



Distr. GENERAL

FCCC/ASR/2006/TUR 2 June 2006

**ENGLISH ONLY** 

## Annual status report of the greenhouse gas inventory of Turkey

- 1. This status report was prepared by the secretariat as part of the initial check of the greenhouse gas inventory submitted in accordance with decision 19/CP.8. It reflects the content of the inventory submission of 2006 as originally submitted by the Party.
- 2. In this report, the following abbreviations are used:

CRF: common reporting format LUCF: Land-use Change and Forestry LULUCF: Land Use, Land-use Change and

Forestry

NIR: national inventory report

SBDT: sectoral background data tables

Notation keys
C: confidential

IE: included elsewhere NA: not applicable NE: not estimated NO: not occurring

Greenhouse gases
CO<sub>2</sub>: carbon dioxide
CH<sub>4</sub>: methane
N<sub>2</sub>O: nitrous oxide

HFCs: hydrofluorocarbons PFCs: perfluorocarbons SF<sub>6</sub>: sulphur hexafluoride NOx: nitrogen oxides CO: carbon monoxide

NMVOCs: non-methane volatile organic

compounds

SO<sub>2</sub>: sulphur dioxide

				I	NTR	ODUCTIO	ON										
	Date of receipt	14 April 2	14 April 2006														
ation	Format	CRF pro	vided	~	NIR provided												
nform	Base year or period	1990	Emissions without adjustments for climate variations or electricity trade														
General information	CRF provided for years	1990–2004															
	Gases covered	$CO_2$	CH <sub>4</sub>	$N_2$	O	HFCs	PFCs	SF <sub>6</sub>	NOx	СО	NMVOCs	$SO_2$					
		>	~	V	7	>		~	>	>	V	<u>\</u>					
National inventory report	1	of Emissic	An NIR has not been submitted. However, Turkey submitted a document "Conceptual Framework of Emission Inventories" containing information on the CRF tables submitted, on the key category and uncertainty analyses. Turkey also submitted a set of Excel tables with results of the tier 1 key category analysis and an Excel table with results of the tier 1 uncertainty analysis.														
~ . <b>I</b>	Language of NIR																

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Information on the base year in this status report does not reflect or prejudge any decision that may be taken by the Party in relation to the use of 1995 as base year for HFCs, PFCs and SF<sub>6</sub>, in accordance with Article 3.8 of the Kyoto Protocol.

		Provision of in	formation for the	PART I latest reported inv	entory year in the	CRF: 2004						
		Energy	Industrial Processes	Solvent Use	Agriculture	Land Use, Land- use Change and Forestry	Waste					
	Sectoral report tables	1 🔽	2(I) <b>2</b> (II) <b>2</b>	3	4	5	6					
	Sectoral background data tables		2(I).A-G	3.A-D	4.A 🔽	5.A	6.A 🔽					
		1.A(b)	2(II).C,E		4.B(a)	5.B	6.B					
		1.A(c)	2(II).F		4.B(b)	5.C	6.C					
		1.A(d)			4.C 🔽	5.D						
		1.B.1			4.D 🔽	5.E						
Tables		1.B.2			4.E	5.F						
T		1.C 🔽			4.F 🔽	5 (I)						
		Bunkers separately				5 (II)						
						5 (III)						
						5 (IV)						
	Summary tables					5 (V)						
		Summary 1.A	✓	Summary 1.B	<b>✓</b>	Summary 2						
	Other tables	Summary 3	V	Table 7 (Key catego	ories) <sup>a</sup>	Table 9(a) (Completeness) <sup>b</sup>						
		Table 10 (Trends)	✓			Table 9(b) (Completeness) <sup>b</sup>						
	Comments	The Party has not	provided the LUI	LUCF reporting tab	oles as required by	decision 13/CP.9						
ls	Totals provided for		CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	HFCs	PFCs	SF <sub>6</sub>					
Trends		>	V	~	>		V					
L J	Totals provided for years	1990–2004	1990–2004	1990–2004	2000–2004		1996–2004					
CO <sub>2</sub>	Comparison of CO <sub>2</sub> from fuel	Reference appro	oach Sec	toral approach	Difference mor 2 per cen							
Э	combustion	>		~		Explanation	on provided					
9.	Disaggregation by species	HF		PF	CCs	SF <sub>6</sub>						
HFCs, PFCs, SF <sub>6</sub>	Reporting of actual and/or		Potential	Actual	Potential	Actual	Potential					
HFCs,	potential estimates in the consumption of halocarbons and SF <sub>6</sub>	V				V	V					
ion		Summary table 1.A		Sectoral report tables Sectoral background data tables								
Notation keys	Comments	Use of notation key	ys is limited in son	ne tables. Frequent	t use of "0" instead	l of data or notation	n keys.					

a The Party used the CRF Microsoft Excel application in which table 7 (Overview) covers completeness and quality of estimates. This is not in accordance with the reporting requirements in decision 18/CP.8 (FCCC/CP/2002/7/Add.2).
 b The Party used the CRF Microsoft Excel application in which table 9 (Completeness) is one table. The Party reported table 9 (Completeness),

and this is reflected in this status report by table 9(a) being ticked and table 9(b) being left blank.

## PART II Provision of CRF tables for years reported Information Years gaps relating Base 1998 1999 2000 2001 2002 2003 2004 to reporting b Comments year<sup>a</sup> 1990 1991 1992 1993 1994 1995 1996 1997 Sectoral report – Table 1 ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ **√** ✓ **√** Table 1.A(a) ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ Table 1.A(b) Table 1.A(c) ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ **√** ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ **√** ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ Table 1.A(d) Table 1.B.1 ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ **√ √** ✓ ✓ No data are reported in this table but ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ Table 1.B.2 notation keys NE and NA are used No data are reported in this table but ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ Table 1.C notation key NE is used Table 2(I) ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ Sectoral reports Table 2(II).F Table 2(II) ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ **√** ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ **✓** ✓ ✓ ✓ **√** For 1993 "0" is reported instead of ✓ ✓ ✓ data or notation kevs ✓ ✓ Sectoral report – Table 3

Solvent Use

Table 3.A–D

## PART II Provision of CRF tables for years reported (continued)

Years													Information						
		Base year <sup>a</sup>	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	gaps relating to reporting <sup>b</sup>	Comments
S	ectoral report – Table 4		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Agriculture SBDT	Table 4.A		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	1	✓	
	Table 4.B(a)		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
	Table 4.B(b)		✓	✓	<b>✓</b>	✓	✓	<b>√</b>	✓	✓	✓	✓	<b>✓</b>	✓	~	<b>✓</b>	✓	✓	Only population size data and the nitrogen excretion are reported. For 1992 only population size data are reported.
	Table 4.C		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
	Table 4.D		<b>~</b>	✓	✓	<b>\</b>	<b>\</b>	<b>*</b>	<b>\</b>	<b>~</b>	<b>~</b>	<b>\</b>	✓	<b>\</b>	✓	✓	✓		No data are reported in this table but notation key NE is used
	Table 4.E																		
	Table 4.F		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	1	✓	
S	ectoral report – Table 5																		
	Table 5.A																		
	Table 5.B																		
rest	Table 5.C																		
Fo	Table 5.D																		
and	Table 5.E																		
nge	Table 5.F																		
ha	Table 5 (I)																		
use (	Table 5 (II)																		
n-p	Table 5 (III)																		
Laı	Table 5 (IV)																		
Jse,	Table 5 (V)																		
Land Use, Land-use Change and Forestry	General comments on entire sector																•		The Party has not provided the LULUCF reporting tables as required by decision 13/CP.9. It has used the LUCF reporting tables as contained in decision 3/CP.5.

Provision of CRF tables for years reported (continued)	
Years Information	

				İ	i			ı	Ye	ars	ı			ı	İ	ı	ı	Information	
		Base year <sup>a</sup>	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	gaps relating to reporting <sup>b</sup>	Comments
	Sectoral report – Table 6		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Ę.	Table 6.A		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Waste	Table 6.B		✓	1	✓	<b>√</b>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		No data are reported in this table but notation key NE is used
	Table 6.C																		
	Summary 1.A		<b>√</b>	<b>√</b>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
S.	Summary 1.B		<b>✓</b>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
	Summary 2 (CO <sub>2</sub> equivalent emissions)		✓	✓	✓	<b>~</b>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
	Summary 3 (Methods/emission factors)		✓	1	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
d of	Table 7 (Key categories) <sup>c</sup>		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Summary	Table 8(b) (Recalculation – explanatory information)																		
$\bar{\mathbf{S}}$	Table 9(a) (Completeness)		✓	✓	✓	✓	<b>√</b>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
	Table 9(b) (Completeness) <sup>d</sup>					·													
	Table 10 (Trends)																✓	✓	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> This Party uses a base year of 1990.

b This column indicates that reporting gaps (blank cells) have been identified in a given table of the CRF. This was due to limited use, or lack of, notation keys (NO, NE, NA, IE, C).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>c</sup> The Party used the CRF Microsoft Excel application in which table 7 (Overview) covers completeness and quality of estimates. This is not in accordance with the reporting requirements in decision 18/CP.8 (FCC/CP/2002/7/Add.2).

d The Party used the CRF Microsoft Excel application in which table 9 (Completeness) is one table. The Party reported table 9 (Completeness), and this is reflected in this status report by table 9(a) being ticked and table 9(b) being left blank.

PART III  Provision of information relating to recalculation												
Table 8(a) (Recalculated data)		Comments	Information on recalcula	tions is not provided								
Recalculation for years												
Recalculated sectors/gases	Energy	Industrial Processes	Solvent Use	Agriculture	Land Use, Land-use Change and Forestry	Waste						
$CO_2$												
CH <sub>4</sub>												
N <sub>2</sub> O												
HFCs												
PFCs												
SF <sub>6</sub>												
Table 8(b) (Explanatory information)												
Full CRF for the recalculated base year		Percentage difference in a	ggregate greenhouse gas ba	se year estimate	<ul><li>with LULUCF</li><li>without LULUCF</li></ul>	% %						