



# ***Latvia`s National Inventory Report***

**Greenhouse Gas Emissions in Latvia from 1990 to 2022  
in Common Reporting Format (CRF)**

Riga, 2024

***DRAFT***

## PREFACE

Latvia's National Inventory Report (NIR) under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and Article 26 of Regulation (EU) 2018/1999 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 December 2018 on the Governance of the Energy Union and Climate Action (EU Governance Regulation) contains following parts:

- Latvia's national greenhouse gas emission inventory report (NIR) is prepared using the reporting guidelines of UNFCCC (adopted by decision 24/CP.19 and decision 18/CMA.1);
- CRF (Common Reporting Format) data tables showing greenhouse gas emissions for the years 1990 to 2022. The CRF tables are compiled with the UNFCCC CRF Reporter software (version v6.0.10\_AR5). This report itself does not contain the full set of CRF tables. The full set of CRF tables is available at the EIONET, Central Data Repository, kept by the European Environmental Agency: [http://https://cdr.eionet.europa.eu/lv/eu/mmr/art07\\_inventory/ghg\\_inventory/envzzvjlg/](http://https://cdr.eionet.europa.eu/lv/eu/mmr/art07_inventory/ghg_inventory/envzzvjlg/).

Ministry of Climate and Energy of the Republic of Latvia is the national entity with the overall responsibility for the compilation and finalisation of inventory reports and their submission to the UNFCCC Secretariat and the European Commission.

**Authors:** Asnate Skrebele, Santija Treija, Laine Lupkina, Intars Cakars, Lauris Siņics, Jeļena Lazdāne-Mihalko, Aiva Puļķe, Vita Štelce (Latvian Environment, Geology and Meteorology Centre), Gaidis Klāvs, Larisa Gračkova (Institute of Physical Energetics), Arta Bārdule, Aldis Butlers, Ieva Līcīte, Andis Lazdiņš (Latvian State Forest Research Institute "Silava"), Laima Bērziņa (Latvia University of Life Sciences and Technologies), Agita Gancone, Beāte Dansone (Ministry of Climate and Energy)

**Cover photo:** Karīna Silauniece

**Edited:** By sectoral ministries

The contact person at Ministry of Climate and Energy of the Republic of Latvia is:  
Agita Gancone  
Maskavas street 165, Riga, LV – 1019, Latvia  
E-mail: [Agita.Gancone@kem.gov.lv](mailto:Agita.Gancone@kem.gov.lv)

## CONTENT

<b>PREFACE</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<b>UNITS AND ABBREVIATIONS</b> .....	<b>16</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b> .....	<b>18</b>
<b>ES.1 BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON GHG INVENTORIES AND CLIMATE CHANGE</b> .....	<b>18</b>
<i>ES.1.1 Background information on climate change</i> .....	<i>18</i>
<i>ES.1.2 Background information on greenhouse gas inventories</i> .....	<i>18</i>
<b>ES.2 SUMMARY OF NATIONAL EMISSION AND REMOVAL-RELATED TRENDS</b> .....	<b>19</b>
<b>ES.3 OVERVIEW OF SOURCE AND SINK CATEGORY EMISSION ESTIMATES AND TRENDS</b> .....	<b>24</b>
<b>ES.4 OVERVIEW OF EMISSION ESTIMATES AND TRENDS OF PRECURSORS AND SULPHUR OXIDES</b> .....	<b>26</b>
<b>1 INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>28</b>
<b>1.1 BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON GHG INVENTORIES AND CLIMATE CHANGE</b> .....	<b>28</b>
<i>1.1.1 Background information on climate change</i> .....	<i>28</i>
<i>1.1.2 Background information on GHG inventories</i> .....	<i>28</i>
<b>1.2 DESCRIPTION OF THE NATIONAL INVENTORY ARRANGEMENTS</b> .....	<b>29</b>
<i>1.2.1 Institutional, legal and procedural arrangements</i> .....	<i>29</i>
<i>1.2.2 Overview of inventory planning, preparation and management</i> .....	<i>32</i>
<i>1.2.3 Quality assurance, quality control and verification plan</i> .....	<i>43</i>
<i>1.2.4 Changes in national inventory arrangements since previous annual GHG inventory submission</i> .....	<i>51</i>
<b>1.3 INVENTORY PREPARATION, DATA COLLECTION, PROCESSING AND STORAGE</b> .....	<b>51</b>
<b>1.4 BRIEF GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF METHODOLOGIES AND DATA SOURCES USED</b> .....	<b>52</b>
<i>1.4.1 GHG inventory</i> .....	<i>52</i>
<i>1.4.2 European Union Emission Trading System (EU ETS) data</i> .....	<i>57</i>
<b>1.5 BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF KEY CATEGORIES</b> .....	<b>59</b>
<b>1.6 GENERAL UNCERTAINTY EVALUATION</b> .....	<b>63</b>
<b>1.7 GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF COMPLETENESS</b> .....	<b>65</b>
<i>1.7.1 GHG inventory</i> .....	<i>65</i>
<i>1.7.2 Completeness by geographical coverage</i> .....	<i>66</i>
<i>1.7.3 Completeness by timely coverage</i> .....	<i>66</i>
<b>2 TRENDS IN GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS</b> .....	<b>67</b>
<b>2.1 DESCRIPTION AND INTERPRETATION OF EMISSION TRENDS FOR AGGREGATED GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS</b> .....	<b>67</b>
<b>2.2 DESCRIPTION AND INTERPRETATION OF EMISSION TRENDS BY GAS</b> .....	<b>68</b>
<b>2.3 DESCRIPTION AND INTERPRETATION OF EMISSION TRENDS BY SECTOR</b> .....	<b>69</b>
<i>2.3.1 Trends in ENERGY</i> .....	<i>69</i>
<i>2.3.2 Trends in INDUSTRIAL PROCESSES AND PRODUCT USE</i> .....	<i>71</i>
<i>2.3.3 Trends in AGRICULTURE</i> .....	<i>73</i>
<i>2.3.4 Trends in LULUCF</i> .....	<i>73</i>
<i>2.3.5 Trends in WASTE</i> .....	<i>74</i>
<b>2.4 DESCRIPTION AND INTERPRETATION OF EMISSION TRENDS OF PRECURSORS AND SULPHUR DIOXIDE</b> .....	<b>75</b>

<b>3</b>	<b>ENERGY (CRF 1)</b> .....	<b>77</b>
3.1	OVERVIEW OF SECTOR.....	77
	3.1.1 Quantitative overview.....	77
	3.1.2 Description.....	81
3.2	FUEL COMBUSTION (CRF 1.A).....	87
	3.2.1 Comparison of the sectoral approach with the reference approach.....	90
	3.2.2 International bunker fuels.....	98
	3.2.3 Feedstocks and non-energy use of fuels (CRF 1.AD).....	102
	3.2.4 Energy Industries (CRF 1.A.1).....	104
	3.2.5 Manufacturing Industries and Construction (CRF 1.A.2).....	115
	3.2.6 Transport (CRF 1.A.3).....	125
	3.2.7 Other Sectors (CRF 1.A.4).....	151
	3.2.8 Other (CRF 1.A.5).....	161
3.3	FUGITIVE EMISSIONS FROM SOLID FUELS AND OIL AND NATURAL GAS (CRF 1.B).....	163
	3.3.1 Fugitive emission from oil (CRF 1.B.2.a).....	164
	3.3.2 Fugitive emissions from natural gas (CRF 1.B.2.b, CRF 1.B.2.c, CRF 1.B.2.d).....	166
3.4	CO <sub>2</sub> TRANSPORT AND STORAGE (CRF 1.C).....	170
<b>4</b>	<b>INDUSTRIAL PROCESSES AND PRODUCT USE (CRF 2)</b> .....	<b>172</b>
4.1	OVERVIEW OF SECTOR.....	172
4.2	MINERAL INDUSTRY (CRF 2.A).....	176
	4.2.1 Category description.....	176
	4.2.2 Cement Production (CRF 2.A.1).....	178
	4.2.3 Lime Production (CRF 2.A.2).....	184
	4.2.4 Glass production (CRF 2.A.3).....	188
	4.2.5 Ceramics (2.A.4.a).....	192
	4.2.6 Other uses of Soda Ash (2.A.4.b).....	206
	4.2.7 Other Process Uses of Carbonates (2.A.4.d).....	208
4.3	CHEMICAL INDUSTRY (CRF 2.B).....	208
	4.3.1 Category description.....	208
4.4	METAL INDUSTRY (CRF 2.C).....	208
	4.4.1 Iron and Steel Production (CRF 2.C.1).....	208
4.5	NON-ENERGY PRODUCTS FROM FUELS AND SOLVENT USE (CRF 2.D).....	216
	4.5.1 Lubricant Use (CRF 2.D.1).....	217
	4.5.2 Paraffin Wax Use (CRF 2.D.2).....	220
	4.5.3 Other (CRF 2.D.3).....	223
4.6	ELECTRONICS INDUSTRY (CRF 2.E).....	234
4.7	PRODUCT USES AS SUBSTITUTES FOR OZONE DEPLETING SUBSTANCES (CRF 2.F).....	235
	4.7.1 Refrigeration and Air Conditioning (CRF 2.F.1).....	238
	4.7.2 Foam Blowing Agents (CRF 2.F.2).....	256
	4.7.3 Fire Protection (CRF 2.F.3).....	261
	4.7.4 Aerosols (Metered Dose Inhalers CRF 2.F.4.a).....	264
4.8	OTHER PRODUCT MANUFACTURE AND USE (2.G).....	267
	4.8.1 Electrical Equipment (CRF 2.G.1).....	269
	4.8.2 N <sub>2</sub> O From Product Uses (CRF 2.G.3).....	272
4.9	OTHER PRODUCTION (CRF 2.H).....	274
	4.9.1 Category description.....	274
	4.9.2 Methodological issues.....	275
	4.9.3 Uncertainties and time-series consistency.....	276
	4.9.4 Category-specific QA/QC and verification.....	277
	4.9.5 Category-specific recalculations.....	277

4.9.6	<i>Category-specific planned improvements</i> .....	277
<b>5</b>	<b>AGRICULTURE (CRF 3)</b> .....	<b>278</b>
5.1	<b>OVERVIEW OF SECTOR</b> .....	<b>278</b>
5.2	<b>ENTERIC FERMENTATION (CRF 3.A)</b> .....	<b>285</b>
5.2.1	<i>Category description</i> .....	285
5.2.2	<i>Methodological issues</i> .....	287
5.2.3	<i>Uncertainties and time-series consistency</i> .....	294
5.2.4	<i>Category-specific QA/QC and verification</i> .....	295
5.2.5	<i>Category-specific recalculations</i> .....	296
5.2.6	<i>Category-specific planned improvements</i> .....	296
5.3	<b>MANURE MANAGEMENT (CRF 3.B)</b> .....	<b>296</b>
5.3.1	<i>Category description</i> .....	296
5.3.2	<i>Methodological issues</i> .....	298
5.3.3	<i>Uncertainties and time-series consistency</i> .....	312
5.3.4	<i>Category-specific QA/QC and verification</i> .....	312
5.3.5	<i>Category-specific recalculations</i> .....	313
5.3.6	<i>Category-specific planned improvements</i> .....	313
5.4	<b>AGRICULTURAL SOILS (CRF 3.D)</b> .....	<b>313</b>
5.4.1	<i>Category description</i> .....	313
5.4.2	<i>Methodological issues and activity data</i> .....	315
5.4.3	<i>Uncertainties and time-series consistency</i> .....	325
5.4.4	<i>Category-specific QA/QC and verification</i> .....	325
5.4.5	<i>Category-specific recalculations</i> .....	325
5.4.6	<i>Category-specific planned improvements</i> .....	325
5.5	<b>FIELD BURNING OF AGRICULTURAL RESIDUES (CRF 3.F)</b> .....	<b>325</b>
5.6	<b>LIMING (CRF 3.G)</b> .....	<b>325</b>
5.7	<b>UREA APPLICATION (CRF 3.H)</b> .....	<b>327</b>
5.8	<b>OTHER CARBON-CONTAINING FERTILIZERS (CRF 3.I)</b> .....	<b>328</b>
5.9	<b>OTHER (CRF 3J)</b> .....	<b>328</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>LAND-USE, LAND-USE CHANGE AND FORESTRY (CRF 4)</b> .....	<b>329</b>
6.1	<b>OVERVIEW OF SECTOR</b> .....	<b>329</b>
6.2	<b>LAND-USE DEFINITIONS AND THE CLASSIFICATION SYSTEMS USED AND THEIR CORRESPONDENCE TO THE LULUCF CATEGORIES</b> .....	<b>338</b>
6.3	<b>INFORMATION ON APPROACHES USED FOR REPRESENTING LAND AREAS AND ON LAND- USE DATABASES USED FOR THE INVENTORY PREPARATION</b> .....	<b>347</b>
6.4	<b>FOREST LAND (CRF 4.A)</b> .....	<b>347</b>
6.4.1	<i>Category description</i> .....	347
6.4.2	<i>Methodological issues</i> .....	354
6.4.3	<i>Uncertainties and time-series consistency</i> .....	363
6.4.4	<i>Category-specific QA/QC and verification</i> .....	364
6.4.5	<i>Category-specific recalculations</i> .....	365
6.4.6	<i>Category-specific planned improvements</i> .....	365
6.5	<b>CROPLAND (CRF 4.B)</b> .....	<b>365</b>
6.5.1	<i>Category description</i> .....	365
6.5.2	<i>Methodological issues</i> .....	368
6.5.3	<i>Uncertainties and time-series consistency</i> .....	372
6.5.4	<i>Category-specific QA/QC and verification</i> .....	373
6.5.5	<i>Category-specific recalculations</i> .....	373
6.5.6	<i>Category-specific planned improvements</i> .....	373
6.6	<b>GRASSLAND (CRF 4.C)</b> .....	<b>373</b>

6.6.1	Category description .....	373
6.6.2	Methodological issues .....	377
6.6.3	Uncertainties and time-series consistency .....	380
6.6.4	Category-specific QA/QC and verification .....	381
6.6.5	Category-specific recalculations .....	381
6.6.6	Category-specific planned improvements .....	382
<b>6.7</b>	<b>WETLANDS (CRF 4.D).....</b>	<b>382</b>
6.7.1	Category description .....	382
6.7.2	Methodological issues .....	386
6.7.3	Uncertainties and time-series consistency .....	390
6.7.4	Category-specific QA/QC and verification .....	391
6.7.5	Category-specific recalculations .....	391
6.7.6	Category-specific planned improvements .....	391
<b>6.8</b>	<b>SETTLEMENTS (CRF 4.E) .....</b>	<b>392</b>
6.8.1	Category description .....	392
6.8.2	Methodological issues .....	395
6.8.3	Uncertainties and time-series consistency .....	397
6.8.4	Category-specific QA/QC and verification .....	397
6.8.5	Category-specific recalculations .....	398
6.8.6	Category-specific planned improvements .....	398
<b>6.9</b>	<b>OTHER LAND (CRF 4.F).....</b>	<b>398</b>
<b>6.10</b>	<b>BIOMASS BURNING (CRF 4(V)) .....</b>	<b>398</b>
6.10.1	Source category description .....	398
6.10.2	Methodological issues .....	401
6.10.3	Uncertainties and time-series consistency .....	403
6.10.4	Category-specific QA/QC and verification .....	403
6.10.5	Category-specific recalculations .....	403
6.10.6	Category-specific planned improvements .....	403
<b>6.11</b>	<b>HARVESTED WOOD PRODUCTS (CRF 4.G) .....</b>	<b>403</b>
6.11.1	Category description .....	403
6.11.2	Methodological issues .....	404
6.11.3	Uncertainties and time-series consistency .....	408
6.11.4	Category-specific QA/QC and verification .....	408
6.11.5	Category-specific recalculations .....	408
6.11.6	Category-specific planned improvements .....	409
<b>6.12</b>	<b>DIRECT N<sub>2</sub>O EMISSIONS FROM MANAGED SOILS .....</b>	<b>409</b>
6.12.1	Category description .....	409
6.12.2	Methodological issues .....	409
6.12.3	Uncertainties and time-series consistency .....	410
6.12.4	Category-specific QA/QC and verification .....	410
6.12.5	Category-specific recalculations .....	411
6.12.6	Category-specific planned improvements .....	411
<b>6.13</b>	<b>INDIRECT N<sub>2</sub>O EMISSIONS FROM MANAGED SOILS (CRF 4 (IV)) .....</b>	<b>411</b>
6.13.1	Category description .....	411
6.13.2	Methodological issues .....	411
6.13.3	Uncertainties and time-series consistency .....	412
6.13.4	Category-specific QA/QC and verification .....	412
6.13.5	Category-specific recalculations .....	413
6.13.6	Category-specific planned improvements .....	413
<b>7</b>	<b>WASTE (CRF 5).....</b>	<b>414</b>
7.1	OVERVIEW OF SECTOR .....	414

<b>7.2</b>	<b>SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL (CRF 5.A)</b> .....	<b>418</b>
	7.2.1 <i>Category description</i> .....	418
	7.2.2 <i>Methodological issues</i> .....	423
	7.2.3 <i>Uncertainties and times-series consistency</i> .....	425
	7.2.4 <i>Category-specific QA/QC and verification</i> .....	425
	7.2.5 <i>Category-specific recalculations</i> .....	426
	7.2.6 <i>Category-specific planned improvements</i> .....	426
<b>7.3</b>	<b>BIOLOGICAL TREATMENT AND SOLID WASTE (CRF 5.B)</b> .....	<b>426</b>
	7.3.1 <i>Composting (CRF 5.B.1)</i> .....	426
	7.3.2 <i>Anaerobic Digestion at Biogas Facilities (CRF 5.B.2)</i> .....	429
<b>7.4</b>	<b>INCINERATION AND OPEN BURNING OF WASTE (CRF 5.C)</b> .....	<b>430</b>
	7.4.1 <i>Waste Incineration (CRF 5.C.1)</i> .....	430
	7.4.2 <i>Open Burning of Waste (CRF 5.C.2)</i> .....	436
<b>7.5</b>	<b>WASTEWATER TREATMENT AND DISCHARGE (CRF 5.D)</b> .....	<b>436</b>
	7.5.1 <i>Domestic Wastewater (CRF 5.D.1)</i> .....	436
	7.5.2 <i>Industrial Wastewater (CRF 5.D.2)</i> .....	449
	7.5.3 <i>Other (CRF 5.D.3)</i> .....	455
<b>8</b>	<b>OTHER (CRF 6)</b> .....	<b>457</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>INDIRECT CO<sub>2</sub> AND NITROUS OXIDE EMISSIONS</b> .....	<b>458</b>
<b>9.1</b>	<b>CATEGORY DESCRIPTION</b> .....	<b>458</b>
	9.1.1 <i>Methodological issues</i> .....	458
	9.1.2 <i>Category-specific QA/QC and verification</i> .....	459
	9.1.3 <i>Category-specific recalculations</i> .....	459
	9.1.4 <i>Category-specific improvements</i> .....	459
<b>10</b>	<b>RECALCULATIONS AND IMPROVEMENTS</b> .....	<b>460</b>
	10.1 <b>EXPLANATIONS AND JUSTIFICATIONS FOR RECALCULATIONS</b> .....	<b>460</b>
	10.2 <b>IMPLICATION FOR EMISSION LEVELS</b> .....	<b>472</b>
	10.3 <b>IMPLICATIONS FOR EMISSION TRENDS, INCLUDING TIME SERIES' CONSISTENCY</b> .....	<b>472</b>
	10.4 <b>RECALCULATIONS, INCLUDING IN RESPONSE TO THE REVIEW PROCESS, AND PLANNED IMPROVEMENTS TO THE INVENTORY</b> .....	<b>472</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>REFERENCES</b> .....	<b>482</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1 Institutions responsible for activity data and calculating emissions.....	33
Table 1.2 Inventory preparation plan.....	36
Table 1.3 Main data sources for activity data and emission values.....	53
Table 1.4 Reported emissions, calculation methods and type of emission factors used in 2022 (CS = country-specific, CR = Corinair, D= default, PS= plant-specific, M= model, OTH= other) .....	54
Table 1.5 Key categories in 2024 submission.....	60
Table 1.6 Uncertainties of 2024 submission .....	63
Table 1.7 Assessment of uncertainties in 1990 emissions .....	64
Table 1.8 Sources and sinks not estimated ("NE") in 2024 submission .....	65
Table 3.1 GHG emissions from Energy sector (CRF 1) in 1990–2022 (kt).....	78
Table 3.2 Consumption of energy resources in Latvia (TJ).....	81
Table 3.3 Heat production and consumption in Latvia (TJ) .....	83
Table 3.4 Electricity production and consumption in Latvia (TJ) .....	83
Table 3.5 Methods and emission factors used in Energy sector.....	85
Table 3.6 Key categories in Energy sector in 2024 submission.....	85
Table 3.7 Reported emissions from fuel combustion in Latvia in 2022 .....	87
Table 3.8 Difference (%) between Sectoral and Reference approach data (PJ) and CO <sub>2</sub> emissions (kt) .....	90
Table 3.9 Carbon emission factors (t/TJ).....	97
Table 3.10 Energy consumption in international transport (TJ) .....	99
Table 3.11 Emission factors used in the calculation of emissions from International Bunkering .....	101
Table 3.12 SO <sub>2</sub> Emission factors used for diesel oil in the SO <sub>2</sub> calculation of emissions International Bunkering.....	102
Table 3.13 SO <sub>2</sub> Emission factors used for RFO in the SO <sub>2</sub> calculation of emissions International Bunkering.....	102
Table 3.14 Activity data for Feedstocks and Non-energy use of fuels in 1990–2022 (TJ) .....	103
Table 3.15 Emissions from Energy industries (CRF 1.A.1) in 1990–2022 (kt).....	105
Table 3.16 Characteristics of liquid solid and solid biomass fuels and estimated CO <sub>2</sub> emission factors.....	107
Table 3.17 Characteristics of natural gas and estimated CO <sub>2</sub> emission factors.....	109
Table 3.18 CH <sub>4</sub> , N <sub>2</sub> O, NO <sub>x</sub> , CO, NMVOC emission factors used in CRF 1.A.1. Energy Industries (kt/PJ) .....	110
Table 3.19 Comparison of country specific and the 2006 IPCC Guidelines default CO <sub>2</sub> emission factor values (kt/PJ) .....	114
Table 3.20 Emissions from Manufacturing industries and construction (CRF 1.A.2) in 1990–2022 (kt).....	116
Table 3.21 CO <sub>2</sub> emission factors, carbon content and NCV for municipal waste by waste types .....	118
Table 3.22 CO <sub>2</sub> emissions from municipal waste non-biomass and biomass fractions by waste types.....	119
Table 3.23 CO <sub>2</sub> emission factors, carbon content and NCV for industrial waste.....	119
Table 3.24 CH <sub>4</sub> , N <sub>2</sub> O, NO <sub>x</sub> , NMVOC, CO emission factors (kt/PJ) .....	121
Table 3.25 Comparison of country specific and the 2006 IPCC Guidelines default CO <sub>2</sub> emission factor values (kt/PJ) .....	124
Table 3.26 Summary of source category description (CRF 1.A.3.a).....	129
Table 3.27 Fuel consumption in domestic civil aviation (TJ) .....	129
Table 3.28 Emission factors used in the calculation of emissions from civil aviation.....	130
Table 3.29 GHG emissions in road transport by vehicle types (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.).....	131
Table 3.30 Summary of source category description (CRF 1.A.3.b).....	135
Table 3.31 Amount of biocomponent in liquid fuels and avoided fossil CO <sub>2</sub> in road transport (TJ) .....	136
Table 3.32 Activity data and sources used for emission calculation in road transport.....	137
Table 3.33 Fuel consumption in road transport (TJ) .....	138
Table 3.34 Calculated lubricant consumption in road transport for CO <sub>2</sub> emission reporting (TJ).....	138
Table 3.35 Summary of source category description (CRF 1.A.3.c) .....	145
Table 3.36 Fuel consumption in railway (TJ) .....	145
Table 3.37 Emission factors used in the calculation of emissions from railway.....	146
Table 3.38 Summary of source category description (CRF 1.A.3.d) .....	147
Table 3.39 Fuel consumption in domestic navigation (TJ) .....	148
Table 3.40 Emission factors used in the calculation of emissions from navigation (t/TJ) .....	149
Table 3.41 Recalculations in CRF 1.A.3 Transport.....	151
Table 3.42 Emissions from Other Sectors (CRF 1.A.4) in 1990–2022 (kt).....	152
Table 3.43 CH <sub>4</sub> , N <sub>2</sub> O, NO <sub>x</sub> , NMVOC, CO emission factors in CRF 1.A.4.a (kt/PJ).....	155
Table 3.44 CH <sub>4</sub> , N <sub>2</sub> O, NO <sub>x</sub> , NMVOC, CO emission factors in CRF 1.A.4.c (kt/PJ).....	155
Table 3.45 CH <sub>4</sub> , N <sub>2</sub> O, NO <sub>x</sub> , NMVOC, CO emission factors in CRF 1.A.4.b (kt/PJ).....	155



Table 3.46 CH <sub>4</sub> , N <sub>2</sub> O, NO <sub>x</sub> , NMVOC, CO emission factors for gasoline, diesel and RFO (kg/t).....	156
Table 3.47 Comparison of country specific and the 2006 IPCC Guidelines default CO <sub>2</sub> emission factor values (kt/PJ) .....	160
Table 3.48 Emissions from Other sources (CRF 1.A.5) in 1990–2022 (kt) .....	161
Table 3.49 CO <sub>2</sub> , CH <sub>4</sub> , N <sub>2</sub> O, NO <sub>x</sub> , NMVOC, CO emission factors .....	162
Table 3.50 Reported fugitive CO <sub>2</sub> , CH <sub>4</sub> , NMVOC emissions in Latvia in 1990–2022 (kt).....	163
Table 3.51 Gasoline consumption in Latvia in 1990–2021 (TJ).....	165
Table 3.52 Fugitive CH <sub>4</sub> , CO <sub>2</sub> and NMVOC emissions from natural gas 1990-2022 (kt) .....	167
Table 3.53 Pipeline length 1990-2022 (km) .....	167
Table 3.54 Amounts of natural gas leaked in 1990-2022 (10 <sup>6</sup> m <sup>3</sup> ).....	169
Table 3.55 Amounts of natural gas in 1990-2022 (10 <sup>6</sup> m <sup>3</sup> ) .....	169
Table 4.1 Greenhouse gas emission trend in 1990–2022 (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.).....	175
Table 4.2 Key categories in IPPU sector in 2024 submission .....	175
Table 4.3 Emissions from 2.A Mineral Industry in 1990–2022 (kt).....	177
Table 4.4 GHG emission categories, methods and gases reported from 2.A Mineral Industry.....	178
Table 4.5 Clinker production and CKD/clinker ratio .....	180
Table 4.6 Parameters for EF <sub>cl</sub> and CF <sub>CKD</sub> emission factor calculation and emission factors 1990–2022.....	181
Table 4.7 EFs for cement clinker production emission estimation (kt/kt).....	182
Table 4.8 Differences between 2.A.1 CO <sub>2</sub> emissions calculated in GHG inventory and EU ETS in 2022 .....	183
Table 4.9 Lime and quicklime production AD and amount of produced lime 1990–2022 (kt).....	185
Table 4.10 CO <sub>2</sub> emission factors for lime production (t CO <sub>2</sub> /t raw material) .....	187
Table 4.11 Activity data for raw materials use in glass production 1990-2022 (kt).....	189
Table 4.12 Emission factors for materials use in glass production (t emissions / t product or raw material) .....	190
Table 4.13 Differences between 2.A.3 CO <sub>2</sub> emissions calculated in GHG inventory and EU ETS in 2022 .....	192
Table 4.14 Data and assumptions used for CO <sub>2</sub> emission estimation for 1990-1993 .....	194
Table 4.15 Data and assumptions used for CO <sub>2</sub> emission estimation from 1 <sup>st</sup> bricks production plant .....	195
Table 4.16 Data and assumptions used for CO <sub>2</sub> emission estimation from 2 <sup>nd</sup> bricks production plant.....	196
Table 4.17 Data and assumptions used for CO <sub>2</sub> emission estimation from 3 <sup>rd</sup> bricks production plant.....	198
Table 4.18 Data and assumptions used for CO <sub>2</sub> emission estimation from 3 <sup>rd</sup> bricks production plant (continuation) .....	198
Table 4.19 Data and assumptions used for CO <sub>2</sub> emission estimation from 4 <sup>th</sup> bricks production plant .....	201
Table 4.20 Data and assumptions used for CO <sub>2</sub> emission estimation from 5 <sup>th</sup> bricks production plant .....	203
Table 4.21 Activity data for tiles production (kt) and reported CO <sub>2</sub> emissions (kt).....	204
Table 4.22 Amount of used Soda for waste water neutralization (kt).....	206
Table 4.23 Emissions from 2.C Metal Production in 1990–2022 (kt) .....	209
Table 4.24 GHG emission categories, methods and gases reported from 2.C .....	210
Table 4.25 Activity data and emissions from 2.C.1 Metal production.....	212
Table 4.26 Carbon contents of raw materials used in iron & steel production .....	213
Table 4.27 Emission factors of metal production (t/t).....	214
Table 4.28 GHG emission categories, methods and gases reported from 2.D .....	216
Table 4.29 CO <sub>2</sub> emissions from lubricant use 1990-2022 (kt).....	217
Table 4.30 Activity data for lubricant use 1990-2022.....	218
Table 4.31 Results of recalculations in 2.D.1 Lubricant use sector (1990-2021).....	220
Table 4.32 Activity data and CO <sub>2</sub> emissions from paraffin wax use 1990-2022.....	221
Table 4.33 Reported emissions from Solvent Use in Latvia in 2022 .....	224
Table 4.34 NMVOC and CO <sub>2</sub> emissions from Solvent Use for the period 1990-2022 (kt).....	225
Table 4.35 Activity data for Road paving and Asphalt roofing 1990-2022 .....	225
Table 4.36 Urea use activity data and CO <sub>2</sub> emissions 2006-2022 .....	227
Table 4.37 Share of export as percentage, calculated on NMVOC emissions .....	228
Table 4.38 The number of population used as activity data under Other solvent and product use for years 1990- 2005.....	229
Table 4.39 Emission factors for asphalt roofing and Road paving in 1990–2022.....	231
Table 4.40 Recalculated NMVOC emissions by subcategories for 2021 (kt) .....	233
Table 4.41 Results of recalculations NMVOC emission in 2.D.3.a Domestic solvent use including fungicides 1990- 2021.....	233
Table 4.42 Results of recalculations in 2.D.3 Urea use sector 2006-2021.....	234
Table 4.43 HFC emissions from 2.F Product Uses as Substitutes for ODS, 1995-2022 (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.) .....	236
Table 4.44 Proportions by 2.F.1 sub applications in LV inventory and EU.....	238

Table 4.45 Summary of emission calculation methods and gases in CFR 2.F.1.....	239
Table 4.46 Raw estimation of emissions from refrigerant management of containers.....	240
Table 4.47 Average share (%) of vehicles equipped with MAC systems by vehicle type and technology .....	250
Table 4.48 HFC-134a average amount by vehicle type.....	250
Table 4.49 Results of recalculations in 2.F.1. Refrigeration and Air Conditioning (1995-2021).....	255
Table 4.50 Summary of emission calculation methods and gases in CFR 2.F.2.....	257
Table 4.51 Summary of emission calculation methods in CFR 2.F.3.....	262
Table 4.52 Summary of emission calculation methods in CFR 2.F.4.....	265
Table 4.53 GHG emission categories, methods and gases reported from 2.G Other Product Manufacture and Use .....	268
Table 4.54 Total emissions from 2.G Other Product Manufacture and Use, 1990-2022 (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.).....	268
Table 4.55 SF <sub>6</sub> emissions from 2.G.1 Electrical Equipment, 1995-2022 (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.).....	270
Table 4.56 Summary of emission calculation methods and gases in CFR 2.G.1.....	270
Table 4.57 Estimated N <sub>2</sub> O emissions from anesthesia and from aerosol cans .....	273
Table 4.58 GHG emission categories, methods and gases reported from 2.H Other.....	275
Table 4.59 Activity data of 2.H Other Production sector .....	275
Table 4.60 NMVOC emission factors for food and beverages industries.....	276
Table 5.1 Greenhouse gas emissions in the Agriculture sector, 1990–2022 (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.).....	279
Table 5.2 Key categories in Agriculture sector in 2024 submission .....	280
Table 5.3 Number of livestock, 1990–2022 (thousands of heads).....	281
Table 5.4 Sown area of agricultural crops, 1990–2022 (thousands of ha).....	284
Table 5.5 Sown area of agricultural crops, 1990–2022 (thousands of ha).....	285
Table 5.6 Reported emissions under the subcategory enteric fermentation.....	286
Table 5.7 CH <sub>4</sub> emissions from enteric fermentation by livestock category 1990–2022 (kt).....	286
Table 5.8 Default CH <sub>4</sub> emission factors from enteric fermentation.....	288
Table 5.9 Average milk yield per cow and fat content, 1990-2022 .....	291
Table 5.10 The number of non-dairy cattle by sub-categories in Latvia, 1990-2022 (thousand of heads).....	292
Table 5.11 Average gross energy (GE) intake (MJ day <sup>-1</sup> ) and CH <sub>4</sub> emission factors (EF) from enteric fermentation (kg CH <sub>4</sub> head <sup>-1</sup> year <sup>-1</sup> ) and cattle weight (kg head <sup>-1</sup> year <sup>-1</sup> ) 1990-2022.....	293
Table 5.12 Gross energy (GE) intake (MJ day <sup>-1</sup> ), weight and CH <sub>4</sub> emission factors (EF) from enteric fermentation for non-dairy cattle sub-groups (kg CH <sub>4</sub> head <sup>-1</sup> year <sup>-1</sup> ) in 2022.....	294
Table 5.13 Review of emission factors for enteric fermentation CH <sub>4</sub> emissions.....	295
Table 5.14 Reported emissions under the subcategory manure management.....	296
Table 5.15 CH <sub>4</sub> emissions from manure management by livestock category 1990-2022 (kt) .....	296
Table 5.16 N <sub>2</sub> O emissions from manure management by livestock category 1990-2022* (kt) .....	297
Table 5.17 CH <sub>4</sub> emission factors from manure management.....	299
Table 5.18 Daily volatile solid (VS) values and CH <sub>4</sub> emission factors (EF) of manure management for cattle, 1990-2022.....	303
Table 5.19 Daily volatile solid (VS) values and CH <sub>4</sub> emission factors (EF) of manure management for non-dairy cattle sub-groups, 2022.....	304
Table 5.20 Estimation parameters and emission factors (EF) of CH <sub>4</sub> emission from manure management for swine 1990-2022 .....	305
Table 5.21 Typical animal weight, average gross energy (GE) intake, volatile solid (VS) values and emission factors (EF) for estimation of CH <sub>4</sub> emission from manure management for swine sub-groups, 2022.....	305
Table 5.22 Average N excretions per head of animal (N, kg year <sup>-1</sup> ) .....	307
Table 5.23 N excretion rates for dairy, non-dairy cattle and swine, 1990-2022 (kg N animal <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> ) .....	308
Table 5.24 N excretion rates (Nex) for N <sub>2</sub> O emissions estimation of non-dairy cattle and swine subgroups, 2022 .....	309
Table 5.25 N excretion (Nex) per manure management system (MMS) and manure N available for application (N MMS_Avb) to managed soils (kg, N yr <sup>-1</sup> ), 1990-2022.....	309
Table 5.26 Grouping of farms 2021-2022.....	311
Table 5.27 Reported emissions under the subcategory agricultural soils .....	313
Table 5.28 N <sub>2</sub> O emissions from managed soils, 1990-2022 (kt).....	314
Table 5.29 N <sub>2</sub> O emissions from N inputs to managed soils, 1990-2022 (kt) .....	315
Table 5.30 Statistics of organic N fertilizers applied to soils, 2001-2022 .....	316
Table 5.31 Dry matter fraction (DRY) of harvested crop (kg fresh weight <sup>-1</sup> ) .....	319
Table 5.32 Data sources for estimation of N in crop residues .....	319
Table 5.33 Area of cultivated organic soil, 1990-2022 (kha).....	321

Table 5.34 Default emission, volatilization and leaching factors for direct and indirect N <sub>2</sub> O emissions calculation .....	322
Table 5.35 Input values for direct N <sub>2</sub> O emission calculations from managed soils 1990-2022.....	324
Table 5.36 Consumed lime and calculated CO <sub>2</sub> emissions, 1990-2022 .....	326
Table 5.37 Urea statistics and calculated CO <sub>2</sub> emissions, 1990-2022.....	327
Table 6.1 Summary of net emissions and removals in the LULUCF sector by land-use category and HWP (positive figures indicate emissions, negative removals) (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.) .....	332
Table 6.2 Summary of net emissions and removals in the LULUCF sector by different gases (positive figures indicate emissions, negative removals) .....	333
Table 6.3 Overview of methods and emission factors used in calculations of GHG emissions from the LULUCF sector .....	335
Table 6.4 Key categories in LULUCF in 2024 submission .....	337
Table 6.5 National application of IPCC land-use categories .....	338
Table 6.6 Areas of IPCC land-use classes in 1990-2022 (kha).....	340
Table 6.7 Summary of land use change matrix (kha) .....	340
Table 6.8 Land use change matrix (kha) .....	341
Table 6.9 Distribution of drained, naturally dry and wet mineral and organic soils in Latvia's forests (forest land remaining forest land except land converted to forest land > 20 years ago) (kha).....	350
Table 6.10 Changes of growing stock of timber on the Land converted to forest land.....	351
Table 6.11 Harvesting stock (1000 m <sup>3</sup> ).....	352
Table 6.12 The cumulative area of land converted to forest land (kha).....	352
Table 6.13 Cumulative area of the land converted to forest land more than 20 years ago (kha) .....	353
Table 6.14 Summary of data for calculation of forest growing stock changes in forest land remaining forest land .....	354
Table 6.15 Wood density.....	357
Table 6.16 Country specific tree biomass expansion factors to calculate crown and below-ground biomass from stem biomass .....	357
Table 6.17 Average carbon stock in living biomass .....	357
Table 6.18 Average periodic mortality (m <sup>3</sup> ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> ).....	358
Table 6.19 Emission factors for rewetted organic soils (tonns C ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> ) .....	361
Table 6.20 Uncertainty of the forest land use data in 2024 submission .....	363
Table 6.21 Area of cropland (kha).....	367
Table 6.22 Assumptions for calculation of CSC in living and dead biomass in cropland .....	369
Table 6.23 Uncertainty of the cropland use data in 2024 submission.....	372
Table 6.24 Area of grassland (kha) .....	376
Table 6.25 Assumptions for calculation of CSC in living and dead biomass in grassland.....	377
Table 6.26 Uncertainty of the grassland use data in 2024 submission .....	380
Table 6.27 Subcategories of Wetlands remaining wetlands (4.D.1) and Land converted to Wetlands (4.D.2) .....	384
Table 6.28 Distribution of wetlands remaining wetlands (CRF 4.D.1) and land converted to wetlands (CRF 4.D.2) (kha).....	385
Table 6.29 Assumptions for calculation of CSC in living and dead biomass in wetlands.....	387
Table 6.30 Comparison of country-specific and IPCC default emission factors (on-site) for organic soils in peatlands drained for peat extraction .....	389
Table 6.31 Uncertainty of the wetland use data in 2024 submission.....	390
Table 6.32 Assumptions for calculation of CSC in living and dead biomass in settlements .....	393
Table 6.33 Uncertainty of the settlements use data in 2024 submission.....	397
Table 6.34 Emission factor for each GHG (g kg <sup>-1</sup> d.m. burned).....	401
Table 6.35 Emission factors for grassland wildfires.....	402
Table 6.36 HWP categories and their subcategories.....	404
Table 6.37 Assumptions for estimation of carbon stock in HWP.....	406
Table 6.38 Common coefficients to estimate balance between CO <sub>2</sub> emissions and removals in HWP .....	407
Table 7.1 Waste sector reported emissions and methods.....	414
Table 7.2 Key categories in Waste sector in 2024 submission.....	416
Table 7.3 Generated waste in Latvia (kt) .....	416
Table 7.4 Reported emissions under subcategory Solid Waste Disposal on Land .....	418
Table 7.5 Estimated disposed waste amounts from 1950–2001.....	419
Table 7.6 Disposed solid waste amounts from 2002-2022 (kt) .....	420
Table 7.7 Disposed waste composition in Latvia waste polygons 1990-2015.....	420

Table 7.8 Recovered CH <sub>4</sub> in Latvia landfills (kt).....	422
Table 7.9 DOC values for waste streams in managed sites (2006 IPCC Guidelines).....	424
Table 7.10 Methane generation rate constant (k) (2006 IPCC Guidelines).....	424
Table 7.11 Reported emissions under composting.....	426
Table 7.12 Composted waste amounts and emissions (kt).....	427
Table 7.13 CH <sub>4</sub> emissions from waste anaerobic digestion at biogas facilities.....	430
Table 7.14 Reported emissions under category Waste Incineration.....	430
Table 7.15 Burned bodies in crematoriums.....	431
Table 7.16 Default emission factors for CO <sub>2</sub> emission calculation.....	432
Table 7.17 Incinerated waste amounts without energy recovery.....	433
Table 7.18 Emission factors for precursors.....	433
Table 7.19 Raw estimations of CH <sub>4</sub> emissions from waste incineration.....	434
Table 7.20 Emission factors for precursors from cremation.....	434
Table 7.21 MCF values applied depending on type and level of treatment.....	439
Table 7.22 Activity data for calculation CH <sub>4</sub> emissions from Domestic Wastewater Handling sector.....	439
Table 7.23 Calculation of CH <sub>4</sub> emission from Domestic Waste Water Handling sector (2022).....	441
Table 7.24 Characteristics of sewage sludge in Latvia.....	442
Table 7.25 Calculation of CH <sub>4</sub> emission from anaerobic sewage sludge and biogas production leakage in 2022.....	442
Table 7.26 Estimation of CH <sub>4</sub> emissions from national population, not connected to centralized wastewater treatment plants in 2022.....	443
Table 7.27 Total CH <sub>4</sub> emissions from domestic wastewater handling sector in 2022.....	443
Table 7.28 Consumption of protein in Latvia per capita, sludge produced and emissions of N <sub>2</sub> O (1990-2022)....	443
Table 7.29 Comparison of Latvian protein consumption data with data from neighbour countries.....	444
Table 7.30 Activity data for estimation emissions of N <sub>2</sub> O from Domestic Wastewater Handling sector.....	445
Table 7.31 Activity data for calculation domestic NMVOC emissions from Wastewater Handling sector.....	446
Table 7.32 Uncertainties for Domestic Wastewater Handling sector.....	447
Table 7.33 Assumptions used for calculation of CH <sub>4</sub> emissions from Industrial Wastewater Handling.....	451
Table 7.34 Choice of MCF values for CH <sub>4</sub> emission calculation from industrial wastewater.....	451
Table 7.35 Activity data for calculation N <sub>2</sub> O emissions from Industrial Waste Water Handling sector.....	452
Table 7.36 Activity data for calculation industrial NMVOC emissions from Wastewater Handling sector.....	453
Table 7.37 Uncertainties for Industrial Wastewater Handling sector.....	453
Table 7.38 Activity data for calculation NMVOC emissions from Wastewater Handling sector.....	455
Table 9.1 Indirect CO <sub>2</sub> emissions from Energy (kt).....	458
Table 10.1 Impacts of recalculations on national emissions.....	460
Table 10.2 Recalculations made in 2024 submission (recalculated year 2021).....	462
Table 10.3 Recalculations made in 2024 submission (recalculated year 1990).....	468
Table 10.4 Recalculations made in 2024 submission (F-gases) (recalculated year 2021).....	470
Table 10.5 Sector specific planned improvements for Latvia's national GHG inventory.....	472
Table 10.6 Responses to the centralized UNFCCC review process.....	473
Table 10.7 Responses to the 2023 EU-internal review process.....	480

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1 The structure of Latvia's National Inventory System.....	30
Figure 1.2 Inventory and QA/QC process of the inventory.....	44
Figure 1.3 The process of inventory preparation from the first step of collecting external data to the last step, where the reporting information are submitted under the UNFCCC and EU .....	52
Figure 2.1 Latvia's aggregated GHG emissions in 1990-2022 (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.) .....	67
Figure 2.2 Trend in GHG emissions by gases (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.) .....	68
Figure 2.3 Latvia's GHGs emissions by source 1990-2022 excluding LULUCF, including indirect CO <sub>2</sub> .....	69
Figure 2.4 Trend in GHG emissions from Energy sector in 1990-2022 (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.).....	69
Figure 2.5 Fuel consumption in Energy sector 1990-2022 (PJ).....	70
Figure 2.6 Trend in GHG emissions from Transport sector in 1990-2022 (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.).....	71
Figure 2.7 Trend in GHG emissions from IPPU sector in 1990-2022 (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.) .....	72
Figure 2.8 Trend in GHG emissions from Agriculture sector in 1990-2022 (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.).....	73
Figure 2.9 Trend in net emissions from LULUCF sector in 1990-2022 (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.).....	74
Figure 2.10 Trend in GHG emissions from Waste sector in 1990-2022 (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.) .....	75
Figure 2.11 Total precursors trend 1990-2022 (kt).....	76
Figure 3.1 Emissions from the Energy sector (CRF 1) compared with the total emissions in 2022.....	77
Figure 3.2 Share of emissions in the Energy sector (CRF 1.A) in 1990-2022 (%) .....	78
Figure 3.3 GHG emissions from Energy sector (CRF 1) 1990-2022 (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.).....	79
Figure 3.4 Total precursors and NH <sub>3</sub> emissions from Energy sector (CRF 1) in 1990-2022 (kt) .....	80
Figure 3.5 Difference in fuel consumption of Liquid fuels between RA and SA (PJ;%).....	94
Figure 3.6 Difference in fuel consumption of Gaseous fuels between RA and SA (PJ;%).....	94
Figure 3.7 Difference in fuel consumption of Peat (including Peat briquettes) between RA and SA (PJ;%) .....	95
Figure 3.8 Difference in consumption of Other fuels between RA and SA (PJ;%) .....	95
Figure 3.9 Difference in consumption of Solid fuels between RA and SA (PJ;%).....	96
Figure 3.10 Emissions from International Bunkers (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.).....	99
Figure 3.11 Loaded, unloaded cargo at ports in Latvia (thsd t).....	101
Figure 3.12 Structure of loaded goods at ports in Latvia (thsd t).....	101
Figure 3.13 GHG emissions in CRF 1.A.1. Energy Industries by subsectors (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.).....	105
Figure 3.14 Fuel consumption in Energy Industries (CRF 1.A.1) for 1990-2022 (PJ).....	111
Figure 3.15 Fuel consumption in Main activity electricity and heat production (CRF 1.A.1.a) and HDD in Latvia (PJ;HDD).....	112
Figure 3.16 GHG emissions in CRF 1.A.2. Manufacturing industries and Construction by subsectors (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.).....	116
Figure 3.17 Fuel consumption in Manufacturing Industries and Construction (CRF 1.A.2) for 1990-2022 (PJ).....	122
Figure 3.18 GHG emissions development in Transport 1990-2022 (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.).....	125
Figure 3.19 GHG emissions in Transport sector by sub-sectors in 2022 (%).....	126
Figure 3.20 GHG emissions in Transport sector by gases in 2022 (%).....	126
Figure 3.21 Fuel consumption in transport by fuel type in 2022 (%).....	127
Figure 3.22 GHG emissions in civil aviation (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.) .....	128
Figure 3.23 Fuel consumption in domestic civil aviation (TJ).....	129
Figure 3.24 GHG emissions in road transport (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.).....	131
Figure 3.25 CO <sub>2</sub> emissions in road transport by vehicle types (kt).....	132
Figure 3.26 CH <sub>4</sub> emissions in road transport by vehicle types (kt).....	133
Figure 3.27 N <sub>2</sub> O emissions in road transport by vehicle types (kt) .....	133
Figure 3.28 Development of Fuel consumption in road transport (PJ;TJ).....	139
Figure 3.29 Distribution of passenger cars fleet by sub-classes (thsd).....	140
Figure 3.30 Distribution of gasoline passenger cars fleet by layers (thsd) .....	141
Figure 3.31 Distribution of diesel oil passenger cars fleet by layers (thsd).....	141
Figure 3.32 Distribution of light commercial vehicles fleet by sub-classes (thsd) .....	142
Figure 3.33 Distribution of light duty vehicles fleet by layers (thsd).....	142
Figure 3.34 Distribution of heavy duty vehicles fleet by sub-classes (thsd).....	143
Figure 3.35 Distribution of heavy duty vehicles fleet by layers (thsd).....	143
Figure 3.36 Development of GHG emissions in railway (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.).....	144
Figure 3.37 Development of fuel consumption in railway (TJ).....	145
Figure 3.38 GHG emission development in domestic navigation (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.).....	147
Figure 3.39 Development of gasoline and diesel oil fuel consumption in domestic navigation (TJ) .....	148
Figure 3.40 GHG emissions in CRF 1.A.4. Other Sectors by subsectors (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.).....	152
Figure 3.41 Fuel consumption in Other Sectors (CRF 1.A.4) for 1990-2022 (PJ).....	157

Figure 3.42 Fuel consumption in Residential sector (CRF 1.A.4.b) for stationary combustion and HDD in Latvia (PJ;HDD).....	158
Figure 3.43 Fugitive NMVOC emissions from oil products in 1990–2022 (kt).....	164
Figure 4.1 Emissions from the Industrial processes and product use sector compared with the total emissions in 2022.....	172
Figure 4.2 GHG emissions from Industrial processes and product use in 1990–2022 (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.).....	174
Figure 4.3 Emissions from Mineral industry in 1990–2022 (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.).....	176
Figure 4.4 Emissions from Cement production in 1990–2022 (SO <sub>2</sub> , NO <sub>x</sub> , NMVOC and CO emissions on secondary axis) (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.; kt).....	178
Figure 4.5 CO <sub>2</sub> emissions from lime production 1990–2022 (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.).....	184
Figure 4.6 Emissions from raw materials used in glass production 1990-2022 (NMVOC emissions on secondary axis) (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.; kt).....	188
Figure 4.7 CO <sub>2</sub> emissions from bricks and tiles production 1990-2022 (kt).....	193
Figure 4.8 CO <sub>2</sub> emissions from other uses of soda ash 2005-2022 (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.).....	206
Figure 4.9 CO <sub>2</sub> and CH <sub>4</sub> emissions from Metal industry 1990-2022 (CH <sub>4</sub> emissions on secondary axis) (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.; kt).....	209
Figure 4.10 Emissions from Non-energy Products from Fuels and Solvent Use sector 1990-2022 (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.).....	216
Figure 4.11 CO <sub>2</sub> emissions from Lubricant use 1990-2022 (kt).....	217
Figure 4.12 CO <sub>2</sub> emissions from Paraffin wax use 1999-2022 (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.).....	221
Figure 4.13 Total NMVOC emissions from Solvent Use for the period 1990-2022 (kt).....	224
Figure 4.14 Emissions from asphalt roofing and road paving in 1990–2022 (NMVOC and CO emissions on secondary axis) (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.; kt).....	226
Figure 4.15 HFC emissions from 2.F Product Uses as ODS Substitutes 1995-2022 (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.).....	236
Figure 4.16 F-gases emissions from 2.F.1. Refrigeration and Air Conditioning equipment 1990-2022 (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.).....	239
Figure 4.17 HFC emissions from 2.F.2 (Closed cell foams on secondary axis) (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.).....	256
Figure 4.18 HFC emissions from 2.F.3 (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.).....	262
Figure 4.19 HFC emissions from 2.F.4.a (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.).....	265
Figure 4.20 Emissions from 2.G Other product manufacture and use (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.).....	268
Figure 4.21 SF <sub>6</sub> emissions from 2.G.1 (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.).....	270
Figure 4.22 NMVOC emissions from 2.H Other Production in 1990–2022 (kt).....	274
Figure 5.1 Emissions from the Agriculture sector compared with the total emissions in 2022.....	278
Figure 5.2 Share of the main crops on sown area in Latvia in 2022 (%).....	284
Figure 6.1 Summary of net emissions (positive sign) and removals (negative sign) in the LULUCF sector by land-use categories and HWP (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.).....	330
Figure 6.2 Summary of net emissions (positive sign) and removals (negative sign) in the LULUCF sector by sink and source categories (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.).....	330
Figure 6.3 Summary of GHG emissions (positive sign) and removals (negative sign) in forest land (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.)..	348
Figure 6.4 Summary of GHG emissions in forest land (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.) by source and sink categories.....	349
Figure 6.5 Gross annual increment in forest land remaining forest land (m <sup>3</sup> ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> ).....	351
Figure 6.6 Emissions due to rewetting (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.).....	361
Figure 6.7 Summary of GHG emissions in cropland (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.) by source categories.....	366
Figure 6.8 Summary of CO <sub>2</sub> emissions in cropland remaining cropland (kt).....	366
Figure 6.9 Summary of GHG emissions from land converted to cropland, N <sub>2</sub> O on secondary axis (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.)....	367
Figure 6.10 Summary of GHG emissions and removals in grassland (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.) by source and sink categories..	374
Figure 6.11 Summary of GHG emissions from grassland remaining grassland, CH <sub>4</sub> and N <sub>2</sub> O emissions on secondary axis (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.).....	374
Figure 6.12 Summary of CO <sub>2</sub> emissions in land converted to grassland (kt).....	375
Figure 6.13 Impact of recalculation on the aggregated net GHG emissions from grassland (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.).....	382
Figure 6.14 Summary of GHG emissions from wetlands (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.) by source and sink categories.....	383
Figure 6.15 Summary of GHG emissions from wetlands (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.).....	383
Figure 6.16 Summary of CO <sub>2</sub> emissions associated with industrial peat extraction (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.).....	386
Figure 6.17 Activity data for calculation of off-site CO <sub>2</sub> -C emissions associated to the horticultural use of peat (kt extracted peat).....	389
Figure 6.18 Summary of net GHG emissions and removals from settlements (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.) by source categories..	392
Figure 6.19 Summary of net GHG emissions and removals from settlements remaining settlements (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.).....	393
Figure 6.20 Summary of net GHG emissions from land converted to settlements (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.).....	393

Figure 6.21 Aggregated emissions from biomass burning (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.)	398
Figure 6.22 Area of forest fires and biomass in burned area (t DM; ha)	399
Figure 6.23 Burned area of grassland since 1990 (ha)	400
Figure 6.24 Amount of harvesting residues (kt)	401
Figure 6.25 Net emissions from HWP during period 1990-2022 (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.)	404
Figure 6.26 Sawnwood production, import and export in 1990-2022, 1000 m <sup>3</sup>	405
Figure 6.27 Wood panels production, import and export in 1990-2022, 1000 m <sup>3</sup>	405
Figure 6.28 Paper and paperboard production, import and export in 1990-2022, 1000 metric t	406
Figure 6.29 Impact of recalculation on CO <sub>2</sub> emissions from HWP (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.)	409
Figure 7.1 Emissions from the Waste sector compared with the total emissions in 2022	414
Figure 7.2 Total GHG emissions from Waste sector 1990-2022 (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.)	415
Figure 7.3 GHG Emissions in Waste subsectors 1990-2022 (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.)	415
Figure 7.4 CH <sub>4</sub> emissions from waste disposing (kt)	423
Figure 7.5 Trendline and proportion waste-to-population for waste disposal	425
Figure 7.6 Total emissions from waste composting (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.)	427
Figure 7.7 Trendline and proportion waste-to-population for waste industrial composting	429
Figure 7.8 CO <sub>2</sub> emissions from Waste Incineration by waste type (kt)	431
Figure 7.9 Trendline and proportion waste-to-population for waste incineration	435
Figure 7.10 Emissions from Domestic Waste Water Handling (N <sub>2</sub> O on secondary axis) (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.)	437
Figure 7.11 Dewatered sewage sludge storage shed. Considered to be no source of CH <sub>4</sub> emissions	440
Figure 7.12 Liquid sewage sludge storage basin. Considered to be source of CH <sub>4</sub> emissions (deep anaerobic lagoon)	441
Figure 7.13 Example of estimation of uncertainties in Wastewater Handling sector	447
Figure 7.14 Impact of recalculations on GHG emissions in Domestic wastewater (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.)	449
Figure 7.15 Emissions from Industrial Wastewater Handling sector (N <sub>2</sub> O on secondary axis) (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.)	450

DRAFT

## UNITS AND ABBREVIATIONS

t	1 ton (metric) = 1 megagram (Mg) = 10 <sup>6</sup> g
Mg	1 megagram = 1 ton (t) = 10 <sup>6</sup> g
kt	1 gigagram = 1 kiloton (kt) = 10 <sup>9</sup> g
Tg	1 teragram = 1 megaton (Mt) = 10 <sup>12</sup> g
TJ	1 terajoule = 1000 gigajoule = 10 <sup>12</sup> J
PJ	1 petajoule = 1000 terajoule = 10 <sup>15</sup> J

CER – Certified Emission Reduction Units

CH<sub>4</sub> – Methane

CIS – Commonwealth of Independent States

CO<sub>2</sub> – Carbon dioxide

CO<sub>2</sub> eq. – Carbon dioxide equivalent

CO – Carbon monoxide

CR – Corinair emission factor

CRF – Common Reporting Format

CS – Country specific

CSB – Central Statistical Bureau

CSC - Carbon stock change

D – Default emission factor

d.m. – Dry matter

EC - European Commission

EMEP/CORINAIR 2007 – Atmospheric emission inventory guidebook, Co-operative Programme for Monitoring and Evaluation of the Long Range Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe, The Core inventory of air emissions in Europe

EMEP/EEA 2019 - EMEP/EEA air pollutant emission inventory guidebook 2019

EMEP/EEA 2023 - EMEP/EEA air pollutant emission inventory guidebook 2023

ESR – Effort Sharing Regulation

EU – European Union

EU ETS – European Union Emission Trading Scheme

ERT – Expert review team

ERU – Emission Reduction Units

ETR – Emission trading registry

GHG – Greenhouse Gases

GDP – Gross domestic product

HDD – Heating degree days

HFC – Hydrofluorocarbon

HWP – Harvested wood products

IE – Included elsewhere

IPCC – Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change

IPCC 1996 – Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse gas Inventories (1997)

2006 IPCC Guidelines – 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories

IPCC Wetlands Supplement - 2013 Supplement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: Wetlands

IPE – Institute of Physical Energetics

IPPC - Integrated Pollution Prevention Control

I-CER – Long term Certified Emission Reduction Unit

LBTU - Latvia University of Life Sciences and Technologies



**LEGMC** – Latvian Environment, Geology and Meteorology Centre  
**LULUCF** – Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry  
**MCF** – Methane conversion factor  
**MoA** - Ministry of Agriculture of the Republic of Latvia  
**MoCE** - Ministry of Climate and Energy of the Republic of Latvia  
**MoE** – Ministry of Economic of the Republic of Latvia  
**MoT** - Ministry of Transport of the Republic of Latvia  
**MEPRD** - Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development of the Republic of Latvia  
**MoT** - Ministry of Transport  
**MMS** – Manure management system  
**NFI** – National forest inventory  
**NF<sub>3</sub>** – Nitrogen trifluoride  
**N<sub>2</sub>O** – Nitrous oxide  
**NO<sub>x</sub>** – Nitrogen oxides  
**NA** – Not applicable  
**NCV** – Net calorific value  
**NE** – Not estimated  
**NIR** – National inventory report  
**NMVOC** - Non-methane volatile organic compounds  
**NO** – Not occurring in Latvia  
**PFC** – Perfluorocarbon  
**QA/QC** – Quality assurance and Quality control  
**RTSD** – Road Traffic Safety Department  
**SAM** – State Agency of Medicines of the Republic of Latvia  
**SFRS** – State Fire and Rescue Service of Latvia  
**SFS** – State Forest Service  
**SF<sub>6</sub>** – Sulphur hexafluoride  
**SNAP** - Selected Nomenclature for Air Pollution  
**SO<sub>2</sub>** – Sulphur dioxide  
**UN** – United Nations  
**UNFCCC** – United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change  
**UNECE CLRTAP** - United Nations Economic Commission for Europe's Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution  
**TERT** – Technical expert review team

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### ***ES.1 BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON GHG INVENTORIES AND CLIMATE CHANGE***

#### **ES.1.1 Background information on climate change**

Under the impact of recent climate change one may observe a uniform increase of air temperature, expressed in mean, minimum and maximum air temperature values. Most changes have been observed in winter and spring seasons. Due to increasing general air temperature, the length of the growing season and the number of summer days and tropical nights has increased, while the number of frost days and ice days has decreased. Upon analysing climate model projections for future periods, a further temperature increase is predicted. Precipitation in the period from 1961 to 2010 has increased, especially in winter and spring seasons. Furthermore, precipitation intensity has increased, which in turn has resulted in more intense and frequent extreme precipitation events. Up to 2100 a further increase in precipitation amount is expected, and it will be more determined by the projected precipitation intensity increase<sup>1</sup>.

#### **ES 1.2 Background information on greenhouse gas inventories**

Latvia participates in the international climate change process and together with many other countries have signed the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change in Rio de Janeiro at the UN Conference on Environment and Development held in 1992. It entered into force on 21 March 1994. The Parliament of the Republic of Latvia (Saeima) ratified the UNFCCC on February 23, 1995. On May 30, 2002 the Parliament ratified the Kyoto Protocol. Latvia has also ratified the Doha Amendment to the Kyoto Protocol. The Parliament ratified the landmark Paris Agreement on climate change on February 2, 2017.

Latvia is a member of the European Union since May, 2004 and therefore it has reporting obligations under the Regulation (EU) 2018/1999 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 December 2018 on the Governance of the Energy Union and Climate Action, amending Regulations (EC) No 663/2009 and (EC) No 715/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council, Directives 94/22/EC, 98/70/EC, 2009/31/EC, 2009/73/EC, 2010/31/EU, 2012/27/EU and 2013/30/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council, Council Directives 2009/119/EC and (EU) 2015/652 and repealing Regulation (EU) No 525/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council (EU Governance regulation). Commission Implementing Regulation 2020/1208 of 7 August, 2020 on structure, format, submission processes and review of information reported by Member States pursuant to Regulation (EU) 2018/1999 of the European Parliament and of the Council and repealing Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 749/2014 determine implementation of the Regulation (EU) 2018/1999 (Regulation 2020/1208). Regulation (EU) 2018/842 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 May 2018 on binding annual greenhouse gas emission reductions by Member States from 2021 to 2030 contributing to climate action to meet commitments under the Paris Agreement and amending Regulation (EU) No 525/2013 and Regulation (EU) 2018/841 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 May 2018 on the inclusion of greenhouse gas emissions and removals from land use, land use change and forestry in the 2030 climate and energy

---

<sup>1</sup> LEGMC, 2017, *Climate Change Scenarios for Latvia, Latvia*, 17 pp

framework, and amending Regulation (EU) No 525/2013 and Decision No 529/2013/EU is relevant to Latvia to fulfil targets set by EU.

Under the above mentioned agreements and regulations Latvia is required to provide information annually on anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions by sources and removals by sinks of all GHG not controlled by the Montreal Protocol from the following sectors: Energy, Industrial Processes and Product Use, Agriculture, Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry, and Waste.

The following greenhouse gases are reported according to UNFCCC: carbon dioxide - CO<sub>2</sub>, methane - CH<sub>4</sub>, nitrous oxide - N<sub>2</sub>O, hydrofluorocarbons - HFCs, perfluorocarbons - PFCs, sulphur hexafluoride - SF<sub>6</sub>, nitrogen trifluoride - NF<sub>3</sub>. Since 2023 submission the global warming potentials for a 100-year time horizon are used according to the IPCC Fifth Assessment Report: CO<sub>2</sub> -1, CH<sub>4</sub> - 28, N<sub>2</sub>O – 265. Some other greenhouse gases (HFCs, PFCs, SF<sub>6</sub>) have significantly higher global warming potentials. For example, HFC-143a has a global warming potential of 4800<sup>2</sup>.

The annual GHG inventory contains information on trends of the national GHG emissions by sources and removals by sinks since 1990. This information is essential for monitoring and planning of climate policies.

Latvia intends to use the flexibilities in the framework of the Regulation (EU) 2018/842 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 May 2018 on binding annual greenhouse gas emission reductions by Member States from 2021 to 2030 contributing to climate action to meet commitments under the Paris Agreement (Regulation (EU) 2018/842) and Regulation (EU) 2018/841 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 May 2018 on the inclusion of greenhouse gas emissions and removals from land use, land use change and forestry in the 2030 climate and energy framework.

## ***ES.2 SUMMARY OF NATIONAL EMISSION AND REMOVAL-RELATED TRENDS***

In 2022, Latvia's GHG emissions amounted 10130.79 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. (including indirect CO<sub>2</sub>, without LULUCF) and 15074.96 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. (including indirect CO<sub>2</sub>, with LULUCF). Latvia's total GHG emissions including indirect CO<sub>2</sub>, without LULUCF showed the decrease of 61.13% compared to the base year, but GHG emissions including indirect CO<sub>2</sub>, with LULUCF have increased by 10.27% compared to base year.

Compared to 2021, total GHG emissions including indirect CO<sub>2</sub>, without LULUCF have decreased by 5.73%, then including indirect CO<sub>2</sub>, with LULUCF GHG emissions have increased by 16.43%, mostly due to a decrease in CO<sub>2</sub> removals in living biomass in forest lands. Fluctuations in total GHG emissions during last years (e.g. peak in 1999, 2014 and 2022) mostly are associated with annual changes in CO<sub>2</sub> removals in living biomass in forest land caused by changes in forest characteristics and related management (harvesting rate, gross annual increment of living biomass, natural mortality, etc.) (Figure ES.1).

---

<sup>2</sup> IPCC Fifth Assessment Report. Available: <https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar5/syr/>




Figure ES.1 Latvia's total GHG emissions (with and without LULUCF) 1990–2022 (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

Aggregated GHG emissions 1990-2022, kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. by gases are reflected in Table ES.1 a and Table ES.1 b and by sectors reflected in Table ES.2 a and Table ES.2 b.




Table ES.1 a Aggregated GHG emissions by gases (1990 - 2014) (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

GHG EMISSIONS	1990 (base year)	1995	2000	2005	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.									
CO <sub>2</sub> emissions excluding net CO <sub>2</sub> from LULUCF	19661.60	9133.94	7081.63	7810.76	8554.52	7811.03	7519.72	7368.75	7172.21
CO <sub>2</sub> emissions including net CO <sub>2</sub> from LULUCF	6262.65	-6737.58	-5819.73	897.63	5601.43	4464.06	2812.46	3944.27	7611.20
CH <sub>4</sub> emissions excluding CH <sub>4</sub> from LULUCF	4060.56	2443.01	2107.92	2091.40	2002.96	1950.25	1999.21	2020.28	2074.77
CH <sub>4</sub> emissions including CH <sub>4</sub> from LULUCF	4583.85	2967.69	2642.75	2584.62	2539.17	2501.34	2567.41	2609.82	2714.64
N <sub>2</sub> O emissions excluding N <sub>2</sub> O from LULUCF	2298.32	994.27	914.16	1012.78	1089.66	1090.89	1150.60	1175.96	1216.63
N <sub>2</sub> O emissions including N <sub>2</sub> O from LULUCF	2783.89	1502.84	1429.57	1527.36	1611.77	1611.49	1675.60	1705.57	1738.50
HFCs	NO,NA	16.25	61.85	101.24	216.35	217.53	216.67	229.26	242.82
PFCs	NO,NA	NO,NA	NO,NA	NO,NA	NO,NA	NO,NA	NO,NA	NO,NA	NO,NA
Unspecified mix of HFCs and PFCs	NO,NA	NO,NA	NO,NA	NO,NA	NO,NA	NO,NA	NO,NA	NO,NA	NO,NA
SF <sub>6</sub>	NO,NA	0.18	0.91	3.89	7.58	7.70	8.02	8.76	8.84
NF <sub>3</sub>	NO,NA	NO,NA	NO,NA	NO,NA	NO,NA	NO,NA	NO,NA	NO,NA	NO,NA
Indirect CO <sub>2</sub> emissions	41.00	32.49	25.16	21.60	16.44	11.07	12.73	15.59	20.66
Total (without LULUCF)	26020.48	12587.64	10166.47	11020.07	11871.07	11077.41	10894.22	10803.02	10715.28
Total (with LULUCF)	13630.39	-2250.62	-1684.65	5114.74	9976.30	8802.12	7280.16	8497.69	12316.00
Total (without LULUCF, with indirect CO <sub>2</sub> emissions)	26061.47	12620.13	10191.63	11041.68	11887.50	11088.48	10906.96	10818.61	10735.94
Total (with LULUCF, with indirect CO <sub>2</sub> emissions)	13671.39	-2218.13	-1659.49	5136.35	9992.74	8813.19	7292.89	8513.28	12336.67

Table ES.1 b Aggregated GHG emissions by gases (2015 - 2022) (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

GHG EMISSIONS	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	Change from 1990 to latest reported year (%)
kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.									
CO <sub>2</sub> emissions excluding net CO <sub>2</sub> from LULUCF	7262.43	7210.69	7215.33	7857.34	7648.48	6997.99	7238.09	6619.94	-66.33
CO <sub>2</sub> emissions including net CO <sub>2</sub> from LULUCF	6414.81	4499.59	3010.21	6060.50	4284.97	6348.63	8005.73	10105.32	61.36
CH <sub>4</sub> emissions excluding CH <sub>4</sub> from LULUCF	1967.09	1993.23	2019.61	1924.81	1920.71	1898.05	1888.63	1893.21	-53.38
CH <sub>4</sub> emissions including CH <sub>4</sub> from LULUCF	2648.09	2718.14	2788.44	2776.45	2758.10	2743.12	2753.35	2782.43	-39.30
N <sub>2</sub> O emissions excluding N <sub>2</sub> O from LULUCF	1262.58	1265.11	1274.23	1225.17	1306.58	1339.80	1336.36	1344.30	-41.51
N <sub>2</sub> O emissions including N <sub>2</sub> O from LULUCF	1792.10	1802.61	1819.80	1782.46	1864.18	1902.36	1905.67	1913.86	-31.25
HFCs	251.86	271.61	264.06	259.17	250.96	243.26	258.80	250.30	100.00
PFCs	NO,NA	NO,NA	NO,NA	NO,NA	NO,NA	NO,NA	NO,NA	NO,NA	0.00
Unspecified mix of HFCs and PFCs	NO,NA	NO,NA	NO,NA	NO,NA	NO,NA	NO,NA	NO,NA	NO,NA	0.00
SF <sub>6</sub>	10.43	10.19	10.64	10.87	14.25	12.30	12.10	12.27	100.00
NF <sub>3</sub>	NO,NA	NO,NA	NO,NA	NO,NA	NO,NA	NO,NA	NO,NA	NO,NA	0.00
Indirect CO <sub>2</sub> emissions	17.13	17.84	19.21	11.27	12.16	12.58	12.39	10.77	-73.72
Total (without LULUCF)	10754.39	10750.84	10783.87	11277.36	11140.97	10491.40	10733.99	10120.02	-61.11
Total (with LULUCF)	11117.29	9302.15	7893.15	10889.45	9172.45	11249.69	12935.65	15064.19	10.52
Total (without LULUCF, with indirect CO <sub>2</sub> emissions)	10771.52	10768.69	10803.08	11288.63	11153.13	10503.98	10746.38	10130.79	-61.13
Total (with LULUCF, with indirect CO <sub>2</sub> emissions)	11134.42	9319.99	7912.36	10900.72	9184.62	11262.27	12948.05	15074.96	10.27

Table ES.2 a Aggregated GHG emissions by sectors (1990 - 2014) (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

GHG emissions	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.									
1. Energy	19529.57	9628.98	7438.01	8175.79	8532.14	7658.93	7344.66	7266.20	7091.15
2. IPPU	655.40	225.71	283.32	366.93	751.60	848.26	905.57	848.29	862.26
3. Agriculture	5030.48	2030.45	1680.55	1790.84	1870.07	1883.73	1962.72	2025.70	2105.34
4. LULUCF	-12390.09	-14838.26	-11851.13	-5905.33	-1894.77	-2275.29	-3614.06	-2305.33	1600.72
5. Waste	805.03	702.50	764.59	686.51	717.26	686.49	681.27	662.83	656.54
6. Other	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total emissions (including LULUCF)	13630.39	-2250.62	-1684.65	5114.74	9976.30	8802.12	7280.16	8497.69	12316.00

Table ES.2 b Aggregated GHG emissions by sectors (2015 - 2022) (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

GHG emissions	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	Change from 1990 to latest reported year (%)
kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.									
1. Energy	7195.32	7269.97	7260.28	7701.45	7475.05	6796.07	7036.79	6419.11	-67.13
2. IPPU	788.38	687.41	764.40	889.91	887.48	865.93	877.14	858.47	30.98
3. Agriculture	2151.47	2163.27	2176.66	2096.41	2198.36	2250.41	2252.96	2253.83	-55.20
4. LULUCF	362.90	-1448.70	-2890.72	-387.91	-1968.51	758.29	2201.66	4944.16	-139.90
5. Waste	619.23	630.20	582.52	589.59	580.08	578.99	567.10	588.61	-26.88
6. Other	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	0.00
Total emissions (including LULUCF)	11117.29	9302.15	7893.15	10889.45	9172.45	11249.69	12935.65	15064.19	10.52

### ES.3 OVERVIEW OF SOURCE AND SINK CATEGORY EMISSION ESTIMATES AND TRENDS

The main sources of GHG emissions are divided into the following sectors according to the UNFCCC reporting guidelines Decision 24/CP.19 and Decision 18/CMA.1: Energy (CRF 1), Industrial processes and Product Use (IPPU) (CRF 2), Agriculture (CRF 3), Land use, Land use change and Forestry (LULUCF) (CRF 4) and Waste (CRF 5). Latvia reports indirect CO<sub>2</sub> emissions due to atmospheric oxidation of CH<sub>4</sub> and NMVOCs. National totals are presented with and without indirect CO<sub>2</sub> consistent with the UNFCCC reporting guidelines.

GHG emissions by sectors for 1990-2022 and the composition of Latvia's GHG emissions in 2022 are presented in Figure ES.2 and Figure ES.3.




Figure ES.2 Latvia's GHG emissions and removals by sectors 1990-2022 (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.). Emissions are in positive and removals in negative quantities




Figure ES.3 The composition of Latvia's GHG emissions in 2022 (including indirect CO<sub>2</sub>, excluding LULUCF)



The **Energy sector** is the most significant source of GHG emissions with a 63.4% share of the total emissions in 2022 (Figure ES.3). Large part of the Energy sector emissions are emitted in the Transport sector (48.9%), Other Sectors (24.2%) and Energy Industries (15.6%). Total emissions in Energy sector in 2022 decreased by 67.1% if compared to the base year and decreased by 8.8% if compared with previous year. GHG emissions fluctuate in the latest years mainly due to economic trends, the energy supply structure and climate conditions as heat production is an essential part of Latvia's energy production. Use of biomass has increased more than 2 times and use of fossil fuels have significantly decreased - liquid fuel (-58.5%), solid fuel (-98.2%), peat (-97.1%) and natural gas (-71.2%) since 1990. The share of biomass has increased from 8.6% in 1990 to 41.3% in 2022.

**Agriculture** is the second most significant source of GHG emissions in 2022, 22.2% of Latvia's total GHG emissions excluding LULUCF. In 2022, GHG emissions increased by 0.04% compared to 2021 due to the increase of livestock and crop productivity. The annual emissions have reduced approximately by 55.2% since 1990 due to decrease in agricultural production. In 2022, given in kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq., N<sub>2</sub>O contributed 49.5%, CH<sub>4</sub> contributed 46.8% of total GHG emission from the Agriculture sector, remaining 3.7% refer to CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from liming and urea application. Total agriculture emissions have been quite steady last years, because there is a decrease in the number of livestock, however statistical data show an increase of intensive agricultural production.

Emissions from **IPPU sector** (referred to as non-energy related ones) include CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O and F-gases (HFCs and SF<sub>6</sub>). The category constitutes 8.5% of the total GHG emissions excluding LULUCF in 2022. Compared to 1990 emissions from IPPU increased by 31.0%, but compared to 2021 emissions decreased by 2.1%. The largest decrease in IPPU sector emissions occurred between 1991 and 1993, when industry was affected by a crisis. In the last years emissions fluctuated due to activity in industrial production processes and F-gases. F-gases emissions from Product use as substitutes for ozone depleting substances (ODS) constitute 2.5% from total GHG emissions, including indirect CO<sub>2</sub>, excluding LULUCF in 2022. Emissions from HFC and SF<sub>6</sub> have grown significantly since 1995 by 1498.3% (246.14 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.). Compared to 2021 total F-gas emissions (including SF<sub>6</sub>) decreased by 3.1%.

In 2022, NMVOC emissions from the Solvent Use sector decreased by 20.9%, compared to 2021. Solvent Use sector was a significant NMVOC emission source and covered 35.4% (11.41 kt) from Latvia's total NMVOC emissions in 2022.

In 2022, emissions from the **Waste sector** were about 5.8% of total GHG emissions (excluding LULUCF, including indirect CO<sub>2</sub>). Solid waste disposal and wastewater handling sectors are the main sources of GHG emissions in Waste sector producing accordingly 68.7% and 20.7% of all Waste sector emissions in 2022. Biological treatment of solid waste together contributes 10.6% of GHG emissions from Waste sector in 2022. GHG emissions from Waste sector have been fluctuated from 1990-2022. In 2022, emissions have decreased by 26.9% compared to 1990. The largest influence for decrease of emissions in the beginning on 1990s is from Wastewater handling due to closure of many industrial enterprises.

Net GHG emissions from **LULUCF** in 2022 were 4944.16 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. compared to -12390.09 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. in the base year (1990). Change from base to the latest reported year of emissions/removals from LULUCF constitutes -140%. This decrease of removals from LULUCF sector is associated with the increase of harvesting stock, and the increase of natural mortality due to ageing of forest stands and reduction of increment in mature forests. Increase of the

GHG emissions in 1999 is associated with significant increase of harvesting stock in forest lands due to favourable economic conditions, but the increase of the GHG emissions in 2014 and 2020-2022 are cumulative result of increase of the harvest rate, higher mortality rate and reduction of increment of living biomass in forest lands according to the National forest inventory (NFI) data. In 2022, the increased harvesting rate in forest land was related to Russia's aggression in Ukraine, disruption of the existing wood supply chains, and timber market turbulences. Latvia's wood resources had to compensate for the previous wood supply from Russia and Belarus.

**Indirect CO<sub>2</sub> emission sources** in Latvia are NMVOC emissions from the road traffic evaporation - cars, CH<sub>4</sub> and NMVOC emissions from natural gas leakages, as well as NMVOC emissions from gasoline distribution that are reported separately under the Energy sector in CRF Table 6. Together they constitute 10.77 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. that is 0.1% from Latvia's total GHG emissions without LULUCF, with indirect CO<sub>2</sub> in 2022.

#### **ES.4 OVERVIEW OF EMISSION ESTIMATES AND TRENDS OF PRECURSORS AND SULPHUR OXIDES**

Emissions trends of precursors are presented in Figure ES.4.




Figure ES 4. Precursors and sulphur dioxide emissions (kt)

In the period from 1990 to 2022 precursors have decreased: NO<sub>x</sub> by 66.9%, CO by 75.0%, NMVOC by 62.0% and SO<sub>2</sub> by 96.3%.

Starting from 2001, fluctuations in NO<sub>x</sub>, NMVOC and CO emissions can be observed as a reason of increasing firewood consumption in Residential sector as well as fuel consumption in Transport sector in particular years. SO<sub>2</sub> emissions decreased significantly because of fuel switch and approved legislation.




Figure ES.5. Emissions of precursors by sector in 2022 (% of total precursors and sulphur oxides in sector)

In 2022, the most important sector producing precursors (including LULUCF) was Energy sector (including fugitive emissions). Fuel combustion in Energy sector causes the largest part of NO<sub>x</sub> emissions (79.8% from total NO<sub>x</sub> emissions in 2022), but IPPU and Agriculture sectors make 6.4% and 13.5%, accordingly. Small part of NO<sub>x</sub> emissions is produced in LULUCF sector (0.3% from total NO<sub>x</sub> emissions).

91.1% of CO emissions appear in Energy sector, mainly from fuel combustion in Residential and Commercial/Institutional subsectors (72.7% from all CO emissions). The remaining part of CO emissions come from LULUCF sector (5.7%), IPPU sector (3.2%) and Waste sector (0.0006%).

The major part of SO<sub>2</sub> emissions (96.6%) are from Energy sector (fuel combustion), from IPPU sector (cement production) (3.4%), and a negligible part of SO<sub>2</sub> comes also from Waste sector (Waste incineration).

The largest amounts of NMVOC emissions are produced in IPPU sector 39.6%, mainly from solvent use and Energy sector (37.7%; fuel combustion mainly in Residential sector). In addition, 22.0% of NMVOC emissions are produced in Agriculture sector, but the remaining 0.8% in Waste sector.

In Agriculture sector, CO and SO<sub>2</sub> emissions, and in LULUCF sector, NMVOC and SO<sub>2</sub> emissions do not appear.

# 1 INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 **BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON GHG INVENTORIES AND CLIMATE CHANGE**

### 1.1.1 **Background information on climate change**

Latvia is a country by the Baltic Sea covering area of 64 589 km<sup>2</sup>, with a population of 1 875 757 (2022) inhabitants<sup>3</sup>. Baltic coastline is approximately 498 km long. Since the beginning of the previous century the forest area in Latvia has almost doubled, reaching 3 281.99 kha (50.8% from the total area of the country in 2022). Latvia lies in a temperate climate zone where an active cyclone determines rapid changes in weather conditions (190-200 days per year), and the annual mean precipitation is 600-700 mm. The main rocks are clay, dolomite, sand, gravel, limestone and gypsum.

Analysis of recent climate and future climate change scenarios shows pronounced climate change tendencies. Most significant changes are related to extreme values of climate variables, indicating that in the future, Latvia will more often face weather conditions uncharacteristic and extreme for its territory. Therefore, in order to prevent risks related to climate change and their possible consequences, it is essential to develop and introduce research-based adaptations in all economy industries<sup>4</sup>.

### 1.1.2 **Background information on GHG inventories**

The Parliament of the Republic of Latvia ratified the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change in February 23, 1995. Since March 23, 1995 Latvia is a Party to the Convention, thus undertaking implementation of series of international commitments. On May 30, 2002 the Parliament ratified the Kyoto Protocol. Latvia has also ratified the Doha Amendment to the Kyoto Protocol. The Parliament ratified the Paris Agreement on climate change on February 2, 2017.

Since May 2004 Latvia is a member of the EU and Latvia's climate change policy is based on Union's climate policy.

For the period starting in 2021, the EU has implemented its climate action in the non-ETS sectors through the Effort Sharing regulation (ESR) (Regulation (EU) 2018/842). Under the ESR EU Member States have binding annual greenhouse gas emission targets for 2021-2030 for those sectors of the economy that fall outside the scope of the EU ETS. These sectors include transport, buildings, agriculture, non-ETS industry and waste. Overall for the EU, the target is a reduction of 40% by 2030 compared to 2005. The reduction commitment for Latvia is a reduction of 17%.

As a Party of the UNFCCC and a Member State of the EU, Latvia is required to submit annual national GHG inventory covering emissions and removals of direct GHGs (CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O, HFC, PFC, SF<sub>6</sub> and NF<sub>3</sub>) from the base year to the most recent inventory year. This report is the annual submission of Latvia to the UNFCCC and the European Commission (EC). It presents the GHG

<sup>3</sup> CSB database IRD010. Resident population at the beginning of the year. Available: <https://stat.gov.lv/lv/statistikas-temas/iedzivotaji/iedzivotaju-skaitis/tabulas/ird010-iedzivotaju-skaitis-un-ipatsvars-pec>

<sup>4</sup> LEGMC, 2017, *Climate Change Scenarios for Latvia, Latvia, 17 pp*

inventory, the process and the methods used for the compilation of the inventory from 1990 to 2022. The structure of NIR follows the UNFCCC reporting guidelines.

The national legislation act – Regulation No. 675 of Cabinet of Ministers (25.10.2022.) determines the institutions that are responsible for the GHG inventory preparation. The Climate Change Department of the Ministry of Climate and Energy (MoCE) is responsible for the coordination of the implementation and development of climate change mitigation and adaptation policies and measures. MoCE in cooperation with an other sectoral ministries is responsible for the actions (coordination, implementation and development) to meet the international and EU emission reduction targets. MoCE also coordinates the monitoring and reporting of GHG emission data as well as is designated as single national entity with overall responsibility for the Latvian GHG inventory.

## **1.2 DESCRIPTION OF THE NATIONAL INVENTORY ARRANGEMENTS**

The national inventory arrangements in Latvia are described below. The descriptions take into account requirements for reporting requirements on national inventory systems under the relevant EU legislation and for reporting on the national inventory arrangements consistent with the UNFCCC reporting guidelines.

### **1.2.1 Institutional, legal and procedural arrangements**

National inventory arrangements are described below. The description is prepared according to requirements for reporting on national inventory systems under EU Governance regulation and UNFCCC reporting guidelines. Latvian national GHG inventory system is designed and operated to ensure the transparency, consistency, comparability, completeness and accuracy of inventory. Inventory activities include planning, preparation and management. The inventory phases are:

- collecting activity data;
- selecting methods and emission factors appropriately;
- estimating anthropogenic GHG emissions by sources and removals by sinks;
- implementing uncertainty assessment and identification of key categories;
- implementing quality assurance and quality control (QA/QC) activities.

A schematic model for the national inventory system (NIS) according to the CoM Regulation No.675 (25.10.2022) is shown in Figure 1.1.




Figure 1.1 The structure of Latvia's National Inventory System

The MoCE Climate Change Department is responsible for:

- Preparation of legal basis for maintaining the National System;
- Informing the inventory experts about the requirements of the national system;
- Overall coordination of GHG inventory process;
- Final checking and approving of the GHG inventory before an official submission to the EC and UNFCCC;
- Formal agreements with inventory experts and third part experts that evaluate quality assurance process;
- Coordinating the work with the involved experts, institutions, EC and UNFCCC (including coordination of the UNFCCC inventory reviews);
- Timely submission of GHG inventory to the UNFCCC and EC;
- Keeping of archive of official submissions to UNFCCC and EC.

Latvian Environment, Geology and Meteorology Centre (LEGMC) is a governmental limited liability company responsible for:

- Activity data collection for Energy, Industrial Processes and Product Use and Waste sectors (activity data are mainly collected from the other institutions and LEGMC (Air and Climate division, Chemicals and Hazardous Waste division, Inland Waters division) use them to calculate emissions);
- Preparation of the emission estimates for the Energy, Industrial Processes and Product Use and Waste sectors;
- Preparation of QC procedures for relevant categories and documentation, archiving of used materials for emission calculation;
- LEGMC Air and Climate Division compiles the final NIR using information from all involved institutions as well as summarizes emission data in CRF Reporter;
- Quality manager from LEGMC Air and Climate division performs the overall QC/QA procedures for all sectors according to the QA/QC plan;
- Maintenance of archive with information for preparation of GHG inventory, official submissions to UNFCCC and EC;
- LEGMC is the National Emissions Trading Authority in Latvia and prepares relevant information for GHG inventory from registry – on emission reduction units, certified emission reductions, temporary certified emission reductions, long term certified emission reductions and assigned amount units for annual inventory submissions in accordance with guidelines for preparation of information under the Article 7 of the Kyoto Protocol (SEF tables).

Calculation of emissions and removals from the LULUCF sector were done by Latvian State Forest Research Institute (LSFRI) "Silava". LSFRI "Silava" is responsible for activity data collection, estimation of emissions/removals, preparation of QC procedures as well as documentation and archiving of used materials for calculations.

Institute of Physical Energetics (IPE) calculates emissions from Transport sector. IPE is responsible for activity data collection, emission estimation from Transport, preparation of QC procedures as well as documentation and archiving of used materials for calculations.

Emission calculations from Agriculture sector were done by Latvia University of Life Sciences and Technologies (LBTU). LBTU is responsible for collecting of necessary activity data cooperating with Central Statistical Bureau (CSB), preparation of the emission estimates, preparation of QC procedures as well as documentation and archiving of used materials for calculations.

Natural gas transmission, storage and distribution enterprises are responsible for data providing and the calculation of annual gas leakage estimates for LEGMC to report 1B2b Natural gas.

The main data supplier for the Latvian GHG inventory is the CSB.

For ensuring the continuity of the functions of the national system, the delegation contracts are signed between the MoCE, LEGMC, LSFRI "Silava", IPE and LBTU.

Before the final Latvia's GHG inventory was submitted to EC and UNFCCC secretariat, draft GHG inventory (submitted on 15 January) was sent for comments and approval to responsible ministries. Based on received comments GHG inventory is improved.

Several sectoral meetings were held before and during preparation of GHG inventory, to discuss and agree on the methodological issues, problems arisen and improvements need to be implemented. There were also discussions on the different problems that came up during the last inventory preparation to find the solutions on how to improve the overall system.

The following issues for solving different problems and to improve cooperation between GHG inventory experts and inventory compiler are:

- Discussion on methodologies and possible changes in the future;
- Discussion on QA/QC plan, available resources and possible improvements;
- Discussion on data collection;
- Agreement on recalculations;
- Archiving system, updating and possible improvements;
- Exchange of relevant information;
- Reporting on the conclusions from the meetings.

Information on the detailed responsibilities of the institutions of activity data, the main experts responsible for the sectoral inventories, the corresponding chapters and annexes are summarized in the Table 1.1.

### **1.2.2 Overview of inventory planning, preparation and management**

The inventory preparation is an annual process and divided into three stages: planning, preparation and management. The specific functions are described below.

**Inventory planning** is one of the main stages in national GHG inventory management system and all responsible institutions are involved in this process, that consists of:

- Establishing the national entity with overall responsibility for the national inventory;
- assigning responsibilities for inventory preparation and management;
- developing time schedule;



- making arrangements to collect data from statistical agencies, companies, industry associations, etc.;
- creating QA/QC plan;
- defining formal approval process within a government;
- developing review processes;
- implementing continuous improvements.

Inventory preparation plan is a part of the Latvia's QA/QC plan and has to be followed by all institutions defined in CoM Regulation No. 675 (25.10.2022). The responsible institutions are reflected in Table 1.1 and inventory preparation plan is presented in Table 1.2.

After the end of the annual reporting cycle in April, the institutions involved in inventory preparation start to plan the next annual inventory following planned improvements and received recommendations by UNFCCC expert review team (ERT). Within the EU level the recommendations by a Technical Expert Review Team (TERT) are also taken into account. Planning includes the identification of improvements to be undertaken due to revised methodologies, updated activity data or emission factors and other relevant technical elements of inventory as well as the addressing the issues and recommendations in review of the previous inventory submission.

**Table 1.1 Institutions responsible for activity data and calculating emissions**

CRF sectors	Data	Responsible institutions/ Responsible experts
Table 1.A(a) - Fuel Combustion Activities (Sectoral Approach)	<i>Activity data</i>	CSB Environment and Energy Statistics Section, Road Traffic Safety Department (RTSD)
	<i>Calculations</i>	LEGMC Air and Climate division (Asnate Skrebele), IPE (Gaidis Klāvs, Larisa Gračkova)
Table 1.A(b) – CO <sub>2</sub> from Fuel Combustion Activities – Reference Approach	<i>Activity data</i>	CSB Environment and Energy Statistics Section
	<i>Calculations</i>	LEGMC Air and Climate division (Asnate Skrebele)
Table 1.A(d) – Feedstock's and Non-Energy Use of Fuels	<i>Activity data</i>	CSB Environment and Energy Statistics Section
	<i>Calculations</i>	LEGMC Air and Climate division (Asnate Skrebele)
Table 1.B.2. – Fugitive Emissions from Oil and Natural Gas	<i>Activity data</i>	CSB Environment and Energy Statistics Section
	<i>Calculations</i>	LEGMC Air and Climate Division (Vita Štelce), natural gas enterprises
Table 1.D – International Bunkers and Multilateral Operations	<i>Activity data</i>	CSB Environment and Energy Statistics Section
	<i>Calculations</i>	IPE (Gaidis Klāvs, Larisa Gračkova)
Table 2(I).A-E,G-H – Industrial Processes and Product Use	<i>Activity data</i>	CSB Population Statistics Section State Agency of Medicines; Research of experts; National database "2-Air", National Chemicals Database and CSB Industrial Statistics Section EU Emission Trading Scheme operators
	<i>Calculations</i>	LEGMC Air and Climate division (Laine Lupkina, Santija Treija)
Table 2(II) F – Industrial Processes - HFCs, PFCs and SF <sub>6</sub>	<i>Activity data</i>	CSB Population Statistics Section, Environment and Energy Statistics Section Electricity supplying companies;

CRF sectors	Data	Responsible institutions/ Responsible experts
		State Agency of Medicines; Annual reports by operators using F-gases (reported to LEGMC) Data from National Chemicals Database (maintained by LEGMC)
	Calculations	LEGMC Air and Climate division (Laine Lupkina)
Table 3.A – Agriculture, Enteric Fermentation	Activity data	CSB Agricultural Statistics Section
	Calculations	LBTU (Laima Bērziņa)
Table 3.B.1 - Agriculture, CH <sub>4</sub> Emissions from Manure Management	Activity data	CSB Agricultural Statistics Section
	Calculations	LBTU (Laima Bērziņa)
Table 3.B.2 - Agriculture, N <sub>2</sub> O un NMVOC Emissions from Manure Management	Activity data	CSB Agricultural Statistics Section
	Calculations	LBTU (Laima Bērziņa and Olga Frolova)
Table 3.D - Agriculture, Agricultural Soils	Activity data	LEGMC database "2-Water", Latvian State Forest Research Institute "Silava"
	Calculations	LBTU (Laima Bērziņa)
Table 3.G Liming	Activity data	CSB
	Calculations	LBTU (Laima Bērziņa)
Table 3.H Urea application	Activity data	CSB
	Calculations	LBTU (Laima Bērziņa)
Table 4.A. Forest Land Table 4.B. Cropland Table 4.C. Grassland Table 4.D. Wetlands Table 4.E. Settlements Table 4.F. Other Land	Activity data	LSFRI Silava (NFI), CSB, LEGMC, Rural Support Service (RSS), State Forest Service (SFS), State Environmental Service (SES), Ministry of Agriculture (MoA)
	Calculations	LSFRI Silava (Andis Lazdiņš, Arta Bārdule, Aldis Butlers, Ieva Līcīte)
Table 4.B. Cropland – 4.B.1 Cropland remaining Cropland	Activity data – Area of organic soil	LSFRI Silava (NFI), National studies
	Calculations – Net carbon stock change in organic soils	LSFRI Silava
Table 4.C. Grassland – 4.C.1 Grassland remaining Grassland	Activity data - Area of organic soil	LSFRI Silava (NFI), National studies
	Calculations – Net carbon stock change in organic soils	LSFRI Silava
4.G. Harvested Wood Products	Activity data	LSFRI Silava, MoA
	Calculations	LSFRI Silava
Table 4. (V) Biomass Burning	Activity data	State Fire and Rescue Service of Latvia (SFRS), SFS
	Calculations	LSFRI Silava
Table 5.A - Waste, Solid Waste Disposal on Land	Activity data	LEGMC "3-Waste" database, Methane recovery installations
	Calculations	LEGMC Chemicals and Hazardous Waste Division (Intars Cakars)
Table 5.B – Biological Treatment and Solid Waste	Activity data	CSB, LEGMC Chemicals and Hazardous Waste Division
	Calculations	CSB, LEGMC Chemicals and Hazardous Waste Division (Intars Cakars)

CRF sectors	Data	Responsible institutions/ Responsible experts
Table 5.C – Incineration and open Burning of Waste	<i>Activity data</i>	<i>LEGMC database “3-Waste”</i>
	<i>Calculations</i>	<i>LEGMC Chemicals and Hazardous Waste Division (Intars Cakars)</i>
Table 5.D - Wastewater Treatment and Discharge	<i>Activity Data</i>	<i>LEGMC “2-Water” database, CSB statistics on national population and production rates of certain industries</i>
	<i>Calculations</i>	<i>LEGMC Inland Waters Division (Lauris Siņics)</i>

**The inventory preparation stage consists of:**

- Identification of key categories, which have a significant influence on a country's total inventory in terms of level or trend in emissions;
- Selection of methods, emission factors and all necessary relevant information for estimating anthropogenic GHG emissions by sources and removals by sinks;
- Collection of activity data;
- Managing recalculations from previous submissions taking into account updates of activity data by CSB, recommendations by ERT, TERT and suggestions from the independent third-part experts etc;
- NIR compilation;
- QA/QC plan implementation (including basic checks on entire inventory (Tier 1) and more in-depth investigations into key categories (Tier 2));
- Documentation.

**The inventory management stage consists of:**

- Implementation of inventory review processes (e.g., expert review, public review);
- Obtaining formal approval of final results and reporting within government;
- Submission of the report to the UNFCCC;
- Making inventory information available to stakeholders and responding to information requests;
- Archiving all documentation and results (A special centralised folder is created where experts can upload/download and store all files and information related to inventory preparation);
- Continuous improvement feedback.

Latvia prepares a NIR and CRF tables annually according to requirements of the UNFCCC and EU Governance regulation.

Table 1.2 Inventory preparation plan

Element	Activity	Responsible performers	Procedures	Due date	
<i>To reconsider the changes needed for the inventory, taking into account comments and recommendations made by the ERT</i>	<i>All institutions established by Regulation of Cabinet of Ministers No.675 (Part II „National Inventory System“)</i>		<i>All institutions involved in inventory preparation process to reconsider the changes needed for the inventory, taking into account comments and recommendations made by ERT and send to national inventory compiler for summarizing.</i>	<i>Middle of May and October</i>	
<i>Annual meeting</i>	<i>All institutions established by Regulation of Cabinet of Ministers No.675 (Part II „National Inventory System“)</i>		<i>Participation of all institutions involved in inventory preparation and approval process. Discussions on previous submissions' review results and planned submission including necessary improvements, changes, recalculations, problems etc.</i>	<i>5<sup>th</sup> July</i>	
<i>Activity data and description</i>	<i>Submission to LEGMC</i>	<i>EU Emission Trading Scheme (EU ETS) operators</i>	<i>EU ETS operators send to LEGMC activity data, CO<sub>2</sub> emission factors, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and descriptions as verified GHG report for enterprises involved in EU ETS annually for previous year.</i>	<i>till 30<sup>th</sup> March</i>	
			<i>LEGMC uses EU ETS data in GHG inventory for emission estimates in Energy and IPPU.</i>		<i>Starting from September</i>
		<i>Operators</i>	<i>LEGMC (Air and Climate division, Chemicals and Hazardous Waste division, Inland Waters Division) collects information for emission calculation in following databases:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>National database "2-Air"</i></li> <li>• <i>National database "3-Waste"</i></li> <li>• <i>National database "2-Water"</i></li> </ul>	<i>till 15<sup>th</sup> June</i>	

Latvia's National Inventory Report 1990-2022

Element	Activity	Responsible performers	Procedures	Due date
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National Chemicals Database</li> <li>Cement producer and Iron &amp; Steel plant send additional information for detailed CO<sub>2</sub> emission estimation according to National legislation.</li> </ul>	till 1 <sup>st</sup> October
			LEGMC uses data from databases for emission estimates in Energy (CRF1), IPPU (CRF2), Waste (CRF5) sectors.	Starting from September
		JSC "Latvijas Gāze" <sup>5</sup> , JSC "Conexus Baltic Grid", JSC "Gasol"	The natural-gas transmission, storage, distribution, and sales operator in Latvia sends the total fugitive emissions for previous year and short information of emission fluctuation according to the national legislation.	till 1 <sup>st</sup> April
			LEGMC uses data from JSC "Latvijas Gāze", JSC "Conexus Baltic Grid", JSC "Gasol" for emission estimates in Energy (CRF1) sector.	Starting from October
		Ministry of Health collaborating with State Agency of Medicines (SAM)	SAM sends to LEGMC activity data – data of imported metered dose inhalers containing GHG (F gases subsector) and amount of used N <sub>2</sub> O for Anaesthesia (Solvent and other product use sector).	till 1 <sup>st</sup> October
			LEGMC uses data from SAM for emission estimates in IPPU sector.	Starting from October

<sup>5</sup> Until 2017

Latvia's National Inventory Report 1990-2022

Element	Activity	Responsible performers	Procedures	Due date
Activity data and description	Submission to LEGMC, LBTU, IPE, LSFRI "Silava"	CSB	CSB send activity data regarding Energy, Agriculture, IPPU, LULUCF and Waste sectors according to CoM Regulation No. 675.	till 1 <sup>st</sup> October
			Many of received and used activity data is available in CSB statistical databases: <a href="https://stat.gov.lv/lv/meklet?Search=%22%22&amp;DataSource=%22data%22&amp;Type=%5B%22table%22%2C%22other_format%22%5D">https://stat.gov.lv/lv/meklet?Search=%22%22&amp;DataSource=%22data%22&amp;Type=%5B%22table%22%2C%22other_format%22%5D</a>	
		LEGMC, LBTU and LSFRI "Silava" use received data for Energy, Agriculture, IPPU, Waste and LULUCF sectors emission calculation	Starting from October	
	Submission to MoCE/ LSFRI "Silava"	LSFRI Silava (NFI)	LSFRI Silava (NFI) send to MoCE activity data – area of land use and land use changes (mineral soil, organic soil) since 1990 (ha) including spatial data (ha) and uncertainties (%); stand parameters of forest stands and trees or tree groups outside the forest land including uncertainties (%) at NFI plots and their sectors level	till 1 <sup>st</sup> October
			LSFRI Silava uses received data for calculation of GHG emissions and CO <sub>2</sub> removals from LULUCF category.	starting from October
		SFRS	SFRS sends to MoCE activity data - area of last year's grass burning (ha).	till 1 <sup>st</sup> October
LSFRI "Silava" uses received data for emission calculation from biomass burning (CRF 4 (V)).			Starting from October	

Latvia's National Inventory Report 1990-2022

Element	Activity	Responsible performers	Procedures	Due date	
		SFS	SFS send to MoCE activity data - area of last year's forest wildfires (ha), including spatial data, forest site type, dominant tree species, stand age, total growing stock ( $m^3 ha^{-1}$ )	till 1 <sup>st</sup> October	
			LSFRI Silava uses received data for emission calculation from forest wildfires (CRF 4 (V)).	starting from October	
		Rural Support Service (RSS)	RSS send to MoCE activity data - field (parcel) register information on cultivated agricultural crops and types of support (aid) received, including spatial data	till 1 <sup>st</sup> October	
			LSFRI Silava collects received data for evaluating changes in soil carbon stock in cropland and grassland	starting from October	
		MoA	MoA send to MoCE activity data - production, export and import of harvested wood products according to the classification used in the GHG inventory report (t per year)	till 1 <sup>st</sup> October	
			LSFRI Silava uses received data for emission calculation from harvested wood products	starting from October	
		LEGMC, SES, Silava	LSFRI	LEGMC, State Environmental Service (SES) and LSFRI Silava send to MoCE activity data – area of peat extraction (ha), data of geospatial units on the licenses for the peat extraction (mining sites), (t when peat moisture is 40%)	till 1 <sup>st</sup> October
				LSFRI Silava uses received data for calculation of emission from peat extraction	starting from October

Latvia's National Inventory Report 1990-2022

Element	Activity	Responsible performers	Procedures	Due date
		LEGMC, State Environmental Service (SES)	LEGMC and State Environmental Service (SES) send to MoCE activity data – area of land converted to other wetlands (rewetted and flooded wetlands): total area (ha), organic soils (ha) including spatial data (ha).	till 1 <sup>st</sup> October
			LSFRI Silava uses elaborated and received data for emission calculation from land converted to other wetlands	starting from October
Emissions/CO <sub>2</sub> removals	Data entry in the CRF Reporter according to the CRF Reporter User Manual	LEGMC, LBTU, IPE, LSFRI "Silava"	Data entry in the CRF Reporter by responsible sectoral experts.	till 15 <sup>th</sup> December
Emissions/CO <sub>2</sub> removals descriptions	Preparation of NIR chapters	LEGMC, LBTU, IPE, LSFRI "Silava"	LSFRI "Silava"/ LBTU (in coloboration with MoA), LEGMC, IPE and MoCE prepare relevant chapters of NIR.	till 15 <sup>th</sup> December
CRF Reporter	Data check by sectoral experts	LEGMC, LBTU, IPE, LSFRI "Silava"	Sectoral experts check the data in the CRF Reporter for consistency and quality assurance (e.g. to check whether the sum of the following adds up to 100%, to check the year to year changes between values reported etc.).  LEGMC (Quality manager) checks completeness, consistency and quality assurance.	till 15 <sup>th</sup> December  till 30 <sup>th</sup> December
Data in CRF, Draft NIR according to Regulation (EU) No 2018/1999 and Commission	CRF, NIR, Annexes	MoCE - Climate Change Department	After corrections in CRF tables, NIR (if necessary) MoCE upload CRF tables, XML, draft NIR, relevant Annexes in the CDR Einoet.	15 <sup>th</sup> January



Latvia's National Inventory Report 1990-2022

Element	Activity	Responsible performers	Procedures	Due date
<i>Implementing Regulation 2020/1208</i>				
<i>Quality control checks: Draft NIR</i>	QA	<i>MoCE - Climate Change Department</i>	<i>According to the CoM Regulation No. 675, MoCE sends Draft NIR for comments and approving to involved institutions.  NIR upload in the LEGMC home page for review by public.</i>	<i>till 18<sup>th</sup> January</i>
		<i>Expert Public</i>		
		<i>All institutions involved in GHG emissions and removals preparation</i>	<i>Expert meetings to improve inventory, quality control activities etc.</i>	<i>January-February</i>
		<i>Involved institutions</i>	<i>Involved institutions send to MoCE comments about NIR 1<sup>st</sup> draft and approval.</i>	<i>15<sup>th</sup> February</i>
	QC	<i>All institutions involved in the GHG inventory preparation process</i>	<i>Answers to the compiled questions by EU review team, which based on 15/1 submissions: <a href="https://emrt-esd.eionet.europa.eu/">https://emrt-esd.eionet.europa.eu/</a>  MoCE approves provided answers from experts.  Verification of national data in EC inventory and updates if necessary and response to EC.  This process includes collaboration with involved institutions for preparing of response to EC.</i>	<i>28<sup>st</sup> February to 15<sup>th</sup> March</i>
<i>CRF data,</i>	<i>CRF, NIR, Annexes</i>	<i>MoCE - Climate</i>	<i>MoCE uploaded CRF tables, XML and NIR to the CDR Eionet.</i>	<i>15<sup>th</sup> March</i>

Latvia's National Inventory Report 1990-2022

Element	Activity	Responsible performers	Procedures	Due date
<i>NIR according to Regulation (EU) No 2018/1999 and Commission Implementing Regulation 2020/1208</i>		<i>Change Department</i>		
<i>NIR and emission data in CRF to UNFCCC</i>	<i>Inventory submission (CRF, NIR)</i>	<i>MoCE - Climate Change Department</i>	<i>MoCE uploaded approved GHG inventory to the CRF Reporter Submission module.</i>	<i>15<sup>th</sup> April (for 2024 submission 31<sup>st</sup> December)</i>

DRAFT

### 1.2.3 Quality assurance, quality control and verification plan

QA/QC procedures are an important component in the development of GHG inventory preparation. The basic aim of the QA/QC process is to ensure the high-quality of the inventory and to contribute to improvement of the inventory. The quality requirements set for annual inventories (transparency, consistency, comparability, completeness, accuracy, timeliness and continuous improvement) are fulfilled by implementing the QA/QC process consistently in conjunction with the inventory process (Figure 1.2).

The quality of result depends on four main stages – planning, preparation, evaluation and improvements, and is ensured by inventory experts during compilation and reporting of inventory.

The inventory planning stage includes the setting of quality objectives and elaboration of the QA/QC plan for the coming inventory preparation, compilation and reporting work.

Based on QA/QC process, the main findings and conclusions about the quality and improvements of the inventory have to be applied into Latvia's GHG inventory system for decision making about the annual inventory process and next inventory preparation.

The outcomes of the QA/QC process results in a reassessment of inventory or source category uncertainty estimates. For example, if data quality is found to be lower than previously thought and this situation cannot be rectified in the timeframe of the current inventory, the uncertainty estimates are re-evaluated. Based on QC results, estimation of emissions is improved and uncertainties are reduced.

On October 25, 2022 Cabinet of Ministers approved Regulation No. 675 "GHG inventory, projections and adaptation to climate change reporting systems", that regulates the issues of the QA/QC plan.

The quality objectives and the planned general and category-specific QA/QC and verification procedures regarding all sectors are set in the QA/QC plan. This is a document that specifies the actions, schedules and responsibilities in order to attain the quality objectives and to provide confidence in the national system's capability to deliver high-quality inventory. The QA/QC plan is written in Latvian, updated annually, and consists of instructions and a QA/QC forms. Instructions include descriptions of, e.g., quality objectives, general and category-specific inventory QC checks, improvement plan of the annual GHG inventory, information on quality assurance and verification, schedules, and responsible parties. The QA/QC form addresses the actions to be taken in each stage of the inventory preparation. Sectoral experts fill in the online form the QA/QC and perform verification procedures, and the results of the procedures. Discussions in the bilateral quality meetings or feedback given during the quality desk reviews are based on information documented on these forms. The QA/QC plan has also include the list of key categories (Level 1) for which sectoral experts and quality control experts must carry out QC procedures, the list of key categories (Level 2) that needs to be taken into account during planning of improvements and preparation of GHG inventory improvement plan and information regarding documentation and archiving procedures. The QA/QC plan is available in the shared workspace of the inventory and archived according to the inventory unit's archive formation plan.

According to CoM Regulation No. 675 (25.10.2022) all institutions involved in inventory process are responsible for implementing QC procedures. Mainly Tier 1 general inventory QC procedures outlined in Table 6.1 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines are used.



Figure 1.2 Inventory and QA/QC process of the inventory

The setting of quality objectives is based on the inventory principles taking into account the available resources.

The quality objectives for the 2024 GHG inventory were the following:

- strengthen QA/QC procedures for the inventory and ensure the completeness of all elements included in the appendix to Annex I to Decision 24/CP.19;
- implementation of specific QC procedure in QA/QC plan that monitors the use of notation keys and ensure that the use of the notation key "IE" is explained transparently in the NIR and CRF table 9. However, there were problems to fill notation key "IE" in CRF Reporter in LULUCF sector.

In order to ensure **improvements** for 2024 GHG inventory:

- All improvements included in the previous NIR are carried out or ongoing;
- Feedback on reviews is systematic;
- Inventory QC procedures meet requirements.

In order to ensure **transparency**:

- transparent information is included in the NIR and CRF (including information regarding the used methodology, activity data and emissions in tables);
- notation keys are used according to the IPCC guidelines;

- recommendations of inventory reviews regarding transparency are taken into account as far as possible;
- documentation regarding quality control check is indicated;
- information regarding the changes since the last inventory in relation to transparency is provided in the NIR under relevant subchapters.

In order to ensure **consistency**:

- recommendations received during inventory reviews regarding consistency is taken into account after evaluation as far as possible;
- information regarding consistency and recalculations is provided in the NIR;
- an explanation for a decline or increase in emissions of time series is provided.

In order to ensure **comparability**:

- make sure that methodologies and formats used in the inventory meet comparability requirements;
- emissions and CO<sub>2</sub> removal are localized and distributed according to the IPCC guidelines.

In order to ensure **completeness**:

- emissions from all potential sources and gases are calculated;
- recommendations of the review of international experts regarding improvements are taken into account as far as possible;
- information regarding completeness is provided in the NIR;
- all reasons for recalculations and reasons why a designation NE (not evaluated) and IE (included elsewhere) are used instead of data are indicated.

In order to ensure **accuracy**:

- Tier 2 or a higher method is used for the main sources as far as possible;
- uncertainties are calculated and information is provided in the NIR.

In order to ensure **timeliness**:

- inventory reports reach the EU and UNFCCC within the set time.

#### 1.2.3.1 Quality Control procedures

The general and category-specific QC procedures are performed by sectoral experts during inventory calculation and compilation according to the QA/QC and verification plan.

MoCE as national entity is responsible for overall QC procedures and QA of national system, including the UNFCCC and EU reviews.

For submission 2023, QC activities were carried out at the various stages of the inventory compilation process - processing, handling, documenting, cross checking and recalculations. These activities are implemented by sectoral experts and quality manager in LEGMC who is

responsible for QC procedures before inventory submission for overall QC procedures and final approving in MoCE.

The centralized archiving system (common FTP folder, maintained by LEGMC) is created where experts have to upload and download all necessary information for inventory preparation, inter alia spreadsheets that need to be filled for QA/QC. Instruction for experts how to prepare NIR to ensure comparability of NIR and CFR is prepared and available to experts.

QC system includes various activities set to ensure transparent data flow through all inventory processes:

- Assumptions and criteria for the selection of activity data and emission factors are documented;
- Transcription errors in data input and references are checked;
- Correctness of calculations of emissions is checked;
- Correctness of emission parameters, units, conversion factors is checked;
- Correctness in use of notation keys (the use of the notation keys "NE" and "IE" is explained transparently in the NIR and CRF table 9);
- Integrity of database files is checked;
- Consistency in data between the source categories is checked.

The QC procedures comply with the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. General inventory QC checks (2006 IPCC Guidelines, Vol 1, Chapter 6, Table 6.1) include routine checks of the integrity, correctness and completeness of data, identification of errors and deficiencies and documentation and archiving of inventory data and QC actions.

Category-specific QC checks including reviews of the activity data, emission factors and methods are applied on a case-by-case basis focusing on key categories and on categories where significant methodological changes or data revisions have taken place.

For submission in 2024:

-) Sectoral experts entered data in the CRF Reporter software either manually or by importing MS Excel spreadsheets. Sectoral experts prepared quality control procedures according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. All findings were documented by using online form with check-lists and introduced in GHG inventory. All corrections are archived in FTP folder;

-) Sectoral experts prepared relevant NIR chapters and sent to LEGMC. Sectoral experts before sending chapters of the NIR have checked if all the information is consistent with the information filled in the CRF Reporter as well as if all the relevant information according to reporting guidelines is included (including descriptions, references and sources of information for the specific methodologies, including higher-tier methods and models, assumptions, EFs and AD, as well as the rationale for their selection). It is also checked if recalculations and methodological changes are explained in the NIR and CRF Reporter. Final NIR is compiled by LEGMC according to the UNFCCC reporting guidelines;

-) Meetings were held with companies to explain and clarify the IPCC requirements, thus strengthening the institutional, legal and procedural national system arrangements;

-) GHG emission data are checked with the data used to prepare inventory of air pollutants under the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe's Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution (UNECE CLRTAP), the actual or estimated allocation of the verified

emissions reported by installations and operators under Directive 2003/87/EC (EU ETS), the energy data reported pursuant to Article 4 of, and Annex B to, Regulation (EC) No 1099/2008 and the data reported pursuant to Article 19 of F-gas regulation No. 517/2014;

-) LEGMC quality manager and MoCE performed cross-checking information for all sectors to verify that no mistakes occurred during input/import process. Completeness and consistency were checked using CRF Reporter functions. In result of the CRF completeness check, the list of gaps in the CRF Reporter was summarized. After detailed re-checking in the CRF Reporter it was concluded that all findings are related to the CRF bugs (for example orange light in completeness check for categories that are obviously complete). Also incompleteness is caused by partially filled F-gas categories. As in the current CRF Reporter version v6.0.10\_AR5 it is not possible to enter notation keys for F-gases which are not occurring in Latvia directly in grey and green cells therefore related to F-gases which are not occurring were left blank until it will be possible to fill in the CRF without adding unnecessary child nodes;

-) LEGMC quality manager summarizes the QA/QC activities performed by the experts and summary submission to MoCE;

-) QA meetings between sectoral experts were held in order to discuss problems and possible improvements in GHG inventory as well as to ensure consistency between activity data used by experts in emission estimation for different sectors;

-) Detailed QA/QC procedures were done by institutions involved in the GHG inventory preparation (MoCE, MoA, MoT, MoE, MEPRD, CSB). Meetings between sectoral experts and involved institutions were held according to comments received and improvements needed in the NIR.

Main activity data provider for Latvia's GHG inventory – CSB – has established Quality Guidelines<sup>6</sup> that is an informative document describing the main aspects of the CSB activity: stages, methods and organizational principles of producing the national statistics, policy of data protection and dissemination. The purpose of the Guidelines is to ensure higher quality to a maximum extent from both ethical and professional aspect, national statistics similarly to the Community statistics must follow the principles of impartiality, reliability, relevance, cost-effectiveness, statistical confidentiality and transparency.

As a general rule, the statistics are revised according to a fixed, coherent and published plan, called a revision cycle. This plan determines when the individual statistics are revised and the periods that are subject to revision:

- CSB Revision Policy is available in the CSB website;
- Database of Macroeconomic statistics data revision analysis established.

Detailed source specific QC descriptions are included under each sub sector relevant chapter.

QC of EU Member States submissions` are performed in web-based tool hosted by the European Environmental Agency (EEA) to facilitate quality checks and reviews of national emission inventories reported by EU Member States under the EU Governance regulation.

---

<sup>6</sup> CSB Quality Guidelines. Available: <https://www.csb.gov.lv/en/documents/official-statistics-system/quality-framework>

### 1.2.3.2 Quality Assurance procedures

Quality Assurance activities include a planned system of review procedures conducted by personnel not directly involved in the inventory compilation/development process. According to Regulation No. 675 (25.10.2022) MoCE is responsible for ensuring QA procedures for GHG inventory.

The QA reviews are performed after the implementation of QC procedures to the finalised inventory. The inventory QA system comprises reviews to assess the quality of the inventory.

A basic review of the draft GHG emission and removal estimates, and the draft report takes place before the final submissions to the EC and UNFCCC (January to March) by the involved institutions in the GHG inventory preparation process. Improvements for GHG inventory are compiled based on the findings of the UNFCCC, EC, internal reviews and recommendations from third party experts (periodically all sectors are revised by third party experts). The European Environmental Agency (EEA) performs QA/QC of EU Member States' submissions under the EU Governance Regulation. These checks and comparisons are useful for GHG inventory improvement.

ERT coordinated by the UNFCCC Secretariat carry out an international reviews of the GHG inventory. ERT produces an independent review reports of GHG inventory. Last UNFCCC review for Latvia was held in 2022 but in 2023 Latvia has not held UNFCCC review.

### 1.2.3.3 Documentation and Archiving

As part of general QC procedures, it is a good practice to document and archive all information that is used for emission estimates. Documentation has a significant role in the inventory quality management.

All institutions involved in GHG inventory preparation process are responsible for archiving the collected data and estimated emissions.

Documentation system in CSB include:

- Survey and calculations documentation system;
- Quality indicators documentation system;
- Thesaurus;
- 2 sub-systems – internal & external.

CSB a Document Storage System (ADS):

- In 2008, ADS was developed in the CSB;
- Each year, since 2009, all the fundamental processes performed for each statistical survey as well as for calculations have to be described in detail;
- In addition, all quality indicators have to be described;
- ADS provides also a technical possibility to attach a number of supporting documents;
- ADS is made accessible for external users on the CSB website.

Revisions of data are defined as any changes to statistics that have already been published.



CSB uses integrated statistical data management system (ISDMS) for data processing. It is a metadata driven system based on metadata and standardisation of data processing, which in essence does not require individual programming. This system is used for processing surveys of business (mainly) and social statistics. Data collected by means of questionnaires which are not included in the ISDMS are processed by the CSB using other especially developed data processing applications. Detailed information is given in the Annex 5.

The expert organizations have archives located in their own facilities. Experts keep all the information (all disaggregated emission factors, activity data, and documentation about how these factors and data have been generated and aggregated for the preparation of the inventory) on the individual expert's computers.

Every annual inventory (CRF tables, XML, NIR and Registry information) is archived.

Latvia has a centralized archiving system at LEGMC where all the information (including corresponding letters, internal documentation on QA/QC procedures, external and internal reviews, documentation on annual key categories and key category identification, planned inventory improvements) used for inventory compilation are collected on the special server (FTP folder) and the backup of data are made periodically.

#### **1.2.3.4 Verification activities**

Verification activities that have been undertaken are described in the category-specific chapters.

Under the EU Governance Regulation annually the GHG inventory data is compared with the data reported under the EU ETS, energy statistics and under the UNECE (CLRTAP) air pollutant data.

The CSB verifies data in two processing stages: on raw data level (processing of individual information) and on aggregated data level (verifying prepared aggregates).

CSB uses several methods for data verification at the raw data level:

- arithmetical connections;
- logical connections;
- comparison with data of previous periods;
- mutual coherence verification with other statistical questionnaires;
- statistical registers and administrative data.

Aggregates are made and different groupings are formed from the raw data produced. CSB uses similar methods for verification of aggregates to ones applied in the verification of raw data.

#### **1.2.3.5 Treatment of confidentiality issues**

For Latvia's GHG Inventory confidentiality is mainly related to activity data provided to LEGMC by CSB. The data then is used for emission estimation and cannot be reported further. If the data that could be considered as confidential is provided to LEGMC by production plan or other enterprise then the data is not considered as a confidential and can be reported within GHG Inventory.

## Data of CSB

Legal, technical and administrative measures:

### Legal:

“Statistics Law”;

“Law on State Information Systems”;

“Personal Data Protection Law”;

“Information Publicity Law”.

### Technical:

Physical Security (environmental (temperature fluctuations, etc.), technical (voltage reduction, etc.) and human factors (theft, deliberate or unintentional damages, etc.);

Logical Security (security measures provided by IT: user names and passwords, antivirus, firewalls etc.).

### Administrative:

Information Security Management Coordination Council (ISMCC) ensure and implement the principles of granting access rights in the CSB security policy, security means and principles of data storage, information classification and confidentiality;

Information Security Policy developed (2008);

CSB ensures confidentiality and protection of information supplied by the respondents, as well individual information received from other sources pursuant to the requirements of National legislation in force;

The CSB takes the necessary organisational, administrative and technical measures to ensure confidentiality.

**Technical:** described in internal regulations and procedures on security and use of Information Systems.

### **Organisational and administrative:**

- “Confidentiality Statement” signed by every employee, laying down the personal data non-disclosure obligation;
- Confidentiality Council established to ensure that individual information possessed by the CSB is used for scientific and research purposes according to the provisions of the Official Statistics Law and legal acts, as well to deal with legally unregulated confidentiality issues;
- Handbook of statistical confidentiality developed in 2009 that provides explanations of the methods used by the CSB for ensuring data confidentiality.

It is strictly determined in Law of Statistics what information could be provided to other institutions even though the information is needed in emission estimation and reporting under international conventions. CSB cannot give the information of amount of production if one or two companies produce up to 95% from total market production in particular sector. Due to small market of Latvia almost all industrial production data is classified as confidential with

some exceptions in food and drink sector. LEGMC has interdepartmental agreement with CSB to receive confidential information for the emission estimation but these activity data has to be reported as "C" in CRF Tables and in NIR.

#### Data of the EU ETS

Some of the Latvia's industrial processes sector's companies are participating in the EU ETS, and accordingly the data from these companies can be obtained from their annual GHG reports within compliance obligations under EU ETS.

#### Emission trading registry (ETR) documentation

As no significant changes were made in Latvia's ETR, International Transaction Log (ITL) initialization documentation was not changed either.

### **1.2.4 Changes in national inventory arrangements since previous annual GHG inventory submission**

No changes have been made in national systems since the previous submission.

## **1.3 INVENTORY PREPARATION, DATA COLLECTION, PROCESSING AND STORAGE**

Each sector has assigned one or more sectoral experts, responsible for conformity with the relevant reporting guidelines, selection of appropriate methods and data sources and activity data collection, processing and updating of data. The methodologies and data sources used for the different sectors are described in Chapter 1.4 and Chapters 3 to 7 and Chapter 9.

For the Energy (excluding Transport), IPPU and Waste sectors data collection and emission estimation is performed by LEGMC experts from Air and Climate Division, Chemicals and Hazardous Waste Division and Inland Waters Division.

For Transport sector activity data is collected and emissions are calculated by experts from IPE.

For Agriculture sector, data collection and emission estimations are made by LBTU.

Land-use, land use change and forestry sector data are collected and emissions/removals are calculated in LSFRI "Silava".

All the experts responsible for data collection and processing in a particular sector are preparing their data (activity data, emission factors) to import into the CRF Reporter software.

For each submission, expert's databases and additional tools are frozen together with the final CRF reporting format. These materials are placed on LEGMC server and archived.

The first step of the process of inventory preparation is to collect external data, then use necessary methodology from guidelines. Data is put on database and after that the estimation of the calculation is made. And the last step is to report necessary information under the UNFCCC and EU (Figure 1.3).




Figure 1.3 The process of inventory preparation from the first step of collecting external data to the last step, where the reporting information are submitted under the UNFCCC and EU

## 1.4 BRIEF GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF METHODOLOGIES AND DATA SOURCES USED

### 1.4.1 GHG inventory

Latvia's GHG emissions inventory is based on:

- 2006 IPCC Guidelines;
- 2013 Supplement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: Wetlands (IPCC Wetlands Supplement);
- EMEP/CORINAIR Guidebook 2007 and EMEP/EEA 2009;
- EMEP/EEA air pollutant emission inventory guidebook 2019;
- EMEP/EEA air pollutant emission inventory guidebook 2023.

The main sources for emission factors are guidelines mentioned above as well as national studies for country specific parameters and emission factors (e.g. CO<sub>2</sub> emission factors, aspects influencing SO<sub>2</sub> emission factors, distribution of animal waste management systems, average N excretion and etc.).

For 2024 submission (NIR and CRF tables) compilation of the CRF Reporter version v6.0.10\_AR5 was used. To calculate GHG emissions, supplemental locally developed database in Excel format was applied for all sectors except for Road Transport where COPERT 5 was used.

In cases where data of bottom-up method were available and plants had reported estimated data using plant specific emission factors and estimation methodologies for Energy sector, these data were used in the submission. If these data were not available, Tier 1 method from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines was used to estimate emissions. Emissions for the whole country fuel

consumption were estimated by adding up fuel consumption of individual sectors multiplied by appropriate emission factors.

Emissions from Road Transport sector were estimated by using COPERT 5 model for 1990–2022 (Tier 2 method for CO<sub>2</sub> and Tier 3 method for CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O). Emissions for the other transport sub-sectors were estimated according to IPCC Tier 1 and Tier 2 methodologies (Tier 2 method for diesel oil CO<sub>2</sub> emission calculation in railway and navigation and Tier 2 method for jet kerosene emission calculation in aviation (civil and international). The rest of the emissions have been calculated using Tier 1 method).

Emissions from Industrial Processes and Product Use were estimated according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, EMEP/CORINAIR 2007 Guidebook, EMEP/EEA 2009, EMEP/EEA air pollutant emission inventory guidebooks 2019 and 2023 as well as using expert research and judgment about activity data and emission factors.

Emissions from Agriculture sector were estimated according to methodologies from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, the IPCC Wetlands Supplement as well as using expert research and judgment about activity data and emission factors.

The 2006 IPCC Guidelines and the IPCC Wetlands Supplement for CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from drained and rewetted soils were used to estimate emissions from LULUCF sector.

The 2006 IPCC Guidelines were used to estimate emissions from Waste sector.

Table 1.3 presents the main data sources used for activity data as well as information on actual calculations.

**Table 1.3 Main data sources for activity data and emission values**

Sector	Data Sources for Activity Data	Emission Calculation
Energy	<i>CSB Energy Balance; IEA/ Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) – EUROSTAT – UNECE Annual questionnaires; National database "2-Air"; Research of experts; Natural gas enterprises.</i>	<i>LEGMC Air and Climate division, plant operators</i>
Transport	<i>CSB Energy Balance; IEA/AIE – EUROSTAT – UNECE Annual questionnaires; Data of Road Traffic safety Directorate; Research of experts.</i>	<i>IPE</i>
IPPU	<i>National production and sales statistics; Direct information from enterprises operating with pollutants; CSB; National Chemicals Database; State Agency of Medicines; GHG report under EU ETS; National database "2-Air"; Research by experts and expert judgment.</i>	<i>LEGMC Air and Climate division, plant operators</i>
Agriculture	<i>National agricultural statistics obtained from CSB; National studies.</i>	<i>LBTU in collaboration with MoA</i>
LULUCF	<i>LSFRI Silava (NFI); SFS; MoA; CSB;</i>	<i>LSFRI "Silava" in collaboration with MoA and LBTU</i>

Sector	Data Sources for Activity Data	Emission Calculation
	<i>SFRS; LEGMC; RSS; SES; National studies and expert judgment.</i>	
Waste	<i>LEGMC "3-Waste" and "2-Water" databases; Methane recovery installations; CSB.</i>	<i>LEGMC Chemicals and Hazardous Waste division, LEGMC Inland Waters Division</i>

The methodologies used for the Latvia's GHG inventory are consistent with 2006 IPCC Guidelines. Methods and emission factors by category are presented in Table 1.4. The NIR includes the correct method and emission factor information for all categories. Detailed descriptions of the methodologies used by sector are found in Chapters 3 to 7 and 9.

**Table 1.4 Reported emissions, calculation methods and type of emission factors used in 2022 (CS = country-specific, CR = Corinair, D= default, PS= plant-specific, M= model, OTH= other)**

CRF and source	Emissions reported	Method	Emission factor
<b>1. Energy</b>			
<i>1.A. Fuel combustion</i>			
1.A.1. Energy industries	<i>CO<sub>2</sub></i>	<i>T1, T2</i>	<i>CS, D</i>
	<i>CH<sub>4</sub></i>	<i>T1</i>	<i>D</i>
	<i>N<sub>2</sub>O</i>	<i>T1</i>	<i>D</i>
1.A.2. Manufacturing industries and construction	<i>CO<sub>2</sub></i>	<i>T1, T2</i>	<i>CS, D, PS</i>
	<i>CH<sub>4</sub></i>	<i>T1</i>	<i>D</i>
	<i>N<sub>2</sub>O</i>	<i>T1</i>	<i>D</i>
1.A.3. Transport	<i>CO<sub>2</sub></i>	<i>T1, T2</i>	<i>CS, D</i>
	<i>CH<sub>4</sub></i>	<i>T1, T2</i>	<i>CR, D, M</i>
	<i>N<sub>2</sub>O</i>	<i>T1, T2</i>	<i>CR, D, M</i>
1.A.4. Other sectors	<i>CO<sub>2</sub></i>	<i>T1, T2</i>	<i>CS, D</i>
	<i>CH<sub>4</sub></i>	<i>T1, T2</i>	<i>CS, D</i>
	<i>N<sub>2</sub>O</i>	<i>T1</i>	<i>D</i>
1.A.5. Other	<i>CO<sub>2</sub></i>	<i>T1</i>	<i>D</i>
	<i>CH<sub>4</sub></i>	<i>T1</i>	<i>D</i>
	<i>N<sub>2</sub>O</i>	<i>T1</i>	<i>D</i>
<i>1.B. Fugitive emissions from fuels</i>			
1.B.2. Oil and natural gas	<i>CO<sub>2</sub></i>	<i>T3</i>	<i>CS</i>
	<i>CH<sub>4</sub></i>	<i>T3</i>	<i>CS</i>
<b>2. Industrial Processes and Product Use</b>			
<i>2.A Mineral Industry</i>			
2.A.1. Cement Production	<i>CO<sub>2</sub></i>	<i>T2</i>	<i>PS</i>
2.A.2. Lime Production	<i>CO<sub>2</sub></i>	<i>T2</i>	<i>D, PS</i>
2.A.3. Glass Production	<i>CO<sub>2</sub></i>	<i>T3</i>	<i>D, PS</i>
2.A.4. Other Process Uses of Carbonates	<i>CO<sub>2</sub></i>	<i>T1,2</i>	<i>D, PS</i>
<i>2.C Metal industry</i>			
2.C.1. Iron and Steel Production	<i>CO<sub>2</sub></i>	<i>T2</i>	<i>D, PS</i>
	<i>CH<sub>4</sub></i>	<i>T1</i>	<i>CR</i>
<i>2.D Non-energy Products from Fuels and Solvent Use</i>			
2.D.1. Lubricant Use	<i>CO<sub>2</sub></i>	<i>T1</i>	<i>D</i>
2.D.2. Paraffin Wax Use	<i>CO<sub>2</sub></i>	<i>T1</i>	<i>D</i>
2.D.3. Other			
Solvent Use	<i>CO<sub>2</sub></i>	<i>CS, D, T1, T2</i>	<i>D, PS</i>
Road paving with asphalt	<i>CO<sub>2</sub></i>	<i>T1</i>	<i>D</i>

CRF and source	Emissions reported	Method	Emission factor
Asphalt roofing	CO <sub>2</sub>	T1	D
Urea use	CO <sub>2</sub>	T1	D
<b>2.F Product uses as substitutes for ODS substances</b>			
2.F.1 Refrigeration and Air Conditioning	HFC-134a	T2a	CS,D,OTH
	HFC-32	T2a	CS,D,OTH
	HFC-125	T2a	CS,D,OTH
	HFC-143a	T2a	CS,D,OTH
	HFC-152a	T2a	CS,D,OTH
	HFC-23	T2a	CS,D,OTH
2.F.2 Foam Blowing agents	HFC-134a	T1a	D,OTH
	HFC-227ea	T1a	D,OTH
	HFC-245fa	T1a	D,OTH
	HFC-152a	T1a	D,OTH
2.F.3 Fire Protection	HFC-365mfc	T1a	D,OTH
	HFC-227ea	T2a	D
2.F.4 Aerosols	HFC-23	T2a	D
	HFC-134a	T1a	D
<b>2.G. Other Product Manufacture and Use</b>			
2.G.1 Electrical Equipment	SF <sub>6</sub>	T1	D
2.G.3 N <sub>2</sub> O from Product Uses	N <sub>2</sub> O	C,OTH	D,OTH
2.H Other	CO <sub>2</sub>	T1	D
<b>3. Agriculture</b>			
<b>3.A Enteric Fermentation</b>			
3.A.1 Dairy cattle/Non-dairy cattle (other mature and growing cattle)	CH <sub>4</sub>	T2	CS
3.A.2 Sheep	CH <sub>4</sub>	T1	D
3.A.3 Swine	CH <sub>4</sub>	T1	D
3.A.4 Other – Deer	CH <sub>4</sub>	T1	D
3.A.4 Other – Goats	CH <sub>4</sub>	T1	D
3.A.4 Other – Horses	CH <sub>4</sub>	T1	D
3.A.4 Other – Rabbits	CH <sub>4</sub>	T1	OTH
3.A.4 Other – Fur-bearing animals	CH <sub>4</sub>	T1	OTH
<b>3.B Manure Management</b>			
3.B.1 Dairy cattle / Non-dairy cattle (other mature and growing cattle)	CH <sub>4</sub>	T2	CS
	N <sub>2</sub> O	T2	D
3.B.2 Sheep	CH <sub>4</sub>	T1	D
	N <sub>2</sub> O	T2	D
3.B.3 Swine	CH <sub>4</sub>	T2	CS
	N <sub>2</sub> O	T2	D
3.B.4 Other – Deer	CH <sub>4</sub>	T1	D
3.B.4 Other – Goats	CH <sub>4</sub>	T1	D
	N <sub>2</sub> O	T2	D
3.B.4 Other – Horses	CH <sub>4</sub>	T1	D
	N <sub>2</sub> O	T2	D
3.B.4 Other – Poultry	CH <sub>4</sub>	T1	D
	N <sub>2</sub> O	T2	D
3.B.4 Other – Rabbits	CH <sub>4</sub>	T1	D
	N <sub>2</sub> O	T1	D
3.B.4 Other – Fur-bearing animals	CH <sub>4</sub>	T1	D
	N <sub>2</sub> O	T1	D
<b>3.D Agricultural soils</b>			
3.D.1.1 Inorganic N fertilizers	N <sub>2</sub> O	T1	D
3.D.1.2.a Animal manure applied to soils	N <sub>2</sub> O	T1	D

CRF and source	Emissions reported	Method	Emission factor
3.D.1.2.b Sewage sludge applied to soils	$N_2O$	T1	D
3.D.1.2.c Other organic fertilizer applied to soils	$N_2O$	T1	D
3.D.1.3 Urine and dung deposited on soils	$N_2O$	T1	D
3.D.1.4 Crop residues	$N_2O$	T1	D
3.D.1.6 Cultivation of organic soils	$N_2O$	T1	CS
3.D.2.1 Atmospheric deposition	$N_2O$	T1	D
3.D.2.2 Nitrogen leaching and run-off	$N_2O$	T1	D
3.G Liming	$CO_2$	T1	D
3.H Urea application	$CO_2$	T1	D
<b>4.Land use, Land use change and Forestry</b>			
<i>4.A Forest land</i>			
4.A.1 Forest Land Remaining Forest Land	$CO_2$	T1, T2	CS, D
	$CH_4$	T1, T2	D
	$N_2O$	T1, T2	D
4.A.1 4(V) Biomass Burning	$CO_2$	T1	D
	$CH_4$	T1, T2	D
	$N_2O$	T1, T2	D
4.A.2 Land Converted to Forest Land	$CO_2$	T2	CS
4.A 4 (II) Emissions and removals from drainage and rewetting and other management of organic and mineral soils	$CO_2$	T1	D
	$CH_4$	T1, T2	CS, D
	$N_2O$	T1	D
<i>4.B Cropland</i>			
4.B.1 Cropland Remaining Cropland	$CO_2$	T2	CS
4.B.2 Land Converted to Cropland	$CO_2$	T2, T3	CS
	$N_2O$	T1	CS
4.B (II) Emissions and removals from drainage and rewetting and other management of organic and mineral soils	$CH_4$	T1	D
<i>4.C Grassland</i>			
4.C.1 Grassland Remaining Grassland	$CO_2$	T2	CS
	$CH_4$	T1	D
	$N_2O$	T1	D
4.C 4(V) Biomass Burning	$CH_4$	T1	D
	$N_2O$	T1	D
4.C.2 Land Converted to Grassland	$CO_2$	T1, T2, T3	CS, D
4.C (II) Emissions and removals from drainage and rewetting and other management of organic and mineral soils	$CH_4$	T2	CS
<i>4.D. Wetland</i>			
4.D.1 Wetlands Remaining Wetlands	$CO_2$	T2	CS
4.D.2 Land Converted to Wetlands	$CO_2$	T1	D
4.D (II) Emissions and removals from drainage and rewetting and other management of organic and mineral soils	$CO_2$	T1, T2	CS, D
	$CH_4$	T1, T2	CS, D
	$N_2O$	T2	CS
<i>4.E Settlements</i>			
4.E.1 Settlements Remaining Settlements	$CO_2$	T2	CS
	$N_2O$	T1	D
4.E.2 Land Converted to Settlements	$CO_2$	T1, T2	CS, D
	$N_2O$	T1	D
4.G Harvested Wood Products	$CO_2$	T2	CS
<b>5.Waste</b>			
<i>5.A. Solid waste disposal</i>			



CRF and source	Emissions reported	Method	Emission factor
5.A.1. Managed waste disposal sites	CH <sub>4</sub>	T2	CS, D
5.A.2. Unmanaged waste disposal sites	CH <sub>4</sub>	T2	CS, D
<i>5.B. Biological treatment of solid waste</i>			
5.B.1. Composting	CH <sub>4</sub>	D	D
	N <sub>2</sub> O	D	D
5.B.2. Anaerobic digestion at biogas facilities	CH <sub>4</sub>	D	D
<i>5.C. Incineration and open burning of waste</i>			
5.C.1. Waste incineration	CO <sub>2</sub>	D	D
	N <sub>2</sub> O	D	D
<i>5.D. Wastewater treatment and discharge</i>			
5.D.1. Domestic wastewater	CH <sub>4</sub>	T1	CS
	N <sub>2</sub> O	T2	D
5.D.2. Industrial wastewater	CH <sub>4</sub>	D, T1	CS, PS
	N <sub>2</sub> O	D	D

### 1.4.2 European Union Emission Trading System (EU ETS) data

The EU ETS is a cornerstone of the EU's policy to combat climate change and its key tool for reducing GHG emissions cost-effectively. It is the world's first major carbon market and remains the biggest one.

Set up in 2005, the EU ETS is the world's first international emissions trading system, and is now the second largest one, accounting for about one-quarter of international carbon trading.

#### *Phase 1 (2005-2007)*

This was a 3-year pilot of 'learning by doing' to prepare for phase 2, when the EU ETS would need to function effectively to help the EU meet its Kyoto targets.

#### *Phase 2 (2008-2012)*

Phase 2 coincided with the first commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol, where the countries in the EU ETS had concrete emissions reduction targets to meet.

#### *Phase 3 (2013-2020)*

Similarly to phase 2, phase 3 coincided with the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol, where the countries in the EU ETS had concrete emissions reduction targets to meet.

#### *Phase 4 (2021-2030)*

The EU ETS is currently in its fourth phase, with an EU-wide GHG emission reduction target of 43% by 2030 for the sectors covered by the EU ETS, compared to 2005 levels. In its fourth phase the EU ETS has more targeted free-allocation as well as more robust and fair rules to address the risk of carbon leakage.

Latvia has fully implemented the Directive 2003/87/EC<sup>7</sup> of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a scheme for GHG emission allowance trading within the Community, as well as any related legal acts that have amended this Directive.

<sup>7</sup> Directive 2003/87/ec of the European Parliament and of the Council. Available: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:02003L0087-20140430&from=EN>

Latvia implemented the EU ETS and set all the requirements in 2003 and 2004 when amendments in Law On Pollution were made and all the necessary Cabinet of Ministers regulations were approved for the stationary installations – monitoring, reporting, verification and compliance obligations, and creating the possibility of voluntary participation for the installations not exceeding thermal input of 20 MW. Since then a total of 93 installations have received GHG permits. Operation of EU ETS in Latvia is ensured mainly by the MoCE and institutions under the supervision of MoCE – namely the State Environmental Service that is responsible for approval of monitoring plans, issuance of permits, and approval of annual emission reports for stationary installations and LEGMC, which is Latvia's National Administrator of ETR (Union Registry since 2012).

Since 2008 (Kyoto Protocol's 1<sup>st</sup> period) the EU ETS was linked to the international emissions trading under the Kyoto Protocol. The scope of the EU ETS was expanded but in Latvia no new installation was included in EU ETS due to enlarged scope.

Since 2012 the aviation activities have also been included in the EU ETS regarding all aircraft operators that perform flights to/from EU. However, in 2013 exemptions were created applied to the flights to/from countries outside European Economic Area (EEA) so in 2013-2017 only internal flights to/from EEA countries as well as to/from aerodromes in the outermost region are included in the EU ETS scope. The current derogation from the EU ETS obligations for flights to and from third countries was extended until 31 December 2023, subject to review, to allow the experience necessary for the implementation of the International Civil Aviation Organization scheme (global market-based measure) to be gathered.

The Civil Aviation Agency (institution under the purview of the Ministry of Transport) is the main competent authority responsible for approval of monitoring plans and approval of annual emission reports for aircraft operators while MoCE is fully responsible regarding the implementation of the requirements for the aviation activities in EU ETS.

The Latvian National Accreditation Bureau, an institution under the supervision of the MoE, is responsible for accreditation and monitoring of verifiers.

Starting in 2013 in EU ETS Phase 3 the scope was again extended and three new installations of Latvia started operations in the EU ETS. Starting in phase 3, the emission allowances are mainly auctioned. EC developed new harmonized requirements for the calculation and allocation of the EU allowances in 2011, and in 2012 harmonized requirements for monitoring, reporting, accreditation and verification were developed. Harmonized templates for monitoring plan, emission report (and tonnkilometer reports for aircraft operators), verification report as well as templates for emission allocation calculation and reporting were developed by the EC. Latvia uses these developed harmonized templates. Since 2013 the MoCE monitors, controls, and recalculates the annual free allocation amounts, based on activity level data.

For phase 4, the EU ETS scope was not revised, but other revisions took place to ensure better functioning of the EU ETS. The linear reduction factor was raised from 1.74% to 2.2% to increase the pace of emissions cuts. The carbon leakage rules were also revised, to ensure better targeted allocation of free allowances. In sectors that are not considered at risk of carbon leakage, allowances allocated free of charge would be capped at 30 % of predicted allowance need of the operator.

In January 2020, the linking agreement between the EU ETS and the Swiss ETS came into force, allowing for allowances to be used between both registries. Additionally, this also means that the EU ETS now covers flights from the EEA to Switzerland. In 2005 Latvia's Emission Trading Registry was developed and launched. Unified emission trading registry system was developed and launched in 2012 so all EU Member States use the same registry for EU ETS compliance activities.

On 14 July 2021, EC adopted a series of legislative proposals setting out how it intends to achieve climate neutrality in the EU by 2050, including the intermediate target of at least 55% net reduction in GHG emissions by 2030. The package proposes to revise several pieces of EU climate legislation, including the EU ETS, Effort Sharing Regulation (ESR), transport and land use legislation, setting out in real terms the ways in which the EC intends to reach EU climate targets under the European Green Deal.

The EU ETS data obtained from annual emission reports submitted by operators to the competent authority is used as source of activity and emission data for the GHG inventory, particularly in Energy and IPPU sectors. All emission reports are available on the web page of the competent authority and are fully available for the GHG inventory.

In 2022, there were 53 stationary installations in Latvia and two aircraft operators of EU ETS were set as administered by Latvia. Latvia's verified ETS emissions (only for stationary installations) in 2022 were 1689.97 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.

## **1.5 BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF KEY CATEGORIES**

This section provides an overview of key categories (Table 1.5).

For 2024 submission, Approach 1 and Approach 2 according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines are used to identify key categories for 1990-2022. Approach 1 point out mainly the large emission sources as key categories. Approach 2 point out some of the sources with larger uncertainty rates.

The identification was divided in two parts, key categories excluding LULUCF and key categories including LULUCF source categories. The starting point for the choice of source categories with LULUCF is the list presented in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Chapter 4 Methodological Choice and Identification of Key Categories (Table 4.1). In Latvia's case the list of IPCC categories is modified to reflect particular national circumstances, for example, types of fuels in transport, more disaggregated agricultural categories (by animal species) and more disaggregated LULUCF categories (by taking into account soil type etc.) Such modifications have been made to clarify the key categories. Key category analysis is an important element for planning and prioritization of necessary inventory improvements.

The base year for CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions is 1990.

Indirect CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are not included in the key category analysis.

Summary of key categories is shown in Table 1.5.

Table 1.5 Key categories in 2024 submission<sup>8</sup>

IPCC category	Gas	Identification criteria	with LULUCF	without LULUCF
1.A.1.a Public Electricity and Heat Production - Biomass Fuels	N <sub>2</sub> O	L2,T1,T2		X
1.A.1.a Public Electricity and Heat Production - Biomass Fuels	CH <sub>4</sub>	T2		X
1.A.1.a Public Electricity and Heat Production - Gaseous Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2	X	X
1.A.1.a Public Electricity and Heat Production - Liquid Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,T1,T2	X	X
1.A.1.a Public Electricity and Heat Production - Peat	CO <sub>2</sub>	T1,T2	X	X
1.A.1.a Public Electricity and Heat Production - Solid Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	T1	X	X
1.A.1.c Manufacture of Solid Fuels and Other Energy Industries - Gaseous Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	T1	X	
1.A.1.c Manufacture of Solid Fuels and Other Energy Industries – Peat	CO <sub>2</sub>	T1		X
1.A.2.a Iron and Steel - Gaseous Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	T1,T2	X	X
1.A.2.a Iron and Steel - Liquid Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	T1	X	X
1.A.2.a Iron and Steel - Other fossil fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	T1,T2		X
1.A.2.c Chemicals - Liquid Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	T1,T2	X	X
1.A.2.d. Pulp, Paper and Print - Gaseous Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	T1	X	X
1.A.2.e Food Processing, Beverages and Tobacco - Gaseous Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,T1	X	X
1.A.2.e Food Processing, Beverages and Tobacco - Liquid Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	T1,T2	X	X
1.A.2.e Food Processing, Beverages and Tobacco - Solid Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	T1	X	X
1.A.2.f Non-metallic Minerals - Gaseous Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,T1	X	X
1.A.2.f Non-metallic Minerals - Liquid Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	T1,T2	X	X
1.A.2.f Non-metallic Minerals - Other Fossil Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1	X	X
1.A.2.f Non-metallic Minerals - Solid Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,T1		X
1.A.2.g Other - Biomass Fuels	N <sub>2</sub> O	T2		X
1.A.2.g Other - Biomass Fuels	CH <sub>4</sub>	T2		X
1.A.2.g Other - Gaseous Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,T1,T2	X	X
1.A.2.g Other - Liquid Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,T1,L2,T2	X	X
1.A.3.b Road Transportation - Diesel Oil	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2	X	X
1.A.3.b Road Transportation - Diesel Oil	N <sub>2</sub> O	L1,L2,T1,T2		X
1.A.3.b Road Transportation - Gasoline	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2	X	X
1.A.3.b Road Transportation - LPG	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,T1	X	X
1.A.3.c Railways - Liquid Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,T1	X	X
1.A.3.c Railways - Liquid Fuels	N <sub>2</sub> O	T2		X
1.A.4.a Commercial/Institutional - Gaseous Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2	X	X
1.A.4.a Commercial/Institutional - Liquid Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2	X	X
1.A.4.a Commercial/Institutional - Peat	CO <sub>2</sub>	T1		X
1.A.4.a Commercial/Institutional - Solid Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	T1,T2	X	X
1.A.4.a Commercial/Institutional - Liquid Fuels	N <sub>2</sub> O	T2		X

<sup>8</sup> Table 1.4 since NIR 2018 was slightly modified by combining columns A and B of Table 4.4 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, which does not change the information reported, and also columns “with LULUCF” and “without LULUCF” were added to show the conditions in which a category is selected as a key one

Latvia's National Inventory Report 1990-2022

IPCC category	Gas	Identification criteria	with LULUCF	without LULUCF
1.A.4.a Commercial/Institutional - Biomass Fuels	CH <sub>4</sub>	L1,L2,T2		X
1.A.4.b Residential - Biomass Fuels	CH <sub>4</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2	X	X
1.A.4.b Residential - Gaseous Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2	X	X
1.A.4.b Residential - Liquid Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T1	X	X
1.A.4.b Residential - Solid Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	T1,T2	X	X
1.A.4.b Residential - Solid Fuels	CH <sub>4</sub>	T2		X
1.A.4.c Agriculture/Forestry/Fisheries - Gaseous Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	T1,T2	X	X
1.A.4.c Agriculture/Forestry/Fisheries - Liquid Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2	X	X
1.A.4.c Agriculture/Forestry/Fisheries - Liquid Fuels	N <sub>2</sub> O	L1,L2,T1,T2		X
1.A.4.c Agriculture/Forestry/Fisheries - Solid Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	T1	X	X
1.A.5.b Mobile - Liquid Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2		X
1.B.2.b Natural Gas	CH <sub>4</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2	X	X
1.B.2.c Venting and Flaring	CH <sub>4</sub>	T1		X
2.A.1. Cement Production	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2	X	X
2.A.2. Lime Production	CO <sub>2</sub>	T1,T2	X	X
2.C.1 Iron and Steel Production	CO <sub>2</sub>	T1		X
2.D.3. Solvent Use	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,T2		X
2.F.1. Refrigeration and air conditioning	HFCs	L1,L2	X	X
3.A.1 Enteric Fermentation - Cattle	CH <sub>4</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2	X	X
3.B.1.1 Manure Management - Cattle	CH <sub>4</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2	X	X
3.B.2.1 Manure Management - Cattle	N <sub>2</sub> O	L1,T1,T2	X	X
3.B.5 Indirect N <sub>2</sub> O emissions from Manure Management	N <sub>2</sub> O	L1,L2,T2		X
3.D.1. Direct N <sub>2</sub> O emissions from managed soils	N <sub>2</sub> O	L1,L2,T1,T2	X	X
3.D.2 Indirect N <sub>2</sub> O Emissions from managed soils	N <sub>2</sub> O	L1,L2,T1,T2	X	X
3.G. Liming	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2	X	X
4.A.1 Forest Land Remaining Forest Land – Carbon stock change, dead wood	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T1	X	
4.A.1 Forest Land Remaining Forest Land – Carbon stock change, living biomass	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2	X	
4.A.1 Forest Land Remaining Forest Land – Carbon stock change, organic soil	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2	X	
4.A. Forest land – 4(II) Emissions and removals from drainage and rewetting and other management of organic and mineral soils, total organic soils	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2	X	
4.A. Forest land – 4(II) Emissions and removals from drainage and rewetting and other management of organic and mineral soils, total organic soils	N <sub>2</sub> O	L1,L2,T2	X	
4.A. Forest land – 4(II) Emissions and removals from drainage and rewetting and other management of organic and mineral soils, total organic soils	CH <sub>4</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2	X	
4.A.2 Land Converted to Forest Land – Carbon stock change, living biomass	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,T1	X	
4.B. Cropland 4(II) Emissions and removals from drainage and rewetting and other management of organic and mineral soils	CH <sub>4</sub>	L1,L2,T2	X	
4.B.1 Cropland remaining Cropland – Carbon stock change, organic soil	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2	X	

IPCC category	Gas	Identification criteria	with LULUCF	without LULUCF
4.B.1 Land converted to Cropland – Carbon stock change, forest land converted to cropland, dead organic matter	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2	X	
4.B.2 Land converted to Cropland – Carbon stock change, organic soil	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2	X	
4.C. Grassland – 4(II) Emissions and removals from drainage and rewetting and other management of organic and mineral soils	CH <sub>4</sub>	L1,L2	X	
4.C.1 Grassland remaining Grassland – Carbon stock change, organic soil	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2	X	
4.C.2 Land converted to Grassland – Carbon stock change, organic soil	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2	X	
4.C.2 Land converted to Grassland – Carbon stock change, forest land converted to grassland, living biomass	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2	X	
4.C.2 Land converted to Grassland – Carbon stock change, forest land converted to grassland, dead organic matter	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1	X	
4.C.2 Land converted to Grassland – Carbon stock change, wetlands converted to grassland, living biomass	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1	X	
4.D. Wetlands 4(II) Emissions and removals from drainage and rewetting and other management of organic and mineral soils, Peat extraction from lands, rewetted organic soils	CO <sub>2</sub>	L2,T2	X	
4.D. Wetlands 4(II) Emissions and removals from drainage and rewetting and other management of organic and mineral soils, Peat extraction from lands, rewetted organic soils	CH <sub>4</sub>	L1,L2,T2	X	
4.D. Wetlands 4(II) Emissions and removals from drainage and rewetting and other management of organic and mineral soils, Peat extraction from lands, drained organic soils	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T1	X	
4.D.1 Wetlands remaining Wetlands – Carbon stock change, living biomass	CO <sub>2</sub>	T2	X	
4.D.1 Wetlands remaining Wetlands – Carbon stock change, organic soils	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T2	X	
4.D.1 Wetlands remaining Wetlands – Carbon stock change, dead organic matter	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1	X	
4.D.2 Land Converted to Wetland - Carbon stock change, organic soils	CO <sub>2</sub>	L2,T2	X	
4.E.1 Settlements remaining Settlements – Carbon stock change, living biomass	CO <sub>2</sub>	T2	X	
4.E.2 Land converted to Settlements – Carbon stock change, dead organic matter	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2	X	
4.E.2 Land converted to Settlements – Carbon stock change, living biomass	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2	X	
4.E.2 Land converted to Settlements – Carbon stock change, mineral soils	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1	X	
4.E.2 Land converted to Settlements – Carbon stock change, organic soils	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2	X	
4.E.2 Lands converted to settlements – Direct nitrous oxide (N <sub>2</sub> O) emissions from nitrogen (N) mineralization/immobilization associated with loss/gain of soil organic matter resulting from change of land use or management of mineral soils	N <sub>2</sub> O	L1,L2,T1,T2	X	
4.G. Harvested Wood Products	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2	X	

IPCC category	Gas	Identification criteria	with LULUCF	without LULUCF
5.A.1. Managed Waste Disposal on Land	CH <sub>4</sub>	L1,L2	X	X
5.A.2. Unmanaged Waste Disposal Sites	CH <sub>4</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2	X	X
5.B.1. Composting	CH <sub>4</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2		X
5.B.1. Composting	N <sub>2</sub> O	L2,T2		X
5.B.2. Anaerobic digestion at biogas facilities	CH <sub>4</sub>	L2		X
5.D.1 Domestic Wastewater	CH <sub>4</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2	X	X
5.D.1 Domestic Wastewater	N <sub>2</sub> O	L1,T2		X
5.D.2 Industrial Wastewater	CH <sub>4</sub>	T1,T2	X	X

Key categories identified in Latvia's GHG inventory slightly differs from the CRF Reporter Table 7 because key categories in the GHG inventory is a combination of categories from both Approaches 1 and 2, whereas in the CRF Reporter key categories are calculated only by using Approach 1.

Results of the key category analysis are important because they guide decisions for the methodological choice (together with uncertainty analysis, see Section 1.6). The goal is to find IPCC categories that are the most important in terms of the emissions level and the trend. This list (Table 1.5) forms the basis of discussions with the sectoral experts on the quality of the estimates and possible need for improvement as well as are also subject to more detailed documentation and QC procedures.

## 1.6 GENERAL UNCERTAINTY EVALUATION

This section provides an overview of to uncertainty analysis for Latvia's GHG inventory.

The uncertainty estimates of the 2024 submission have been made according to Approach 1 method presented in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. The Approach 1 is based on emission estimates and uncertainty coefficients for activity data and emission factors. The mandatory, detailed reporting tables of the uncertainty analysis (Table 3.3 of volume 1 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines with and without LULUCF) are provided in Annex 2 of this submission.

The uncertainty analysis was prepared for all the sectors: Energy, IPPU, Agriculture, Waste and LULUCF. Uncertainties are estimated for direct GHGs, e.g. CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O and F-gases only.

The results of the uncertainty analysis are used to prioritise inventory improvements in association with the key category analysis.

### Results of uncertainties analysis

In 2024 submission total uncertainties are reflected in the Table 1.6.

**Table 1.6 Uncertainties of 2024 submission**

	Uncertainty in total inventory %	Trend uncertainty %
With LULUCF	17%	22%
Without LULUCF	6%	2%

Uncertainties of activity data are taken from:

- CSB (generally 2% uncertainty is used according to received information from CSB);
- GHG reports from enterprises operating within EU ETS;

- Information by companies;
- NFI.

In some cases uncertainty of activity data is calculated using trend line and measured data (Waste sector).

Uncertainties of emission factors are taken from:

- 2006 IPCC Guidelines;
- IPCC Wetlands Supplement;
- Expert judgments;
- NFI;
- Specific research results.

All sources of uncertainties are documented and referenced.

The uncertainty calculation is based on Excel file, that is annually sent to sectoral experts for updating. Responsible experts are requested to go through uncertainties and make an updates if necessary. When the information is received from experts, the inventory compiler summarizes all the uncertainties and performs the uncertainty analysis. For each source, the combined uncertainty for activity data and emission factors were estimated and given in percent.

In the annual meeting at the beginning of the inventory cycle the experts are advised to go through the uncertainty ranges of activity data and emissions factors in order to prioritize inventory improvements.

Detailed information about uncertainty assessment is described under each subsector.

#### **Base year (1990) uncertainties**

Annex I Parties shall quantitatively estimate the uncertainty of the data used for all source and sink categories using at least approach 1, as provided in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, and report uncertainties for the base year. Latvia has included an overview of uncertainties in the base year in Annex 2.

The improvement of uncertainties in the base year is still ongoing in order to obtain the most accurate uncertainties for 1990.

Table 1.7 shows the uncertainties in the base year (Approach 1).

**Table 1.7 Assessment of uncertainties in 1990 emissions**

	Uncertainty for 1990 %
With LULUCF	25%
Without LULUCF	4%



## 1.7 GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF COMPLETENESS

### 1.7.1 GHG inventory

Latvia has provided estimates for all significant IPCC source and sink categories according to the detailed CRF classification. Estimates are provided for the following gases: CO<sub>2</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O, CH<sub>4</sub>, F-gases (HFC, PFC, SF<sub>6</sub> and NF<sub>3</sub>), NMVOC, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO and SO<sub>2</sub>. No additional sources and sinks have been identified.

In accordance with the IPCC Guidelines, international aviation and marine bunker fuel emissions are not included in national totals.

The notation keys presented below are used to fill in the blanks in all the tables in the CRF. Notation keys used in the NIR are consistent with those reported in the CRF.

*NE (not estimated):*

"NE" is used for existing emissions by sources and removals by sinks of GHG that have not been estimated.

*IE (included elsewhere):*

"IE" is used for emissions by sources and removals by sinks of GHG that have been estimated but included elsewhere in the inventory instead of the expected source/sink category.

*NA (not applicable):*

"NA" is used for activities in a given source/sink category that do not produce emissions or emissions are negligible.

*C (confidential):*

"C" is used for emissions that could lead to the disclosure of confidential information classified in the National legislation if reported at the most disaggregated level. In this case a minimum of aggregation is required to protect business information.

Table 1.8 represents categories reported as "not estimated" (NE) in 2024 submission. Emissions/removals are not estimated mainly due to lack of available IPCC methodologies and/or lack of activity data as well as gases and categories considered insignificant.

**Table 1.8 Sources and sinks not estimated ("NE") in 2024 submission**

Sources and sinks not estimated ("NE")			
GHG	Sector	Source/sink category	Explanation
CH <sub>4</sub>	Agriculture	3.D Agricultural Soils	Emissions are negligible (explanation is provided in NIR chapter 5.4)
CH <sub>4</sub>	Waste	5.C Incineration and Open Burning of Waste/5.C.2 Open Burning of Waste/5.C.2.1 Biogenic/5.C.2.1.a Municipal Solid Waste	Emissions are negligible (explanation is provided in NIR Chapter 7.4.2)
CH <sub>4</sub>	Waste	5.C Incineration and Open Burning of Waste/5.C.2 Open Burning of Waste/5.C.2.1 Biogenic/5.C.2.1.b Other (please specify)	Emissions are negligible (explanation is provided in NIR Chapter 7.4.2)
CH <sub>4</sub>	Waste	5.C Incineration and Open Burning of Waste/5.C.2 Open Burning of Waste/5.C.2.2 Non-biogenic/5.C.2.2.a Municipal Solid Waste	Emissions are negligible (explanation is provided in NIR Chapter 7.4.2)

Sources and sinks not estimated ("NE")			
GHG	Sector	Source/sink category	Explanation
CH <sub>4</sub>	Waste	5.C Incineration and Open Burning of Waste/5.C.2 Open Burning of Waste/5.C.2.2 Non-biogenic/5.C.2.2.b Other (please specify)	Emissions are negligible (explanation is provided in NIR Chapter 7.4.2)
CO <sub>2</sub>	Agriculture	3.1 Other Carbon-containing Fertilizers	The amount of emissions is negligible (explanation is provided in NIR chapter 5.8)
CO <sub>2</sub>	Waste	5.C Incineration and Open Burning of Waste/5.C.2 Open Burning of Waste/5.C.2.1 Biogenic/5.C.2.1.a Municipal Solid Waste	Emissions are negligible (explanation is provided in NIR Chapter 7.4.2)
CO <sub>2</sub>	Waste	5.C Incineration and Open Burning of Waste/5.C.2 Open Burning of Waste/5.C.2.1 Biogenic/5.C.2.1.b Other (please specify)	Emissions are negligible (explanation is provided in NIR Chapter 7.4.2)
CO <sub>2</sub>	Waste	5.C Incineration and Open Burning of Waste/5.C.2 Open Burning of Waste/5.C.2.2 Non-biogenic/5.C.2.2.a Municipal Solid Waste	Emissions are negligible (explanation is provided in NIR Chapter 7.4.2)
CO <sub>2</sub>	Waste	5.C Incineration and Open Burning of Waste/5.C.2 Open Burning of Waste/5.C.2.2 Non-biogenic/5.C.2.2.b Other (please specify)	Emissions are negligible (explanation is provided in NIR Chapter 7.4.2)
N <sub>2</sub> O	Waste	5.C Incineration and Open Burning of Waste/5.C.2 Open Burning of Waste/5.C.2.1 Biogenic/5.C.2.1.a Municipal Solid Waste	Emissions are negligible (explanation is provided in NIR Chapter 7.4.2)
N <sub>2</sub> O	Waste	5.C Incineration and Open Burning of Waste/5.C.2 Open Burning of Waste/5.C.2.1 Biogenic/5.C.2.1.b Other (please specify)	Emissions are negligible (explanation is provided in NIR Chapter 7.4.2)
N <sub>2</sub> O	Waste	5.C Incineration and Open Burning of Waste/5.C.2 Open Burning of Waste/5.C.2.2 Non-biogenic/5.C.2.2.a Municipal Solid Waste	Emissions are negligible (explanation is provided in NIR Chapter 7.4.2)
N <sub>2</sub> O	Waste	5.C Incineration and Open Burning of Waste/5.C.2 Open Burning of Waste/5.C.2.2 Non-biogenic/5.C.2.2.b Other (please specify)	Emissions are negligible (explanation is provided in NIR Chapter 7.4.2)
SF <sub>6</sub>	Industrial Processes and Product Use	2.G Other Product Manufacture and Use/2.G.2 SF <sub>6</sub> and PFCs from Other Product Use	Emissions are negligible (explanation is provided in NIR Chapter 4.8)

### 1.7.2 Completeness by geographical coverage

All statistical data sources covers the whole territory of Latvia, therefore, the GHG inventory represents the whole country.

### 1.7.3 Completeness by timely coverage

A complete set of CRF tables are provided for all years and the estimates are calculated in a consistent manner.

## 2 TRENDS IN GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Detailed information on emission trends is provided in the description of IPCC sectors in Chapters 3-7 and in the CRF trend tables.

### 2.1 DESCRIPTION AND INTERPRETATION OF EMISSION TRENDS FOR AGGREGATED GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

As illustrated in Figure 2.1, since 1990 Latvia's GHG emissions have considerably decreased by 61.1% (excluding LULUCF, with indirect CO<sub>2</sub>) and increased by 10.3% including LULUCF, with indirect CO<sub>2</sub>. This decrease has influenced the economic situation in the country. In Latvia the transition period to market economy started after 1991. This process caused essential changes in all sectors of national economy and resulted in decrease of GHG emissions after 1990.

In 2022, GHG emissions excluding LULUCF, including indirect CO<sub>2</sub> in Latvia constituted 10130.79 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. The main GHG emission source in Latvia is Energy sector (63.4%) followed by Agriculture (22.2%), IPPU (8.5%) and Waste (5.8%).




Figure 2.1 Latvia's aggregated GHG emissions in 1990-2022 (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

In contrast, GHG emissions from the LULUCF sector since 1990 has fluctuated. These changes are driven mostly by reduction of CO<sub>2</sub> removals in living biomass due to increase of harvest rate and ageing of forests, increasing of mortality in mature forests. If compared to 1990, both figures are significantly increased since 1990; respectively, average mortality rate (stem volume) in forest in 1990 was 1.29 m<sup>3</sup> ha<sup>-1</sup> annually, now (in 2022) it is 1.77 m<sup>3</sup> ha<sup>-1</sup> annually, but felling rate in 1990 was 6.3 mill. m<sup>3</sup> annually, now it is 19.5 mill. m<sup>3</sup> (in 2022, excluding deforestation). LULUCF sector is also heavily affected by land use changes – in 1990s considerable area of afforested lands was converted back to agricultural production, however, in recent decade another trend is growing – conversion of forest land to settlements to build roads, industrial centres and other infrastructure.

## 2.2 DESCRIPTION AND INTERPRETATION OF EMISSION TRENDS BY GAS

**CO<sub>2</sub> emissions** is the main GHG causing climate change in Latvia. In 2022, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions constituted 65.4% of Latvia's total GHG emissions (without indirect CO<sub>2</sub> emissions) (Figure 2.2). In 2022, total CO<sub>2</sub> eq. emissions without LULUCF and indirect CO<sub>2</sub> emissions decreased by 66.3% compared to 1990.

The most important source of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions (kt) in 2022 was fossil fuel combustion – 89.8%, including Energy Industries – 14.4%, Manufacturing Industries and Construction – 8.2%; Transport – 46.9% and Other sectors (Agriculture, Forestry, etc.) – 19.9%.

Other anthropogenic emission sources of CO<sub>2</sub> are IPPU – 8.9% and Agriculture 1.3%.

Main sources of **CH<sub>4</sub> emissions** in Latvia are Enteric Fermentation of Livestock and Solid Waste Disposal Sites. Other important sources of CH<sub>4</sub> emissions are leakage from natural gas pipeline systems and combustion of biomass. CH<sub>4</sub> emissions in 2022 contributed to 18.7% of total GHG emissions (excluding LULUCF, excluding indirect CO<sub>2</sub>). CH<sub>4</sub> emissions (kt) decreased 53.4% in 2022 since 1990.

Agricultural soils are the main source of **N<sub>2</sub>O emissions** in Latvia generating 78.0% of all N<sub>2</sub>O emissions (kt) in 2022. Other N<sub>2</sub>O emission sources are from Transport sector and, biomass, liquid and other solid fuel combustion in other Energy sectors, also IPPU and Waste sectors. Since 1990 total N<sub>2</sub>O emissions had decreased by 41.5% in 2022, mainly due to decrease in the emissions from agriculture.

**Emissions from HFCs and sulphur hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>)** consumption are reported for the period of 1995-2022. Total HFCs and SF<sub>6</sub> emissions decreased by 3.1% in 2022 compared to 2021. Since 1995 HFC emissions have increased significantly due to substitution of ozone depleting substances in refrigeration and air conditioning as well as due to increase of cars, trucks and buses equipped with mobile air conditioners. SF<sub>6</sub> emissions from electrical equipment contributed to 12.27 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. in 2022. Emissions of the PFCs and NF<sub>3</sub> does not occur (NO) in Latvia for all time series.




Figure 2.2 Trend in GHG emissions by gases (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

Emissions by sources are illustrated in Figure 2.3.




Figure 2.3 Latvia's GHGs emissions by source 1990-2022 excluding LULUCF, including indirect CO<sub>2</sub>

## 2.3 DESCRIPTION AND INTERPRETATION OF EMISSION TRENDS BY SECTOR

### 2.3.1 Trends in ENERGY

Energy sector share of GHG emissions in 2022 is 63.4% or 6419.11 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. that makes it the largest emitter in Latvia. Emissions since 1990 in the Energy sector have decreased by 67.1%.




Figure 2.4 Trend in GHG emissions from Energy sector in 1990-2022 (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

Figure 2.4 shows GHG emission trends in Energy sector from 1990 to 2022. The most of the Energy sector emissions in 1990 were produced in the Energy Industries (32.3%) and the Other Sectors (Commercial/Institutional; Residential; Agriculture/Forestry/Fishing) (30.4%). In 2022,

situation has changed and the largest GHG emitter is Transport sector with 48.9% from total GHG emissions emitted in Energy sector.

In 2022, emissions have decreased in Energy Industries by 84.2%, Manufacturing Industries and Construction by 84.8% and Other Sectors (Commercial/Institutional; Residential; Agriculture/Forestry/Fishing) by 73.8% since 1990. Only in Transport sector GHG emissions have increased (3.4%) compared to 1990. In Fugitive emissions sector in 2022 the decrease in GHG emissions is 64.5% compared to 1990. One of the reasons for these changes, is amount of fuel consumed in sectors have changed, as well as fuel switching from coal and liquid fossil fuels that is used for combustion to biomass and natural gas. Use of biomass has increased more than 2 times and use of fossil fuels have significantly decreased - liquid fuel (-58.5%), solid fuel (-98.2%), peat (-97.1%) and natural gas (-71.2%) since 1990. The share of biomass has increased from 8.6% in 1990 to 40.5% in 2022. Biofuels (biodiesel and bioethanol) constitutes 1.5% of the total fuel consumption in the Transport sector in 2022.




Figure 2.5 Fuel consumption in Energy sector 1990-2022 (PJ)

Total GHG emissions in Energy sector in 2022 have decreased by 8.8% in comparison with previous year. Energy Industries have decreased by 30.5%, Manufacturing Industries and Construction decreased by 8.2%, Transport sector decreased by 2.6%, Other Sectors (Commercial/institutional; Residential; Agriculture/forestry/fishing) decreased by 1.9%, Other increased by 1.4% and Fugitive emissions (oil and natural gas) decreased by 10.9%.

After the decrease in the period 1990-1999, total GHG emissions from Transport sector had the rapid growth in the period 2000 – 2007 (Figure 2.6). Peak of GHG emissions in Transport sector has been recognized in 2007 when emissions exceeded 1990 level by 27.4%. The main reason for this increase of emissions was a sharp growth of economy and income of population, that resulted in an increase in the number of cars (mainly passenger cars).




Figure 2.6 Trend in GHG emissions from Transport sector in 1990-2022 (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

Recession of the national economy was the major reason for decreasing of transport activities – decrease of mobility parameters (passenger km by passenger cars and ton km by freight transport) - and corresponding GHG emission decreasing in the time period 2008–2009. GHG emissions have increased for time period 2013–2019. In 2020, emissions in the transport sector mainly decreased in road transport. The main reason was the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic.

The reduction in freight transport by railway has significantly decreased GHG emissions in this sector. The share of GHG emissions from railway in total transport sector GHG emissions has decreased from 10% in 2012 to 2.5% in 2022.

In 2022, Transport sector contributed 31.0% of total GHG emissions in Latvia or 3141.7 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. In 2022, total GHG emissions in the Transport sector compared to 1990 have increased by 3.4% and decreased by 2.6% compared to 2021.

The decrease of emissions in 2022 in the Transport sector was caused mainly by the decreasing of road transport emissions.

### 2.3.2 Trends in INDUSTRIAL PROCESSES AND PRODUCT USE

In 2022, IPPU sector contributed 8.5% of the total GHG emissions in Latvia or 858.47 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. Emissions from IPPU have increased by 31.0% since 1990 with significant fluctuations afterwards (Figure 2.7). Compared to 2021 emissions from IPPU sector in 2022 have decreased by 2.1%.




Figure 2.7 Trend in GHG emissions from IPPU sector in 1990-2022 (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

The largest part of GHG emissions in IPPU sector constitutes CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from 2.A Mineral industry (63.8% of total GHG emissions from IPPU sector and 5.4% from total CO<sub>2</sub> emissions without LULUCF, with indirect CO<sub>2</sub> in 2022). The second largest source is 2.F Product Uses as ODS Substitutes causing 29.2% from all the IPPU emissions and 2.5% from total GHG emissions without LULUCF, with indirect CO<sub>2</sub> in 2022. Considerably smaller are the rest of the IPPU emission sources – 2.G Other Product manufacture and use and 2.D Non energy products from fuels and solvents use, together constituting 7.1% from the entire IPPU emissions in 2022. 2.C Metal industry emissions are not occurring in Latvia since 2016, due to interruption of production in the only metal producing plant.

The largest decrease of emissions occurred between 1990 and 1993 when industry was affected by an economic crisis. In addition, at the beginning of 1990s during the countrywide changes of governmental system and national economy, statistics was not well kept. Therefore extrapolation is made for activity data in some subsectors.

GHG emissions from IPPU sector have increased from 283.32 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. in 2000 to 905.57 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. in 2012. It can be explained with sharp development of Latvian industry when construction activities increased and industrial production of building materials also increased. Since 2007–2008 the industry development was slowing down as the construction activity declined. In 2010, compared to 2009 IPPU emissions increased by 67.6% mainly due to sharp increase of mineral industry emissions because the cement production plant increased the capacity by approximately 2.4 times.

1995 is the base year for F-gases under the Kyoto Protocol. The total F-gas emissions increased significantly since that time. The main reason that caused emission growth was substitution of ozone depleting substances (ODS) with F-gases in refrigeration and air conditioning appliances. The usage of products that substitute ODSs in Latvia mainly depends on import. The imported amounts could be associated with the economic situation in the country that consequently led to F-gases emission growth, especially in the latest years.



CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the Solvent Use sector have exhibited a consistent upward trajectory from 2009 until 2022. The variability in NMVOC emissions can be predominantly attributed to the economic well-being of the nation, encompassing heightened GDP and an augmented consumer demand for goods.

### 2.3.3 Trends in AGRICULTURE

In 2022, Agriculture sector contributed 22.2% of the total GHG emissions in Latvia or 2253.8 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. GHG emissions increased by 0.04% in 2022 compared to 2021 due to the increase of livestock and crop productivity. The trend of emissions in CO<sub>2</sub> eq. by category is presented in Figure 2.8. The annual emissions have reduced approximately by 55.2% since 1990 due to decrease in agricultural production, including livestock population, crop production and amounts of mineral fertilizer consumption.




Figure 2.8 Trend in GHG emissions from Agriculture sector in 1990-2022 (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

Emissions from agricultural soils contributed major share of the total emissions from the sector – 46.5%, enteric fermentation emissions was second largest source from the sector – 42.0%. The share of manure management emissions was evaluated as 7.8% of total emissions in the sector, remaining 3.7% of emissions refer to liming and urea application.

### 2.3.4 Trends in LULUCF

In 2022, total emissions of aggregated GHGs in the LULUCF sector were 4944.16 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. Aggregated net removals of the GHG were reduced by 140% in 2022 compared to 1990 mostly due to increase of harvest rate in mature forests, however considerable role in the increase of the GHG emissions has conversion of forest land to settlements, as well as conversion of naturally afforested lands to cropland and grassland. The land use conversion to cropland is associated mostly to removal of woody vegetation from naturally afforested farmlands abandoned in 1980s and 1990s. In 1990-2021 (excluding 2014), the increment of living biomass in forest land remaining forest land and afforested land was larger than the carbon losses due to commercial felling and natural mortality, but the gap between gains and losses was decreasing, causing reduction of the net removals of CO<sub>2</sub> in forest land. In 2022, losses in carbon

stock in living biomass exceeded gains in forest land remaining forest land, thus net GHG emissions from forest land is reported (1287.54 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.). Based on NFI data, annual living biomass stock change (including deforestation) has decreased from 13817.16 thousand m<sup>3</sup> in 1990 to 2048.73 thousand m<sup>3</sup> in 2021 and to -380.93 thousand m<sup>3</sup> in 2022. In 2022, the increased harvesting rate in forest land was related to Russia's aggression in Ukraine, disruption of the existing wood supply chains, and timber market turbulences. Latvia's wood resources had to compensate for the previous wood supply from Russia and Belarus. Summary of the net emissions including HWP is shown in Figure 2.9. Fluctuations in total GHG emissions during the last years (e.g. peak in 2014 and 2022) mostly are associated with the annual changes in CO<sub>2</sub> removals in living biomass in forest land caused by changes in forest characteristics and related management (gross annual increment of living biomass, natural mortality, harvesting rate, etc.). The most important impact factor is harvesting rate (e.g. peaks in 1999, 2014, 2022) that is also the main cause of net emission fluctuation between the last years.




Figure 2.9 Trend in net emissions from LULUCF sector in 1990-2022 (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

Absolute increase of the net annual GHG emissions in LULUCF sector in 2022 if compared to 1990 is 17334.25 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq., mostly because of reduction of the net CO<sub>2</sub> removals in living biomass in forest lands (by 18946.31 kt CO<sub>2</sub> between 1990 and 2022). Between 1990 and 2022, emissions increased also in grassland (by 547.57 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.), in wetlands (by 768.55 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.) mostly due to increased emissions from organic soil (peat used in horticulture) and in settlements (by 1165.59 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.) mostly due to increased emissions from organic and mineral soil (result of land use change to settlements) as well as increased emissions from living biomass (result of increased wood (biofuel) extraction). Reduction of emissions in cropland is caused by mineralization of organic matter in soils in cropland and due to conversion of cropland to grassland.

### 2.3.5 Trends in WASTE

In 2022, emissions have decreased by 26.9% compared to 1990, but compared to 2021 emissions have increased by 3.8% due to decrease of methane recovery in managed solid waste disposal sites. In 2022, emissions from the Waste sector were 588.16 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq., contributing

5.8% of the total GHG emissions (excluding LULUCF, including indirect CO<sub>2</sub>). Main reasons for emission decrease in Waste sector are the implementation of decent environment protection legislation, as well as decrease of national population.

GHG emissions from Waste sector have fluctuated from 1990-2000. Fluctuations in total GHG emissions in Waste sector could be explained with changes of economic situation and data availability (Figure 2.10).




Figure 2.10 Trend in GHG emissions from Waste sector in 1990-2022 (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

The main sources of GHG emissions from waste sector are Solid waste disposal (5A) and Wastewater handling (5D). Emissions from Biological treatment of solid waste (5B) increases since 2010, when biogas production plants starts to operate in Latvia. Incineration and open burning of waste (5C) in 2022 is reported as NO, because there is no incineration of waste without energy recovery.

Fluctuations in Wastewater handling sector are the main reason for GHG emission changes for period of 1990-2000. Main reasons of these fluctuations are decreased of industrial activity, decreasing of national population and implementing of more stringent environment requirements. Solid waste disposal (SWD) emissions are calculated according to First order decay method and disposed waste amount is estimated as equal rise between years 1975-2002, that gives equal growth of emissions in times series untill year 2002. Starting of methane recovery landfills causes SWD emissions decrease in years 2002–2004. Following years emissions increase gradually according to First order decay calculation method.

## 2.4 DESCRIPTION AND INTERPRETATION OF EMISSION TRENDS OF PRECURSORS AND SULPHUR DIOXIDE

The emissions trends of the precursors and sulphur dioxide emissions are presented in Figure 2.11.




Figure 2.11 Total precursors trend 1990-2022 (kt)

In 2022, the **sulphur dioxide emissions** were 3.76 kt from which 96.6% originated in the Energy sector and 3.4% from the IPPU. Since 1990 to 2022 the total SO<sub>2</sub> emissions have decreased by 96.3%. The reduction is mainly due to use of fuels with lower content of sulphur as well as fuel switching from solid and liquid types of fuel to natural gas and biomass.

**Emissions from nitrogen oxides** were 32.38 kt in 2022. 79.8% of NO<sub>x</sub> emissions generated in the Energy sector, 13.5% in Agriculture and 6.4% in IPPU. Transport sector was responsible for 37.2% of the total NO<sub>x</sub> emissions. The total NO<sub>x</sub> emissions have decreased by 66.9% from 1990 to 2022. Generally the reduction is due to decrease of total fuel consumption that was caused by transformation of national economy as well as the energy efficiency and control measures and also solid fuels and heavy liquid fuels replacement with natural gas and biomass fuels.

**Carbon monoxide** emissions were 99.89 kt, being produced generally in the Energy sector (91.1%). Other Sectors (include heating of buildings, other fuel use in agriculture, forestry, fisheries) generate the biggest part of the total CO emissions – 72.7%. The CO emission trend shows the decrease of the emissions for period 1990 - 2022 by 75.0%.

Total emissions of **non-methane volatile organic compounds** were 32.20 kt from which 39.6% comes from IPPU (mainly from Non-energy products from fuels and solvent use which constitute 35.6% from total NMVOC emissions in 2022) and 37.7% are generated in Energy sector (mainly residential stationary combustion plants). Also 22.0% from NMVOC emissions come from Agriculture mainly from manure management. The NMVOC emission trend shows a decrease of emissions for period 1990 - 2022 by 62.0%.

Emission consistency with the data used to prepare inventories of air pollutants under the EU Directive 2016/2284/EU and CLRTAP are verified.

## 3 ENERGY (CRF 1)

### 3.1 OVERVIEW OF SECTOR

#### 3.1.1 Quantitative overview

Energy sector is the main emission source in Latvia's GHG inventory in 2022 (Figure 3.1). In total, Energy sector forms 63.4% of all GHG emissions (including indirect CO<sub>2</sub>, excluding LULUCF), and largest part of it contributes to Transport sector (48.9% of Energy GHG emissions). As Latvia is located on temperate climate zone, heat production is an essential part of Latvia's energy production, thus having an impact on GHG and air pollutant emissions.




Figure 3.1 Emissions from the Energy sector (CRF 1) compared with the total emissions in 2022

Energy sector consists of two subsectors – fuel combustion (contributing 98.5%) including stationary combustion and transport emissions, and fugitive emissions (1.5%), where emissions from non-combustion processes of fuels are reported, e.g., leakages from natural gas and diffuse emissions from gasoline.

In fuel combustion (CRF 1.A), the largest part of GHG emissions contributes Transport sector (CRF 1.A.3; 49.7%) followed by Energy Industries (CRF 1.A.1; 15.8%), Other Sectors (CRF 1.A.4; 24.6%) that include heating of buildings (small combustion installations in institutions and households) and fuel use in agriculture, forestry and fisheries, Manufacturing Industries and Construction (CRF 1.A.2; 9.5%). Emissions from other sources are reported under Other (CRF 1.A.5; in the figure above depicted as Other fuel use). These emissions contribute to 0.4% from all Energy emissions.

In the following sections of Chapter 3 both emissions from fuel combustion and fugitive emissions are described.

As can be seen in Figure 3.2, the GHG emission share of subsectors in the Energy sector has changed, especially 1.A.3 Transport, 1.A.4 Other Sectors and 1.A.1. Energy Industries sector.




Figure 3.2 Share of emissions in the Energy sector (CRF 1.A) in 1990-2022 (%)

In 1990, the largest share of GHG emissions from fuel combustion was generated by Energy Industries with 32.8% and Other Sectors with 30.8% from emissions produced in Energy sector. 20.6% of emissions occurred in Manufacturing Industries and Construction sector, and the smallest share of emissions was in the Transport sector with only 15.8%. Emissions in Other (CRF 1.A.5) were not estimated until 1995.

The share of Transport emissions have grown since 1990 reaching 33.9% in 2001. Since then, Transport sector has been the largest emissions' producer in Energy sector, that can be generally explained with the increase of population's income. In 2022, Transport sector is responsible for 49.7% of Energy sector GHG emissions.

In 2022, the second largest subsector with 24.6% share is 1.A.4 Other Sectors (Commercial/Institutional (7.4%), Residential (8.7%) and Agricultural/Forestry/Fishing (8.5%)), and the third largest subsector with 15.8% share is Energy Industries. Emissions from Other (CRF 1.A.5) contribute 0.4% share from Energy emissions.

Table 3.1 GHG emissions from Energy sector (CRF 1) in 1990–2022 (kt)

Year	A Fuel combustion			B Fugitive emissions from fuels		Aggregate GHGs
	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub> , CH <sub>4</sub> , N <sub>2</sub> O
	kt			kt		kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.
1990	18645.15	11.99	1.02	0.0115	9.9033	19529.57
1995	8926.13	13.03	0.44	0.0092	7.9150	9628.98
2000	6857.75	10.92	0.40	0.0070	6.0255	7438.01
2005	7549.28	12.41	0.49	0.0062	5.3272	8175.79
2010	8024.45	9.53	0.52	0.0043	3.6642	8532.14
2011	7179.65	9.50	0.54	0.0054	2.5212	7658.93
2012	6826.96	9.91	0.57	0.0049	3.1843	7344.66
2013	6744.80	9.07	0.58	0.0080	4.0400	7266.20
2014	6541.37	8.60	0.59	0.0138	5.4127	7091.15
2015	6713.99	7.40	0.60	0.0129	4.1120	7195.32
2016	6778.18	7.40	0.58	0.0119	4.6632	7269.97

Year	A Fuel combustion			B Fugitive emissions from fuels		Aggregate GHGs
	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub> , CH <sub>4</sub> , N <sub>2</sub> O
	kt			kt		kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.
2017	6695.35	8.21	0.62	0.0157	6.1074	7260.28
2018	7196.52	8.26	0.65	0.0093	3.6381	7701.45
2019	6975.07	7.95	0.63	0.0102	3.9111	7475.05
2020	6319.82	7.09	0.62	0.0110	4.0039	6796.07
2021	6551.83	7.25	0.65	0.0109	3.9470	7036.79
2022	5944.27	7.18	0.66	0.0086	3.5158	6419.11
2022 vs 2021	-9.3%	-1.0%	2.3%	-21.1%	-10.9%	-8.8%
2022 vs 1990	-68.1%	-40.1%	-35.4%	-25.5%	-64.5%	-67.1%

Overall emissions from Energy sector have decreased from 1990 to 2022.

GHG emissions from the Energy sector in latest years (since 2000) are fluctuating with a peak point in 2007 (Figure 3.3). In the second half of 2008, a recession of the national economy started, caused by the global economic crisis. Decrease in economic output is one of the reasons why all GHG emissions in Energy sector decreased by 13.2% in 2007-2009. But in 2010, total GHG emissions increased as economy started to recover from crisis, also number of heating degree days (HDD) increased, compared to 2009.

In 2022, emissions in Energy sector are 8.8% lower than in 2021, emissions have decreased in almost all sectors with exception of CRF 1.A.5 Other.




Figure 3.3 GHG emissions from Energy sector (CRF 1) 1990–2022 (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

In CRF 1.A.1 Energy Industries sector GHG emission decrease in 2008-2009 can be explained with the recession in national economy caused by the global financial crisis, also winter in 2009 was quite warm, therefore in 2009 GHG emissions in CRF 1.A.1 decreased by 2.6% compared to 2008. In 2009-2010 an increase of emissions by 20.4% in Energy Industries was observed, mostly because global economic crisis ended. As 2011 was warmer than previous year, the fuel consumption decreased and emissions decreased. Similar fluctuations in emissions in Energy sector can be observed through later years as well. Emission decrease can also be linked to the

increase of energy efficiency in buildings that reduces use of heat and power in them. EU ETS policy promotes use of renewable energy resources, therefore decrease of fossil fuels and increase use of biomass can be observed in the sector. In 2022 emissions decrease by 30.5% compared to 2021 due to significant decrease of natural gas use in the sector.

The decrease of industrial production (CRF 1.A.2) was influenced by economic situation when national economy in financial and real estate sectors were undergoing development. Therefore, GHG emissions from CRF 1.A.2 sector decreased by 19.8% in 2008-2009. In 2011, emissions decreased by 17.5% which can be explained with great reconstructions in the steel and iron enterprise under CRF 1.A.2.a sector where the fuel consumption decreased significantly (-76.5%). In 2012 compared to 2011 the GHG emissions increased by 5.5% mainly due to intensified steel melting as emissions in CRF 1.A.2.a sector increased by 44.1%, but in 2013, largest metallurgy company went bankrupt. In 2022, emissions decreased by 8.6% compared to 2021 due to the decreased use of natural gas and solid fuel.

For the Transport sector (CRF 1.A.3) emissions decreased from 2008 to 2009 by 12.4%, that was influenced mainly by recession of the national economy and decrease of transport activities – decrease of passenger km by passenger cars and ton km by freight transport. In 2022 compared to 2021 2.6% decrease can be observed.

Emissions in CRF 1.A.4 Other Sectors are constantly decreasing since 1990, with some fluctuations from year to year. Similar as Energy Industries fluctuations can be explained with average outdoor air temperature during heating season and increase of energy efficiency in the buildings. In 2022, emissions have decreased by 1.9% compared to 2021.

Decrease of fugitive emissions since 1990 can be explained with a constant improvement of natural gas supply infrastructure. 10.9% decrease of fugitive emissions in 2022 vs 2021 can be partly explained by emission decrease from venting in transmission system because no initially planned repair works were carried out in transmission pipelines with Russia and there are no plans to carry them out at all, because these pipelines will no longer be used.




Figure 3.4 Total precursors and NH<sub>3</sub> emissions from Energy sector (CRF 1) in 1990–2022 (kt)



In 2022, the largest part of precursors contributes CO, then NO<sub>x</sub> and NMVOC emissions (Figure 3.4). Most of CO and NMVOC emissions come from wood combustion in the Residential sector, while the largest share of NO<sub>x</sub> emissions comes from Transport sector.

The biggest decrease is observed in SO<sub>2</sub> emissions where emissions decreased from 96.88 kt in 1990 to 3.63 kt in 2022. It can be explained with switching towards fuels with less sulphur content due to the implementation of National legislations for sulphur content in liquid fuels used for transport. One of the largest decreases can be observed in Energy Industries and it can be explained with change of used fuel. Consumption of liquid fossil fuel for heat production was widespread, but in latest years it was switched to biomass or gaseous fuels with lower sulphur content.

Precursors are lower in 2022 compared to 2021: NO<sub>x</sub> emissions have decreased by 3.6%, CO emissions by 2.2%, and NMVOC emissions by 5.7% but SO<sub>2</sub> emissions increased by 3.8%.

There are also ammonia emissions calculated and reported in Energy sector. In 1990-2022, NH<sub>3</sub> emissions have increased by 23.5% that can be explained with increased amounts of biomass burned in Energy Industries, Manufacturing Industries, as well as in Other Sectors (Commercial/Institutional, Residential, Agriculture/Forestry/Fisheries).

### 3.1.2 Description

#### Activity data

Both the imported (natural gas, liquid gas, oil and oil products, coal) and local energy resources (wood, peat, hydro and wind resources) are used in the Energy sector in Latvia (Table 3.2). Mainly the imported fuels (natural gas, coal) are used in combined heat and power plants and heat generation. Smaller boiler houses burn local fuel (wood) and coal as well as natural gas and other fuels.

Table 3.2 Consumption of energy resources in Latvia (TJ)

Fuel type	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
<b>Energy consumption</b>	<b>318554</b>	<b>176156</b>	<b>143519</b>	<b>178628</b>	<b>185685</b>	<b>175926</b>	<b>180678</b>	<b>182092</b>	<b>185902</b>	<b>192458</b>	<b>171334</b>	<b>179623</b>	<b>166858</b>
<b>Liquid fuels, total</b>	161191	81670	53513	68005	72021	68610	72017	73187	64782	75186	65226	67725	66912
Shale Oil	NO	78	2440	157	39	NO	7	1	8	9	1	2	NO
LPG	3691	1548	2095	2552	2103	4103	4174	4226	3892	3432	3256	3088	3298
Gasoline	26752	18130	14833	15131	12666	8922	8752	8363	8032	7638	7323	7237	6238
Jet Kerosene	3068	1172	1142	2525	4929	4530	5170	5924	6462	6637	2456	3322	6107
Other Kerosene	647	432	43	NO	NO	NO	6	4	4	1	NO	NO	NO
Diesel Oil	48023	18273	20907	36712	41923	45520	47458	49399	46098	55571	51849	53454	50057
RFO	76326	41290	9462	10231	8661	5467	6258	5154	207	1822	202	539	1112
Petroleum Coke	NO	NO	NO	429	627	NO	124	44	5	NO	60	NO	NO
Other Oil Products	2684	748	2593	268	1072	67	68	71	74	75	79	83	99
<b>Solid fuels, total</b>	26249	7225	2785	3199	4378	1950	1678	1689	1894	1644	966	719	470
Anthracite	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	27	7	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Coal	25984	7172	2759	3145	4378	1950	1651	1679	1893	1643	966	719	470
Coke	237	53	26	54	NO	NO	NO	3	1	1	NO	NO	NO
Oil Shale	28	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
<b>Peat products, total</b>	3217	3837	2392	80	46	11	34	40	135	72	51	69	92
Peat	2350	3436	2361	80	40	10	34	29	119	54	34	49	85

Fuel type	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Peat Briquettes	867	401	31	NO	6	1	NO	11	16	18	17	20	7
Natural gas	99517	41304	44962	56685	61044	45758	46751	41193	48494	45680	37754	40023	28638
Biomass, total	27501	42120	39774	49681	47655	58316	59277	64811	68946	68397	65632	69368	68990
Wood	27501	42102	39695	49124	45375	52231	53905	59118	61890	61617	58221	62339	63768
Charcoal	NO	NO	NO	60	60	60	65	66	68	87	90	89	68
Straws	NO	NO	NO	NO	60	135	161	223	414	457	426	415	281
Biofuel	NO	NO	NO	101	1116	1013	495	450	1600	1488	1989	1994	782
Landfill Gas	NO	NO	NO	251	331	422	408	423	403	364	363	365	283
Sludge Gas	NO	18	41	95	137	85	107	101	83	90	76	81	63
Other Biogas	NO	NO	NO	NO	66	3239	3328	3463	3242	2970	2961	2353	1972
Municipal Wastes	NO	NO	37	49	510	1131	808	968	1247	1324	1506	1732	1772
Other fuels, total	879	NO	94	977	540	1281	921	1172	1651	1480	1705	1719	1756
Municipal Waste	NO	NO	NO	NO	320	934	736	962	1215	1086	1270	1256	1373
Industrial Waste	NO	NO	94	125	84	284	155	180	338	320	351	372	367
Other Fossil Fuels	NO	NO	NO	6	42	33	5	3	65	61	72	78	13
Waste Oil	879	NO	NO	847	95	29	25	27	33	13	12	12	3

*Liquid fossil fuels* have an important place as energy resource. Its share was about 40.1% in 2022. The essential decrease of residual fuel oil (RFO) share in Energy Balance is explained with increasing fuel costs because of implementation of the EU Directive 1999/32/EC prescribing that sulphur content of heavy oil should not exceed 1%. The major part of the liquid fuel consumption contributes to diesel oil with approximately 74.8% from total liquid fuel consumption in 2022; diesel oil is mostly used in Transport sector. The total consumption of liquid fuels in 2022 has decreased by 58.5% since 1990. The reason for such a drastic decrease can be explained with the changes in technology (with the exception of Transport sector and Other (CRF 1.A.5)), since the technology that uses liquid fuel is replaced with one that uses natural gas and biomass.

Total share of *solid fossil fuels* in national market is low – approximately 0.3% in 2022. The solid fuel consumption in recent years has decreased. The total consumption of solid fuels in 2022 has decreased by 98.2% since 1990. Decrease of solid fuel consumption can be explained with the technology change in combustion, when solid fuel was replaced with natural gas and biomass for heat and energy production.

*Peat* and *peat briquettes* are local fuels that were used in Latvia in 1990 with 1.0% of total energy consumption. However, nowadays amounts of peat products used for stationary burning have decreased by 97.1% compared to 1990 and has 0.06% of total share in 2022. Peat was widely used in heat production, but now mostly biomass and gaseous fuels are used for both heat and electricity production.

The largest consumers of *natural gas* are combined heat and power plants, and heat generation enterprises as well as industrial enterprises. Natural gas has a stable place in total fuel consumption where its share was 31.2% in 1990 and 17.2% in 2022. Natural gas consumption has decreased by 71.2% in 1990-2022. Decrease in natural gas use could be explained with fuel switching from natural gas to biomass as well as increased energy efficiency in buildings.

*Biomass* fuels are wood and wood products, straw, charcoal, liquid biofuels (bioethanol and biodiesel), biogas (landfill gas, sludge gas, other biogas). In the total fuel consumption, the share of firewood and other wood products is substantial – 38.3% of total energy consumption in

2022, while in 1990 all biomass fuels in total made up only 8.6% from total energy consumption. Such fuels as straws have an increasing trend in the past few years.

*Industrial and municipal waste*<sup>9</sup> was also consumed and in 2022 reached 1.1% share from the total energy consumption. In 2022, consumption increased by 4.5% compared to 2021. Waste oils are reported as other fuels.

Hydroelectric power plants (HPP) and combined heat and power plants (CHP) produce part of the electrical power, while also part is imported (Table 3.3, Table 3.4). Volume of electricity generation in HPP directly depends on the through-flow of the largest river in Latvia - Daugava. Also, the import and export of electricity from other countries has a significant role in the internal electricity market in Latvia.

**Table 3.3 Heat production and consumption in Latvia (TJ)**

Year	Production	Own use and losses	Final consumption		
			CRF 1.A.2	CRF 1.A.4	TOTAL
1990	99439	15171	32929	51339	84268
1995	46112	7156	1969	36987	38956
2000	31867	6815	659	24393	25052
2005	31144	5886	684	24574	25258
2010	28662	4590	387	23685	24072
2011	25000	4104	268	20628	20896
2012	26857	4464	259	22134	22393
2013	26249	4551	479	21219	21698
2014	25747	4608	890	20249	21139
2015	25459	4358	1450	19651	21101
2016	28967	4635	2506	21826	24332
2017	29989	4668	3291	22030	25321
2018	29688	4494	3781	21413	25194
2019	28612	4288	3324	21000	24324
2020	27010	3782	2932	20296	23228
2021	31202	4261	2937	24004	26941
2022	27781	4145	2822	20814	23636

**Table 3.4 Electricity production and consumption in Latvia (TJ)**

Year	Production	Own use and losses	Import	Export	Final consumption			
					CRF 1.A.2	CRF 1.A.3	CRF 1.A.4	TOTAL
1990	23933	6883	25700	12798	11484	918	17550	29952
1995	14324	6371	9529	1408	5130	677	10267	16074
2000	14890	5203	7589	1159	5159	547	10411	16117
2005	17658	4766	10278	2545	6120	533	13972	20625
2010	23857	4626	14303	11160	5724	453	16197	22374
2011	21938	4133	14432	9950	6012	446	15829	22287
2012	22202	3636	17766	11678	7175	464	17015	24654
2013	22352	3556	18018	13140	6509	446	16719	23674
2014	18500	3138	19221	10883	6003	421	17276	23700
2015	19921	3215	18888	12330	6130	384	16750	23264
2016	23129	3513	17382	13662	6005	378	16953	23336
2017	27111	3535	14662	14893	6345	377	16623	23345

<sup>9</sup> For reporting purposes municipal waste has been divided into fossil and non-fossil fractions, but in the particular paragraph it is described as whole.

Year	Production	Own use and losses	Import	Export	Final consumption			
					CRF 1.A.2	CRF 1.A.3	CRF 1.A.4	TOTAL
2018	24210	3498	18625	15353	6630	374	16980	23984
2019	23178	3312	16599	12574	6646	363	16882	23891
2020	20609	2976	15024	9172	6709	339	16437	23485
2021	21047	3167	16799	10417	7005	351	16906	24262
2022	17990	3047	19110	10788	6636	365	16264	23265

Types of fuels used for combustion in Latvia:

**Liquid fuels** are mainly imported from Latvia's neighbouring countries (Lithuania, Belarus, Russian Federation), Scandinavian countries and others:

- shale oil;
- liquefied petroleum gas (LPG);
- motor gasoline and aviation gasoline;
- kerosene type jet fuel;
- other kerosene;
- gasoline type jet fuel;
- motor diesel oil and heating gas oil;
- residual fuel oil (RFO);
- other liquids;
- petroleum coke.

**Solid fuels** - coal and coke are mainly imported from Russian Federation, Kazakhstan and Ukraine;

**Peat products** - peat and peat briquettes are mainly domestic;

**Gaseous fuels** (natural gas) are imported from Russian Federation and Lithuania;

**Biomass fuels:**

- solid biomass – wood and other wood products, charcoal, straw - are mainly domestic;
- biogas that is produced domestically – landfill gas, used since 2002 when the first landfill started to collect and combust biogas with the energy recovery; sludge gas that is combusted with the energy recovery since 1993 largest sewage purification plant; and other biogases produced from agriculture crops, animal slurries, breweries and other agro-food industries from anaerobic fermentation;
- liquid biofuels – biogasoline and biodiesel, are mainly imported from Latvia's neighbouring countries.

**Other fuels** are municipal waste and industrial waste – used tires, different types of industrial fuel collected by and combusted in cement production plant in Latvia, as well as waste oils.

*Methodological issues*

The main methods and emission factors (EF) are presented in the Table 3.5.

**Table 3.5 Methods and emission factors used in Energy sector**

CATEGORIES	CO <sub>2</sub>		CH <sub>4</sub>		N <sub>2</sub> O	
	Method applied	Emission factor	Method applied	Emission factor	Method applied	Emission factor
1. Energy	<i>T1, T2, T3</i>	<i>CS, D, PS</i>	<i>T1, T2, T3</i>	<i>CR, CS, D, M</i>	<i>T1, T2</i>	<i>CR, D, M</i>
A. Fuel combustion	<i>T1, T2</i>	<i>CS, D, PS</i>	<i>T1, T2</i>	<i>CR, CS, D, M</i>	<i>T1, T2</i>	<i>CR, D, M</i>
1. Energy industries	<i>T1, T2</i>	<i>CS, D</i>	<i>T1</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>T1</i>	<i>D</i>
2. Manufacturing industries and construction	<i>T1, T2</i>	<i>CS, D, PS</i>	<i>T1</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>T1</i>	<i>D</i>
3. Transport	<i>T1, T2</i>	<i>CS, D</i>	<i>T1, T2</i>	<i>CR, D, M</i>	<i>T1, T2</i>	<i>CR, D, M</i>
4. Other sectors	<i>T1, T2</i>	<i>CS, D</i>	<i>T1, T2</i>	<i>CS, D</i>	<i>T1</i>	<i>D</i>
5. Other	<i>T1</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>T1</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>T1</i>	<i>D</i>
B. Fugitive emissions from fuels	<i>T3</i>	<i>CS</i>	<i>T3</i>	<i>CS</i>	<i>NA</i>	<i>NA</i>
1. Solid fuels	<i>NA</i>	<i>NA</i>	<i>NA</i>	<i>NA</i>	<i>NA</i>	<i>NA</i>
2. Oil and natural gas	<i>T3</i>	<i>CS</i>	<i>T3</i>	<i>CS</i>	<i>NA</i>	<i>NA</i>
C. CO <sub>2</sub> transport and storage	<i>NA</i>	<i>NA</i>	<i>NA</i>	<i>NA</i>	<i>NA</i>	<i>NA</i>

In fuel combustion for CO<sub>2</sub> emission calculations methods from Tier 1 to Tier 3 are used, generally Tier 2. For CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O Tier 1 and Tier 2 are used, generally Tier 1. In stationary combustion, CO<sub>2</sub> EFs are country-specific (CS), but for CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O – default values (D) from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, while in Transport country-specific, default, Corinair (CR) and model (M) values are used. For fugitive emissions, Tier 3 method and country-specific EFs are used. As from solid fuels there are only particulate matter emissions, a notation key “NA” has been used. There are no operations for CO<sub>2</sub> transport and storage therefore also a notation key “NA” is used.

*Key categories*

Key categories of Energy sector are presented in Table 3.6. They are estimated using Approach 1 and Approach 2 both by level and trend with and without taking LULUCF sector into account.

**Table 3.6 Key categories in Energy sector in 2024 submission**

Category	Gas	Identification criteria	with LULUCF	without LULUCF
1.A.1.a Public Electricity and Heat Production - Biomass Fuels	<i>N<sub>2</sub>O</i>	<i>L2, T1, T2</i>		<i>X</i>
1.A.1.a Public Electricity and Heat Production - Biomass Fuels	<i>CH<sub>4</sub></i>	<i>T2</i>		<i>X</i>
1.A.1.a Public Electricity and Heat Production - Gaseous Fuels	<i>CO<sub>2</sub></i>	<i>L1, L2, T1, T2</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>X</i>
1.A.1.a Public Electricity and Heat Production - Liquid Fuels	<i>CO<sub>2</sub></i>	<i>L1, T1, T2</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>X</i>
1.A.1.a Public Electricity and Heat Production - Peat	<i>CO<sub>2</sub></i>	<i>T1, T2</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>X</i>
1.A.1.a Public Electricity and Heat Production - Solid Fuels	<i>CO<sub>2</sub></i>	<i>T1</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>X</i>

Latvia's National Inventory Report 1990-2022

Category	Gas	Identification criteria	with LULUCF	without LULUCF
1.A.1.c Manufacture of Solid Fuels and Other Energy Industries - Gaseous Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	T1	X	
1.A.1.c Manufacture of Solid Fuels and Other Energy Industries – Peat	CO <sub>2</sub>	T1		X
1.A.2.a Iron and Steel - Gaseous Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	T1,T2	X	X
1.A.2.a Iron and Steel - Liquid Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	T1	X	X
1.A.2.a Iron and Steel - Other fossil fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	T1,T2		X
1.A.2.c Chemicals - Liquid Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	T1,T2	X	X
1.A.2.d. Pulp, Paper and Print - Gaseous Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	T1	X	X
1.A.2.e Food Processing, Beverages and Tobacco - Gaseous Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,T1	X	X
1.A.2.e Food Processing, Beverages and Tobacco - Liquid Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	T1,T2	X	X
1.A.2.e Food Processing, Beverages and Tobacco - Solid Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	T1	X	X
1.A.2.f Non-metallic Minerals - Gaseous Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,T1	X	X
1.A.2.f Non-metallic Minerals - Liquid Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	T1,T2	X	X
1.A.2.f Non-metallic Minerals - Other Fossil Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1	X	X
1.A.2.f Non-metallic Minerals - Solid Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,T1		X
1.A.2.g Other - Biomass Fuels	N <sub>2</sub> O	T2		X
1.A.2.g Other - Biomass Fuels	CH <sub>4</sub>	T2		X
1.A.2.g Other - Gaseous Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,T1,T2	X	X
1.A.2.g Other - Liquid Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,T1,L2,T2	X	X
1.A.3.b Road Transportation - Diesel Oil	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2	X	X
1.A.3.b Road Transportation - Diesel Oil	N <sub>2</sub> O	L1,L2,T1,T2		X
1.A.3.b Road Transportation - Gasoline	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2	X	X
1.A.3.b Road Transportation - LPG	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,T1	X	X
1.A.3.c Railways - Liquid Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,T1	X	X
1.A.3.c Railways - Liquid Fuels	N <sub>2</sub> O	T2		X
1.A.4.a Commercial/Institutional - Gaseous Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2	X	X
1.A.4.a Commercial/Institutional - Liquid Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2	X	X
1.A.4.a Commercial/Institutional - Peat	CO <sub>2</sub>	T1		X
1.A.4.a Commercial/Institutional - Solid Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	T1,T2	X	X
1.A.4.a Commercial/Institutional - Liquid Fuels	N <sub>2</sub> O	T2		X
1.A.4.a Commercial/Institutional - Biomass Fuels	CH <sub>4</sub>	L1,L2,T2		X
1.A.4.b Residential - Biomass Fuels	CH <sub>4</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2	X	X
1.A.4.b Residential - Gaseous Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2	X	X
1.A.4.b Residential - Liquid Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T1	X	X
1.A.4.b Residential - Solid Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	T1,T2	X	X
1.A.4.b Residential - Solid Fuels	CH <sub>4</sub>	T2		X
1.A.4.c Agriculture/Forestry/Fisheries - Gaseous Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	T1,T2	X	X
1.A.4.c Agriculture/Forestry/Fisheries - Liquid Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2	X	X
1.A.4.c Agriculture/Forestry/Fisheries - Liquid Fuels	N <sub>2</sub> O	L1,L2,T1,T2		X
1.A.4.c Agriculture/Forestry/Fisheries - Solid Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	T1	X	X

Category	Gas	Identification criteria	with LULUCF	without LULUCF
1.A.5.b Mobile - Liquid Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2		X
1.B.2.b Natural Gas	CH <sub>4</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2	X	X
1.B.2.c Venting and Flaring	CH <sub>4</sub>	T1		X

### 3.2 FUEL COMBUSTION (CRF 1.A)

Emissions from fuel combustion comprise all in-country fuel combustion, including point sources, transport and other fuel combustion. Emissions from fuel combustion in the Energy sector are divided into following subcategories:

- 1.A.1 Energy Industries;
- 1.A.2 Manufacturing Industries and Construction;
- 1.A.3 Transport (Road transport, Civil aviation, Railways and Domestic navigation);
- 1.A.4 Other Sectors (Commercial/Institutional, Residential, Agriculture/Forestry/Fisheries);
- 1.A.5 Other (Not elsewhere specified).

Reported emissions are listed in Table 3.7.

Table 3.7 Reported emissions from fuel combustion in Latvia in 2022

Source	Fuel Type	Emissions						
		CO <sub>2</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	NMVOC	SO <sub>2</sub>
<b>1.A.1 Energy Industries</b>								
<b>a. Public Electricity and Heat Production</b>								
	Liquid Fuels	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Solid Fuels	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Peat	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Gaseous Fuels	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Biomass	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Other Fuels	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
<b>b. Petroleum Refining</b>								
	Liquid Fuels	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Solid Fuels	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Peat	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Gaseous Fuels	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Biomass	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Other Fuels	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
<b>c. Manufacture of Solid Fuels and Other Energy Industries</b>								
	Liquid Fuels	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Solid Fuels	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Peat	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Gaseous Fuels	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Biomass	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Other Fuels	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
<b>1.A.2 Manufacturing Industries and Construction</b>								
<b>a. Iron and Steel</b>								
	Liquid Fuels	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Solid Fuels	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Source	Fuel Type	Emissions						
		CO <sub>2</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	NMVOC	SO <sub>2</sub>
	Peat	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Gaseous Fuels	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Biomass	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Other Fuels	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
<b>b. Non-Ferrous Metals</b>								
	Liquid Fuels	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Solid Fuels	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Peat	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Gaseous Fuels	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Biomass	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Other Fuels	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
<b>c. Chemicals</b>								
	Liquid Fuels	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Solid Fuels	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Peat	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Gaseous Fuels	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Biomass	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Other Fuels	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
<b>d. Pulp, Paper and Print</b>								
	Liquid Fuels	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Solid Fuels	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Peat	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Gaseous Fuels	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Biomass	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Other Fuels	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
<b>e. Food Processing, Beverages and Tobacco</b>								
	Liquid Fuels	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Solid Fuels	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Peat	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Gaseous Fuels	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Biomass	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Other Fuels	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
<b>f. Non-metallic minerals</b>								
	Liquid Fuels	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Solid Fuels	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Peat	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Gaseous Fuels	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Biomass	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Other Fuels	✓	✓	✓	NO	NO	NO	NO
<b>g. Other</b>								
	Liquid Fuels	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Solid Fuels	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Peat	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Gaseous Fuels	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Biomass	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Other Fuels	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
<b>1.A.3 Transport</b>								
<b>a. Civil Aviation</b>								
	Aviation Gasoline	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Jet Kerosene	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Biomass	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
<b>b. Road Transportation</b>								



Source	Fuel Type	Emissions						
		CO <sub>2</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	NMVOC	SO <sub>2</sub>
	Gasoline	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Diesel Oil	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	LPG	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Other Liquid Fuels	✓	✓	✓	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Gaseous Fuels	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	NA
	Biomass	✓	✓	✓	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Other Fuels	✓	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
c. Railways								
	Liquid Fuels	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Solid Fuels	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Gaseous Fuels	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Biomass	✓	✓	✓	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Other Fuels	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
d. Navigation								
	Residual Oil (Residual Fuel Oil)	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Gas/Diesel Oil	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Gasoline	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Other Liquid Fuels	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Gaseous Fuels	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Biomass	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Other Fuels	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
e. Other Transportation <sup>10</sup>								
	Liquid Fuels	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Solid Fuels	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Gaseous Fuels	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Biomass	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Other Fuels	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
1.A.4 Other Sectors								
a. Commercial/Institutional								
	Liquid Fuels	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Solid Fuels	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Peat	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Gaseous Fuels	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Biomass	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Other Fuels	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
b. Residential								
	Liquid Fuels	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Solid Fuels	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Peat	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Gaseous Fuels	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Biomass	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Other Fuels	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
c. Agriculture/Forestry/Fisheries								
	Liquid Fuels	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Solid Fuels	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Peat	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Gaseous Fuels	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Biomass	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

<sup>10</sup> CRF 1.A.3.e.i Pipeline transport is reported as "NO" after consultation with CSB and natural gas companies.

Source	Fuel Type	Emissions						
		CO <sub>2</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	NMVOOC	SO <sub>2</sub>
	Other Fuels	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
<b>1.A.5 Other</b>								
<b>a. Stationary</b>								
	Liquid Fuels	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Solid Fuels	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Peat	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Gaseous Fuels	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Biomass	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Other Fuels	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
<b>b. Mobile</b>								
	Liquid Fuels	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
	Solid Fuels	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Peat	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Gaseous Fuels	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Biomass	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Other Fuels	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from fuel combustion were 5944.28 kt (including Transport sector) in 2022 and accounted for 89.6% of the total CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. The biggest CO<sub>2</sub> emissions contributor is Transport sector with 3103.58 kt CO<sub>2</sub> (46.8% of total CO<sub>2</sub> emissions).

CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from fuel combustion were 10.7 kt (including Transport sector) in 2022 and accounted for 15.8% of total CH<sub>4</sub> emissions. The biggest part of CH<sub>4</sub> emissions contribute Other sectors (CRF 1.A.4) – 5.67 kt.

N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from fuel combustion were 0.66 kt (including Transport sector) and accounted 13.0% of the total N<sub>2</sub>O emissions in 2022.

### 3.2.1 Comparison of the sectoral approach with the reference approach

Reference approach (RA) is carried out using import, export, production and stock change data as well as data of fuel consumption in international aviation and navigation reported as bunkering from CSB Energy Balance.

Difference between fuel consumption estimated with RA and Sectorial Approach (SA) liquid fuels is from 3.59% in 1995 to -19.6% in 2010 (Table 3.8). Difference for solid fuels is smaller from 0.6% in 2008 to -1.6% in 2005. Difference for gaseous fuels fluctuates from 3.1% in 1993 to 0.1% in 1990. For other fuels the fluctuations are from -7.7% in 2010 to 0% in 1999-2003. For peat the fluctuations are more significant – from 130.4% in 2010 to 0% in 2002, 2011, 2012, 2014, 2015, 2017-2022.

**Table 3.8 Difference (%) between Sectoral and Reference approach data (PJ) and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions (kt)**

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
<b>Fuel consumption - Liquid fuels</b>										
SA	138.37	123.92	103.90	96.85	91.07	74.33	80.21	68.89	67.75	63.13
RA	139.74	123.06	104.10	96.51	93.07	77.00	79.64	67.35	66.37	55.12
Diff., %	1.0	-0.7	0.2	-0.4	2.2	3.6	-0.7	-2.2	-2.0	-12.7
<b>CO<sub>2</sub> emissions - Liquid fuels</b>										
SA	10353.09	9256.70	7761.03	7233.77	6831.45	5563.80	6022.35	5149.31	5056.75	4703.00
RA	10431.75	9162.88	7749.85	7179.87	6954.01	5736.05	5960.01	5018.69	4936.96	4118.94
Diff., %	0.8	-1.0	-0.1	-0.7	1.8	3.1	-1.0	-2.5	-2.4	-12.4
<b>Fuel consumption - Solid fuels</b>										

## Latvia's National Inventory Report 1990-2022

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
SA	26.25	22.51	18.76	17.09	12.17	7.22	6.85	5.63	4.18	3.64
RA	26.13	22.63	18.87	17.05	12.10	7.17	6.80	5.58	4.16	3.59
Diff., %	-0.5	0.5	0.6	-0.3	-0.6	-0.7	-0.7	-0.9	-0.5	-1.4
<b>CO<sub>2</sub> emissions - Solid fuels</b>										
SA	2408.52	2062.19	1718.08	1567.33	1116.31	662.62	628.57	516.51	383.10	333.91
RA	2426.35	2085.29	1743.79	1585.32	1136.97	679.93	646.11	545.15	411.92	362.55
Diff., %	0.7	1.1	1.5	1.1	1.9	2.6	2.8	5.5	7.5	8.6
<b>Fuel consumption - Gaseous fuels</b>										
SA	99.52	98.84	70.75	46.15	33.62	41.30	35.22	43.12	42.22	40.44
RA	99.65	100.47	72.23	47.58	34.62	42.28	36.22	44.15	43.25	41.44
Diff., %	0.1	1.6	2.1	3.1	3.0	2.4	2.8	2.4	2.4	2.5
<b>CO<sub>2</sub> emissions - Gaseous fuels</b>										
SA	5485.52	5448.37	3972.21	2591.66	1872.62	2296.46	1975.74	2416.35	2368.89	2263.35
RA	5496.73	5541.69	4058.32	2674.04	1929.74	2352.32	2033.25	2475.85	2428.49	2320.86
Diff., %	0.2	1.7	2.2	3.2	3.1	2.4	2.9	2.5	2.5	2.5
<b>Fuel consumption – Peat</b>										
SA	3.22	3.24	3.85	3.62	3.37	3.84	3.50	3.47	2.45	1.36
RA	4.15	3.93	4.62	4.12	3.68	4.24	3.93	3.81	2.63	1.46
Diff., %	29.1	21.2	20.0	13.7	9.2	10.6	12.5	9.9	7.4	7.6
<b>CO<sub>2</sub> emissions – Peat</b>										
SA	333.59	338.61	402.16	379.48	354.45	403.26	366.79	364.41	257.61	143.24
RA	433.18	411.77	483.97	432.34	387.63	446.47	413.22	401.07	276.78	153.54
Diff., %	29.9	21.6	20.3	13.9	9.4	10.7	12.7	10.1	7.4	7.2
<b>Fuel consumption - Other fuels</b>										
SA	0.88	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	0.03
RA	0.88	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	0.03
Diff., %	0.0	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	0.0
<b>CO<sub>2</sub> emissions - Other fuels</b>										
SA	64.43	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	2.09
RA	64.50	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	2.09
Diff., %	0.1	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	0.1

## Continuation of Table 3.8

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
<b>Fuel consumption - Liquid fuels</b>										
SA	52.05	52.27	51.98	53.90	55.17	54.65	59.95	65.01	60.08	54.86
RA	44.98	48.00	43.85	47.87	49.78	49.31	53.59	59.41	55.77	46.92
Diff., %	-13.6	-8.2	-15.7	-11.2	-9.8	-9.8	-10.6	-8.6	-7.2	-14.5
<b>CO<sub>2</sub> emissions - Liquid fuels</b>										
SA	3838.65	3843.15	3825.84	3978.21	4071.74	4017.93	4406.87	4770.47	4406.56	4033.42
RA	3299.69	3512.44	3217.21	3582.31	3274.63	3025.88	3948.98	4332.19	4054.50	3427.79
Diff., %	-14.0	-8.6	-15.9	-10.0	-19.6	-24.7	-10.4	-9.2	-8.0	-15.0
<b>Fuel consumption - Solid fuels</b>										
SA	2.79	3.64	2.93	2.67	2.60	3.20	3.44	4.25	4.22	3.41
RA	2.76	3.61	2.90	2.65	2.57	3.15	3.41	4.25	4.25	3.41
Diff., %	-0.9	-0.7	-0.9	-1.0	-1.0	-1.6	-0.9	0.0	0.6	0.0
<b>CO<sub>2</sub> emissions - Solid fuels</b>										
SA	255.54	333.64	268.66	251.90	244.56	301.62	323.93	399.63	397.16	320.70
RA	284.14	362.33	294.80	266.53	262.07	316.29	338.07	411.37	414.26	335.28
Diff., %	11.2	8.6	9.7	5.8	7.2	4.9	4.4	2.9	4.3	4.5
<b>Fuel consumption - Gaseous fuels</b>										
SA	44.96	52.25	53.50	55.67	55.25	56.69	58.63	56.59	55.48	50.74
RA	45.74	53.16	54.07	56.41	55.79	56.85	58.89	56.92	55.81	51.38
Diff., %	1.7	1.7	1.1	1.3	1.0	0.3	0.5	0.6	0.6	1.3
<b>CO<sub>2</sub> emissions - Gaseous fuels</b>										
SA	2502.88	2903.72	2974.76	3090.32	3070.32	3148.81	3258.51	3145.26	3081.69	2822.65
RA	2547.78	2956.23	3008.60	3133.69	3102.37	3160.29	3275.62	3166.04	3102.51	2860.18
Diff., %	1.8	1.8	1.1	1.4	1.0	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.7	1.3

## Latvia's National Inventory Report 1990-2022

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
<b>Fuel consumption – Peat</b>										
SA	2.39	1.25	1.01	0.67	0.08	0.08	0.07	0.09	0.05	0.03
RA	2.48	1.26	1.01	0.91	0.09	0.08	0.07	0.09	0.09	0.04
Diff., %	3.8	1.3	0.0	35.8	13.8	1.1	1.1	0.8	78.1	38.5
<b>CO<sub>2</sub> emissions – Peat</b>										
SA	253.22	131.85	106.52	71.33	8.48	8.49	7.44	9.56	5.41	2.70
RA	263.09	133.62	106.59	96.94	9.65	8.59	7.53	9.65	9.63	3.80
Diff., %	3.9	1.3	0.1	35.9	13.8	1.2	1.2	1.0	78.2	40.7
<b>Fuel consumption - Other fuels</b>										
SA	0.09	0.55	1.03	0.62	0.72	0.98	0.35	0.30	0.41	0.16
RA	0.09	0.55	1.03	0.62	0.72	0.97	0.35	0.30	0.40	0.16
Diff., %	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.1	-0.5	-0.9	-1.2	-1.1	-2.1
<b>CO<sub>2</sub> emissions - Other fuels</b>										
SA	7.46	41.60	77.25	46.48	54.30	72.43	26.29	22.59	31.37	12.58
RA	7.47	41.63	77.32	46.52	54.28	72.15	26.09	22.32	31.07	12.34
Diff., %	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	-0.4	-0.8	-1.2	-0.9	-2.0

Continuation of Table 3.8

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
<b>Fuel consumption - Liquid fuels</b>													
SA	56.59	50.50	49.31	49.71	51.19	53.45	53.70	56.43	56.76	56.37	54.12	55.77	56.34
RA	45.50	43.82	47.43	47.14	51.14	49.35	49.31	55.10	55.99	54.39	53.21	54.67	54.23
Diff., %	-19.6	-13.2	-3.8	-5.2	-0.1	-7.7	-8.2	-2.4	-1.4	-3.5	-1.7	-2.0	3.8
<b>CO<sub>2</sub> emissions - Liquid fuels</b>													
SA	4174.87	3704.74	3611.64	3636.22	3742.96	3914.02	3935.04	4138.33	4167.59	4144.70	3981.68	4105.64	4149.18
RA	3375.08	3190.00	3456.61	3431.10	3722.31	3594.14	3604.25	4031.05	4099.27	3986.74	3906.54	4015.59	4017.98
Diff., %	-19.2	-13.9	-4.3	-5.6	-0.6	-8.2	-8.4	-2.6	-1.6	-3.8	-1.9	-2.2	-3.2
<b>Fuel consumption - Solid fuels</b>													
SA	4.38	4.51	3.65	2.91	2.47	1.95	1.68	1.69	1.89	1.64	0.97	0.72	0.47
RA	4.38	4.51	3.65	2.91	2.47	1.95	1.68	1.69	1.89	1.64	0.97	0.72	0.47
Diff., %	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.2	-0.1	-0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>CO<sub>2</sub> emissions - Solid fuels</b>													
SA	411.88	424.18	343.26	280.51	238.75	188.26	162.05	163.11	182.87	158.73	93.26	69.42	45.38
RA	420.72	433.05	360.72	286.37	238.92	188.39	162.16	163.22	183.37	158.84	93.33	69.46	45.41
Diff., %	2.1	2.1	5.1	2.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
<b>Fuel consumption - Gaseous fuels</b>													
SA	61.04	53.53	50.30	49.99	44.80	45.76	46.75	41.19	48.49	45.68	37.75	40.02	28.64
RA	61.31	54.03	50.81	50.54	45.39	46.10	47.21	41.67	49.02	46.30	38.21	40.46	29.04
Diff., %	0.4	0.9	1.0	1.1	1.3	0.7	1.0	1.2	1.1	1.4	1.2	1.1	1.4
<b>CO<sub>2</sub> emissions - Gaseous fuels</b>													
SA	3388.97	2971.03	2786.68	2724.61	2443.64	2499.75	2599.26	2289.89	2693.62	2538.14	2093.92	2221.97	1587.44
RA	3406.26	3001.20	2816.61	2756.50	2477.43	2519.96	2626.54	2318.01	2724.95	2574.60	2120.52	2247.80	1610.86
Diff., %	0.5	1.0	1.1	1.2	1.4	0.8	1.0	1.2	1.2	1.4	1.3	1.2	1.5
<b>Fuel consumption – Peat</b>													
SA	0.05	0.04	0.03	0.06	0.04	0.01	0.03	0.04	0.14	0.07	0.05	0.07	0.09
RA	0.11	0.04	0.03	0.08	0.04	0.01	0.04	0.04	0.14	0.07	0.05	0.07	0.09
Diff., %	130.4	0.0	0.0	31.3	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>CO<sub>2</sub> emissions – Peat</b>													
SA	4.82	4.53	3.57	6.75	3.67	1.16	3.60	4.15	14.17	7.48	5.26	7.14	9.69
RA	11.21	4.55	3.60	8.89	3.67	1.14	3.71	4.19	14.07	7.36	5.22	7.10	9.56

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Diff. , %	132.4	0.5	0.9	31.7	0.1	-1.9	3.0	1.0	-0.8	-1.6	-0.9	-0.6	-1.3
<b>Fuel consumption - Other fuels</b>													
SA	0.54	0.78	0.90	1.14	1.31	1.28	0.92	1.17	1.65	1.48	1.70	1.72	1.76
RA	0.50	0.75	0.88	1.12	1.28	1.25	0.92	1.17	1.59	1.42	1.63	1.64	1.74
Diff. , %	-7.7	-4.2	-3.1	-2.4	-2.7	-2.6	-0.5	-0.3	-3.9	-4.1	-4.2	-4.5	-0.9
<b>CO<sub>2</sub> emissions - Other fuels</b>													
SA	43.91	75.17	81.81	96.71	112.35	110.81	78.23	99.87	138.27	126.02	145.70	147.66	152.58
RA	40.80	72.75	79.77	94.70	109.77	108.33	77.93	99.71	133.46	121.50	140.39	139.41	149.25
Diff. , %	-7.1	-3.2	-2.5	-2.1	-2.3	-2.2	-0.4	-0.2	-3.5	-3.6	-3.6	-5.6	-2.2

The biomass consumption in comparison is not included as this type of fuel is assumed as CO<sub>2</sub> neutral.

The amount of used tires combusted in cement production plant is reported as Other fuels as well as municipal waste combusted in the same cement production plant. According to 2006 IPCC Guidelines, used oils are also reported under the Other fuels.

### 3.2.1.1 Explanation of the difference

#### *Energy Balance*

In the Annual questionnaires, as well as in CSB online database statistical differences, distribution losses and interproduct transfer are reported for certain fuels, whereas in the RA table only stock changes are possible to insert. These data are not taken into account and are not put in stock changes' cells of the CRF Reporter RA tables. Therefore the difference in liquid fuels and peat have been quite significant for many years. For example, distribution losses for peat are quite visible, in comparison to total consumption, especially in 2010. To improve the transparency of reporting, the statistical differences, losses, as well as an interproduct transfers for the whole time series are presented in Annex A.3.1 "Energy losses, statistical differences, transfers and secondary production of products in Energy sector, TJ" of this report.

CSB estimates total consumption data by taking production, import, export, international bunkering and stock changes data into account. Final consumption data is estimated by taking into account sectoral consumption data reported by fuel consumers, excluding reported distribution losses data. Transformation of Energy sectors are not included in final consumption data. For several fuel types difference between these two estimation approaches is reported as a statistical difference that is quite significant for some fuel types – diesel oil, gasoline, residual fuel oil. For peat amount of distribution losses is also quite significant but this amount is not taken into account in RA reporting.

CSB also reports the amount of fuel that is used in interproduct transfer, but it is not reported in RA tables. Therefore the consumption of fuel in RA tables is reported even though the fuel was not consumed in Latvia, for example, for other kerosene in 2004–2008.

The changes larger than 5% between fuel consumption in RA and SA are explained below for each fuel type.




Figure 3.5 Difference in fuel consumption of Liquid fuels between RA and SA (PJ;%)

The difference in Liquid fuels consumption between different types of fuels varies from -2% to 4% until 1998, and with up to -19.6% difference in 2010 (Table 3.5). The differences after 1998 can be generally explained with statistical differences in diesel oil energy balance that are not taken into account when calculating RA, and also with interproduct transfers of RFO, shale oil, jet fuel and kerosene. For transparency purposes of reporting, the statistical differences and losses for the whole time series are presented in Annex A.3.1 of this report.




Figure 3.6 Difference in fuel consumption of Gaseous fuels between RA and SA (PJ;%)

The differences in Natural gas consumption between SA and RA are small. Largest difference 3.2% is in 1993 due to large Natural gas losses. As losses decrease difference between SA/RA reduced and is around 1% from 2000 mainly due to losses that occur every year (Figure 3.6).

For transparency purposes of reporting, the statistical differences and losses for the whole time series are presented in Annex A.3.1 of this report.




Figure 3.7 Difference in fuel consumption of Peat (including Peat briquettes) between RA and SA (PJ;%)

Among the all fuel types, for peat and peat briquettes the differences are the most significant (Figure 3.7). It is because there are significant losses of peat reported by CSB, for example, in 2003, there were 241 TJ reported by CSB as peat losses, and it can be clearly seen in difference of RA and SA - while the total consumption according to RA is 914 TJ, within SA only 673 TJ were reported. The same applies to years 2008-2011 and 2013, where losses of peat are around 10-60 TJ. With a small total peat consumption these losses immensely affect the difference between SA and RA. For transparency purposes of reporting, losses for the whole time series are presented in Annex A.3.1 of this report.




Figure 3.8 Difference in consumption of Other fuels between RA and SA (PJ;%)

The differences for Other fuels are not more than  $\pm 5\%$  (Figure 3.8), therefore they are not analysed.




Figure 3.9 Difference in consumption of Solid fuels between RA and SA (PJ;%)

Also the differences for solid fuels are no more than  $\pm 5\%$  (Figure 3.9), therefore they are not analysed.

### 3.2.1.2 Explanation of the fluctuations

Fluctuations of emissions estimated with SA and RA are more or less equal. All fuels had decreased in 1990-1995 due to continual changes of structure of the economy, inflation and collapse of the former Soviet Union industry. Still in 1995-1996 the government adopted strict rules to cut back the inflation and downward of industry, so the fuel consumption since 1995-1996 also was restructured. Since 1996 the natural gas consumption was increasing, while the other fuel consumption was increasing only after 2000, due to the development of national economy that was prepared for joining the EU. In addition, in recent years there can be seen the influence of the global economic crisis in 2007-2009 and a recovery after that in 2010-2014 with a decreasing trend of emissions. In 2014-2018 overall use of fuels has increased that can be explained with the economic growth and increased household purchasing power (increase in average salary), largest fuel consumption can be seen in Road transportation (CRF 1.A.3.b).

### 3.2.1.3 Methodological issues

The 2006 IPCC Guidelines RA for the CO<sub>2</sub> emission estimations and comparison of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions were used. CRF Reporter software was used to report emission data. Annual import, export, production, international bunkers and stock changes data divided by fuel types are put in the RA tables of CRF Reporter as well as carbon EF and coefficient of fraction of carbon oxidized.

Generally emissions are calculated by multiplying fuel consumption with country specific, plant specific or IPCC default carbon EF taking into account fraction of carbon oxidized.

Carbon EFs were estimated by taking into account net calorific values (NCV) and the molecular weight ratio of the carbon and CO<sub>2</sub>. NCV of the fuels are taken from CSB Energy Balance. The consumption of fuels is taken from CSB on-line database due to more precise data (smaller units) as in Annual Questionnaires, therefore, in order to improve transparency of the reporting, it was decided to use data from CSB Energy Balance instead of Annual Questionnaires.



For coal, peat, gasoline, diesel oil, RFO, shale oil, jet fuel, kerosene, wood, used oils and natural gas carbon EF is assumed as country specific. For several fuels NCV changes once in whole time series, but for natural gas and municipal waste NCV and also carbon EF changes for every year in whole time series. NCV and carbon emission factor ( $C_{EF}$ ) of other liquid fuels changes in every year in time series are explained with the fluctuation of other oil fuel structure (biogasoline, biodiesel, other liquid biofuels – bioethanol). Municipal waste structure also influenced  $C_{EF}$  change in 2008-2022.

Table 3.9 Carbon emission factors (t/TJ)

Fuel type	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Peat	28.93	28.93	28.93	28.93	28.93	28.93	28.93	28.93	28.93	28.93	28.93	28.93	28.93
Gasoline	18.89	18.89	18.89	18.91	18.91	18.91	18.91	18.91	18.91	18.91	18.91	18.91	18.91
Diesel oil	20.40	20.40	20.40	20.40	20.40	20.40	20.40	20.40	20.40	20.40	20.40	20.40	20.40
RFO	21.11	21.11	21.11	21.11	21.11	21.11	21.11	21.11	21.11	21.11	21.11	21.11	21.11
Shale oil	21.05	21.05	21.05	21.05	21.05	21.05	21.05	21.05	21.05	21.05	21.05	21.05	21.05
LPG	17.13	17.13	17.13	17.13	17.13	17.13	17.13	17.13	17.13	17.13	17.13	17.13	17.13
Jet fuel	19.72	19.72	19.72	19.71	19.71	19.71	19.71	19.71	19.71	19.71	19.71	19.71	19.71
Kerosene	19.72	19.72	19.72	19.72	19.72	19.72	19.72	19.72	19.72	19.72	19.72	19.72	19.72
Wood	30.01	30.01	30.01	30.01	30.01	30.01	30.01	28.86	28.86	28.86	28.86	28.86	28.86
Used oils	20.01	20.01	20.01	20.01	20.01	20.01	20.01	20.01	20.01	20.01	20.01	20.01	20.01
Natural gas	15.04	15.17	15.19	15.16	15.15	14.91	15.17	15.17	15.16	15.16	15.14	15.15	15.13
Landfill gas, sludge gas, other biogas	NO	14.90	14.90	14.90	14.90	14.90	14.90	14.90	14.90	14.90	14.90	14.90	14.90
Municipal waste (biomass)	NO	NO	6.14	6.14	23.77	12.14	11.27	10.99	10.31	12.14	11.68	12.79	4.77
Industrial waste	NO	NO	21.68	21.68	23.97	22.17	23.48	23.46	21.88	23.15	23.49	23.46	23.07
Municipal waste (non-biomass)	NO	NO	NO	NO	22.57	24.25	23.23	23.32	23.32	23.46	23.46	23.12	23.48
Petroleum coke	26.60	26.60	26.60	26.60	26.60	26.60	26.60	26.60	26.60	26.60	26.60	26.60	26.60
Anthracite	26.80	26.80	26.80	26.80	26.80	26.80	26.80	26.80	26.80	26.80	26.80	26.80	26.80
Peat briquettes	26.60	26.60	26.60	26.60	26.60	26.60	26.60	26.60	26.60	26.60	26.60	26.60	26.60
Waste oils	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00
Straws	27.30	27.30	27.30	27.30	27.30	27.30	27.30	27.30	27.30	27.30	27.30	27.30	27.30
Charcoal	30.50	30.50	30.50	30.50	30.50	30.50	30.50	30.50	30.50	30.50	30.50	30.50	30.50
Oil shale	29.10	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Coal	25.00	25.00	25.00	25.68	25.68	26.35	26.35	26.35	26.35	26.35	26.35	26.35	26.35
Coke	29.20	29.20	29.20	29.20	29.20	29.20	29.20	29.20	29.20	29.20	29.20	29.20	29.20
Other oil	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00
Biogasoline, biodiesels	NO	NO	NO	19.30	19.30	19.30	19.30	19.30	19.30	19.30	19.30	19.30	19.30

$C_{EF}$  for landfill gas, sludge gas, other biogas, petroleum coke, anthracite, peat briquettes, waste oils, straws, charcoal, oil shale, coke, biogasoline, biodiesels and other liquid biofuels taken from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines were used (Table 3.9).  $C_{EF}$  for industrial and municipal waste was estimated based on  $CO_2$  EF reported by a cement production plant within EU ETS.

### 3.2.1.4 Time-series consistency

Time series of the estimated emissions are consistent and complete because the same methodology, EFs and data sources are used for sectors for all years in time series. Emissions

from all sectors are estimated or reported as not occurring / not applicable therefore there are no "not estimated" sectors.

### 3.2.1.5 Category-specific QA/QC and verification

The best way to check RA data is to compare them with SA data that is done already in CRF Reporter. The difference between these two emission estimation and reporting methodologies has to be double-checked and explained.

Activity data are checked:

- Energy sector data is taken from the CSB Energy Balance, and it has the internal QA/QC procedures based on mathematical model and analysis to avoid logic mistakes.
- Data of RA are verified by CSB within QA and in case of inconsistency of data reported in NIR and CRF with the data in CSB Energy Balance and data reported to EUROSTAT by CSB, all the information of data mismatch is reported to LEGMC. After that, the Energy sector's sectoral expert checks the reported data and incorporates the necessary changes in the CRF and NIR. If the sectoral expert does not agree with the reported data mismatch and considers that no changes are necessary, the information is sent to CSB with the detailed explanation.

Estimated CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are checked:

- By comparing the emissions estimated with RA and SA. All significant differences (more than 5%) are double-checked. Difference has to be explained and agreed with CSB. This verification step is done for total fuel combustion sector.
- By comparing used carbon emission factor with CO<sub>2</sub> EFs used in SA.

### 3.2.2 International bunker fuels

International bunkers cover international aviation and navigation according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. Emissions from international aviation and navigation are not included in national total emissions. Taking into consideration that ports in Latvia are focused on transit cargo transport, navigation activities have big fluctuations and depend on neighbouring countries' economical and international trading activities and competitiveness of Latvian ports' with other neighbouring ports in Baltic Sea. At the same time emissions from aviation are more stable, and recent trend depicts a persistent increase by 2019. In 2022, total GHG emissions of International Bunkering (see Figure 3.10), compared to 2021, have decreased by 17.0%. GHG emissions increase in international aviation (by 81.9%) but decrease in international navigation (by 49.1%).




Figure 3.10 Emissions from International Bunkers (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

Data about international bunker fuel consumption is provided by CSB (Table 3.10). CSB split of fuel for national and international navigation/aviation is based on EUROSTAT and IEA guidelines on data collection. Defined approach concerning energy consumption allocation for international and national navigation/aviation is fully in line with the defined criteria in IPCC GPG 2000 (for more details see “Energy Statistics Manual”, IEA, EUROSTAT (2005)). In Latvia there are no situations where international marine/aviation transport departs from one port and stops in other port of Latvia for passengers or freight and then departs to final destination in other country. Therefore, implemented data collections of fuel consumption in international and national navigation/aviation fully ensure a correct allocation between national and international mode.

To provide consistent allocation of fuel consumption between domestic and international mode in the navigation and aviation, CSB each month collects and summarizes the information that is submitted by every enterprise performing fuel bunkering. For this purpose, the particular statistical report format is elaborated where the enterprises must fill in the data regarding amount of fuel sold respectively in domestic and international navigation and aviation.

Table 3.10 Energy consumption in international transport (TJ)

Year	Aviation	Navigation	
	Jet Kerosene	Diesel Oil	Residual Fuel oil
1990	3067	5014	14738
1995	1080	1105	5156
2000	1123	340	NO
2001	1123	4249	3938
2002	1166	3612	4994
2003	1685	3102	4750
2004	2031	3187	5278
2005	2463	3824	7064
2006	2765	2762	5481
2007	3371	2507	4953

Year	Aviation	Navigation	
	Jet Kerosene	Diesel Oil	Residual Fuel oil
2008	4051	1912	6699
2009	4278	2592	8851
2010	4907	2932	7592
2011	4921	3187	5800
2012	4984	3697	6374
2013	5142	3148	6658
2014	4580	2932	6780
2015	4494	5226	5440
2016	5116	6976	6226
2017	5858	5779	5116
2018	6417	1531	72
2019	6568	10523	1727
2020	2434	8541	128
2021	3275	8241	439
2022	5956	3614	999

The change of the type of fuel used on board ships stated in 2015 was resulted due to stricter requirements on the sulphur content in marine fuels used on board ships entered into force in 2015. The maximum sulphur content in marine fuels was reduced from 1.0% to 0.10% by mass. To fulfil this requirement, the consumption of diesel oil substantially increased in 2015 (Table 3.10).

In 2022, GHG emissions from international aviation, compared to 2021, have increased by 81.9% (Figure 3.10). Since 2021 was slightly relieved by travel restrictions related to COVID19, the number of aircraft flights increased. In 2022, the number of arriving and departing international flights have increased by around 43%, compared to 2021.

CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the international navigation are affected by fuel consumption depending on several factors:

- On the one hand it is affected by the port activity indicators (loaded, unloaded cargo). As shown in Figure 3.11, the total loaded and unloaded cargo volume in 2022 has increased by nearly 15.2% compared to 2021. At the same time the structure of the cargo loaded in the time span 2002 - 2022 has changed (see Figure 3.12). The main changes have affected the oil transshipment, whose share in loaded cargo volume has decreased from 15.5% to 0.01%. At the same time, the cargo in containers share in the total loaded cargo volume has increased from 1% to 8.8% but grains and grains product share increased from 1.4% to 16.8%.
- On the other hand, important reason for these fluctuation of fuel consumption in international navigation has been the variation in bunker fuel prices. Vessels can refuel in one or other country depending on fuel prices. This was the main factor for a sharp decrease in fuel consumption in 2018 and 2022 and increase in 2019.




Figure 3.11 Loaded, unloaded cargo at ports in Latvia (thsd t)




Figure 3.12 Structure of loaded goods at ports in Latvia (thsd t)

The implemented EFs for emission calculation from international navigation are displayed in Table 3.11.

Table 3.11 Emission factors used in the calculation of emissions from International Bunkering

Fuel	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	NM VOC
	kt/PJ	kt /PJ	kt /PJ	kt /PJ	kt /PJ	kt /PJ
Diesel oil	74.75	0.004	0.03	1.8475	0.1742	0.0659
RFO	77.4	0.005	0.002	1.9532	0.1822	0.0665

The methodology used for calculation of emissions from international aviation corresponds to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines Tier 2 where the amount of LTO/cruises (landing and take-off) is crucial. The calculated average specific fuel consumption of LTO have been compared and verified with Eurocontrol's emission data for time span 2005-2022. Emissions from international navigation are calculated in pursuance with the 2006 IPCC Guidelines Tier 1.

The relevant EFs are used from different sources. All of the international aviation and navigation EFs (CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O) derived from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, while the remaining factors – from EMEP/EEA 2019 (for determination of SO<sub>2</sub> EF country-specific sulphur content is applicable) (see Table 3.12 and Table 3.13).

**Table 3.12 SO<sub>2</sub> Emission factors used for diesel oil in the SO<sub>2</sub> calculation of emissions International Bunkering**

Diesel oil	Content in fuel, %	NCV, GJ/t	EF (Gg/PJ)
1990-2002	0.2	42.49	0.094
2003-2004	0.05	42.49	0.024
2004-2007	0.2	42.49	0.094
2008-present	0.1	42.49	0.047

**Table 3.13 SO<sub>2</sub> Emission factors used for RFO in the SO<sub>2</sub> calculation of emissions International Bunkering**

RFO	Content in fuel, %	NCV, GJ/t	EF (Gg/PJ)
1990-1999	3.5	40.6	1.689
2000-2009	1.5	40.6	0.724
2010-2014	1.0	40.6	0.483
2015-present	0.1	40.6	0.048

### 3.2.3 Feedstocks and non-energy use of fuels (CRF 1.AD)

#### 3.2.3.1 Category description

Under this category consumption of different types of fuels used as feedstock are reported. Emissions from these fuels are reported as “CO<sub>2</sub> not emitted” because it is assumed that in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are captured and not emitted to the air.

Consumption of Bitumen, Lubricants, Coke, White spirits and Paraffin wax is reported in 1.AD tables for all years in time series 1990–2022.

#### 3.2.3.2 Methodological issues

C<sub>EF</sub> used in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines were used for calculation:

- Bitumen - 22 t/TJ;
- Lubricants - 20 t/TJ;
- Coke - 29.2 t/TJ;
- White spirits - 20 t/TJ;
- Paraffin waxes - 20 t/TJ.

Carbon excluded from fuel combustion emissions is calculated using 2006 IPCC Guidelines Volume 2 Energy equation 6.4

$$\text{Excluded Carbon}_{fuel} = \text{Activity Data}_{fuel} * CC_{fuel} * 10^{-3} \quad (3.1)$$

where:

Excluded carbon – carbon excluded from fuel combustion emissions (kt C)

Activity Data – activity data (TJ)

CC – carbon content (ton C/TJ)

Activity data was prepared by CSB and available on CSB online database (Table 3.14).

**Table 3.14 Activity data for Feedstocks and Non-energy use of fuels in 1990–2022 (TJ)**

Year	Bitumen	Lubricants <sup>11</sup>			Coke	Other Oil <sup>12</sup>		
		Total consumption from Energy balance	Amount in Transport sector from combustion	Fuel quantity <sup>13</sup>		White spirits	Paraffin waxes	Fuel quantity <sup>14;15</sup>
1990	1633	1633	46.7	1586.3	290	84	NO	84
1991	544	1047	43.0	1004.0	105	84	NO	84
1992	84	921	40.0	881.0	132	84	NO	84
1993	167	1088	39.3	1048.7	211	84	NO	84
1994	544	1005	37.7	967.3	264	84	NO	84
1995	712	963	35.5	927.5	211	84	NO	84
1996	879	963	34.9	928.1	211	84	NO	84
1997	1633	879	34.6	844.4	316	84	NO	84
1998	2051	1005	34.9	970.1	290	126	NO	126
1999	2344	879	35.4	843.6	316	84	126	210
2000	2009	879	39.7	839.3	290	126	126	252
2001	1507	837	47.2	789.8	290	126	167	293
2002	2093	837	48.7	788.3	268	84	167	251
2003	2177	921	51.4	869.6	161	84	167	251
2004	2009	1005	54.7	950.3	188	126	251	377
2005	2512	1088	57.7	1030.3	188	126	335	461
2006	3098	1088	65.3	1022.7	161	126	251	377
2007	3349	1088	74.2	1013.8	107	84	251	335
2008	3600	1047	70.8	976.2	134	84	209	293
2009	2218	628	63.4	564.6	134	42	293	335
2010	1967	586	67.2	518.8	80	40	461	501
2011	2930	795	58.0	737.0	80	42	293	335
2012	2888	922	55.9	866.1	161	42	251	293
2013	3181	880	58.0	822.0	52	42	377	419
2014	2930	632	62.3	569.7	NO	42	335	377
2015	3349	1022	67.3	954.7	NO	42	335	377
2016	2244	1398	68.3	1329.7	NO	47	316	363
2017	2398	872	71.2	800.8	3	42	249	291
2018	2649	1122	73.9	1048.1	1	45	396	441
2019	2205	1118	75.4	1042.6	1	47	368	415
2020	2739	905	73.8	831.2	NO	56	345	401
2021	3088	961	76.6	884.4	NO	54	612	666
2022	3089	846	72.2	773.8	NO	54	467	521

Bitumen is used for Asphalt roofing and Road paving. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are reported under Non-energy Products. Additional information about CO<sub>2</sub> calculations can be found in CRF 2.D.3

<sup>11</sup> Lubricants used in Transport sector are subtracted from total consumption.

<sup>12</sup> Paraffin waxes and White spirits are included in "Other Oil" – IPCC 2006, Volume 2 Energy, Chapter 6: Reference Approach Table 6.2 Activity data for excluded carbon flows.

<sup>13</sup> Activity data entered in the CRF Table 1.A(d) Feedstock, reductants, and other non-energy use of fuels

<sup>14</sup> Activity data entered in the CRF Table 1.A(d) Feedstock, reductants, and other non-energy use of fuels

<sup>15</sup> In the CRF Table 1.A(b) Reference Approach Other oil is sum of White spirit (non-energy use), Paraffin waxes (non-energy use) and Other oil products (combustion)

Asphalt roofing and Road paving (4.5.3 Road paving with asphalt (2.D.3.b) and Asphalt roofing (2.D.3.c)).

Lubricants are used in Transport sector (3.2.6.1.2 Road transport (CRF 1.A.3.b)) and IPPU (4.5.1 Lubricant Use (CRF 2.D.1)). Excluded CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from RA are reported under Lubricant use.

Coke was used as ingredient in metallurgy to produce higher quality steel. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are reported under Iron and Steel Production (4.4.1 Iron and Steel Production (CRF 2.C.1)). Iron and steel production includes not only coke, but all emissions from Iron and Steel production process, therefore the notation key "IE" is used.

Other oils (Paraffin waxes and White spirits) mainly are used in chemical industry and wood processing. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are reported under Paraffin Wax Use, Solvent Use (4.5.2 Paraffin Wax Use (CRF 2.D.2) and 4.5.3 Other (CRF 2.D.3)). Solvent use includes not only white spirits, but also a variety of substances therefore it is not possible to determine the exact amount of CO<sub>2</sub> from white spirits exclusively, Paraffin wax emissions are calculated separately, therefore notation key "IE" is used.

### **3.2.4 Energy Industries (CRF 1.A.1)**

#### **3.2.4.1 Category description**

CRF 1.A.1 Energy Industries sector includes emissions from fuel combustion in point sources in energy and heat production. According to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, emissions from autoproducers (undertakings which generate electricity/heat wholly or partly for their own use, as an activity that supports their primary activity) are assigned to the sector where they were generated and not under CRF 1.A.1.

Emissions from combustion installations with NACE 2 codes 35.11 and 35.30 are reported in CRF 1.A.1.a sector. There are no petroleum refineries in Latvia therefore in CRF 1.A.1.b notation key „NO" is used. CRF 1.A.1 sector also includes the emissions from on-site use of fuel in the energy production facilities and emissions from manufacturing of solid fuels (peat briquettes and charcoal production plants) – these emissions are reported under 1.A.1.c Manufacture of solid fuels and other energy industries sector.

The GHG emissions were reported under following sectors:

- 1. A.1. Energy industries:
- 1.A.1.a. Public electricity and heat production:
  - 1.A.1.a.i Electricity generation;
  - 1.A.1.a.ii Combined heat and power generation;
  - 1.A.1.a.iii Heat plants;
- 1.A.1.c. Manufacture of solid fuels and other energy industries:
  - 1.A.1.c.i Manufacture of solid fuels.






Figure 3.13 GHG emissions in CRF 1.A.1. Energy Industries by subsectors (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

In Figure 3.13 there can be seen a distribution of GHG emissions in CRF 1.A.1. sector. The largest part of emissions consists of CRF 1.A.1.a Public electricity and heat production (95.2% in 2022), while CRF 1.A.1.c Manufacture of solid fuels and Other energy industries contributes only 4.8% of Energy Industry emissions. As mentioned above, there are no emissions in CRF 1.A.1.b Petroleum refining, therefore notation key “NO” is used.

Table 3.15 Emissions from Energy industries (CRF 1.A.1) in 1990–2022 (kt)

Year	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	GHGs (CO <sub>2</sub> eq)	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	NMVOC	SO <sub>2</sub>
	kt			kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.	kt			
1990	6301.72	0.19	0.038	6317.03	10.64	2.65	0.22	36.39
1995	3417.27	0.12	0.026	3427.61	6.25	1.39	0.12	22.83
2000	2491.00	0.15	0.024	2501.72	4.40	1.56	0.12	7.64
2005	2058.13	0.17	0.023	2068.99	3.61	1.66	0.12	1.61
2010	2260.90	0.20	0.027	2273.66	3.38	1.42	0.13	0.68
2011	2081.80	0.19	0.025	2093.61	3.06	1.25	0.11	0.63
2012	1864.41	0.22	0.029	1878.05	3.17	1.47	0.12	0.63
2013	1929.18	0.32	0.043	1949.47	3.45	1.73	0.15	0.65
2014	1670.10	0.38	0.050	1693.99	3.29	1.84	0.15	0.60
2015	1746.42	0.41	0.054	1772.42	3.43	1.93	0.17	0.63
2016	1821.90	0.52	0.068	1854.38	3.75	2.23	0.19	0.80
2017	1510.68	0.59	0.078	1547.69	3.69	2.43	0.20	0.91
2018	1893.32	0.61	0.081	1931.87	3.97	2.44	0.21	0.98
2019	1783.09	0.64	0.085	1823.70	3.85	2.45	0.22	1.00
2020	1328.81	0.61	0.081	1367.32	3.37	2.33	0.20	0.93
2021	1391.84	0.71	0.094	1436.64	3.65	2.60	0.22	1.11
2022	954.89	0.70	0.093	999.03	3.10	2.43	0.20	1.13
Share of Energy total, 2022	16.1%	6.5%	14.0%	15.6%	12.0%	2.7%	1.7%	31.1%
2022 vs 2021	-31.4%	-1.7%	-1.3%	-30.5%	-15.1%	-6.6%	-8.5%	1.5%

Year	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	GHGs (CO <sub>2</sub> eq)	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	NM VOC	SO <sub>2</sub>
	kt			kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.	kt			
2022 vs 1990	-84.8%	267.4%	146.0%	-84.2%	-70.9%	-8.3%	-8.3%	-96.9%

CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from CRF 1.A.1 sector have a decreasing trend with a few fluctuations (Table 3.15). Since 1990 CO<sub>2</sub> emissions have decreased by 84.8%. In the beginning of the 90's the decrease of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions is explained with economic crisis caused by changes of political and social situation in country when national economy was completely reorganized. Decrease of emissions can be explained with higher standards of physical specification of fuels and switching to fuels with lower costs and emissions – natural gas and biomass. In recent years, fluctuation of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions can be explained with colder/warmer winter changes and therefore changes in length of the heating season - it is related with the amounts of fuel used for heat and electricity production. Emission fluctuations in later years can be explained with changes of hydro power production, increase of energy efficiency in buildings as well as policies that promotes use of renewable energy resources, therefore significant decrease of fossil fuels and increased use of biomass can be observed in the sector. In 2022, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions have had significant decrease compared to 2021 – 31.4% and it is mainly due to the decreased use of natural gas (36.3%).

CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions increased in recent years, starting from 2011, due to increased use of biomass. Since 2011 up to 2022 CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions increased by 270.7% and 276.4%, respectively. If compared with CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, the increase in CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions is due to the biomass use – as it is considered as CO<sub>2</sub> neutral, it does not take place in CO<sub>2</sub> balance (CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from biomass is not included in national total), however, from biomass combustion CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions are counted. In 2022, CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions have decreased compared to 2021 by 1.7% and 1.5%.

Precursors from CRF 1.A.1 Energy Industries were estimated as well. SO<sub>2</sub> had the biggest decrease by 96.9% in 1990–2022. It can be explained with fuel switching from coal, peat and heavy fuel oils to natural gas and biomass from what SO<sub>2</sub> emissions are emitted in considerably smaller amounts. Also a strict National legislation was approved to improve the quality of used liquid fuels in country. NO<sub>x</sub> emissions have also decreased by 70.9% in 1990-2022, NMVOC emissions decreased by 8.3%, and CO emissions decreased by 8.3%. These changes can be explained with fuel switch from liquid and solid fuels to natural gas and biomass, which have lower EFs.

### 3.2.4.2 Methodological issues

The 2006 IPCC Guidelines' Tier 2 method was used to estimate CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from fuel combustion as country specific parameters were used to estimate CO<sub>2</sub> EF. However, for some fuels country-specific EFs is not available, therefore the 2006 IPCC Tier 1 method using default EFs was used. The 2006 IPCC Guidelines' Tier 1 method was used to calculate CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from the CRF 1.A.1 sector.

For calculation of all emissions from fuel combustion is used Excel databases developed by the experts from LEGMC. The general method for emission data calculation:

$$Em = EF * B_q \quad (3.2)$$

where:

$Em$  – total emissions (kt)

$EF$  – estimated or default emission factor (t/TJ)

$B_q$  – amount of fuel in thermal units (TJ)

SO<sub>2</sub> emission data are taken from the national database “2-Air” where enterprises that do any pollution activity and have A, B or C category pollution permits report their emissions and information about sulphur content in fuel used. Other precursors (NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, NMVOC) are calculated using Tier 1 and Tier 2 method.

#### Emission factors and other parameters

The main sources for EFs are:

- National studies for country specific parameters and EFs;
- Data from natural gas provider company - natural gas physical characteristics;
- 2006 IPCC Guidelines;
- EMEP/EEA 2019.

Country specific EFs were used to calculate carbon dioxide and sulphur dioxide emissions.

#### CO<sub>2</sub> emission factors

In 2004, a research by a local expert was made regarding CO<sub>2</sub> EFs for Latvia. National expert assessed influences on CO<sub>2</sub> EF and calculated CO<sub>2</sub> EF in “Methodological instructions for CO<sub>2</sub> emissions determination” study. This research was made considering the 2006 IPCC guidelines and physical characterizations of types of fuels used in Latvia.

In 2017, research “Determination of Carbon Content and Calculation of Carbon Dioxide Emission Factors”<sup>16</sup> was carried out. In this research CO<sub>2</sub> EF for coal and wood was updated.

#### Solid and liquid fuels and solid biomass

For calculating CO<sub>2</sub> EFs for liquid and solid fuels following equation was used:

$$EF_{CO_2} = \frac{C^d \cdot M_{CO_2} \cdot 1000}{Q_d^z \cdot M_C \cdot 100} \quad (3.3)$$

where:

$EF_{CO_2}$  – emission factor for CO<sub>2</sub> (kg CO<sub>2</sub>/MJ)

$Q_d^z$  – net calorific value of fuel (MJ/kg (m<sup>3</sup>))

$C^d$  – carbon content in fuel (%)

$M_{CO_2}$  – molecule weight for CO<sub>2</sub> – 44. 0098 (g/mcl)

$M_C$  – molecule weight for C – 12.011 (g/mcl)

NCV value was obtained from fuel consumers that must report the data about amount of fuel used and other relevant information to CSB within the annual reporting process (Table 3.16).

**Table 3.16 Characteristics of liquid solid and solid biomass fuels and estimated CO<sub>2</sub> emission factors**

Fuel type	Carbon content in working mass of fuel, (C <sup>d</sup> ) %	NCV, GJ/t	Oxidation factor	Emission factor (EF CO <sub>2</sub> ), t/TJ
Peat W <sub>d</sub> =40%	29.07	10.05	1	105.99
Motor gasoline (for off-roads)	83.13	44 (1990-2002)	1	69.23
		43.97 (2003-)		69.27

<sup>16</sup> Determination of Carbon Content and Calculation of Carbon Dioxide Emission Factors. Available: [https://drive.google.com/file/d/1sbh7tna1pZfohvL\\_P-EVJjvzJqCvAyBR/view](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1sbh7tna1pZfohvL_P-EVJjvzJqCvAyBR/view) (in Latvian)

Fuel type	Carbon content in working mass of fuel, (C <sup>d</sup> ) %	NCV, GJ/t	Oxidation factor	Emission factor (EF CO <sub>2</sub> ), t/TJ
Diesel oil	86.68	42.49	1	74.75
RFO	85.72	40.6	1	77.36
Shale oil	82.82	39.35	1	77.12
LPG	77.99	45.54	1	62.75
Jet fuel	85.18	43.2 (1990-2002)	1	72.25
		43.21 (2003-)		72.23
Other kerosene	85.17	43.2 (1990-2000)	1	72.24
		43.21 (2004)		72.22
		43.2 (2005-)		72.24
Other Oil Products	83.77	41.86	1	73.33
Wood <sub>wd=55%</sub>	20.11	6.7 <sup>17</sup> (1990-2016)	1	109.98
Firewood <sub>wd=51%</sub>	22.88	7.7 <sup>18</sup> (2017-)	1	108.45
Wood waste <sub>wd=57.2%</sub>	20.3	2.69 <sup>19</sup> (2017-)	1	117.32
Wood chips <sub>wd=44.7%</sub>	23.92	3.26 <sup>20</sup> (2017-)	1	98.70
Wood briquettes <sub>wd=9.65%</sub>	48.1	16.78 (2017-)	1	105.03
Pellete wood <sub>wd=7.38%</sub>	49.83	17.54 (2017-)	1	104.01
Coal	67.32	28.46 (1990-2002)	1	94.08
		26.22 (2003-2012)		91.60
		24.1 (2013-)		96.54

For fuels mentioned below default CO<sub>2</sub> EFs from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Volume 2, Chapter 2 Stationary combustion, Table 2.2, were taken due to unavailability of country specific data:

- coke – 107 kt/PJ;
- peat briquettes – 97.5 kt/PJ;
- landfill gas – 54.6 kt/PJ;
- sludge gas – 54.6 kt/PJ;
- other biogas – 54.6 kt/PJ;
- biodiesel – 70.8 kt/PJ;
- straws – 100 kt/PJ;
- waste oils – 73.3 kt/PJ.

#### Natural gas

For calculating CO<sub>2</sub> EF for natural gas following equation was used:

$$EF_{CO_2} = \frac{C^d * M_{CO_2}}{M_c * 100} * \rho \quad (3.4)$$

where:

$EF_{CO_2}$  – emission factor for CO<sub>2</sub> (t/1000m<sup>3</sup>)

$C^d$  – carbon content in fuel (%)

$M_{CO_2}$  – molecule weight for CO<sub>2</sub> – 44.0098 (g/mcl)

$M_c$  – molecule weight for C – 12.011 (g/mcl)

$\rho$  – natural gas density – for transition from density to mass units (t/1000m<sup>3</sup>)

Data of carbon content and natural gas density for 1990-2016 were obtained from only natural gas supplier JSC “Latvijas Gāze” that collected/measured these data by themselves (Table 3.17).

<sup>17</sup> Wood NCV – GJ/tight m<sup>3</sup>

<sup>18</sup> Firewood NCV – GJ/tight m<sup>3</sup>

<sup>19</sup> Wood waste NCV – GJ/bulk m<sup>3</sup>

<sup>20</sup> Wood chips NCV – GJ/bulk m<sup>3</sup>

In 2017 and after that information about natural gas density and carbon content was received from JSC "Conexus Baltic Grid". After liberalization of the Latvian gas market JSC "Conexus Baltic Grid" was handed over the natural gas infrastructure (main transmission system and underground gas storage). NCV values to calculate data further in energy units were taken from CSB.

**Table 3.17 Characteristics of natural gas and estimated CO<sub>2</sub> emission factors**

Year	Carbon content in working mass of fuel, (C <sub>d</sub> )	Natural gas density, (ρ)	Oxidation factor	Emission factor, (EF CO <sub>2</sub> )	Net calorific value, (NCV)
	%	t/1000m <sup>3</sup>		t/1000m <sup>3</sup>	GJ/1000 m <sup>3</sup>
1990	74.33	0.687	1	1.8703	33.93
1991	74.33	0.687	1	1.8703	33.93
1992	74.36	0.692	1	1.8863	33.60
1993	74.15	0.697	1	1.8924	33.70
1994	74.04	0.691	1	1.8757	33.68
1995	74.26	0.689	1	1.8745	33.71
1996	74.30	0.686	1	1.8673	33.29
1997	74.39	0.685	1	1.8658	33.29
1998	74.35	0.686	1	1.8680	33.29
1999	74.31	0.684	1	1.8627	33.28
2000	74.32	0.688	1	1.8733	33.65
2001	74.36	0.688	1	1.8735	33.71
2002	74.36	0.686	1	1.8686	33.61
2003	74.38	0.685	1	1.8672	33.63
2004	74.39	0.684	1	1.8641	33.54
2005	74.40	0.684	1	1.8633	33.54
2006	74.39	0.684	1	1.8639	33.53
2007	74.38	0.683	1	1.8609	33.48
2008	74.38	0.683	1	1.8622	33.53
2009	74.41	0.686	1	1.8704	33.62
2010	74.42	0.686	1	1.8692	33.67
2011	74.43	0.686	1	1.8698	33.69
2012	74.31	0.686	1	1.8665	33.69
2013	74.34	0.688	1	1.8751	34.41
2014	74.36	0.692	1	1.8857	34.57
2015	74.41	0.697	1	1.9009	34.80
2016	74.40	0.698	1	1.9020	34.21
2017	74.42	0.697	1	1.9012	34.20
2018	74.44	0.697	1	1.9022	34.25
2019	74.45	0.697	1	1.9008	34.21
2020	74.51	0.697	1	1.9024	34.30
2021	74.48	0.693	1	1.8920	34.08
2022	74.73	0.697	1	1.9091	34.44

Fluctuation in the natural gas EF is due to changes of the natural gas composition. NCV and carbon content fluctuations are related to quality of the natural gas received.

### SO<sub>2</sub> emission factors

SO<sub>2</sub> EFs were calculated by equation taken from EMEP/EEA 2019 by national expert considering physical characterizations of types of fuels used in Latvia and national and international legislation. Percentage amount of sulphur content in used fuels is taken from the national

database “2-Air” where polluters report the sulphur content data for certain types of fuels (Annex A.3.1 “Sulphur content and SO<sub>2</sub> EFs by fuel type in Energy sector (excluding Transport)”).

EFs for SO<sub>2</sub> are calculated by using following equation:

$$EF_{SO_2} = 2 * \left(\frac{s}{100}\right) * \frac{1}{Q} * 10^6 * \left(\frac{100-r}{100}\right) * \left(\frac{100-n}{100}\right) \quad (3.5)$$

where:

EF – emission Factor (kg/TJ)

2 – SO<sub>2</sub> / S (kg/kg)

s – sulphur content in fuel (%)

r – retention of sulphur in ash (%)

Q – net calorific value (TJ/kt)

10<sup>6</sup> – (unit) conversion factor

n – efficiency of abatement technology and/or reduction efficiency (%)

### Other emission factors

The default CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O EFs used in estimation of emissions were taken from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Volume 2, Chapter 2 *Stationary combustion*, Table 2.2.

EFs for NO<sub>x</sub>, NMVOC and CO were taken from EMEP/EEA 2019, 1.A.1 Energy Industries, Table 3-2 (coal, coke), Table 3-3 (peat, peat briquettes), Table 3-4 (LPG, biogas), Table 3-5 (RFO), Table 3-6 (liquid fuels, including biodiesel), Table 3-7 (biomass), Table 3-12 and Table 3-17 (natural gas). EFs used in 2024 submission are listed in Table 3.18.

**Table 3.18 CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, NMVOC emission factors used in CRF 1.A.1. Energy Industries (kt/PJ)**

Fuel type	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	NO <sub>x</sub>	NMVOC	CO
Diesel oil	0.003	0.0006	0.065	0.0008	0.0162
RFO	0.003	0.0006	0.142	0.0023	0.0151
LPG	0.001	0.0001	0.089	0.0026	0.039
Jet fuel	0.003	0.0006	0.065	0.0008	0.0162
Other kerosene	0.003	0.0006	0.065	0.0008	0.0162
Other liquid	0.003	0.0006	0.065	0.0008	0.0162
Shale oil	0.003	0.0006	0.065	0.0008	0.0162
Coal	0.001	0.0015	0.209	0.0010	0.0087
Coke	0.001	0.0015	0.209	0.0010	0.0087
Peat briquettes	0.001	0.0015	0.247	0.0014	0.0087
Peat	0.001	0.0015	0.247	0.0014	0.0087
Natural gas	0.001	0.0001	0.089	0.0026	0.0390
			0.048	0.0016	0.0048
Wood	0.030	0.0040	0.081	0.00731	0.0900
Sludge gas	0.001	0.0001	0.089	0.0026	0.0390
Landfill gas	0.001	0.0001	0.089	0.0026	0.0390
Other biogas	0.001	0.0001	0.089	0.0026	0.0390
Biodiesel	0.003	0.0006	0.065	0.0008	0.0162
Straws	0.030	0.0040	0.081	0.00731	0.0900
Waste oils	0.030	0.0040	0.065	0.0008	0.0162

### Activity data

Emissions from fuel combustion are mainly calculated using fuel consumption data from the CSB Energy Balance. Data on fuel consumption in CRF 1.A.1 sector is presented in Annex A.3.1 “1.A.1 Energy Industries”.

The CSB data collection system is based on detailed compulsory survey 2-EK (annual). Form 2-EK "Survey on acquisition and consumption of energy resources" is collected from about 6000 enterprises and organizations (with all kinds of economic activity) included in the lists of suppliers of statistical information.

Approximately 6000 respondents were surveyed - all enterprises of the local and public administration employing 10 or more persons, other enterprises employing 80 and more persons, as well as enterprises with largest statistical units with turnover of 50% of total industry, and other enterprises that CSB considers to be significant enough to include in the CSB Energy Balance, for example, with large imports of coal and oil products as well as wooden briquettes and chip pellets manufacturers. Enterprises and organizations that are not included in the above mentioned selection were surveyed by random sampling and the acquired results were extrapolated afterwards. Survey 2-EK represents the basic tool for creating energy balances at a country level. The amount of methane from combusted landfill gas is described in Chapter 7.2 Solid waste disposal and is consistent with numbers of recovered amounts of landfill gas in Waste sector (CRF 5.A). The amount of methane from combusted sludge gas is given by only Sludge gas combustion enterprise and is consistent with numbers of gas, recovered from Wastewater handling sector (CRF 5.D).

Fuel consumption by fuel types in 1990-2022 in Energy Industries sector can be seen in Figure 3.14. Gaseous fuels are mostly used in Energy Industries in this time period. Liquid fuels were mostly used in the beginning of 1990-ties and in the beginning of 2000 the use of them notably decreased. The amounts of biomass consumed is constantly increasing, while the consumption of solid fossil fuels and peat have decreased.





Figure 3.14 Fuel consumption in Energy Industries (CRF 1.A.1) for 1990-2022 (PJ)

Use of liquid fuel in 1990–2022 for the two sub-sectors of 1.A.1 Energy Industries sector decreased by 97.2%. It can be explained with fuel switching when liquid fuels were switched to cheaper fuels. Also, a stronger legislation contributed fuel switch to the type of fuels with lower level of emissions. It also explains why consumption of solid fuels have decreased (by 98.7%). Use of peat decreased by 97.5% and gaseous fuels by 69.0% in comparison with 1990. In 2021-2022 fuel consumption increased for liquid fuels (almost 3 times), peat (130.4%), but decreased

for solid fuel (58.3%) and natural gas (36.3%). Consumption of biomass fuel has significantly increased in 1990–2022 for more than 50 times. Solid biomass is a local fuel and has lower costs therefore liquid and solid fuels were replaced with it. And due to biomass CO<sub>2</sub> neutrality, enterprises switched from fossil fuels to biomass. In 2022, biomass consumption has decreased by 1.7% compared to 2021.



**Figure 3.15 Fuel consumption in Main activity electricity and heat production (CRF 1.A.1.a) and HDD in Latvia (PJ;HDD)**

As can be seen in Figure 3.15 the fuel consumption in 1.A.1.a sector can be related with HDD with an exception of the beginning of 1990s when Soviet Union collapsed and reorganizations took place in Latvia. From 1997 to 2002 in years where energy consumption reduced, the HDD were also reduced. In 2006-2008 average temperature had quite high therefore the fuel consumption of combined heat plants and heat plants for heat production decreased as there was limited need for heat production. In 2009-2010 the average temperature was lower and the use of fuel consumption increased. However, in 2011 the fuel consumption decreased because of a relatively warm winter, and in 2012 the consumption of fuel continued to decrease despite the fall of average temperature (hence the decrease in HDDs), that could be explained with the better heat insulation installed in houses and therefore less heat needed.

### 3.2.4.3 Uncertainties and time-series consistency

Uncertainty analysis for 2024 submission is carried out by using Approach 1. Quantitative estimates of uncertainties are provided in Annex 2. Overall description of uncertainty analysis is included in Section 1.6.

Uncertainty of activity data for fuel combustion in CRF 1.A.1 is  $\pm 2\%$  in 2022. CSB gives approximately 2% statistical sample error for statistical data. According to CSB, since data is obtained using information given by respondents, this number is a variation coefficient which characterizes selection of respondents. Total variation coefficient for energy balance is within 2-3%. In Latvia all fossil fuels (oil, natural gas and coal) are imported and import and export statistics are fairly accurate.



Uncertainty of activity data for solid biomass was assigned 1% as biomass activity data was collected by CSB with questionnaires sent by enterprises consuming biomass. Uncertainty activity data for peat combustion was assigned 2%. Uncertainty of landfill gas stationary combusted in enterprises covered by CRF 1.A.1 Energy Industries was assumed rather low – 2% because the combusted fuel amount is obtained directly from landfill plant that has precise measurement equipment for accounting of combusted fuel.

CO<sub>2</sub> EF was estimated according to the physical characterization of used fuels in country based on average NCV reported by fuel consumers and carbon content, hence the uncertainty for liquid fuels was assigned as quite low – about 10%. As EFs for other fossil fuels were taken from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, the uncertainty was assumed 20%. EF uncertainty for peat and peat briquettes was assumed 10% because peat EF is country specific. CO<sub>2</sub> EF for natural gas was assumed rather low – as 5% because annual plant specific fuel data is used to estimate EF. Uncertainty for coal is assumed 3% provided in 2017 national research “Determination of Carbon Content and Calculation of Carbon Dioxide Emission Factors”.

CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O EFs used in estimation of emissions were taken from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Volume 2, Chapter 2 *Stationary combustion*, Table 2.12, that provides the range of default values for uncertainties. The uncertainty of both CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O EFs of 50% was assigned similarly as in previous submissions – 50%.

Time series of the estimated emissions are consistent and complete because the same methodology, EFs and data sources are used for sectors for all years in time series. Emissions from all sectors are estimated or reported as not occurring / not applicable, therefore there are no “not estimated” sectors.

#### **3.2.4.4 Category-specific QA/QC and verification**

All the documentation and information received for inventory purposes are archived in FTP folder (maintained by LEGMC).

##### *Activity data verification*

All sources of energy data are presented in the corresponding NIR chapter (3.2.4.2 Methodological issues), as well as the disaggregated data at the finest level possible are presented in the corresponding Annex A.3.1. Data completeness has been explained in the previous subchapter.

Activity data has been verified with the data provider – CSB, that has its own internal QA/QC procedures based on mathematic model and analysis to avoid logic mistakes. When activity data is received, the sectoral expert responsible for the emission estimation and reporting is comparing all the changes of the data with the previous inventory, and all changes are explained in the corresponding subchapter. All fluctuations or changes in NCVs are double checked and agreed with CSB.

Activity data used in SA are also compared with activity data used in RA estimations. All significant differences ( $\pm 5\%$ ) are explained in the corresponding subchapter. Apparent consumption reported in GHG inventory has been compared with activity data form AQ in Annex A.3.3.

*Emission factor verification*

For country-specific CO<sub>2</sub> EFs, the sources of the calorific values, carbon content and oxidation factors, as well as these values are provided in 3.2.4.2 Methodological issues.

Country specific CO<sub>2</sub> values for year are compared with default ones available in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Volume 2, Chapter 2 *Stationary combustion*, Table 2.2. Whether country specific CO<sub>2</sub> EF is or is not in the confidence interval can be seen in Table 3.19.

**Table 3.19 Comparison of country specific and the 2006 IPCC Guidelines default CO<sub>2</sub> emission factor values (kt/PJ)**

Fuel type	Lower	CS	Upper
Gasoline	67.50	71.18	73.00
Diesel oil	72.60	74.75	74.80
RFO	75.50	77.36	78.80
LPG	61.60	62.75	65.60
Jet fuel	69.70	72.23	74.40
Other kerosene	70.80	72.24	73.70
Other liquid	72.20	73.30	74.40
Shale oil	67.80	77.12	79.20
Peat	100.00	105.99	108.00
Natural gas	54.30	55.52	58.30
Wood	95.00	109.98	132.00
Firewood	95.00	108.45	132.00
Wood waste	95.00	117.32	132.00
Wood chips	95.00	98.70	132.00
Wood briquettes	95.00	105.03	132.00
Pellete wood	95.00	104.10	132.00
Coal	89.50	91.60 (1990-2002)	99.70
		94.08 (2003-2013)	
		96.54 (2013-)	

All country specific values incorporate in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines default CO<sub>2</sub> EF value range.

*Emission verification:*

To verify the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, logical mistakes are checked on the time series of the activity data, EFs and emissions consistency to display all significant and illogical changes in the activity data and emissions. The emissions of precursors in the database are cross-checked with emissions reported within CLRTAP for verification purposes.

CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are compared with emissions in RA estimations, and all significant differences ( $\pm 5\%$ ) are explained in the corresponding subchapter.

**3.2.4.5 Category-specific recalculations**

No recalculations were done for this sector.

**3.2.4.6 Category-specific planned improvements**

No improvements are planned for this sector.

### 3.2.5 Manufacturing Industries and Construction (CRF 1.A.2)

#### 3.2.5.1 Category description

CRF 1.A.2 Manufacturing industries and construction sector includes emissions from fuel combustion in combustion installations for industrial production including emissions from off-road. CRF 1.A.2 sector also includes the emissions from on-site use of fuel in the industrial production facilities (autoproducers) – these emissions are reported under particular sub-sectors of CRF 1.A.2 according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.

According to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Volume 2, Chapter 2 *Stationary combustion*, Table 2.1., emissions arising from off-road and other mobile machinery in industry should be taken out as a separate subcategory. These emissions are calculated together from gasoline and diesel oil use in particular subsectors within CRF 1.A.2. It also ensures the consistency between CLRTAP and UNFCCC data.

CRF 1.A.2 Manufacturing industries and Construction sector is split into subsectors that are in line with the 2006 IPCC Guidelines/CRF Reporter structure:

- 1.A.2.a Iron and steel;
- 1.A.2.b Non-ferrous metals;
- 1.A.2.c Chemicals;
- 1.A.2.d Pulp, paper and print;
- 1.A.2.e Food processing, beverages and tobacco;
- 1.A.2.f Non-metallic minerals;
- 1.A.2.g Other:
  - 1.A.2.g.i Manufacturing of machinery;
  - 1.A.2.g.ii Manufacturing of transport equipment;
  - 1.A.2.g.iii Mining (excluding fuels) and quarrying;
  - 1.A.2.g.iv Wood and wood products;
  - 1.A.2.g.v Construction;
  - 1.A.2.g.vi Textile and leather;
  - 1.A.2.g.vii Off-road vehicles and other machinery;
  - 1.A.2.g.viii Other.




Figure 3.16 GHG emissions in CRF 1.A.2. Manufacturing industries and Construction by subsectors (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

In Figure 3.16 there can be seen a distribution of GHG emissions in CRF 1.A.2 sector. The largest part of emissions are contributed by CRF 1.A.2.f Non-metallic minerals (41.9% in 2022) and CRF 1.A.2.g Other (41.8% in 2022), where emissions from Machinery, Transport equipment, Mining and quarrying, Wood processing, Construction, Textiles, Offroads and Other products are produced. In CRF 1.A.2.e Food processing, beverages and tobacco 11.5% of CRF 1.A.2 GHG emissions are produced in 2022. Such sectors as CRF 1.A.2.a Iron and Steel, 1.A.2.b Non-ferrous metals, 1.A.2.c Chemicals, 1.A.2.d Pulp, Paper and Print contributes to 0.1%, 0.1%, 4.0% and 0.7% from total CRF 1.A.2 GHG emissions in 2022, accordingly.

Table 3.20 Emissions from Manufacturing industries and construction (CRF 1.A.2) in 1990–2022 (kt)

Year	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	GHGs (CO <sub>2</sub> eq)	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	NMVOC	SO <sub>2</sub>
	kt			kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.	kt			
1990	3909.78	0.24	0.184	3965.32	18.73	22.82	3.92	24.33
1995	1905.58	0.14	0.063	1926.34	10.11	4.65	1.65	15.08
2000	1156.55	0.12	0.058	1175.48	5.47	3.72	1.46	4.70
2005	1143.59	0.23	0.069	1168.50	4.30	5.29	1.14	1.56
2010	1073.71	0.37	0.087	1107.03	4.23	4.92	0.78	0.99
2011	872.49	0.44	0.108	913.20	3.77	5.38	0.84	0.81
2012	917.06	0.49	0.121	963.02	4.24	5.87	0.84	0.94
2013	761.63	0.51	0.123	808.44	4.00	5.51	0.72	0.83
2014	691.29	0.57	0.123	739.87	3.94	5.74	0.71	0.90
2015	640.34	0.56	0.118	687.39	3.76	5.52	0.61	0.84
2016	576.87	0.50	0.110	620.00	3.49	5.05	0.59	0.79
2017	619.25	0.51	0.114	663.89	3.40	4.92	0.59	0.76
2018	704.21	0.60	0.127	754.63	3.78	5.73	0.70	0.88
2019	625.85	0.58	0.120	674.09	3.62	5.83	0.71	0.86
2020	607.88	0.61	0.125	658.03	3.73	5.47	0.72	0.87
2021	604.44	0.63	0.127	655.60	3.87	5.46	0.68	0.85
2022	545.02	0.69	0.142	601.93	4.24	6.00	0.73	0.98
Share of Energy total, 2022	9.2%	6.4%	21.5%	9.4%	16.4%	6.6%	6.0%	26.9%
2022 vs 2021	-9.8%	9.4%	12.2%	-8.2%	9.7%	9.9%	8.6%	15.2%
2022 vs 1990	-86.1%	187.1%	-22.9%	-84.8%	-77.3%	-73.7%	-81.3%	-96.0%

Emissions from CRF 1.A.2 significantly decreased in 1990 to 2001, which can be explained with collapse of Soviet Union and following reformations and reorganizations within Latvia after that. Since 2001 the emissions started to increase until 2006, because of development in national economy and industry, as well as growing demand of industrial production (Table 3.20). Growth in GHG emissions in the given time period were caused by increased amounts of coal and natural gas consumed. Crisis in national economy in the 2008 caused a decrease in total emissions. The increasing amounts of solid biomass consumption caused a drop in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. The national economy was affected by the global financial crisis in 2008-2009 influencing significantly the decrease of GHG emissions by 19.8%. The development of EU ETS influenced biomass consumption for 2008-2009 in CRF 1.A.2 sector that was growing, while amounts of almost all the other fuels decreased. In 2010-2013 emissions were fluctuating mainly due to reconstruction of the largest steel producer company (from 2011 to 2012). As it replaced its furnace to electric one, the emissions decreased, however, in 2013 due to several reasons it initiated bankruptcy, therefore the amounts of production decreased significantly afterwards. From 2012-2016 CO<sub>2</sub> emissions have constantly decreased. Currently, CRF 1.A.2 produces only 9.4% of total GHG emissions in Energy sector, thus emissions in this sector have decreased by 84.8% compared to 1990. In comparison to 2021 CRF 1.A.2 emissions decreased by 8.2% in 2022.

Due to increase of biomass consumption CH<sub>4</sub> emissions have increased more than two times in 1990-2022. N<sub>2</sub>O emissions have decreased by 22.9% since 1990 due to decrease of the fossil fuel used in sector.

Also precursors from CRF 1.A.2 sector were estimated. In this sector all precursors have decreased: NO<sub>x</sub> emissions have decreased by 77.3%, CO emissions – by 73.7%, NMVOC by 81.3% and SO<sub>2</sub> emissions have a decrease by 96.0% in 1990–2022. The decrease in emissions is explained with fuel switching to natural gas and biomass, and there are less NO<sub>x</sub> and CO emissions from these fuels comparing with solid and liquid fuels.

### 3.2.5.2 Methodological issues

#### *Methods*

The 2006 IPCC Guidelines' Tier 2 method was used to estimate CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from fuel combustion as country specific parameters were used to estimate CO<sub>2</sub> EFs. However, for some fuels there are no country-specific EFs, therefore the 2006 IPCC Tier 1 method using default EFs was used. To calculate CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from Industrial and Municipal waste plant specific values was applied. The 2006 IPCC Guidelines' Tier 1 method was used to calculate CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from the CRF 1.A.2 sector.

Calculation of all emissions from fuel combustion were made with Excel databases developed by the experts from LEGMC.

The general method for emission data preparation was used:

$$Em = EF * B_q \quad (3.6)$$

where:

*Em* – total emissions (kt)

*EF* – estimated or default emission factor (t/TJ)

*B<sub>q</sub>* – amount of fuel in thermal units (TJ)

*Emission factors and other parameters*

The main sources for EFs are:

- National studies for country specific parameters and EFs;
- Data from only natural gas supplier company of natural gas physical characteristics;
- EU ETS reports (for used tires and municipal waste);
- 2006 IPCC Guidelines;
- EMEP/EEA 2019.

Country specific EFs were used to calculate CO<sub>2</sub> and SO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

**CO<sub>2</sub> emission factors**

CO<sub>2</sub> EFs for CRF 1.A.2 Manufacturing Industries and Construction sector are estimated with the same equations and using the same method as for CRF 1.A.1 Energy industries sector with the exception for industrial waste and municipal waste that are not combusted in CRF 1.A.1 sector.

For some fuels default CO<sub>2</sub> EFs from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Volume 2, Chapter 2 Stationary combustion, Table 2.3, were taken due to unavailability of country specific data:

- other liquid fuels – 73.3 kt/PJ;
- coke – 107 kt/PJ;
- anthracite – 98.3 kt/PJ;
- oil shale – 107 kt/PJ;
- petroleum coke – 97.5 kt/PJ
- peat briquettes – 97.5 kt/PJ;
- other biogas – 54.6 kt/PJ;
- biodiesel – 70.8 kt/PJ;
- straws – 100 kt/PJ;
- waste oils – 73.3 kt/PJ.

Municipal waste

CO<sub>2</sub> EFs of municipal waste combusted in the cement production plant are taken from plant's annual GHG report within EU ETS for 2008-2022. This CO<sub>2</sub> EFs are estimated by using plant specific data about combustion installation as well as net calorific value and carbon content measured and obtained in the plant laboratory. The 2006 IPCC Guidelines state separate non-biomass and biomass parts of the municipal waste. It has been done in submission 2024 as follows: CO<sub>2</sub> emissions reported to EU ETS have been taken from 2008-2022 for non-biomass part. EFs given in the reports are for whole emissions and it is possible to calculate the EF for non-biomass fraction. EFs for total CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and for non-biomass fraction are provided in Table 3.21.

**Table 3.21 CO<sub>2</sub> emission factors, carbon content and NCV for municipal waste by waste types**

Municipal waste type	2008	2010	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
	<b>Total CO<sub>2</sub> EF, kt/PJ</b>									
<i>Ecofuel 1</i>	85.19	82.69							87.44	87.27
<i>Ecofuel 2</i>			88.85	85.13	85.44	85.45	85.97	85.97	84.70	83.76
	<b>Fossil CO<sub>2</sub> EF, kt/PJ</b>									
<i>Ecofuel 1</i>	44.16	35.11							41.70	40.51
<i>Ecofuel 2</i>			42.31	42.62	45.76	46.72	46.18	46.10	44.98	45.63
	<b>C content, %</b>									

Municipal waste type	2008	2010	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
	<b>Total CO<sub>2</sub> EF, kt/PJ</b>									
Ecofuel 1	23.25	22.57							23.86	23.82
Ecofuel 2			24.25	23.23	23.32	23.32	23.46	23.46	23.12	22.86
	<b>NCV, TJ/kt</b>									
Ecofuel 1	22.78	19.59							21.59	21.70
Ecofuel 2			20.21	20.84	21.36	21.54	20.77	21.54	23.34	23.04
	<b>Biomass content, %</b>									
Ecofuel 1	48.2%	57.5%							52.3%	53.6%
Ecofuel 2			52.4%	49.9%	46.4%	45.3%	46.3%	46.4%	46.9%	45.5%

For estimating biomass emissions the following equation was used:

$$E_{biomass} = E_{total} - E_{non-biomass} \quad (3.7)$$

where:

$E_{biomass}$  – CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from biomass fraction (kt)

$E_{total}$  – total CO<sub>2</sub> emissions (kt)

$E_{non-biomass}$  – CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from biomass fraction (kt)

The calculated results for total CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from municipal waste, as well as from biomass and non-biomass fraction can be found in Table 3.22.

**Table 3.22 CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from municipal waste non-biomass and biomass fractions by waste types**

Municipal waste type	2008	2010	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
	<b>Fossil CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, t</b>									
Ecofuel 1	6856	26440							79738	77702
Ecofuel 2			83051	62691	82173	103849	93342	109179	29173	42689
	<b>Biomass CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, t</b>									
Ecofuel 1	6370	35835							87459	89685
Ecofuel 2			91323	62540	71245	86106	80421	94422	25763	33809
	<b>Total CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, t</b>									
Ecofuel 1	13226	62275							167198	167387
Ecofuel 2			174374	125231	153418	189955	173763	203602	54936	76498

### Industrial waste

EFs for CO<sub>2</sub> emission estimation for industrial waste – used tires, neutralised polluted soil, waste wood, fluffy tyre, wood processing residues and shredded rubber – combusted in CRF 1.A.2.f Non-metallic minerals (cement production) for years 1999–2022 are used from GHG emission reports that plant submitted under EU ETS (Table 3.23). These CO<sub>2</sub> EFs are estimated at the plant by using plant specific data about combustion installation as well as NCV and carbon content measured and obtained in the plant laboratory. Also for this fuel type biomass and non-biomass emissions have been calculated, as this fuel contains biomass.

**Table 3.23 CO<sub>2</sub> emission factors, carbon content and NCV for industrial waste**

Industrial waste	1999	2000	2005	2010	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
	<b>Total CO<sub>2</sub> EF, kt/PJ</b>											
Used tyres	79.44	79.44	79.44	85.00	85.00	85.00	85.00	85.00	85.00	85.00	85.00	85.00
Fluffy tyres					88.22	85.21	85.84	87.40	84.29	85.53	86.77	83.27
NPS					72.90	91.93	89.01	69.60	87.51	91.68	88.37	94.95
Waste wood				117.60								
	<b>Fossil CO<sub>2</sub> EF, kt/PJ</b>											
Used tyres	56.93	56.93	56.93	60.91	60.91	60.91	60.91	60.91	60.91	60.95	60.91	60.91

Industrial waste	1999	2000	2005	2010	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
<b>Total CO<sub>2</sub> EF, kt/PJ</b>												
Fluffy tyres					45.23	47.72	57.51	55.40	44.29	34.00	31.49	39.95
NPS					59.70	51.46	31.11	30.35	10.61	28.08	19.83	21.36
Waste wood				15.88	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00				
<b>C content, %</b>												
Used tyres	21.68	21.68	21.68	23.20	23.20	23.20	23.20	23.20	23.20	23.20	23.20	23.20
Fluffy tyres					24.08	23.26	23.43	23.85	23.00	23.34	23.68	22.73
NPS					19.90	25.09	24.29	18.99	23.88	25.02	24.12	25.91
Waste wood				32.09								
<b>NCV (TJ/kt)</b>												
Used tyres	26.21	26.21	26.21	26.21	26.21	26.21	26.21	26.21	26.21	26.21	26.21	26.21
Fluffy tyres					31.34	30.23	31.93	32.09	31.48	31.28	29.22	33.06
NPS					17.46	15.10	13.28	16.73	15.54	15.11	14.92	14.37
Waste wood				13.18								
<b>Biomass content, %</b>												
Used tyres	28.3%	28.3%	28.3%	28.3%	28.3%	28.3%	28.3%	28.3%	28.3%	28.3%	28.3%	28.3%
Fluffy tyres					48.7%	44.0%	33.0%	36.6%	47.5%	60.3%	63.7%	52.0%
NPS					18.1%	44.0%	65.1%	56.4%	87.9%	69.4%	77.6%	77.5%
Waste wood				86.5%								

For estimating biomass emissions, the above mentioned equation (3.7) for municipal waste is used.

Since 2005 the cement production plant is participating in EU ETS therefore estimated CO<sub>2</sub> EF is verified by accredited verifiers and approved by the State Environmental Service.

### SO<sub>2</sub> emission factors

SO<sub>2</sub> EFs for all fuels, except industrial and municipal waste, in CRF 1.A.2 Manufacturing Industries and Construction sector are estimated with the same equations and using the same method as for CRF 1.A.1 Energy industries sector.

For industrial and municipal waste SO<sub>2</sub> EFs are taken from EMEP/EEA 2019, Chapter 5.C.1.b, Table 3-1 (0.047 kg/Mg) and Chapter 5.C.1.a, Table 3-1 (0.087 kg/Mg).

### Other emission factors

List of other EFs can be seen in Table 3.24.

The default CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O EFs are taken from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Volume 2, Chapter 2 *Stationary combustion*, Table 2.3. Gasoline EFs are used for CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emission estimation from off-roads (2006 IPCC Guidelines, Volume 2, Chapter 3 *Mobile combustion*, Table 3.3.1.). As there is no information on distribution between 2-stroke and 4-stroke engines, it was assumed that 25% of consumed gasoline is combusted in 2-stroke engines, while 75% - in 4-stroke engines. Such an assumption has been made, based on Danish data presented in EMEP/EEA 2019 for air pollutants' calculations.

NO<sub>x</sub>, CO and NMVOC EFs used in estimation of emission from stationary combustion were taken from EMEP/EEA 2019, Chapter 1.A.21, Tables 3-13, EMEP/EEA 2019, Chapter 1.A.2, Tables 3-2 to 3-5 and EMEP/EEA 2019, Chapter 1.A.4 Small combustion, Table 3-26, Table 3-27, Table 3-45 and Table 3-46. For industrial waste and municipal waste NO<sub>x</sub>, CO and NMVOC EFs are taken from EMEP/EEA 2019, Chapter 5.C.1.b, Table 3-1 and Chapter 5.C.1.a, Table 3-1. For CRF 1.A.2.g.v.ii Off-road vehicles and other machinery NO<sub>x</sub>, CO and NMVOC EFs are taken from EMEP/EEA 2019 1.A.2.g.vii Non-road mobile sources and machinery Table 3.2.



Table 3.24 CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O, NO<sub>x</sub>, NMVOC, CO emission factors (kt/PJ<sup>21</sup>)

Fuel type		CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	NO <sub>x</sub>	NMVOC	CO
Gasoline	2-stroke	0.130	0.0004	2.58 <sup>22</sup>	116.72 <sup>22</sup>	695.13 <sup>22</sup>
	4-stroke	0.050	0.002	6.48 <sup>22</sup>	15.71 <sup>22</sup>	800.36 <sup>22</sup>
Diesel oil (off-road)		0.00415	0.0286	12.41 <sup>22</sup>	1.15 <sup>22</sup>	6.81 <sup>22</sup>
Diesel oil		0.003	0.0006	0.513	0.025	0.066
RFO		0.003	0.0006	0.513	0.025	0.066
LPG		0.001	0.0001	0.074	0.023	0.029
Jet fuel		0.003	0.0006	0.513	0.025	0.066
Other kerosene		0.003	0.0006	0.513	0.025	0.066
Other liquid		0.003	0.0006	0.513	0.025	0.066
Petroleum coke		0.003	0.0006	0.513	0.025	0.066
Other oil products		0.003	0.0006	0.513	0.025	0.066
Shale oil		0.003	0.0006	0.513	0.025	0.066
Coal		0.01	0.0015	0.173	0.0888	0.931
Coke		0.01	0.0015	0.173	0.0888	0.931
Anthracite		0.01	0.0015	0.173	0.0888	0.931
Oil shale		0.01	0.0015	0.173	0.0888	0.931
Peat briquettes		0.01	0.0015	0.173	0.0888	0.931
Peat		0.002	0.0015	0.173	0.0888	0.931
Natural gas		0.001	0.0001	0.074	0.023	0.029
				0.073 <sup>23</sup>	0.000360 <sup>23</sup>	0.024 <sup>23</sup>
Wood		0.03	0.004	0.04 <sup>23</sup>	0.03 <sup>23</sup>	0.002 <sup>23</sup>
				0.091	0.3	0.57
Other biogas		0.001	0.0001	0.181 <sup>24</sup>	0.016 <sup>24</sup>	0.265 <sup>24</sup>
				0.074	0.023	0.029
Biodiesel		0.003	0.0006	0.513	0.025	0.066
Industrial waste (used tyres)		0.03	0.004	0.87	7.4	0.07
Municipal waste		0.03	0.004	1.071	0.0059	0.041
Waste oils		0.03	0.004	0.513	0.025	0.066

There is a different approach regarding CRF 1.A.2.f Non-metallic minerals subsector and corresponding subsector under IPPU (CRF 2.A.1 Cement production). Until 2010 emissions of precursors under CRF 2.A.1 sector were calculated using EMEP/CORINAIR 2007 and EMEP/EEA 2019 methodology, but afterwards these emissions were automatically detected at plant site, and measurements were taken from the main chimney. However, as these values are measured directly from the chimney, there is no way to allocate emissions under the Energy and IPPU sectors separately (there are both emissions from fuel combustion and technological processes). Regarding calculation of precursors, to avoid double counting, the following fuel types (used tyres, petroleum coke, wood, coal, natural gas consumed in "SCHWENK") are subtracted from Energy part (from CRF 1.A.2.f subsector) and their emissions can be considered as included elsewhere (CRF 2.A.1 sector under IPPU) in case of "SCHWENK". However, as "SCHWENK" is not the only company under CRF 1.A.2.f subsector, fuel consumption and emissions appear from the other enterprises. As for GHGs, these emissions are taken from EU ETS reports (CO<sub>2</sub>) reported by "SCHWENK" or calculated (CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O), therefore can be allocated under the appropriate sectors.

<sup>21</sup> For precursors for gasoline, industrial and municipal waste – kg/Mg

<sup>22</sup> IEF for year 2021 – kg/t. Calculations made using Tier 2 method from EMEP/EEA 2019 1.A.2.g vii Non-road mobile sources and machinery Table 3-2, Table 3-3 and Table 3-4.

<sup>23</sup> Tier 2 EF for emission calculations from Natural gas use in sector CRF 1.A.2.g – kt/PJ.

<sup>24</sup> Tier 2 IEF for emission calculation from Wood combustion in 2021 sector CRF 1.A.2.g – kt/PJ

### Activity data

Mainly emissions from fuel combustion are calculated using fuel consumption data from the CSB Energy Balance. The data collection system for CRF 1.A.2 sector is the same as for CRF 1.A.1 sector. Data on fuel consumption in 1.A.2 sector is presented in Annex A.3.1 "1.A.2 Manufacturing Industries and Construction".

Autoproducers data prepared by CSB is taken into account calculating emissions from CRF 1.A.2 sector according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.

Gasoline combustion is reported as off-roads in CRF 1.A.2 sector. Also, total diesel oil combustion is reported as off-road in CRF 1.A.2 sector, with exception for sectors: CRF 1.A.2.a (stationary combusted 35% from total diesel oil combustion), CRF 1.A.2.g.i (stationary combusted 1% from total diesel oil combustion) and CRF 1.A.2.g.v (stationary combusted 1% from total diesel oil combustion).




Figure 3.17 Fuel consumption in Manufacturing Industries and Construction (CRF 1.A.2) for 1990-2022 (PJ)

The most of the fuel types with an exception of biomass and other fossil fuels have decreased in 1990-2022 (Figure 3.17). Liquid fuels have the biggest decrease 92.0%. It is explained with fuel switching processes when liquid fuels were replaced with other cheaper fuels. Also stronger legislation contributed fuel replacement to the type of fuels with lower level of emissions. Decrease of natural gas (-87.2%) reflects the total decrease of industrial production if compared with 1990.

Since 1990 solid fuel consumption have decreased by 77.0% and by 33.0% in comparison with previous year mainly due to decreased fuel consumption in CRF 1.A.2.f Non-metallic mineral sector.

During the 1990s natural gas consumption started to decrease steadily with some minor exceptions due to fuel replacement processes and development of national economy or due to the changes in demand. In 1990-2022 natural gas consumption have decreased by 87.2% and in 2021-2022 consumption have decreased by 30.5%.

Consumption of biomass have increased significantly by more than 30 times compared to 1990. Large availability of the fuel in-country as well as development of EU ETS were reasons for liquid and solid fuels' replacement with biomass and natural gas.

Consumption of used tires and municipal waste in Mineral production (information about waste burnt in cement production company taken from „SCHWENK”, the only company which combusts used tires and municipal waste for energy purposes) reported as other fossil fuels have increased by approximately 50 times since 1999. The increase was influenced by intensified cement production caused by increased demand of construction materials and sharp development of construction sector. In the category other fossil fuels waste oils are also reported, and the amount of this fuel is fluctuating over the years with a decreasing trend in recent years. But in 2021-2022 consumption increased by 6.8%.

### 3.2.5.3 Uncertainties and time-series consistency

Uncertainty analysis for 2024 submission is carried out by using Approach 1. Quantitative estimates of uncertainties are provided in Annex 2. Overall description of uncertainty analysis is included in Section 1.6.

Uncertainty for activity data of fuel combustion in CRF 1.A.2 sector is  $\pm 2\%$  in 2022. CSB gives approximately 2% statistical sample error for statistical data. According to CSB, as data is obtained using information given by respondents, this number is a variation coefficient which characterizes selection of respondents. Total variation coefficient for energy balance is within 2-3%. In Latvia all fossil fuels (oil, natural gas and coal) are imported and import and export statistics are fairly accurate.

Uncertainty of activity data for solid biomass was assigned 1% as biomass activity data was collected by CSB (with questionnaires sent by enterprises consumed biomass). Uncertainty for peat combustion activity data was assigned 2%.

Uncertainty of other fuels consumption – municipal and industrial waste used in mineral production is assumed also low as 2% as the activity data is obtained from only one producer within EU ETS therefore the data is verified by accredited verifier and Regional Environmental Board.

CO<sub>2</sub> EF was estimated according physical characterization of used fuels in country based on average NCV reported by fuel consumers and carbon content so uncertainty for liquid fuels was assigned as quite low - about 10%. The same uncertainty level was assigned for peat. However, for combustion of solid fuels and other fossil fuels (waste oils) the uncertainty of CO<sub>2</sub> EF was assigned higher - to 20% because CO<sub>2</sub> EF of anthracite and coke was taken from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. CO<sub>2</sub> EF for natural gas was assumed rather low - as 5%, because plant specific fuel data is used to estimate EF. Uncertainty for coal is assumed 3% provided in 2017 research “Determination of Carbon Content and Calculation of Carbon Dioxide Emission Factors”.

CO<sub>2</sub> EFs for industrial and municipal waste are assumed as 2% as were determined in accredited laboratory of cement production company.

CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O EF used in estimation of emissions was taken according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Volume 2, Chapter 2 *Stationary combustion*, Table 2.12., which provides the range of default values for uncertainties. The uncertainty both for CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O EFs was assigned as uncertainties used in previous submissions – 50%.

Time series of the estimated emissions are consistent and complete because the same methodology, EFs and data sources are used for sectors for all years in time series. Emissions from all sectors are estimated or reported as not occurring/not applicable therefore there are no “not estimated” sectors.

### 3.2.5.4 Category-specific QA/QC and verification

All documentation and information received for inventory purposes are archived in FTP folder (maintained by LEGMC).

#### *Activity data verification*

All sources of energy data are presented in the corresponding NIR chapter Methodological issues.

In addition, disaggregated data at the finest level possible are presented in the corresponding Annex A.3.1. Data completeness has been explained in the previous subchapter.

Activity data has been checked at the data provider – CSB, that has its own internal QA/QC procedures based on mathematic model and analysis to avoid logic mistakes. When activity data is received, the sectoral expert responsible for the emission estimation and reporting is comparing all data changes with the previous inventory, and all the changes are explained in the corresponding subchapter. All fluctuations or changes in NCVs are double checked and agreed with CSB.

All activity data used in SA are also compared with activity data used in RA estimations. All significant differences ( $\pm 5\%$ ) are explained in the corresponding subchapter. Apparent consumption reported in GHG inventory has been compared with activity data form AQ in Annex A.3.3.

#### *Emission factor verification*

For country-specific CO<sub>2</sub> EFs, the sources of the calorific values, carbon content and oxidation factors, as well as these values are provided in corresponding NIR chapter Methodological issues.

Country specific CO<sub>2</sub> values for year are compared with default ones available in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Volume 2, Chapter 2 *Stationary combustion*, Table 2.2. Information on the country specific CO<sub>2</sub> EF, can be seen in Table 3.25.

**Table 3.25 Comparison of country specific and the 2006 IPCC Guidelines default CO<sub>2</sub> emission factor values (kt/PJ)**

Fuel type	Lower	CS	Upper
Gasoline	67.50	71.18	73.00
Diesel oil	72.60	74.75	74.80
RFO	75.50	77.36	78.80
LPG	61.60	62.75	65.60
Jet fuel	69.70	72.23	74.40
Other kerosene	70.80	72.24	73.70
Other liquid	72.20	73.30	74.40
Shale oil	67.80	77.12	79.20
Peat	100.00	105.99	108.00
Natural gas	54.30	55.52	58.30
Wood	95.00	109.98	132.00
Firewood	95.00	108.45	132.00
Wood waste	95.00	117.32	132.00
Wood chips	95.00	98.70	132.00
Wood briquettes	95.00	105.03	132.00

Fuel type	Lower	CS	Upper
Pellete wood	95.00	104.10	132.00
Coal	89.50	91.60 (1990-2002)	99.70
		94.08 (2003-2013)	
		96.54 (2013-)	

All country specific values incorporate in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines default CO<sub>2</sub> EF value range.

#### *Emission verification:*

To verify the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, logical mistakes are checked. It is done by checking the time series of the activity data, EFs and emissions consistency to display all significant and illogical changes in the activity data and emissions. The emissions of precursors GHGs in the database are cross-checked with emissions reported within CLRTAP for verification purposes.

CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are compared with emissions in RA estimations, and all significant differences ( $\pm 5\%$ ) are explained in the corresponding subchapter.

#### 3.2.5.5 Category-specific recalculations

No recalculations were made for this sector.

#### 3.2.5.6 Category-specific planned improvements

No improvements are planned for this sector.

### 3.2.6 Transport (CRF 1.A.3)

#### 3.2.6.1 Category description

This section describes GHG emissions resulting from transport fuel combustion. In 2022, this source category was responsible for around 31.0% of total GHG emissions in Latvia, reaching 3141.7 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. (see Figure 3.18).




Figure 3.18 GHG emissions development in Transport 1990–2022 (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

Emissions from Transport (CRF 1.A.3) include all domestic transport sectors: Civil aviation, Road Transport, Railways and Domestic navigation.

In 2022, total GHG emissions in the Transport sector, compared to 1990, have increased by 3.4%. GHG emissions in 2022, compared to 2021, were by 2.6% lower.

Peak of GHG emissions in Transport sector has been recognized in 2007 when emissions exceeded 1990 level by 27.5%.

Road transport constitutes a convincing majority of the total GHG emissions in the Transport sector. In 2022, it gave around 97.1% of total emissions but the next largest emission source was railway – 2.5% (see Figure 3.19).

CO<sub>2</sub> emissions constitute nearly 98.8 % of the total GHG emissions in the Transport sector and they are key categories in Road transport and Railway as well (see Figure 3.20).




Figure 3.19 GHG emissions in Transport sector by sub-sectors in 2022 (%)




Figure 3.20 GHG emissions in Transport sector by gases in 2022 (%)

One of the critical factors influencing CO<sub>2</sub> emission is the amount and type of the consumed fuel. In 2022, total fossil fuel consumption (excluding consumption of lubricants) in the transport sector, compared to 2021, has decreased by 2.5%. In different subsectors various

changes have taken place in 2022. The main impact to changes in total fuel consumption related to decreasing of fuel consumption is in road transport where the fuel consumption has decreased by around 2.5%. At the same time, fuel consumption in railways declined by 5.7%.

It has to be emphasised that the additional impact on CO<sub>2</sub> emission changes in transport sector is caused also due to the increase of the share of diesel fuel in the total consumption.

In total (excluding electricity and lubricants), road transport consumes around 97.3%, railway – about 2.3% and domestic civil aviation and domestic navigation – the remaining share of fuel.

Diesel oil is the major fuel type in the Transport sector in Latvia, and it constitutes 80.6%, followed by gasoline – 14.0%, but LPG constitutes 3.5% and biofuels (biodiesel and bioethanol) 1.6% of the total fuel consumption in Transport sector (see Figure 3.21). Biofuel includes biodiesel and bioethanol and it is mainly used in road transport, but small portion of biodiesel is consumed in railway as well. In 2022, compared to 2021, gasoline and LPG consumption declined by 14.5 and 8.8% respectively. In 2022, compared to 2021, diesel oil and natural gas consumption increased by 0.3% and 56.4% respectively.




Figure 3.21 Fuel consumption in transport by fuel type in 2022 (%)

#### 3.2.6.1.1 Civil aviation (CRF 1.A.3.a)

In Latvia, civil aviation, excluding international flights, has really a small impact to development of GHG emissions in transport sector. Therefore the fuel consumption and thus also the volume of GHG emissions is comparably insignificant, constituting mere 0.15% of GHG emissions from the Transport sector in 2022. In aviation emissions are calculated for aviation gasoline and jet kerosene. The aviation gasoline is mainly used by small-sized propeller planes but jet kerosene is used by airplanes with turbofan and turbo props engines.




Figure 3.22 GHG emissions in civil aviation (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

In Latvia, there are two airports for commercial aviation, of which the largest is the Riga International Airport. Considering that local commercial flights are very dependent on the strategy of local state owned airline company; the number of flights, fuel consumption and emission amount are quite unsteady over the years. As it can be seen, after the state owned (80.05% of shares) national airline company (Air Baltic Corporation) had aborted domestic commercial flights in 2009, fuel consumption had decreased dramatically in 2009. The main activities in civil aviation are related to private flights. Economic recovery that started in 2011 has fostered activity and fuel consumption in civil aviation in Latvia. The results from additional analyses indicate no evidence of any certain trend in gasoline and jet fuel consumption. In 2017, Air Baltic Corporation restarted the commercial domestic flights. Thus the consumption of jet kerosine in 2017 increased by 2.8 times, compared to 2016. Due to this change, the total GHG emissions in civil aviation in 2017 increased by 2.3 times compared to 2016 as well. In 2022, GHG emissions in civil aviation, compared to 2021, have increased by around 2.6 times.

#### Methods

When calculating emissions from civil aviation, two approaches have been applied. The 2006 IPCC Guidelines Tier 1 method has been applied when estimating emissions from aviation gasoline for all gases. When calculating emissions from jet kerosene Latvia uses Tier 1 to estimate emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> and SO<sub>2</sub>, and Tier 2 to estimate CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O and all other gases. Using Tier 2 approach, emissions for LTO (landing/take off) and cruise are calculated individually. Separate EFs are provided for LTO and Cruise activities. Prior to the emission calculation, representative aircraft type was selected, for which the fuel consumption and emission data exist in the EMEP database (EMEP/EEA 2019).

1. *Total Emissions = LTO Emissions + Cruise Emissions*
2. *LTO Emissions = Number of LTOs \* Emission Factor of LTOs*
3. *LTO Fuel Consumption = Number of LTOs \* Fuel Consumption per LTO*
4. *Cruise Emissions = (Total Fuel Consumption – LTO Fuel Consumption) \* EF Cruise*

The summary of the latest key category assessment, methods and EFs used is presented in Table 3.26.



Table 3.26 Summary of source category description (CRF 1.A.3.a)

CRF	Gas	Method	EF
1.A.3.a	CO <sub>2</sub>	T1	D
	CH <sub>4</sub>	T1, T2	D
	N <sub>2</sub> O	T1, T2	D

### Activity data

The data about fuel consumption (Table 3.27) in aviation is derived from the CSB. CSB has started to separate fuel consumption for domestic flights from total fuel consumption data in aviation since 2006. For the time period 1990 – 2005 the data for fuel consumption is used from the study (“Evaluation of fuel consumption for domestic aviation and navigation”, IPE, 2004). For 2004 onwards, the air flight statistics is provided by the Riga and Liepaja airports.




Figure 3.23 Fuel consumption in domestic civil aviation (TJ)

Table 3.27 Fuel consumption in domestic civil aviation (TJ)

Year	Jet kerosene	Gasoline
1990	0.8	0.2
1995	5.4	1.1
2000	18.8	4.0
2001	21.4	4.6
2002	23.7	5.1
2003	25.5	5.4
2004	43.0	5.7
2005	38.0	6.0
2006	43.0	6.4
2007	19.0	8.4
2008	33.0	6.0
2009	2.0	1.7
2010	2.0	4.0
2011	2.0	7.0

Year	Jet kerosene	Gasoline
2012	24.0	7.0
2013	43.0	4.0
2014	43.0	4.0
2015	18.0	6.0
2016	20.0	7.0
2017	56.0	6.0
2018	10.0	6.0
2019	11.7	4.0
2020	10.5	8.0
2021	11.5	14.0
2022	50.0	15.0

### Emission factors

Default EFs of LTO and cruise (jet kerosene) for civil aviation is used (2006 IPCC Guidelines and EMEP/EEA 2019).

**Table 3.28 Emission factors used in the calculation of emissions from civil aviation**

Fuel type	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	NM VOC	SO <sub>2</sub>
	kt/PJ	kt/PJ	kt/PJ	kt/PJ	kt/PJ	kt/PJ	kt/PJ
Aviation gasoline	70.0	0.0005	0.002	0.25	0.1	0.05	0.023

#### 3.2.6.1.2 Road transport (CRF 1.A.3.b)

The road transport constituted around 97.1% of GHG emissions in the Transport sector in 2022. After the rapid growth in the period 2000 – 2007 (see Figure 3.24), emissions in 2009 have sharply decreased. The main reason was a sharp decrease of fuel consumption in the Road transport in 2009. It decreased by 12.8%, compared to 2008. The major reason for this tendency was recession of the national economy and decrease of transport activities – decrease of passenger km by passenger cars and ton km by freight transport. GHG emissions in 2022 are by 2.5% less than in 2021. Relative, emissions decreased from passenger cars and motorcycles but increased by light commercial vehicles.

The road transport is widely used for the local transportation and also for providing cross-border transportation. The freight road transport approximately constitutes 66.3% (2022) of the total freight in the country (traffic of goods in ton-km). The share has decreased slightly (by around 0.9% point), compared to 2021. In the freight road transport (traffic of goods in ton), the inland freight constitutes approximately 79% of the last 10 years– mining and quarrying products, agriculture products and timber products are dominant. Fuel consumption in road transport has decreased by around 5.3% in 2022 compared to 2021. In different fuels various changes have taken place in 2022, compared to 2021. Diesel fuel consumption has increased by 0.3%, gasoline consumption has decreased by 14.5% and LPG consumption by 8.8% whereas biofuel consumption has decreased by 67.0% (see Figure 3.28).




Figure 3.24 GHG emissions in road transport (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

Road transport includes five vehicle categories: Passenger cars, Buses, Heavy duty-vehicles (HDV), Light duty-vehicles (LDV) and Mopeds & Motorcycles. In 1990–2022, essential changes have taken place in structure of GHG emissions created by the road transport (Table 3.29). Gasoline has been the most common fuel used for road transport up to 2000, but in 2022 the amount of diesel used for road traffic is 5.6 times more as gasoline and the emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> from diesel surpassed the emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> from gasoline as from 2001.

In 2021, GHG emissions from gasoline consumption created by passenger cars were less than that of 1990 level, while emissions created by diesel oil consumption in passenger cars have increased several times. Emissions of LDV and HDV gasoline consumption have decreased, but the emissions of diesel oil fuel consumption have essentially increased at this time span.

Table 3.29 GHG emissions in road transport by vehicle types (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

Year	Passenger Cars		LDV		HDV	
	Gasoline	Diesel	Gasoline	Diesel	Gasoline	Diesel
1990	1192	32	74	19	485	580
1995	846	27	83	30	374	464
2000	856	104	55	70	143	692
2001	934	183	50	94	126	925
2002	939	220	42	106	105	969
2003	951	268	37	120	96	1016
2004	984	322	34	137	73	1065
2005	971	374	31	157	64	1141
2006	1088	464	30	184	62	1254
2007	1205	603	29	220	54	1399
2008	1106	628	25	217	42	1283
2009	924	620	22	204	30	1071
2010	840	739	20	205	24	1127
2011	777	524	20	209	23	997

Year	Passenger Cars		LDV		HDV	
	Gasoline	Diesel	Gasoline	Diesel	Gasoline	Diesel
2012	656	529	18	231	21	934
2013	594	587	17	254	18	935
2014	582	677	16	282	17	959
2015	580	782	16	308	15	1023
2016	566	838	16	330	14	1018
2017	545	922	14	343	13	1117
2018	523	980	13	344	11	1107
2019	496	1049	12	358	10	1098
2020	477	1015	11	357	9	1009
2021	472	1091	11	379	8	1047
2022	404	1072	9	397	6	1050
Trend 2022 vs 1990 (%)	-66.1	3261.4	-87.4	1991.6	-98.7	81.1
Trend 2022 vs 2021 (%)	-14.4	-1.8	-11.0	4.9	-19.8	0.2




Figure 3.25 CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in road transport by vehicle types (kt)

CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are directly fuel-use dependent and, in this way, the development in the emissions reflects a trend in the fuel consumption. As shown in Figure 3.25, the most important emission source for the road transport is passenger cars and HDV vehicles followed by LDV, buses and motorcycles. Share of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from passenger cars was 51.5%, HDV and buses 34.7 % and LDV 13.6% in 2022. In 2022, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in road transport, compared to 2021, have decreased by 2.5%.




Figure 3.26 CH<sub>4</sub> emissions in road transport by vehicle types (kt)

CH<sub>4</sub> emissions present consistent decrease trend within the whole period (see Figure 3.26). In 2022, CH<sub>4</sub> emissions in road transport, compared to 2021, have decreased by 10.3%. The majority of CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from the road transport come from passenger cars (59.3%). The substantial emission drop from 2001 onwards is explained by the sharp penetration of EURO4, EURO5 and EURO6 passenger cars into Latvia's fleet and additionally in years 2009 - 2022 with decrease of gasoline consumption by passenger cars. Share of CH<sub>4</sub> emissions of HDV and buses was 34.1%, LDV 3.5% and mopeds and motorcycles 3.0% in 2022.




Figure 3.27 N<sub>2</sub>O emissions in road transport by vehicle types (kt)

In 2022, N<sub>2</sub>O emissions in road transport, compared to 2021, have decreased by 3.3%. Taking into account that N<sub>2</sub>O emission rates are largely dependent from implemented combustion and emission control technologies, different factor interaction characterises the trend of N<sub>2</sub>O changes.

To analyze the trend of N<sub>2</sub>O emission at first the significance of different emission sources should be clearly identified. The passenger cars (Figure 3.27) contribute 46.9%, LDV 11.8% and HDV and busses 41.2% of total N<sub>2</sub>O emission in Latvia's road transport (2022). Thus the N<sub>2</sub>O emission trend is mainly determined by the change in the technologies and fuel used by passenger cars and HDV.

Regarding total N<sub>2</sub>O emission created by the fleet of Latvia passenger cars, gasoline fuelled passenger cars contribute slightly above 9.4%, the rest is mainly emitted by diesel fuelled passenger cars (81.7%). Important, in the period after year 2005 the average N<sub>2</sub>O EF (t/TJ) for gasoline fuelled passenger cars has tendency to decrease due to change in the relative share of EURO3, EURO4 cars and EURO5 and EURO6 cars. The N<sub>2</sub>O EF (g/km) of gasoline fuelled passenger cars of the EURO1 and EURO2 classes is more than twice higher compared to the EF of gasoline fuelled passenger cars of the EURO3 and EURO4 classes. The mileage shares in 2022, calculated by summing the shares of EURO3 and EURO4 and EURO5 and EURO6 gasoline passenger cars, has increased at least five times – from 15% to 84.8% of the total gasoline passenger cars mileage, compared to 2005.

At the same time, one can see the opposite trend in the group of diesel passenger cars. The N<sub>2</sub>O EF (g/km) of EURO3 and EURO4 and EURO5 diesel passenger cars is per about 60% higher than the EF for EURO1 and EURO2 diesel passenger cars. Thus, due to the significant rise of the mileage share of EURO3, EURO4, EURO5 cars – from 24% (year 2005) up to 78.2% (year 2022) of the total diesel passenger cars mileage, the average N<sub>2</sub>O EF (t/TJ) for diesel passenger cars has also slightly increased.

#### *Methods*

For Road transport, the detailed methodology is used to calculate emissions, as described in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines and EMEP/EEA 2019. The actual calculation is made with a COPERT 5 model<sup>25</sup>. COPERT 5 provides factors for fuel consumption and for all exhaust emission components which are included in the national inventory. For several reasons, COPERT 5 is regarded as the most appropriate source of road traffic fuel consumption and EFs. First of all, very few Latvia's emission measurements exist, so data are too scarce to support emission calculations on a national level. Secondly, the COPERT model is regularly updated with new experimental findings from European research programmes and, apart from updated fuel-use and EFs, the use of COPERT 5 by many European countries ensures a large degree of cross-national consistency in reported emission results.

In COPERT 5, fuel consumption and emission simulation can be made for operationally hot engines, taking into account gradually tighten emission standards and emission degradation due to catalyst wear. Furthermore, the emission effects of cold-start and evaporation are simulated. Estimation of evaporative emissions of hydrocarbons and the inclusion of cold start emission effects are dealt with in the Latvian inventory by using LEGMC meteorological input data for ambient temperature variations during months; the distribution of evaporate emissions in the driving modes are used default by COPERT 5 model.

Corresponding to the COPERT 5 fleet classification, all vehicles in the Latvia's fleet are grouped into vehicle classes, subclasses and layers. The layer classification is a further division of vehicle

---

<sup>25</sup> COPERT model. Available: [www.emisia.com](http://www.emisia.com)

sub-classes into groups of vehicles with the same average fuel consumption and emission behaviour, according to EU emission legislation levels.

Trip-speed dependent basis factors for fuel consumption and emissions are implemented. The fuel consumption and EFs used in the Latvia's inventory are taken from the COPERT 5 model. The summary of the methods and EFs used is presented in Table 3.30.

**Table 3.30 Summary of source category description (CRF 1.A.3.b)**

CRF	Gas	Method	EF
1.A.3.b Gasoline, diesel, LPG, CNG	CO <sub>2</sub>	T2	CS
	CH <sub>4</sub>	T3	D (COPERT 5 model)
	N <sub>2</sub> O	T3	D (COPERT 5 model)
1.A.3.b Biofuel, lubricants, biodiesel (FAME) fuel that are of fossil origin	CO <sub>2</sub>	T1	D
1.A.3.b Biofuel, lubricants	CH <sub>4</sub>	T1	D
	N <sub>2</sub> O	T1	D

Reported CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from lubricant consumption in road transport have been calculated based on kilometres travelled. Lubricant consumption have been calculated for an each of road transport groups (passenger cars, HDV, LDV, busses and motorcycles) including 2-stroke motorcycles whom petrol engine should be lubricated by a mixture of lubricating oil and petrol.

To calculate CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from lubrication oil using in car's engines in road transport is calculated amount of oil, which the oil film developed on the inner cylinder walls. This oil film further is exposed to combustion and burned along with the fuel. A calculation of lubricant oil consumption for engine operation has been performed using a typical oil consumption factors for different vehicle types, fuel used and vehicle age (see Table 3-30 EMEP/EEA 2019). Based on this calculated lubricant oil consumption and using default EF (2006 IPCC Guidelines) CO<sub>2</sub> emissions for lubricant oil burning for engine operation has been calculated.

Further from the total quantity of lubricants consumed in road transport, the above mentioned amount of lubricants for which CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in road transport from combustion have been calculated and reported, is deducted.

Total consumption of lubricants (road transport) = lubricants consumption of engines (burned along with the fuel) + other consumption of lubricants

where:

- Lubricant consumption burned along with the fuel is calculated and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions reported under category road transport;
- Other consumption of lubricants is reported under IPPU sector (CRF 2.D).

For estimating CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from use of urea-based additives in catalytic converters (non-combustive emissions), it is used equation from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines:

$$\mathbf{Emission} = \mathbf{Activity} * \frac{12}{60} * \mathbf{Purity} * \frac{44}{12} \quad (3.8)$$

where:

Emissions - CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions from urea-based additive in catalytic converters (Gg CO<sub>2</sub>);

*Activity* - amount of urea-based additive consumed for use in catalytic converters (Gg);  
*Purity* - the mass fraction (= percentage divided by 100) of urea in the urea-based additive;  
*12/60* - conversion from urea to carbon;  
*44/12* - conversion from carbon to CO<sub>2</sub>.

In calculations, it is assumed that 75% of the HDV (starting with Euro IV class and later) the urea-based additives are used in catalytic converters. The activity level is 3 percent of diesel consumption by the HDV. 32.5% is taken as default purity. Estimated CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are reported in the IPPU sector (CRF 2).

#### *Bioshares of transport fuels*

Due to the activity data (statistics) of biofuels consumption in road transport sector are not split for blended and pure biofuels, it is assumed that all biofuel is consumed as the mix to fossil fuel in the volume defined by Cabinet of Minister's Regulation No. 332 (2000, with amendments) "Requirements for Conformity Assessment of Petrol and Diesel Fuel". To ensure efficient growth of the share of RES in the transport sector, the mandatory 4.5-5% volume of bioethanol mix for the gasoline of "95" trademark and mandatory 4.5-5% volume of biodiesel mix for the diesel fuel were introduced as from October 1, 2009. From 01.01.2020 the mandatory mix share for biofuels have been increased - at least 9.5% (volume) of bioethanol mix for the gasoline of "95" trademark and mandatory 6.5% (volume) of biodiesel mix for the diesel fuel. Exemptions are made for diesels utilised: (i) in case of winter climate, namely, in the period 1st November - 1st April, (ii) in sea transport engines. Blended biofuels shall correspond to the sustainability criteria.

At the first step the calculations of emissions in COPERT 5 model are performed using total fuel consumption data, including biofuels. Afterwards it is calculated separately the average share of bioethanol and biodiesel in the gasoline and diesel mix respectively and, assuming that each of the road vehicle groups (passenger cars, HDV, LDV and busses) consume this calculated average biofuel share, the fossil fuel consumption is calculated for each of noted vehicle groups. In preparing the inventory, CO<sub>2</sub> emission data for each of vehicle groups include only emissions related to fossil fuels consumption; thus CO<sub>2</sub> EFs are defined to include the fossil share of total fuel mix.

**Table 3.31 Amount of biocomponent in liquid fuels and avoided fossil CO<sub>2</sub> in road transport (TJ)**

Year	Gasoline, TJ	Diesel oil, TJ	Avoided fossil CO <sub>2</sub> , kt
2005	NO	107	8
2006	43	57	7.4
2007	NO	71	5.3
2008	1	81	6
2009	108	65	12.5
2010	350	752	81.1
2011	318	526	62
2012	279	463	54.5
2013	264	473	54.2
2014	257	583	61.9
2015	322	558	64.6
2016	343	22	26.1
2017	331	28	25.7
2018	354	1151	111.2
2019	306	1101	104.1



Year	Gasoline, TJ	Diesel oil, TJ	Avoided fossil CO <sub>2</sub> , kt
2020	534	1312	136.1
2021	491	1429	141.8
2022	423	211	45.8

In Latvia the following biofuels are used to replace fossil diesel and gasoline: 1) biodiesel (FAME) and 2) bioethanol. According to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (volume 2, chapter 3, section 'CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from biofuels' in page 3.17): "it is important to assess the biofuel origin so as to identify and separate fossil from biogenic feedstocks". It means that a part of the carbon of biofuels (and the associated CO<sub>2</sub> emissions) may have a fossil origin. To evaluate both fossil and biogenic CO<sub>2</sub> emissions associated to FAME the proposed method (2006 IPCC Guidelines and Note on fossil carbon content in biofuels presents in WG1) has been implemented. Calculated CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from biodiesel (FAME) fuel that are of fossil origin in 2022 is 0.84 kt (emissions have been reported in CRF under category road transport other fossil fuels).

#### Activity data

As a basis for model input information CSB and LR Road Traffic Safety Directorate (RTSD) data is used. CSB data have been used considering the fuel consumption, RTSD collected and published data have been used considering stock of road transport in Latvia. Total mileage data for passenger cars, light commercial trucks, heavy duty trucks and buses produced by the RTSD is used for the years 1996-2022. The summary of the data sources used in emission calculation for road transport are presented in Table 3.32.

**Table 3.32 Activity data and sources used for emission calculation in road transport**

Activity data	Source of activity data	Remarks
<i>Fuel consumption</i>	<i>National statistics (CSB)</i>	<i>It is assumed that all liquid biofuel is consumed as blended with fossil fuel</i>
<i>Number of cars</i>	<i>Road Traffic Safety Directorate</i>	<i>For calculation it is used number of cars with permission to participate in traffic</i>
<i>Number of cars by fuel and vehicle type</i>	<i>Road Traffic Safety Directorate and expert calculation</i>	<i>Based on available data cars are grouped by fuel type, engine power, age and vehicle categories according to emission control system</i>
<i>Distance travelled by cars by fuel and vehicle type</i>	<i>Road Traffic Safety Directorate and expert calculation</i>	<i>Based on an average data by cars classes it is modelled by fuel type, engine power, age and vehicle categories</i>
<i>Emission factors</i>	<i>National specific for CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, COPERT emission factors for CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O</i>	<i>CO<sub>2</sub> emission factors are based on carbon content in fuel. 1990 – onwards EF for gasoline is 71.18 kt/PJ; 1990 – onwards EF diesel oil 74.75 kt/PJ.</i>

General information about activity data is presented in Figure 3.29-Figure 3.35 (number of cars and their split by sub-classes and layers). Before emission calculation COPERT 5 model was calibrated to be consistent with actual fuel consumption (energy statistics see Table 3.33).

Table 3.33 Fuel consumption in road transport (TJ)

Year	Gasoline, TJ	Diesel oil, TJ	LPG, TJ	Natural gas, TJ	Biofuel (biodiesel and bioethanol), TJ
1990	24200	8328	592	305	NO
1995	17996	6883	91	33	NO
2000	14520	11472	865	68	NO
2001	15268	15934	865	101	NO
2002	14960	17166	865	68	NO
2003	14950	18611	956	68	NO
2004	15038	20225	1047	68	NO
2005	14730	22180	1093	68	107
2006	16313	25235	1184	68	100
2007	17852	29488	1093	67	71
2008	16269	28256	956	33	82
2009	13586	25154	865	4	173
2010	12308	27449	989	1	1102
2011	11432	22945	1184	NO	844
2012	9697	22465	1858	NO	742
2013	8794	23539	2368	NO	737
2014	8617	25409	2646	NO	840
2015	8576	28001	2687	NO	880
2016	8363	28992	2591	NO	365
2017	8030	31570	2440	NO	359
2018	7700	32158	2312	2	1505
2019	7307	33123	2028	8	1407
2020	7015	31475	1833	22	1846
2021	6943	33270	1653	55	1920
2022	5938	33355	1508	86	634

As mentioned above reported CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from lubricant consumption in Road transport have been calculated based on kilometres travelled. Lubricant consumption have been calculated for an each of road transport groups (passenger cars, HDV, LDV, busses and motorcycles) including 2-stroke motorcycles whom petrol engine should be lubricated by a mixture of lubricating oil and petrol. The quantity of lubricants in Road transport for which emissions are calculated is shown in Table 3.34.

Table 3.34 Calculated lubricant consumption in road transport for CO<sub>2</sub> emission reporting (TJ)

Year	Lubricants, TJ
1990	46.73
1995	35.54
2000	39.75
2005	57.75
2010	67.17
2015	67.32
2016	68.28
2017	71.24
2018	73.94
2019	75.39
2020	73.78
2021	76.61
2022	72.25

As it can be seen in Figure 3.28 the fuel consumption has essentially changed in the time period 1990 – 2022. The gasoline consumption from the highest consumption in 1990 has decreased until 1999, reaching the lowest consumption and after six year stabilization the increase was observed in 2006 and 2007. Consumption of gasoline had decreased in 2022 by 14.5% compared to 2021. Whereas diesel fuel consumption starting from 1997 has increased gradually until 2007, however, it decreased in 2008 and 2009, mainly due to economic recession. Diesel fuel consumption has increased in 2022 by 0.3% compared to 2021.

The increase in LPG consumption is observed between 2011 and 2016, but from 2017 onwards there is a continuous decrease in consumption. Consumption of biofuel had decreased in 2022 by 67.0% compared to 2021.




Figure 3.28 Development of Fuel consumption in road transport (PJ;TJ)<sup>26</sup>

The vehicle numbers per passenger cars sub-class and layers are shown in Figure 3.29.

<sup>26</sup> LPG, natural gas and biofuel on secondary axes




Figure 3.29 Distribution of passenger cars fleet by sub-classes (thsd)

Analyzing the development of the passenger car fleet from 1990 – 2022 (Figure 3.30, Figure 3.31), following features can be noted:

- Cars with a diesel engine of a capacity 1.4l - 2.0l (Medium) constitute the major part (41.1%) but the second leading group (24.5%) are cars with a diesel engine of a capacity > 2.0l (Large-SUV-Executive); cars with a gasoline engine of a capacity 1.4l - 2.0l (Medium) -16.9%;
- Cars with a gasoline engine of a capacity <1.4l during the whole period have small changes and constitute approximately 6.9% in year 2022 from total passenger cars;
- Cars with a gasoline engine of a capacity >2.0l starting from 2010 have a small decreasing in their share of total passenger cars and they constitutes around 3.9% in 2022;
- The number of BEV and PHEV has been increasing in recent years, with a share of 0.7% in 2022.
- As of 2000, the number of cars with diesel engines, both, <2.0l and >2.0l, grow rapidly and their share is 66.1% from the total number of passenger cars in 2022;
- As of 2005, in the car fleet with a gasoline engine, the number of EURO4, EURO5 and EURO6 cars grows gradually. In 2022 a share of EURO4 and EURO5 and EURO6 cars constitutes around 58.8%;
- As of 2005, in the car fleet with a diesel engine, the number of EURO 4 and EURO 5 cars grows gradually. In 2022 a share of EURO4, EURO5 and EURO6 cars constitute around 53.6%.




Figure 3.30 Distribution of gasoline passenger cars fleet by layers (thsd)




Figure 3.31 Distribution of diesel oil passenger cars fleet by layers (thsd)

Analyzing the development of LDV fleet (Figure 3.32, Figure 3.33) in the period of time 1990-2022 major features can be noted as follows:

- As of 1996, the number of cars with a gasoline engines have decreased;
- As of 2000, the number of cars with a diesel engine rapidly increases. In 2022 the share of diesel cars is 95.4%;
- As of 2005, the number of EURO4 and EURO5 and EURO6 cars have increased. In 2022 the share of EURO4, EURO5 and EURO6 cars constitute 74.9%.




Figure 3.32 Distribution of light commercial vehicles fleet by sub-classes (thsd)




Figure 3.33 Distribution of light duty vehicles fleet by layers (thsd)

The vehicle numbers per HDV sub-classes and layers are presented in Figure 3.34 and Figure 3.35. Analyzing the development of HDV fleet in the following time period, major features can be noted as follows:

- Since 2000 the number of cars with a gasoline engines have rapidly decreased. The share of gasoline cars has decreased from 28% to 1.6% corresponding years 2000 and 2022;
- Since 2000 the number HDV cars with tonnage 14-50 t and a diesel engine starts to increase. In 2022 the share of this group constitutes around 49.4%;
- As of 2000, average age reduction of cars takes place gradually. In 2022, the share of EURO IV, EURO V and EURO VI cars constituted around 74.7%.




Figure 3.34 Distribution of heavy duty vehicles fleet by sub-classes (thsd)




Figure 3.35 Distribution of heavy duty vehicles fleet by layers (thsd)

*Emission factors*

CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in COPERT 5 model were calculated using country-specific CO<sub>2</sub> EF that are calculated based on the information available on the C and H content in fuel. Country specific EF for CO<sub>2</sub> emission calculation (gasoline, diesel oil) in road transport is used:

- 1990 – 2022 EF diesel oil 74.75 kg/GJ;
- 1990 – 2022 EF for unleaded gasoline is 71.18 kg/GJ.

In 2012, MoCE funded research “Research on carbon content in transport fuels”. The research on C content in fuels carried out in 2012 quantified C and H content in gasoline. For gasoline the C content is 84.7%, further it is calculated NCV for gasoline (43.97 MJ/kg) and estimated CO<sub>2</sub> EF is in accordance with requirements from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. For diesel oil the C content is 86.7%, further it is calculated NCV for diesel oil (42.49 MJ/kg) and estimated CO<sub>2</sub> EF

is in accordance with requirements from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. Based on the results of this research, CO<sub>2</sub> EF of gasoline has been calculated - 71.18 kg/GJ and diesel oil 74.75 kg/GJ (oxidation factor is 1). Although quantification of C and H content in gasoline and diesel oil has been performed for fuel with a requirement for gasoline quality which is in force since January 1, 2009, the updated CO<sub>2</sub> EF is implemented for emissions calculation 1990-2008 as well to ensure consistent time series. Rest of EFs (CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O) comes from the COPERT 5 model.

### 3.2.6.1.3 *Railways (CRF 1.A.3.c)*

In 2022, the fuel consumption in railway constituted 2.5% of GHG emissions from the total GHG emissions in transport. Freight transport had a dominant role in railway fuel consumption. The railway transport accomplishes around 33.7% (2022) of the total freight transport in Latvia (measured in ton-kilometres) and the transit transport traffic to ports is dominant. Since 2012 the transported freight along the railway (measured in ton-kilometres) have decreased by around 66.1% due to dependence on transit transport of goods from Russian Federation and other neighboring countries. Fuel consumption has decreased by approximately 70.8% in 2022 compared to 2012.

The very sharp decline in fuel consumption came in exactly 2020, compared to 2019 (40.5%). The decline in fuel consumption continued in 2022 and was 5.6% lower than in 2021.

It results in decreased GHG emissions by 5.7% in 2022 compared to 2021. Emission calculation in railway transport includes railway transport operated by diesel locomotives.

Railway related fuel consumption is key categories for CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. In 2022, total GHG emissions in railway, compared to 1990, have decreased by 86.5% (see Figure 3.36).




Figure 3.36 Development of GHG emissions in railway (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

#### Methodological issues

##### *Methods*

When calculating emissions from railway, the 2006 IPCC Guidelines Tier 1 and Tier 2 methods have been applied. The summary of the latest key category assessment, methods and EFs used is presented in Table 3.35.



Table 3.35 Summary of source category description (CRF 1.A.3.c)

CRF	Gas	Method	EF	All sources estimated
1.A.3.c	CO <sub>2</sub>	T2	CS	Yes
	CH <sub>4</sub>	T1	D	Yes
	N <sub>2</sub> O	T1	D	Yes

### Activity data

The data on diesel oil consumption in railway derived from the CSB. Development of diesel oil consumption is presented in Figure 3.37 and Table 3.36. As can be seen, starting from 2010 only small portion of biodiesel is used in railway.




Figure 3.37 Development of fuel consumption in railway (TJ)

Table 3.36 Fuel consumption in railway (TJ)

Year	Diesel oil	Biodiesel
1990	7181	NO
1995	3229	NO
2000	2762	NO
2001	2847	NO
2002	2974	NO
2003	3399	NO
2004	3484	NO
2005	3484	NO
2006	3059	NO
2007	3314	NO
2008	3314	NO
2009	3102	NO
2010	2804	35
2011	3144	91
2012	3357	63
2013	3017	48
2014	2889	83
2015	2765	74

Year	Diesel oil	Biodiesel
2016	2335	67
2017	2193	29
2018	2235	78
2019	1836	55
2020	1083	42
2021	1021	38
2022	963	37

### Emission factors

Country specific EF for CO<sub>2</sub> emissions is used ("Guidance Manual for CO<sub>2</sub> emission estimations" (2004)). Rest of EFs comes from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines and EMEP/EEA 2019 (see Table 3.37).

**Table 3.37 Emission factors used in the calculation of emissions from railway**

Fuel type	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	NMVOC	SO <sub>2</sub>
	kt/PJ	kt/PJ	kt/PJ	kt/PJ	kt/PJ	kt/PJ	kt/PJ
Diesel oil	74.75	0.00415	0.0286	1.2332	0.251823	0.10943	0.02353 (2003-2004) 0.09414 (1990-2007) 0.04707 (2008-2014) 0.005 (2015 -)

#### 3.2.6.1.4 Domestic Navigation (CRF 1.A.3.d)

In 2021, fuel consumption in navigation was responsible for around 0.3% of GHG emissions from total GHG emissions in transport.

Although Latvia has several ports, domestic navigation providing transport of freight or passengers among local ports is not developed. Major activities in ports deal with international freight transport. In domestic navigation, the emissions are calculated for miscellaneous vessels (tugs, barges, towboats, and icebreakers), recreational crafts and personal boats (Figure 3.38).




Figure 3.38 GHG emission development in domestic navigation (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

Fuel consumption and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions trend in domestic navigation mainly depends from international (import, export) cargo activities in ports (cargo turnover and number of vessels served in ports). Variation in domestic navigation's fuel consumption in 2006-2022 indicates that this consumption is highly dependent on the harbour services' activities and weather conditions.

Before the GHG emission calculation is performed CSB is asked to check and further confirm fuel consumption in sector if fluctuation is more than 20% compare to the previous year.

#### Methodological issues

##### *Methods*


When calculating emissions from navigation, Tier 1 and Tier 2 methods from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines have been applied. Country specific CO<sub>2</sub> EFs are used for emission calculation from diesel fuel consumption. The summary of the latest key category assessment, methods and EFs used are presented in Table 3.38.

Table 3.38 Summary of source category description (CRF 1.A.3.d)

CRF	Gas	Method	EF	All sources estimated
1.A.3.d	CO <sub>2</sub>	T1,T2	CS (diesel); D (gasoline)	Yes
	CH <sub>4</sub>	T1	D	Yes
	N <sub>2</sub> O	T1	D	Yes

##### *Activity data*

The data about diesel oil consumption and gasoline consumption in domestic navigation are obtained from the CSB. CSB have started to collect data about diesel oil consumption and gasoline consumption in domestic navigation from 2006. For the period of time 1990 – 2005 the data for fuel consumption is used from the study "Evaluation of fuel consumption for domestic aviation and navigation" (IPE, 2004). Development of fuel consumption in domestic navigation is presented in Figure 3.39 and in Table 3.39.



**Figure 3.39 Development of gasoline and diesel oil fuel consumption in domestic navigation (TJ)**

Part of the total consumption of diesel oil in domestic navigation is the provision of permanent port service by miscellaneous vessels. Variation in domestic navigation's fuel consumption in 2012-2022 indicates that total consumption is highly dependent on the additional harbour services' activities. In 2013, there had harbour deepening project of large scale resulting also in significant increase in fuel consumption. After the realization of this project, the fuel consumption in 2014 and 2015 come back to roughly 2012 level. Also in 2018 the main reason of fuel consumption increase was performing of mentioned harbour service' activities. Due to the rapid decline in cargo volumes in 2020, this was a key factor in the reduction in diesel consumption in domestic navigation.

An additional factor that have an impact on fuel consumption in domestic navigation is weather conditions. This can be observed in 2010 and 2011 when air temperature was low and sea was covered by ice. An ice breaker operated many months to ensure operation of ports in 2010 and 2011. This factor had an impact on fuel consumption in 2010 and 2011.

In the last 10 years, diesel consumption has only been affected by the first of these factors.

**Table 3.39 Fuel consumption in domestic navigation (TJ)**

Year	Diesel oil	Gasoline
1990	11	2
1995	6	3
2000	6	3
2001	6	3
2002	6	4
2003	6	4
2004	6	4
2005	5	4
2006	4	4
2007	43	5
2008	85	5
2009	170	4
2010	212	3
2011	212	3

Year	Diesel oil	Gasoline
2012	170	3
2013	340	4
2014	170	5
2015	129	3
2016	176	5
2017	187	5
2018	270	3
2019	132	4
2020	94	5
2021	98	9
2022	68	6

### Emission factors

Default EFs for navigation are used (2006 IPCC Guidelines and EMEP/EEA 2019, Table 3.40).

**Table 3.40 Emission factors used in the calculation of emissions from navigation (t/TJ)**

Fuel type	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	NM VOC
Gasoline	69.3	0.0473	0.000296	0.2	13.1	4.1
Diesel oil	74.75	0.004	0.003	1.8	0.2	0.1

#### 3.2.6.1 Uncertainties and time series consistency

Uncertainty analysis for 2024 submission is carried out by using Approach 1. Quantitative estimates of uncertainties are provided in Annex 2. Overall description of uncertainty analysis is included in Section 1.6. Activity data about fuel consumption in transport sector is mainly available from 1990 and they are provided by CSB. Considering that CSB gives approximately 2% statistical sample error for statistical data uncertainty in activity data of fuel consumption in transport is  $\pm 2\%$  in 2021. Before GHG emission calculation is performed CSB is asked to check and further confirm fuel consumption in sector if fluctuation is more than 10% compare to the previous year.

As mentioned above, for certain categories (domestic aviation and domestic navigation), fuel consumption in the base year (1990) has been determined using a calculation model and an extrapolation method ("Evaluation of fuel consumption for domestic aviation and navigation" (IPE, 2004)). Consequently, the uncertainty over fuel consumption is relatively high and 20% assumed.

CO<sub>2</sub> EF was estimated according to physical characterization of used fuels in country based on average NCV reported by fuel consumers and carbon content so uncertainty was assigned as quite low about 2%. If default CO<sub>2</sub> EF is used uncertainty was assigned about 5-10%. Default CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O EFs used in estimation of emissions were taken from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, so uncertainty was assigned 30-70%.

In order to maintain consistency with the time-series the estimation procedures have been developed as described above (Section 1.6.). However, due to the fact that some of the estimations are not based on activity data but on other factors as LTO cycles in civil aviation sector, a certain degree of uncertainty exists. In road transport one important basic parameter for the COPERT 5 model is vehicle-km, which is calculated through another model. This second model is based on the mileage driven by the vehicle noted at time of TA (annual

inspection/testing of the vehicle) at Road Traffic Safety Directorate. In case if there is in place sharp changes of some external factors impacting the fuel consumption, for example economy recession, or fuel price or energy tax, it will not be shown as clearly in the development of vehicle mileage as in statistics on fuel consumption.

To ensure time series consistency any recalculations related with model version updating are done for all time period. Linear interpolation has been implemented only for cases when activity data fluctuation does not take place.

### 3.2.6.2 Source-specific QA/QC and verification

The quality objectives and the QA/QC plan for the Latvia's GHG inventory at the National Inventory level are presented in Section 1.2.3. The QC procedures are performed according to the QA/QC plan in the transport sector in order to achieve these quality objectives. Meetings dedicated for quality ensure and improvement are held annually among inventory and external experts.

All Tier 1 general inventory level QC procedures listed in chapter 1.2. applicable to this sector are used. These measures are implemented every year during the transport sector inventory. In addition, the consumption of every type of fuel in the last year is checked and compared with previous years. If large variations are discovered for certain fuels, responsible CSB staff is contacted for an explanation.

The country specific CO<sub>2</sub> EFs used to calculate transport sector CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are compared with IPCC default (2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Volume 2, Chapter 3, Mobile combustion) to see if they compare reasonably well.

In making this comparison, it can be concluded that all the country specific CO<sub>2</sub> EFs used are within the interval specified in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, this is between the lowest and the highest values. The assessment is carried out taking into account the values represent 100 percent oxidation of fuel carbon content.

Estimated emission verification:

- All transport sector emission estimations are examined on the logical mistakes by checking the time series of the activity data, EFs and emission consistency to display the significant and illogic changes in the activity data and emissions.
- Emissions are checked using time series consistency check for the IEF estimated in CRF Reporter and all IEF changes in time series are double-checked and reasonable explanation for IEF changes has to be found under the each subsector source category description. The calculated air transport emissions have been compared and verified with Eurocontrol's emission data for 2008-2022. The calculated activity data for fuel consumption of LTO and cruise mode and emissions were comparable and very close to those estimated by Eurocontrol.
- For the road transport examination is made on less aggregated level than CRF reporter. Non CO<sub>2</sub> EF changes that are higher than 5% in time series are double-checked and reasonable explanation for IEF changes has to be found.

The QC form has been filled in for each category taking into account criteria given in QA/QC plan approved in National legislation. All information on activity data and emission calculations are stored and archived in the common FTP folder.

#### Additional QA/QC checks for Tier2 methodology

For emission calculation in road transport additional QA/QC check approach has to be implemented. QC activities are realized with emission data and activity data QC.

It is assessed that implemented default EF from COPERT 5 model are applicable to national circumstances because model comprises all the necessary technologies. Country specific EFs for CO<sub>2</sub> are calculated based on the 2006 IPCC Guidelines methodology. Activity data (fuel consumption, total number of vehicles) provider CSB has the internal QA/QC procedures based on mathematical model and analysis to avoid logic mistakes. To ensure QA procedure expert from Road Traffic Safety Directorate is asked to make peer review about the main assumption implemented in emission calculation.

### 3.2.6.3 Category-specific recalculations

The following recalculations and improvements in 2024 submission have been made in the transport sector since the 2023 submission (Table 3.41).

**Table 3.41 Recalculations in CRF 1.A.3 Transport**

Sub-category	Recalculation	Improvements
Road transport (CRF 1.A.3.b)	<i>All GHG emissions for time period 1990 – 2021 have been recalculated</i>	<i>Recalculations have been done due to the switch from COPERT 5.6.1 model version to COPERT 5.7.2 model version. In addition, the distribution of buses in sub-groups and the number of LCV vehicle and km travelled by individual types of cars have been corrected. Compared to the 2023 submission, overall GHG emissions in road transport changed to 0.8% over the time period 1990 – 2021.</i>
Civil aviation (CRF 1.A.3.a)	<i>All GHG emissions for time period 2017 – 2021 have been recalculated</i>	<i>Recalculations have been done due to the correction of jet fuel consumption. Compared to the 2023 submission, overall GHG emissions in civil aviation decreased between 39% and 77%.</i>

### 3.2.6.4 Source specific planned improvements

The applicability of implied EFs for international aviation calculated by Eurocontrol will be studied.

## 3.2.7 Other Sectors (CRF 1.A.4)

### 3.2.7.1 Category description

CRF 1.A.4 Other Sectors include emissions from the small combustion of fuels in Commercial/Institutional, Residential sectors and Agriculture/Forestry/Fisheries. In addition, emissions from mobile machinery used in Commercial, Residential and Agriculture and Forestry sectors are included here as off-road. Also emissions from the autoproducers are included in

relevant sectors of CRF 1.A.4 – according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines these emissions have to be reported in sectors producing them.

The CRF subsector 1.A.4. Other Sectors were split into subsectors which are in line with the 2006 IPCC Guidelines/CRF Reporter structure:

- 1.A.4.a Commercial/Institutional:
  - 1.A.4.a.i Stationary combustion;
  - 1.A.4.a.ii Off-road vehicles and other machinery;
- 1.A.4.b Residential:
  - 1.A.4.b.i Stationary combustion;
  - 1.A.4.b.ii Off-road vehicles and other machinery;
- 1.A.4.c Agriculture/Forestry/Fishing:
  - 1.A.4.c.i Stationary combustion;
  - 1.A.4.c.ii Off-road vehicles and other machinery;
  - 1.A.4.c.iii Fishing.




Figure 3.40 GHG emissions in CRF 1.A.4. Other Sectors by subsectors (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

In Figure 3.40, there can be seen the distribution of GHG emissions in CRF 1.A.4 sector. The largest part of emissions contribute CRF 1.A.4.b Residential subsector (35.3% in 2022). CRF 1.A.4.a Commercial/Institutional contributes 29.9% from 1.A.4 emissions, while CRF 1.A.4.c Agriculture/Forestry/Fisheries, where also offroad emissions from Fisheries contributes 34.8% of emissions.

Table 3.42 Emissions from Other Sectors (CRF 1.A.4) in 1990–2022 (kt)

Year	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	GHGs (CO <sub>2</sub> eq)	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	NMVOC	SO <sub>2</sub>
	kt			kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.	kt			
1990	5493.45	10.70	0.527	5932.72	24.36	170.20	22.03	35.12
1995	1549.14	12.16	0.203	1943.44	11.09	141.72	21.22	9.95
2000	1049.47	10.10	0.175	1378.81	8.78	126.24	18.88	3.93
2005	1292.67	11.52	0.214	1671.88	9.87	142.91	19.42	3.66
2010	1458.02	8.63	0.247	1765.22	8.37	112.16	14.51	2.27
2011	1356.71	8.59	0.243	1661.44	8.10	117.50	14.98	2.23



Year	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	GHGs (CO <sub>2</sub> eq)	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	NM VOC	SO <sub>2</sub>
	kt			kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.	kt			
2012	1280.01	8.95	0.253	1597.52	7.89	117.29	15.07	2.16
2013	1252.77	8.00	0.251	1543.27	7.49	104.26	13.31	2.01
2014	1252.47	7.44	0.253	1527.81	7.33	96.88	12.34	1.97
2015	1220.09	6.22	0.26	1462.51	6.79	77.61	9.91	1.79
2016	1247.99	6.20	0.24	1485.76	6.57	78.08	9.91	1.70
2017	1279.94	6.93	0.26	1543.84	6.82	86.46	11.19	1.79
2018	1283.23	6.89	0.27	1546.67	6.61	89.18	11.52	1.81
2019	1260.20	6.57	0.27	1515.08	6.23	84.63	11.06	1.66
2020	1299.41	5.74	0.29	1535.63	5.96	74.88	9.82	1.47
2021	1346.02	5.78	0.29	1584.19	5.95	75.59	9.83	1.49
2022	1316.55	5.67	0.29	1553.55	6.05	72.63	9.44	1.48
Share of Energy total, 2022	22.1%	53.0%	44.6%	24.2%	23.4%	79.8%	77.8%	40.8%
2022 vs 2021	-2.2%	-1.8%	2.2%	-1.9%	1.7%	-3.9%	-3.9%	-0.8%
2022 vs 1990	-76.0%	-47.0%	-44.0%	-73.8%	-75.2%	-57.3%	-57.1%	-95.8%

CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in CRF 1.A.4 sector have decreased by 76.0% in 1990-2022 due to the transition and reorganizations in the country after the collapse of Soviet Union, as mentioned in previous chapters (Table 3.42). Since 2000 CO<sub>2</sub> emissions started to grow due to development of the national economy, and increased by 31.0% in 2007. During economic crisis in 2008-2009 emissions decreased. In later years emissions fluctuated form year to year. In 2022, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from Other Sectors make up 22.1% from total CO<sub>2</sub> emission produced in Energy sector. Compared to 2021, emissions have decreased by 2.2%.

CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions in 2022 since 1990 have decreased by 47.0% and 44.0% accordingly. In 2022, CH<sub>4</sub> emissions have decreased by 1.8% and N<sub>2</sub>O increased by 2.2% in comparison with 2021. They make up 53.0% and 44.6% from total emissions produced in Energy sector accordingly.

Emissions of precursors from CRF 1.A.4 Other Sectors were estimated as well. SO<sub>2</sub> had the biggest decrease by 95.8% in 1990–2022. It can be explained with fuel switching from coal, peat and heavy fuel oils to natural gas and biomass. Also a strict National legislation was approved to improve the quality of used liquid fuels in country. NO<sub>x</sub> emissions have also decreased by 75.2% in 1990-2022, NMVOC emissions – by 57.1%, and CO emissions – by 57.3%. The decrease can also be explained with fuel switch from solid to natural gas and biomass, which have lower EFs.

### 3.2.7.2 Methodological issues

#### *Methods*

The 2006 IPCC Guidelines' Tier 2 method was used to estimate CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from fuel combustion as country specific parameters were used to estimate CO<sub>2</sub> EF. However, for some fuels there are no country specific EFs, therefore the 2006 IPCC Guidelines Tier 1 method using default EFs was used. The 2006 IPCC Guidelines' Tier 1 method was used to calculate CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from the CRF 1.A.4 Sector.

Calculation of all emissions from fuel combustion is done with Excel databases developed by the experts from LEGMC.

The general method for emission data preparation used:

$$Em = EF * B_q \quad (3.9)$$

where:

*Em* – total emissions (kt)

*EF* – estimated or default emission factor (t/TJ)

*B<sub>q</sub>* – amount of fuel in thermal units (TJ)

*Emission factors and other parameters*

The main sources for EFs are:

- National studies for country specific parameters and EFs;
- Data from only natural gas supplier company of natural gas physical characteristics;
- 2006 IPCC Guidelines;
- EMEP/EEA 2019.

Country specific EFs were used to calculate CO<sub>2</sub> and SO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

### CO<sub>2</sub> emission factors

CO<sub>2</sub> EFs for CRF 1.A.4 Other Sectors are estimated with the same equations and using same methods as for CRF 1.A.1 Energy Industries sector, including calculation methods and assumptions for landfill gas and other biogas as in CRF 1.A.1 sector.

For some fuels default CO<sub>2</sub> EFs from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Volume 2, Chapter 2 *Stationary combustion*, Table 2.4, were taken due to unavailability of country specific data:

- anthracite – 98.3 kt/PJ;
- other liquid fuels – 73.3 kt/PJ;
- landfill gas – 54.6 kt/PJ;
- other biogas – 54.6 kt/PJ;
- biodiesel – 70.8 kt/PJ;
- straws – 100 kt/PJ;
- charcoal – 112 kt/PJ;
- waste oils – 73.3 kt/PJ.

For CRF 1.A.4.c.iii Fishing default EFs were taken from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Volume 2, Chapter 3 *Mobile combustion*, Table 3.5.2:

- diesel oil – 74.1 kt/PJ;
- residual fuel oil – 77.4 kt/PJ.

### SO<sub>2</sub> emissions factors

SO<sub>2</sub> EFs for CRF 1.A.4 Other Sectors are estimated with the same equations and using the same method as for CRF 1.A.1 and CRF 1.A.2 sectors.

### Other emission factors

The default CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O EFs are taken from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Volume 2, Chapter 2 *Stationary combustion*, Table 2.3 (CRF 1.A.4.a, 1.A.4.c). For estimating CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from wood in CRF 1.A.4.b.i sector, Tier 2 approach with country specific EFs was used. N<sub>2</sub>O EFs for wood products are taken from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Chapter 2 *Stationary combustion*, Table 2.3. It has to be noted that for wood and charcoal the lowest N<sub>2</sub>O EFs were taken from the given range.

NO<sub>x</sub>, CO and NMVOC EFs used in estimation of emission were taken from EMEP/EEA 2019, Chapter 1.A.4 Small combustion, Tables 3-12 to 3-25 (CRF 1.A.4.b.i), Tables 3-7 to 3-10 (CRF 1.A.4.a.i, 1.A.4.c.i) and Tables 3-26 to 3-27.

List of other EFs can be seen in Table 3.43, Table 3.44 and Table 3.45.

**Table 3.43 CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O, NO<sub>x</sub>, NMVOC, CO emission factors in CRF 1.A.4.a (kt/PJ)**

Fuel type	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	NO <sub>x</sub>	NMVOC	CO
Shale oil	0.01	0.0006	0.3033	0.0129	0.0403
LPG	0.005	0.0001	0.074	0.023	0.029
Other kerosene	0.01	0.0006	0.3033	0.0129	0.0403
Diesel oil	0.01	0.0006	0.3033	0.0129	0.0403
RFO	0.01	0.0006	0.3033	0.0129	0.0403
Other liquid	0.01	0.0006	0.3033	0.0129	0.0403
Anthracite	0.01	0.0015	0.173	0.0888	0.931
Coal	0.01	0.0015	0.173	0.0888	0.931
Peat	0.01	0.0014	0.173	0.0888	0.931
Peat briquettes	0.01	0.0015	0.173	0.0888	0.931
Natural gas	0.005	0.0001	0.073	0.00036	0.024
			0.04	0.002	0.03
Wood	0.3	0.004	0.091	0.3	0.57
			0.162 <sup>27</sup>	0.0696 <sup>28</sup>	0.354 <sup>28</sup>
Straws	0.3	0.004	0.091	0.3	0.57
Biodiesel	0.01	0.0006	0.3033	0.0129	0.0403
Landfill gas	0.005	0.0001	0.074	0.023	0.029
Other biogas	0.005	0.0001	0.074	0.023	0.029
Waste oils	0.3	0.004	0.3033	0.0129	0.0403

**Table 3.44 CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O, NO<sub>x</sub>, NMVOC, CO emission factors in CRF 1.A.4.c (kt/PJ)**

Fuel type	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	NO <sub>x</sub>	NMVOC	CO
LPG	0.005	0.0001	0.074	0.023	0.029
Other kerosene	0.01	0.0006	0.3033	0.0129	0.0403
Diesel oil	0.01	0.0006	0.3033	0.0129	0.0403
RFO	0.01	0.0006	0.3033	0.0129	0.0403
Other liquid	0.01	0.0006	0.3033	0.0129	0.0403
Coal	0.3	0.0015	0.173	0.0888	0.931
Peat	0.3	0.0014	0.173	0.0888	0.931
Peat briquettes	0.3	0.0015	0.173	0.0888	0.931
Natural gas	0.005	0.0001	0.074	0.023	0.029
Wood	0.3	0.004	0.091	0.3	0.57
Straws	0.3	0.004	0.091	0.3	0.57
Biodiesel	0.01	0.0006	0.3033	0.0129	0.0403
Other biogas	0.005	0.0001	0.074	0.023	0.029
Waste oils	0.3	0.004	0.3033	0.0129	0.0403

**Table 3.45 CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O, NO<sub>x</sub>, NMVOC, CO emission factors in CRF 1.A.4.b (kt/PJ)**

Fuel type	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	NO <sub>x</sub>	NMVOC	CO
LPG	0.005	0.0001	0.042	0.0018	0.022
Other kerosene	0.01	0.0006	0.069	0.00017	0.0037
Diesel oil	0.01	0.0006	0.069	0.00017	0.0037

<sup>27</sup> Tier 2 IEF for emission calculation from Wood combustion in 2021 – kt/PJ

Fuel type	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	NO <sub>x</sub>	NMVOC	CO
RFO	0.01	0.0006	0.069	0.00017	0.0037
Coal	0.3	0.0015	0.158	0.174	4.787
Peat	0.3	0.0014	0.158	0.174	4.787
Peat briquettes	0.3	0.0015	0.158	0.174	4.787
Natural gas	0.005	0.0001	0.042	0.0018	0.022
Wood <sup>28</sup>	0.232	0.0015	0.0646	0.4469	3.498
Charcoal	0.2	0.0003	0.05	0.6	4
Straws	0.3	0.004	0.05	0.6	4

Gasoline EFs are used for CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emission estimation from off-roads (2006 IPCC Guidelines, Volume 2, Chapter 3 *Mobile combustion*, Table 3.3.1.). As there is no information about distribution between 2-stroke and 4-stroke engines, it was assumed that 25% of consumed gasoline is combusted in 2-stroke engines, while 75% in 4-stroke engines. Such an assumption has been made, based on Danish data that were presented in EMEP/EEA 2019 for air pollutants' calculations. NO<sub>x</sub>, CO and NMVOC EFs used in estimation of emission were taken from EMEP/EEA 2019, Chapter 1.A.4 Non-road mobile sources and machinery, Table 3-1 and Table 3-2. Default diesel oil EFs are used for CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emission estimation from off-roads (2006 IPCC Guidelines, Volume 2, Chapter 3 *Mobile combustion*, Table 3.3.1.) and EFs for precursors were taken from EMEP/EEA 2019 Chapter 1.A.4. Non-road mobile sources and machinery. NO<sub>x</sub>, CO and NMVOC EFs used in estimation of emission were taken from EMEP/EEA 2019, Chapter 1.A.4 Non-road mobile sources and machinery, Table 3-1 and Table 3-2. It was assumed that not all diesel oil in sector CRF 1.A.4.a combusts in off-roads (99% form total diesel oil combustion in sector), but 1% is used in stationary combustion. For sector CRF 1.A.4.b it is assumed that all diesel oil used is used in off-roads.

Also, diesel oil and residual fuel oil consumed in Fisheries sector was assumed as consumed by fishing ships and EFs were taken from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Volume 2, Chapter 3 *Mobile combustion*, Table 3.5.2 and Table 3.5.3. EFs for precursors are taken from EMEP/EEA 2019, Chapter 1.A.3.d., Table 3-1. It was assumed that not all diesel oil combusts in off-roads, but 99% of amount that is produced in 1.A.4.c. CSB confirmed that 1% of diesel oil is used in stationary combustion.

EFs for gasoline and diesel oil consumed in off-roads and diesel oil and residual fuel oil consumed in Fisheries are presented in Table 3.46.

**Table 3.46 CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O, NO<sub>x</sub>, NMVOC, CO emission factors for gasoline, diesel and RFO (kg/t<sup>29</sup>)<sup>30</sup>**

Category	Gasoline		Diesel oil	Diesel oil		RFO	
	2-stroke	4-stroke		Agriculture	Forestry		
1.A.4.a.ii	CH <sub>4</sub>	0.18	0.12	0.00415	NO	NO	NO
	N <sub>2</sub> O	0.0004	0.002	0.0286	NO	NO	NO
	NO <sub>x</sub>	2.5	6.68	13.87	NO	NO	NO
	NMVOC	113.16	16.13	1.27	NO	NO	NO
	CO	695.24	804.16	6.93	NO	NO	NO
1.A.b.ii	CH <sub>4</sub>	0.18	0.12	0.00415	NO	NO	NO

<sup>28</sup> IEF for 2021 – kt/PJ. Calculations for CH<sub>4</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, NMVOC and CO emissions done using Tier 2 methodology and country specific residential combustion plant distribution

<sup>29</sup> For CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O – kt/PJ

<sup>30</sup> For sectors CRF 1.A.4.a.ii and CRF 1.A.4.c.ii NO<sub>x</sub>, NMVOC and CO IEF are shown in the table. For these sectors calculations are made using Tier 2 method from EMEP/EEA 2019 1.A.4i Non-road mobile sources and machinery Table 3-2, Table 3-3 and Table 3-4.

Category	Gasoline		Diesel oil	Diesel oil		RFO	
	2-stroke	4-stroke		Agriculture	Forestry		
	N <sub>2</sub> O	0.0004	0.002	0.0286	NO	NO	NO
	NO <sub>x</sub>	2.765	7.117	32.629	NO	NO	NO
	NMVOG	227.289	18.893	3.377	NO	NO	NO
	CO	620.793	770.368	10.774	NO	NO	NO
1.A.4.c.ii	CH <sub>4</sub>	0.17	0.08	NO	0.00415	0.00415	NO
	N <sub>2</sub> O	0.0004	0.002	NO	0.286	0.286	NO
	NO <sub>x</sub>	2.5	6.68	NO	15.42	10.53	NO
	NMVOG	113.16	16.13	NO	1.43	1.1	NO
	CO	695.24	804.16	NO	6.89	6.94	NO
1.A.4.c.iii	CH <sub>4</sub>	NO	NO	0.007	NO	NO	0.007
	N <sub>2</sub> O	NO	NO	0.002	NO	NO	0.002
	NO <sub>x</sub>	NO	NO	78.3	NO	NO	79.3
	NMVOG	NO	NO	2.8	NO	NO	2.7
	CO	NO	NO	7.4	NO	NO	7.4

### Activity data

Mainly emissions from fuel combustion are calculated using fuel consumption data from the CSB Energy Balance. The data collection system for CRF 1.A.4 sector is the same as for CRF 1.A.1 and CRF 1.A.2 sectors. Data on fuel consumption in 1.A.4 sector are presented in Annex A.3.1 "1.A.4 Other Sectors".

Autoproducers data prepared by CSB are taken into account into the calculation of the emissions from CRF 1.A.4 sector according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.

Gasoline and diesel oil combustion is reported as off-roads in CRF 1.A.4 sector. Only 1% of diesel oil is combusted stationary in CRF 1.A.4.a and CRF 1.A.4.c.

In CRF 1.A.4.c.iii Fishing it is assumed, that diesel oil and residual fuel oil is consumed by fishing vessels.





Figure 3.41 Fuel consumption in Other Sectors (CRF 1.A.4) for 1990-2022 (PJ)

The major decrease in 1990-2022 was for solid fuel consumption – 99.2%, liquid fuels consumption – 62.3% (Figure 3.41) and gaseous fuels by 58.2%. It is explained with fuel

switching processes when solid and liquid fuels were replaced with cheaper fuels. Also stronger legislation contributed fuel switching to the type of fuels with a lower level of emissions.

Since 1990 biomass dominates as a fuel in CRF 1.A.4 sector. The biggest part of solid biomass consumption goes to Residential sector where biomass is the main fuel in small capacity burning installations. Consumption of biomass fuel has increased by 3.5% in 1990–2019 in Other Sector but, compared to 2020, consumption have decreased by 8.0% comperad to 2021. It can be seen that the amount of biomass has been fluctuating over the recent years which can be partly explained with changes of HDD. In 2021, increased by 0.5% compared to 2020 and in 2022 decreased by 2.7%.



**Figure 3.42 Fuel consumption in Residential sector (CRF 1.A.4.b) for stationary combustion and HDD in Latvia (PJ;HDD)**

As it can be seen in Figure 3.42, fuel consumption in 1.A.4.b sector is related with changes in temperature – in years where HDD are more, the amounts of consumed fuel are also larger, especially it can be seen in 1994-2003. In 2009-2010 the correlation between HDDs and consumption is less visible because of impact of global crisis, which clearly affected the Residential sector. Difference in trend between fuel used and HDD could be explained with changes in heating devices that impact the amount of fuel used (more energy efficient). Higher efficiently boiler will use less fuel to produce the same amount of heat. Also, energy efficiency was increasing due to building new and renovating residential buildings to be more energy efficient.

### 3.2.7.3 Uncertainties and time-series consistency

Uncertainty analysis for 2024 submission is carried out by using Approach 1. Quantitative estimates of uncertainties are provided in Annex 2. Overall description of uncertainty analysis is included in Section 1.6.

Uncertainty for activity data of fuel combustion in CRF 1.A.4 sector is  $\pm 2\%$  in 2022. CSB gives approximately 2% statistical sample error for statistical data. According to CSB, as data is obtained using information given by respondents, this number is a variation coefficient which characterizes selection of respondents. Total variation coefficient for energy balance is within

2-3%. In Latvia all fossil fuels (oil, natural gas and coal) are imported and import and export statistics are fairly accurate.

Uncertainty of activity data for solid biomass was assigned 1% as biomass activity data was collected by CSB with questionnaires sent by enterprises consumed biomass. Uncertainty for peat combustion activity data was assigned 2%. Uncertainty of landfill gas stationary combusted in enterprises covered by CRF 1.A.4 Other Sectors was assumed rather low – 2% because the combusted fuel amount is obtained directly from landfill plant that has precise measurement equipment for accounting of combusted fuel.

CO<sub>2</sub> EF was estimated according physical characterization of used fuels in country based on average NCV reported by fuel consumers and carbon content, hence the uncertainty for liquid fuels was assigned as quite low – about 10%. The same level of uncertainty was assigned for solid fuels. CO<sub>2</sub> EF for natural gas was assumed rather low – as 5% because annual plant specific fuel data is used to estimate EF. Uncertainty for coal is assumed 3% provided in 2017 research “Determination of Carbon Content and Calculation of Carbon Dioxide Emission Factors”.

CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O EFs used in estimation of emissions were taken according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Volume 2, Chapter 2 *Stationary combustion*, Table 2.12., which provides the range of default values for uncertainties. The uncertainty both for CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O EFs was assigned as uncertainties used in previous submissions – 50%.

Time series of the estimated emissions are consistent and complete because the same methodology, EFs and data sources are used for sectors for all years in time series. Emissions from all sectors are estimated or reported as not occurring / not applicable, therefore there are no “not estimated” sectors.

#### **3.2.7.4 Category-specific QA/QC and verification**

All documentation and information received for inventory purposes are archived in FTP folder.

##### *Activity data verification*

All sources of energy data are presented in the corresponding NIR chapter as well as disaggregated data at the finest level possible are presented in the corresponding Annex A.3.1. Data completeness has been explained in the previous subchapter.

Activity data has been checked at the data provider – CSB, which has its own internal QA/QC procedures based on mathematic model and analysis to avoid logic mistakes. When activity data is received, the sectoral expert responsible for the emission estimation and reporting is comparing all data changes with the previous inventory, and all changes are explained in the corresponding subchapter. All fluctuations or changes in NCVs are double checked and agreed with CSB.

All activity data used in SA are also compared with activity data used in RA estimations. All significant differences ( $\pm 5\%$ ) are explained in the corresponding subchapter. Apparent consumption reported in GHG inventory has been compared with activity data form AQ in Annex A.3.3.

##### *Emission factor verification*

For country-specific CO<sub>2</sub> EFs, the sources of the calorific values and carbon content, as well as these values are provided in 3.2.7.2 Methodological issues.

Country specific CO<sub>2</sub> values for year are compared with default ones available in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Volume 2, Chapter 2 *Stationary combustion*, Table 2.2. Whether country specific CO<sub>2</sub> EF is or is not in the confidence interval, can be seen in Table 3.47.

**Table 3.47 Comparison of country specific and the 2006 IPCC Guidelines default CO<sub>2</sub> emission factor values (kt/PJ)**

Fuel type	Lower	CS	Upper
Gasoline	67.50	71.18	73.00
Diesel oil	72.60	74.75	74.80
RFO	75.50	77.36	78.80
LPG	61.60	62.75	65.60
Jet fuel	69.70	72.23	74.40
Other kerosene	70.80	72.24	73.70
Other liquid	72.20	72.59	74.40
Shale oil	67.80	77.12	79.20
Peat	100.00	105.99	108.00
Natural gas	54.30	55.52	58.30
Wood	95.00	109.98	132.00
Firewood	95.00	108.45	132.00
Wood waste	95.00	117.32	132.00
Wood chips	95.00	98.70	132.00
Wood briquettes	95.00	105.03	132.00
Pellete wood	95.00	104.10	132.00
Coal	89.50	91.60 (1990-2002)	99.70
		94.08 (2003-2013)	
		96.54 (2013-)	

All country specific values incorporate in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines default CO<sub>2</sub> EF value range.

#### *Emission verification:*

To verify CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, logical mistakes are examined by checking the time series of the activity data, EFs and emissions consistency to display all significant and illogical changes in the activity data and emissions. Emissions of precursors in the database are cross-checked with emissions reported within CLRTAP for verification purposes.

CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are compared with emissions in RA estimations, and all significant differences ( $\pm 5\%$ ) are explained in the corresponding subchapter.

#### **3.2.7.5 Category-specific recalculations**

No recalculations were done for this sector.

#### **3.2.7.6 Category-specific planned improvements**

No improvements are planned for this sector.



### 3.2.8 Other (CRF 1.A.5)

#### 3.2.8.1 Category description

Under the CRF 1.A.5.b Other Mobile sources emissions from liquid fuels – gasoline, diesel oil and jet kerosene. These emissions appear since 1995 (Table 3.48).

Table 3.48 Emissions from Other sources (CRF 1.A.5) in 1990–2022 (kt)

Year	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	Aggregate GHGs	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	NMVOC	SO <sub>2</sub>
	kt			kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.	kt			
1990	NO,NE	NO,NE	NO,NE	NO,NE	NO,NE	NO,NE	NO,NE	NO,NE
1995	6.18	4.32E-05	0.00017	6.22	0.008	2.4	0.038	0.004
2000	0.14	9.67E-07	3.87E-06	0.14	1.76E-04	0.05	0.001	1.32E-05
2005	7.62	0.0006	0.00021	7.69	0.14	0.75	0.017	0.008
2010	7.87	0.0006	0.00021	7.94	0.16	0.58	0.015	0.005
2011	7.22	0.0006	0.00020	7.29	0.15	0.51	0.013	0.005
2012	7.33	0.0006	0.00020	7.40	0.15	0.60	0.014	0.005
2013	6.45	0.0005	0.00018	6.51	0.12	0.69	0.015	0.004
2014	9.44	0.0007	0.00026	9.53	0.20	0.65	0.017	0.006
2015	9.57	0.0008	0.00026	9.66	0.21	0.52	0.015	0.006
2016	11.39	0.0009	0.00031	11.50	0.23	0.95	0.023	0.007
2017	13.17	0.0012	0.00036	13.30	0.31	0.31	0.015	0.008
2018	19.85	0.0016	0.00054	20.04	0.43	1.05	0.031	0.013
2019	23.70	0.0019	0.00064	23.92	0.49	1.66	0.043	0.015
2020	14.72	0.0013	0.00040	14.87	0.35	0.39	0.018	0.009
2021	23.90	0.0020	0.00065	24.13	0.53	1.09	0.035	0.015
2022	24.23	0.0016	0.00066	24.45	0.43	2.92	0.061	0.015
Share of Energy total, 2022	0.4%	0.02%	0.1%	0.4%	1.7%	3.2%	0.5%	0.4%
2022 vs 2021	1.4%	-18.9%	2.1%	1.4%	-19.4%	167.4%	71.2%	1.8%
2022 vs 1995	292.3%	3699.3%	282.8%	292.9%	5263.7%	21.5%	59.3%	284.3%

In the recent years there has been an increase of fuel consumption and therefore increase in emissions. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions 2021-2022 have increased by 1.4%, and N<sub>2</sub>O by 2.1%, but CH<sub>4</sub> emissions decreased by 18.9%.

#### 3.2.8.2 Methodological issues

##### Methods

The 2006 IPCC Guidelines' Tier 1 method was used to calculate GHG emissions from the 1.A.5.b Other Mobile source sector.

Calculations of all emissions from fuel combustion are done with Excel databases developed by experts from LEGMC.

The general method for preparing inventory data was used:

$$Em = EF * B_q \quad (3.10)$$

where:

*Em* – total emissions (kt)

*EF* – estimated or default emission factor (t/TJ)

*B<sub>q</sub>* – amount of fuel in thermal units (TJ)

#### *Emission factors and other parameters*

Default EFs for direct GHGs from aircrafts are taken from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Volume 2, Chapter 3 *Mobile combustion*, Table 3.5.2 and Table 3.6.4 (Table 3.49).

Precursors EFs were taken from EMEP/EEA 2019. Country specific EFs were used to calculate SO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

**Table 3.49 CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O, NO<sub>x</sub>, NMVOC, CO emission factors<sup>31</sup>**

Fuel type	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	NO <sub>x</sub>	NMVOC	CO
Aviation gasoline	70.0	0.0005	0.002	4	19	1200
Diesel oil	74.1	0.007	0.002	78.5	2.8	7.4
Jet fuel	71.5	0.0005	0.002	4	19	1200

#### **3.2.8.3 Uncertainties and time-series consistency**

Uncertainty analysis for 2024 submission is carried out by using Approach 1. Quantitative estimates of uncertainties are provided in Annex 2. Overall description of uncertainty analysis is included in Section 1.6.

Uncertainty for activity data of fuel combustion in sectors CRF 1.A.5.b is 2±% in 2022 because official statistical information from CSB is used.

EFs used for emission estimation were taken from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. For diesel oil the uncertainty for CO<sub>2</sub> EF, according to these Guidelines, Volume 2, Chapter 3 *Mobile combustion*, Section 3.5.1.7, is 2%, but for CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O it is much higher - about 50%. For aviation gasoline and jet fuel, the uncertainty for CO<sub>2</sub> EF, according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Volume 2, Chapter 3 *Mobile combustion*, Section 3.6.1.7, is 5%, but for CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O it is assumed that the uncertainty is 100%.

Time series of the estimated emissions are consistent and complete because the same methodology, EFs and data sources are used for sectors for all years in time series.

#### **3.2.8.4 Category-specific QA/QC and verification**

All the documentation and information received for inventory purposes is archived in FTP folder (maintained by LEGMC).

##### *Activity data verification*

All sources of energy data are presented in the corresponding NIR chapter (3.2.8.2 Methodological issues) as well as disaggregated data at the finest level possible are presented in the corresponding Annex A.3.1 "1.A.5 Other". Data completeness has been explained in the previous subchapter.

Activity data has been checked at the data provider – CSB, that has its own internal QA/QC procedures based on mathematic model and analysis to avoid logic mistakes. When activity data is received, the sectoral expert responsible for the emission estimation and reporting is comparing all data changes with the previous inventory, and all changes are explained in the

<sup>31</sup> Units for GHGs are in kt/PJ, for precursors GHGs in kg/Mg.

corresponding subchapter. All fluctuations or changes in NCVs are double checked and agreed with CSB.

All activity data used in SA are also compared with activity data used in RA estimations. All significant differences ( $\pm 5\%$ ) are explained in the corresponding subchapter.

#### *Emission factor verification*

As all EFs are taken from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, no additional verification procedures have been performed.

#### *Emission verification*

To verify CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, logical mistakes are checked by checking the time series of the activity data, EFs and emissions consistency to display all significant and illogical changes in the activity data and emissions. The emissions of precursors GHGs in the database are cross-checked with emissions reported within CLRTAP for verification purposes.

CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are compared with emissions in RA estimations, and all significant differences ( $\pm 5\%$ ) are explained in the corresponding subchapter. Apparent consumption reported in GHG inventory has been compared with activity data form AQ in Annex A.3.3.

#### **3.2.8.5 Category-specific recalculations**

No recalculations were done for this sector.

#### **3.2.8.6 Category-specific planned improvements**

No improvements are planned for this sector.

### **3.3 FUGITIVE EMISSIONS FROM SOLID FUELS AND OIL AND NATURAL GAS (CRF 1.B)**

Under the 1.B Fugitive emissions category CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and NMVOC emissions from operations with natural gas and light liquid fuels are reported (Table 3.50).

**Table 3.50 Reported fugitive CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, NMVOC emissions in Latvia in 1990-2022 (kt)**

Year	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub>	Aggregate GHGs	NMVOC
	kt		kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.	kt
1990	0.0115	9.90	277.30	4.31
1995	0.0092	7.92	221.63	3.28
2000	0.0070	6.03	168.72	2.55
2005	0.0062	5.33	149.17	2.35
2010	0.0043	3.66	102.60	2.40
2015	0.0129	4.11	115.15	2.44
2016	0.0119	4.66	130.58	2.10
2017	0.0157	6.11	171.02	0.95
2018	0.0093	3.64	101.88	0.68
2019	0.0102	3.91	109.52	0.75
2020	0.0110	4.00	112.12	0.81
2021	0.0109	3.95	110.53	0.79
2022	0.0086	3.52	98.45	0.57
Share of Energy total, 2022	0.0001%	32.9%	1.5%	4.7%

Year	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub>	Aggregate GHGs	NMVOC
	kt		kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.	kt
2022 vs 2021	-21.10%	-10.92%	-10.92%	-28.7%
2022 vs 1990	-25.46%	-64.50%	-64.50%	-86.8%

Only particulate matter emissions are estimated from hard coal transportation in Latvia and reported within CLRTAP. It is assumed that no GHG emissions are generated during hard coal transportation via railways.

There are lasting peat extraction and manufacturing traditions in Latvia. As stated in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Volume 4 *Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use*, Chapter 1 *Introduction*, with current state of scientific knowledge, it is possible to provide methods for estimating CO<sub>2</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions associated with management of peatlands, and CO<sub>2</sub> from conversion to wetlands by flooding. However, according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Volume 4, Chapter 7 *Wetlands*, all on-site sources of GHG emissions should be reported under AFOLU *Wetlands* category regardless of the end-use of peat.

There are no coal mines in Latvia and therefore no fugitive emissions from mining processes occur.

### 3.3.1 Fugitive emission from oil (CRF 1.B.2.a)

#### 3.3.1.1 Category description

CRF sector 1.B.2.a Oil includes NMVOC emissions from refined oil products storage and distribution. There are no oil refineries in Latvia, therefore NMVOC emissions from gasoline distribution only were calculated for 1990–2022.




Figure 3.43 Fugitive NMVOC emissions from oil products in 1990–2022 (kt)

NMVOC emissions trend can partly be explained with fluctuating costs of gasoline as well as changes in technology, that impact gasoline consumption in Energy sector. In 2005–2007 there are rise in emissions that can be explained with the economic growth, however, in 2008 due to global crisis, the use of gasoline, as well as NMVOC emissions decreased, and continued to

decline after that because the consumption of gasoline in road transport are decreasing as the share of cars using diesel fuel increased rapidly in the total number of passenger cars (Figure 3.43).

Since 1990 up 2022 NMVOC emissions have decreased by 76.7%. In 2022, NMVOC emissions have decreased by 14.8% compared to 2021.

### 3.3.1.2 Methodological issues

#### Methods

EMEP/EEA 2023 Tier 1 methodology is used to estimate fugitive NMVOC emissions from operations with gasoline in 1990–2022. It uses the general equation, where emissions are obtained by multiplying the total amount of gasoline sold with the EF.

#### *Emission factors*

For emission calculation from gasoline distribution EF was taken from EMEP/EEA 2023, Chapter 1.B.2.a.v Distribution of oil products, Table 3-1.

NMVOC EF – 2.2 kg/Mg oil assuming the Stage I vapour recovery.

#### *Activity data*

Activity data for NMVOC emission calculation was taken from CSB Energy Balance (Table 3.51).

**Table 3.51 Gasoline consumption in Latvia in 1990–2021 (TJ)**

Year	Gasoline consumption (TJ)
1990	26796
1995	18128
2000	14831
2005	15126
2010	12667
2011	11926
2012	10146
2013	9282
2014	9018
2015	8922
2016	8751
2017	8362
2018	8030
2019	7637
2020	7317
2021	7232
2022	6233

### 3.3.1.3 Uncertainties and time-series consistency

Uncertainty analysis for 2024 submission is carried out by using Approach 1. Quantitative estimates of uncertainties are provided in Annex 2. Overall description of uncertainty analysis is included in Section 1.6.

Activity data for fugitive emissions from operations with gasoline were taken from CSB and uncertainty was assumed as low as 2% statistical frame mistake. Uncertainty for EF is assumed

as 100%, according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Volume 2, Chapter 4 *Fugitive emissions*, Table 4.2 (refined product distribution).

Time series of the estimated emissions are consistent and complete because the same methodology, EFs and data sources are used for sectors for all years in time series. Emissions from all sectors are estimated or reported as not occurring/not applicable therefore there are no “not estimated” sectors.

#### **3.3.1.4 Category-specific QA/QC and verification**

All documentation and information received for inventory purposes are archived in FTP folder.

##### *Activity data verification*

All sources of energy data are presented in the corresponding NIR chapter (3.3.1.2 Methodological issues) as well as disaggregated data at the finest level possible are presented in the corresponding Annex A.3.1. Data completeness has been explained in the previous subchapter.

Activity data has been checked at the data provider – CSB, which has its own internal QA/QC procedures based on mathematic model and analysis to avoid logic mistakes. When activity data is received, the sectoral expert responsible for the emission estimation and reporting is comparing all data changes with the previous inventory, and all changes are explained in the corresponding subchapter. All fluctuations or changes in NCVs are double checked and agreed with CSB.

##### *Emission factor verification*

As all EFs are taken from EMEP/EEA 2023, no additional verification procedures have been performed.

##### *Emission verification*

To verify NMVOC emissions, logical mistakes are examined by checking the time series of the activity data, EFs and emissions consistency to display all significant and illogical changes in the activity data and emissions. Emissions are also cross-checked with emissions reported within CLRTAP for verification purposes.

#### **3.3.1.5 Category-specific recalculations**

NMVOC emissions from gasoline distribution were recalculated from 1990 till 2021 according to implementation of new EMEP/EEA 2023 guidelines and updating of NMVOC EF for distribution of gasoline.

#### **3.3.1.6 Category-specific planned improvements**

No improvements are planned for this sector.

### **3.3.2 Fugitive emissions from natural gas (CRF 1.B.2.b, CRF 1.B.2.c, CRF 1.B.2.d)**

#### **3.3.2.1 Category description**

CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and NMVOC emissions from operations with natural gas are reported in the following sub-sectors CRF 1.B.2.b Natural gas sector:

- 1.B.2.b.i Venting;
- 1.B.2.b.iii All other:
  - 1.B.2.b.iii 4 Transmission and storage;
  - 1.B.2.b.iii 5 Distribution;
  - 1.B.2.b.iii 6 Other (includes leakage at residential and commercial sectors)

Table 3.52 Fugitive CH<sub>4</sub>, CO<sub>2</sub> and NMVOC emissions from natural gas 1990-2022 (kt)

Year	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub>	Aggregate GHGs	NMVOC
	kt		kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.	kt
1990	0.0115	9.90	277.30	2.97
1995	0.0092	7.92	221.63	2.37
2000	0.0070	6.03	168.72	1.80
2005	0.0062	5.33	149.17	1.60
2010	0.0043	3.66	102.60	1.77
2011	0.0054	2.52	70.60	0.86
2012	0.0049	3.18	89.17	0.98
2013	0.0080	4.04	113.13	1.28
2014	0.0138	5.41	151.57	1.93
2015	0.0129	4.11	115.15	2.00
2016	0.0119	4.66	130.58	1.66
2017	0.0157	6.11	171.02	0.53
2018	0.0093	3.64	101.88	0.28
2019	0.0102	3.91	109.52	0.36
2020	0.0110	4.00	112.12	0.45
2021	0.0109	3.95	110.53	0.43
2022	0.0086	3.52	98.45	0.25
Share of Energy total, 2022	0.0001%	32.9%	1.5%	2.1%
2022 vs 2021	-21.10%	-10.92%	-10.92%	-41.18%
2022 vs 1990	-25.46%	-64.50%	-64.50%	-91.42%

GHG emissions have decreased in 1990-2022 by 64.5%. There are few years where the emissions increased, and in all cases the increase is related with repair works and modernisation of existing pipeline system. Compared to 2021, emissions have decreased by 10.92% in 2022 mainly due to lower emissions from venting in transmission system because no initially planned repair works were carried out in transmission pipelines with Russia and there are no plans to carry them out at all, because these pipelines will no longer be used.

Table 3.53 Pipeline length 1990-2022 (km)

Year	Transport (main) gas pipeline system length, km	Distribution pipeline length, km
1990	1109	-
1995	1213	-
2000	1213	3085
2005	1281	4339
2010	1240	4825
2011	1240	4857
2012	1240	4898
2013	1240	4934
2014	1240	4967

Year	Transport (main) gas pipeline system length, km	Distribution pipeline length, km
2015	1191	5040
2016	1191	5124
2017	1188	5212
2018	1188	5243
2019	1188	5272
2020	1188	5337
2021	1190	5381
2022	1190	5420

Information about gas pipeline length was received from JSC "Latvijas Gāze" (1990-2016) and can be seen in Table 3.53. In 2017 after liberalization of the Latvian gas market "Latvijas Gāze" was split up and JSC "Conexus Baltic Grid" was handed over the natural gas infrastructure (main transmission system and underground gas storage) and JSC "Gasol" natural gas distribution. Pipeline length differs from year to year due to construction of new pipelines and closing old ones.

In the distribution part of pipeline system operated by AS "Gasol" gas pressure ranges from 20mbar to 16bar. Gas pressure in the transmission part of pipeline system operated by JSC "Conexus Baltic Grid" is around of 35bar. Pipeline materials are range from steel pipes with bitumen insulation (USSR) and with triple polyethylene insulation after separation from the USSR; polyethylene pipes. Gas quality and parameters of natural gas to be input into transmission and storage system in JSC "Conexus Baltic Grid" is measured by ISO standards<sup>32</sup>.

### 3.3.2.2 Methodological issues

#### Methods

LEGMC received data about CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from the natural gas holding company JSC "Latvijas Gāze" for the time period 1990–2016. Consequently JSC "Latvijas Gāze" calculates emissions itself, using data of natural gas density and other physical parameters and measures the content of methane and other chemical compounds in natural gas, therefore it is assumed as Tier 3 method, using country-specific data and calculations. In 2017, after liberalization of the Latvian gas market JSC "Conexus Baltic Grid" was handed over the natural gas infrastructure (main transmission system and underground gas storage) and JSC "Gasol" natural gas distribution. Therefore information about fugitive emissions from natural gas starting from 2017 is received from new companies.

JSC "Conexus Baltic Grid" calculates emissions from main transmission system and underground gas storage for:

- venting (CRF1.B.2.c.1.ii);
- transmission and storage (CRF 1.B.2.b.iii 4).

JSC "Gasol" calculates emissions from distribution system for:

- venting (CRF 1.B.2.c.1.ii);

<sup>32</sup> <https://www.conexus.lv/gas-quality-standards>



- distribution (CRF 1.B.2.b.iii 5);
- other (CRF 1.B.2.b.iii 6).

Detailed description of the methodologies used for emission calculations is available in Annex A.3.6 Fugitive emissions.

#### Activity data

CH<sub>4</sub> emissions are obtained from the holding company JSC "Latvijas Gāze" (1990-2016), JSC "Conexus Baltic Grid" (2017-now), JSC "Gasol" (2017-now) and the activity data (millions m<sup>3</sup>) are provided in Table 3.54.

**Table 3.54 Amounts of natural gas leaked in 1990-2022 (10<sup>6</sup> m<sup>3</sup>)**

Year	1.B.2.c.1.ii Venting	1.B.2.b.iii 4 Transmission and storage	1.B.2.b.iii 5 Distribution	1.B.2.b.iii 6 Other	Total
1990	5.61	0.13	0.69	12.44	18.87
1995	4.32	0.13	0.69	9.94	15.08
2000	3.11	0.11	0.69	7.57	11.48
2005	3.25	0.09	0.69	6.12	10.15
2010	1.64	0.06	0.69	4.59	6.98
2011	1.77	0.05	0.69	1.70	4.21
2012	1.34	0.05	0.69	3.35	5.43
2013	1.09	0.04	0.69	4.06	5.89
2014	1.53	0.04	0.66	5.69	7.93
2015	0.95	0.04	0.71	4.35	6.06
2016	0.93	0.04	0.67	5.18	6.83
2017	0.83	0.01	0.73	7.82	9.39
2018	0.41	0.01	0.72	4.42	5.56
2019	0.84	0.01	0.73	4.40	5.98
2020	1.04	0.01	0.73	4.32	6.10
2021	1.00	0.01	0.75	4.26	6.02
2022	0.46	0.01	0.76	4.15	5.38

In Table 3.54 information received from natural gas companies and represents natural gas companies' calculations about amount of natural gas leaked 1990-2022.

**Table 3.55 Amounts of natural gas in 1990-2022 (10<sup>6</sup> m<sup>3</sup>)**

Year	Import	Export	Stock change	Apparent consumption
1990	3310	150	223	2937
1995	1241	NO	-13	1254
2000	1385	NO	26	1359
2005	1790	NO	95	1695
2010	1125	NO	696	1821
2011	1755	NO	-151	1604
2012	1717	NO	-209	1508
2013	1698	NO	-237	1461
2014	947	NO	366	1313
2015	1305	NO	19	1324
2016	1132	NO	239	1371
2017	1244	NO	-1	1243
2018	1422	NO	3	1425

Year	Import	Export	Stock change	Apparent consumption
2019	1363	NO	NO	1363
2020	1115	NO	NO	1115
2021	1205	NO	-1	1204
2022	839	NO	3	842

In Table 3.55 information about natural gas net supply from CSB Energy Balance is provided.

### 3.3.2.3 Uncertainties and time-series consistency

Uncertainty analysis for 2024 submission is carried out by using Approach 1. Quantitative estimates of uncertainties are provided in Annex 2. Overall description of uncertainty analysis is included in Section 1.6.

The level of uncertainty was determined by natural gas distributing company JSC „Latvijas Gāze”, JSC “Conexus Baltic Grid” and JSC “Gasos”. The uncertainty both for activity data (gas amounts) and CH<sub>4</sub>, CO<sub>2</sub> and NMVOC emissions from gas venting and natural gas leakages in gas distribution and transmission systems, as well as in gas storage facility is assigned as quite low – 10%, as these were estimated by the enterprise operated with natural gas by methodology developed for enterprise. However, for other leakage (CRF 1.B.2.b.iii 6) the uncertainty for the emissions is assumed as 35%.

Emissions from all sectors are estimated or reported as not occurring / not applicable therefore there are no “not estimated” sectors.

### 3.3.2.4 Category-specific QA/QC and verification

JSC “Latvijas Gāze”, JSC “Conexus Baltic Grid” and JSC “Gasos” report fugitive CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from the operations with natural gas, estimates CH<sub>4</sub> and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions according to methodology prepared especially for the organization that is internationally verified and approved by the Environment State Bureau. Underground storage “Inčukalns” also has an ISO standard and all the information obtaining procedures are controlled and verified.

Emissions are compared with calculations made using Tier 1 methodology from IPCC 2006 Chapter 4: Fugative Emissions emission factors from Table 4.2.4 “Tier 1 emission factors for fugitive emissions (including venting and flaring) from oil and gas operations in developed countries”. Calculations are available to ERT after request.

All documentation and information received for inventory purposes are archived in FTP folder.

### 3.3.2.5 Category-specific recalculations

Slightly precised data on natural gas CH<sub>4</sub> emissions and activity data in distribution network 2018-2021 according to minor corrections sent by JSC “Gasos”.

### 3.3.2.6 Category-specific planned improvements

No improvements are planned for this sector.

## 3.4 CO<sub>2</sub> TRANSPORT AND STORAGE (CRF 1.C)

There is no CO<sub>2</sub> captured and further stored in Latvia. There is a research done to find the potential sites for CO<sub>2</sub> geological storage in Latvia within international project “Assessing

European Capacity for Geological Storage of Carbon Dioxide" (EU GeoCapacity)<sup>33,34</sup>. Latvia has a storage potential in local structures in the Cambrian water-saturated sandstone. In one of such geological structures, an underground storage of natural gas was established already in 1968 – the Inčukalns natural gas storage. For modelling the potential costs, the largest CO<sub>2</sub> source in Latvia in 2005 from EU ETS was taken, and as potential storages were selected the two largest ones. The modelling results demonstrated that the efficiency of the establishment of CO<sub>2</sub> storages there is too low. The unsatisfactory results are associated with the inefficient injection of small volumes of CO<sub>2</sub> in the storages, and the cost of the establishment of infrastructure is quite high, and the expenditure is unfounded with the low level of CO<sub>2</sub> injection.

DRAFT

---

<sup>33</sup> *Assessing European capacity for geological storage of carbon dioxide—the EU GeoCapacity project*. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1876610209006778>

<sup>34</sup> *Potential sites for CO<sub>2</sub> geological storage*. Available: <http://meteo.lv/fs/CKFinderJava/userfiles/files/Geologija/Potential%20sites.pdf>

## 4 INDUSTRIAL PROCESSES AND PRODUCT USE (CRF 2)

### 4.1 OVERVIEW OF SECTOR

GHG emissions from Industrial Processes and Product Use contributed 8.5% to the total anthropogenic GHG emissions excluding LULUCF, including indirect CO<sub>2</sub> totalling 858.47 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. in 2022 (Figure 4.1).




Figure 4.1 Emissions from the Industrial processes and product use sector compared with the total emissions in 2022

The majority (63.8%) of IPPU emissions originate in 2.A Mineral industry (emissions from Cement production (62.9%), Other process uses of carbonates (0.8%) and Glass production (0.1%)). The second largest emission category under IPPU sector is 2.F Product uses as substitutes for ODS constituting 29.2% from IPPU emissions and 2.5% from total GHG emissions in Latvia (excluding LULUCF, including indirect CO<sub>2</sub>). Almost all 2.F. emissions comes from 2.F.1 Refrigeration and air conditioning appliances (97.3%). Remaining sectors generating emissions in IPPU are 2.D Non-energy products from fuels and solvent use (5.2%) and 2.G Other product manufacture and use constituting 1.9% from total IPPU emissions in 2022.


Sources of emissions from IPPU sector reported in Latvia's GHG inventory are as follows:

- Mineral Industry (CRF 2.A)
  - Cement Production (CRF 2.A.1)
    - CO<sub>2</sub> from cement production
    - SO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, NMVOCs from cement production
  - Lime Production (CRF 2.A.2)
    - CO<sub>2</sub> from limestone and dolomite use in lime production and quicklime production in iron & steel industry
  - Glass Production (CRF 2.A.3)
    - CO<sub>2</sub> from raw material use in glass production
    - NMVOCs from glass fibre production
  - Other Process Uses of Carbonates (CRF 2.A.4)
    - CO<sub>2</sub> from Ceramics (Bricks and tiles production) (CRF 2.A.4.a)

- CO<sub>2</sub> from Other uses of Soda Ash (waste water neutralization in glass fibre production plant) (CRF 2.A.4.b)
    - Other (NO<sub>x</sub> and CO emissions from cement production, NMVOCs from cement and glass fibre production) (CRF 2.A.4.d)
- Metal Industry (CRF 2.C)
  - Iron and Steel Production (CRF 2.C.1)
    - CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from crude iron use as raw material
    - CH<sub>4</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, CO, NMVOC emissions from total iron and steel production
    - CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from limestone, dolomite, coke and carbon electrodes use in steel production
- Non-energy products from fuels and solvent use (CRF 2.D)
  - CO<sub>2</sub> from lubricant use (CRF 2.D.1)
  - CO<sub>2</sub> from paraffin wax use (CRF 2.D.2)
  - Other (CRF 2.D.3)
    - CO<sub>2</sub> and NMVOCs from Solvent use
    - CO<sub>2</sub> and NMVOCs from road paving with asphalt
    - CO<sub>2</sub>, CO and NMVOCs from asphalt roofing
    - CO<sub>2</sub> from urea use
- Product uses as Substitutes for ODS (CRF 2.F)
  - HFCs from Refrigeration and Air Conditioning (CRF 2.F.1)
    - Commercial Refrigeration (CRF 2.F.1.a)
    - Domestic Refrigeration (CRF 2.F.1.b)
    - Industrial Refrigeration (CRF 2.F.1.c)
    - Transport Refrigeration (CRF 2.F.1.d)
    - Mobile Air-Conditioning (CRF 2.F.1.e)
    - Stationary Air-Conditioning (CRF 2.F.1.f)
  - HFCs from Foam Blowing Agents (CRF 2.F.2)
    - Closed Cells (CRF 2.F.2.a)
    - Open Cells (CRF 2.F.2.b)
  - HFCs from Fire Protection (CRF 2.F.3)
  - HFCs from Aerosols (CRF 2.F.4)
    - Metered Dose Inhalers (CRF 2.F.4.a)
- Other product manufacture and use (CRF 2.G)
  - SF<sub>6</sub> from Electrical Equipment (CRF 2.G.1)
  - N<sub>2</sub>O From Product Uses (CRF 2.G.3)
- Other Production (CRF 2.H)
  - SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from Pulp and Paper production for 1990–1996 (2.H.1).
  - NMVOC emissions from food and beverages production (2.H.2)
  - CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from limestone use in sugar production for 2005-2006 (2.H.2)

Emissions from the Chemical Industry (CRF 2.B), Electronics Industry (CRF 2.E) are not occurring (NO) in Latvia for all timeseries. Since 2016 emissions from 2.A.2 Lime production and 2.C Metal Production are not occurring due to interruption of lime and iron & steel production in the country.

Emissions from IPPU have been increased by 31.0% since 1990 and decreased by 2.1% in 2022 compared to 2021 (Figure 4.2, Table 4.1).



**Figure 4.2 GHG emissions from Industrial processes and product use in 1990–2022 (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)**

Emission fluctuations through the years are mainly linked to the economic situation in country. The largest decrease in emissions occurred between 1991 and 1993, when industry was affected by a crisis. It has to be noted that at the beginning of 1990s during the countrywide changes in the governmental system the national economy statistics was not well developed. Therefore there are a lack of statistical data regarding industry during this period of time or statistical data are vague. The data extrapolation was carried out for the sectors where it was possible.

A key drivers for IPPU emission growth starting from 1994 are overall increase of activity in industrial production processes (cement and lime production). Since that time sharp development of construction activities has been observed and industrial production of building materials also increased. Changes in export of products from Latvia to Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) countries has also caused emission fluctuations 1998-2000.

F-gas emissions have been increasing significantly since 1995. This growth is reflected in IPPU emission curve. The sharp increase of F-gas emissions is related to growing demand for refrigeration and air conditioning equipment along with improved economic situation in Latvia. There is no manufacturing of F-gases containing products in the country thus emissions mainly depend on consumption of imported products.

In 2010, compared to 2009 rapid emission growth could be observed in Mineral industry (by 137.2%) where CO<sub>2</sub> emission increase was a result of setting up of a new dry process technological plant in cement production.

In 2014, the CO<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from metal industry have decreased by 100% compared to 1990 due to insolvency of the only metal production plant in Latvia however in 2015 the metal production company begun to produce steel again therefore emissions again appeared, but in

2016 again metal production was stopped and facility was not reporting GHG emissions from metal production processes anymore (NO).

**Table 4.1 Greenhouse gas emission trend in 1990–2022 (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)**

Year	Total	2.A Mineral Industry	2.C Metal Industry	2.D Non-Energy Products from Fuels and Solvent	2.F Product Uses as Substitutes for ODS	2.G Other Product Manufacture and Use	2.H. Other
1990	655.40	537.24	69.63	44.23	NE,NO	4.30	NA,NO
1995	225.71	126.57	45.42	33.26	16.25	4.21	NA,NO
2000	283.32	122.68	61.17	32.87	61.85	4.74	NA,NO
2005	366.94	165.38	50.05	37.89	101.24	7.52	4.85
2010	751.60	452.96	38.72	32.15	216.35	11.42	NA,NO
2011	848.26	569.00	13.73	36.09	217.53	11.90	NA,NO
2012	905.57	586.96	53.45	36.44	216.67	12.04	NA,NO
2013	848.29	553.79	13.90	38.53	229.26	12.81	NA,NO
2014	862.26	571.51	0.01	35.08	242.82	12.83	NA,NO
2015	788.38	479.57	0.81	41.72	251.86	14.42	NA,NO
2016	687.41	356.11	NO	45.69	271.61	14.00	NA,NO
2017	764.40	447.25	NO	38.52	264.06	14.56	NA,NO
2018	889.91	561.62	NO	54.30	259.17	14.82	NA,NO
2019	887.48	570.83	NO	47.67	250.96	18.02	NA,NO
2020	865.93	560.56	NO	46.58	243.26	15.53	NA,NO
2021	877.14	547.70	NO	55.18	258.80	15.45	NA,NO
2022	858.47	547.49	NO	44.77	250.30	15.91	NA,NO
Share of total % in 2022	-	63.8%		5.2%	29.2%	1.9%	-
2022 versus 2021	-2.1%	-0.04%	-100.0%	-18.9%	-3.3%	3.0%	-
2022 versus 1990	31.0%	1.9%	-100.0%	1.2%	1440.3%	269.9%	-

Key categories under IPPU sector are listed in Table 4.2. Information regarding approaches used for key category analysis available in Chapter 1.5 and Annex 1.

**Table 4.2 Key categories in IPPU sector in 2024 submission**

Category	Gas	Identification criteria	with LULUCF	without LULUCF
2.A.1. Cement Production	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2	X	X
2.A.2. Lime Production	CO <sub>2</sub>	T1,T2	X	X
2.C.1 Iron and Steel Production	CO <sub>2</sub>	T1		X
2.D.3. Solvent Use	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,T2		X
2.F.1. Refrigeration and air conditioning	HFCs	L1,L2	X	X

## 4.2 MINERAL INDUSTRY (CRF 2.A)

### 4.2.1 Category description

Mineral industry sector is the main emission source under IPPU sector. Sources of non-energy CO<sub>2</sub> emissions under Mineral industry sector is a cement production (98.6%), glass production (0.1%), ceramics (1.2%) and other use of soda ash (0.04%). Mineral industry sector GHG emissions amounts to 547.49 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. (5.4%) of total GHG emissions without LULUCF, with indirect CO<sub>2</sub> and 63.8% from total IPPU emissions in Latvia in 2022. The only lime production plant stopped lime production in 2016 therefore since 2016 emissions are not occurring (NO) in 2.A.2 sector.

In 2022, emissions from Mineral industry have increased by 1.9% since 1990 and decreased by 0.04% compared to 2021 (Figure 4.3 and Table 4.3).




Figure 4.3 Emissions from Mineral industry in 1990–2022 (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are strongly influenced by economic situation in the country. Emission curve reflects economic crisis in the period of time 1991–1993 after transition of national economy due to collapse of former Soviet Union market when significant amount of industrial producers stopped their activity (Table 4.3). Since 1993 Latvia's economy started to recover and GDP started to increase hence industrial production and IPPU emissions increased until 2007.

Due to Latvia's economic downturn in 2007–2008 the industry development was slowing down as the financing and real estate sectors started to dominate in national economy. In 2009–2010 emissions from Cement production have been significantly growing due to setting up a new technology and installations increasing its capacity approximately 2.4 times. Cement industry reached its emissions peak in 2012. Afterwards emissions started to fluctuate and since 2014 the decrease in emissions from cement production can be observed. In 2016, compared to 2015 the amount of clinker production has decreased by 26.2% due to decrease of export amounts and reduced activity in building sector which caused lower demand for cement but



then until 2020 there is an increase in emissions due to a growth in demand. Then decrease in clinker production but in 2022 the amount of clinker has increased by 1.1% compared to 2021.

**Table 4.3 Emissions from 2.A Mineral Industry in 1990–2022 (kt)**

Year	CO <sub>2</sub>						NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	NMVOC	SO <sub>2</sub>
	2.A	2.A.1	2.A.2	2.A.3	2.A.4.a	2.A.4.b				
1990	537.24	345.78	121.91	0.36	69.18	NO	0.90	NO,NA,NE	0.16	3.41
1995	126.57	94.32	17.85	3.40	11.00	NO	0.24	NO,NA,NE	0.04	0.90
2000	122.68	88.37	13.97	5.93	14.41	NO	0.23	NO,NA,NE	0.04	0.85
2005	165.38	134.38	14.12	5.71	10.97	0.20	0.46	0.01	0.07	1.39
2006	193.11	169.24	9.74	2.68	11.21	0.22	0.54	0.01	0.08	1.72
2007	199.63	171.49	10.69	4.45	12.78	0.22	0.58	0.03	0.10	1.77
2008	198.81	167.70	11.97	4.04	14.91	0.20	0.57	0.03	0.09	1.75
2009	190.97	178.06	6.80	2.62	3.38	0.11	0.63	0.02	0.05	1.77
2010	452.96	430.57	12.31	4.49	5.49	0.10	0.59	0.85	0.03	0.12
2011	569.00	556.96	0.09	4.34	7.51	0.10	1.11	1.78	0.03	0.41
2012	586.96	575.09	0.28	3.77	7.58	0.24	1.60	3.56	0.01	0.44
2013	553.79	540.50	0.25	3.30	9.12	0.62	1.64	2.62	0.01	0.23
2014	571.51	558.63	0.42	0.95	10.88	0.63	1.90	2.27	0.02	0.21
2015	479.57	470.31	0.46	0.48	7.64	0.67	1.97	1.68	0.02	0.25
2016	356.11	346.34	NO	0.62	8.82	0.34	1.41	0.71	0.02	0.10
2017	447.25	437.08	NO	0.73	9.27	0.18	1.75	1.28	0.01	0.08
2018	561.62	550.93	NO	0.75	9.78	0.16	2.13	1.48	0.02	0.11
2019	570.83	561.46	NO	0.57	8.67	0.12	2.09	2.42	0.02	0.10
2020	560.56	550.83	NO	0.68	8.86	0.19	1.95	2.60	0.02	0.20
2021	547.70	538.55	NO	0.72	8.18	0.25	2.04	3.29	0.02	0.14
2022	547.49	540.09	NO	0.70	6.48	0.22	2.06	3.11	0.02	0.12
Share of IPPU total in 2022, %	63.8%	62.9%	0.0%	0.1%	0.8%	0.0%				
2022 versus 2021	-0.04%	0.3%	-100%	-2.4%	-20.8%	-14.0%	1.0%	-5.5%	6.4%	-10.7%
2022 versus 1990	1.9%	-56.2%	-100%	96.8%	-90.6%	9.4%	127.9%	26017%	-88.3%	-96.3%

Beside GHG emissions also SO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, NMVOC and CO emissions from cement production and NMVOC emissions from glass fibre production are reported under Mineral industry. NO<sub>x</sub>, CO and NMVOC emissions from glass and cement production and SO<sub>2</sub> from glass production are reported in 2.A.4.d Other sector because it is not technically possible to enter data under relevant sectors in CRF Reporter.

Reported emissions and calculation methods for the Mineral Industry in Latvia's GHG inventory are summarized in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4 GHG emission categories, methods and gases reported from 2.A Mineral Industry

Category	Method used	Gases reported
2.A Mineral Industry		
1. Cement Production	Tier2	CO <sub>2</sub> , CO, NMVOC, SO <sub>2</sub> , NO <sub>x</sub>
2. Lime Production	Tier2	CO <sub>2</sub>
3. Glass Production	Tier3	CO <sub>2</sub> , CO, NMVOC, SO <sub>2</sub> , NO <sub>x</sub>
4. Other Process Uses of Carbonates		
4.a Ceramics		
Production of bricks	Tier2	CO <sub>2</sub>
Production of tiles	Tier1,2	CO <sub>2</sub>
4.b Other uses of soda ash		
	Tier1	CO <sub>2</sub>

## 4.2.2 Cement Production (CRF 2.A.1)

### 4.2.2.1 Category description

In 2022, GHG emissions from Cement production were 540.09 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. (5.3%) of Latvia's total CO<sub>2</sub> eq. emissions including indirect CO<sub>2</sub>, without LULUCF and 62.9% from total IPPU sector emissions. Compared to 2021 emissions have increased by 0.3%, but compared to 1990 emissions have increased by 56.2% (Table 4.3 and Figure 4.4).




Figure 4.4 Emissions from Cement production in 1990–2022 (SO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, NMVOC and CO emissions on secondary axis) (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.; kt)

The emission curve represents the situation in national economy where the big decrease occurred in the beginning of the 1990s due to changes in national economy, domestic market and production demand. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from Cement Production had decreased by 95.4% in 1990-1993. Increase of emissions in period 2000-2007 by 94.1% represents the development of building sector and development of external market. In the middle of 2009 new production plant with dry process kiln production technology was built instead of the old one where the wet process kiln technology was used. Consequently the cement kiln dust recovery was stopped

and further cement kiln dust was collected and transported to landfill for storage. Therefore the amount of cement kiln dust and CKD/clinker ratio increased affecting CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

NMVOC emissions have decreased in 2009-2010 by 72.0% due to adjustment of EF for new dry production process that is lower than for the old production plant's wet kiln process technology. SO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub> and CO emissions are automatically measured at plant site.

Starting from 2010 fully dry process kiln is used in cement production in Latvia. For 2009 both kiln processes - dry and wet was used in cement production. Previously (1990 – 2009 partly) only wet process kiln was used in cement production. Due to increasing activity for cement clinker production in 2010, decrease of SO<sub>x</sub> emissions can be observed. Tyres and lube oil consisting of sulphur compounds were used as raw materials.

For 2010 SO<sub>x</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub> and CO data are not representative as new technology began to operate with full capacity only in July on 2<sup>nd</sup> half of year 2010 and fully in 2011. Emissions rapidly increased in 2010 due to capacity building in cement production comparing with previous years. Clinker production is depending on the demand in internal and external market. In 2016 amount of clinker production has decreased by about 26.1%, compared to 2015, due to decrease of exported amounts and decrease of building activities in Latvia. From 2017 to 2019 the amount of clinker has grown, then for two years the amount of clinker decreased. But in 2022 the amount of clinker has increased by 1.1% compared to 2021.

#### 4.2.2.2 Methodological issues

##### *Activity data*

Data on the clinker production and cement kiln dust (CKD) are used as activity data for CO<sub>2</sub> emission calculation from 2.A.1 sector. As the only cement producer in Latvia participates in European Union Emission Trading Scheme (EU ETS), the activity data are available annually from the installation's annual GHG report<sup>35</sup> under the EU ETS. In 2019, the company changed its name from "Cemex" to "SCHWENK Latvija", but without changing its operations.

The clinker production is estimated from final produced amount of cement clinker because clinker production is not weighted directly in the cement production plant due to non-stop production process. As plant produces many types of cement, clinker activity data are estimated taking into account different cement types multiplying with cement/clinker ratio and also mass balance of cement, clinker and used additives in cement production. Based on the information from the cement producer, clinker production is estimated from cement production data and all incoming and outgoing volumes of material are weighed on calibrated car and rail scales.

Producer does the mass balance approach calculation at plant site. Final clinker data are calculated using plant mass balance approach in two steps:

- 1) Clinker production = ((cement export – cement stock changes) \* clinker/cement ratio) - clinker export – clinker stock changes ;
- 2) Clinker production = used clinker + clinker export – clinker import + clinker stock change.

<sup>35</sup>Polluting activity permit. Available: [https://registri.vvd.gov.lv/izsniestas-atlajas-un-licences/atlauju-un-licencu-mekletajs/?company\\_name=schwenk&company\\_code=&s=1](https://registri.vvd.gov.lv/izsniestas-atlajas-un-licences/atlauju-un-licencu-mekletajs/?company_name=schwenk&company_code=&s=1)

The official CKD data for 1990-1994 are not available therefore the default CKD correction factor 1.02 according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines is used. Since 1995 CKD data are available from cement plant. The CKD is weighted before the transportation outside the company for the storage. CKD ratio fluctuates from year to year depending on clinker production and CKD (Table 4.5).

**Table 4.5 Clinker production and CKD/clinker ratio**

Year	Clinker production (kt)	Produced cement kiln dust (kt)	CKD / clinker ratio (%)
1990	668.50	NA	NA
1995	175.69	15.00	8.54
2000	167.18	10.00	5.98
2005	265.40	1.53	0.58
2010	834.94	7.02	0.84
2011	1095.23	10.87	0.99
2012	1129.11	13.29	1.18
2013	1054.95	12.43	1.18
2014	1093.04	12.92	1.18
2015	918.41	12.96	1.41
2016	678.27	9.02	1.33
2017	853.97	10.59	1.24
2018	1072.87	15.13	1.41
2019	1091.08	11.69	1.07
2020	1084.22	12.88	1.19
2021	1056.09	17.97	1.70
2022	1067.27	19.60	1.84

#### *Emission factors and calculations*

CaO and MgO content in clinker production is measured in the cement plant therefore are plant specific.

Tier 2 method from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines is used for CO<sub>2</sub> EF and emission estimation. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from clinker production are estimated using the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.

$$\mathbf{CO_2 Emissions} = \mathbf{M_{cl}} * \mathbf{EF_{cl}} * \mathbf{CF_{ckd}} \quad (4.1)$$

where:

CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions - emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> from cement production (tons)

M<sub>cl</sub> – weight (mass) of clinker production (tons)

EF<sub>cl</sub> – emission factor for clinker, tons CO<sub>2</sub>/ton clinker. This clinker emission factor (EF<sub>cl</sub>) is not corrected for CKD

CF<sub>ckd</sub> – emissions correction factor for CKD (dimensionless)

CO<sub>2</sub> EF is calculated using 2006 IPCC Guidelines for all time series according to the plant specific CaO content in used limestone and CKD correction factor.

$$\mathbf{EF_{clc}} = (\mathbf{0.785 * CaO_{content}}) * \mathbf{CKD_{correction}} \quad (4.2)$$

where:

EF<sub>clc</sub> – clinker production EF (kt/kt)

0.785 – molecular weight ration of CO<sub>2</sub> to CaO in the raw material (CaCO<sub>3</sub>)

CaO – CaO content (weight fraction) in clinker production (%)

CKD<sub>correction</sub> – correction factor for cement kiln dust

CKD correction factor is calculated using the 2006 IPCC Guidelines taking into account cement/clinker ratio, plant specific fraction of original carbonate in the CKD ( $C_d$ ), fraction calcination of the original carbonate in the CKD ( $F_d$ ),  $EF_c$  from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (0.43971 tCO<sub>2</sub>/t carbonate) and clinker production EF without CKD correction (calculated by multiplying CaO content in clinker production with molecular weight ratio of CO<sub>2</sub> to CaO in the raw material (0.785 t/t)) (Table 4.6).

$$CF_{ckd} = 1 + \left(\frac{M_d}{M_{cl}}\right) * C_d * F_d * \left(\frac{EF_c}{EF_{cl}}\right) \quad (4.3)$$

where:

$CF_{ck}$  - emissions correction factor for CKD (dimensionless)

$M_d$  - weight of CKD not recycled to the kiln (tons)

$M_{cl}$  - weight of clinker production (tons)

$C_d$  - fraction of original carbonate in the CKD (i.e., before calcination) (fraction)

$F_d$  - fraction calcination of the original carbonate in the CKD (fraction)

$EF_c$  - emission factor for the carbonate (tons CO<sub>2</sub>/ton carbonate)

$EF_{cl}$  - emission factor for clinker uncorrected for CKD ( tons CO<sub>2</sub>/ ton clinker)

**Table 4.6** Parametrs for  $EF_{cl}$  and  $CF_{CKD}$  emission factor calculation and emission factors 1990–2022

Year	CaO content (%)	MgO content (%)	Cd (%)	Fd (Fraction)	Clinker production EF without CKD correction factor	CKD correction factor	Clinker production EF with CKD correction factor
1990	64.60	3.56	1.16	0.77	0.51	1.02	0.52
1995	64.06	3.76	1.17	0.78	0.50	1.07	0.54
2000	64.29	3.65	1.17	0.78	0.50	1.05	0.53
2005	64.21	3.79	1.16	0.78	0.50	1.00	0.51
2010	65.24	3.61	1.19	0.81	0.51	1.01	0.52
2011	64.34	3.61	1.13	0.70	0.51	1.01	0.51
2012	64.30	3.59	1.14	0.78	0.50	1.01	0.51
2013	64.65	3.51	1.14	0.82	0.51	1.01	0.51
2014	64.50	3.81	1.13	0.81	0.51	1.01	0.51
2015	64.52	3.85	1.11	0.81	0.51	1.01	0.51
2016	64.41	3.79	1.17	0.73	0.51	1.01	0.51
2017	64.57	3.64	1.12	0.81	0.51	1.01	0.51
2018	64.76	3.62	1.14	0.72	0.51	1.01	0.51
2019	65.21	3.40	1.10	0.52	0.51	1.01	0.51
2020	64.35	3.55	1.12	0.50	0.51	1.01	0.51
2021	64.40	3.54	1.13	0.52	0.51	1.01	0.51
2022	63.86	3.75	1.10	0.53	0.51	1.01	0.51

Until 2009 Tier 2 approach from EMEP/EEA 2023 was used to calculate NO<sub>x</sub>, NMVOC, SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from cement production taking into account of clinker production in wet and dry process kiln. EFs for NO<sub>x</sub>, NMVOC and SO<sub>2</sub> are not available in EMEP/EEA 2023<sup>36</sup> therefore the EFs from EMEP/CORINAIR 2007<sup>37</sup> were used. Since 2010 NO<sub>x</sub>, CO and SO<sub>2</sub> emissions are automatically measured in cement plant in dry process production therefore are plant-specific

<sup>36</sup> EMEP/EEA air pollutant emission inventory guidebook 2023 2.A.1 Cement production. Available: <https://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/emep-eea-guidebook-2023/part-b-sectoral-guidance-chapters/2-industrial-processes-and-product-use/2-a-mineral-products/2-a-1-cement-production-2023/view>

<sup>37</sup> EMEP/CORINAIR Emission Inventory Guidebook – 2007. Available: <https://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/EMEP-CORINAIR5/page013.html>

(data publicly available in the national database "2-Air"). The cement production plant "SCHWENK Latvija" has indicated in its "2-Air" report that emissions of precursors arise from technological processes which include also heat generation to maintain certain temperatures during particular process.

Regarding calculation of precursors since 2010, to avoid double counting fuel types used in cement production process in "SCHWENK Latvija" are subtracted from Energy part and their emissions can be considered as included elsewhere "IE" (2.A.1 sector under IPPU) in case of cement producer "SCHWENK Latvija".

For both technologies only NMVOC emissions are estimated using EFs provided in EMEP/CORINAIR 2007 for all timeseries (Table 4.7).

**Table 4.7 EFs for cement clinker production emission estimation (kt/kt)**

Technology	NO <sub>x</sub>	NMVOC	SO <sub>2</sub>
Wet process kiln	0.00135	0.00023	0.0051
Dry process kiln	0.00175	0.00001	0.0051

#### 4.2.2.3 Uncertainties and time-series consistency

Uncertainty analysis for 2024 submission is carried out by using Approach 1. Quantitative estimates of uncertainties are provided in Annex 2. Overall description of uncertainty analysis is included in Section 1.6.

Uncertainty of cement production data is taken from Cement production installation's annual GHG report under the EU ETS (2.5% uncertainty for activity data of clinker production and 7.5% uncertainty for activity data of CKD).

The total uncertainty  $U_{total}$  is being calculated, using following formula of combined uncertainty:

$$U_{total} = \sqrt{(U_1^2 + U_2^2 + \dots + U_n^2)} \quad (4.4)$$

where:

$U_{total}$  - the percentage uncertainty in the product of the quantities

$U_i$  - the percentage uncertainties associated with each of the quantities

Combined activity data uncertainty is calculated as 8%.

CO<sub>2</sub> EF for 2.A.1 sector is estimated based on plant specific data of used limestone characterizations so average uncertainty of 4.5% is assumed according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.

Time series of the estimated emissions are consistent and complete because the same methodology, EFs and data sources are used for sectors for all years. GHG emissions from the sector are estimated or reported excepting 2.A.4.c sector for which NO is reported.

All industrial production historical data used in emission estimation from 2.A Mineral Products sector till 2005 are obtained from mineral producers, but since 2005 data are taken from annual GHG reports that industrial producers submit within the EU ETS. According to the EU ETS legislation all GHG reports have to be verified by an ISO accredited verifiers checks whether all reported information – activity data, CO<sub>2</sub> EFs, estimated emissions as well as estimation methodology, is correct and corresponds to certain requirements from the legislation. Cement

and lime production facilities certify that all additional information for CO<sub>2</sub> emission estimation is verified. State Environmental Service also checks the annual GHG reports and compares the data in the reports with the data reported by the enterprise to the national database "2-Air" and to CSB.

Consistency of time series was checked by verifying IEF, AD and emission changes. Fluctuations in time series are explained in NIR Chapter 4.2.2.1.

#### 4.2.2.4 Category-specific QA/QC and verification

The quality objectives and the QA/QC plan for the Latvia's GHG inventory at the National Inventory level are presented in Section 1.2.3. The QC procedures are performed according to the QA/QC plan in the IPPU sector in order to achieve these quality objectives. Issues related to QA/QC and verification are discussed at the sectoral meetings.

Emissions are checked using time series consistency check for the IEF estimated in CRF Reporter and all IEF changes - in time series are double-checked and reasonable explanation for IEF changes has to be found under each subsector source category description.

Quality control check list is filled for each category taking into account criteria given in QA/QC plan approved in National legislation. All corrections are archived.

In September 2020, there was a conversation with a representative from cement production plant, who confirmed the amount of produced clinker, and that all materials in the plant are weighed on calibrated scales thus strengthening the institutional, legal and procedural arrangements for national systems where data collection and evaluation are carried out by other organizations.

Data comparison between EU ETS data and GHG inventory emissions was made. Results of checks are represented in Table 4.8.

**Table 4.8 Differences between 2.A.1 CO<sub>2</sub> emissions calculated in GHG inventory and EU ETS in 2022**

Year	2.A.1 Cement Production (kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.)		Difference (%)
	IPCC methodology 2006 IPCC Guidelines Volume 3 Chapter 2 equation 2.2	Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2018/2066 <sup>38</sup> Art.30 and 31.	
2022	540.09	570.61	5.7

Differences between CO<sub>2</sub> emissions under EU ETS and GHG inventory are caused by use of different emission calculation methodologies from cement production under UNFCCC reporting (2006 IPCC Guidelines) and Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2018/2066 of 19 December 2018 on the monitoring and reporting of greenhouse gas emissions pursuant to Directive 2003/87/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council and amending Commission Regulation (EU) No 601/2012 (Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2018/2066). There is only one cement plant in Latvia which uses Tier 1 method under EU ETS reporting. In Tier 1 default EFs are taken for CO<sub>2</sub> emission calculation as it is not possible to

<sup>38</sup> Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2018/2066 of 19 December 2018 on the monitoring and reporting of greenhouse gas emissions pursuant to Directive 2003/87/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council and amending Commission Regulation (EU) No 601/2012. Available : <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32018R2066>

obtain all necessary laboratory measurements in plant laboratory to apply higher Tier method under EU ETS as this laboratory is not accredited.

All information on activity data and emission calculations are stored and archived in the common FTP folder.

#### 4.2.2.5 Category-specific recalculations

No recalculations were done for this sector.

#### 4.2.2.6 Category-specific planned improvements

No improvements are planned for this sector.

### 4.2.3 Lime Production (CRF 2.A.2)

#### 4.2.3.1 Category description

In Latvia CO<sub>2</sub> emissions of Lime production occur from calcination of dolomite ("Saulkalne S" - 1990-2015 except 2011) and limestone ("Būvmateriāli AN" - 2007-2015). In 2016, "Saulkalne S" ceased lime production therefore since 2016 CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from lime production are not occurring (NO). In 2022, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from Lime production sector have decreased by 100% compared to 1990 and 2015 (Figure 4.5). In 2011, dolomite was not used in lime production and production was stopped due to exhausted limestone career and preparation of implementing the highest best available technology (BAT) according to information by lime production plant but emissions from Lime production, but in 2011 emissions from Lime production occurred from limestone use ("Būvmateriāli AN").

CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from non-marketed lime (quicklime) produced in iron & steel industry are also accounted under Lime production sector according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. These emissions are added since 2018 submission for the time period 1990-2010.




Figure 4.5 CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from lime production 1990–2022 (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from dolomite use in lime production are continuously decreasing since the beginning of 1990s due to recession of overall national economy. Economic crisis also affected



lime production in 2008-2009. After 2009 emissions from lime production remained very small and fluctuated due to economic situation and changes in industrial activities in the country but in 2016 the lime production has been fully stopped.

#### 4.2.3.2 Methodological issues

##### Activity data

Data on total produced lime from dolomite and limestone was used as activity data for emission calculation from 2.A.2 sector. It means that different types of lime were used as activity data. As both lime producers in Latvia were participants of EU ETS, the activity data were available annually from the installation's annual GHG reports under EU ETS<sup>39,40</sup>. Activity data before 2005 were available from the installation's applications for the GHG permit to operate within the EU ETS.

Limestone in lime production were used 2007-2012. Since 2013 limestone is not used anymore, but dolomite was still used in lime production in one plant till 2015 (Table 4.9).

Limestone is also used for non-marketed lime (quicklime) production in iron and steel industry. Amounts of limestone for the production of quicklime are used to determine activity data and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions within the iron and steel industry. The quantities were obtained directly from the iron and steel production company and for the period 2005-2010 from the installation's annual GHG reports under the EU ETS<sup>39,40</sup>.

Activity data are summarized in Table 4.9.

**Table 4.9 Lime and quicklime production AD and amount of produced lime 1990–2022 (kt)**

Year	Total produced lime from lime	Total produced lime from dolomite	Total produced quicklime (iron & steel industry)
	kt		
1990	NO	214.23	10.45
1995	NO	19.21	10.45
2000	NO	7.89	13.42
2005	NO	3.16	17.10
2010	0.20	0.66	16.32
2011	0.20	NO	NO
2012	0.18	0.37	NO
2013	NO	0.47	NO
2014	NO	0.79	NO
2015	NO	0.87	NO
2016	NO	NO	NO
2017	NO	NO	NO
2018	NO	NO	NO
2019	NO	NO	NO
2020	NO	NO	NO
2021	NO	NO	NO
2022	NO	NO	NO

<sup>39</sup> GHG reports for period till 2012. Available: <http://www.meteo.lv/lapas/uznemumi-kuriem-izsniegtas-siltumnicefeka-gazu-emisijas-atlaujas-2-pe?id=1253&nid=575>

<sup>40</sup> GHG reports for period since 2013. Available: [https://registri.vvd.gov.lv/izsniegtas-atlaujas-un-licences/atlauju-un-licencu-mekletajs/?company\\_name=saulkalne&company\\_code=&s=1](https://registri.vvd.gov.lv/izsniegtas-atlaujas-un-licences/atlauju-un-licencu-mekletajs/?company_name=saulkalne&company_code=&s=1)

Activity data fluctuates in whole time series. The largest decrease could be observed at the beginning of 1990s when economic situation in the country was unstable due to change from a centrally planned economy to a market economy. In latest years there is an overall decrease of activity in sector 2.A.2 due to reduced industrial activity. Since 2016 CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from lime production are not occurring.

#### *Emission factors and calculations*

CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from limestone and dolomite use in lime production and non-marketed quicklime production in iron & steel industry were estimated using Tier 2 method from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines Volume 3, Chapter 2, pp. 2.23:

$$CO_2 \text{ Emissions} = (EF_{lime,i} * M_l * CF_{lkd} * C_h) \quad (4.5)$$

where:

*CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions* - emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> from lime production (tons)

*EF<sub>lime,i</sub>* - emission factor for lime type *i*, tons CO<sub>2</sub>/ton lime (estimated according Equation 2.9)

*M<sub>l,i</sub>* - lime production of type *i* (tons)

*CF<sub>lkd,i</sub>* - correction factor for LKD for lime of type (dimensionless) (default 1.02 according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Volume 3, Chapter 2, pp. 2.24 is used)

*C<sub>h,i</sub>* - correction factor for hydrated lime of the type *i* of lime (dimensionless) (default 0.97 according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Volume 3, Chapter 2, pp. 2.24 is used only in case of quicklime emission estimation)

*i* –each specific lime types (dolomite, hydraulic and quicklime)

According to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines the CO<sub>2</sub> EF from dolomite use in lime production were calculated taken into account Tier 2 equation 2.9 and derived plant specific CaO\*MgO content.

$$EF_{lime} = SR_{CaO*MgO} * CaO * MgO \text{ Content} \quad (4.6)$$

where:

*EF<sub>lime</sub>* - emission factor for dolomite lime (tons CO<sub>2</sub>/ton lime)

*SR<sub>CaO\*MgO</sub>* – stoichiometric ratio of CO<sub>2</sub> and CaO\*MgO (tons CO<sub>2</sub>/ton CaO\*MgO)

*CaO\*MgO content* – derived CaO\*MgO content (tons CaO\*MgO/ton lime)

CO<sub>2</sub> EF from limestone use in lime production were calculated taken into account Tier 2 equation 2.9 and derived plant specific CaO content.

$$EF_{lime} = SR_{CaO*MgO} * CaO \text{ Content} \quad (4.7)$$

where:

*EF<sub>lime</sub>* - emission factor for hydraulic lime (tons CO<sub>2</sub>/ton lime)

*SR<sub>CaO</sub>* – stoichiometric ratio of CO<sub>2</sub> and CaO (tons CO<sub>2</sub>/ton CaO)

*CaO content* – derived CaO content (tons CaO/ton lime)

CO<sub>2</sub> EF for quicklime is also calculated according to equation:

$$EF_{lime} = SR_{CaO} * CaO \text{ Content} \quad (4.8)$$

where:

*EF<sub>lime a</sub>* - emission factor for quicklime (high-calcium lime) (tons CO<sub>2</sub>/ton lime)

*SR<sub>CaO</sub>* - stoichiometric ratio of CO<sub>2</sub> and CaO (0.785 according to Table 2.4 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Volume 3, Chapter 2, pp.2.22) (tons CO<sub>2</sub>/ton CaO)

*CaO<sub>Content</sub>* - derived CaO content (tons CaO/ton lime)

**Table 4.10 CO<sub>2</sub> emission factors for lime production (t CO<sub>2</sub>/t raw material)**

	1990–2022
Dolomite use in lime production	0.523155
Limestone use in lime production	0.439600
Quicklime production	0.749675

According to the plant's laboratory data:

- average content of water in dolomite is 5.24%;
- average content of water in produced lime is 0%;
- average content of dolomite (dry) is 94.76%.

Average moisture content in dolomite (5.24%) is taken into account when activity data of used dolomite is estimated for the inventory. The amount of used dolomite (wet) are multiplied with moisture content coefficient  $k=0.9476$ . As a result amount of dry dolomite is obtained. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are calculated by multiplying dry dolomite amount with derived EF and default CF<sub>lkd</sub> correction factor for LKD for lime (1.02).

#### 4.2.3.3 Uncertainties and time-series consistency

Uncertainty analysis for 2024 submission is carried out by using Approach 1. Quantitative estimates of uncertainties are provided in Annex 2. Overall description of uncertainty analysis is included in Section 1.6.

Uncertainty of lime production activity data is taken from Lime production installation's GHG report under EU ETS (7.5% uncertainty for activity data of lime production).

CO<sub>2</sub> EF for 2.A.2 sector is estimated based on plant specific data of used dolomite characterizations so average uncertainty of 2% is assumed according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.

Time series of the estimated emissions are consistent and complete because the same methodology, EFs and data sources are used for sectors for all years in time series. All other GHG emissions except CO<sub>2</sub> emissions could not be reported in CRF Reporter.

Consistency of time series was checked by verifying IEF, AD and emission changes and attention was paid to increase/decrease that are explained in NIR Chapter 4.2.3.1.

#### 4.2.3.4 Category-specific QA/QC and verification

The quality objectives and the QA/QC plan for the Latvia's GHG inventory at the National Inventory level are presented in Section 1.2.3. The QC procedures are performed according to the QA/QC plan in the IPPU sector in order to achieve these quality objectives. Issues related to QA/QC and verification are discussed at the sectoral meetings.

Activity data are taken from the annual GHG reports that lime production plant submits within EU ETS. According to EU ETS legislation all GHG reports have to be verified by an ISO accredited verifier that checks that all reported information is correct and corresponds to certain requirements from the legislation. State Environmental Service also checks the annual GHG reports and approves the report if everything reported is correct.

Emissions are checked using time series consistency check for the IEF estimated in CRF Reporter and all IEF changes in time series are double-checked and reasonable explanation for IEF changes has to be found under each subsector source category description.

The QC form has been filled in for each category taking into account criteria given in QA/QC plan approved in National legislation.

Data comparison between EU ETS data and GHG inventory emissions was made. Differences in 2013-2015 occurred due to methodological inconsistencies between IPCC and EU ETS methodology. Under EU ETS lime producer using dolomite (one company in Latvia) used Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2018/2066 methodology and calculated EF differently from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines by taking into account CO<sub>2</sub> content 16.99% in lime.

All information on activity data and emission calculations are stored and archived in the common FTP folder.

#### 4.2.3.5 Category-specific recalculations

No recalculations were done for this sector.

### 4.2.4 Glass production (CRF 2.A.3)

#### 4.2.4.1 Category description

Glass production sector constitutes 0.70 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. which is less than 0.1% of total IPPU emissions in Latvia in 2022.

CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from 2.A.3 sector have increased by 96.8% since 1990 and decreased by 2.4% compared to 2021 (Figure 4.6 and Table 4.3).

Emissions are calculated using the use of carbonates as activity data. Emissions from raw materials used in glass production are reflected in Figure 4.6.




Figure 4.6 Emissions from raw materials used in glass production 1990-2022 (NMVOC emissions on secondary axis) (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.; kt)

Limestone, dolomite, fluorspar, potash, witherite (barium carbonate), butylacetate and soda ash are typically used as raw materials in the production of glass in Latvia from which CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are calculated. Additionally NMVOC emissions from glass production and glass fibre production were reported by production facilities. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from glass fibre production processes are estimated from NMVOC emissions due to lack of CO<sub>2</sub> EFs and activity data to CO<sub>2</sub> emissions directly. NMVOC emissions are fluctuating in whole timeseries because use of raw materials depends on market demand.

#### 4.2.4.2 Methodological issues

##### Activity data

Activity data of used carbonates are collected from individual glass and glass fibre producing company's annual GHG reports under EU ETS<sup>41</sup> as well as installations applications for the GHG permit to operate within the EU ETS system before 2005.

Amount of raw materials used in glass production is quite small and fluctuates in whole time series. Potash was used in two glass production facilities from 2001-2007. Use of witherite occurred in 2005-2007 and 2016, but emissions from fluorspar have been estimated in 1993-2012.

NMVOC emissions for 1997-2022 were taken from the national database "2-Air" where the only glass fiber producer reported its emissions divided by NMVOC sub-type. For time period 1990-1996 only butylacetate data was available from the installation's application for the GHG permit to operate within to EU ETS (Table 4.11).

**Table 4.11 Activity data for raw materials use in glass production 1990-2022 (kt)**

Year	Use of potash	Use of fluorspar	Use of barium carbonate (whiterite)	Use of butylacetate and other NMVOCs	Use of dolomite	Use of limestone	Soda ash use
1990	NO	NO	NO	0.001	NO	0.80	NO
1995	NO	0.12	NO	0.002	1.70	4.43	1.55
2000	NO	0.08	NO	0.003	2.88	6.13	4.48
2005	0.04	0.27	0.01	0.011	2.09	7.07	3.74
2010	NO	0.62	NO	0.021	NO	10.07	NO
2011	NO	0.59	NO	0.022	NO	9.73	NO
2012	NO	0.64	NO	0.002	NO	8.47	0.09
2013	NO	NO	NO	0.004	NO	6.77	0.74
2014	NO	NO	NO	0.010	NO	1.26	0.88
2015	NO	NO	NO	0.008	NO	NO	1.10
2016	NO	NO	0.02	0.010	NO	NO	1.40
2017	NO	NO	NO	0.006	NO	NO	1.72
2018	NO	NO	NO	0.006	NO	NO	1.76
2019	NO	NO	NO	0.006	NO	NO	1.34
2020	NO	NO	NO	0.006	NO	NO	1.60
2021	NO	NO	NO	0.006	NO	NO	1.68

<sup>41</sup> Polluting activity permit. Available: [https://registri.vvd.gov.lv/izsnieltas-atlaujas-un-licences/atlauju-un-licencu-mekletajs/?company\\_name=stikla+C5%A1%C4%B7iedra&company\\_code=&s=1](https://registri.vvd.gov.lv/izsnieltas-atlaujas-un-licences/atlauju-un-licencu-mekletajs/?company_name=stikla+C5%A1%C4%B7iedra&company_code=&s=1)

Year	Use of potash	Use of fluorspar	Use of barium carbonate (whiterite)	Use of butylacetate and other NMVOCs	Use of dolomite	Use of limestone	Soda ash use
2022	NO	NO	NO	0.007	NO	NO	1.63

Dolomite was used in two glass production plants from 1993 till 2005, but limestone - in two plants from 1990 till 2014. In 2016, soda ash and barium carbonate are used as raw materials in glass production but from 2017 onwards only soda ash is used as raw materials.

#### *Emission factors and calculations*

Emissions are calculated using Tier 3 method (Equation 2.12 from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines), as various types of carbonates consumed for glass production have been collected from annual GHG reports by glass producers under EU ETS.

$$CO_2 \text{ Emissions} = (M_i * EF_i * F_i) \quad (4.9)$$

where:

$CO_2 \text{ Emissions}$  - emissions of  $CO_2$  from glass production (tons)

$EF_i$  - emissions factor for the particular carbonate  $i$  (tons  $CO_2$ /ton carbonate)

$M_i$  - weight or mass of the carbonate  $i$  consumed (tons)

$F_i$  - fraction calcination achieved for the carbonate  $i$  (fraction)

According to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines it was assumed that the fraction calcination is equal to 1.00.

$CO_2$  EFs used to estimate emissions from use of raw materials in glass production are taken from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (Volume 3, Chapter 2, pp. 2.7, Table 2.1) and plants annual GHG reports within EU ETS (Table 4.12). NMVOC emissions for time period 1997-2022 are taken from the national database "2-Air" where both glass production and glass fibre production companies report their emissions.

**Table 4.12 Emission factors for materials use in glass production (t emissions / t product or raw material)**

Used material	1990 – 2022
Fluorspar	0.0017
Potash	0.32
Barium carbonate (witherite)	0.223
Butylacetate (NMVOC) <sup>42</sup>	1.0
Limestone	0.440
Dolomite	0.477
Soda ash	0.415

Emissions of precursors from glass fibre production processes were estimated according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.  $CO_2$  EF is not provided in methodology and it is not possible to obtain activity data for direct  $CO_2$  emission estimation.

NMVOC emissions were taken as activity data for  $CO_2$  calculation and  $CO_2$  emissions were estimated using carbon conversion factor.

<sup>42</sup> For emission estimation only for year 1990-1996, since 1997 the plant reported data from the national database "2-Air" is used

$$E_{CO_2} = EF_{CO_2} * NMVOC \quad (4.10)$$

where:

$E_{CO_2}$  – CO<sub>2</sub> emissions (kt)

$EF_{CO_2}$  – estimated CO<sub>2</sub> emission factor

NMVOC – NMVOC emissions (kt)

For CO<sub>2</sub> emission from glass fibre production estimation 80% of carbon content conversion factor was used. According to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines<sup>43</sup>, indirect emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> from atmospheric oxidation of emitted NMVOC are calculated and reported in the inventory. The average amount of carbon in NMVOC is assumed to be 80%<sup>44</sup>.

The CO<sub>2</sub> EF from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines was estimated using following equation:

$$EF_{CO_2} = 80\% * \frac{44.0098}{12.011} \quad (4.11)$$

where:

$EF_{CO_2}$  – CO<sub>2</sub> emission factor (kt/kt)

80% – the average amount of carbon in NMVOC

44.0098 / 12.011 – carbon dioxide and carbon molmass ratio

This leads to an EF for indirect CO<sub>2</sub> release of 2.931299642 kg CO<sub>2</sub>/kg NMVOC.

#### 4.2.4.3 Uncertainties and time-series consistency

Uncertainty analysis for 2024 submission is carried out by using Approach 1. Quantitative estimates of uncertainties are provided in Annex 2. Overall description of uncertainty analysis is included in Section 1.6.

Uncertainty of glass production activity data is taken from Glass production installations' GHG report under EU ETS (2.5% uncertainty for activity data of glass production). The uncertainty is quite low as plant specific reported data is used. Accredited verifiers verify and State Environmental Service approves the activity data reported in production plant's annual GHG reports within EU ETS so the activity data is adequately verified.

As default EFs for limestone, dolomite and soda ash use are used the uncertainty is assumed quite high. Other CO<sub>2</sub> EFs for this sector are taken from glass production plant. As the default Tier 1 methodology is used for emission calculation from glass production sector, the default EF uncertainty 2% from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines is used.

Time series of the estimated emissions are consistent and complete because the same methodology, EFs and data sources are used for sectors for all years in time series. All emissions with exception of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions for use of fluorspar and potash as well as NMVOC emissions for glass fibre production are not estimated due to lack of estimation methodology.

Consistency of time series was checked by verifying IEF, AD and emission changes and attention was paid to important increase/decrease that are explained in NIR Chapter 4.2.4.1.

<sup>43</sup>2006 IPCC Guidelines, Vol.1 Ch.7. Available : [http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/2006gl/pdf/1\\_Volume1/V1\\_7\\_Ch7\\_Precursors\\_Indirect.pdf](http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/2006gl/pdf/1_Volume1/V1_7_Ch7_Precursors_Indirect.pdf) (page 7.6)

<sup>44</sup> Basing of the most often used average carbon conversion factor

#### 4.2.4.4 Category-specific QA/QC and verification

The quality objectives and the QA/QC plan for the Latvia's GHG inventory at the National Inventory level are presented in Section 1.2.3. The QC procedures are performed according to the QA/QC plan in the IPPU sector in order to achieve these quality objectives. Issues related to QA/QC and verification are discussed at the sectoral meetings.

Activity data, CO<sub>2</sub> EFs and estimated emissions from glass production plants are taken from the annual GHG reports that installations submit within the EU ETS. All GHG reports are verified by an ISO accredited verifier that checks that all reported information is correct and corresponds to certain requirements from the legislation. State Environmental Service also checks the annual GHG reports and approves the report if everything reported is correct.

Data comparison between EU ETS data and GHG inventory emissions was made. Small differences are represented in Table 4.13.

**Table 4.13 Differences between 2.A.3 CO<sub>2</sub> emissions calculated in GHG inventory and EU ETS in 2022**

2.A.3 Glass production			Difference
kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.			%
Year	2006 IPCC Tier 3 method	Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2018/2066 <sup>45</sup> Annex IV section 11	
2022	0.70	0.68	-3.1

Difference is caused because under EU ETS soda use in wastewater neutralization is reported under 2.A.3 Glass production, but in GHG inventory soda use in wastewater neutralization in glass fibre production company is reported in separate subsector 2.A.4.b Other uses of soda ash.

All information on activity data and emission calculations are stored and archived in the common FTP folder.

#### 4.2.4.5 Category-specific recalculations

No recalculations were done for this sector.

#### 4.2.4.6 Category-specific planned improvements

No improvements are planned for this sector.

### 4.2.5 Ceramics (2.A.4.a)

#### 4.2.5.1 Category description

Under Ceramics sector CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from bricks and tiles production are reported. Ceramics sector emissions constituted 6.48 kt (0.8%) of total IPPU emissions in Latvia in 2022. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from 2.A.4.a sector decreased by 90.6% since 1990 and decreased by 20.8% compared to 2021 (Figure 4.7).

<sup>45</sup> Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2018/2066 of 19 December 2018 on the monitoring and reporting of greenhouse gas emissions pursuant to Directive 2003/87/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council and amending Commission Regulation (EU) No 601/2012. Available : <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32018R2066>






Figure 4.7 CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from bricks and tiles production 1990-2022 (kt)

Bricks production has strong traditions in Latvia as production plants operate many decades, for example in bricks production plant “Lode” the brick production was started in 1964. Still from 5 now operating bricks production plants only two were operating up to 1990. There is no information if the other companies were working for time period 1990-1993 what is not covered by GHG permit application requirements.

In 1990-1993, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions were estimated only using total produced bricks amount due to lack of data for raw materials used in bricks production companies No 1 and No 5. After 1993 it was possible to estimate CO<sub>2</sub> emissions for each plant separately.

There is only one tiles production plant in Latvia and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from use of clay in tile production process in 1995-2014 are reported in 2.A.4.a sector. The tiles production plant and all bricks production plants are covered by the EU ETS so the data from the installation annual GHG reports are available for GHG inventory.

CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from Ceramics are decreasing 1990-1994 due to recession of overall national economy. 1995-2008 emission trend is quite stable, but in 2009 CO<sub>2</sub> emissions decreased approximately 4 times as a result of economic crisis because the building and construction sector became inactive. In later years emissions slightly increased depending on demand for construction materials (Figure 4.7).

#### 4.2.5.2 Methodological issues

For 1990-1993 no plant specific data is available from bricks production plants therefore CO<sub>2</sub> emission estimation for these 3 years is done based on final produced bricks amount taking into account average weight of one brick. Average weight of one brick is 3.9 kg. According to plant data average produced bricks/used clay ratio is 1.25.

If final amount of produced bricks is known, it is possible to estimate approximate clay consumption (Table 4.14). In CO<sub>2</sub> emission estimation EF 0.047 tCO<sub>2</sub>/t used clay is applied.

**Table 4.14 Data and assumptions used for CO<sub>2</sub> emission estimation for 1990-1993**

	1990	1991	1992	1993
produced bricks (thousand pieces)	471800	546423	259918	722020
average weight of one brick (kg)	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9
produced bricks (tons)	1840020	2131049.7	1013680.2	281587.8
average produced bricks / used clay ratio	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25
used clay (kt)	1472.016	1704.84	810.9442	225.2702
CO <sub>2</sub> emission factor of used clay tCO <sub>2</sub> /t used clay	0.047	0.047	0.047	0.047
CO <sub>2</sub> emissions (kt)	69.1848	80.1275	38.1144	10.5877

Since 1994 CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are estimated differently in five Latvia's brick production plants because it was possible to use higher tier of emission estimation due to availability of necessary activity data and laboratory measurements of used raw materials.

### 1<sup>st</sup> bricks production plant

According to 1<sup>st</sup> bricks installations application for a GHG permit and annual GHG reports for 2005-2009 under the EU ETS the plant has changed CO<sub>2</sub> emission estimation methodology 3 times:

1. CO<sub>2</sub> emission for time period 1993-2004 was estimated by using used clay as an activity data and CO<sub>2</sub> EF for used clay – 0.047 t CO<sub>2</sub>/t used clay. The particular EF is determined for total used clay data when clay characterizations are not known. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are determined by ignition losses of clay: in 1000 °C – 4.7% of instant CO<sub>2</sub> is emitted).
2. For 2005-2007 the plant is using calculation method B – alkali earth oxides, from the from EU Monitoring Reporting Guidelines (MRG)<sup>46</sup> when calculation is based on the content of the CaO, MgO and other (earth) alkali.
3. For years 2008-2012 plant is using the calculation method “A” – carbon input, from the MRG when calculation is based on the carbon input on each of the relevant raw materials. Tier 1 EFs from the MRG corresponding particular method are used when conservative value of 0.2 tons CaCO<sub>3</sub> (0.08794 tons of CO<sub>2</sub>) per ton of dry clay is applied for the calculation of the EF instead of results of analyses.

#### Activity data

As MgO and CaO content data was not available for years 1993-2004 therefore the data reported in bricks production plant's GHG report for 2005 was used: MgO content – 4.9%, CaO content – 11.6%.

As for years 2008-2009 different emission estimation methodology is used and MgO and CaO data is not available content data of 2006-2007 was used also to estimate emissions for 2008-2012: MgO content – 2.9%, CaO content – 10.26%.

<sup>46</sup> EU Monitoring Reporting Guidelines. Available: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2007:229:0001:0085:EN:PDF> (page 80)

**Table 4.15 Data and assumptions used for CO<sub>2</sub> emission estimation from 1<sup>st</sup> bricks production plant**

Year	Use of clay (kt)	MgO content (%)	CaO content (%)	MgO amount (kt)	CaO amount (kt)	MgO CO <sub>2</sub> EF (tCO <sub>2</sub> /t oxide)	CaO CO <sub>2</sub> EF (tCO <sub>2</sub> /t oxide)	CO <sub>2</sub> emissions (kt)	Average CO <sub>2</sub> EF (tCO <sub>2</sub> /t oxides)
1990	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
1995	2.700	4.90%	11.60%	0.132	0.313	1.092	0.785	0.390	0.876
2000	4.800	4.90%	11.60%	0.235	0.557	1.092	0.785	0.694	0.876
2005	5.257	4.90%	11.60%	0.258	0.610	1.092	0.785	0.760	0.876
2006	6.245	2.90%	10.26%	0.181	0.641	1.092	0.785	0.701	0.853
2007	7.745	2.90%	10.26%	0.225	0.795	1.092	0.785	0.869	0.853
2008	3.880	2.90%	10.26%	0.113	0.398	1.092	0.785	0.435	0.853
2009	2.268	2.90%	10.26%	0.066	0.233	1.092	0.785	0.254	0.853
2010	1.922	2.90%	10.26%	0.056	0.197	1.092	0.785	0.216	0.853
2011	1.698	2.90%	10.26%	0.049	0.174	1.092	0.785	0.191	0.853
2012	1.670	2.90%	10.26%	0.048	0.171	1.092	0.785	0.187	0.853

Since 2013 1<sup>st</sup> bricks production plant is not operating anymore.

#### *Emission factors and calculations*

CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in whole timeseries was calculated by using calculation method B – alkali earth oxides, from the MRG<sup>47</sup> when calculation is based on the content of the CaO, MgO and other (earth) alkali.

According to bricks production plant's information the following equation for CO<sub>2</sub> emission estimation was used:

$$CO_2 = \sum((AD_{raw} * AD_{CaO,MgO}) * EF * CF) \quad (4.12)$$

where:

- CO<sub>2</sub> – total CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from bricks production (kt)
- AD<sub>raw</sub> – activity data of used raw materials – clay (kt)
- AD<sub>CaO,MgO</sub> – CaO and MgO content in used raw materials (%)
- EF – CO<sub>2</sub> emission factor of CaO and MgO (kt/kt)
- CF – conversion factor

CO<sub>2</sub> EFs for CaO and MgO – 0.785 and 1.092 for ton CO<sub>2</sub> per ton of oxide respectively, were taken from MRG<sup>48</sup> (Table 4.15).

#### **2<sup>nd</sup> bricks production plant**

For 1999-2008 the plant is using the same emission estimation methodology but for 2008 average default EF from MRG is used.

The plant was closed at the end of 2008 and was not operated in 2009 due to company's reorganization when production plant using old obsolete installations were closed and all production was transferred to other modern production facilities.

<sup>47</sup> EU Monitoring Reporting Guidelines. Available: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2007:229:0001:0085:EN:PDF> (page 80)

<sup>48</sup> EU Monitoring Reporting Guidelines. Available: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2007:229:0001:0085:EN:PDF> (page 81)

*Activity data*

The content of CaCO<sub>3</sub> and MgCO<sub>3</sub> are determined in plant laboratories or stated in mineral deposits passport.

Activity data carbonate is CaCO<sub>3</sub>, MgCO<sub>3</sub> or other alkali earth or alkali carbonates amount that is used during the reporting period input (clay). Carbonate mass is estimated using clay consumption amount and results of clay content measurement with maximal allowable process uncertainty of ± 2.5% (Table 4.16).

**Table 4.16 Data and assumptions used for CO<sub>2</sub> emission estimation from 2<sup>nd</sup> bricks production plant**

	1990	1995	2000	2005	2006	2007	2008
Use of clay (kt)	NO	NO	16.37	22.983	28.559	37.203	13.975
MgCO <sub>3</sub> content (%)	NO	NO	5.00%	10.98%	9.56%	9.52%	9.50%
CaCO <sub>3</sub> content (%)	NO	NO	9.00%	13.06%	13.15%	13.10%	13.10%
MgCO <sub>3</sub> amount (kt)	NO	NO	0.819	2.523	2.729	3.542	1.328
CaCO <sub>3</sub> amount (kt)	NO	NO	1.473	3.002	3.756	4.874	1.831
MgCO <sub>3</sub> CO <sub>2</sub> EF (tCO <sub>2</sub> /t oxide)	NO	NO	0.522	0.522	0.522	0.522	0.522
CaCO <sub>3</sub> CO <sub>2</sub> EF (tCO <sub>2</sub> /t oxide)	NO	NO	0.440	0.440	0.440	0.440	0.440
CO <sub>2</sub> emissions (kt)	NO	NO	1.076	2.638	3.077	3.993	1.500
Average CO <sub>2</sub> EF (tCO <sub>2</sub> /t oxides)	NO	NO	0.469	0.477	0.475	0.475	0.474

Since 2009 2<sup>nd</sup> bricks production plant is not operating anymore.

*Emission factors and calculations*

Calculation method A – carbon input, from the MRG<sup>49</sup> is used in plant's emission estimation for its application for GHG permit as well for reporting of annual CO<sub>2</sub> emission:

$$CO_2 = (AD_{raw} * AD_{CaCO_3} * EF_{CaCO_3}) + (AD_{raw} * AD_{MgCO_3} * EF_{MgCO_3}) \quad (4.13)$$

where:

CO<sub>2</sub> – CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from 2<sup>nd</sup> bricks production plant (kt)

AD<sub>raw</sub> – activity data of used clay (kt)

AD<sub>CaCO<sub>3</sub></sub> – CaCO<sub>3</sub> content in used clay (%)

EF<sub>CaCO<sub>3</sub></sub> – CaCO<sub>3</sub> emission factor (kt/kt)

AD<sub>MgCO<sub>3</sub></sub> – MgCO<sub>3</sub> content in used clay (%)

EF<sub>MgCO<sub>3</sub></sub> – MgCO<sub>3</sub> emission factor (kt/kt)

Default CO<sub>2</sub> EFs from the MRG for the CaCO<sub>3</sub> and MgCO<sub>3</sub> are used. CO<sub>2</sub> EF for CaCO<sub>3</sub> is 0.44 tCO<sub>2</sub>/t CaCO<sub>3</sub> and CO<sub>2</sub> EF for MgCO<sub>3</sub> is 0.522 tCO<sub>2</sub>/t MgCO<sub>3</sub>.

**3<sup>rd</sup> bricks production plant**

CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from 3<sup>rd</sup> plant is estimated for 1998-2022. In 2005, the methodology was changed from one approach – alkali earth oxides, to other approach – carbon input because the carbon input laboratory measurement data became available since 2005. As both methodologies are appropriate and both are assumed as Tier 2 therefore the methodology change was considered as acceptable.

<sup>49</sup> EU Monitoring Reporting Guidelines. Available: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2007:229:0001:0085:EN:PDF> (page 79)

For years 2008-2009 lower Tier EF from MRG<sup>50</sup> – a conservative value of 0.2 tons CaCO<sub>3</sub> (corresponding to 0.08794 tons of CO<sub>2</sub>) per ton of dry clay, was used to estimate CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. The plant indicated that the lower Tier use is acceptable within the EU ETS as the installation is low emission producer.

#### Activity data

For 1998-2004 emission estimation MgO and CaO content is used. According to mineral passport of State Geology Service's quarry "Progress" alkali earth oxides – MgO and CaO, contents are 8.03% and 3.02% respectively.

For years 2005-2007 emission estimation the contents of CaCO<sub>3</sub> and MgCO<sub>3</sub> are determined in plant laboratories or stated in mineral deposits passport and are 12.79% and 10.75% respectively. As for year 2008-2009 the carbonates input percentage amount is not known the data of 2005-2007 was used (Table 4.17, Table 4.18).

According to production plant's application for the GHG permit and annual GHG reports activity data of used raw materials are estimated using following equation:

$$AD_{raw} = AD_{clay} * (1 - M) \quad (4.14)$$

where:

$AD_{raw}$  – activity data of used raw materials – dry clay (kt)

$AD_{clay}$  – amount of used clay (kt)

$M$  – moisture content of clay in bricks pressing process (%)

For year 2005-2022 the activity data was estimated by using following equation from bricks production plant's GHG report:

$$AD_{raw} = \sum(AD_{bulk} * M_{av}) \quad (4.15)$$

where:

$AD_{raw}$  – activity data of used raw materials – clay (kt)

$AD_{bulk}$  – amount of dried bulk materials (pieces)

$M_{av}$  – average mass with 0% moisture content (kt)

The activity data was estimated by plant randomly taking 10 examples of production from drying tunnels dried after that till 0% moisture content and weighted. After that average mass of production is estimated. Therefore for 2005-2022 the used clay is reported already with 0% moisture content.

The used raw materials – used clay, were estimated by taking into account the moisture content of the clay.

<sup>50</sup> EU Monitoring Reporting Guidelines. Available: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2007:229:0001:0085:EN:PDF> (page 80)

Table 4.17 Data and assumptions used for CO<sub>2</sub> emission estimation from 3<sup>rd</sup> bricks production plant

	1990	1995	2000
use of clay (kt)	NO	NO	10.25
moisture content (%)	NO	NO	17.00%
used raw materials – dry clay (kt)	NO	NO	8.51
MgO content (%)	NO	NO	8.03%
CaO content (%)	NO	NO	3.02%
MgO amount (kt)	NO	NO	0.683
CaO amount (kt)	NO	NO	0.257
MgO CO <sub>2</sub> EF (tCO <sub>2</sub> /t oxide)	NO	NO	1.092
CaO CO <sub>2</sub> EF (tCO <sub>2</sub> /t oxide)	NO	NO	0.785
CO <sub>2</sub> emissions (kt)	NO	NO	0.95
Average CO <sub>2</sub> EF (tCO <sub>2</sub> /t oxides)	NO	NO	1.008

Table 4.18 Data and assumptions used for CO<sub>2</sub> emission estimation from 3<sup>rd</sup> bricks production plant (continuation)

Year	Use of clay (kt)	MgCO <sub>3</sub> content (%)	CaCO <sub>3</sub> content (%)	MgCO <sub>3</sub> amount (kt)	CaCO <sub>3</sub> amount (kt)	MgCO <sub>3</sub> CO <sub>2</sub> EF (tCO <sub>2</sub> /t oxide)	CaCO <sub>3</sub> CO <sub>2</sub> EF (tCO <sub>2</sub> /t oxide)	CO <sub>2</sub> emissions (kt)	Average CO <sub>2</sub> EF (tCO <sub>2</sub> /t oxides)
2005	29.891	10.75%	12.79%	3.213	3.823	0.522	0.440	3.359	0.477
2006	22.316	10.75%	12.79%	2.399	2.854	0.522	0.440	2.508	0.477
2007	23.854	10.75%	12.79%	2.564	3.051	0.522	0.440	2.681	0.477
2008	77.687	10.75%	12.79%	8.351	9.936	0.522	0.440	8.730	0.477
2009	19.814	10.75%	12.79%	2.13	2.534	0.522	0.440	2.230	0.477
2010	32.513	10.75%	12.79%	3.495	4.158	0.522	0.440	3.650	0.477
2011	38.914	10.75%	12.79%	4.183	4.977	0.522	0.440	4.370	0.477
2012	40.698	10.75%	12.79%	4.375	5.205	0.522	0.440	4.570	0.477
2013	49.705	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	4.772	0.096
2014	63.733	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6.145	0.096
2015	54.317	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	5.237	0.096
2016	74.917	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	7.223	0.096
2017	76.487	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	7.375	0.096
2018	89.084	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	8.589	0.096
2019	81.635	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	7.871	0.096
2020	81.609	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	7.869	0.096
2021	74.347	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	7.169	0.096
2022	61.612	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	5.941	0.096

According to the data from plant GHG annual report average CO<sub>2</sub> EF=0.0964 tCO<sub>2</sub>/t oxides already include CaCO<sub>3</sub> and MgCO<sub>2</sub> EFs.

#### *Emission factors and calculations*

According to the installation's application for a GHG permit under the EU ETS, for 1998-2004 the plant is using calculation method B – alkali earth oxides, from the MRG when calculation is based on the content of the CaO, MgO and other (earth) alkali.

According to bricks production installations reported information the following equation to estimate CO<sub>2</sub> emissions was used:

$$CO_2 = \sum((AD_{raw} * AD_{CaO,MgO}) * EF * CF) \quad (4.16)$$

where:

*CO<sub>2</sub>* – total CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from bricks production (kt)  
*AD<sub>raw</sub>* – activity data of used raw materials – clay (kt)  
*AD<sub>CaO,MgO</sub>* – CaO and MgO content in used raw materials (%)  
*EF* – CO<sub>2</sub> emission factor of CaO and MgO (kt/kt)  
*CF* – conversion factor

The plant for time period 2005-2007 is using the calculation method A – carbon input, from the MRG when calculation is based on the carbon input on each of the relevant raw materials. As it was mentioned above the plant in using different methodology again for 2008-2009 therefore the data was recalculated using the emission estimation method as for 2005-2007. Following equation from MRG is used to estimate emissions for 2005-2012:

$$CO_2 = (AD_{raw} * AD_{CaCO_3} * EF_{CaCO_3}) + (AD_{raw} * AD_{MgCO_3} * EF_{MgCO_3}) \quad (4.17)$$

where:

*CO<sub>2</sub>* – CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from 3<sup>rd</sup> bricks production plant (kt)  
*AD<sub>raw</sub>* – activity data of used clay (kt)  
*AD<sub>CaCO<sub>3</sub></sub>* – CaCO<sub>3</sub> content in used clay (%)  
*EF<sub>CaCO<sub>3</sub></sub>* – CaCO<sub>3</sub> emission factor (kt/kt)  
*AD<sub>MgCO<sub>3</sub></sub>* – MgCO<sub>3</sub> content in used clay (%)  
*EF<sub>MgCO<sub>3</sub></sub>* – MgCO<sub>3</sub> emission factor (kt/kt)

CO<sub>2</sub> EFs for CaO and MgO – 0.785 and 1.092 for ton CO<sub>2</sub> per ton of oxide respectively, were taken from MRG<sup>51</sup> (Table 4.17).

CO<sub>2</sub> EFs for CaCO<sub>3</sub> and MgCO<sub>3</sub> – 0.44 and 0.522 for ton CO<sub>2</sub> per ton of carbonates respectively, were taken from MRG<sup>52</sup> to recalculate the emissions (Table 4.17, Table 4.18).

#### 4<sup>th</sup> bricks production plant

The estimation of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from 4<sup>th</sup> bricks production plant is rather complicated due to allowed approach in Latvia that Latvia's ETS operator can use different methodology for every year to estimate their CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

According to 4<sup>th</sup> bricks production plant's application for GHG permit and the plant's annual GHG reports in 2005-2008 the plant's used methodology for CO<sub>2</sub> emission estimation is changed four times:

1. CO<sub>2</sub> emission for time period 2000-2004 was estimated by using used clay (with moisture content 23%) as an activity data and CO<sub>2</sub> EF for used clay – 0.0658 t CO<sub>2</sub>/t used clay. Then CO<sub>2</sub> EF for dry clay is estimated by reducing it by 23% that gives EF – 0.050666 tCO<sub>2</sub>/t used clay.

<sup>51</sup> EU Monitoring Reporting Guidelines. Available: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2007:229:0001:0085:EN:PDF> (page 81)

<sup>52</sup> EU Monitoring Reporting Guidelines. Available: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2007:229:0001:0085:EN:PDF> (page 79)

2. The plant for year 2005 is using the calculation method "A" – carbon input, from the MRG when calculation is based on the carbon input on each of the relevant raw materials. The content of CaCO<sub>3</sub> and MgCO<sub>3</sub> are determined in plant laboratories or stated in mineral deposits passport. Default CO<sub>2</sub> emission EFs
3. For 2006 and 2007 the plant is using calculation method B – alkali earth oxides, from the MRG when calculation is based on the content of the CaO, MgO and other (earth) alkali.
4. For 2008 plant is using the same calculation method A as for year 2005– carbon input, from the MRG when calculation is based on the carbon input on each of the relevant raw materials. Still Tier 1 EFs from the MRG corresponding particular method are used when conservative value of 0.2 tons CaCO<sub>3</sub> (0.08794 tons of CO<sub>2</sub>) per ton of dry clay is applied for the calculation of the EF instead of results of analysis.

To make emission estimation more consistent:

1. For years 2000-2004 emissions were calculated by using the CaCO<sub>3</sub> and MgCO<sub>3</sub> content data reported by plant in its application for a GHG permit when the EU ETS was created in Latvia – CaCO<sub>3</sub> – 11.48%, and MgCO<sub>3</sub> – 1.8%, and using EFs from MRG.
2. For year 2006-2007 the CaCO<sub>3</sub> and MgCO<sub>3</sub> content data were estimated from MgO and CaO content data corresponding molar mass of MgO, CaO and CO<sub>2</sub>.
3. For year 2008 the same CaCO<sub>3</sub> and MgCO<sub>3</sub> content data as for 2007 was used in emission estimation as other information was not available (Table 4.19).

#### Activity data

The plant reported that amount of carbonates (CaCO<sub>3</sub> and MgCO<sub>3</sub>) in used clay is estimated according to chemical content of clay that was determined in Institute of Silicate Materials. For 2005 the CaCO<sub>3</sub> and MgCO<sub>3</sub> content is taken from production plant's annual GHG report. For 2006-2007 CaCO<sub>3</sub> and MgCO<sub>3</sub> data was estimated by taking into account used clay content data and its estimation parameters available from bricks production plant. For 2008 that particular data was no available therefore the percentage amount of carbonates of year 2007 was used (Table 4.19).

According to production plant's application for GHG permit and annual GHG reports activity data of used raw materials is estimated using following equation:

$$AD_{raw} = \sum \left( AD_{bulk} * M_{av} - M_{bulk} * \frac{moisture}{100} \right) - M_{chippings} - M_{tenisite} \quad (4.18)$$

where:

$AD_{raw}$  – activity data of used raw materials – clay (kt)

$AD_{bulk}$  – amount of dried bulk materials (pieces)

$M_{av}$  – average mass (kt)

$M_{bulk}$  – mass of dried bulk materials loaded in furnace

$moisture/100$  – average moisture content of clay (%)

$M_{chippings}$  – mass of dried scobs (kt)

$M_{tenisite}$  – mass of tenisite (granulated burnt defectives of ceramics) (kt)

Mass of chippings wasn't taken into account as it is biomass and is assumed as CO<sub>2</sub> neutral. Mass of tenisite – granulated burnt defectives of previously made ceramics that is folded into



mass of clay to improve lasting of final production, is not taken into account as it is secondary process and during repeated burning the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are not emitted.

**Table 4.19 Data and assumptions used for CO<sub>2</sub> emission estimation from 4<sup>th</sup> bricks production plant**

	1990	1995	2000	2005	2006	2007	2008
Use of clay (kt)	NO	NO	9.000	25.246	29.826	34.166	27.329
MgCO <sub>3</sub> content (%)	NO	NO	1.80%	6.47%	6.47%	6.67%	6.67%
CaCO <sub>3</sub> content (%)	NO	NO	11.48%	14.62%	14.62%	13.71%	13.71%
MgCO <sub>3</sub> amount (kt)	NO	NO	0.162	1.634	1.929	2.28	1.824
CaCO <sub>3</sub> amount (kt)	NO	NO	1.033	3.691	4.361	4.684	3.747
MgCO <sub>3</sub> CO <sub>2</sub> EF (tCO <sub>2</sub> /t oxide)	NO	NO	0.522	0.522	0.522	0.522	0.522
CaCO <sub>3</sub> CO <sub>2</sub> EF (tCO <sub>2</sub> /t oxide)	NO	NO	0.440	0.440	0.440	0.440	0.440
CO <sub>2</sub> emissions (kt)	NO	NO	0.539	2.477	2.926	3.251	2.601
Average CO <sub>2</sub> EF (tCO <sub>2</sub> /t oxides)	NO	NO	0.451	0.465	0.465	0.467	0.467

In 2009, the bricks production plant is not operating due to economic crisis that affected construction sector in Latvia when demand for the production sharply decreased. Still the non-operation of particular plant is assumed only temporary and it is prospective that plant will be operating again.

#### *Emission factors and calculations*

As 4<sup>th</sup> bricks production plant is changing used methodology to estimate their annual CO<sub>2</sub> emissions within the EU ETS requirements from year to year, the emissions were calculated using the most appropriate approach. As the CaCO<sub>3</sub> and MgCO<sub>3</sub> content data was available for 2000-2004 and then for 2005 but MgO and CaO content data was available for 2006-2007 CO<sub>2</sub> emissions were calculated using Calculation A method – carbon input from MRG<sup>53</sup>.

The following equation was used to estimate CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from 4<sup>th</sup> bricks production plant:

$$CO_2 = (AD_{clay} * ADCaCO_3 * EFCaCO_3) + (AD_{clay} * ADMgCO_3 * EFMgCO_3) \quad (4.19)$$

where:

CO<sub>2</sub> – CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from 4<sup>th</sup> bricks production plant (kt)

AD<sub>clay</sub> – activity data of used clay (kt)

ADCaCO<sub>3</sub> – CaCO<sub>3</sub> content in used clay (%)

EFCaCO<sub>3</sub> – CaCO<sub>3</sub> emission factor (kt/kt)

ADMgCO<sub>3</sub> – MgCO<sub>3</sub> content in used clay (%)

EFMgCO<sub>3</sub> – MgCO<sub>3</sub> emission factor (kt/kt)

CO<sub>2</sub> EFs for CaCO<sub>3</sub> and MgCO<sub>3</sub> – 0.44 and 0.522 for ton CO<sub>2</sub> per ton of carbonates were taken from MRG<sup>54</sup>.

#### **5<sup>th</sup> bricks production plant**

According to 5<sup>th</sup> bricks plant's application for GHG permit and annual GHG reports activity data of used raw materials is estimated using following equation:

<sup>53</sup> EU Monitoring Reporting Guidelines. Available: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2007:229:0001:0085:EN:PDF> (pages 78,79)

<sup>54</sup> EU Monitoring Reporting Guidelines. Available: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2007:229:0001:0085:EN:PDF> (page 79)

$$AD_{raw} = \sum(AD_{bulk} * M_{av} - M_{bulk} * moisture/100) \quad (4.20)$$

where:

$AD_{raw}$  – activity data of used raw materials – clay (kt)

$AD_{bulk}$  – amount of dried bulk materials (pieces)

$M_{av}$  – average mass (kt)

$M_{bulk}$  – mass of dried bulk materials

$moisture/100$  – content of moisture (%)

Content of CaO and MgO in used clay is determined in independent certified laboratory taking analysis of used clay. Used additives – CaCO<sub>3</sub> (limestone flour) is weighted in production plant before addition to clay.

For 1993-2004 the CaO and MgO content was unknown as such laboratory measurements were not done before the EU ETS monitoring requirements. The CaO and MgO content data was determined only in the end of 2003. This particular amount was then used for all years in time period 1993-2004 as other data was not available.

#### *Emission factors and calculations*

The particular bricks production plant is using Calculation method B – alkali earth oxides, from MRG<sup>55</sup>. According to the MRG calcination of CO<sub>2</sub> is calculated based on the amounts of ceramics produced and the CaO, MgO and other (earth) alkali oxide contents of the ceramics.

Following equation from bricks production installation's annual GHG reports within the EU ETS was used to estimate CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

$$CO_2 = \sum\left(AD_{raw} * \frac{AD_{CaO,MgO}}{100}\right) * EF * CF \quad (4.21)$$

where:

$CO_2$  – total CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from bricks production (kt)

$AD_{raw}$  – activity data of used raw materials – clay (kt)

$AD_{CaO,MgO} / 100$  – CaO and/or MgO content in used raw materials (%)

$EF$  – CO<sub>2</sub> emission factor of CaO and/or MgO (kt/kt)

$CF$  – conversion factor

For some years in bricks production also CaCO<sub>3</sub> was used as additive to clay for yellow bricks production. Following equation from plant's annual GHG reported was used to estimate CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from CaCO<sub>3</sub> use:

$$CO_2 = \sum\left(AD_{raw} * \frac{AD_{additive}}{100}\right) * 1.785 * EF * CF \quad (4.22)$$

where:

$CO_2$  – total CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from additive use (kt)

$AD_{raw}$  – activity data of used raw materials – clay (kt)

$AD_{additive} / 100$  – CaO content in used raw materials (%)

1.785 – factor to estimate CaO from used CaCO<sub>3</sub> data

$EF$  – CO<sub>2</sub> emission factor of CaO (kt/kt)

$CF$  – conversion factor

In latest years 2008-2013 the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions were estimated for different bulks of used clay therefore CaO and MgO content data for these bulks differs. Therefore the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions were

<sup>55</sup> EU Monitoring Reporting Guidelines. Available: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2007:229:0001:0085:EN:PDF> (page 80)

estimated separately. In 2022, EF=0.013 (tCO<sub>2</sub>/t oxides) which already includes CO<sub>2</sub> EFs from MgO and CaO is used (Table 4.20).

**Table 4.20 Data and assumptions used for CO<sub>2</sub> emission estimation from 5<sup>th</sup> bricks production plant**

Year	Use of clay (kt)	MgO content (%)	CaO content (%)	MgO amount (kt)	CaO amount (kt)	MgO CO <sub>2</sub> EF (tCO <sub>2</sub> /t oxide)	CaO CO <sub>2</sub> EF (tCO <sub>2</sub> /t oxide)	CaCO <sub>3</sub> (additive) (kt)	CO <sub>2</sub> emissions (kt)	Average CO <sub>2</sub> EF (tCO <sub>2</sub> /t oxides)
1990	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
1995	107.38	1.43%	10.39%	1.536	11.152	1.092	0.785	0.000	10.431	0.822
2000	112.50	1.43%	10.39%	1.609	11.683	1.092	0.785	0.000	10.928	0.822
2005	88.29	0.39%	1.75%	0.344	1.545	1.092	0.785	0.000	1.589	0.841
2006	94.44	0.39%	1.75%	0.368	1.653	1.092	0.785	0.342	1.849	0.841
2007	80.90	0.36%	1.47%	0.291	1.189	1.092	0.785	1.218	1.787	0.845
2008	26.32	1.23%	0.32%	0.324	0.084	1.092	0.785	0.000	1.594	1.029
	28.33	1.35%	0.41%	0.382	0.116	1.092	0.785			1.020
	28.82	1.26%	0.38%	0.363	0.110	1.092	0.785			1.021
	13.21	1.09%	0.25%	0.144	0.033	1.092	0.785			1.035
2009	1.05	1.09%	0.25%	0.011	0.003	1.092	0.785	0.000	0.647	1.035
	21.02	1.07%	0.27%	0.225	0.057	1.092	0.785			1.030
	22.05	1.16%	0.27%	0.256	0.060	1.092	0.785			1.034
	1.19	1.12%	0.23%	0.013	0.003	1.092	0.785			1.040
2010	0.82	1.12%	0.23%	0.009	0.002	1.092	0.785	1.019	1.396	1.040
	21.05	1.23%	0.26%	0.259	0.055	1.092	0.785			1.038
	21.15	1.13%	0.24%	0.239	0.051	1.092	0.785			1.038
	20.80	1.16%	0.28%	0.241	0.058	1.092	0.785			1.032
2011	17.72	1.12%	0.23%	0.198	0.041	1.092	0.785	2.875	2.638	1.040
	26.51	1.23%	0.26%	0.326	0.069	1.092	0.785			1.038
	25.05	1.13%	0.24%	0.283	0.060	1.092	0.785			1.038
	24.07	1.16%	0.28%	0.279	0.067	1.092	0.785			1.032
2012	21.17	1.12%	0.23%	0.237	0.049	1.092	0.785	2.465	2.287	1.040
	20.83	1.23%	0.26%	0.256	0.054	1.092	0.785			1.038
	18.59	1.13%	0.24%	0.210	0.045	1.092	0.785			1.038
	21.41	1.16%	0.28%	0.248	0.060	1.092	0.785			1.032
2013	20.75	1.02%	0.25%	0.212	0.052	1.092	0.785	5.863	3.744	1.032
	20.28	1.22%	0.39%	0.247	0.079	1.092	0.785			1.018
	18.48	1.20%	0.30%	0.222	0.055	1.092	0.785			1.031
	20.60	1.20%	0.03%	0.247	0.006	1.092	0.785			1.085
2014	76.93	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6.932	4.163	0.0145
2015	64.53	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	3.265	2.403	0.0150
2016	82.46	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.830	1.599	0.0150
2017	83.23	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1.619	1.892	0.0142
2018	72.04	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.398	1.191	0.0141
2019	59.98	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.000	0.802	0.0134
2020	72.15	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.000	0.989	0.0137
2021	72.33	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.026	1.015	0.0140
2022	39.74	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.010	0.537	0.0135

CO<sub>2</sub> EFs for CaO and MgO – 0.785 and 1.092 for ton CO<sub>2</sub> per ton of oxide respectively, were taken from MRG<sup>56</sup>. EF for 1993-2004 was calculated using MRG.

### Production of tiles

There is only one tiles production plant in Latvia and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from use of clay in tile production process in 1995-2014 are reported in 2.A.4 sector. The tiles production plant is a participant of the EU ETS therefore the data from plant's annual GHG reports is available for inventory. In 2015, tiles production was ceased due to financial complications and decrease of demand. Therefore plant were not using clay and emissions from tiles production are not occurring since 2015 (Table 4.21).

**Table 4.21 Activity data for tiles production (kt) and reported CO<sub>2</sub> emissions (kt)**

Year	Use of clay in tiles production	CO <sub>2</sub> emissions
		kt
1990	NO	NO
1995	2.034	0.18
2005	1.685	0.15
2006	1.748	0.15
2007	2.242	0.20
2008	0.525	0.05
2009	2.861	0.25
2010	2.497	0.22
2011	3.484	0.31
2012	6.033	0.53
2013	6.684	0.59
2014	6.556	0.58
2015-2022	NO	NO

Default methodology was used to estimate emissions by multiplying activity data with EF. CO<sub>2</sub> EF – 0.08794 (t CO<sub>2</sub>/t dry clay) which is used to estimate emissions from clay use in tiles production is taken from EU MRG<sup>57</sup>.

#### 4.2.5.3 Uncertainties and time-series consistency

Uncertainty analysis for 2024 submission is carried out by using Approach 1. Quantitative estimates of uncertainties are provided in Annex 2. Overall description of uncertainty analysis is included in Section 1.6.

The uncertainty of activity data for this sector is assumed as 7.5%. The activity data reported in bricks production plant's annual GHG reports within the EU ETS is verified by accredited verifiers and approved by the State Environmental Service so the activity data is adequately verified.

<sup>56</sup> EU Monitoring Reporting Guidelines. Available: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2007:229:0001:0085:EN:PDF> (page 81)

<sup>57</sup> EU Monitoring Reporting Guidelines. Available: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2007:229:0001:0085:LV:PDF> (page 80)

CO<sub>2</sub> EFs used in emission calculation from bricks and tiles production are the default ones from Monitoring and Reporting Regulation within the EU ETS<sup>58</sup> so the uncertainty of EFs is assumed as 3%.

Only CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from tiles and bricks production are estimated. Other emissions are not estimated due to lack of methodology and EFs.

For years 1990-1992 and 1993-2008 two different emission estimation methodologies are used still the time series is assumed as consistent as for 1990-1992 default Tier1 methodology is used but for 1993-2008 already plant specific emission estimation methodology assumed as Tier2 is used.

For time period 1993-2008 two different methodologies are used for 3<sup>rd</sup> bricks production plant so that could lead to inconsistent time series although it is assumed that these are plant specific data and there is no need to recalculate them with using default EFs or average carbonates content data.

Consistency of time series was checked by verifying IEF, AD and emission changes and attention was paid to important increase/decrease that are explained in NIR Chapter 4.2.5.1.

#### 4.2.5.4 Category-specific QA/QC and verification

The quality objectives and the QA/QC plan for the Latvia's GHG inventory at the National Inventory level are presented in Section 1.2.3. The QC procedures are performed according to the QA/QC plan in the IPPU sector in order to achieve these quality objectives. Issues related to QA/QC and verification are discussed at the sectoral meetings.

Activity data, CO<sub>2</sub> EF and estimated emissions are taken from the annual GHG reports that tiles production plant submit within EU ETS.

CO<sub>2</sub> EFs for tiles production are taken from MRG<sup>59</sup> and are the default ones therefore there is no need to re-check correctness of EFs.

Quality control check list is filled for each category taking into account criteria given in QA/QC plan approved in National legislation. All findings were documented and introduced in GHG inventory. All corrections are archived.

All estimations of the emissions done in the LEGMC also are checked on the logical mistakes by checking the time series of the activity data, EFs and emissions consistency to display all significant and illogic changes in the activity data and emissions.

Data comparison between the EU ETS data and GHG inventory emissions was made.

All information on activity data and emission calculations are stored and archived in the common FTP folder.

#### 4.2.5.5 Category-specific recalculations

No recalculations were done for this sector.

---

<sup>58</sup> EU Monitoring Reporting Guidelines. Available: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2007:229:0001:0085:EN:PDF> (page 80)

<sup>59</sup> EU Monitoring Reporting Guidelines. Available: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2007:229:0001:0085:EN:PDF> (page 78-81)

#### 4.2.5.6 Category-specific planned improvements

No improvements are planned for this sector.

### 4.2.6 Other uses of Soda Ash (2.A.4.b)

#### 4.2.6.1 Category description

Under this category CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from waste water neutralization using soda ash have been estimated 2005-2022. Till 2005 soda ash was not used in waste water neutralization.

In 2022, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions constitute 0.22 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. which are 14.0% lower than in 2021. Compared to 2005 emissions have increased by 9.4% (Figure 4.8).




Figure 4.8 CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from other uses of soda ash 2005-2022 (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

#### 4.2.6.2 Methodological issues

##### Activity data

Glass fibre production company annually reports amounts of used soda ash in waste water neutralization within the the EU ETS since 2005. This data is available in annual GHG reports under the EU ETS<sup>60</sup> (Table 4.22).

Table 4.22 Amount of used Soda for waste water neutralization (kt)

Year	Soda use for waste water neutralization (kt)
1990	NO
1995	NO
2000	NO
2005	0.48
2010	0.25
2011	0.25
2012	0.58

<sup>60</sup> Polluting activity permit. Available: [https://registri.vvd.gov.lv/izsnieltas-atlaujas-un-licences/atlauju-un-licencu-mekletajs/?company\\_name=stikla+C5%A1%C4%B7iedra&company\\_code=&s=1](https://registri.vvd.gov.lv/izsnieltas-atlaujas-un-licences/atlauju-un-licencu-mekletajs/?company_name=stikla+C5%A1%C4%B7iedra&company_code=&s=1)

Year	Soda use for waste water neutralization (kt)
2013	1.50
2014	1.51
2015	1.62
2016	0.81
2017	0.44
2018	0.38
2019	0.29
2020	0.46
2021	0.61
2022	0.52

#### *Emission factors and calculations*

Emissions are calculated according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines default methodology by multiplying amount of soda used with appropriate EF for soda ash taken from Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2018/2066 (0.415 tCO<sub>2</sub>/t).

#### **4.2.6.3 Uncertainties and time-series consistency**

Uncertainty analysis for 2024 submission is carried out by using Approach 1. Quantitative estimates of uncertainties are provided in Annex 2. Overall description of uncertainty analysis is included in Section 1.6.

Activity data for emission calculation from other uses of soda ash is taken from glass production plant's annual GHG report under the EU ETS. According to that the 7.5% uncertainty for activity data could be applied.

As the EF for CO<sub>2</sub> emission calculation is default from EU MRR (0.415 tCO<sub>2</sub>/t) the uncertainty of EF is assumed 3%.

#### **4.2.6.4 Category-specific QA/QC and verification**

The quality objectives and the QA/QC plan for the Latvia's GHG inventory at the National Inventory level are presented in Section 1.2.3. The QC procedures are performed according to the QA/QC plan in the IPPU sector in order to achieve these quality objectives. Issues related to QA/QC and verification are discussed at the sectoral meetings.

Quality control check list is filled for each category taking into account criteria given in QA/QC plan approved in National legislation. All corrections are archived.

All estimations of the emissions done in the LEGMC also are checked on the logical mistakes by checking the time series of the activity data, EFs and emissions consistency to display all significant and illogic changes in the activity data and emissions.

Data comparison between the EU ETS data and GHG inventory emissions was made.

All information on activity data and emission calculations are stored and archived in the common FTP folder.

#### **4.2.6.5 Category-specific recalculations**

No recalculations were done for this sector.

**4.2.6.6 Category-specific planned improvements**

No improvements are planned in this sector.

**4.2.7 Other Process Uses of Carbonates (2.A.4.d)**

Under sector 2.A.4.d Other emissions of SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from glass production and NO<sub>x</sub>, CO and NMVOC emissions from cement production and glass production are reported as it is not technically possible to report these emissions under 2.A.1 Cement production sector and 2.A.3 Glass production sector in CRF Reporter directly under relevant categories.

**4.3 CHEMICAL INDUSTRY (CRF 2.B)****4.3.1 Category description**

There are no chemical industry production processes listed in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines or EMEP/EEA 2023 generating GHG emissions.

The biggest part of chemical industry is medicine production and then small part of paints and varnishes production.

There are no F-gases emissions under sectors 2.B.9.a By-Product Emissions and 2.B.9.2 Fugitive emissions so there are no child nodes added under these categories in CRF Reporter. Corresponding CRF tables are left blank due to CRF internal issue which does not allow to directly enter NO in green and grey cells without adding child nodes. It was confirmed by CRF help desk that this issue will be improved in the future releases of the software. Some F-gases data in the parent categories (green and grey cells) in corresponding CRF tables are missing due to this reason.

**4.4 METAL INDUSTRY (CRF 2.C)**

CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and precursors (NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, NMVOC, SO<sub>2</sub>) from Iron and Steel production are reported under 2.C Metal Industry. There are no GHG emissions under rest of the sectors under 2.C. therefore these categories are NO in CRF Reporter.

There are no F-gases emissions under sectors Aluminium production, Magnesium production in Latvia therefore in CRF Reporter the corresponding CRF tables are left blank due to CRF internal issue which does not allow to directly enter NO in green and grey cells without adding child nodes. Some F-gases data in the parent categories (green and grey cells) in corresponding CRF tables are missing due to this reason.

**4.4.1 Iron and Steel Production (CRF 2.C.1)****4.4.1.1 Category category description**

In Latvia only one company produced steel 1990-2015 which used open-heart furnaces (OHF) from 1990 till 2010 and electric arc furnaces (EAF) from 1990 till 2015 in their steel production process. In 2016, steel production in Latvia was stopped as the only metal producing plant ceased to produce steel. According to information by plant, activity which still occurs in the plant is rolling of armature. This process cannot be accounted under Iron and Steel production sector emissions. Emissions from combustion of fuels for provision of this process is accounted under 1.A.2.a sector.



Since 1990 and compared to 2015 both CO<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from Iron and Steel production sector have decreased by 100% because metal production was stopped and facility is not reporting GHG emissions from metal production processes anymore (NO) (Figure 4.9).




Figure 4.9 CO<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from Metal industry 1990-2022 (CH<sub>4</sub> emissions on secondary axis) (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.; kt)

CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from crude iron as input material in iron and steel production in OHF and crude iron used in EAF are included in the inventory according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. Emissions of precursors are also estimated from iron and steel production (Table 4.23).

Table 4.23 Emissions from 2.C Metal Production in 1990–2022 (kt)

Year	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub>	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	NM VOC	SO <sub>2</sub>
	kt					
1990	69.56	0.003	0.004	0.012	0.011	0.087
1995	45.38	0.001	0.002	0.006	0.006	0.044
2000	61.10	0.003	0.003	0.007	0.010	0.080
2005	49.98	0.003	0.004	0.011	0.011	0.088
2006	48.36	0.003	0.004	0.011	0.011	0.088
2007	44.41	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.011	0.089
2008	37.73	0.003	0.003	0.006	0.011	0.085
2009	39.01	0.002	0.002	0.001	0.009	0.070
2010	38.64	0.003	0.003	0.002	0.011	0.086
2011	13.71	0.001	0.022	0.285	0.008	0.010
2012	53.34	0.004	0.109	1.422	0.038	0.050
2013	13.88	0.001	0.025	0.328	0.009	0.012
2014	0.01	4.6255E-07	1.20263E-05	0.0002	4.25546E-06	5.5506E-06
2015	0.81	6.23796E-05	0.002	0.021	0.001	0.001
2016-2022	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
2022 versus 2021	-	-	-	-	-	-
2022 versus 1990	-100%	-100%	-100%	-100%	-100%	-100%

Considerable emission decrease can be observed in 1990–1992 due to changes in Latvia's national economy (Figure 4.9). Decrease of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in 1990–1996 also occurred due to decrease of used crude iron in OHF as CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are estimated only from crude iron use

excluding used scrap metal part. It can be explained with modification of production process when majority of primary and final steel products was produced by smelting of scrap metal.

CO<sub>2</sub> emissions increased almost twice in 2002–2004 when amount of used crude iron increased but the amount of used scrap metal remained at the same level. In 2005 emissions decrease by 27% compared to 2004 due to decline of used raw materials as well as decreased amount of produced steel. Afterwards till 2010 the emission level was quite stable with small fluctuations. In 2011 sharp decrease of emissions can be observed due to closing of OHF (installations were dismantled). In 2011 the metal production plant was working only 4 months. Since 2011 entire amount of crude steel was produced only in EAF and plant worked only 5-7 months in a year. The highest emission peak was reached in 2012, but after that emissions decreased. In 2014 only 0.09 kt crude steel were produced from scrap metal that caused 0.01 kt CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and was the lowest result since the plant exists. In 2015, the metal production company resumed to produce steel therefore small emissions appeared again, but in 2016 the iron & steel production was stopped at all.

#### 4.4.1.2 Methodological issues

Reported gases and calculation methods for the 2.C Metal Industry are summarized in Table 4.24.

**Table 4.24 GHG emission categories, methods and gases reported from 2.C**

Category	Method used	Gases reported
C. Metal Industry		
1. Iron and Steel Production	Tier1,2	CO <sub>2</sub> , CH <sub>4</sub> , NO <sub>x</sub> , CO, NMVOC, SO <sub>2</sub>

#### Activity data

Activity data used for 2.C.1 emission calculations were:

- Amount of raw materials used in steel production in OHF and EAF (1990-2004 data was available from the installation's application for a GHG permit to operate within the EU ETS system. Since 2005 data is available annually from the installation's annual GHG report under the EU ETS<sup>61</sup> and directly from metal plant);
- Carbon electrodes consumption (data received directly from metal plant);
- Mass of steel produced in OHF and EAF (data received directly from metal plant);
- Used scrap metal in steel production in OHF and EAF (data received directly from metal plant);
- Carbon content in crude iron and Carbon content in crude steel (data received directly from metal plant);

Raw materials - coke, coke fine and carburizers - are used in crude steel production process as reducing agents to decrease the carbon content in final produced crude steel. Also lime, limestone and dolomite is used for steel smelting in OHF.

<sup>61</sup>Polluting activity permit. Available: [https://registri.vvd.gov.lv/izsnieltas-atlaujas-un-licences/atlauju-un-licencu-mekletajs/?company\\_name=liep%C4%81jas+metalurgs&company\\_code=&s=1](https://registri.vvd.gov.lv/izsnieltas-atlaujas-un-licences/atlauju-un-licencu-mekletajs/?company_name=liep%C4%81jas+metalurgs&company_code=&s=1)

Since large amount of scrap metals is used in crude steel production it was necessary to exclude this amount from total crude steel amount and to estimate only amount of crude steel in what production crude iron where involved in both technologies. It was estimated by using crude iron/scrap metal ratio since amounts of used scrap metal in OHF and EAF as well as used crude iron in the furnaces were known. Then the iron/scrap metal ratio was multiplied with amount of steel produced in OHF or EAF to estimate amount of crude steel produced directly from crude iron.

But coke was used only as raw material in crude steel production and metallurgical coke was not produced in Latvia during the period 1990-2015.

The amount of direct limestone used in iron and steel production facility and the amount of limestone used for quicklime production were different. Since activity data were taken from the only metal producer's annual GHG report under the EU ETS then metal producer clearly distinguished limestone stream which was used in iron and steel production from the amount of non-marketed lime (quicklime) produced during iron and steel making process. Therefore there are two limestone streams and is not double counting.

Activity data and parameters for emission calculation from iron and steel production as well as emissions (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.) are reflected in Table 4.25.

DRAFT

Table 4.25 Activity data and emissions from 2.C.1 Metal production

Year	Crude steel production, t	Mass of steel produced in OHF, t	Mass of steel produced in EAF, t	Crude iron used in OHF, t	Crude iron used in EAF, t	Used coke, t	Used Limestone, t	Used Dolomite, t	Carbon electrodes consumption kg/t steel	Used scrap metal in steel production in OHF, t	Used scrap metal in steel production in EAF, t	Crude iron/scrap metal ratio	Amount of crude steel in what production crude iron where involved (in OHF), t	Amount of crude steel in what production crude iron where involved (in EAF), t	Carbon content in crude iron	Carbon content in crude steel	Total emissions from Iron and Steel, kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.
1990	550000	543074	6926	107732	1160.79	11362.49	14300	33000	1.5	537227	5788.52	0.20	108905	1389	3.5%	0.25%	69.63
1995	279326	275747	3579	37086	412.71	6207.00	14300	33000	1.5	285015	3171.79	0.13	35880	466	3.5%	0.25%	45.42
2000	500292	496434	3858	70637	475.83	10061.00	14300	33000	1.5	503123	3389.18	0.14	69698	542	3.5%	0.25%	61.17
2005	554345	548472	5873	104010	969.77	6757.14	6325.85	29706.56	1.5	527950	4922.49	0.20	108053	1157	3.5%	0.25%	50.05
2010	535301	534168	1133	81340	165.73	3985.92	4146.5	28114.65	6.4	476868	971.63	0.17	91114	193	4%	0.20%	38.72
2011	167624	NO	167624	NO	3389.46	3948.52	1.728	245.86	1.8	NO	187103	0.02	NO	3037	4%	0.20%	13.73
2012	535301	NO	836431	NO	13387.21	3985.92	541.354	28114.65	1.4	NO	900803	0.01	NO	12431	4%	0.20%	53.45
2013	193190	NO	193190	NO	3185.32	3710.19	NO	NO	3.0	NO	227834	0.01	NO	2701	4%	0.20%	13.90
2014	92.51	NO	92.51	NO	NO	2.97	NO	NO	NO	NO	120.50	NO	NO	NO	4%	0.20%	0.01
2015	12475.91	NO	12475.91	NO	4.54	239.31	NO	NO	1.8	NO	14180.69	0.0003	NO	4	4%	0.20%	0.81
2016	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
2020	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
2021	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
2022	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

*Emission factors and calculations*

The 2006 IPCC Guidelines, EMEP/CORINAIR 2009 and EMEP/EEA 2023 were used to calculate GHG emissions and precursors from the Iron and Steel production sector.

For CO<sub>2</sub> emission calculation Tier 2 method from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines is used. It is based on estimation of carbon losses through the production processes when remaining carbon is emitted to air.

CO<sub>2</sub> emissions were estimated only from crude iron used. In steel production steel is produced mostly by melting scrap metal that does not produce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by leaking carbon therefore only amount of crude steel in what production crude iron where involved in OHF and EAF was used as activity data.

Equation 4.9 from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines is used to calculate CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from steel production:

$$E_{CO2,non-energy} = [PC * C_{PC} + L * C_L + D * C_D + CE * C_{CE} + O_b * C_b + S_{in} * C_{in} - S_{out} * C_{out}] * 44/12 \quad (4.23)$$

where:

*PC*—quantity of coke consumed in iron and steel production (not including sinter production) (tons)

*C<sub>PC</sub>*—carbon content in coke (tC/ton)

*L*—quantity of limestone consumed in iron and steel production (tons)

*C<sub>L</sub>*—carbon content in limestone (tC/ton)

*D*—quantity of dolomite consumed in iron and steel production (tons)

*C<sub>D</sub>*—carbon content in dolomite (tC/ton)

*CE*—quantity of carbon electrodes consumed in EAFs (tons)

*C<sub>CE</sub>*—carbon contents in carbon electrodes (tC/ton)

*O<sub>b</sub>*—quantity of other carbonaceous and process material (tons)

*C<sub>b</sub>*—carbon content of other carbonaceous material (tC/ton)

*S<sub>in</sub>*—amount of used metal in steel production process as input material (crude iron) (tons)

*C<sub>in</sub>*—carbon content in input material (crude iron) (tC/ton)

*S<sub>out</sub>*—amount of produced metal material as output material (crude steel) (tons)

*C<sub>out</sub>*—carbon content in output material (crude steel) (tC/ton)

Carbon contents for raw materials are taken from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines<sup>62</sup> and are reflected in Table 4.26.

**Table 4.26 Carbon contents of raw materials used in iron & steel production**

Process material	Carbon content (kg C/kg )
Limestone	0.12
Dolomite	0.13
Coke	0.83

Carbon emissions from consumed electrodes in EAF are estimated by multiplying emission mass of steel produced in electric arc furnaces with carbon electrodes consumption EF.

EFs of CH<sub>4</sub> and precursors are taken from EMEP/CORINAIR 2007 and EMEP/EEA 2023 for estimations of emissions from processes in OHFs, where 95% of total steel production is produced till 2010 and for EAF starting from year 2011 (Table 4.27).

<sup>62</sup> IPCC 2006 Guidelines, Vol.3, Ch.4. Available: <http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/2006gl/vol3.html>

**Table 4.27 Emission factors of metal production (t/t)**

	CH <sub>4</sub>	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	NMVOC	SO <sub>2</sub>
OHF	0.000005	0.0051	0.000001	0.00002	0.00016
EAF	0.000005	0.00013	0.0017	0.000046	0.00006

CH<sub>4</sub>, NMVOC, CO, NO<sub>x</sub> and SO<sub>2</sub> emissions are estimated from total produced crude steel data but for CO<sub>2</sub> emission estimation only crude steel produced from crude iron is taken into account.

#### 4.4.1.3 Uncertainties and time-series consistency

Uncertainty analysis for 2024 submission is carried out by using Approach 1. Quantitative estimates of uncertainties are provided in Annex 2. Overall description of uncertainty analysis is included in Section 1.6.

The uncertainty of activity data for this sector is assumed as 5%. The activity data reported in iron and steel production plant's annual GHG report within EU ETS is verified by accredited verifiers and approved by the State Environmental Service so the activity data is adequately verified.

As the material-specific default carbon contents for process materials are used from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, the 10% EF uncertainty could be applied.

Time series of the estimated emissions are consistent and complete because the same methodology, EFs and data sources are used for sectors for all years in time series. GHG emissions from all sectors are estimated or reported as not occurring / not applicable therefore there are no "not estimated" sectors.

Time series consistency was checked by verifying IEF, AD and emission changes and attention was paid to important increase/decrease that are explained in NIR Chapter 4.4.1.1.

#### 4.4.1.4 Category-specific QA/QC and verification

The quality objectives and the QA/QC plan for the Latvia's GHG inventory at the National Inventory level are presented in Section 1.2.3. The QC procedures are performed according to the QA/QC plan in the IPPU sector in order to achieve these quality objectives. Issues related to QA/QC and verification are discussed at the sectoral meetings.

All estimations of the emissions done in the LEGMC also are checked on the logical mistakes by checking the time series of the activity data, EFs and emissions consistency to display all significant and illogic changes in the activity data and emissions.

Quality control check list is filled for each category taking into account criteria given in QA/QC plan approved in National legislation. All findings were documented and introduced in GHG inventory. All corrections are archived.

Data comparison between the EU ETS data and GHG inventory emissions was made. Differences in 2013-2015 were caused by different emission calculation methodologies that are used under UNFCCC reporting (2006 IPCC Guidelines) and EU ETS monitoring and reporting. According to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from 2.C.1 were estimated taking into account only particular part of used raw materials that generate CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in production

process. As mostly scrap metals are used in production of crude steel in Latvia, only amount of used crude iron as input material in crude steel production is taken into account. During remelting of scrap metal the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are not generated. The crude iron/scrap metal ratio is used in emission calculation.

Under the EU ETS CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by plant are calculated by multiplying AD (used raw materials) with EF without any division into used technologies that gives very approximately calculated CO<sub>2</sub> emissions that differ from emissions reported in GHG inventory.

All information on activity data and emission calculations are stored and archived in the common FTP folder.

#### **4.4.1.5 Category-specific recalculations**

No recalculations were done for this sector.

#### **4.4.1.6 Category-specific planned improvements**

No improvements are planned for this sector.

## 4.5 NON-ENERGY PRODUCTS FROM FUELS AND SOLVENT USE (CRF 2.D)

Under Non-energy Products from Fuels and Solvent Use sector emissions from Paraffin wax, Lubricant use and Other (including Solvent use, Asphalt roofing and Road paving with asphalt, urea use) are reported.

Non-energy products from fuels and solvent use sector GHG emissions were 44.77 kt which is 5.2% from total IPPU emissions and 0.4% of total CO<sub>2</sub> eq. emissions including indirect CO<sub>2</sub>, without LULUCF in Latvia in 2022. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from Non-energy Products from Fuels and Solvent Use sector have increased by 1.2% since 1990 and decreased by 18.9% compared to 2021 due to decreased amount of solvents and paraffin wax (Figure 4.10). The main part of this sector emissions constitute 2.D.3 Other subsector with 26.59 kt (59.4%) from total 2.D sector emissions. 2.D.3 Other subsector includes emissions from Solvent use, Asphalt roofing, Road paving with asphalt and Urea use. Solvent use sector constitutes 94.3% of 2.D.3 Other sector. Remaining part of emissions (5.7%) from 2.D.3 Other constitute Asphalt roofing, Road paving with asphalt and Urea Use.




Figure 4.10 Emissions from Non-energy Products from Fuels and Solvent Use sector 1990-2022 (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

Reported emissions and calculation methods for the Non-energy Products from Fuels and Solvent Use in the Latvian inventory are summarized in Table 4.28.

Table 4.28 GHG emission categories, methods and gases reported from 2.D

Category	Method used	Gases reported
D. Non-energy Products from Fuels and Solvent Use		
1. Lubricant Use	Tier1	CO <sub>2</sub>
2. Paraffin Wax Use	Tier1	CO <sub>2</sub>
3. Other		
Solvent Use	Tier1,2, CS,D	CO <sub>2</sub> , NMVOC, CO, SO <sub>2</sub> , NO <sub>x</sub>
Road paving with asphalt	Tier1	CO <sub>2</sub> , NMVOC
Asphalt roofing	Tier1	CO <sub>2</sub> , NMVOC, CO
Urea use	Tier1	CO <sub>2</sub>



## 4.5.1 Lubricant Use (CRF 2.D.1)

### 4.5.1.1 Category description

Lubricant use sector emissions amounts 11.34 kt (25.3%) of total Non-energy sector products emissions in Latvia in 2022. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from 2.D.1 sector decreased by 51.2% since 1990 and decreased by 12.5% compared to 2021 due to decreased lubricant consumption (Figure 4.11 and Table 4.29).




Figure 4.11 CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from Lubricant use 1990-2022 (kt)

Under this category lubricant consumption are reported as feedstocks in Latvia. Emissions from lubricants use are reported as „CO<sub>2</sub> not emitted” because it is assumed that CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are captured and not emitted into air.

Consumption and emissions from lubricants are reported in sector 2.D.1 for all years in time series 1990-2022 (Table 4.29).

Table 4.29 CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from lubricant use 1990-2022 (kt)

Year	CO <sub>2</sub> emissions (kt)
1990	23.25
1995	13.59
2000	12.30
2005	15.10
2010	7.60
2011	10.80
2012	12.69
2013	12.05
2014	8.35
2015	13.99
2016	19.49
2017	11.74
2018	15.36
2019	15.28

Year	CO <sub>2</sub> emissions (kt)
2020	12.18
2021	12.96
2022	11.34
Share in IPPU total in 2022	1.3%
2022 versus 2021	-12.5%
2022 versus 1990	-51.2%

#### 4.5.1.2 Methodological issues

##### Activity data

Lubricant consumption data from CSB Energy Balance<sup>63</sup> was used as activity data for emission calculation.

Lubricants are mainly used in transport sector. The amount of oil from which the oil film has been formed on the inner cylinder walls is calculated. This oil film further is exposed to combustion and burned along with the fuel.

Share of used lubricants in transport sector is calculated according to kilometres travelled. It includes used lubricants for each of the subgroups of road transport separately, including 2 - stroke motorcycles for which petrol engine should be lubricated by a mixture of lubricating oil and petrol.

CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the lubricants consumed in transport are estimated and reported under transport sector and constitute 8.5% of total lubricants amount in 2022. The rest of the lubricants are used as feedstocks and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from them are calculated and reported under 2.D.1 sector.

**Table 4.30 Activity data for lubricant use 1990-2022**

Year	Total consumption of lubricants	Consumption of lubricants in 1.A.3.b	Consumption of lubricants in Lubricants Use 2.D.1. sector	Share of total lubricants used in 1.A.3.b sector
				TJ
				%
1990	1633	46.73	1586.27	2.9
1995	963	35.54	927.46	3.7
2000	879	39.75	839.25	4.5
2005	1088	57.75	1030.25	5.3
2010	586	67.17	518.83	11.5
2011	795	57.98	737.02	7.3
2012	922	55.91	866.09	6.1
2013	880	57.97	822.03	6.6
2014	632	62.34	569.66	9.9
2015	1022	67.32	954.68	6.6
2016	1398	68.28	1329.72	6.6
2017	872	71.24	800.76	8.2
2018	1122	73.94	1048.06	6.6
2019	1118	75.39	1042.61	6.7
2020	905	73.78	831.22	8.2

<sup>63</sup> Energy balance. Available: [https://data.stat.gov.lv/pxweb/lv/OSP\\_PUB/START\\_\\_NOZ\\_\\_EN\\_\\_ENB/ENB060/](https://data.stat.gov.lv/pxweb/lv/OSP_PUB/START__NOZ__EN__ENB/ENB060/)

Year	Total consumption of lubricants	Consumption of lubricants in 1.A.3.b	Consumption of lubricants in Lubricants Use 2.D.1. sector	Share of total lubricants used in 1.A.3.b sector
	TJ			%
2021	961	76.61	884.39	8.0
2022	846	72.25	773.75	8.5

#### Emission factors and calculations

CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are calculated according to Tier 1 method and EFs as well as default carbon content are taken from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. Carbon content for lubricant is 20.0 kg/GJ according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines Volume 3 Chapter 5 Table 5.2.

NCV for lubricants is 40.20 TJ/10<sup>3</sup> t and it is taken from CSB Energy Balance<sup>64</sup>.

CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are calculated using the 2006 IPCC Guidelines:

$$CO_2 \text{Emissions} = LC * CC_{Lubricant} * ODU_{Lubricant} * 44/12 \quad (4.24)$$

where:

CO<sub>2</sub> emissions - CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions from lubricants (ton CO<sub>2</sub>)

LC - total lubricant consumption (TJ)

CC<sub>Lubricant</sub> - carbon content of lubricants (default) (ton C/TJ(=kg/ C/TJ)

ODU<sub>Lubricant</sub> - ODU (Oxidised during use) factor (based on default composition of oil and grease) fraction

44/12 - mass ratio of CO<sub>2</sub>/C

#### 4.5.1.3 Uncertainties and time-series consistency

Uncertainty analysis for 2024 submission is carried out by using Approach 1. Quantitative estimates of uncertainties are provided in Annex 2. Overall description of uncertainty analysis is included in Section 1.6.

Activity data are taken from CSB of Latvia and uncertainty are assumed as 2%.

As the default ODU factor is used, the uncertainty (50%) from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines is applied for ODU EF.

The carbon content coefficients is taken from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines and are based on two studies of the carbon content and heating value of lubricants, from which an uncertainty range is about 3%.

The total EF uncertainty  $U_{total}$  is being calculated, using following formula of combined uncertainty:

$$U_{total} = \sqrt{(U_1^2 + U_2^2 + \dots + U_n^2)} \quad (4.25)$$

where:

$U_{total}$  - the percentage uncertainty in the product of the quantities

$U_i$  - the percentage uncertainties associated with each of the quantities

Combined EF uncertainty is calculated as 50%.

<sup>64</sup> Energy balance. Available: [https://data.stat.gov.lv/pxweb/lv/OSP\\_PUB/START\\_\\_NOZ\\_\\_EN\\_\\_ENB/ENB060/](https://data.stat.gov.lv/pxweb/lv/OSP_PUB/START__NOZ__EN__ENB/ENB060/)

#### 4.5.1.4 Category-specific QA/QC and verification

The quality objectives and the QA/QC plan for the Latvia's GHG inventory at the National Inventory level are presented in Section 1.2.3. The QC procedures are performed according to the QA/QC plan in the IPPU sector in order to achieve these quality objectives. Issues related to QA/QC and verification are discussed at the sectoral meetings.

QA/QC check is performed according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. There are compared the amounts discarded, recovered and combusted in Transport sector with total consumption figures in the calculation to check the internal consistency data and ODU factors if they are used in the calculation of different source categories across sectors.

All information on activity data and emission calculations are stored and archived in the common FTP folder.

#### 4.5.1.5 Category-specific recalculations

Recalculation was done due to precised activity data for 1990-2021 (Table 4.31).

**Table 4.31 Results of recalculations in 2.D.1 Lubricant use sector (1990-2021)**

Year	CO <sub>2</sub> emissions before recalculation	CO <sub>2</sub> emissions after recalculation	Absolute difference	Relative difference
		kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.		%
1990	23.30	23.25	-0.05	-0.22
1995	13.63	13.59	-0.04	-0.30
2000	12.34	12.30	-0.04	-0.34
2005	15.15	15.10	-0.05	-0.34
2010	7.67	7.60	-0.07	-0.86
2015	14.06	13.99	-0.07	-0.51
2016	19.57	19.49	-0.08	-0.40
2017	11.82	11.74	-0.08	-0.68
2018	15.45	15.36	-0.09	-0.57
2019	15.26	15.28	0.02	0.16
2020	12.18	12.18	0.00	0.01
2021	12.97	12.96	-0.01	-0.06

#### 4.5.1.6 Category-specific planned improvements

No improvements are planned for this sector.

### 4.5.2 Paraffin Wax Use (CRF 2.D.2)

#### 4.5.2.1 Category description

Paraffin wax use subsector emissions constitute 6.84 kt (15.3%) of total Non-energy sector emissions in Latvia in 2022. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from 2.D.2 sector have been increased by 270.6% since 1999 and decreased by 23.7% compared to 2021 (Figure 4.12 and Table 4.32).




Figure 4.12 CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from Paraffin wax use 1999-2022 (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

Under this category paraffin wax consumption is reported as feedstocks in Latvia. Paraffin wax mainly is used in chemical substance in chemical production as well as plastic, rubber and furniture production. Emissions from paraffin wax are reported as „CO<sub>2</sub> not emitted” because it is assumed that CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are captured and not emitted into the air.

Consumption and emissions of paraffin wax are reported in sector 2.D.2 for time series 1990-2022 (Table 4.32).

Table 4.32 Activity data and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from paraffin wax use 1990-2022

Year	Consumption of paraffin wax (TJ)	CO <sub>2</sub> emissions (kt)
1990	NO	NO
1995	NO	NO
2000	126	1.85
2005	335	4.91
2010	461	6.76
2011	293	4.29
2012	251	3.68
2013	377	5.53
2014	335	4.91
2015	335	4.91
2016	316	4.63
2017	249	3.65
2018	396	5.80
2019	368	5.39
2020	345	5.06
2021	612	8.97
2022	467	6.84
Share in IPPU total in 2022	-	0.8%

#### 4.5.2.2 Methodological issues

##### *Activity data*

Paraffin wax consumption data from CSB Energy Balance was used as activity data for emission calculation. Data from CSB about paraffin wax consumption are available only from 1999.

##### *Emission factors and calculations*

CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are calculated according to Tier1 method and EFs as well as default carbon content are taken from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. Carbon content for paraffin wax is 20.0 kg/GJ as default one taken from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines Volume 3 Chapter 5 p.p 5.12.

NCV for paraffin wax is 40.20 TJ/10<sup>3</sup> t and it is taken from CSB Energy Balance<sup>65</sup>.

CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are calculated using the 2006 IPCC Guidelines equation 5.4:

$$\mathbf{CO_2Emissions = PW * CC_{wax} * ODU_{wax} * 44/12} \quad (4.26)$$

where:

*CO<sub>2</sub> emissions* - CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions from waxes (ton CO<sub>2</sub>)

*LC* - total wax consumption (TJ)

*CC<sub>wax</sub>* - carbon content of paraffin wax (default) (tonC/TJ =kg/ C/TJ)

*ODU<sub>wax</sub>* - Oxidised during use (ODU) factor for paraffin wax (fraction)

*44/12* - mass ratio of CO<sub>2</sub>/C

#### 4.5.2.3 Uncertainties and time-series consistency

Uncertainty analysis for 2024 submission is carried out by using Approach 1. Quantitative estimates of uncertainties are provided in Annex 2. Overall description of uncertainty analysis is included in Section 1.6.

Activity data are taken from CSB of Latvia and uncertainty is assumed 2%.

The default ODU factor for paraffin wax is taken from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. Due to lack of information regarding application of paraffin wax in the country, the uncertainty of ODU factor is assumed 100%.

The carbon content coefficient is taken from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines and uncertainty is 5%.

The total EF uncertainty  $U_{total}$  is being calculated, using following formula of combined uncertainty:

$$\mathbf{U_{total} = \sqrt{(U_1^2 + U_2^2 + \dots + U_n^2)}} \quad (4.27)$$

where:

*U<sub>total</sub>* - the percentage uncertainty in the product of the quantities

*U<sub>i</sub>* - the percentage uncertainties associated with each of the quantities

Combined EF data uncertainty is calculated as 100%.

<sup>65</sup> Energy balance. Available: [https://data.stat.gov.lv/pxweb/lv/OSP\\_PUB/START\\_\\_NOZ\\_\\_EN\\_\\_ENB/ENB060/](https://data.stat.gov.lv/pxweb/lv/OSP_PUB/START__NOZ__EN__ENB/ENB060/)

#### 4.5.2.4 Category-specific QA/QC and verification

The quality objectives and the QA/QC plan for the Latvia's GHG inventory at the National Inventory level are presented in Section 1.2.3. The QC procedures are performed according to the QA/QC plan in the IPPU sector in order to achieve these quality objectives. Issues related to QA/QC and verification are discussed at the sectoral meetings.

QA/QC check is performed according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. There are compared the amounts discarded, recovered and combusted with total consumption figures in the calculation to check the internal consistency data and ODU factors if they are used in the calculation of different source categories across sectors.

All information on activity data and emission calculations are stored and archived in the common FTP folder.

#### 4.5.2.5 Category-specific recalculations

No recalculations were done.

#### 4.5.2.6 Category-specific planned improvements

No improvements are planned for this sector.

### 4.5.3 Other (CRF 2.D.3)

#### 4.5.3.1 Category description

This chapter describes emissions from Solvent Use, Road paving with asphalt and Asphalt roofing sector under Other (CRF 2.D.3).

##### **Solvent Use**

The use of solvents and products containing solvents results in emissions of non-methane volatile organic compounds (NMVOC). NMVOC emissions are regarded as an indirect GHG as it over a period of time will oxidize into CO<sub>2</sub> when emitted to the atmosphere.

According to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines and EMEP/EEA 2023 Solvent Use sector covers emissions from the four SNAP (Selected Nomenclature for Air Pollution) subcategories:

- SNAP 0601: Paint application (Including such activities as paints and varnishes from decorative, industrial and other coating applications);
- SNAP 0602: Degreasing, Dry cleaning (Degreasing includes cleaning products from water-insoluble substances such as grease, fats, oils waxes and tars. Dry cleaning refers to any process to remove contamination from furs, leather, down leathers, textiles or other objects made of fibres using organic solvents);
- SNAP 0603: Chemical products manufacturing or processing (Including the processing of polyester, PVC, foams and rubber, manufacture of paints, inks, glues and adhesives and finishing of textile);
- SNAP 0604: Other use of solvents and related activities (Including such activities as "enduction" (i.e. coating) of glass wool and mineral, printing industry, fat and oil extraction, uses of glues and adhesives, wood preservation, domestic use (other than paint application) and vehicle underseal treatment and vehicle dewaxing);


- SNAP 060602: Other product use (e.g. tobacco, fireworks).

Latvia's reported NMVOC and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from NMVOC under Solvent Use sector in 2022 are shown in Table 4.33.

**Table 4.33 Reported emissions from Solvent Use in Latvia in 2022**

Category		Subcategory title	Emissions
SNAP	NRF		
0601	2D3d	Paint application	NMVOC, indirect CO <sub>2</sub>
0602	2D3e	Degreasing	NMVOC, indirect CO <sub>2</sub>
0602	2D3f	Dry cleaning	NMVOC, indirect CO <sub>2</sub>
0603	2D3g	Chemical products	NMVOC, indirect CO <sub>2</sub>
0604	2D3h	Printing industry	NMVOC, indirect CO <sub>2</sub>
0604	2D3a	Domestic solvent use (other than paint application)	NMVOC, indirect CO <sub>2</sub>
0604	2D3i	Other solvent use	NMVOC, indirect CO <sub>2</sub>
0606	2G	Other product use (e.g. tobacco, fireworks)	NMVOC, indirect CO <sub>2</sub>

Solvent Use sector is significant pollution source of NMVOC emissions in Latvia in 2022 and it covered over 35.4% (11.41 kt) from the total Latvia's NMVOC emissions. From Solvent use sector the main share of total NMVOC emissions contributed Coating applications – 39.4% or 4.49 kt and Other solvent use – 27.7% or 3.16 kt. In 2019, NMVOC emissions of Solvent sector have decreased, compared to 2018. This is explained by the fact that one company in 2018 imported massive quantities of cleaning solvent which causes large amount of NMVOC emission (Figure 4.13).



**Figure 4.13 Total NMVOC emissions from Solvent Use for the period 1990-2022 (kt)**

Since 1990, NMVOC emissions have increased in the solvent sector by 19.6%. Categories where an increase in NMVOC emissions has occurred in recent years include Domestic solvent use



(other than paint application) (2D3a) and Other solvent use (2D3i). The fluctuation of NMVOC emissions in the period 1990-2022 has mostly occurred due to the welfare of the economic state of the country. The slightly decrease in emissions occurred between years 1990 and 2006. From 2006 the economy began to grow until 2008, when the world was struck by the economic crisis which also affected the Solvent Use sector in Latvia. As a result, by the year 2009, NMVOC emissions decrease by 34.6% in comparison with 2007. As shown there is increase of NMVOC emissions during the later period of 2010 till 2022. In 2022, NMVOC emissions of Solvent sector have decreased by 20.9% compared to 2021 (Table 4.34) due to the increase in activity data of Domestic solvent use including fungicides (2D3a) and Other solvent and product use (2D3i). Since 2023 submission is also calculated the Aircraft de-icing under subcategory Other solvent and product use.

**Table 4.34 NMVOC and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from Solvent Use for the period 1990-2022 (kt)**

Year	NMVOC	Indirect CO <sub>2</sub> emissions
	kt	
1990	9.54	20.97
1995	8.94	19.66
2000	8.50	18.69
2005	8.09	17.79
2010	7.93	17.43
2011	9.34	20.53
2012	8.89	19.55
2013	9.26	20.36
2014	9.58	21.06
2015	9.94	21.85
2016	9.34	20.53
2017	9.98	21.93
2018	14.47	31.81
2019	11.65	25.60
2020	12.73	27.98
2021	14.42	31.70
2022	11.41	25.07

The operational assumption is that NMVOC containing products imported into the country in a given year are presumed to be utilized within the same year as the data of the actual use is not available or is confidential. Simultaneously, enterprises tend to provide a stockpiles taking into account economic situation. This practice consequently influences the quantity of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, introducing fluctuations in the time series.

#### Road paving with asphalt (2.D.3.b) and Asphalt roofing (2.D.3.c)

In this sector emissions from road paving activities are reported.

**Table 4.35 Activity data for Road paving and Asphalt roofing 1990-2022**

Year	Amount of bitumen mixtures used (kt)	% of asphalt used for Road Paving	% of asphalt used for Asphalt roofing	Road Paving with asphalt (kt)	Asphalt roofing (kt)
1990	39	80%	20%	31	8

Year	Amount of bitumen mixtures used (kt)	% of asphalt used for Road Paving	% of asphalt used for Asphalt roofing	Road Paving with asphalt (kt)	Asphalt roofing (kt)
1995	117	80%	20%	94	23
2000	424	90%	10%	381	42
2005	1165	90%	10%	1049	117
2010	937	90%	10%	843	94
2011	1481	90%	10%	1333	148
2012	1585	90%	10%	1426	158
2013	1255	90%	10%	1130	126
2014	1290	90%	10%	1161	129
2015	1724	90%	10%	1552	172
2016	1681	90%	10%	1513	168
2017	1317	90%	10%	1185	132
2018	1263	90%	10%	1137	126
2019	1255	90%	10%	1129	125
2020	1418	90%	10%	1276	142
2021	1922	90%	10%	1730	192
2022	1629	90%	10%	1466	163

According to CSB data the biggest share of NMVOC and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are originating during road paving with asphalt. Just small part of all bitumen mixtures is used in asphalt roofing sector (Table 4.35).




Figure 4.14 Emissions from asphalt roofing and road paving in 1990–2022 (NMVOC and CO emissions on secondary axis) (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.; kt)

The emissions from these two particular sectors are constantly increasing since the beginning of 1990s. Slight emission decrease in 1999-2000 could be explained with the change of percentage that is used to divide activity data used in roofing and road paving. The sharp emission increase in 2003-2004 could be explained with Latvia's joining the EU in the May of 2004 before and after when the road paving works were very active and there were built VIA

Baltic that connects all Baltic States. In 2011 and 2012 activity in road paving and asphalt roofing risen by 58.1% and 7.0% respectively. In 2013 overall activity of bitumen use in industrial processes had decreased by about 20.8% and was related to financial resources that were assigned directly to this sector for road paving or asphalt roofing. In 2015 emission increase has been observed because according to Latvia's State Road Network Statistics the length of renewed and constructed bituminous pavements (km) increased compared with 2014. In 2022, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from road paving with asphalt and asphalt roofing decreased by 15.2% compared to 2021 (Figure 4.14).

### Urea use

Urea are used as catalyst in fuel consumption and calculated under 1.A.3 Transport sector but emissions are reported under 2.D Non-energy Products from Fuels and Solvent Use (Table 4.36).

**Table 4.36 Urea use activity data and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions 2006-2022**

Year	Urea consumption (t)	CO <sub>2</sub> emissions (kt)
1990	NO	NO
1995	NO	NO
2000	NO	NO
2005	NO	NO
2010	1210	0.29
2011	1475	0.35
2012	1642	0.39
2013	2056	0.49
2014	2745	0.65
2015	3490	0.83
2016	3772	0.90
2017	4614	1.10
2018	5164	1.23
2019	5434	1.30
2020	5218	1.24
2021	5857	1.40
2022	5802	1.38

### 4.5.3.2 Methodological issues

#### Solvent Use

The NMVOC inventory is carried out to fulfil the obligations of the UNECE CLRTAP.

#### Activity data

From the 1990ties till 2005 statistics for Domestic solvent use including fungicides (2D3a), Paint application (2D3d) and Other solvent use (2D3i) were not well kept due to the country-wide changes in the governmental system and national economy. For 2006-2022 activity data for these subcategories was obtained from National Chemicals Database at LEGMC. In the National Chemicals Database data of imported and produced amount of chemical products containing NMVOCs is collected together with the percentage of a particular NMVOC in imported or produced products. It is assumed that the NMVOC containing products imported in the country in a particular year are utilized in the same year as the data of the actual use is not available or

is confidential. In the National Chemicals Database information on a particular year, amount of produced and imported chemicals (ton), product group (intended use), trade name, chemical name, CAS number and concentration (from ... till ... %) is provided.

Tobacco activity data on imports and exports are obtained from the CSB.

Activity data on the Aircraft de-icing from companies are available since 2015, and is obtained from National Chemicals Database at LEGMC, but for time series consistency, surrogate statistical parameter data is used to calculate activity data for the period 2004-2014 where data of the average number of departing airplanes per day, data on the weather conditions in which aircraft de-icing is usually carried out in the winter months is used.

In 2018, first time estimation of exported NMVOC containing products from the country for the period 2006-2017 was carried out. Activity data on export of solvent products for the years 2006-2017 was provided by CSB. The results of estimation of exported NMVOC containing products are presented in Table 4.37. As shown NMVOC emission has decreased for all time series between 14.6% in 2013 and 30.7% in 2005.

Share of export as percentage, calculated on NMVOC emissions for the year 2022 were extrapolated taking into account GDP in 2017-2022 taken from CSB database.

**Table 4.37 Share of export as percentage, calculated on NMVOC emissions**

Year	Share of export as percentage, calculated on NMVOC emissions, %
2006	23.86
2007	21.31
2008	28.44
2009	26.89
2010	19.17
2011	13.77
2012	14.65
2013	14.60
2014	15.19
2015	15.77
2016	18.03
2017	19.61
2018	21.19
2019	22.27
2020	21.45
2021	24.24
2022	28.25

To obtain a comparable data in time series for 1990-2005 where statistics on imported, produced and exported NMVOC containing products was not well kept NMVOC emissions were extrapolated taking into account number of inhabitants taken from CSB database<sup>66</sup> in Table 4.38.

<sup>66</sup> CSB database IRD010. Resident population at the beginning of the year. Available: <https://stat.gov.lv/lv/statistikas-temas/iedzivotaji/iedzivotaju-skaitis/tabulas/ird010-iedzivotaju-skaitis-un-ipatsvars-pec>

Activity data from Degreasing (2D3e), Dry cleaning (2D3f), Chemical products (2D3g) and Printing (2D3h) subsectors is not available as that data is not required to be reported under National legislation and could be assumed as confidential.

#### *Emission factors*

The main database of EFs is the EMEP/EEA 2023.

#### *Methods*

NMVOC emissions from Domestic solvent use including fungicides (2D3a), Coating applications (2D3d) and Other solvent use (2D3i) were estimated according to EMEP/EEA 2023 methodology based on Tier 1 or Tier 2 approach (Table 4.28). NMVOC emissions (kt) from these subcategories of Solvent Use sector were calculated for the time series 2006-2022 using the equation below:

$$E_{NMVOC} = EF_{NMVOC} * AD \quad (4.28)$$

where:

$E_{NMVOC}$  – non-methane volatile organic compounds emissions from solvents and other production use (kt);

$EF_{NMVOC}$  – emission factor from EMEP/EEA 2023;

$AD$  – activity data from the National Chemicals Database (kt).

NMVOC emissions data from Degreasing (2D3e), Dry cleaning (2D3f), Chemical products (2D3g) and Printing (2D3h) subsectors was obtained directly from the national database “2-Air” for 2006-2022. From the 1990ties till 2001 statistics for NMVOC emissions data was not kept. The “2-Air” is a database where enterprises (that do any pollution activity and have category A, B, or C polluting activity) report their emissions data. There are 788 licences currently in force in Latvia (Category A – 40 licences, category B – 748 licences). From these enterprises data is used only from the enterprises that produced NMVOC emissions according to the EMEP/EEA 2023. The enterprises have been reporting their produced NMVOC emissions dividing in a particular NMVOC.

To obtain a comparable data in time series for 1990-2005 where statistics was not kept NMVOC emissions were extrapolated taking into account number of inhabitants taken from CSB database (Table 4.38).

**Table 4.38** The number of population used as activity data under Other solvent and product use for years 1990-2005

Year	Number of inhabitants
1990	2668140
1991	2658161
1992	2643000
1993	2585675
1994	2540904
1995	2500580
1996	2469531
1997	2444912
1998	2420789
1999	2399248
2000	2381715
2001	2353384
2002	2320956

Year	Number of inhabitants
2003	2299390
2004	2276520
2005	2249724

CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from Solvent Use sector was estimated using methodology from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines:

$$Emissions_{CO_2} = Emissions_{NMVOC} * Percent\ carbon\ in\ NMVOCs\ by\ mass * 44.0098/12.011 \quad (4.29)$$

It was assumed that the average carbon content of NMVOC is 60% by mass for all categories under the sector of Solvent Use in accordance with the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.

This leads to an EF for indirect CO<sub>2</sub> release of 2.198474731 kg CO<sub>2</sub>/kg NMVOC.

### Road paving with asphalt (2.D.3.b) and Asphalt roofing (2.D.3.c)

EMEP/EEA 2023 Tier 1 method was used to estimate NMVOC emissions from the 2.D.3.b Road paving with asphalt and 2.D.3.c Asphalt roofing. According to CSB data the biggest part of bitumen mixtures amount is used for road paving (90%). Only small part is used for roofing activities (10%) (Table 4.39).

NMVOC emissions are estimated using simpler default methodology:

$$E_{NMVOC} = AD_{bitumen} * EF_{NMVOC} \quad (4.30)$$

where:

$E_{NMVOC}$  – NMVOC emissions (kt)

$AD_{bitumen}$  – bitumen and bitumen mixtures used in CRF 2.D.3.b and 2.D.3.c activities (kt)

$EF_{NMVOC}$  – NMVOC emission factor (kt/kt)

CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from asphalt roofing and road paving with asphalt activities were estimated according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines and explanation of indirect CO<sub>2</sub> emission estimation basing on carbon conversion factor and average default carbon content amount.

For the CO<sub>2</sub> emission estimation NMVOC emissions were taken as activity data and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions were estimated using carbon conversion factor:

$$E_{CO_2} = EF_{CO_2} * NMVOC \quad (4.31)$$

where:

$E_{CO_2}$  – CO<sub>2</sub> emissions (kt)

$EF_{CO_2}$  – estimated CO<sub>2</sub> emission factor

$NMVOC$  – NMVOC emissions (kt)

### Emission factors

For CO<sub>2</sub> emission estimation 80% of carbon content conversion factor is used. According to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines<sup>67</sup> indirect emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> from atmospheric oxidation of emitted NMVOC are included in the national emission inventory. The average amount of carbon in NMVOC is assumed as 80%<sup>68</sup>.

<sup>67</sup> IPCC 2006 Guidelines, Vol.1 Ch.7. Available :[http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/2006gl/pdf/1\\_Volume1/V1\\_7\\_Ch7\\_Precursors\\_Indirect.pdf](http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/2006gl/pdf/1_Volume1/V1_7_Ch7_Precursors_Indirect.pdf) (page 7.6)

<sup>68</sup> Based of the most often used average carbon conversion factor

Therefore the CO<sub>2</sub> EF from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines was estimated using following equation:

$$EF_{CO_2} = 80\% * 44.0098/12.011 \quad (4.32)$$

where:

$EF_{CO_2}$  – CO<sub>2</sub> emission factor (kt/kt)

80% – the average amount of carbon in NMVOC

44.0098 / 12.011 – carbon dioxide and carbon molmass ratio

This leads to an EF for indirect CO<sub>2</sub> release of 2.931299642 kg CO<sub>2</sub>/kg NMVOC.

Default CO and NMVOC EFs are taken from EMEP/EEA 2023<sup>69,70</sup>. Due to lack of the technology use information Tier1 EFs were used (Table 4.39).

**Table 4.39 Emission factors for asphalt roofing and Road paving in 1990–2022**

Category	CO <sub>2</sub> (t CO <sub>2</sub> /t NMVOC)	CO (kt/kt)	NMVOC (kt/kt)
Asphalt Roofing	2.93	0.0000095	0.00013
Road Paving with Asphalt	2.93	NE	0.000016

## Urea use

Description of methodology to calculate CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from Urea use is reported under sector 1.A.3 Transport.

### 4.5.3.3 Uncertainties and time series consistency

Uncertainty analysis for 2024 submission is carried out by using Approach 1. Quantitative estimates of uncertainties are provided in Annex 2. Overall description of uncertainty analysis is included in Section 1.6.

## Solvent use

Latvia has developed a detailed inventory for the Solvent Use sector thereby the uncertainty of activity data for Domestic solvent use including fungicides (2D3a), Paint application (2D3d) and Other solvent use (2D3i) is estimated to be the default value of 25% according to the IPCC 2006 Guidelines. However the uncertainty of activity data for Degreasing (2D3e), Dry cleaning (2D3f), Chemical products (2D3g) and Printing (2D3h) subsectors cannot be determined as that activity data is not required to be reported under national legislation and could be assumed as confidential. Uncertainties of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from Solvent Use sector were estimated on the basis on uncertainties of respective NMVOC emissions. Uncertainty of EF is assumed to be default value of 10%. According to the IPCC 2006 Guidelines the uncertainty of EF took into account the fact that the default fossil carbon content fraction of NMVOC is 60% by mass, and can vary between 50-70%.

### Road paving with asphalt (2.D.3.b) and Asphalt roofing (2.D.3.c)

<sup>69</sup>EMEP/EEA air pollutant emission inventory guidebook 2023, 2.D.3.b Road paving with asphalt. Available: <https://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/emep-eea-guidebook-2023/part-b-sectoral-guidance-chapters/2-industrial-processes-and-product-use/2-d-2-l-other/2-d-3-b-road/view>

<sup>70</sup>EMEP/EEA air pollutant emission inventory guidebook 2023, 2.D.3.c Asphalt roofing. Available: <https://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/emep-eea-guidebook-2023/part-b-sectoral-guidance-chapters/2-industrial-processes-and-product-use/2-d-2-l-other/2-d-3-c-asphalt/view>

Uncertainty of activity data for estimations of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from 2.D.3.c Asphalt roofing sector and 2.D.3.b Road paving with asphalt sector is assumed rather low as CSB data of used bitumen mixtures are used and the percentage of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines is used to divide bitumen use for roofing and paving activities. Still as it is not clearly known how much of the total bitumen is used for asphalt paving and for asphalt roofing (bitumen use in construction sector) the uncertainty is assumed at least 20%.

CO<sub>2</sub> EFs for 2.D.3.b and 2.D.3.c sectors are assumed as high as 50% because default EFs are used and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are estimated from NMVOC emissions. The uncertainty of precursors factors for these two sectors taken from EMEP/EEA 2023 as Tier 1 EFs is assumed as high as 50% as the default EFs are used.

Time series of the estimated emissions are consistent and complete because the same methodology, EFs and data sources are used for sectors for all years in time series. NO<sub>x</sub>, CO and SO<sub>2</sub> emissions are not estimated due to lack of estimation methodology and official EFs.

Time series consistency was checked by verifying IEF, AD and emission changes and attention was paid to important increase/decrease that are explained in NIR Chapter 4.5.3.1.

#### **4.5.3.4 Category-specific QA/QC and verification**

The quality objectives and the QA/QC plan for the Latvia's GHG inventory at the National Inventory level are presented in Section 1.2.3. The QC procedures are performed according to the QA/QC plan in the IPPU sector in order to achieve these quality objectives. Issues related to QA/QC and verification are discussed at the sectoral meetings.

##### **Solvent use**

All estimations of emissions done in the LEGMC are checked on the logical mistakes by checking the time series of the activity data, EFs and emissions consistency to display all significant and illogic changes in the activity data and emissions.

A quality control checklist is completed for each category, adhering to the criteria outlined in the approved QA/QC plan as stipulated in the National legislation. All corrections are systematically archived in a centralized archiving system.

All information on activity data and emission calculations are stored and archived in the common FTP folder.

##### **Road paving with asphalt (2.D.3.b) and Asphalt roofing (2.D.3.c).**

Activity data used in NMVOC and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from asphalt roofing and road paving with asphalt was reported by CSB in Annual Questionnaire tables. Bitumen data used in emission estimation and reported in NIR are verified by CSB. Data also is compared to the data reported in 1A(d) sector.

CSB has the internal QA/QC procedures based on mathematical model and analysis to avoid logic mistakes.

The activity data used in estimations is repeatedly verified by CSB energy experts by checking the data input in data estimation database and reported in the NIR.



All estimations of emissions done in the LEGMC also are checked on the logical mistakes by checking the time series of the activity data, EFs and emissions consistency to display all significant and illogic changes in the activity data and emissions.

All information on activity data and emission calculations are stored and archived in the common FTP folder.

#### 4.5.3.5 Category-specific recalculations

##### Solvent use

In order to obtain more precise emission data, the activity data from the National Chemicals Database for the last submitted year (in this case, 2021) is reviewed and, if necessary, recalculated (Table 4.40).

**Table 4.40 Recalculated NMVOC emissions by subcategories for 2021 (kt)**

Sector	Emissions before recalculation	Emissions after recalculation	Relative difference
	kt NMVOC		%
2D3a	3.73	3.28	-11.89
2D3d	4.30	4.56	5.90
2D3e	0.03	0.03	0.33
2D3f	0.004	0.004	0.33
2D3g	1.44	1.44	0.33
2D3h	0.01	0.01	0.33
2D3i	4.92	5.08	3.25
2G	0.01	0.01	-
Total	14.44	14.42	-0.17

The 2023 NECD review revealed, in accordance with the EMEP/EEA 2023 guidelines, that Latvia does not need to apply a correction factor in the calculation of NMVOC emissions for the 2.D.3.a. Domestic solvent use, including fungicides sub-category. Consequently, a recalculation has been executed for sector 2.D.3.a.

**Table 4.41 Results of recalculations NMVOC emission in 2.D.3.a Domestic solvent use including fungicides 1990-2021**

Year	Emissions on sub-category 2D3a with the correction factor (before recalculation)	Emissions on sub-category 2D3a without the correction factor (after recalculation)	Absolute difference	Relative difference
	kt NMVOC			%
1990	2.32	1.89	-0.44	-18.84
1995	2.18	1.77	-0.41	-18.84
2000	2.07	1.68	-0.39	-18.84
2005	1.96	1.59	-0.37	-18.84
2006	1.54	1.25	-0.29	-18.84
2007	2.79	2.26	-0.53	-18.84
2008	1.45	1.18	-0.27	-18.84
2009	0.93	0.76	-0.18	-18.84
2010	1.27	1.03	-0.24	-18.84
2011	1.74	1.41	-0.33	-18.84

Year	Emissions on sub-category 2D3a with the correction factor (before recalculation)	Emissions on sub-category 2D3a without the correction factor (after recalculation)	Absolute difference	Relative difference
	kt NMVOC			
2012	1.73	1.41	-0.33	- 18.84
2013	1.83	1.49	-0.35	- 18.84
2014	2.04	1.66	-0.38	- 18.84
2015	2.24	1.82	-0.42	- 18.84
2016	2.07	1.68	-0.39	- 18.84
2017	2.14	1.74	-0.40	- 18.84
2018	7.52	6.10	-1.42	- 18.84
2019	3.79	3.08	-0.71	- 18.84
2020	4.12	2.34	-0.78	- 18.84
2021	3.73	3.28	-0.44	- 11.89

### Urea use

Recalculation was done for CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in 2.D.3 Urea use for 2006-2021 due to precised activity data.

**Table 4.42 Results of recalculations in 2.D.3 Urea use sector 2006-2021**

Year	CO <sub>2</sub> emissions from urea use before recalculation	CO <sub>2</sub> emissions from urea use after recalculation	Absolute difference	Relative difference
	kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.			%
2006	0.09	0.07	-0.02	-18.2
2010	0.38	0.29	-0.09	-24.6
2015	0.82	0.83	0.02	1.9
2016	0.89	0.90	0.01	1.1
2017	1.08	1.10	0.02	1.8
2018	1.20	1.23	0.03	2.6
2019	1.29	1.30	0.01	0.6
2020	1.29	1.24	-0.05	-3.9
2021	1.40	1.40	-0.01	-0.5

#### 4.5.3.6 Category-specific planned improvements

##### Solvent use

No improvements are planned for this sector.

##### Urea use

No improvements are planned for this sector.

##### Road paving with asphalt (2.D.3.b) and Asphalt roofing (2.D.3.c)

No improvements are planned for this sector.

## 4.6 ELECTRONICS INDUSTRY (CRF 2.E)

HFC, PFC, SF<sub>6</sub> and NF<sub>3</sub> emissions from manufacturing of integrated circuit of semiconductors, TFT flat panel displays, photovoltaics and heat transfer fluids are not occurring in Latvia.

There is one company in Latvia which manufactures liquid crystal displays (LCDs) and 3D products for industrial, professional, medical and defence applications. Directly contacting with the company they confirmed that NF<sub>3</sub> is not used in technology as well as company has no plans to use it in the future.

Other types of equipment listed in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Volume 3, Chapter 6 under this sector are not manufactured in Latvia. Currently using CRF Reporter software version v6.0.10\_AR5 it is not possible to enter NO in green and grey cells although CRF Reporter User manual says that if disaggregated data is not available for certain categories, the CRF Reporter allows users to report information in the parent category. This can be done by directly entering data in the green cells (i.e. overwriting formulas).

Under Electronics industry subcategories Latvia doesn't report emissions so child nodes (gases) are not added according to CRF User manual however it is not currently possible to enter data in green cells so some information in the parent category (green cells) in corresponding CRF tables are missing. It was confirmed by CRF Reporter help desk that this is an CRF internal issue which will be improved in the future releases of the software. But for the moment it was suggested to leave cells blank.

#### ***4.7 PRODUCT USES AS SUBSTITUTES FOR OZONE DEPLETING SUBSTANCES (CRF 2.F)***

Under 2.F Latvia reports emissions from usage of hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) occurring in following sectors:

- Refrigeration and air-conditioning equipment (CRF 2.F.1);
- Foam blowing products (CRF 2.F.2);
- Fire Protection (CRF 2.F.3);
- Aerosols (CRF 2.F.4).

In 2022, GHG emissions from Product uses as substitutes for ODS substances amounted 250.30 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. (2.5%) from Latvia's total CO<sub>2</sub> eq. emissions with indirect CO<sub>2</sub>, without LULUCF. Compared to 2021, 2.F category emissions have decreased by 3.3%, but compared to 1995 emissions have increased by even 1440.3%.

There is no production of HFCs in Latvia. Emissions of the perfluorocarbons (PFCs) and nitrogen trifluoride (NF<sub>3</sub>) do not occur in Latvia for all time series. HFC and PFC emissions from Solvents (CRF 2.F.5) and Other Applications (CRF 2.F.6) are not occurring in Latvia (reported as "NO" in CRF Reporter). Currently using CRF Reporter software version v6.0.10\_AR5 it is not possible to enter NO in green and grey cells therefore some information in the parent category (green cells) in corresponding CRF tables are missing.

The calculation of emissions under 2.F was carried out for following gases:

- HFC-23
- HFC-32
- HFC-125
- HFC-134a
- HFC-143a
- HFC-152a
- HFC-245fa

- HFC-365mfc
- HFC-227ea

The biggest part of 2.F emissions constitutes 2.F.1 Refrigeration and Air Conditioning (97.3%) which is also a key category of Latvia's GHG inventory. Additionally, 2.3% from 2.F emissions comes from 2.F.4. Aerosols (metered dose inhalers), but 0.4% comes from 2.F.2 Foam blowing agents. About 0.004% comes from 2.F.3 Fire protection in 2022 (Figure 4.15).




Figure 4.15 HFC emissions from 2.F Product Uses as ODS Substitutes 1995-2022 (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

The total emissions from 2.F have increased significantly since 1995 to 2016 but after 2016 the amount of emissions is decreased. In 2022, emissions decreased compared to 2021 (see Table 4.43 and Figure 4.15). The main reason which caused emission growth was substitution of ODS with alternatives commonly named F-gases in refrigeration and air conditioning appliances. However, F-gases are powerful GHG, with a global warming effect up to 23000 times greater than CO<sub>2</sub>, hence their emissions were growing rapidly<sup>71</sup>. The usage of products which substitute ODSs in Latvia mainly depends on import. The imported amounts could be associated with economic situation in the country consequently this led to F-gases emission growth. As the significant part of total 2.F.1.e emissions (38.0% in 2022) results from the increase of car population under this subsector.

Table 4.43 HFC emissions from 2.F Product Uses as Substitutes for ODS, 1995-2022 (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

Year	2.F	2.F.1	2.F.2	2.F.3	2.F.4
	Product Uses as Substitutes for ODS	Refrigeration and Air Conditioning	Foam blowing agents	Fire Protection	Aerosols
1995	16.25	15.83	0.36	NO	0.06
2000	61.85	60.02	0.71	NO	1.12
2005	101.24	95.94	3.31	0.053	1.94
2010	216.35	208.24	5.63	0.014	2.47
2011	217.53	210.95	4.10	0.015	2.46

<sup>71</sup> Fluorinated GHG. Available: [https://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/f-gas\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/f-gas_en)

Year	2.F	2.F.1	2.F.2	2.F.3	2.F.4
	Product Uses as Substitutes for ODS	Refrigeration and Air Conditioning	Foam blowing agents	Fire Protection	Aerosols
2012	216.67	211.91	2.39	0.062	2.32
2013	217.53	224.33	1.67	0.062	3.20
2014	242.82	237.65	0.87	0.026	4.27
2015	251.86	243.82	3.67	0.003	4.37
2016	271.61	265.17	2.05	0.003	4.39
2017	264.06	259.34	0.13	0.003	4.59
2018	259.17	254.09	0.59	0.009	4.48
2019	250.96	246.19	0.64	0.009	4.12
2020	243.26	237.48	0.26	0.009	5.52
2021	258.80	251.99	0.42	0.009	6.38
2022	250.30	243.52	1.09	0.009	5.67
Share of total IPPU emissions in 2022 (%)	29.2%	28.4%	0.13%	0.001%	0.7%
2022 versus 2021	-3.3%	-3.4%	158.5%	0.0%	-11.2%
2022 versus 1995	1440.3%	1438.4%	200.8%	-45.0%	1263.9%

In 2004, the first research of F-gases sources and emissions in Latvia was carried out. Within the project “SF<sub>6</sub>, HFC and PFC emission inventory in Latvia 1995-2003”<sup>72</sup> (hereinafter F-gases research (2004)) the areas and users of F-gases in Latvia were identified for the first time. The result of this project was initial activity and consumption data for F-gases emission estimation (in accordance with IPCC 1996 methodology). Activity data and assumptions derived during this project and shortly after were used for F-gases emission calculations. Obtained data from the research did not provide completeness, therefore extrapolation is used for historical data.

In 2015-2016 the F-gases research within the EEA Financial Mechanism 2009-2014 Programme "National Climate Policy (hereinafter F-gases research (2016)) was carried out. The aim of this research was to improve activity data obtaining process and EFs in 2.F.1 Refrigeration and Air conditioning sector as well as to split the activity data for years 2004-2014 between the 2.F.1 subcategories according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.

F-gases research (2016) has been bottom-up orientated. F-gases importers, suppliers, users and service companies were asked to supplement the information reported under F-gas Regulation No. 517/2014<sup>73</sup> and previous national Regulation No.563<sup>74</sup> with the information regarding the sector and purpose of the substances they import, use or refill in equipment in the country. As a result F-gas data was divided by categories relevant to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines 2.F.1 sector. EFs and assumptions were discussed and confirmed by Latvian Association of Refrigeration Engineers which is the responsible institution in certification of F-gases operators in Latvia.

<sup>72</sup> Project report “SF<sub>6</sub>, HFC and PFC emission inventory in Latvia 1995-2003”, Riga 2004

<sup>73</sup> F-gas regulation No. 517/2014 of The European Parliament and the Council of 16 April 2014 on fluorinated greenhouse gases and repealing Regulation (EC) No 842/2006

<sup>74</sup> Regulation No.563 of the Cabinet of Ministers of Latvia on “Provisions concerning specific restrictions and prohibitions on activities with ozone-depleting substances and fluorinated greenhouse gases”

In 2016-2017 the split of 2.F.1 subcategories were revised during evaluation study on F-gases in stocks (amount of refrigerants in new and operating systems as well as number of companies per F-gas sectors). The results revealed that within the F-gas research (2016) emissions from commercial and industrial refrigeration were overestimated and emissions from stationary air conditioning and transport refrigeration were underestimated (Table 4.44). Results are included in this report under relevant categories. This F-gas split evaluation has calculated since submission 2017.

**Table 4.44 Proportions by 2.F.1 sub applications in LV inventory and EU**

Proportion of F-gas emissions 2.F.1	Commercial refrigeration	Domestic refrigeration	Industrial Refrigeration	Transport refrigeration	Mobile air conditioning	Stationary air conditioning
EU average*	34%	1%	16%	5%	26%	18%
F-gases research (2016)	41%	0.3%	15%	2%	33%	9%
F-gas split evaluation (since Submission 2017)	28%	0.3%	7%	5%	36%	24%

\*14 MS, weighted shares

## 4.7.1 Refrigeration and Air Conditioning (CRF 2.F.1)

### 4.7.1.1 Category description

The calculation of actual emissions from Refrigeration and Air Conditioning is done according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Chapter 7 (Emissions of Fluorinated Substitutes for Ozone Depleting Substances).

Refrigeration and Air Conditioning Systems are responsible for about 97.3% of the 2.F Product uses as substitutes for ozone depleting substances sector in 2022. Under 2.F.1 sector HFC emissions are reported covering 6 subcategories according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines:

- Commercial Refrigeration (refrigerators for supermarkets, shops etc.);
- Domestic Refrigeration (fridges and freezers in households);
- Industrial Refrigeration (refrigeration units in food and chemical industries);
- Transport Refrigeration (refrigerated vehicles);
- Mobile Air Conditioning (air conditioning systems in passenger cars, light and heavy duty vehicles and buses);
- Stationary Air Conditioning (room air-conditioning systems and heat pumps).

In 2022, HFC emissions from 2.F.1 Refrigeration and Air Conditioning totalled 243.52 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. Compared to 2021, emissions were decreased by 3.4%. In 2022, the majority of F-gases emissions under 2.F.1 originates from 2.F.1.e Mobile air conditioning (39.0%), 2.F.1.f Stationary Air Conditioning (34.6%) and 2.F.1.a Commercial Refrigeration (19.6%). Other less significant sources are 2.F.1.c Industrial Refrigeration (4.7%) and 2.F.1.d Transport Refrigeration (1.9%) as well as 2.F.1.b Domestic Refrigeration (0.2%) (Figure 4.16).




Figure 4.16 F-gases emissions from 2.F.1. Refrigeration and Air Conditioning equipment 1990-2022 (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

#### 4.7.1.2 Methodological issues

An overview of the methods used and gases reported under 2.F.1 sector is presented in Table 4.45.

Table 4.45 Summary of emission calculation methods and gases in CFR 2.F.1

CRF Category/subcategory	Method used	Gases reported
2.F.1.a Commercial Refrigeration	Tier 2a	HFC-134a HFC-32 HFC-125 HFC-143a HFC-152a HFC-23
2.F.1.b Domestic Refrigeration	Tier 2a	HFC-134a
2.F.1.c Industrial Refrigeration	Tier 2a	HFC-134a HFC-32 HFC-125 HFC-143a
2.F.1.d Transport Refrigeration	Tier 2a	HFC-134a HFC-32 HFC-125 HFC-143a HFC-23
2.F.1.e Mobile Air Conditioning	Tier 2a	HFC-134a
2.F.1.f Stationary Air Conditioning	Tier 2a	HFC-134a HFC-32 HFC-125 HFC-143a HFC-152a

Emissions are calculated by the IPCC Tier 2a EF approach of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (Vol. 3, Chapter 7, Equation 7.10, p. 7.49). However, Tier 2 method is written in the CRF tables because it is not possible to enter Tier 2a.

Based on the 2006 IPCC Guidelines one part of Vol. 3, Chapter 7, Equation 7.10 is emissions from refrigerant management of containers. Applying default EF and according to information represented by F-gas database emissions of refrigerant management of containers are below the 0.05% (0.01-0.04% for time period 2013-2018) of the national total GHG emissions and could be characterized as emissions below the threshold of significance in Latvia. Therefore for Latvia emissions are considered as negligible.

Example of the evaluation of possible emissions for 2018:

- From national F-gases database the amount of HFC charged into new equipment in year is obtained;
- According to 2006 IPCC Guidelines 2% as emission factor is used;
- Then the amount of HFC charged into new equipment in year and emission factor is multiplied;
- In Table 4.46 is seen the raw calculation of emissions from refrigerant management of containers.

**Table 4.46 Raw estimation of emissions from refrigerant management of containers**

Gas	The amount of HFC charged into new equipment, t	Emission factor	Emissions, t	Emissions, kt	Emissions, kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.
HFC134a	6.20848	2%	0.12417	0.00012	0.16142
HFC125	10.36795	2%	0.20736	0.00021	0.65733
HFC143a	8.06816	2%	0.16136	0.00016	0.77454
HFC32	3.35994	2%	0.06720	0.00007	0.04549
HFC152a	0.00063	2%	0.00001	0.00000001	0.000002
<i>Total</i>					1.63879

- Total HFCs emissions from refrigerant management of containers is 1.64 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. that is below the 0.05% of national total GHG emissions and could be characterized as emissions below the threshold of significance in Latvia.

Commercial Refrigeration (CRF 2.F.1.a)

*Activity data*

Activity data for emission calculation is taken from annual reports by F-gases operators according to F-gas Regulation No.517/2014 and national Regulation No.704<sup>75</sup> "Requirements for operations with ozone-depleting substances and fluorinated greenhouse gases". According to these regulations operators (merchants and other institutions) which perform activities with ozone depleting substances or F-gases annually shall report to LEGMC the following information:

- Name of the substance;
- Amount of substance in the equipment;
- Charged amount in freezing equipment uni;
- Amount of leakage;
- Recycled amount;
- Regenerated amount;

<sup>75</sup> Regulation No.704 of the Cabinet of Ministers of Latvia on "Requirements for operations with ozone-depleting substances and fluorinated greenhouse gases"



- Disposed amount;
- etc.

From 1995 to 1997 the amount of filled in new manufactured products is extrapolated based on IPCC 2006 Guidelines Volume 1 Chapter 5 about extrapolation. For 1998-2003 activity data were obtained from questionnaires within first F-gases research. For 2004-2005 activity data were obtained from enterprises that responded on data request letters sent by LEGMC. For 2006-2008 activity data for HFC-32 was obtained from previous national Regulation No. 563, for 2009-2011 data was extrapolated, for 2012-2020 data was obtained from previous national Regulation No. 563, since 2021 data were obtained from national Regulation No. 704. For HFC-134a, HFC-125, HFC-143a, HFC-23 and HFC-152a data were obtained from national Regulation No. 563 for 2006-2020, since 2021 national Regulation No.704 is in force.

In 2017, the share of F-gases filled into new commercial refrigeration units were reduced due to F-gas evaluation study. As a result of the study it was concluded that share of F-gases filled into new commercial refrigeration units is lower than estimated in F-gas research (2016). According to study results commercial refrigeration constitutes 28% from all 2.F.1 emissions and not 41% as previously thought (Table 4.44). Share of F-gases filled in new appliances in 2016 was based on evaluation study results. These results from F-gas evaluation study were used until 2022.

Since 2022 the share of F-gases filled into new equipment was used direct from national Regulation No. 704.

#### *Emission factors and calculations*

Tier 2a – emission-factor approach from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines was used to estimate emissions from commercial refrigeration. Emissions result from charging, lifetime and end-of-life of equipment and are calculated for each type of HFC separately.

According to the methodology, refrigerant emissions at a reporting year can be calculated separately for each stage of life of the equipment. These emissions come from:

- $E_{\text{charge},t}$  – emissions related to the refrigerant charge: connection and disconnection of the refrigerant container and the new equipment to be charged;
- $E_{\text{lifetime},t}$  – annual emissions from the banks of refrigerants during operation (fugitive emissions and ruptures) and servicing;
- $E_{\text{end-of-life},t}$  – emissions at system disposal.

Equation 7.10 from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines was used to sum up all the emissions occurring during the lifetime of the equipment:

$$E_{\text{total},t} = E_{\text{Charge},t} + E_{\text{Lifetime},t} + E_{\text{End-of-life},t} \quad (4.33)$$

There are no HFC-containing equipment manufacturing companies in Latvia and all appliances used in commercial refrigeration are imported.

EFs and assumptions used in emission calculation from commercial refrigeration are as follows:

- HFCs mainly charged in Commercial Refrigeration are HFC-134a, HFC-404a, HFC-422d, HFC-407c, HFC-507a and HFC-410a;

- Average EF during charging of equipment is 1.8%<sup>76</sup>;
- Average EF during operation of equipment is 18%<sup>77</sup>;
- Average life time of commercial applications assumed 15 years;
- Residual charge of HFC in equipment being disposed 90%<sup>78</sup>;
- Recovery efficiency at disposal 70%<sup>79</sup>.

Equation from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for charging emissions estimation:

$$E_{Charged,t} = M_t * k/100 \quad (4.34)$$

where:

$E_{charged}$  – emissions during system manufacture/assembly in year (kg)

$M_t$  – amount of HFC charged into a new equipment in year (kg)

$k$  – charging losses (%)

Equation from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for emission estimation stocks:

$$E_{lifetime,t} = B_t * x/100 \quad (4.35)$$

where:

$E_{lifetime}$  – amount of emissions during equipment operation (t)

$B_t$  – amount of HFC held in stocks in year t

$x$  – losses during operation period (%)

Equation from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for emission estimation from disposal:

$$E_{end-of-life,t} = M_{t-d} * \frac{p}{100} * (1 - \eta_{rec,d}/100) \quad (4.36)$$

where:

$E_{end-of-life}$  – amount of HFC emitted at system disposal in year (t)

$M_{t-d}$  – residual charge of HFC in equipment being disposed of expressed in percentage of full charge (%)

$\eta_{rec, d}$  – recovery efficiency at disposal, which is the ration of recovered HFC referred to the HFC contained in the system (%)

There are no HFC-134a emissions for 1990-1994 therefore notation key – NO – is used. Started from 1995 emissions are calculated for HFC-134a. HFC-32, HFC-125, HFC-143a are not used before 2004, so for 1900-2003 the notation key – NO – are used. HFC-152a is not used before 2006, so for 1900-2005 the notation key – NO is used. HFC-23 is not used before 2008, so for 1900-2007 the notation key – NO – is used.

The total amount of HFC charged into commercial refrigeration equipment in 2022 amounts to 5.28 t constituting 0.09 t manufacturing emissions. HFC in stocks amounts to 49.48 t constituting 29.04 t operating emissions.

As the HFC-134a amount filled into refrigeration equipment is available since 1995, disposal emissions according to 15 years lifetime are estimated from 2010. Before 2010 notation key – NO – is used. HFC-32, HFC-125 and HFC-143a amount that has been filled in new manufactured

<sup>76</sup> 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Vol.3, Ch.7, Table 7.9 – Average value applied for commercial applications.

<sup>77</sup> 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Vol.3, Ch.7, Table 7.9 – Average value applied for commercial applications.

<sup>78</sup> 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Vol. 3, Ch. 7, Table 7.9, expert judgement

<sup>79</sup> 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Vol.3, Ch.7, Table 7.9, expert judgement

products and amounts in operating systems has been since 2004, therefore disposal emissions are estimated from 2019. Before 2019 notation key - NO – is used. HFC-152a amount that has been filled in new manufactured products and amounts in operating systems has been since 2006, therefore disposal emissions are estimated from 2021. HFC-23 amount that has been filled in new manufactured products and amounts in operating systems has been since 2008. Based on the 2006 IPCC guidelines according that lifetime of equipment is 15 years, disposal emissions are not yet occurred, so notation key - NO – is used.

In 2022, the amount of HFCs remained in decommission is amount of refrigerant initially charged into the systems in 2007 (18.50 t) which constitutes 5.00 t disposal emissions.

### Domestic Refrigeration (CRF 2.F.1.b)

#### *Activity data*

This category includes all refrigeration units (fridges and freezers) for domestic use. As there is no production of such equipment in Latvia, emissions could be estimated taking into account data on imported units which are charged and used within the country. Prior to 1990 most refrigeration appliances used CFC-12. Since 1993 there was a shift to HFC-134a. Many countries have subsequently moved to systems using hydrocarbon HFC-600a which is now the predominant refrigerant for new domestic refrigeration appliances.

From domestic refrigeration HFC-134a emissions are estimated.

The activity data for HFC-134a emission estimation from domestic refrigerators and freezers are:

- number of inhabitants in Latvia – data taken from CSB database „Resident population at the beginning of the year”<sup>80</sup>;
- number of households in Latvia – data taken from CSB database „Total number of households and the average size of a household”<sup>81</sup>;
- number of new imported fridges and freezers – data taken from CSB database “Imports by countries 1995-2022”<sup>82</sup>;
- share of annually sold new equipment filled with HFC-134a – taken from Finland according to Finnish research<sup>83</sup>;
- share (%) of households using refrigerators and freezers – for 1996, 2001, 2006, 2010, 2015, 2020 years data taken from CSB database „Number of electrical appliances used in dwellings and average age of appliances”<sup>84</sup>;
- share (%) of refrigerators and freezers charged with HFC-134a from 1995 till 2005 were determined during first F-gases research in 2004. As from 2006 the F-gases regulation entered into force it was assumed that the share of HFC-134a containing domestic

<sup>80</sup>Population in regions and cities by age and gender at the beginning of the year. Available: <https://stat.gov.lv/lv/statistikas-temas/iedzivotaji/iedzivotaju-skaitstabus/ird040-iedzivotaji-pec-dzimuma-un-vecuma>

<sup>81</sup>Total number and average size of private households in regions, cities, municipalities, urban and rural areas at the beginning of the year. Available: <https://stat.gov.lv/lv/statistikas-temas/iedzivotaji/privato-majsaimniecibu-skaitstabus/mvs010-privato-majsaimniecibu>

<sup>82</sup>Exports and imports by countries. Available: [https://data.stat.gov.lv/pxweb/lv/OSP\\_PUB/START\\_TIR\\_AT\\_ATD/ATD020](https://data.stat.gov.lv/pxweb/lv/OSP_PUB/START_TIR_AT_ATD/ATD020)

<sup>83</sup>Share of annually sold new equipment filled with HFC-134. Available: <http://www.vtt.fi/inf/pdf/tiedotteet/2001/T2099.pdf>

<sup>84</sup>Number of electrical appliances used in dwellings and average age of appliances. Available: [https://data.stat.gov.lv/pxweb/lv/OSP\\_OD/OSP\\_OD\\_\\_apsekojumi\\_\\_energ\\_pat/EPM210.px/](https://data.stat.gov.lv/pxweb/lv/OSP_OD/OSP_OD__apsekojumi__energ_pat/EPM210.px/)

refrigerators (stocks) started to decrease since that time. All European manufacturers of household appliances have changed their production from HFC-134a to R600a some time ago and appliances containing HFC-134a have only been imported from outside the EU to a small extent in recent years. No new equipment entered the stock from 2011 onwards. It was confirmed by Latvian Association of Refrigeration Engineers that the share of HCF-134a in domestic refrigeration stock is 15%.

#### *Emission factors and calculations*

HFC-134a emissions from domestic refrigerators and freezers are estimated by using the 2006 IPCC Guidelines Tier 2a – Emission-factor approach.

EFs and assumptions used in emission calculation from domestic refrigeration are as follows:

- Country specific average refrigerant charge per unit: 150 g HFC-134a;
- Default manufacturing EF 0.6%<sup>85</sup>;
- Default operating EF 0.3%<sup>86</sup>;
- Default disposal EF 80%<sup>87</sup>;
- Recovery efficiency at disposal 60%<sup>88</sup>.

There are no manufacturing companies in Latvia and all domestic refrigerators and freezers are imported.

That gives approximate annual amount of HFC-134a charged that is estimated with equation from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines:

$$\mathbf{HFC}_{Charged,t} = \mathbf{R} * \mathbf{n}/\mathbf{f} \quad (4.37)$$

*where:*

*HFC<sub>charged</sub>* – amount of HFC-134a charged in year t (tons)

*R* – amount of refrigerators and freezers charged with HFC-134a (units)

*n* – average equipment lifetime (years)

*f* – amount of HFC-134a charged once in lifetime of equipment

Equation from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines was used for charging emissions estimation:

$$\mathbf{E}_{Charged,t} = \mathbf{Mt} * \mathbf{k}/\mathbf{100} \quad (4.38)$$

*where:*

*E<sub>charged</sub>* – emissions during system manufacture/assembly in year (kg)

*Mt* – amount of HFC-134a charged into a new equipment in year (kg)

*k* – charging losses (%)

Amount of HFC-134a in stocks is estimated according to data from CSB. Approximate amount of HFC-134a stored in domestic refrigerators and freezers was estimated based on CSB data on number of households and share of households using refrigerators and freezers as well as assumption of share (%) of refrigerators and freezers filled with with HFC-134a.

<sup>85</sup> 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Vol.3, Ch.7, Table 7.9, average value applied for domestic refrigeration

<sup>86</sup> 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Vol.3, Ch.7, Table 7.9, average value applied for domestic refrigeration

<sup>87</sup> 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Vol.3, Ch.7, Table 7.9, value applied for domestic refrigeration, , expert judgement

<sup>88</sup> 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Vol.3, Ch.7, Table 7.9, , expert judgement

Equation from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for emission estimation from equipment lifetime:

$$E_{lifetime,t} = B_t * x / 100 \quad (4.39)$$

where:

$E_{lifetime}$  – amount of HFC emitted during system operation in year (kg)

$B_t$  – amount of HFC banked in existing systems in year (kg)

$x$  – annual emission rate (%)

According to 15 years lifetime it is assumed that first disposal emissions from domestic refrigerators and freezers appear in 2010. Equation from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for emission estimation from disposal:

$$E_{end-of-life,t} = M_{t-d} * \frac{p}{100} * (1 - \eta_{rec,d} / 100) \quad (4.40)$$

where:

$E_{end-of-life}$  – amount of HFC emitted at system disposal in year  $t$  (kg)

$M_{t-d}$  – residual charge of HFC in equipment being disposed of expressed in percentage of full charge, (%)

$\eta_{rec,d}$  – recovery efficiency at disposal, which is the ration of recovered HFC referred to the HFC contained in the system (%)

HFC-134a emissions were not occurring for 1990-1994. So there is used notation key – NO. Since 1995 HFC-134a emissions are calculated.

In 2022, the total HFC emissions from HFC-134a used in domestic refrigeration amounts to 0.34 t or 0.45 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. There is an increase (5.7%) in 2022 compared to 2021 because in the calculation are not only used inhabitants and households of Latvia but also is used HFC-134a that were charged into new refrigerators and freezers 15 years ago. And in this case the increase is because in 2007 HFC-134a, that were charged into refrigerators and freezers, were higher that it was charged in 2006. The majority of HFC emissions from domestic refrigerators occur at end-of-life from 2010 onwards. There are no charging emissions since 2011 and stock emissions are comparably low since HFC-134a is replaced with HFC-600a in domestic refrigerators and freezers.

### Industrial Refrigeration (CRF 2.F.1.c)

#### Activity data

Activity data for emission calculation from Industrial Refrigeration is taken from annual reports by F-gases operators according to F-gas Regulation No.517/2014 and national Regulation No.704<sup>89</sup>. For historical years 1995-2009 the amount of filled in new manufactured products is extrapolated based on IPCC 2006 Guidelines Volume 1 Chapter 5 about extrapolation. For 2010-2020 activity data was obtained from previous national Regulation No. 563, since 2021 data were obtained from national Regulation No. 704.

In 2017 the share of F-gases filled into new industrial refrigeration units were reduced due to F-gas evaluation study. As a result of the study it was concluded that share of F-gases filled into new industrial refrigeration units is lower than estimated in F-gas research (2016). According to study results industrial refrigeration constitutes 7% from all 2.F.1 emissions and not 15% as previously thought (Table 4.44). This could be explained with better control measures of

<sup>89</sup> Regulation No.704 of the Cabinet of Ministers of Latvia on "Requirements for operations with ozone-depleting substances and fluorinated greenhouse gases"

industrial appliances done by State Environmental Service. Share of F-gases filled in new appliances in 2016 was based on evaluation study results. These results from F-gas evaluation study were used until 2022.

Since 2022 the share of F-gases filled into new equipment was used direct from national Regulation No. 704.

#### *Emission factors and calculations*

Tier 2a – emission-factor approach from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines was used to estimate emissions from industrial refrigeration. Emissions result from charging, lifetime and end-of-life of equipment and are calculated for each type of HFC separately.

According to the methodology, refrigerant emissions at a reporting year can be calculated separately for each stage of life of the equipment. These emissions come from:

- $E_{\text{charge},t}$  – emissions related to the refrigerant charge: connection and disconnection of the refrigerant container and the new equipment to be charged;
- $E_{\text{lifetime},t}$  – annual emissions from the banks of refrigerants during operation (fugitive emissions and ruptures) and servicing;
- $E_{\text{end-of-life},t}$  – emissions at system disposal.

Equation 7.10 from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines was used to sum up all the emissions occurring during the lifetime of the equipment:

$$E_{\text{total},t} = E_{\text{Charge},t} + E_{\text{Lifetime},t} + E_{\text{End-of-life},t} \quad (4.41)$$

There are no HFC-containing equipment manufacturing companies in Latvia and all appliances used in industrial refrigeration are imported.

EFs and assumptions used in emission calculation from industrial refrigeration are as follows:

- HFCs mainly charged in Industrial Refrigeration are HFC-134a, HFC-404a, HFC-422d, HFC-407c, HFC-507a and HFC-410a;
- Average EF during charging of equipment is 1.8%<sup>90</sup>;
- Average EF during operation of equipment is 16%<sup>91</sup>;
- Average life time of industrial applications 15 years<sup>92</sup>;
- Residual charge of HFC in equipment being disposed 90%<sup>93</sup>;
- Recovery efficiency at disposal 70%<sup>94</sup>.

Equation from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for charging emissions estimation:

$$E_{\text{Charged},t} = M_t * k/100 \quad (4.42)$$

where:

$E_{\text{charged}}$  – emissions during system manufacture/assembly in year (kg)

<sup>90</sup> 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Vol.3, Ch.7, Table 7.9 – Average value applied for industrial applications.

<sup>91</sup> 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Vol.3, Ch.7, Table 7.9 – Average value applied for industrial applications.

<sup>92</sup> Assumed in accordance with similarities to Estonia and Lithuania

<sup>93</sup> 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Vol.3, Ch.7, Table 7.9, expert judgement

<sup>94</sup> 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Vol.3, Ch.7, Table 7.9, expert judgement

$M_t$  – amount of HFC-134a charged into a new equipment in year (kg)  
 $k$  – charging losses (%)

Equation from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for emission estimation stocks:

$$E_{lifetime,t} = B_t * x / 100 \quad (4.43)$$

where:

$E_{lifetime}$  – amount of emissions during equipment operation (t)  
 $B_t$  – amount of F-gases held in stocks in year t (tons)  
 $x$  – losses during operation period (%)

Equation from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for emission estimation from disposal:

$$E_{end-of-life,t} = M_{t-d} * \frac{p}{100} * (1 - \eta_{rec,d} / 100) \quad (4.44)$$

where:

$E_{end-of-life}$  – amount of HFC emitted at system disposal in year t (kg)  
 $M_{t-d}$  – residual charge of HFC in equipment being disposed of expressed in percentage of full charge, (%)  
 $\eta_{rec, d}$  – recovery efficiency at disposal, which is the ration of recovered HFC referred to the HFC contained in the system (%)

There are no emissions for 1990-1994 therefore the notation key – NO – are used. Started from 1995 emissions are calculated.

The total amount of HFC filled into industrial refrigeration equipment in 2022 amounts to 3.58 t constituting 0.10 t manufacturing emissions. HFC in stocks amounts to 18.21 t constituting 2.91 t operating emissions.

As the HFC amounts filled into refrigeration equipment are available since 1995, the disposal emissions according to 15 years lifetime are estimated from 2010. Before 2010 notation key – NO – is used.

In 2022, the amount of HFCs remained in decommission is amount of refrigerant initially charged into the systems in 2007 (2.96 t) which constitutes 0.80 t disposal emissions.

#### Transport Refrigeration (CRF 2.F.1.d)

##### Activity data

According to F-gases research (2004), only negligible amount of HFCs was used in railways and water transport. Small amount of HFC-23 was filled into refrigerating equipment in ships. HFC-134a and HFC-125 was filled into mobile refrigerators used in road transport. For 1995-1997 HFC-134a amount of filled in new manufactured products is extrapolated based on IPCC 2006 Guidelines Volume 1 Chapter 5 about extrapolation. For 1998-2003 activity data for HFC-134a emission calculation were taken from responses to questionnaires during first F-gases research (2004). For 1995-2003 HFC-32, HFC-125 and HFC-143a amount of filled in new manufactured products is extrapolated based on IPCC 2006 Guidelines Volume 1 Chapter 5 about extrapolation. For 2004-2009 activity data were extrapolated for all gases. For 2012-2020 data were obtained from previous national Regulation No. 563 and since 2021 data were obtained from national Regulation No. 704.

In 2017, during evaluation study the substances and their share in transport refrigeration were reevaluated. It was concluded that only HFC-134a is being filled in new manufactured products hence only HFC-134a manufacturing emissions are reported under this category. For the rest

of previously filled gases (HFC-125, HFC-32 and HFC-143a) only operation emissions are estimated. According to study results transport refrigeration constitutes 5% from all 2.F.1 emissions and not 2% as it was previously thought (Table 4.44). Share of F-gases filled in new appliances in 2016 was based on evaluation study results. These results from F-gas evaluation study were used until 2022.

Since 2022 the share of F-gases filled into new equipment was used direct from national Regulation No. 704.

#### *Emission factors and calculations*

Tier 2a – emission-factor approach from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines was used to estimate emissions from transport refrigeration. Emissions result from charging, lifetime and end-of-life of equipment and are calculated for each type of HFC separately.

According to the methodology, refrigerant emissions at a reporting year can be calculated separately for each stage of life of the equipment. These emissions come from:

- $E_{charge,t}$  – emissions related to the refrigerant charge: connection and disconnection of the refrigerant container and the new equipment to be charged;
- $E_{lifetime,t}$  – annual emissions from the banks of refrigerants during operation (fugitive emissions and ruptures) and servicing;
- $E_{end-of-life,t}$  – emissions at system disposal.

Equation 7.10 from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines was used to sum up all the emissions occurring during the lifetime of the equipment:

$$E_{total,t} = E_{Charge,t} + E_{Lifetime,t} + E_{End-of-life,t} \quad (4.45)$$

There are no HFC-containing equipment manufacturing companies in Latvia and all appliances used in transport refrigeration are imported therefore HFC emissions are estimated from stocks and from disposal.

EFs and assumptions used in emission calculation from transport refrigeration are as follows:

- HFCs mainly charged in Transport Refrigeration are HFC-134a and HFC-404a;
- Average EF during charging of equipment is 0.6%<sup>95</sup>;
- Country specific EF during operation of equipment is 30%<sup>96</sup>;
- Average life time of transport applications 8 years<sup>97</sup>;
- Residual charge of HFC in equipment being disposed 50%<sup>98</sup>;
- Recovery efficiency at disposal 70%<sup>99</sup>.

Equation from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for charging emissions estimation:

$$E_{charged,t} = M_t * k/100 \quad (4.46)$$

<sup>95</sup> 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Vol.3, Ch.7, Table 7.9 – Average value applied for transport applications.

<sup>96</sup> Confirmed by Latvian Association of Refrigeration Engineers

<sup>97</sup> 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Vol.3, Ch.7, Table 7.9 – Average value applied for transport applications

<sup>98</sup> 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Vol.3, Ch.7, Table 7.9, expert judgement

<sup>99</sup> 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Vol.3, Ch.7, Table 7.9, expert judgement



where:

$E_{charged}$  – emissions during system manufacture/assembly in year (kg)  
 $M_t$  – amount of HFC-134a charged into a new equipment in year (kg)  
 $k$  – charging losses (%)

Equation from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for emission estimation stocks:

$$E_{lifetime,t} = B_t * x/100 \quad (4.47)$$

where:

$E_{lifetime}$  – amount of emissions during equipment operation (t)  
 $B_t$  – amount of F-gases held in stocks in year t (tons)  
 $x$  – losses during operation period (%)

Equation from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for emission estimation from disposal:

$$E_{end-of-life,t} = M_{t-d} * \frac{p}{100} * (1 - \eta_{rec,d}/100) \quad (4.48)$$

where:

$E_{end-of-life}$  – amount of HFC emitted at system disposal in year t (kg)  
 $M_{t-d}$  – residual charge of HFC in equipment being disposed of expressed in percentage of full charge, (%);  
 $\eta_{rec,d}$  – recovery efficiency at disposal, which is the ration of recovered HFC referred to the HFC contained in the system (%)

There are no HFC-134a, HFC-125, HFC-143a and HFC-32 emissions for 1990-1994 therefore the notation key – NO – are used. Started from 1995 emissions are calculated. Also there are no HFC-23 emissions for all time series therefore the notation key – NO – are used.

The total amount of HFC filled into transport refrigeration equipment in 2022 amounts to 0.27 t constituting 0.002 t manufacturing emissions. HFC in stocks amounts to 6.25 t constituting 1.87 t operating emissions.

As the HFC amounts filled into refrigeration equipment are available since 1995, disposal emissions according to 8 years lifetime are estimated starting from 2003. Before 2003 notation key - NO – is used.

In 2022, the amount of HFCs remained in decommission is amount of refrigerant initially charged into the systems in 2014 (8.53 t) which constitutes 1.28 t disposal emissions.

#### Mobile Air Conditioning (CRF 2.F.1.e)

##### Activity data

Under 2.F.1.e HFC-134a emissions are estimated for the following road vehicle types which were assessed according to emission control system (EURO classes):

- Passenger cars
- Light Duty Vehicles <3,5t
- Heavy duty vehicles 3,5 -12 t
- Heavy duty vehicles >=12 t
- Buses <=18 t
- Buses >18 t

Number of road vehicles in technical order by types above was used as activity data for emission estimation in this sector. This data is received annually by IPE and are also used for CO<sub>2</sub> emission

calculation from road transport (1.A.3.b sector). EU MAC Directive<sup>100</sup> prohibits the use of F-gases with GWP of more than 150 in all new cars and vans produced from 2017 and refrigerant R-1234yf is used as a replacement for R134a in mobile air conditioning systems. It is assumed, that air conditioning systems of vehicles produced from 2017 are filled with refrigerant R-1234yf, so these vehicles are not included in the total number of cars. R-1234yf emissions from mobile air conditioning are about 0.01 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. Taking into account that these emissions are insignificant and are not subject to reporting obligations, emissions are neither reported in the CRF tables or included in the national total emissions.

Average share (%) of vehicles equipped with mobile air conditioning (MAC) systems according to technology used in each vehicle type was estimated taking into account the information from Lithuanian NIR 2023<sup>101</sup> according to vehicle suppliers assuming similar conditions with Lithuania's vehicle fleet (Table 4.47).

**Table 4.47 Average share (%) of vehicles equipped with MAC systems by vehicle type and technology**

Technology	Passenger cars	Light Duty Vehicles <3,5t	Heavy duty vehicles 3,5 -12 t	Heavy duty vehicles >=12 t	Buses <=18 t	Buses >18 t
Conventional 1990-1993	0	0	0	3	0	0
EURO 1 1993-1997	16	0	3	12	4	4
EURO 2 1997-2001	41	25	22	24	22	22
EURO 3 2001-2006	66	40	33	47	38	38
EURO 4 2006-2011	80	50	47	73	55	55
EURO 5 2011-2014	89	50	50	89	60	60
EURO 6 Since 2014	94	50	69	95	74	76

Average amounts of HFC-134a in each vehicle type are summarized in Table 4.48.

**Table 4.48 HFC-134a average amount by vehicle type**

Vehicle type	Average refrigerant amount (kg)
Passenger cars	0.7
Light Duty Vehicles <3,5t	0.7
Heavy duty vehicles 3,5 -12 t	1.2
Heavy duty vehicles >=12 t	1.2
Buses <=18 t	8
Buses >18 t	13

#### *Emission factors and calculations*

Tier 2a – emission-factor approach from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for each vehicle type was used to estimate emissions from MACs. As most part of vehicle fleet in Latvia are second hand there are no data available on the original factory charge. HFC emissions from MACs are estimated from stocks and disposal. According to the methodology, refrigerant emissions at a reporting year can be calculated separately for each stage of life of the equipment. HFC-134a emissions from MACs are estimate from following stages:

<sup>100</sup> EU MAC Directive. Available: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A32006L0040>

<sup>101</sup>National Inventory Report of Lithuania. Available: <https://unfccc.int/ghg-inventories-annex-i-parties/2023>

- $E_{lifetime,t}$  – annual emissions from the banks of refrigerants during operation (fugitive emissions and ruptures) and servicing;
- $E_{end-of-life,t}$  – emissions at system disposal.

Equation 7.10 from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines was used to sum up all the emissions occurring during the lifetime of the equipment:

$$E_{total,t} = E_{lifetime,t} + E_{end-of-life,t} \quad (4.49)$$

EFs and assumptions used in emission calculation from MACs are as follows:

- HFC used in mobile air conditioning is HFC-134a;
- Average EF during operation of equipment is 15%<sup>102</sup>;
- 8% of total MACs are disposed every year<sup>103</sup>;
- Average life time of transport applications 13 years<sup>104</sup>;
- Residual charge of HFC in equipment being disposed 100%<sup>105</sup>;
- $\eta_{rec,d} = 0$ <sup>106</sup>.

Equation from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for emission estimation stocks:

$$E_{lifetime,t} = B_t * x / 100 \quad (4.50)$$

where:

$E_{lifetime}$  – amount of emissions during equipment operation (t)

$B_t$  – amount of F-gases held in stocks in year t (tons)

$x$  – losses during operation period (%)

The amount of F-gases remained in MACs after the disposal every year is estimated by multiplying amount of MACs disposed with the approximate amount of F-gases remained in one appliance. It is assumed that 100% of F-gases remained in MACs after their lifetime.

Equation from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for emission estimation from disposal of MACs:

$$E_{end-of-time,t} = M_{t-d} * \frac{p}{100} * (1 - \eta_{rec,d} / 100) \quad (4.51)$$

where:

$E_{end-of-life,t}$  – amount of emissions from system disposal (t)

$M_{t-d}$  – amount of HFC initially charged into new systems installed in year (t-n) (tons)

$p$  – residual charge of HFC in equipment being disposed of expressed in percentage of full charge (%)

$\eta_{rec,d}$  – recovery efficiency at disposal (%)

There are no HFC-134a emissions for 1990-1994 therefore the notation key – NO – is used. Started from 1995 emissions are calculated.

<sup>102</sup> 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Vol.3, Ch.7, Table 7.9 – Average value applied for mobile air conditioners

<sup>103</sup> Confirmed by Latvian Association of Refrigeration Engineers

<sup>104</sup> 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Vol.3, Ch.7, Table 7.9 – Average value applied for mobile air conditioners

<sup>105</sup> Confirmed by Latvian Association of Refrigeration Engineers

<sup>106</sup> Confirmed by Latvian Association of Refrigeration Engineers

In 2022, the total HFC-134a stock in all road vehicle types in Latvia amounts to 401.70 t. The HFC-134a emissions from stocks are 60.25 t. In 2022, the amount of HFC in disposed MACs was 12.85 t which according to assumption of 100% emission of disposal resulted in 12.85 t of HFC-134a. Expressed in CO<sub>2</sub> eq. total emissions from mobile air conditioners constituted 95.04 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. and hence was the major F-gas emission source in 2.F.1 category in 2022. The increase in emissions in 2022 compared to 2021 can be explained by the increase in the number of vehicles.

#### Stationary Air Conditioning (CRF 2.F.1.f)

##### *Activity data*

Activity data for emission calculation from stationary air conditioning is taken from annual reports by F-gases operators according to F-gas Regulation No.517/2014 and national Regulation No.704<sup>107</sup>. For historical years (1995-2009) the amount of filled in new manufactured products is extrapolated based on IPCC 2006 Guidelines Volume 1 Chapter 5 about extrapolation. For 2010-2020 activity data for were obtained from previous national Regulation No. 563, since 2021 data were obtained from national Regulation No. 704.

In 2017, based on F-gases research the share of F-gases filled in stationary air conditioning systems for time period 2010-2015 were reevaluated. It was concluded that emissions from this category previously have been underestimated therefore recalculations were done taking into account study results which show that stationary air conditioning constitutes 24% from all 2.F.1 emissions and not 9% as previously thought (Table 4.44). Recalculation affects all timeseries because years prior to 2010 are extrapolated taking into account 2010-2015 data. Share of F-gases filled in new appliances in 2016 was based on evaluation study results. These results from F-gas evaluation study were used until 2022.

Since 2022 the share of F-gases filled into new equipment was used direct from national Regulation No. 704.

##### *Emission factors and calculations*

Tier 2a – emission-factor approach from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines was used to estimate emissions from stationary air conditioning. Emissions result from charging, lifetime and end-of-life of equipment and are calculated for each type of HFC separately.

According to the methodology, refrigerant emissions at a reporting year can be calculated separately for each stage of life of the equipment. These emissions come from:

- $E_{\text{charge}, t}$  – emissions related to the refrigerant charge: connection and disconnection of the refrigerant container and the new equipment to be charged;
- $E_{\text{lifetime}, t}$  – annual emissions from the banks of refrigerants during operation (fugitive emissions and ruptures) and servicing;
- $E_{\text{end-of-life}, t}$  – emissions at system disposal.

Equation 7.10 from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines was used to sum up all the emissions occurring during the lifetime of the equipment:

---

<sup>107</sup> Regulation No.704 of the Cabinet of Ministers of Latvia on "Requirements for operations with ozone-depleting substances and fluorinated greenhouse gases"

$$E_{total,t} = E_{Charge,t} + E_{Lifetime,t} + E_{End-of-life,t} \quad (4.52)$$

There are no HFC-containing equipment manufacturing companies in Latvia and all appliances used in stationary air conditioning are imported.

EFs and assumptions used in emission calculation from stationary air conditioners are as follows:

- HFCs mainly charged in Industrial Refrigeration are HFC-407c, HFC-410a, HFC-404a, HFC-134a, HFC-422d and HFC-417a;
- Average EF during charging of equipment is 0.6%<sup>108</sup>;
- Average EF during operation of equipment is 8%<sup>109</sup>;
- Average life time of stationary air conditioning applications 15 years<sup>110</sup>;
- Residual charge of HFC in equipment being disposed 80%<sup>111</sup>;
- Recovery efficiency at disposal 70%<sup>112</sup>.

Equation from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for charging emissions estimation:

$$E_{Charged,t} = M_t * k/100 \quad (4.53)$$

where:

$E_{charged}$  – emissions during system manufacture/assembly in year (kg)

$M_t$  – amount of HFC-134a charged into a new equipment in year (kg)

$k$  – charging losses (%)

Equation from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for emission estimation stocks:

$$E_{lifetime,t} = B_t * x/100 \quad (4.54)$$

where:

$E_{lifetime}$  – amount of emissions during equipment operation (t)

$B_t$  – amount of F-gases held in stocks in year t (tons)

$x$  – losses during operation period (%)

There are no emissions for 1990-1994 therefore notation key – NO – are used for HFC-125, HFC-134a, HFC-143a and HFC-32. Started from 1995 emissions are calculated. HFC-152a is not used before 2011, so for 1900-2010 the notation key – NO – is used.

The total amount of HFC filled into stationary air conditioners in 2022 amounts to 1.86 t constituting 0.01 t manufacturing emissions. HFC in stocks amounts to 283.91 t constituting 22.71 t operating emissions.

As the HFC-125, HFC-134a, HFC-143a and HFC- amounts filled into refrigeration equipment are available since 1995, disposal emissions according to 15 years lifetime are estimated starting from 2010. Before 2010 notation key – NO – is used. HFC-152a amount that has been filled in

<sup>108</sup> 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Vol.3, Ch.7, Table 7.9 – Average value applied for residential and commercial air conditioners including heat pumps

<sup>109</sup> 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Vol.3, Ch.7, Table 7.9 – Average value applied for residential and commercial air conditioners including heat pumps

<sup>110</sup> Confirmed by Latvian Association of Refrigeration Engineers

<sup>111</sup> 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Vol.3, Ch.7, Table 7.9, expert judgement

<sup>112</sup> 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Vol.3, Ch.7, Table 7.9, expert judgement

new manufactured products and amounts in operating systems are available since 2011, therefore disposal emissions are not yet occurred, so notation key - NO – is used.

In 2022, the amount of HFCs remained in decommission is amount of refrigerant initially charged into the systems in 2007 (28.82 t) which constitutes 6.92 t disposal emissions.

#### 4.7.1.3 Uncertainties and time series-consistency

Uncertainty analysis for 2024 submission is carried out by using Approach 1. Quantitative estimates of uncertainties are provided in Annex 2. Overall description of uncertainty analysis is included in Section 1.6.

Uncertainty for Refrigeration and air conditioning sector activity data is assumed 30% according to expert judgment. It has been reduced in 2017 according to F-gas evaluation study during which the procentual shares of F-gases used in each 2.F.1 subsector were revised.

Uncertainty of EFs is based on EF ranges from Table 7.8 (2006 IPCC Guidelines, Volume 3, Chapter 7, pp.7.52) that highlight the uncertainty associated with this sector. The total uncertainty  $U_{total}$  is being calculated, using following formula of combined uncertainty:

$$U_{total} = \sqrt{(U_1^2 + U_2^2 + \dots + U_n^2)} \quad (4.55)$$

where:

$U_{total}$  - the percentage uncertainty in the product of the quantities

$U_i$  - the percentage uncertainties associated with each of the quantities

Combined EF uncertainty is 40.91%.

Time series of the estimated emissions are consistent because the same methodology, EFs and data sources are used for sectors for all years in time series.

#### 4.7.1.4 Category-specific QA/QC and verification

The quality objectives and the QA/QC plan for the Latvia's GHG inventory at the National Inventory level are presented in Section 1.2.3. The QC procedures are performed according to the QA/QC plan in the 2.F. sector in order to achieve these quality objectives. Issues related to QA/QC and verification are discussed at the sectoral meetings.

All information on activity data and emission calculations are stored and archived in the common FTP folder. All findings are documented using check-lists which are archived and documented in centralized archiving system (common FTP folder).

All estimations of the emissions done in the LEGMC are checked on the logical mistakes by checking the time series of the activity data, EFs and emissions consistency to display all significant and illogic changes in the activity data and emissions.

Quality control check list is filled for each category taking into account criteria given in QA/QC plan approved in National legislation.

Quality manager from LEGMC has checked the data between CRF and NIR to ensure the consistency as well as QC actions were done in CRF in purpose to double check if all sub-applications are covered.

Currently using CRF Reporter software version v6.0.10\_AR5 it is not possible to enter NO in green and grey cells for those F-gases where emissions are not occurring in Latvia although CRF Reporter User manual says that if disaggregated data is not available for certain categories, the CRF Reporter allows users to report information in the parent category. This can be done by directly entering data in the green cells (i.e. overwriting formulas).

Under 2.F.1 Refrigeration and Air Conditioning only F-gases which are source of emissions are reported. Remaining F-gases are not added as child nodes according to CRF User manual however it is not currently possible to enter data in green cells for these F-gases therefore some information in the parent category (green cells) in corresponding CRF tables are missing. It was confirmed by CRF Reporter help desk that this is an CRF internal issue which will be improved in the future releases of the software. But for the moment it was suggested to leave cells blank. Due to this reason completeness check in CRF Reporter shows incompleteness (orange light) which could be solved when CRF Reporter will allow to enter notation keys for F-gases directly in green and grey cells.

QA/QC procedures within CRF Reporter were carried out in order to ensure completeness and consistency of reported data.

#### 4.7.1.5 Category-specific recalculations

For 2.F.1.e Mobile Air Conditioning recalculations were done from 1995 to 2021 due to updated average share of vehicles equipped with MAC systems. Recalculations were done in 2.F.1.b Domestic Refrigeration due to updated percentage of households having refrigerators and also due to updated percentage of residual charge of HFC in equipment being disposed and recovery efficiency at disposal. Total results of recalculations are shown in Table 4.49.

**Table 4.49 Results of recalculations in 2.F.1. Refrigeration and Air Conditioning (1995-2021)**

Year	HFC emissions before recalculation	HFC emissions after recalculation	Absolute difference	Relative difference
		kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.		%
1995	16.35	16.25	-0.10	-0.63%
2000	62.11	61.85	-0.26	-0.42%
2005	100.59	101.24	0.65	0.64%
2010	205.96	216.35	10.39	5.05%
2015	243.16	251.86	8.70	3.58%
2016	263.50	271.61	8.12	3.08%
2017	256.80	264.06	7.26	2.83%
2018	251.59	259.17	7.57	3.01%
2019	243.35	250.96	7.61	3.13%
2020	236.90	243.26	6.36	2.68%
2021	250.34	258.80	8.46	3.38%

#### 4.7.1.6 Category-specific planned improvements

No improvements are planned for this sector.

## 4.7.2 Foam Blowing Agents (CRF 2.F.2)

### 4.7.2.1 Category description

The category covers HFC emissions from open and closed-cell foams. HFCs from foams are emitted only from the use of imported foams containing F-gases as there is no production of foams in Latvia. Emissions from foaming of polyether for shoe soles are not occurring anymore due to prohibitions described in F-gas Regulation No.517/2014.

The calculation of emissions under 2.F.2 was carried out for following gases:

- HFC-134a
- HFC-227ea
- HFC-245fa
- HFC-152a
- HFC-365mfc

In 2022, emissions from foam blowing agents totalled 1.09 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. and this is 158.5% higher than in 2021 (Figure 4.17). Fluctuations in 2.F.2 emissions could be observed from year to year because data very depends on information provided by merchants which is available in National Chemicals Database.




Figure 4.17 HFC emissions from 2.F.2 (Closed cell foams on secondary axis) (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

HFC-134a emissions were not occurring for 1990-1994, so notation key – NO - is used. Manufacturing of shoes (shoe soles) containing HFC-134a occurred in 1995-2002 when comparatively smaller amounts of HFC were emitted. After 2002 emissions from stocks and disposal were estimated and emissions started to increase reaching peak level in 2010. According to F-gas regulation No.517/2014 which repeals Regulation (EC) No.842/2006 from 4 July 2006 it is prohibited to place on the EU market footwear containing F-gases. According to prohibitions described in EU regulations it was assumed that amount of shoes containing HFC-134a started to decrease since 2007 however emissions from disposal were still at previous level.



Emissions from closed-cell PU foams used in construction are estimated starting from 2003 when data from National Chemicals Database become available. Since then emissions have been increased very rapidly due to economic development and increased activity in building sector reaching the highest level in 2006. Afterwards emissions started to decrease and since 2008 rather small amounts are emitted. HFC-152a emissions from Closed cells were not occurring for 1995-2005 and for 2008-2014, therefore notation key – NO - is used, HFC-227ea and HFC-245fa emissions were not occurring for 1995-2003 and after 2004, therefore notation key – NO - is used. HFC-365mfc emissions were not occurring for 1995-2007 and for 2015-2018 and for 2020, therefore notation key – NO - is used.

Emissions from open-cell foams are estimated starting from 2015.

#### 4.7.2.2 Methodological issues

An overview of the methods used and gases reported under 2.F.2 sector is presented in Table 4.50.

**Table 4.50 Summary of emission calculation methods and gases in CFR 2.F.2**

CRF Category/subcategory	Method used	Gases reported
2.F.2 Foam Blowing agents		
<i>2.F.2.a Closed Cells</i>	<i>Tier 1a</i>	<i>HFC-134a HFC-227ea HFC-245fa HFC-152a HFC-365mfc</i>
<i>2.F.2.b Open Cells</i>	<i>Tier 1a</i>	<i>HFC-227ea HFC-245fa HFC-365mfc HFC-134a</i>

- *Closed-cell PU foams*

##### *Activity data*

The imported amount of PU construction foams is obtained from National Chemicals Database. No export and production data is reported to the National Chemicals Database therefore only imported amount can be obtained. So only emissions from use of PU foams (stocks) are calculated.

Although the activity in building sector in previous years has radically increased, emission estimations for PU foams can be done starting from 2003 due to the lack of activity data of imported and used building foams or foams used in windows manufacturing as well as lack of data on foams containing F-gases. It is assumed that all the construction foams imported are closed cells foams (used in insulation applications) according to NACE classification. The data on foams imported as well as the average share (%) of F-gases in foams were obtained from National Chemicals Database.

##### *Emission factors and calculations*

HFC emissions are calculated from foams in stocks. Emission calculations were done according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines Tier 1a method using activity data on imported foams and default EF – annual losses 4.5% of the original HFC charge/year<sup>113</sup>.

Equation from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for emissions from closed-cell foam in year was used:

$$\mathbf{Emissions}_t = \mathbf{Bank}_t * \mathbf{EF}_{AL} \quad (4.56)$$

where:

$Emissions_t$  - emissions from closed-cell foam in year t (tons)

$Bank_t$  - HFC charge blown into closed-cell foam manufacturing between year t and year t-n (tons)

$EF_{AL}$  - annual loss emission factor (fraction)

t - current year

The product lifetime of foam is 20 years. As in that time Latvia was part of Soviet Union the specific data was not collected as well as it is believable that the foam blowing did not occur in country. Therefore decommissioning losses from foams are not occurring.

- Closed-cell foams from foaming of polyether for shoe soles

#### Activity data

Activity data for emission estimation from foaming of polyether for shoe soles is taken from CSB databases about produced imported and exported amount of shoes<sup>114</sup>. Assumptions and default leakage factors are taken from Danish project "The Greenhouse gases: HFCs, PFCs and SF<sub>6</sub>"<sup>115</sup>.

The manufacturing of shoe soles containing HFC-134a occurred in Latvia in 1995-2002. The amount of produced shoes (shoe soles) is obtained by CSB. According to Danish project<sup>103</sup> it was assumed that 5% of all shoes with plastic, rubber and leather soles contain polyether containing 8 g of HFC-134a per shoe.

#### Emission factors and calculations

Total amount of HFC-134a used for manufacturing of shoe soles can be estimated by using equation:

$$\mathbf{HFC}_{filled} = \mathbf{Sh}_{produced} * \mathbf{d}_{HFC} * \mathbf{HFC}_{sh} \quad (4.57)$$

where:

$HFC_{filled}$  – total amount of HFC-134a used in manufacturing of shoes (t)

$Sh_{produced}$  – amount of produced shoes (pieces)

$d_{HFC}$  – amount of shoes containing HFC-134a (%)

$HFC_{sh}$  – amount of HFC-134a filled in one shoe sole (t)

Danish default leakage EF for HFC-134a emitted during manufacturing is 15%.

The HFC-134a emissions from manufacturing of shoe soles can be estimated by using equation:

$$\mathbf{E}_{production} = \mathbf{HFC}_{filled} * \mathbf{k} \quad (4.58)$$

<sup>113</sup> 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Vol.3, Ch.7, p.7.35

<sup>114</sup> Exports and imports by countries. Available: [https://data.stat.gov.lv/pxweb/lv/OSP\\_PUB/START\\_\\_TIR\\_\\_AT\\_\\_ATD/ATD020](https://data.stat.gov.lv/pxweb/lv/OSP_PUB/START__TIR__AT__ATD/ATD020)

<sup>115</sup> Danish consumption and emission of F-gases. Available: <https://www2.mst.dk/Udgiv/publications/2016/03/978-87-93435-48-3.pdf>

where:

$E_{production}$  – HFC-134a emissions from shoe manufacturing (t)

$HFC_{filled}$  – total amount of HFC used in manufacturing of shoes (t)

$k$  – leakage from shoes production (%)

The amount of imported, exported and produced shoes (shoe soles) is obtained by CSB. According to Danish project<sup>115</sup> it was assumed that 5% of all shoes with plastic, rubber and leather soles contain polyether containing 8 g of HFC-134a per shoe.

Total amount of HFC-134a held in stocks in shoe soles can be estimated by using equation:

$$\mathbf{HFC_{stocks} = HFC_{filled} + HFC_{imported} - HFC_{exported}} \quad (4.59)$$

where:

$HFC_{stocks}$  – total amount of HFC-134 held in stocks in shoe soles and used in country in particular year (t)

$HFC_{filled}$  – total amount of HFC-134a filled in shoes during manufacture of shoes (t)

$HFC_{imported}$  – total amount of HFC-134a imported in shoes (t)

$HFC_{exported}$  – total amount of HFC-134a exported in shoes (t)

Danish default leakage EF for HFC-134a emitted during lifetime is 4.5% (lifetime is 3 years) or 1.5% annually.

The HFC-134a emissions from stocks held in shoe soles can be estimated by using equation:

$$\mathbf{E_{stocks} = HFC_{stocks} * x} \quad (4.60)$$

where:

$E_{stocks}$  – HFC-134a emissions from shoe lifetime (t)

$HFC_{stocks}$  – total amount of HFC-134 held in stocks in shoe soles and used in country in particular year (t)

$x$  – leakage from using of shoes during its lifetime (%)

According to above mentioned Danish project average lifetime of shoes is 3 years. It means that for HFC-134a emission estimation the amount of HFC-134a remained in shoe soles after their lifetime in year<sup>-3</sup> has to be known. As CSB does not have so old data the approximate amount back to year 1992 is extrapolated taken into account the amount curve in 1995-2000.

Total amount of HFC-134a left in shoe soles after their lifetime ends can be estimated by using equation:

$$\mathbf{HFC_{remained} = HFC_{stocks} * (1 - x)} \quad (4.61)$$

where:

$HFC_{remained}$  – total amount of HFC-134a remained in shoes after their lifetime in year<sup>-3</sup> (t)

$(1-x)$  – percentage amount of HFC left in shoes (%)

For the emission estimation from disposal default Danish EF 71.5% is used as some part of shoes are destroyed in incineration and thereby not released as emissions.

The HFC-134a emissions from disposal of shoe soles can be estimated by using equation:

$$\mathbf{E_{disposal} = HFC_{remained} * Q} \quad (4.62)$$

where:

$E_{disposal}$  – total amount of HFC-134a emissions from disposal

$HFC_{remained}$  – total amount of HFC-134a remained in shoes after their lifetime in year<sup>-3</sup> (t)

*Q – leakage from disposal (%)*

- Open-cell foams

#### *Activity data*

The imported amount of open-cell foams used in furniture and seating is obtained from National Chemicals Database. No export and production data is reported to National Chemicals Database therefore only imported amount well as the average percentage of F-gases in foams can be obtained.

According to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines open-cell foam upon foaming the blowing agent is released almost completely within one year hence the manufacturing EF is assumed as 100%. All the amounts are emitted during manufacturing therefore emissions from stocks are not calculated.

#### *Emission factors and calculations*

HFC emissions are calculated from foams in manufacturing. The emission calculations were done according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines Tier 1a method using activity data on imported foams and default EF – first year loss factor 100% of the original HFC charge/year.

Equation 7.8 from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for emissions from ope-cell foam in year was used:

$$\mathbf{Emissions}_t = \mathbf{M}_t \quad (4.63)$$

where:

*Emissions<sub>t</sub>* - emissions from open-cell foam in year t (tons)

*M<sub>t</sub>* - total HFC used in manufacturing new open-cell foam in year t (tons)

The product lifetime according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines is 12 years. Therefore decommissioning losses from open-cell foams are not occurring yet.

#### **4.7.2.3 Uncertainties and time-series consistency**

Uncertainty analysis for 2024 submission is carried out by using Approach 1. Quantitative estimates of uncertainties are provided in Annex 2. Overall description of uncertainty analysis is included in Section 1.6.

Uncertainty for Foam Blowing sector could arise to 50% according to assumptions. Also uncertainty of EFs for HFCs is assumed as 50%.

Time series of the estimated emissions are consistent because the same methodology, EFs and data sources are used for sectors for all years in time series.

#### **4.7.2.4 Category-specific QA/QC and verification**

The quality objectives and the QA/QC plan for the Latvia's GHG inventory at the National Inventory level are presented in Section 1.2.3. The QC procedures are performed according to the QA/QC plan in the 2.F. sector in order to achieve these quality objectives. Issues related to QA/QC and verification are discussed at the sectoral meetings.

More detailed description can be found under chapter 4.7.1.4.

Currently using CRF Reporter software version v6.0.10\_AR5 it is not possible to enter NO in green and grey cells for those F-gases where emissions are not occurring in Latvia although CRF

Reporter User manual says that if disaggregated data is not available for certain categories, the CRF Reporter allows users to report information in the parent category. This can be done by directly entering data in the green cells (i.e. overwriting formulas).

It is not currently possible to enter notation keys NO in green cells for these F-gases which are not occurring under this sector therefore some information in the parent category (green cells) in corresponding CRF tables are missing. It was confirmed by CRF Reporter help desk that this is an CRF internal issue which will be improved in the future releases of the software. But for the moment it was suggested to leave cells blank. Due to this reason completeness check in CRF Reporter shows incompleteness (orange light) which could be solved when CRF Reporter will allow to enter notation keys for F-gases directly in green and grey cells.

QA/QC procedures within CRF Reporter were carried out in order to ensure completeness and consistency of reported data.

All information on activity data and emission calculations are stored and archived in the common FTP folder.

#### **4.7.2.5 Category-specific recalculations**

Recalculations were done for 2021 due to precised data and relative difference is 44.96% but absolute difference is 0.13 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.

#### **4.7.2.6 Category-specific planned improvements**

No improvements are planned for this sector.

### **4.7.3 Fire Protection (CRF 2.F.3)**

#### **4.7.3.1 Category description**

The category covers HFC emissions from use of fire protecting equipment. In 2022, emissions totalled 0.009 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. giving about 0.004% from total HFC emissions in 2.F (Figure 4.18). As the emissions from fire suppression systems occur when the system is discharged in case of fire or accidentally, emissions are estimated only from for operating of fire protection systems using HFC-227ea and HFC-23.

HFC-227ea emissions were not occurring for time period 1990-2000 so notation key – NO - is used. But HFC-23 emissions were not occurring for time period 1990-2009 and 2015-2022 therefore notation key – NO - is used.

Emission time series started in 2001 when the first data regarding use of fire protection systems containing HFCs was received during the first F-gases research (2004). Since then strong emission fluctuations have been observed until 2018. In 2022, the emissions from this category remained at the same level as in 2021.




Figure 4.18 HFC emissions from 2.F.3 (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

Emissions from fire extinguishing are problematic to estimate due to the fact that there is only statistical information of the registered fires (incidents) where different extinguishing materials were used. Type of materials (substances) used in equipment is not registered.

According to the national Regulation No.704 of the Cabinet of Ministers of Latvia companies who use F-gases in stationary fire protection equipment shall report amounts used to responsible institution (LEGMC) each year till 31<sup>st</sup> of March. Information from LEGMC database on ozone depleting substances and F-gases available since 2010. Till then historical data from basic F-gases research (2004) was used and extrapolation was done.

#### 4.7.3.2 Methodological issues

An overview of the methods used and gases reported under 2.F.3 sector is presented in Table 4.51.

Table 4.51 Summary of emission calculation methods in CFR 2.F.3

CRF Category/subcategory	Method used	Gases reported
2.F.3 Fire Protection	Tier 2a	HFC-227ea, HFC-23

Emissions are calculated based on the Tier 2a method of the 2006 IPCC guidelines, however, Tier 2 method is written in the CRF tables because it is not possible to enter Tier 2a.

#### Activity data

During the F-gases research (2004) it was found out that there is no manufacturing of fire extinguishers containing F-gases. 19 enterprises were questioned including only manufacturer of fire extinguishers. According to responses received a little amount of fire extinguishers are filled with F-gases. Only 2 enterprises reported the amount of HFC-227ea in their installed equipment in particular year and amount of HFC-227ea held in stocks (containers) of fire extinguishing equipment. It was reported that no charging was done for the installed equipment. Fire extinguishers were installed already filled with F-gases and there weren't any necessity to recharge them. Therefore only emissions from stocks were calculated.

Amount of F-gases in annually installed equipment and amount held in containers is used as activity data for emission estimations from stocks. Activity data for historical years (2001-2006) is taken from the first F gases research done in 2004. Since 2010 data is taken from annual F-gases reports, where operators annually report F-gases amounts used in their equipment.

#### *Emission factors and calculations*

It is assumed that 2% from total stocks is emitted during equipment operations annually according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines<sup>116</sup>.

Equation from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for emission estimation from stocks:

$$E_{Lifetime,t} = B_t * x / 100 \quad (4.64)$$

where:

*E<sub>lifetime</sub>* – amount of emissions during equipment operation (t)

*B<sub>t</sub>* – amount of F-gases held in stocks in year t (tons)

*x* – losses during operation period (%)

The lifetime of the equipment is 20 years therefore emissions at system disposal were not estimated.

#### **4.7.3.3 Uncertainties and time-series consistency**

Uncertainty analysis for 2024 submission is carried out by using Approach 1. Quantitative estimates of uncertainties are provided in Annex 2. Overall description of uncertainty analysis is included in Section 1.6.

Uncertainty for Fire Protection sector could arise to 50% according to expert judgement. Also uncertainty of EFs for HFCs is assumed as 50%.

Time series of the estimated emissions are consistent because the same methodology, EFs and data sources are used for sectors for all years in time series.

#### **4.7.3.4 Category-specific QA/QC and verification**

The quality objectives and the QA/QC plan for the Latvia's GHG inventory at the National Inventory level are presented in Section 1.2.3. The QC procedures are performed according to the QA/QC plan in the 2.F. sector in order to achieve these quality objectives. Issues related to QA/QC and verification are discussed at the sectoral meetings.

More detailed description can be found under chapter 4.7.1.4.

Currently using CRF Reporter software version v6.0.10\_AR5 it is not possible to enter NO in green and grey cells for those F-gases where emissions are not occurring in Latvia although CRF Reporter User manual says that if disaggregated data is not available for certain categories, the CRF Reporter allows users to report information in the parent category. This can be done by directly entering data in the green cells (i.e. overwriting formulas).

Under 2.F.3 Fire Protection only F-gases which are source of emissions are reported. Remaining F-gases are not occurring and are not added as child nodes according to CRF User manual however it is not currently possible to enter data in green cells for these F-gases therefore some

---

<sup>116</sup> 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Vol.3, Ch.7, p.7.63

information in the parent category (green cells) in corresponding CRF tables are missing. It was confirmed by CRF Reporter help desk that this is an CRF internal issue which will be improved in the future releases of the software. But for the moment it was suggested to leave cells blank. Due to this reason completeness check in CRF Reporter shows incompleteness (orange light) which could be solved when CRF Reporter will allow to enter notation keys for F-gases directly in green and grey cells.

QA/QC procedures within CRF Reporter were carried out in order to ensure completeness and consistency of reported data.

All information on activity data and emission calculations are stored and archived in the common FTP folder.

#### **4.7.3.5 Category-specific recalculations**

No recalculations were done for this sector.

#### **4.7.3.6 Category-specific planned improvements**

No improvements are planned for this sector.

### **4.7.4 Aerosols (Metered Dose Inhalers CRF 2.F.4.a)**

#### **4.7.4.1 Category description**

This category covers HFC-134a emissions from metered dose inhalers. There are no other HFC containing aerosol types used in Latvia.

There are no emissions for 1990-1994 therefore notation key – NO – is used. After 1995 HFC-134a emissions are calculated.

In 2022, emissions totalled 5.67 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. giving 2.3% from total HFC emissions in 2.F (Figure 4.19). In 2022, emissions decreased by 11.2% compared to 2021 due to the decreased amount of imported HFC-134a in products. Emissions have increased compared to the base year. The fluctuation in the time series is due to observed changes in consumption of HFC containing metered dose inhalers.






Figure 4.19 HFC emissions from 2.F.4.a (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

During the first F-gases research (2004) it was found out that there is no production of F-gases containing aerosols in Latvia. All aerosols used in Latvia are imported. It is very difficult to collect the data of imported aerosols as it is necessary to separate HFCs containing aerosols from others. It is almost impossible to get the information from all households and importers of industrial aerosols in Latvia as Central Custom Service registers only all imported aerosols with one custom code not dividing them by type or by substances containing. Also since Latvia is in Schengen zone only imported amount from Third Countries is registered.

Only the aerosols used in medicine for asthmatics are estimated and reported under this category. During the first F-gases research number of inhalers containing HFC-134a was obtained as well as average amount of HFC-134a filled in one inhaler divided by the type of medicine. All the inhalers are imported as no inhalers for asthmatics are produced in Latvia.

#### 4.7.4.2 Methodological issues

An overview of the methods used and gases reported under 2.F.4 sector is presented in Table 4.52.

Table 4.52 Summary of emission calculation methods in CFR 2.F.4

CRF Category/subcategory	Method used	Gases reported
2.F.4 Aerosols	Tier 1a	HFC-134a

#### Activity data

From 1995 to 1997 the amount of metered dose inhalers is extrapolated based on IPCC 2006 Guidelines Volume 1 Chapter 5 about extrapolation. For 1998-2006 data of imported inhalers reported by importers of medical preparations was used as activity data for emission calculations. From 2007 till 2022 data for emission estimations annually is reported by State Agency of Medicines of Latvia. All users of the medical preparations shall report the sold amount of medicines so these data are very precise.

Total amount of HFC-134a used in metered dose inhalers in particular year can be estimated as the amount of inhalers containing HFC-134a and an average amount of HFC-134a filled in each type of inhalers is known.

#### *Emission factors and calculations*

Equation for total amount HFC-134a used as medical preparation:

$$\mathbf{HFC}_{sold} = \sum \mathbf{MDI}_{sold} * \mathbf{HFC}_{filled} \quad (4.65)$$

*where:*

$HFC_{sold}$  – total amount of HFC sold in country (t)

$MDI_{sold}$  – amount of sold particular type of metered dose inhalers containing F-gases (pieces)

$HFC_{filled}$  – amount of HFCs filled in particular type of inhaler (t)

According to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines 50%<sup>117</sup> leakage from metered dose inhalers sold in particular year and 50% from inhalers sold in year before particular year is assumed.

Equation from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for metered dose inhalers emissions:

$$\mathbf{Emissions}_t = \mathbf{S}_t * \mathbf{EF} + \mathbf{S}_{t-1} * (\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{EF}) \quad (4.66)$$

*where:*

$Emissions_t$  - emissions in year t (tons)

$S_t$  – quantity of HFC and PFC contained in aerosol products sold in year t (tons)

$S_{t-1}$  – quantity of HFC and PFC contained in aerosol products sold in year t-1 (tons)

$EF$  - emission factor (=fraction of chemical emitted during the first year) (fraction)

#### **4.7.4.3 Uncertainties and time-series consistency**

Uncertainty analysis for 2024 submission is carried out by using Approach 1. Quantitative estimates of uncertainties are provided in Annex 2. Overall description of uncertainty analysis is included in Section 1.6.

Uncertainty for Aerosol sector could arise to 50% according to expert judgement. Also uncertainty of EFs for HFCs is assumed as 50%.

Time series of the estimated emissions are consistent because the same methodology, EFs and data sources are used for sectors for all years in time series.

#### **4.7.4.4 Category-specific QA/QC and verification**

The quality objectives and the QA/QC plan for the Latvia's GHG inventory at the National Inventory level are presented in Section 1.2.3. The QC procedures are performed according to the QA/QC plan in the 2.F. sector in order to achieve these quality objectives. Issues related to QA/QC and verification are discussed at the sectoral meetings.

More detailed description can be found under chapter 4.7.1.4.

Currently using CRF Reporter software version v6.0.10\_AR5 it is not possible to enter NO in green and grey cells for those F-gases where emissions are not occurring in Latvia although CRF Reporter User manual says that if disaggregated data is not available for certain categories, the CRF Reporter allows users to report information in the parent category. This can be done by

<sup>117</sup> 2006 IPCC Guidelines Vol.3, Ch.7, p.7.29

directly entering data in the green cells (i.e. overwriting formulas). Entering data in green cells is only possible when the parent node to which the grid with green cells belongs does not have any child nodes.

Under 2.F.4 Aerosols only F-gases which are source of emissions are reported. Remaining F-gases are not occurring and are not added as child nodes according to CRF User manual however it is not currently possible to enter data in green cells for these F-gases therefore some information in the parent category (green cells) in corresponding CRF tables are missing. It was confirmed by CRF Reporter help desk that this is an CRF internal issue which will be improved in the future releases of the software. But for the moment it was suggested to leave cells blank. Due to this reason completeness check in CRF Reporter shows incompleteness (orange light) which could be solved when CRF Reporter will allow to enter notation keys for F-gases directly in green and grey cells.

QA/QC procedures within CRF Reporter were carried out in order to ensure completeness and consistency of reported data.

All information on activity data and emission calculations are stored and archived in the common FTP folder.

#### 4.7.4.5 Category-specific recalculations

No recalculations were done for this sector.

#### 4.7.4.6 Category-specific planned improvements

No improvements are planned for this sector.

### **4.8 OTHER PRODUCT MANUFACTURE AND USE (2.G)**

Under 2.G Latvia reports emissions from SF<sub>6</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O in following sectors:

- Electrical equipment (2.G.1);
- N<sub>2</sub>O from product uses (2.G.3).

SF<sub>6</sub> emissions from medical accelerators of Other product use (2.G.2) are characterized as NE (1995-2022). Applying default EF and according to the information of the total number of accelerators used in radiotherapy treatment obtained from the Ministry of Health and based on the 2006 IPCC Guidelines Vol. 3, Chapter 8, Equation 8.18, emissions of medical accelerators are below the 0.05% (0.002% for year 2021) of the national total GHG emissions and could be characterized as emissions below the threshold of significance in Latvia. Therefore for Latvia SF<sub>6</sub> emissions for Other product use (2.G.2) are considered as negligible. SF<sub>6</sub> and PFCs emissions from other processes of Other product use (2.G.2) are not occurring in Latvia. For 1990-1994 emissions were not occurring in Latvia.

SF<sub>6</sub> and PFCs emissions from Other (2.G.4) are not occurring in Latvia. Remaining F-gases are not occurring and are not added as child nodes in CRF Reporter software version v6.0.10\_AR5 according to CRF User manual (25.03.2018) however it is not currently possible to enter data in green cells for these F-gases therefore some information in the parent category (green cells) in corresponding CRF tables are missing.

In 2022, GHG emissions from other product manufacture and use amounted 15.91 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. (0.2%) from Latvia's total CO<sub>2</sub> eq. emissions without LULUCF. In 2022, compared to 2021,

emissions have increased by 3.0%, but compared to 1990 emissions have increased by 269.9% (Figure 4.20 and Table 4.54).




Figure 4.20 Emissions from 2.G Other product manufacture and use (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

Emission trend could mainly associated with increase in activity data received from companies. Emission fluctuations in the N<sub>2</sub>O From Product Uses sector are linked with the economic situation of the country.

Reported emissions and calculation methods for the Other Product Manufacture and Use in the Latvian inventory are summarized in Table 4.53.

Table 4.53 GHG emission categories, methods and gases reported from 2.G Other Product Manufacture and Use

Category	Method used	Gases reported
G. Other Product Manufacture and Use		
2.G.1 Electrical Equipment	Tier1	SF <sub>6</sub>
2.G.3 N <sub>2</sub> O from Product Uses (Medical Applications and Propellant for pressure and aerosol products)	CS	N <sub>2</sub> O

Table 4.54 Total emissions from 2.G Other Product Manufacture and Use, 1990-2022 (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

Year	2.G Other Product manufacture and Use	2.G.1 Electrical Equipment	2.G.3 N <sub>2</sub> O from Product Uses
1990	4.30	NO	4.30
1995	4.21	0.18	4.03
2000	4.74	0.91	3.83
2005	7.52	3.89	3.63
2010	11.42	7.58	3.84
2011	11.90	7.70	4.20
2012	12.04	8.02	4.03


Year	2.G Other Product manufacture and Use	2.G.1 Electrical Equipment	2.G.3 N <sub>2</sub> O from Product Uses
2013	12.81	8.76	4.04
2014	12.83	8.84	3.99
2015	14.42	10.43	3.99
2016	14.00	10.19	3.80
2017	14.56	10.64	3.93
2018	14.82	10.87	3.95
2019	18.02	14.25	3.78
2020	15.53	12.30	3.22
2021	15.45	12.10	3.35
2022	15.91	12.27	3.64
Share of total IPPU % in 2022	1.9%	1.4%	0.4%
2022 versus 2021	3.0%	1.4%	8.7%
2022 versus 1990	269.9%	6768.8%	-15.4%

## 4.8.1 Electrical Equipment (CRF 2.G.1)

### 4.8.1.1 Category description

This category covers emissions of sulphur hexafluoride from electrical equipment used in high and medium voltage commutation and control installations. Equipment is not manufactured in Latvia. SF<sub>6</sub> emissions are estimated from charging and lifetime. There is only 3 enterprises where SF<sub>6</sub> is filled. Installations are not produced in Latvia and the old equipment without fill of the SF<sub>6</sub> was dismantled at the beginning of 1990s. Only starting from 1992 new equipment was gradually installed. Since 1992 it uses small amount of SF<sub>6</sub> in electrical equipment, but since 1995 used amount is increasing.

In 2022, SF<sub>6</sub> emissions from Electrical Equipment constituted 12.27 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. (77.1% from total 2.G emissions). Emissions have grown since 1995 by 6768.8% due to replacement of the old equipment and installation of the new equipment where, until then, SF<sub>6</sub> was not used. But in 2022 SF<sub>6</sub> emissions from electrical equipment increased by 1.4% compared to 2021 due to a little higher amount that is filled into new manufactured products (Figure 4.21 and Table 4.55).

Figure 4.21 SF<sub>6</sub> emissions from 2.G.1 (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)Table 4.55 SF<sub>6</sub> emissions from 2.G.1 Electrical Equipment, 1995-2022 (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
SF <sub>6</sub> from electrical equipment	0.18	0.91	3.89	7.58	10.43	10.19	10.64	10.87	14.25	12.30	12.10	12.27

#### 4.8.1.2 Methodological issues

An overview of the methods used and gases reported under 2.G.1 sector is presented in Table 4.56.

Table 4.56 Summary of emission calculation methods and gases in CFR 2.G.1

CRF Category/subcategory	Method used	Gases reported
2.G.1 Electrical Equipment	Tier1	SF <sub>6</sub>

#### Activity data

Enterprises imports equipment already filled with SF<sub>6</sub>. There is no manufacturing of the electric equipment containing SF<sub>6</sub> in Latvia, therefore only emissions from charging and operating were estimated using amount of SF<sub>6</sub> in newly installed equipment as activity data reported by the company. For 2003-2022 enterprises report the emergency leakage from electrical equipment which are also reported as operating emissions.

#### Emission factors and calculations

For emission estimations the Tier 1 default EF method from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines was used. Emissions are estimated by multiplying default regional EF (for Europe) by amount of SF<sub>6</sub> used in equipment in enterprises according the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. The emissions are estimated by splitting data into the sealed pressure electrical equipment (MV switchgear) and closed pressure electrical equipment (HV switchgear) containing the SF<sub>6</sub> due to the different EFs for

each of these installations in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. For HV switchgears 2.6%, but for MV switchgears 0.2% EF was used.

Equation from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for emission estimation from charging:

$$E_{charged,t} = M_t * k/100 \quad (4.67)$$

where:

$E_{charged}$  – emissions during system manufacture/assembly in year (kg)

$M_t$  – amount of HFC-134a charged into a new equipment in year (kg)

$k$  – charging losses (%)

Equation from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for emission estimation from stocks:

$$E_{lifetime,t} = B_t * x/100 \quad (4.68)$$

where:

$E_{lifetime}$  – amount of emissions during equipment operation (t)

$B_t$  – amount of F-gases held in stocks in year t (tons)

$x$  – losses during operation period (%)

Lifetime of used equipment is 30 years and no equipment was dismantled yet therefore emissions from disposal are marked "NO" in CRF Reporter.

#### 4.8.1.3 Uncertainties and time-series consistency

Uncertainty analysis for 2024 submission is carried out by using Approach 1. Quantitative estimates of uncertainties are provided in Annex 2. Overall description of uncertainty analysis is included in Section 1.6.

As there are three facilities in the country which uses SF<sub>6</sub> in their technology and report the data on SF<sub>6</sub> usage directly to LEGMC, it is assumed that data used for emission estimation under this subcategory is more precise. Uncertainty of activity data for SF<sub>6</sub> from electrical equipment is assumed as ±2% for AD, but EF uncertainty is 30% according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.

Time series of the estimated emissions are consistent because the same methodology, EFs and data sources are used for sectors for all years in time series.

#### 4.8.1.4 Category-specific QA/QC and verification

The quality objectives and the QA/QC plan for the Latvia's GHG inventory at the National Inventory level are presented in Section 1.2.3. The QC procedures are performed according to the QA/QC plan in the 2.G. sector in order to achieve these quality objectives. Issues related to QA/QC and verification are discussed at the sectoral meetings.

More detailed description can be found under chapter 4.7.1.4.

Currently using CRF Reporter software version v6.0.10\_AR5 it is not possible to enter NO in green and grey cells for those F-gases where emissions are not occurring in Latvia although CRF Reporter User manual says that if disaggregated data is not available for certain categories, the CRF Reporter allows users to report information in the parent category. This can be done by directly entering data in the green cells (i.e. overwriting formulas).

Under Electrical equipment only F-gases which are source of emissions are reported. Remaining F-gases are not occurring and are not added as child nodes according to CRF User manual however it is not currently possible to enter data in green cells for these F-gases therefore some information in the parent category (green cells) in corresponding CRF tables are missing. It was confirmed by CRF Reporter help desk that this is an CRF internal issue which will be improved in the future releases of the software. But for the moment it was suggested to leave cells blank. Due to this reason completeness check in CRF Reporter v6.0.10\_AR5 shows incompleteness (orange light) which could be solved when CRF Reporter will allow to enter notation keys for F-gases directly in green and grey cells.

QA/QC procedures within CRF Reporter were carried out in order to ensure completeness and consistency of reported data.

All information on activity data and emission calculations are stored and archived in the common FTP folder.

#### **4.8.1.5 Category-specific recalculations**

No recalculations were done for this sector.

#### **4.8.1.6 Category-specific planned improvements**

No improvements are planned for this sector.

### **4.8.2 N<sub>2</sub>O From Product Uses (CRF 2.G.3)**

#### **4.8.2.1 Category description**

This chapter describes emissions from the use of N<sub>2</sub>O for anesthesia and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from aerosol cans. N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from this sector formed a negligible part of total GHG emissions in Latvia. In 2022, these emissions were 3.64 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.

#### **4.8.2.2 Methodological issues**

N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from anesthesia were estimated taking into account the amount of N<sub>2</sub>O sold. According to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, it was assumed that 100% of N<sub>2</sub>O sold for anaesthesia was emitted to the air, therefore activity data is equal to estimated emissions. The data on N<sub>2</sub>O sales was available since 2007. Activity data was provided by the State Agency of Medicines of Latvia. The estimation of emissions is based on the assumption that all used N<sub>2</sub>O is emitted to the atmosphere in the same year when it is produced or imported in Latvia. To obtain a comparable data in time series for years 1990-2006 assume that base year for N<sub>2</sub>O emissions is year 2007, N<sub>2</sub>O emissions for years 1990-2006 were calculated proportionally, taking into account the number of inhabitants provided by CSB.

Presently, there is an absence of data on N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from aerosol cans in Latvia. Nevertheless, to approximate these emissions, the methodology employed is based on the approach utilized in Belgium<sup>118</sup>.

N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from anesthesia and from aerosol cans are shown in Table 4.57.

---

<sup>118</sup> Belgium's greenhouse gas inventory (1990-2021) 2G3b Other (propellant for pressure and aerosol product 189p. Available: <https://unfccc.int/ghg-inventories-annex-i-parties/2023>



**Table 4.57 Estimated N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from anesthesia and from aerosol cans**

Year	N <sub>2</sub> O emissions from anesthesia, kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.	N <sub>2</sub> O emissions from aerosol cans, kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.	Total emissions from N <sub>2</sub> O from product Use, kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.
1990	1.16	3.14	4.30
1995	1.09	2.95	4.03
2000	1.03	2.80	3.83
2005	0.98	2.65	3.63
2010	1.35	2.50	3.84
2011	1.76	2.44	4.20
2012	1.62	2.41	4.03
2013	1.74	2.30	4.04
2014	1.79	2.20	3.99
2015	1.89	2.10	3.99
2016	1.79	2.01	3.80
2017	2.01	1.92	3.93
2018	2.06	1.89	3.95
2019	1.90	1.88	3.78
2020	1.36	1.86	3.22
2021	1.50	1.85	3.35
2022	1.81	1.83	3.64
2022 vs 2021	20.5%	-0.9%	8.7%
2022 vs 1990	56.2%	-41.7%	-15.4%

#### 4.8.2.3 Uncertainties and time-series consistency

Uncertainty analysis for 2024 submission is carried out by using Approach 1. Quantitative estimates of uncertainties are provided in Annex 2. Overall description of uncertainty analysis is included in Section 1.6.

Uncertainty of available activity data for anaesthesia under CRF 2.G.3.a N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from anesthesia was 2% in 2022. EF uncertainty is assumed to be 2%. Time series consistency was ensured by using one method for all time series.

As the activity data (number of cans) of CRF 2.G.3.b N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from aerosol cans is estimated on the basis of the average European consumption, the uncertainty is considered high.

#### 4.8.2.4 Category-specific QA/QC and verification

The quality objectives and the QA/QC plan for the Latvia's GHG inventory at the National Inventory level are presented in Section 1.2.3. The QC procedures are performed according to the QA/QC plan in the Other product manufacture and use (2.G.3) sector in order to achieve these quality objectives. Issues related to QA/QC and verification are discussed at the sectoral meetings.

All estimations of the emissions done in the LEGMC also are checked on the logical mistakes by checking the time series of the activity data, EFs and emissions consistency to display all significant and illogic changes in the activity data and emissions.

Quality control check list is filled for each category taking into account criteria given in QA/QC plan approved in the National legislation. All findings were documented and introduced in GHG inventory. All corrections are archived in centralized archiving system.

All information on activity data and emission calculations are stored and archived in the common FTP folder.

#### 4.8.2.5 Category-specific recalculations

No recalculations were done for this sector.

#### 4.8.2.6 Category-specific planned improvements

No improvements are planned for this sector.

### 4.9 OTHER PRODUCTION (CRF 2.H)

#### 4.9.1 Category description

Other Production sub-sector includes emissions of precursors from:

- Pulp and Paper (2.H.1);
- Food and beverages industry (2.H.2).

In 2022, NMVOC emissions constituted 1.27 kt and it is 2.0% lower than in 2021. NMVOC emissions are decreased compared to 1990 by 62.5%.




Figure 4.22 NMVOC emissions from 2.H Other Production in 1990–2022 (kt)

Considerable fluctuations occurred in time period 1991–1993 due to changes in economic situation in country (Figure 4.22). Decrease of NMVOC emissions in time period 1999–2001 is explained with decreasing demand of Food and beverages export to Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). In 2005–2008 NMVOC emissions decreased by 36.9% due to decrease of produced spirits by 28.4% and closure of sugar production plants. Sugar is no longer produced in Latvia since 2007.

For time period 2005-2006 data of used limestone in sugar production are reported. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions were calculated as two sugar production plants entered into the EU ETS as stationary installations and detailed information became available from annual GHG reports. After these two years sugar production plants stopped their activities and were closed. Since 2007 the total amount of food and beverages industry sector decrease. That could be explained with economic crisis in 2008-2009 as well with rise in prices of national and imported production.

SO<sub>2</sub> emissions are reported for time period 1990–1996 when pulp and paper was produced. Since 1996 such facilities are closed.

#### 4.9.2 Methodological issues

Reported emissions and calculation methods for the 2.H Other in the Latvian inventory are summarized in Table 4.58.

**Table 4.58 GHG emission categories, methods and gases reported from 2.H Other**

Category	Method used	Gases reported
Pulp & Paper	<i>Tier1</i>	SO <sub>2</sub>
Food and beverages industry	<i>Tier1</i>	NM VOC, CO <sub>2</sub>

#### Activity data

Activity data for calculation of the NMVOC emissions from the food and drink industry is obtained from the CSB. Activity data of pulp and paper subsector also were taken from CSB (Table 4.59). LEGMC has signed an agreement with CSB to get data of total production of products from sectors where data are confidential. Data for the categories – wine and spirits production, was classified as confidential. That is why for this category 2006 data was used also for 2007-2022.

**Table 4.59 Activity data of 2.H Other Production sector**

Year	Pulp and Paper	Wine	Beer	Spirits	Meat, fish, poultry	Sugar	Limestone use in sugar production	Cakes, biscuits, breakfast cereals	Bread	Animal forage	Coffee roasting
	kt	hl	hl	hl	kt	kt	kt	kt	kt	kt	kt
1990	36.6	19880	87380	324500	569.3	31.0	NO	54.8	314.0	200.0	NO
1995	1.5	159190	652820	341500	82.8	29.3	NO	24.4	145.4	214.4	NO
2000	NO	C	945147	C	197.3	C	NO	24.3	121.1	173.8	NO
2005	NO	C	1293300	C	243.8	C	11.0	53.6	116.3	248.6	NO
2006	NO	C	1383049	C	288.4	C	10.7	45.0	107.3	244.2	NO
2007	NO	C	1414259	C	286.0	NO	NO	46.5	102.3	336.8	NO
2008	NO	C	1333800	C	297.7	NO	NO	38.5	100.7	307.3	NO
2009	NO	C	1292447	C	253.5	NO	NO	33.0	95.9	299.3	NO
2010	NO	C	1484925	C	252.7	NO	NO	38.0	90.0	409.8	NO
2011	NO	C	1626595	C	261.5	NO	NO	39.7	88.6	360.9	NO
2012	NO	C	1488504	C	264.3	NO	NO	44.5	91.4	348.2	NO
2013	NO	C	1513697	C	286.2	NO	NO	56.4	88.1	380.1	1.8
2014	NO	C	967478	C	270.7	NO	NO	50.4	84.9	379.5	2.1
2015	NO	C	887838	C	260.4	NO	NO	51.8	86.9	396.7	2.0
2016	NO	C	760811	C	234.9	NO	NO	58.4	82.9	389.7	2.2

Year	Pulp and Paper	Wine	Beer	Spirits	Meat, fish, poultry	Sugar	Limestone use in sugar production	Cakes, biscuits, breakfast cereals	Bread	Animal forage	Coffee roasting
	kt	hl	hl	hl	kt	kt	kt	kt	kt	kt	kt
2017	NO	C	845905	C	235.7	NO	NO	61.3	80.7	415.3	2.4
2018	NO	C	821051	C	253.4	NO	NO	75.1	78.6	424.1	2.2
2019	NO	C	779139	C	249.3	NO	NO	84.5	75.9	442.4	2.0
2020	NO	C	747291	C	259.5	NO	NO	91.9	72.7	420.4	1.6
2021	NO	C	770619	C	260.6	NO	NO	114.1	58.6	532.7	1.5
2022	NO	C	853729	C	272.9	NO	NO	256.1	50.3	423.8	1.5

### Emission factors and calculations

NM VOC emissions from the food and beverages industry as well as SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from pulp and paper are calculated. Emissions are calculated according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines default methodology.

SO<sub>2</sub> EF 2 (kg/Mg air dried pulp) is taken from EMEP/EEA 2023<sup>119</sup>.

NM VOC EFs (Table 4.60) are taken from the EMEP/EEA 2023<sup>120</sup>. CSB provided aggregated statistical data where it can be seen that 95.5% of all spirits produced in Latvia is produced from grains (sheer alcohol or spirits) and no brandy and whiskey is produced in Latvia. That is why EF for Other Spirits 0.4 kg/hl (alcohol) is used.

**Table 4.60 NM VOC emission factors for food and beverages industries**

Production	Emission factors
Wine	0.08 kg/hl
Beer	0.035 kg/hl
Spirits	0.4 kg/hl
Meat, fish, poultry	0.3 kg/t
Sugar	10 kg/t
Cakes, biscuits, breakfast cereals	1 kg/t
Bread	8 kg/t
Animal forage	1 kg/t
Coffee roasting	0.55 kg/t

### 4.9.3 Uncertainties and time-series consistency

Uncertainty analysis for 2024 submission is carried out by using Approach 1. Quantitative estimates of uncertainties are provided in Annex 2. Overall description of uncertainty analysis is included in Section 1.6.

Uncertainty of activity data was assumed as 2% for 1990-2006 because statistical data from CSB were used. For 2007-2008 the uncertainty is assumed higher – 10%, as no precise

<sup>119</sup> EMEP/EEA air pollutant emission inventory guidebook 2023 2.H.1. Pulp and paper industry. Available: <https://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/emep-eea-guidebook-2023/part-b-sectoral-guidance-chapters/2-industrial-processes-and-product-use/2-h-other-industry-production/2-h-1-pulp-and/view>

<sup>120</sup> EMEP/EEA air pollutant emission inventory guidebook 2023 2.H.2. Pulp and beverages industry. Available: <https://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/emep-eea-guidebook-2023/part-b-sectoral-guidance-chapters/2-industrial-processes-and-product-use/2-h-other-industry-production/2-h-2-food-and/view>

information is available about wine production. SO<sub>2</sub> and NMVOC EF uncertainty were assigned as 50% because default EFs were used.

Time series of the estimated emissions are consistent and complete because the same methodology, EFs and data sources are used for sectors for all years in time series. GHG emissions from all sectors are estimated or reported as not occurring/not applicable therefore there are no "not estimated" sectors.

Time series consistency was checked by verifying IEF, AD and emission changes that increased 10% level. There are no such issues.

#### **4.9.4 Category-specific QA/QC and verification**

The quality objectives and the QA/QC plan for the Latvia's GHG inventory at the National Inventory level are presented in Section 1.2.3. The QC procedures are performed according to the QA/QC plan in the IPPU sector in order to achieve these quality objectives. Issues related to QA/QC and verification are discussed at the sectoral meetings.

Activity data used in NMVOC and SO<sub>2</sub> emissions was reported by CSB to LEGMC within National Inventory System. CSB has the internal QA/QC procedures based on mathematical model and analysis to avoid logic mistakes. The activity data used in estimations is repeatedly verified by CSB energy experts by checking the data input in data estimation database and reported in the NIR. All estimations of the emissions done in the LEGMC also are checked on the logical mistakes by checking the time series of the activity data, EFs and emissions consistency to display all significant and illogic changes in the activity data and emissions.

Emissions are checked using time series consistency check for the IEF estimated in CRF Reporter and all IEF changes in time series are double-checked and reasonable explanation for IEF changes has to be found under each subsector source category description.

The QC form has been filled in for each category taking into account criteria given in QA/QC plan approved in National legislation.

All information on activity data and emission calculations are stored and archived in the common FTP folder.

#### **4.9.5 Category-specific recalculations**

No recalculations were done for this sector.

#### **4.9.6 Category-specific planned improvements**

No improvements are planned for this sector.

## 5 AGRICULTURE (CRF 3)

### 5.1 OVERVIEW OF SECTOR

In 2022, the Agriculture sector contributed 2253.83 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. of the total national GHG emissions in Latvia. Agriculture was the second largest GHG emission sector after the Energy sector with a 22.2% share of the total GHG emissions in 2022. Overview of GHG emission sources for the Agriculture sector in 2022 is shown in Figure 5.1.




Figure 5.1 Emissions from the Agriculture sector compared with the total emissions in 2022

GHG emissions from the Agriculture sector in Latvia include:

1. CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from enteric fermentation of domestic livestock and manure management (3.A and 3.B);
2. N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from manure management and agricultural soils (3.B and 3.D);
3. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from liming and urea application (3.G and 3.H).

Emissions from managed soils include:

-) direct N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from:

1. application of synthetic nitrogen (N) fertilizer;
2. application of animal manure, compost, sewage sludge and other organic fertilizers;
3. urine and dung N deposited by grazing animals on pasture, range and paddock;
4. N release from crop residues;
5. cultivation of organic soil in croplands and grasslands;
6. N mineralisation associated with loss of soil organic matter resulting from change of land use or management of mineral soils.

-) indirect N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from atmospheric deposition and nitrogen leaching/run-off:

1. volatilized N from agricultural inputs of N;
2. N from fertilizers and other agricultural inputs that is lost through leaching and run-off.

Rice cultivation (3.C) and Savannas (3.E) are not typical for Latvia, therefore these categories are reported as "NO" in CRF tables. Legislative measures and agricultural residue management

practices prohibit agricultural residues burning on fields, therefore a notation key "NO" is used in CRF tables under the category Field Burning of Agricultural Residues (3.F). Emissions of other carbon-containing fertilizers are characterized as emissions below the threshold of significance in Latvia. Notation key "NE" is used in CRF tables under the category Other Carbon-containing Fertilizers (3.I).

The calculation of emissions is based on the 2006 IPCC Guidelines and EMEP/EEA 2023 methodology. Detailed information about methods is provided under each subcategory.

In 2022, GHG emissions from the agriculture sector in Latvia increased by 0.04% compared to 2021. However, annual emissions have been reduced by 55.2% since 1990 due to decrease mainly in the number of livestock, sown area and nitrogen fertilizers (Table 5.1).

**Table 5.1 Greenhouse gas emissions in the Agriculture sector, 1990–2022 (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)**

Year	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	CO <sub>2</sub>	Total
1990	2700.7	1964.9	364.8	5030.5
1991	2590.1	1826.8	229.7	4646.5
1992	2142.1	1411.0	36.2	3589.3
1993	1406.9	1066.0	3.9	2476.9
1994	1234.9	945.5	2.4	2182.8
1995	1203.6	825.0	1.9	2030.5
1996	1151.8	830.3	1.5	1983.6
1997	1127.2	834.4	1.3	1962.9
1998	1048.8	802.1	3.3	1854.2
1999	904.1	749.4	3.4	1656.8
2000	909.1	765.4	6.0	1680.6
2001	960.7	826.7	2.2	1789.5
2002	951.7	793.3	19.5	1764.5
2003	951.8	826.0	26.1	1803.9
2004	921.0	805.4	2.4	1728.8
2005	949.4	838.5	2.9	1790.8
2006	957.4	831.9	2.8	1792.1
2007	1001.6	866.4	6.3	1874.4
2008	973.0	856.6	5.9	1835.5
2009	970.5	875.6	8.3	1854.5
2010	963.7	900.4	6.0	1870.1
2011	974.7	896.8	12.2	1883.7
2012	996.5	950.5	15.7	1962.7
2013	1034.6	973.8	17.3	2025.7
2014	1073.2	1008.5	23.7	2105.3
2015	1074.5	1050.8	26.1	2151.5
2016	1078.8	1053.9	30.5	2163.3
2017	1087.1	1055.7	33.9	2176.7
2018	1052.7	999.2	44.5	2096.4
2019	1057.9	1085.6	54.9	2198.4
2020	1058.2	1121.2	71.0	2250.4
2021	1059.8	1109.8	83.3	2253.0
2022	1055.5	1114.9	83.4	2253.8
Share of total % in 2022	46.8%	49.5%	3.7%	100.0%
2022 versus 2021	-4.3%	+0.5%	+0.1%	+0.04%
2022 versus 1990	-60.9%	-43.3%	-77.1%	-55.2%

*\*In all tables non-rounded values are used to calculate percentage*

In 2022, agricultural soils were responsible for 46.5% of the total emissions from agriculture. The second largest emission source was enteric fermentation by contributing 42.0% of the total agricultural emissions. Manure management constituted 7.8% from the agricultural emissions in 2022. Liming and urea application were less significant emission sources producing 3.7% of the total agriculture emissions in 2022.

N<sub>2</sub>O emissions constituted 49.5% (1114.9 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.) and CH<sub>4</sub> emissions resulted in 46.8% (1055.5 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.) of the total GHG emissions from agricultural sector. Remaining 3.7% (83.4 kt CO<sub>2</sub>) of the total GHG emissions from agriculture originated from liming and urea fertilization. Over the year, the most intensive increase of emissions in the agriculture sector was observed for category: liming (3.G). This could be explained by the increase of lime consumption. In 2022, 173.7 kt of liming materials were used, and it is 6.0% more than in 2021. 89.7% of the total agriculture sector CH<sub>4</sub> emissions resulted from enteric fermentation and 10.3% - from manure management. The largest part (94.0%) of total N<sub>2</sub>O emissions resulted from direct-indirect emissions of managed soils, only 6.0% of the total N<sub>2</sub>O emissions related to manure management.

Information regarding results of key category analysis for the Agriculture sector is presented in Table 5.2.

**Table 5.2 Key categories in Agriculture sector in 2024 submission**

Category	Gas	Identification criteria	with LULUCF	without LULUCF
3.A.1 Enteric Fermentation - Cattle	CH <sub>4</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2	X	X
3.B.1.1 Manure Management - Cattle	CH <sub>4</sub>	L1,L2,T1,L2	X	X
3.B.2.1 Manure Management - Cattle	N <sub>2</sub> O	L1		X
3.B.5 Indirect N <sub>2</sub> O emissions from Manure Management	N <sub>2</sub> O	L1,L2,T2		X
3.D.1. Direct N <sub>2</sub> O emissions from managed soils	N <sub>2</sub> O	L1,L2,T1,T2	X	X
3.D.2 Indirect N <sub>2</sub> O Emissions from managed soils	N <sub>2</sub> O	L1,L2,T1,T2	X	X
3.G. Liming	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2	X	X

Interannual variation of emissions, which can be noticed from the time series, was mainly caused by fluctuation in activity data among the years due to changes in the number of animals, which had been significantly affected by economic situation in the country, as well as agricultural policy. CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from manure management were affected by the fluctuation in the number of animals and the proportion of manure managed in different manure management systems which vary depending on animal species. N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from managed soils generally were affected by the numbers describing managed organic soils area, amount of synthetic fertilizers consumption, and the number of grazing livestock, sown area and crop yields, which have large variation among the years.

Emissions from agriculture noticeably decreased in the beginning of 1990s after the Soviet system and large state or collective farms collapses. However, in the recent years it is possible to observe a slight increase of sown area, use of synthetic N-fertilizers, non-dairy, sheep, swine and poultry numbers. State effort to improve animal manure management systems (MMS) and expansion of anaerobic digestion in the largest farms is the main reason that reduces the



increase of emissions from manure management. In the last years, dairy farming in Latvia turns to liquid slurry management system according to closing of small farms and reflection to the trend to this management system in developed countries, however liquid slurry produces more CH<sub>4</sub> and results in increase of this type of emissions.

The number of cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, poultry, rabbits and fur-bearing animals population, as well as data on milk production and fat content in milk are obtained from the CSB Database<sup>121</sup> and statistical yearbooks<sup>122</sup> or no open access Database. Similarly to the number of livestock, also statistical information about amounts of synthetic fertilizer N application and crop production is obtained from the CSB Database. The information of deer breeding in Latvia is also available from informative reports prepared by MoA<sup>123</sup> and Latvian Organic Farmers and Wild Animal Breeders Association<sup>124</sup>. Calculation of the MMS distribution is done based on national research results and methodology provided by LBTU<sup>125</sup>.

Statistical information about livestock number in Latvia is included in Table 5.3. The number of fur-bearing animals is not available for 1990-1992 and 1995, therefore interpolation and extrapolation is used to fill in the gaps of time series.

**Table 5.3 Number of livestock, 1990–2022 (thousands of heads)**

Year	Dairy cattle	Non-dairy cattle	Sheep	Swine	Goats	Horses	Poultry	Rabbits	Fur-bearing animals	Deer
1990	535.1	904.2	164.6	1401.1	5.4	30.9	10321.1	193.9	260.2	NO
1995	291.9	245.2	72.2	552.8	8.9	27.2	4198.3	152.5	213.5	NO
2000	204.5	162.2	28.6	393.5	10.4	19.9	3104.6	110.9	97.2	NO
2005	185.2	200.0	41.6	427.9	14.9	13.9	4092.3	97.9	140.8	NO
2006	182.4	194.7	41.3	416.8	14.3	13.6	4488.1	92.9	181.9	3.3
2007	180.4	218.3	53.9	414.4	13.0	13.0	4756.8	96.4	176.1	4.0
2008	170.4	209.8	67.1	383.7	12.9	13.1	4620.5	57.4	197.5	5.3
2009	165.5	212.7	70.7	376.5	13.2	12.6	4828.9	43.9	164.4	7.8
2010	164.1	215.4	76.8	389.7	13.5	12.0	4948.7	33.5	166.1	7.6
2011	164.1	216.5	79.7	375.0	13.4	11.5	4417.9	39.3	183.7	9.6
2012	164.6	228.5	83.6	355.2	13.3	10.9	4910.9	37.3	231.6	9.3
2013	165.0	241.5	84.8	367.5	12.6	10.7	4985.8	38.9	231.6	11.5
2014	165.9	256.1	92.5	349.4	12.3	10.1	4413.9	38.3	313.9	13.2
2015	162.4	256.7	102.3	334.2	12.7	9.6	4532.0	39.8	272.2	12.6
2016	154.0	258.3	106.6	336.4	13.2	9.3	4711.7	34.9	243.3	13.4
2017	150.4	255.4	112.2	320.6	12.8	8.9	4943.8	29.1	298.4	15.3
2018	144.5	250.9	107.3	304.9	12.2	8.4	5403.1	25.8	154.1	15.4
2019	138.4	256.9	99.8	314.2	11.7	8.3	5690.4	26.2	140.3	16.0
2020	136.0	263.0	91.9	306.8	11.5	8.3	5837.9	24.3	138.1	17.0
2021	131.2	262.3	90.3	327.0	11.4	8.4	5857.7	21.3	124.6	17.0
2022	127.8	263.6	87.3	307.9	11.7	8.7	5744.3	46.5	59.5	16.2

<sup>121</sup>CSP data base Available: <https://stat.gov.lv/en/statistics-themes/business-sectors/agriculture>

<sup>122</sup> Agriculture of Latvia. Collection of Statistics. Riga (2023) <https://stat.gov.lv/en/statistics-themes/business-sectors/fishery-and-aquaculture/publications-and-infographics/15214?themeCode=Zl>

<sup>123</sup>Ministry of Agriculture. Available: <https://www.zm.gov.lv/lv/media/12006/download?attachment>

<sup>124</sup>Latvian Organic Farmers and Wild Animal Breeders Association. Available: <https://deerparks.lv/lv/par-mums/>

<sup>125</sup> Project "Development of the national system for greenhouse gas (GHG) inventory and reporting on policies, measures and projections". Available: <https://eeagrants.org/archive/2009-2014/projects/LV02-0002>

Year	Dairy cattle	Non-dairy cattle	Sheep	Swine	Goats	Horses	Poultry	Rabbits	Fur-bearing animals	Deer
2022 versus 2021	-2.6%	+0.5%	-3.3%	-5.8%	+2.6%	+3.6%	-1.9%	+118.3%	-52.2%	-4.7%
2022 versus 1990	-76.1%	-70.8%	-47.0%	-78.0%	+116.7%	-71.8%	-44.3%	-76.0%	-77.1%	NA

Latvian livestock industry has been influenced by historical events and economical situation. Particularly significant changes in the livestock industry began in 1992 after the restoration of Latvian independence when the most of big farms went into liquidation. Since the Soviet Union had a planned economy, most of the output of livestock products was carried out in other Soviet republics. Reorientation of livestock product export to Western markets was more difficult in terms of market saturation. Latvian farmers were forced to reduce production levels of milk, meat and crop. Consequently, livestock numbers declined most rapidly in 1990-1994 in all sectors, except for goat farming. All the above-mentioned social and economic changes lead to also eliminating of stud-farms. The horses were sold, only the strongest stud-farms continued to work. Starting from 2004, according to Latvia's accession to the EU, the number of livestock has stabilized. The increase of production indicators was characteristic for beef cattle, sheep, goat and poultry industries.

Dairy farming is one of the most important branches of agriculture in Latvia. However, at the end of 2022 the number of cattle decreased by 2.1 thousand or 0.5%. Number of dairy cows kept declining – from 131.2 thousand at the end of 2021 to 127.8 thousand at the end of 2022 or by 2.6%. In 2022, the total number of cattle accounted for 391.4 thousand. The average milk yield per dairy cow grew by 130 kg or 1.8%, reaching 7492 kg annually.

At the end of 2022, compared to the year before, the number of pigs and sheep fell by 19.1 thousand or 5.8 % and 3.0 thousand or 3.3 %, respectively. The number of goats and horses, grew slightly – by 2.5 % and 3.3 %, respectively. At the end of 2022 the number of laying hens dropped by 51.7 thousand or 1.5 %<sup>126</sup>.

Since 2009 the number of large farms has increased, while small farms have been closed, however dairy and other farms in Latvia are characterized by a low herd size in comparison with other European countries.

Statistical surveys are the source of data on crop production in commercial companies, private farms and individual merchants. Fluctuations in activity data is observed due to economic situation in the country. Since 2007 two sugar factories have stopped their activity therefore no data is presented further. Agricultural statistics data fulfil criteria determined by the EU and requirements are determined in the legislative acts. The Project Documentation System (ADS) is established at CSB. It is a quality metadata system for internal and external users. There are methodological descriptions of all statistical surveys and calculations. Annual samples are made up as stratified simple samples. Holdings are selected by economic size (standard output – SO) and type of farming. SO is a standard indicator characterizing the economic activity of agricultural holding, i.e., value acquired from one hectare of agricultural crops or one livestock

<sup>126</sup> Agriculture of Latvia. Collection of Statistics. Rīga (2023) <https://stat.gov.lv/en/statistics-themes/business-sectors/fishery-and-aquaculture/publications-and-infographics/15214?themeCode=ZI>

head (unit), estimated at prices of the corresponding region and expressed in EUR. A total standard output characterises the economic size of the holding in monetary terms. Farms with SO  $\geq$  50000 EUR are included for 100% statistical surveys; farms with 1500 EUR  $<$  SO  $<$  50000 EUR are selected by economic size and type of farming. Sample size for annual sample (Crop and Animal survey) includes 3.8 thousand holdings. Small holdings with SO  $<$  1500 EUR are not included in annual Crop and Animal surveys, but information for these holdings is estimated using experts' method. For this estimation CSB uses information from Agricultural Censuses and surveys of small farms, which are organized between Censuses.

At the end of 2022 in Latvia were 61.8 thousand agricultural holdings, which is 15.3% fewer than in 2020., and the average size of a holding constituted 44.7 ha, which is 13.5% more than in 2020. Agricultural area on average per holding has increased from 26.9 ha in 2020 to 31.1 ha in 2022 or by 15.6%. Compared to 2021, in 2022 the total utilized agricultural area in the country grew by only 0.3 thousand ha and found 1970.4 thousand ha. Over the year arable land has decreased by 5.5 thousand ha or 0.4% while areas of pastures and meadows increased by 4.8 thousand ha or 0.8%.

In 2022, 780.1 thousand ha of land were covered with cereals, which is 3.7 thousand ha or 0.5% more than a year before, and this is the largest area registered in the agriculture of Latvia. In 2022, 3.2 million t of grain were harvested, which is 249.1 thousand t or 8.3% more than in 2021. In 2022 cereals took 59.9% of the total sown area (59.0% in 2020). The share of winter wheat in the cereal area increased significantly – from 50.7% in 2020 to 57.5% in 2022. Harvested production of winter cereals reached 2.5 million tons in 2022, which is 168.8 thousand t or 7.3% more than a year ago. The share of winter cereals in the harvested production of grain has dropped from 77.6% in 2021 to 76.8% in 2022. Winter wheat took 69.0% of all harvested grain (70.1% in 2021). Due to the wider areas of winter cereals (up by 22.5 thousand ha or 5.3%), the harvested production reached 2.2 million t, which is 141.7 thousand t or 6.8% more than a year ago.

In 2022 sown area of rape reached 160.3 thousand ha, which is 13.4 thousand ha or 9.2% more than in 2021 and the widest area of rape recorded in the history of Latvia. Due to unfavorable weather conditions only 354.9 thousand t of rape seeds were harvested, which is 16.5% less than a year ago. In 2022, a total of 246.7 thousand t of potatoes were harvested, which is 2.3 thousand t or 0.9% less than a year ago. The average yield of potatoes from one hectare grew by 8.8%. Potato plantations have diminished more than twice over the past 12 years – from 30.1 thousand ha in 2010 to 14.9 thousand ha in 2022.

The year 2022, just like the year before, was unfavorable for open field vegetables. A total of 115.5 thousand t of vegetables were produced (including in greenhouses), which is 11.6 thousand t or 9.2% less than in 2021<sup>127</sup>.

---

<sup>127</sup> *Agriculture of Latvia. Collection of Statistics. Rīga (2023)* <https://stat.gov.lv/en/statistics-themes/business-sectors/fishery-and-aquaculture/publications-and-infographics/15214?themeCode=ZI>




Figure 5.2 Share of the main crops on sown area in Latvia in 2022 (%)

Statistical information about crop production in Latvia for calculation of N<sub>2</sub>O emissions is included in Table 5.4 and Table 5.5.

Table 5.4 Sown area of agricultural crops, 1990–2022 (thousands of ha)

Year	Wheat	Barley	Triticale	Oats	Rye	Buckwheat	Pulses
1990	141.5	306.9	1.1	82.4	130.7	0.1	10.5
1995	109.6	203.3	2.7	45.6	40.4	0.1	3.0
2000	158.1	134.9	5.9	45.5	54.8	6.2	2.1
2005	187.4	148.7	13.3	58.0	39.3	10.4	2.2
2006	215.1	154.2	11.3	62.9	42.8	14.0	1.4
2007	224.6	145.3	12.4	62.4	57.5	10.7	1.6
2008	256.6	131.2	13.8	66.2	59.0	10.4	1.6
2009	285.7	104.6	13.1	60.6	59.0	10.1	2.5
2010	307.6	106.5	12.1	63.3	34.6	8.2	2.7
2011	311.3	98.7	9.9	59.3	28.4	9.5	3.8
2012	354.7	87.9	13.3	62.0	37.0	11.7	4.6
2013	371.8	85.4	14.2	62.4	29.1	10.6	7.0
2014	402.5	119.9	10.7	66.8	32.3	10.2	11.9
2015	448.2	99.6	10.4	60.3	37.4	10.5	31.6
2016	482.9	96.1	11.1	64.6	36.3	17.9	41.8
2017	471.6	81.5	8.5	70.9	34.0	30.9	57.4
2018	419.9	120.2	4.5	90.5	22.0	27.9	53.7
2019	495.5	87.6	7.7	84.3	43.9	16.2	40.4
2020	498.8	84.7	7.1	98.9	41.6	15.7	43.7
2021	539.9	76.1	7.7	90.1	36.6	19.9	50.1
2022	539.0	77.2	8.1	83.4	35.3	29.0	48.7
2022 versus 2021	-0.2%	+1.4%	+5.2%	-7.4%	-3.6%	+45.7%	-2.8%
2022 versus 1990	+280.9%	-74.8%	+636.4%	+1.2%	-73.0%	+28900.0%	+363.8%

Data about sown area of oil flax (1990-1999) are not available; therefore data for filling gaps in the time series are extrapolated from the closest numbers. Other statistical data are included in relevant subchapters.

Table 5.5 Sown area of agricultural crops, 1990–2022 (thousands of ha)

Year	Sugar beet	Fodder roots	Potatoes	Maize for silage and forage	Crops for green feed and silage	Perennial grass	Flax	Rape
1990	14.7	37.0	80.3	44.8	73.9	664.0	12.2	1.9
1995	9.5	19.8	75.3	0.6	17.8	374.7	1.7	1.1
2000	12.7	9.0	51.3	1.2	11.4	347.2	1.9	6.9
2005	13.5	3.8	45.1	2.9	8.7	360.6	2.4	71.4
2006	12.7	2.8	45.1	3.5	11.4	425.8	1.7	83.2
2007	0.3	2.3	40.3	5.1	11.1	427.1	1.5	99.2
2008	NO	0.9	37.8	5.9	8.2	413.1	0.6	82.6
2009	NO	0.7	30	9.8	7.2	413.7	0.3	93.3
2010	NO	0.9	30.1	7.1	6.3	387.3	1.1	110.6
2011	NO	0.8	29.7	11.3	5.7	370.8	1.5	121.3
2012	NO	0.6	28.2	20.6	10.6	351.4	0.9	117.5
2013	NO	0.3	27.3	20.4	7.7	356.7	0.3	128.2
2014	NO	0.2	26.8	21.7	7.3	312.4	0.6	100.1
2015	NO	0.2	24.8	25.6	8.6	304.3	0.3	89.0
2016	NO	0.2	23.3	27.3	8.5	298.7	0.2	101.1
2017	NO	0.2	22.7	25.7	1.6	270.3	0.4	117.4
2018	NO	0.2	22.3	25.6	2.0	272.6	0.1	123.6
2019	NO	0.2	22.4	25.4	2.0	273.3	0.2	140.1
2020	NO	0.1	18.1	23.3	1.6	274.5	0.2	145.9
2021	NO	0.1	16.3	25.6	1.6	269.4	0.2	146.9
2022	NO	0.1	14.9	22.5	3.0	255.3	0.2	160.3
2022 versus 2021	-	0.0%	-8.6%	-12.1%	+87.5%	-5.2%	0.0%	+9.1%
2022 versus 1990	-	-99.7%	-81.4%	-49.8%	-95.9%	-61.6%	-98.4%	+8336.8%

Due to the significantly higher mineral fertilizer prices, the volume of mineral fertilizers used on agricultural crops decreased by 9.4% over the year, however the sown area remained unchanged. The volume of mineral fertilizers used per one hectare has reduced from 117 kg in 2021 to 106 kg in 2022 or by 9.4%. The volume of mineral fertilizers used per hectare decreased for all principal agricultural crops; the biggest decrease was recorded for open-field vegetables (of 28.6%) and potatoes (21.6%). Straight nitrogen fertilizers were used more commonly – their share in the total utilization of mineral fertilizers (in physical weight) has risen from 38.2% in 2021 to 44.5% in 2022. In 2022, compared to 2021, utilization of organic fertilizers decreased. The volume of organic fertilizers applied on average per one hectare of sown area dropped from 3.5 t in 2021 to 3.4 t in 2022<sup>128</sup>.

## 5.2 ENTERIC FERMENTATION (CRF 3.A)

### 5.2.1 Category description

CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from enteric fermentation of domestic livestock comprised 42.0% of total emissions in the Agriculture sector, being 946.6 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. in 2022. CH<sub>4</sub> is emitted as a by-product of the normal livestock digestive process, in which microbes resident in the animals' digestive system ferment the feed consumed by the animal. This fermentation process is also

<sup>128</sup> Agriculture of Latvia. Collection of Statistics. Rīga (2023) <https://stat.gov.lv/en/statistics-themes/business-sectors/fishery-and-aquaculture/publications-and-infographics/15214?themeCode=ZI>

known as enteric fermentation. Ruminant livestock (cattle, sheep and goats) are the primary source of CH<sub>4</sub> emissions. The amount of enteric CH<sub>4</sub> emitted is driven primarily by the number and size of domestic animals, the type of digestive system, and the type and amount of feed consumed<sup>129</sup>. Latvia reports emissions from cattle (including dairy cows, other mature non-dairy cattle and growing cattle according to CRF Option B), sheep, swine, goats, horses, rabbits, and fur-bearing animals (Table 5.6).

**Table 5.6 Reported emissions under the subcategory enteric fermentation**

CRF	Source	Emissions reported	Level
3.A.1	<i>Dairy cattle / Non-dairy cattle (other mature and growing cattle)</i>	<i>CH<sub>4</sub></i>	<i>Tier 2</i>
3.A.2	<i>Sheep</i>	<i>CH<sub>4</sub></i>	<i>Tier 1</i>
3.A.3	<i>Swine</i>	<i>CH<sub>4</sub></i>	<i>Tier 1</i>
3.A.4	<i>Other – Buffalo</i>	<i>NO</i>	<i>NA</i>
3.A.4	<i>Other – Camels</i>	<i>NO</i>	<i>NA</i>
3.A.4	<i>Other – Deer</i>	<i>CH<sub>4</sub></i>	<i>Tier 1</i>
3.A.4	<i>Other – Goats</i>	<i>CH<sub>4</sub></i>	<i>Tier 1</i>
3.A.4	<i>Other – Horses</i>	<i>CH<sub>4</sub></i>	<i>Tier 1</i>
3.A.4	<i>Other – Mules and asses</i>	<i>NO</i>	<i>NA</i>
3.A.4	<i>Other – Poultry</i>	<i>NE</i>	<i>Tier 1</i>
3.A.4	<i>Other – Rabbits</i>	<i>CH<sub>4</sub></i>	<i>Tier 1</i>
3.A.4	<i>Other – Fur-bearing animals</i>	<i>CH<sub>4</sub></i>	<i>Tier 1</i>

Emissions from poultry enteric fermentation have not been estimated. According to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, methodology for enteric fermentation calculation from poultry is not developed. CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from poultry are calculated only in the manure management category.

Cattle are the largest source of enteric fermentation CH<sub>4</sub> emissions (94.9% from total enteric fermentation CH<sub>4</sub> emissions) in Latvia. In 2022, dairy cattle produced 57.5% and non-dairy cattle – 37.3% of CH<sub>4</sub> emissions. Emissions from sheep formed 2.1%, from swine – 1.4% and from other livestock – 1.7% of the total emissions from enteric fermentation. In 2022, the total CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from enteric fermentation of domestic livestock decreased by 0.4 kt or 2.0%, compared to 2021. This is caused by the decrease of the number of cattle. Since 1990 generally due to the evident fall of the number of livestock, CH<sub>4</sub> emissions decreased by 64.7% (Table 5.7).

**Table 5.7 CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from enteric fermentation by livestock category 1990–2022 (kt)**

Year	Dairy cattle	Non-dairy cattle	Sheep	Swine	Goats	Horses	Rabbits	Fur-bearing animals	Deer	Total, CH <sub>4</sub>
1990	55.11	29.61	1.32	2.10	0.03	0.56	0.11	0.03	NO	88.86
1995	29.41	7.69	0.58	0.83	0.04	0.49	0.09	0.02	NO	39.16
2000	23.03	4.99	0.23	0.59	0.05	0.36	0.07	0.01	NO	29.33
2005	22.19	6.54	0.33	0.64	0.07	0.25	0.06	0.01	NO	30.11
2006	22.26	6.61	0.33	0.63	0.07	0.24	0.05	0.02	0.07	30.28

<sup>129</sup> Good Practice Guidance and Uncertainty Management in National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, 2000. Available: <https://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/gp/english/>

Year	Dairy cattle	Non-dairy cattle	Sheep	Swine	Goats	Horses	Rabbits	Fur-bearing animals	Deer	Total, CH <sub>4</sub>
2007	22.42	7.71	0.43	0.62	0.07	0.23	0.06	0.02	0.08	31.64
2008	21.57	7.52	0.54	0.58	0.06	0.24	0.03	0.02	0.11	30.66
2009	21.13	7.81	0.57	0.56	0.07	0.23	0.03	0.02	0.16	30.56
2010	20.70	8.15	0.61	0.58	0.07	0.22	0.02	0.02	0.15	30.52
2011	20.80	8.39	0.64	0.56	0.07	0.21	0.02	0.02	0.19	30.90
2012	21.17	9.04	0.67	0.53	0.07	0.20	0.02	0.02	0.19	31.91
2013	21.65	9.87	0.68	0.55	0.06	0.19	0.02	0.02	0.23	33.28
2014	22.06	10.58	0.74	0.52	0.06	0.18	0.02	0.03	0.26	34.46
2015	21.51	10.96	0.82	0.50	0.06	0.17	0.02	0.03	0.25	34.33
2016	21.23	11.34	0.85	0.50	0.07	0.17	0.02	0.02	0.27	34.47
2017	21.29	11.50	0.90	0.48	0.06	0.16	0.02	0.03	0.31	34.75
2018	20.62	11.51	0.86	0.46	0.06	0.15	0.02	0.02	0.31	34.00
2019	20.22	11.95	0.80	0.47	0.06	0.15	0.02	0.01	0.32	34.00
2020	20.17	12.30	0.74	0.46	0.06	0.15	0.01	0.01	0.34	34.24
2021	19.84	12.47	0.72	0.49	0.06	0.15	0.01	0.01	0.34	34.09
2022	19.45	12.62	0.70	0.46	0.06	0.16	0.03	0.01	0.32	33.81
Share of total % in 2022	57.5%	37.3%	2.1%	1.4%	0.2%	0.5%	0.1%	0.0%	1.0%	100.0%
2022 versus 2021	-2.0%	+1.3%	-3.3%	-5.8%	+2.6%	+3.6%	+118.3%	-52.2%	-4.7%	-0.8%
2022 versus 1990	-64.7%	-57.4%	-47.0%	-78.0%	+116.7%	-71.8%	-76.0%	-77.1%	NA	-62.0%

## 5.2.2 Methodological issues

### 5.2.2.1 Methods

The Tier 1 approach of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines relies on default emissions factors. For Tier 1 methodology Latvia collecting data on the numbers of animals for specific livestock category. The Tier 2 approach is more complex based on country-specific information about animal and feed characteristics. The Tier 2 approach for Latvia is implemented to estimate CH<sub>4</sub> emissions for cattle. Emissions from enteric fermentation of domestic livestock in Latvia have been calculated by using the IPCC Tier 1 and Tier 2 methodologies presented in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (Volume 4, Chapter 10.3).

CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from enteric fermentation for sheep, swine, goats, horses, rabbits, fur-bearing animals and deer (reindeer do not appear in Latvia according to data of Organic Farmers and Wildlife Animal Breeders Association as well as Agricultural Data Centre) have been calculated by using the Equation 10.19 (2006 IPCC Guidelines, page 10.28) according to the IPCC Tier 1 methodology by multiplying the number of the animals in each category with the IPCC default EF or other origin EF of the respective livestock category:

$$Emissions = EF_{(T)} * \left(\frac{N_{(T)}}{10^6}\right) \quad (5.1)$$

where:

*Emissions* - methane emissions from Enteric Fermentation, kt CH<sub>4</sub> yr<sup>-1</sup>

*EF<sub>(T)</sub>* - emission factor for the defined livestock population, kg CH<sub>4</sub> head<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>

*N<sub>(T)</sub>* - the number of head of livestock species / category T in the country

*T* - species/category of livestock

The default EFs as for developed countries (2006 IPCC Guidelines, Table 10.10, page 10.28) were used to calculate CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from enteric fermentation for sheep, swine, goats, horses and deer. As default the 2006 IPCC Guidelines and national EFs for rabbits and fur-bearing animals are not available, other origin EFs as Norwegian<sup>130</sup> for fur-bearing animals and Russian<sup>131</sup> for rabbits were used for enteric fermentation emissions calculations similarly by experience of the neighboring countries (Table 5.8).

**Table 5.8 Default CH<sub>4</sub> emission factors from enteric fermentation**

Livestock category	EF (kg CH <sub>4</sub> head <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> )
Sheep	8.00
Swine	1.50
Goats	5.00
Horses	18.00
Rabbits	0.59
Fur-bearing animals	0.10
Deer	20.0

The Tier 2 approach to estimate emissions is implemented for cattle, because emissions from cattle make up the biggest part of total agricultural sector CH<sub>4</sub> emissions. With the Tier 2 methodology CH<sub>4</sub> emissions have been calculated as in the Tier 1 methodology mentioned above, but EFs for dairy cattle and young and mature non-dairy cattle have been calculated according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines methodology represented in Equation 10.21, page 10.31:

$$EF = \left[ \frac{GE * \left( \frac{Y_m}{100} \right) * 365}{55.65} \right] \quad (5.2)$$

where:

*EF* - emission factor, kg CH<sub>4</sub> head<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>

*GE* - gross energy intake, MJ head<sup>-1</sup> day<sup>-1</sup>

*Y<sub>m</sub>* - methane conversion factor, % of gross energy in feed converted to methane (default values in table 10.12, page 10.30 from 2006 IPCC Guidelines)

The factor 55.65 (MJ/kg CH<sub>4</sub>) is the energy content of methane

For cattle, the gross energy intake (GE) has been calculated according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines Equation 10.16, page 10.21:

<sup>130</sup> Greenhouse Gas Emissions 1990-2021, National Inventory Report. The Norwegian Environment Agency, 2023, p. 5-22, Table 5.11. Available: <https://unfccc.int/documents/627398>

<sup>131</sup> Национальный доклад о кадастре антропогенных выбросов из источников и абсорбции поглотителями парниковых газов не регулируемых Монреальским протоколом за 1990 – 2021 гг. Часть 1. Москва, 2023., с. 186, Таблица 5.7. Available: <https://unfccc.int/documents/631719>



$$GE = \left[ \frac{(NE_m + NE_a + NE_l + NE_{work} + NE_p) + \left(\frac{NE_g}{REG}\right)}{\frac{REM}{\frac{DE\%}{100}}} \right] \quad (5.3)$$

where:

$GE$  - gross energy, MJ day<sup>-1</sup>

$NE_m$  - net energy required by the animal for maintenance, MJ day<sup>-1</sup>

$NE_a$  - net energy for animal activity, MJ day<sup>-1</sup>

$NE_l$  - net energy for lactation, MJ day<sup>-1</sup>

$NE_{work}$  - net energy for work, MJ day<sup>-1</sup>

$NE_p$  - net energy required for pregnancy, MJ day<sup>-1</sup>

$REM$  - ratio of net energy available in a diet for maintenance to digestible energy consumed

$NE_g$  - net energy needed for growth, MJ day<sup>-1</sup>

$REG$  - ratio of net energy available for growth in a diet to digestible energy consumed

$DE\%$  - digestible energy expressed as a percentage of gross energy

The equations for calculating  $NE_m$  (Equation 10.3, page 10.15),  $NE_a$  (Equation 10.4, page 10.16),  $NE_l$  (Equation 10.8, page 10.18),  $NE_p$  (Equation 10.13, page 10.20),  $NE_g$  (Equation 10.6, page 10.17),  $REM$  (Equation 10.14, page 10.20) and  $REG$  (Equation 10.15, page 10.20) are:

$$NE_m = Cf_i * (Weight)^{0.75}$$

$$NE_a = C_a * NE_m$$

$$NE_l = Milk * (1.47 + 0.40 * Fat)$$

$$NE_p = C_{pregnancy} * NE_m$$

$$NE_g = 22.02 * \frac{BW^{0.75}}{C * MW} * WG^{1.097}$$

$$REM = \left[ 1.123 - (4.092 * 10^{-3} * DE\%) + [1.126 * 10^{-5} * (DE\%)^2] - \left(\frac{25.4}{DE\%}\right) \right]$$

$$REG = \left[ 1.164 - (5.160 * 10^{-3} * DE\%) + [1.308 * 10^{-5} * (DE\%)^2] - \left(\frac{37.4}{DE\%}\right) \right] \quad (5.4)$$

where:

$Cf_i$  - maintenance coefficient (default values from 2006 IPCC Guidelines. Volume 4, Chapter 10, Table 10.4, page 10.16 are used)

$Weight$  - animal weight, kg

$C_a$  - coefficient corresponding to animals feeding situation (default values from 2006 IPCC Guidelines. Volume 4, Chapter 10, Table 10.5, page 10.17 are used)

$Milk$  - amount of milk produced, kg of milk day<sup>-1</sup>

$Fat$  - fat content of milk, % by weight

$C_{pregnancy}$  - pregnancy coefficient (default values from 2006 IPCC Guidelines. Volume 4, Chapter 10, Table 10.7, page 10.20 are used)

$BW$  - the average live body weight (BW) of the animals in the population, kg

$MW$  - the mature live body weight of an adult female in moderate body condition, kg

$WG$  - the average daily weight gain of the animals in the population, kg day<sup>-1</sup>

$C$  - a coefficient with a value of 0.8 for females, 1.0 for castrates and 1.2 for bulls

$REM$  - ratio of net energy available in a diet for maintenance to digestible energy consumed

$REG$  - ratio of net energy available for growth in a diet to digestible energy consumed

$DE\%$  - digestible energy, %

When using  $NE_p$  to calculate  $GE$ , the  $NE_p$  estimate must be weighted by the portion of the mature females that actually go through gestation in a year. According to of animal breeding

association's recommendation, calculations are based on Agricultural Data Centre Republic of Latvia Register data, thereby 83% of the NEp value for dairy cattle is used in the GE equation.

CH<sub>4</sub> conversion factor (Y<sub>m</sub>) of zero is assumed for juveniles consuming only milk (2006 IPCC Guidelines, p.10.30). In Latvia, it was supposed that calves feed milk and milk substitute no longer than of age 3 months. Therefore it was assumed (according to interviews with agricultural and academic experts in the field of animal feeding) that CH<sub>4</sub> conversion rate of young growing cattle group (under 1 year old) is 5.5% in 2022. The rate was estimated from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines default Y<sub>m</sub> 6.5%, based on an assumption that for calves between 0 and 3 months Y<sub>m</sub> is 0%.

Feed digestibility (DE) 65% for dairy cattle is used in calculations according to the average value represented in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines Table 10.2 (page 10.14) for 1990-2009, because detailed information on feed digestibility are not available in the country for this period. DE 66% is used for 2010-2014 and 67% for 2015-2022 based on national studies. For non-dairy cattle DE 65% is used according to 2006 IPCC Guidelines. Assumptions of DE are done based on national research results described below.

Forage quality, level of concentrates in the diet and feed digestibility directly affect enteric CH<sub>4</sub> production in the rumen, therefore the chemical content of typical forage used for cattle feeding was analysed from all regions of Latvia at the LBTU Scientific Laboratory of Agronomic Analysis. Research activities were done according to the tasks of the pre-defined project "Development of the National System for Greenhouse Gas Inventory and Reporting on Policies, Measures and Projections" under 2009 – 2014 EEA Grants Programme National Climate Policy<sup>132</sup> and financial support for the project "Agricultural sector GHG emissions calculation methods and data analysis with the modelling tool development, integrating climate change".

The cattle feed samples were collected from January until December in 2015. The chemical analysis of animal feed was made according to generally accepted methods of feed analysis: dry matter (DM) %, crude protein (CP) %, insoluble protein, %, soluble protein, %, undegraded intake protein (UIP) %, crude fiber (CF) %, acid detergent fiber (ADF) %, neutral detergent fiber (NDF) %, ash %, Ca and P %, according ISO 5983, ISO 6490/2 and ISO 6491 standards. Digestibility was determined using the cellulase method. Special attention was given to ADF and NDF values, because they could be used also for calculation of feed digestibility. The ADF value refers to the cell wall portions of the forage that are made up of cellulose and lignin and relate to the ability of an animal to digest the forage. As ADF increases, the ability to digest the forage decreases. The NDF value is the total cell wall which is comprised of the ADF fraction plus hemicellulose. NDF values reflect the amount of forage the animal can consume.

The research results showed that NDF content and digestibility vary significantly for analysed forage samples. Depending on the growth stage of green biomass in the harvesting period, the content of NDF in hay was found within 51-71%, 24-48% in silage, 38-62% in haylage and 30-45 % in total mixed ration (TMR) of DM. The average determined digestibility of forage for natural meadow hay was 52.3±4.3% and 53.8±5.2% for cereal grass hay; for grass silage with preservative 65.2±6.1%, without preservative 62.8±4.9%; and for corn silage, respectively

---

<sup>132</sup> Project "Development of the national system for greenhouse gas (GHG) inventory and reporting on policies, measures and projections". Available: [https://ppdb.mk.gov.lv/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/petijums\\_VARAM\\_2017\\_Lauksaimn\\_SEG\\_emisij\\_aprek\\_metodolog\\_un\\_datu\\_analiz\\_ar\\_model\\_riku\\_izstrad\\_integrej\\_klim\\_mainas.pdf](https://ppdb.mk.gov.lv/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/petijums_VARAM_2017_Lauksaimn_SEG_emisij_aprek_metodolog_un_datu_analiz_ar_model_riku_izstrad_integrej_klim_mainas.pdf)

71.1±0.6%, 68.2±3.1%; for haylage 62.6±4.1%, for TMR 71.7±5.7%. Detailed description of the research results is available in the scientific literature<sup>133</sup>. All forage quality analysis results are summarized and included in the catalogue of forage digestibility and chemical analysis results<sup>134</sup>.

The interviews with agricultural and academic experts in the field of animal feeding as additional study were conducted with the main aim to identify the country typical feed rations for dairy cows and other cattle. According to the survey results, the feed ration of dairy cows consists in average of 71% (58.1-84.4%) of grass forage and 29% (15.6-41.9%) of concentrates based on dry matter intake. Other cattle feed ration includes grass forage and concentrates in following proportions: for 1-2 years old cattle – 92% and 8%, for beef cattle over 2 years old – 91% and 9%, and other cattle over 2 years old – 83% and 17% of the dry matter intake, respectively. Based on detailed calculations of the cattle feed quality parameters and feeding rations in 2015, it was concluded to use in the inventory DE 67% for dairy cows for the same and latter years. Based on historical records of feed quality analysis and feeding rations, it was set to use DE 66% for the time period 2010-2014, taking in to account that since 2010 the number of farms with higher proportion of concentrates in the dairy cow diet showed tendency to increase. Overall analysis of other cattle feeding lead to conclusion that digestibility of feed for other cattle fluctuates around DE 65% in the case of typical conditions for Latvia.

### 5.2.2.2 Activity data

The calculation of GE for dairy cattle is strongly based on the milk production and fat content in milk. Trends about milk production and fat content in milk are presented in Table 5.9. Values of milk fat content for 1990-1997 are derived by extrapolation based on an assumption that fat content in milk was around 3.5% in 1990; all other information is adopted from CSB of Latvia<sup>135</sup>.

**Table 5.9 Average milk yield per cow and fat content, 1990-2022**

Year	Average milk yield, kg year <sup>-1</sup>	Fat content, %
1990	3437	3.50
1995	3074	3.92
2000	3898	4.08
2005	4364	4.25
2006	4492	4.26
2007	4636	4.31
2008	4822	4.29
2009	4892	4.31
2010	4998	4.29
2011	5064	4.22
2012	5250	4.16

<sup>133</sup>Degola L., Trupa A., Aplocina E. (2016) Forage quality and digestibility for calculation of enteric methane emission from cattle /15th International scientific conference "Engineering for Rural Development" : proceedings, Jelgava, Latvia, May 25 - 27, 2016 Latvia University of Agriculture. Faculty of Engineering. - Jelgava, 2016. - Vol.15, p. 456-461. Available: <http://tf.llu.lv/conference/proceedings2016/Papers/N084.pdf>

<sup>134</sup> Degola L., Trūpa A., Aplociņa E. Lopbarības ķīmiskās analīzes un sagremojamība, 2016. 52. lpp. Available: <http://www.vbf.llu.lv/sites/vbf/files/files/lapas/Lopbar%C4%ABbas%20%C4%B7%C4%ABmisk%C4%81s....pdf> or <https://vdocuments.mx/lopbarbas-misks-analzes-un-sagremojamba-bas-miskspdf-vidjie.html?page=1>

<sup>135</sup> Agriculture of Latvia. Collection of Statistics. Rīga (2023) <https://stat.gov.lv/en/statistics-themes/business-sectors/fishery-and-aquaculture/publications-and-infographics/15214?themeCode=ZI>

Year	Average milk yield, kg year <sup>-1</sup>	Fat content, %
2013	5508	4.08
2014	5812	3.86
2015	5905	3.99
2016	6182	4.15
2017	6525	4.10
2018	6614	4.10
2019	6891	4.10
2020	7163	4.01
2021	7362	4.04
2022	7492	3.99
2022 versus 2021	+1.8%	-1.2%
2022 versus 1990	+118.0%	+14.0%

Average milk yield per dairy cow rose by 130 kg or 1.8%, reaching 7492 kg annually.

In Latvian GHG inventory livestock category Cattle (CRF 3.A.1) is reported in three sub-categories: mature dairy cattle, other mature cattle and growing cattle. Calculations of CH<sub>4</sub> emission from enteric fermentation for dairy cattle are not divided into smaller sub-groups. Estimation of CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from non-dairy cattle is split in seven age and production type sub-groups according to the records in the database of CSB of Latvia. Growing cattle group is represented by young cattle under 1 year and young cattle aged from 1 to 2 years. These two growing cattle groups are segregated for dairy and beef cattle. Other mature cattle group include bulls, heifers and other cows aged over 2 years old. The numbers of non-dairy cattle by sub-categories are presented in Table 5.10. Activity data and calculations of emissions for non-dairy are divided in mentioned sub-categories of cattle because:

- the inventory is strongly linked to data base of CSB and therefore provide consistency with EUROSTAT and other official statistical data;
- it promotes easier reporting of cattle weights and feeding situation;
- it facilitates proper estimation of MMS, that significantly differs by defined cattle types in the herd.

**Table 5.10 The number of non-dairy cattle by sub-categories in Latvia, 1990-2022 (thousand of heads)**

Year	Growing cattle		Other mature cattle		
	Young cattle under 1 year	Young cattle aged from 1 to 2 years	Mature non-dairy cattle over 2 years		
	total	total	bulls	heifers	other cows
1990	525.2	302.6	12.0	54.3	10.1
1995	134.8	82.0	3.2	14.7	2.8
2000	97.9	51.6	0.8	9.8	2.1
2005	118.9	59.6	1.6	11.9	8.0
2006	107.5	62.9	1.8	13.1	9.5
2007	114.9	72.5	1.2	14.6	15.2
2008	108.4	66.2	2.6	19.9	12.7
2009	107.4	66.8	3.0	19.9	15.5
2010	105.6	67.6	3.2	20.3	18.7
2011	103.9	66.7	3.1	20.9	22.0
2012	108.4	70.0	3.5	21.0	25.6

Year	Growing cattle		Other mature cattle		
	Young cattle under 1 year	Young cattle aged from 1 to 2 years	Mature non-dairy cattle over 2 years		
	total	total	bulls	heifers	other cows
2013	109.3	75.3	4.3	23.4	29.2
2014	118.4	74.9	4.4	24.3	34.2
2015	113.6	76.2	4.4	23.6	38.9
2016	113.0	72.5	4.3	23.8	44.7
2017	108.2	69.7	3.9	25.0	48.6
2018	105.9	64.9	4.0	24.5	51.6
2019	108.2	64.7	4.1	23.6	56.4
2020	111.5	65.4	4.2	21.8	60.0
2021	106.7	67.9	4.5	21.7	61.4
2022	107.2	65.7	4.9	22.9	62.9
2022 versus 2021	+0.5%	-3.2%	+8.91%	+5.5%	+2.4%
2022 versus 1990	-79.6%	-78.3%	-59.2%	-57.8%	+522.8%

Missing data or no available data for 1990-1995 are created by linear extrapolation. The total numbers of young cattle under 1 year and aged 1 to 2 years are provided by CSB. Data of young dairy and beef cattle are calculated by LBTU experts based on CSB totals of mentioned young cattle groups. All numbers of other mature cattle over 2 years are original data obtained from CSB data base.

Results of gross energy intake (GE) calculation for dairy and non-dairy cattle from enteric fermentation are summarized in Table 5.11. Two breeds prevailing in the herds of dairy cows – Latvian Brown (Red breed group) and Black and White Holstein. Based on animal breeding programmes data, the documented weight for Latvian Brown breed is 530-580 kg<sup>136</sup>, for Black and White Holstein breed – 600-900<sup>137</sup> kg. For the period 1990-1999, mostly Latvian Brown breed were observed in the herds, later the number of Black and White Holstein breed showed tendency to increase, therefore the average weight for dairy cows is updated every 5 years, since 2000. The average weight for other cattle is calculated based on data from Agricultural Data Center<sup>138</sup>, which operates the national recording scheme, provided information about most important meat cattle breed's standard weights. For GE calculation weight is important parameter, that is only one parameter that changes in average for other mature non-dairy cattle to relation of livestock number in mentioned groups. It is possible to observe evidence that from 2004 to 2005 and the from 2007 to 2008 numbers of bulls, heifers and other cows changes significantly that gives also significant fluctuation to EF of whole group of other mature cattle. Livestock numbers are sensitive to economic situation in the country, as well as agricultural policy in Latvia.

**Table 5.11 Average gross energy (GE) intake (MJ day<sup>-1</sup>) and CH<sub>4</sub> emission factors (EF) from enteric fermentation (kg CH<sub>4</sub> head<sup>-1</sup> year<sup>-1</sup>) and cattle weight (kg head<sup>-1</sup> year<sup>-1</sup>) 1990-2022**

Year	Dairy cows			Growing cattle			Other mature cattle		
	Weight	GE	EF	Weight	GE	EF	Weight	GE	EF
1990	550	241.6	103.0	272	80.4	29.8	581	152.9	65.2
1995	550	236.3	100.8	272	78.6	29.3	580	152.9	65.2
2000	555	264.2	112.6	262	76.0	28.1	542	147.6	62.9

<sup>136</sup> Gaļas šķirņu liellopu audzēšanas programma. Available: <https://www.ldc.gov.lv/lv/media/98/download>

<sup>137</sup> Holšteinas šķirnes govju audzēšanas programma. Available: <http://www.holstein.lv/uploads/images/ProgrammaLHA.pdf>

<sup>138</sup> Agricultural data centre. Available at <https://www.ldc.gov.lv/en>

Year	Dairy cows			Growing cattle			Other mature cattle		
	Weight	GE	EF	Weight	GE	EF	Weight	GE	EF
2005	555	281.1	119.8	261	76.1	28.0	563	167.3	71.3
2006	560	286.2	122.0	268	76.4	28.5	564	168.8	72.0
2007	560	291.5	124.3	271	77.1	28.8	557	174.8	74.5
2008	560	296.9	126.6	269	76.5	28.5	561	165.2	70.4
2009	560	299.4	127.7	271	77.1	28.8	567	170.5	72.7
2010	560	295.8	126.1	272	77.5	29.0	570	173.8	74.1
2011	565	297.4	126.8	272	77.2	28.9	569	176.2	75.1
2012	565	301.7	128.6	274	77.9	29.2	572	179.4	76.5
2013	565	307.8	131.2	278	79.1	29.8	575	180.1	76.8
2014	565	311.8	132.9	274	78.7	29.4	575	182.4	77.8
2015	565	310.7	132.5	278	79.6	29.9	576	185.4	79.0
2016	570	323.3	137.8	276	79.5	29.7	576	187.8	80.1
2017	570	332.1	141.6	276	79.4	29.7	576	188.2	80.2
2018	570	334.7	142.7	273	79.0	29.5	574	189.7	80.9
2019	570	342.8	146.1	272	78.7	29.3	576	192.0	81.8
2020	570	348.0	148.3	271	78.5	29.2	578	194.4	82.9
2021	570	354.7	151.2	275	79.3	29.7	579	194.4	83.1
2022	570	357.0	152.2	274	79.1	29.5	580	194.5	82.9

EFs calculation parameters for non-dairy cattle sub-groups from enteric fermentation (1990-2022) are summarized in Table 5.12. The average daily weight gain for young cattle is set 0.7 and 0.85, kg day<sup>-1</sup> for dairy and beef young cattle respectively. It is assumed that young cattle aged from 1 to 2 years have average daily weight gain for young 0.6 kg day<sup>-1</sup>. Mature non-dairy cattle over 2 years have average daily weight gain 0.2 kg day<sup>-1</sup>, except bulls (0.05 kg day<sup>-1</sup>). Digestibility for all sub-groups is assumed to be 65%.

**Table 5.12 Gross energy (GE) intake (MJ day<sup>-1</sup>), weight and CH<sub>4</sub> emission factors (EF) from enteric fermentation for non-dairy cattle sub-groups (kg CH<sub>4</sub> head-1 year<sup>-1</sup>) in 2022**

Non-dairy cattle sub-groups		Weight	GE	EF
Young cattle under 1 year	<i>dairy cattle calves</i>	180	58.0	18.6
	<i>beef cattle calves</i>	200	74.8	23.9
Young cattle aged from 1 to 2 years	<i>dairy cattle</i>	400	95.7	40.8
	<i>beef cattle</i>	450	123.2	52.5
Mature non-dairy cattle over 2 years	<i>bulls</i>	950	215.3	91.8
	<i>heifers</i>	500	127.1	54.2
	<i>other cows</i>	580	217.4	92.7
IPCC default				57.0

### 5.2.3 Uncertainties and time-series consistency

Uncertainty analysis for 2024 submission is carried out by using Approach 1. Quantitative estimates of uncertainties are provided in Annex 2. Overall description of uncertainty analysis is included in Section 1.6.

The uncertainty associated with livestock population varies widely depending on the source, but according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines is set as 20%. According to received information

from CSB of Latvia, the uncertainty of activity data provided by the institution must be set as 2%.

The 2006 IPCC Guidelines suggest that EFs estimated using the Tier 1 method are to be known more accurately than 30% and may be uncertain to 50%. Tier 2 method is likely to be in the order of 20% (2006 IPCC Guidelines: Volume 4, Chapter 10, page 10.33). According to the assumptions above, Tier 1 method EFs are set to be uncertain of 50%, but uncertainty of EFs estimated by the Tier 2 is set as 20%. Inter-annual changes of CH<sub>4</sub> EF values for cattle are primarily a result of changes in the activity data that occur in response to agricultural policy, the economic situation and market demands.

#### 5.2.4 Category-specific QA/QC and verification

The quality objectives and the QA/QC plan for the Latvia's GHG inventory at the National Inventory level are presented in Section 1.2.3. The QC procedures are performed according to the QA/QC plan in the agriculture sector in order to achieve these quality objectives. Issues related to QA/QC and verification are discussed at the sectoral meetings. All information on activity data and emission calculations are stored and archived in the common FTP folder.

**Activity data check.** Livestock data were checked by an inventory compiler and CSB specialist. Livestock age sub-groups data that were collected by extrapolating methods are compared with statistical data of CSB to achieve correct total numbers. Data collection methods are documented in agriculture sector inventory compilers data base for GHG inventory purposes.

**Review of emission factors.** Country-specific EFs derived with Tier 2 method are cross-checked against the IPCC 2006 Guidelines defaults. Results of comparison of EFs for CH<sub>4</sub> emission from enteric fermentation of dairy cows and non-dairy cattle are shown below (Table 5.13).

**Table 5.13 Review of emission factors for enteric fermentation CH<sub>4</sub> emissions**

Category	Source	EF (kg CH <sub>4</sub> head <sup>-1</sup> year <sup>-1</sup> )
Dairy cows	<i>Latvia, Tier 2, 2023</i>	152.2
	<i>2006 IPCC Guidelines (Western Europe, Table 10.11, page 10.29)</i>	117.0
Non-dairy cattle	<i>Latvia, Tier 2, 2023 (in average)</i>	47.8
	<i>2006 IPCC Guidelines (Western Europe, Table 10.11, page 10.29)</i>	57.0

Latvia uses higher EF for dairy cows based on a different feeding situation that is not totally characterized as stall fed (set for Tier 1). Also digestibility used for calculations of emission coefficient is lower (65%-67% against 70% for Tier 1). Detailed information on feeding situation is included in chapter 5.2.2.1. In average enteric fermentation CH<sub>4</sub> EF for non-dairy cattle is slightly lower than the 2006 IPCC Guidelines default. Emissions from non-dairy cattle are calculated from three groups (Table 5.12). Growing cattle are included in two sub-groups of animals: (1) cattle under 1 year; and (2) cattle aged 1–2 years old. In 2022, 65.6% of the non-cattle population was included in these two sub-groups, and 63% of them was under 1 year old with a reported value of 0% for methane conversion rate (Y<sub>m</sub>) recommended for between 0 and 3 months old cattle. Another reason for the lower EF is that Latvia uses lower calf weights (180–200 kg), which are country specific.

### 5.2.5 Category-specific recalculations

No recalculations were done for this sector.

### 5.2.6 Category-specific planned improvements

Evaluation of excreted nitrogen and GE values for swine, according to the latest study results of feeding situation data is planned for the next submission.

## 5.3 MANURE MANAGEMENT (CRF 3.B)

### 5.3.1 Category description

GHG emissions from manure management constituted 175.3 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. (7.8% from the total emissions originated from agriculture). N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from manure management were 2.9% and CH<sub>4</sub> emissions 4.8% of total emissions in the agriculture sector in 2022. Both emission sources cover management of manure from domestic livestock. Latvia reports CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from cattle (including groups represented in the chapter 1.2), sheep, swine (including mature swine as breeding sows and boars, piglets under 50 kg of weight, young breeding sows and fattening pigs), horses, goats and poultry (including layers, broilers, turkeys, ducks, geese and other poultry), as well as rabbits, fur-bearing animals and deer (Table 5.14).

Table 5.14 Reported emissions under the subcategory manure management

CRF	Source	Emissions reported	Level
3.B 1	Dairy cattle / Non-dairy cattle (other mature and growing cattle)	CH <sub>4</sub> , N <sub>2</sub> O	Tier 2, Tier 2
3.B 2	Sheep	CH <sub>4</sub> , N <sub>2</sub> O	Tier 1, Tier 2
3.B 3	Swine	CH <sub>4</sub> , N <sub>2</sub> O	Tier 2, Tier 2
3.B 4	Other – Buffalo	NO	NA
3.B 4	Other – Camels	NO	NA
3.B 4	Other – Deer	CH <sub>4</sub> , N <sub>2</sub> O	Tier 1, Tier 2
3.B 4	Other – Goats	CH <sub>4</sub> , N <sub>2</sub> O	Tier 1, Tier 2
3.B 4	Other – Horses	CH <sub>4</sub> , N <sub>2</sub> O	Tier 1, Tier 2
3.B 4	Other – Mules and asses	NO	NA
3.B 4	Other – Poultry	CH <sub>4</sub> , N <sub>2</sub> O	Tier 1, Tier 2
3.B 4	Other – Rabbits	CH <sub>4</sub> , N <sub>2</sub> O	Tier 1, Tier 1
3.B 4	Other – Fur-bearing animals	CH <sub>4</sub> , N <sub>2</sub> O	Tier 1, Tier 1

CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from manure management have decreased by 48.8% over the time period of 1990-2022 (Table 5.15). In 2022, CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from manure management of domestic livestock increased by 3.7 kt or 3.5% compared to 2021 due to increase of of slurry manure share.

Table 5.15 CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from manure management by livestock category 1990-2022 (kt)

Year	Dairy cattle	Non-dairy cattle	Sheep	Swine	Goats	Horses	Poultry	Rabbits	Fur-bearing animals	Deer	Total CH <sub>4</sub>
1990	3.42	1.02	0.03	2.62	0.001	0.05	0.26	0.0155	0.18	NO	7.59
1995	2.00	0.28	0.01	1.23	0.001	0.04	0.10	0.0122	0.15	NO	3.83
2000	1.82	0.19	0.01	0.93	0.001	0.03	0.08	0.0089	0.07	NO	3.14
2005	2.11	0.23	0.01	1.21	0.002	0.02	0.10	0.0078	0.10	NO	3.80
2006	2.18	0.24	0.01	1.22	0.002	0.02	0.11	0.0074	0.12	0.0007	3.92



Year	Dairy cattle	Non-dairy cattle	Sheep	Swine	Goats	Horses	Poultry	Rabbits	Fur-bearing animals	Deer	Total CH <sub>4</sub>
2007	2.31	0.27	0.01	1.27	0.002	0.02	0.12	0.0077	0.12	0.0009	4.13
2008	2.34	0.26	0.01	1.20	0.002	0.02	0.11	0.0046	0.13	0.0012	4.09
2009	2.39	0.27	0.01	1.18	0.002	0.02	0.12	0.0035	0.11	0.0017	4.10
2010	2.20	0.28	0.01	1.15	0.002	0.02	0.12	0.0027	0.11	0.0017	3.90
2011	2.27	0.28	0.02	1.09	0.002	0.02	0.10	0.0031	0.12	0.0021	3.91
2012	2.18	0.30	0.02	0.91	0.002	0.02	0.10	0.0030	0.16	0.0021	3.68
2013	2.17	0.32	0.02	0.88	0.002	0.02	0.10	0.0031	0.16	0.0025	3.67
2014	2.37	0.34	0.02	0.83	0.002	0.02	0.08	0.0031	0.21	0.0029	3.86
2015	2.50	0.35	0.02	0.88	0.002	0.01	0.09	0.0032	0.19	0.0028	4.05
2016	2.54	0.35	0.02	0.87	0.002	0.01	0.09	0.0028	0.17	0.0029	4.06
2017	2.61	0.35	0.02	0.79	0.002	0.01	0.07	0.0023	0.20	0.0034	4.07
2018	2.29	0.35	0.02	0.74	0.0016	0.01	0.07	0.0021	0.10	0.0034	3.60
2019	2.48	0.36	0.02	0.73	0.0015	0.01	0.07	0.0021	0.09	0.0035	3.78
2020	2.29	0.37	0.02	0.67	0.0015	0.01	0.09	0.0019	0.09	0.0037	3.55
2021	2.42	0.38	0.02	0.74	0.0015	0.01	0.10	0.0017	0.08	0.0037	3.76
2022	2.66	0.38	0.02	0.67	0.0015	0.01	0.10	0.0037	0.04	0.0036	3.89
Share of total % in 2022	68.4%	9.7%	0.4%	17.3%	0.04%	0.3%	2.5%	0.1%	1.0%	0.1%	100.0%
2022 versus 2021	+10.0%	+0.8%	-3.3%	-9.2%	+2.6%	+3.6%	-2.7%	+118.3%	-52.2%	-4.7%	+3.5%
2022 versus 1990	-22.2%	-62.9%	-47.0%	-74.3%	+116.7%	-71.8%	-61.7%	-76.0%	-77.1%	NA	-48.8%

In 2022, direct N<sub>2</sub>O emissions reached 0.16 kt (+1.2% compared to 2021), however over the time period of 1990-2022 N<sub>2</sub>O emissions decreased by 74.2% due to decrease mainly of the livestock number. In 2022, indirect N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from manure management increased by 0.02% compared to 2021 and decreased by 72.5% compared to 1990. Total emissions of N<sub>2</sub>O from manure management increased by 0.8% over the year and by 73.6% since 1990. The fluctuation of emissions is related to the variation of animal numbers, as well as changes in the distribution of livestock MMS (Table 5.16).

**Table 5.16 N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from manure management by livestock category 1990-2022\* (kt)**

Year	Dairy cattle	Non-dairy cattle	Sheep	Swine	Goats	Horses	Poultry	Rabbits	Fur-bearing animals	Deer	Total direct, N <sub>2</sub> O	Total indirect, N <sub>2</sub> O
1990	0.32	0.09	0.016	0.135	0.001	0.009	0.035	0.012	0.009	NO	0.62	0.33
1995	0.17	0.03	0.007	0.056	0.001	0.008	0.015	0.010	0.008	NO	0.30	0.16
2000	0.14	0.02	0.003	0.035	0.001	0.006	0.012	0.007	0.004	NO	0.23	0.12
2005	0.14	0.02	0.004	0.036	0.002	0.004	0.015	0.006	0.005	NO	0.23	0.12
2006	0.14	0.02	0.004	0.035	0.002	0.004	0.016	0.006	0.007	0.000	0.23	0.12
2007	0.14	0.03	0.005	0.036	0.001	0.004	0.017	0.006	0.006	0.000	0.24	0.12
2008	0.13	0.02	0.006	0.033	0.001	0.004	0.016	0.004	0.007	0.000	0.23	0.11
2009	0.13	0.02	0.007	0.032	0.001	0.004	0.017	0.003	0.006	0.000	0.22	0.11
2010	0.12	0.02	0.007	0.030	0.001	0.004	0.017	0.002	0.006	0.000	0.21	0.11

Year	Dairy cattle	Non-dairy cattle	Sheep	Swine	Goats	Horses	Poultry	Rabbits	Fur-bearing animals	Deer	Total direct, N <sub>2</sub> O	Total indirect, N <sub>2</sub> O
2011	0.12	0.02	0.008	0.028	0.001	0.004	0.015	0.003	0.007	0.000	0.21	0.10
2012	0.11	0.02	0.008	0.022	0.001	0.003	0.015	0.002	0.008	0.000	0.20	0.10
2013	0.11	0.02	0.008	0.021	0.001	0.003	0.014	0.002	0.008	0.000	0.19	0.10
2014	0.12	0.03	0.009	0.019	0.001	0.003	0.011	0.002	0.011	0.000	0.20	0.10
2015	0.11	0.03	0.009	0.020	0.001	0.003	0.013	0.003	0.010	0.000	0.20	0.10
2016	0.11	0.03	0.009	0.019	0.001	0.003	0.013	0.002	0.009	0.000	0.19	0.10
2017	0.11	0.03	0.010	0.017	0.001	0.002	0.010	0.002	0.011	0.000	0.19	0.10
2018	0.10	0.02	0.009	0.015	0.001	0.002	0.009	0.002	0.006	0.000	0.17	0.09
2019	0.10	0.03	0.008	0.015	0.001	0.002	0.010	0.002	0.005	0.000	0.17	0.09
2020	0.09	0.02	0.007	0.013	0.001	0.002	0.013	0.002	0.005	0.000	0.16	0.09
2021	0.09	0.02	0.007	0.015	0.001	0.002	0.014	0.001	0.005	0.000	0.16	0.09
2022	0.09	0.03	0.006	0.014	0.001	0.002	0.014	0.002	0.002	0.000	0.16	0.09
Share of total % in 2022	58.3%	15.9%	4.0%	8.5%	0.8%	1.2%	8.5%	1.3%	1.3%	0.0%	100%	
2022 vs 2021	+5.1%	+2.9%	-3.3%	-6.1%	+2.6%	+3.6%	-2.8%	+58.6%	-52.2%	NA	+1.5%	0.0%
2022 vs 1990	-70.6%	-70.1%	-58.6%	-89.8%	+118.8%	-79.4%	-61.0%	-82.6%	-77.1%	NA	-74.1%	-72.5%

\*emissions from pasture not included, they are reported under 3.D Managed soils

When organic matter in livestock manure decomposes in anaerobic environment, methanogenic bacteria produce CH<sub>4</sub>. The amount of CH<sub>4</sub> produced from manure depends on livestock type and diet, special feeding and digestibility of food, as well as animal waste management system. The N<sub>2</sub>O estimated in this section is the N<sub>2</sub>O produced during the storage and treatment of manure before it is applied to land. Production of N<sub>2</sub>O during storage and treatment of animal waste occurs via combined nitrification-denitrification of nitrogen in animal waste.

## 5.3.2 Methodological issues

### 5.3.2.1 Methods

Emissions from manure management of domestic livestock in Latvia have been calculated by using methodologies presented in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (Volume 4, Chapter 10.4 and 10.5). The 2006 IPCC Guidelines include two Tiers to estimate emissions from livestock manure. The Tier 1 approach requires livestock population data by animal species/category and climate region in order to estimate emissions. Tier 2 approach requires detailed information on animal characteristics and the manner in which manure is managed; it is encouraged to be used if a particular livestock species/category represents a significant share of emissions. The process of developing Tier 2 EFs involves determining the mass of volatile solids excreted by the animals (VS, in kg) along with the maximum CH<sub>4</sub> producing capacity for the manure (Bo, in m<sup>3</sup> kg of VS). In addition, a methane conversion factor (MCF) that accounts for the influence of climate on CH<sub>4</sub> production must be obtained for each manure management system. Latvia uses Tier 2 for estimation CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from cattle and swine and Tier 2 for estimation N<sub>2</sub>O emissions for all categories, except rabbits and fur-bearing animals.

CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from manure management for sheep, goats, horses, poultry (divided as layers/broilers, turkeys, ducks, geese and others), rabbits, fur-bearing animals and deer were calculated by using Tier 1 methodology by multiplying the number of the animals with the default EF for each animal category according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (Equation 10.22, page 10.37):

$$CH_4\text{manure} = \sum_{(T)} \frac{EF_{(T)} * N_{(T)}}{10^6} \quad (5.5)$$

where:

$CH_{4Manure}$  - CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from manure management, for a defined population, kt CH<sub>4</sub> yr<sup>-1</sup>

$EF_{(T)}$  - emission factor for the defined livestock population, kg CH<sub>4</sub> head<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>

$N_{(T)}$  - the number of head of livestock species / category T in the country

T - species/category of livestock

EFs for Tier 1 methodology calculations were chosen as for cool climate region and are represented in Table 5.17. The original source of default EFs is the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (Tables 10.15 and 10.16, page 10.40-10.41).

**Table 5.17 CH<sub>4</sub> emission factors from manure management**

Animal category	Emission factor (kg head <sup>-1</sup> year <sup>-1</sup> )
Sheep	0.19
Goats	0.13
Horses	1.56
Layers	0.03
Broilers and others	0.02
Turkeys	0.09
Ducks	0.02
Geese	0.02
Rabbits	0.08
Fur-bearing animals	0.68
Deer	0.22

According to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (table 10A-9) Manure Management System MCFs for sheep, goats, horses, rabbits and ducks could be set as 1%; for layers, broilers and turkeys as 1.5%; for fur-bearing animals as 8%.

For dairy cattle, non-dairy cattle and swine Tier 2 approach was used for estimating CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from manure management systems as dairy cattle and swine represent a significant share of total emissions from agriculture sector. This method requires detailed information on animal characteristics and the manner in which manure is managed. CH<sub>4</sub> EFs for cattle and swine were derived from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (Equation 10.23, page 10.41):

$$EF_T = (VS_T * 365) * \left[ B_{O(T)} * 0.67 \frac{kg}{m^3} * \sum_{S,k} \frac{MCF_{S,k}}{100} * MS_{T,S,k} \right] \quad (5.6)$$

where:

$EF_{(T)}$  - annual CH<sub>4</sub> emission factor for livestock category T, kg CH<sub>4</sub> animal<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>

$VS_{(T)}$  - daily volatile solid excreted for livestock category T, kg dry matter animal<sup>-1</sup> day<sup>-1</sup>

$B_{O(T)}$  - maximum methane producing capacity for manure produced by livestock category T, m<sup>3</sup> CH<sub>4</sub> kg<sup>-1</sup> of VS excreted

$MCF_{(S,k)}$  - methane conversion factors for each manure management system by climate region k, % (as represented in table 10.17, page 10.44, 2006 IPCC)

$MS_{(T,S,k)}$  - fraction of livestock category manure handled using manure management system in climate region  $k$ , dimensionless

0.67 - conversion factor of  $m^3 CH_4$  to kilograms  $CH_4$

365 - basis for calculating annual VS production, days  $yr^{-1}$

The manure management systems (MMS) reported in the inventory are:

- liquid system;
- solid storage;
- pasture/range/paddock;
- anaerobic digester.

The manure management systems used in practice have been changed in Latvia over the time. In the last decade of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, milk cows were mainly stanchioned, producing farmyard manure, whereas now there is a gradual transition to producing the liquid manure.

Distribution of MMS is based on Cabinet Regulation No. 829 Special Requirements for the Performance of Polluting Activities in Animal Housing (adopted 23 December 2014)<sup>139</sup>. In the regulation does not provide for separate accounting of solid manure and deep litter manure in Latvia. Latvia, calves and young cattle could be kept on deep litter. Pregnant young cattle are kept tied (in small barns) or in boxes (large barns) shortly before birth. In the large barns, the birth takes place in separate pens and may be used a deep litter system, but as this system is not officially declared in normative acts, there are no statistics on deep liter use.

IPCC 2006 Guidelines, Vol 4, Table 10.18, Page 10.49 states that cattle deep bedding means, that bedding is continually added to absorb moisture over a production cycle and possibly for as long as 6 to 12 months, however such rare frequency of deep bedding removing was typical for Latvia only before 1990. One of the most comprehensive research on manure management was done in 2016 when several national experts evaluated manure management systems in Latvia – and deep bedding was not considered in this research<sup>140</sup>. Alternative research<sup>141</sup> also confirms typical manure management systems approved for Latvia.

Since 2007 the production of biogas by partially using the manure of livestock is observed in Latvia. Detailed description of methodology of calculation of manure management systems distributions is available at scientific publication *Calculation Methodology for Cattle Manure Management Systems Based on the 2006 IPCC Guidelines* by J.Priekulis and A. Aboltins<sup>142</sup>.

Calculation of manure management systems distribution is revived every year due to quality control procedure by scientists of Latvia University of Life Sciences. The following input data were used to calculate manure management systems distribution:

<sup>139</sup> Cabinet Regulation No. 829. Available: <https://likumi.lv/ta/en/en/id/271374-special-requirements-for-the-performance-of-polluting-activities-in-animal-housing>

<sup>140</sup> Pētījuma „Lauksaimniecības sektora SEG emisiju aprēķina metodoloģijas un datu analīzes ar modelēšanas rīku izstrāde, integrējot klimata pārmaiņas” līguma Nr.2014/94 5.posma pārskats un gala pārskats. Available: [https://ppdb.mk.gov.lv/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/petijums\\_VARAM\\_2017\\_Lauksaimn\\_SEG\\_emisij\\_aprek\\_metodolog\\_un\\_datu\\_analiz\\_ar\\_model\\_rik\\_u\\_izstrad\\_integrej\\_klim\\_mainas.pdf](https://ppdb.mk.gov.lv/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/petijums_VARAM_2017_Lauksaimn_SEG_emisij_aprek_metodolog_un_datu_analiz_ar_model_rik_u_izstrad_integrej_klim_mainas.pdf)

<sup>141</sup> Myrbeck A., Kaasik A., Luostarinen S. Manure data collection - experiences from pilot farms. Available: <https://projects.luke.fi/manurestandards/wp-content/uploads/sites/25/2020/04/Manure-data-collection-experiences-from-pilot-farms.pdf>

<sup>142</sup> Priekulis J., Āboltiņš A. (Calculation methodology for cattle manure management systems based on the 2006 IPCC guidelines. NJF 25th Congress, 2015. Available: <http://www.vbf.llu.lv/sites/vbf/files/files/lapas/Calculation....pdf>

- Cabinet Regulation No. 834<sup>143</sup> determines the amount of manure excretion, t/year, depending on the livestock species, age, type of keeping, productivity of dairy cows;
- Cabinet Regulation No. 834<sup>142</sup> determines dry matter content of the manure;
- Annual reports of the MoA and CSB on the percentage distribution of various livestock at the national level by their herd size;
- Annual information of the Latvian Biogas Association and the Rural Support Service on the number of biogas plants established in Latvia and the type and quantity of raw materials used in each plant, t/year;
- Research results of LBTU on the size of dairy herds, pigs and laying hens, at which the transition from solid manure to liquid manure system takes place<sup>144</sup>;
- Lengths of the grazing period of livestock, h/year, determined in the research of LBTU<sup>143</sup>.

The traditional grazing season in Latvia is from mid-May to early October or at least 140 days. Latvia has different experiences with the duration of grazing periods (Annex A.3.7).

For calculation of MMS for calves and young cattle of dairy cows, it is considered that part of the manure remains in the pasture. In addition, it is assumed that only calves and young cattle kept in small enclosures grazing and there also dairy cows graze. Other parameters consider for dairy cows are:

- yield of solid manure - 15 t / animal per year;
- yield of liquid manure - 19 t / animal / year;
- dry matter content of solid manure - 20%;
- dry matter content of fresh manure - 12%;
- pasture utilization rate - 0.188.

Solid manure is obtained from beef cattle and part of the manure remains in the pasture. In addition, the share of manure obtained in pastures is calculated according to the pasture utilization coefficient determined by research of LBTU.

Solid manure and slurry are obtained from pig farming. The share of liquid manure is calculated using statistical data on the distribution of pig herds in the country according to the size of their herd and according to the results of LBTU research, at which herd size the transition from solid manure to liquid manure production takes place.

Laying hens are kept in cage batteries. This part of the poultry is calculated according to the percentage distribution of the laying hen herd at the national level, as well as the data of the LBTU study on the size of the laying hen herds at which the transition from free-range laying to

---

<sup>143</sup> Republic of Latvia, Cabinet Regulation No. 834. 2014. Regulation Regarding Protection of Water and Soil from Pollution with Nitrates Caused by Agricultural Activity. Available: <https://www.fao.org/faolex/results/details/en/c/LEX-FAOC172823/f>

<sup>144</sup> Pētījuma „Lauksaimniecības sektora SEG emisiju aprēķina metodoloģijas un datu analīzes ar modelēšanas rīku izstrāde, integrējot klimata pārmaiņas” Līguma Nr.2014/94. Pētījuma 5.posma pārskats un gala pārskats. Available: [https://ppdb.mk.gov.lv/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/petijums\\_VARAM\\_2017\\_Lauksaimn\\_SEG\\_emisij\\_aprek\\_metodolog\\_un\\_datu\\_analiz\\_ar\\_model\\_riku\\_izstrad\\_integrej\\_klim\\_mainas.pdf](https://ppdb.mk.gov.lv/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/petijums_VARAM_2017_Lauksaimn_SEG_emisij_aprek_metodolog_un_datu_analiz_ar_model_riku_izstrad_integrej_klim_mainas.pdf)

caging batteries takes place. The amount of manure remaining in the pasture is calculated according to the number of free-range birds and the pasture utilization rate.

From sheep, goats and horses, part of the manure remains in the stables, part in the pastures. The part remaining outside the holding shall be determined by means of the grazing coefficient. The distribution of manure for geese, ducks and turkeys is calculated similarly.

In order to determine the proportion of manure used for biogas production, statistics on the amount and type of manure processed in biogas plants have been considered. Usually manure from fattening (meat) cattle could not be used for biogas because they contain increased soil admixture. It is also not possible to use manure from small holdings, as this leads to significant transportation costs.

According to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, default methane conversion factor or MCF values for manure management systems: solid storage – 2%, liquid storage (with crust) – 10%, pasture/range/paddock – 1% (Table 10.17, page 10.44); as well as CH<sub>4</sub> producing capacities B<sub>0</sub> 0.24 for dairy cows, 0.17 for other cattle and 0.45 for swine (Table 10A-4, 10A-5, 10A-7, page 10.77-10.80) are used for Latvia's National GHG Inventory purposes.

In response to question raised by Technical expert review team during European Union ESD voluntary review in 2015, MCF value 2% for CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from anaerobic digesters was implemented according to recommendation from the country biogas production experts. For anaerobic digester the 2006 IPCC Guidelines recommends MCF in the range from 0 to 100%. Based on available information and expert judgement from Latvian Biogas Association, it is assumed that anaerobic digestion completely is referred to energy production and consequently storage of manure before transfer to the digester is not typical for Latvia. History of biogas plants in Latvia is available in Latvian Biogas association home page<sup>145</sup>. Official list of biogas plants in Latvia is available in Food and veterinary service register<sup>146</sup>. Information on the amount of processed manure was collected by LBTU scientists and this information is not publicly available.

Almost all biogas plants are built on large dairy or pig farms. Therefore, they rarely use manure from other farms. Biogas plants receiving manure from the farm where it is located. It is also very expensive to transport manure to biogas plants from other farms. Manure from large farm is pumped to the biogas plants every day. Manure storage facilities for long periods storage are therefore not typical for Latvia. CH<sub>4</sub> leakage emissions are included and reported in the category 3.B.1.4. MCF value and leakage around 2% are derived from Swedish and national studies<sup>147;148</sup>.

In 2022, significant part of laying hens manure was used for biogas production. According to information provided above, CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from laying hens estimated by Tier 1 are corrected by following assumption:

<sup>145</sup> Latvijas Biogāzes asociācija. Available: <http://www.latvijasbiogaze.lv/pakalpojumi/>

<sup>146</sup> 6.sekcija - Biogāzes ražošanas uzņēmumi. Available:

<https://registri.pvd.gov.lv/cr/faili/78ac619f9ddb8c8097e5e7e8f0b9d9a2>

<sup>147</sup> Greenhouse Gas Balances of Bioenergy Systems. Patricia Thornley, Paul Adams. Academic Press (2017) p. 286.

<sup>148</sup> National research project: Latvijas lauksaimniecības SEG inventarizācijas starptautiskajā pārbaudē pieprasītā precizētā informācija par kūtsmēslu izmantošanu biogāzes ražošanai / Trial review of the 2015 greenhouse gas inventory of Latvia under the Effort Sharing Decision, 2015. Dr.sc. ing. Vilis Dubrovskis, 2016-05-17

$$CH_4 \text{ layer manure} = N_{(L)} * EF_{(L)} * (1 - MMS(\text{anaerobic digester})) + N_{(L)} * EF_{(L)} * MMS(\text{anaerobic digester}) * 2\% \quad (5.7)$$

where:

$CH_4$  layer manure -  $CH_4$  emissions from manure management, for laying hens,  $kt CH_4 yr^{-1}$

$N_{(L)}$  - the number of laying hens

$EF_{(L)}$  - emission factor for the laying hens population,  $kg CH_4 head^{-1} yr^{-1}$ , Table 5.17

MMS (anaerobic digester) - share of manure digested

Daily volatile solid excretion rate (per day on a dry-matter weight basis) was estimated as represented in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (equation 20.24, page 10.42):

$$VS = \left[ GE * \left( 1 - \frac{DE\%}{100} \right) + (UE * GE) \right] * \left[ \frac{1-ASH}{18.45} \right] \quad (5.8)$$

where:

VS - volatile solid excretion per day on a dry-organic matter basis,  $kg VS day^{-1}$

GE - gross energy intake,  $MJ day^{-1}$

DE% - digestibility of the feed in percent (67% for dairy cows, 65% for other cattle, 80% for breeding swine and fattening pigs, 85% for piglets under 50 kg)

(UE • GE) - urinary energy expressed as fraction of GE (0.04•GE are considered as urinary energy)

ASH - the ash content of manure calculated as a fraction of the dry matter feed intake (0.08 for cattle and 0.02 for swine)

18.45 - conversion factor for dietary GE per kg of dry matter ( $MJ kg^{-1}$ )

Results of calculation of the country specific  $CH_4$  emissions factors from manure management are included in Table 5.18.

**Table 5.18 Daily volatile solid (VS) values and  $CH_4$  emission factors (EF) of manure management for cattle, 1990-2022**

Year	Dairy cows		Growing cattle		Other mature cattle	
	VS ( $kg day^{-1}$ )	EF ( $kg CH_4 head^{-1} year^{-1}$ )	VS ( $kg day^{-1}$ )	EF ( $kg CH_4 head^{-1} year^{-1}$ )	VS ( $kg day^{-1}$ )	EF ( $kg CH_4 head^{-1} year^{-1}$ )
1990	4.70	6.39	1.56	1.09	2.97	1.59
1995	4.60	6.84	1.53	1.12	2.97	1.59
2000	5.14	8.90	1.48	1.11	2.87	1.53
2005	5.47	11.42	1.48	1.10	3.25	1.74
2006	5.57	11.95	1.49	1.14	3.28	1.75
2007	5.67	12.82	1.50	1.15	3.40	1.82
2008	5.77	13.72	1.49	1.15	3.21	1.72
2009	5.82	14.44	1.50	1.15	3.31	1.77
2010	5.61	13.44	1.51	1.15	3.38	1.80
2011	5.63	13.86	1.50	1.15	3.43	1.83
2012	5.72	13.21	1.52	1.15	3.49	1.86
2013	5.83	13.16	1.54	1.15	3.50	1.87
2014	5.91	14.29	1.53	1.13	3.55	1.89
2015	5.73	15.42	1.55	1.14	3.61	1.93
2016	5.96	16.42	1.55	1.13	3.65	1.95
2017	6.13	17.28	1.54	1.13	3.66	1.95
2018	6.18	15.87	1.54	1.13	3.69	1.97
2019	6.32	17.89	1.53	1.12	3.73	1.99
2020	6.42	16.82	1.53	1.12	3.78	2.02
2021	6.54	18.43	1.54	1.13	3.79	2.02
2022	6.59	20.81	1.54	1.13	3.78	2.02

Country specific CH<sub>4</sub> emissions factors for non-dairy cattle groups are lower than IPCC default EF, because the amount of manure stored in liquid/ slurry based systems for non-dairy cattle in Latvia is assumed to be zero, that is lower than IPCC default share (Table 5.18, Table 5.19).

**Table 5.19 Daily volatile solid (VS) values and CH<sub>4</sub> emission factors (EF) of manure management for non-dairy cattle sub-groups, 2022**

Non-dairy cattle sub-groups		VS (kg day <sup>-1</sup> )	EF (kg CH <sub>4</sub> head <sup>-1</sup> year <sup>-1</sup> )
Young cattle under 1 year	dairy cattle calves	1.13	0.97
	beef cattle calves	1.46	0.78
Young cattle aged from 1 to 2 years	dairy cattle	1.86	1.59
	beef cattle	2.40	1.28
Mature non-dairy cattle over 2 years	bulls	4.19	2.24
	heifers	2.47	1.32
	other cows	4.23	2.26
IPCC default (Table 10.14, page 10.38)			6

As Tier 2 methodology to estimate CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from manure management requires information of gross energy intake by swine, but enteric fermentation emission for swine was derived by Tier 1 methodology. Gross energy intake calculation for swine is based on swine live weight and digestible energy:

$$GE = \frac{ME}{DE\%} \quad (5.9)$$

where:

GE - gross energy intake, MJ day<sup>-1</sup>

DE% - digestible energy as percentage of gross energy, %

ME - 2.0 x W = energy intake for maintenance and growth MJ day<sup>-1</sup>

W - live weight of swine, kg

Feed digestibility data for swine are taken from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines: 80% for breeding sows, boars, young breeding sows and fattening pigs (suggested range 70-80% for confinement mature swine) and 85% for piglets (suggested range 80-90% (Table 10.2, page 10.14) for confinement growing swine). Several publications were revised including national and nearest neighbor countries level to calculate emissions from swine as close as possible to national values. It could be concluded that digestibility for mature and growing swine ranges around 80%, and up to 80% for young swine. Additionally, consultations about swine digestibility were took place with Latvian Pig Breeding Association experts. Latvian Pig Breeding Association confirmed that swine feeding strategies in Latvia show digestibility up to 80% in Latvia. Therefore it was concluded to use upper limit of DE% for sows and fattening pigs represented by IPCC (70-80%), because middle point can't show appropriate situation with digestibility in the country. However, values of DE, % for piglets could be characterized within the IPCC suggested range midpoint (80-90%). DE values for pigs in Latvia therefore are in line with IPCC guidelines. Deep research of pig feeding in Latvia was done due project 2009-2014 EEA Grants Programme National Climate Policy and financial support for the project "Agricultural sector GHG emissions calculation methods and data analysis with the modelling tool development, integrating climate change" (by Degola, Trūpa, & Aplociņa, 2016)<sup>149</sup>.

<sup>149</sup> Pētījuma „Lauksaimniecības sektora SEG emisiju aprēķina metodoloģijas un datu analīzes ar modelēšanas rīku izstrāde, integrējot klimata pārmaiņas” Līguma Nr.2014/94. Pētījuma 5.posma pārskats un gala pārskats. Available: <https://ppdb.mk.gov.lv/wp->



Results of the calculation of CH<sub>4</sub> emission from manure management for swine are presented in Table 5.20.

**Table 5.20 Estimation parameters and emission factors (EF) of CH<sub>4</sub> emission from manure management for swine 1990-2022**

Year	Weight (head <sup>-1</sup> year <sup>-1</sup> )	GE (MJ day <sup>-1</sup> )	VS (kg day <sup>-1</sup> )	EF (kg CH <sub>4</sub> head <sup>-1</sup> year <sup>-1</sup> )
1990	75.11	35.46	0.40	1.87
1995	80.70	36.94	0.41	2.23
2000	69.23	33.51	0.37	2.38
2005	65.12	31.93	0.35	2.83
2006	65.93	32.17	0.35	2.94
2007	66.97	32.57	0.36	3.07
2008	66.35	32.41	0.35	3.13
2009	64.98	31.85	0.35	3.13
2010	65.44	31.98	0.35	2.95
2011	64.51	31.64	0.34	2.91
2012	62.85	31.23	0.34	2.56
2013	62.48	31.06	0.34	2.40
2014	64.33	31.84	0.35	2.36
2015	64.85	32.16	0.35	2.63
2016	63.95	31.66	0.34	2.58
2017	64.00	31.69	0.35	2.47
2018	62.78	31.31	0.34	2.44
2019	64.74	32.09	0.35	2.32
2020	64.18	31.84	0.35	2.19
2021	63.42	31.65	0.35	2.27
2022	62.89	31.46	0.34	2.15

Table 5.21 shows the main CH<sub>4</sub> emissions calculation results for all swine sub-groups and default manure management methane emission coefficients recommended by the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for Western Europe. Swine weight data are based on the judgement of LBTU and Latvian Pig Breeding Association experts. Swine weight decreasing due to the increase of the number of piglets. Estimated emission coefficients are lower than the 2006 IPCC Guidelines default mainly explained by different distribution of manure management systems.

**Table 5.21 Typical animal weight, average gross energy (GE) intake, volatile solid (VS) values and emission factors (EF) for estimation of CH<sub>4</sub> emission from manure management for swine sub-groups, 2022**

Swine sub-groups	Number, (thousand heads)	Weight, (head <sup>-1</sup> year <sup>-1</sup> )	GE, (MJ day <sup>-1</sup> )	VS, (kg day <sup>-1</sup> )	EF, (kg CH <sub>4</sub> head <sup>-1</sup> year <sup>-1</sup> )
Piglets under 50 kg of weight (under 4 months)	150.7	27.5	19.0	0.17	1.07
Young breeding sows and fattening pigs	135.4	75.0	38.0	0.44	2.79
Mature breeding sows and boars	23.7	231.1	77.2	0.90	5.66
IPCC default (Table 10.14, page 10.38 (Western Europe))					6-9

The 2006 IPCC Guidelines methodology was used for estimating N<sub>2</sub>O emission from manure management by multiplying the total amount of N excretion (from all animal species/categories) in each type of manure management system by an EF for that type of manure management system. Emissions are then summed over all manure management systems. Direct N<sub>2</sub>O emissions (kg N<sub>2</sub>O yr<sup>-1</sup>) from manure management have been calculated by using the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (Equation 20.25, page 10.54):

$$N_2O_{D(mm)} = \left[ \sum_S \left[ \sum_T (N_{(T)} * Nex_{(T)} * MS_{(T,S)}) \right] * EF_{3(S)} \right] * \frac{44}{28} \quad (5.10)$$

where:

$N_2O_{D(mm)}$  - direct N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from Manure Management in the country, kg N<sub>2</sub>O yr<sup>-1</sup>

$N_{(T)}$  - number of head of livestock species/category T in the country

$Nex_{(T)}$  - annual average N excretion per head of species/category T in the country, kg N animal<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>

$MS_{(T,S)}$  - fraction of total annual nitrogen excretion for each livestock species/category T that is managed in manure management system in the country, dimensionless

$EF_{3(S)}$  - emission factor for direct N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from manure management system S in the country, kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N kg<sup>-1</sup> N in manure management system

S - manure management system

T - species/category of livestock

The annually excreted amount of nitrogen is categorized by manure management system and multiplied with the 2006 IPCC Guidelines default EF for each manure management system.

Following EFs for direct N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from manure management were implemented: EF<sub>3</sub> = 0.005 for liquid manure/slurry with natural crust cover; EF<sub>3</sub> = 0.005 for solid storage; EF<sub>3</sub> = 0 for pasture/range/paddock; EF<sub>3</sub> = 0 for digester (2006 IPCC Guidelines: Table 10.21, page 10.62). Data about the distribution of MMS (as fraction of livestock category manure handled using manure management system) according to the national studies are available in the Annex A.3.7 Agriculture. N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from pasture are calculated under manure management, but are reported under category Urine and dung deposited by grazing animals in CRF 3.D.

### 5.3.2.2 Activity data

Data of N excretion during the year per each livestock category used for the inventory are country specific and are obtained from national studies<sup>150</sup> and research projects outcomes<sup>151</sup> or calculated following by the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. The 2006 IPCC Guidelines default annual average nitrogen excretion rate was used for rabbits (Table 10.19, page 10.59). EMEP/EEA recommended N excretion value is used for turkeys and fur-bearing animals (Table 3.9, page 29)<sup>152</sup>. N excretion rate for deer is adopted from Norway's GHG inventory<sup>153</sup>. All N excretion values used in the inventory are represented in Table 5.22.

<sup>150</sup> Fertiliser Recommendations for Agricultural Crops (2013) Ed.A. Karklins and A.Ruza. Jelgava: LLU, 55 p.

<sup>151</sup> Priekulis J. Pētījuma "Lauksaimniecības sektora SEG emisiju aprēķina metodoloģijas un datu analīzes un modelēšanas rīku izstrāde, integrējot klimata pārmaiņas, Līguma Nr.2014/94. Pētījuma 4.ceturkšņa progresa ziņojums. Jelgava, 2016

<sup>152</sup> EMEP/EEA Air pollutant emission inventory guidebook (2023) 3.B Manure management. European Environment Agency. Table 3.9, page 31. Available: <https://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/emep-eea-guidebook-2023/part-b-sectoral-guidance-chapters/3-agriculture/3-b-manure-management-2023/view>

<sup>153</sup> Greenhouse Gas Emissions 1990-2021, National Inventory Report. The Norwegian Environment Agency, 2023, p. 5-34, Table 5.14. Available: <https://unfccc.int/documents/627398>

Table 5.22 Average N excretions per head of animal (N, kg year<sup>-1</sup>)

Livestock category	1990-2022	Source
Sheep	15.30	National studies
Goats	15.80	National studies
Horses	44.00	National studies
Layers	0.55	National studies
Broilers and others	0.35	National studies
Turkeys	1.64	EMEP/EEA 2023
Ducks	0.58	National studies
Geese	1.12	National studies
Rabbit	8.10	2006 IPCC default
Fur – bearing animals	4.60	EMEP/EEA 2023
Deer	12.00	Norway's GHG inventory

Values about annual N excretion ( $N_{ex}$ ) per animal for dairy cattle and non-dairy cattle were calculated according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines Tier 2 methodology (Equation 10.31, page 10.58):

$$N_{ex(T)} = N_{intake} * (1 - N_{retention}) \quad (5.11)$$

where:

$N_{ex(T)}$  - annual N excretion rates, kg N animal<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>

$N_{intake(T)}$  - the annual N intake per head of animal of species/category T, kg N animal<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>

$N_{retention(T)}$  - fraction of annual N intake that is retained by animal of species/category T, dimensionless

The daily N intake per head of each cattle category is calculated as (Equation 10.32, page 10.58):

$$N_{intake(T)} = \frac{GE}{18.45} * \left( \frac{CP\%}{6.25} \right) \quad (5.12)$$

where:

$N_{intake(T)}$  - daily N consumed per animal of category T, kg N animal<sup>-1</sup> day<sup>-1</sup>

GE - gross energy intake of the animal, MJ animal<sup>-1</sup> day<sup>-1</sup>

18.45 - conversion factor for dietary GE per kg of dry matter, MJ kg<sup>-1</sup>

CP% - percent crude protein in diet, input

6.25 - conversion from kg of dietary protein to kg of dietary N, kg feed protein (kg N<sup>-1</sup>)

The daily N retention per animal head of species/category is estimated as (Equation 10.33, page 10.60):

$$N_{retention(T)} = \left[ \frac{Milk * \left( \frac{MilkPR\%}{100} \right)}{6.38} \right] + \left[ \frac{WG * \left[ 268 - \left( \frac{7.03NEg}{WG} \right) \right]}{\frac{1000}{6.25}} \right] \quad (5.13)$$

where:

$N_{retention(T)}$  - daily N retained per animal of category T, kg N animal<sup>-1</sup> day<sup>-1</sup>

Milk - milk production, kg animal<sup>-1</sup> day<sup>-1</sup> (dairy cows only)

Milk PR% - percent of protein in milk, calculated as  $[1.9 + 0.4 * \%Fat]$

6.38 - conversion from milk protein to milk N, kg Protein (kg N)<sup>-1</sup>

WG - weight gain, input for each livestock category, kg day<sup>-1</sup>

268 and 7.03 - constants

NEg - net energy for growth, MJ day<sup>-1</sup>

6.25 - conversion from kg dietary protein to kg dietary N, kg Protein (kg N)<sup>-1</sup>

Crude protein (CP) values are adopted from national studies regarding to feeding requirements for cattle<sup>154</sup> based on milk yield and milk fat content data, CP=14% (1990-1995) and CP=15% is set for dairy cows. For other cattle CP values ranging from 9% to 14%.

Annual N excretion rate for swine is derived from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (Equation 10.30, page 10.57) by using typical animal mass (TAM) data:

$$N_{ex(T)} = N_{rate} * \frac{TAM}{1000} * 365 \quad (5.14)$$

where:

$N_{ex(T)}$  - annual N excretion rates, kg N animal<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>

$N_{rate(T)}$  - default N excretion rate, kg N (1000 kg mass)<sup>-1</sup> day<sup>-1</sup> (Market swine=0.52, Breeding swine=0.42 according to 2006 IPCC Guidelines. Volume 4, Chapter 10, Table 10.19, page 10.59)

TAM - typical animal mass, kg livestock<sup>-1</sup>

Calculated values of N excretion per animal for dairy cattle, non-dairy cattle and swine for reporting in CRF are represented in Table 5.23.

**Table 5.23 N excretion rates for dairy, non-dairy cattle and swine, 1990-2022 (kg N animal<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>)**

Year	Dairy cattle	Growing cattle	Other mature cattle	Swine
1990	85.8	20.1	58.6	12.3
1995	84.7	20.0	58.5	12.8
2000	99.6	19.5	55.0	11.5
2005	104.0	19.4	58.9	10.7
2006	105.5	19.5	59.1	10.8
2007	106.9	19.8	59.2	11.0
2008	108.3	19.7	58.4	11.0
2009	108.9	19.7	59.6	10.7
2010	106.6	19.8	60.1	10.7
2011	107.1	19.7	60.3	10.6
2012	108.2	19.8	61.0	10.5
2013	109.6	20.0	61.3	10.4
2014	110.5	19.9	61.5	10.7
2015	108.8	20.0	61.9	10.9
2016	112.2	20.0	62.2	10.7
2017	114.4	20.0	62.0	10.7
2018	115.0	19.9	62.3	10.5
2019	117.0	19.8	62.7	10.9
2020	118.2	19.8	63.1	10.8
2021	119.9	19.9	63.3	10.7
2022	120.4	19.9	63.3	10.3

Calculations of N excretion for cattle have been based on the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. Detailed information of estimated N excretion for cattle and swine sub-groups by IPCC methodology is represented in Table 5.24. During 2014-2017 Latvia made efforts to update country-specific N excretion values based on national research data, therefore in the inventory Latvia uses country-specific data for nitrogen excretion from sheep, swine, horses, goats and poultry. For the inventory year 2022 based on assumption that the Best Available Techniques (BAT) Reference for the Intensive Rearing of Poultry or Pigs is used for many of intensive pig production farms in Latvia N excretion rate is set to 13 kg N animal<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> for young breeding

<sup>154</sup>Latvietis J. (1994) Govju ēdināšanas normas. Jelgava: LLU, p.102

sows and fattening pigs<sup>155</sup>. For time period 1990-2021 N excretion rate as 14 kg N animal<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> for young breeding sows and fattening pigs is included in calculations.

**Table 5.24 N excretion rates (Nex) for N<sub>2</sub>O emissions estimation of non-dairy cattle and swine subgroups, 2022**

Non-dairy cattle sub-groups		Nex (kg N animal <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> )
Young cattle under 1 year	dairy cattle calves	15.6
	beef cattle calves	18.5
Young cattle aged from 1 to 2 years	dairy cattle	24.6
	beef cattle	26.4
Mature non-dairy cattle over 2 years	bulls	93.9
	heifers	49.4
	other cows	65.9
Swine sub-groups		
Piglets under 50 kg of weight (under 4 months)		5.1
Young breeding sows and fattening pigs		13.0
Mature breeding sows and boars		27.6

The total quantity of excreted N by livestock among MMS implemented in Latvia and estimation results of managed manure N available for application to managed soils is summarized in Table 5.25.

**Table 5.25 N excretion (Nex) per manure management system (MMS) and manure N available for application (N<sub>MMS\_Avb</sub>) to managed soils (kg, N yr<sup>-1</sup>), 1990-2022**

Year	Manure management system (MMS)				Total Nex per MMS	N <sub>MMS_Avb</sub>
	solid storage	liquid systems	pasture range and paddock	anaerobic digester		
1990	71856740	7404768	16360390	0	95621898	51153382
1995	33772538	4571694	5559145	0	43903377	25211831
2000	24226599	4848148	3761259	0	32836006	18880378
2005	22178083	7087773	4139005	0	33404861	18849655
2006	22187767	7381551	4102430	0	33671748	19034045
2007	22275546	8004449	4486673	0	34766669	19460768
2008	20854354	8088914	4512765	0	33456034	18604919
2009	19926222	8332127	4672807	20687	32951842	18086525
2010	19107227	7729066	4791130	1299746	32927170	17207299
2011	18578212	7823793	4906461	1610653	32919120	17011815
2012	18459162	6745609	5220517	3332466	33757753	16384434
2013	18205827	6476007	5683365	4435129	34800329	16074363
2014	18067368	6986285	6096340	4657942	35807934	16470432
2015	16908034	8032716	6230376	4068834	35239961	16258130
2016	16168536	8135361	6565511	4178977	35048384	15778417
2017	15581303	8120082	6772505	4845921	35319812	15484538
2018	14136411	6873589	6887667	6113284	34010951	13640942
2019	13666616	7540267	7089670	5778129	34074682	13673690
2020	13422571	6597046	7224448	6767146	34011211	12873489

<sup>155</sup> Frolova O., Degola L., Bērziņa L. (2019) The Pig Feeding and Nitrogen Associated Gaseous Emissions in Latvia. Research For Rural Development 2019, Volume 1, Jelgava, pp. 188-194. Available: [https://llufb.llu.lv/conference/Research-for-Rural-Development/2019/LatviaResRuralDev\\_25th\\_2019\\_vol1-188-194.pdf](https://llufb.llu.lv/conference/Research-for-Rural-Development/2019/LatviaResRuralDev_25th_2019_vol1-188-194.pdf)

Year	Manure management system (MMS)				Total Nex per MMS	N <sub>MMS_Avb</sub>
	solid storage	liquid systems	pasture range and paddock	anaerobic digester		
2021	12800401	7331050	7208396	6525794	33865641	12825225
2022	12297490	8074399	7275876	5528334	33176099	12944158
Share of total % in 2022	37.1%	24.3%	21.9%	16.7%	100.0%	100.0%
2022 versus 2021	-3.9%	+10.1%	+0.9%	-15.3%	-2.0%	+0.9%
2022 versus 1990	-82.9%	+9.0%	-55.95%	NA	-65.3%	-74.7%

N<sub>2</sub>O emissions calculation is prepared according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines Tier 2 methodology, because country specific data is included in the estimation (country specific N excretion rates).

The indirect N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from volatilisation of N in forms of NH<sub>3</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> from manure management are estimated as (2006 IPCC Guidelines: Equation 10.29 page 10.57):

$$N_2O_{G(mm)} = (N_{volatilization-MMS} * EF_4) \quad (5.15)$$

where:

*N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>G(mm)</sub>* - indirect N<sub>2</sub>O emissions due to volatilization of N from Manure Management in the country, kg N<sub>2</sub>O yr<sup>-1</sup>

*N<sub>volatilization-MMS</sub>* - amount of manure nitrogen that is lost due to volatilisation of NH<sub>3</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub>, kg N yr<sup>-1</sup>

*EF<sub>4</sub>* - emission factor for N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from atmospheric deposition of nitrogen on soils and water surfaces, kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N (kg NH<sub>3</sub>-N + NO<sub>x</sub>-N volatilised)<sup>-1</sup>; default value 0.01 kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N (kg NH<sub>3</sub>-N + NO<sub>x</sub>-N volatilised)<sup>-1</sup> is used

The indirect N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from leaching and runoff of N from manure management systems are estimated as (2006 IPCC Guidelines: Equation 10.27 page 10.56):

$$N_2O_{L(mm)} = (N_{leaching-MMS} * EF_5) \quad (5.16)$$

where:

*N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>L(mm)</sub>* - indirect N<sub>2</sub>O emissions due to leaching and runoff from Manure Management in the country, kg N<sub>2</sub>O yr<sup>-1</sup>

*N<sub>leaching-MMS</sub>* - amount of manure nitrogen that leached from manure management systems, kg N yr<sup>-1</sup>

*EF<sub>5</sub>* - emission factor for N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from nitrogen leaching and runoff, kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N/kg N leached and runoff (default value 0.0075 kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N (kg N leaching/runoff)<sup>-1</sup>)

The amount of manure nitrogen that is lost due to volatilisation of NH<sub>3</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> is assigned to Tier 2 approach to calculate N that is lost due to volatilisation of NH<sub>3</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> from the livestock buildings and manure storage facilities is adopted from EMEP/EEA 2023<sup>156</sup>. All EFs used for calculations are explained in EMEP/EEA 2023 Guidelines chapter 3.B Manure management Table 3.9.

Probability of risks related to the agricultural point source pollution of surface waters by N leaching and run-off from manure storages must be considered for Latvia, because there are a number of farms with high livestock number (more than 250 animal units), especially from pig-breeding and poultry farming branches. Many of large livestock farms as potential point source polluters in the Nitrate Vulnerable Zone are located within the catchment basin closer than 500 m of distance to the water bodies of national importance, because of high density of

<sup>156</sup> EMEP/EEA Air pollutant emission inventory guidebook. (2023) 3.B Manure management. European Environment Agency, Available: <https://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/emep-eea-guidebook-2023/part-b-sectoral-guidance-chapters/3-agriculture/3-b-manure-management-2023/view>

hydrographic network in this region. Additionally, the proportion of livestock on larger farms continues to grow gradually regarding to CSB information (Table 5.26).

**Table 5.26 Grouping of farms 2021-2022**

By the number of pigs and breeding sows at end of year								
Pigs	2021				2022			
	Farms with the respective livestock		Livestock		Farms with the respective livestock		Livestock	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
	1 989	100	327 020	100	1 667	100	307 947	100
2000-4999	7	0.4	21 967	6.7	6	0.4	19 069	6.2
>=5000	16	0.8	277 971	85.0	14	0.8	265 109	86.1
By the number of dairy cows at end of year								
Dairy cows	2021				2022			
	Farms with the respective livestock		Livestock		Farms with the respective livestock		Livestock	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
	10 063	100	131 199	100	9 067	100	127 759	100
200-299	34	0.3	8 131	6.2	33	0.4	7 856	6.1
>=300	50	0.5	30 488	23.2	54	0.6	32 354	25.4

Based on the measures taken at the national level in order to reduce the pollution of surface waters caused by agricultural production, the long-term agricultural point source pollution monitoring observations results indicate that concentrations of pollutants show negative trends, but still should be taken into account<sup>157</sup>.

Values of FracLeach is based on expert conclusions who are involved in national agricultural point source monitoring activities under Agricultural Runoff programme. In 1990-2004, FracLeach is set to 10% by reducing the value to 1% for slurry storages and 5% to solid storages till 2019. The amount of manure N that is leached from manure management systems is derived from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (Equation 10.28, page, 10.56). 2006 IPCC guidelines declare typical range 1-20% for FracLeachMS or managed manure nitrogen losses for livestock due to runoff and leaching during solid and liquid storage of manure. Agriculture point source runoff monitoring data showed that approximately 10% of N from manure storages was loss during 1990-1994, when the largest number of cattle in Latvia was observed in the time series. After this period the numbers of cattle dropped. Situation with N loss was improved also after implementation of Nitrates Directive in Latvia, and after Latvia become the member of the EU (2004). Then many financial mechanisms were available for manure management improvement. It was assumed that all manure storages comply with the requirements of the Nitrates Directive, however agriculture point source runoff monitoring data showed that FracLeachMS can't be set exactly as 0% for all state. Regarding to requirements of slurry manure storage, the lowest value of FracLeachMS as 1% is set for last years (2013-2018). It is allowed

<sup>157</sup>Berzina L. (2014) *Analysis of Point Source Pollution from Agricultural Production Influence on Surface Water Quality in Highly Vulnerable Zones. Summary of the Thesis for Doctoral Degree in Engineering Sciences, Environmental Science branch, Environmental Engineering subbranch.* 91 p.

for small farms (less than 5 animal units) to avoid building of solid manure storage, therefore 5% of FracLeachMS is set for solid storages. 10% of FracLeachMS is set till 2005 when manure storages went to progress of improvement. Values between 10% and 5 to 1% are interpolated for 2005-2013, because agriculture point source runoff monitoring data show the highest quality of waters since 2013.

### 5.3.3 Uncertainties and time-series consistency

Uncertainty analysis for 2024 submission is carried out by using Approach 1. Quantitative estimates of uncertainties are provided in Annex 2. Overall description of uncertainty analysis is included in Section 1.6.

The uncertainty of the manure management system usage data depends on the characteristics of each country's livestock industry and how information on manure management is collected. The 2006 IPCC Guidelines show that for one type of management system, the uncertainty associated with management system usage data can be 10% or less. However, for countries where there is a wide variety of management systems, the uncertainty range in management system usage data can be much higher, in the range of 25% to 50%, depending on the availability of reliable and representative survey data that differentiates animal populations by system usage (2006 IPCC Guidelines: page 10.50). For Latvia uncertainty of 25% is set, because only three manure management systems are used without pastures. Latvia also uses country specific values for N excretion rates to reduce uncertainty of activity data to 25%. IPCC expert judgment shows that uncertainty ranges for the default N excretion rates are estimated at about 50% (2006 IPCC Guidelines: page 10.66)

The uncertainty for the default EFs is estimated to be 30%. Improvements achieved by Tier 2 methodologies are evaluated to reduce uncertainty ranges in EFs to 20% for Latvia.

### 5.3.4 Category-specific QA/QC and verification

**Activity data check.** The quality objectives and the QA/QC plan for the Latvia's GHG inventory at the National Inventory level are presented in Section 1.2.3. General QC procedures including quality checks related to calculations, data processing, completeness, and documentation were used during the inventory. Defined manure management systems in the inventory are consistent with definitions that are presented in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (Table 10.18, page 10.49). Latvia uses country specific methodology to determine distribution of manure management systems that is available in scientific literature<sup>158</sup>.

All information on activity data and emission calculations are stored and archived in the common FTP folder.

**Review of emission factors.** Country-specific EFs were compared to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines defaults. EFs were chosen as for cool climate region by average annual temperature  $\leq 10^{\circ}\text{C}$ . Review results are presented in the chapter 5.3.2.1.

Latvia uses country specific nitrogen excretion rates, according to the latest research results. Calculated and measured nitrogen excretion rates are compared with other countries inventory

---

<sup>158</sup> Priekulis J., Āboltiņš A. (2015) Calculation Methodology for Cattle Manure Management Systems Based on the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. Proceedings of the 25th NJF Congress Nordic View to Sustainable Rural Development. Riga, pp.274-280



data and default factors. No significant differences were found for rates used for inventory that are within the range of values reported in other EU countries.

### 5.3.5 Category-specific recalculations

No recalculations were done for this sector.

### 5.3.6 Category-specific planned improvements

Revision of N excretion for sows and piglets according to the latest study results of feeding situation data is planned for the next submission.

## 5.4 AGRICULTURAL SOILS (CRF 3.D)

### 5.4.1 Category description

N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from agricultural soils (CRF 3.D) are a significant emission source comprising about 1048.60 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. or 46.5% of total agricultural emissions in 2022. According to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, direct and indirect emissions of N<sub>2</sub>O from managed soils must be estimated separately. The following N sources are included in the inventory for estimating direct N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from managed soils:

- synthetic N fertilizers (F<sub>SN</sub>);
- organic N fertilizers (e.g., animal manure, compost, sewage sludge, digestate) (F<sub>ON</sub>);
- urine and dung N deposited on pasture, range and paddock by grazing animals (F<sub>PRP</sub>);
- N in crop residues (above-ground and below-ground), including from N-fixing crops and from forages during pasture renewal (F<sub>CR</sub>);
- drainage/management of organic soils (F<sub>OS</sub>).

Indirect N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from managed soils are determined for volatilization and leaching processes. N<sub>2</sub>O emissions included in the inventory are reported in Table 5.27.

Table 5.27 Reported emissions under the subcategory agricultural soils

CRF	Source	Emissions reported	Level
3.D 1.1	<i>Inorganic N fertilizers</i>	<i>N<sub>2</sub>O</i>	<i>Tier 1</i>
3.D 1.2.a	<i>Animal manure applied to soils</i>	<i>N<sub>2</sub>O</i>	<i>Tier 1</i>
3.D 1.2.b	<i>Sewage sludge applied to soils</i>	<i>N<sub>2</sub>O</i>	<i>Tier 1</i>
3.D 1.2.c	<i>Other organic fertilizer applied to soils</i>	<i>N<sub>2</sub>O</i>	<i>Tier 1</i>
3.D 1.3	<i>Urine and dung deposited on soils</i>	<i>N<sub>2</sub>O</i>	<i>Tier 1</i>
3.D 1.4	<i>Crop residues</i>	<i>N<sub>2</sub>O</i>	<i>Tier 1</i>
3.D 1.5	<i>Mineralization/immobilization associated with loss/gain of soil organic matter</i>	<i>NO</i>	<i>NA</i>
3.D 1.6	<i>Cultivation of organic soils</i>	<i>N<sub>2</sub>O</i>	<i>Tier 1</i>
3.D 1.7	<i>Other</i>	<i>NO</i>	<i>NA</i>
3.D 2.1	<i>Atmospheric deposition</i>	<i>N<sub>2</sub>O</i>	<i>Tier 1</i>
3.D 2.2	<i>Nitrogen leaching and run-off</i>	<i>N<sub>2</sub>O</i>	<i>Tier 1</i>

The total N<sub>2</sub>O emission from managed soils reached 4.0 kt in 2022; which is 0.4% more than in 2021. In general, emission has decreased in 2022 by 38.8% compared to 1990. The main reason for that was decreasing of livestock numbers that affected the amount of nitrogen excreted annually to soil and lower consumption of fertilizers. In 2022, N<sub>2</sub>O emission increased by 0.02

kt compared to 2021 (Table 5.28). The main reason of the increase of emission absolute number is slight increase of all emission source amounts except nitrogen fertilizers and sludge. In 2022, the total N<sub>2</sub>O emission from managed soils originated as 85.0% from direct sources. Indirect N<sub>2</sub>O emission from volatilization formed 5.2% and from leaching – 9.6% of the N<sub>2</sub>O total emission (Table 5.28).

**Table 5.28 N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from managed soils, 1990-2022 (kt)**

Year	N <sub>2</sub> O direct emission	N <sub>2</sub> O indirect emission from atmospheric deposition	N <sub>2</sub> O indirect emission from leaching and run-off	Total
1990	5.42	0.42	0.63	6.47
1995	2.39	0.11	0.15	2.65
2000	2.28	0.11	0.16	2.54
2005	2.45	0.14	0.22	2.81
2006	2.42	0.14	0.22	2.79
2007	2.52	0.15	0.25	2.91
2008	2.49	0.15	0.25	2.89
2009	2.56	0.15	0.26	2.97
2010	2.64	0.17	0.28	3.08
2011	2.63	0.16	0.28	3.07
2012	2.80	0.17	0.31	3.29
2013	2.88	0.18	0.32	3.38
2014	2.98	0.19	0.34	3.51
2015	3.11	0.20	0.36	3.67
2016	3.13	0.20	0.36	3.69
2017	3.14	0.20	0.36	3.70
2018	2.99	0.19	0.33	3.51
2019	3.26	0.20	0.38	3.84
2020	3.38	0.21	0.39	3.98
2021	3.35	0.21	0.38	3.94
2022	3.37	0.20	0.38	3.96
Share of total % in 2022	85.2%	5.2%	9.6%	100.0%
2022 versus 2021	+0.7%	-1.6%	-0.5%	+0.4%
2022 versus 1990	-38.8%	-51.1%	-39.4%	-38.8%

In 2022, synthetic fertilizers formed the major part of total direct emissions (38.4%), following by emission from managed organic soils (31.6%), crop residues (15.9%), animal manure applied to soils (6.0%), urine and dung deposited on pasture (6.4%), and other organic N additions applied to soils (1.8%) (Table 5.29). Overall, N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from application of N fertilizer increased most rapidly in last years, however in 2022 the application numbers decreased. The amount of harvested production is mainly affected by the cereal crop area and yield. According to CSB information in 2022 the sown area was the same as a year before and reached 1302.4 thousand ha.<sup>159</sup>. Detailed description of crop production in Latvia is included in the Chapter 5.1.

<sup>159</sup>Agriculture of Latvia. Collection of Statistics. Riga (2023) <https://stat.gov.lv/en/statistics-themes/business-sectors/fishery-and-aquaculture/publications-and-infographics/15214?themeCode=ZI>

Table 5.29 N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from N inputs to managed soils, 1990-2022 (kt)

Year	F <sub>SN</sub>	F <sub>ON</sub> (animal manure)	F <sub>ON</sub> (sludge)	F <sub>ON</sub> (other)	F <sub>PRP</sub>	F <sub>CR</sub>	F <sub>OS</sub>
1990	2.06	0.80	NA	NA	0.50	0.51	1.54
1995	0.18	0.40	NA	NA	0.17	0.22	1.43
2000	0.36	0.30	NA	NA	0.11	0.19	1.31
2005	0.64	0.30	0.005	NA	0.13	0.28	1.10
2006	0.67	0.30	0.007	NA	0.12	0.26	1.06
2007	0.72	0.31	0.007	NA	0.14	0.32	1.02
2008	0.75	0.29	0.004	NA	0.14	0.33	0.98
2009	0.82	0.28	0.005	NA	0.14	0.34	0.97
2010	0.94	0.27	0.008	0.008	0.14	0.31	0.96
2011	0.94	0.27	0.007	0.004	0.15	0.31	0.95
2012	1.02	0.26	0.006	0.010	0.16	0.41	0.94
2013	1.10	0.25	0.006	0.022	0.17	0.39	0.94
2014	1.15	0.26	0.006	0.029	0.18	0.41	0.94
2015	1.19	0.26	0.004	0.025	0.19	0.51	0.95
2016	1.23	0.25	0.003	0.019	0.20	0.48	0.95
2017	1.22	0.24	0.003	0.049	0.20	0.47	0.95
2018	1.17	0.21	0.004	0.046	0.20	0.39	0.96
2019	1.27	0.21	0.005	0.048	0.21	0.53	0.98
2020	1.32	0.20	0.005	0.059	0.21	0.57	1.01
2021	1.33	0.20	0.005	0.057	0.21	0.51	1.03
2022	1.29	0.20	0.002	0.057	0.215	0.53	1.07
Share of total % in 2022	38.4%	6.0%	0.1%	1.7%	6.4%	15.9%	31.6%
2022 versus 2021	-2.7%	+0.9%	-54.1%	+0.8%	+1.2%	+4.7%	+3.2%
2022 versus 1991	-37.4%	-74.7%	NA	NA	-57.3%	+4.5%	-30.6%

F<sub>SN</sub> = synthetic N fertilizer, F<sub>ON</sub> = organic N additions, F<sub>PRP</sub> = urine and dang N deposited on pasture, F<sub>CR</sub> = N in crop residues, F<sub>OS</sub> = managed organic soil in grassland and cropland.

#### 5.4.2 Methodological issues and activity data

Emissions from managed soils, and emissions from lime and urea application in Latvia have been calculated by using methodologies presented in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (Volume 4, Chapter 11). For estimation of N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from managed soils the Tier 1 methodology was used. Direct N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from agricultural soils have been calculated using the following equation according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (Equation 11.1, page 11.7):

$$\begin{aligned}
 N_2O_{direct} - N &= N_2O - N_{N\ inputs} + N_2O - N_{OS} + N_2O - N_{PRP} \\
 N_2O - N_{N\ inputs} &= (F_{SN} + F_{ON} + F_{CR} + F_{SOM}) * EF_1 \\
 N_2O - N_{OS} &= (F_{OS} * EF_2) \\
 N_2O - N_{PRP} &= [(F_{PRP} * EF_3)]
 \end{aligned} \tag{5.17}$$

where:

$N_2O_{Direct} - N$  - annual direct N<sub>2</sub>O-N emissions produced from managed soils, kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N yr<sup>-1</sup>

$N_2O - N_{N\ inputs}$  - annual direct N<sub>2</sub>O-N emissions from N inputs to managed soils, kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N yr<sup>-1</sup>

$N_2O - N_{OS}$  - annual direct N<sub>2</sub>O-N emissions from managed organic soils, kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N yr<sup>-1</sup>

$N_2O - N_{PRP}$  - annual direct N<sub>2</sub>O-N emissions from urine and dung inputs to grazed soils, kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N yr<sup>-1</sup>

F<sub>SN</sub> - annual amount of synthetic fertilizer N applied to soils, kg N yr<sup>-1</sup>

F<sub>ON</sub> - annual amount of animal manure, compost, sewage sludge and other organic N additions applied to soils, kg N yr<sup>-1</sup>

$F_{CR}$  - annual amount of N in crop residues (above-ground and below-ground), including N-fixing crops, and from forage/pasture renewal, returned to soils, kg N yr<sup>-1</sup>

$F_{SOM}$  - annual amount of N in mineral soils that is mineralised, in association with loss of soils C from soils organic matter as a result of changes to land use or management, kg N yr<sup>-1</sup>

$F_{OS}$  - annual area of managed/drained organic soils in grasslands and croplands, ha

$F_{PRP}$  - annual amount of urine and dung N deposited by grazing animals on pasture, range and paddock, kg N yr<sup>-1</sup>

$EF_1$  - emission factor for N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from N inputs, kg N<sub>2</sub>O–N kg<sup>-1</sup> N input

$EF_2$  - emission factor for N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from drained/managed organic soils, kg N<sub>2</sub>O–N ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>

$EF_3$  - emission factor for N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from urine and dung N deposited on pasture, range and paddock by grazing animals, kg N<sub>2</sub>O–N/kg N input

### Inorganic N fertilizers: CRF 3.D 1.1

Annual amount of the synthetic fertilizer N is one of the parameters to estimate direct N<sub>2</sub>O emission from N inputs to managed soils. Data of inorganic fertilizer N applied to soils are provided by CSB of Latvia. Input values for direct N<sub>2</sub>O emission calculation from inorganic N fertilizers are represented in Table 5.35.

### Organic N fertilizers: CRF 3.D 1.2

Amount of the organic N fertilizer ( $F_{ON}$ ) applied to soils is calculated using methodology represented in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (Equation 11.3, page 11.12). This includes applied to soils animal manure, sewage, compost, as well as other organic amendments of regional importance to agriculture:

$$F_{ON} = F_{AM} + F_{SEW} + F_{COMP} + F_{OOA} \quad (5.18)$$

where:

$F_{ON}$  - total annual amount of organic N fertilizer applied to soils other than by grazing animals, kg N yr<sup>-1</sup>

$F_{AM}$  - annual amount of animal manure N applied to soils, kg N yr<sup>-1</sup>

$F_{SEW}$  - annual amount of total sewage N that is applied to soils, kg N yr<sup>-1</sup>

$F_{COMP}$  - annual amount of total compost N applied to soils, kg N yr<sup>-1</sup>

$F_{OOA}$  - annual amount of other organic amendments used as fertilizer, kg N yr<sup>-1</sup>

Data on the amount of sewage sludge applied to managed soils are provided by LEGMC, other data of organic N fertilizer applied to soils are obtained from CSB. Application of sewage sludge as fertilizer is relatively small in Latvia. Other organic amendments used as fertilizer mainly refer to digestate. Amount of nitrogen in sewage sludge, digestate and composts are calculated based on agriculture research results done by LBTU scientists,<sup>160</sup> and other research projects<sup>161</sup>. Statistics of different types of organic N fertilizers applied to soils are limited in Latvia. Available data are represented in Table 5.30. Applied amounts of composts and digestate are represented in fresh weight.

**Table 5.30 Statistics of organic N fertilizers applied to soils, 2001-2022**

Year	Sewage sludge applied to managed soils, t dry matter	Composts applied to managed soils, thousand t	Other organic N (including digestate) applied to managed soils, thousand t
2001	30946.7	NA	NA
2002	22513.9	NA	NA
2003	9230.9	NA	NA

<sup>160</sup>Gemste I., Vucāns A. (2010) *Notekūdeņu dūņas*. Jelgava, LLU, 276 lpp.

<sup>161</sup>Litiņa I. (2013) *Digestāta kā mēslošanas līdzekļa efektivitātes novērtējums kukurūzas sējumā*. Zinātniski praktiskā konference LAUKSAIMNIECĪBAS ZINĀTNE VEIKSMĪGAI SAIMNIEKOŠANAI. Jelgava, LLU, 206-209 lpp.

Year	Sewage sludge applied to managed soils, t dry matter	Composts applied to managed soils, thousand t	Other organic N (including digestate) applied to managed soils, thousand t
2004	7683.7	NA	NA
2005	6545.5	NA	NA
2006	8936.4	NA	NA
2007	8131.6	NA	NA
2008	5251.4	NA	NA
2009	6686.9	NA	NA
2010	9306.2	95.5	3.7
2011	8758.6	39.9	6.1
2012	7470.5	62.2	82.5
2013	7479.2	40.4	289.9
2014	6861.2	36.2	413.9
2015	4706.0	15.3	369.5
2016	4249.5	30.7	261.8
2017	3315.7	15.9	740.1
2018	4288.5	16.7	690.5
2019	6229.4	18.9	718.3
2020	6460.7	21.0	885.8
2021	5643.8	33.8	840.5
2022	2591.4	45.1	834.0
2022 versus 2021	-54.1%	+33.4%	-0.8%

Animal manure N ( $F_{AM}$ ) emits from agricultural soil through manure application to fields as an organic fertilizer. Calculation of emissions from nitrogen input through application of animal manure is done according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (Equation 11.4, page 11.13):

$$F_{AM} = N_{MMS_{Avb}} * [1 - (Frac_{FEED} + Frac_{FUEL} + Frac_{CNST})] \quad (5.19)$$

where:

$F_{AM}$  - annual amount of animal manure N applied to soils, kg N yr<sup>-1</sup>

$N_{MMS_{Avb}}$  - amount of managed manure N available for soil application, feed, fuel or construction, kg Nyr<sup>-1</sup>

$Frac_{FEED}$  - fraction of managed manure used for feed

$Frac_{FUEL}$  - fraction of managed manure used for fuel

$Frac_{CNST}$  - fraction of managed manure used for construction

Total annual amount of the managed manure N available for soil application ( $F_{MMS_{Avb}}$ ) is determined by the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (Chapter 10.5.4) according to the directions of estimation of N lost from manure management systems to final application on managed soils. Calculation of  $F_{MMS_{Avb}}$  is done by fully adopted IPCC methodology (2006 IPCC Guidelines, Volume 4, Chapter 10, Equation 10.34, p.10.65; following by default values for total N loss from manure management represented in Table 10.23, p.10.67). There is no data available on the fraction of manure being used as feed, fuel or material of construction therefore  $F_{AM}$  is considered to be equal to  $N_{MMS_{Avb}}$ . Total annual amount of managed manure N available for soil application is calculated under CRF category 3B Manure management and is represented in Table 5.25, Chapter 5.3.2.2.

### **Urine and dung deposited by grazing animals: CRF 3.D 1.3**

The term  $F_{PRP}$  refers to the annual amount of N deposited on pasture, range and paddock soils by grazing animals.  $F_{PRP}$  is estimated using the 2006 IPCC Guidelines from the number of animals

in each livestock species/category  $T(N_{(T)})$ , the annual average amount of N excreted by each livestock species/category  $T(N_{ex(T)})$ , and the fraction of this N deposited on pasture, range and paddock soils by each livestock species/category  $T(MS_{(T,PRP)})$ , (2006 IPCC Guidelines: Equation 11.5, page 11.13):

$$F_{PRP} = \sum_T [(N_{(T)} * Nex_{(T)}) * MS_{(T,PRP)}] \quad (5.20)$$

Total annual amount of N deposited on pasture, range and paddock soils by grazing animals is determined under CRF category 3B Manure management and is represented in Table 5.25.

Total annual amount of N deposited on pasture, range and paddock soils separately for two groups:  $F_{PRP, CPP}$  (cattle, poultry and swine) and  $F_{PRP, SO}$  (other livestock), according to directions of  $N_2O$  emissions estimation by 2006 IPCC is summarized in Table 5.35.

#### **Crop residues: CRF 3.D 1.4**

The annual production of the amount of crop residue N ( $F_{CR}$ ) is estimated based on 2006 the IPCC Guidelines Tier 1 methodology (Equation 11.6, page 11.14):

$$= \sum_T^{F_{CR}} \{ Crop_{(T)} * Frac_{Renew(T)} * [(Area_{(T)} - Area_{burnt(T)} * C_f) * R_{AG(T)} * N_{AG(T)} * (1 - Frac_{Remove(T)}) + Area_{(T)} * R_{EG(T)} * N_{EG(T)}] \} \quad (5.21)$$

where:

$F_{CR}$  - annual amount of N in crop residues (above and below ground), including N-fixing crops, and from forage/pasture renewal, returned to soils annually, kg N yr<sup>-1</sup>

$Crop_{(T)}$  - harvested annual dry matter yield for crop T, kg d.m. ha<sup>-1</sup>

$Area_{(T)}$  - total annual area harvested of crop T, ha yr<sup>-1</sup>

$Area_{burnt(T)}$  - annual area of crop T burnt, ha yr<sup>-1</sup>

$C_f$  - combustion factor

$Frac_{Renew(T)}$  - fraction of total area under crop T

$R_{AG(T)}$  - ratio of above-ground residues dry matter to harvested yield for crop T

$N_{AG(T)}$  - N content of above-ground residues for crop T, kg N (kg d.m.)<sup>-1</sup>

$Frac_{Remove(T)}$  - fraction of above-ground residues of crop T removed annually for purposes such as feed, bedding and construction, kg N (kg crop-N)<sup>-1</sup>

$R_{BG(T)}$  - ratio of below-ground residues to harvested yield for crop T, kg d.m. (kg d.m.)<sup>-1</sup>

$N_{BG(T)}$  - N content of below-ground residues for crop T, kg N (kg d.m.)<sup>-1</sup>

T - crop or forage type.

Correction factor to estimate dry matter yields ( $Crop_{(T)}$ ) is determined as (Equation 11.7, page 11.15):

$$Crop_{(T)} = Yield_{Fresh(T)} * DRY \quad (5.22)$$

where:

$Crop_{(T)}$  - harvested dry matter yield for crop T, kg d.m. ha<sup>-1</sup>

$Yield_{Fresh(T)}$  - harvested fresh yield for crop T, kg fresh weight ha<sup>-1</sup>

$DRY$  - dry matter fraction of harvested crop T, kg d.m. (kg fresh weight)<sup>-1</sup>

Mainly default data were used to estimate N that is returned to soils by crop residues, except data of crop production (area and yield) that originates from CSB Database. Dry matter fractions of harvested crop are collected as combination of 2006 IPCC default and national values (Kārkliņš A., Līpenīte I., 2018) (Table 5.31).

**Table 5.31 Dry matter fraction (DRY) of harvested crop (kg fresh weight<sup>-1</sup>)**

Crop	DRY	Source
Wheat	0.86	National value
Barley	0.86	National value
Triticale	0.86	National value
Oats	0.86	National value
Rye	0.86	National value
Buckwheat	0.86	National value
Pulses	0.86	National value
Fodder roots	0.15	National value
Potatoes	0.22	2006 IPCC, National value
Vegetable	0.12	National value
Maize for silage and forage	0.30	National value
Crops for green feed and silage	0.20	National value
Perennial grass	0.84	National value
Rape	0.92	National value
Flax straw/seed	0.81/0.88	National value

Calculations on annual amount of N in crop residues are done based on default factors represented in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (Table 11.2, page 11.17) with the exception of wheat. Latvia has long history of wheat breeding. A gene pool of Latvian winter and spring wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) has been created over a very long period, by collection, evaluation and selection of local genetic resources. It is not only a historical collection, but also serves as the foundation for research and plant breeding. National wheat germplasm is the framework for creating competitive winter and spring wheat varieties acceptable for producers in the Baltic agroclimatical region. Many wheat varieties are created at Priekulji and Stende selection stations and introduced in the market. Based on local breed investigation that are popular for producers national  $R_{AG}$  values are determined. Many of popular wheat varieties have low plant height as 'Fredis' (77 cm) and average plant height of variety 'Brencis' the newest winter wheat variety bred at Stende (2018) is 87 cm. Low plant height reduces above ground residues value. This could be reason why IPCC default value is higher as for national varieties of wheat.

National  $R_{AG}$  value is determined as weighted average value from above mentioned research (including unpublished project data) based on characteristics for varieties typically grown in Latvia. According to long-term national studies  $N_{AG}=0.005$ , (National research: Ruža A. Project Report No. S293. Setting maximum levels for fertilizers for crops<sup>162</sup>) and  $R_{AG}$  or ratio of above-ground residues dry matter to harvested yield in the range from 1.00 to 1.10 is set for wheat. National research results show that  $R_{AG}$  is equal to 1.10 or 1.00 or 0.85 if yield is below 2.5, 2.5-5 and up to 5 tons from hectare, respectively<sup>163</sup>. All data sources to calculate N that is returned to soil by crop residues are represented in Table 5.32.

**Table 5.32 Data sources for estimation of N in crop residues**

Input parameter	Data source
Crop harvested yield	CSB
Crop harvested area	CSB

<sup>162</sup> Ruža A. (2017) Project Report No. S293. Setting maximum levels for fertilizers for crops. Jelgava: LLU

<sup>163</sup> Kārklīņš A., Līpenīte I. (2018). Aprēķinu metodes un normatīvi augsnes iekultivēšanai un mēslošanas līdzekļu lietošanai. Jelgava: LLU. 200 lpp

Input parameter	Data source
Burnt crop area	NO
FraC <sub>Renew</sub>	Expert judgement, IPCC default
FraC <sub>Remove</sub>	Expert judgement, IPCC default
AG <sub>DM</sub>	2006 IPCC, Table 11.2
N <sub>AG</sub>	2006 IPCC, Table 11.2, national research values for wheat <sup>161, 162</sup>
R <sub>BG-BIO</sub>	2006 IPCC, Table 11.2
N <sub>BG</sub>	2006 IPCC, Table 11.22, national research values for wheat <sup>161, 162</sup>
R <sub>AG</sub>	2006 IPCC, Page 11.4 national research values for wheat <sup>161, 162</sup>
R <sub>GB</sub>	2006 IPCC, Page 11.4

There is no field burning of agricultural residues observed in Latvia and area burnt is set to zero. It is estimated by LBTU experts that approximately 30% of above-ground residues of all main crops (wheat, oats, barley and rye) are removed annually for purposes such as feeding, bedding and construction (FraC<sub>Remove</sub>). This number is set as 70%, for 1900-2000, by rapid decrease till 2010. Till 2000 above-ground crop residues were widely used for bedding and feeding. Also the total number of cattle was the highest for that period. And the share of solid manure management systems was higher. After 2000 it became more popular to incorporate residues in the soil, also the number of cattle continued to fall down. Since 2010 it is assumed that specialization of farms in Latvia was stabilized and now crop farms use crop residues for crop production purposes. Only farms located near to cattle farms and mixed specialization farms remove crop residues for bedding possibilities. Largest cattle farms after 2000 turned to slurry based manure management systems. Situation between 2000 and 2010 was strongly changing therefore FraC<sub>Remove</sub> value for the time period is interpolated from 70% to 30%. No other data to estimate the fraction of above-ground residues of crop removed for purposes such as feed, bedding and construction is available. According to national conclusions, perennial grass is renewed on average every 4 years. For annual crops FraC<sub>Renew</sub> 1 was set, as also proposed in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. Final results of estimation of annual amount of N in crop residues are available in Table 5.35.

#### ***Mineralization/immobilization associated with loss/gain of soil organic matter: CRF 3.D 1.5***

Average annual loss of soils carbon due to land use or management systems change was obtained from LULUCF sector. The net annual amount of N mineralised in mineral soils as a result from loss of soil organic C stocks due land use change is accounted under LULUCF sector. The net annual amount of N mineralised in mineral soils as a result from loss of soil organic C stocks due to management activities, including conversion of cropland to grassland, is assumed to be NO, because of the net removals of CO<sub>2</sub> in soil in cropland and grassland due to management activities<sup>164;165</sup>. In relation to Latvian State Forest Research Institute "Silava" research outcome, similar research results also are applicable to mineral soils from cropland remaining cropland.

<sup>164</sup> Lupikis, A., Bardule, A., Lazdins, A., Stola, J., & Butlers, A. (2017). Carbon stock changes in drained arable organic soils in Latvia: results of a pilot study. *Agronomy Research*, 15(3), 788–798

<sup>165</sup> Bārdulis, A., Lupikis, A., & Stola, J. (2017). Carbon balance in forest mineral soils in Latvia modelled with Yasso07 soil carbon model. In *Research for Rural Development (Vol. 1, pp. 28–34)*. Latvia University of Agriculture



**Cultivation of organic soils: CRF 3.D 1.6**

Data on annual area of managed organic soils are adopted from the LULUCF sector. For the LULUCF sector data are prepared by Latvian State Forest Research Institute "Silava". N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from cultivated organic soils have been calculated with the country specific emissions factors: EF = 7.1 ± 3.29 kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N/ha/yr for drained cropland and EF = 0.3 ± 0.25 kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N/ha/yr for drained grassland<sup>166</sup>. The area of cultivated organic soils is shown in Table 5.33.

**Table 5.33 Area of cultivated organic soil, 1990-2022 (kha)**

Year	Organic soil in cropland	Organic soil in grassland	Total
1990	135.1	59.9	195.1
1995	125.4	59.4	184.7
2000	114.7	57.4	172.1
2005	95.5	71.4	166.9
2006	91.9	74.1	166.0
2007	88.3	76.8	165.1
2008	84.8	79.5	164.3
2009	83.8	79.7	163.5
2010	82.9	80.0	162.8
2011	81.9	80.2	162.1
2012	81.0	80.5	161.5
2013	81.0	80.8	161.8
2014	81.3	80.4	161.6
2015	81.5	80.0	161.5
2016	81.8	79.6	161.4
2017	82.0	79.7	161.7
2018	82.3	79.7	162.0
2019	84.6	78.8	163.4
2020	87.0	77.9	164.9
2021	89.3	77.0	166.3
2022	92.3	76.3	168.6
Share of total % in 2022	54.7%	45.3%	100%
2022 versus 2021	+3.3%	-0.9%	+1.4%
2022 versus 1990	-31.7%	+27.3%	-13.6%

**Atmospheric deposition: CRF 3.D 2.1**

The N<sub>2</sub>O emission from atmospheric deposition of N volatilised from managed soil is estimated using the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (Equation 11.9, page 11.21):

$$N_2O_{(ATD)} - N = [(F_{SN} * Frac_{GASF}) + ((F_{ON} + F_{PRP}) * Frac_{GASM})] * EF_4 \quad (5.23)$$

where:

$N_2O_{(ATD)} - N$  - annual amount of N<sub>2</sub>O-N produced from atmospheric deposition of N volatilised from managed soils, kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N yr<sup>-1</sup>

$F_{SN}$  - annual amount of synthetic fertilizer N applied to soils, kg N yr<sup>-1</sup>

$Frac_{GASF}$  - fraction of synthetic fertilizer N that volatilises as NH<sub>3</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub>, kg N volatilised (kg of N applied)<sup>-1</sup>

<sup>166</sup> Licite I., Lupikis, A. 2020. Impact of land use practices on greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture land on organic soils. Proceedings of 19th International Scientific Conference Engineering for Rural Development, 1823–1830. DOI: 10.22616/ERDev.2020.19.TF492

$F_{ON}$  - annual amount of managed animal manure, compost, sewage sludge and other organic N additions applied to soils, kg N yr<sup>-1</sup>

$F_{PRP}$  - annual amount of urine and dung N deposited by grazing animals on pasture, range and paddock, kg N yr<sup>-1</sup>

$Frac_{GASM}$  - fraction of applied organic N fertilizer materials ( $F_{ON}$ ) and of urine and dung N deposited by grazing animals ( $F_{PRP}$ ) that volatilises as  $NH_3$  and  $NO_x$ , kg N volatilised (kg of N applied or deposited)<sup>-1</sup>

$EF_4$  - Emission factor for  $N_2O$  emissions from atmospheric deposition of N on soils and water surfaces, kg  $N_2O$ -N/kg  $NH_3$ -N and  $NO_x$ -N emitted

Results of estimation are available in Table 5.28.

### Nitrogen leaching and run-off: CRF 3.D 2.2

$N_2O$  emissions from nitrogen loss from agricultural soils through leaching and runoff is estimated as shown in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (Equation 11.10, page 11.2):

$$N_2O_{(L)} - N = (F_{SN} + F_{ON} + F_{PRP} + F_{CR} + F_{SOM}) * Frac_{LEACH-(H)} * EF_5 \quad (5.24)$$

where:

$N_2O_{(L)}-N$  - annual amount of  $N_2O$ -N produced from leaching and runoff, kg  $N_2O$ -N yr<sup>-1</sup>

$F_{CR}$  - amount of N in crop residues (above- and below-ground), including N-fixing crops, and from forage/pasture renewal, kg N yr<sup>-1</sup>

$F_{SOM}$  - annual amount of N mineralised in mineral soils, kg N yr<sup>-1</sup>

$Frac_{LEACH-(H)}$  - Fraction of N input that is lost through leaching and runoff, kg N (kg of N additions)<sup>-1</sup>

$EF_5$  - emission factor for  $N_2O$  emissions from N leaching and runoff, kg  $N_2O$ -N (kg N leached and runoff)<sup>-1</sup>

The results of estimation of  $N_2O$  emission from nitrogen loss from agricultural soils through leaching and runoff are available in Table 5.28. All EFs and fractions for direct and indirect emissions estimation from managed soils are summarized in Table 5.34.

**Table 5.34 Default emission, volatilization and leaching factors for direct and indirect  $N_2O$  emissions calculation**

Factor	Value	Uncertainty range	Source
$EF_1$ for N additions from mineral fertilizers, organic amendments and crop residues [kg $N_2O$ -N (kg N) <sup>-1</sup> ]	0.01	0.003 – 0.03	2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Volume 4, page 11.11, Table 11.1
$EF_{2C}$ , for boreal and temperate drained organic cropland soil (kg $N_2O$ -N ha <sup>-1</sup> ) $EF_{2G}$ , for temperate organic soil grassland, deep drained, nutrient-rich (kg $N_2O$ -N ha <sup>-1</sup> )	7.1 0.3	7.1 ± 3.29 0.3 ± 0.25	Licite I., Lupikis, A. 2020. Impact of land use practices on greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture land on organic soils DOI: 10.22616/ERDev.2020.19.TF492
$EF_{3PRP, CPP}$ for cattle (dairy, non dairy), poultry and pigs [kg $N_2O$ -N (kg N) <sup>-1</sup> ]	0.02	0.007 – 0.06	2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Volume 4, page 11.11, Table 11.1
$EF_{3PRP, SO}$ for sheep and other animals [kg $N_2O$ -N (kg N) <sup>-1</sup> ]	0.01	0.003 – 0.03	2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Volume 4, page 11.11, Table 11.1
$EF_4$ [N volatilization and re-deposition], kg $N_2O$ -N [kg $NH_3$ -N + $NO_x$ -volatilized]	0.010	0.002 – 0.05	2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Volume 4., page 11.24, Table 11.3
$EF_5$ (leaching/runoff), kg $N_2O$ -N [kg N leaching/runoff]	0.0075	0.0005 -0.025	2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas

Factor	Value	Uncertainty range	Source
			Inventories, Volume 4, page 11.24, Table 11.3
Frac <sub>GASF</sub> (Volatilization from synthetic fertilizer), (kg NH <sub>3</sub> -N + NO <sub>x</sub> -N) [kg N applied] <sup>-1</sup>	0.10	0.03 – 0.3	2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Volume 4, page 11.24, Table 11.3
Frac <sub>GASM</sub> (Volatilization from all organic N fertilizers applied, and dung and urine deposited by grazing animals), [kg NH <sub>3</sub> -N + NO <sub>x</sub> -N] [kg N applied or deposited] <sup>-1</sup>	0.20	0.05 – 0.5	2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Volume 4, page 11.24, Table 11.3
Frac <sub>LEACH-(H)</sub> , N losses by leaching/runoff [kg N lost from kg N input]	0.23	0.18 – 0.27	Sudars R., Berzina L., Grinberga L. Analysis of Agricultural Run-Off Monitoring Program Results for Estimation of Nitrous Oxide Indirect Emissions in Latvia <sup>167</sup> .

The Department of Environment and Water Management of LBTU has been responsible for monitoring agricultural runoff since 1994. The aim of monitoring is to determine and evaluate the impact of agricultural activities on water quality, paying increased attention to nutrient inputs at interrelated research levels. To determine the nitrogen leaching coefficient, the monitoring data of agricultural runoff from 1998-2014 obtained at the Department of Environment and Water Management were analysed. The observation data used for calculations, comparison, evaluation and specification of the obtained results were obtained at the monitoring stations "Mellupīte", and also from "Bērze" and "Vienziemīte" located in Saldus, Dobele and Jaunpiebalga counties, respectively. The following levels of research are used to assess agricultural pollution in different combinations: drained plot; drainage field; small catchment area. Based on a comprehensive analysis of monitoring object data, the following conclusions have been made. When mineral fertilizers with an annual use of up to 130 kg N / ha are applied to the test plots, without taking into account additional nitrogen from plant residues, but taking into account the nitrogen background leakage, the N leaching coefficient in different test variants was from 0.146 - 0.19 (on average 0.163). At the level of drainage systems with an annual nitrogen use of up to 167 kg N / ha, the average nitrogen leaching coefficient obtained in two monitoring objects, taking into account the background leakage, was on average 0.13. Considering the possible risk factors when applying fertilizer and the fact that the amount of applied nitrogen may increase in the future, it is recommended to use the maximum value of the leaching coefficient - 0.19 in further calculations. When applying organic fertilizer with an annual nitrogen rate of up to 78 kg N / ha (without nitrogen in plant residues), the nitrogen leaching coefficient, considering its background leakage, reaches 0.264. In order to find out how fertilizer application in the monitoring objects correspond to the use of nitrogen fertilizer in agriculture in the current period, and whether the results obtained in the monitoring objects can be applied to Latvia as a whole, an analysis of nitrogen application norms and sown area was performed. By taking into account general situation in Latvia with

<sup>167</sup> Sudars R., Berzina L., Grinberga L. (2016) Analysis of Agricultural Run-Off Monitoring Program Results for Estimation of Nitrous Oxide Indirect Emissions in Latvia. ENGINEERING FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT. Jelgava. Available: <http://tf.llu.lv/conference/proceedings2016/Papers/N198.pdf>

sown area and used nitrogen for fertilization scientists conclude that weighted average nitrogen leaching factor in agricultural areas never have been estimated higher as  $F_{Leach}=0.23$ . These results also are approved in the monograph "Possibilities for Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions with Climate-Friendly Agriculture and Forestry in Latvia" prepared on the basis of the projects of the National Research Program "Latvian Ecosystem Value and its Dynamics under Climate Influence (EVIDEnT) 3.2. "Analysis of GHG emissions from the agricultural sector and economic assessment of emission reduction measures " and 3.3. "Analysis of the contribution of the forestry sector to the fulfillment of climate policy goals.

Summary of input variables for direct  $N_2O$  emission estimation according to methodology explained above are provided in Table 5.35.

**Table 5.35 Input values for direct  $N_2O$  emission calculations from managed soils 1990-2022**

Year	$F_{SN}$	$F_{ON}$	$F_{PRP, CPP}$	$F_{PRP, SO}$	$F_{CR}$
1990	131.40	51.15	15.67	0.69	32.56
1995	11.50	25.21	5.18	0.38	13.74
2000	23.00	18.88	3.55	0.21	12.41
2005	40.90	19.19	3.91	0.23	18.02
2006	42.70	19.50	3.84	0.26	16.48
2007	46.10	19.88	4.18	0.31	20.42
2008	47.50	18.88	4.15	0.37	21.01
2009	51.90	18.43	4.27	0.41	21.48
2010	59.50	18.18	4.37	0.42	19.79
2011	59.80	17.69	4.46	0.45	20.03
2012	65.20	17.42	4.76	0.46	25.97
2013	69.70	17.85	5.20	0.49	24.70
2014	72.90	18.70	5.57	0.53	26.18
2015	75.80	18.09	5.63	0.60	32.20
2016	78.29	17.23	5.89	0.68	30.74
2017	77.40	18.77	5.98	0.79	30.05
2018	74.50	16.78	6.07	0.82	25.10
2019	80.70	17.03	6.24	0.85	33.91
2020	84.30	16.94	6.33	0.89	36.35
2021	84.60	16.73	6.33	0.88	32.53
2022	82.30	16.72	6.42	0.86	34.04
2022 versus 2021	-2.7%	-0.1%	+1.4%	-2.5%	+4.7%
2022 versus 1990	-37.4%	-67.3%	-59.1%	+24.3%	+4.5%

$F_{SN}$  - annual amount of synthetic fertilizer N applied to soils, kt N yr<sup>-1</sup>

$F_{ON}$  - annual amount of organic N fertilizer applied to soils, kt N yr<sup>-1</sup>

$F_{PRP, CPP}$  - annual amount of urine and dung N deposited by grazing cattle, swine and poultry on pasture, kt N yr<sup>-1</sup>

$F_{PRP, SO}$  - annual amount of urine and dung N deposited by grazing other animals on pasture, kt N yr<sup>-1</sup>

$F_{CR}$  - annual amount of N in crop residues (above and below ground), kt N yr<sup>-1</sup>

### 5.4.3 Uncertainties and time-series consistency

Uncertainty analysis for 2024 submission is carried out by using Approach 1. Quantitative estimates of uncertainties are provided in Annex 2. Overall description of uncertainty analysis is included in Section 1.6.

The uncertainty of activity data is set to 2% according to CSB of Latvia. Uncertainty for organic soils is used the same as in the LULUCF sector. The uncertainty of the default EFs are based on the 2006 IPCC Guidelines and represented in Table 5.34.

### 5.4.4 Category-specific QA/QC and verification

The quality objectives and the QA/QC plan for the Latvia's GHG inventory at the national inventory level are presented in Section 1.2.3. The QC procedures are performed according to the QA/QC plan in the agriculture sector in order to achieve quality objectives. Issues related to QA/QC and verification are discussed at the sectoral meetings. A complete coverage of the direct and indirect N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from managed land requires estimation of emissions for all anthropogenic inputs and activities as F<sub>SN</sub>, F<sub>ON</sub>, F<sub>CR</sub>, F<sub>PRP</sub>, F<sub>SOM</sub> and F<sub>OS</sub>, that is implemented in the inventory. N excretion data are consistent with those used for the manure management emissions calculation. National crop production and synthetic fertilizer consumption statistics is compared with FAO. CSB of Latvia shows efforts to reduce differences between national statistics and FAO data. All calculations mostly are done according to Tier 1. Fluctuations in time series are explained by fluctuations of statistical data, showing that agricultural production numbers in Latvia are highly variable. As production levels are strongly associated with support of farmers from state, situation on agriculture products market, agricultural products price changes, local demand of agricultural products and other. All information on activity data and emission calculations are stored and archived in the common FTP folder.

### 5.4.5 Category-specific recalculations

No recalculations were done for the sector.

### 5.4.6 Category-specific planned improvements

No improvements are planned for this sector.

## 5.5 FIELD BURNING OF AGRICULTURAL RESIDUES (CRF 3.F)

Notation key – NO - is used for reporting field burning of agricultural residues in Latvia. Legislative measures and agricultural residue management practices prohibit field burning of agricultural residues. This is explained by Latvian Administrative Violations Code Section 179 Violation of Fire Safety Regulations.

## 5.6 LIMING (CRF 3.G)

Liming is used to reduce soil acidity and improve plant growth in managed systems, particularly agricultural lands and managed forests. Adding carbonates to soils in the form of lime (e.g., calcic limestone (CaCO<sub>3</sub>), or dolomite (Ca Mg(CO<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>) leads to CO<sub>2</sub> emissions as the carbonate limes dissolve and release bicarbonate (2HCO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>), which evolves into CO<sub>2</sub> and water (H<sub>2</sub>O). CO<sub>2</sub> emission from additions of carbonate limes to soils are estimated using Tier 1 methodology with the formula from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (Equation 11.12, page 11.27):

$$CO_2 - C \text{ Emission} = (M_{Limestone} * EF_{Limestone}) + (M_{Dolomite} * EF_{Dolomite}) \quad (5.25)$$

where:

$CO_2-C$  Emission - annual C emissions from lime application, tons C yr<sup>-1</sup>

M - annual amount of calcic limestone (CaCO<sub>3</sub>) or dolomite (CA Mg(CO<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>), tons yr<sup>-1</sup>

EF - emission factor, ton of C (ton of limestone or dolomite)<sup>-1</sup>

2006 IPCC default emission factors EF=0.12 for limestone and EF=0.13 for dolomite is used for inventory purposes. The uncertainty of them is set as 50%. Statistical data in Latvia provides information on overall consumption of liming material (uncertainty of them is 2%). For 1990-2016 amount of used lime and dolomite is estimated based on assumption that both liming materials limestone and dolomite are intensively used in Latvia and create share of consumption 50:50. In 2017, CSB of Latvia started to report information on use of lime and dolomite 41.0 thousand t and 13.4 thousand t, respectively. For 2018 CSB of Latvia provided information on use of lime and dolomite 59.5 thousand t and 17.2 thousand t, respectively. In 2019, the use of lime and dolomite achieved 76.2 thousand t and 23.3 thousand t, respectively. In 2020, the use of lime and dolomite was 96.2 thousand t and 41.0 thousand t, respectively. In 2021, reported numbers are 119.0 and 44.9 thousand t, respectively. The use of lime was 134 thousand t and the use dolomite was 39.7 thousand t in 2022. Activity data and calculated emissions are represented Table 5.36.

**Table 5.36 Consumed lime and calculated CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, 1990-2022**

Year	Annual amount of consumed liming material (kt year <sup>-1</sup> )	CO <sub>2</sub> emissions (kt)
1990	779.2	357.1
1995	2.7	1.2
2000	10.2	4.7
2005	3.3	1.5
2006	3.0	1.4
2007	10.7	4.9
2008	6.0	2.8
2009	8.7	4.0
2010	4.3	2.0
2011	17.4	8.0
2012	21.6	9.9
2013	28.9	13.2
2014	41.3	18.9
2015	43.5	19.9
2016	49.3	22.6
2017	54.4	24.4
2018	76.7	34.4
2019	99.5	44.6
2020	137.2	61.9
2021	163.9	73.8
2022	173.7	77.9
2022 versus 2021	+6.0%	+5.6%
2022 versus 1990	-77.7%	-78.2%

Latvian agricultural land has a tendency of soil acidification. According to information provided by State Plant Protection Service, almost half of agricultural land in Latvia needs both the annual maintenance liming and basic liming of soil to neutralize the soil acidity. Since 1992 soil liming has to be characterized as insufficient. However, liming activities rapidly increase in last years.

There have been no recalculations performed for this source category this year. There are no planned activities this year that will improve the data quality for this source category.

## 5.7 UREA APPLICATION (CRF 3.H)

CO<sub>2</sub> emission from urea fertilization is estimated with the Equation 11.13 from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (page 11.32):

$$CO_2 - C \text{ Emission} = M * EF \quad (5.26)$$

where:

*CO<sub>2</sub>-C Emission* - annual C emissions from urea application, tons C yr<sup>-1</sup>

*M* - annual amount of urea fertilization, tons urea yr<sup>-1</sup>

*EF* - emission factor, ton of C (tons of urea)<sup>-1</sup>

EF of 0.20 for urea application emission is used for calculations. The default 50% of uncertainty is applied for EF and activity data uncertainty is evaluated as 2%. CSB of Latvia data of urea application is available from 2007. FAO data for 2002 and 2003 is also available. Data for all other years are derived by extrapolation of available statistical values. Therefore, higher uncertainty for urea application in the base year is set for activity data.

Table 5.37 represents activity data and estimated CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from urea fertilization. Urea application on agriculture soils is a minor source of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in the inventory and contributes about 0.2% of the agriculture GHG emissions in 2022. However, the significant decrease in urea use is observed during the last inventory year.

Table 5.37 Urea statistics and calculated CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, 1990-2022

Year	Annual amount of urea fertilization (tons yr <sup>-1</sup> )	CO <sub>2</sub> emissions (kt)
1990	10512	7.71
1995	920	0.67
2000	1840	1.35
2001	2528	1.85
2002	6078	4.46
2003	1942	1.42
2004	1943	1.42
2005	1944	1.43
2006	1945	1.43
2007	1946	1.43
2008	4323	3.17
2009	5930	4.35
2010	5459	4.00
2011	5798	4.25
2012	7901	5.79
2013	5558	4.08
2014	6445	4.73
2015	8468	6.21
2016	10815	7.93
2017	12921	9.48
2018	13787	10.11
2019	13958	10.24
2020	12413	9.10
2021	13053	9.57
2022	7522	5.52

Year	Annual amount of urea fertilization (tons yr <sup>-1</sup> )	CO <sub>2</sub> emissions (kt)
2022 versus 2021	-42.4%	-42.4%
2022 versus 1990	-28.4%	-28.4%

There have been no recalculations performed for this source category this year. There are no planned activities that will improve the data quality for this source category.

### **5.8 OTHER CARBON-CONTAINING FERTILIZERS (CRF 3.I)**

According to information represented by FAO and CSB emissions of other carbon-containing fertilizers are below the 5% (0.004-0.007%) of the national total GHG emissions and could be characterized as emissions below the threshold of significance in Latvia. Therefore for Latvia notation key NE is used.

### **5.9 OTHER (CRF 3J)**

There is no information on other sources in Latvia. Notation key – NO is used.



## 6 LAND-USE, LAND-USE CHANGE AND FORESTRY (CRF 4)

### 6.1 OVERVIEW OF SECTOR

In 2022, total net emissions of aggregated GHGs in Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry (LULUCF) sector were 4944.16 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. (Figure 6.1, Table 6.1, Table 6.2). The main source of GHG emissions in LULUCF sector is organic soils (7008.11 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. in 2022 including emissions due to peat extraction for horticulture, Figure 6.2). Aggregated net removals of the GHG reduced by 140% in 2022 compared to 1990 mostly due to increase in harvest rate; however, the ageing of forests also resulted in an increase in natural mortality and reduction of increment. Increased harvest rate impact is also reflected in the decrease of the net CO<sub>2</sub> removals in living biomass in Forest Land in 2014, 2015 and 2020-2022 when LULUCF sector was a net source of GHG emissions. The harvest rate depends on the increased availability of forest resources in mature forests. In 2022, the increased harvesting rate in forest land was related to Russia's aggression in Ukraine, disruption of the existing wood supply chains, and timber market turbulences. Latvia's wood resources had to compensate for the previous wood supply from Russia and Belarus. Forest land category has been a net sink of GHG emissions in 1990-2021, while in 2022 forest land category became a net source of GHG emissions (1287.54 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.).

From 1990 to 2013 and from 2016 to 2019 LULUCF sector was a net sink (as the removals in the sector exceeded the emissions). Since 1990, the cropland and grassland categories have been a source of GHG emissions. In 2022, total GHG emissions in cropland category (1964.16 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.) decreased by 24% if compared to 1990, while total GHG emissions in grassland category (1710.93 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.) increased by 47%. Also settlements and wetlands categories were a source of GHG emissions in 2022 (1192.72 and 1787.58 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq., respectively); furthermore emissions increased by 1165.59 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. (4296%) and 768.55 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. (75%), respectively, if compared to 1990. Harvested Wood Products (HWP) have totalled a net sink for all time period excluding 1992 and 1993 (-3001.51 kt CO<sub>2</sub> in 2022). Further descriptions on the trends can be found under the section describing each land-use category.




Figure 6.1 Summary of net emissions (positive sign) and removals (negative sign) in the LULUCF sector by land-use categories and HWP (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)




Figure 6.2 Summary of net emissions (positive sign) and removals (negative sign) in the LULUCF sector by sink and source categories (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

According to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines land area is divided into six land-use categories (Forest Land, Cropland, Grassland, Wetlands, Settlements and Other Land). In Latvia, LULUCF sector comprises emissions and removals arising from Forest Land, Cropland, Grassland, Wetlands and Settlements divided into the subcategories “lands remaining in the same land-use category for the last 20 years” and “lands converted to present land use during the past 20 years”. Other land is considered as unmanaged land and does not contain considerable amount of organic carbon in any of carbon pools and the emissions and removals are not reported. Emissions and

removals from HWP are included in the LULUCF estimates. The information about area of all land use categories since 2009 comes from the National forest inventory (NFI). Until submission 2019 land use changes were identified by using NFI data supported with other spatial data (e.g., aerial photographs and satellite images). Since submission 2020 land use changes are calculated by the method that uses the most recent NFI data and auxiliary information provided by the land parcel information system (LPIS) and stand-wise forest inventory<sup>168</sup>. The new method introduces elaborated GIS and spreadsheet tools that considerably improve the quality of the activity data by eliminating possible errors of manual calculations and by reducing non-existing land use changes like conversion of cropland to grassland and vice versa, through linearization of the land use change trends.

Summary of net emissions and removals in the LULUCF sector by land-use category and HWP is shown in Table 6.1. Decrease of CO<sub>2</sub> removals in living biomass in forest land is associated with increase of the harvesting rate, increase of mortality and reduction of increment of living biomass in forest land.

---

<sup>168</sup> Krumsteds L.L., Ivanovs J., Jansons J., Lazdins A. 2019. Development of Latvian land use and land use change matrix using geospatial data of National Forest Inventory. *Agronomy Research* 17(6), p. 2295–2305, DOI: 10.15159/AR.19.195.

Table 6.1 Summary of net emissions and removals in the LULUCF sector by land-use category and HWP (positive figures indicate emissions, negative removals) (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

Category	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2021	2022
4. LULUCF	-12390.09	-14838.26	-11851.13	-5905.33	-1894.77	362.90	758.29	2201.66	4944.16
4.A Forest Land	-17024.37	-18213.34	-13248.47	-8239.12	-4550.93	-2061.00	-2606.59	-797.96	1287.54
living biomass	-17804.84	-17845.63	-11783.12	-6886.00	-492.55	-1517.10	-2914.40	-1765.26	1141.47
dead wood	-542.41	-1773.34	-2986.56	-2660.71	-5406.59	-2022.04	-1326.72	-702.38	-1481.01
litter	-6.45	-8.52	-23.26	-31.01	-35.62	-44.30	-40.93	-44.21	-49.07
organic soils	1275.36	1314.88	1319.69	1310.13	1331.33	1451.89	1622.85	1632.72	1633.75
biomass burning	53.97	99.27	224.78	28.47	52.50	70.56	52.60	81.17	42.39
4.B Cropland	2590.87	2402.55	2198.52	1829.15	1623.10	1527.83	1717.60	1796.39	1964.16
living biomass	-6.46	-7.30	-7.30	-7.08	-2.49	-68.68	-31.10	-1.16	28.42
dead organic matter	-1.24	-0.90	-0.55	-0.16	31.71	27.29	72.80	75.95	156.05
mineral soils	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.45	1.48	2.95	3.42	4.41
organic soils	2598.57	2410.76	2206.36	1836.38	1593.41	1567.64	1672.74	1717.92	1774.94
4(III) N mineralization	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.11	0.22	0.26	0.33
4.C Grassland	1163.36	1149.27	1167.39	1655.35	1762.46	1530.42	1599.43	1541.43	1710.93
living biomass	-20.23	-22.01	-0.14	73.59	34.96	-73.73	-85.21	108.17	40.83
dead organic matter	-3.88	-2.99	33.68	182.14	165.32	43.06	166.15	-67.93	181.93
organic soils	1187.37	1174.18	1133.42	1399.25	1561.71	1560.49	1518.32	1501.00	1487.97
biomass burning	0.10	0.10	0.42	0.38	0.47	0.61	0.17	0.19	0.20
4.D Wetlands	1019.02	322.08	453.67	907.78	733.01	1349.75	1487.43	1525.77	1787.58
living biomass	-68.17	-96.37	-104.72	-101.76	-165.36	-63.72	5.63	-8.98	2.55
dead organic matter	-13.09	-13.60	-10.63	-8.46	-41.38	-62.57	50.86	29.73	53.47
organic soils	1100.29	432.06	569.03	1018.00	939.75	1476.04	1430.94	1505.02	1731.55
4.E Settlements	27.14	-23.57	0.23	132.66	298.01	-165.59	686.68	736.83	1192.72
living biomass	20.32	-59.23	-58.76	-18.07	10.91	-633.33	-8.66	448.13	275.07
dead organic matter	-5.82	-4.96	1.30	38.15	83.30	113.52	133.38	-315.95	252.47
mineral soils	0.00	9.79	10.82	23.27	47.20	84.41	136.81	144.33	156.75
organic soils	10.64	21.37	34.82	68.96	120.49	205.87	317.22	343.60	379.89
4(III) N mineralization	1.99	9.47	12.06	20.34	36.11	63.93	107.93	116.73	128.54
4.G Harvested Wood Products	-166.11	-475.42	-2422.65	-2191.54	-1761.23	-1819.98	-2128.66	-2603.31	-3001.51
4(IV) Indirect N <sub>2</sub> O Emissions from Managed Soils	0.00	0.17	0.18	0.40	0.81	1.46	2.38	2.52	2.75

Table 6.2 Summary of net emissions and removals in the LULUCF sector by different gases (positive figures indicate emissions, negative removals)

Emissions, unit	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2021	2022
Total emissions, kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.	-12390.09	-14838.26	-11851.13	-5905.33	-1894.77	362.90	758.29	2201.66	4944.16
CO <sub>2</sub> kt	-13398.95	-15871.52	-12901.36	-6913.13	-2953.09	-847.62	-649.35	767.64	3485.39
CH <sub>4</sub> kt	18.69	18.74	19.10	17.62	19.15	24.32	30.18	30.88	31.76
N <sub>2</sub> O kt	1.83	1.92	1.94	1.94	1.97	2.00	2.12	2.15	2.15
NO <sub>x</sub> kt	0.18	0.27	0.47	0.09	0.09	0.11	0.09	0.11	0.08
CO kt	12.81	18.74	32.48	6.05	5.66	6.62	5.76	7.15	5.66

The definitions (based of NFI) of carbon pools are as follows:

- Living biomass consist of above-ground biomass (all biomass of living vegetation, both woody and herbaceous, above the soil including stems, stumps, branches, bark, seeds, and foliage and below-ground biomass (all biomass of live roots and stump, fine roots of less than 2 mm diameter are excluded because these often cannot be distinguished empirically from soil organic matter or litter)). Forest understory is a relatively small component of the above-ground biomass carbon pool and it is excluded from calculation in the inventory time series.
- Dead wood consists of all non-living woody biomass not contained in the litter, either standing, lying on the ground, or in the soil. Dead wood includes wood lying on the surface, dead roots down to a diameter of 2 mm, and stumps. Litter includes all non-living biomass with a size greater than the limit for soil organic matter (2 mm) and less than the minimum diameter chosen for dead wood (bottom diameter above 6 cm), lying dead, in various states of decomposition above or within the mineral or organic soil. This includes the litter layer as usually defined in soil typologies. Live fine roots above the mineral or organic soil (with diameter less than 2 mm) are included in litter where they cannot be distinguished from it empirically.
- Soil carbon is organic carbon in mineral and organic soils (including peat) to a 30 cm depth. Live fine roots of less than 2 mm are included with soil organic matter.

The LULUCF sector is important in Latvia's GHG balance due to the fact that more than half of the country area is covered with forests and due to long history of sustainable forest management which secured continuous increase of growing stock in forests since beginning of 20<sup>th</sup> century (from 101 m<sup>3</sup> ha<sup>-1</sup> in 1935 to 220 m<sup>3</sup> ha<sup>-1</sup> in 2022)<sup>169</sup>. According to data provided by NFI<sup>170</sup> total forest area (including afforested lands) in 2022 was 3281.99 kha (50.8% of total country area). Total area of land converted to forest land in 2022 was 165.75 kha. Twenty years transition period is considered for land use changes, therefore area of forest land remaining forest land is increasing during recent years, but area of lands converted to forest is decreasing, because area converted to forest until 2002 (including) is now reported as forest land remaining forest land. The same approach is applied to conversion of cropland to grassland and other land use changes.

Overview of calculation methods and types of EFs for the LULUCF sector is shown in Table 6.3. In the forest land category removals and emissions associated with living biomass and soil were estimated using mixed approach of Tier 1 and Tier 2 and country specific activity data, like increment and harvesting figures, mortality rate in forests, wood density values, biomass expansion factors (BEFs), carbon stock in biomass, as well as the land use information.

Estimation of conversion of land use from cropland to grassland was introduced in 2011 to represent land use changes associated with reduction of area of cropland. According to the

<sup>169</sup> Latvia's Forests During 20 Years of Independence. Available:

[https://www.zm.gov.lv/public/ck/files/ZM/mezhi/buklets/MN\\_20\\_EN.pdf](https://www.zm.gov.lv/public/ck/files/ZM/mezhi/buklets/MN_20_EN.pdf) and NFI data

<http://www.silava.lv/userfiles/file/Meza%20statistiska%20inventarizacija/Kopsavilkumi%202014%20II%20cikls%204gadi.xlsx>;

[http://www.silava.lv/userfiles/file/Meza%20statistiska%20inventarizacija/Kopsavilkumi\\_2019\\_III\\_cikls\(3\).xlsx](http://www.silava.lv/userfiles/file/Meza%20statistiska%20inventarizacija/Kopsavilkumi_2019_III_cikls(3).xlsx)

<sup>170</sup> Methodology of Activity 1.1 "Monitoring of Forest Resources" of the National Forest Inventory (Nacionālā meža monitoringa 1.1. aktivitātes "Meža resursu monitorings" metodika). Available:

[http://www.silava.lv/userfiles/file/Nacionalais%20meza%20monitorings/Me%C5%BEa%20resursu%20monitoringa%20metodi%2026\\_04\\_2013.pdf](http://www.silava.lv/userfiles/file/Nacionalais%20meza%20monitorings/Me%C5%BEa%20resursu%20monitoringa%20metodi%2026_04_2013.pdf) (in Latvian). Translation in english is included in Report "Improvement of quality assurance and quality control system in land use, land use change and forestry sector in Latvia", pp. 33-65. Available:

[https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/0Bxv4jQ\\_04jXZNTM5aGNDTVdRvzQ](https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/0Bxv4jQ_04jXZNTM5aGNDTVdRvzQ).

results of study by Bardule et al. (2017), soil carbon stock changes (CSCs) in mineral soils should not be reported when the land use change from cropland to grassland or vice versa are estimated by the NFI, because there is not statistically significant difference between soil carbon stock in these land use categories<sup>171</sup>.

**Table 6.3 Overview of methods and emission factors used in calculations of GHG emissions from the LULUCF sector**

CRF	Source	CO <sub>2</sub>		CH <sub>4</sub>		N <sub>2</sub> O	
		Methods	EF	Methods	EF	Methods	EF
4.A	<b>Forest land</b>						
4.A.1	Forest Land Remaining Forest Land	<i>Tier 1, Tier 2</i>	<i>CS, D</i>	<i>Tier 1, Tier 2</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>Tier 1, Tier 2</i>	<i>D</i>
4.A.1	4(V) Biomass Burning	<i>Tier 1</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>Tier 1, Tier 2</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>Tier 1, Tier 2</i>	<i>D</i>
4.A.2	Land Converted to Forest Land	<i>Tier 2</i>	<i>CS</i>	-	-	-	-
<b>4(II)</b>	Emissions and removals from drainage and rewetting and other management of organic and mineral soils	<i>Tier 1</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>Tier 1, Tier 2</i>	<i>CS, D</i>	<i>Tier 1</i>	<i>D</i>
4.B	<b>Cropland</b>						
4.B.1	Cropland Remaining Cropland	<i>Tier 2</i>	<i>CS</i>	-	-	-	-
4.B.2	Land Converted to Cropland	<i>Tier 2, Tier 3</i>	<i>CS</i>	-	-	<i>Tier 1</i>	<i>CS</i>
<b>4(II)</b>	Emissions and removals from drainage and rewetting and other management of organic and mineral soils	-	-	<i>Tier 1</i>	<i>D</i>	-	-
4.C	<b>Grassland</b>						
4.C.1	Grassland Remaining Grassland	<i>Tier 2</i>	<i>CS</i>	<i>Tier 1</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>Tier 1</i>	<i>D</i>
4.C.1	4(V) Biomass Burning	-	-	<i>Tier 1</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>Tier 1</i>	<i>D</i>
4.C.2	Land Converted to Grassland	<i>Tier 1, Tier 2 Tier 3</i>	<i>CS, D</i>	-	-	-	-
<b>4(II)</b>	Emissions and removals from drainage and rewetting and other management of organic and mineral soils	-	-	<i>Tier 2</i>	<i>CS</i>	-	-
4.D	<b>Wetland</b>						
4.D.1	Wetlands Remaining Wetlands	<i>Tier 2</i>	<i>CS</i>	-	-	-	-
4.D.2	Land Converted to Wetlands	<i>Tier 1</i>	<i>D</i>	-	-	-	-
<b>4(II)</b>	Emissions and removals from drainage and rewetting and other management of organic and mineral soils	<i>Tier 1, Tier 2</i>	<i>CS, D</i>	<i>Tier 1, Tier 2</i>	<i>CS, D</i>	<i>Tier 2</i>	<i>CS</i>
4.E	<b>Settlements</b>						
4.E.1	Settlements Remaining Settlements	<i>Tier 2</i>	<i>CS</i>	-	-	<i>Tier 1</i>	<i>D</i>
4.E.2	Land Converted to Settlements	<i>Tier 1, Tier 2</i>	<i>CS, D</i>	-	-	<i>Tier 1</i>	<i>D</i>
4.G	<b>Harvested Wood Products</b>	<i>Tier 2</i>	<i>CS</i>	-	-	-	-

Emissions of GHG due to forest fires in LULUCF sector are calculated using data about areas of forest fires provided by the State Forest Service (SFS).

<sup>171</sup> Bardule A., Lupikis A., Butlers A., Lazdins A. 2017. Organic carbon stock in different types of mineral soils in cropland and grassland in Latvia. *Zemdirbyste-Agriculture*, 104, 1, p. 3–8.

Net emissions due to production of the HWP are calculated according to methodology of 2013 IPCC Kyoto Protocol Supplement. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions due to roundwood production in deforested land are calculated using instantaneous oxidation method.

Knowledge of dynamics of dead wood in forest lands is improved by adding more recent data from NFI inventories, both in terms of mortality rate and decay periods, because forest management principles have significantly changed since 1990, for instance, in the 80<sup>th</sup>s it was a common practice to debark stumps and to incinerate harvesting residues to reduce risk of distribution of pests. Nowadays this practice is not used any more in State owned forests and in very limited amount is used in private forests. Instead of that extraction of the residues for biofuel production becomes more common. Comparison of different sources of information about dead wood (NFI and internationally reported data) demonstrates constant increase of dead wood stock in forests during the last decade; however, it could be also result of several extreme weather events. Mortality rate excluding extreme events was elaborated in 2012 on the base of the NFI data (sample plots measured in 2006 and 2012) for the FMRL calculations<sup>172</sup>. Both, mortality rate and increment factors improve by usage of newly available NFI and research data.

Emissions from drained organic and mineral soils are calculated using both default EFs of the IPCC Wetlands Supplement and country-specific EFs (results of scientific studies), as well as national activity data. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from drained organic soils in forest land, cropland, grassland and peatlands drained for peat extraction are calculated using results of scientific studies (country-specific EFs: 0.52 tons C ha<sup>-1</sup> annually in forest land, 4.8 tons C ha<sup>-1</sup> in cropland, 4.4 tons C ha<sup>-1</sup> in grassland, and 1.2 tons C ha<sup>-1</sup> in peatlands drained for peat extraction)<sup>173,174,175</sup>. Information about area of drained mineral and organic soils in forest land is taken from the NFI (total area of forest types on drained soils). Until submission 2018 information on area of organic soils in farmland was taken from summaries of land surveys based on field measurements completed in 60<sup>th</sup>s, 70<sup>th</sup>s and early 80<sup>th</sup>s, but since submission 2018 area of organic soils in cropland and grassland is reported according to the research results<sup>176</sup>.

The further implementation of improved quantitative results of modelling (using Yasso) to characterize CSCs in mineral soils in forest land, cropland and grassland is in progress according to improvement plan (summary in Chapter 10.4).

<sup>172</sup> Lazdiņš A., Donis J., Strūve L. 2012. Projekts "Latvijas meža apsaimniekošanas radītās ogļskābās gāzes (CO<sub>2</sub>) piesaistes un siltumnīcefekta gāzu (SEG) emisiju references līmeņa aprēķina modeļa izstrāde" (Project "Elaboration of model for estimation of GHG emissions and CO<sub>2</sub> removals due to forest management").

<sup>173</sup> Lupikis A., Lazdiņš A. 2017. Soil carbon stock changes in transitional mire drained for forestry in Latvia: A case study. *Proceedings of 23rd Annual International Scientific Conference "Research for Rural Development 2017"*, p. 55-61, DOI: 10.22616/rrd.23.2017.008.

<sup>174</sup> Licite I., Lupikis, A. 2020. Impact of land use practices on greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture land on organic soils. *Proceedings of 19th International Scientific Conference Engineering for Rural Development, 1823–1830*. DOI: 10.22616/ERDev.2020.19.TF492

<sup>175</sup> Lazdiņš A., Lupikis A. 2019. LIFE REstore project contribution to the greenhouse gas emission accounts in Latvia. In: A. Priede, A. Gancone (Eds.), *Sustainable and responsible after-use of peat extraction areas* (pp. 21–52). Baltijas Krasti.

<sup>176</sup> Lazdiņš A., Bārdule A., Butlers A., Lupikis A., Okmanis M., Bebre I., ... Petaja G. 2016. Projekts "Aramzemes un ilggadīgo zālāju apsaimniekošanas radīto siltumnīcefekta gāzu (SEG) emisiju un oglekļa dioksīda (CO<sub>2</sub>) piesaistes uzskaites sistēmas pilnveidošana un atbilstošu metodisko risinājumu izstrādāšana" (Project "Improving the accounting system of CO<sub>2</sub> removals and GHG emissions due to management practices in cropland and grassland and development of methodological solutions"). 2016. gada starpziņojums, No. 101115/S109, p. 123. Available: [https://drive.google.com/open?id=0Bxv4jQ\\_04jXZRExSMWhPMWhDNDg](https://drive.google.com/open?id=0Bxv4jQ_04jXZRExSMWhPMWhDNDg).



Key categories in LULUCF sector in 2022 in Latvia are summarised in Table 6.4. The most significant key category according to the level assessment (Approach 1) and trend assessment (Approach 1) relates to Forest land remaining forest land.

**Table 6.4 Key categories in LULUCF in 2024 submission**

Category	Gas	Identification criteria
4.A.1 Forest Land remaining Forest Land – Carbon stock change, dead wood	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T1
4.A.1 Forest Land remaining Forest Land – Carbon stock change, living biomass	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2
4.A.1 Forest Land remaining Forest Land – Carbon stock change, organic soil	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2
4.A. Forest land – 4(II) Emissions and removals from drainage and rewetting and other management of organic and mineral soils, total organic soils	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2
4.A. Forest land – 4(II) Emissions and removals from drainage and rewetting and other management of organic and mineral soils, total organic soils	N <sub>2</sub> O	L1,L2,T2
4.A. Forest land – 4(II) Emissions and removals from drainage and rewetting and other management of organic and mineral soils, total organic soils	CH <sub>4</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2
4.A.2 Land converted to Forest Land – Carbon stock change, living biomass	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,T1
4.B. Cropland 4(II) Emissions and removals from drainage and rewetting and other management of organic and mineral soils	CH <sub>4</sub>	L1,L2,T2
4.B.1 Cropland remaining Cropland – Carbon stock change, organic soil	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2
4.B.1 Land converted to Cropland – Carbon stock change, forest land converted to cropland, dead organic matter	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2
4.B.2 Land converted to Cropland – Carbon stock change, organic soil	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2
4.C. Grassland – 4(II) Emissions and removals from drainage and rewetting and other management of organic and mineral soils	CH <sub>4</sub>	L1,L2
4.C.1 Grassland remaining Grassland – Carbon stock change, organic soil	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2
4.C.2 Land converted to Grassland – Carbon stock change, organic soil	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2
4.C.2 Land converted to Grassland – Carbon stock change, forest land converted to grassland, living biomass	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2
4.C.2 Land converted to Grassland – Carbon stock change, wetlands converted to grassland, living biomass	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1
4.D. Wetlands 4(II) Emissions and removals from drainage and rewetting and other management of organic and mineral soils, Peat extraction from lands, rewetted organic soils	CO <sub>2</sub>	L2,T2
4.D. Wetlands 4(II) Emissions and removals from drainage and rewetting and other management of organic and mineral soils, Peat extraction from lands, rewetted organic soils	CH <sub>4</sub>	L1,L2,T2
4.D. Wetlands 4(II) Emissions and removals from drainage and rewetting and other management of organic and mineral soils, Peat extraction from lands, drained organic soils	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T1
4.D.1 Wetlands remaining Wetlands – Carbon stock change, living biomass	CO <sub>2</sub>	T2
4.D.1 Wetlands remaining Wetlands – Carbon stock change, organic soils	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T2
4.D.1 Wetlands remaining Wetlands – Carbon stock change, dead organic matter	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1
4.D.2 Land Converted to Wetland - Carbon stock change, organic soils	CO <sub>2</sub>	L2,T2
4.E.1 Settlements remaining Settlements – Carbon stock change, living biomass	CO <sub>2</sub>	T2
4.E.2 Land converted to Settlements – Carbon stock change, dead organic matter	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2
4.E.2 Land converted to Settlements – Carbon stock change, living biomass	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2
4.E.2 Land converted to Settlements – Carbon stock change, mineral soils	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1
4.E.2 Land converted to Settlements – Carbon stock change, organic soils	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2
4.E.2 Lands converted to settlements – Direct nitrous oxide (N <sub>2</sub> O) emissions from nitrogen (N) mineralization/immobilization associated with loss/gain of	N <sub>2</sub> O	L1,L2,T1,T2

Category	Gas	Identification criteria
soil organic matter resulting from change of land use or management of mineral soils		
4.G. Harvested wood products	CO <sub>2</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2

The most important improvements in this submission are related to implementation of improved activity data (area of wildfires in forest land and grassland in 2021; activity data for recalculation of CO<sub>2</sub> removals in HWP for 2019-2021) and improved methodology for calculation of CSCs in living biomass in settlements converted to grassland category and to improved methodology for calculation of CSCs in dead organic matter for cropland converted to settlements category (implemented based on recommendations of the ERT and EU-internal inventory review).

## **6.2 LAND-USE DEFINITIONS AND THE CLASSIFICATION SYSTEMS USED AND THEIR CORRESPONDENCE TO THE LULUCF CATEGORIES**

For the GHG inventory, land area and inland water bodies are classified according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. Definitions of the IPCC land-use categories in the national GHG inventory is provided in Table 6.5.

**Table 6.5 National application of IPCC land-use categories**

IPCC category	National land use categories and definitions fits to IPCC categories
Forest land	<i>Land of a minimum area of 0.1 ha with potential tree crown cover of more than 20% and with the potential of trees to reach a minimum height of 5 m at maturity. Young natural stands and all plantations established for the forestry purposes, which have to reach a crown density of 20% or tree height of 5 m. Areas normally forming part of the forest area, which are temporarily unstocked as a result of human intervention or natural causes, but which are expected to revert to forest. For linear formations, a minimum width of 20 m is applied.</i>
Cropland	<i>Arable land, including orchards and extensively managed arable lands (ploughed at least once per 20 years). Animal feeding glades (periodically ploughed areas if forest used for wild animal feeding), which according to national land use classification belong to forest land.</i>
Grassland	<i>Pastures, glades and bush-land which do not fit to forest definition. Vegetated areas on non-forest lands complying to forest definition where land use type can be easily returned to grassland by cutting grass and small trees without legal requirement of transformation of the land use, but except grassland used in forage production and extensively managed cropland reported under cropland. Non-forest lands with average diameter of trees at the breast height less than 2 cm are reported under grassland's category.</i>
Wetlands	<i>All inland water bodies (rivers, ponds, lakes), swamps (constantly wet areas where height of trees cannot reach more than 5 m and ground vegetation consists mostly of sphagnum and different sword grasses), flood-lands (usually small areas suffering from exceeding water periodically); alluvial lands (larger glades and bush-lands suffering from exceeding water).</i>
Settlements	<i>Land under buildings including yards and gardens as well as land necessary to maintain and to access those buildings, land under roads including buffer zones, forest infrastructure including ditches and their management bands, as well as seed orchards, forest nurseries and fire-breaks, drainage systems in cropland and grassland, other infrastructure – buffer zones of industrial networks, quarries etc., but excluding peat extraction sites.</i>
Other land	<i>Dunes not covered by woody vegetation.</i>

The information about area of all land use categories since 2009 comes from the NFI. Information about grassland, cropland, wetlands and other lands provided by the State Land Service of Latvia are used for reference – to estimate potential errors in the NFI data as well as to estimate the area of cropland and grassland in 1990.

Until submission 2019 conversion of cropland to grassland was estimated using remote sensing method comparing vegetation index in the NFI sample plots listed as cropland or grassland<sup>177</sup>.

Since submission 2020 new method for calculation of land use changes using the most recent NFI data and auxiliary information provided by the land parcel information system (LPIS) and stand-wise forest inventory was implemented (Krumsteds et al., 2019)<sup>178</sup>. In general, the new method introduces elaborated GIS tools that considerably improve the quality of the activity data by eliminating possible errors of manual calculations and by reducing non-existing land use changes like conversion of cropland to grassland and vice versa, through linearisation of the land use change trends, e.g., NFI teams mark area as a grassland if the area is not ploughed for several years, in spite the area is used for crop production during the previous visit of NFI team. In most of the cases it is temporal abandonment due to crop rotation and in the next visit (in 5 years) the area will be sown again. Such temporal changes affects 5-10% of farmlands annually and about 200 kha (8% of farmlands) during 5 years cycle, resulting in very messy land use matrix. New methodology was necessary to exclude temporal changes from accounting of land use changes. After implementation of new methodology reported land use changes decreased in average more than 10 times. Temporal changes are successfully eliminated from the land use matrix. LPIS data and NFI at the same time ensures correct crop/biomass production data from all areas. According to Krumsteds et al. (2019), new calculation method considerably reduces uncertainty of the land-use estimates by usage of auxiliary data that increase accuracy of determination of final land-use category. Information of recalculated land use data are used to determine more precise land use information for each individual plot. Added auxiliary data is land parcel information system (LPIS), which is maintained by Rural Support Service. LPIS data provides information about permanent and cultivated grassland and cropland areas. If grassland in NFI plot intersects with a polygon of sown grassland in LPIS the land use category is changed to cropland. This eliminates potential errors where field measurement teams during field work have reported grassland as a land use category, but the grassland is sown and regularly cultivated and possibly will be ploughed next season to change the cultivated crop. Furthermore, the method already contains the solution for non-completed NFI cycles. Basically, the land use changes are estimated on the base of 20%, 40%, 60%, 80% and, finally, 100% of NFI data, as soon as new measurement years are added. For the NFI plots where land use category depends on the most recent inventory data, but those are not available, the model takes land use data from the previous NFI cycle (in some cases it means land use changes, in some cases changes are avoided). Additionally, in cropland and grassland LPIS data are used to set actual land use category.

The areas of IPCC land-use categories based on the NFI data and Latvia's total land area according to the CSB data are given in Table 6.6.

<sup>177</sup> Lazdiņš A., Zariņš J. 2012. Projekts "Vēsturiskās (1990. gada) apsaimniekoto aramzemju platības noteikšana un līdz 2009. gadam notikušo aramzemju platības izmaiņu novērtēšana" (Project "Estimation of area of managed croplands and change of cropland's area until 2009").

<sup>178</sup> Krumsteds L.L., Ivanovs J., Jansons J., Lazdiņš A. 2019. Development of Latvian land use and land use change matrix using geospatial data of National forest inventory. *Agronomy Research* 17(6), p. 2295–2305, DOI: 10.15159/AR.19.195.

Table 6.6 Areas of IPCC land-use classes in 1990-2022 (kha)

Year	Total country area	Forest land	Cropland	Grassland	Settlements	Wetland	Other land
1990	6458.95	3177.53	2061.23	547.31	292.55	374.90	5.44
1991	6458.95	3178.92	2051.31	555.93	292.62	374.72	5.44
1992	6458.95	3180.32	2041.39	564.56	292.70	374.55	5.44
1993	6458.95	3181.72	2031.47	573.18	292.77	374.37	5.44
1994	6458.95	3183.12	2021.55	581.80	292.85	374.20	5.44
1995	6458.95	3184.51	2011.63	590.43	292.92	374.03	5.44
1996	6458.95	3193.17	1995.08	597.38	293.08	374.80	5.44
1997	6458.95	3201.82	1978.52	604.34	293.24	375.58	5.44
1998	6458.95	3210.48	1961.97	611.30	293.40	376.36	5.44
1999	6458.95	3219.13	1945.42	618.25	293.56	377.14	5.44
2000	6458.95	3227.79	1928.87	625.21	293.72	377.92	5.44
2001	6458.95	3228.03	1877.69	675.46	292.40	379.94	5.44
2002	6458.95	3228.27	1826.50	725.71	291.08	381.95	5.44
2003	6458.95	3228.50	1775.32	775.95	289.76	383.97	5.44
2004	6458.95	3228.74	1724.14	826.20	288.44	385.99	5.44
2005	6458.95	3228.98	1672.95	876.45	287.12	388.01	5.44
2006	6458.95	3229.22	1621.77	926.70	285.80	390.03	5.44
2007	6458.95	3229.46	1570.59	976.94	284.48	392.04	5.44
2008	6458.95	3229.69	1519.40	1027.19	283.16	394.06	5.44
2009	6458.95	3234.06	1509.90	1030.05	284.34	395.16	5.44
2010	6458.95	3238.43	1500.39	1032.91	285.51	396.27	5.44
2011	6458.95	3242.80	1490.89	1035.77	286.69	397.37	5.44
2012	6458.95	3247.17	1481.38	1038.63	287.86	398.47	5.44
2013	6458.95	3251.54	1471.88	1041.48	289.04	399.57	5.44
2014	6458.95	3250.22	1471.56	1039.00	293.11	399.63	5.44
2015	6458.95	3248.89	1471.24	1036.51	297.18	399.69	5.44
2016	6458.95	3247.57	1470.92	1034.02	301.25	399.75	5.44
2017	6458.95	3246.25	1470.61	1031.54	305.32	399.81	5.44
2018	6458.95	3244.92	1470.29	1029.05	309.39	399.86	5.44
2019	6458.95	3253.51	1496.21	994.39	310.46	398.97	5.41
2020	6458.95	3262.09	1522.13	959.73	311.54	398.07	5.38
2021	6458.95	3270.68	1548.05	925.07	312.62	397.18	5.36
2022	6458.95	3281.99	1578.13	883.71	314.71	395.08	5.33

Area of cropland and grassland in LULUCF reporting is synchronized with Agriculture reporting. It is considered that all forest land, grassland, cropland and settlements are managed. Detailed land use change matrices are provided in Table 6.8; summary – in Table 6.7.

Table 6.7 Summary of land use change matrix (kha)

Changes	To Forest land	To Cropland	To Grassland	To Settlements	To Wetland (managed)	To Wetland	To Other land
1990 (initial area)	3155.79	2073.22	560.73	289.06	48.15	326.56	5.44
From Forest land	-	9.36	53.16	32.54	NO	33.11	0.24
From Cropland	62.03	-	643.46	16.92	NO	13.56	NO
From Grassland	142.95	220.99	-	15.62	NO	17.34	NO
From Settlements	26.29	6.85	8.00	-	NO	2.19	NO
From Wetland (managed)	6.65	0.93	NO	2.37	-	6.58	NO
From Wetland	16.33	2.76	15.27	1.53	NO	-	NO

Changes	To Forest land	To Cropland	To Grassland	To Settlements	To Wetland (managed)	To Wetland	To Other land
From Other land	0.35	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	-
2022 (final area)	3281.99	1578.13	883.71	314.71	31.62	363.47	5.33

Table 6.8 Land use change matrix (kha)

Changes	To Forest land	To Cropland	To Grassland	To Settlements	To Wetland (managed)	To Wetland	To Other land
<b>Land use change 1990</b>							
Initial area	3155.79	2073.22	560.73	289.06	48.15	326.56	5.44
From Forest land	3155.79*	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
From Cropland	5.34	2057.97*	7.78	1.91	NO	0.21	NO
From Grassland	16.19	3.23	539.53*	1.50	NO	0.29	NO
From Settlements	NO	NO	NO	289.06*	NO	NO	NO
From Wetland (managed)	0.21	0.03	NO	0.07	47.63*	0.21	NO
From Wetland	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	326.56*	NO
From Other land	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	5.44*
Final area	3177.53	2061.23	547.31	292.55	47.63	327.26	5.44
<b>Land use change 1995</b>							
From Forest land	3183.12*	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
From Cropland	0.54	2011.28*	9.60	NO	NO	0.14	NO
From Grassland	0.65	0.32	580.83*	NO	NO	NO	NO
From Settlements	NO	NO	NO	292.85*	NO	NO	NO
From Wetland (managed)	0.21	0.03	NO	0.07	45.05*	0.21	NO
From Wetland	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	328.63*	NO
From Other land	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	5.44*
Final area	3184.51	2011.63	590.43	292.92	45.05	328.98	5.44
<b>Land use change 2000</b>							
From Forest land	3217.85*	NO	0.61	0.09	NO	0.58	NO
From Cropland	3.60	1927.75*	13.77	NO	NO	0.31	NO
From Grassland	6.13	0.96	610.83*	NO	NO	0.33	NO
From Settlements	NO	NO	NO	293.56*	NO	NO	NO
From Wetland (managed)	0.21	0.03	NO	0.07	42.47*	0.21	NO
From Wetland	NO	0.13	NO	NO	NO	334.03*	NO
From Other land	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	5.44*
Final area	3227.79	1928.87	625.21	293.72	42.47	335.45	5.44
<b>Land use change 2001</b>							
From Forest land	3222.81*	NO	2.93	0.66	NO	1.40	NO
From Cropland	1.63	1871.41*	54.88	0.26	NO	0.69	NO
From Grassland	1.36	6.17	616.91*	0.06	NO	0.72	NO
From Settlements	1.89	0.08	0.37	291.36*	NO	0.03	NO
From Wetland (managed)	0.21	0.03	NO	0.07	41.95*	0.21	NO

## Latvia's National Inventory Report 1990-2022

Changes	To Forest land	To Cropland	To Grassland	To Settlements	To Wetland (managed)	To Wetland	To Other land
From Wetland	0.14	NO	0.36	NO	NO	334.95*	NO
From Other land	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	5.44*
Final area	3228.03	1877.69	675.46	292.40	41.95	337.99	5.44
<b>Land use change 2002</b>							
From Forest land	3223.04*	NO	2.93	0.66	NO	1.40	NO
From Cropland	1.63	1820.23*	54.88	0.26	NO	0.69	NO
From Grassland	1.36	6.17	667.15*	0.06	NO	0.72	NO
From Settlements	1.89	0.08	0.37	290.04*	NO	0.03	NO
From Wetland (managed)	0.21	0.03	NO	0.07	41.43*	0.21	NO
From Wetland (unmanaged)	0.14	NO	0.36	NO	NO	337.48*	NO
From Other land	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	5.44*
Final area	3228.27	1826.50	725.71	291.08	41.43	340.52	5.44
<b>Land use change 2003</b>							
From Forest land	3223.28*	NO	2.93	0.66	NO	1.40	NO
From Cropland	1.63	1769.05*	54.88	0.26	NO	0.69	NO
From Grassland	1.36	6.17	717.40*	0.06	NO	0.72	NO
From Settlements	1.89	0.08	0.37	288.71*	NO	0.03	NO
From Wetland (managed)	0.21	0.03	NO	0.07	40.92*	0.21	NO
From Wetland	0.14	NO	0.36	NO	NO	340.02*	NO
From Other land	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	5.44*
Final area	3228.50	1775.32	775.95	289.76	40.92	343.06	5.44
<b>Land use change 2004</b>							
From Forest land	3223.52*	NO	2.93	0.66	NO	1.40	NO
From Cropland	1.63	1717.86*	54.88	0.26	NO	0.69	NO
From Grassland	1.36	6.17	767.65*	0.06	NO	0.72	NO
From Settlements	1.89	0.08	0.37	287.39*	NO	0.03	NO
From Wetland (managed)	0.21	0.03	NO	0.07	40.40*	0.21	NO
From Wetland	0.14	NO	0.36	NO	NO	342.55*	NO
From Other land	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	5.44*
Final area	3228.74	1724.14	826.20	288.44	40.40	345.59	5.44
<b>Land use change 2005</b>							
From Forest land	3223.76*	NO	2.93	0.66	NO	1.40	NO
From Cropland	1.63	1666.68*	54.88	0.26	NO	0.69	NO
From Grassland	1.36	6.17	817.90*	0.06	NO	0.72	NO
From Settlements	1.89	0.08	0.37	286.07*	NO	0.03	NO
From Wetland (managed)	0.21	0.03	NO	0.07	39.88*	0.21	NO
From Wetland	0.14	NO	0.36	NO	NO	345.09*	NO
From Other land	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	5.44*
Final area	3228.98	1672.95	876.45	287.12	39.88	348.13	5.44
<b>Land use change 2006</b>							

## Latvia's National Inventory Report 1990-2022

Changes	To Forest land	To Cropland	To Grassland	To Settlements	To Wetland (managed)	To Wetland	To Other land
From Forest land	3224.00*	NO	2.93	0.66	NO	1.40	NO
From Cropland	1.63	1615.50*	54.88	0.26	NO	0.69	NO
From Grassland	1.36	6.17	868.14*	0.06	NO	0.72	NO
From Settlements	1.89	0.08	0.37	284.75*	NO	0.03	NO
From Wetland (managed)	0.21	0.03	NO	0.07	39.37*	0.21	NO
From Wetland	0.14	NO	0.36	NO	NO	347.62*	NO
From Other land	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	5.44*
Final area	3229.22	1621.77	926.70	285.80	39.37	350.66	5.44
<b>Land use change 2007</b>							
From Forest land	3224.23*	NO	2.93	0.66	NO	1.40	NO
From Cropland	1.63	1564.31*	54.88	0.26	NO	0.69	NO
From Grassland	1.36	6.17	918.39*	0.06	NO	0.72	NO
From Settlements	1.89	0.08	0.37	283.43*	NO	0.03	NO
From Wetland (managed)	0.21	0.03	NO	0.07	38.85*	0.21	NO
From Wetland	0.14	NO	0.36	NO	NO	350.16*	NO
From Other land	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	5.44*
Final area	3229.46	1570.59	976.94	284.48	38.85	353.19	5.44
<b>Land use change 2008</b>							
From Forest land	3224.47*	NO	2.93	0.66	NO	1.40	NO
From Cropland	1.63	1513.13*	54.88	0.26	NO	0.69	NO
From Grassland	1.36	6.17	968.64*	0.06	NO	0.72	NO
From Settlements	1.89	0.08	0.37	282.11*	NO	0.03	NO
From Wetland (managed)	0.21	0.03	NO	0.07	38.33*	0.21	NO
From Wetland	0.14	NO	0.36	NO	NO	352.69*	NO
From Other land	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	5.44*
Final area	3229.69	1519.40	1027.19	283.16	38.33	355.73	5.44
<b>Land use change 2009</b>							
From Forest land	3223.25*	0.48	2.70	1.50	NO	1.77	NO
From Cropland	3.25	1503.18*	11.30	1.01	NO	0.66	NO
From Grassland	5.45	5.47	1014.96*	0.58	NO	0.73	NO
From Settlements	0.93	0.50	0.49	281.14*	NO	0.10	NO
From Wetland (managed)	0.21	0.03	NO	0.07	37.82*	0.21	NO
From Wetland	0.97	0.24	0.61	0.03	NO	353.88*	NO
From Other land	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	5.44*
Final area	3234.06	1509.90	1030.05	284.34	37.82	357.35	5.44
<b>Land use change 2010</b>							
From Forest land	3227.62*	0.48	2.70	1.50	NO	1.77	NO
From Cropland	3.25	1493.67*	11.30	1.01	NO	0.66	NO
From Grassland	5.45	5.47	1017.81*	0.58	NO	0.73	NO
From	0.93	0.50	0.49	282.31*	NO	0.10	NO

## Latvia's National Inventory Report 1990-2022

Changes	To Forest land	To Cropland	To Grassland	To Settlements	To Wetland (managed)	To Wetland	To Other land
Settlements							
From Wetland (managed)	0.21	0.03	NO	0.07	37.30*	0.21	NO
From Wetland	0.97	0.24	0.61	0.03	NO	355.50*	NO
From Other land	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	5.44*
Final area	3238.43	1500.39	1032.91	285.51	37.30	358.97	5.44
<b>Land use change 2011</b>							
From Forest land	3231.99*	0.48	2.70	1.50	NO	1.77	NO
From Cropland	3.25	1484.17*	11.30	1.01	NO	0.66	NO
From Grassland	5.45	5.47	1020.67*	0.58	NO	0.73	NO
From Settlements	0.93	0.50	0.49	283.49*	NO	0.10	NO
From Wetland (managed)	0.21	0.03	NO	0.07	36.78*	0.21	NO
From Wetland	0.97	0.24	0.61	0.03	NO	357.11*	NO
From Other land	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	5.44*
Final area	3242.80	1490.89	1035.77	286.69	36.78	360.59	5.44
<b>Land use change 2012</b>							
From Forest land	3236.36*	0.48	2.70	1.50	NO	1.77	NO
From Cropland	3.25	1474.66*	11.30	1.01	NO	0.66	NO
From Grassland	5.45	5.47	1023.53*	0.58	NO	0.73	NO
From Settlements	0.93	0.50	0.49	284.66*	NO	0.10	NO
From Wetland (managed)	0.21	0.03	NO	0.07	36.27*	0.21	NO
From Wetland	0.97	0.24	0.61	0.03	NO	358.73*	NO
From Other land	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	5.44*
Final area	3247.17	1481.38	1038.63	287.86	36.27	362.20	5.44
<b>Land use change 2013</b>							
From Forest land	3240.73*	0.48	2.70	1.50	NO	1.77	NO
From Cropland	3.25	1465.16*	11.30	1.01	NO	0.66	NO
From Grassland	5.45	5.47	1026.39*	0.58	NO	0.73	NO
From Settlements	0.93	0.50	0.49	285.84*	NO	0.10	NO
From Wetland (managed)	0.21	0.03	NO	0.07	35.75*	0.21	NO
From Wetland	0.97	0.24	0.61	0.03	NO	360.35*	NO
From Other land	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	5.44*
Final area	3251.54	1471.88	1041.48	289.04	35.75	363.82	5.44
<b>Land use change 2014</b>							
From Forest land	3248.31*	0.38	0.56	1.92	NO	0.36	NO
From Cropland	0.26	1468.90*	1.48	1.00	NO	0.23	NO
From Grassland	1.27	2.03	1036.72*	1.25	NO	0.22	NO
From Settlements	0.05	0.09	NO	288.83*	NO	0.07	NO
From Wetland (managed)	0.21	0.03	NO	0.07	35.23*	0.21	NO
From Wetland	0.12	0.13	0.23	0.03	NO	363.31*	NO
From Other land	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	5.44*



Latvia's National Inventory Report 1990-2022

Changes	To Forest land	To Cropland	To Grassland	To Settlements	To Wetland (managed)	To Wetland	To Other land
Final area	3250.22	1471.56	1039.00	293.11	35.23	364.40	5.44
<b>Land use change 2015</b>							
From Forest land	3246.99*	0.38	0.56	1.92	NO	0.36	NO
From Cropland	0.26	1468.58*	1.48	1.00	NO	0.23	NO
From Grassland	1.27	2.03	1034.23*	1.25	NO	0.22	NO
From Settlements	0.05	0.09	NO	292.90*	NO	0.07	NO
From Wetland (managed)	0.21	0.03	NO	0.07	34.72*	0.21	NO
From Wetland	0.12	0.13	0.23	0.03	NO	363.88*	NO
From Other land	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	5.44*
Final area	3248.89	1471.24	1036.51	297.18	34.72	364.97	5.44
<b>Land use change 2016</b>							
From Forest land	3245.66*	0.38	0.56	1.92	NO	0.36	NO
From Cropland	0.26	1468.26*	1.48	1.00	NO	0.23	NO
From Grassland	1.27	2.03	1031.75*	1.25	NO	0.22	NO
From Settlements	0.05	0.09	NO	296.97*	NO	0.07	NO
From Wetland (managed)	0.21	0.03	NO	0.07	34.20*	0.21	NO
From Wetland	0.12	0.13	0.23	0.03	NO	364.46*	NO
From Other land	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	5.44*
Final area	3247.57	1470.92	1034.02	301.25	34.20	365.55	5.44
<b>Land use change 2017</b>							
From Forest land	3244.34*	0.38	0.56	1.92	NO	0.36	NO
From Cropland	0.26	1467.94*	1.48	1.00	NO	0.23	NO
From Grassland	1.27	2.03	1029.26*	1.25	NO	0.22	NO
From Settlements	0.05	0.09	NO	301.04*	NO	0.07	NO
From Wetland (managed)	0.21	0.03	NO	0.07	33.68*	0.21	NO
From Wetland (unmanaged)	0.12	0.13	0.23	0.03	NO	365.03*	NO
From Other land	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	5.44*
Final area	3246.25	1470.61	1031.54	305.32	33.68	366.12	5.44
<b>Land use change 2018</b>							
From Forest land	3243.02*	0.38	0.56	1.92	NO	0.36	NO
From Cropland	0.26	1467.62*	1.48	1.00	NO	0.23	NO
From Grassland	1.27	2.03	1026.77*	1.25	NO	0.22	NO
From Settlements	0.05	0.09	NO	305.11*	NO	0.07	NO
From Wetland (managed)	0.21	0.03	NO	0.07	33.17*	0.21	NO
From Wetland (unmanaged)	0.12	0.13	0.23	0.03	NO	365.61*	NO
From Other land	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	5.44*
Final area	3244.92	1470.29	1029.05	309.39	33.17	366.70	5.44
<b>Land use change 2019</b>							
From Forest	3237.13*	0.99	2.62	2.15	NO	1.97	0.06

## Latvia's National Inventory Report 1990-2022

Changes	To Forest land	To Cropland	To Grassland	To Settlements	To Wetland (managed)	To Wetland	To Other land
land							
From Cropland	1.09	1464.42*	3.96	0.60	NO	0.22	NO
From Grassland	11.38	30.01	985.38*	1.07	NO	1.21	NO
From Settlements	1.48	0.74	0.61	306.31*	NO	0.25	NO
From Wetland (managed)	0.21	0.03	NO	0.07	32.65*	0.21	NO
From Wetland (unmanaged)	2.14	0.01	1.82	0.26	NO	362.46*	NO
From Other land	0.08	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	5.36*
Final area	3253.51	1496.21	994.39	310.46	32.65	366.32	5.41
<b>Land use change 2020</b>							
From Forest land	3245.72*	0.99	2.62	2.15	NO	1.97	0.06
From Cropland	1.09	1490.34*	3.96	0.60	NO	0.22	NO
From Grassland	11.38	30.01	950.72*	1.07	NO	1.21	NO
From Settlements	1.48	0.74	0.61	307.39*	NO	0.25	NO
From Wetland (managed)	0.21	0.03	NO	0.07	32.13*	0.21	NO
From Wetland (unmanaged)	2.14	0.01	1.82	0.26	NO	362.08*	NO
From Other land	0.08	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	5.33*
Final area	3262.09	1522.13	959.73	311.54	32.13	365.94	5.38
<b>Land use change 2021</b>							
From Forest land	3254.30*	0.99	2.62	2.15	NO	1.97	0.06
From Cropland	1.09	1516.26*	3.96	0.60	NO	0.22	NO
From Grassland	11.38	30.01	916.06*	1.07	NO	1.21	NO
From Settlements	1.48	0.74	0.61	308.46*	NO	0.25	NO
From Wetland (managed)	0.21	0.03	NO	0.07	31.62*	0.21	NO
From Wetland (unmanaged)	2.14	0.01	1.82	0.26	NO	361.70*	NO
From Other land	0.08	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	5.30*
Final area	3270.68	1548.05	925.07	312.62	31.62	365.56	5.36
<b>Land use change 2022</b>							
From Forest land	3260.29*	2.09	2.50	3.28	NO	2.45	0.07
From Cropland	2.20	1540.32*	3.96	1.08	NO	0.49	NO
From Grassland	14.22	34.46	873.78*	1.31	NO	1.30	NO
From Settlements	1.87	1.08	0.75	308.61*	NO	0.31	NO
From Wetland (managed)	NO	NO	NO	NO	31.62*	NO	NO
From Wetland (unmanaged)	3.31	0.18	2.73	0.42	NO	358.92*	NO
From Other land	0.10	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	5.26*
Final area	3281.99	1578.13	883.71	314.71	31.62	363.47	5.33

\* total area of land remaining in the same land-use category.

### **6.3 INFORMATION ON APPROACHES USED FOR REPRESENTING LAND AREAS AND ON LAND-USE DATABASES USED FOR THE INVENTORY PREPARATION**

Spatial approach is used to represent area of forest land, grassland, cropland, wetlands, settlements and other lands. Activity data are provided by the NFI<sup>179</sup>. Source data of the inventory (about 16000 plots representing 400 ha each) are used in calculations of land use and land use changes, as well as drainage and rewetting of forest land. The NFI data are adapted to the harmonized country area for the whole reporting period and to land use categories used in the GHG inventory. Four cycles of the NFI (2004-2008, 2009-2013 and 2014-2018 and 2019-2022, the first four years of 4<sup>th</sup> cycle) are used in the GHG inventory to determine stock change in living biomass. Average data constructed from the most recent 5 years measurement period of the NFI are used for calculation of mortality and harvest rate.

Until submission 2019 research data (remote sensing studies based on LANDSAT images) was used to identify Forest Land and woody areas converted to Cropland and Settlements. The same approach was applied for identification of extensively managed croplands (e.g., organic farms, where considerable area of arable land is set aside for a longer time period and can be reported in NFI as grassland or forest land, depending on the vegetation). Vegetation index was estimated in all the NFI plots (including outside forest) in satellite image series from 1990, 1995 and 2000 with aim to identify plots where vegetation index permanently changed from the values characteristic for forest to the values characteristic for settlements, grassland and cropland. Area of cropland considerably increased and area of grasslands decreased, when research data were applied, in comparison to the original NFI data, because extensively managed farmlands (organic farms and grassland utilized in forage production) were reported under cropland category as well as lands, which at least once during last 10 years had value of vegetation index typical for cropland.

Area of land converted to settlements before 2004 was estimated using LANDSAT satellite images within the scope of the project "Elaboration and integration into National greenhouse gas inventory report matrices of land use changes of areas belonging to Kyoto protocol article 3.3 and 3.4 activities"<sup>180</sup>.

Since submission 2020 new method for calculation of land use changes using the most recent NFI data was implemented<sup>181</sup>.

## **6.4 FOREST LAND (CRF 4.A)**

### **6.4.1 Category description**

In Latvia, forest land was a net sink in 1990-2021 (GHG removals reached 19758.20 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. in 1994), while in 2022 forest land was a net source of GHG emissions (total net GHG emissions

<sup>179</sup> Summary of National Forest Inventory. Available:

[http://www.silava.lv/userfiles/file/Meza%20statistiska%20inventarizacija/Kopsavilkumi%202014%20I%20cikls%20\(2\).xlsx](http://www.silava.lv/userfiles/file/Meza%20statistiska%20inventarizacija/Kopsavilkumi%202014%20I%20cikls%20(2).xlsx);

[http://www.silava.lv/userfiles/file/Meza%20statistiska%20inventarizacija/Kopsavilkumi%202014%20II%20cikls%20\(2\).xlsx](http://www.silava.lv/userfiles/file/Meza%20statistiska%20inventarizacija/Kopsavilkumi%202014%20II%20cikls%20(2).xlsx);

[http://www.silava.lv/userfiles/file/Meza%20statistiska%20inventarizacija/Kopsavilkumi\\_2019\\_III\\_cikls\(3\).xlsx](http://www.silava.lv/userfiles/file/Meza%20statistiska%20inventarizacija/Kopsavilkumi_2019_III_cikls(3).xlsx)

<sup>180</sup> Lazdiņš A., Zariņš J. 2010. Projekts "Mežu zemes izmantošanas maiņas matricas izstrādāšana un integrēšanu nacionālajā siltumnīcefekta gāzu inventarizācijas pārskatā par Kioto protokola 3.3 un 3.4 pantā minētajiem pasākumiem" (Project "Elaboration and integration into National greenhouse gas inventory report matrices of land use changes of areas belonging to Kyoto protocol Article 3.3 and 3.4 activities").

<sup>181</sup> Krumsteds L.L., Ivanovs J., Jansons J., Lazdiņš A. 2019. Development of Latvian land use and land use change matrix using geospatial data of National forest inventory. *Agronomy Research* 17(6), p. 2295–2305, DOI: 10.15159/AR.19.195.

in forest lands, excluding HWP, were 1287.54 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. in 2022, Figure 6.3, Figure 6.4). Aggregated net removals of the GHG reduced by 108% in 2022 in forest land compared to 1990 mostly due to increase in harvest rate; however, the ageing of forests also resulted in an increase in natural mortality and reduction of increment. Increased harvest rate impact is also reflected in the decrease of the net CO<sub>2</sub> removals in living biomass in Forest Land in 2014, 2015 and 2020-2022. The harvest rate depends on the increased availability of forest resources in mature forests. In 2022, the increased harvesting rate in forest land was related to Russia's aggression in Ukraine, disruption of the existing wood supply chains, and timber market turbulences. Latvia's wood resources had to compensate for the previous wood supply from Russia and Belarus.

Forest land category includes emissions and removals resulting from CSCs in living biomass, litter, dead wood, and emissions from drainage and rewetting of organic soils, and biomass burning. Forest land category is subdivided into Forest land remaining forest land (CRF 4.A.1) and Land converted to forest land less than 20 years ago (CRF 4.A.2). The aggregated net GHG emissions from forest land remaining forest land were 621.81 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. in Latvia in 2022, excluding removals in HWP (respectively -3001.51 kt CO<sub>2</sub>) and emissions from drainage and rewetting of organic soils (respectively 929.58 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.). The net emissions from land converted to forest land in 2022 were -263.85 kt CO<sub>2</sub>.




Figure 6.3 Summary of GHG emissions (positive sign) and removals (negative sign) in forest land (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)




Figure 6.4 Summary of GHG emissions in forest land (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.) by source and sink categories

There are several key source and sink categories in forest land in Latvia – CO<sub>2</sub> in Forest Land remaining Forest Land and as well as 3 key source categories (CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O) under 4 (II) Emissions and removals from drainage and rewetting and other management of organic and mineral soils. The NFI and research data are used to estimate time series for areas and gross increment<sup>182</sup>. Species specific mortality rate is applied according to the most recent NFI data as the 5 year average value. Distinction between forest land remaining forest land and land converted to forest land is made according to the age of dominant species in forests on afforested land – if age of dominant species was less than zero in 1990, it is considered as land converted to forest land, in other cases it is considered as forest land remaining forest land.

Carbon stock changes in above and below ground living and dead biomass are reported in the submission. Decay factor for dead wood including harvesting residues not incinerated on-site is considered 20 years. In forest land remaining forest land, changes of organic carbon in litter and mineral soil organic matter in naturally dry and wet soils are assumed to be zero according to the national research data on carbon stock in forest soil in 2006 and 2012<sup>183</sup>. In addition, results of Yasso modelling proved that mineral soils in forest lands are not a source of emissions (Bārdulis et al., 2017<sup>184</sup>; Lupiķis and Lazdiņš, 2017<sup>185</sup>; Lupiķis, 2017<sup>186</sup>).

Carbon stock changes are reported separately on naturally dry and wet mineral and organic soils and drained mineral and organic soils. Soils are considered organic as defined in the NFI: a soil is classified as organic if the organic layer (H horizon) is at least 20 cm deep. Distribution

<sup>182</sup> Summary of NFI. Available: <http://www.silava.lv/petijumi/nacionlais-mea-monitorings.aspx>

<sup>183</sup> Lazdiņš et al. 2011.-2015. Projekts "Mežsaimniecisko darbību ietekmes uz siltumnīcefekta gāzu emisijām un CO<sub>2</sub> piesaisti novērtējums" (Project "Evaluation of impact of forest management practices on greenhouse gas emissions and CO<sub>2</sub> removals").

<sup>184</sup> Bārdulis, A., Lupiķis, A., Stola, J. 2017. Carbon balance in forest mineral soils in Latvia modelled with Yasso07 soil carbon model. *Research for Rural Development*, 1, p.28–34.

<sup>185</sup> Lupiķis, A., Lazdiņš, A. 2017. Oglekļa aprite minerālaugsnes Latvijas mežos: Modelēts ar Yasso07 augsnes oglekļa modeli [Carbon cycling in mineral soils in Latvian forests: modelled using YASSO07 soil carbon model]. *Starptautiskā zinātniski praktiskā konference Zinātne un prakse nozares attīstībai Mežzinātnes un augstākās mežizglītības loma nozares konkurētspējas paaugstināšanā tēzes*, 17.

<sup>186</sup> Lupiķis, A. (31.01.2017). Meža zemju augsnes oglekļa aprite modelēta ar Yasso07 augsnes oglekļa modeli [The soil carbon cycling in forest land modelled using the Yasso07 soil carbon model]. *Latvijas Universitātes 75. konference, Rīga, Latvija*.

of the forest site types according to the NFI is shown in Table 6.9. Conversion of forest stands on drained mineral or organic soil to initially wet conditions is reported as rewetting.

**Table 6.9 Distribution of drained, naturally dry and wet mineral and organic soils in Latvia's forests (forest land remaining forest land except land converted to forest land > 20 years ago) (kha)**

Year	Forest at the end of year	Forest on dry mineral soils	Forest on drained mineral soils	Forest on wet mineral soils	Forest on drained organic soils	Forest on wet organic soils
1990	3155.79	1546.09	572.88	335.31	404.98	296.54
1995	3155.79	1551.31	601.72	306.38	416.96	279.42
2000	3149.38	1548.16	600.50	305.76	416.11	278.85
2001	3144.40	1545.71	599.55	305.28	415.46	278.41
2002	3139.41	1543.26	598.60	304.79	414.80	277.97
2003	3134.43	1540.81	597.65	304.31	414.14	277.53
2004	3129.45	1538.36	596.70	303.82	413.48	277.09
2005	3124.46	1535.91	595.75	303.34	412.82	276.65
2006	3119.48	1533.46	594.80	302.86	412.16	276.20
2007	3114.49	1531.01	593.85	302.37	411.50	275.76
2008	3109.51	1528.56	592.89	301.89	410.85	275.32
2009	3103.07	1538.02	569.78	297.62	406.60	291.04
2010	3096.63	1534.83	568.60	297.00	405.76	290.44
2011	3090.18	1531.64	567.42	296.38	404.92	289.83
2012	3083.74	1528.44	566.23	295.76	404.07	289.23
2013	3077.30	1525.25	565.05	295.14	403.23	288.63
2014	3074.07	1535.54	543.01	291.31	388.23	315.98
2015	3070.84	1533.93	542.44	291.00	387.82	315.64
2016	3067.61	1532.32	541.87	290.70	387.41	315.31
2017	3064.39	1530.71	541.30	290.39	387.01	314.98
2018	3061.16	1529.09	540.73	290.09	386.60	314.65
2019	3053.37	1535.70	536.46	285.70	380.85	314.66
2020	3045.57	1542.62	526.88	283.35	377.52	315.21
2021	3037.78	1541.76	521.76	283.88	375.12	315.25
2022	3027.39	1570.93	511.71	280.18	364.80	299.77

The CSC in living biomass is estimated with the Tier 2 method of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines – carbon uptake and release of the living biomass correspond to the mean gross annual increment of forest growing stock, annual harvesting of trees and decay due to natural mortality (Table 6.14). The time series for gross annual increment of growing stock of trees on a forest land remaining forest land are given in Figure 6.5.

Land converted to forest land provides relatively small net increment of growing stock of trees – about 0.155 mill. m<sup>3</sup> in 2022 (Table 6.10). Areas afforested 20 years ago (in 1990-2002) are reported under the forest land remaining forest land. Losses due to harvesting and natural mortality are reported using NFI data.

The dynamics of CSCs in living biomass are very much affected by commercial felling. The accessibility of forest resources was low at the beginning of the 1990s due to implementation of land reform (only privatized forests were available for felling); therefore, felling was also at a low level and the CO<sub>2</sub> sink of living biomass was higher. The felling stock increased during 1990s with implementation of the land reform and reached top average in early 2000s.

Updated figures according to the results of the NFI of felling, including biofuel gathering, are shown in Table 6.11.




Figure 6.5 Gross annual increment in forest land remaining forest land (m³ ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹)

Table 6.10 Changes of growing stock of timber on the Land converted to forest land<sup>187</sup>

Year	Stock changes, m³	Stem biomass, 1000 tonnes	Crown biomass, 1000 tonnes	Below-ground biomass, 1000 tonnes	Total biomass, 1000 tonnes
1990	576.03	0.26	0.06	0.08	0.39
1995	7746.15	3.42	0.81	1.05	5.28
2000	25505.06	11.24	2.70	3.48	17.42
2001	31110.87	13.71	3.30	4.24	21.25
2002	37350.32	16.46	3.96	5.10	25.51
2003	44216.43	19.48	4.68	6.03	30.20
2004	51709.74	22.72	5.53	7.06	35.31
2005	59834.18	26.29	6.40	8.17	40.86
2006	68595.52	30.13	7.34	9.37	46.84
2007	78000.56	34.27	8.35	10.65	53.26
2008	88056.74	38.68	9.42	12.02	60.13
2009	98919.99	43.11	10.50	13.32	66.93
2010	72007.97	31.39	7.64	9.70	48.72
2011	79687.01	34.73	8.45	10.73	53.92
2012	88169.27	38.43	9.35	11.87	59.66
2013	97494.64	42.49	10.34	13.13	65.97
2014	107462.57	46.76	11.28	14.38	72.42
2015	117962.34	51.32	12.44	15.83	79.58
2016	113744.67	49.26	12.06	15.23	76.55
2017	108961.06	47.99	11.55	14.88	74.42
2018	103567.03	44.92	11.09	13.96	69.97
2019	97907.73	42.99	10.58	13.45	67.02
2020	92181.41	38.90	9.94	12.11	60.96
2021	94881.45	40.02	10.20	12.43	62.66

<sup>187</sup> Lazdiņš A. Zariņš J. 2010. Projekts "Mežu zemes izmantošanas maiņas matricas izstrādāšana un integrēšanu nacionālajā siltumnīcefekta gāzu inventarizācijas pārskatā par Kioto protokola 3.3 un 3.4 pantā minētajiem pasākumiem" (Project "Elaboration and integration into National greenhouse gas inventory report matrices of land use changes of areas belonging to Kyoto protocol Article 3.3 and 3.4 activities").

Year	Stock changes, m <sup>3</sup>	Stem biomass, 1000 tonnes	Crown biomass, 1000 tonnes	Below-ground biomass, 1000 tonnes	Total biomass, 1000 tonnes
2022	154948.352	65.15	16.56	20.17	101.88

 Table 6.11 Harvesting stock (1000 m<sup>3</sup>)

Year	Total excluding deforestation	Aspen	Grey alder	Birch	Spruce	Black alder	Oak, ash	Other	Pine
1990	6297.93	577.09	302.98	1863.39	1757.86	112.59	22.93	0.09	1773.67
1991	5532.35	506.94	266.15	1636.87	1544.18	98.90	20.14	0.08	1558.06
1992	5056.73	463.36	243.27	1496.15	1411.42	90.40	18.41	0.07	1424.12
1993	5992.10	549.07	288.27	1772.90	1672.50	107.12	21.82	0.09	1687.54
1994	7217.42	661.35	347.22	2135.44	2014.51	129.02	26.28	0.11	2032.63
1995	8673.13	794.74	417.25	2566.14	2420.83	155.05	31.58	0.13	2442.59
1996	8515.39	780.28	409.66	2519.47	2376.80	152.23	31.00	0.12	2398.17
1997	11235.72	1029.55	540.53	3324.34	3136.09	200.86	40.91	0.16	3164.29
1998	12628.94	1157.22	607.56	3736.56	3524.97	225.76	45.98	0.18	3556.66
1999	16922.00	1550.60	814.09	5006.76	4723.23	302.51	61.61	0.25	4765.71
2000	13852.01	1313.01	630.98	3839.58	3607.21	247.63	36.73	0.20	4176.87
2001	13007.52	1291.82	753.41	3673.92	3242.51	206.77	37.39	0.19	3801.70
2002	14061.41	1419.32	959.65	3799.35	3178.36	223.34	47.12	0.21	4434.26
2003	14570.16	1380.21	1157.26	4083.52	3157.61	265.38	49.19	0.21	4476.99
2004	13513.27	805.82	798.72	3421.10	3523.78	248.51	79.02	0.20	4636.34
2005	14179.72	1356.31	988.96	4092.23	2735.16	293.35	60.38	0.21	4653.33
2006	12310.62	1137.91	1038.95	3720.67	2460.53	246.04	62.30	0.18	3644.04
2007	12723.14	1116.19	1007.91	3713.93	2234.99	289.59	51.98	8.45	4308.54
2008	11258.49	1011.52	639.51	3298.83	1796.04	212.35	45.94	7.47	4254.29
2009	13439.25	1170.56	852.24	4694.00	1970.40	308.04	46.42	8.92	4397.58
2010	16276.84	1450.63	1267.45	4443.06	2782.50	285.33	84.70	10.81	5952.36
2011	15948.21	1263.47	4753.58	1357.38	2561.80	236.51	62.02	11.67	5701.77
2012	14696.69	1189.39	4315.34	1306.49	2415.81	285.76	76.36	9.64	5097.90
2013	14612.05	2694.18	1258.02	2415.04	2042.73	824.02	118.95	2744.15	2514.95
2014	16473.59	3790.72	1748.39	3378.72	2719.86	1107.23	184.66	163.09	3380.92
2015	16930.21	3746.86	1996.39	3474.34	3028.41	1049.41	153.27	180.73	3300.80
2016	17279.66	3501.70	2270.46	3730.85	3070.50	1104.79	197.09	330.19	3074.08
2017	17238.77	3493.42	2265.08	3722.02	3063.24	1102.18	196.62	329.40	3066.81
2018	17588.02	3578.00	2635.99	3754.47	3268.27	1093.04	172.63	349.09	2736.52
2019	16937.80	3370.72	3567.67	2481.55	3242.05	1136.25	130.34	345.67	2663.55
2020	17616.08	1477.69	1116.32	6083.42	3016.15	842.08	107.47	230.26	4742.69
2021	18286.97	1510.75	1248.85	5990.42	3110.02	981.24	117.31	287.96	5040.42
2022	19463.38	1607.93	1329.19	6375.79	3310.09	1044.36	124.86	306.48	5364.67

The total area of the land converted to forest land is shown in Table 6.12 and Table 6.13. In 2016 it started to reduce, because area afforested in 1990-2002 in the convention reporting is reported under the forest land remaining forest land category.

Table 6.12 The cumulative area of land converted to forest land (kha)

Year	Land converted to forest land at the end of year	Forest on dry mineral soils	Forest on drained mineral soils	Forest on wet mineral soils	Forest on drained organic soils	Forest on wet organic soils
1990	21.74	21.31	0.38	0.00	0.00	0.05
1991	23.13	21.39	1.70	0.00	0.00	0.05
1992	24.53	22.26	1.76	0.29	0.17	0.05
1993	25.93	22.64	2.38	0.29	0.57	0.05



## Latvia's National Inventory Report 1990-2022

Year	Land converted to forest land at the end of year	Forest on dry mineral soils	Forest on drained mineral soils	Forest on wet mineral soils	Forest on drained organic soils	Forest on wet organic soils
1994	27.33	22.20	3.82	0.69	0.57	0.05
1995	28.72	23.22	4.19	0.69	0.57	0.05
1996	38.66	31.38	5.17	0.69	1.36	0.05
1997	48.60	40.63	5.25	0.69	1.58	0.45
1998	58.53	48.43	6.26	0.86	2.54	0.45
1999	68.47	57.16	7.46	0.86	2.54	0.45
2000	78.41	64.86	8.58	1.58	2.94	0.45
2001	83.63	68.88	9.79	1.58	2.94	0.45
2002	88.85	73.53	10.35	1.58	2.94	0.45
2003	94.07	78.76	10.35	1.58	2.94	0.45
2004	99.30	83.13	10.56	1.89	3.27	0.45
2005	104.52	87.55	11.36	1.89	3.27	0.45
2006	109.74	91.67	12.46	1.89	3.27	0.45
2007	114.96	96.24	12.72	1.89	3.27	0.85
2008	120.18	101.46	12.72	1.89	3.27	0.85
2009	131.00	112.05	12.72	2.10	3.27	0.85
2010	120.07	101.49	12.34	2.10	3.33	0.80
2011	129.48	111.94	11.02	2.39	3.33	0.80
2012	138.90	121.88	10.96	2.10	3.17	0.80
2013	148.31	131.86	10.79	2.10	2.77	0.80
2014	148.82	133.88	9.68	1.70	2.77	0.80
2015	149.33	134.76	9.31	1.70	2.77	0.80
2016	141.30	128.30	8.47	1.72	2.01	0.80
2017	133.26	120.75	8.54	1.75	1.83	0.40
2018	125.23	114.64	7.67	1.60	0.90	0.41
2019	131.67	120.44	7.72	1.82	1.21	0.48
2020	138.11	127.28	7.84	1.32	1.12	0.56
2021	149.27	137.79	7.88	1.54	1.42	0.64
2022	165.75	152.39	8.96	1.83	1.83	0.74

Table 6.13 Cumulative area of the land converted to forest land more than 20 years ago (kha)

Year	Land Converted to Forest Land >20 years ago	Forest on dry mineral soils	Forest on drained mineral soils	Forest on wet mineral soils	Forest on drained organic soils	Forest on wet organic soils
2010	21.74	21.31	0.38	0.00	0.00	0.05
2011	23.13	21.39	1.70	0.00	0.00	0.05
2012	24.53	22.26	1.76	0.29	0.17	0.05
2013	25.93	22.64	2.38	0.29	0.57	0.05
2014	27.33	22.20	3.82	0.69	0.57	0.05
2015	28.72	23.22	4.19	0.69	0.57	0.05
2016	38.66	31.38	5.17	0.69	1.36	0.05
2017	48.60	40.63	5.25	0.69	1.58	0.45
2018	58.53	48.43	6.26	0.86	2.54	0.45
2019	68.47	57.16	7.46	0.86	2.54	0.45
2020	78.41	64.86	8.58	1.58	2.94	0.45
2021	83.63	68.88	9.79	1.58	2.94	0.45
2022	88.85	73.53	10.35	1.58	2.94	0.45

Summary of assumptions for calculation of forest growing stock changes in forest land remaining forest land is shown in Table 6.14.

**Table 6.14 Summary of data for calculation of forest growing stock changes in forest land remaining forest land**

Year	Harvesting stock, 1000 m <sup>3</sup>	Average mortality, 1000 m <sup>3</sup>	Gross annual increment, 1000 m <sup>3</sup>	Annual living biomass stock changes (including deforestation), 1000 m <sup>3</sup>
1990	6297.93	4066.07	24181.15	13817.16
1991	5532.35	4066.07	24181.15	14582.73
1992	5056.73	4066.07	24181.15	15058.35
1993	5992.10	4066.07	24181.15	14122.99
1994	7217.42	4391.08	27051.16	15442.66
1995	8673.13	4391.08	27051.16	13986.96
1996	8519.33	4389.30	27040.18	14131.55
1997	11239.66	4387.51	27029.20	11402.02
1998	12632.89	4385.73	27018.21	9999.60
1999	16925.93	4549.15	27539.16	6064.07
2000	13855.94	4547.30	27527.96	9124.71
2001	13037.34	4540.11	27484.40	9906.95
2002	14091.23	4532.91	27440.83	8816.68
2003	14599.98	4525.72	27397.27	8271.57
2004	13543.06	4606.98	24070.56	5920.51
2005	14209.51	4599.65	24032.22	5223.06
2006	12340.41	4592.31	23993.88	7061.16
2007	12752.92	4584.97	23955.55	6617.65
2008	11288.28	4577.63	23917.21	8051.30
2009	13512.71	6975.11	23719.29	3231.48
2010	16350.30	7009.49	23836.20	476.42
2011	16021.67	6998.14	23797.63	777.82
2012	14770.15	6986.80	23759.07	2002.11
2013	14685.51	6975.46	23720.50	2059.53
2014	16565.94	6941.09	21911.39	-1595.65
2015	17022.54	5771.65	23637.10	842.92
2016	17372.25	6147.21	25166.92	1647.46
2017	17329.96	6272.22	26312.66	2710.48
2018	17680.17	6247.08	26480.09	2552.84
2019	17045.04	6233.19	26420.43	3142.20
2020	17726.70	5816.98	26469.64	2925.96
2021	18397.78	5233.80	25680.31	2048.73
2022	19760.12	5523.34	24902.53	-380.93

Further improvement of quantitative results of Yasso modelling to characterize CSCs in mineral soils is in progress according to improvement plan. New/improved results of studies on carbon input through above- and below-ground litter will be available for inclusion in GHG inventory as soon as results will be statistically analyzed and published in peer-reviewed scientific journal.

## 6.4.2 Methodological issues

### 6.4.2.1 Forest land remaining forest land (CRF 4.A.1)

Calculations of CSCs and GHG emissions in forest lands are based on activity data provided by the NFI (area, living biomass and dead wood) and Level I forest monitoring data (soil organic carbon). National statistics (SFS) are used to estimate historical commercial felling (1990-2011) related emissions and removals, but since 2012 NFI data are used to estimate emissions due to

commercial felling. Historical data are recalculated using empirical coefficient characterizing average ratio between the NFI and stand wise inventory data to retain integrity with recent, NFI base data. The calculation of GHG emissions and CO<sub>2</sub> removals in historical forest lands is based on research report "Elaboration of the model for calculation of the CO<sub>2</sub> removals and GHG emissions due to forest management"<sup>188</sup> and factors and coefficients elaborated within the scope of the research program on impact of forest management on GHG emissions and CO<sub>2</sub> removals<sup>189</sup>.

Changes of the carbon stock and GHG emissions are estimated according to the Tier 2 method with country specific data. Tier 2 method (the carbon loss to be subtracted from the carbon removals for the reporting year) is used in calculations of removals and emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> in living biomass.

Methodologies for estimation of CSCs and GHG emissions are merged together into the "Emissions projection & inventory model (EPIM)" spreadsheet tool. Input data are harmonized for UNFCCC reporting needs.

The concept of the EPIM:

- land use and land use change data are elaborated separately to simplify the structure of the tool, the connection is organized as linked tables;
- main input data – area under different growth and management conditions, gross annual increment, mortality per area, harvesting rate and species composition and others;
- calculations are done on annual basis using periodic (5 year period) and annual input data;
- historical data (1990-2004) – backward calculation on the base of the NFI data; for 1970-1989 research data and expert judgement assuming linearized data on land use changes are utilized;
- all modules in the spreadsheet are merged together following to the forest management cycle (from growth to decay);
- the tool combines all land use and land use change categories.

Content of the tool (separate calculation sheets):

- living biomass (annual gross increment of living biomass, summary of growing stock and characteristics of biomass);
- mortality (natural reduction of number of living trees, estimation of decay of harvesting residues, calculation of dynamics of carbon stock in dead biomass);
- commercial harvesting (input to the HWP, losses in above-ground and below-ground biomass);

---

<sup>188</sup> Lazdiņš A., Donis J., Strūve L. 2012. Projekts "Latvijas meža apsaimniekošanas radītās ogļskābās gāzes (CO<sub>2</sub>) piesaistes un siltumnīcefekta gāzu (SEG) emisiju references līmeņa aprēķina modeļa izstrāde" (Project "Elaboration of the model for calculation of the CO<sub>2</sub> removals and GHG emissions due to forest management") ( No. 5.5-9.1-0070-101-12-91). LVMI Silava, Salaspils. Lazdiņš A., Donis J., Strūve L., 2012b. Latvia's national methodology for reference level of forest management activities (English summary).

<sup>189</sup> Lazdiņš et al. 2011-2015. Projekts "Mežsaimniecisko darbību ietekmes uz siltumnīcefekta gāzu emisijām un CO<sub>2</sub> piesaisti novērtējums" (Project "Evaluation of impact of forest management practices on greenhouse gas emissions and CO<sub>2</sub> removals").

- HWP (CSC in locally originated and consumed HWP);
- emissions from soils (CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O from drained organic soils and CH<sub>4</sub>, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from rewetted soils in forest land and wetlands);
- fire (emissions of CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O due to incineration of harvesting residues and wildfires);
- conversion from forests land to other land uses (CSC in living biomass, dead wood, litter and soil);
- conversion of other land uses to forest land (CSC in living biomass, dead wood, litter and soil);
- cropland (emissions from soil, CSC in living and dead biomass);
- grassland (emissions from soil, CSC in living and dead biomass, wildfires);
- settlements (CSC in soil, living and dead biomass);
- land use changes (CSC in living biomass, dead wood, litter and soil);
- managed wetlands including peat extraction sites, rewetted and flooded lands (emissions from soil, CSC in living and dead biomass).

Module for estimation of the gross annual increment of trees (at the beginning of the calculation period):

- increment figures on the base of the NFI data on growing stock changes and mortality rate<sup>190</sup>;
- species, age of stands and dimensions specific gross increment equations for the most common tree species (values specific for birch are used for other tree species);
- species specific wood densities (Table 6.15) and BEFs<sup>191</sup> used for verification of the biomass calculation in NFI (Table 6.16);
- average carbon stock in biomass is provided in Table 6.17.

Biomass equations elaborated by Liepiņš et al. (2017)<sup>192</sup> and the carbon fraction factor are applied at a single tree level already in the NFI database and GHG inventory team receives data recalculated to volume, biomass and carbon stock per NFI plot and extrapolated to country area.

---

<sup>190</sup>Donis J. 2011. Projekts "Latvijas meža resursu ilgtspējīgas, ekonomiski pamatotas izmantošanas un prognozēšanas modeļu izstrāde" (Project "Developing models for sustainable and economically feasible utilization and prediction of the availability of forest resources in Latvia"); Lazdiņš A., Donis J., Strūve L. 2012. Projekts "Latvijas meža apsaimniekošanas radītās ogļskābās gāzes (CO<sub>2</sub>) piesaistes un siltumnīcefekta gāzu (SEG) emisiju referenes līmeņa aprēķina modeļa izstrāde" (Project "Elaboration of calculation model for evaluation of GHG emissions and CO<sub>2</sub> removals due to forest management").

<sup>191</sup>Liepiņš J., Lazdiņš A., Liepiņš K. 2015. Above- and below-ground biomass functions for four most common tree species in Latvia, in: Abstracts from the International Scientific Conference Knowledge based forest sector, Riga, Latvia, pp. 51–53. Liepins J., Liepins K., Lazdins A. 2015. Biomass equations for the most common tree species in Latvia. Presented at the Adaptation and mitigation: strategies for management of forest ecosystems, Airport hotel ABC, pp. 47–50.

Liepiņš J., Liepiņš K., Lazdiņš A. 2016. Estimation of the biomass stock from growing stock volume, in: Collection of Abstracts. Presented at the 11th International Scientific Conference Students on Their Way to Science, Jelgava, p. 120.

<sup>192</sup>Liepiņš, J., Lazdiņš, A., Liepiņš, K. 2017. Equations for estimating above- and belowground biomass of Norway spruce, Scots pine, birch spp. and European aspen in Latvia. *Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research*, 1–43, DOI: 10.1080/02827581.2017.1337923.

The figures of the gross annual increment of living trees is calculated according to stock change in forest stands with different dominant tree species.

**Table 6.15 Wood density<sup>193</sup>**

Species	Density, tonns m <sup>-3</sup>
Aspen	0.40
Grey alder	0.39
Birch	0.49
Spruce	0.39
Black alder	0.49
Oak, ash	0.49
Other species (mostly <i>Salix</i> sp.)	0.46
Pine	0.44

**Table 6.16 Country specific tree biomass expansion factors to calculate crown and below-ground biomass from stem biomass<sup>194, 195</sup>**

Species	Stem biomass to crown biomass	Stem biomass to below-ground biomass
Aspen	1.20	0.27
Grey alder	1.22	0.28
Birch	1.19	0.31
Spruce	1.41	0.39
Black alder	1.19	0.30
Oak, ash	1.19	0.30
Other species	1.21	0.30
Pine	1.22	0.29

**Table 6.17 Average carbon stock in living biomass<sup>196</sup>**

Species	C, kg in ton of dry biomass (dried at 105 °C temperature)
Aspen	507
Grey alder, black alder, oak, ash and other species	522
Birch	521
Spruce	528
Pine	531

Mortality and decay:

- species specific coefficients of mortality (Table 6.18) do not depend on size of dominant or undergrowth trees, but on the stand age and average dimensions of trees;

<sup>193</sup>Lazdiņš et al. 2011-2015. Projekts "Mežsaimniecisko darbību ietekmes uz siltumnīcefekta gāzu emisijām un CO<sub>2</sub> piesaisti novērtējums" (Project "Evaluation of impact of forest management practices on greenhouse gas emissions and CO<sub>2</sub> removals").

<sup>194</sup>Liepiņš J., Lazdiņš A., Liepiņš K. 2015. Above- and below-ground biomass functions for four most common tree species in Latvia, in: Abstracts from the International Scientific Conference Knowledge based forest sector, Riga, Latvia, pp. 51–53. Liepins J., Liepins K., Lazdiņš A. 2015. Biomass equations for the most common tree species in Latvia. Presented at the Adaptation and mitigation: strategies for management of forest ecosystems, Airport hotel ABC, pp. 47–50.

Liepiņš J., Liepiņš K., Lazdiņš A. 2016. Estimation of the biomass stock from growing stock volume, in: Collection of Abstracts. Presented at the 11th International Scientific Conference Students on Their Way to Science, Jelgava, p. 120.

Liepiņš, J., Lazdiņš, A., Liepiņš, K. 2017. Equations for estimating above- and belowground biomass of Norway spruce, Scots pine, birch spp. and European aspen in Latvia. *Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research*, 1–43, DOI: 10.1080/02827581.2017.1337923.

<sup>195</sup> Not used in calculation, but for verification of the NFI data and comparison with the default BEFs in the IPCC guidelines

<sup>196</sup>Muiznieks E., Liepins J., Lazdiņš A. 2015. Carbon content in biomass of the most common tree species in Latvia. Presented at the Latvia University of Agriculture 10th International Scientific Conference „Students on their way to science”, Jelgava.

- calculations on the base of the NFI using backward calculation for 5 year period, assuming equal rate of commercial thinning in the 1990s;
- 20 year decomposition period (mortality since 1970 considered in the calculation);
- constant mortality values considered for the period before 1990.

The increase of mortality after 2008 are associated with long-term impact of wind-throws in 2007 and 2010, which reflected in 2<sup>nd</sup> cycle (2009-2013) of NFI. Another reason for continuous increase of mortality is ageing of forests.

**Table 6.18 Average periodic mortality ( $m^3 ha^{-1} yr^{-1}$ )<sup>197</sup>**

Species	1970 -	1994 -	1999 -	2004 -	2009 -	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
	1993	1998	2003	2008	2013									
Aspen	1.64	1.95	1.97	1.92	3.35	2.99	2.57	2.60	2.54	2.60	2.33	2.36	2.11	2.15
Grey alder	0.30	0.33	0.36	0.48	2.41	2.56	2.18	2.29	1.79	2.33	1.75	1.80	1.69	1.78
Birch	1.59	1.67	1.58	1.43	2.12	2.12	1.77	1.90	2.18	1.90	2.05	2.32	2.10	2.15
Spruce	1.61	1.76	1.94	2.05	2.77	2.79	2.38	2.22	2.18	2.15	1.92	2.02	1.78	1.99
Black alder	1.30	1.42	1.47	1.64	2.67	2.67	2.41	2.56	2.53	2.69	2.38	2.42	1.92	2.02
Oak, ash	2.29	2.66	2.67	2.87	4.43	4.90	3.50	4.07	3.52	3.73	3.76	3.31	3.07	2.73
Other species	0.75	0.66	0.67	0.77	1.26	0.98	1.37	1.77	1.56	2.05	1.54	2.20	2.24	1.40
Pine	1.16	1.24	1.38	1.48	1.69	1.82	1.56	1.62	1.62	1.67	2.09	1.49	1.36	1.40

Commercial felling:

- dominant species specific harvesting data since 1970 (1970-1989 research data<sup>198</sup>, 1990-2013 CSB data in combination with NFI data, since 2014 NFI data);
- decomposition of crown and underground biomass – 20 years; species specific wood densities and different BEFs for coniferous and deciduous trees (Table 6.15 and Table 6.16).

Carbon stock in deadwood is calculated by using NFI data on mortality (Table 6.18), harvesting rate (Table 6.11) and share of harvesting residues left on site. Share of carbon stock in deadwood is calculated using NFI data of natural mortality expressed as standing volume of trees that changed destiny from alive to dead between NFI cycles. To calculate deadwood C stock same values of BEF, above- below-ground ratio and ratio of C content are used to recalculate from mortality in volume to mortality in C as for calculation of carbon stock of living biomass. Initial C stock in deadwood is calculated by the same approach as for living biomass (except by using volume of decayed trees instead of living trees) and by adding 20 year decomposition period. Same approach is applied to calculate deadwood from harvesting – amount of deadwood from harvesting residues is calculated by using felling stock 20 year

<sup>197</sup>Lazdiņš et al. 2011-2015. Projekts "Mežsaimniecisko darbību ietekmes uz siltumnīcefekta gāzu emisijām un CO<sub>2</sub> piesaisti novērtējums" (Project "Evaluation of impact of forest management practices on greenhouse gas emissions and CO<sub>2</sub> removals"); Lazdiņš A., Donis J., Strūve L. 2012. Projekts "Latvijas meža apsaimniekošanas radītās ogļskābās gāzes (CO<sub>2</sub>) piesaistes un siltumnīcefekta gāzu (SEG) emisiju referenču līmeņa aprēķina modeļa izstrāde" (Project "Elaboration of calculation model for evaluation of GHG emissions and CO<sub>2</sub> removals due to forest management").

<sup>198</sup>Saliņš Z. 2002. Mežs - Latvijas Nacionālā Bagātība (Forest - The National Wealth of Latvia), Jelgava: Jelgavas tipogrāfija; Saliņš Z. 1999. Meža izmantošana Latvijā: stāvoklis, perspektīvas (Forest use in Latvia: status, perspectives), Jelgava: LLU Meža izmantošanas katedra.

decomposition period is applied. Share of harvesting residues incinerated are deducted from calculation. Trend of carbon stock in deadwood is affected by harvest rate and natural mortality, which in turn is affected by dynamics of forest age class and species distribution. Carbon stock dynamics may seem significant between years in absolute numbers, but relative to dynamics of harvesting rate and annual increment of carbon stock in deadwood is rather consistent, with a higher rate in last decade due to changes in forest age structure.

The methodology for HWP is based on Rüter, S. (2011)<sup>199</sup>. More detailed description follows in further chapters.

Area of organic soils in the forest lands is reported according to structure of distribution of the forest stand types. Total area of organic soils as well as total area of forests was updated according to the research data on land use structure based on the NFI<sup>200</sup>.

CO<sub>2</sub> EFs for drained organic soils provided by the IPCC Wetlands Supplement are built on results of few studies implemented in different climatic conditions (western and central Europe) and therefore do not represent conditions in Baltic countries. Thus, several national research projects were conducted<sup>201,202</sup> and national CO<sub>2</sub> EF for drained organic soils in forest land (0.52 tonns CO<sub>2</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>) was developed<sup>203</sup>. The study was based on the subsistence and CSC measurements. Since submission 2019, this national CO<sub>2</sub> EF is used to report CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from drained organic soils in forest land. Applied country-specific value (0.52 tonns CO<sub>2</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>) is much lower than that in the IPCC Wetlands Supplement (2.6 tonns CO<sub>2</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>); however, it is still within the range of the uncertainty of the default factors. The difference is caused by a number of factors. The most important is that the IPCC Wetlands Supplement EFs that theoretically correspond to climate in Latvia, were calculated on the basis of results obtained in the central, western or south-eastern parts of Europe. Taking into account that climatic factors have a significant impact on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and that in warmer climatic conditions higher emissions occur, the current IPCC Wetlands Supplement factors are not applicable to conditions in Latvia. Also, results of LIFE REstore project show that in Latvia carbon losses in forests with organic soils is 0.23-0.96 tonns CO<sub>2</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> depending from soil moisture regime<sup>204</sup>. The studies on CSCs in organic soils continues within the scope of LIFE OrgBalt project and future inventories will be based on country specific Tier 3 modelling approach. In addition, CO<sub>2</sub> EF for drained organic soils in forest land used in other Baltic countries (0.68 t CO<sub>2</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> in Lithuania and 0.329 t CO<sub>2</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> in Estonia) are more similar to Latvia's national EFs than EF provided by the IPCC Wetlands Supplement.

<sup>199</sup>Rüter S. 2011. *Projection of net emissions from harvested wood products in European Countries*. Hamburg: Johann Heinrich von Thünen-Institute (vTI), 63 p, Work Report of the Institute of Wood Technology and Wood Biology, Report No: 2011/1

<sup>200</sup>Lazdiņš A. and Zariņš J. "Elaboration and integration into National greenhouse gas inventory report matrices of land use changes of areas belonging to Kyoto protocol article 3.3 and 3.4 activities".

<sup>201</sup>OÜ Severitas. 2018. *Approbation of greenhouse gas measurement methodology in peatlands in Latvia within the scope of LIFE REstore (LIFE14 CCM/LV/001103) project*. Author Kairi Sepp, Monitoring report, 15 p.

<sup>202</sup>OÜ Severitas. 2019. *Approbation of greenhouse gas measurement methodology in peatlands in Latvia within the scope of LIFE REstore (LIFE14 CCM/LV/001103) project*. Author Kairi Sepp, Final report, 20 p.

<sup>203</sup>Lupikis A., Lazdins A. 2017. *Soil carbon stock changes in transitional mire drained for forestry in Latvia: A case study*. Proceedings of 23rd Annual International Scientific Conference "Research for Rural Development 2017".

<sup>204</sup>Lazdiņš A., Lupikis, A. 2019. *LIFE REstore project contribution to the greenhouse gas emission accounts in Latvia*. In: *Sustainable and responsible after-use of peat extraction areas*, A. Priede & A. Gancone (Eds.), Baltijas Krasti, pp. 21–52. Lazdiņa, D., Lazdiņš, A., Bebre, I., Lupikis, A., Makovskis, K., Spalva, G., Sarkanābols, T., Okmanis, M., Krigere, I., Dreimanis, I., Kalniņa, L. 2019. *Afforestation*. In: *Sustainable and responsible after-use of peat extraction areas*, A. Priede & A. Gancone (Eds.), Baltijas Krasti, pp. 178–183.

Drained organic soil in forest land is source of N<sub>2</sub>O and CH<sub>4</sub> emissions. The N<sub>2</sub>O EF for drained organic soils is 2.8 kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> (Table 2.5 of IPCC Wetlands Supplement). CH<sub>4</sub> emissions are calculated by equation 2.6 in the IPCC Wetlands Supplement (equation No. 6.1 in the NIR).

$$CH_{4\_organic} = A * ((1 - Frac_{ditch}) * EF_{CH_4\_land} + Frac_{ditch} * EF_{CH_4\_ditch}) \quad (6.1)$$

where:

$CH_{4\_organic}$  – annual CH<sub>4</sub> loss from drained organic soils, kg CH<sub>4</sub> yr<sup>-1</sup>

$A$  – land area of drained organic soils in a land-use category, ha

$EF_{CH_4\_land}$  – emission factor for direct CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from drained organic soils, kg CH<sub>4</sub> ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>

$EF_{CH_4\_ditch}$  – emission factor for CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from drainage ditches, kg CH<sub>4</sub> ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>

$Frac_{ditch}$  – fraction of the total area of drained organic soil which is occupied by ditches

The CH<sub>4</sub> EF for organic soils of drained forest land (Table 2.3 and Table 2.4 in the IPCC Wetlands Supplement) is 2.5 kg CH<sub>4</sub> ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>. Since submission 2023, national CH<sub>4</sub> EF for drainage ditches in forest land with organic soils (10.3 kg CH<sub>4</sub> ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>)<sup>205</sup> is used for reporting. Applied country-specific value (10.3 kg CH<sub>4</sub> ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>) is lower than that in the IPCC Wetlands Supplement (217 kg CH<sub>4</sub> ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> according to the Table 2.4 of the IPCC Wetlands Supplement). Values of EFs mainly differ due to the variance in climatic factors between central and western parts of Europe (where IPCC Wetlands Supplement default EFs were developed) and condition in Latvia; in warmer climatic conditions higher emissions occur. Thus, Latvia's national CH<sub>4</sub> EF for drainage ditches in forest land with organic soils more reflects the climatic conditions in the region than default EF provided by the IPCC Wetlands Supplement. Fraction of the total area of drained organic soil that is occupied by ditches is 0.025 (Table 2.4 in the IPCC Wetlands Supplement).

GHG emissions from rewetted organic soils are estimated according to the Tier 1 methods. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are calculated using equation 3.3 of the IPCC Wetlands Supplement:

$$CO_2 - C_{rewetted\ org\ soil} = CO_2 - C_{composite} + CO_2 - C_{DOC} \quad (6.2)$$

where:

$CO_2 - C_{rewetted\ org\ soil}$  – CO<sub>2</sub> – C emissions/removals from rewetted organic soils, tonns C yr<sup>-1</sup>

$CO_2 - C_{composite}$  – CO<sub>2</sub> – C emissions/removals from the soil and non-tree vegetation, tonns C yr<sup>-1</sup>

$CO_2 - C_{DOC-off\ site}$  – CO<sub>2</sub> – C emissions from dissolved organic carbon exported from rewetted organic soils, tonns C yr<sup>-1</sup>

Complemented by equations 3.4 and 3.5 of the IPCC Wetlands Supplement.

$$CO_2 - C_{composite} = \sum_{c,n} (A * EF_{CO_2}) \quad (6.3)$$

where:

$A_{c,n}$  – area of rewetted organic soil in climate zone  $c$  and nutrient status  $n$ , ha

$EF_{CO_2,c,n}$  – CO<sub>2</sub> – C emission factor for rewetted organic soils in climate zone  $c$ , nutrient status  $n$ , tonns C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>

$$CO_2 - C_{DOC} = \sum_c (A * EF_{DOC\_REWETTED}) \quad (6.4)$$

where:

$A_c$  – area of rewetted organic soils in climate zone  $c$ , ha

$EF_{DOC\_rewetted,c}$  – CO<sub>2</sub> – C emission factor from DOC exported from rewetted organic soils in climate zone  $c$ , tonns C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>

<sup>205</sup> Vanags-Duka, M.; Bardule, A.; Butlers, A.; Upenieks, E.M.; Lazdin, Š, A.; Purvin, a, D.; Līcīte, I. GHG Emissions from drainage ditches in peat extraction sites and peatland forests in hemiboreal Latvia. Land 2022, 11, 2233. <https://doi.org/10.3390/land11122233>



EF for CO<sub>2</sub>-C (0.5 tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>) is taken from Table 3.1 of the IPCC Wetlands Supplement. N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from rewetted organic soils according to the the Tier 1 method are assumed to be negligible and are not estimated ("NA" notation key is reported), CH<sub>4</sub> emissions are calculated applying Tier 1 method using equation 3.7 of the IPCC Wetlands Supplement (equation No. 6.5). Default EF (216 kg CH<sub>4</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>) from Table 3.3 of IPCC Wetlands Supplement was used (Table 6.19).

$$CH_4 - C_{rewetted\ org\ soil} = \frac{\sum_{c,n}(A * EF_{CH_4soil})c,n}{1000} \tag{6.5}$$

where:

$CH_4 - C_{rewetted\ org\ soil}$  – CH<sub>4</sub> – C emissions/removals from rewetted organic soils, tonnes C yr<sup>-1</sup>


$A_{c,n}$  – area of rewetted organic soils in climate zone c and nutrient status n, ha

$EF_{CH_4soils}$  – emission factor from rewetted organic soils in climate zone c and nutrient status n, kg CH<sub>4</sub> – C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>

**Table 6.19 Emission factors for rewetted organic soils (tonnes C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>)**

No	GHG	Emission factor
1	CO <sub>2</sub>	0.5
2	CH <sub>4</sub>	0.216

Rewetting is reported under forest land – conversion of forests on drained organic soils to forest on initially wet soil. The conversion is usually approved by changes in ground vegetation and groundwater table during the site visits. Rewetting usually takes place due to wearing of drainage systems. In 2022, total rewetted area according to comparison of the NFI data is 43.64 kha. It is assumed, that the rewetted area increases linearly during 5 year period – 2.0 kha of forests were rewetted every year from 2009 to 2013, 5.2 kha of forests were rewetted every year from 2014 to 2018, 1.5 kha of forests were rewetted every year from 2019 to 2021 and 3.0 kha of forests were rewetted in 2022 according to an average figures provided by the NFI. Total emissions from soil due to rewetting in 2022 was 470.37 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. (Figure 6.6).



**Figure 6.6 Emissions due to rewetting (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)**

#### 6.4.2.2 Land converted to forest land (CRF 4.A.2)

Latvia reports CSC in living biomass, dead wood and litter for cropland converted to forest land, grassland converted to forest land, wetland converted to forest land and settlements converted

to forest land as well as in organic soils (cropland converted to forest land, grassland converted to forest land, wetland converted to forest land).

Carbon stock change in living biomass in land converted to forest land is calculated using Tier 2 method. C stock changes in living biomass in area of Land converted to Forest land categories are estimated by stock change method, therefore it is not possible to quantify C stock gains and losses separately. C stock losses in living biomass are reported as "IE" and included in C stock gains in living biomass. Losses in living biomass are reported as natural mortality. If by some reasons (for instance, thinning) harvesting took place on afforested area it is also reported in national statistics and reported as C-stock changes related to harvesting in forest land remaining forest land to avoid underestimation of C losses.

Weighted average wood density for a particular year in forest land remaining forest land is used to convert stem volume to biomass. Similarly, average carbon stock in living biomass and BEFs characteristic for particular year were applied to calculation.

It is assumed according to the NFI data based expert judgement that average stock of dead wood, and consequently in litter in forest land remaining forest land and land converted to forest land becomes equal at certain stand age. The assumption is based on the NFI field measurements considering that increment of the dead wood stock in afforested areas will follow linear regression and will reach values characteristic for the forest land (12.6 tons C ha<sup>-1</sup>) within 150 years, which corresponds to 2 generations of trees. The main difference between the 1<sup>st</sup> and following generations of trees is presence of trees, which corresponds to about 20% of carbon stock in living biomass in mature stands.

Values of average carbon stock in dead wood in 1990-2022 were used in calculation. Similarly, weighted average above-ground and below-ground biomass expansion factors and carbon content in living biomass for a particular year obtained in living biomass calculations are used to convert stem biomass to the total biomass. Two generations of trees (150 years) were considered to properly encompass carbon stock in harvesting residues, stumps and the above-ground fraction of dead trees.

Average carbon stock in litter is 12.14 tons C ha<sup>-1</sup> according to the BioSoil project forest soil inventory data<sup>206</sup>. The same transformation period of 150 years is considered.

Emissions from organic soils in afforested lands were calculated using the same approach as for emissions from drained organic soils on lands remaining forest.

No removals in mineral soil are reported due to conversion to forest land, because there are no scientific evidences of increase of carbon stock in soil after afforestation. The research project that started in 2012 on comparison of carbon stock in cropland remaining cropland and grassland remaining grassland shows no difference in carbon stock between grassland, recently afforested land and forest land remaining forest land in the upper soil layer (0-40 cm)<sup>207</sup>.

<sup>206</sup> Bārdule, A., Bāders, E., Stola, J., Lazdiņš, A. 2009. Forest soil characteristic in Latvia according results of the demonstration project BioSoil. *Mežzinātne / Forest Science* 20(53): 105-124. Available: [http://www.silava.lv/userfiles/file/Mezzinatne%2020\(53\)2009/8\\_Bardule\\_MZ\\_20-2009.pdf](http://www.silava.lv/userfiles/file/Mezzinatne%2020(53)2009/8_Bardule_MZ_20-2009.pdf)

<sup>207</sup> Lazdins, A., Bardule, A., Butlers, A. 2015. Preliminary results of comparison of carbon stock in soil in grassland, cropland and forest land. 54–57; Lazdiņš, A., Bārdule, A., & Stola, J. (2013). Preliminary results of evaluation of carbon stock in historical cropland and grassland. *Abstracts of International Baltic Sea Regional Scientific Conference*, 56–57.

### 6.4.3 Uncertainties and time-series consistency

Uncertainty analysis for 2024 submission is carried out by using Approach 1. Quantitative estimates of uncertainties are provided in the Annex 2. Overall description of uncertainty analysis is included in the Section 1.6.

Uncertainties are estimated on the base of the NFI and expert judgement. Uncertainty of emissions from soil are estimated according to data obtained within the scope of the international forest soil monitoring project BioSoil, study by Lupikis A. & Lazdins A. (2017)<sup>208</sup> and values provided in the IPCC Wetlands Supplement.

The uncertainty of area (Table 6.20) is estimated as standard error of proportion.

**Table 6.20 Uncertainty of the forest land use data in 2024 submission**

Land use category	Number of NFI plots	Share of NFI plots, %	Uncertainty, %
Forest land	8322	51.5	1.5
forest land remaining forest land	7885	48.8	1.6
drained organic soil	1116	6.9	5.3
other soil	5040	31.2	2.3
land converted to forest land	437	2.7	8.0
drained organic soil	10	0.1	43.5
other soil	380	2.4	8.7

In cases with large data sets, the uncertainty in the mean calculated as plus or minus 1.96 (or approximately 2) multiples of the standard error according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines Volume 1, Chapter 3. Combined category uncertainty is calculated according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines Tier 1 – simple propagation of errors.

According to the NFI, uncertainty of growing stock of trees in forest land remaining forest land is 2.3%, in land converted to forest land – 15.6%. Uncertainty of annual increment of growing stock of trees is 2.2%. BEFs utilized in calculations have uncertainty level of 2.2% in average according to the study results. For harvesting stock, uncertainty according to forest regulations is 10%. Uncertainty of dead wood stock is 3.9%. Uncertainty of average carbon stock in litter is 23.1%. Uncertainty of carbon content in wood is 0.14%.

Uncertainty of CSC in organic soils is 296%<sup>209</sup>.

95% confidence interval for CH<sub>4</sub> EF for drained organic soil of forest land is -0.6-+5.7 kg CH<sub>4</sub> ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> (average uncertainty is 126%) according to the IPCC Wetlands Supplement Table 2.3. According to the study results<sup>210</sup>, standard error (S.E.) for CH<sub>4</sub> EF for drainage ditches in drained forest land with organic soils is 11.5 kg CH<sub>4</sub> ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>. 95% confidence interval for N<sub>2</sub>O-N EF for drained organic soils is -0.57-+6.1 kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> (average uncertainty is 119%) according to the IPCC Wetlands Supplement, Table 2.5. Uncertainty range of CO<sub>2</sub>-C EF for rewetted organic soils is -0.71-+1.71 tons CO<sub>2</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> (average uncertainty is 242%) according to the IPCC Wetlands Supplement, Table 3.1. Uncertainty range of CO<sub>2</sub>-C EF for DOC exported from

<sup>208</sup> Lupikis A., Lazdins A. 2017. Soil carbon stock changes in transitional mire drained for forestry in Latvia: A case study. *Proceedings of 23rd Annual International Scientific Conference "Research for Rural Development 2017"*.

<sup>209</sup> Lupikis A., Lazdins A. 2017. Soil carbon stock changes in transitional mire drained for forestry in Latvia: A case study. *Proceedings of 23rd Annual International Scientific Conference "Research for Rural Development 2017"*.

<sup>210</sup> Vanags-Duka, M.; Bardule, A.; Butlers, A.; Upenieks, E.M.; Lazdin, Š. A.; Purvin, a, D.; Līcīte, I. GHG Emissions from drainage ditches in peat extraction sites and peatland forests in hemiboreal Latvia. *Land* 2022, 11, 2233. <https://doi.org/10.3390/land11122233>

rewetted organic soils is 0.14-0.36 tons CO<sub>2</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup>yr<sup>-1</sup> (average uncertainty is 45.8%) according to the IPCC Wetlands Supplement, Table 3.2. 95% range of CH<sub>4</sub>-C EF for rewetted organic soils is 0-856 kg CH<sub>4</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> (average uncertainty is 198%) according to the IPCC Wetlands Supplement, Table 3.3.

#### 6.4.4 Category-specific QA/QC and verification

The quality objectives and the QA/QC plan for the Latvia's GHG inventory are presented in Section 1.2.3. The QC procedures are performed according to the QA/QC plan in the LULUCF sector in order to achieve these quality objectives. General and source-specific QC activities are carried out by LSFRI Silava according to the QA/QC guidelines<sup>211</sup>.

Quality control procedures listed in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines Chapter 4.4.3 were implemented for all calculations, including elaboration of country specific allometric biomass equations, wood density and carbon content factors. Issues related to QA/QC and verification are discussed at the sectoral meetings.

Manual data check is introduced to compare figures imported into the CRF Reporter and actually calculated values.

The NFI data have gone through the following QC measures:

- field gauges and instruments were checked and calibrated;
- new instruments were tested to find possible differences in measurement results compared with the old ones;
- before field surveying, the personnel has had a training period to ascertain that observers are able to use the equipment correctly, that observers do measurements and classifications correctly and that the guidelines and instructions are understood correctly;
- verification measurements were carried out during field seasons in 10% of the NFI plots;
- field data are checked by evaluation if all sample plots are measured, no required information is missing (if missing entries are found, they are completed and re-measurement is done, if necessary), the compatibility between data variables is checked using logical controls;
- calculated results are compared with the results of previous inventories. If considerable or unexpected changes are found, reasons for the changes were clarified and explained.

Work on improvement of tree height and timber equations used in calculations in the NFI and development of verification tools continues therefore changes in the input data provided by the NFI are possible.

The NFI team applies quality guidelines and QA/QC measures to the all work stages. Documentation is in Latvian with brief descriptions of NFI methods and measurements in English<sup>212</sup>.

<sup>211</sup> *Improvement of quality assurance and quality control system in Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry Sector in Latvia.* Available: [https://drive.google.com/open?id=0Bxv4jQ\\_04jXZdEhJVFJ4OVRPTkE](https://drive.google.com/open?id=0Bxv4jQ_04jXZdEhJVFJ4OVRPTkE)

<sup>212</sup> *Latvijas Republikas Zemkopības ministrija, 2004. Meža statistiskās inventarizācijas veikšanas un mežaudzes sekundāro parametru aprēķināšanas metodika (instrukcija Nr. 10 no 17.03.2004.,).* Available: [http://www.silava.lv/userfiles/file/Nacionalais%20meza%20monitorings/2022\\_04\\_28\\_metodikas/2022\\_04\\_28\\_MRM\\_metodika.pdf](http://www.silava.lv/userfiles/file/Nacionalais%20meza%20monitorings/2022_04_28_metodikas/2022_04_28_MRM_metodika.pdf)

The data based on forest statistics were produced by the LSFRI Silava<sup>213</sup>. Data descriptions are available including the applied definitions, methods of data compilation, reliability and comparability. It was confirmed that all data used in this section cover whole land area of Latvia.

All information related to the preparation of the annual inventory is archived in the centralized archiving system (common FTP folder) in accordance with QA/QC plan.

The country-specific EF used to estimate CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from drained organic soils in forest land was published as a peer-reviewed article and compared to EF used in other countries in the Baltic Sea region. The Latvian value was within uncertainty range of CS EF of other countries in the region.

#### **6.4.5 Category-specific recalculations**

Recalculation of GHG emissions due to forest wildfires for 2021 was done due to implementation of improved activity data (area of wildfires in forest land); recalculation resulted in slight reduction (by 4%) in GHG emissions (see detailed in chapter 6.10 BIOMASS BURNING (CRF 4(V))).

#### **6.4.6 Category-specific planned improvements**

It is planned to improve quantitative results of modelling (using Yasso) for calculation of CSCs in mineral soil, dead wood and litter.

### **6.5 CROPLAND (CRF 4.B)**

#### **6.5.1 Category description**

Cropland remaining cropland and land converted to cropland is a key category of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions (Figure 6.7). Under the cropland's category emissions from soils (CO<sub>2</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O and CH<sub>4</sub>), living and dead woody biomass (CO<sub>2</sub>) are reported. Net aggregated emissions from cropland remaining cropland were 1259.23 kt CO<sub>2</sub> in 2022, excluding CH<sub>4</sub> emissions (150.53 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.) from drained organic soils (Figure 6.8). Slight decrease of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in cropland remaining cropland is associated with land use change from cropland to grassland. The net GHG emissions from land converted to croplands in 2022 (excluding CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from drainage of organic soils) were 554.06 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. (Figure 6.9).

---

<sup>213</sup>Summary of NFI results. Available: [http://www.silava.lv/userfiles/file/2010%20nov%20MRM\\_visi%20mezi\\_04-08g.xls](http://www.silava.lv/userfiles/file/2010%20nov%20MRM_visi%20mezi_04-08g.xls)




Figure 6.7 Summary of GHG emissions in cropland (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.) by source categories




Figure 6.8 Summary of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in cropland remaining cropland (kt)




Figure 6.9 Summary of GHG emissions from land converted to cropland, N<sub>2</sub>O on secondary axis (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

Updated values of area of organic and other soils split into cropland remaining cropland (including land converted to cropland at least 20 years ago) and land converted to cropland less than 20 years ago are shown in Table 6.21. The stock change (between recent available NFI measurements period) method was applied to characterize biomass of living trees in cropland on the base of stock changes during 5 year period.

Table 6.21 Area of cropland (kha)

Year	Cropland	Land remaining cropland		Land converted to cropland	
		organic soil	other soils	organic soil	other soils
1990	2061.23	134.74	1923.24	0.39	2.87
1991	2051.31	132.69	1915.01	0.45	3.15
1992	2041.39	130.66	1906.77	0.52	3.44
1993	2031.47	128.64	1898.52	0.58	3.72
1994	2021.55	126.64	1890.25	0.64	4.01
1995	2011.63	124.65	1881.97	0.71	4.30
1996	1995.08	122.22	1866.73	0.97	5.16
1997	1978.52	119.81	1851.47	1.22	6.02
1998	1961.97	117.43	1836.18	1.48	6.88
1999	1945.42	115.07	1820.87	1.74	7.74
2000	1928.87	112.74	1805.53	1.99	8.61
2001	1877.69	108.11	1752.70	2.63	14.24
2002	1826.50	103.57	1699.79	3.26	19.89
2003	1775.32	99.10	1646.80	3.88	25.54
2004	1724.14	94.70	1593.74	4.49	31.20
2005	1672.95	90.39	1540.60	5.10	36.87
2006	1621.77	86.15	1487.38	5.70	42.54
2007	1570.59	81.99	1434.09	6.29	48.22
2008	1519.40	77.90	1380.71	6.88	53.91
2009	1509.90	76.07	1366.32	7.74	59.77
2010	1500.39	74.65	1354.78	8.21	62.76

Year	Cropland	Land remaining cropland		Land converted to cropland	
		organic soil	other soils	organic soil	other soils
2011	1490.89	72.92	1340.63	8.99	68.35
2012	1481.38	71.22	1326.45	9.77	73.94
2013	1471.88	70.46	1311.34	10.54	79.54
2014	1471.56	70.37	1308.79	10.89	81.51
2015	1471.24	70.28	1306.25	11.23	83.48
2016	1470.92	70.39	1304.28	11.38	84.87
2017	1470.61	70.50	1302.31	11.53	86.27
2018	1470.29	70.61	1300.34	11.67	87.67
2019	1496.21	70.56	1295.63	14.07	115.94
2020	1522.13	70.52	1290.92	16.46	144.22
2021	1548.05	70.86	1290.99	18.47	167.73
2022	1578.13	71.10	1289.30	21.20	196.54

N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from managed organic soils in cropland are reported under Agriculture sector (detailed methodology is described in section 5.4.2).

The improvement of quantitative results of modelling (using Yasso) to characterize CSCs in mineral soils is in progress according to improvement plan. Studies continues, for instance, to elaborate biomass expansion factors and data on carbon turnover in cropland and grassland. The study "Improvement of GHG emission calculations from managed croplands and grasslands and development of appropriate methodological solutions" provides additional C input information and BEFs for different agricultural crops. The study results will be available for inclusion in GHG inventory as soon as results will be statistically analyzed and published in peer-reviewed scientific journal.

## 6.5.2 Methodological issues

### 6.5.2.1 Cropland remaining cropland (CRF 4.B.1)

Area of land remaining cropland is estimated using NFI data and research results<sup>214</sup>. Until submission 2018 it was assumed that area of organic soils in farmland according to summaries of land surveys<sup>215</sup> is  $5.18 \pm 0.5$  %. This value characterizes area of organic soils in cropland before 1990 because it is based on field measurements completed in 60<sup>ths</sup>, 70<sup>ths</sup> and early 80<sup>ths</sup>. Since submission 2018 area of organic soils in cropland is reported according to the results of research projects<sup>216,217</sup>. According to the results of research project there were 71.10 kha organic soil (5.2% of total area) in cropland remaining cropland in 2022.

<sup>214</sup> Krumsteds, L. L., Ivanovs, J., Jansons, J., Lazdiņš, A. 2019. Development of Latvian land use and land use change matrix using geospatial data of National forest inventory. *Agronomy Research*, 17(6), p. 2295–2305, DOI: 10.15159/AR.19.195.

<sup>215</sup> L.U. Consulting. 2010. Augšņu un reljefa izejas datu sagatavošana un Eiropas Komisijas izstrādāto augsnes un reljefa kritēriju mazāk labvēlīgo apvidu noteikšanai piemērošanas simulācija. Projekta kopsavilkuma ziņojums (Elaboration of soil and terrain data and simulation of application of the criteria elaborated by the European Commission for identification of less valuable regions. Summary of the project report), Latvijas Republikas Zemkopības Ministrija.

<sup>216</sup> Lazdiņš A., Bārdule A., Butlers A., Lupiķis A., Okmanis M., Bebre I., ... Petaja G. 2016. Projekts "Aramzemes un ilggadīgo zālāju apsaimniekošanas radīto siltumnīcefekta gāzu (SEG) emisiju un oglekļa dioksīda (CO<sub>2</sub>) piesaistes uzskaites sistēmas pilnveidošana un atbilstošu metodisko risinājumu izstrādāšana" (Project "Improving the accounting system of CO<sub>2</sub> removals and GHG emissions due to management practices in cropland and grassland and development of methodological solutions"). 2016. gada starpziņojums, No. 101115/S109, Salaspils, p. 123. Available: [https://drive.google.com/open?id=0Bxv4jQ\\_04jXZRExSMWhPMWhDNDg](https://drive.google.com/open?id=0Bxv4jQ_04jXZRExSMWhPMWhDNDg)

<sup>217</sup> Vēsturiskā augsnes digitālā datubāze (Digital database of historical soils). Available: <https://geolatvija.lv/geo/p/239>



Carbon stock change in living and dead woody biomass is based on activity data provided by the NFI. Carbon stock changes in cropland are calculated using recent NFI data by comparison stock changes in living biomass during recent 5 years and mortality of trees. Carbon stock in living and dead biomass is calculated using the same coefficients as in calculations of CSCs in forested land. The conversion factors for estimation of carbon in biomass are developed domestically<sup>218</sup>.

The assumptions used in EPIM tool for estimation of CSC in living and dead biomass are shown in Table 6.22, default 20 years decay period is considered for dead wood. Years since 2017 (especially, 2018) were very favourable for biofuel production due to considerable increase of demand and prices of all roundwood assortments including biofuel. Due to this reason farmers harvested roadsides, ditch sides and other groups of trees in croplands not conforming to the forest definition for biofuel production. Therefore gross increment of woody biomass in cropland considerably decreased since 2017.

**Table 6.22 Assumptions for calculation of CSC in living and dead biomass in cropland**

Year	Cropland with woody vegetation, kha	Gross increment of living biomass		Wood density, kg m <sup>-3</sup>	Natural mortality, m <sup>3</sup> ha <sup>-1</sup>	BEFs		Carbon content, kg t <sup>-1</sup>
		mill. m <sup>3</sup>	m <sup>3</sup> ha <sup>-1</sup>			stem to crown	stem to below-ground	
1990	2.34	0.01	2.52	0.44	0.42	0.24	0.31	523.30
1991	2.34	0.01	2.52	0.44	0.42	0.24	0.31	523.30
1992	2.34	0.01	2.52	0.44	0.42	0.24	0.31	523.30
1993	2.34	0.01	2.52	0.44	0.42	0.24	0.31	523.30
1994	2.65	0.01	2.52	0.44	0.42	0.24	0.31	522.95
1995	2.65	0.01	2.52	0.44	0.42	0.24	0.31	522.95
1996	2.65	0.01	2.52	0.44	0.42	0.24	0.31	522.95
1997	2.65	0.01	2.52	0.44	0.42	0.24	0.31	522.95
1998	2.65	0.01	2.52	0.44	0.42	0.24	0.31	522.95
1999	2.65	0.01	2.52	0.44	0.42	0.24	0.31	523.34
2000	2.65	0.01	2.52	0.44	0.42	0.24	0.31	523.34
2001	2.65	0.01	2.52	0.44	0.42	0.24	0.31	523.34
2002	2.65	0.01	2.52	0.44	0.42	0.24	0.31	523.34
2003	2.65	0.01	2.52	0.44	0.42	0.24	0.31	523.34
2004	2.65	0.01	2.52	0.44	0.48	0.24	0.31	524.03
2005	2.65	0.01	2.52	0.44	0.48	0.24	0.31	524.03
2006	2.65	0.01	2.52	0.44	0.48	0.24	0.31	524.03
2007	1.45	0.01	6.19	0.44	1.18	0.24	0.31	524.03
2008	1.45	0.01	6.19	0.44	1.18	0.24	0.31	524.03
2009	1.45	0.01	6.19	0.44	1.82	0.24	0.31	522.56
2010	1.45	0.01	6.19	0.44	1.82	0.24	0.31	522.56
2011	1.45	0.01	6.19	0.44	1.82	0.24	0.31	522.56
2012	3.07	0.06	19.09	0.44	0.61	0.24	0.31	522.56
2013	3.07	0.06	19.09	0.44	0.61	0.24	0.31	522.56
2014	3.07	0.06	19.09	0.44	0.61	0.24	0.31	522.62
2015	3.07	0.06	19.09	0.44	0.61	0.24	0.31	522.15
2016	4.07	0.06	14.40	0.43	0.61	0.24	0.31	521.93
2017	6.69	0.03	3.80	0.44	0.59	0.24	0.31	522.18
2018	6.43	0.01	0.91	0.43	0.58	0.25	0.31	522.42

<sup>218</sup>Lazdiņš et al. 2011.-2015. Projekts "Mežsaimniecisko darbību ietekmes uz siltumnīcefekta gāzu emisijām un CO<sub>2</sub> piesaisti novērtējums" (Project "Evaluation of impact of forest management practices on greenhouse gas emissions and CO<sub>2</sub> removals")

Year	Cropland with woody vegetation, kha	Gross increment of living biomass		Wood density, kg m <sup>-3</sup>	Natural mortality, m <sup>3</sup> ha <sup>-1</sup>	BEFs		Carbon content, kg t <sup>-1</sup>
		mill. m <sup>3</sup>	m <sup>3</sup> ha <sup>-1</sup>			stem to crown	stem to below-ground	
2019	7.25	0.01	1.45	0.44	0.82	0.24	0.31	522.48
2020	7.39	0.04	5.40	0.42	0.80	0.26	0.31	522.82
2021	9.33	0.06	5.92	0.42	4.81	0.26	0.31	522.66
2022	9.51	0.001	0.11	0.42	0.38	0.25	0.31	523.99

Pilot study on implementation of Yasso07 model on mineral soils in cropland and grassland approved that there are not net carbon losses in mineral soil in cropland<sup>219</sup>, thus net CSCs in mineral soil in cropland are reported as not a source (“NA” notation key).

Since submission 2021 national CO<sub>2</sub> EF (4.80 t CO<sub>2</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>)<sup>220</sup> for drained organic soils in cropland was used. National CO<sub>2</sub> EF was developed within the scope of LIFE REstore project. Within the project, two methods were used for CO<sub>2</sub> measurements – manual autotrophic measurements with opaque closed chambers and air sampling and manual ecosystem flux measurements with closed transparent chambers. Applied country-specific value (4.80 t CO<sub>2</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>) is lower than that in the IPCC Wetlands Supplement (7.9 tons CO<sub>2</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>). The values of EFs mainly differ due to the variance in climatic factors between central and western parts of Europe (where IPCC Wetlands Supplement default EFs were developed) and condition in Latvia; in warmer climatic conditions higher emissions occur. In addition, use of a similar CO<sub>2</sub> EFs in other Baltic countries (5 t CO<sub>2</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> in Lithuania and 6.1 t CO<sub>2</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> in Estonia) confirms compliance of Latvia's national CO<sub>2</sub> EF with climatic conditions in region.

Drained organic soil in cropland is source of CH<sub>4</sub> emissions. CH<sub>4</sub> emissions are calculated by equation 2.6 in the IPCC Wetlands Supplement. The EF for organic soils (Table 2.3 and table 2.4 in the IPCC Wetlands Supplement) is 0±2.8 kg CH<sub>4</sub> ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> (cropland, drained) and EF for drainage ditches 1165±830 kg CH<sub>4</sub> ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> (deep – drained cropland); respectively, only CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from ditches are calculated. Drainage systems on organic soils are considered. Fraction of the total area of drained organic soil which is occupied by ditches is 0.05 (Table 2.4 in the IPCC Wetlands Supplement). Thus, in category 4(II) Emissions and removals from drainage and rewetting and other management of organic and mineral soils (Total Organic Soils, Drained Organic Soils) only area of drainage ditches and corresponding CH<sub>4</sub> emissions in cropland remaining cropland and land converted to cropland is reported (4.61 kha in 2022), as CH<sub>4</sub> EF for drained organic soils is 0 according to the 2006 IPCC guidelines.

### 6.5.2.2 Land converted to cropland (CRF 4.B.2)

Carbon stock changes in living biomass, dead organic matter and mineral soil are reported for forest land converted to cropland. Carbon stock changes in organic soil are reported for forest

<sup>219</sup> Lazdiņš A., Bārdule A., Butlers A., Lupiķis A., Okmanis M., Bebre I., ... Petaja G. 2016. Projekts “Aramzemes un ilggadīgo zālāju apsaimniekošanas radīto siltumnīcefekta gāzu (SEG) emisiju un oglekļa dioksīda (CO<sub>2</sub>) piesaistes uzskaites sistēmas pilnveidošana un atbilstošu metodisko risinājumu izstrādāšana” (Project “Improving the accounting system of CO<sub>2</sub> removals and GHG emissions due to management practices in cropland and grassland and development of methodological solutions”). 2016. gada starpziņojums, No. 101115/S109, Salaspils, p. 123. Available: [https://drive.google.com/open?id=0Bxv4jQ\\_04jXZRExSMWhPMWhDNDg](https://drive.google.com/open?id=0Bxv4jQ_04jXZRExSMWhPMWhDNDg)

<sup>220</sup> Licite I., Lupiķis, A. 2020. Impact of land use practices on greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture land on organic soils. Proceedings of 19th International Scientific Conference Engineering for Rural Development, 1823–1830. DOI: 10.22616/ERDev.2020.19.TF492

land converted to cropland, grassland converted to cropland and wetlands converted to cropland.

Transition period for all land use changes is considered 20 years; respectively, land converted to cropland in 1990 is reported under the cropland remaining cropland category in 2010. New method for calculation of land use changes using the most recent NFI data was implemented in 2019 (Krumsteds et al., 2019)<sup>221</sup>.

Area of organic soil in land converted to cropland is calculated using different approach than in cropland remaining cropland - the values characteristic for initial land use are applied. Respectively, if share of organic soil in forest land remaining forest land in 1990 is 22%, it is considered, that area of organic soil in forest land converted to cropland in 1990 is 22%<sup>222</sup>.

In forest land converted to cropland, unlike to cropland remaining cropland, CSC in living biomass is calculated as losses in living biomass due to felling of trees, considering that losses in living biomass are equal to average growing stock in forest land converted to cropland (BEFs, carbon content and wood density are considered as weighted by total biomass distribution between species). Instant oxidation method is applied to living biomass carbon pool.

Losses in dead wood are reported as loss of average carbon stock in dead organic matter in the most recent 5 year period in all NFI plots where the changes are detected. Carbon stock in litter is considered as constant value 12.14 t C ha<sup>-1</sup> according to the BioSoil project results in fertile stand types (*Hylocomiosa*, *Oxalidosa*, *Myrtilloso-sphagnosa*, *Myrtillosoi-polytrichosa*, *Myrtillosa mel.*, *Mercurialosa mel.*). Carbon stock change in dead organic matter in the forest land converted to cropland is reported using instant oxidation method and depends from the average carbon stock in dead organic matter in forest land converted to cropland during the specified reporting period according to the NFI data. Due to the fact that CSCs in dead organic matter if forest land converted to cropland is reported using instant oxidation method, "NO" is used for years when conversion of forest land to cropland is not reported by the NFI.

Changes in living biomass and dead organic matter for grassland converted to cropland are not reported ("IE" notation key) to avoid double accounting, because input of C in soil through biomass is included in calculation of CSC in mineral soil using Yasso model. Improvement referred to the use of country-specific biomass expansion factors to estimate CSC in the living biomass pool is proposed within the improvement plan for the next annual submission (2024). The resources for this activity are allocated and, so far, initial results on the estimation of country-specific biomass expansion factors soon will be published in a scientific peer-reviewed publication.

As IPCC 2006 guidelines does not provide default EFs, "NE" is used for reporting C stock changes in living biomass (gains, losses and net change) and dead organic matter for wetlands converted to cropland.

In forest land converted to cropland, CSCs in mineral soil are estimated using Equation 2.25 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. Impact factors for calculations of the CSC under different management activities are taken from Table 5.5 in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines:

- FLU 0.69 (Long-term cultivated, Temperate moist);

<sup>221</sup> Krumsteds L.L., Ivanovs J., Jansons J., Lazdins A. 2019. Development of Latvian land use and land use change matrix using geospatial data of National forest inventory. *Agronomy Research* 17(6), p. 2295–2305, DOI: 10.15159/AR.19.195.

<sup>222</sup> Lazdiņš, A., Bārdule, A., Stola, J. 2013. Preliminary results of evaluation of area of organic soils in arable lands in Latvia. *Abstracts of International Baltic Sea Regional Scientific Conference*, 79–80.

- FMG 1.00 (Full tillage, Temperate dry and wet);
- FI 1.00 (Medium input, all).

The initial carbon stock in mineral forest soil at 0-30 cm depth (reference C stock) is 82.6 t ha<sup>-1</sup> according to the forest soil monitoring project BioSoil<sup>223</sup>. Forest stand types similar to agricultural lands are selected to calculate average carbon stock in forest soil (*Hylocomiosa*, *Oxalidosa*, *Myrtilloso-sphagnosa*, *Myrtillosoi-polytrichosa*, *Myrtillosa mel.*, *Mercurialosa mel.*). The carbon stock in forest land converted to cropland after transition period of 20 years according to the equation 2.25 is 79.4 t C ha<sup>-1</sup> at 0-30 cm depth (default reference soil organic C stock for mineral soils 115 t C ha<sup>-1</sup> according to the Table 2.3. in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines was used for calculation). Respectively, reduction of carbon stock in mineral soils is 3.3 t ha<sup>-1</sup> or 0.16 t C ha<sup>-1</sup> annually.

In organic soil of forest land converted to cropland, grassland converted to cropland and wetlands converted to cropland the factor for cropland remaining cropland (4.80 t CO<sub>2</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> annually) is used to estimate CSCs. The same approach as for cropland remaining cropland is used to calculate CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from drainage ditches.

### 6.5.3 Uncertainties and time-series consistency

Uncertainty analysis for 2024 submission is carried out by using Approach 1. Quantitative estimates of uncertainties are provided in the Annex 2. Overall description of uncertainty analysis is included in the Section 1.6.

Uncertainty of area estimates is provided in Table 6.23.

**Table 6.23 Uncertainty of the cropland use data in 2024 submission**

Land use category	Number of NFI plots	Share of NFI plots, %	Uncertainty, %
Cropland	4295	26.6	2.6
cropland remaining cropland	4255	26.3	2.6
organic soil	221	1.4	13.3
other soil	4034	25.0	2.7
land converted to cropland	40	0.3	53.4
organic soil	5	0.03	113.9
other soil	35	0.2	64.5

According to the NFI, uncertainty of growing stock is 135%. Uncertainty of annual increment of growing stock of trees is 2.20%. BEFs utilized in calculations have uncertainty level of 2.2% in average according to the study results. Uncertainty of dead wood stock is 3.9%. Uncertainty of carbon content in wood is 0.14%. Uncertainty of average carbon stock in litter in forest land is 23.1%.

The uncertainty of CO<sub>2</sub> EF for organic soils (13.3%) is determined according to the results of LIFE REstore project<sup>224</sup>. According to Table 5.5 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines the uncertainty of impact factor for different management practices applied in croplands is 12% for long term cultivating. No uncertainty is considered for full tillage and medium input (impact factor – 1).

<sup>223</sup> Lazdiņš et al. 2011.-2015. Projekts "Mežsaimniecisko darbību ietekmes uz siltumnīcefekta gāzu emisijām un CO<sub>2</sub> piesaisti novērtējums" (Project "Evaluation of impact of forest management practices on greenhouse gas emissions and CO<sub>2</sub> removals").

<sup>224</sup> Licite I., Lupikis, A. 2020. Impact of land use practices on greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture land on organic soils. Proceedings of 19th International Scientific Conference Engineering for Rural Development, 1823–1830, DOI: 10.22616/ERDev.2020.19.TF492

Uncertainty of carbon stock in mineral soil in forest land at 0-30 cm is 18.8%. Uncertainty of CH<sub>4</sub> EF for drainage ditches is 71.2% (Table 2.4 in the IPCC Wetlands Supplement).

Consistency of time series of calculations is secured by use of the NFI data for the cropland and grassland area and the NFI based remote sensing analysis for land use changes.

#### **6.5.4 Category-specific QA/QC and verification**

The quality objectives and the QA/QC plan for the Latvia's GHG inventory are presented in Section 1.2.3. The QC procedures are performed according to the QA/QC plan in the LULUCF sector in order to achieve these quality objectives.

The QA/QC plans for the cropland category includes the QC measures based on the IPCC (2006 IPCC Guidelines, Chapter 5.4.3, Tier 1 based QA/QC). The QA/QC procedures are implemented during every inventory. Issues related to QA/QC and verification are discussed at the sectoral meetings. Potential errors and inconsistencies are documented and corrections are made if necessary. Land use, as well as carbon stock in living and dead biomass related QA/QC procedures is implemented within the scope of the standard NFI procedure by re-measuring of 10% of all sample plots. Training of the NFI field teams takes place every spring before starting the field works.

Manual data check is introduced to compare figures imported into the CRF Reporter and actually calculated values. The mathematical errors identified during the previous review are corrected in the EPIM model used for calculation of GHG emissions in LULUCF sector.

All information related to the preparation of the annual inventory is archived in the centralized archiving system (common FTP folder) in accordance with QA/QC plan.

The country-specific EF used to estimate CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from drained organic soils in cropland was published as a peer-reviewed article and compared to EF used in other countries in the Baltic Sea region. The Latvian value was within uncertainty range of CS EF of other countries in the region.

#### **6.5.5 Category-specific recalculations**

No recalculations were done for this sector.

#### **6.5.6 Category-specific planned improvements**

There are several improvements proposed for the following inventories:

- The implementation of improved quantitative results of Yasso modelling to characterize CSCs in mineral soils according to improvement plan;
- Elaboration of climate, moisture regime and soil fertility driven modelling solution and activity data for organic soil in cropland (LIFE OrgBalt project, since 2025).

### **6.6 GRASSLAND (CRF 4.C)**

#### **6.6.1 Category description**

The grassland is a key category of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from soils and living biomass (Figure 6.10). Total area of grassland in Latvia in 2022 was 883.71 kha, including 408.58 kha of grassland remaining grassland. Grassland remaining grassland is divided into mineral and organic soils.

Area of the grassland is estimated using research data<sup>225</sup> on the base of remote sensing and NFI data analysis. The net emissions from grassland remaining grassland were 489.63 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. (including emissions from biomass burning) in Latvia in 2022 (Figure 6.11). CO<sub>2</sub> removals are reported in living and dead biomass in grasslands not fulfilling criteria of forest definition. Other peaks in time series of N<sub>2</sub>O and CH<sub>4</sub> emissions in 2003, 2006, 2009 and 2014 (Figure 6.11) are due to increase of area of wildfires in grassland.




Figure 6.10 Summary of GHG emissions and removals in grassland (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.) by source and sink categories




Figure 6.11 Summary of GHG emissions from grassland remaining grassland, CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions on secondary axis (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

<sup>225</sup>Krumsteds, L. L., Ivanovs, J., Jansons, J., Lazdiņš, A. 2019. Development of Latvian land use and land use change matrix using geospatial data of National forest inventory. *Agronomy Research*, 17(6), p. 2295–2305, DOI: 10.15159/AR.19.195.

The total area of lands converted to grassland less than 20 years ago<sup>226</sup> is estimated to be 475.13 kha in 2022. Net GHG emissions in land category land converted to grassland excluding CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from drained organic soil in 2022 were 964.04 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. (Figure 6.12). Increased values of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in period from 2001 to 2008, in 2019 and in 2020 are related to conversion of forest land to grassland resulting in emissions from living biomass, dead organic matter and organic soils.




Figure 6.12 Summary of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in land converted to grassland (kt)

Grassland remaining grassland is divided into mineral and organic soils according to the results of research project implemented in 2016<sup>227</sup>. It is assumed that mineral soils are neither a source nor sink of CO<sub>2</sub>. It could be changed depending on management level (degraded or improved) in grasslands; however, according to the expert judgement it was considered that all grasslands are managed in a way that there are no degraded or improved grasslands. The judgement is based on a pilot study of implementation of the Yasso07 model in grassland approving that soil CSCs in grassland remaining grassland are not significant. This type of management systems is not associated with decrease of carbon stock in soil. Organic soils are considerable source of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. Organic soils and drainage ditches in grasslands are reported as a source of CH<sub>4</sub> according to the IPCC Wetlands Supplement Chapter 2.

Increase of the area of organic soils in the land converted to grassland category is associated with conversion of cropland to grassland during the 1990s and during the last decade. Opposite

<sup>226</sup> Lazdiņš A., Zariņš J. 2010. Projekts "Mežu zemes izmantošanas maiņas matricas izstrādāšana un integrēšanu nacionālajā siltumnīcefekta gāzu inventarizācijas pārskatā par Kioto protokola 3.3 un 3.4 pantā minētajiem pasākumiem" (Project "Elaboration and integration into National greenhouse gas inventory report matrices of land use changes of areas belonging to Kyoto protocol Article 3.3 and 3.4 activities"); Lazdiņš A. Harmonization of land use matrix in Latvia according to requirements of international greenhouse gas reporting system - extending outputs of National Forest Inventory program; Lazdiņš A., Čugunovs M. 2013. Projekts "Oglekļa dioksīda (CO<sub>2</sub>) piesaistes un siltumnīcefekta gāzu (SEG) emisiju un zemes lietojuma veida ietekmes novērtējums intensīvi un ekstensīvi kultivētās aramzemēs, daudzgadīgos zālājos un bioloģiski vērtīgos zālājos" (Project "Evaluation of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) removals and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, and impact of land use in intensive and extensive cultivated cropland, grassland and biologically valuable grassland").

<sup>227</sup> Lazdiņš A., Bārdule A., Butlers A., Lupiķis A., Okmanis M., Bebre I., ... Petaja G. 2016. Projekts "Aramzemes un ilggadīgo zālāju apsaimniekošanas radīto siltumnīcefekta gāzu (SEG) emisiju un oglekļa dioksīda (CO<sub>2</sub>) piesaistes uzskaites sistēmas pilnveidošana un atbilstošu metodisko risinājumu izstrādāšana" (Project "Improving the accounting system of CO<sub>2</sub> removals and GHG emissions due to management practices in cropland and grassland and development of methodological solutions"). 2016. gada starpziņojums, No. 101115/S109, Salaspils, p. 123. Available: [https://drive.google.com/open?id=0Bxv4jQ\\_04jXZRExSMWhPMWhDNDg](https://drive.google.com/open?id=0Bxv4jQ_04jXZRExSMWhPMWhDNDg)

process – reduction of area of grassland – took place due to afforestation (both natural expansion of forest and planting) of the grassland.

Updated values of area of organic and other soils split into grassland remaining grassland (including land converted to grassland at least 20 years ago) and land converted to grassland less than 20 years ago are shown in Table 6.24.

**Table 6.24 Area of grassland (kha)**

Year	Grassland	Land remaining grassland		Land converted to grassland	
		organic soil	other soils	organic soil	other soils
1990	547.31	59.42	480.10	0.51	7.27
1991	555.93	58.69	479.87	1.14	16.23
1992	564.56	57.95	479.63	1.76	25.21
1993	573.18	57.22	479.39	2.38	34.19
1994	581.80	56.49	479.15	2.99	43.18
1995	590.43	55.76	478.91	3.59	52.17
1996	597.38	54.37	472.87	4.58	65.56
1997	604.34	53.00	466.82	5.56	78.96
1998	611.30	51.64	460.76	6.53	92.37
1999	618.25	50.30	454.67	7.49	105.79
2000	625.21	48.98	448.57	8.44	119.22
2001	675.46	47.59	441.66	12.66	173.55
2002	725.71	46.22	434.72	16.84	227.93
2003	775.95	44.87	427.77	20.98	282.34
2004	826.20	43.54	420.80	25.08	336.78
2005	876.45	42.22	413.81	29.15	391.27
2006	926.70	40.93	406.79	33.18	445.79
2007	976.94	39.66	399.76	37.17	500.35
2008	1027.19	38.40	392.71	41.12	554.95
2009	1030.05	36.82	382.06	42.91	568.26
2010	1032.91	35.79	378.64	44.17	574.31
2011	1035.77	34.89	376.90	45.31	578.66
2012	1038.63	34.02	375.13	46.45	583.02
2013	1041.48	33.17	373.34	47.59	587.39
2014	1039.00	32.96	378.39	47.41	580.25
2015	1036.51	32.75	383.43	47.23	573.10
2016	1034.02	32.93	392.86	46.67	561.56
2017	1031.54	33.53	401.88	46.12	550.01
2018	1029.05	34.12	410.90	45.58	538.44
2019	994.39	31.60	384.13	47.20	531.45
2020	959.73	29.07	357.37	48.82	524.47
2021	925.07	29.81	371.52	47.16	476.58
2022	883.71	29.90	378.69	46.40	428.73

The improvement of quantitative results of Yasso modelling to characterize CSCs in mineral soils is in progress according to improvement plan. Studies continues, for instance, to elaborate biomass expansion factors and data on carbon turnover in cropland and grassland. The study "Improvement of GHG emission calculations from managed croplands and grasslands and



development of appropriate methodological solutions”<sup>228</sup> provides additional C input information and BEFs for the most common farm crops and management systems. The study results will be available for inclusion in GHG inventory as soon as results will be statistically analyzed and published in peer-reviewed scientific journal.

## 6.6.2 Methodological issues

### 6.6.2.1 Grassland remaining grassland (CRF 4.C.1)

Activity data are provided by the NFI. Woody biomass increment figures for 2004-2022 are taken from the NFI. Four cycles of the NFI (2004-2008, 2009-2013, 2014-2018 and the first four years of the 4<sup>th</sup> cycle) are used. For the earlier years the results of recalculation of increment of living biomass in grassland are considered<sup>229</sup>. Mortality rate in wooden areas are taken from the NFI using the most recent 5 years period. Decay period for dead wood is considered 20 years according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.

Calculations are done in EPIM tool. Assumptions used in EPIM tool are shown in Table 6.25, default 20 years decay period is considered for dead wood.

Table 6.25 Assumptions for calculation of CSC in living and dead biomass in grassland

Year	Grassland with woody vegetation, kha	Gross increment of living biomass		Wood density, kg m <sup>-3</sup>	Natural mortality, m <sup>3</sup> ha <sup>-1</sup>	BEFs		Carbon content, kg t <sup>-1</sup>
		mill. m <sup>3</sup>	m <sup>3</sup> ha <sup>-1</sup>			stem to crown	stem to below-ground	
1990	19.13	0.02	0.97	0.44	0.16	0.24	0.31	523.30
1991	19.44	0.02	0.95	0.44	0.16	0.24	0.31	523.30
1992	19.75	0.02	1.00	0.44	0.17	0.24	0.31	523.30
1993	20.07	0.02	0.99	0.44	0.17	0.24	0.31	523.30
1994	20.38	0.02	0.99	0.44	0.16	0.24	0.31	522.95
1995	20.69	0.02	0.97	0.44	0.16	0.24	0.31	522.95
1996	21.00	0.02	0.96	0.44	0.16	0.24	0.31	522.95
1997	21.32	0.02	0.96	0.44	0.16	0.24	0.31	522.95
1998	21.63	0.02	0.94	0.44	0.15	0.24	0.31	522.95
1999	21.94	0.02	0.98	0.44	0.16	0.24	0.31	523.34
2000	22.26	0.02	0.97	0.44	0.16	0.24	0.31	523.34
2001	22.57	0.02	0.96	0.44	0.16	0.24	0.31	523.34
2002	22.88	0.02	0.94	0.44	0.16	0.24	0.31	523.34
2003	23.19	0.02	0.93	0.44	0.15	0.24	0.31	523.34
2004	23.51	0.02	0.92	0.44	0.18	0.24	0.31	524.03
2005	23.82	0.02	0.91	0.44	0.17	0.24	0.31	524.03
2006	24.13	0.02	0.89	0.44	0.17	0.24	0.31	524.03
2007	23.54	0.05	2.12	0.44	0.41	0.24	0.31	524.03
2008	23.54	0.05	2.12	0.44	0.41	0.24	0.31	524.03
2009	23.54	0.05	2.12	0.44	0.62	0.24	0.31	522.56
2010	23.54	0.05	2.12	0.44	0.62	0.24	0.31	522.56
2011	23.54	0.05	2.12	0.44	0.62	0.24	0.31	522.56
2012	38.80	0.07	1.85	0.44	0.06	0.24	0.31	522.56

<sup>228</sup> Project “Improvement of GHG emission calculations from managed croplands and grasslands and development of appropriate methodological solutions”. Available: <http://www.silava.lv/24/section.aspx/View/314> and <http://www.silava.lv/24/section.aspx/View/237>

<sup>229</sup>Jansons, J. 2007. Methods utilized to recalculate historical forest increment data (p. 21). Available: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1yXUg6yf7NQ4PF2ff7HhPS6xOqPs2QpOo/view?usp=sharing>

Year	Grassland with woody vegetation, kha	Gross increment of living biomass		Wood density, kg m <sup>-3</sup>	Natural mortality, m <sup>3</sup> ha <sup>-1</sup>	BEFs		Carbon content, kg t <sup>-1</sup>
		mill. m <sup>3</sup>	m <sup>3</sup> ha <sup>-1</sup>			stem to crown	stem to below-ground	
2013	38.80	0.07	1.85	0.44	0.06	0.24	0.31	522.56
2014	38.80	0.07	1.85	0.44	0.06	0.24	0.31	522.62
2015	38.80	0.07	1.85	0.44	0.06	0.24	0.31	522.15
2016	166.04	0.07	0.43	0.43	0.06	0.24	0.31	521.93
2017	181.58	0.16	0.89	0.44	0.10	0.24	0.31	522.18
2018	180.25	0.00	0.00	0.43	0.00	0.25	0.31	522.42
2019	177.07	0.14	0.79	0.44	0.12	0.24	0.31	522.48
2020	176.41	0.14	0.79	0.42	0.15	0.26	0.31	522.82
2021	176.03	0.18	1.05	0.42	1.26	0.26	0.31	522.66
2022	176.59	0.01	0.08	0.42	0.11	0.25	0.31	523.99

National CO<sub>2</sub> EF (4.40 t CO<sub>2</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>)<sup>230</sup> for drained organic soils in grassland was developed within the scope of LIFE REstore project and used to report CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from drained organic soils since submission 2021. Within the LIFE REstore project, two methods were used for CO<sub>2</sub> measurements – manual autotrophic measurements with opaque closed chambers and air sampling and manual ecosystem flux measurements with closed transparent chambers. Applied country-specific value (4.40 t CO<sub>2</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>) is lower than that in the IPCC Wetlands Supplement (6.1 tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>). Values of EFs mainly differ due to the variance in climatic factors between central and western parts of Europe (where IPCC Wetlands Supplement default EFs were developed) and condition in Latvia; in warmer climatic conditions higher emissions occur. In addition, CO<sub>2</sub> EFs for grassland currently used in other Baltic countries (0.25 t CO<sub>2</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> in Lithuania and 1.50 t CO<sub>2</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> in Estonia) are even more lower if compare to the Latvia's national EF or default EF provided by the IPCC Wetlands Supplement. It reinforces that Latvia's national CO<sub>2</sub> EF more reflects the climatic conditions in the region than default EF provided by the IPCC Wetlands Supplement.

EFs for CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from drained organic soil and drainage ditches are, respectively, 57.80 kg CH<sub>4</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> and 1165 kg CH<sub>4</sub> ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> according to research results<sup>231</sup> and Table 2.4 in IPCC Wetlands Supplement. Fraction of the total area of drained organic soil that is occupied by ditches is 0.05 (Table 2.4 in the IPCC Wetlands Supplement).

N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from managed organic soils in grassland are reported under Agriculture sector (detailed methodology is described in section 5.4.2).

Yasso07 is used to estimate CSCs in grassland on mineral soils. According to the study results<sup>232</sup> demonstrating that grassland remaining grassland on mineral soils is not a source of GHG emissions this category is not reported. Removals in soil obtained by the study are within a range of uncertainty therefore they are not reported in the inventory.

<sup>230</sup> Licite I., Lupikis, A. 2020. Impact of land use practices on greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture land on organic soils. Proceedings of 19th International Scientific Conference Engineering for Rural Development, 1823–1830. DOI: 10.22616/ERDev.2020.19.TF492

<sup>231</sup> Licite, I., Lupikis, A. 2020. Impact of land use practices on greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture land on organic soils. Proceedings of 19th International Scientific Conference Engineering for Rural Development, 1823–1830, DOI: 10.22616/ERDev.2020.19.TF492

<sup>232</sup> Lupikis, A., Lazdiņš, A. 2017. Oglekļa aprite minerālaugsnēs Latvijas mežos: modelēts ar Yasso07 augsnes oglekļa modeli (Carbon cycling in mineral soils in forest land in Latvia: modeled by Yasso07 soil carbon model). In Starptautiskā zinātniski praktiskā konference Zinātne un prakse nozares attīstībai, Mežzinātnes un augstākās mežizglītības loma nozares konkurētspējas paaugstināšanā, tēzes, p. 17, Jelgava, LLU.

N<sub>2</sub>O and CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from biomass burning are calculated according to methodology described in following chapter on Biomass burning.

### 6.6.2.2 Land converted to grassland (CRF 4.C.2)

In forest land converted to grassland, CSCs in living biomass, dead organic matter and organic soil are reported. Carbon stock change in living biomass is calculated as losses in living biomass due to felling of trees, considering that losses in living biomass are equal to average growing stock in forest land converted to grassland (BEFs, carbon content and wood density are considered as weighted by total biomass distribution between species). Gains in living biomass is calculated using default biomass stock present on grassland 13.6 tonnes d.m. ha<sup>-1</sup> and carbon fraction 0.47 ton C (ton d.m.)<sup>-1</sup> for herbaceous biomass according to 2006 IPCC Guidelines (T1 method). Carbon stock changes in mineral soil from conversion of forest land to grassland is calculated by Tier 1 methodology, results of calculations show that there are no changes in carbon stock in mineral soil due to conversion. Naturally afforested lands are usually converted back to grasslands or croplands at relatively early development stage, when soil carbon input into soil does not differ significantly in forest land and grassland. BioSoil and NFI soil monitoring data prove that soil organic carbon stock difference in forest land and grassland on fertile mineral soils (that are typical for grasslands) is insignificant<sup>233</sup>.

In cropland converted to grassland, CSCs in organic soil are reported. Changes in living biomass and dead organic matter for cropland converted to grassland are not reported ("IE" notation key) to avoid double accounting, because input of C in soil through biomass is included in calculation of CSC in mineral soil using Yasso model.

Carbon stock changes in mineral soils in cropland converted to grassland are reported as "NA" notation key according to the research data<sup>234</sup> and results of study on carbon stock in mineral soils in cropland and grassland<sup>235</sup>. CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from ditches on organic soils have been included in estimates also for lands converted to grasslands and it is calculated with the same approach as grassland remaining grassland.

In wetlands converted to grassland, CSCs in living biomass and organic soil are reported. Gains in living biomass are calculated by T1 method using default biomass stock present on grassland 13.6 tonnes d.m. ha<sup>-1</sup> and carbon fraction 0.47 ton C (ton d.m.)<sup>-1</sup> for herbaceous biomass according to 2006 IPCC Guidelines. Losses in living biomass and CSCs in dead organic matter are reported as "NE" notation key due to 2006 IPCC guidelines does not provide T1 EF.

In settlements converted to grassland, CSCs in living biomass are reported. Gains in living biomass are calculated by T1 method using default biomass stock present on grassland 13.6 tonnes d.m. ha<sup>-1</sup> and carbon fraction 0.47 ton C (ton d.m.)<sup>-1</sup> for herbaceous biomass according to 2006 IPCC Guidelines. Losses in living biomass due to felling of trees were estimated assuming immediate oxidation, where the living biomass prior to land-use change is considered equivalent to the cumulative annual increment of growing stock as calculated for category settlements remaining settlements. CSCs in dead organic matter are reported as "NE" notation

<sup>233</sup> Lazdiņš A. et al. 2013. *Temporary carbon stock changes in forest soil in Latvia*, in *Abstracts of International Baltic Sea Regional Scientific Conference, Riga, LSFRI Silava, 2013*, p. 51–52; Bardule A., Lupikis A., Butlers A., Lazdins A. 2017. *Organic carbon stock in different types of mineral soils in cropland and grassland in Latvia. Zemdirbyste-Agriculture*, 104, 1, p. 3–8.

<sup>234</sup> Projekts "Augsnes oglekļa krājumu novērtēšana aramzemē un pļavās" (Project "Evaluation of soil carbon stocks in cropland and grassland"). Available: [https://drive.google.com/file/d/0Bxv4jQ\\_04jXZUTJ5c28za2c1eW8/view](https://drive.google.com/file/d/0Bxv4jQ_04jXZUTJ5c28za2c1eW8/view)

<sup>235</sup> Bardule A., Lupikis A., Butlers A., Lazdins A. 2017. *Organic carbon stock in different types of mineral soils in cropland and grassland in Latvia. Zemdirbyste-Agriculture*, 104, 1, p. 3–8.

key due to 2006 IPCC guidelines does not provide T1 EF. Carbon stock changes in mineral soil are reported as not occurring ("NA" notation key). According to IPCC tier 1 methodology C removals would be reported in settlements converted to grassland, but it is not done to avoid overestimation of C removals and to stay consistent with the national conditions. Information available from NFI approves that the most common type of such land use conversion is abandonment of industrial and military infrastructure.

Improvement of methodology for estimating CSC in living biomass, deadwood and litter, as well as in mineral soils and organic soils is in progress. T1 method for calculation of CSCs in living biomass in wetlands converted to grassland and settlements converted to grassland will be replaced by actual values of C-stock changes after improvement of NFI data processing system, that will allow to track C-stock changes in living biomass and dead organic matter directly associated with land use changes at separate NFI plot level. The results of the study are published<sup>236</sup>; however, work is continuing to reduce uncertainty.

Carbon stock changes in organic soil for forest land, cropland and wetlands converted to grassland are reported. National CO<sub>2</sub> EF (4.40 t CO<sub>2</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>)<sup>237</sup> for drained organic soils was used to report CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from drained organic soils since submission 2021. Due to limited information available on area of organic soils in wetlands converted to grassland it is assumed in the calculation that all wetlands converted to grasslands have organic soils and the national CO<sub>2</sub> EF for organic soils in grassland is applied in calculation of soil CSCs. This approach avoids potential underestimation of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from soil.

### 6.6.3 Uncertainties and time-series consistency

Uncertainty analysis for 2024 submission is carried out by using Approach 1. Quantitative estimates of uncertainties are provided in the Annex 2. Overall description of uncertainty analysis is included in the Section 1.6.

Uncertainty of area estimates is provided in Table 6.26.

**Table 6.26 Uncertainty of the grassland use data in 2024 submission**

Land use category	Number of NFI plots	Share of NFI plots, %	Uncertainty, %
Grassland	1747	10.8	4.2
grassland remaining grassland	1407	8.7	5.0
organic soil	73	0.5	25.7
other soil	1334	8.3	5.1
land converted to grassland	340	2.1	9.8
organic soil	17	0.1	55.1
other soil	324	2.0	10.0

According to the NFI, uncertainty of growing stock is 55.5%. Uncertainty of annual increment of growing stock of trees is 2.20%. BEFs utilized in calculations have uncertainty level of 2.2% in average according to the study results. Uncertainty of dead wood stock is 3.9%. Uncertainty of carbon content in wood is 0.14%. Uncertainty of average carbon stock in litter in forest land is 23.1%.

<sup>236</sup> Krumsteds L.L., Lazdins A., Butlers A., Ivanovs J. 2019. Recalculation of forest increment, mortality and harvest rate in Latvia according to updated land use data. *Rural Development 2019 (1)*: 295–299, DOI:10.15544/RD.2019.037

<sup>237</sup> Licite I., Lupikis, A. 2020. Impact of land use practices on greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture land on organic soils. *Proceedings of 19th International Scientific Conference Engineering for Rural Development, 1823–1830*, DOI: 10.22616/ERDev.2020.19.TF492

The uncertainty estimate for the CO<sub>2</sub> EF for organic soils is 39.7 % according to the the results of LIFE REstore project<sup>238</sup>.

Uncertainties for EFs used in calculation of CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from organic soils and drainage ditches are 153.2% and 71.2% according to the results of LIFE REstore project<sup>239</sup> and Table 2.4 in the IPCC Wetlands Supplement, respectively.

#### 6.6.4 Category-specific QA/QC and verification

The quality objectives and the QA/QC plan for the Latvia's GHG inventory at the National Inventory level are presented in Section 1.2.3. The QC procedures are performed according to the QA/QC plan in the LULUCF sector in order to achieve these quality objectives.

The QA/QC plans for the Grassland's category includes the QC measures based on the IPCC (2006 IPCC Guidelines, Chapter 6.4.3, Tier 1 approach). These measures are implemented every year during the inventory. Potential errors and inconsistencies are documented and corrections are made if necessary. The files and documents used in preparation of the inventory are archived annually and back-up copies are made weekly. Issues related to QA/QC and verification are discussed at the sectoral meetings.

Manual data check is introduced to compare figures imported into the CRF Reporter and actually calculated values. The mathematical errors identified during the previous review are corrected in the EPIM model used for calculation of GHG emissions in LULUCF sector.

All information related to the preparation of the annual inventory is archived in the centralized archiving system (common FTP folder) in accordance with QA/QC plan.

Country-specific EFs<sup>240</sup> used to estimate CO<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from drained organic soils in grassland were published as a peer-reviewed article and compared to EFs used in other countries in the Baltic Sea region. Latvian values were within uncertainty ranges of CS EFs of other countries in the region.

#### 6.6.5 Category-specific recalculations

Recalculations are done due to correction of an error in sign of values when reporting carbon stock change in organic soil in wetlands converted to grassland category. In addition, 1) improvement of methodology for calculation of CSCs in living biomass in settlements converted to grassland category was implemented (improvement resulted in a slight increase by a maximum of 16.61 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. in 2021) based on recommendation of EU-internal inventory review; 2) improved activity data (area of wildfires in grassland for 2021) was implemented, recalculation resulted in slight reduction in GHG emissions (see detailed in chapter 6.10 BIOMASS BURNING (CRF 4(V))). Summary of the impact of recalculation on the aggregated net GHG emissions from grassland is shown in Figure 6.13.

---

<sup>238</sup> Licite I., Lupikis, A. 2020. Impact of land use practices on greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture land on organic soils. *Proceedings of 19th International Scientific Conference Engineering for Rural Development, 1823–1830*, DOI: 10.22616/ERDev.2020.19.TF492

<sup>239</sup> Licite I., Lupikis, A. 2020. Impact of land use practices on greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture land on organic soils. *Proceedings of 19th International Scientific Conference Engineering for Rural Development, 1823–1830*, DOI: 10.22616/ERDev.2020.19.TF492

<sup>240</sup> Licite I., Lupikis, A. 2020. Impact of land use practices on greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture land on organic soils. *Proceedings of 19th International Scientific Conference Engineering for Rural Development, 1823–1830*. DOI: 10.22616/ERDev.2020.19.TF492




Figure 6.13 Impact of recalculation on the aggregated net GHG emissions from grassland (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

### 6.6.6 Category-specific planned improvements

There are several improvements proposed for the following inventories:

- The implementation of improved quantitative results of Yasso modelling to characterize CSCs in mineral soils according to improvement plan;
- Elaboration of model based estimates of GHG emissions and activity data for organic soil in grassland (LIFE OrgBalt project, since 2025).

## 6.7 WETLANDS (CRF 4.D)

### 6.7.1 Category description

The net GHG emissions in wetlands in 2022 were 1787.58 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. (Figure 6.14, Figure 6.15, Figure 6.16). Wetlands remaining wetlands is a key category of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions mainly due to peat extraction for horticulture which contributed 90.2% (1612.18 kt CO<sub>2</sub> sum of on-site and off-site emissions) from total net GHG emissions from Wetland category in 2022. N<sub>2</sub>O and CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from drainage and rewetting (described in Section 6.7.2.3) contribute to about 0.33% and 5.2% (5.79 and 89.12 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq., respectively) of total emissions from organic soils (1731.55 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq., sum of on-site and off-site GHG emissions) in 2022.




Figure 6.14 Summary of GHG emissions from wetlands (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.) by source and sink categories




Figure 6.15 Summary of GHG emissions from wetlands (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

According to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines wetlands include land that is covered or saturated by water for all or part of the year and that does not fall into the forest land, cropland, and grassland or settlement categories. In 2022, total area of wetlands was 395.08 kha, including 31.62 kha of peatlands drained for peat extraction based on the results of the LIFE REstore project, 8.69 kha of wetlands with woody vegetation not meeting threshold for definition of forest land, and 5.34 kha of flooded land remaining flooded land (including rewetted land). Managed wetlands are determined within the scope of LIFE REstore project<sup>241</sup>.

<sup>241</sup>Pētersons J., Lazdiņš A., Kasakovskis A. 2019. LIFE REstore database on areas affected by peat extraction. In Priede A., Gancone A. (Eds.), *Sustainable and responsible after-use of peat extraction areas* (pp. 122–129). Baltijas Krasti; Butlers A.,

**Table 6.27 Subcategories of Wetlands remaining wetlands (4.D.1) and Land converted to Wetlands (4.D.2)**

CRF classification		Land use types included in this category	Type of emissions and removals included in the CRF subcategory
CRF category	CRF subcategory		
4.D.1 Wetlands Remaining Wetlands	4.D.1.1 Peat Extraction Remaining Peat Extraction	Peatlands drained for peat extraction	CSC in organic soils (on-site CO <sub>2</sub> emissions) is reported.
	4.D.1.2 Flooded Land Remaining Flooded Land	Flooded and rewetted wetlands	<p>"IE" notification key is reported for CSC in living biomass and dead organic matter. Included in CRF subcategory other wetlands remaining other wetlands (CRF 4.D.1.3).</p> <p>"IE" notification key is reported for CSC in organic soils (on-site CO<sub>2</sub> emissions). Included in CRF category 4(II) Emissions and removals from drainage and rewetting and other management of organic and mineral soils (Peat Extraction Lands, Rewetted Organic Soils).</p>
	4.D.1.3 Other Wetlands Remaining Other Wetlands	Wetlands with woody vegetation and other wetlands	CSC in living biomass and dead organic matter is reported.
4.D.2 Land Converted to Wetlands	4.D.2.1 Land Converted for Peat Extraction	-	-
	4.D.2.2 Land Converted to Flooded Land	Land converted to flooded and rewetted wetlands	<p>"IE" notification key is reported for CSCs in living biomass and dead organic matter. Included in CRF subcategory other wetlands remaining other wetlands (CRF 4.D.1.3).</p> <p>"IE" notification key is reported for CSC in organic soils (on-site CO<sub>2</sub> emissions). Included in CRF category 4(II) Emissions and removals from drainage and rewetting and other management of organic and mineral soils (Peat Extraction Lands, Rewetted Organic Soils).</p>
	4.D.2.3 Land Converted to Other Wetlands	Land converted to wetlands with woody vegetation and other wetlands	<p>"IE" notification key is reported for CSCs in living biomass and dead organic matter. Included in CRF subcategory other wetlands remaining other wetlands (CRF 4.D.1.3).</p> <p>CSC in organic soils (on-site CO<sub>2</sub> emissions) is reported.</p>



**Table 6.28 Distribution of wetlands remaining wetlands (CRF 4.D.1) and land converted to wetlands (CRF 4.D.2) (kha)**

Year	Wetlands remaining wetlands				Land converted to wetlands			
	Peat extraction	Flooded land		Other wetlands	Peat extraction	Flooded land		Other wetlands
		Flooded land	Rewetted land			Flooded land	Rewetted land	
1990	47.63	NO	NO	326.56	NO	0.20	0.00	0.50
1991	47.12	NO	NO	326.56	NO	0.41	0.00	0.64
1992	46.60	NO	NO	326.56	NO	0.61	0.00	0.77
1993	46.08	NO	NO	326.56	NO	0.82	0.00	0.91
1994	45.57	NO	NO	326.56	NO	1.02	0.00	1.05
1995	45.05	NO	NO	326.56	NO	1.23	0.00	1.18
1996	44.53	NO	NO	326.43	NO	1.43	0.00	2.40
1997	44.02	NO	NO	326.30	NO	1.64	0.00	3.62
1998	43.50	NO	NO	326.17	NO	1.84	0.01	4.84
1999	42.98	NO	NO	326.04	NO	2.05	0.01	6.07
2000	42.47	NO	NO	325.91	NO	2.25	0.01	7.29
2001	41.95	NO	NO	325.40	NO	2.46	0.01	10.12
2002	41.43	NO	NO	324.90	NO	2.66	0.01	12.95
2003	40.92	NO	NO	324.39	NO	2.87	0.01	15.78
2004	40.40	NO	NO	323.89	NO	3.07	0.01	18.62
2005	39.88	NO	NO	323.39	NO	3.28	0.01	21.45
2006	39.37	NO	NO	322.88	NO	3.48	0.01	24.28
2007	38.85	NO	NO	322.38	NO	3.69	0.01	27.12
2008	38.33	NO	NO	321.87	NO	3.89	0.01	29.95
2009	37.82	NO	NO	320.02	NO	4.10	0.01	33.21
2010	37.30	0.41	0.00	318.46	NO	4.10	0.01	35.98
2011	36.78	0.82	0.00	316.54	NO	4.10	0.01	39.11
2012	36.27	1.23	0.00	314.62	NO	4.10	0.01	42.24
2013	35.75	1.64	0.00	312.70	NO	4.10	0.01	45.37
2014	35.23	2.05	0.01	312.12	NO	4.10	0.01	46.11
2015	34.72	2.46	0.01	311.53	NO	4.10	0.01	46.86
2016	34.20	2.87	0.01	312.03	NO	4.10	0.01	46.53
2017	33.68	3.28	0.01	312.53	NO	4.10	0.01	46.19
2018	33.17	3.69	0.01	313.03	NO	4.10	0.01	45.85
2019	32.65	4.10	0.01	309.81	NO	4.10	0.01	48.29
2020	32.13	4.51	0.01	306.59	NO	4.10	0.01	50.72
2021	31.62	4.92	0.01	304.98	NO	4.10	0.01	51.54
2022	31.62	5.33	0.02	300.96	NO	4.10	0.01	53.26

In the Wetlands category, Latvia reports emissions (on-site and off-site) associated with industrial peat extraction. Off-site CO<sub>2</sub>-C emissions are associated with the horticultural (non-energy) use of extracted peat. Off-site emissions from peat used for energy are reported in the Energy Sector (1.A.1. Energy industries, 1.A.2. Manufacturing industries and construction and 1.A.4. Other sectors), and is therefore not included here. Summary of on-site and off-site CO<sub>2</sub> emissions associated with industrial peat extraction is shown in Figure 6.16.

The rest of the area of wetlands is not managed (remains undrained) and therefore CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are not calculated. The exception are areas with woody vegetation (mainly narrow bands of trees) located adjacent to water courses, water bodies or swamps which do not fit under the definition of Forest Land category – shorelines of rivers and lakes, that are usually maintained as buffer zones because of environmental restrictions. Mostly removals in this category (4.D.1.3 Other Wetlands Remaining Other Wetlands) are reported in living biomass

and dead organic matter. Other types of wetlands remaining wetlands included in CRF table 4.D.1 are lower, upper and transitional bogs and water bodies, excluding drainage ditches and channels. All these types of lands are estimated using the NFI data and a consistent methodology, therefore no overlapping is possible.




Figure 6.16 Summary of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions associated with industrial peat extraction (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

## 6.7.2 Methodological issues

### 6.7.2.1 Wetlands Remaining Wetlands (CRF 4.D.1)

Under category Wetlands Remaining Wetlands emissions and CO<sub>2</sub> removals are reported in following sub-categories:

- Peat Extraction Remaining Peat Extraction (CRF 4.D.1.1);
- Flooded Land Remaining Flooded Land (CRF 4.D.1.2);
- Other Wetlands Remaining Other Wetlands (CRF 4.D.1.3).

#### 6.7.2.1.1 *Peat Extraction Remaining Peat Extraction (4.D.1.1)*

Under this category CSC in organic soils (on-site CO<sub>2</sub> emissions) is reported using Tier 2 method. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are calculated from peatlands drained for peat extraction. Since submission 2019 country specific data of area of peat extraction remaining peat extraction was implemented according to the results of the LIFE REstore project<sup>242</sup> (31.62 kha in 2022). Since submission 2021 national CO<sub>2</sub> EF (1.21 t CO<sub>2</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>) developed within the scope of LIFE REstore project<sup>243</sup> for organic soils in drained peat extraction areas was used for reporting. Within the LIFE REstore project, two methods were used for CO<sub>2</sub> measurements – manual autotrophic measurements with opaque closed chambers and air sampling and manual ecosystem flux measurements with closed transparent chambers. Although the elaborated country-specific EF (1.21 t CO<sub>2</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>) is lower than that in the IPCC Wetlands Supplement (2.8 tons CO<sub>2</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>), it is within uncertainty range of the IPCC Wetlands Supplement provided value (Table

<sup>242</sup>Priede A., Gancone A. (eds.) 2019. Sustainable and responsible after-use of peat extraction areas. Baltijas krasti, Riga. Available: <https://restore.daba.gov.lv/public/lat/jaunumi/117/>

<sup>243</sup>Lazdiņš A., Lupiķis A. 2019. LIFE REstore project contribution to the greenhouse gas emission accounts in Latvia. In: Priede, A., Gancone A.(Eds.), Sustainable and responsible after-use of peat extraction areas (pp. 21–52). Baltijas Krasti.

6.30). Reason for these differences is mainly the climatic factors - significant difference between central and western parts of Europe where IPCC Wetlands Supplement EFs were developed and condition in Latvia (in warmer climatic conditions higher emissions occur). In addition, use of a similar CO<sub>2</sub> EFs in other Baltic countries (0.2-1.1 t CO<sub>2</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> in Lithuania<sup>244</sup> and 1.74 t CO<sub>2</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> in Estonia<sup>245</sup>) confirms compliance of Latvia's national CO<sub>2</sub> EF with climatic conditions in the region.

#### 6.7.2.1.2 Flooded Land Remaining Flooded Land (CRF 4.D.1.2)

Carbon stock change in living biomass and dead organic matter in flooded land remaining flooded land is included in category other wetlands remaining other wetlands (CRF 4.D.1.3). Carbon stock change in organic soils in flooded land remaining flooded land is included in category 4(II) Emissions and removals from drainage and rewetting and other management of organic and mineral soils (Rewetted Organic Soils).

#### 6.7.2.1.3 Other Wetlands Remaining Other Wetlands (CRF 4.D.1.3)

Under this category CSC in living biomass and dead organic matter in wetlands with woody vegetation is reported. The assumptions for calculations of CSC in living biomass and dead organic matter used in EPIM tool are shown in Table 6.29, default 20 years decay period is considered for dead wood.

**Table 6.29 Assumptions for calculation of CSC in living and dead biomass in wetlands**

Year	Wetlands with woody vegetation, kha	Gross increment of living biomass		Wood density, kg m <sup>-3</sup>	Natural mortality, m <sup>3</sup> ha <sup>-1</sup>	BEFs		Carbon content, kg t <sup>-1</sup>
		mill. m <sup>3</sup>	m <sup>3</sup> ha <sup>-1</sup>			stem to crown	stem to below-ground	
1990	189.25	0.06	0.33	0.44	0.06	0.24	0.31	523.30
1991	191.55	0.07	0.37	0.44	0.06	0.24	0.31	523.30
1992	193.42	0.08	0.41	0.44	0.07	0.24	0.31	523.30
1993	194.24	0.08	0.42	0.44	0.07	0.24	0.31	523.30
1994	195.72	0.09	0.44	0.44	0.07	0.24	0.31	522.95
1995	196.29	0.09	0.45	0.44	0.07	0.24	0.31	522.95
1996	197.92	0.09	0.46	0.44	0.07	0.24	0.31	522.95
1997	199.26	0.09	0.46	0.44	0.08	0.24	0.31	522.95
1998	201.05	0.09	0.47	0.44	0.08	0.24	0.31	522.95
1999	201.20	0.09	0.47	0.44	0.08	0.24	0.31	523.34
2000	202.54	0.10	0.47	0.44	0.08	0.24	0.31	523.34
2001	203.12	0.10	0.47	0.44	0.08	0.24	0.31	523.34
2002	204.27	0.10	0.47	0.44	0.08	0.24	0.31	523.34
2003	205.96	0.10	0.47	0.44	0.08	0.24	0.31	523.34
2004	206.59	0.10	0.46	0.44	0.09	0.24	0.31	524.03
2005	206.71	0.10	0.46	0.44	0.09	0.24	0.31	524.03
2006	210.16	0.10	0.46	0.44	0.09	0.24	0.31	524.03
2007	97.62	0.18	1.85	0.44	0.35	0.24	0.31	524.03
2008	97.62	0.18	1.85	0.44	0.35	0.24	0.31	524.03
2009	97.62	0.18	1.85	0.44	0.54	0.24	0.31	522.56
2010	97.62	0.18	1.85	0.44	0.54	0.24	0.31	522.56
2011	97.62	0.18	1.85	0.44	0.54	0.24	0.31	522.56

<sup>244</sup> Lithuania's Greenhouse Gas Inventory Report 2022. Available: <https://unfccc.int/ghg-inventories-annex-i-parties/2022>

<sup>245</sup> Estonia's National Inventory Report 2022. Available: <https://unfccc.int/ghg-inventories-annex-i-parties/2022>

Year	Wetlands with woody vegetation, kha	Gross increment of living biomass		Wood density, kg m <sup>-3</sup>	Natural mortality, m <sup>3</sup> ha <sup>-1</sup>	BEFs		Carbon content, kg t <sup>-1</sup>
		mill. m <sup>3</sup>	m <sup>3</sup> ha <sup>-1</sup>			stem to crown	stem to below-ground	
2012	75.64	0.14	1.79	0.44	1.14	0.24	0.31	522.56
2013	75.64	0.14	1.79	0.44	1.14	0.24	0.31	522.56
2014	75.64	0.14	1.79	0.44	1.14	0.24	0.31	522.62
2015	75.64	0.14	1.79	0.44	1.14	0.24	0.31	522.15
2016	75.64	0.14	1.79	0.43	1.14	0.24	0.31	521.93
2017	73.85	0.15	1.98	0.44	1.29	0.24	0.31	522.18
2018	7.57	0.00	0.35	0.43	0.51	0.25	0.31	522.42
2019	7.85	0.02	3.06	0.44	0.49	0.24	0.31	522.48
2020	7.32	0.00	-0.52	0.42	0.61	0.26	0.31	522.82
2021	7.90	0.03	3.60	0.42	2.71	0.26	0.31	522.66
2022	8.69	0.00	-0.10	0.42	0.23	0.25	0.31	523.99

Area of other wetlands remaining other wetlands on mineral soils is included in total area of other wetlands remaining other wetlands on organic soils (the "IE" notation key is reported for area of mineral soils) due to lack of data about share of mineral soils in category other wetlands remaining other wetlands.

#### 6.7.2.2 Land Converted to Wetlands (CRF 4.D.2)

Under this category areas of Land Converted to Flooded Land and Land Converted to Other Wetlands are reported. Area of land converted to other wetlands is divided into mineral soil and organic soil.

Carbon stock change in organic soils in Land Converted to Other Wetlands is reported using Tier 1 method. Default EF for CO<sub>2</sub> (EF<sub>CO2</sub>) is 0.50 t CO<sub>2</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> (Table 3.1 from IPCC Wetlands Supplement), but EF<sub>DOC\_REWETTED</sub> value (0.24 t CO<sub>2</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>) is provided in Table 3.2 from IPCC Wetlands Supplement. "IE" for CSCs in living biomass and dead organic matter for Land Converted to Flooded Land and Land Converted to Other Wetlands are reported (CSC is reported under category Other Wetlands Remaining Other Wetlands).

Carbon stock changes in organic soils in Land Converted to Flooded Land is included in category 4(II) Emissions and removals from drainage and rewetting and other management of organic and mineral soils (Peat Extraction Lands, Rewetted Organic Soils), "IE" notation key is reported.

#### 6.7.2.3 Emissions and removals from drainage and rewetting and other management of organic and mineral soils (CRF 4(II))

Under this category off-site CO<sub>2</sub> and on-site CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from peat extraction fields (drained organic soils) are reported.

Off-site CO<sub>2</sub>-C emissions associated to the horticultural (non-energy) use of peat extracted and removed are reported using instant oxidation method (Tier 2 method). Data on peat extraction for horticulture purposes is taken from statistical reports of CSB (statistics table VIM010<sup>246</sup> and ENB050<sup>247</sup> Figure 6.17). Carbon content in peat is considered 45% according to the Table 7.5<sup>248</sup>

<sup>246</sup> Material flow accounts-domestic extraction (thsd tons) 1995 – 2022. Available:

[https://data.stat.gov.lv/pxweb/en/OSP\\_PUB/START\\_\\_ENV\\_\\_VI\\_\\_VIM/VIM010/table/tableViewLayout1/](https://data.stat.gov.lv/pxweb/en/OSP_PUB/START__ENV__VI__VIM/VIM010/table/tableViewLayout1/)

<sup>247</sup> Energy balance, in natural units (NACE Rev.2) 2008 – 2022. Available:

[https://data.stat.gov.lv/pxweb/lv/OSP\\_PUB/START\\_\\_NOZ\\_\\_EN\\_\\_ENB/ENB050/table/tableViewLayout1/](https://data.stat.gov.lv/pxweb/lv/OSP_PUB/START__NOZ__EN__ENB/ENB050/table/tableViewLayout1/)

<sup>248</sup> Conversion factors for CO<sub>2</sub>-C for volume and weight production data (Boreal and Temperate, Nutrient-Poor)

of the IPCC Wetlands Supplement, relative moisture – 40% (CSB data) according to a methodology used in statistical data.




Figure 6.17 Activity data for calculation of off-site CO<sub>2</sub>-C emissions associated to the horticultural use of peat<sup>249</sup> (kt extracted peat)

On-site CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from organic soils in peatlands drained for peat extraction (31.62 kha in 2022 based on the results of the LIFE REstore project<sup>250</sup>) are calculated using Tier 2 method. Since submission 2021 national CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O EFs for organic soils in drained peat extraction areas (10.83 kg CH<sub>4</sub> ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> and 0.44 kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>)<sup>251</sup> developed within the scope of the LIFE REstore project is used for reporting. Although applied country-specific CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O EFs are slightly higher than that in the IPCC Wetlands Supplement (6.1 kg CH<sub>4</sub> ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> and 0.3 kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>, respectively), they are within uncertainty ranges of both IPCC Wetlands Supplement provided EFs values (Table 6.30) and EFs used in other countries in the region.

Table 6.30 Comparison of country-specific and IPCC default emission factors (on-site) for organic soils in peatlands drained for peat extraction

Emission factor	CO <sub>2</sub> , t CO <sub>2</sub> -C ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup>	CH <sub>4</sub> , kg CH <sub>4</sub> ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup>	N <sub>2</sub> O, kg N <sub>2</sub> O-N ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup>
Country-specific	1.21	10.83	0.44
IPCC Wetlands Supplement (95% confidence interval)	1.1...4.2	1.6...11	-0.03...0.64

Since submission 2023, national CH<sub>4</sub> EF for drainage ditches in peatlands drained for peat extraction (122.5 kg CH<sub>4</sub> ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>)<sup>252</sup> is used for reporting. Applied country-specific value (122.5

<sup>249</sup> CSB data

<sup>250</sup> EU LIFE program project "Sustainable and responsible management and re-use of degraded peatlands in Latvia" (LIFE REstore). Available: [https://restore.daba.gov.lv/public/eng/about\\_the\\_project/](https://restore.daba.gov.lv/public/eng/about_the_project/)

<sup>251</sup> Lazdiņš A., Lupiķis A. 2019. LIFE REstore project contribution to the greenhouse gas emission accounts in Latvia. In: Priede A., Gancone A. (Eds.), Sustainable and responsible after-use of peat extraction areas (pp. 21–52). Baltijas Krasti.

<sup>252</sup> Vanags-Duka, M.; Bardule, A.; Butlers, A.; Upenieks, E.M.; Lazdin, Š, A.; Purvin, a, D.; Līcīte, I. GHG Emissions from drainage ditches in peat extraction sites and peatland forests in hemiboreal Latvia. Land 2022, 11, 2233. <https://doi.org/10.3390/land11122233>

kg CH<sub>4</sub> ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>) is lower than that in the IPCC Wetlands Supplement (542 kg CH<sub>4</sub> ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> according to the Table 2.4 of the IPCC Wetlands Supplement). Nevertheless, applied country-specific CH<sub>4</sub> EF is within uncertainty range of IPCC Wetlands Supplement provided EF values (102-981 kg CH<sub>4</sub> ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>). Values of EFs mainly differ due to the variance in climatic factors between central and western parts of Europe (where IPCC Wetlands Supplement default EFs were developed) and condition in Latvia; in warmer climatic conditions higher emissions occur. Thus, Latvia's national CH<sub>4</sub> EF for drainage ditches in peatlands drained for peat extraction more reflects the climatic conditions in the region than default EF provided by the IPCC Wetlands Supplement. Density of ditches is considered 0.05 ha per 1 ha of peatland (Table 2.4 in the IPCC Wetlands Supplement).

Under category 4(II) Emissions and removals from drainage and rewetting and other management of organic and mineral soils (Peat Extraction Lands, Rewetted Organic Soils) on-site CO<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from rewetted organic soils are reported. Under this category area of rewetted and flooded land is reported. GHG emissions from rewetted organic soils are estimated according to the Tier 1 methods. EF for CO<sub>2</sub>-C (0.5 tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>) is taken from Table 3.1 of the IPCC Wetlands Supplement. CO<sub>2</sub>-C EF from DOC exported from rewetted organic soils is 0.24 tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> (Table 3.2 of the IPCC Wetlands Supplement). CH<sub>4</sub> emissions are calculated applying Tier 1 method using equation 3.7 of the IPCC Wetlands Supplement, default EF (216 kg CH<sub>4</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>) from Table 3.3 of IPCC Wetlands Supplement was used. N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from rewetted organic soils according to the Tier 1 method are assumed to be negligible and are not estimated ("NA" notation key is reported).

### 6.7.3 Uncertainties and time-series consistency

Uncertainty analysis for 2024 submission is carried out by using Approach 1. Quantitative estimates of uncertainties are provided in Annex 2. Overall description of uncertainty analysis is included in Section 1.6.

Uncertainty of area estimates is provided in Table 6.31.

**Table 6.31 Uncertainty of the wetland use data in 2024 submission**

Land use category	Number of NFI plots	Share of NFI plots, %	Uncertainty, %
Wetlands	1123	7.0	5.7
wetlands remaining wetlands	1119	6.9	5.9
land converted to wetlands	4	0.03	13.4

According to the NFI, average uncertainty of growing stock is 109%. Uncertainty of annual increment of growing stock of trees is 2.20%. BEFs utilized in calculations have uncertainty level of 2.2% in average according to the study results. Uncertainty of dead wood stock is 3.9%. Uncertainty of carbon content in wood is 0.14%.

Uncertainty of off-site CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from peat use in horticulture reported under the 4(II) Emissions and removals from drainage and rewetting and other management of organic and mineral soils (Peat Extraction Lands, Drained Organic Soils) is 5% according to the CSB.

According to the study results<sup>253</sup>, standard error (S.E.) for CH<sub>4</sub> EF for drainage ditches in peatlands drained for peat extraction is 72.0 kg CH<sub>4</sub> ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>.

Uncertainty range of CO<sub>2</sub>-C EF for rewetted organic soils is -0.71-+1.71 tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> (average uncertainty is 242%) according to the IPCC Wetlands Supplement, Table 3.1. Uncertainty range of CO<sub>2</sub>-C EF for DOC exported from rewetted organic soils is 0.14-0.36 tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup>yr<sup>-1</sup> (average uncertainty is 45.8%) according to the IPCC Wetlands Supplement, Table 3.2. 95% range of CH<sub>4</sub>-C EF for rewetted organic soils is 0-856 kg CH<sub>4</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> (average uncertainty is 198%) according to the IPCC Wetlands Supplement, Table 3.3.

Complete consistency of the time-series is secured by use of the same data source for estimation of area and emissions for the whole time period.

#### 6.7.4 Category-specific QA/QC and verification

The quality objectives and the QA/QC plan for the Latvia's GHG inventory are presented in Section 1.2.3. The QC procedures are performed according to the QA/QC plan in the LULUCF sector in order to achieve these quality objectives.

Quality control procedures listed in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines were done, particularly, data about peat extraction were compiled from different sources (national statistics and Union of peat producers) as well as EFs provided by different authors were compared. Issues related to QA/QC and verification are discussed at the sectoral meetings.

Manual data check is introduced to compare figures imported into the CRF Reporter and actually calculated values. The mathematical errors identified during the previous review are corrected in the EPIM model which is used for calculation of GHG emissions in LULUCF sector.

All information related to the preparation of the annual inventory is archived in the centralized archiving system (common FTP folder) in accordance with QA/QC plan.

Country-specific EFs<sup>254</sup> used to estimate on-site CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from peatlands drained for peat extraction were compared to EFs used in other countries in the Baltic Sea region. The Latvian values were within uncertainty ranges of CS EFs of other countries in the region.

#### 6.7.5 Category-specific recalculations

No recalculations were done for this sector.

#### 6.7.6 Category-specific planned improvements

Specific improvements in wetlands category are related to continuation of implementation of country specific EFs for managed wetlands, including CO<sub>2</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O and CH<sub>4</sub> EFs for flooded areas and peatland managed as berry plantations (excluding drainage ditches) (since 2024 submission).

<sup>253</sup> Vanags-Duka, M.; Ārdule, A.; Butlers, A.; Upenieks, E.M.; Lazdin, Š, A.; Purvin, a, D.; Līcīte, I. GHG Emissions from drainage ditches in peat extraction sites and peatland forests in hemiboreal Latvia. *Land* 2022, 11, 2233. <https://doi.org/10.3390/land11122233>

<sup>254</sup> Lazdiņš A., Lupiķis A. 2019. LIFE REstore project contribution to the greenhouse gas emission accounts in Latvia. In: Priede A., Gancone A. (Eds.), *Sustainable and responsible after-use of peat extraction areas* (pp. 21–52). *Baltijas Krasti*.

## 6.8 SETTLEMENTS (CRF 4.E)

### 6.8.1 Category description

Net GHG emissions from settlements in 2022 were 1192.72 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. (Figure 6.18). Net GHG emissions from land converted to settlements in 2022 were 1092.19 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. (Figure 6.20). From 1991 to 1999 and from 2012 to 2016 emissions from organic and mineral soils (mainly due to land use change from forest land to settlements) are compensated by the CO<sub>2</sub> removals in living biomass in settlements remaining settlements category (Figure 6.19). This increase of carbon stock in living biomass in settlements remaining settlements reflects increase of age and gross increment of trees growing on settlements (according to NFI average annual net increment increased from 0.11 million m<sup>3</sup> in period 2007-2011 to 0.65 million m<sup>3</sup> in 2012-2016), as well as area of settlements covered by woody vegetation (Table 6.32). Since 2017 (especially in 2018 and 2021), CO<sub>2</sub> removals in settlements remaining settlements covered by woody and herbaceous vegetation decreased significantly in comparison to 2012-2016 due to significant increase of biofuel extraction during these years including non-forest lands, e.g. roadsides, power lines and other settlements covered by woody vegetation. This resulted in decrease of annual gross increment of trees growing on settlements to average 0.13 million m<sup>3</sup> in 2017-2022. The losses due to extraction of wood in settlements is reported using instant oxidation method, in contrast to natural mortality, which is decomposing during 20 years period according to the applied assumptions.

The significant inter-annual fluctuations of estimates of the CSCs in living biomass can be explained by the application of so called "floating NFI cycle" to the calculations. Every next year the data set used in calculations of stock changes is moved forward by one year and quality issues related changes (corrections in area of polygons belonging to specific land use) are implemented. Gross increment is calculated as stock changes during 5 year period + mortality + harvest rate during the period, respectively, the whole data set used to calculate stock changes represents 10 years period and vary not only because of adding of the latest data, but also because of moving of the whole calculation period.




Figure 6.18 Summary of net GHG emissions and removals from settlements (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.) by source categories






Figure 6.19 Summary of net GHG emissions and removals from settlements remaining settlements (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)




Figure 6.20 Summary of net GHG emissions from land converted to settlements (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

The assumptions used in EPIM tool are shown in Table 6.32, default 20 years decay period is considered for dead wood.

Table 6.32 Assumptions for calculation of CSC in living and dead biomass in settlements

Year	Settlements with woody vegetation, kha	Gross increment of living biomass		Wood density, kg m <sup>-3</sup>	Natural mortality, m <sup>3</sup> ha <sup>-1</sup>	BEFs		Carbon content, kg t <sup>-1</sup>
		mill. m <sup>3</sup>	m <sup>3</sup> ha <sup>-1</sup>			stem to crown	stem to below-ground	
1990	63.40	0.04	0.68	0.44	0.11	0.24	0.31	523.30
1991	64.11	0.05	0.71	0.44	0.12	0.24	0.31	523.30
1992	65.45	0.05	0.73	0.44	0.12	0.24	0.31	523.30
1993	65.45	0.05	0.73	0.44	0.12	0.24	0.31	523.30

Year	Settlements with woody vegetation, kha	Gross increment of living biomass		Wood density, kg m <sup>-3</sup>	Natural mortality, m <sup>3</sup> ha <sup>-1</sup>	BEFs		Carbon content, kg t <sup>-1</sup>
		mill. m <sup>3</sup>	m <sup>3</sup> ha <sup>-1</sup>			stem to crown	stem to below-ground	
1994	67.45	0.05	0.74	0.44	0.12	0.24	0.31	522.95
1995	69.22	0.05	0.73	0.44	0.12	0.24	0.31	522.95
1996	70.01	0.05	0.73	0.44	0.12	0.24	0.31	522.95
1997	71.53	0.05	0.75	0.44	0.12	0.24	0.31	522.95
1998	72.11	0.05	0.74	0.44	0.12	0.24	0.31	522.95
1999	73.34	0.05	0.74	0.44	0.12	0.24	0.31	523.34
2000	73.89	0.05	0.74	0.44	0.12	0.24	0.31	523.34
2001	74.58	0.05	0.73	0.44	0.12	0.24	0.31	523.34
2002	75.10	0.05	0.73	0.44	0.12	0.24	0.31	523.34
2003	75.40	0.05	0.73	0.44	0.12	0.24	0.31	523.34
2004	75.62	0.05	0.72	0.44	0.14	0.24	0.31	524.03
2005	76.90	0.05	0.71	0.44	0.14	0.24	0.31	524.03
2006	76.90	0.05	0.71	0.44	0.14	0.24	0.31	524.03
2007	37.35	0.11	2.81	0.44	0.54	0.24	0.31	524.03
2008	37.35	0.11	2.81	0.44	0.54	0.24	0.31	524.03
2009	37.35	0.11	2.81	0.44	0.83	0.24	0.31	522.56
2010	37.35	0.11	2.81	0.44	0.83	0.24	0.31	522.56
2011	37.35	0.11	2.81	0.44	0.83	0.24	0.31	522.56
2012	68.12	0.65	9.47	0.44	0.66	0.24	0.31	522.56
2013	68.12	0.65	9.47	0.44	0.66	0.24	0.31	522.56
2014	68.12	0.65	9.47	0.44	0.66	0.24	0.31	522.62
2015	68.12	0.65	9.47	0.44	0.66	0.24	0.31	522.15
2016	68.14	0.65	9.47	0.43	0.66	0.24	0.31	521.93
2017	68.04	0.23	3.41	0.44	0.71	0.24	0.31	522.18
2018	67.94	0.00	0.06	0.43	0.58	0.25	0.31	522.42
2019	69.35	0.18	2.57	0.44	0.83	0.24	0.31	523.79
2020	71.88	0.17	2.42	0.42	0.80	0.26	0.31	522.82
2021	73.04	0.19	2.59	0.42	8.85	0.26	0.31	522.66
2022	73.36	0.01	0.11	0.42	0.65	0.25	0.31	523.99

Land converted to settlements is a key category of CO<sub>2</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions according to trend and level assessment due to losses of soil carbon pool. The role of conversion of forest land to settlements is increasing with a growth of economic activity and road construction in rural regions, because more than half of the country area is covered by forests, so any new constructions are usually associated with conversion of forest lands. At the same time conversion of grassland to forest land is more intensive in terms of the converted area; however, young forests on farmlands cannot fully compensate emissions due to the forest lands conversion to settlements.

Under the settlements category emissions from soils, litter, living and dead biomass due to conversion of land use type are reported. Removals in living and dead biomass in settlements are reported using the NFI data on increment of growing stock in settlements, which is represented mostly by overgrowing of roadsides, power lines and other infrastructure.

Total area of settlements in 2022 was 314.71 kha. The total area of settlements is estimated according to the information provided by the NFI. The increase of area of settlements during last 20 years occurred due to conversion of forest land. Increase of area of settlements is generally associated with road construction. All roads, including forest roads are reported in the settlements category; therefore, the deforested area is considerably higher than official

statistics, where forest roads are not reported as deforested area and still belong to forest land category.

## 6.8.2 Methodological issues

### 6.8.2.1 Settlements remaining settlements (CRF 4.E.1)

The CO<sub>2</sub> removals are reported for living and dead biomass categories in settlements remaining settlements based on the NFI data. Removals are reported based on weighed (by area) gross increment, mortality rate, BEFs, carbon content and wood density in a particular year in forest land remaining forest land. For emissions from dead wood pool in settlements remaining settlements 20 years transition period is considered. Age of woody vegetation on settlements is counted backwards and as soon as age of trees reach "0", it is considered, that there is no more vegetation and no increment calculations are done. EPIM tool is used in calculations.

Emissions from soils in settlements remaining settlements are calculated according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. It is assumed that inputs equal outputs so that settlement mineral soil C stocks do not change in settlements remaining settlements. Emissions from organic soils in settlements remaining settlements are calculated using equation 2.26 in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (equation No. 6). If soils are drained and the peat is not removed, the emissions are calculated using EFs for cultivated organic soils, due to deep drainage in settlements similar to cropland. The default EF for cultivated organic soils in cool temperate climate zone is 7.9 tonns CO<sub>2</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> (Table 2.1 in IPCC Wetlands Supplement).

$$L_{Organic} = \sum_c (A * EF)_c \quad (6.6)$$

where:

*L<sub>Organic</sub>* – annual carbon loss from drained organic soils, tonns C yr<sup>-1</sup>

*A* – land area of drained organic soils in climate type *c*, ha

*EF* – emission factor for climate type *c*, tonns C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>

### 6.8.2.2 Land converted to settlements (CRF 4.E.2)

NFI data are used to estimate land converted to settlements in 2009-2022. New method for calculation of land use changes using the most recent NFI data was implemented in 2019 (Krumsteds et al., 2019)<sup>255</sup>. Total area of land converted to settlements in 2022 was 62.23 kha.

Under category forest land converted to settlements, the emissions (losses in carbon pools) are reported. Carbon stock changes associated with commercial felling are reported considering that losses in living biomass are equal to average growing stock in forest land converted to settlements (BEFs, carbon content and wood density are considered as weighted by total biomass distribution between species). Dead wood stock in forest land remaining forest land in a particular year is considered as carbon losses from dead wood due to conversion of forest land to settlements. Instant oxidation method is considered for living and dead wood carbon pools. Average carbon stock in dead biomass (12.14 tonns C ha<sup>-1</sup> in litter according to the BioSoil

<sup>255</sup> Krumsteds L.L., Ivanovs J., Jansons J., Lazdins A. 2019. Development of Latvian land use and land use change matrix using geospatial data of NFI. *Agronomy Research* 17(6), p. 2295–2305, DOI: 10.15159/AR.19.195.

project forest soil inventory data<sup>256</sup> and 6.0 tonnes C ha<sup>-1</sup> in dead wood according to the NFI) is used in calculations.

Under categories cropland converted to settlements and grassland converted to settlements, CSCs in living biomass and dead organic matter are calculated using Tier 1 method. CSCs in dead organic matter for cropland converted to settlements are reported considering that dead wood stock in cropland remaining cropland in a particular year is considered as carbon losses from dead wood due to conversion of cropland to settlements. Instant oxidation method is considered for living and dead wood carbon pools. According to the Tier 1 method CSCs in dead organic matter for grassland converted to settlements is zero.

Carbon stock changes in living biomass and dead organic matter for wetlands converted to settlements are not calculated due to lack of default C-stock values (not provided by the 2006 IPCC Guidelines).

The total change in soil C stocks for land converted to settlements is computed using equation 2.24 in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, which combines the change in soil organic C stocks for mineral soils and organic soils. Change in soil organic C stocks is estimated for mineral soils with land-use conversion to settlements using equation 2.25 in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (equation No. 7). Emission from mineral soil due to land use change from forest land to settlements is reported according to average carbon stock in forest mineral soil, assuming that carbon accumulated in upper 30 cm (82.6 tonnes C ha<sup>-1</sup>) partially turns into emissions within 20 years (0.8 tonnes C h<sup>-1</sup> annually). The impact factor ( $F_{LU} \times F_{MG} \times F_I$ ) is 0.8.

$$\Delta C_{Mineral} = \frac{(SOC_0 - SOC_{(0-T)})}{D}$$

$$SOC = \sum_{c,s,i} (SOC_{REFc,s,i} * F_{LUC,s,i} * F_{MGc,s,i} * F_{Ic,s,i} * A_{c,s,i}) \quad (6.7)$$

where:

$\Delta C_{Mineral}$  – annual change in carbon stocks in mineral soils, tonnes C yr<sup>-1</sup>

$SOC_0$  – soil organic carbon stock in the last year of an inventory time period, tonnes C

$SOC_{(0-T)}$  – soil organic carbon stock at the beginning of the inventory time period, tonnes C

$D$  – time dependence of stock change factors which is the default time period for transition between equilibrium SOC values, yr

$c$  – represents the climate zones

$s$  – the soil types

$i$  – the set of management systems that are present a country

$SOC_{REF}$  – the reference carbon stock, tonnes C ha<sup>-1</sup>

$F_{LU}$  – stock change factor for land-use systems or sub-system for a particular land-use, dimensionless

$F_{MG}$  – stock change factor for management regime, dimensionless

$F_I$  – stock change factor for input of organic matter, dimensionless

$A$  – land area of the stratum being estimated, ha

Land converted to settlements on organic soils within the inventory time period is treated the same as settlements remaining settlements. Carbon losses are computed using equation 2.26 in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.

<sup>256</sup> Bārdule, A., Bāders, E., Stola, J., Lazdiņš, A. 2009. Forest soil characteristic in Latvia according results of the demonstration project BioSoil. *Mežzinātne / Forest Science* 20(53): 105-124. Available: [http://www.silava.lv/userfiles/file/Mezzinatne%2020\(53\)2009/8\\_Bardule\\_MZ\\_20-2009.pdf](http://www.silava.lv/userfiles/file/Mezzinatne%2020(53)2009/8_Bardule_MZ_20-2009.pdf)

Methodological work for estimating CSC in living biomass and dead organic matter is improved based on national research study aimed to determine increment, mortality and harvest rate in Latvia (Krumsteds et al., 2019)<sup>257</sup>.

### 6.8.3 Uncertainties and time-series consistency

Uncertainty analysis for 2024 submission is carried out by using Approach 1. Quantitative estimates of uncertainties are provided in Annex 2. Overall description of uncertainty analysis is included in Section 1.6.

Uncertainty of area estimates is provided in Table 6.33.

**Table 6.33 Uncertainty of the settlements use data in 2024 submission**

Land use category	Number of NFI plots	Share of NFI plots, %	Uncertainty, %
Settlements	661	4.1	7.8
settlements remaining settlements	570	3.5	8.7
organic soil	1	0.01	-
other soil	569	3.5	8.7
land converted to settlements	91	0.6	19.6
organic soil	12	0.1	47.0
other soil	78	0.5	22.0

According to the NFI, uncertainty of growing stock is 83.5%. Uncertainty of annual increment of growing stock of trees is 2.20%. BEFs utilized in calculations have uncertainty level of 2.2% in average according to the study results. Uncertainty of dead wood stock is 3.9%. Uncertainty of carbon content in wood is 0.14%. Uncertainty of average carbon stock in litter in forest land is 23.1%.

Uncertainty of annual CSC factor (EF) for cultivated organic soils in cool temperate climatic temperature regime is 18.4% (IPCC Wetlands Supplement, Table 2.1). Uncertainty of carbon stock in 0-30 cm soil layer in mineral soils in forest land is 9.4%.

Uncertainties of EFs for estimation of CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from drained organic soils are indicated under chapter Cropland.

Consistency of time series is secured by using the same activity data (NFI) for the whole period.

### 6.8.4 Category-specific QA/QC and verification

The quality objectives and the QA/QC plan for the Latvia's GHG inventory are presented in Section 1.2.3. The QC procedures are performed according to the QA/QC plan in the LULUCF sector in order to achieve these quality objectives.

The QA/QC plans for the settlements' category include the QC measures based on the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. Specific QA/QC checks across the settlements methodology were done. Potential errors and inconsistencies are documented and corrections are made if necessary. The files and documents used in preparation of the inventory are archived annually and back-up copies are made weekly. Issues related to QA/QC and verification are discussed at the sectoral meetings.

<sup>257</sup> Krumsteds, L., Lazdins, A., Butlers, A., Ivanovs, J. 2019. Recalculation of forest increment, mortality and harvest rate in Latvia according to updated land use data. *Rural Development 2019 (1): 295–299, DOI:10.15544/RD.2019.037*

Manual data check is introduced to compare figures imported into the CRF Reporter and actually calculated values. The mathematical errors identified during the previous review are corrected in the EPIM model used for calculation of GHG emissions in LULUCF sector.

All information related to the preparation of the annual inventory is archived in the centralized archiving system (common FTP folder) in accordance with QA/QC plan.

### 6.8.5 Category-specific recalculations

Recalculations resulted in negligible decrease (by maximum 0.028 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. in 2021) were done due to improvement of methodology of calculation of CSCs in dead organic matter for cropland converted to settlements (implemented based on the ERT recommendation).

### 6.8.6 Category-specific planned improvements

No improvements are planned for this sector.

## 6.9 OTHER LAND (CRF 4.F)

According to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines other lands are territories without vegetation like rocks, glaciers as well as the rest of unmanaged lands which are not included in other land use categories. According to the national land use statistics (State Land Service data) other lands include unmanaged lands, wetlands and settlements (1 459.3 mill. ha in 2008). Instead national land use statistics since 2009 the NFI is used to estimate area of other lands. It is assumed that other lands are dunes not covered by woody vegetation. In 2022, total area of these lands was 5.33 kha. No GHG emissions or CO<sub>2</sub> removals are reported in this category.

## 6.10 BIOMASS BURNING (CRF 4(V))

### 6.10.1 Source category description

This source category includes greenhouse gas emissions (CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O) and other emissions (NO<sub>x</sub> and CO) from biomass burning on forest land comprising wildfires and controlled burning, as well as wildfires in grassland. Total aggregated emissions from biomass burning in 2022 were 42.59 kt of CO<sub>2</sub> eq. (Figure 6.21).




Figure 6.21 Aggregated emissions from biomass burning (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

Biomass burning occurs in forest land and grassland. Taking into account that wetlands (bogs and fens) belong to forest land according to the national land use definitions, emissions associated with wildfires in wetlands cannot be separated and are reported under forest lands remaining forests. According to NFI data, no evidences of forest fires or grassland wildfires are found in land converted to forest land category, therefore it is considered that no forest fires takes place in afforested area. The approach used in the Latvia's GHG inventory (reporting emissions under land use categories according to the national statistics) secures that emissions from biomass burning are not overlapping.

Statistical data on area impacted by forest wildfires is compiled by SFS on the basis of local unit level information. Area of forest fires and biomass in burned area is shown in Figure 6.22.




Figure 6.22 Area of forest fires and biomass in burned area (t DM; ha)

Area of grassland burning is provided by the SFRS, cartographic information about location of wildfires in grasslands since 2005 is provided by the Rural Support Service. Wildfires in grasslands are more common in southeastern part of the country and around Riga. Concentration of wildfires in the south-east correlates with area of abandoned farmlands. Total area of burned grassland is shown in Figure 6.23. For 1990-1992 no statistical information exists. It was decided to use extrapolated burned area of following years period for 1990-1992 instead of notification key NO.




Figure 6.23 Burned area of grassland since 1990 (ha)

Emissions from biomass burning are represented by incineration of harvesting residues during forest logging operations (Figure 6.24). Amount of harvesting residues is calculated using biomass equations<sup>258</sup> from stem wood over bark. Data on share of harvesting residues left for incineration was based on study conducted by Līpiņš (2004)<sup>259</sup> and questionnaire of forest owners on forest management<sup>260</sup>.

Since no commercial felling takes place in forest stands younger than 20 years in Land Converted to Forest Land category, all emissions of on site incineration of harvesting residues during commercial harvesting are attributed to the Forest Land Remaining Forest Land category.

<sup>258</sup> Liepiņš J., Lazdiņš A., Liepiņš K. 2017. Equations for estimating above- and belowground biomass of Norway spruce, Scots pine, birch spp. and European aspen in Latvia. *Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research*, June 2017, 1–43, DOI: 10.1080/02827581.2017.1337923.

<sup>259</sup> Līpiņš L. 2004. Assessment of wood resources and efficiency of wood utilization (*Koksnes izejvielu resursu un to izmantošanas efektivitātes novērtējums*), LLU.

<sup>260</sup> Lazdiņš A., Zariņš J., 2013. Meža ugunsgrēku un mežizstrādes atlieku dedzināšanas radītās siltumnīcefekta gāzu emisijas Latvijā (*Greenhouse gas emissions in Latvia due to incineration of harvesting residues and forest fires*), in: Referātu Tēzes. Presented at the Latvijas Universitātes 71. zinātniskā konference "Ģeogrāfija, ģeoloģija, vides zinātne", Latvijas Universitāte, Rīga, pp. 133–137.






Figure 6.24 Amount of harvesting residues (kt)

### 6.10.2 Methodological issues

Tier 1 and 2 methods of calculation provided in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines were utilized. Emissions from any type of fires were calculated using equation 2.27 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines:

$$L_{fire} = A * M_B * C_f * G_{ef} * 10^{-3} \quad (6.8)$$

where:

$L_{fire}$  – amount of GHG emissions from fire, tonns of each GHG e.g.  $CH_4$ ,  $N_2O$  etc.

$A$  – area burnt, ha

$M_B$  – mass of fuel available for combustion, tonns  $ha^{-1}$ . This includes biomass, ground litter and dead wood. When Tier1 methods are used then litter and dead wood pools are assumed zero, except where there is a land-use change

$C_f$  – combustion factor dimensionless

$G_{ef}$  – emission factor,  $g\ kg^{-1}\ d.m.\ burnt$

#### 6.10.2.1 Forest wildfires

Tier 1 method and default EFs of calculation provided in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines was utilized. Amount of burned biomass is considered according to average growing stock of living biomass, dead wood and litter in a particular year. Combustion efficiency or fraction of biomass combusted (dimension-less) is considered 0.45 according to Table 2.6 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines<sup>261</sup>. EFs are shown in Table 6.34.

Table 6.34 Emission factor for each GHG ( $g\ kg^{-1}\ d.m.\ burned$ )

Gas	$CH_4$	CO	$N_2O$	$NO_x$	$CO_2$
Emission factor	$6.1 \pm 2.2$	$78 \pm 31$	0.06	$1.1 \pm 0.6$	$1550 \pm 95$

#### 6.10.2.2 Grassland wildfires

Tier 1 method and default EFs of calculation provided in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines was utilized. Emissions from wildfires in grassland were calculated using equation 2.27 of the 2006 IPCC

<sup>261</sup> Combustion factor values (proportion of prefire biomass consumed) for fires in a range of vegetation types.

Guidelines. Mass of available fuel in grassland fires – 2.1 t dm ha<sup>-1</sup> (Table 2.4 of 2006 IPCC Guidelines<sup>262</sup>), fraction of the biomass combusted 0.74 (Table 2.6 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines<sup>263</sup>). EFs for grassland fires are shown in Table 6.35.

**Table 6.35 Emission factors for grassland wildfires<sup>264</sup>**

No	Gas	Factor, g kg <sup>-1</sup> d.m. burned
1.	CO	65±20
2.	CH <sub>4</sub>	2.3±0.9
3.	NO <sub>x</sub>	3.9±2.4
4.	N <sub>2</sub> O	0.21±0.10

### 6.10.2.3 Controlled fires in forests

Tier 2 method and default EFs of calculation provided in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines was utilized. Emissions from controlled fires were calculated considering average stock of harvesting residues (BEF for conversion of stem biomass over bark to above-ground biomass), which considerably increased due to increase of harvesting stock.

Data on share of harvesting residues left for incineration in Latvia is provided by study conducted by Līpiņš (2004)<sup>265</sup> (characterizing forest management before 2000) and results of questionnaire<sup>266</sup> of forest owners on forest management, including section characterizing utilization of harvesting residues (characterizing forest management after 2005). Based on the knowledge gained from mentioned study and questionnaire, the following expert judgements have been made for burned harvesting residues calculation:

- 1990 to 2000 – 50% of harvesting residues are left for incineration and 67% of the left residues are incinerated, the rest are left to decay;
- 2001 to 2004 – 30% of harvesting residues are left for incineration and 67% of the left residues are incinerated, the rest are left to decay;
- 2005 to 2009 – 7% of harvesting residues are left for incineration and 100% of the left residues are incinerated; the rest of the residues are left for decay or extracted for bioenergy production;
- starting from 2010 – 4% of harvesting residues are left for incineration and 100% of the left residues are incinerated; the rest of the residues are left for decay or extracted for bioenergy production.

Factors of emissions are shown in Table 6.34. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are calculated only from wildfires taking into account that carbon located in harvesting residues is already reported as losses in living biomass. Incinerated residues are extracted from removals in dead wood. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions

<sup>262</sup> Fuel (dead organic matter plus live biomass) biomass consumption values for fires in a range of vegetation types.

<sup>263</sup> Combustion factor values (proportion of prefire biomass consumed) for fires in a range of vegetation types.

<sup>264</sup> IPCC 2006 Guidelines, Table 2.5: Emission factors (g kg<sup>-1</sup> dry matter burned) for various types of burning.

<sup>265</sup> Liepiņš J., Lazdiņš A., Liepiņš K. 2017. Equations for estimating above- and belowground biomass of Norway spruce, Scots pine, birch spp. and European aspen in Latvia. *Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research*, June 2017, 1–43, DOI: 10.1080/02827581.2017.1337923.

<sup>266</sup> Lazdiņš A., Zariņš J., 2013. Meža ugunsgreku un mežizstrādes atlieku dedzināšanas radītās siltumnīcefekta gāzu emisijas Latvijā (Greenhouse gas emissions in Latvia due to incineration of harvesting residues and forest fires), in: Referātu Tēzes. Presented at the Latvijas Universitātes 71. zinātniskā konference "Ģeogrāfija, ģeoloģija, vides zinātne", Latvijas Universitāte, Rīga, pp. 133–137.

are reported using instant oxidation method and do not appear in the inventory as removals in dead wood.

### **6.10.3 Uncertainties and time-series consistency**

Uncertainty analysis for 2024 submission is carried out by using Approach 1. Quantitative estimates of uncertainties are provided in Annex 2. Overall description of uncertainty analysis is included in Section 1.6.

Uncertainty in activity data (area) for biomass burning is estimated at  $\pm 10\%$  based on expert judgement. Uncertainty concerning combustion efficiencies in combined is  $\pm 10\%$  according to the expert judgement. Uncertainties in EFs are based on the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (Table 2.5.) default values.

### **6.10.4 Category-specific QA/QC and verification**

The quality objectives and the QA/QC plan for the Latvia's GHG inventory are presented in Section 1.2.3. The QC procedures are performed according to the QA/QC plan in the LULUCF sector in order to achieve these quality objectives.

Quality control procedures listed in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines were done. Possible overlapping in emission/removal estimation with other sources has been checked as far as it is possible on the base of existing data. Land areas of wildfires and controlled burning were reviewed with latest statistics. It was confirmed that all data used in this section cover whole land area of Latvia. Issues related to QA/QC and verification are discussed at the sectoral meetings.

Manual data check is introduced to compare figures imported into the CRF Reporter and actually calculated values. The mathematical errors identified during the previous review are corrected in the EPIM model used for calculation of GHG emissions in LULUCF sector.

All information related to the preparation of the annual inventory is archived in the centralized archiving system (common FTP folder) in accordance with QA/QC plan.

### **6.10.5 Category-specific recalculations**

Recalculations were done due to implementation of improved activity data for 2021 (area of wildfires in grassland and forest land in 2021); recalculation resulted in slight reduction in GHG emissions from biomass burning in 2021 (by 34.14 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.).

### **6.10.6 Category-specific planned improvements**

No improvements are planned for this sector.

## **6.11 HARVESTED WOOD PRODUCTS (CRF 4.G)**

### **6.11.1 Category description**

The category HWP is a key category of CO<sub>2</sub> removals. The net emissions in HWP in 2022 were -3001.51 kt CO<sub>2</sub>. The net emissions during the reporting period are shown in Figure 6.25. Increase of removals in the HWP during the last decade is associated with increase of harvesting rate and implementation of more advanced timber processing technologies. Approach B is used in calculation.




Figure 6.25 Net emissions from HWP during period 1990-2022 (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

Net emissions due to production of the HWP are calculated according to methodology in the 2013 IPCC Kyoto Protocol Supplement. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions due to roundwood production in deforested land are reported using instantaneous oxidation method.

### 6.11.2 Methodological issues

The net emissions from the HWP are calculated according to the methodology elaborated by S. Rüter (2011) which refers to approach B in CRF Reporter. The methodology corresponds to Tier 2 for HWP in the 2013 IPCC Kyoto Protocol Supplement for HWP. Three main HWP groups are used in calculations – sawnwood, wood based panels and paper and paperboard with more detailed division on products in Table 6.36 (according to Table 2.8.1 of the 2013 IPCC Kyoto Protocol Supplement).

Table 6.36 HWP categories and their subcategories

HWP category	HWP subcategory
Sawn wood	<i>Coniferous sawnwood</i>
	<i>Non-coniferous sawnwood</i>
Wood-based panels	<i>Hardboard (HDF)</i>
	<i>Insulating board (Other board, LDF)</i>
	<i>Fibreboard compressed</i>
	<i>Medium-density fibreboard (MDF)</i>
	<i>Particle board</i>
	<i>Plywood</i>
	<i>Veneer sheets</i>
Paper and paperboard	-

The calculation is based on harvesting statistics collected by the SFS (historical commercial felling, 1990-2011) and NFI (since 2012), production statistics by the Latvian Forest Industry Federation<sup>267</sup>, FAO and EUROSTAT<sup>268</sup> (Figure 6.27, Figure 6.28, Figure 6.29). Data on production and import for 1990-1991 is calculated as average value from data on the first 5 years available in statistics (1992-1996). Export data for 1990-1991 were derived based on linear function for

<sup>267</sup> The Latvian Forest Industry Federation. Available: <https://www.lvokoks.lv/aboutus/>

<sup>268</sup> FAO, EUROSTAT. Available: [http://fenixservices.fao.org/faostat/static/bulkdownloads/Forestry\\_E\\_Europe.zip](http://fenixservices.fao.org/faostat/static/bulkdownloads/Forestry_E_Europe.zip)

sawn timber and exponential function for wood-based panels (data from period 1992-1996 are used to obtain functions). NFI harvesting data are validated by comparison of area reported as regenerative felling in SFS and NFI. Only locally harvested wood is reported in estimates.




Figure 6.26 Sawnwood production, import and export in 1990-2022, 1000 m³




Figure 6.27 Wood panels production, import and export in 1990-2022, 1000 m³




Figure 6.28 Paper and paperboard production, import and export in 1990-2022, 1000 metric t

The proportion is calculated by equation No. 6.9 to estimate the share of harvesting stock extracted due to deforestation and is used to calculate share of domestic industrial roundwood. This proportion is applied to HWP to estimate how much HWP could be produced from wood obtained in deforested areas. Instant oxidation is applied to the proportion of HWP potentially produced from the wood obtained in deforested areas.

$$IRW_{p(i)} = \left(1 - \frac{D * M_{avg}}{MH_{total}}\right) * IRW_{total(i)} \quad (6.9)$$

where:

$IRW_{p(i)}$  – production of industrial roundwood excluding roundwood from deforested area in year  $i$ , Gg C yr<sup>-1</sup>

$D$  – annual deforested area, ha

$M_{avg}$  – average growing stock in deforested area, m<sup>3</sup> ha<sup>-1</sup>

$MH_{total}$  – total harvested stock volume, m<sup>3</sup>

$IRW_{total(i)}$  – total industrial domestic roundwood production, Gg C yr<sup>-1</sup>

Historical data on production, import and export of HWP, as well as the share of different types of the products are used in calculation. The coefficients and numeric values used in calculation are default conversion factors recommended in the 2013 IPCC Kyoto Protocol Supplement (Table 2.8.1) and are provided in Table 6.37 and Table 6.38. Net emissions due to decay of harvesting residues are reported separately considering 20 years transition period for above and below ground biomass. Instant oxidation is considered for the firewood assortment.

Table 6.37 Assumptions for estimation of carbon stock in HWP

HWP categories	Density (oven dry mass over air dry volume), Mg m <sup>-3</sup>	C conversion factor (per air dry volume), C m <sup>-3</sup>
Sawnwood – Coniferous	0.450	0.225
Sawnwood – Non-Coniferous	0.560	0.280
Veneer sheets	0.505	0.253
Plywood	0.542	0.267
Particle board	0.596	0.269
Hardboard	0.788	0.335
MDF (Medium density fibreboard)	0.691	0.295
Fibreboard compressed	0.739	0.315

HWP categories	Density (oven dry mass over air dry volume), Mg m <sup>-3</sup>	C conversion factor (per air dry volume), C m <sup>-3</sup>
Insulating board	0.159	0.075
-	oven dry mass over air dry mass, Mg Mg <sup>-1</sup>	per air dry mass, Mg C Mg <sup>-1</sup>
Paper and paperboard (aggregate)	0.900	0.386

Share of locally originated wood in HWP is calculated using equation No. 6.10.

$$f_{IRW}(i) = \frac{IRW_P(i) - IRW_{EX}(i)}{IRW_P(i) + IRW_{(IM)}(i) - IRW_{EX}(i)} \quad (6.10)$$

where:

$f_{IRW}(i)$  – share of industrial roundwood for the domestic production of HWP originating from domestic forests in year  $i$

$IRW_P(i)$  – production of industrial roundwood excluding roundwood from deforested area in year  $i$ , Gg C yr<sup>-1</sup>

$IRW_{EX}(i)$  – export of industrial roundwood in year  $i$ , Gg C yr<sup>-1</sup>

$IRW_{(IM)}(i)$  – import of industrial roundwood in year  $i$ , Gg C yr<sup>-1</sup>

Organic carbon in HWP originated from domestic wood is calculated using equation No. 6.11.

$$CHWP = f_{IRW}(i) * HWP_D \quad (6.11)$$

where:

$CHWP$  – organic carbon in domestically produced HWP excluding HWP from wood produced in deforested area, Gg C yr<sup>-1</sup>

$HWP_D$  – domestic production of HWP, Gg C yr<sup>-1</sup>

The rate of the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and removals in HWP is calculated using equations No. 6.12 and 6.13.

$$C(i+1) = e^{-k} * C(i) + \left[ \frac{1 - e^{-k}}{k} \right] * inflow(i) \quad (6.12)$$

where:

$C(i+1)$  – annual carbon stock, Gg C yr<sup>-1</sup>

$e$  – exponential constant

$k$  – decay constant for each HWP category, units yr<sup>-1</sup>

$C(i)$  – carbon stock in particular category at the beginning of year  $i$ , Gg C

$inflow(i)$  – the inflow to the particular HWP category during year  $i$ , Gg C yr<sup>-1</sup>

$$k = \frac{\ln(2)}{HL} \quad (6.13)$$

where:

$HL$  – the number of years it takes to lose one-half of the material currently in the pool, yr

$$\Delta C(i) = C(i+1) - C(i) \quad (6.14)$$

where:

$\Delta C(i)$  – carbon stock change of the HWP category during year  $i$ , Gg C yr<sup>-1</sup>

**Table 6.38 Common coefficients to estimate balance between CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and removals in HWP**

Factors	Numeric value
<b>Common coefficients:</b>	
e	2.718282
ln(2)	0.6931
<b>Assortment specific coefficients:</b>	

Factors	Numeric value		
	Sawnwood	Platewood	Pulpwood
Assortment			
HL	35	25	2
k	0.02	0.03	0.35
e <sup>-k</sup>	0.98	0.97	0.71
$k = \frac{1 - \ln(2)}{H * L}$	0.99	0.99	0.85

The equations of calculation of the HWP are included into the National tool for calculation of the net emissions due to forest management as separate module.

### 6.11.3 Uncertainties and time-series consistency

Uncertainty analysis for 2024 submission is carried out by using Approach 1. Quantitative estimates of uncertainties are provided in Annex 2. Overall description of uncertainty analysis is included in Section 1.6.

Uncertainty level of the activity data for the whole time series is assumed 15%.

### 6.11.4 Category-specific QA/QC and verification

The quality objectives and the QA/QC plan for the Latvia's GHG inventory are presented in Section 1.2.3. The QC procedures are performed according to the QA/QC plan in the LULUCF sector in order to achieve these quality objectives.

Harvesting rate and production of HWP used in the calculations is compared with other data sources, particularly statistics collected by the Latvia Forest industry federation. Issues related to QA/QC and verification are discussed at the sectoral meetings.

Manual data check is introduced to compare figures imported into the CRF Reporter and actually calculated values. The mathematical errors identified during the previous review are corrected in the EPIM model used for calculation of GHG emissions in LULUCF sector.

All information related to the preparation of the annual inventory is archived in the centralized archiving system (common FTP folder) in accordance with QA/QC plan.

### 6.11.5 Category-specific recalculations

Recalculations were done due to implementation of improved activity data for 2019-2021; recalculation resulted in increase in CO<sub>2</sub> removals (by maximum 565.33 kt CO<sub>2</sub> in 2021). Summary of the impact of recalculation on CO<sub>2</sub> removals is shown in Figure 6.29.






Figure 6.29 Impact of recalculation on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from HWP (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

### 6.11.6 Category-specific planned improvements

No improvements are planned for this sector.

## 6.12 DIRECT N<sub>2</sub>O EMISSIONS FROM MANAGED SOILS

### 6.12.1 Category description

Direct N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from drainage of organic soils are estimated for forest land, settlements and wetlands. Direct N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from nitrogen mineralisation associated with loss of soil organic matter from change of land use or management are estimated for settlements remaining settlements and land-use change to croplands and settlements. Total aggregated direct N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from managed soils in 2022 were 2.13 kt N<sub>2</sub>O.

### 6.12.2 Methodological issues

Direct emissions of N<sub>2</sub>O due to drainage of organic soils are calculated according equation No. 6.15 (Equation 2.7 of the IPCC Wetlands Supplement).

$$N_{2O} - N_{OS} = [(F_{OS,CG,Temp} * EF_{2CG,Temp}) + (F_{OS,F,Temp,NR} * EF_{2F,Temp,NR})] \quad (6.15)$$

where:

$N_{2O} - N_{OS}$  – annual direct N<sub>2</sub>O–N emissions from managed/drained organic soil, kg N<sub>2</sub>O–N yr<sup>-1</sup>

$F_{OS}$  – annual area of managed/drained organic soils, ha. The subscripts CG, F, Temp, NR refer to cropland and grassland, forestland, temperate and nutrient rich, respectively

$EF_2$  – emission factor for N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from drained/managed organic soils, kg N<sub>2</sub>O–N ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>

Activity data consist of areas of land remaining in a land-use category and land converted to other land-use category on drained organic soils. Default N<sub>2</sub>O EFs for drained organic soils in forest land is 2.8 kg N<sub>2</sub>O–N ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> according to Table 2.5 of the IPCC Wetlands Supplement. Default N<sub>2</sub>O EFs for drained organic soils in cropland (13 kg N<sub>2</sub>O–N ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> according to Table 2.5 of the IPCC Wetlands Supplement) is used to report N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from drained organic

soil in settlements remaining settlements. Since submission 2021 national N<sub>2</sub>O EFs for organic soils in drained peat extraction areas (0.44 kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>)<sup>269</sup> developed within the scope of LIFE REstore project is used for reporting.

N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from land converted to another land-use category on drained organic soils are calculated in the same way as emissions from land remaining in a land-use category.

Direct N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from N inputs to managed soils and from N mineralisation resulted from loss of soil organic C stocks in mineral soils due to land-use change are estimated by Tier 1 methodology using equation No. 6.15 (equation 11.1 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines):

$$N_2O - N_{N \text{ inputs}} = F_{SOM} * EF_1 \quad (6.16)$$

where:

*N<sub>2</sub>O-N<sub>N inputs</sub>* – annual direct N<sub>2</sub>O-N emissions from N inputs to managed soils, kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N yr<sup>-1</sup>

*EF<sub>1</sub>* – emission factor for N mineralized from mineral soil as a results of loss of soil carbon, kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N (kg N)<sup>-1</sup>

The equation No. 15 is supplemented by equation 11.8 from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (equation No. 17 in the NIR). Default EF for N mineralised from mineral soil as a result of loss of soil carbon (0.01 kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N (kg N)<sup>-1</sup>) from Table 11.1 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines is used. Default C:N ratio (15) for soil organic matter is utilized for estimation of annual amount of N mineralised in mineral soils as a result of loss of soil carbon due to land use change to cropland (2006 IPCC Guidelines). As there is no fixed default EFs for settlements provided by IPCC guidelines, default EFs of croplands land-use category are applied, C:N ratio for soil organic matter applied based on expert judgement is 15, and annual carbon losses in organic soil in settlements are reported using default emissions factor from cropland – 7.9 tons CO<sub>2</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yearly (Table 2.1 of IPCC Wetlands Supplement).

### 6.12.3 Uncertainties and time-series consistency

Uncertainty analysis for 2024 submission is carried out by using Approach 1. Quantitative estimates of uncertainties are provided in Annex 2. Overall description of uncertainty analysis is included in Section 1.6.

Uncertainty of soil nitrogen (N<sub>2</sub>O) emissions are estimated according to data obtained within the scope of the international forest soil monitoring project BioSoil<sup>270</sup> and values provided in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. Uncertainty range of EFs for N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from drained organic soils in forest land and cropland is shown in Table 2.5 of the IPCC Wetlands Supplement.

Uncertainty range of EF for N mineralised from mineral soil as a result of loss of soil carbon is 0.003-0.03 kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N (kg N)<sup>-1</sup> (average uncertainty is 135%). Uncertainty range of C:N ratio of the soil organic matter for land-use change is 10-30 (67%).

### 6.12.4 Category-specific QA/QC and verification

The quality objectives and the QA/QC plan for the Latvia's GHG inventory are presented in Section 1.2.3. The QC procedures are performed according to the QA/QC plan in the LULUCF sector to achieve these quality objectives.

<sup>269</sup> Lazdiņš A., Lupiķis A. 2019. LIFE REstore project contribution to the greenhouse gas emission accounts in Latvia. In: Priede A., Gancone A.(Eds.), *Sustainable and responsible after-use of peat extraction areas* (pp. 21–52). Baltijas Krasti.

<sup>270</sup> Bārdule, A., Bāders, E., Stola, J., Lazdiņš, A. 2009. Forest soil characteristic in Latvia according results of the demonstration project BioSoil. *Mežzinātne / Forest Science* 20(53): 105-124. Available: [http://www.silava.lv/userfiles/file/Mezzinatne%2020\(53\)2009/8\\_Bardule\\_MZ\\_20-2009.pdf](http://www.silava.lv/userfiles/file/Mezzinatne%2020(53)2009/8_Bardule_MZ_20-2009.pdf)

QA/QC procedures include double check of area affected by the land use change and soil CO<sub>2</sub> emissions – under calculation of land use changes and during calculation of N<sub>2</sub>O emissions. Issues related to QA/QC and verification are discussed at the sectoral meetings.

Manual data check is introduced to compare figures imported into the CRF Reporter and calculated values. The mathematical errors identified during the previous review are corrected in the EPIM model used for calculation of GHG emissions in LULUCF sector.

All information related to the preparation of the annual inventory is archived in the centralized archiving system (common FTP folder) by March 15 in accordance with QA/QC plan.

### 6.12.5 Category-specific recalculations

No recalculations were done for this sector.

### 6.12.6 Category-specific planned improvements

It is planned to elaborate specific N<sub>2</sub>O EFs for wetlands with organic soils and mineral soils (LIFE OrgBalt project, since 2025).

## 6.13 INDIRECT N<sub>2</sub>O EMISSIONS FROM MANAGED SOILS (CRF 4 (IV))

### 6.13.1 Category description

Indirect N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from N mineralisation associated with loss of soil organic matter from change of land use or management are estimated for land-use change to croplands and settlements on mineral soils. Total aggregated indirect N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from N mineralisation in 2022 were 0.0104 kt N<sub>2</sub>O. Indirect N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from organic soils are not calculated, because the 2006 IPCC Guidelines does not include such a methodology.

### 6.13.2 Methodological issues

Indirect N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from land use change to cropland are calculated according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. Amount of N<sub>2</sub>O-N emissions produced from leaching and run-off as a result from land use change to cropland are estimated by Tier 1 methodology using equation 11.10 (equation No. 6.17 in the NIR).

$$N_2O_{(L)} - N = F_{SOM} * Frac_{LEACH-H} * EF_5 \quad (6.17)$$

where:

$N_2O_{(L)} - N$  – annual amount of N<sub>2</sub>O-N produced from leaching and runoff of N additions to managed soils where leaching/runoff occurs, kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N yr<sup>-1</sup>

$Frac_{LEACH(H)}$  – fraction of all N added to/mineralized in managed soils in regions where leaching/runoff occurs that is lost through leaching and runoff, kg N (kg of N additions)<sup>-1</sup>

$EF_5$  – emission factor for N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from leaching and runoff, kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N (kg N leached and runoff)<sup>-1</sup>

It is supplemented by equation 11.8 from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (equation No. 6.18 in the NIR).

$$F_{SOM} = (\Delta C_{Mineral} * \frac{1}{R}) * 1000 \quad (6.18)$$

where:

$F_{SOM}$  – the net annual amount of N mineralised in mineral soils as a result of loss of soil carbon through change in land use or management, kg N

$\Delta C_{Mineral}$  – average annual loss of soil carbon for land-use type, tonnes C R-C:N ratio of the soil organic matter

Default C:N ratio (15) for soil organic matter (2006 IPCC Guidelines) is utilized for estimation of the net annual amount of N mineralised in mineral soils as a result of leaching/run-off associated with loss of soil carbon through land use change to cropland. Carbon losses are calculated according to the Tier 1 method of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. Default values of fraction of all N added to/mineralised in managed soils due to leaching and run-off (0.3 kg N (kg of N additions)<sup>-1</sup>) and EF for N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from N leaching and run-off (0.0075 kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N (kg N leached and run-off)<sup>-1</sup>) are taken from table 11.3 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.

Indirect N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from land use change to settlements are also reported using the 2006 IPCC Guidelines Tier 1 method. Amount of N<sub>2</sub>O-N emissions produced from leaching and run-off as a result from land use change to settlements are estimated by Tier 1 methodology using equation 11.10 supplemented by equation 11.8 from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. C:N ratio 15 for soil organic matter based on expert judgement is utilized for estimation of annual amount of N mineralised in mineral soils as a result of leaching/run-off associated with loss of soil carbon thorough land use change to settlements. Tier 1 method of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (loss of 20 % of soil carbon in land converted to settlement) is used to estimate CSCs. Default values of fraction of all N added to mineralised in managed soils due to leaching and run-off (0.3 kg N per kg of N added<sup>-1</sup>) and EF for N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from N leaching and run-off (0.0075 kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N per kg N leached and run-off<sup>-1</sup>) are taken from table 11.3 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.

### **6.13.3 Uncertainties and time-series consistency**

Uncertainty analysis for 2024 submission is carried out by using Approach 1. Quantitative estimates of uncertainties are provided in Annex 2. Overall description of uncertainty analysis is included in Section 1.6.

Uncertainty range of C:N ratio of the soil organic matter for land-use change from Forest Land or Grassland to Cropland is 10-30 (average uncertainty is 67%). Uncertainty range of fraction of all N added to or mineralised in managed soils in regions where leaching/run-off occurs that is lost through leaching a run-off is 0.1-0.8 kg N (kg of N additions<sup>-1</sup>), average uncertainty is 117%. Uncertainty range of EF for N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from N leaching and run-off according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines is 0.0005-0.025 kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N (kg N leached and run-off<sup>-1</sup>), average uncertainty is 163%.

### **6.13.4 Category-specific QA/QC and verification**

The quality objectives and the QA/QC plan for the Latvia's GHG inventory are presented in Section 1.2.3. The QC procedures are performed according to the QA/QC plan in the LULUCF sector in order to achieve these quality objectives. QA/QC procedures include double check of area affected by the land use change and soil CO<sub>2</sub> emissions – under calculation of land use changes and during calculation of N<sub>2</sub>O emissions. Issues related to QA/QC and verification are discussed at the sectoral meetings.

Manual data check is introduced to compare figures imported into the CRF Reporter and actually calculated values. The mathematical errors identified during the previous review are corrected in the EPIM model used for calculation of GHG emissions in LULUCF sector.

All information related to the preparation of the annual inventory is archived in the centralized archiving system (common FTP folder) in accordance with QA/QC plan.

#### **6.13.5 Category-specific recalculations**

No recalculations were done for this sector.

#### **6.13.6 Category-specific planned improvements**

No improvements are planned for this sector.

## 7 WASTE (CRF 5)

### 7.1 OVERVIEW OF SECTOR

In 2022, emissions from the Waste sector were 588.61 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.; it contributes about 5.8% of total GHG emissions (excluding LULUCF, including indirect CO<sub>2</sub>) (Figure 7.1). Solid waste disposal and wastewater handling sectors are the main sources of GHG emissions in Waste sector producing accordingly 68.7% and 20.7% of all Waste sector emissions in 2022. Incineration and Biological treatment of solid waste together contribute only 10.6% of GHG emissions from Waste sector in 2022.




Figure 7.1 Emissions from the Waste sector compared with the total emissions in 2022

Emission categories reported under Waste sector as well as used methods and EFs are summarized in Table 7.1.

Table 7.1 Waste sector reported emissions and methods

Sector categories	Reported GHG	Methods	EF
<b>A. Solid waste disposal</b>			
1. Managed waste disposal sites	CH <sub>4</sub>	Tier 2 (D)	CS, D
2. Unmanaged waste disposal sites	CH <sub>4</sub>	Tier 2 (D)	CS, D
3. Uncategorized waste disposal sites	NO	NA	NA
<b>B. Biological treatment of solid waste</b>			
1. Composting	CH <sub>4</sub> , N <sub>2</sub> O	D	D
2. Anaerobic digestion at biogas facilities	CH <sub>4</sub>	D	D
<b>C. Incineration and open burning of waste</b>			
1. Waste incineration	CO <sub>2</sub> , N <sub>2</sub> O	D	D
2. Open burning of waste	NE	NA	NA
<b>D. Wastewater treatment and discharge</b>			
1. Domestic wastewater	CH <sub>4</sub> , N <sub>2</sub> O, NMVOC	Tier 1, Tier 2	CS, D
2. Industrial wastewater	CH <sub>4</sub> , N <sub>2</sub> O, NMVOC	Tier 1	CS, D, PS
3. Other (as specified in table 6.B)	NMVOC	D	D

Sector categories	Reported GHG	Methods	EF
<i>E. Other (please specify)</i>	<i>NO</i>	<i>NA</i>	<i>NA</i>

GHG emissions from Waste sector have been fluctuated from 1990-2022. In 2022, emissions have decreased by 26.9% compared to 1990.




Figure 7.2 Total GHG emissions from Waste sector 1990-2022 (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

Fluctuations in total GHG emissions in Waste sector could be explained with changes of economic situation in last 30 years (Figure 7.2). Some industry sectors were almost closed in the middle of 1990s. Biggest influence to total emission trend in the beginning on 1990s gives GHG emissions from Wastewater handling, decrease of total emissions in years 2002-2004 is due to starting of CH<sub>4</sub> collection in landfills.




Figure 7.3 GHG Emissions in Waste subsectors 1990-2022 (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

For 5.C Incineration and open burning of waste emissions for 2022 are reported as NO. According to waste data there are no waste incineration in Latvia without energy recovery in 2022.

N<sub>2</sub>O is emitted as the release from sewage purification system and waste incineration.

Data on CO<sub>2</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from waste incineration are available only since 1999. Emissions are estimated since 1990, data on incinerated amount 1990–1998 are extrapolated according to disposed and incinerated waste amounts proportion. Calculation of precursors emissions from cremation is shown in Section 7.4.1.1. Emissions from waste incineration with energy recovery are allocated under Energy sector (CRF 1.A.2.f Non-metallic minerals).

CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O are emitted from waste composting. Enterprises data available only since 2003, when composting facilities started to report within state statistical survey about waste composting. Emissions from household waste composting are estimated since 1990. 2006 IPCC Guidelines and default EFs are used to calculate emissions.

Key categories from Waste sector are summarized in Table 7.2.

**Table 7.2 Key categories in Waste sector in 2024 submission**

Category	Gas	Identification criteria	with LULUCF	without LULUCF
5.A.1. Managed Waste Disposal on Land	CH <sub>4</sub>	L1,L2	X	X
5.A.2. Unmanaged Waste Disposal Sites	CH <sub>4</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2	X	X
5.B.1. Composting	CH <sub>4</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2		X
5.B.1. Composting	N <sub>2</sub> O	L2,T2		X
5.B.2. Anaerobic digestion at biogas facilities	CH <sub>4</sub>	L2		X
5.D.1 Domestic Wastewater	CH <sub>4</sub>	L1,L2,T1,T2	X	X
5.D.1 Domestic Wastewater	N <sub>2</sub> O	L1,T2		X
5.D.2 Industrial Wastewater	CH <sub>4</sub>	T1,T2	X	X

According to the annual waste statistics report<sup>271</sup> the total generated amount of waste is shown in Table 7.3.

**Table 7.3 Generated waste in Latvia (kt)**

Year	Municipal (all non-hazardous) waste	Hazardous waste	Total
2006	1420.46	54.37	1474.83
2007	1386.57	41.61	1428.18
2008	1368.79	46.40	1415.16
2009	1033.91	55.56	1089.47
2010	1131.40	55.09	1186.49
2011	1535.06	58.48	1593.53
2012	1799.44	85.12	1884.56
2013	1902.01	109.23	2011.24
2014	2128.73	80.98	2209.70
2015	2087.51	86.60	2174.11
2016	1980.28	63.66	2043.94
2017	2141.21	68.76	2209.97

<sup>271</sup>Waste statistics report. Available: <https://videscents.lv/gmc.lv/lapas/atkritumi-un-radiacijas-objekti>



Year	Municipal (all non-hazardous) waste	Hazardous waste	Total
2018	1587.74	118.14	1705.88
2019	1698.71	115.46	1814.17
2020	1605.95	150.03	1755.98
2021	2011.35	111.18	2122.53
2022	2099.51	79.17	2178.68

Waste management has acquired prior significance in the environmental protection policy as one of the instruments for sustainable use of natural resources. The main directions in the waste management are the development of the construction of polygons and collecting system for non-hazardous municipal waste and the development of system for the collection and treatment of hazardous waste. At the moment 10 non-hazardous waste polygons and two polygons for hazardous waste got "A" category permits according to integrated pollution prevention and control (IPPC) directive. Biogas collection and use for energy production from biodegradable waste and sludge is set as one of waste management priorities in Latvia.

Main activity data sources for GHG emissions calculations in Waste sector are databases<sup>272</sup> "3-Waste", "2-Water" and data from CSB.

Data on hazardous waste in Latvia have been collected and compiled by LEGMC since 1997, but data on municipal (non-hazardous) waste since 2001. Until then the waste volume was determined on the basis of separate pilot projects and the assessments and projections by waste management experts.

Since 2002 databases about hazardous and municipal waste are combined in one database "3-Waste". Data in this database are gathered from State Statistical survey about waste, which is conducted annually.

Statistical survey must be completed annually by all enterprises, which have permits on polluting activities (A and B category) and all enterprises, which have permits on waste management operations. To estimate disposed waste amounts in preliminary years; data from Landfill research 2016<sup>273</sup> were used.

"2-Water" database was developed by LEGMC as well. Data of water abstraction and use, wastewater treatment and discharge have been collected since 1991 in the frame of state statistical survey "2-Water". State statistical survey "2-Water" must be reported by all enterprises which have issued permits on water use, water resources use or mineral deposits quarry use, or IPPC permit. Both LEGMC "2-Water" and CSB data are used as activity data for emission calculation - CSB and "2-Water" data for CH<sub>4</sub> emission from Domestic Waste Water Handling, Industrial Wastewater Handling and Sewage Sludge, N<sub>2</sub>O emission from Industrial Wastewater Handling and NMVOC emission, and CSB for CH<sub>4</sub> emission from industrial wastewater handling and N<sub>2</sub>O from Domestic Wastewater Handling.

<sup>272</sup>Databases. Available: [http://parissrv.lv/gmc.lv/public\\_reports](http://parissrv.lv/gmc.lv/public_reports)

<sup>273</sup> "Landfill data collection and compilation for GHG estimates", 2016, LEGMC.

Available: <https://www.meteo.lv/lapas/atkritumu-izgastuvju-datu-savaksana-un-apkoposana-seg-aprekinem?id=2182>

## 7.2 SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL (CRF 5.A)

### 7.2.1 Category description

CH<sub>4</sub> emission is calculated from SWD (Table 7.4). It is main GHG source from Waste sector in Latvia. Compared to 2021, CH<sub>4</sub> emissions have increased by 7.7% in 2022. Compared to 1990, CH<sub>4</sub> emissions have increased by 52 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. due to First order decay calculation method. In 2002, CH<sub>4</sub> recovery started in Latvia waste polygons. Recovery gives effort for small decrease of emissions in 2003 – 2007. IPCC Waste Model from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines is used.

**Table 7.4 Reported emissions under subcategory Solid Waste Disposal on Land**

CRF	Source	Emissions reported
5.A.1	<i>Managed Waste Disposal on Land</i>	<i>CH<sub>4</sub>, NMVOC</i>
5.A.2	<i>Unmanaged Waste disposal Sites</i>	<i>CH<sub>4</sub>, NMVOC</i>
5.A.3	<i>Uncategorized Waste disposal Sites</i>	<i>NO</i>

To estimate CH<sub>4</sub> emissions with IPCC Waste Model (First Order Decay (Tier2)) was used. Time series for disposed waste amounts till 1950 was developed. The base year for estimation of disposed amount is 1975. According to Landfill research made in 2016<sup>274</sup>, disposed amount in 1975 was 249 860 tonnes. Research estimation is based on information from questionnaires, what was filled by municipalities about landfill situation in their territory. During the research municipalities were asked to provide information on:

- active and closed landfills names;
- years of each landfill activity;
- disposed amounts in each landfills (volume or mass);
- landfill recovery status;
- number in contaminated sites register.

List of landfills was selected, which was already active in 1975 and for which information was available on the active operational period and disposed waste.

To perform calculations - information about 62 landfills was available in 1975. From these 62 landfills full information, including the amount of disposed waste and active operational period, was available for 50 landfills.

Using the information on the active operational period - it was possible to determine how much waste were landfilled by dividing the total amount of disposed waste with active years. The amount of waste disposed in accordance with the research calculations in 1975 was 249 860 tons.

Amount for disposed waste 1950–1974 was assumed the same like in 1975. Disposed amount for years 1976–2001 were estimated like steady growth till year 2002 amount, when data became available from data base “3-Waste” (Table 7.5).

<sup>274</sup> “Landfill data collection and compilation for GHG estimates”, 2016, LEGMC.

Available: <https://www.meteo.lv/lapas/atkritumu-izgastuvju-datu-savaksana-un-apkoposana-seg-aprekliem?id=2182>

Table 7.5 Estimated disposed waste amounts from 1950–2001

Year	Disposed solid waste amount (kt)	Population in rural areas (%)	Population in urban areas (%)	Disposed waste in rural areas (kt) (MCF=0.4)	Disposed waste in urban areas (kt) (MCF= 0.8)
1950-1974	249.86	39%	61%	97.44	152.41
1975	249.86	39%	61%	97.44	152.41
1976	263.90	33%	67%	87.08	176.81
1977	277.94	33%	67%	91.72	186.22
1978	291.98	33%	67%	96.35	195.63
1979	306.02	33%	67%	100.98	205.03
1980	320.06	33%	67%	105.61	214.44
1981	334.1	32%	68%	106.91	227.19
1982	348.14	32%	68%	111.40	236.73
1983	362.18	32%	68%	115.89	246.28
1984	376.23	32%	68%	120.39	255.84
1985	390.27	32%	68%	124.88	265.38
1986	404.31	31%	69%	125.33	278.97
1987	418.35	31%	69%	129.68	288.66
1988	432.39	31%	69%	134.04	298.34
1989	446.43	31%	69%	138.39	308.03
1990	460.47	31%	69%	142.74	317.72
1991	474.51	31%	69%	147.09	327.41
1992	488.55	31%	69%	151.45	337.07
1993	502.59	31%	69%	155.80	346.78
1994	516.63	31%	69%	160.15	356.47
1995	530.67	31%	69%	164.50	366.16
1996	544.71	31%	69%	168.86	375.84
1997	558.75	31%	69%	173.21	385.53
1998	572.79	31%	69%	177.56	395.22
1999	586.83	32%	68%	187.78	399.05
2000	600.87	32%	68%	192.28	408.59
2001	614.91	32%	68%	196.77	418.14

Landfills from 1950–2001 are assumed as unmanaged<sup>275</sup>. Disposed amount is divided between rural and urban areas, according to the proportion of population between these areas. Methane correction factors (MCF) for CH<sub>4</sub> emissions calculations in urban areas (deep sites - 0.8) and rural areas (shallow sites - 0.4) are used.

Data about waste disposal on land for 2002-2022 are taken from database “3-Waste” (Table 7.6). Starting from 2002, according to data base information, biggest sites could be assumed as managed sites (polygons) and MCF-1 was started. For each year (2002-2022) in polygons disposed amount are determined according to disposing site profile from “3-Waste” data base.

From 2016-2022 bioreactor in the Latvia's biggest polygon Getlini was in operation.

<sup>275</sup> “Degradable organic carbon in disposed waste”, 2011, Ltd Virsma

Table 7.6 Disposed solid waste amounts from 2002-2022 (kt)

Year	Total disposed solid waste amount	Disposed in polygons (MCF=1)	Stored in bioreactor	Disposed in deep unmanaged sites (urban area, MCF=0.8)	Disposed in shallow unmanaged sites (rural area, MCF=0.4)
2002	658.00	217.46	NO	303.97	136.57
2003	578.90	207.74	NO	256.07	115.05
2004	631.70	282.84	NO	240.71	108.15
2005	610.90	370.43	NO	165.89	74.53
2006	670.00	454.39	NO	148.78	66.84
2007	775.10	553.27	NO	153.09	68.78
2008	704.80	566.89	NO	95.12	42.74
2009	637.50	549.50	NO	60.71	27.28
2010	605.40	586.90	NO	12.73	5.72
2011	548.70	543.50	NO	2.60	2.60
2012	529.50	525.50	NO	1.98	1.98
2013	534.20	534.20	NO	NO	NO
2014	505.20	505.20	NO	NO	NO
2015	503.90	503.90	NO	NO	NO
2016	515.70	353.90	161.90	NO	NO
2017	517.90	230.60	287.20	NO	NO
2018	508.80	219.30	289.50	NO	NO
2019	506.39	202.78	303.61	NO	NO
2020	494.35	218.61	275.74	NO	NO
2021	502.03	283.11	218.92	NO	NO
2022	432.75	432.75	NO	NO	NO

Two separate IPCC Waste Model calculations were used. One for unmanaged sites and other for managed (waste polygons since 2002 and bioreactor since 2016). For unmanaged sites calculation method for bulk waste was used, because there are no correct information about disposed waste content available. According to Ltd Virsma research, DOC factor for these calculations is 0.17. Other factors are default from the 2006 IPCC guidelines.

For managed sites method "waste by composition" in IPCC Waste Model was used. Data on waste composition was taken from Ltd Virsma research (Table 7.7).

Table 7.7 Disposed waste composition in Latvia waste polygons 1990-2015

Polygons	Samples	Organic fraction (%)					Inorganic fraction (%)		
		Paper	Plastics	Organic (food, hygiene waste, other)	Wood	Textile, rubber	Minerals (ceramics)	Glass	Metals
Pentuli	No1	3.8	19.5	45.4	4.1	3.6	7.2	15.6	0.8
	No2	14.3	5.2	37.8	8.3	0.6	9.4	8.2	16.2
	No3	9.7	6.9	52.9	0.5	2.2	10.4	15.5	1.9
	No4	11.6	8.7	59.5	1.5	3.7	5.3	6.1	3.6
	No5	4.6	6.5	72	0.7	0.8	8.3	5.7	1.4
	No6	4.1	23.9	42.8	3.9	2.3	7.4	14.5	1.1
Pentuli average		<b>8.02</b>	<b>11.78</b>	<b>51.73</b>	<b>3.16</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10.93</b>	<b>4.16</b>
Kivites	No1	5.1	2.2	58.3	0.2	3.9	11.6	14	4.7
	No2	6.1	5.6	51.4	0.6	3.1	10.5	19.6	3.1

Polygons	Samples	Organic fraction (%)					Inorganic fraction (%)		
		Paper	Plastics	Organic (food, hygiene waste, other)	Wood	Textile, rubber	Minerals (ceramics)	Glass	Metals
	No3	1.3	5	56.9	2.1	0.3	9.7	18.2	6.5
	No4	11.3	6	31	3.9	33.3	2.8	8.1	3.6
	No5	4.5	4.8	62	3.2	2.6	12.7	9.2	1
Kivites average		<b>5.66</b>	<b>4.72</b>	<b>51.92</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8.64</b>	<b>9.46</b>	<b>13.82</b>	<b>3.78</b>
Getlini	No1	6.4	5.8	42.3	1.1	1.2	19.9	21.6	1.7
	No2	19.4	20	41	1.1	0	1.8	16.3	0.4
	No3	2.2	4.8	58.7	1.6	0.7	0.9	23.7	7.4
	No4	3.9	5.8	57.2	0	11.1	6.6	14.9	0.5
	No5	3.2	14.9	52.3	4.6	1.8	4.5	18.7	0
Getlini average		<b>7.02</b>	<b>10.26</b>	<b>50.3</b>	<b>1.68</b>	<b>2.96</b>	<b>6.74</b>	<b>19.04</b>	<b>2</b>
Daibe	No1	3.1	4.8	40.2	1.4	0.2	14.3	35.3	0.7
	No2	4.9	5.8	19.3	3.9	0.9	22.3	42.8	0.1
	No3	3.7	2.1	73.8	1.8	0.3	3.4	14.7	0.2
	No4	3	4.7	18	2.1	0.2	16.7	55.2	0.1
	No5	3.5	2.3	12.9	3.2	0.4	15.7	61.9	0.1
Daibe average		<b>3.64</b>	<b>3.94</b>	<b>32.84</b>	<b>2.48</b>	<b>0.40</b>	<b>14.48</b>	<b>41.98</b>	<b>0.24</b>
Average in Country		<b>6.40</b>	<b>8.54</b>	<b>47.90</b>	<b>2.11</b>	<b>3.35</b>	<b>8.69</b>	<b>20.64</b>	<b>2.36</b>

To determine average waste composition from 4 biggest waste polygons in Latvia - size of polygons was taken into account. In Getlini 50% of all waste are disposed. Getlini composition gives the biggest influence to determine average waste composition in country. Organic waste for IPCC Waste Model calculations is assumed as Food and Garden fractions. This waste composition is applied for period 1990-2015.

For managed sites method "waste by composition" in IPCC Waste Model was used.

Since 2016 bioreactor starts to operate in SIA Getlini Eko waste polygon. In bioreactor waste are stored after mechanical sorting. Biological part of stored waste in bioreactor is approximately 75%. Data about waste composition are reported in annual waste polygon reports. These reports are provided to state institutions each year. Waste composition for 2022 disposed waste was estimated.

Estimation is done for 3 types of waste streams:

1. Disposed waste in disposal cells after sorting (data collected from waste polygon reports);
2. Direct disposed waste (without sorting) according to EWC code (estimation for each EWC code is expert judgment);
3. Stored waste in bioreactor (for biogas collection after sorting, estimation according weekly measurements is - 75% biological part and 25% inert part).

Estimation is applied for period 2016-2021, because biggest bioreactors starts to operate in 2016. For each reported disposed or stored in bioreactor waste code estimation of composition was done according to IPCC waste model classification.

Waste composition average in 2021:

1. Food – 21.3%;

2. Garden – 22.2%;
3. Paper - 6.3%;
4. Wood – 2.4%;
5. Textile – 2.8%;
6. Nappies – NA;
7. Plastic, other inert – 45.0%.

Waste compostion average in 2022:

1. Food – 17.8%;
2. Garden – 18.3%;
3. Paper - 9.4%;
4. Wood – 2.6%;
5. Textile – 2.8%;
6. Nappies – 0.1%;
7. Plastic, other inert – 49.0%.

Since October 2002 CH<sub>4</sub> recovery from landfills was started. In 2022, in seven waste polygons CH<sub>4</sub> recovery was realized:

1. In *SIA Getlini EKO* polygon methane was collected from old waste disposing area, from new waste disposing cells, which is specially built for waste disposing with biogas collection and bioreactor;
2. In *SIA Liepajas RAS* methane collection also is developed in old landfill *Skede* (2004-2013) and in new polygon *Kivites* (since 2005);
3. In *SIA ZAAO* polygon *Daibe* methane collection was started in the middle of 2009.
4. In *SIA Jelgavas komunalie pakalpojumi* polygon *Braski* methane is started to collect in year 2013;
5. In *SIA Labiekārtošanas kombināts* polygon *Pentuļi* CH<sub>4</sub> recovery was started in 2021. In 2021, all collected landfill gas was flared;
6. In *SIA Atkritumu apsaimniekošanas sabiedrība Piejūra* polygon *Janvari* CH<sub>4</sub> recovery was started in 2022. In 2022, all collected landfill gas was flared;
7. In *SIA Atkritumu apsaimniekošanas dienvidlatgales starppašvaldību organizācijas* polygon *Ciniši* CH<sub>4</sub> recovery was started in 2021. In 2022, all collected landfill gas was flared.

In total, 5.547 kt CH<sub>4</sub> was collected and recovered in 2022. Information about recovered methane amount is collected directly from waste disposal sites operators. Methane concentration and volume of collected polygon gas are provided. CH<sub>4</sub> recovery is estimated based on the monitoring of produced amount of electricity from the gas and landfill gas content measurements. All assumptions used in the estimation of the CH<sub>4</sub> recovery are in accordance with the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (Vol. 5, Ch. 3, p.3.19).

Methane recovery is distributed between Unmanaged deep (MCF = 0.8 ) and Managed (MCF = 1) landfills. In the biggest landfill in Latvia Getlini CH<sub>4</sub> recovery occurs from old landfill part and from new disposal cells. Information about distribution between old landfill, new disposal cells and bioreactor are received from polygon Getlini. See distribution of CH<sub>4</sub> recovery in Table 7.8.

**Table 7.8 Recovered CH<sub>4</sub> in Latvia landfills (kt)**

Year	Total	MCF (0.8) unmanaged	MCF 1 managed
2002	0.859	0.859	NO

Year	Total	MCF (0.8) unmanaged	MCF 1 managed
2003	3.016	3.016	NO
2004	4.507	4.507	NO
2005	4.687	4.000	0.687
2006	4.833	2.434	2.400
2007	5.055	2.469	2.586
2008	5.250	2.500	2.750
2009	5.847	2.300	3.547
2010	6.173	2.100	4.073
2011	6.499	1.900	4.599
2012	6.463	1.700	4.763
2013	6.917	1.500	5.417
2014	6.873	1.300	5.573
2015	7.858	1.100	6.758
2016	7.624	1.000	6.623
2017	7.876	0.986	6.877
2018	7.502	0.833	6.669
2019	6.792	0.742	6.051
2020	6.762	0.731	6.031
2021	7.084	0.579	6.505
2022	5.547	0.658	4.889

CH<sub>4</sub> emission from waste disposing in SWD sites is presented in Figure 7.4.




Figure 7.4 CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from waste disposing (kt)

### 7.2.2 Methodological issues

Tier 2 method from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines is used for CH<sub>4</sub> emissions calculation and is based on IPCC Waste Model.

**Emission factors used in IPCC Waste Model****Factors for managed site emissions calculations:**

MCF (CH<sub>4</sub> correction factor) Managed sites – 1:

**Table 7.9 DOC values for waste streams in managed sites (2006 IPCC Guidelines)**

Food waste	0.15
Garden	0.20
Paper	0.40
Wood and straw	0.43
Textiles	0.24
Sewage sludge	0.05

**Table 7.10 Methane generation rate constant (k) (2006 IPCC Guidelines)**

Food waste	0.185
Garden	0.10
Paper	0.06
Wood and straw	0.03
Textiles	0.06
Sewage sludge	0.185

DOC<sub>f</sub> – fraction of DOC dissimilated - 0.5

F – fraction of CH<sub>4</sub> landfill gas - 0.5

Delay time – 6 month

**Factors for unmanaged site emissions calculations:**

Deep unmanaged sites - 0.8

Shallow unmanaged sites - 0.4

DOC – degradable organic carbon - 0.17

DOC<sub>f</sub> – fraction of DOC dissimilated - 0.5

F – fraction of CH<sub>4</sub> landfill gas - 0.5

k- methane generation rate - 0.09

OX – oxidation factor (for unamanged sites calculation before 2008 is used default – 0.1, for unamanged sites calculation since year 2008 is used 0.09).

DOC value 0.17 is used according to research which was carried out in Latvia in 2011 (“Degradable organic carbon in disposed waste”, 2011, Ltd Virsma). Other EFs are default from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.

Based on national research<sup>276</sup>, Latvia assumes 10% of old unmanaged SWDS are not covered by soils. To include this aspect in emissions calculations the oxidation factor is used as 0.09 (reduced by 10%). Oxidation factor 0.09 has been used from year 2008, because unmanaged SWDS were covered till year 2007. Till year 2008 oxidising was not applied for unmanaged landfills. Covering was realised with EC funds financing in 3 stages.

<sup>276</sup> Landfill data collection and compilation for GHG estimates”, 2016, LEGMC Availabe:

<https://www.meteo.lv/lapas/atkritumu-izgastuvju-datu-savaksana-un-apkoposana-seg-aprekliem?id=2182&nid=909>



Fraction of CH<sub>4</sub> in landfill gas is estimated as 0.5 according to information, which is received from CH<sub>4</sub> collection enterprises. CH<sub>4</sub> collection enterprises provide information about collected CH<sub>4</sub> amount and also about CH<sub>4</sub> concentration in landfill gas. CH<sub>4</sub> concentration is mutable, it diversifies from 0.47 – 0.54 depending on time frame and weather conditions.

### 7.2.3 Uncertainties and times-series consistency

Uncertainty analysis for 2024 submission is carried out by using Approach 1. Quantitative estimates of uncertainties are provided in Annex 2. Overall description of uncertainty analysis is included in Section 1.6.

To calculate CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from SWD many EFs are used. According to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for each factor uncertainty is estimated as:

DOC – 20%;  
 DOCf – 30%;  
 MCF – 10%;  
 CH<sub>4</sub> fraction F – 5%;  
 k – 40%.

$$EF_{uncert.} = \sqrt{DOC^2 + DOCf^2 + MCF^2 + F^2 + k^2} \quad (7.1)$$

Combined uncertainty for EFs from SWD is 52%.

Uncertainty for activity data is estimated as 5.74%.

Uncertainty assessment of activity data is done using the proportion between disposed amount and population (2002-2022). Uncertainty is calculated as the standard medium of the average from linear trend line.




Figure 7.5 Trendline and proportion waste-to-population for waste disposal

### 7.2.4 Category-specific QA/QC and verification

The quality objectives and the QA/QC plan for the Latvia's GHG inventory at the National Inventory level are presented in Section 1.2.3. The QC procedures are performed according to

the QA/QC plan in the waste sector in order to achieve these quality objectives. Issues related to QA/QC and verification are discussed at the sectoral meetings.

Disposed waste amount since 2002 is taken from waste data base "3-Waste". Data in this data base are checked and approved by Regional Environmental Boards.

National factor of DOC is determined in national research "Degradable organic carbon in disposed waste", 2011, Ltd Virsma. Distribution between managed and unmanaged sites is also described in this research which is available in QA/QC documentation.

Information regarding CH<sub>4</sub> recovery is taken directly from waste polygon reports. Latvia's waste polygon report is published in LEGMC website every year.

All information on activity data and emission calculations are stored and archived in the common FTP folder.

### 7.2.5 Category-specific recalculations

For 2024 submission new estimation of recovered CH<sub>4</sub> amount was applied since 2018. Distribution between managed and unmanaged sites was changed according to new information from waste operators. Total changes in CH<sub>4</sub> emissions were about 0.15% for years 2018-2021.

### 7.2.6 Category-specific planned improvements

No improvements are planned for this sector.

## 7.3 BIOLOGICAL TREATMENT AND SOLID WASTE (CRF 5.B)

### 7.3.1 Composting (CRF 5.B.1)

#### 7.3.1.1 Category description

Under 5.B.1 sector CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from waste composting are calculated. Composting is set as one of priorities in waste treatment in Latvia. For composting biological degradable waste are useful. In Latvia these are mostly "park - garden" and "food production" waste.

Data about industrial composting become available since 2003, when waste treatment companies started waste composting and get IPPC permits on this activity.

Composting in private households has been very popular for many years. Composted waste amount in households is estimated according to the household statistics from CSB<sup>277</sup>. To estimate composted amount research<sup>278</sup> done by Waste Management Association of Latvia in 2015 about composting was taken into account.

**Table 7.11 Reported emissions under composting**

CRF	Source	Emissions reported
5.B.1.	Composting	CH <sub>4</sub> , N <sub>2</sub> O

From composting CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions are calculated according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. Data regarding composted waste are taken from "3-Waste" database.

<sup>277</sup> CSB data. Available: <https://www.csp.gov.lv/lv/majsaimniecibas-un-gimenes>

<sup>278</sup> "Composting emission factor development from waste and waste water sectors and methane correction factor estimation for Latvia landfills", 2015, Waste Management Association of Latvia

Sharp increase of composting emissions in 2016 compared to previous years can be observed due to increase of industrial composted waste amounts (Figure 7.6). Sorting out of biological waste before waste disposal in polygons occur in larger volumes. Emissions from composting in 2022 have increased by 70.8% compared to 1990 due to industrial composting activities since 2003. Compared to 2021, total GHG emissions from composting have decreased by 4.3%.




Figure 7.6 Total emissions from waste composting (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

### 7.3.1.2 Methodological issues

Default method from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines is used for emission calculations from composting. Composted waste amount is multiplied with default EF. Composted waste amount is taken from “3-Waste” database, R3 - Recycling/reclamation of organic substances that are not used as solvents (including composting and other biological transformation processes), recovery operation for determination of composted amounts was used. Not all amounts, which are classified under recovery as R3, are composted. To determine composted waste amount, each enterprise, which reports recovery operations R3, working profile must be taken into account. Since 2014 special R code (R3A) for composting was implemented in Latvian legislation. Data selection for emission calculations become more simplified.

Default EFs for composting were used from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines:

Industrial and home composting:

1. 4 g CH<sub>4</sub>/ kg composted waste;
2. 0.24 g N<sub>2</sub>O/ kg composted waste.

Table 7.12 Composted waste amounts and emissions (kt)

Year	Composted amounts in households (kt)	Industrial composted amount (kt)	CH <sub>4</sub> emission (kt)	N <sub>2</sub> O emission (kt)
1990	166.8863	-	0.6675	0.0401
1991	166.2622	-	0.6650	0.0399
1992	165.3139	-	0.6613	0.0397
1993	161.7283	-	0.6469	0.0388

Year	Composted amounts in households (kt)	Industrial composted amount (kt)	CH <sub>4</sub> emission (kt)	N <sub>2</sub> O emission (kt)
1994	158.9280	-	0.6357	0.0381
1995	156.4058	-	0.6256	0.0375
1996	154.4638	-	0.6179	0.0371
1997	155.3406	-	0.6214	0.0373
1998	155.9775	-	0.6239	0.0374
1999	157.3667	-	0.6295	0.0378
2000	157.1398	-	0.6286	0.0377
2001	158.1811	-	0.6327	0.0380
2002	158.1800	-	0.6327	0.0380
2003	159.4941	2.2240	0.6469	0.0388
2004	160.0516	7.9050	0.6718	0.0403
2005	164.9071	6.5640	0.6859	0.0412
2006	148.1782	11.6980	0.6395	0.0384
2007	161.8781	9.4160	0.6852	0.0411
2008	159.2327	9.2820	0.6741	0.0404
2009	161.1365	15.1100	0.7050	0.0423
2010	165.1933	18.5500	0.7350	0.0441
2011	168.7196	23.6990	0.7697	0.0462
2012	170.7857	17.6200	0.7536	0.0452
2013	166.7016	14.3670	0.7243	0.0435
2014	168.2496	40.0380	0.8332	0.0500
2015	170.5342	67.5770	0.9524	0.0571
2016	167.8159	135.2240	1.2122	0.0727
2017	166.1008	98.9000	1.0600	0.0636
2018	166.1743	112.2500	1.1137	0.0668
2019	165.8701	81.9420	0.9912	0.0595
2020	173.8290	95.4830	1.0772	0.0646
2021	171.1290	126.6000	1.1909	0.0714
2022	168.64	116.33	1.1399	0.0684
2022 versus 2021			-4.3%	-4.3%
2022 versus 1990			+70.7%	+70.7%

### 7.3.1.3 Uncertainties and times-series consistency

Uncertainty analysis for 2024 submission is carried out by using Approach 1. Quantitative estimates of uncertainties are provided in Annex 2. Overall description of uncertainty analysis is included in Section 1.6.

EF uncertainties are calculated according to the range, which is published in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Volume 5, Chapter 4, for N<sub>2</sub>O range is 0.06 – 0.6, for CH<sub>4</sub> 0.03 – 8, Uncertainty for N<sub>2</sub>O EF is 90%, for CH<sub>4</sub> – 100%.

Time series for composting begin in 1990.

Uncertainty for households composted amounts are assumed as 20% as expert judgement.

Activity data uncertainty for industrial composting is estimated as 28.13%.

Uncertainty assessment of activity data for industrial composting is done using the proportion between composted amount and population (2004-2022). Uncertainty is calculated as the standard medium of the average from exponential trend line.

Total uncertainty for composting activity data is 28.13% (Figure 7.7).




Figure 7.7 Trendline and proportion waste-to-population for waste industrial composting

#### 7.3.1.4 Category-specific QA/QC and verification

The quality objectives and the QA/QC plan for the Latvia's GHG inventory at the National Inventory level are presented in Section 1.2.3. The QC procedures are performed according to the QA/QC plan in the waste sector in order to achieve these quality objectives. Issues related to QA/QC and verification are discussed at the sectoral meetings.

Industrial composted waste amounts are taken from from "3-Waste" data base. Data in this data bases are checked and approved by Regional Environmental Boards.

All information on activity data and emission calculations are stored and archived in the common FTP folder.

#### 7.3.1.5 Category-specific recalculations

No recalculations were done for this sector.

#### 7.3.1.6 Category-specific planned improvements

Update of home composting data estimation is planned.

### 7.3.2 Anaerobic Digestion at Biogas Facilities (CRF 5.B.2)

Anaerobic Digestion at biogas facilities is carried out in Latvia. Emissions are allocated under Energy and Agriculture sectors. All biogas is used for energy production.

According to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines Volume 5, Chapter 4.1 leakages are 5% from collected biogas volume. The main feedstocks are agriculture crops, agriculture remains, manure, organic remains from food production and organic waste. Total amount of biogas is taken from CSB Energy Balance. Amount of landfill and sludge gas is excluded. CH<sub>4</sub> emission is estimated from total biogas volume according to the amount of waste and organic remains from food production in feedstock. Waste contributes about ¼ of all feedstock. ¾ of feedstock consist of manure and agriculture crops. Average CH<sub>4</sub> concentration is assumed as 54%, feedstock dry

matter is 14%, CH<sub>4</sub> density – 0.6687 kg/m<sup>3</sup> (reference – Biogas association research, 2020), Table 7.13.

**Table 7.13 CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from waste anaerobic digestion at biogas facilities**

Year	Biogas collected in Latvia, mil. m <sup>3</sup>	CH <sub>4</sub> collected, mil. m <sup>3</sup>	CH <sub>4</sub> , kt	CH <sub>4</sub> from waste, kt	5% leakages, emission of CH <sub>4</sub> , kt	Amount of waste treated (wet), kt	Amount of waste treated (dry), kt
2010	3.32	1.80	1.20	0.30	0.02	9.786	1.37
2011	24.66	13.39	8.95	2.24	0.11	72.723	10.18
2012	90.76	49.28	32.95	8.24	0.41	267.642	37.46
2013	119.35	64.81	43.34	10.83	0.54	351.955	49.27
2014	141.32	76.74	51.32	12.83	0.64	416.765	58.34
2015	170.29	92.47	61.83	15.46	0.77	502.195	70.30
2016	174.88	94.96	63.50	15.88	0.79	515.723	72.20
2017	181.98	98.81	66.08	16.52	0.83	536.64	75.13
2018	170.45	92.56	61.89	15.47	0.77	502.66	70.37
2019	156.15	84.79	56.70	14.16	0.71	460.14	64.42
2020	151.98	82.53	55.18	13.79	0.69	447.85	62.69
2021	123.68	61.84	41.35	10.34	0.52	335.59	46.98
2022	103.65	51.83	34.66	8.66	0.43	281.25	39.37

## **7.4 INCINERATION AND OPEN BURNING OF WASTE (CRF 5.C)**

### **7.4.1 Waste Incineration (CRF 5.C.1)**

#### **7.4.1.1 Category description**

For year 2022 waste incineration without energy recovery is reported as NO.

Data on amount of waste incinerated in Latvia can be found in databases that are created and maintained by LEGMC. Data on hazardous waste incineration are available since 1999. In the hazardous waste data base there is a separate entry for 1997-2001 on the amount of incinerated waste. Since 2002 the database also contains entries for recovery (R) and disposal (D) of waste, which is consistent with the EU Waste legislation.

**Table 7.14 Reported emissions under category Waste Incineration**

CRF	Source	Emissions reported
5.C 1	<i>Biogenic (cremation)</i>	<i>SO<sub>2</sub>, NMVOC, CO, NO<sub>x</sub></i>
5.C 2	<i>Other – non biogenic (clinical (animal) and hazardous (industrial) waste)</i>	<i>CO<sub>2</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O, SO<sub>2</sub>, NMVOC, CO, NO<sub>x</sub></i>

Currently there are no large amounts of waste being incinerated in Latvia without energy recovery. The main source of emissions refer to the hazardous and clinical waste incineration. Amounts of incinerated clinical waste are registered in the hazardous waste database (from 2002 in “3-Waste” data base) as *Health service for humans and animals as well as related research waste*. Amount of incinerated animal waste (dead animals) are assumed as Clinical waste. The rest of the incinerated waste from hazardous waste database is considered as hazardous (industrial) waste.

In 2001, large increase of emissions can be observed, because one enterprise reported huge amount of incinerated waste. Incinerated amounts for 1990–1998 are extrapolated according to average value of incinerated amount for 2002–2013 which refers to disposed waste value.

In latest years incinerated amount of waste has decreased due the reason that hazardous waste incineration is not occurring in full scale. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from Waste Incineration are presented in Figure 7.8.




Figure 7.8 CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from Waste Incineration by waste type (kt)

Data about burned bodies is available from Riga crematorium since 1994 and Valmiera crematorium since 2016. Calculations of emissions are done in accordance with the EMEP/EEA 2023 methodology. The main gases emitted during cremation are SO<sub>x</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, and NMVOC, and all of them have to be reported in the inventory as precursors. These amounts are reported under general 5C sector.

Table 7.15 Burned bodies in crematoriums

Year	Burned bodies
1994	54
1995	564
1996	819
1997	817
1998	869
1999	982
2000	1127
2001	1297
2002	1293
2003	1389
2004	1391
2005	1529
2006	1630
2007	1959
2008	2227
2009	1977
2010	2102
2011	2158
2012	1970
2013	2150
2014	2222

Year	Burned bodies
2015	2395
2016	2909
2017	3443
2018	3708
2019	4029
2020	4200
2021	4500
2022	4100

#### 7.4.1.2 Methodological issues

According to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines CO<sub>2</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions are calculated from Waste Incineration. CH<sub>4</sub> emissions in well-functioning incinerators are usually very small. CH<sub>4</sub> emissions are particularly relevant for open burning. Usually CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are substantially larger than emissions of N<sub>2</sub>O. Emissions from waste incineration without energy production are considered under the Waste sector, while emissions from waste incineration with energy production are considered under the Energy sector (CRF 1.A.2.f Non-metallic minerals).

CO<sub>2</sub> emissions were calculated using following the 2006 IPCC Guidelines equation:

$$CO_2 \text{ emissions} = \sum_i [SW_{ix} * CF_i * FCF_i * OX_i * 44/12] \text{ kt/year} \quad (7.2)$$

where:

*i* = waste type (hazardous waste, clinical waste)

*SW<sub>i</sub>* = amounts of type *i* waste incinerated. (kt/year)

*CF<sub>i</sub>* = carbon contents in the type *i* waste

*FCF<sub>i</sub>* = fossil carbon contents in the type *i* waste

*OX<sub>i</sub>* = oxidation factor of type *i* waste

44/12 = conversion of C into CO<sub>2</sub>

There are no national factors for carbon and fossil carbon amounts in each type of waste; therefore default EFs from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines were used.

**Table 7.16 Default emission factors for CO<sub>2</sub> emission calculation**

Emission factor	Clinical (animal) waste	Hazardous (industrial) waste
C contents in waste (CCW)	0.6	0.5
Fossil C contents in waste (FCF)	0.4	0.9
Oxidation factor (OX)	100%	100%

N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from Waste incineration are calculated according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Volume 5 Table 5.6. Factor 100 (g N<sub>2</sub>O/t waste) is used. This factor is determined for Industrial waste in wet weight. Latvia's incinerated hazardous waste are used oils, solvents and other liquids. Clinical waste is not dried before burning. The same factor also is used for N<sub>2</sub>O emission calculation from clinical waste.



**Table 7.17 Incinerated waste amounts without energy recovery**

Year	Hazardous waste (kt)	Clinical waste (kt)	Animal waste (kt)	Total (kt)
1990	0.4291	0.1167	NO	0.5458
1991	0.4050	0.1102	NO	0.5151
1992	0.3808	0.1036	NO	0.4845
1993	0.3567	0.0970	NO	0.4538
1994	0.3326	0.0905	NO	0.4231
1995	0.3085	0.0839	NO	0.3924
1996	0.3214	0.0874	NO	0.4089
1997	0.3419	0.0930	NO	0.4349
1998	0.3624	0.0986	NO	0.4610
1999	0.3472	0.2014	NO	0.5486
2000	0.6903	0.0564	NO	0.7467
2001	1.3193	0.2133	NO	1.5326
2002	0.1656	0.0322	NO	0.1979
2003	0.2018	0.0406	NO	0.2424
2004	0.2101	0.1123	NO	0.3225
2005	0.2151	0.1021	NO	0.3173
2006	0.7862	0.2619	NO	1.0481
2007	0.5405	0.3509	NO	0.8914
2008	0.2998	0.0124	NO	0.3121
2009	0.2000	0.0117	NO	0.2117
2010	0.2000	0.0128	NO	0.2128
2011	0.0063	0.0127	0.3661	0.3851
2012	NO	0.0180	0.3489	0.3669
2013	NO	0.0059	0.4798	0.4857
2014	0.1669	0.0103	0.3166	0.4933
2015	NO	0.0185	0.1855	0.2040
2016	NO	0.0102	0.1865	0.1967
2017	0.1354	0.0291	0.0421	0.2066
2018	0.2396	0.0014	NO	0.2410
2019	0.0100	0.0141	NO	0.0241
2020	0.0192	0.0081	NO	0.0273
2021	0.02	NO	NO	0.02
2022	NO	NO	NO	NO

Precursors are calculated from waste incineration according to EMEP/EEA 2023 (Table 7.18).

**Table 7.18 Emission factors for precursors**

Gas	Clinical waste (kg/Mg)	Hazardous waste (kg/Mg)
NMVOG	0.7	7.4
CO	0.19	0.07
SO <sub>2</sub>	0.24	0.047
NO <sub>x</sub>	2.3	0.87

#### CH<sub>4</sub> emissions estimation from waste incineration

Default EF CH<sub>4</sub> – 300 kg/TJ (IPCC 2006; Volume 2: Energy; Chapter 2. Stationary combustion table 2.5 page 2.23). CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from waste incineration are very small (Table 7.19). Value

for 2019 – 0.0018 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. is under 0.05% of total emissions and it means that is under the threshold of significance. In 2020, raw activity data are lower than in 2019 and it means that emissions are below 0.05% of total emissions in Latvia. Latvia could not investigate the dominant incineration technology and process (e.g. batch-type/continuous/semi-continuous) used, because waste incineration without energy recovery reports different small installations in different years. This installation do not have any filters or semi combustion cameras and it worked only few hours in the week. In CRF CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from incineration are reported as NE.

**Table 7.19 Raw estimations of CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from waste incineration**

Year	Waste amount incinerated (kt)	CH <sub>4</sub> EF kg/TJ	NCV TJ/kt	CH <sub>4</sub> emissions (kt)	CO <sub>2</sub> eq. (kt)
1990	0.3869	300	10	0.0012	0.0290
1995	0.4509	300	10	0.0014	0.0338
2000	0.7467	300	10	0.0022	0.0560
2005	0.3173	300	10	0.0010	0.0238
2006	1.0481	300	10	0.0031	0.0786
2007	0.8914	300	10	0.0027	0.0669
2008	0.3121	300	10	0.0009	0.0234
2009	0.2117	300	10	0.0006	0.0159
2010	0.2128	300	10	0.0006	0.0160
2011	0.3851	300	10	0.0012	0.0289
2012	0.3669	300	10	0.0011	0.0275
2013	0.4857	300	10	0.0015	0.0364
2014	0.4933	300	10	0.0015	0.0370
2015	0.2040	300	10	0.0006	0.0153
2016	0.1967	300	10	0.0006	0.0148
2017	0.2066	300	10	0.0006	0.0155
2018	0.2410	300	10	0.0007	0.0181
2019	0.0241	300	10	0.0001	0.0018

### Cremation

Emissions of precursors from cremation were calculated by multiplying the number of bodies burned with the corresponding EF. Calculations were based on EFs given in the EMEP/EEA 2023 (

Table 7.20).

**Table 7.20 Emission factors for precursors from cremation**

Precursor	Emission factor (kg/body)
NMVOC	0.013
CO	0.140
SO <sub>2</sub>	0.113
NO <sub>x</sub>	0.825

#### 7.4.1.3 Uncertainties and times-series consistency

Uncertainty analysis for 2024 submission is carried out by using Approach 1. Quantitative estimates of uncertainties are provided in Annex 2. Overall description of uncertainty analysis is included in Section 1.6.

CO<sub>2</sub> EF uncertainty is estimated as 40%, according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, because no correct information on carbon content in incinerated waste is known. Uncertainty for N<sub>2</sub>O EF is 100%.

Activity data uncertainty for waste incineration is estimated as 51.79% (Figure 7.9).

Uncertainty assessment of activity data for waste incineration is done using the proportion between incinerated amount and population (years 2002-2022). Uncertainty is calculated as the standard medium of the average from linear trend line.




Figure 7.9 Trendline and proportion waste-to-population for waste incineration

#### 7.4.1.4 Category-specific QA/QC and verification

The quality objectives and the QA/QC plan for the Latvia's GHG inventory at the National Inventory level are presented in Section 1.2.3. The QC procedures are performed according to the QA/QC plan in the waste sector in order to achieve these quality objectives. Issues related to QA/QC and verification are discussed at the sectoral meetings.

QA/QC procedures for waste incineration are done. Incinerated waste amounts are taken from "3-Waste" data base. Data in this data bases are checked and approved by Regional Environmental Boards.

All information on activity data and emission calculations are stored and archived in the common FTP folder.

#### 7.4.1.5 Category-specific recalculations

No recalculations were done for this sector.

#### 7.4.1.6 Category-specific planned improvements

No improvements are planned for this sector.

## 7.4.2 Open Burning of Waste (CRF 5.C.2)

Open burning of waste is reported as NE (Not estimated). Open burning is not allowed in Latvia according to the Waste Management Law<sup>279</sup>.

If emissions are occurred then it is very negligible amount. Evaluation of possible emissions:

- Number of detached houses in Latvia – 213 004 according to Central statistical bureau data;
- 30% of them are in rural regions – 63 901 (population distribution in Latvia CSB data);
- Estimation that in one house lives 2 inhabitants (expert judgment) – 127 802 inhabitants;
- Total generated amount of Municipal solid waste in 2018 are 802 000 tons for – 1 934 379 inhabitants;
- 127 802 inhabitants generated - 52 987 tonnes;
- Assumption is made that 1-2% of these wastes are burned (Estonia's estimation) – it was used average value - 1.5% from 52987 – **795** tonnes in year 2018;
- Net Calorific value for MSW is 10 TJ/Gg (IPCC 2006; Volume 2: Energy; Chapter 1: Introduction; Table 1.2 Default NCVs and lower and upper limits of the 95% confidence intervals). Default EFs for MSW (with biomass) CO<sub>2</sub> - 100 000 kg/TJ (IPCC 2006; Volume 2: Energy; Chapter 2. Stationary combustion Table 2.5, page 2.23);
- $0.795 \text{ Gg} * 10 = 7.95 \text{ TJ}$ ;
- **CO<sub>2</sub> emissions** calculated  $7.95 * 100\,000 = 795\,000 \text{ kg}$  that is **0.795 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.**;
- **CH<sub>4</sub> emissions** calculated  $7.95 * 300 \text{ kg/TJ} = 2385 \text{ kg}$  that is **0.002385 kt CH<sub>4</sub>** and **0.059625 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.**;
- **N<sub>2</sub>O emissions** calculated  $7.95 * 4 \text{ kg/TJ} = 31.8 \text{ kg}$  that is **0.0000318 kt N<sub>2</sub>O** and **0.0094764 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.**;
- $0.795 + 0.059625 + 0.0094764 = \mathbf{0.8641014 \text{ kt CO}_2 \text{ eq.}}$  that is below the 0.05% of national total GHG emissions and could be characterized as emissions below the threshold of significance in Latvia. Therefore for Latvia emissions are considered as negligible. In CRF emissions are reported as NE.

## 7.5 WASTEWATER TREATMENT AND DISCHARGE (CRF 5.D)

### 7.5.1 Domestic Wastewater (CRF 5.D.1)

#### 7.5.1.1 Category description

The emission sources cover handling of collected and uncollected domestic wastewater for CH<sub>4</sub> from both wastewater and sewage sludge and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from human sewage.

In most cases urban wastewater is treated in well managed biological treatment plants in Latvia. However, certain part of national population still is not connected to a centralized collection and treatment systems and are served with septic tanks and latrines.

<sup>279</sup> Waste Management Law. Available: <https://likumi.lv/ta/id/221378-atkritumu-apsaimniekosanas-likums>

Data on type of treatment plant and its treatment level is available within national database on water use "2-Water", and all the treatment plants and number of population they serve is distributed by their type and level of treatment. Share of septic tank and latrine use is estimated, according to data on urbanization and default values from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.

CH<sub>4</sub> is main pollutant in the Domestic Wastewater sector, making 72.8% of total GHG emissions of this sector, while N<sub>2</sub>O corresponds for 27.2% in 2022.

In total, taking into account of recovered CH<sub>4</sub> as well, emissions from Domestic Waste water Handling sector made 118.5 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. in 2022, what makes a decrease of 55.6%, compared to 1990, and a decrease of 3.9%, compared to 2021 (Figure 7.10). In 2022, GHG emissions from Domestic Wastewater handling contributes 97.2% of total GHG emissions from Wastewater handling sector and 20.1% of total GHG emissions in Waste sector.




Figure 7.10 Emissions from Domestic Waste Water Handling (N<sub>2</sub>O on secondary axis) (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

### 7.5.1.2 Methodological issues

Calculation of CH<sub>4</sub> emission from Domestic Waste Water Handling is based on amount of BOD<sub>5</sub> (biochemical oxygen demand, 5-day test) produced by national population. However, different MCFs are applied depending of type and level of treatment of certain treatment plant. Data on treatment type and level of certain wastewater treatment plant serving certain number of population is available in national data base "2-Water"<sup>280</sup>, collecting treatment plant-level data on water abstraction and use, wastewater treatment and discharge. Distribution of national population by type and level of wastewater treatment was extrapolated for period, uncovered by water statistics (1990-1999).

Default formula from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, chapter 6.2.2 „Domestic Wastewater” was used for calculation of CH<sub>4</sub> emission from Domestic Wastewater Handling sector. However,

<sup>280</sup>Public acces of surveys of official environment statistics. Available: [http://parissrv.lv/gmc.lv/public\\_reports](http://parissrv.lv/gmc.lv/public_reports)

distribution of national population by treatment type and level is used instead of distribution of national population by income level.

$$\mathbf{CH_4Emissions} = [\sum_i(\mathbf{U}_i * \mathbf{EF}_i)] * (\mathbf{TOW} - \mathbf{S}) - \mathbf{R} \quad (7.3)$$

where

$\mathbf{CH_4Emissions}$  –  $\mathbf{CH_4}$  emissions in the inventory year, kg  $\mathbf{CH_4}/\mathbf{yr}$

$\mathbf{TOW}$  – total organics in wastewater in inventory year, kg  $\mathbf{BOD}/\mathbf{yr}$

$\mathbf{S}$  – organic component removed as sludge in inventory year, kg  $\mathbf{BOD}/\mathbf{yr}$

$\mathbf{U}_i$  – degree of national population receiving certain wastewater treatment type and level, %

$i$  – wastewater treatment type and level (well-managed biological, poor-managed biological, non-biological, septic tanks and latrines)

$\mathbf{EF}_i$  – emission factor for each treatment type fraction, kg  $\mathbf{CH_4}/\mathbf{kg BOD}$

$\mathbf{R}$  – amount of  $\mathbf{CH_4}$  recovered in inventory year, kg  $\mathbf{CH_4}/\mathbf{yr}$

$$\mathbf{EF}_i = \mathbf{B}_o * \mathbf{MCF}_i \quad (7.4)$$

where:

$\mathbf{EF}_i$  – emission factor for each treatment type fraction, kg  $\mathbf{CH_4}/\mathbf{kg BOD}$

$i$  – wastewater treatment type and level (well-managed biological, poor-managed biological, non-biological, septic tanks and latrines)

$\mathbf{B}_o$  – maximum  $\mathbf{CH_4}$  producing capacity, kg  $\mathbf{CH_4}/\mathbf{kg BOD}$

$\mathbf{MCF}_i$  – methane correction factor for each treatment type and level

$$\mathbf{TOW} = \mathbf{P} * \mathbf{BOD} * \mathbf{0.001} * \mathbf{I} * \mathbf{365} \quad (7.5)$$

where

$\mathbf{TOW}$  – total organics in wastewater in inventory year, kg  $\mathbf{BOD}/\mathbf{yr}$

$\mathbf{P}$  – country population in inventory year, persons

$\mathbf{BOD}$  – country-specific per capita  $\mathbf{BOD}$  in inventory year, g/person/day

$\mathbf{I}$  – correction factor for additional industrial  $\mathbf{BOD}$  discharged into sewers

$\mathbf{CH_4}$  emissions from anaerobic sewage sludge were calculated using default formula from „Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: Reference Manual”; chapter 6.3.5 „Methodology for Estimating Emissions from Wastewater Handling”. In this case IPCC 1996 were used because the 2006 IPCC Guidelines do not provide methodology to estimate emissions from anaerobic sewage sludge.

$$\mathbf{SM} = \mathbf{TOS} * \mathbf{EF} \quad (7.6)$$

where:

$\mathbf{SM}$  – total  $\mathbf{CH_4}$  emission from sewage sludge, kg  $\mathbf{CH_4}$

$\mathbf{TOS}$  – total organic content of sludge, kg  $\mathbf{COD}/\mathbf{yr}$

$\mathbf{EF}$  – emission factor for sludge, kg  $\mathbf{CH_4}/\mathbf{kg COD}$

$$\mathbf{EF} = \mathbf{B}_o * \mathbf{MCF} \quad (7.7)$$

where:

$\mathbf{EF}$  – emission factor for anaerobic sewage sludge, kg  $\mathbf{CH_4}/\mathbf{kg COD}$

$\mathbf{B}_o$  – maximum  $\mathbf{CH_4}$  producing capacity, kg  $\mathbf{CH_4}/\mathbf{kg COD}$

$\mathbf{MCF}$  – methane correction factor

$\mathbf{MCF}$ s were applied depending of treatment type and level. The 2006 IPCC Guidelines were used as source of  $\mathbf{MCF}$  values; however, expert judgment was performed to choose values applicable for Latvian conditions (Table 7.21).

**Table 7.21 MCF values applied depending on type and level of treatment**

Treatment type and level	MCF
Biological treatment with secondary or higher treatment level	0
Biological treatment with treatment level lower than secondary	0.3
Mechanical and chemical treatment	0.1
Not connected to centralized waste water treatment plants	0.5 (septic tanks) 0.7 (latrines)

According to recommendations of "Issues on waste during ESD-review 2020" webinar (Oct 6, 2020), MCF value 0.1 were applied to the flow of non-biological (mechanical and chemical) treatment instead of previously used value of 0.3.

Organic load – so called "population equivalent" or 60 g of BOD per person per day – is determined by National legislation (Cabinet Regulation No. 34 "Regulations regarding Discharge of Polluting Substances into Water" (22.01.2002)<sup>281</sup>).

Activity data, used for calculation of CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from domestic wastewater, are summarized in Table 7.22.

**Table 7.22 Activity data for calculation CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from Domestic Wastewater Handling sector**

Year	Population received well-managed biological treatment	Population receiving poor-managed biological treatment	Population receiving non-biological treatment	Population receiving no centralized treatment	Amount of anaerobic sludge, t/y (dry solids)	Amount of recovered CH <sub>4</sub> , kt/y	Total CH <sub>4</sub> emission produced, kt
1990	1 459 034	410 363	69 301	729 442	18 057	0	7.93
1995	1 367 407	384 592	64 949	683 633	11 563	0.36	7.13
2000	1 300 118	373 987	54 044	653 566	7 294	0.80	6.65
2005	1 455 262	82 748	37 302	674 412	9 377	1.77	6.27
2010	1 270 798	141 411	21 507	686 788	4 233	2.25	5.88
2011	1 471 797	91 310	18 946	492 552	6 915	1.97	4.75
2012	1 410 131	106 951	23 748	503 983	4 186	2.06	4.52
2013	1 426 233	94 621	19 207	483 764	4 278	1.90	4.32
2014	1 454 147	46 366	14 580	486 375	5 389	1.79	4.34
2015	1 458 218	34 249	14 287	452 342	3 971	1.96	3.89
2016	1 483 951	24 580	14 511	445 915	4 641	2.17	3.90
2017	1 563 931	18 992	12 503	354 690	3 623	2.11	3.12
2018	1 517 818	16 417	11 270	388 874	3 826	1.72	3.36
2019	1 546 430	21 082	10 898	341 558	3 140	1.92	2.96
2020	1 525 893	9 779	11 069	360 604	3 301	1.58	3.07
2021	1 503 876	15 490	11 392	362 465	4 263	1.67	3.23
2022	1 505 041	10 308	9 730	350 678	3 701	2.13	3.08
Share of total CH <sub>4</sub> emissions in Waste sector in 2022, %							14.7%
2022 versus 1990							-61.1%
2022 versus 2021							-4.5%

Some assumptions are made to calculate emissions from domestic wastewater handling:

<sup>281</sup> Cabinet Regulation No. 34 "Regulations regarding Discharge of Polluting Substances into Water". Available: <https://likumi.lv/ta/en/en/id/58276>

- Total organically degradable carbon, removed from domestic wastewater with sludge, is divided proportionally between types of treatment. Type of treatment “not connected” removes no carbon in sludge.
- Only temporal storage of sewage sludge with dry solid content less than 20% could be considered as anaerobic conditions, since all other ways or conditions of sewage sludge (for example, storage after dewatering procedures, what results in content of dry solids 20% and more) does not allow to use MCF value for “deep anaerobic lagoons”, as it was recommended by TERT, especially, if dewatered sewage sludge is being stored in the piles. An expert judgment was performed and documented to establish the 20% solid content threshold value to divide sludge in anaerobic/aerobic<sup>282</sup> (Figure 7.11 and Figure 7.12).



Figure 7.11 Dewatered sewage sludge storage shed. Considered to be no source of CH<sub>4</sub> emissions

---

<sup>282</sup> Expert judgment protocol EJ\_Waste\_5D\_2016\_001





Figure 7.12 Liquid sewage sludge storage basin. Considered to be source of CH<sub>4</sub> emissions (deep anaerobic lagoon)

Example of methane emission calculation for 2022 is shown in Table 7.23.

Table 7.23 Calculation of CH<sub>4</sub> emission from Domestic Waste Water Handling sector (2022)

Treatment type	Population (persons)	Total DC (kt BOD/yr)	DC WW w/o sludge (kt BOD/yr)	Correction factor for additional industrial discharges of BOD into a sewer	Maximum CH <sub>4</sub> producing capacity B <sub>0</sub> , kg CH <sub>4</sub> /kg BOD	MCF	Emission factor	Emission (kt of CH <sub>4</sub> )
Well managed biological	1 505 041	32.960	19.879	1.25	0.6	0	0	0
Poor managed biological	10 308	0.226	0.136	1.25	0.6	0.3	0.18	0.031
Non-biological	9 730	0.213	0.129	1.25	0.6	0.1	0.06	0.010
Not connected to centralized treatment plants*	350 678	7.680	7.680	1				2.455
<b>Total:</b>	<b>1 875 757</b>	<b>41.079</b>	<b>27.824</b>					<b>2.495</b>

\*See detailed calculations in the Table 7.26.

Assumptions regarding sewage sludge are shown in Table 7.24.

**Table 7.24 Characteristics of sewage sludge in Latvia**

Characteristic	Value
Average content of dry solids in sludge, % <sup>283</sup>	14 <sup>284</sup>
Average content of COD in dry solids, %	65 <sup>285</sup>
Average content of N in dry solids, %	5.2 <sup>286</sup>

Extrapolation was used to estimate amount of sewage sludge produced and treated anaerobically for period 1990 – 1997, where statistic data were not available. Based on trend of statistics available (1998 – 2022), assumption was made about the part of anaerobically stored sludge. Emissions from sludge, used as fertilizer in agriculture or disposed in landfills, are reported under corresponding sectors.

Data on recovery of CH<sub>4</sub> from wastewater handling are plant specific data from treatment plant “Daugavgrīva”, operated by largest Latvian water supply and wastewater Treatment Company “Rīgas ūdens”. Recovery of CH<sub>4</sub> is also performed by its daughter company “Rīgens”, starting from 2002. Up to 2021, plant data of this enterprise on amount of biogas produced and flared was used to estimate emissions of CH<sub>4</sub>, taking into account 5% leakage value, as it is stated by 2006 IPCC Guidelines. Recovered amount of CH<sub>4</sub> is being used as fuel in the cogeneration plant, and emissions from it are reported under the Energy sector. It is assumed, that density of CH<sub>4</sub> is 0.6687 kg/m<sup>3</sup>, and data from enterprise included content of CH<sub>4</sub> in biogas for each year too.

Starting from 2022, a survey was performed for biogas producers, in order to identify possible additional sources of CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from biogas handling. As result, in total 8 biogas producers reported using certain amounts of sewage sludge for their biogas production. Since most of these producers used another raw materials too, amount of biogas (and CH<sub>4</sub> within) was estimated using the same methodology as for calculation CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from anaerobic sewage sludge. According to surveyed data and estimations of thereof, in total 16 412 t of sewage sludge (dry solids) was used for biogas production, resulting in production of 2.134 kt of biogas CH<sub>4</sub>, which, in turn, gave emission of 0.107 kt as 5% leakage of recovery in 2022.

Since CH<sub>4</sub> is recovered from the sewage sludge, already removed from the wastewater in well managed treatment plant, therefore this amount of CH<sub>4</sub> is not being subtracted from total emissions of CH<sub>4</sub>.

Example of CH<sub>4</sub> emission calculation from sewage sludge is shown in Table 7.25.

**Table 7.25 Calculation of CH<sub>4</sub> emission from anaerobic sewage sludge and biogas production leakage in 2022**

Emission source	Total DC sludge (kt COD/yr)	Maximum CH <sub>4</sub> producing capacity Bo, kg CH <sub>4</sub> /kg COD	MCF for deep anaerobic lagoons	Emission factor for sludge (kg CH <sub>4</sub> / kg COD)	Emission of sludge (kt CH <sub>4</sub> )
Storage of anaerobic sludge	2.406	0.25	0.8	0.2	0.481
Sludge used for production of biogas	10.668	0.25	0.8	0.2	0.107*

<sup>283</sup> It is used to estimate content of dry solids for years where statistic data are not available (1998-2002)

<sup>284</sup> “Notekūdeņu dūņas un to izmantošana” („Sewage Sludge and Disposal of it”), Gemste I., Vucāns A., Jelgava, 2002.

<sup>285</sup> Average data of 1996

<sup>286</sup> “Notekūdeņu dūņas” (“Sewage Sludge”), Gemste I., Vucāns A., Jelgava, 2007.

\*As 5% leakage from biogas production

To estimate emission from part of national population, not connected to centralized waste water treatment plants, recommendations from TERT were followed and estimation of use of septic tanks and latrines among national population was performed.

Proportion of urban (68.0% of national population) and rural (32.0%) population (2022) was taken from the demographic statistics of CSB (IRD070)<sup>287</sup>, default “suggested values for urbanisation and degree of utilization of treatment, pathway or method” from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines were used.

It was estimated, that 81.3% from national population, not connected to centralized wastewater treatment, are served by septic tanks, while 18.7% - with latrines (2022). Corresponding default MCF values from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines were chosen to estimate emissions of CH<sub>4</sub> from this source (Table 7.26).

**Table 7.26 Estimation of CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from national population, not connected to centralized wastewater treatment plants in 2022**

Type of treatment or discharge pathway	Part of not connected national population, using treatment or discharge pathway	Population, using treatment or discharge pathway	Total DC (kt BOD/yr)	MCF	Emission factor, kg CH <sub>4</sub> /kg BOD	Emissions of CH <sub>4</sub> , kt
Septic tanks	81.3%	293 379	6.425	0.5	0.3	1.928
Latrines	18.7%	57 299	1.255	0.7	0.42	0.527
<i>Total:</i>						2.455

Thus, total CH<sub>4</sub> emission from Domestic Wastewater handling and sewage sludge in 2022 is 3.08 kt of CH<sub>4</sub>, making decrease of 61.1% in comparison of emissions in 1990 and decrease of 4.7% compared to 2021. It also makes 14.7% from GHG emissions in the Waste sector in 2022 (Table 7.27).

**Table 7.27 Total CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from domestic wastewater handling sector in 2022**

Source of CH <sub>4</sub> emissions	Emissions of CH <sub>4</sub> , kt
Emissions from waste water, treated in waste water treatment plants	0.041
Emissions from leakage from recovered CH <sub>4</sub>	0.107
Emissions from anaerobic sewage sludge	0.481
Emissions from national population, not connected to centralized treatment plant	2.455
<i>Total:</i>	3.083

Calculation of emissions of N<sub>2</sub>O from Domestic Wastewater handling is based on amount of nitrogen, generated from the protein consumption by national population. Number of national population is taken from national statistics (CSB) while country specific values of protein consumption are obtained from FAOSTAT data base visualization<sup>288</sup> (Table 7.28).

**Table 7.28 Consumption of protein in Latvia per capita, sludge produced and emissions of N<sub>2</sub>O (1990-2022)**

Year	g/person/day	kg/person/yr	Amount of sludge produced, t	N in the effluent, kt	Emissions of N <sub>2</sub> O, kt
1990	109.3	39.9	36 115	21.5	0.169
1995	97.1	35.4	25 695	18.2	0.143

<sup>287</sup> CSB database. Available: [https://data.stat.gov.lv/pxweb/lv/OSP\\_PUB/START\\_\\_POP\\_\\_IR\\_\\_IRD/IRD070](https://data.stat.gov.lv/pxweb/lv/OSP_PUB/START__POP__IR__IRD/IRD070)

<sup>288</sup> Protein supply. Available: <https://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/FBS/visualize>

Year	g/person/day	kg/person/yr	Amount of sludge produced, t	N in the effluent, kt	Emissions of N <sub>2</sub> O, kt
2000	77.2	28.2	18 234	13.8	0.109
2005	85.8	31.3	26 390	14.1	0.111
2010	105.2	38.4	21 280	16.8	0.133
2011	105.3	38.4	19 905	16.5	0.131
2012	101.8	37.2	20 140	15.7	0.125
2013	101.0	36.9	22 926	15.2	0.121
2014	103.6	37.8	22 322	15.5	0.126
2015	104.6	38.2	22 476	15.5	0.126
2016	108.7	39.7	26 653	15.8	0.129
2017	107.5	39.2	25 620	15.5	0.127
2018	105.2	38.4	25 135	15.0	0.123
2019	108.5	39.6	25 088	15.4	0.126
2020	106.0	38.7	23 274	15.0	0.123
2021	106.2	38.7	18 985	15.1	0.124
2022	106.2	38.7	20 393	14.9	0.122

When compared with similar data with Latvian neighbour countries (Estonia, Lithuania, Russian Federation and Belarus), Latvian data shows consistent value (Table 7.29).

**Table 7.29 Comparison of Latvian protein consumption data with data from neighbour countries**

Country	g/person/day	kg/person/yr
Latvia	77.0...109.3	28.2...39.9
Estonia	84.9...103.9**	31.0...37.9*
Lithuania	63.6...81.9***	23.6...29.3**
Russian Federation	61.0...103.5****	31.1...38.0****
Belarus	77.5**	28.3*****

\*Data taken from Estonian NIR (2019)

\*\*Recalculated for comparison

\*\*\*Data taken from Lithuanian NIR (2021)

\*\*\*\*Data taken from NIR of Russian Federation (2021)

\*\*\*\*\*Data taken from NIR of Belarus (2021)

Amount of N<sub>2</sub>O emission from Domestic Wastewater Handling is calculated according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines; Chapter 6.3.1 „Methodological issues”.

$$N_2O_{Emissions} = N_{Effluent} * EF_{Effluent} * 44/28 \quad (7.8)$$

where:

$N_2O_{Emissions}$  – N<sub>2</sub>O emission in inventory year, kg N<sub>2</sub>O/yr

$N_{Effluent}$  – Nitrogen in the effluent discharged to aquatic environment

$EF_{Effluent}$  – Emission factor for N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from discharged wastewater, kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N/kg N

$$N_{Effluent} = (P * Protein * F_{NPR} * F_{NON-COM} * F_{IND-COM}) - N_{Sludge} \quad (7.9)$$

where:

$N_{Effluent}$  – Total annual amount of nitrogen in wastewater effluent, kg N/yr

$P$  – National population

$Protein$  – Annual per capita protein consumption, kg/pers/y

$F_{NPR}$  – Fraction of nitrogen in protein, kg N/kg protein

$F_{NON-COM}$  – Factor for non-consumed protein added to wastewater

$F_{IND-COM}$  – Factor for industrial and commercial co-discharged protein into a sewer system

$N_{Sludge}$  – Nitrogen removed with sludge, kg N/y

Default value for nitrogen fraction in protein – 0.16 kg N/kg protein – is used in calculation. Default EF – 0.005 kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N/kg N – was used as well. Both values were taken from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, as well as factors for non-consumed (for countries with no garbage disposals) and industrial and commercial protein co-discharged in the sewer system.

Content of nitrogen in the dry solids of sewage sludge was already shown in the table with characteristics of sewage sludge in Latvia (Table 7.24).

N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from centralized wastewater treatment processes are estimated as well.

$$N_2O_{Plants} = P * T_{Plant} * F_{IND-COM} * EF_{Plant} \quad (7.10)$$

where:

$N_2O_{Plants}$  – Total N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from plants in the inventory year, kg N<sub>2</sub>O/y

$P$  – Human population

$T_{Plant}$  – Degree of utilization of modern, centralized treatment plants, %

$F_{IND-COM}$  – Fraction of industrial and commercial co-discharged protein

$EF_{Plant}$  – Emission factor, g N<sub>2</sub>O/pers/y

According to Note from BOX 6.1 (Chapter 6.3.1.3.) of 2006 IPCC Guidelines, amount of nitrogen associated with emissions from modern centralized treatment plants is back calculated (using molecular weight of nitrogen and N<sub>2</sub>O molecule) and subtracted from the N<sub>Effluent</sub>.

Wastewater treatment plants, providing tertiary treatment (i.e. removal of nitrogen of phosphorus), are considered to be in compliance with requirements for “modern, centralized treatment plants”. Degree of their utilization is estimated based on number of national population, provided with such treatment. National wastewater database “2-Water” provides according statistical data (starting from 2000). Constant value of 3% was used for years, previous to 2000.

Activity data for estimation emissions of N<sub>2</sub>O from Domestic Wastewater Handling sector are shown in the following Table 7.30.

**Table 7.30 Activity data for estimation emissions of N<sub>2</sub>O from Domestic Wastewater Handling sector**

Year	Population	Degree of utilization of modern, centralized treatment plants, %	N <sub>2</sub> O emissions from modern, centralized treatment plants, kt
1990	2 668 140	3.0	0.00032
1995	2 500 580	3.0	0.00030
2000	2 377 383	0.8	0.00008
2005	2 249 724	8.4	0.00076
2010	2 120 504	16.4	0.00139
2011	2 070 371	18.2	0.00151
2012	2 044 813	17.8	0.00145
2013	2 023 825	17.4	0.00141
2014	2 001 468	56.3	0.00451
2015	1 986 096	56.9	0.00452
2016	1 968 957	58.3	0.00459
2017	1 950 116	62.1	0.00484
2018	1 934 379	60.4	0.00468
2019	1 919 968	62.6	0.00480
2020	1 907 675	60.5	0.00462
2021	1 893 223	60.5	0.00458

Year	Population	Degree of utilization of modern, centralized treatment plants, %	N <sub>2</sub> O emissions from modern, centralized treatment plants, kt
2022	1 875 757	58.0	0.00435

Considerable increase of share of population, served with modern, centralized treatment plants in last years can be explained by intensive implementing of Urban Wastewater Treatment Directive 91/271/EEC.

Default values from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines are used for fraction of industrial and commercial co-discharged protein and EF (correspondingly, 1.25 and 3.2 g N<sub>2</sub>O/pers/y). Total emission of N<sub>2</sub>O from Domestic Wastewater Handling in 2022, taking into account both emissions from protein consumption, emissions from modern treatment plants and their removal of nitrogen, was 0.122 kt N<sub>2</sub>O, what makes decrease by 28.2% compared to 1990 and decrease by 1.6% compared to 2021. Share of N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from Domestic Wastewater handling is 5.5% from total GHG emissions in the Waste sector (2022).

Treated domestic waste water is also source of NMVOC emissions. Emissions of NMVOC was calculated and using default EMEP EF from EMEP/EEA 2019 was used for this calculation – 15 mg of NMVOC per m<sup>3</sup> of treated wastewater discharged (100 mio m<sup>3</sup>, 2022), giving emissions of 0.00150 kt of NMVOC (2022). It makes decrease by 59.3% compared to 1990, and increase by 2.5% compared to 2021 (Table 7.31).

**Table 7.31 Activity data for calculation domestic NMVOC emissions from Wastewater Handling sector**

Year	Amount of treated domestic waste water discharged, mio m <sup>3</sup>	Emissions of NMVOC, kt
1990	246	0.00369
1995	155	0.00233
2000	118	0.00177
2005	106	0.00159
2010	106	0.00159
2011	107	0.00161
2012	103	0.00154
2013	105	0.00158
2014	100	0.00150
2015	100	0.00150
2016	102	0.00153
2017	107	0.00162
2018	94	0.00142
2019	103	0.00154
2020	97	0.00146
2021	98	0.00146
2022	100	0.00150
<i>Share of total NMVOC emissions in Waste sector in 2022, %</i>		0.6%
<i>2022 versus 1990</i>		-59.3%
<i>2022 versus 2021</i>		+2.5%

### 7.5.1.3 Uncertainties and times-series consistency

Uncertainty analysis for 2024 submission is carried out by using Approach 1. Quantitative estimates of uncertainties are provided in Annex 2. Overall description of uncertainty analysis is included in Section 1.6.


The following uncertainties were used for Domestic Wastewater Handling sector for activity data and EFs (Table 7.32).

**Table 7.32 Uncertainties for Domestic Wastewater Handling sector**

Gas	Activity data	Emission factor
CH <sub>4</sub>	6%	30%*
N <sub>2</sub> O	8%	30%*
NMVOC	8%	-

\*30% - default uncertainty from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines

Uncertainties for activity data of each subsector are estimated using similar methodology. To estimate an uncertainty for certain subsector, its activity data are drawn on chart for each year, then the mathematical relationship of activity data timeline is found as equation of the trend line. Then “theoretical values” of activity data is calculated for each year, using the equation of the trend line, and uncertainty being calculated as deviation (in %) of “actual” value from the “theoretical” one (Figure 7.13).



**Figure 7.13 Example of estimation of uncertainties in Wastewater Handling sector**

Each deviance is calculated as:

$$\text{Uncertainty, \%} = \frac{100 \cdot |b|}{a} \tag{7.11}$$

where:

*a* – “theoretical” value of activity data, calculated through equation of the trend line

*b* – difference between “theoretical” and “actual” value of activity data for certain year

Total uncertainty for certain type of activity data is calculated as average for entire timeline. Then total uncertainty  $U_{tot}$  for subsector is being calculated, using following formula of combined uncertainty:

$$U_{tot} = \frac{\sqrt{(x_1 U_1)^2 + (x_2 U_2)^2}}{x_1 + x_2} \tag{7.12}$$

where:

*x* – emissions from certain pathway/subsector

*U – uncertainties for each type of activity data for certain subsector associated with emissions from the same pathway/subsector*

Default uncertainty values for CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O EFs were taken from IPCC 2006 Guidelines. EMEP/EEA 2019 does not provide uncertainty for NMVOC EFs or methodology to estimate it.

Time series mostly show continuous decrease of emissions in the entire timeline. Main reason of this decrease is implementation of more and better technologies in wastewater treatment plants, decrease of national population and consumption of protein also can be observed. However, the same driving force (implementing of more stringent and advanced wastewater treatment technologies) is reason for increase of N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from subsector of modern centralized treatment plants.

Inconsistencies in data (for example, potential outlier of CH<sub>4</sub> emissions in 2003, as well as considerable fluctuations in 2003 and from 2010 to 2011) can be explained with quality of activity data. Although data collection system on population, receiving certain grade of wastewater treatment is generally well-designed and allows to collect data on plant level, the actual data quality still largely depends on competence of person in enterprise, responsible for reporting these data, as well as inspector of regional environmental board, who assesses and accepts the survey with plant level data. Some additional and retrospective data checks are performed occasionally, which leads to recalculations and overall improvement and reliability of statistic data.

NMVOC emission time series show gradual decrease in the entire reporting period, this can be explained with more efficient water use and decrease of national population.

#### **7.5.1.4 Category-specific QA/QC and verification**

The quality objectives and the QA/QC plan for the Latvia's GHG inventory at the National Inventory level are presented in Section 1.2.3. The QC procedures are performed according to the QA/QC plan in order to achieve these quality objectives. Issues related to QA/QC and verification are discussed at the sectoral meetings.

Following procedures of quality assurance and quality control were carried out:

- Statistic data of national population, served by certain treatment type and level, as well as amount of sludge produced and disposed are collected through annual state statistical survey "2-Water". In frames of this survey, enterprises, performing collection and treatment of wastewater, submit their data using online database. Reported data are checked by Latvian State Environment Service, whose environment inspectors approve reports or return them to submitters for correcting of data;
- Units of measurement were checked during comparison with results of previous reports;
- Number of national population was cross-checked with activity data, used in others sectors (solvents and waste disposal);
- Amount of CH<sub>4</sub> recovery from sewage sludge was checked by comparing data from Energetic sector on amount of sludge gas burned in waste water treatment facility;
- Protein consumption data were compared with values with neighbour countries of Latvia – Lithuania, Estonia, Belarus and Russian Federation (see Table 7.29).

All information on activity data and emission calculations are stored and archived in the common FTP folder.



### 7.5.1.5 Category-specific recalculation

Emissions for both CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O were recalculated for period 2010 - 2021 due to update of activity data. Increased values of protein supply data (compared to previous inventory), published FAOSTAT webpage<sup>289</sup>, caused also increased of N<sub>2</sub>O emission levels for said period. Emissions of N<sub>2</sub>O increased up to 10% for certain years.




Figure 7.14 Impact of recalculations on GHG emissions in Domestic wastewater (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

### 7.5.1.6 Category-specific planned improvements

For the next submission it is planned to review data on characteristics of sewage sludge if National Strategy on Sewage Sludge will be adopted officially.

## 7.5.2 Industrial Wastewater (CRF 5.D.2)

### 7.5.2.1 Category description

Industrial Wastewater Handling is responsible for CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions. Fluctuations of CH<sub>4</sub> emission from Industrial Wastewater Handling are connected with fluctuations of amount of production produced, which is activity data for this sector. Significant decrease in CH<sub>4</sub> emission in period 1993–1999 is due to decrease of economic activity after collapse of Soviet Union. Slight decrease of CH<sub>4</sub> in last two decades are mostly due the polices of saving water and environmental protection, increasing requirements of industrial waste water treatment.

Main pollutant in Industrial Wastewater sector is CH<sub>4</sub>, making 98.1% of the emissions, while emissions of N<sub>2</sub>O corresponds only for 1.9% of this sector (2022).

In total, emissions from Industrial Waste Water Handling sector made 3.37 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq. in 2022, what makes decrease by 97.8% compared to 1990 and decrease by 7.0% compared to 2021 (Figure 7.15). GHG emissions from Industrial Wastewater handling contributes 2.8% of total GHG emissions from Wastewater handling sector and 0.6% of total GHG emissions in Waste sector (2022).

<sup>289</sup> FAO Food Balances: <https://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/FBS/visualize>




Figure 7.15 Emissions from Industrial Wastewater Handling sector (N<sub>2</sub>O on secondary axis) (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.)

### 7.5.2.2 Methodological issues

Emissions of CH<sub>4</sub> from Industrial Waste Water Handling is calculated from amount of total organic product (expressed as COD – chemical oxygen demand) and total nitrogen in waste water, generated in certain branches of industry (mostly food-processing industry).

The 2006 IPCC Guidelines general equation from chapter 6.2.3 „Industrial Wastewater” was used for calculation of CH<sub>4</sub> emission from Industrial Wastewater Handling sector.

$$CH_4 = \sum_i [(TOW_i - S_i) * EF_i - R_i] \quad (7.13)$$

where:

CH<sub>4</sub> – CH<sub>4</sub> emissions in inventory year, kg CH<sub>4</sub>/yr

TOW<sub>i</sub> – total organically degradable material in industrial wastewater from industry *i* in inventory year, kg COD/yr

*i* – industrial sector

S<sub>i</sub> – organic component removed with sludge in the inventory year, kg COD/yr

EF<sub>i</sub> – emission factor for industry *i*, kg CH<sub>4</sub>/kg COD

R<sub>i</sub> – amount of CH<sub>4</sub> recovered in inventory year, kg CH<sub>4</sub>

$$EF_i = B_o * MCF_i \quad (7.14)$$

where:

EF<sub>i</sub> – emission factor for each industry *i*, kg CH<sub>4</sub>/kg COD

*i* – each type of industry

B<sub>o</sub> – maximum CH<sub>4</sub> producing capacity, kg CH<sub>4</sub>/kg COD

MCF<sub>i</sub> – methane correction factor for each type of industry

$$TOW_i = P_i * W_i * COD_i \quad (7.15)$$

where:

TOW<sub>i</sub> – total organically degradable material for industry *i*, kg COD/yr

*i* – industrial sector

P<sub>i</sub> – total industrial product for industry *i*, t/yr

W<sub>i</sub> – waste water generated for each type of industry, m<sup>3</sup>/t product

COD<sub>i</sub> – industrial degradable organic component in wastewater, kg COD/m<sup>3</sup>

Activity data (amount of certain industrial products) was taken from national statistics – CSB data base. Default IPCC value 0.25 kg CH<sub>4</sub>/kg COD was used for maximum CH<sub>4</sub> producing capacity, as it is recommended in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. Amount on generation of waste water per certain type of product and organic component in that wastewater were taken as default values from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.

Plant specific survey was performed during 2012, to obtain MCF values for certain industries. The average weighted MCF for each industry were estimated depending of level of contribution of said industry in terms of amount of waste water generated and its fate (level of treatment or transfer to certain urban waste water treatment plant). Average results of this survey were applied to estimate CH<sub>4</sub> emissions for this period.

Activity data (amount of discharged industrial wastewater) for period 2000–2022 was taken from national statistics – data base “2-Water” on water abstraction and use, treatment and discharge of wastewater. This data base also was used as data source to obtain plant-level MCF value for each enterprise/wastewater discharge.

Assumptions for all relevant industries are summarized in Table 7.33.

**Table 7.33 Assumptions used for calculation of CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from Industrial Wastewater Handling**

Industry type	Generation of waste water, m <sup>3</sup> /t of product*	Organic component in waste water, kg COD/m <sup>3</sup> *	Weighted MCF value**
Milk	7	2.7	0.10
Meat	13	4.1	0.15
Fish	13	2.5	0.05
Beer	6.3	2.9	0.04
Fruits and vegetables	20	5	0.13
Sugar	11	3.2	0.50
Paper and pulp	162	9	0.30
Plastics	0.6	3.7	0.14
Organic chemicals	67	3	0.03

\*Assumptions used from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines

\*\*rounded to 2 decimal positions

Organic component removed with sludge and amount of recovered CH<sub>4</sub> under this sector is assumed to be 0 – all sewage sludge is included elsewhere (in Domestic Wastewater sector).

There were totally 43 relevant direct discharges of industrial waste water registered in 2022. Main industries were milk production (11 discharges) and fish processing (10 discharges) and meat processing (7 discharges).

Default IPCC MCFs were applied for each discharge depending type and level of treatment of the corresponding waste water flow. Thus, MCFs are considered to be plant-specific. Due to most mechanical waste water treatment plants are small and deal will small amounts of waste water, MCF of anaerobic shallow lagoon was chosen for according pathway (Table 7.34).

**Table 7.34 Choice of MCF values for CH<sub>4</sub> emission calculation from industrial wastewater**

IPCC MCF description	According fate of industrial waste water	MCF value
Aerobic treatment plant, well managed	At least secondary treatment with waste water treated to standards	0
Direct discharge of untreated waste water	No treatment	0.1
Anaerobic shallow lagoon	Primary treatment	0.2

IPCC MCF description	According fate of industrial waste water	MCF value
Aerobic treatment plant, not well managed or overloaded	Secondary treatment failing to treat waste water to standards	0.3

Taking into account that plant-level amounts of wastewater are used for period 2000 – 2022 and there are no complete data on content of COD (especially incoming values), method is considered to be Tier 1.

There is no CH<sub>4</sub> recovery calculated from the sludge of industrial waste water in Latvia – all CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from sewage sludge are included in Domestic Waste Water sector.

Thus, total emission of CH<sub>4</sub> from Industrial Waste Water treatment in 2022 was 0.118 kt of CH<sub>4</sub>, that makes 97.8% decrease if compared to 1990 and 6.9% decrease compared to 2021. Share of CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from Industrial Wastewater handling is 0.6% from total GHG emissions in the Waste sector (2022).

N<sub>2</sub>O emission from Industrial Wastewater Handling was calculated, using default method from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, chapter 6.3.1 “Nitrous Oxide Emissions from Wastewater”. Calculation is based on load of nitrogen in the industrial wastewater:

$$WM = N_{ef} * EF * \frac{44}{28} * 10^{-6} \quad (7.16)$$

where:

*WM* – total emission of N<sub>2</sub>O from industrial wastewater handling in kt N<sub>2</sub>O

*N<sub>ef</sub>* – load of nitrogen, kg/yr

*EF* – emission factor, kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N/kg N

Default value (0.005 kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N/kg N) from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines was used for calculation.

Activity data, used for calculation of N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from Industrial Wastewater Handling, are summarized in Table 7.35.

**Table 7.35 Activity data for calculation N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from Industrial Waste Water Handling sector**

Year	Load of N in industrial waste water, t/yr	Emissions of N <sub>2</sub> O, kt
1990	1 000	0.00786
1995	480	0.00377
2000	221	0.00173
2005	135	0.00106
2010	69	0.00054
2011	90	0.00071
2012	41	0.00033
2013	60	0.00047
2014	54	0.00042
2015	54	0.00042
2016	34	0.00027
2017	27	0.00021
2018	32	0.00025
2019	55	0.00044
2020	62	0.00049
2021	35	0.00028
2022	32	0.00025
Share of total N <sub>2</sub> O emissions in Waste sector in 2022, %		0.01%
2022 versus 1990		-96.8%

Year	Load of N in industrial waste water, t/yr	Emissions of N <sub>2</sub> O, kt
<i>2022 versus 2021</i>		<i>-10.5%</i>

N<sub>2</sub>O emission from Industrial Wastewater Handling is negligible – 0.00025 kt/yr (2022), what makes decrease by 96.8% compared to 1990 and decrease by 10.5% compared to 2021. It makes 0.02% from total GHG emissions from Waste sector (2022).

Treated industrial wastewater is also source of NMVOC emissions. Emissions of NMVOC was calculated and default EMEP EF from EMEP/EEA 2019 was used for this calculation – 15 mg of NMVOC per m<sup>3</sup> of treated wastewater discharged (3.06 mio m<sup>3</sup>, 2022), giving emissions of 0.000046 kt of NMVOC (2022). It makes decrease by 95.2% compared to 1990, and decrease by 17.2% compared to 2021 (Table 7.36).

**Table 7.36 Activity data for calculation industrial NMVOC emissions from Wastewater Handling sector**

Year	Amount of treated industrial wastewater discharged, mio m <sup>3</sup>	Emissions of NMVOC, kt
1990	63.6	0.000954
1995	32.8	0.000493
2000	19.5	0.000293
2005	12.2	0.000182
2010	6.28	0.000094
2011	8.72	0.000131
2012	8.72	0.000131
2013	9.69	0.000145
2014	9.40	0.000141
2015	9.75	0.000146
2016	4.65	0.000070
2017	4.48	0.000067
2018	4.21	0.000063
2019	4.11	0.000062
2020	5.07	0.000076
2021	3.69	0.000055
2022	3.06	0.000046
<i>Share of total NMVOC emissions in Waste sector in 2022, %</i>		<i>0.02%</i>
<i>2022 versus 1990</i>		<i>-95.2%</i>
<i>2022 versus 2021</i>		<i>-17.2%</i>

### 7.5.2.3 Uncertainties and times-series consistency

Uncertainty analysis for 2024 submission is carried out by using Approach 1. Quantitative estimates of uncertainties are provided in Annex 2. Overall description of uncertainty analysis is included in Section 1.6.

The following uncertainties were used for Industrial Wastewater Handling sector for activity data and EFs (Table 7.37).

**Table 7.37 Uncertainties for Industrial Wastewater Handling sector**

Gas	Activity data	Emission factor
CH <sub>4</sub>	26%	30%*

Gas	Activity data	Emission factor
N <sub>2</sub> O	20%	30%*
NMVOG	29%	-

\*default uncertainty from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines

In estimation of emissions from Industrial Wastewater Handling uncertainties for activity data in Industrial Wastewater Handling are estimated similarly as uncertainties for activity data for Domestic Wastewater subsector (see Chapter 7.5.1.3).

Fluctuation of AD is the main reason for percent of AD uncertainty. Gradual changes of AD for N<sub>2</sub>O emissions were observed during the period 1990–2000, since 2001 a decrease of AD was still in place with some fluctuations.

Emissions in the Industrial Wastewater Handling sector show clear trends to decrease over entire timeline for all gases. It is connected both with rapid decrease of industrial activities after 1990 due to collapse of Soviet Union and use of better environmental technologies in the treatment of wastewater, as well rate of transfer of industrial wastewater to urban waste water treatment plants. Fluctuations of CH<sub>4</sub> emissions for period 2013–2022 can be observed due to some instability with waste water treatment, leading to different values of MCF applied.

#### 7.5.2.4 Source-specific QA/QC and verification

The quality objectives and the QA/QC plan for the Latvia's GHG inventory at the National Inventory level are presented in Section 1.2.3. The QC procedures are performed according to the QA/QC plan in the 2.G. sector in order to achieve these quality objectives. Issues related to QA/QC and verification are discussed at the sectoral meetings.

Following procedures of quality assurance and quality control were carried out:

- Statistic data on amounts wastewater produced/discharged and nitrogen load in wastewater are collected through annual state statistical survey "2-Water". In frames of this survey, enterprises, performing collection and treatment of wastewater, submit their data using online database. Reported data are checked by Latvian State Environment Service, whose environment inspectors approve reports or return them to submitters for correcting of data;
- Units of measurement were checked during comparison with results of previous reports.

All information on activity data and emission calculations are stored and archived in the common FTP folder.

#### 7.5.2.5 Source-specific recalculations

Emissions for N<sub>2</sub>O were recalculated for period 2011 - 2021, and for NMVOG for years 2008 and 2015 - 2021. All recalculations were done due to update of activity data. N<sub>2</sub>O emissions changed insignificantly for the subsector, for most impacted year (2021) it changed for -1.1%.

#### 7.5.2.6 Source-specific planned improvements

No improvements are planned for this sector.

### 7.5.3 Other (CRF 5.D.3)

#### 7.5.3.1 Category description

Data from annual state statistical survey “2-Water” shows there were total 173 mio m<sup>3</sup> of waste water discharged in Latvia (2022). Most of national population (81.3%, 2022) is served by centralized urban wastewater collecting and treatment. According to EMEP/EEA 2019, treated waste water is a source of NMVOC emissions.

#### 7.5.3.2 Methodological issues

Emissions of NMVOC was calculated using default EF from EMEP/EEA 2019 – 15 mg of NMVOC per m<sup>3</sup> of treated other wastewater discharged (11 mio m<sup>3</sup>, 2022), what gives 0.00017 kt of NMVOC (2022). It makes decrease of emissions by 75.3% compared to 1990 and decrease by 6.5% compared to 2021. Activity data, used for this calculation, are summarized in the Table 7.38.

Table 7.38 Activity data for calculation NMVOC emissions from Wastewater Handling sector

Year	Amount of treated other waste water discharged, mio m <sup>3</sup>	Emissions of NMVOC, kt
1990	45.6	0.000684
1995	27.1	0.000407
2000	15.7	0.000235
2005	14.6	0.000219
2010	19.7	0.000295
2011	12.2	0.000183
2012	9.72	0.000146
2013	12.2	0.000183
2014	15.0	0.000224
2015	12.2	0.000183
2016	7.52	0.000113
2017	30.7	0.000460
2018	24.9	0.000373
2019	19.1	0.000287
2020	10.0	0.000150
2021	12.0	0.000181
2022	11.3	0.000169
<i>Share of total NMVOC emissions in Waste sector in 2022, %</i>		0.1%
<i>2022 versus 1990</i>		-75.3%
<i>2022 versus 2021</i>		-6.5%

#### 7.5.3.3 Uncertainties and time-series consistency

Uncertainty for activity data regarding NMVOC emissions is 24%. It is calculated the same way as uncertainties for Domestic and Industrial Wastewater Handling (See Chapter 7.5.1.3 for description). EMEP/EEA 2019 does not provide uncertainty for EFs or methodology to estimate it.

Consistency of NMVOC emission time series in this subsector is good for period 1990–2009, showing gradual decrease of emissions. However, it slightly fluctuates in the years 2008 and 2017 - 2019.

#### **7.5.3.4 Source-specific QA/QC and verification**

The quality objectives and the QA/QC plan for the Latvia's GHG inventory at the National Inventory level are presented in Section 1.2.3. The QC procedures are performed according to the QA/QC plan in the 2.G. sector in order to achieve these quality objectives. Issues related to QA/QC and verification are discussed at the sectoral meetings.

Statistic data of amount of waste water produced and discharged are collected through annual state statistical survey "2-Water". In frames of this survey, enterprises, performing collection and treatment of wastewater, submit their data using online database. Reported data are checked by Latvian State Environment Service, whose environment inspectors approve reports or return them to submitters for correcting of data. Units of measurement were checked during comparison with results of previous reports.

All information on activity data and emission calculations are stored and archived in the common FTP folder.

#### **7.5.3.5 Source-specific recalculations**

Emissions were recalculated for period 2000–2021 due to update of activity data.

#### **7.5.3.6 Source-specific planned improvements**

No improvements are planned for this sector.



## **8 OTHER (CRF 6)**

Latvia does not report emissions under CRF 6 Other.

## 9 INDIRECT CO<sub>2</sub> AND NITROUS OXIDE EMISSIONS

### 9.1 CATEGORY DESCRIPTION

In accordance with UNFCCC reporting guidelines Annex I Parties may report indirect CO<sub>2</sub> from the atmospheric oxidation of CH<sub>4</sub>, CO and NMVOCs.

Sources of indirect CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in Latvian inventory are indirect CO<sub>2</sub> from the atmospheric oxidation of CH<sub>4</sub> and NMVOCs under Energy and IPPU sectors.

The estimation of indirect CO<sub>2</sub> emissions is based on the official Latvian inventories reported under the UNECE CLRTAP.

#### 9.1.1 Methodological issues

Indirect CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are generally calculated using the methodology described in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.

The indirect CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from NMVOCs in solvent use, road paving with asphalt, asphalt roofing and glass fibre production are reported under CRF 2.D.3 Other in accordance with UNFCCC reporting guidelines. Other sources of indirect CO<sub>2</sub> emissions occurring in Energy and Transport sectors are calculated and reported in CRF Table 6.

According to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, there are sources in Energy sector that produce indirect CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from CH<sub>4</sub> and NMVOCs. Those sources in case of Latvia are NMVOC emissions from gasoline evaporation in road traffic cars (Transport sector) as well as CH<sub>4</sub> and NMVOC emissions from natural gas leakages and NMVOC emissions from gasoline distribution (Energy sector). The general equations to calculate indirect CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are provided below:

$$\text{from CH}_4: \text{inputs}_{\text{CO}_2} = \text{emissions}_{\text{CH}_4} * 44/16$$

$$\text{from NMVOC: inputs}_{\text{CO}_2} = \text{emissions}_{\text{NMVOC}} * C * 44/12 \quad (9.1)$$

where:

*c* – fraction of carbon

The 2006 IPCC Guidelines provide a default factor – 0.6 – for the fraction of carbon in NMVOC. Separate sources and emissions are presented in Table 9.1.

Table 9.1 Indirect CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from Energy (kt)

Year	Indirect CO <sub>2</sub> from gas leakage (NMVOC)	Indirect CO <sub>2</sub> from gas leakage (CH <sub>4</sub> )	Indirect CO <sub>2</sub> from gasoline distribution (NMVOC)	Indirect CO <sub>2</sub> from gasoline evaporation (NMVOC)	Total Indirect CO <sub>2</sub> emissions
1990	6.52	27.23	2.95	4.29	41.00
1991	6.28	26.23	2.49	3.89	38.90
1992	5.73	23.92	2.39	3.99	36.02
1993	5.48	22.87	2.31	3.41	34.08
1994	5.35	22.35	2.21	3.57	33.49
1995	5.21	21.77	1.99	3.51	32.49
1996	5.02	20.97	1.97	3.26	31.22
1997	4.69	19.58	1.81	3.21	29.29
1998	4.50	18.78	1.69	2.79	27.77
1999	4.29	17.91	1.64	3.24	27.07
2000	3.97	16.57	1.63	2.99	25.16

Year	Indirect CO <sub>2</sub> from gas leakage (NMVOC)	Indirect CO <sub>2</sub> from gas leakage (CH <sub>4</sub> )	Indirect CO <sub>2</sub> from gasoline distribution (NMVOC)	Indirect CO <sub>2</sub> from gasoline evaporation (NMVOC)	Total Indirect CO <sub>2</sub> emissions
2001	3.87	16.07	1.71	2.92	24.57
2002	4.02	16.78	1.68	2.90	25.38
2003	3.14	13.10	1.67	2.29	20.20
2004	3.11	12.97	1.69	1.99	19.75
2005	3.51	14.65	1.66	1.78	21.60
2006	2.52	10.51	1.84	1.98	16.85
2007	4.16	10.79	2.01	1.61	18.56
2008	3.82	11.08	1.84	1.37	18.10
2009	3.98	10.46	1.53	1.13	17.11
2010	3.90	10.08	1.39	1.07	16.44
2011	1.89	6.93	1.31	0.93	11.07
2012	2.16	8.76	1.12	0.71	12.73
2013	2.83	11.11	1.02	0.63	15.59
2014	4.24	14.88	0.99	0.54	20.66
2015	4.39	11.31	0.98	0.45	17.13
2016	3.66	12.82	0.96	0.40	17.84
2017	1.17	16.80	0.92	0.33	19.21
2018	0.62	10.00	0.28	0.37	11.27
2019	0.80	10.76	0.27	0.34	12.16
2020	0.98	11.01	0.26	0.33	12.58
2021	0.95	10.85	0.25	0.33	12.39
2022	0.56	9.67	0.22	0.33	10.77

As it can be seen in Table 9.1 the largest part of indirect CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in all years contributes to natural gas leakage. In 2022, natural gas leakages made 95.0% of total indirect CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

### 9.1.2 Category-specific QA/QC and verification

The quality objectives and the QA/QC plan for the Latvia's GHG inventory at the National Inventory level are presented in Section 1.2.3. The QC procedures are performed according to the QA/QC plan in order to achieve these quality objectives. Issues related to QA/QC and verification are discussed at the sectoral meetings.

### 9.1.3 Category-specific recalculations

In road transport recalculations have been done due to switch from COPERT 5.6.1 model version to COPERT 5.7.2 model version. In addition, the distribution of vehicles in sub-groups and vehicle km travelled by individual types of cars have been corrected.

NMVOC emissions from gasoline distribution were recalculated from 1990 till 2021 according to implementation of new EMEP/EEA 2023 guidelines and updating of NMVOC EF for distribution of gasoline.

### 9.1.4 Category-specific improvements

No improvements are planned for this sector.

## 10 RECALCULATIONS AND IMPROVEMENTS

### 10.1 EXPLANATIONS AND JUSTIFICATIONS FOR RECALCULATIONS

The changes in inventory since the previous submission to the UNFCCC were done according to:

- 2023 EU-internal review of national GHG inventory data;
- Updated activity data.

Overall impacts of recalculations since 1990 are summarized in Table 10.1.

**Table 10.1 Impacts of recalculations on national emissions**

Year		Previous submission	Latest submission	Difference	Difference
		kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.			(%)
1990	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions with LULUCF	13632.62	13630.39	-2.23	-0.02
	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions without LULUCF	26022.70	26020.48	-2.23	-0.01
1991	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions with LULUCF	11322.07	11319.82	-2.25	-0.02
	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions without LULUCF	24132.74	24130.49	-2.25	-0.01
1992	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions with LULUCF	6163.19	6160.90	-2.29	-0.04
	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions without LULUCF	19362.02	19359.74	-2.29	-0.01
1993	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions with LULUCF	2829.46	2827.28	-2.18	-0.08
	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions without LULUCF	15905.35	15903.17	-2.18	-0.01
1994	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions with LULUCF	-2017.51	-2019.64	-2.13	0.11
	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions without LULUCF	13958.30	13956.17	-2.13	-0.02
1995	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions with LULUCF	-2248.43	-2250.62	-2.19	0.10
	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions without LULUCF	12589.83	12587.64	-2.19	-0.02
1996	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions with LULUCF	-2365.19	-2367.41	-2.22	0.09
	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions without LULUCF	12639.33	12637.11	-2.22	-0.02
1997	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions with LULUCF	-1155.31	-1157.62	-2.31	0.20
	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions without LULUCF	12080.47	12078.17	-2.31	-0.02
1998	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions with LULUCF	-709.75	-711.99	-2.25	0.32
	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions without LULUCF	11576.37	11574.12	-2.25	-0.02
1999	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions with LULUCF	2181.59	2179.06	-2.53	-0.12
	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions without LULUCF	10790.40	10787.86	-2.53	-0.02
2000	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions with LULUCF	-1683.34	-1684.65	-1.31	0.08
	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions without LULUCF	10167.78	10166.47	-1.31	-0.01
2001	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions with LULUCF	-1602.21	-1591.84	10.38	-0.65
	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions without LULUCF	10760.03	10758.82	-1.21	-0.01
2002	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions with LULUCF	81.40	104.38	22.98	28.23
	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions without LULUCF	10727.99	10726.71	-1.28	-0.01
2003	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions with LULUCF	688.77	724.51	35.74	5.19
	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions without LULUCF	10921.16	10921.10	-0.05	0.00
2004	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions with LULUCF	4343.52	4390.89	47.36	1.09
	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions without LULUCF	10862.71	10862.54	-0.18	0.00
2005	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions with LULUCF	5055.86	5114.74	58.89	1.16
	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions without LULUCF	11020.37	11020.07	-0.30	0.00
2006	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions with LULUCF	4743.94	4814.77	70.83	1.49
	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions without LULUCF	11489.43	11489.42	-0.01	0.00
2007	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions with LULUCF	5616.03	5697.82	81.79	1.46
	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions without LULUCF	11935.99	11935.20	-0.79	-0.01
2008	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions with LULUCF	4769.36	4863.20	93.84	1.97
	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions without LULUCF	11475.38	11474.90	-0.48	0.00

Latvia's National Inventory Report 1990-2022

Year		Previous submission	Latest submission	Difference	Difference
		kt CO <sub>2</sub> eq.			(%)
2009	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions with LULUCF	6979.91	7094.18	114.27	1.64
	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions without LULUCF	10790.56	10790.25	-0.31	0.00
2010	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions with LULUCF	9828.95	9976.30	147.35	1.50
	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions without LULUCF	11857.88	11871.07	13.18	0.11
2011	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions with LULUCF	8637.24	8802.12	164.88	1.91
	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions without LULUCF	11066.32	11077.41	11.09	0.10
2012	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions with LULUCF	7095.56	7280.16	184.60	2.60
	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions without LULUCF	10884.33	10894.22	9.89	0.09
2013	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions with LULUCF	8299.43	8497.69	198.26	2.39
	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions without LULUCF	10800.43	10803.02	2.60	0.02
2014	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions with LULUCF	12116.74	12316.00	199.26	1.64
	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions without LULUCF	10712.58	10715.28	2.70	0.03
2015	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions with LULUCF	10903.67	11117.29	213.62	1.96
	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions without LULUCF	10744.79	10754.39	9.60	0.09
2016	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions with LULUCF	9081.94	9302.15	220.21	2.42
	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions without LULUCF	10742.11	10750.84	8.73	0.08
2017	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions with LULUCF	7666.45	7893.15	226.70	2.96
	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions without LULUCF	10776.10	10783.87	7.77	0.07
2018	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions with LULUCF	10658.02	10889.45	231.43	2.17
	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions without LULUCF	11272.33	11277.36	5.03	0.04
2019	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions with LULUCF	8838.97	9148.39	309.42	3.50
	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions without LULUCF	11131.87	11140.97	9.10	0.08
2020	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions with LULUCF	11284.64	11249.69	-34.95	-0.31
	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions without LULUCF	10483.14	10491.40	8.26	0.08
2021	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions with LULUCF	13119.74	12935.65	-184.09	-1.40
	Total CO <sub>2</sub> eq. emissions without LULUCF	10725.29	10733.99	8.70	0.08

Recalculations made for the 2024 inventory submission by CRF category and gas and their implications to the emission level in 1990 and 2021 as well as explanations for recalculations are provided: Table 10.2; Table 10.3 and Table 10.4.

Table 10.2 Recalculations made in 2024 submission (recalculated year 2021)

GHG SOURCE AND SINK CATEGORIES	Gas	Previous submission (CO <sub>2</sub> eq., kt)	Latest submission (CO <sub>2</sub> eq., kt)	Difference (CO <sub>2</sub> eq., kt)	Difference %	Impact of recalculation on total emissions excluding LULUCF %	Impact of recalculation on total emissions including LULUCF %	Explanation for recalculations
Total National Emissions and Removals	CO <sub>2</sub>	8196.79	8005.73	-191.06	-2.330889794	-1.78	-1.48	
1. Energy	CO <sub>2</sub>	6554.17	6551.84	-2.34	-0.035636193	-0.02	-0.02	
A. Fuel combustion activities	CO <sub>2</sub>	6554.16	6551.83	-2.34	-0.035636786	-0.02	-0.02	
3. Transport	CO <sub>2</sub>	3187.98	3185.64	-2.34	-0.073265725	-0.02	-0.02	<i>Recalculations have been done due to the switch from COPERT 5.6.1 model version to COPERT 5.7.2 model version. In addition, the distribution of buses in sub-groups and the number of LCV vehicle and km travelled by individual types of cars have been corrected in Road Transport. The recalculations of emissions into Civil aviation is due to the correction of jet fuel consumption.</i>
B. Fugitive Emissions from Fuels	CO <sub>2</sub>	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.323415265	0.00	0.00	<i>Recalculations were done due to slightly precised data on natural gas CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and activity data in distribution network according to minor corrections sent by JSC "Gaso".</i>
2. Industrial processes and product use	CO <sub>2</sub>	602.95	602.89	-0.07	-0.011271325	0.00	0.00	

## Latvia's National Inventory Report 1990-2022

GHG SOURCE AND SINK CATEGORIES	Gas	Previous submission (CO <sub>2</sub> eq., kt)	Latest submission (CO <sub>2</sub> eq., kt)	Difference (CO <sub>2</sub> eq., kt)	Difference %	Impact of recalculation on total emissions excluding LULUCF %	Impact of recalculation on total emissions including LULUCF %	Explanation for recalculations
D. Non-energy products from fuels and solvent use	CO <sub>2</sub>	55.25	55.18	-0.07	-0.123002702	0.00	0.00	<i>Recalculations in 2.D.1 Lubricant use are made due to precised Activity data. NMVOC emissions from Solvent use sector were recalculated taking into account that activity data for year 2021, according to the 2023 National Emissions Ceilings Directive review and following EMEP/EEA 2023 guidelines, 2.D.3.a. has been recalculated for the entire time series, as correction factor has not to be applied for calculations. Recalculations in 2.D.3. Urea use are made due to precised Activity data.</i>
4. Land use, land-use change and forestry (net)	CO <sub>2</sub>	956.29	767.64	-188.65	-19.7276622		-1.46	
A. Forestland	CO <sub>2</sub>	-1584.17	-1614.18	-30.00	1.893870417		-0.23	<i>Recalculations are made due to implementation of improved activity data (area of wildfires in forest land).</i>
C. Grassland	CO <sub>2</sub>	875.37	1282.08	406.71	46.46142352		3.14	<i>Recalculations are made due to correction of an error in sign of values when reporting carbon stock change in organic soil in wetlands converted to grassland category. In addition, improvement of methodology for calculation of CSCs in living biomass in settlements converted to grassland category was implemented based on recommendation of EU-internal inventory review.</i>

## Latvia's National Inventory Report 1990-2022

GHG SOURCE AND SINK CATEGORIES	Gas	Previous submission (CO <sub>2</sub> eq., kt)	Latest submission (CO <sub>2</sub> eq., kt)	Difference (CO <sub>2</sub> eq., kt)	Difference %	Impact of recalculation on total emissions excluding LULUCF %	Impact of recalculation on total emissions including LULUCF %	Explanation for recalculations
E. Settlements	CO <sub>2</sub>	620.13	620.11	-0.03	-0.004443918		0.00	<i>Recalculations are made due to improvement of methodology of calculation of CSCs in dead organic matter for cropland converted to settlements (implemented based on the ERT recommendation).</i>
G. Harvested wood products	CO <sub>2</sub>	-2037.97	-2603.31	-565.33	27.73996679		-4.37	<i>Recalculations are made due to implementation of improved activity data.</i>
Aviation	CO <sub>2</sub>	238.71	238.77	0.06	0.026923753	0.00	0.00	<i>Emissions have been recalculated due to adjusted jet fuel consumption</i>
Navigation	CO <sub>2</sub>	672.49	649.99	-22.50	-3.34572206	-0.21	-0.17	<i>Emissions have been recalculated due to adjusted diesel fuel consumption</i>
Indirect CO <sub>2</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub>	12.83	12.39	-0.43	-3.389485427	0.00	0.00	<i>Recalculations have been done due to the switch from COPERT 5.6.1 model version to COPERT 5.7.2 model version. In addition, the distribution of buses in sub-groups and the number of LCV vehicle and km travelled by individual types of cars have been corrected. NMVOC emissions from gasoline distribution were recalculated according to implementation of new EMEP/EEA 2023 guidelines and updating of NMVOC EF for distribution of gasoline.</i>
Total National Emissions and Removals	CH <sub>4</sub>	2757.87	2753.35	-4.53	-0.164109275	-0.04	-0.03	
1. Energy	CH <sub>4</sub>	312.94	313.55	0.61	0.194650037	0.01	0.00	



## Latvia's National Inventory Report 1990-2022

GHG SOURCE AND SINK CATEGORIES	Gas	Previous submission (CO <sub>2</sub> eq., kt)	Latest submission (CO <sub>2</sub> eq., kt)	Difference (CO <sub>2</sub> eq., kt)	Difference %	Impact of recalculation on total emissions excluding LULUCF %	Impact of recalculation on total emissions including LULUCF %	Explanation for recalculations
A. Fuel combustion activities	CH <sub>4</sub>	202.82	203.03	0.22	0.107502733	0.00	0.00	
3. Transport	CH <sub>4</sub>	3.54	3.75	0.22	6.16777147	0.00	0.00	<i>Recalculations have been done due to the switch from COPERT 5.6.1 model version to COPERT 5.7.2 model version. In addition, the distribution of buses in sub-groups and the number of LCV vehicle and km travelled by individual types of cars have been corrected in Road Transport. The recalculations of emissions into Civil aviation is due to the correction of jet fuel consumption.</i>
B. Fugitive Emissions from Fuels	CH <sub>4</sub>	110.12	110.51	0.39	0.355149193	0.00	0.00	<i>Recalculations were done due to slightly precised data on natural gas CH<sub>4</sub> emissions and activity data in distribution network according to minor corrections sent by JSC "Gasol".</i>
4. Land use, land-use change and forestry (net)	CH <sub>4</sub>	868.30	864.72	-3.59	-0.412968199		-0.03	
A. Forestland	CH <sub>4</sub>	375.60	372.29	-3.31	-0.880205161		-0.03	<i>Recalculations are made due to implementation of improved activity data (area of wildfires in forest land).</i>
C. Grassland	CH <sub>4</sub>	259.55	259.27	-0.28	-0.107794507		0.00	<i>Recalculations are made due to implementation of improved activity data (area of wildfires in grassland).</i>

## Latvia's National Inventory Report 1990-2022

GHG SOURCE AND SINK CATEGORIES	Gas	Previous submission (CO <sub>2</sub> eq., kt)	Latest submission (CO <sub>2</sub> eq., kt)	Difference (CO <sub>2</sub> eq., kt)	Difference %	Impact of recalculation on total emissions excluding LULUCF %	Impact of recalculation on total emissions including LULUCF %	Explanation for recalculations
5. Waste	CH <sub>4</sub>	516.85	515.30	-1.55	-0.299747046	-0.01	-0.01	
A. Solid waste disposal	CH <sub>4</sub>	372.76	373.38	0.62	0.165970966	0.01	0.00	<i>Recalculations are done according to new information about CH<sub>4</sub> recovery since 2018. Distribution of CH<sub>4</sub> recovery between managed and unmanaged sites are changed.</i>
D. Waste water treatment and discharge	CH <sub>4</sub>	96.27	94.10	-2.17	-2.251941831	-0.02	-0.02	<i>Recalculations due to update of activity data.</i>
Aviation	CH <sub>4</sub>	0.07	0.06	-0.018928052	-25.32031858	0.00	0.00	<i>Emissions have been recalculated due to adjusted jet fuel consumption.</i>
Navigation	CH <sub>4</sub>	1.02	0.98	-0.033712	-3.311057944	0.00	0.00	<i>Emissions have been recalculated due to adjusted diesel fuel consumption.</i>
Total National Emissions and Removals	N <sub>2</sub> O	1902.64	1905.67	3.03	0.159337941	0.03	0.02	
1. Energy	N <sub>2</sub> O	171.48	171.40	-0.07	-0.043124956	0.00	0.00	
A. Fuel combustion activities	N <sub>2</sub> O	171.48	171.40	-0.07	-0.043124956	0.00	0.00	
3. Transport	N <sub>2</sub> O	36.39	36.32	-0.07	-0.203196239	0.00	0.00	<i>Recalculations have been done due to the switch from COPERT 5.6.1 model version to COPERT 5.7.2 model version. In addition, the distribution of buses in sub-groups and the number of LCV vehicle and km travelled by individual types of cars have been corrected in</i>

## Latvia's National Inventory Report 1990-2022

GHG SOURCE AND SINK CATEGORIES	Gas	Previous submission (CO <sub>2</sub> eq., kt)	Latest submission (CO <sub>2</sub> eq., kt)	Difference (CO <sub>2</sub> eq., kt)	Difference %	Impact of recalculation on total emissions excluding LULUCF %	Impact of recalculation on total emissions including LULUCF %	Explanation for recalculations
								<i>Road Transport. The recalculations of emissions into Civil aviation is due to the correction of jet fuel consumption.</i>
4. Land use, land-use change and forestry (net)	N <sub>2</sub> O	569.85	569.30	-0.55	-0.096401028		0.00	
A. Forestland	N <sub>2</sub> O	444.23	443.92	-0.31	-0.069258068		0.00	<i>Recalculations are made due to implementation of improved activity data (area of wildfires in forest land).</i>
C. Grassland	N <sub>2</sub> O	0.33	0.09	-0.24	-73.48912168		0.00	<i>Recalculations are made due to implementation of improved activity data (area of wildfires in grassland).</i>
5. Waste	N <sub>2</sub> O	48.11	51.77	3.65	7.596825208	0.03	0.03	
D. Waste water treatment and discharge	N <sub>2</sub> O	29.18	32.83	3.65	12.53	0.03	0.03	<i>Recalculations due to update of activity data.</i>
Aviation	N <sub>2</sub> O	2.06	1.97	-0.09	-4.416141466	0.00	0.00	<i>Emissions have been recalculated due to adjusted jet fuel consumption.</i>
Navigation	N <sub>2</sub> O	68.14	65.75	-2.39	-3.511732999	-0.02	-0.02	<i>Emissions have been recalculated due to adjusted diesel fuel consumption.</i>

Table 10.3 Recalculations made in 2024 submission (recalculated year 1990)

GHG SOURCE AND SINK CATEGORIES	Gas	Previous submission (CO <sub>2</sub> eq., kt)	Latest submission (CO <sub>2</sub> eq., kt)	Difference (CO <sub>2</sub> eq., kt)	Difference %	Impact of recalculation on total emissions excluding LULUCF %	Impact of recalculation on total emissions including LULUCF %	Explanation for recalculations
Total National Emissions and Removals	CO <sub>2</sub>	6263.77	6262.65	-1.12	-0.017878413	0.00	-0.01	
1. Energy	CO <sub>2</sub>	18645.27	18645.17	-0.10	-0.000555427	0.00	0.00	
A. Fuel combustion activities	CO <sub>2</sub>	18645.26	18645.15	-0.10	-0.000555427	0.00	0.00	
3. Transport	CO <sub>2</sub>	2940.31	2940.21	-0.10	-0.003522101	0.00	0.00	<i>Recalculations have been done due to the switch from COPERT 5.6.1 model version to COPERT 5.7.2 model version. In addition, the distribution of buses in sub-groups and the number of LCV vehicle and km travelled by individual types of cars have been corrected in Road Transport.</i>
2. Industrial processes and product use	CO <sub>2</sub>	652.04	651.02	-1.02	-0.16	0.00	-0.01	
D. Non-energy products from fuels and solvent use	CO <sub>2</sub>	45.24	44.23	-1.02	-2.24	0.00	-0.01	<i>Recalculations in 2.D.1 Lubricant use are made due to precised Activity data. The application of a correction factor in the calculations is unnecessary, and the recalculation has been conducted without applying the correction factor.</i>
4. Land use, land-use change and forestry (net)	CO <sub>2</sub>	-13398.95	-13398.95	0.00	9.51604E-06		0.00	
E. Settlements	CO <sub>2</sub>	25.15	25.15	0.00	-0.005070396		0.00	<i>Recalculations are made due to improvement of methodology of calculation of CSCs in dead organic matter for cropland converted to</i>

## Latvia's National Inventory Report 1990-2022

GHG SOURCE AND SINK CATEGORIES	Gas	Previous submission (CO <sub>2</sub> eq., kt)	Latest submission (CO <sub>2</sub> eq., kt)	Difference (CO <sub>2</sub> eq., kt)	Difference %	Impact of recalculation on total emissions excluding LULUCF %	Impact of recalculation on total emissions including LULUCF %	Explanation for recalculations
								<i>settlements (implemented based on the ERT recommendation).</i>
Indirect CO <sub>2</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub>	40.41	41.00	0.59	1.450497428	0.00	0.00	<i>Recalculations have been done due to the switch from COPERT 5.6.1 model version to COPERT 5.7.2 model version. In addition, the distribution of buses in sub-groups and the number of LCV vehicle and km travelled by individual types of cars have been corrected. NMVOC emissions from gasoline distribution were recalculated according to implementation of new EMEP/EEA 2023 guidelines and updating of NMVOC EF for distribution of gasoline.</i>
Total National Emissions and Removals	CH <sub>4</sub>	4584.50	4583.85	-0.65	-0.014174967	0.00	0.00	
1. Energy	CH <sub>4</sub>	613.57	612.92	-0.65	-0.105912644	0.00	0.00	
A. Fuel combustion activities	CH <sub>4</sub>	336.28	335.63	-0.65	-0.193246608	0.00	0.00	
3. Transport	CH <sub>4</sub>	24.55	23.90	-0.65	-2.647262825	0.00	0.00	<i>Recalculations have been done due to the switch from COPERT 5.6.1 model version to COPERT 5.7.2 model version. In addition, the distribution of buses in sub-groups and the number of LCV vehicle and km travelled by individual types of cars have been corrected in Road Transport.</i>

GHG SOURCE AND SINK CATEGORIES	Gas	Previous submission (CO <sub>2</sub> eq., kt)	Latest submission (CO <sub>2</sub> eq., kt)	Difference (CO <sub>2</sub> eq., kt)	Difference %	Impact of recalculation on total emissions excluding LULUCF %	Impact of recalculation on total emissions including LULUCF %	Explanation for recalculations
Total National Emissions and Removals	N <sub>2</sub> O	2784.34	2783.89	-0.46	-0.016398334	0.00	0.00	
1. Energy	N <sub>2</sub> O	271.94	271.48	-0.46	-0.167900921	0.00	0.00	
A. Fuel combustion activities	N <sub>2</sub> O	271.94	271.48	-0.46	-0.167900921	0.00	0.00	
3. Transport	N <sub>2</sub> O	73.53	73.08	-0.46	-0.620919631	0.00	0.00	<i>Recalculations have been done due to the switch from COPERT 5.6.1 model version to COPERT 5.7.2 model version. In addition, the distribution of buses in sub-groups and the number of LCV vehicle and km travelled by individual types of cars have been corrected in Road Transport.</i>

Table 10.4 Recalculations made in 2024 submission (F-gases) (recalculated year 2021)

GHG SOURCE AND SINK CATEGORIES	Gas	Previous submission (CO <sub>2</sub> eq., kt)	Latest submission (CO <sub>2</sub> eq., kt)	Difference (CO <sub>2</sub> eq., kt)	Difference %	Impact of recalculation on total emissions excluding LULUCF %	Impact of recalculation on total emissions including LULUCF %	Explanation for recalculations
F-gases: Total actual Emissions	HFCs	250.34	258.80	8.46	338.01%	0.08	0.06	

Latvia's National Inventory Report 1990-2022

GHG SOURCE AND SINK CATEGORIES	Gas	Previous submission (CO <sub>2</sub> eq., kt)	Latest submission (CO <sub>2</sub> eq., kt)	Difference (CO <sub>2</sub> eq., kt)	Difference %	Impact of recalculation on total emissions excluding LULUCF %	Impact of recalculation on total emissions including LULUCF %	Explanation for recalculations
2.F.1. Refrigeration and air conditioning	HFCs	243.65836	251.9889	8.330539	3.418942	0.08	0.06	<i>For 2.F.1.e Mobile Air Conditioning recalculations were done due to updated average share of vehicles equipped with MAC systems. Recalculations were done also due to updated percentage of residual charge of HFC in equipment being disposed and recovery efficiency at disposal</i>
2.F.2. Foam blowing agents	HFCs	0.29	0.42	0.13	4496.38%	0.00	0.00	<i>Recalculations were done due to precised Activity data</i>

## 10.2 IMPLICATION FOR EMISSION LEVELS

See section 10.1.

## 10.3 IMPLICATIONS FOR EMISSION TRENDS, INCLUDING TIME SERIES' CONSISTENCY

See section 10.1.

## 10.4 RECALCULATIONS, INCLUDING IN RESPONSE TO THE REVIEW PROCESS, AND PLANNED IMPROVEMENTS TO THE INVENTORY

The development of the GHG inventory aims to improve the calculation and reporting of the inventory. The improvement plan is discussed and approved by all experts and organizations involved in GHG inventory preparation process.

Table 10.5 shows the sector specific improvements planned for the forthcoming GHG inventories. More detailed information about planned improvements are described under sectoral chapters.

Table 10.5 Sector specific planned improvements for Latvia's national GHG inventory

CRF category	Planned improvement	Tentative submission
LULUCF 4.A Forest land	<i>Implementation of improved quantitative results of Yasso20 model in calculation of CSCs in soil, dead wood and litter.</i>	2024-2025
LULUCF 4.A.2 Land converted to forest land	<i>Improvement of methodology for estimating CSC in living biomass, deadwood and litter for cropland converted to forest land, wetlands converted to forest land and settlements converted to forest land as well as in mineral soils (cropland converted to forest land and settlements converted to forest land) and organic soils (wetlands converted to forest land), and report the estimates in the annual submission.</i>	2024-2025
LULUCF 4.B Cropland	<i>Implementation of improved quantitative results of Yasso20 modelling to characterize carbon stock changes in mineral soils (added value - biomass expansion factors for typical farm crops and management systems).</i>	2024-2025
LULUCF 4.B Cropland	<i>Elaboration of climate, moisture regime and soil fertility driven modelling solution and activity data for organic soil in cropland based on LIFE OrgBalt project results.</i>	From 2025
LULUCF 4.C Grassland	<i>Implementation of improved quantitative results of Yasso20 modelling to characterize carbon stock changes in mineral soils (added value – biomass expansion factors and carbon input data for typical management systems).</i>	2024-2025
LULUCF 4.C Grassland	<i>Elaboration of model based estimates of GHG emissions and activity data for organic soil in grassland based on LIFE OrgBalt project results.</i>	From 2025
LULUCF 4.D Wetlands	<i>Implementation of emissions factors for N<sub>2</sub>O, CH<sub>4</sub> and CO<sub>2</sub> for rewetted areas, peatland managed as berry plantations as well as for wetlands converted to cropland, grassland, forest land after peat extraction.</i>	Fully implemented in 2025

In Table 10.6 is summarised Latvia's responses on recommendations of UNFCCC Report on the individual review of the annual submission of Latvia submitted in 2022 and in Table 10.7 responses to the EU-internal review of 2023 submission.



Table 10.6 Responses to the centralized UNFCCC review process

CRT category / issue	Review Recommendation	Review Report/ Paragraph	LV response / status of implementation	Chapter/section in the NIR
National system	Where necessary, strengthen its institutional, legal and procedural national system arrangements for organizations other than the Latvian inventory agency that are required to collect data and estimate emissions, such as cement companies and natural gas transmission, storage and distribution enterprises, with the aim of collecting sufficient additional information to ensure the quality of the GHG inventory, as indicated in decision 19/CMP.1, annex, paragraph 7, in conjunction with decisions 3/CMP.11 and 4/CMP.11, and include in the NIR information on the steps taken to strengthen these arrangements, as well as information required by paragraph 50(a) of the UNFCCC Annex I inventory reporting guidelines on the country-specific methods used, as necessary.	G.3	Regarding 2A1 Cement company provides all necessary data to calculate emissions for GHG inventory through national regulations and EU ETS data, including clinker production data. Regarding 1.B.2.b natural gas - The methodology used for emission calculations by natural gas companies is available in Annex A.3.6 Fugitive emissions.	Chapter 3.3.2.4 and 4.2.2
Fuel combustion – reference approach – gaseous fuels – CO <sub>2</sub>	Conduct an investigation, in cooperation with the gas companies and CSB (as the institution responsible for the energy balance), in order to (1) clarify and document the scope of losses in the natural gas system of Latvia, (2) harmonize reporting of gas leakages reported in the GHG inventory and the energy balance losses, and (3) understand and accurately clarify the reasons for the differences in the reported natural gas consumption between the sectoral and reference approaches, make any recalculation found necessary, and document in the NIR of the next annual submission all the relevant findings of this investigation.	E.1	Difference between SA and RA approach for natural gas supplemented with additional information.	Chapter 3.2.1.1 Explanation of the difference
1.A.1 Energy industries – biomass – CO <sub>2</sub>	Provide information on the difference in the CO <sub>2</sub> EF for landfill gas and sludge gas between the IPCC default value and the value used by Latvia, or use the default CO <sub>2</sub> EF for these gases.	E.5	Since 2021 submission default CO <sub>2</sub> EF is used to calculate emissions from landfill gas and sludge gas.	Chapter 3.2.4.2 Methodological issues

CRT category / issue	Review Recommendation	Review Report/ Paragraph	LV response / status of implementation	Chapter/section in the NIR
1.A.3.e.i Pipeline transport – all fuels – CO <sub>2</sub> , CH <sub>4</sub> and N <sub>2</sub> O	Report CO <sub>2</sub> , CH <sub>4</sub> and N <sub>2</sub> O emissions for subcategory 1.A.3.e.i pipeline transport for liquid, solid and other fossil fuels and biomass using the notation key “NO” instead of “IE” for the entire time series, providing relevant explanations in the NIR, and report CO <sub>2</sub> , CH <sub>4</sub> and N <sub>2</sub> O emissions from gaseous fuels (natural gas) under this subcategory in CRF table 1.A(a) (sheet 3) for the entire time series, providing relevant documentation on the method, AD and EFs used in the estimates in the NIR.	E.7	Notation key "NO" is used for all fuels in CRF 1.A.3.e.i Pipeline transport and in the NIR Table 3.7 Reported emissions from fuel combustion in Latvia in 2021 additional information is provided.	Chapter 3.2 FUEL COMBUSTION (CRF 1.A)
1.B.2.b Natural gas – gaseous fuels – CH <sub>4</sub>	Aggregate detailed individual data and present them in the NIR so as to highlight the information that is important for the transparency of the inventory without disclosing individual data that would compromise confidentiality.	E.8	Methodology used for emission calculations by natural gas companies is reported in Annex A.3.6. Table 3.57 data has not changed because it represents amount of natural gas leaked as reported by natural gas companies.	Chapter 3.3.2.2 and Annex A.3.6.
1.B.2.b Natural gas – gaseous fuels – CH <sub>4</sub>	Describe methods and data used in the NIR, including more detailed background information, such as on the length of the pipeline and the materials used for the distribution network, on the pressure conditions of the different parts of the network, on flow rates and on annual reconstruction rates to explain the improvements made to the network.	E.9	Information on pipeline lengths, materials used, pressure and composition is available in NIR Chapter 3.3.2.1. Methodology used by natural gas companies is reported in Annex A.3.6. as mentioned in NIR Chapter 3.3.2.2 Methodological issues.	Chapter 3.3.2.2
1.B.2.b Natural gas – gaseous fuels – CH <sub>4</sub>	Provide in the NIR a time series of CH <sub>4</sub> and CO <sub>2</sub> emission estimates for subcategories 1.B.2.b.4 transmission and storage, 1.B.2.b.5 distribution and 1.B.2.c.ii gas (venting) using the tier 1 method and default EFs presented in tables 4.2.4–4.2.5, as appropriate, from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (vol. 2, chap. 4, p.4.41 and p.4.49 or p.4.57, respectively) and provide information in the NIR on the comparison of these estimates with the tier 3 estimates, including explanations of any differences, as a verification of the reported estimates in accordance with paragraph 41 of the UNFCCC Annex I inventory reporting guidelines.	E.11	Comparison of Tier 3 and Tier 1 estimates is already done. Tier 1 methodology from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines uses default emission factors and total natural gas consumption in the country every year and does not take in consideration changes and upgrades in the system. Calculations are available to ERT after request.	Chapter 3.3.2.4

CRT category / issue	Review Recommendation	Review Report/ Paragraph	LV response / status of implementation	Chapter/section in the NIR
1.B.2.b Natural gas – gaseous fuels– CO <sub>2</sub> and CH <sub>4</sub>	Provide in the NIR a clear description of the methodology and AD used by the gas companies for estimating fugitive CO <sub>2</sub> and CH <sub>4</sub> emissions for subcategory 1.B.2.b.6 other, including information on the coverage of emission sources under the subcategory, and clearly explain in the NIR the reported trend in emissions across the time series.	E.12	Under subcategory 1.B.2.b.6 Other fugitive CO <sub>2</sub> and CH <sub>4</sub> emissions from residential and commercial sectors are reported. Data is received annually by natural gas companies.	Chapter 3.3.2.1
2.A.2 Lime production – CO <sub>2</sub>	Update the text in the NIR to reflect the revised EF calculation and AD for CO <sub>2</sub> emissions from lime production.	I.2	Activity data used for the calculation of emissions associated with quicklime production is specified.	Chapter 4.2.3., Table 4.9
2.F.1 Refrigeration and air conditioning – HFCs	Provide an estimation of HFC emissions related to the management of refrigerant containers.	I.3	In the NIR is provided raw estimates for 2018 with example to make that determination of significance.	Chapter 4.7.1, Table 4.47
2.F.1 Refrigeration and air conditioning – HFCs	Include in the NIR detailed information on the methodology, assumptions, AD and EFs used for estimating HFC emissions from disposal of equipment for subcategories 2.F.1.a commercial refrigeration, 2.F.1.c industrial refrigeration and 2.F.1.f stationary air conditioning, clearly explaining the use of notation keys for relevant years of the time series where numerical values are not reported, and continue reporting HFC emissions from disposal of equipment for relevant subcategories under category 2.F.1 refrigeration and air conditioning in future annual submissions.	I.4	All of the detailed information about the sources of activity data for 2.F.1.a Commercial refrigeration is included in the NIR.	Chapter 4.7.1 Commercial Refrigeration (CRF 2.F.1.a)
2.F.1 Refrigeration and air conditioning – HFCs	The ERT recommends that the Party report detailed information on how AD for subcategory 2.F.1.d transport refrigeration were obtained for each year of the period 2004–2020.	I.5	All of the detailed information about the sources of activity data for 2.F.1.d Transport refrigeration is included in the NIR.	Chapter 4.7.1 Transport refrigeration (CRF 2.F.1.d)
3.A.1 Cattle – CH <sub>4</sub>	Include in the NIR or in an annex to the NIR, information on its calculation of GE values for the whole time series for the animal subgroups considered under other mature cattle, including changes in animal weight and population, and, if possible, for all subcategories of cattle.	A.1	Information is added in NIR Chapter 5.2.2.2.	Chapter 5.2.2.2.

CRT category / issue	Review Recommendation	Review Report/ Paragraph	LV response / status of implementation	Chapter/section in the NIR
3.B Manure management – CH <sub>4</sub>	Report in the NIR information on the nature of the biogas plants operating in the country, including documentation explaining that the residence time of the manure is short (daily emptying) and further document, as part of the next annual submission, the assumed leakage value from biogas plants using references that are available to be reviewed.	A.2	New references are added to the NIR Chapter 5.3.2.1. References including the list of biogas plants. Documentation of manure emptying is available only in scientific research unpublished materials and project report in Latvian. 3 references are added with explanation of leakage value.	Chapter 5.3.2.1
3.B Manure management – CH <sub>4</sub> and N <sub>2</sub> O	(a) Expand the information provided in the NIR on how it derives the MMS distribution used in the calculations for the complete time series, including by specifying the changes made compared with the MMS distribution provided in the technical paper by Priekulis and Aboltins (2015), considering that the same MMS distribution values for 2013 have been reported since the 2016 annual submission and that these values differ from those in the cited paper. (b) Provide information in the NIR on grazing days, including references for the values used, for each animal category or subcategory, as appropriate.	A.3	New Annex is added.	Annex A.3.6
3.B.3 Swine – CH <sub>4</sub>	Provide in the NIR references to the additional publications mentioned during the review (e.g. Frolova et al., 2019; Kaasik et al., 2002) and include the explanation provided to the ERT of how it sought to establish the most accurate values of DE under Latvian conditions used in the calculations	A.5	All DE for swine are with IPCC suggested ranges. Explanation is provided in the NIR Chapter 5.3.2.1. Additional reference is included: Pētījuma „Lauksaimniecības sektora SEG emisiju aprēķina metodoloģijas un datu analīzes ar modelēšanas rīku izstrāde, integrējot klimata pārmaiņas” Līguma Nr.2014/94. Pētījuma 5.posma pārskats un gala pārskats. Available: <a href="https://cupdf.com/document/petijuma-5posma-parskats-un-gala-pa-1-slaucamo-govju-skaits-centralas.html">https://cupdf.com/document/petijuma-5posma-parskats-un-gala-pa-1-slaucamo-govju-skaits-centralas.html</a>	Chapter 5.3.2.1
3.D.a.4 Crop residues – N <sub>2</sub> O	Explain in the NIR which values used for estimating N <sub>2</sub> O emissions from crop residues are country-specific and which are default values, and provide more information on the	A.6	Information is added in the NIR Table 5.33 and Chapter 5.4.2	Chapter 5.4.2, Table 5.33

CRT category / issue	Review Recommendation	Review Report/ Paragraph	LV response / status of implementation	Chapter/section in the NIR
	referenced 2018 national study by Kārklīš and Līpenīte, specifically on the country-specific value of 1.00 for RAG.			
4. General (LULUCF) – CO <sub>2</sub>	Implement the model in a consistent manner for the mineral soils pool for the forest land, cropland and grassland categories, paying particular attention to the balanced estimation of CSC during conversion.	L.2	We are avoiding reporting of CO <sub>2</sub> removals in mineral soil in areas converted from cropland to forest land to avoid overestimation of the removals, since we don't have scientific substantiation of CO <sub>2</sub> removals in mineral soils in afforested areas. Considering that afforested area (mainly croplands abandoned after 1990) is about 10% of the forest area in 1990, the effect of an overestimation of CO <sub>2</sub> removals in soil would significantly affect the GHG balance. Soil monitoring program for cropland and grassland is started in 2021 and will provide comprehensive information for verification of the soil carbon stock modelling; therefore, the improvements are on the way and gradual implementation will avoid unreasoned optimism in the assessment of GHG balance. NA should be interpreted as not significant CSC – no emission are excluded from the reporting and reporting approach can be considered conservative.	Chapter 6
4.A.2 Land converted to forest land – CO <sub>2</sub>	Continue the methodological work for estimating CSC in living biomass, deadwood and litter for cropland converted to forest land, wetlands converted to forest land and settlements converted to forest land as well as in mineral soils (cropland converted to forest land and settlements converted to forest land) and organic soils (wetlands converted to forest land), and report the estimates in the annual submission.	L.5	Previously reported NE (that led to the recommendation) in categories mentioned in the recommendation are replaced with either estimation results or NK NA; additional issues with improvements implemented are not identified in this review. Reported NA should not be interpreted as category is not reported. NA shows that emissions/removals are evaluated and found to be insignificant. In our cases CSC in land converted to forest land are reported as NA to avoid overestimation of C removals, hence no	Chapter 6.4.2.2

CRT category / issue	Review Recommendation	Review Report/ Paragraph	LV response / status of implementation	Chapter/section in the NIR
			emissions are excluded from reporting and approach can be considered as conservative reporting.	
4.B.2.2 Grassland converted to cropland – CO <sub>2</sub>	Use the country-specific factors for the GHG inventory to estimate CSC in the living biomass pool for this category as soon as they are available and provide detailed information on this in the NIR.	L.7	Biomass expansion factors and the yield data for the main farm crops and grasslands are under development within the scope of the project "Evaluation of factors affecting greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction potential in cropland and grassland with organic soils" (No. 1.1.1.1/21/A/031, <a href="https://www.silava.lv/en/research/projects-archive/evaluation-of-factors-affecting-greenhouse-gas-ghg-emissions-reduction-potential-in-cropland-and-grassland-with-organic-soils">https://www.silava.lv/en/research/projects-archive/evaluation-of-factors-affecting-greenhouse-gas-ghg-emissions-reduction-potential-in-cropland-and-grassland-with-organic-soils</a> ) and other studies, e.g. E2SOILAGRI ( <a href="https://mail.silava.lv/petnieciba/aktivie-petijumi/E2SOILAGRI">https://mail.silava.lv/petnieciba/aktivie-petijumi/E2SOILAGRI</a> ) and LIFE OrgBalt ( <a href="https://www.orgbalt.eu/?page_id=1719&amp;lang=lv">https://www.orgbalt.eu/?page_id=1719&amp;lang=lv</a> ).	Chapter 6.5.2.2
4.C.2 Land converted to grassland – CO <sub>2</sub>	Continue the methodological work for estimating CSC in living biomass, deadwood and litter for forest land converted to grassland, wetlands converted to grassland and settlements converted to grassland as well as in mineral soils (forest land converted to grassland and settlements converted to grassland) and organic soils (wetlands converted to grassland), and report the estimates in the annual submission.	L.8	The methodological development is continuing by implementation the most recent research results. Previously reported NEs (pointed out in the recommendation) are replaced with either estimated carbon stock changes or notation keys IE (if estimation is included in yassso modeling), NO (if there is no carbon stock changes occurring due to no land use conversion), NA (if land land conversion not associated with soil C stock changes occurs), NE (if T1 is not provided by IPCC guidelines). Settlements has complex land use structure – from asphalted roads to organics rich greening areas; therefore, use of tier 1 based estimation of soil carbon stock changes due to conversion of settlements to grasslands may lead to significant overestimation of CO <sub>2</sub> removals in soil,	Chapter 6.6.2.2

CRT category / issue	Review Recommendation	Review Report/ Paragraph	LV response / status of implementation	Chapter/section in the NIR
			while conversion of grassland to settlements is usually associated with soil carbon losses, which is accounted in the GHG inventory. We are applying conservative approach in the carbon stock change calculations to avoid overestimation of CO <sub>2</sub> removals in soil.	
4.E.2 Land converted to settlements – CO <sub>2</sub>	Continue the methodological work for estimating CSC in living biomass and dead organic matter for cropland converted to settlements and grassland converted to settlements and report the estimates in the annual submission.	L.9	Dead organic matter (DOM) in cropland and grassland in the National forest inventory (NFI) is reported in areas covered by trees, but not corresponding to criteria of forest lands. In case of land use change to settlements, DOM is reported using instant oxidation method; however, up to now no such areas are converted to settlements and no carbon losses in DOM are reported.	Chapter 6.8.2.2
5.A Solid waste disposal on land – CH <sub>4</sub>	Correct the reporting errors related to the methane correction factor values in CRF table 5.A for 1990–2001, 2011 and 2012, use an appropriate notation key for 2013 onward, document and justify in the NIR the methane correction factors used since 1990 and enhance its QC procedures to ensure consistency of information reported in the NIR and the CRF tables.	W.2	Correct MCF are reported in CRF 5.A.2. QC procedures to ensure consistency of information reported in the NIR and the CRF tables were implemented.	-
5.A Solid waste disposal on land – CH <sub>4</sub>	Obtain detailed information (e.g. through consultations with landfill operators) on how CH <sub>4</sub> recovery data are measured or calculated, and reported by landfill operators under national legislation, and document in the NIR how CH <sub>4</sub> recovery data are verified and applied to the estimates in the national inventory, in accordance with the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (vol. 5, chap. 3, pp.3.18–3.19), specifying all underlying assumptions used in the estimates and the choice of uncertainty values applied.	W.4	Recommendation is implemented. CH <sub>4</sub> recovery is estimated based on the monitoring of produced amount of electricity from the gas and landfill gas content measurements. Monitoring is done by landfill operators	-

CRT category / issue	Review Recommendation	Review Report/ Paragraph	LV response / status of implementation	Chapter/section in the NIR
5.A.2 Unmanaged waste disposal sites – CH <sub>4</sub>	Correct the description in its NIR of the default oxidation factor of 0.09 (removing “default”) and provide information on how the oxidation factor of 0.09 is calculated using assumptions and relevant information, including the national research.	W.6	Description is improved in NIR Chapter 7.2.2 and the word "default" is removed.	Chapter 7.2.2
5.C.1 Waste incineration – CH <sub>4</sub>	Estimate the CH <sub>4</sub> emissions using the CH <sub>4</sub> EF for fuel combustion in accordance with the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.	W.7	Explanation is provided in NIR Chapter 7.4.1.2	Chapter 7.4.1.2
5.A Solid waste disposal on land – CH <sub>4</sub>	The ERT recommends that the Party clarify the source of the DOC value for food waste in NIR table 7.9 and clearly explain in the NIR that the DOC value of 0.17 is based on a national research.	W.9	Based on this recommendation, expert reviewed DOC values. DOC value 0.15 for food waste is implemented in calculations. DOC value 0.17 is used for unsorted waste for all time series.	Chapter 7.2.2
5.A.1 Managed waste disposal sites – CH <sub>4</sub>	The ERT considers that using an MCF of 1 for bioreactors is conservative and recommends that the Party explain in the NIR the use of this MCF for bioreactors.	W.10	Explanation is provided in Chapter 7.2.1.	Chapter 7.2.1
5.A Solid waste disposal on land – CH <sub>4</sub>	The ERT recommends that the Party correct the statement “The same waste composition for all years since 2002 was used” by adding information on waste composition for years before 2002 in future annual submissions.	W.11	Waste composition estimation for years 2016-2021 was done and implemented in GHG calculations. The information about waste composition is included in NIR Chapter 7.2.1	Chapter 7.2.1-

Table 10.7 Responses to the 2023 EU-internal review process

CRF Category/ Issue	Review Recommendation	Review Report/ Paragraph	LV Response (status of implementation)	Chapter/Section in the NIR
4C2 Land converted to grassland	The initial change in biomass carbon stocks of land converted to another land category should follow equation 2.16 in Vol 4, chapter 2 of the IPCC 2006 guidelines considering biomass stocks before and after the conversion. The wood harvest that goes to HWP should be reported as an inflow to the HWP pool. Settlements converted to grassland may not have any woody biomass, but we were not sure about this, hence the follow-up question. If there were such woody biomass that	-	In submission 2024, we improved methodology for calculation of carbon stock changes in living biomass in category Settlements Converted to Grassland. Now, losses in living biomass due to felling of trees were estimated assuming immediate oxidation, where the living biomass prior to land-use change is considered equivalent to the cumulative annual increment of growing stock as calculated for category	NIR Chapter 6.6.2.2.



CRF Category/ Issue	Review Recommendation	Review Report/ Paragraph	LV Response (status of implementation)	Chapter/Section in the NIR
	<p>would be harvested on non-forest land as part of a land use conversion, then it is correct that including this also as a decrease in carbon stocks due to biomass losses in land remaining in the same land use category such as forest land remaining forest land following equation 2.11 would be double counting. But here it would be more transparent to report it under the relevant land use category using equation 2.16 and not also include it using equation 2.11. Since no more interactions are foreseen for this year under the QAQC system, this issue is concluded as partially resolved and it will be followed up next year.</p>		<p>Settlements Remaining Settlements. Thus, review's recommendation is implemented.</p>	
2F1 Refrigeration and air conditioning	<p>The choice of the upper ranges for recovery efficiency given in the 2006 IPCC guidelines results in low DLF, and considering that there is no evidence that these recovery efficiencies are actually achieved, actual emissions might be underestimated. Therefore, we recommend that you collect data or other information from e.g. national industry to substantiate or revise the expert judgement for the parameters applied.</p>	-	<p>Expert judgement on DLF is revised and included in the calculation.</p>	NIR Chapter 4.7.1

## 11 REFERENCES

### *Energy*

- 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Volume 2 *Energy*:
  - Chapter 2 *Stationary combustion*;
  - Chapter 3 *Mobile combustion*;
  - Chapter 4 *Fugitive emissions*.
- 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Volume 4 *Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use*:
  - Chapter 1 *Introduction*;
  - Chapter 4 *Wetlands*.
- EMEP/EEA air pollutant emission inventory guidebook 2019, Part B: sectoral guidance, Volume 1 *Energy*, 1A *Combustion*, 1B *Fugitive emissions from fuels*:
  - 1.A.1 *Energy industries*;
  - 1.A.2 *Manufacturing industries and construction*;
  - 1.A.3.a *Aviation*;
  - 1.A.3.d *Navigation (shipping)*;
  - 1.A.4 *Small combustion*;
  - 1.A.4 *Non-road mobile sources and machinery*;
  - 1.B.2.a.v *Distribution of oil products*;
- EMEP/EEA air pollutant emission inventory guidebook 2019, Part B: sectoral guidance, Volume 5 *Waste*:
  - 5.C.1.a *Municipal waste incineration*;
  - 5.C.1.b *Industrial waste incineration including hazardous waste and sewage sludge*.
- Metodiskie norādījumi CO<sub>2</sub> emisiju noteikšanai, izstrādāti, ievērojot ANO Vispārējās konvencijas "Par klimata pārmaiņām", Klimata pārmaiņu starpvaldību padomes (IPCC) rekomendācijas un Latvijā pielietotā kurināmā fizikālās īpašības. Rīga, 2004.
- CSB. Annual Eurostat Energy Questionnaire, 2021
- Annual Energy data, CSB, 2021:  
[https://data.stat.gov.lv/pxweb/lv/OSP\\_PUB/START\\_NOZ\\_EN\\_ENB/ENB060](https://data.stat.gov.lv/pxweb/lv/OSP_PUB/START_NOZ_EN_ENB/ENB060)
- EU ETS data:
  - 2005-2007: <http://www.meteo.lv/lapas/uznemumi-kuriem-izsniegtas-siltumnicefekta-gazu-emisijas-atlajas-?id=1255&nid=574>
  - 2008.-2012: <http://www.meteo.lv/lapas/uznemumi-kuriem-izsniegtas-siltumnicefekta-gazu-emisijas-atlajas-2-pe?id=1253&nid=575>
  - 2013-2020: <https://registri.vvd.gov.lv/izsniegtas-atlajas-un-licences/seg-atlajas/>
  - 2021-2030: <https://registri.vvd.gov.lv/izsniegtas-atlajas-un-licences/seg-atlajas/>

- Fizikālās enerģētikas institūts, "Oglekļa noteikšana un oglekļa dioksīda emisiju faktoru aprēķināšana Latvijā biežāk izmantojamiem kurināmā veidiem". Rīga, 2017
- [https://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=nrg\\_chdd\\_a&lang=en](https://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=nrg_chdd_a&lang=en)
- Average retail prices of selected commodity (gasoline): <https://www.csb.gov.lv/lv/statistika/statistikas-temas/ekonomika/pci/tabulas/pcg030/atsevisku-produktu-videjas-mazumtirdzniecibas-cenas-euro-par>
- Nulle, U., Nulle, I. Potential sites for CO<sub>2</sub> geological storage in Latvia. LEGMC. Available on: <http://meteo.lv/fs/CKFinderJava/userfiles/files/Geologija/Potential%20sites.pdf>
- CO<sub>2</sub>GeoNet brochure "What does CO<sub>2</sub> geological storage really mean?"

### **Industrial Processes and Product Use**

- 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories. Hayama: IPCC and IGES. <http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/2006gl/index.htm>. Volume 3 "IPPU"
- EMEP/EEA air pollutant emission inventory guidebook 2023
- National Chemicals Database
- National database "2-Air", available at <https://videscentrs.lvgmc.lv/lapas/parskatu-ievadisana>
- Data from State Agency of Medicines
- Data from CSB data bases
- COMMISSION REGULATION (EU) No 601/2012 of 21 June 2012 on the monitoring and reporting of greenhouse gas emissions pursuant to Directive 2003/87/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council. Available in <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32012R0601>
- Project report "SF<sub>6</sub>, HFC and PFC emission inventory in Latvia 1995-2003", Riga 2004;
- F-gas regulation No. 517/2014 of The European Parliament and the Council of 16 April 2014 on fluorinated greenhouse gases and repealing Regulation (EC) No 842/2006. Available at <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32014R0517&from=EN>
- Regulation No.563 of the Cabinet of Ministers of Latvia on "Provisions concerning specific restrictions and prohibitions on activities with ozone-depleting substances and fluorinated greenhouse gases". Available at <http://likumi.lv/ta/id/233736-noteikumi-par-ipasiem-ierobezojumiem-un-aizliegumiem-attieciba-uz-darbibam-ar-ozona-slani-noardosam-vielam-un-fluoretam-siltumn...>
- Regulation No.704 of the Cabinet of Ministers of Latvia on "Requirements for operations with ozone-depleting substances and fluorinated greenhouse gases". Available at <https://likumi.lv/ta/id/327117-prasibas-darbibam-ar-ozona-slani-noardosam-vielam-un-fluoretam-siltumnicfekta-gazem>

### **Agriculture**

- 6.sekcija - Biogāzes ražošanas uzņēmumi. Available: <https://registri.pvd.gov.lv/cr/faili/78ac619f9ddb8c8097e5e7e8f0b9d9a2>

- Agricultural Data Centre. Available at <https://www ldc.gov.lv/en>
- Agriculture of Latvia 2022. Collection of Statistics. Rīga (2022) 92 p. Available: [https://admin.stat.gov.lv/system/files/publication/2022-06/Nr\\_15\\_Latvijas\\_Lauksaimnieciba\\_2022\\_%2822\\_00%29\\_LV\\_EN\\_0.pdf](https://admin.stat.gov.lv/system/files/publication/2022-06/Nr_15_Latvijas_Lauksaimnieciba_2022_%2822_00%29_LV_EN_0.pdf)
- Bārdulis, A., Lupiķis, A., & Stola, J. (2017). Carbon balance in forest mineral soils in Latvia modelled with Yasso07 soil carbon model. In Research for Rural Development (Vol. 1, pp. 28–34). Latvia University of Agriculture
- Berzina L. (2014) Analysis of Point Source Pollution from Agricultural Production Influence on Surface Water Quality in Highly Vulnerable Zones. Summary of the Thesis for Doctoral Degree in Engineering Sciences, Environmental Science branch, Environmental Engineering subbranch. 91 p.
- Cabinet Regulation No. 829. Available: <https://likumi.lv/ta/en/en/id/271374-special-requirements-for-the-performance-of-polluting-activities-in-animal-housing>
- Ciltsdarba programma sarkano šķirņu govju selekcijā 2013.-2017. gadam un tuvākajai perspektīvai. Available: [http://www ldc.gov.lv/upload/doc/sarkano\\_skirnu\\_ciltsdarba\\_programma\\_2013\\_2017.pdf](http://www ldc.gov.lv/upload/doc/sarkano_skirnu_ciltsdarba_programma_2013_2017.pdf)
- Degola L. Trupa A., Aplocina E. (2016) Forage quality and digestibility for calculation of enteric methane emission from cattle /15th International scientific conference "Engineering for Rural Development" : proceedings, Jelgava, Latvia, May 25 - 27, 2016 Latvia University of Agriculture. Faculty of Engineering. - Jelgava, 2016. - Vol.15, p. 456-461.
- Degola L., Trūpa A., Aplociņa E. Lopbarības ķīmiskās analīzes un sagremojamība, 2016. 52. lpp. Available: <http://www.vbf.llu.lv/sites/vbf/files/files/lapas/Lopbar%C4%ABbas%20%C4%B7%C4%ABmisk%C4%81s....pdf>
- EMEP/EEA Air pollutant emission inventory guidebook (2019) 3.B Manure management. European Environment Agency. Table 3.9, page 31. Available: <https://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/emep-eea-guidebook-2019/part-b-sectoral-guidance-chapters/4-agriculture/3-b-manure-management/view>
- Fertiliser Recommendations for Agricultural Crops (2013) Ed.A. Karklins and A.Ruza. Jelgava: LLU, 55 p.
- Gaļas šķirņu govju ciltsdarba programma 2013. – 2017. gadam. Available: [http://www ldc.gov.lv/upload/doc/ciltsdarba.programma\\_2013-2017.pdf](http://www ldc.gov.lv/upload/doc/ciltsdarba.programma_2013-2017.pdf)
- Gemste I., Vucāns A. (2010) Notekūdeņu dūņas. Jelgava, LLU, 276 lpp.
- Greenhouse Gas Balances of Bioenergy Systems. Patricia Thornley, Paul Adams. Academic Press (2017) p. 286.
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions 1990-2022 National Inventory Report. The Norwegian Environment Agency, 2022, p.5-35, Table 5.15. Available: <https://unfccc.int/ghg-inventories-annex-i-parties/2022>
- Holšteinas šķirnes govju audzēšanas programma. Available: <http://www.holstein.lv/uploads/images/ProgrammaLHA.pdf>
- Priekulis J., Āboltiņš A. (2015) Calculation methodology for cattle manure management systems based on the 2006 IPCC guidelines. NJF 25th Congress. Available: <http://www.vbf.llu.lv/sites/vbf/files/files/lapas/Calculation....pdf>
- Kārkliņš A., Līpenīte I. (2018). Aprēķinu metodes un normatīvi augsnes iekultivēšanai un mēslošanas līdzekļu lietošanai. Jelgava: LLU. 200 lpp.
- Latvietis J. (1994) Govju ēdināšanas normas. Jelgava: LLU, p.102

- Latvijas Biogāzes asociācija. Available: <http://www.latvijasbiogaze.lv/pakalpojumi/>
- Licite I., Lupikis, A. (2020). Impact of land use practices on greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture land on organic soils. Proceedings of 19th International Scientific Conference Engineering for Rural Development, 1823–1830. DOI: [10.22616/ERDev.2020.19.TF492](https://doi.org/10.22616/ERDev.2020.19.TF492)
- Litiņa I. (2013). Digestāta kā mēslošanas līdzekļa efektivitātes novērtējums kukurūzas sējumā. Zinātniski praktiskā konference LAUKSAIMNIECĪBAS ZINĀTNE VEIKSMĪGAI SAIMNIEKOŠANAI. Jelgava, LLU, 206-209 lpp.
- Lupikis, A., Bardule, A., Lazdins, A., Stola, J., & Butlers, A. (2017). Carbon stock changes in drained arable organic soils in Latvia: results of a pilot study. *Agronomy Research*, 15(3), 788–798
- Myrbeck A., Kaasik A., Luostarinen S. Manure data collection - experiences from pilot farms. Available: <https://projects.luke.fi/manurestandards/wp-content/uploads/sites/25/2020/04/Manure-data-collection-experiences-from-pilot-farms.pdf>
- National research project: Vilis Dubrovskis (2016) ATSKAITE: Latvijas lauksaimniecības SEG inventarizācijas starptautiskajā pārbaudē pieprasītā precizētā informācija par kūtsmēsli izmantošanu biogāzes ražošanai / Trial review of the 2015 greenhouse gas inventory of Latvia under the Effort Sharing Decision, 2015. Dr.sc. ing. Vilis Dubrovskis, 2016-05-17
- Pētījuma „Lauksaimniecības sektora SEG emisiju aprēķina metodoloģijas un datu analīzes ar modelēšanas rīku izstrāde, integrējot klimata pārmaiņas” līguma Nr.2014/94 5.posma pārskats un gala pārskats. Available: [http://petijumi.mk.gov.lv/sites/default/files/title\\_file/petijums\\_VARAM\\_2017\\_Lauksaimn\\_SEG\\_emisij\\_aprek\\_metodolog\\_un\\_datu\\_analiz\\_ar\\_model\\_riku\\_izstrad\\_integrej\\_klim\\_mainas.pdf](http://petijumi.mk.gov.lv/sites/default/files/title_file/petijums_VARAM_2017_Lauksaimn_SEG_emisij_aprek_metodolog_un_datu_analiz_ar_model_riku_izstrad_integrej_klim_mainas.pdf)
- Pētījuma „Lauksaimniecības sektora SEG emisiju aprēķina metodoloģijas un datu analīzes ar modelēšanas rīku izstrāde, integrējot klimata pārmaiņas” līguma Nr.2014/94. Pētījuma 5.posma pārskats un gala pārskats. Available: <https://cupdf.com/document/petijuma-5posma-parskats-un-gala-pa-1-slaucamo-govju-skaitis-centralas.html>
- Priekulis J. Pētījuma ”Lauksaimniecības sektora SEG emisiju aprēķina metodoloģijas un datu analīzes un modelēšanas rīku izstrāde, integrējot klimata pārmaiņas, līguma Nr.2014/94. Pētījuma 4.ceturkšņa progresa ziņojums. Jelgava, 2016
- Priekulis J., Āboltiņš A. (2015) Calculation Methodology for Cattle Manure Management Systems Based on the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. Proceedings of the 25th NJF Congress Nordic View to Sustainable Rural Development. Riga, pp.274-280
- Project “Development of the national system for greenhouse gas (GHG) inventory and reporting on policies, measures and projections”. Available: [http://www.varam.gov.lv/eng/fondi/EEA\\_Norv/european\\_economic\\_area\\_financial\\_mechanism\\_programme\\_national\\_climate\\_policy/?doc=18431](http://www.varam.gov.lv/eng/fondi/EEA_Norv/european_economic_area_financial_mechanism_programme_national_climate_policy/?doc=18431)
- Republic of Latvia, Cabinet Regulation No. 834. 2014. Regulation Regarding Protection of Water and Soil from Pollution with Nitrates Caused by Agricultural Activity. Available: <http://extwprlegs1.fao.org/docs/pdf/lat172823.pdf>
- Ruza A. (2016) Minerālmēsliu maksimālo normu noteikšana kultūraugiem. Project Report No. S293 Setting maximum levels for fertilizers for crops. Available: [https://www.llu.lv/sites/default/files/files/projects/16-100-INV16-5-000003\\_S293.pdf](https://www.llu.lv/sites/default/files/files/projects/16-100-INV16-5-000003_S293.pdf)

- Sudars R., Berzina L., Grinberga L. (2016) Analysis of Agricultural Run-Off Monitoring Program Results for Estimation of Nitrous Oxide Indirect Emissions in Latvia. *ENGINEERING FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT*. Jelgava. Available: <http://tf.llu.lv/conference/proceedings2016/Papers/N198.pdf>
- The Swedish Voluntary system for control of methane emissions. Anneli Petersson, Magnus Andreas Holmgren (2012) p.13. Available: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/275409531> The Swedish Voluntary system for control of methane emissions
- Wild Animal Breeders Association. Available: [http://www.losp.lv/sites/default/files/articles/attachments/publications/22.12.2011\\_-\\_1500/17\\_savvalas\\_dzivnieki.pdf](http://www.losp.lv/sites/default/files/articles/attachments/publications/22.12.2011_-_1500/17_savvalas_dzivnieki.pdf)
- Национальный доклад о кадастре антропогенных выбросов из источников и абсорбции поглотителями парниковых газов не регулируемых Монреальским протоколом за 1990 – 2020 гг. Часть 1. Москва, 2022., с. 183, Таблица 5.7. Available: <https://unfccc.int/ghg-inventories-annex-i-parties/2021>

### **LULUCF**

- Bardule et al. (2017) Organic carbon stock in different types of mineral soils in cropland and grassland in Latvia. *Zemdirbyste-Agriculture*, 104, 1, p. 3–8.
- CSB data, available at: [http://data.csb.gov.lv/pxweb/lv/vide/vide\\_ikgad\\_vide/VI0080.px/?rxid=cdbc978c-22b0-416a-aacc-aa650d3e2ce0](http://data.csb.gov.lv/pxweb/lv/vide/vide_ikgad_vide/VI0080.px/?rxid=cdbc978c-22b0-416a-aacc-aa650d3e2ce0)
- Donis J. (2011) Latvijas meža resursu ilgtspējīgas, ekonomiski pamatotas izmantošanas un prognozēšanas modeļu izstrāde (Developing models for sustainable and economically feasible utilization and prediction of the availability of forest resources in Latvia)
- EU LIFE program project “Sustainable and responsible management and re-use of degraded peatlands in Latvia” (LIFE REstore), [https://restore.daba.gov.lv/public/eng/about\\_the\\_project/](https://restore.daba.gov.lv/public/eng/about_the_project/)
- Emissions projection & inventory model (EPIM) spreadsheet tool, available: [https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0Bxv4jQ\\_04jXZNTM5aGNdTVdRVzQ&usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0Bxv4jQ_04jXZNTM5aGNdTVdRVzQ&usp=sharing)
- Kukuļs I., Nikodemus O., Kasparinskis R., Grāvelsiņa S., Prižavoite D. (2015) Carbon accumulation and humification in soils of abandoned former agricultural lands in the hemiboreal zone. *Nordic view to sustainable rural development*, NJF 25<sup>th</sup> Congress, 201 – 207.
- Krumsteds L.L., Ivanovs J., Jansons J., and Lazdins A. (2019) Development of Latvian land use and land use change matrix using geospatial data of National forest inventory. *Agronomy Research* 17, DOI: 10.15159/AR.19.195.
- Krumsteds L. L., Lazdins A., Butlers A., and Ivanovs J. (2019) Recalculation of forest increment, mortality and harvest rate in Latvia according to updated land use data. *Rural Development* 2019 (1): 295–299. DOI:10.15544/RD.2019.037
- Latvijas Republikas Zemkopības ministrija (2004) Meža statistiskās inventarizācijas veikšanas un mežaudzes sekundāro parametru aprēķināšanas metodika (instrukcija Nr.

10 no 17.03.2004.), [https://drive.google.com/open?id=1PxbGhS0VolJw-hsgjV3gOfd\\_h44cByLO](https://drive.google.com/open?id=1PxbGhS0VolJw-hsgjV3gOfd_h44cByLO)

- L.U. Consulting (2010) Augšņu un reljefa izejas datu sagatavošana un Eiropas Komisijas izstrādāto augsnes un reljefa kritēriju mazāk labvēlīgo apvidu noteikšanai piemērošanas simulācija. Projekta kopsavilkuma ziņojums (Elaboration of soil and terrain data and simulation of application of the criteria elaborated by the European Commission for identification of less valuable regions. Summary of the project report), Latvijas Republikas Zemkopības Ministrija
- Lazdiņš A. et al. (2011-2015) Mežsaimniecisko darbību ietekmes uz siltumnīcefekta gāzu emisijām un CO<sub>2</sub> piesaisti novērtējums (Evaluation of impact of forest management practices on greenhouse gas emissions and CO<sub>2</sub> removals)
- Lazdiņš A. and Čugunovs M. (2013) Oglekļa dioksīda (CO<sub>2</sub>) piesaistes un siltumnīcefekta gāzu (SEG) emisiju un zemes lietojuma veida ietekmes novērtējums intensīvi un ekstensīvi kultivētās aramzemēs, daudzgadīgos zālajos un bioloģiski vērtīgos zālajos (Evaluation of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) removals and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, and impact of land use in intensive and extensive cultivated cropland, grassland and biologically valuable grassland)
- Lazdiņš A., Donis J., and Strūve L. (2012) Latvijas meža apsaimniekošanas radītās oglekļa dioksīda (CO<sub>2</sub>) piesaistes un siltumnīcefekta gāzu (SEG) emisiju references līmeņa aprēķina modeļa izstrāde (Elaboration of model for estimation of GHG emissions and CO<sub>2</sub> removals due to forest management)
- Lazdiņš A. and Zariņš J. (2012) Vēsturiskās (1990. gada) apsaimniekoto aramzemju platības noteikšana un līdz 2009. gadam notikušo aramzemju platības izmaiņu novērtēšana (Estimation of area of managed croplands and change of cropland's area until 2009)
- Lazdiņš A. and Zariņš J. Elaboration and integration into National greenhouse gas inventory report matrices of land use changes of areas belonging to Kyoto protocol Article 3.3 and 3.4 activities
- Lazdiņš A., Butlers A., and Lupiķis A. (2014) Case study of soil carbon stock changes in drained and afforested transitional bog. In Forest Ecosystems and Its Management: Towards Understanding the Complexity (presented at the 9th Baltic theriological conference, Ilgas: Latvian State Forest Research Institute "Silava," 2014)
- Lazdiņš A. and Lupiķis A. (2014) Hidrotehniskās meliorācijas ietekme uz CO<sub>2</sub> emisijām mežaudzēs uz susinātām augsnēm (Impact of hydrotechnical melioration on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in forest stands on drained soils), Salaspils
- Lazdiņš A. and Lupiķis A. (2019) LIFE REstore project contribution to the greenhouse gas emission accounts in Latvia. In: A. Priede & A. Gancone (Eds.), Sustainable and responsible after-use of peat extraction areas (pp. 21–52). Baltijas Krasti.
- Lazdiņš A., Bārdule A., Butlers A., Lupiķis A., Okmanis M., Bebre I., ... Petaja G. (2016) Aramzemes un ilggadīgo zālāju apsaimniekošanas radīto siltumnīcefekta gāzu (SEG) emisiju un oglekļa dioksīda (CO<sub>2</sub>) piesaistes uzskaites sistēmas pilnveidošana un atbilstošu metodisko risinājumu izstrādāšana (Improving the accounting system of CO<sub>2</sub> removals and GHG emissions due to management practices in cropland and grassland and development of methodological solutions). 2016. gada starpziņojums, No.

101115/S109, Salaspils, p. 123. Available:  
[https://drive.google.com/open?id=0Bxv4jQ\\_04jXZRExSMWhPMWhDNDg](https://drive.google.com/open?id=0Bxv4jQ_04jXZRExSMWhPMWhDNDg)

- Lazdiņš A. (2016) Improving the accounting system of CO<sub>2</sub> removals and GHG emissions due to management practices in cropland and grassland and development of methodological solutions, available:  
[https://drive.google.com/file/d/0Bxv4jQ\\_04jXZRu9vQXZsNE12LTA/view](https://drive.google.com/file/d/0Bxv4jQ_04jXZRu9vQXZsNE12LTA/view)
- Lazdiņš A., Bārdule A., and Stola J. Preliminary results of evaluation of area of organic soils in arable lands in Latvia
- Lazdiņš A. Harmonization of land use matrix in Latvia according to requirements of international greenhouse gas reporting system - Extending outputs of National Forest Inventory program
- Lazdiņš A. and Zariņš J. (2013) Meža ugunsgrēku un mežizstrādes atlieku dedzināšanas radītās siltumnīcefekta gāzu emisijas Latvijā (Greenhouse gas emissions in Latvia due to incineration of harvesting residues and forest fires), in: Referātu Tēzes. Presented at the Latvijas Universitātes 71. zinātniskā konference "Ģeogrāfija, ģeoloģija, vides zinātne", Latvijas Universitāte, Rīga, pp. 133–137
- Lazdiņš A. et al. (2013) Temporary carbon stock changes in forest soil in Latvia. In: Abstracts of International Baltic Sea Regional Scientific Conference (Riga: LSFRI Silava, 2013), 51–52
- Lazdiņš A. (2015) Augsnes oglekļa krājumu novērtēšana aramzemē un pļavās (Evaluation of soil carbon stocks in cropland and grassland), <https://sites.google.com/site/lvlulucf/research-projects/augsnesogleklakrajumunovertesanaaramzemeunplavas>
- Liepiņš J., Lazdiņš A. and Liepiņš K. (2015) Above- and below-ground biomass functions for four most common trees species in Latvia, in: Abstracts. Presented at the International Scientific Conference Knowledge based forest sector, Riga, Latvia, pp. 51–53
- Liepins J., Liepins K. and Lazdins A. (2015) Biomass equations for the most common tree species in Latvia. Presented at the Adaptation and mitigation: strategies for management of forest ecosystems, Airport hotel ABC, pp. 47–50
- Liepiņš J., Liepiņš K. and Lazdiņš A. (2016) Estimation of the biomass stock from growing stock volume, in: Collection of Abstracts. Presented at the 11th International Scientific Conference Students on Their Way to Science, Jelgava, p. 120
- Liepiņš J., Lazdiņš A. and Liepiņš K. (2017) Equations for estimating above- and belowground biomass of Norway spruce, Scots pine, birch spp. and European aspen in Latvia. Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research, June 2017, 1–43, <https://doi.org/10.1080/02827581.2017.1337923>
- Liepiņš, J., Liepiņš, K. (2017) Mean basic density and its axial variation in Scots pine, Norway spruce and birch stands. Research for Rural Development 2017, 1, 21–27.
- Licite I. and Lupikis A. (2020) Impact of land use practices on greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture land on organic soils. Proceedings of 19th International Scientific Conference Engineering for Rural Development, 1823–1830. <https://doi.org/10.22616/ERDev.2020.19.TF492>



- Līpiņš L. (2004) Assessment of wood resources and efficiency of wood utilization (Koksnes izejvielu resursu un to izmantošanas efektivitātes novērtējums), LLU
- Lupikis A. and Lazdins A. (2017) Soil carbon stock changes in transitional mire drained for forestry in Latvia: A case study. Proceedings of 23rd Annual International Scientific Conference "Research for Rural Development 2017"
- Muiznieks E., Liepins J., Lazdins A. (2015) Carbon content in biomass of the most common tree species in Latvia. Presented at the Latvia University of Agriculture 10th International Scientific Conference „Students on their way to science”, Jelgava
- Saliņš Z. (2002) Mežs - Latvijas Nacionālā Bagātība (Forest - The National Wealth of Latvia), Jelgava: Jelgavas tipogrāfija; Saliņš Z. 1999. Meža izmantošana Latvijā: stāvoklis, perspektīvas (Forest use in Latvia: status, perspectives), Jelgava: LLU Meža izmantošanas katedra
- Summary of NFI, sources:  
[http://www.silava.lv/userfiles/file/Meza%20statistiska%20inventarizacija/Kopsavilkumi%202014%20I%20cikls%20\(2\).xlsx](http://www.silava.lv/userfiles/file/Meza%20statistiska%20inventarizacija/Kopsavilkumi%202014%20I%20cikls%20(2).xlsx);  
[http://www.silava.lv/userfiles/file/Meza%20statistiska%20inventarizacija/Kopsavilkumi%202014%20II%20cikls%20\(2\).xlsx](http://www.silava.lv/userfiles/file/Meza%20statistiska%20inventarizacija/Kopsavilkumi%202014%20II%20cikls%20(2).xlsx);  
<http://www.silava.lv/userfiles/file/2010%20nov%20MRM%20visi%20mezi%2004-08.xls>
- Valsts vienotais ģeotelpiskās informācijas portāls (Ģeoportāls), <https://geolatvija.lv/geo/p/247>
- Vanags-Duka, M.; Bārdule, A.; Butlers, A.; Upenieks, E.M.; Lazdiņš, A.; Purviņa, D.; Līcīte, I. GHG Emissions from drainage ditches in peat extraction sites and peatland forests in hemiboreal Latvia. Land 2022, 11, 2233. <https://doi.org/10.3390/land11122233>

## **Waste**

- 2006 IPCC Guidelines. Volume 5 “Waste”
- EMEP/EEA air pollutant emission inventory guidebook 2019 and 2023
- LEGMC public national databases “2-Air”, “2-Water” and “3-Waste”, available at [http://parissrv.lv/gmc.lv/public\\_reports](http://parissrv.lv/gmc.lv/public_reports)
- “Research about solid waste management in Latvia”, 1998, Ltd GEO Consultants. [http://www.lv-gmc.lv/fs/CKFinderJava/userfiles/files/Vide/Atkritumi/statistika/Rokasgramatata\\_atkr\\_faktori.pdf](http://www.lv-gmc.lv/fs/CKFinderJava/userfiles/files/Vide/Atkritumi/statistika/Rokasgramatata_atkr_faktori.pdf)
- Statistical Yearbook of Latvia 2004, CSB, 2005.
- “Degradable organic carbon in disposed waste”, 2011, Ltd Virsma
- “Composting emission factor development from waste and waste water sectors and methane correction factor estimation for Latvia landfills”, 2015, Waste Management Association of Latvia
- “Waste landfill data collection for GHG inventory”, LEGMC, 2016.
- Gemste I., Vucāns A., Jelgava, 2002. “Notekūdeņu dūņas un to izmantošana” („Sewage Sludge and Disposal of it”)
- Gemste I., Vucāns A., Jelgava, 2007 “Notekūdeņu dūņas” (“Sewage Sludge”),
- Urban population, available at <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.URB.TOTL.IN.ZS>.
- Urban and rural population in Latvia, CSB database: [https://data.stat.gov.lv/pxweb/lv/OSP\\_PUB/START\\_POP\\_IR\\_IRD/IRD070](https://data.stat.gov.lv/pxweb/lv/OSP_PUB/START_POP_IR_IRD/IRD070)

- Protein supply data, FAOSTAT database:  
<https://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/FBS/visualize>