THE 6TH WORKSHOP ON GHG INVENTORIES IN ASIA

16-18 July 2008; Tsukuba - Japan



Uncertainty Assessment in GHG Inventories in Viet Nam



Nguyen Chi Quang, Ph.D. Senior Advisor to Chairman of Board VINACOMIN - VIET NAM

Uncertainty in GHG Inventories

A general and imprecise term which refers to the lack of certainty in emissionsrelated data resulting from any causal factor, such as the application of nonrepresentative factors or methods, incomplete data on sources and sinks, lack of transparency etc. Reported uncertainty information typically specifies a quantitative estimates of the likely or perceived difference between a reported value and a qualitative description of the likely causes of the difference



Uncertainty investigations should be integrated within your QA/QC plan!



Focus on Direct and Indirect GHG Emissions



GHG Emissions Inventory Modeling



Inventory Model: Spatial Database and Processing

The GHG inventory in 1994 in INC



The National GHG inventory in 1998

(Source: MONRE 2004)

The GHG inventory in 2000 in SNC

Strictly uncertainties in GHG inventories cannot be exactly quantified

1. Activity data

- Gaps in time series
 - Unknown sources
 - Gaps in understanding of existing sources

- Use of surrogate or proxy variables
- Lack of references (calculation or estimation methods, representativeness at local or national level)
- 2. Emission Factors
- Usually high uncertainty
 - Measurement for emission factors are inadequate to quantify uncertainties
 - Emission factors may be inappropriate for specific sources
- Scarcity of quantitative information (measurements, sample representativeness) as compared to qualitative information (experts judgement)

Uncertainty of the Knowledge that is Predicted

Variability and Uncertainty in GHG Inventories

Sources of Uncertainty:

- Random sampling error for a random sample of data
- Measurement errors
 - Systematic error (bias, lack of accuracy)
 - Random error (imprecision)
- Non-representativeness
 - Not a random sample, leading to bias in mean (e.g., only measured loads not typical of daily operations)
 - Direct monitoring versus infrequent sampling versus estimation, averaging time
 - Omissions
- Surrogate data (analogies with similar sources
- Lack of relevant data, Lack of completeness
- Misreporting or misclassification
- Problem and scenario specification
- Bias and random errors from modeling

The Groundows Cas Protocol

March

Tools.

6.

IPCC Guidelines and Guidance

Methods agreed by the COP

- 1. Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (IPCC 1996)
 - Mandatory for **all** Parties
- 2. IPCC Good Practice Guidance and Uncertainty Management in National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (2000)
 - Mandatory for Annex I Parties
 - Non-Annex I Parties encouraged to use
- 3. IPCC Good Practice Guidance for land use, land-use change and forestry (2003)

Mandatory for Annex I Parties

Tetreter & Mon-Annex I Parties encouraged to use

4. 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas

WRI 2004a. The Greenhouse Gas Protocol – A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard. Revised Edition.

WRI 2004b. GHG Protocol Initiative – GHG Estimation

Good practice inventories contain under or over estimates and uncertainties are reduced as far as is practicable

Overview of methods and guidance

Approach 1:

- emission sources aggregated up to level similar to IPCC Summary Table 7A
- uncertainties then estimated for these categories
- uncertainties calculated based on error propagation equations
- Provides basis for Key Source analysis

Approach 2:

- corresponds to Monte Carlo approach
- Can use software such as @RISK and MS excel spreadsheets
- Combine Monte Carlo and design-based methods to account for
 - sampling uncertainty
 - input uncertainty
 - model uncertainty
- Recommend reading the IPCC Guidelines "Uncertainties"

Error propagation equations

Uncertainty of a product of several quantities

$$U_{E} = \frac{\sqrt{(U_{1} \bullet E_{1})^{2} + (U_{2} \bullet E_{2})^{2} + \dots + (U_{n} \bullet E_{n})^{2}}}{|E_{1} + E_{2} + \dots + E_{n}|}$$

where:

- U_E : percentage uncertainty of the sum
- U_i : percentage uncertainty associated with source i
- E_i : emission estimate for source I

(Equation 5.2.1, IPCC GPG 2004)

Uncertainty assessment of CO2 Emission by Error Propagation Equations

	GHG Emission (GT)			
Emission Sources	1994	1998	2000	
Energy	25,600.00	43,200.00	50,368.03	
Industrial Processes	3,800.00	5,600.00	10,005.72	
Agriculture	52,450.00	57,300.00	65,090.61	
Land use change and Forestry	19,380.00	12,100.00	15,104.72	
Waste	2,560.00	2,600:00	sf, ch, N20 2;601.08	
Total	103,790.00	120,800.00	143,170.16	
Cummulated Uncertainty	9.10%	PURCHANNEL 9111K 30%	8.90% -	

(Source: MONRE 2000,2004,2008)

Uncertainties Assessment: Monte Carlo Simulation

Electricity Demand and Resources Forecast to 2025

(Source: Sixth Master Plan – EVN, November 2007)

Coal Supply for Electicity Generation Forecast to 2025

Given nearly identical human emissions, models project dramatically different futures. Carbon cycle feedbacks are among the <u>largest</u> sources of uncertainty for future climate.

Uncertainty Assessment of CO2 Emission by Statistical Analysis

Number of values	19.00	9
Sum	5,637,297,240.00	8
Minimum	14,439,970.00	31.6%
Maximum	809,464,095.00	
Range	795,024,125.00	
Mean	296,699,854.70	
Median	236,294,900.00	10,5% 10.5% 10.5%
First quartile	64,859,080.00	5.3% 5.3% 5.3%
Third quartile	489,206,981.30	
Standard error	59,258,864.07	-1e8 0 1e8 2e8 3e8 4e8 5e8 6e8 7e8 8e8 9e GHG Emission (Tons)
95% confidence interval	124,502,873.40	CMSPATCH System Touristics and the second se
99% confidence interval	170,547,010.80	
Variance	66,720,646,450,000,000 .00	
Average deviation	216,534,572.30	
Standard deviation	258,303,400.00	
Coefficient of variation	0.87	

Uncertainty Assessment of CO2 Emission by Monte Carlo Simulation

				Sample Number	Percentage
				14,439,970	91%
	Histogra	m f <mark>or Un</mark> ce	rtainty Leve	e 16,187,655	88%
				23,639,350	82%
				37,975,790	94%
140	Summary Statistics			58,694,115	91%
120	Average = 89.96%			83,353,975	97%
120	SD = 3.114%			111,787,750	86%
100 -	Max = 99%			149,041,295	95%
	Min = 80%			192,804,905	96%
80 -		<u> </u>		236,294,900	94%
60				282,400,260	91%
00 -				332,373,205	91%
40 -				384,300,895	88%
				441,681,165	90%
20 -				505,048,920	92%
				575,616,940	92%
0 +				651,640,005	88%
78%	% 80% 82% 84% 8	36% 88% 90%	92% 94% 96% 9	98% 100% 730,552,050	89%
				809,464,095	84%

Conclusions and future prospects

- Uncertainties are not a good measure of inventory quality
- The subjectivity component in uncertainty estimates will probably be reduced through use of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines and better competence of inventory compilers
- Inventory quality needs to be measured using also other indicators (transparency and review reports)
- Uncertainties can be reduced and uncertainty estimates improved by addressing category-specific QA/QC and uncertainties at the data collection step
- Need to develop systematic methods for expert judgments addressing all errors
- Uncertainties are quantified for every submission; Sensitivity analysis is used to guide inventory improvement

Areas for co-operation proposal

- Exchange of information and experiences.
- Share of information, studies, more uncertainty data available within emission inventory guidebook.
- Clarify approaches for expert judgement to exclude subjective approaches and have influence on uncertainty estimates.
- Improve utilisation of analysis results by arranging a course in sensitivity analysis.
- It is possible to assess the uncertainty of national, sector and corporation GHG emission inventories.
- Scenario analysis and sensitivity runs allow to assess this influence and to understand/evaluate it.

Intuitive aspect gains weight when uncertainties are larger

Average emissions Thousand million tonnes of CO₂ equivalent per year

Source: Greenpeace, Cool farming: Climate impacts of agriculture and mitigation potential, January 2008 (data for 2005).

