

13 October 1999

ENGLISH ONLY

UNITED NATIONS FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE

SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR IMPLEMENTATION

Eleventh session

Bonn, 25 October - 5 November 1999

Item 8 (b) of the provisional agenda

**NATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS FROM PARTIES INCLUDED IN
ANNEX I TO THE CONVENTION**

**GUIDELINES FOR THE TECHNICAL REVIEW OF GREENHOUSE GAS
INVENTORIES**

Views of Parties on the draft guidelines contained in document FCCC/SBI/1999/13

Note by the secretariat

1. The Subsidiary Body for Implementation, at its tenth session, requested the secretariat to prepare draft guidelines for the technical review of GHG inventories, and invited Parties to submit views on the draft guidelines by 1 October 1999 (FCCC/SBI/1999/8, para. 28 (d)).
2. Five such submissions have been received in electronic form. In accordance with the procedure for miscellaneous documents, these submissions are reproduced as received and without formal editing.

FCCC/SBI/1999/MISC.7

GE.99-66538

CONTENTS

Paper No.		Page
1.	Finland	3
2.	Norway	7
3.	New Zealand	9
4.	Switzerland	11
5.	United States of America	12

PAPER NO. 1: FINLAND

SUBMISSION BY FINLAND ON BEHALF OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY AND ITS MEMBER STATES ON THE GUIDELINES FOR THE TECHNICAL REVIEW OF GREENHOUSE GAS INVENTORIES

Finland, on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, thanks the Secretariat for preparing document FCCC/SBI/1999/13, which includes the Draft Greenhouse Gas Review Guidelines, a work plan and operational arrangements for the technical review process and elements for a draft decision of the COP.

1. General comments

The EU welcomes this document as a contribution towards the improvement of the review process which is necessary to complement the improvement of UNFCCC reporting guidelines on annual inventories. The EU believes that FCCC/SBI/1999/13 fulfils the mandate from the 10th session of the Subsidiary Bodies and provides a sound basis for the consideration of these matters at the 11th session and at COP 5.

The technical review of GHG Inventories of Annex I Parties should focus on the transparency, completeness, comparability, consistency and accuracy of national inventories taking into account the requirements of the UNFCCC Annex I Reporting Guidelines, the IPCC Inventory Guidelines, and any Good Practice Guidance developed by the IPCC and agreed by the COP.

The EU emphasises that the facilitative, non-confrontational and transparent nature of the review process should be maintained and that the Secretariat should not be put in a position to judge the inventories of Parties.

The EU welcomes the trial period and the examination of different approaches to the review process. Nevertheless the EU notes that as Parties agreed on a trial period for the technical review during SBSTA/SBI 10 without precisely defining its aims and purposes. Without clear aims, it will be more difficult to evaluate the experience gained. The EU therefore suggests additional text to the draft decision along the following lines:

“The trial period will assess specific advantages and disadvantages of elements such as the periodicity of review, the size of teams, decentralized or centralized reviews, the time needed for review, and costs. The views of Parties involved in the trials should be taken into account in making this assessment with a view to achieving an effective as well as cost-efficient technical review process of greenhouse gas inventories.”

The trial period should assess how frequently additional country visits limited to greenhouse gas inventories should take place during the period between the in-depth reviews of national communications.

The EU notes that experiences during the trial period and with subsequent inventory reviews will help to develop the UNFCCC guidelines on Annex I inventory reporting in future.

The technical review process for greenhouse gas inventories is connected to the establishment of national systems according to Article 5 of the Kyoto Protocol which have not yet been defined.

Therefore it may be necessary to update the guidelines for technical review when guidelines for national systems have been established.

The EU suggests that the selection of experts to take part in reviews should take advantage of expertise available internationally, for example via the IPCC Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories. Involving these experts is likely to have advantages, both to the review process and to the future development of inventory methodologies to meet the needs of Parties.

Consideration may also be given to whether and how certified auditors or auditing institutions might be included in the technical review process and if such independent audits would improve the process.

The UNFCCC reporting guidelines on annual inventories encourage Parties “to report on any peer review of their inventory conducted nationally”. The EU also stated in previous submissions (FCCC/SBSTA/1999/MISC.4) that self verification procedures and any independent peer review conducted nationally should be assessed by the expert review team. This should be reflected in the guidelines for technical review.

The EU notes that realistically several of the purposes and tasks mentioned under part F the review of individual greenhouse gas inventories could be undertaken only during the country visit since UNFCCC reporting guidelines on annual inventories do not request the submission of the relevant information which may only be available in the countries. The particular issues are:

para 16 (f), assessment of “adherence to requirements for record keeping, since” this is a task performed at national level);

para 17, last sentence “consideration of the 'paper trail' of an inventory from the collection of data to reported emission estimate.”;

para 19 (a), examination of “procedures and institutional arrangements for inventory development and management.”;

para 19 (f), examination of “record keeping and documentation procedures.”

This suggests that the three operational approaches to the in-depth review process are not in fact fully equivalent. The EU would encourage the Secretariat to assess this aspect in the evaluation of the trial period and in particular to assess whether a fully satisfactory review could be conducted without a country visit.

The EU notes the expediency and cost effectiveness of disseminating information via the UN/FCCC website and believes that full use should be made of this facility for publishing.

Results at different stages of the technical review process.

Reports should be sent to Parties on request. If combined approaches for individual review are undertaken (as proposed in para 26 of Annex I of FCCC/SBI/1999/13) for a Party, the results should be contained in a single document.

II. Specific comments

Annex I

Part I - General description of the technical review process

para 14

Add the following item as para 14 (c): “assess the availability of results from national self verification procedures or independent peer reviews in the technical review process.”

Add the following item as para 14 (d): “assess the consistency of information on methodologies and emission factors in the common reporting format with related information in the national inventory report.”

para 19 (ab)

Insert “addressed and” before resolved. It is possible that the solution of problems that have been found during previous review stages will take some time, so the review should assess if the Party has started to resolve the problems.

Part II - Work plan for the technical review process

Para 26:

The work plan should outline the type of combinations that will be tested during the trial period. In the view of the EU the following combinations should be tested:

1. desk review and country visit
2. meeting in a single location and country visit
3. all three approaches together

Desk review and the meeting in a single location in combination with the country visit could be seen as a thorough preparation of the country visit, so that during the visit only open questions and problems have to be resolved.

Para 27:

Insert “The experts will each cover several individual inventories.” after the first sentence. The EU believes that efficiency of desk review would be enhanced if experts responsible for specific sectors review several inventories at the same time.

Proposal for Para 29 bis:

The three approaches to review (data review, review at a single location, and review by country visits) should be assessed critically for the quality of review as well as for the human and financial resource requirements, and the Secretariat should be asked to report on this at the end of the trial phase.

PART IV - Editorial comments

The use of “Annex I Party” and “Party” seems not to be consistent in the paper. Sometimes Annex I Parties are explicitly addressed, sometimes only Parties (e.g. para 4).

PAPER NO. 2: NORWAY

Norwegian views on the review process related to greenhouse gas (GHG) inventories

Norway hereby submits views on the review process related to GHG inventories as requested in document FCCC/SBI/1999/L.2.

Norway welcomes the ongoing work on an improved technical review process related to greenhouse gas inventories. As a follow up of the reporting commitments in the UNFCCC there is a need for developments both connected to the work done by the FCCC secretariat in yearly Compilation and Synthesis Reports and through reviews of each Party's inventories. In our view, improvements in the technical review process will also be beneficial in the development of a review process and a compliance system for the Kyoto Protocol.

Norway supports the idea that the secretariat should be entrusted to do more analytical work based on the data gathered through the reports from the Parties. However, this should not only be limited to the assessment of how Parties fulfil their reporting commitments under the UNFCCC. It should also include more specific analytical work related to issues relevant for the ongoing discussions in the Convention bodies regarding implementation of the UNFCCC and the development of guidelines and modalities under the Kyoto Protocol.

We find the suggestions in documents FCCC/SBSTA/1999/3 and FCCC/SBI/1999/13 to be a sound basis for further treatment of these issues. In general Norway supports the proposed approaches. We would however, provide some preliminary comments and suggestions for adjustments. We are prepared to come back to our views on the more detailed proposals for guidelines in document FCCC/SBI/1999/13 at the upcoming sessions.

Domestic review process

In document FCCC/SBSTA/3 the Parties are encouraged to use domestic review practices and to provide relevant information to the secretariat. We support that relevant information of this kind is reported. In the coming years it could be valuable to get more information about different possible approaches for domestic review processes based on the Parties' experience, and present such examples in the synthesis and assessment reports.

UNFCCC review process

Due to the high level of complexity of most inventories, the review processes could be very resource demanding. Because the capacity of relevant expertise is limited, it is important that the review procedures are efficient. It is not necessary to carry out detailed reviews of reports from each Parties every year. In the periods between more detailed reviews, it should be sufficient to focus on changes done by the Party in question, e.g. changes in methodologies.

The reports should give an overview of common methodological issues, assessments of trends in inventories, and other aspects relevant for the work in the Convention bodies. The annual synthesis and assessment reports should at least give information corresponding to a specified minimum format. The Convention bodies are likely to have changing needs over time, and hence

the extent and focus beyond the minimum could vary from one year to another. A more thorough assessment could be given at appropriate intervals e.g. every 3-5 year.

In the future there will be an increasing need to see the connection between implementation of policies and measures on one side and how this will affect the emissions reductions reflected in the inventories on the other side. Hence, it is important to establish linkages also in the reviews of the annual reports on GHG inventories and the periodical National Communications.

PAPER NO. 3: NEW ZEALAND

**New Zealand submission on
Draft Guidelines for the Technical Review of Annex I Parties' Greenhouse Gas Inventories**

New Zealand welcomes the progress being made regarding a technical review process related to the greenhouse gas inventories of Annex I Parties. New Zealand has long advocated improvements to the in-depth review process, including for greenhouse gas inventories. The introduction of the UNFCCC reporting guidelines on annual inventories, including the common reporting format, provides an opportunity to also begin a process for enhanced technical review of the inventories. All these elements should combine to improve reporting as we move towards the requirements of the Kyoto Protocol. Development of guidelines for a technical review process for greenhouse gas inventories can be viewed as the first phase of the development of guidelines for the review of information under Article 8.

Before dealing with the some of the detail of the draft guidelines for the technical review of greenhouse gas inventories, it is appropriate to look briefly at some of the other issues on the UNFCCC work programme which have some bearing on the issue of technical review. These issues are the IPCC work on '*good practice*', the development of national inventory systems under Article 5.1 of the Kyoto Protocol, 'freezing' baselines for the purposes of calculating Parties' initial assigned amounts, adjustments under Article 5.2 of the Kyoto Protocol, and, as mentioned in the first paragraph of this submission, the process of review under Article 8 of the Kyoto Protocol.

The IPCC work on '*good practice*' and the development of national inventory systems under Article 5.1 are well covered within the draft guidelines for technical review. In New Zealand's view, some kind of technical review process could also have a role in 'freezing' base years. Before this happens, base year inventories will need very careful review. In our view, the process of review before base years are "frozen" could be regarded as a type of Article 8 review taking place before the beginning of the first commitment period. This role of the review process should be reflected in the "purposes" section of the draft guidelines.

Similarly, the technical reviews of inventories will have a fundamental role in any adjustment process under Article 5.2 and this should be also be reflected in the draft guidelines. Calculations made by the reviewers could also form the basis of such adjustments.

In addition to the above suggestions for broadening the scope of the technical review, in relation to document FCCC/SBI/1999/13, New Zealand has some specific comments to make. We are particularly supportive of the following elements:

- The trial period for the review guidelines from 2000 to 2002 (paragraph 4). This trial period and subsequent amendment of the guidelines is important when dealing with issues that are evolutionary in nature. We note that the amendments to the guidelines will be based on experience gained together with new tasks and requirements for the review process.

- The adoption of the greenhouse gas review guidelines at COP5 (paragraph 6). This will help to ensure the trial review period gets underway in a timely manner, ready for the inventories which are due to be reported by 15 April 2000.
- The publication of the results of each stage of the review process on the UNFCCC web site (paragraph 11).
- The greenhouse gas review guidelines as set out in Annex I of the above FCCC document. These draft guidelines set out the different aspects of the review process in a logical manner, and are sufficiently comprehensive and detailed to enable the trial period to proceed. An additional element which could be added to the Purpose (and is signalled in the Objective) is that of the review process being able to build the confidence of not only Annex I Parties in providing high quality inventories, but also of all Parties that quality reporting is taking place.

For the technical review process to be successful, all Annex I Parties should be encouraged to take part in the trial period. The review process should be regarded as an essential part of progressively improving the reporting of greenhouse gas inventories, and Parties will benefit more by being directly involved than they would be by observing the review process from the outside. New Zealand will be a very willing participant.

Referring to paragraph 30 in Part III of Annex I, in our view, the first two steps of the review (the initial check and the synthesis and assessment) should be carried out for all Annex I Party inventories. We note that the secretariat already carries out the synthesis function on an annual basis for all inventories from Annex I Parties, and we would not like to see this function departed from or reduced in any way. During the trial period, the voluntary part of the process should only apply to the third step - the review of individual greenhouse gas inventories (by way of a desk top review or country visit).

As greenhouse gas inventory and review processes evolve under the UNFCCC, including under the Kyoto Protocol, careful and expert scrutiny of inventory data and information becomes more and more important. To succeed, the process must have integrity, must be consistent, fully transparent and accountable, and will depend on Parties having confidence in the expertise of those conducting the reviews. Experience in reviewing inventory information will be gained during the trial period, but this experience is likely to be distributed across a number of experts (paragraphs 12 to 15 of FCCC/SBI/1999/13, and paragraphs 35 to 38 of Annex I refer). As the review process develops, moving into the issue of compliance with legally binding targets, we should examine the option of having semi-permanent reviewers i.e. experts that are perhaps seconded to the secretariat for one to two years.

The technical review process has several components - the less technical matters such as good practice and institutional arrangements, and the more technical matters of the quality of the inventory data itself and matters relating to adjustments (under Article 5.2). The suggestion of having semi-permanent reviewers is made because the reviews must have a high level of consistency, and overall, the inventory review and compliance process will be highly technical, will be time-intensive, and will require a level of expertise that will not be developed by using different experts for one-off reviews.

PAPER NO. 4: SWITZERLAND

Draft guidelines for the technical review of greenhouse gas inventories

In response to the call at the tenth session of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation for views on draft guidelines for the technical review of greenhouse gas inventories, Switzerland presents the following views.

1. Switzerland welcomes the draft guidelines prepared by the Convention Secretariat. They well reflect previous discussions and conclusions of the SBSTA on this matter. The general description of the technical review process, the work plan and the proposed operational arrangements form a very useful basis for consideration at the eleventh session of the SBI.
2. For the success and credibility of the review process it is crucial that a sufficiently large number of experts endowed with (i) adequate expertise in all relevant sectors of emissions and sinks, (ii) the necessary range of language abilities, (iii) sufficient diversity of geographical and institutional background, be available for selection. Thus, the detailed status of nominations, together with a process to address possible gaps, should be a standard item on the agenda of upcoming meetings of the subsidiary bodies. A brief oral report by the Secretariat to SBI 11 on potential or overt deficiencies in the existing rosters (including lack of detail in information) with a view to the needs of the upcoming inventory review process could be helpful in this regard.
3. With a view to the assessment of experience gained with the review process by the Convention at the end of the period 2000-2002, special attention should be given to the systematic and coherent presentation of findings at all stages and on all aspects of the individual reviews.
4. When considering the draft text contained in document FCCC/SBI/1999/13, it should be kept in mind that the review guidelines, once adopted by the COP, will be of preliminary nature as they are designed to serve the needs of the trial period defined by COP4. Expanding and refining their content in the light of the provisions of Articles 5, 7 and 8 of the Kyoto Protocol will be necessary after a thorough assessment of this trial period.

PAPER NO. 5: UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

United States Views on Inventory Review

The United States appreciates the Secretariat's effort in preparing the draft guidelines for the technical review of inventories of Annex I Parties. We are generally supportive of the experimental approach laid out in document FCCC/SBI/1999/13, and believe it improves Parties' understanding of the proposed review process.

Given the limited time and large amount of work to be completed at the 11th session of the Subsidiary Bodies, it will not be feasible to discuss and adopt the entirety of the proposed guidelines. Therefore, we recommend that only Part I of the draft guidelines be negotiated and adopted at COP5. With respect to parts II and III - the workplan and operational arrangements - there is no need to negotiate and adopt these portions of the text if Parties agree on the approach. Instead, we suggest that key elements of the workplan (e.g. the number of reviews to be conducted at each stage of the review process) be reflected in the decision. Reducing the amount of text to be negotiated will increase the likelihood that Parties can complete work and adopt the inventory review guidelines at COP5.

With respect to part I of the guidelines, the US believes that additional detail is needed to clarify the tasks of the review process, particularly for the initial check and synthesis and assessment. The initial check should be designed to assess the completeness of inventory submissions and quickly communicate this information to Parties. The second stage of the review process is more complex. We note that the proposed "synthesis and assessment" combines two different functions: a compilation and synthesis of aggregated inventory information and a preliminary assessment of individual inventories. The former is by definition an aggregate exercise and will entail comparison of inventory information across Annex I Parties. The latter will provide a thorough examination of individual inventories for technical consistency with reporting guidelines and identification of any discrepancies or changes in methodologies.

On the final stage of the review process, we generally agree with the tasks laid out in the guidelines and the approach of the trial period. However, we reiterate our view that individual review process will require in-country visits to examine procedures and institutional arrangements for inventory development, and to facilitate a constructive dialogue between the reviewers and Parties' experts. Given the amount of time and resources required to conduct in-country visits, we do not believe it will be feasible or appropriate to conduct the in-country inventory review more than every 3 years. Our detailed comments on part I of the guidelines are attached.

We have a few comments on the workplan and operational arrangements, but generally support the approach. First, we note that the various operational arrangements are suggested for the third stage of the inventory process. We believe that there would also be value in testing various operational approaches for part ii of the synthesis and assessment stage. Specifically, we recommend that the Secretariat test both desk and centralized reviews as a means of involving experts in the synthesis and assessment. Second, we consider it important to test more than one approach for several countries and to vary the order of the approaches (e.g. desk review before country visit and vice versa). This will provide better insight into the relative merits of each

approach. Finally, the draft document is unclear on the exact number and frequency of reviews which will be conducted under each approach during the trial period. The US recommends five to seven desk reviews per year and two centralized reviews per year, each covering five to ten inventories. The Secretariat should also coordinate three or four in-country reviews per year and

ensure that a representative group of Parties is subject to both a paper review and in-country review. These numbers should be reflected in the decision adopting the review guidelines.

As the Secretariat has noted, the development of an electronic database and specialized software to process and analyze inventory information will greatly enhance the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of the inventory review process. We urge the Secretariat to begin development of this database and will explore ways that the US can support it. Additionally, we request the Secretariat to develop a checklist for each stage of the inventory process. Such a checklist will help ensure consistent application of the review guidelines across Parties. Finally, we note that the Secretariat has previously raised a concern regarding the need for appropriate expertise in the inventory review process. We share this concern and ask the Secretariat to consider options for ensuring the technical competence of reviewers, such as training or certification, and to make recommendations on this matter in its report on the inventory review trial to the Subsidiary Bodies.

We look forward to successful adoption of these guidelines at COP5 and volunteer for review of the US greenhouse gas inventory in 2001.

US Comments on Part I of the Draft Guidelines for Inventory Review

General Comments

- Paper is somewhat duplicative, primarily with respect to the purposes and would benefit from streamlining.
- We would like to see the tasks elaborated in more clarity.

Purpose

- Paragraph 2: The lettered bullets are somewhat duplicative. We recommend merging subparagraphs b, d and e. We also recommend deletion of ‘non-confrontational’ as this is covered by ‘facilitative’.

General Approach

- Paragraph 4 bis : Insert new paragraph: “At all stages of the inventory review process, the Secretariat will provide individual Parties with the opportunity to clarify issues or provide additional information. The Parties will also be sent drafts of their status report, the relevant country section of the synthesis and assessment report and their individual inventory report. Every effort will be made to reach agreement with the Party on the content of a report prior to its publication. In the case of a Party and the expert team being unable to agree on an issue, the Party may provide explanatory text to be included in a separate section of the report.”

Initial Check of Inventories

- Paragraph 5: Since these points are further elaborated under paragraph 7, we recommend replacing the existing text: “The purpose of the initial check is to determine whether the information provided is complete and in the correct format to enable subsequent review stages to occur, and to communicate this determination to Parties.”
- Paragraph 7: Subparagraphs a and b needs to be expanded for clarity. Additionally, we recommend deletion of sub-paragraph c, as this task is more appropriate for the individual review stage. We recommend replacing the text with the following:.

“The initial checks will:

- (a) Indicate the date of receipt by the Secretariat
- (b) Verify that the submission was received in both hard-copy and the correct electronic format;
- (c) Determine whether the submission is complete and that information has been provided in the correct format as called for in the inventory reporting guidelines. The assessment of completeness will determine whether :
 - i) All sources, sinks and gases included in the 1996 IPCC guidelines are reported and any gaps are explained;
 - ii) Methodologies are documented;

- iii) Estimates for summary totals and individual source categories are provided in mass units and GWP – weighted units using the IPCC 1995 values;
 - iv) Total emissions estimates are provided for all required years (i.e base year to current submission);
 - v) Unadjusted emission estimates are reported;
 - vi) Estimates for CO₂ from fossil fuel combustion are reported using the IPCC reference approach in addition to estimates derived using national methods;
 - vii) Estimates for HFCs, PFCs, and SF₆ are reported by individual chemical species;
 - viii) Any recalculations are reported for the entire time series with transparent documentation; And
- (d) Identify any gaps in the data or documentation.

- Paragraph 8: Suggested revision: “The results of initial checks will be presented in a status report for each Annex I Party, mainly in a tabular format, within 4 weeks of the date of submission.”

Synthesis and Assessment

- Paragraph 9: As these points are elaborated under paragraph 13, we recommend shortening this paragraph: “The purpose of the annual synthesis and assessment of Annex I Parties’ greenhouse inventories is to facilitate the consideration of inventory data and other information across Parties, and to identify issues for further consideration during the review of individual inventories.”
- Paragraph 10: Suggested revision: “The synthesis and assessment will be conducted annually be the Secretariat, with the assistance of nominated experts for Part II.”
- Paragraph 11: It is not clear what is meant by “supplementary information”. If this refers to the national inventory report, then it should be specified.
- Paragraph 13: The distinction between parts 1 and 2 needs clarification:
“Part I of the synthesis and assessment would compile and compare information across Parties, including inter alia:
 - a) Implied emissions factors and ranges contained in the 1996 IPCC Guidelines;
 - b) Methodologies used in the preparation of inventories;
 - c) Estimates of CO₂ from fuel combustion using the IPCC reference approach;
 - d) Estimates of actual and potential emissions from hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons and sulphur hexafluoride.
 - d) Inventory recalculations; and
 - e) Any trends in reporting problems.”

- Paragraph 14: Paragraph needs to clarify that these activities refer to individual inventories, rather than aggregated data. Suggested revision:
“ Part II of the synthesis and assessment would for each individual inventory, inter alia:
 - a) Compare emissions, activity data, implied emission factors and any recalculations with data from previous submissions to identify, to the extent possible, any irregularities or inconsistencies;
 - b) Compare activity data with relevant external authoritative sources, if feasible, and identify any inconsistencies;
 - c) Examine whether *good practice* is documented and identify areas where it is not;
 - d) Based on the above activities, identify source or sink categories requiring further consideration/clarification during the individual inventory review stage.”
- Paragraph 15: Suggested revision: “The addendum will compile and tabulate aggregate information on greenhouse gas emissions by sources and removals by sinks for all gases and sources, and their trends.”
- Paragraph 16: We recommend deletion of this paragraph as the points are elaborated under paragraph 19.
- Paragraph 19 e): Suggested revision: “Examine data and the application of methodologies for sources and sink categories identified during Part II of the synthesis and assessment;”
- Paragraph 21: We believe that a COP decision on *good practice* will require formal revision of these guidelines. For this reason, we recommend deletion of this paragraph.

US Comments on Draft Decision

The Conference of Parties

1. Adopts the guidelines for **the trial period of the** technical review process related to greenhouse gas inventories of Annex I Parties contained in annex I to this decision;
2. Requests the secretariat to conduct annual initial checks and ~~prepare~~ annual synthesis and assessment ~~reports~~ of greenhouse gas inventories for all Annex I Parties beginning in 2000, according to the above-mentioned guidelines for the technical review process;
3. Decides to initiate individual reviews of inventories coordinated by the secretariat for a limited number of Annex I Parties **on a voluntary basis** during the period 2000 ~~to 2002~~ **through 2001**, according to the above-mentioned guidelines for the technical review process;
4. Requests the secretariat to coordinate **different approaches** to the synthesis and assessment and individual review stages of the process, specifically ~~the inventory reviews in accordance with the operational arrangements identified in the work plan,~~
 - a) **five to seven desk reviews per year,**
 - b) **two centralized reviews per year, each covering five to ten inventories; and,**
 - c) **three or four in-country reviews per year.**
5. Requests the subsidiary bodies to evaluate, after ~~2002-2001~~, the experience gained with the review process conducted in accordance with paragraphs 2 ~~and 3~~ **through 4** above, with a view to adopting revised guidelines and/or operational arrangements for the technical review of inventories **at COP 8;**
6. Invites Annex I Parties which are in a position to do so, to subject their inventories to an individual ~~technical~~ review in the period 2000 ~~to 2002~~ **through 2001 and to designate a government focal point for the coordination of the review;**
7. Decides to initiate individual review of inventories for all Annex I Parties in 2003; and
7 bis: Urges Annex I Parties to facilitate the review of their inventories by responding to the Secretariat's requests for additional information or comments in a timely manner.
8. Invites Parties to nominate inventory experts with expertise in relevant sectors by 15 April 2000 **and encourages Parties to ensure that these experts have adequate time and, as appropriate, financial support to participate in the review process.**