

I. NAP summary table – target calculation ANNEX 3
(Grey fields are filled out automatically)

| Row | Data table no. | | Emissions (Mt CO ₂ eq) |
|--|----------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| A | | Target under Kyoto Protocol or Burden Sharing Agreement (avg. annual GHG emissions 2008-12) | 50,1 |
| B | III | <i>Total GHG emissions 2003 (excluding LULUCF emissions and removals)</i> | 54,2 |
| C | | Difference +/- (row A - row B) (negative means need to reduce) | -4,1 |
| D | III | <i>Av. annual projected total GHG emissions 2008-2012 ('with measures' projection)</i> | 58,5 |
| E | | Difference +/- (row A - row D) (negative means need to reduce) | -8,4 |
| Reduction measures (where relevant) | | | |
| F | V | EU emissions trading scheme [1], [2] | [a] |
| G | VI | Additional policies and measures (other than emissions trading), including LULUCF [b] | -0,65 |
| H | VII | Government purchase of Kyoto mechanisms | [c] |
| I | | Total reduction measures (row F + row G + row H) | |

- [1] Please insert average annual contribution to reduction (in negative figure)
 [2] Please insert the figure in Table V, Line L, Column iv minus the annual average emissions in 2008-2012 in the ETS sector under the business as usual scenario

- [a] The price incentive through the ETS could in itself reduce domestic emissions. A total quantity of allowances of no more than 15 MT compared to projected emissions of 21 Mt could lead to a net use of the Kyoto mechanisms of -6 MT/year through the ETS.
 [b] Additional to those policies and measures reflected in the projection in D (58.5 Mt).
 [c] See ch. 8.15. A programme with approved budget is set up to acquire the necessary Kyoto units for compliance with the Protocol and a unilateral target of 10 % overfulfilment.

IX

NAP Summary table – Further details on selected new entrants

| | Power plant with a rated thermal input exceeding 20 MW | Power plant with a rated thermal input exceeding 20 MW |
|---|---|---|
| Maximum capacity of the actual installation | | |
| Fuel (s) used | | |
| Forecast number of operating hours/year in the period 2008 to 2012 | | |
| Annual allowance allocation in 2008 to 2012 | | |

NAP Summary table – Details on new entrants, closures and auctioning

| Issues with respect to new entrants | Description of NAP provisions |
|--|---|
| Does the plan contain a new entrants' reserve? | Ch. 3.2 |
| What is its size in absolute terms and as a percentage of the total quantity of allowances for the period? | 9 Mt, corresponding to 1.8 Mt/year. 12 % of total quantity of allowances. |
| What use is made of allowances left over in the reserve at the end of the trading period? (cancellation, sold) | Sold or used for compliance with Kyoto Protocol. |
| How will new entrants be treated in case the reserve runs out of allowances before the end of the trading period? (reserve replenished, further new entrants buy in the market) | Buy in the market. |
| Does the allocation to the new entrant depend on the actual choice of fuel? | No |
| Does the allocation to the new entrant depend on the actual choice of technology? | Yes |
| Does the allocation to the new entrant depend on the estimated or actual number of operating hours or does the allocation use a standard number of operating hours? | Standard |
| Auctioning | |
| Will any allowances be auctioned? | Yes |
| What share of the total quantity of allowances will be auctioned? | ~50 % |
| Who can participate in the auction? | All (in principle) |
| What auctioning method will be used? | Not decided |
| When/at what intervals will the auction(s) be held? | Not decided |
| What quantity of allowances will be auctioned each time? | Not decided |
| What use will be made of the revenues? | General public revenue |
| Will the auctions be coordinated with any auctions in other Member States? | Probably not |
| Closures | |
| Do operators have to report to the competent authority when an installation closes, and on what conditions is an installation considered to be closed? | Operators must report, and Norwegian Pollution Control Authority (SFT) must consider that closing is permanent. |
| Does the operator continue to be issued allowances for a closed installation in the remaining years of the trading period? If the reply depends on whether the operator sets up a new entrant installation replacing the closed installation, please briefly describe the provision. | No |
| What happens to any allowances that were intended for an installation, which will not receive them after closure? (cancellation, fed into a new entrants' reserve, auctioning) | Could be sold or used for compliance. |

VII

NAP Summary table – Government's planned use of Kyoto units (Mt CO₂e) and status of implementation [a]

(Grey fields are filled out automatically)

| | | ERUs | CERs | AAUs and others | Total | |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|---------|-----------------|---------|---------|
| A | Planned purchase | Total 2008-2012 | | | 0,00 | |
| B | | Annual average | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0,00 |
| C | Quantity of units already paid for | | | | 0,00 | |
| D | Quantity of units contracted, but yet unpaid [1] | | | | 0,00 | |
| E | Neither bought nor contracted by date of notification (A - C - D) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0,00 |
| F | Full budget appropriated to first commitment period (2008-12) | Currently available for 2006 (M EUR) | | | | 0,00 |
| G | | Committed for the future (M EUR) [2] | | | | 0,00 |
| H | Implied future price M EUR/Mt CO ₂ e ((F+G)/E) | | #DIV/0! | #DIV/0! | #DIV/0! | #DIV/0! |

[1] Units partially paid for should be proportionally distributed between lines C and D

[2] Row G should not include the sums intended to cover payments for units represented in row D

[a] See chapter 8.15.

| | Measures | i | ii | iii | iv | v | vi | vii | viii | ix |
|-----|---|---|--------------------|------------------------------------|---|--------------------|------------------------------------|---|--------------------|------------------------------------|
| | | Under implementation [1] | | | Adopted [2] | | | Planned [3] | | |
| | | Expected average annual reduction (2008-12) | | Full effects expected as from year | Expected average annual reduction (2008-12) | | Full effects expected as from year | Expected average annual reduction (2008-12) | | Full effects expected as from year |
| | | In ETS sectors | In non-ETS sectors | | In ETS sectors | In non-ETS sectors | | In ETS sectors | In non-ETS sectors | |
| A | Emission trading scheme 2005-2007 | 0,50 | | 2007 | | | | | | |
| B | Ban on landfilling of decomposable waste and stricter requirement for the extractio of methane from landfills | | 0,15 | 2010 | | | | | | |
| C | | | | | | | | | | |
| D | | | | | | | | | | |
| E | | | | | | | | | | |
| F | | | | | | | | | | |
| G | | | | | | | | | | |
| H | | | | | | | | | | |
| I | | | | | | | | | | |
| ... | | | | | | | | | | |
| X | Subtotal | 0,50 | 0,15 | | 0,00 | 0,00 | | 0,00 | 0,00 | |
| | Total (equal to row G in Table I) | | | | | | 0,65 | | | |

[1] Implementation is ongoing, and the measure is not taken into account for the "with measures" projections presented in Table III. As regards the year, Member States should indicate the year where the full or a substantial part of the effects can be expected, not the first year of implementation.

[2] The measure has been adopted by the final instance at the relevant local, regional or national level, but it is not yet implemented.

[3] The measure is at least mentioned in a formal government document.

V NAP Summary table – Proposed allocation in relation to first period allocation (without additional policies and measures) in the sectors covered by the EU emissions trading scheme [a]

(Grey fields are filled out automatically)

| | | i | ii | iii | iv | v |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | 2003 actual CO ₂ emissions (Mt CO ₂) | 2004 actual CO ₂ emissions (Mt CO ₂) | Average annual allocation 2005 - 2007 | Proposed average annual allocation in 2008-2012 [1] | Proposed ETS allocation as a percentage of first period ETS allocation |
| A | combustion installations total (excluding installations covered under rows B-J) | 13,82 | 14,06 | 2,83 | 2,11 | 74,54 % |
| | main activity 1 | 13,82 | 14,06 | 2,83 | 2,11 | 74,54 % |
| | main activity 2 | 0,00 | 0,00 | | | #DIV/0! |
| | flaring | 0,00 | 0,00 | | | #DIV/0! |
| | integrated steelworks | 0,00 | 0,00 | | | #DIV/0! |
| | crackers | 0,00 | 0,00 | | | #DIV/0! |
| | furnaces | 0,00 | 0,00 | | | #DIV/0! |
| | main activity n | 0,00 | 0,00 | | | #DIV/0! |
| B | mineral oil refineries | 1,95 | 1,79 | 1,91 | 1,71 | 89,58 % |
| C | coke ovens | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | #DIV/0! |
| D | metal ore roasting, sintering, pig iron and steel producing installations | 0,05 | 0,08 | 0,06 | 0,08 | 127,11 % |
| E | cement producing installations | 1,32 | 1,13 | 1,30 | 1,30 | 99,73 % |
| F | lime producing installations | 0,14 | 0,20 | 0,23 | 0,13 | 64,05 % |
| G | glass and glass fibre producing installations | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 80,00 % |
| H | ceramics producing installations | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | #DIV/0! |
| I | pulp, paper and board producing installations | 0,52 | 0,54 | 0,04 | 0,47 | 1113,15 % |
| J | New entrants (total, without sectoral breakdown) | n.a. | n.a. | | 1,80 | #DIV/0! |
| K | Total | 17,82 | 17,81 | 6,41 | 5,82 | 90,78 % |

[1] Please quantify in footnotes, for rows where relevant, how much is due to a change in scope from the first to the second phase

[a] Scope and allocation rules are very different in 2008-2012 compared to 2005-2007.

Source: The Norwegian Pollution Control Authority

IV NAP Summary table – Recent and projected CO₂ emissions in sectors covered by the EU emissions trading scheme

(Grey fields are filled out automatically)

| Emissions in Mt CO ₂ eq | | i | ii | iii [3] | iv | v | vi | vii | viii | ix | x | xi |
|------------------------------------|---|---------|---------|---------|-------|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--|
| Year | | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | Average annual projected emissions 2008 – 2012 [1] |
| A | combustion installations total (excluding installations covered under rows B-J) | 13,82 | 14,06 | 13,90 | 14,49 | 16,05 | 16,02 | 15,66 | 16,29 | 15,67 | 15,56 | 15,84 |
| | main activity 1 | 13,82 | 14,06 | 13,90 | 14,49 | 16,05 | 16,02 | 15,66 | 16,29 | 15,67 | 15,56 | 15,84 |
| | main activity 2 | | | | | | | | | | | #DIV/0! |
| | flaring | | | | | | | | | | | #DIV/0! |
| | integrated steelworks | | | | | | | | | | | #DIV/0! |
| | crackers | | | | | | | | | | | #DIV/0! |
| | furnaces | | | | | | | | | | | #DIV/0! |
| | main activity n | | | | | | | | | | | #DIV/0! |
| B | mineral oil refineries | 1,95 | 1,79 | 1,96 | 2,11 | 2,04 | 1,90 | 1,90 | 1,90 | 1,90 | 1,90 | 1,90 |
| C | coke ovens | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| D | metal ore roasting, sintering, pig iron and steel producing installations | 0,05 | 0,08 | 0,07 | 0,07 | 0,08 | 0,08 | 0,12 | 0,12 | 0,12 | 0,12 | 0,11 |
| E | cement producing installations | 1,32 | 1,13 | 1,14 | 1,20 | 1,25 | 1,25 | 1,25 | 1,25 | 1,25 | 1,25 | 1,25 |
| F | lime producing installations | 0,14 | 0,20 | 0,18 | 0,18 | 0,23 | 0,51 | 0,56 | 0,58 | 0,63 | 0,66 | 0,59 |
| G | glass and glass fibre producing installations | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,03 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 | 0,04 |
| H | ceramics producing installations | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| I | pulp, paper and board producing installations | 0,52 | 0,54 | 0,53 | 0,59 | 0,48 | 0,48 | 0,49 | 0,50 | 0,51 | 0,52 | 0,50 |
| J | Total (ΣRows A and B to I) [2] | 17,82 | 17,81 | 17,82 | 18,67 | 20,22 | 20,28 | 20,02 | 20,67 | 20,11 | 20,04 | 20,22 |
| K | Share of EU ETS CO₂ in total GHG emissions (%) (Row J / Row N in table III) [a] | 32,86 % | 32,45 % | 32,90 % | | | #DIV/0! | #DIV/0! | 35,33 % | #DIV/0! | #DIV/0! | 35,33 |

[1] Numbers to be used in last two columns of Table V.

[2] Row J must be equal to 17,82 17,81 17,82 20,28 20,02 20,67 20,11 20,04 20,22
Row O in Table III:

[3] Please insert figures equal to the registry data on the surrendered amount of allowances (note that this is not the allocation data). (Scope is too different, n.a.)

[a] Without opt-in

Sources: Ministry of Finance and The Norwegian Pollution Control Authority

III NAP Summary table – Recent and projected greenhouse gas emissions per common reporting format sector (without taking into account additional policies and measures in Table VI)
(Grey fields are filled out automatically)

in Mt CO₂eq

| Row ref. | CRF subsector | | | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | Average annual projected emissions 2008-2012 |
|----------|-------------------------------------|--|------------------------|-------|-------|-------|------|------|--------|------|------|--|
| A | 1.A.1 | Energy generation | GHG | 12,4 | 12,5 | 12,6 | | | 16,8 | | | 16,83 |
| B | | | CO ₂ in ETS | 11,9 | 12,1 | 12,0 | 14,0 | 13,6 | 14,2 | 13,6 | 13,5 | 13,79 |
| C | 1.A.3 | Transport | GHG | 13,9 | 14,3 | 14,6 | | | 15,8 | | | 15,83 |
| D | 1.A.4.a + b + c | Commercial and institutional, Residential, and Agricultural energy use | GHG | 4,2 | 3,8 | 3,4 | | | 3,4 | | | 3,41 |
| E | | | CO ₂ in ETS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0,0 | 0 | 0 | 0,00 |
| F | 2 | Industrial processes | GHG | 9,7 | 10,5 | 10,2 | | | 9,6 | | | 9,59 |
| G | | | CO ₂ in ETS | 2,5 | 2,3 | 2,5 | 2,7 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 2,77 |
| I | 4 | Agriculture | GHG | 4,4 | 4,3 | 4,3 | | | 4,3 | | | 4,30 |
| J | 5 | Land-Use Change and Forestry [a] | GHG | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | | | | | | #DIV/0! |
| K | 6 | Waste | GHG | 1,6 | 1,6 | 1,5 | | | 1,4 | | | 1,43 |
| L | 1.A.2 + 1.A.4 + 1.A.5 + 1.B + 3 + 7 | All other sectors | GHG | 8,1 | 7,9 | 7,5 | | | 7,1 | | | 7,13 |
| M | | | CO ₂ in ETS | 3,4 | 3,3 | 3,3 | 3,6 | 3,6 | 3,7 | 3,7 | 3,7 | 3,66 |
| N | | Total (A+C+D+F+I+J+K+L) | GHG | 54,24 | 54,89 | 54,15 | 0 | 0 | 58,520 | 0 | 0 | 11,70 |
| O | | Total in ETS (B + E + G + M) | CO ₂ in ETS | 17,8 | 17,8 | 17,8 | 20,3 | 20,0 | 20,7 | 20,1 | 20,0 | 20,22 |

[a] The net sequestration from the land-use, land-use change and forestry sector (LULUCF) in 2003, 2004 and 2005 were calculated at 25.2, 25.5 and 27.2 million tonnes of CO₂ respectively. The contribution from KP article 3.3 ARD activities is expected to be +/-0 Mt. Norway will not use RMUs issued under article 3.4 for compliance purposes.
Sources: Ministry of Finance and The Norwegian Pollution Control Authority

11b. NAP Summary table – Basic data on electricity sector [1]
(Grey fields are filled out automatically)

| | Year | 2000 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | Average 2008-2012 |
|---|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|----------------------|
| A | Total domestic electricity production (TWh) | 142,8 | 107,2 | 110,4 | 137,8 | 121,6 | 137,7 | | | | | | #DIV/0! |
| B | Total Imports (TWh) | 1,5 | 13,5 | 15,3 | 3,7 | 9,8 | 4,2 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| | B/a Country 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | #DIV/0! |
| | B/b Country n | | | | | | | | | | | | #DIV/0! |
| | B/c Other countries | | | | | | | | | | | | #DIV/0! |
| C | Total Exports (TWh) | 20,5 | 5,6 | 3,8 | 15,7 | 8,9 | 15,8 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| | C/a Country 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | #DIV/0! |
| | C/b Country n | | | | | | | | | | | | #DIV/0! |
| | C/c Other countries | | | | | | | | | | | | #DIV/0! |
| D | Electricity trade balance (TWh, total row B - total row C) | -19,0 | 7,9 | 11,5 | -12,0 | 0,9 | -11,6 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 |
| E | Share of gas in total domestic electricity production (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | #DIV/0! |
| F | Share of oil in total domestic electricity production (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | #DIV/0! |
| G | Share of coal in total domestic electricity production (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | #DIV/0! |
| H | Share of nuclear energy in total domestic electricity production (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | #DIV/0! |
| I | Share of renewable energy, including biomass, in total domestic electricity production (%) [2] | 99,7 | 99,1 | 99,2 | 99,4 | 99,0 | 98,9 | | | | | | #DIV/0! |

[1] Indicate data source(s), separately per year where relevant. Source: Statistics Norway and The Norwegian Water Resources and Energy Directorate (NVE)

[2] [The cell in row I for the year 2010 should also include \(in footnote\) the target pursuant to Directive 2001/77/EC.](#)

Ila NAP Summary table – Basic data
(Grey fields are filled out automatically)

| | | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | |
|------|--|----------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------------------------|
| A | Real GDP [1] (in billion €2000) | Absolute | 126,9 | 130,9 | 135,5 | 139,3 | 146,3 | 152,4 | 160,2 | 168,8 | 173,4 | 176,9 | 182,6 | 186,3 |
| | | Trend index 2003=100 | 66,44 | 68,53 | 70,94 | 72,93 | 76,60 | 79,79 | 83,87 | 88,38 | 90,79 | 92,62 | 95,60 | 97,54 |
| B | Emissions [1] (Mt of CO ₂) [2] | Absolute | 34,8 | 33,2 | 34,2 | 35,9 | 37,9 | 37,8 | 40,8 | 41 | 41,1 | 42 | 41,6 | 42,9 |
| | | Trend index 2003=100 | 80,18 | 76,50 | 78,80 | 82,72 | 87,33 | 87,10 | 94,01 | 94,47 | 94,70 | 96,77 | 95,85 | 98,85 |
| C | Carbon intensity [1] (million tonnes CO ₂ / billion €) | Absolute | 0,27 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,26 | 0,26 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,24 | 0,24 | 0,24 | 0,23 | 0,23 |
| | | Trend index 2003=100 | 120,69 | 111,62 | 111,08 | 113,42 | 114,01 | 109,16 | 112,08 | 106,89 | 104,31 | 104,49 | 100,26 | 101,34 |
| Year | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | Annual average 2008-2012 |
| A | Real GDP [1] (in billion €2000) | Absolute | 189,1 | 191 | 198,4 | 203,7 | 209,4 | 216,8 | 223,5 | 227,9 | 232,5 | 235,8 | 240,9 | 232,12 |
| | | Trend index 2003=100 | 99,01 | 100 | 103,87 | 106,65 | 109,63 | 113,51 | 117,02 | 119,32 | 121,73 | 123,46 | 126,13 | 121,53 |
| B | Emissions [1] (Mt of CO ₂) [2] | Absolute | 42 | 43,4 | 43,9 | 43,1 | 43,3 | | | | 48,3 | | | 48,30 |
| | | Trend index 2003=100 | 96,77 | 100 | 101,15 | 99,31 | 99,77 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 111,29 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 22,26 |
| C | Carbon intensity [1] (million tonnes CO ₂ / billion €) | Absolute | 0,22 | 0,23 | 0,22 | 0,21 | 0,21 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,21 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,04 |
| | | Trend index 2003=100 | 97,75 | 100 | 97,38 | 93,12 | 91,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 91,43 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 18,29 |

[1] Indicate data source(s), separately per year where relevant. Source: Ministry of Finance.

[2] Please note that contrary to the explanation of Table Ila on page 34 of the English version of the NAP2 guidance communication, we are requesting here only CO₂ and not total greenhouse gas emissions.

X

NAP Summary table - Important assumptions on annual averages

| Year | EU Allowance price (in Euro) | Crude oil price (Brent) [NOK per barrel, Source Statistics Norway] | Natural gas price [NOK per sm³] | Coal price [NOK per tonne, no estimates in macroeconomic forecasts, not important for Norway] | Exchange rate [2] | Other |
|-------------|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|--------------------------|--------------|
| 2005 | 19 | 345 | 1,44 | 385 | 8,01 | |
| 2006 | 20 | 414 | 1,86 | 385 | 8,05 | |
| 2007 | 19 | 400 | 1,83 | | 8,06 | |
| 2008 | 12,6 | 360 | 1,76 | | 8,06 | |
| 2009 | 12,7 | 337 | 1,67 | | 8,16 | |
| 2010 | 12,8 | 322 | 1,65 | | 8,25 | |
| 2011 | 12,9 | 307 | 1,65 | | 8,33 | |
| 2012 | 13 | 291 | 1,51 | | 8,41 | |

[1] Use common market standard and specify, including the currency used; indicate in detail sources of data and methodologies

[2] For those Member States outside the Euro-zone
Source: Ministry of Finance