PANAMÁ
— GOBIERNO NACIONAL —



CBIT-GSP
CLIMATE TRANSPARENCY

Thank you for your attention !

Fernando Farías
Senior Advisor

UNEP- Copenhagen Climate Center
Fernando.farias@un.org



copenhagen
climate centre

