



Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice

Thirty-seventh session

Doha, 26 November to 1 December 2012

Item 12(e) of the provisional agenda

Methodological issues under the Kyoto Protocol

Annual report on the technical review of greenhouse gas inventories and other information reported by Parties included in Annex I to the Convention that are also Parties to the Kyoto Protocol under Article 7, paragraph 1, of the Kyoto Protocol

Annual report on the technical review of greenhouse gas inventories and other information reported by Parties included in Annex I to the Convention that are also Parties to the Kyoto Protocol under Article 7, paragraph 1, of the Kyoto Protocol

Note by the secretariat

Summary

This document provides information on the status of submission and review of the annual information required under Article 7, paragraph 1, of the Kyoto Protocol, including the greenhouse gas inventories, and the status of submission of the review reports to the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol and the Compliance Committee in 2012. It also provides information on the selection of experts and lead reviewers and their participation in the review process and on the annual report to the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice prepared by the lead reviewers in accordance with decision 22/CMP.1. In addition, it provides information regarding the information submitted in accordance with decision 15/CMP.1 on Article 3, paragraph 14, of the Kyoto Protocol and the information submitted in accordance with decision 14/CP.7.

Contents

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction.....	1–9	3
A. Mandate.....	1–3	3
B. Background.....	4–6	3
C. Scope of the note.....	7–8	4
D. Possible action by the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice.....	9	5
II. Submission and review of annual reports from Parties included in Annex I.....	10–14	5
III. Expert review teams and lead reviewers.....	15–26	9
IV. Annual report of inventory lead reviewers.....	27–81	13
V. Other matters relating to the annual reviews.....	82–86	21
A. Compilation of information submitted by Parties on the minimization of adverse impacts in accordance with Article 3, paragraph 14, of the Kyoto Protocol.....	82–83	21
B. Information regarding the information submitted by Parties in accordance with decision 14/CP.7.....	84–86	21

I. Introduction

A. Mandate

1. In accordance with decision 15/CMP.1, each Party included in Annex I to the Convention that is also a Party to the Kyoto Protocol (hereinafter referred to as Party included in Annex I) shall start reporting the information under Article 7, paragraph 1, of the Kyoto Protocol with the inventory submission due under the Convention for the first year of the commitment period after the Protocol has entered into force for that Party.

2. The annual review of this information should start in the year that the Party commences reporting information under Article 7, paragraph 1, in accordance with decision 22/CMP.1. In accordance with the same decision, the secretariat shall prepare an annual report to the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) on the composition of the expert review teams (ERTs), including the selection of experts for the review teams and the lead reviewers (LRs).¹ The LRs collectively shall prepare an annual report to the SBSTA with suggestions on how to improve the review process and advise on the standardized data comparisons of inventory information to be conducted by the secretariat based on the electronic common reporting format (CRF) submissions to be used in the review process.²

3. In accordance with decisions 15/CMP.1 and 14/CP.7, the secretariat shall compile information submitted by Parties on the minimization of adverse impacts in accordance with Article 3, paragraph 14, of the Kyoto Protocol and on relevant emission factors related to the impact of single projects.

B. Background

4. At its thirtieth session, the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) requested the secretariat to facilitate the work of the LRs, including by organizing their annual meetings.³ The SBI re-emphasized the urgent need to strengthen the secretariat's capacity to manage the reporting and review processes, including the training for members of ERTs participating in annual reviews under Article 8 of the Kyoto Protocol, planning and conducting the reviews, organizing the LRs' meetings and the further development of the greenhouse gas (GHG) information system,⁴ and to prioritize these fundamental activities.⁵

5. In 2010 and 2011 the secretariat prepared the annual report⁶ referred to in paragraph 2 above, containing information on the status of submissions by Parties included in Annex I of the annual information required under Article 7, paragraph 1, of the Kyoto Protocol, the status of review of this information in conjunction with the review of the GHG inventories, the status of submission of the review reports to the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP) and the Compliance Committee in 2010 and 2011 and the annual report to the SBSTA prepared by the LRs in accordance with decision 22/CMP.1, as well as information on the selection of experts and LRs and their

¹ Decision 22/CMP.1, annex, paragraph 35.

² Decision 22/CMP.1, annex, paragraph 40.

³ FCCC/SBI/2009/8, paragraph 86(a).

⁴ The term "greenhouse gas information system" describes the status of and current developments in the systems that support the reporting and review processes, requiring a number of information technology systems which differ in purpose, scope, size and degree of support.

⁵ FCCC/SBI/2009/8, paragraph 85.

⁶ FCCC/SBSTA/2010/INF.9 and FCCC/SBSTA/2011/INF.16, respectively.

participation in the review process, the information on the minimization of adverse impacts in accordance with Article 3, paragraph 14, of the Kyoto Protocol as required by decision 15/CMP.1 and the information submitted by Parties in accordance with decision 14/CP.7. At its thirty-third and thirty-fifth sessions, the SBSTA took note of those documents.^{7,8}

6. In 2010, all 41 Parties included in Annex I submitted their annual information required under Article 7, paragraph 1, of the Kyoto Protocol in accordance with decision 15/CMP.1 and the secretariat organized reviews of that information in accordance with the “Guidelines for review under Article 8 of the Kyoto Protocol” (hereinafter referred to as the Article 8 review guidelines). Thirty-eight reports of the reviews conducted up to 9 October 2010 were published and forwarded by the secretariat to the CMP, the Compliance Committee and the Party concerned.⁹ The published 2010 annual review reports,¹⁰ with two exceptions, do not contain questions of implementation.¹¹ Eight of the reports contain adjustments referred to in Article 5, paragraph 2, of the Kyoto Protocol. In 2011, all 41 Parties included in Annex I submitted their annual information required under Article 7, paragraph 1, of the Kyoto Protocol and the secretariat organized reviews of that information in accordance with the Article 8 review guidelines. At the time of the publication of this report, 40 reports of the reviews conducted up to 22 October 2011 had been published and forwarded by the secretariat to the CMP, the Compliance Committee and the Party concerned. The published 2011 annual review reports,¹² with two exceptions, do not contain questions of implementation. Four of the reports contain adjustments referred to in Article 5, paragraph 2, of the Kyoto Protocol.

C. Scope of the note

7. This document provides information on: the status of submission of the annual information required from Parties included in Annex I under Article 7, paragraph 1, of the Kyoto Protocol; the review of that information, including the GHG inventories of those Parties; and the status of submission of the review reports to the CMP and the Compliance Committee in 2012 (see chapter II below). It also provides information on the selection of experts and LRs for the review process and their participation in this process (see chapter III below) and on the annual report to the SBSTA prepared by the LRs in accordance with decision 22/CMP.1, including their conclusions and recommendations on how to improve the review process (see chapter IV below). The document further provides information regarding the information on the minimization of adverse impacts in accordance with Article 3, paragraph 14, of the Kyoto Protocol as required by decision 15/CMP.1 and the information submitted by Parties in accordance with decision 14/CP.7 (see chapter V below).

⁷ FCCC/SBSTA/2010/13, paragraph 98.

⁸ FCCC/SBSTA/2011/5, paragraph 87.

⁹ Belarus indicated that its 2010 and 2011 annual submissions are made under the Convention only. Kazakhstan indicated that its 2010 and 2011 annual submissions are made under the Kyoto Protocol; however, since Kazakhstan does not have a quantified emission limitation or reduction commitment inscribed in Annex B to the Kyoto Protocol its submissions are being treated as submissions under the Convention. Turkey indicated that its 2010 and 2011 annual submissions are made under both the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol; however, since Turkey does not have a quantified emission limitation or reduction commitment inscribed in Annex B to the Kyoto Protocol its submissions are being treated as submissions under the Convention.

¹⁰ See <http://unfccc.int/national_reports/annex_i_ghg_inventories/inventory_review_reports/items/5687.php>.

¹¹ See <http://unfccc.int/kyoto_protocol/compliance/questions_of_implementation/items/5451.php>.

¹² See <http://unfccc.int/national_reports/annex_i_ghg_inventories/inventory_review_reports/items/6048.php>.

8. In accordance with the Article 8 review guidelines, the review under the Kyoto Protocol encompasses the existing review under the Convention. The lessons learned and problems encountered in the review process in 2012 under the Convention and that under the Kyoto Protocol have many common elements. This document focuses on the elements of the review process that are specific to the Kyoto Protocol and should be read in conjunction with the “Annual report on the technical review of greenhouse gas inventories from Parties included in Annex I to the Convention”¹³ prepared in accordance with decision 12/CP.9.

D. Possible action by the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice

9. The SBSTA will be invited to take note of the information contained in this document.

II. Submission and review of annual reports from Parties included in Annex I

10. The annual inventory submission under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol comprises the national inventory report (NIR) and the CRF tables. The due date of the submission is 15 April. In 2012 the majority of Parties submitted their inventories before or on 15 April, while in six cases the submission was made within six weeks after the due date and in one case after that period. Submissions made by Parties after the due date can delay the review process, making the preparation of the review tools to support the review process more difficult, and the GHG inventory data of such Parties may not be included in the reports prepared by the secretariat. More information on the timeliness of submissions by Parties can be found in the “National greenhouse gas inventory data for the period 1990–2010”¹⁴ report prepared by the secretariat.

11. In 2012 the secretariat received 41 annual submissions from all Parties included in Annex I (see table 1). Thirty-eight of those submissions, containing the information required under Article 7, paragraph 1, of the Kyoto Protocol, including information on GHG inventories, were made by Parties in accordance with decision 15/CMP.1 for the third year of the commitment period. Status reports for all 41 submissions had been prepared and published on the UNFCCC website¹⁵ and 38 of them forwarded to the Compliance Committee by June 2012 (with the exception of those for Belarus, Kazakhstan and Turkey). The secretariat coordinated individual reviews of the 41 submissions, with 38 of them being reviewed following the requirements established under the Article 8 review guidelines. Ten of the individual reviews of the submissions, those of Belgium, Croatia, Estonia, Finland, Greece, Lithuania, Norway, Portugal, Slovakia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, were conducted as in-country reviews between 10 September and 6 October 2012 and the rest were conducted as centralized reviews. Altogether, eight centralized reviews were conducted between 3 and 29 September 2012 in Bonn, Germany. The reports of the reviews are expected to be finalized and published between January and March 2013. In addition, the secretariat organized an expedited in-country review, conducted on 28–29 September 2012, for the reinstatement of Lithuania’s eligibility to use

¹³ FCCC/SBSTA/2012/INF.10.

¹⁴ FCCC/SBI/2012/31.

¹⁵ See <http://unfccc.int/national_reports/annex_i_ghg_inventories/inventory_review_reports/items/6617.php>.

the mechanisms established under Articles 6, 12 and 17 of the Kyoto Protocol, requested by Lithuania in accordance with the Article 8 review guidelines.

Table 1

Submission of the annual information required under the Kyoto Protocol in 2012, review dates and status of review reports

<i>Party included in Annex I</i>	<i>Dates of submission of NIR and CRF tables</i>	<i>Language of NIR</i>	<i>Document symbol of status report</i>	<i>Review dates</i>	<i>Status of review report</i>
Australia	NIR – 14 Apr. 2012 CRF – 14 Apr. 2012	English	FCCC/ASR/2012/AUS	24–29 Sep. 2012	In preparation
Austria	NIR – 12 Apr. 2012 CRF – 12 Apr. 2012	English	FCCC/ASR/2012/AUT	10–15 Sep. 2012	In preparation
Belarus ^a	NIR – 14 Apr. 2012 CRF – 14 Apr. 2012	Russian	FCCC/ASR/2012/BLR	3–8 Sep. 2012	In preparation
Belgium	NIR – 15 Apr. 2012 CRF – 15 Apr. 2012	English	FCCC/ASR/2012/BEL	10–15 Sep. 2012	In preparation
Bulgaria	NIR – 12 Apr. 2012 CRF – 12 Apr. 2012	English	FCCC/ASR/2012/BGR	3–8 Sep. 2012	In preparation
Canada	NIR – 11 Apr. 2012 CRF – 11 Apr. 2012	English	FCCC/ASR/2012/CAN	10–15 Sep. 2012	In preparation
Croatia	NIR – 13 Apr. 2012 CRF – 13 Apr. 2012	English	FCCC/ASR/2012/HRV	17–22 Sep. 2012	In preparation
Czech Republic	NIR – 18 Apr. 2012 CRF – 15 Apr. 2012	English	FCCC/ASR/2012/CZE	3–8 Sep. 2012	In preparation
Denmark	NIR – 13 Apr. 2012 CRF – 13 Apr. 2012	English	FCCC/ASR/2012/DNK	3–8 Sep. 2012	In preparation
Estonia	NIR – 13 Apr. 2012 CRF – 13 Apr. 2012	English	FCCC/ASR/2012/EST	10–15 Sep. 2012	In preparation
European Union	NIR – 14 Apr. 2012 CRF – 13 Apr. 2012	English	FCCC/ASR/2012/EU	24–29 Sep. 2012	In preparation
Finland	NIR – 14 Apr. 2012 CRF – 12 Apr. 2012	English	FCCC/ASR/2012/FIN	1–6 Oct. 2012	In preparation
France	NIR – 4 Apr. 2012 CRF – 4 Apr. 2012	French	FCCC/ASR/2012/FRA	17–22 Sep. 2012	In preparation
Germany	NIR – 13 Apr. 2012 CRF – 13 Apr. 2012	English	FCCC/ASR/2012/DEU	3–8 Sep. 2012	In preparation
Greece	NIR – 18 Apr. 2012 CRF – 11 Apr. 2012	English	FCCC/ASR/2012/GRC	1–6 Oct. 2012	In preparation
Hungary	NIR – 4 May 2012 CRF – 14 Apr. 2012	English	FCCC/ASR/2012/HUN	10–15 Sep. 2012	In preparation
Iceland	NIR – 15 Apr. 2012 CRF – 14 Apr. 2012	English	FCCC/ASR/2012/ISL	10–15 Sep. 2012	In preparation
Ireland	NIR – 13 Apr. 2012 CRF – 13 Apr. 2012	English	FCCC/ASR/2012/IRL	3–8 Sep. 2012	In preparation

<i>Party included in Annex I</i>	<i>Dates of submission of NIR and CRF tables</i>	<i>Language of NIR</i>	<i>Document symbol of status report</i>	<i>Review dates</i>	<i>Status of review report</i>
Italy	NIR – 11 Apr. 2012 CRF – 11 Apr. 2012	English	FCCC/ASR/2012/ITA	24–29 Sep. 2012	In preparation
Japan	NIR – 12 Apr. 2012 CRF – 12 Apr. 2012	English	FCCC/ASR/2012/JPN	10–15 Sep. 2012	In preparation
Kazakhstan ^b	NIR – 18 Jul. 2012 CRF – 13 Apr. 2012	Russian	FCCC/ASR/2012/KAZ	17–22 Sep. 2012	In preparation
Latvia	NIR – 14 Apr. 2012 CRF – 14 Apr. 2012	English	FCCC/ASR/2012/LVA	10–15 Sep. 2012	In preparation
Liechtenstein	NIR – 13 Apr. 2012 CRF – 13 Apr. 2012	English	FCCC/ASR/2012/LIE	24–29 Sep. 2012	In preparation
Lithuania	NIR – 14 Apr. 2012 CRF – 13 Apr. 2012	English	FCCC/ASR/2012/LTU	28–29 Sep. 2012 ^c 1–6 Oct. 2012	11 Oct. 2012 In preparation
Luxembourg	NIR – 11 May 2012 CRF – 5 Apr. 2012	English	FCCC/ASR/2012/LUX	24–29 Sep. 2012	In preparation
Monaco	NIR – 4 Apr. 2012 CRF – 29 Mar. 2012	French	FCCC/ASR/2012/MCO	17–22 Sep. 2012	In preparation
Netherlands	NIR – 14 Apr. 2012 CRF – 14 Apr. 2012	English	FCCC/ASR/2012/NLD	17–22 Sep. 2012	In preparation
New Zealand	NIR – 12 Apr. 2012 CRF – 12 Apr. 2012	English	FCCC/ASR/2012/NZL	10–15 Sep. 2012	In preparation
Norway	NIR – 15 Apr. 2012 CRF – 15 Apr. 2012	English	FCCC/ASR/2012/NOR	17–22 Sep. 2012	In preparation
Poland	NIR – 13 Apr. 2012 CRF – 13 Apr. 2012	English	FCCC/ASR/2012/POL	24–29 Sep. 2012	In preparation
Portugal	NIR – 13 Apr. 2012 CRF – 13 Apr. 2012	English	FCCC/ASR/2012/PRT	24–29 Sep. 2012	In preparation
Romania	NIR – 21 Mar. 2012 CRF – 21 Mar. 2012	English	FCCC/ASR/2012/ROU	17–22 Sep. 2012	In preparation
Russian Federation	NIR – 25 May 2012 CRF – 13 Apr. 2012	Russian	FCCC/ASR/2012/RUS	3–8 Sep. 2012	In preparation
Slovakia	NIR – 15 Apr. 2012 CRF – 14 Apr. 2012	English	FCCC/ASR/2012/SVK	1–6 Oct. 2012	In preparation
Slovenia	NIR – 13 Apr. 2012 CRF – 12 Apr. 2012	English	FCCC/ASR/2012/SVN	3–8 Sep. 2012	In preparation
Spain	NIR – 17 Apr. 2012 CRF – 17 Apr. 2012	Spanish	FCCC/ASR/2012/ESP	17–22 Sep. 2012	In preparation
Sweden	NIR – 26 Mar. 2012 CRF – 26 Mar. 2012	English	FCCC/ASR/2012/SWE	24–29 Sep. 2012	In preparation
Switzerland	NIR – 12 Apr. 2012 CRF – 12 Apr. 2012	English	FCCC/ASR/2012/CHE	17–22 Sep. 2012	In preparation

<i>Party included in Annex I</i>	<i>Dates of submission of NIR and CRF tables</i>	<i>Language of NIR</i>	<i>Document symbol of status report</i>	<i>Review dates</i>	<i>Status of review report</i>
Turkey ^d	NIR – 14 Apr. 2012 CRF – 14 Apr. 2012	English	FCCC/ASR/2012/TUR	24–29 Sep. 2012	In preparation
Ukraine	NIR – 13 Apr. 2012 CRF – 13 Apr. 2012	Russian	FCCC/ASR/2012/UKR	17–22 Sep. 2012	In preparation
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	NIR – 13 Apr. 2012 CRF – 13 Apr. 2012	English	FCCC/ASR/2012/GBR	17–22 Sep. 2012	In preparation

Abbreviations: CRF = common reporting format, NIR = national inventory report, Party included in Annex I = Party included in Annex I to the Convention that is also a Party to the Kyoto Protocol.

^a Belarus is a Party to the Kyoto Protocol and its quantified emission reduction commitment in Annex B (92 per cent) was established through an amendment to Annex B to the Kyoto Protocol (decision 10/CMP.2). As at the time of the publication of this report, that amendment had not yet been ratified by enough Parties to allow its entry into force. Belarus has indicated explicitly that its 2012 annual submission is made under the Convention.

^b Kazakhstan is a Party included in Annex I for the purposes of the Kyoto Protocol. However, since Kazakhstan does not have a quantified emission limitation or reduction commitment inscribed in Annex B to the Kyoto Protocol its submission is being treated as a submission under the Convention.

^c Expedited in-country review for the reinstatement of Lithuania's eligibility to use the mechanisms established under Articles 6, 12 and 17 of the Kyoto Protocol.

^d Turkey is a Party included in Annex I. Turkey indicated that its 2012 annual submission is made under both the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol. However, since Turkey does not have a quantified emission limitation or reduction commitment inscribed in Annex B to the Kyoto Protocol its submission is being treated as a submission under the Convention.

12. The review of the annual submissions of the information required under Article 7, paragraph 1, of the Kyoto Protocol is more complex than the review of the annual GHG inventories under the Convention, because of the additional elements under review. These include: emissions and removals from activities under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol, their accounting and additional information on these activities; information on accounting of Kyoto Protocol units reported in the standard electronic format and reports from the national registry; changes in the national systems; changes in the national registries; information on the minimization of adverse impacts in accordance with Article 3, paragraph 14, of the Kyoto Protocol; and the calculation of the commitment period reserve. This puts additional pressure on the ERTs, as the amount of information to review and the expertise needed are greater than for the reviews under the Convention and the reviews of the initial reports.

13. In addition, 2012 is the third year for the mandatory annual submission under the Kyoto Protocol. Therefore, the ERTs have a mandate, in accordance with the Article 8 review guidelines, to identify potential problems pertaining to language of a mandatory nature in those guidelines in relation to the national systems, national registries and information on activities under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol. In addition, the ERTs shall identify potential problems arising from Parties' failure to follow agreed guidelines under Article 5, paragraph 2, of the Kyoto Protocol in preparing their GHG inventories – that is, emission and removal estimates that are not in line with the requirements set out in the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) *Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*, as elaborated by the IPCC *Good Practice Guidance and Uncertainty Management in National Greenhouse Gas*

Inventories (hereinafter referred to as the IPCC good practice guidance) and the IPCC *Good Practice Guidance for Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry*, or the estimates that were not reported at all, including recalculations of previous years' estimates and, in particular, recalculations of estimates for the first and second years of the commitment period. This is of particular importance in relation to estimates of GHG emissions by sources and removals by sinks resulting from activities under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol reported by the Parties included in Annex I that account for those activities annually.

14. In some cases, the number and complex nature of the identified potential problems may make the provision of revised estimates and/or additional information an intensive and time-consuming activity for the Party; it may also take more time and effort for the ERT to assess that information, elaborate conclusions and prepare the annual review report. There is also the possibility, in the case that a Party is not able to resolve the potential problem through the submission of revised estimates and/or satisfactory additional information, that the ERT would have to proceed with calculating and recommending adjustments. This is a time-consuming activity for ERTs, which may cause problems in meeting the strict deadlines established in the Article 8 review guidelines.

III. Expert review teams and lead reviewers

15. The information provided in the annual submissions under Article 7, paragraph 1, of the Kyoto Protocol, including the GHG inventories, is examined by international teams of experts, who are selected by the secretariat from those nominated by Parties to the UNFCCC roster of experts. Invitations to experts to participate in the review are copied to the national focal point. Only experts who have taken the training courses under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol and have passed the corresponding examinations can participate in the reviews of annual submissions.¹⁶

16. In general, depending on the modality of the review (in-country or centralized), each team comprises one or two generalists, who cover cross-cutting inventory issues and the supplementary information under Article 7, paragraph 1, of the Kyoto Protocol, and one or two experts for each inventory sector: energy; industrial processes; solvent and other product use; agriculture; land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF); and waste. Each team is led by two LRs, one from a Party not included in Annex I to the Convention (non-Annex I Party) and one from a Party included in Annex I to the Convention (Annex I Party). The LRs are experts with substantial experience of inventory reviewing and/or the management of national institutional arrangements for inventory preparation.

17. Conducting reviews in accordance with the Article 8 review guidelines is a demanding task, owing to the extended scope of the reviews compared with the reviews under the Convention (see para. 12 above). In addition, more time must be spent on reviewing complex sectors, such as energy and LULUCF, and the information on activities under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol. Although the number of experts potentially available to conduct reviews has increased steadily since 2009,¹⁷ it is still not sufficient to conduct the reviews effectively in accordance with the Article 8 review guidelines, making it very difficult to ensure complete teams for the in-country and centralized reviews of the 2012 annual submissions (see paras. 19–21 below). This situation may be indicative that this problem is of a serious and recurrent nature and needs to be

¹⁶ For more information on the training of review experts, see chapter V of document FCCC/SBSTA/2012/INF.10.

¹⁷ FCCC/SBSTA/2009/INF.4, paragraph 14, FCCC/SBSTA/2010/INF.8, paragraph 49 and FCCC/SBSTA/2011/INF.13, paragraph 56.

addressed as such. In addition, time is needed for newly trained experts to gain enough experience to be able to conduct reviews independently and for more experienced experts to become LRAs.

18. In accordance with the “Guidelines for the preparation of national communications by Parties included in Annex I to the Convention, Part I: UNFCCC reporting guidelines on annual inventories” (hereinafter referred to as the UNFCCC reporting guidelines), Parties may submit their NIRs in any of the official languages of the United Nations. The UNFCCC reporting guidelines also encourage Parties to submit, where relevant, an English translation of their NIR. Submitting NIRs in a language other than English limits the transparency of Parties’ reporting and puts an additional burden on the secretariat to process the information provided and to find review experts with knowledge of that language, in addition to English, which is the working language of the secretariat. Given the limited number of review experts, especially those with sufficient knowledge of languages other than English, selecting a team capable of working in a language other than English is a major challenge, which the secretariat faced again, as in previous years, when inviting experts to participate in the 2012 review cycle. The review becomes limited if the ERT does not have knowledge of the language that the NIR is submitted in as it cannot review the information submitted in depth, including any additional information provided in the language of the Party under review. In addition, many experts have to review the same Parties’ submissions year after year because of their language skills, reducing the valuable perspective and expertise if the inventory is reviewed by different experts in successive years and limiting somehow the scope and focus of the review activities. Further, these experts are not able to use their experience and contribute in the review of other Parties’ submissions. These issues are especially true in the case of centralized reviews, but also apply to in-country reviews.

19. The LRAs, at their ninth meeting, requested the secretariat and Parties to increase their efforts to ensure that a sufficient number of review experts participate in the 2012 review cycle (see para. 32 below). Following that request, in 2012 the secretariat invited 228 experts in total to participate in the reviews.¹⁸ Of these, 66 experts declined the invitation, on account of being unavailable due to previous commitments, a heavy workload or a lack of financial resources, or for other reasons. In addition, 22 experts informed the secretariat of their availability on dates other than the scheduled review dates on which they were invited to participate or of their availability only on particular dates, making it necessary for the secretariat to organize their participation in other reviews and to find at the same time experts scheduled to participate in those reviews willing and available to change the dates of their participation. Such issues were also experienced in the case of the in-country expedited review of Lithuania, for which the secretariat invited 24 experts in total to participate in the review but in the end only two of the needed three experts participated.

20. Overall, these issues had a negative impact on and increased the difficulty of the secretariat’s planning of ERTs for 2012 review cycle, while also affecting the timeliness of the experts’ preparation for the reviews. At the same time, the issues affected the completeness of the ERTs and their proper geographical balance; for example, for one centralized review, the secretariat invited 23 experts in total; of these, eight declined and three informed the secretariat of their willingness to participate in reviews on different dates; finally, only 12 experts were available to participate in that review supported by two desk reviewers, instead of the expected 14 ERT members, including an additional LULUCF expert. Six experts that had previously confirmed their participation in the reviews then declined to participate at very short notice, causing a significant challenge for the

¹⁸ The figures provided in this paragraph and paragraphs below referred to participation of experts in the 2012 review cycle, include the experts that participated in an in-country review of an Annex I Party.

secretariat to find replacements and maintain the geographical balance of the ERTs. In one case, the secretariat had to consider the cancellation of the review because it would have been impossible to cover one sector without an expert.¹⁹ Overall, one in-country review and three centralized reviews had to conduct the review tasks with incomplete teams, not taking into account that two in-country reviews and two centralized reviews had desk reviewers performing the review tasks during the review week. To improve this situation, the secretariat intends to start planning for the 2013 review cycle earlier and to issue an earlier call for the participation of experts, as it was made for the 2012 review cycle. However, such measures can help only if experts are available and respond positively to the invitations in good time, and if Parties pay more attention to this issue, possibly taking further action, such as ensuring that nominated experts are fully available for reviews and receive the necessary support from their governments and institutions.

21. For centralized reviews, the secretariat usually invites two review experts to cover each sector and two generalists to cover cross-cutting issues, except in the case of the energy sector, for which three experts are usually invited to conduct the review as this is the largest sector and one of the most complex in the inventories. Owing to the lack of available review experts, there were three energy sector experts in the case of only five of the eight centralized reviews conducted in 2012. The review for the LULUCF sector is also complex and demanding. It can be beneficial to have three experts for this sector in centralized reviews, but the number of experts available did not allow for this in 2012 and there were three LULUCF experts in the case of only three of the centralized reviews. Furthermore, the secretariat was able to secure only one LULUCF expert for all 10 in-country reviews and the expedited review of Lithuania. In addition, in the case of one centralized review, owing to the last-minute cancellation of an expert, the one industrial processes expert remaining was supported by two experts participating as desk reviewers, each performing the review of one Party's annual submission. Also, in one centralized review it was only one generalist, who reviewed the four Parties under this review facing significant challenges in performing all review tasks. In 2012 the secretariat was able in five of eight centralized reviews to reinforce ERTs with new review experts, owing, in general, to the lack of available experienced review experts and particularly the lack of a sufficient number of experts able to guide and train new experts in the review tasks. In 2012, 38 new review experts who had taken the training courses and passed the examinations were involved in the reviews. The continued limited availability of experts could influence the quality and level of detail of the reviews, particularly for complex sectors.

22. In selecting members of ERTs, the secretariat seeks to ensure an overall balance in the number of experts from Annex I Parties and non-Annex I Parties and a geographical balance within these two groups. In 2012 a total of 157 individuals from 67 Parties served as inventory experts on review teams. Of these experts, 58 were from non-Annex I Parties, 28 were from Annex I Parties with economies in transition and 71 were from other Annex I Parties. Owing to the shortage of experts or their unavailability to participate in a review, some experts had to participate in two reviews (11 experts from non-Annex I Parties and five from Annex I Parties). This puts additional pressure on the experts and may influence the quality and level of detail of the reviews. In addition, a number of experts were invited in 2012 to participate in the review of the fifth national communications of Parties included in Annex I, which represented an additional effort for those experts.

23. Table 2 provides a breakdown of the participation of experts by nominating Party in 2012. It shows that experts from Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Monaco and Portugal were

¹⁹ The problem was resolved at the very last minute thanks to one expert kindly making herself available, with the approval of her Government. But the risk of the cancellation of the review was high.

not involved in the review process in 2012. In general, there are several reasons for experts not participating in the reviews: (a) some Parties, for example Liechtenstein and Monaco, had not nominated any experts; (b) some Parties had nominated experts only recently and those experts had not yet taken the training courses and passed the relevant examinations; (c) some Parties had not fully updated their nominations to the UNFCCC roster of experts and some nominated experts included on the roster were not available for the reviews; (d) some experts had a heavy workload and other job obligations during the review period; and (e) some Parties were experiencing a shortage of financial resources for supporting experts' participation in the reviews; for example, in the course of the preparation of the 2012 review cycle the secretariat received 11 requests from experts nominated by Parties included in Annex I for exceptional funding. The table also shows that many Parties continue to strongly support the review process by providing two experts, and that the following Parties provided three or more experts: Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Brazil, China, European Union (EU), Finland, Georgia, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Republic of Korea, Lithuania, Netherlands, New Zealand, Russian Federation, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand and Ukraine.

Table 2

Number of inventory review experts participating in the 2012 review cycle, by nominating Party

<i>Annex I Parties</i>		<i>Annex I Parties with economies in transition</i>		<i>Non-Annex I Parties</i>	
Australia – 4	Japan – 9	Belarus – 2	Algeria – 1	Pakistan – 1	
Austria – 1	Netherlands – 4	Bulgaria – 4	Argentina – 2	Peru – 1	
Belgium – 3	New Zealand – 5	Croatia – 1	Benin – 2	Philippines – 1	
Canada – 2	Norway – 2	Czech Republic – 1	Bhutan – 1	Republic of Korea – 3	
Denmark – 2		Estonia – 1	Brazil – 9	Republic of Moldova – 1	
European Union – 3		Hungary – 1	Chile – 2	San Marino – 1	
Finland – 4					
France – 2					
Germany – 4	Poland – 1	Kazakhstan ^a – 2	China – 5	South Africa – 1	
Greece – 1	Spain – 1	Latvia – 1	Colombia – 1	Sudan – 2	
Iceland – 1	Sweden – 6	Lithuania – 3	Egypt – 2	Swaziland – 2	
Ireland – 3	Switzerland – 3	Romania – 2	Gambia – 1	Thailand – 4	
	Turkey – 2	Russian Federation – 4	Georgia – 3	Uruguay – 2	

<i>Annex I Parties</i>	<i>Annex I Parties with economies in transition</i>	<i>Non-Annex I Parties</i>
Italy – 5	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland – 2	Slovakia – 1
	United States of America – 1	Slovenia – 1
		Ukraine – 5
		Ghana – 2
		India – 1
		Malawi – 1
		Mauritius – 1
		Mongolia – 2
		Montenegro – 1
		Venezuela – 1

^a Kazakhstan is a Party included in Annex I for the purposes of the Kyoto Protocol.

24. As when selecting other members of ERTs, when inviting experts to participate as LRs the secretariat seeks to ensure an overall balance in the number of experts from Annex I Parties and non-Annex I Parties and a geographical balance within these two groups. In accordance with decision 24/CMP.1, it also takes into consideration the experts' experience in the preparation and management of GHG inventories, previous participation in reviews, technical expertise in the IPCC sectors, proficiency in the use of the Article 8 review guidelines and the "Guidelines for the preparation of the information required under Article 7 of the Kyoto Protocol" and successful completion of the training courses. In 2012 a total of 39 individuals from 26 Parties served as inventory LRs. Of these experts, 17 were from non-Annex I Parties, three were from Annex I Parties with economies in transition and 19 were from other Annex I Parties. Owing to the insufficient number of LRs or the unavailability of LRs to participate in a review, one expert from a non-Annex I Party had to participate as LR in two reviews, 11 experts from non-Annex I Parties participated as either LRs or experts in two reviews and five experts from Annex I Parties participated as either LRs or experts in two reviews. In some cases, the second lead review confirmed his or her participation very late (e.g., within a week of the start of the review). This puts additional pressure on the LRs and may influence the quality of the reviews.

25. From 2000, when the individual reviews were first conducted during the trial period, to 2012, 328²⁰ individual experts from 97 Parties (40 Annex I Parties and 57 non-Annex I Parties) have participated in GHG review activities.

26. The limited number of experts and LRs available for the reviews makes it difficult to ensure a proper geographical balance in the review teams and, as mentioned in paragraph 21 above, to ensure a sufficient number of experts in the teams for the review of the complex sectors. Despite the dedication and commitment of many experts from non-Annex I Parties, in 2012 it was not possible to ensure a proper balance in the review teams between Annex I Party experts and non-Annex I Party experts, owing to the insufficient number of available experts.

IV. Annual report of inventory lead reviewers

27. The Article 8 review guidelines stipulate that ERTs should be led by two experts with substantial experience of inventory reviewing and/or the management of national institutional arrangements for inventory preparation, who are nominated as LRs for an

²⁰ Twelve observers who participated in the reviews between 2000 and 2008 are not included in these totals.

individual review process. In each ERT, one LR should be from a non-Annex I Party and the other from an Annex I Party. LRs have a special role in guiding the review teams in order to ensure the consistency, quality and objectivity of the reviews. Recognizing this role, the CMP, by its decision 23/CMP.1, decided that LRs should regularly attend scheduled meetings in order to be better able to perform the duties described in the Article 8 review guidelines. To that end, and in accordance with decisions 12/CP.9, 22/CMP.1 and 24/CMP.1, the secretariat organizes meetings of LRs. The purpose of these meetings is to promote a common approach to methodological and procedural issues encountered in the inventory reviews and to make recommendations to the secretariat on ways to further improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the review process.

28. The LRs have established themselves as an important group under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol, with a critical role in the review process, ensuring the consistency, quality and objectivity of the reviews. The annual meetings of the LRs help them to fulfil this role. The most recent, ninth meeting of inventory LRs took place in Bonn, Germany, from 27 to 29 March 2012. Sixty-one experts, 34 from non-Annex I Parties and 35 from Annex I Parties, were invited to the meeting, which was attended by only 40 experts, 17 from non-Annex I Parties and 23 from Annex I Parties. In addition, a member of the enforcement branch and a member of the facilitative branch of the Compliance Committee and two representatives of the European Union attended the meeting as observers. The meeting addressed procedural and technical issues relating to the reviews of GHG inventories of Annex I Parties under the Convention and similar reviews under the Kyoto Protocol. The conclusions and recommendations arising from the meeting form the basis for the annual report to the SBSTA that is prepared by the LRs in accordance with decision 22/CMP.1. The annual report for 2012 is presented in paragraphs 29–80 below.

1. Statistics and follow-up of the eighth lead reviewers' meeting

29. The LRs noted, as in the eighth meeting of LRs, that there is a need to continue to improve the efficiency and timeliness of the review process. The starting point for improving the efficiency is to conduct better planning of and preparation for the reviews.

30. The LRs noted with concern the decrease in the number of experts participating in the 2011 review cycle. Compared with the 2010 review cycle, when 165 experts participated in the review activities, the number of experts has decreased by 24 per cent, as only 126 experts participated.

31. The LRs noted that the decrease in the number of participating experts was especially marked in the centralized reviews and, as a consequence, most of the ERTs in centralized reviews in the 2011 review cycle were incomplete in the sense that for one or more sectors there was only one sectoral expert.

32. The LRs recognized that incompleteness of review teams had a negative impact on the reviews. The LRs also recognized the importance of the review process for the objectives of the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol. Therefore, the LRs requested the secretariat and the Parties to increase their efforts to ensure that a sufficient number of review experts participate in the 2012 review cycle.

33. The LRs welcomed the secretariat's improvement of the introductory presentation to ERTs, including specific guidance for ERTs on using the words "recommend" and "encourage" when advising a Party on how to resolve an identified problem.

34. The LRs also welcomed the secretariat's provision, in response to a request from the eighth LR meeting, of a tool that examined the recalculations.

35. The LRs noted that the total number of issues identified as potential problems during the review process is decreasing. The LRs also noted with concern that issues related to

national systems were still identified as potential problems and that these may not be solved until late in the first commitment period.

2. Consistency and timeliness in reviews

36. The LRs welcomed the information provided by the secretariat on the analysis of consistency of reviews under the Kyoto Protocol during the 2011 review cycle and noted that the general consistency across reviews is increasing. The LRs also noted that there are still issues of consistency with respect to the review of the completeness of estimates, transparency and estimates not in line with the IPCC good practice guidance, which show that ERTs, under the LRs' guidance and with the support of the secretariat, must continue their efforts to achieve consistency as a matter of priority.

37. The LRs recognized that there are concerns over the consistency in identifying problems in national systems from individual and isolated potential problems related to estimates of emissions or removals, and noted that these would be better handled by the application of adjustments. The LRs noted that the existence of significant and unresolved multiple, recurrent and cross-cutting potential problems in the inventory may be an indicator of problems in the national system. The LRs recommended that ERTs, on identifying a potential problem in a national system, make every effort to establish good and early communication with the Party and take into consideration the plans of the Party to solve these potential problems, including feasibility, prioritization and timeliness.

38. The LRs recommended that ERTs ensure that the issues identified are reported in a transparent, thorough and objective manner in the list of potential problems and further questions ("Saturday paper"), and that the recommendations are clear and comprehensive, and provide several options, where applicable and possible, for the Party to solve the issue in the six-week period as defined in the Article 8 review guidelines.

39. The LRs noted that it is important that the quality assurance activities performed by the secretariat start as early as possible during the review process, as a way to increase the efficiency of the work by the ERT.

40. The LRs noted with concern that the finalization of annual review reports (ARRs) was late in both the 2010 and the 2011 review cycles and in many cases ARRs were finalized after the one-year deadline as included in the Article 8 review guidelines.

41. The LRs agreed on the need to deliver ARR on schedule, as agreed by Parties. One of the main objectives of the planned improvements for the 2012 review cycle is to live up to that commitment.

42. The LRs agreed that it is desirable to have the complete zero order²¹ draft review reports available at the end of the review week for both in-country and centralized reviews, while noting that achieving this is challenging for centralized reviews.

43. The LRs requested the secretariat to provide the review report template to the review experts no later than one week prior to the start of the review week.

44. The LRs welcomed the questionnaire prepared by the secretariat to enquire about review experts' availability for the 2012 reviews. The LRs requested the secretariat to invite review experts to the reviews as early as possible and provide information on which Parties they will review.

²¹ The complete zero order ARR contains the ARR sections for all sectors compiled together.

3. Planning and preparation for 2012 reviews

45. The LRs noted that the 2012 review cycle of the annual submissions of Parties to the Kyoto Protocol will focus on 2010, which is the middle year of the first commitment period. This means that there is not much time left for Parties to resolve issues identified by the ERTs, such as potential problems with the national system or related to activities of land use, land-use change and forestry emissions and removals under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol (KP-LULUCF), before the end of the first commitment period. In that respect, the LRs encouraged ERTs to identify the remaining problems and, as appropriate, to strongly recommend that Parties solve these issues as a matter of priority and that Parties report on their plans and actions to solve these issues in their next annual submissions.

46. The LRs also noted that there is limited time available during centralized reviews. Therefore, the LRs reiterated their recommendation from the eighth meeting of LRs that during centralized reviews special attention should be paid, by review experts and LRs, to follow up on the recommendations made in previous review reports and on recalculations, while still ensuring that all review requirements are covered during the review.

47. The LRs agreed to take a stronger role in leading ERTs, to ensure proper time management and that all review requirements are covered. This could be done by developing an explicit stepwise approach to the review by providing more clarity with regard to what needs to be done and when. The stepwise approach could also help to integrate new review experts in the teams and the review work. The LRs requested the secretariat, together with a group of LRs, to develop a stepwise approach to the reviews and to trial it during the 2012 review cycle.

48. The LRs requested the secretariat to decrease the number of Parties reviewed by one ERT to be no more than four, subject to availability of a sufficient number of experts. The LR also requested the secretariat to explore the possibility of having an ERT reviewing two Parties.

49. The LRs stressed the need for good preparation by review experts prior to the actual review week, and the role of LRs in such good preparation; this should be considered within the stepwise approach.

50. The LRs agreed to continue the practice of the last two years with regard to the preparation of draft status reports. This means that LRs provide comments to the draft status report prepared by the secretariat within one week of receipt of the draft.

51. The LRs endorsed the overall approach to the annual reviews in 2012, as presented by the secretariat during the meeting. This includes the priorities for choosing Parties to have an in-country review, namely, Parties with remaining potential problems with the national system and/or KP-LULUCF, Parties that have been adjusted two years in a row, Parties that have requested an in-country review and Parties to the Convention that had their last in-country review five years ago.

52. The LRs encouraged the ERTs, with the assistance of the secretariat, to record all communication with the Parties in order to enhance the documentation of the review.

53. The LRs agreed to the procedure presented by the secretariat for the preparation of the annual report by the LRs to the SBSTA in 2012, which is the same as that followed in 2010 and 2011, including suggestions on how to improve the review process in accordance with the Article 8 review guidelines.

4. Improvements in documents

Annual review report templates

54. The LRs noted that the instructions provided in the 2011 review report templates were updated and made more clear. They requested the secretariat to further improve the instructions provided in the review report templates and, if possible, develop short checklists providing tips to the review experts when drafting the report.

55. The LRs also requested the secretariat to continue to streamline the review report template, with a view to avoiding any duplication of information in the review report and unnecessary repetition of information provided by Parties in their national inventory report, and preventing any technical difficulties encountered by review experts when using the review report templates.

56. They also requested the secretariat to continue developing standard language for the review report templates, with options where relevant, to further improve consistency across the review reports.

57. The LRs encouraged the secretariat to further explore the option of providing information in the ARR in a tabular format. The LRs noted that this would facilitate the drafting of the review reports for review experts and improve their readability.

58. The LRs requested the secretariat to include a table at the end of the review report where all recommendations, sector by sector, will be included. This will replace the current section on recommendations in the review report.

59. The LRs recommended that review experts carefully follow up on inventory problems that led to adjustments or a question of implementation in previous reviews, and analyse what actions Kyoto Protocol Parties have implemented to provide recalculations and replace the adjustments and to remedy the question of implementation. They requested the secretariat to include a new section in the review report template for such cases.

Synthesis and assessment report

60. The LRs welcomed the information provided by the secretariat on the questionnaire on the usefulness of the tables and graphs in the Synthesis and Assessment (S&A) part I report. The LRs concluded that although the S&A was found useful there is a strong interest in revising its structure in order to make it more flexible and focused on the data that ERTs mostly use.

61. The LRs encouraged the secretariat to revisit the tables that are part of S&A part I report, with a view to reducing the number of tables, such as trend tables, while maintaining consistency with the requirements set out in the Guidelines for the preparation of national communications by Parties included in Annex I to the Convention, Part I: UNFCCC reporting guidelines on annual inventories. The LRs also encouraged the secretariat to explore other alternatives for displaying the information in tables and graphs, such as the use of the GHG data interface.

62. The LRs noted that information in the S&A part II for Kyoto Protocol Parties could be streamlined taking into consideration the information that is already included in the annual status reports.

5. Review tools

63. The LRs welcomed the work undertaken by the secretariat to further develop the review tools in order to meet the needs under the Convention and its Kyoto Protocol. They noted that this work facilitates the annual review by the ERTs and the consistency of this review, and also noted that providing feedback on the review tools is crucial for the further

development of the tools. The LRs requested the secretariat to provide more guidance to ERTs on the review tools by preparing a list of the review tools available and giving a presentation at the beginning of the review on available review tools and a short description of their use, aiming for full utilization of the review tools by the ERT during and after the review week.

64. The LRs concluded once again that the review transcript is a useful tool; however, it is not always filled in by review experts and not always updated after the Party's comments to the draft review report have been provided. The LRs noted the need to raise this and the importance of the review transcript with the review experts during the whole review cycle.

65. The LRs reiterated request from the eighth meeting that the secretariat include recommendations from the previous year's in the review transcripts to be used in the 2012 review cycle.

66. The LRs requested the secretariat to explore options to improve the Locator tool by including some basic graph options to make it easier to copy from the Locator, the possibility export a sector to Excel and the search options.

6. Virtual team room

67. The LRs noted the work undertaken by the secretariat on the redesign of the virtual team room (VTR) to support the review activities, and welcomed the new guidance for its development, in particular the requirement to simplify its structure and use and to increase the efficiency of its use by ERTs. The LRs welcomed the version of the Reference Library component of the VTR that was shown during the LRs' meeting, noting that it is a valuable tool to support the review process and GHG inventories in general. The LRs encouraged the secretariat to share the Reference Library with all ERTs as soon as possible, preferably for the next review cycle. However, the LRs recommended that the secretariat take into consideration the specific circumstances of some Parties, such as limited access to the Internet, older versions of Internet browsers and word-processing documents, in the design and development of later phases of the VTR, such as the ERT workspace, the review issues tracking system and the document management system, in order to guarantee its functionality and efficiency. The LRs noted that the funding for this project is not secured in its totality, and emphasized the importance of Parties contributing to this work with financial resources.

7. Suggested further improvements to the review process

68. The LRs noted the need for better communication between the secretariat, the LRs and the Party that will undergo an in-country review, to make sure that enough time will be provided for the review experts to work with the Party experts on the issues that need further clarification during the review.

69. The LRs agreed that having an experienced review expert participating in a review as a desk reviewer could be a fallback option when there are difficulties with having complete review teams.

70. The LRs encouraged the use of telephone conferences and web-based tools to facilitate the review, especially prior to the review week.

71. The LRs welcomed the draft decision trees on notation keys, derived from the Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, the IPCC good practice guidance and from the guidance to European Union member States for reporting carbon pools which are not a net source. These draft decision trees were presented during the refresher seminar (see para. 72 below). The LRs agreed that these draft decision trees are a good starting point but they need further elaboration. They agreed to take on work to

develop the decision trees further. The revised decision trees will be sent to the secretariat by 2 May 2012 and will be provided to all LRs attending the meeting for comments. The LRs further agreed that these decision trees, if agreed to by the LRs, could be a useful tool for the 2012 review cycle under the Convention and Kyoto Protocol, separately if appropriate.

8. Training of review experts

72. The LRs welcomed the information on ongoing and planned training activities in 2012, including the organizing of annual and regional training seminars, the launch of a new training course for the review of higher-tier methods and complex models, and the organizing of a refresher seminar for experienced reviewers. The LRs noted the success of the refresher seminar that was held on 27 March 2012, back-to-back with the ninth meeting of inventory LRs, with the participation of LRs and experienced reviewers of all sectors. They noted that the seminar, with its focus on the good practice approaches to inventory issues identified during the review process, helped to refresh and further develop common understanding of some issues and problems that ERTs face during the review process. The LRs recommended that the secretariat continue organizing regional training and refresher seminars, subject to the availability of resources, and encouraged Parties to provide such resources and, in particular, continue supporting regional training seminars.

73. Given the complexity of the annual review process, the LRs reiterated the need to further enhance the approach for the integration of new reviewers into the work of the ERTs. The LRs requested the secretariat to continue to take into account the need for smooth integration of the new reviewers into the work of the ERTs when planning the composition of ERTs, and agreed that LRs would continue to take this into account when allocating and supporting tasks within the team, in particular by guiding new experts in the preparation for the centralized reviews and encouraging mentoring by more experienced reviewers. To support this effort, the LRs noted the information provided by the secretariat on which experts are participating in the review process for the first time was helpful in fulfilling the above-mentioned need, and requested the secretariat to continue to provide such information to the LRs.

74. The LRs noted a need for increasing the number of review experts who actively participate in the review process, to ensure the completeness and balance of expertise of the ERTs, in particular review experts from non-Annex I Parties and Parties with economies in transition. The LRs reiterated the need for the governments that nominate experts to the UNFCCC roster of experts and agree on their participation in reviews to ensure that these experts are fully available during the whole review process. The LRs also reiterated the need for Parties to update the UNFCCC roster of experts on a regular basis and requested the secretariat to remind all Parties once a year to update it.

75. The LRs noted a need for the training courses to be updated to meet future requirements of the ERTs.

9. Development of the new CRF Reporter

76. The LRs noted the information provided by the secretariat on the work to develop the new CRF Reporter software. The LRs noted that this work is in accordance with decision 15/CP.17 adopting the revised UNFCCC “Guidelines for the preparation of national communications by Parties included in Annex I to the Convention, Part I: UNFCCC reporting guidelines on annual greenhouse gas inventories” (hereinafter referred to as the Revised UNFCCC Annex I inventory reporting guidelines), which incorporate methodologies of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories. The LRs also noted that in accordance with decision 15/CP.17, paragraphs 3 and 5, the Revised UNFCCC Annex I inventory reporting guidelines and the new CRF Reporter will be used

on a voluntary trial basis from October 2012 to May 2013 and fully implemented from 2015.

77. The LRs noted that the funds currently available for this work are not sufficient for the completion of the project. The LRs emphasized the importance of advancing the development of the new CRF Reporter and the need for Parties to contribute to this work with supplementary financial resources in order to ensure completion in the allotted time.

10. Issues related to the second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol

78. The LRs welcomed the presentation by the secretariat on the preparations for a second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol and the post-2012 phase under the first commitment period. The LRs noted that decisions adopted by Parties at the United Nations Climate Change Conference in Durban, South Africa, in particular decisions 2/CMP.7 to 5/CMP.7, will have a significant impact on processes and systems operated by the secretariat, such as the international transaction log.

79. The LRs noted the request by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol to the SBSTA contained in decision 1/CMP.7 to assess and address the implications of the implementation of decisions 2/CMP.7 to 5/CMP.7 on previous decisions on methodological issues related to the Kyoto Protocol, including those relating to Articles 5, 7 and 8 of the Kyoto Protocol.

80. The LRs further noted that the related work on the revision of the UNFCCC Annex I inventory reporting guidelines will offer an opportunity for Parties to improve their reporting, taking into consideration, inter alia, the lessons learned and the recommendations provided by LRs and ERTs.

81. The full text of the conclusions of the ninth LRs' meeting is available on the UNFCCC website.²² At the time of the publication of this report, the secretariat had implemented most of LRs' recommendations, fully or partially, while work on implementing some recommendations was still in progress. Of particular note are the following actions already undertaken to address the LRs' recommendations:

(a) The earlier start of the process of forming ERTs in 2012, resulting in an earlier preparation of the review teams;

(b) Making the ARR template available to ERTs not later than one week before the start of the review week;

(c) The release and use in reviews of modules 1 ("Reference Library") and 2 ("ERT Space") of the VTR, with the Reference Library being available to all ERTs and module 2 being tested on a pilot basis in one centralized review;

(d) The preparation and distribution to LRs and ERTs of a new "Stepwise guide" for conducting the reviews, which presents the typical workflows during the whole review process and describes in detail the roles of LRs, ERTs, Parties and the secretariat;

(e) The release to Parties of the new CRF Reporter for trial use (planned for release by 1 November 2012).

²² See <http://unfccc.int/files/national_reports/annex_i_ghg_inventories/review_process/application/pdf/con_rec9.pdf>.

V. Other matters relating to the annual reviews

A. Compilation of information submitted by Parties on the minimization of adverse impacts in accordance with Article 3, paragraph 14, of the Kyoto Protocol

82. The CMP, by its decision 15/CMP.1, requested²³ the secretariat to compile the supplementary information submitted annually by Parties relating to how they are striving, under Article 3, paragraph 14, of the Kyoto Protocol, to implement their commitments mentioned in Article 3, paragraph 1, of the Kyoto Protocol in such a way as to minimize adverse social, environmental and economic impacts on developing country Parties, particularly those identified in Article 4, paragraphs 8 and 9, of the Convention, and information on any changes that have occurred compared with the information reported in their previous annual submissions.

83. The compilation shall also include information on how Parties included in Annex II to the Convention, and other Parties included in Annex I that are in a position to do so, give priority, in implementing their commitments under Article 3, paragraph 14, to the actions referred to in paragraph 24 of the annex to decision 15/CMP.1, based on relevant methodologies referred to in paragraph 11 of decision 31/CMP.1. The compilation report can be found on the UNFCCC website.²⁴

B. Information regarding the information submitted by Parties in accordance with decision 14/CP.7

84. In accordance with decision 14/CP.7, Parties with single projects as defined in paragraph 1 of that decision which meet the requirements specified in paragraph 2 of that decision are required to report in their annual inventory submissions emission factors, total process emissions from those projects and an estimate of the emission savings resulting from the use of renewable energy in those projects.

85. The only Party that notified the COP, prior to the eighth session of the COP of its intention to avail itself of the provisions of that decision was Iceland. In the NIR of its 2012 annual submission,²⁵ Iceland reported the information required by decision 14/CP.7 indicated in paragraph 84 above.

86. In accordance with decision 14/CP.7, the secretariat provides information on relevant emission factors reported by other Parties in its synthesis and assessment report on the GHG inventories submitted in 2012²⁶ to allow comparisons with the information submitted by Iceland in its 2012 annual submission.

²³ Decision 15/CMP.1, annex, paragraph 26.

²⁴ See <<http://unfccc.int/resource/webdocs/art314/2012.pdf>>.

²⁵ Pages 79–85, 252–253 and 286–293 of the NIR, available at <http://unfccc.int/national_reports/annex_i_ghg_inventories/national_inventories_submissions/items/6598.php>.

²⁶ See <<http://unfccc.int/resource/webdocs/sai/2012.pdf>>.