

# Overview of planning and preparation of the 2015 - 2016 reviews

12<sup>th</sup> Meeting of Lead Reviewers  
Bonn, Germany, 2–4 March 2015



**Vitor Góis**

UNFCCC secretariat, Mitigation Data and Analysis

# Overview

---

- ❑ Background information
  - New UNFCCC guidance for reporting and review
  - New timing rules for the completion of review
  - Issues related to date of submission 2015
- ❑ Overview of plans for the 2015 – 2016 review
- ❑ Annual reports to SBSTA
- ❑ Discussion

---

New guidance for reporting and review of  
GHG inventories under UNFCCC and  
Kyoto Protocol



# Guidance framework (overview)

---

- **Convention**

- Agreed review guidelines (decision 13/CP.20)
  - Replacing decision 19/CP.8, to be effective immediately
  - In combination with the new reporting guidelines (decision 24/CP.19), to be used starting 2015

- **Kyoto Protocol**

- Guidelines on reporting, accounting and review were not agreed as a whole
  - Some elements for reporting agreed (gases, GWP, methodologies, initial report, KP-LULUCF)
  - Missing
    - Reporting guidelines (decision 15/CMP.1)
    - Accounting, including the calculation of the assigned amount (decision 13/CMP.1) and SEF tables (decision 14/CMP.1)
    - Review guidelines (decision 22/CMP.1)
    - Adjustments (decision 20/CMP.1)
    - National systems (decision 19/CMP.1)
    - Training (decision 8/CMP.5)

# New timing rules: comparison to old guidelines and KP

Step		'old' review guidelines (ICR/CR/DR)			'new' review guidelines	Dec. 22/CMP.1 (KP)
Sub.	Due date	15-Apr				
	Grace period	-			6 wks	6 wks
SR	Preparation draft	3 wks			3 wks*	4 wks*
	Party comments	+ 3 wks			+ 3 wks	6 wks*
	Publication	7 wks*			-	10 wks*
AR (SA II)	Preparation draft	7 wks#			7 wks#	-
	Party comments	+ 3 wks			+ 3 wks	-
	Completion	4 wks#			ND	-
Review report	Information provided	1 month#			1 month#	-
	Saturday papers	-			-	25 + (6) wks*
	Comments SP	-			-	+ 0-6 wks
	Draft report (ERT)	3	10	7	6	+8 wks
	Sec. (QA+edits)	ND			+4	ND
	Party comments	+4			+4	+4 + (4) wks
	Finalization (ERT)	+3	+6	+4	+4	+4 wks
	Publication	+1	+2	+2	+2	ND
	Completion	14	20	25	20	1 year*
* after submission due date						
# before review						
ND - not defined						

**Example**

**Review week**

1-Sep

**Publication**

KP – 1 Feb (14 April)

Conv. – 26 Jan

---

# Specific issues related to the planning of the 2015 review cycle

## Expected date of submissions



## Rules for the date of submissions 2015

---

- Decision 24/CP.19
  - ❑ (paras. 3 and 5) If the CRF Reporter is not available in line with paragraph 5 below (June 2014), Parties may submit the CRF tables
    - after 15 April;
    - but no longer than the corresponding delay in the CRF Reporter availability
- Decision 2/CMP.8
  - ❑ Each Party with a QELRC shall submit to the secretariat, by 15 April 2015, the report to facilitate the calculation of the assigned amount
- Decision 6/CMP.9
  - ❑ (para. 4) the same provisions as under the Convention



## Rules for the date of submissions 2015

---

- Decision 13/CP.20
  - ❑ 11. Recognizes that the deadline, as set out in decision 24/CP.19, paragraph 5, for providing the upgraded CRF Reporter to Annex I Parties, enabling Parties to submit their greenhouse gas inventories, was not met;
  - ❑ 12. Notes that version 5.0.0 of the CRF Reporter is not functioning in order to enable Annex I Parties to submit their common reporting format tables for the year 2015;
  - ❑ 13. Reiterates that Annex I Parties in 2015 may submit their common reporting format tables after 15 April, but no longer than the corresponding delay in the CRF Reporter availability;
  - ❑ 14. Urges Annex I Parties to submit the information referred to in paragraph 13 above as soon as practically possible;



## Delay of submissions and reporting on KP

---

- ❑ Secretariat's letter to Parties (5 February 2015)
  - Because of the current delay in the availability of the upgraded CRF reporter, there may be a corresponding delay in the submission of Annex I GHG inventories in 2015 and in the reporting of KP-LULUCF activities
  - Any delay may impact on the submission date of the initial reports for the second commitment period set out in decision 2/CMP.8.
- ❑ Organization of reviews under Article 8 of the Kyoto Protocol in 2015 is questionable,
  - considering the current status of the CMP guidance on accounting, reporting and review in relation to the second commitment period under the Protocol



# Current perspectives for the CRF Reporter

---

## ❑ Current situation and expected future developments

- Release of 30 January: addressed the performance issues in the software (successful)
- Release of March: will address known data entry problems and major issues in aggregations and reporting tables (including critical bugs)
- Release of April: issues with the reporting tables (incompleteness, cases of in-accuracy, etc.)

## ❑ Implications on submissions

- Most likely, the CRF Reporter is fully functional by the end of April
- This situation
  - ⇒ Max. allowed delay = 10 months, i.e. **15 February 2016**
  - But, some Parties may submit earlier**

- **The secretariat cannot know today when submissions will come and how many will be received**

## Decision 27/CP.19

---

- ❑ The budget decision in Warsaw (27/CP.19) requested the secretariat to implement an exceptional measure in 2014-2015:
  - ✓ Para 9: *“Requests the secretariat, on an exceptional basis and as part of measures to improve cost efficiency, to conduct the reviews of individual annual greenhouse gas inventories of those Annex I Parties which do not have quantified emission reduction or limitation commitments inscribed for the first or the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol only one time in the biennium 2014–2015”*
- During the 2014 cycle, Cyprus, Malta, Belarus, US and Kazakhstan were not reviewed individually
- 2015 cycle: Canada, Japan, New Zealand, Russian Federation, Turkey are planned not be reviewed individually



---

# Overview of plans for 2015–2016



## Objectives for the 2015 review cycle

---

1. Managing the uncertainty in submission dates
2. Minimize the impact of the delay in submissions (CRF Reporter)
3. Maximize gaining experience with the use of the new reporting and review guidelines
  - In particular, gain experience with desk reviews
4. Implement the new review tools, materials and templates under the guidance of the lead reviewers and under the framework of the data warehouse
5. Develop stable procedures to meet the strict timing deadlines under decision 13/CP.20, including
  - A stable report template usable for a long period
  - Stable review practices to enable meeting the deadlines but not compromising the quality of review
  - Implement a pragmatic, efficient and effective QA system and secretariat's QA procedures that is not an obstacle to meeting the deadlines
  - Maximize efficiency and gains during the review week, including the streamlining of RT and ARR's

## Proposal for a flexible plan for 2015

---

- Taking into consideration the uncertainty in submission dates,
  - ❑ Strict use of the Warsaw/Lima “delay provisions” would mean that
    - The 2015 submissions coming by 15 Feb. 2016 would have to be reviewed in conjunction with the 2016 submissions
- In case that Parties respond positively to the encouragement in decision 13/CP.20 (to Parties to submit asap), and continuing to consider September-October as the preferred review period, an alternative scenario could be:
  - ❑ For those Parties submitting annual inventories by end May 2015
    - Centralized and in-country reviews in September 2015
  - ❑ For those Parties submitting annual inventories by July 2015
    - Desk reviews in October-November 2015
  - ❑ For those Parties submitting inventories later than July 2015
    - Reviewed in conjunction with the 2016 review cycle
  - ❑ Reviews under the Kyoto Protocol for all Parties postponed to 2016
  - ❑ Reviews in accordance with decision 27/CP.19
    - CYP, MLT, BLR, USA, KAZ



# Planning details

---

- **Questionnaires**

- To ERTs on availability to participate in reviews
- To Parties on expected submission dates and preferences for review

- **Planning for reviews**

- Preliminary plans
  - Centralized reviews
    - September
    - Number dependent on submissions
    - 3 – 4 Parties per centralized review
    - 2 experts per sector, 3 for energy and LULUCF
    - New experts subject to training
  - Desk reviews
    - Number dependent on submissions
    - 2 Parties per team
    - Only experienced reviewers
  - In-country reviews
    - In accordance to voluntary participation (questionnaire)
    - Parties under decision 27/CP.19

---

The annual report to the SBSTA



# Annual reports to the SBSTA

---

- ❑ Provide information and advise to SBSTA under Convention (dec. 13/CP.20) and KP (dec. 22/CMP.1) so that SBSTA will provide guidance to the secretariat
  - Process related issues on annual submissions and reviews
  - How to improve the quality, efficiency and consistency of reviews
- ❑ Approach, outline and scope:
  - Approach: continuity with existing approach, enhanced utility and usefulness
  - Report under Kyoto Protocol likely to be deferred to 2016



---

# Conclusions



# Possible elements for draft conclusions

---

- ❑ Additional challenges for the 2015 review cycle
  - Possible delays in submission by Parties (CRF reporter)
- ❑ Recognize the importance of ensuring the timeliness of review in accordance with decision 13/CP.20
- ❑ Requesting the secretariat to continue practices that have contributed to improvements in efficiency of review during the 2014 review cycle
  - To consult with Parties to agree on review dates
  - Prepare ERTs as early as possible
  - At least one LR does not have sectoral responsibilities
  - ERTs with a sufficient number of experienced experts (CR/ICR)
  - Materials, templates and review tools available early
- ❑ Leadership role in ensuring that ERTs follow the new UNFCCC review guidelines
  - Noting the importance of gaining experience and ways to use it to improve future reviews



## Possible elements for draft conclusions

---

- Any suggestions on how to conduct DR?
- Any suggestions on how to manage the uncertainty in submissions for 2015?
  - Views on the flexible plan proposed by the secretariat
- Any views on reviews 2016 and post-2016?
  - KP and Convention



---

Thank you

