

# **Close Encounters**

## **(National consultations within the NEC Review Contract)**

**Zbigniew Klimont**

International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, Laxenburg, Austria  
(*klimont@iiasa.ac.at*)

TFEIP 19-21 October, 2005, Rovaniemi, Finland

## Background (1)



- **IIASA's RAINS model selected as one of the tools used within the EU NEC Review Contract,**
- **Continuation of CAFE consultations; similar format,**
- **Meeting with EU-25 countries' experts and a number of industrial associations from March to November, 2005**

## Background (2)



- **Discussed subjects:**
  - **Emissions (broad): national inventory vs. RAINS**
  - **Emissions (detailed): various parameters used in calculation or needed for calculation in RAINS**
  - **Activity data: national, international, RAINS, other models**
  - **Costs: national, industrial, RAINS**
  - **Projections (activities): national, industrial, RAINS**
  - **Projections (emissions): national, industrial, RAINS, legislation**

# Selected findings (1)



- **Varying interpretation of NFR categories in reporting emissions, for example:**
  - **4D: Direct Soil (N-fertilizers, manure application, grazing)**
  - **3D: Other (tons of things can be in or not)**
  - **Off-road – distributed in a number of NFR?**

## **REASONS?:**

- 1. National inventory systems**
- 2. Available data**
- 3. UNFCCC vs. UNECE interpretation**

## Selected findings (2)



- **Varying methods used in estimation of emissions from specific NFR categories leads to significant differences, for example:**
  - **Paint use,**
  - **Solvent use activities (e.g., printing, adhesives, chemicals, etc.),**
  - **Evaporative emissions from liquid fuel distribution system,**
  - **Evaporative emissions from cars,**
  - **PM sources**

### **REASONS?:**

- 1. National inventory systems**
- 2. Available data**
- 3. Specific national experience**
- 4. 'Guidebook' not up-to-date**
- 5. Poor (not appropriate) representation of a specific activity in NFR**

## Selected findings (3)



- **Temporal changes not included for a number of NFR categories, for example:**
  - **Paint use,**
  - **Several solvent use sectors**
  - **Domestic combustion**

### **REASONS?:**

- 1. 'Guidebook' not up-to-date**
- 2. Lack of data**
- 3. UNFCCC does not require it**
- 4. Lack of resources**

## Selected findings (4)



- **Significant improvements/advancements in methods used for estimation of several NFR categories, for example:**
  - **Ammonia from agriculture,**
  - **Road transport,**

### **REASONS?:**

- 1. 'Guidebook' provides up-to-date information**
- 2. Availability of data**
- 3. UNFCCC reporting**
- 4. Access to new approaches via the Expert Panels**

# Conclusions



- **Consultations very useful but take a lot of resources,**
- **The modelling team served as a catalyst in few cases inspiring improvements (additional work),**
- **The modelling team served as a “exchange warehouse” between modellers-industry-national teams,**
- **Without such consultation it would not be possible to explain some of the differences,**
- **A number of differences (from country to country) in interpretation of reporting categories identified,**
- **A need for update of the ‘Guidebook’ identified,**
- **A need for regular verification/comparison/review programs identified,**
- **From the perspective of UNECE, lack of non-EU countries.**