



Energy research Centre of the Netherlands

How to make NAMAs work for transport?

Stefan Bakker (ECN; bakker@ecn.nl) and Cornie Huizenga (ADB/IDB)

In collaboration with Ecofys, Wuppertal Institute, Embarq, Transport Research Laboratory

Bridging the Gap side event, Copenhagen, 11 December 2009



© Jürg Grütter, Grütter Consulting



Partnership on Sustainable Low Carbon Transport



Study context

- Goal: provide recommendations for post-2012 mechanisms to be suited for transport sector
- Initiated by ADB and IADB, as part of the SLoCaT partnership
- Case studies by TRL, Ecofys, Embarq and Wuppertal Institute
- September 2009 – April 2010
- COP15: interim results
- Input into formulation of detailed guidelines for NAMAs

Emission reductions in transport: Avoid – Shift - Improve

- Most studies and mitigation efforts focus on improving energy and carbon efficiency
 - Biofuels, electric vehicles, energy efficiency
- Measures to reduce transport demand (avoid) and shift to more efficient modes are increasingly acknowledged
- Developing countries lower level of vehicle ownership: opportunity to leap frog to more sustainable transport systems

Current instruments

- CDM: currently 0.4% of CERs in transport sector
 - Recently approved methodologies and development of PoAs provide limited scope for improvement
- Multilateral banks
 - traditionally focus on road construction
 - slowly more attention for sustainable transport and more integrated vision
 - programme lending
- GEF, Clean Investment Fund

Future instruments: NAMAs

- Voluntary, in context of sustainable development
- Unilateral – supported – credited
- Less strict MRV requirements than CDM
 - no offsets, but need to validate impact
- Scope:
 - policy, programme, project,
 - enabling activities (capacity building, policy support)

NAMA case studies (1)

- Hefei, China: ‘walkable city’: urban planning for non-motorised and public transport
- Jakarta: transport demand management: road pricing, parking policies and BRT enhancement
- Belo Horizonte (Brazil): integrated mobility plan – BRT/metro, NMT, landuse and parking policies
- Mexico City: optimisation of conventional bus system – institutional framework, implementation of changes, data gathering, public awareness



NAMAs for the transport sector

- Incremental cost for avoid and shift measures often low to negative (particularly if co-benefits are included), but implementation difficult
 - need to focus on barrier removal cost
- MRV: measuring impact on GHG emissions challenging
- Financing approaches
 - grants
 - soft loans
 - combination of domestic and external funding
- Institutional structure

Conclusions

- Mitigation in transport sector currently focused on 'improve'
- Current mechanisms have had limited impact
 - Carbon finance a factor of limited importance
 - Methodological issues
- NAMAs could be promising



Recommendations and further work

- Avoid – shift – improve measures
- Focus on barrier removal cost needed including capacity building
 - funding of enabling activities
- Transport data and models
- Can co-benefits incentivise action?
- How does NAMA financing relate to other external and domestic funds?