

# *QA process and procedures*

12th Meeting of Lead Reviewers

March 2015



**Lisa Hanle**  
**Mitigation Data and Analysis**  
UNFCCC secretariat

## Overview

---

- ❖ Quality is the responsibility of everyone
- ❖ Current elements of QA/QC (2014)
- ❖ QA mandate from decision 13/CP.20
- ❖ QA/QC procedures for 2015
- ❖ Elements of possible LR conclusions



# Quality is the responsibility of everyone

LRs should ensure that the reviews in which they participate are performed by each ERT according to the relevant review guidelines and consistently across Parties. They should also ensure the quality and objectivity of the thorough and comprehensive technical examinations in the reviews and provide for the continuity, comparability and timeliness of the reviews. (Para. 42 of annex to decision 13/CP.20)

Lead Reviewers

Secretariat to ensure “consistent identification and treatment of issues” (Para. 89 of annex to decision 13/CP.20)

ERT

## Goal: Quality ARR

- Promote...a thorough, objective and comprehensive technical review of all aspects of the implementation of the Convention and promote TACCC (para. 5 of 13/CP.20)
- Ensure consistency with Annex I inventory reporting guidelines (para. 58)
- Ensure COP has accurate, consistent and relevant information

Secretariat

Each ERT “shall provide a thorough and comprehensive technical review of the information reported under the Convention related to GHG inventories” and “shall be responsible for performing the review...in accordance with the procedures and time frames established in these guidelines.” (Paras. 24-25 of annex to 13/CP.20) “in order to assess whether the COP has accurate, consistent and relevant information on annual GHG inventories”(para. 72 of annex to 13/CP.20).

Respond to draft report (para. 90 of annex to 13/CP.20)

Party



## 2014 Quality Assurance/ quality control process

---

FCCC/SBSTA/2009/3

**Para. 73** The SBSTA requested the secretariat to implement the following additional activities, subject to the availability of resources:

... (b) Strengthen its capacity to manage and improve the review process, including enhanced secretarial support to review activities and creating an additional post at Professional level for an officer responsible for quality assurance of review activities;

**Para. 74.** The SBSTA requested the secretariat...to give priority to the enhanced training activities and the quality assurance of review activities.



## Challenges of Current (2014) QA/QC Process

---

- ❖ Timing
  - ❖ Bottlenecks can appear both in getting ARR's to RO and in QA
  - ❖ Reports for QA often come in right before/during COP
  - ❖ Clearance step...function and timing?
  
- ❖ Effectiveness:
  - ❖ If significant issues identified, often too late to address (KP) or elaboration by ERT not feasible because further questions not asked during review week (Convention)
  - ❖ Are existing procedures being followed? QC issues remain in latter stages
  
- ❖ Consistency of QA
  - ❖ Multiple QA officers can lead to emphasizing different elements
  - ❖ Multiple QA/QC steps can lead to “flip flopping”



## Secretariat mandate for QA process in 2015 onwards

---

- ❖ QA has been an integral part of the review process for several years, but not explicitly recognized in the previous review guidelines
- ❖ Decision 13/CP. 20 changes that:
  - ❖ To achieve consistent review reports and a comparable treatment of Annex I Parties in the review process **the secretariat shall implement QA procedures**. The QA procedures developed by the secretariat should be presented to and discussed at the meeting of the lead reviewers for GHG inventories. **The purpose of the QA procedures is to ensure a consistent identification and treatment of issues**. Editorial streamlining should take place only to the extent that the timelines for publication of the review reports are not compromised. (paragraph 89)
  - ❖ The secretariat applies QA/QC procedures, edits and formats the draft reports and the ERT considers comments **within four weeks** and sends them to the respective Annex I Party for comment; (paragraph 90(b))



## 2015 QA Procedures- Approach

---

- ❖ Reiterating that all play a role in achieving common goal of quality of the final ARR
- ❖ Building on current procedures and experience, while...
  - ✓ Recognizing time constraints (overall review timeline, and mandated QA timeline)
    - Procedures now focus on Convention timeline, assuming no changes in KP
  - ✓ Addressing current challenges (timing, effectiveness, adherence to procedures)
    - The revised 2015 ARR template may address some of these challenges; particularly timing
- ❖ Recognizing that in the end, the mandate is a challenge. Can the secretariat “ensure” consistent “treatment of issues”.
  - ✓ Secretariat strives to ensure consistent identification of issues, and alert the ERTs to potential consistency issues, but in the end, the ARR is the collective responsibility of the ERT.



## 2015 QA procedures: Functions and timing

---

- ❖ Setting the stage for quality reports (Primary responsibility: ERT, LRs)
  - ✓ If potential key issues are identified before the week, ERT/LR/RO can better focus on substance of issues (incl. discussion with the Party) during week
  - ✓ Goal to clearly elaborate all unresolved issues by end of review week.
  
- ❖ Review week (Primary responsibility: LRs, [secretariat](#))
  - ✓ LR/RO to provide initial feedback on draft ARR to extent possible to allow revisions from ERT during the week (should be more feasible with tabular ARR)
  - ✓ To promote consistent identification and treatment of issues: at least 1 secretariat staff not involved in the review will attend all wrap up meetings and RO to send out summary of review week issues within 3 days after review week
  
- ❖ Immediately following review week: (Primary responsibility: ERT, LRs, [secretariat](#))
  - ✓ Maximize use of 2-4 weeks after review week.



## 2015 QA Procedures- Functions and timing

---

- ❖ Remaining QA procedures would be similar to current procedures:
  - ❖ RO Officer full QA/QC:
    - ✓ Commences upon receipt of draft ARR
    - ✓ Focus is on substantive checks (consistency with UNFCCC reporting and review guidelines), completeness and clarity, adherence to template
  - ❖ Consistency Officer:
    - ✓ Commences upon receipt of draft ARR from RO
    - ✓ Focus to highlight any major issues related to “consistent identification and treatment of issues” that must be either resolved/clarified prior to submission to the Party
    - ✓ Other issues may be identified but only to the extent that the timelines for publication of the review reports are not compromised.
  - ❖ Proofreading
  - ❖ Clearance for Publication



## QA tools

---

- ❖ QA / QC plan: Secretariat to document specific procedures
- ❖ QA/QC Checks: to be updated based on updated procedures and template
  - ❖ **LR checklist**: Focus that all parts of ARR have been provided, adherence to UNFCCC Annex I Inventory reporting guidelines, checking final numbers
  - ❖ **RO checklist** : Focus on completeness, adherence to UNFCCC Annex I Inventory reporting guidelines, adherence to ARR template language, checking final numbers
  - ❖ **Consistency Officer checklist** : Adherence to UNFCCC Annex I Inventory reporting guidelines, with a view to promoting consistency
- ❖ Actual content of checks will depend on final ARR template



## 2015 QA Function, timing and tools- How it all fits together

Timing	Who	What? Key steps to promote quality	"Tools"
<b>Before review week (April-August)</b>	ERT and LRs	Identify preliminary questions and possible key issues	Background materials (including review tools)
<b>During review week</b>	ERT and LRs	Elaborate findings / recommendations for remaining problems	Review tools, communication with Parties, coordination within ERT
	LR	Monitor review to ensure it is carried out in accordance with UNFCCC Guidelines	LR completeness checklist
	Secretariat	Work closely with ERT to identify possible consistency issues early	
<b>2-4 weeks after review week</b>	ERT	Focus on completing draft ARR, including incorporation of any responses from Party to preliminary main findings	NA
	LR	Coordinate closely with team to finalize draft ARR for submission to RO	
	Secretariat	To provide preliminary QA on issues identified	
<b>6 weeks after review week</b>	ERT/LR	Submit final draft ARR	LR QA/QC checklist
<b>Secretariat QA (6-10 weeks after review)</b>	RO	Review entire draft ARR	RO QA/QC checklist
	Editor	Review draft ARR against template and relevant editorial checks	internal UN checklists
	Consistency Officer	Review draft ARR against pre-defined checks designed to ensure consistency	CO checklist
	ERT	Consider QA comments	NA
<b>10-14 weeks after review after review week</b>	Party	Comments on the draft ARR	Country-specific procedures
<b>14-18 weeks after review week</b>	ERT	ERT finalizes report, taking into account Party comment	NA
<b>18-20 weeks after review week</b>	Secretariat	Final proofreading and clearance for publication	NA

## Elements of Possible LR Conclusions

---

- ❖ Provide reaction to the secretariat's planned QA procedures for the technical review of GHG inventories from Parties included in Annex I to the Convention. They recommended that the secretariat document the procedures in a plan and update existing QA/QC checks in accordance with that plan.
- ❖ In development of the QA plan, to acknowledge that everyone- ERTs, LRs, Parties and the secretariat- has a role to play in ensuring the overall quality of the published annual review report.

