

Training Workshop for Eswatini: In country Training on NDC tracking improving indicators, filling CTF tables, and introducing the BTR road map tool

Presentation: Tracking progress
of NDC: mitigation assessments
and elements of mitigation
tracking

Fernando Farias
Senior Advisor

UNEP Copenhagen Climate Centre

Relevance of assessing and tracking progress of mitigation

- Tracking progress towards NDC targets and accounting for NDC targets answers the question of **how much progress** the country has made towards achieving its NDC targets over time and to what extent the country has **achieved its NDC**.
- This is implemented by **reporting a time series** of the relevant indicator and comparing it to the target level.
- Source: “Accounting for nationally determined contributions”. PATPA (2022)

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

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 GHG emissions related NDC targets, it is simpler and the main tool is the National GHG Inventory of the country

Compiling and reporting results of mitigation assessments

the MPGs do not require countries to report the **full set of mitigation actions, policies and measures** considering to implement or all the mitigation actions, policies and measures currently under implementation.

Usually, a **subset** of mitigation actions, policies and measures is more practical to be reported, particularly those having a **larger impact in terms of GHG emissions** reductions, or those associated with sectors of relevance or key categories in the National GHG Inventory.

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 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.

Compiling and reporting results of mitigation assessments

Box 4: Cobenefits of mitigation actions, policies and measures identified from the economy side

- Overall economic growth;
- Job creation;
- Poverty reduction;
- Rural development;
- Reduced pollution;
- Enhanced education;
- Improved health;
- Strengthening national identity;
- reduced misplaced government spending (fuel subsidies)
- Sociopolitical stability.

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, leading to difficulties in integrating the data into a single set of results to report.

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

Different **format of results** of the mitigation potential calculations

Different **timeframes and frequency of reporting** (Annualized, period, or number of specific years)

Differences in **baseline considerations**

Differences in **measurement and units** e.g. costs

- **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
Senior Advisor
UNEP-Copenhagen Climate Centre
Fernando.farias@un.org