

SUMMARY RESULTS

Public stakeholder consultation on the Revision of the Monitoring Mechanism Decision (MMD) - Decision 280/2004

General

29 responses were received to the questionnaire, the majority of which were from private individuals (12) indicating the strong interest of citizens in climate change issues. The remainder of the responses was from industry, private companies, 2 national administrations (Belgium and the United Kingdom), 2 NGOs (including Climate Action Network Europe) and a research institution. The responses originated in 18 different countries one of which outside the EU with the majority of the responses originating in Belgium, France and Spain. There was a fairly even mix of EU-15 and EU-12 respondents to the questionnaire.

The majority of the respondents (24) were "familiar" to "very familiar" with climate change policies and aware that GHG data is collected and made publicly available at the EU (26) and also considered that they are "somewhat" to well informed by public authorities on efforts made to combat climate change (total 25 respondents). However, 19 respondents still considered that there is room for improvement with regard to the amount and quality of information communicated to the public.

The majority of the respondents to the questionnaire indicated that they use at least once a year, if not more often, the databases and reports made available to the public by the European Commission and the European Environmental Agency (EEA) in the context of the monitoring mechanism decision. Most of them consider this information understandable, clear and easy to retrieve and use.

20 respondents declared that they are familiar with the monitoring mechanism decision but only 10 of them have been "directly" (5) or "indirectly" (5) involved in its implementation. From the 24-25 respondents who expressed an opinion on whether the comprehensiveness, reliability and transparency is satisfactory the majority (including the Member States) seemed to "somewhat agree" (most popular response) to "strongly agree" that this was indeed so whereas the NGOs tended to disagree. Views seemed to more widely diverge with regard to the transparency of the data. In any case, the majority of the respondents (70%) agreed that the MMD needs to be improved. Opinions, however, differed significantly as to whether the MMD should be the main instrument to address reporting matters linked to various climate change data and information (8) or whether this should be tackled through various reporting instruments (11) with a slight preference for the latter.

Reporting on policies and measures

Most of the respondents (including the NGOs but not the responding national administrations) indicate that they are not really satisfied with the level of information and the methods used to report on projections, policies and measures. Further elaboration of methods to be used and of reporting formats seem to be highly favored options for implementation among the respondents.

Streamlining

Most respondents are in favor of streamlining of the MMD enabling streamlining of reporting of all data (actual, projected, policies and measures). A bit more than half of the respondents, including the NGOs but not the two national administrations, also advocate the establishment of a national inventory review process at the EU level to assess the information provided by MS.

Climate-change related financial flows

The majority of the respondents (55%) believe that the information available on climate-related funding is not transparent, easy to access and to compile and believe that including this information in the MMD will have an added value compared to existing development finance reporting. The majority of the respondents, but not the two national administrations, also believe that it would be useful to monitor such flows centrally at EU level.

Adaptation

On adaptation, the majority of the respondents (54%), but not the two national administrations, were of the opinion that reporting should include measures taken at national and regional level along with budgetary allocation while there seem to be little preference for simply providing information linked to a web-based information system. The option of setting a national focal point responsible for adaptation was highly favored (63%).

LULUCF

On LULUCF the majority of the respondents (59%) were in favor of establishing additional reporting on rewetting and drainage, force-majeure events and harvested wood products.

Maritime transport

There was significant agreement (76%) among respondents that more accurate data on emissions from the maritime sector should be required to facilitate future action to tackle these emissions and 36% believes that the collection and consolidation of related data should be done both at the EU and at the national level with second preferred choice that of having only a central body at EU level.

Aviation

74% of the respondents acknowledge that existing reporting instruments do not provide enough information to enable us to understand the full impact of aviation on the climate.

Specific comments provided

In the comments provided issues raised were among other the need for the revised MMD to allow for flexibility in reporting and for the reporting frequency to reflect the frequency of data and information changes. The need to avoid overlaps with other monitoring, reporting and review streams at both the domestic and the international level was also noted as this could create consistency and comparability issues and could undermine these other processes. For the reporting of projections, policies and measures, the need for determining basic assumptions and for providing guidance on appropriate methods and formats was noted. On finance, the need for transparency, for taking into consideration the OECD process, for enabling ex-ante assessment and creating new climate finance lines were some of the issues brought forward.

On international maritime transport and aviation a concern was raised as to whether the EU has the right to regulate. Also opinions varied as to whether these areas are appropriate for inclusion in the MMD, on maritime because decisions are still pending at the international level and on aviation because of the high uncertainties and the existing ongoing scientific processes. Other comments, however, encouraged the collection of fairly detailed data on aviation and advocated for inclusion of the maritime sector so as to enable further action.

On adaptation, generally the information gaps were acknowledged and people felt that this is an area where more information would be useful, there was a commentary advocating the

creation of national adaptation systems. However, another respondent felt that although adaptation is important there is no need for further regulating reporting at the EU level.

Other issues brought forward in the comments were with respect to the need:

- for transparent information on the use of auctioning revenues;
- for transparent implementation of the annual emission allowances linked to the non-ETS sectors;
- for establishment of voluntary reporting frameworks for post 2012 Green investment schemes;
- to address soil carbon;
- to have an assessment of the costs of inaction;
- to create space-based monitoring systems to address both mitigation and adaptation and for the initiation at EU level of a satellite monitoring constellation.

With regard to the reports and tools available reflecting the information captured through the MMD respondents felt that these are not adequately "advertised" and do not reach the European citizens. Further use of media and communication channels could be helpful in bringing this information more effectively back to the public.