



---

**Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice**

**Thirty-ninth session**

**Warsaw, 11–16 November 2013**

Item 12(d) 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 2013. 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	5
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 .....	10–11	5
III. Expert review teams and lead reviewers .....	12–23	8
IV. Annual report of inventory lead reviewers .....	24–70	12
V. Other matters relating to the annual reviews .....	71–75	19
A. Compilation of information submitted by Parties on the minimization of adverse impacts in accordance with Article 3, paragraph 14, of the Kyoto Protocol .....	71–72	19
B. Information regarding the information submitted by Parties in accordance with decision 14/CP.7 .....	73–75	19

## 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).<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup>

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.<sup>3</sup> 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,<sup>4</sup> and to prioritize these fundamental activities.<sup>5</sup>

5. In 2010, 2011 and 2012 the secretariat prepared the annual report<sup>6</sup> 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

---

<sup>1</sup> Decision 22/CMP.1, annex, paragraph 35.

<sup>2</sup> Decision 22/CMP.1, annex, paragraph 40.

<sup>3</sup> FCCC/SBI/2009/8, paragraph 86(a).

<sup>4</sup> 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.

<sup>5</sup> FCCC/SBI/2009/8, paragraph 85.

<sup>6</sup> FCCC/SBSTA/2010/INF.9, FCCC/SBSTA/2011/INF.16 and FCCC/SBSTA/2012/INF.8, respectively.

Compliance Committee in 2010, 2011 and 2012 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 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, thirty-fifth and thirty-seventh sessions, the SBSTA took note of those documents.<sup>7, 8, 9</sup>

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.<sup>10</sup> The published 2010 annual review reports,<sup>11</sup> with two exceptions, do not contain questions of implementation.<sup>12</sup> 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. Thirty-eight 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,<sup>13</sup> 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. In 2012, 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, thirty-eight reports of the reviews conducted up to 6 October 2012 had been published and forwarded by the secretariat to the CMP, the Compliance Committee and the Party concerned. The published 2012 annual review reports<sup>14</sup> do not contain questions of implementation. Two of the reports contain adjustments referred to in Article 5, paragraph 2, of the Kyoto Protocol.

---

<sup>7</sup> FCCC/SBSTA/2010/13, paragraph 98.

<sup>8</sup> FCCC/SBSTA/2011/5, paragraph 87.

<sup>9</sup> FCCC/SBSTA/2012/5, paragraph 98.

<sup>10</sup> 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.

<sup>11</sup> See <[http://unfccc.int/national\\_reports/annex\\_i\\_ghg\\_inventories/inventory\\_review\\_reports/items/5687.php](http://unfccc.int/national_reports/annex_i_ghg_inventories/inventory_review_reports/items/5687.php)>.

<sup>12</sup> See <[http://unfccc.int/kyoto\\_protocol/compliance/questions\\_of\\_implementation/items/5451.php](http://unfccc.int/kyoto_protocol/compliance/questions_of_implementation/items/5451.php)>.

<sup>13</sup> See <[http://unfccc.int/national\\_reports/annex\\_i\\_ghg\\_inventories/inventory\\_review\\_reports/items/6048.php](http://unfccc.int/national_reports/annex_i_ghg_inventories/inventory_review_reports/items/6048.php)>.

<sup>14</sup> See <[http://unfccc.int/national\\_reports/annex\\_i\\_ghg\\_inventories/inventory\\_review\\_reports/items/6616.php](http://unfccc.int/national_reports/annex_i_ghg_inventories/inventory_review_reports/items/6616.php)>.

### **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 2013 (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).

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 2013 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”<sup>15</sup> 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 2013 the majority of Parties submitted their inventories before or on 15 April, while in one case the submission was made within six weeks after the due date. 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.

11. In 2013 the secretariat received 40 annual submissions from all Parties included in Annex I (see table 1). Thirty-seven 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 fourth year of the commitment period. Status reports for all 40 submissions had been

---

<sup>15</sup> FCCC/SBSTA/2013/INF.8.

prepared and published on the UNFCCC website<sup>16</sup> and 37 of them forwarded to the Compliance Committee by June 2013 (with the exception of those for Belarus, Kazakhstan and Turkey). The secretariat coordinated individual reviews of the 40 submissions, with 37 of them being reviewed following the requirements established under the Article 8 review guidelines. Eleven of the individual reviews of the submissions, those of Austria, European Union, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Monaco, Poland, Slovenia and Sweden, were conducted as in-country reviews between 2 September and 5 October 2013 and the rest were conducted as centralized reviews. Altogether, eight centralized reviews were conducted between 2 and 28 September 2013 in Bonn, Germany. The reports of the reviews are expected to be finalized and published between January and April 2014.

Table 1  
**Submission of the annual information required under the Kyoto Protocol in 2013, review dates and status of review reports**

<i>Annex I Party</i>	<i>NIR and CRF submission dates</i>	<i>Language of NIR</i>	<i>Status report symbol</i>	<i>Review dates</i>	<i>Status of review report</i>
Australia	NIR – 15 Apr. 2013 CRF – 15 Apr. 2013	English	FCCC/ASR/2013/AUS	23–28 Sept. 2013	In preparation
Austria	NIR – 15 Apr. 2013 CRF – 15 Apr. 2013	English	FCCC/ASR/2013/AUT	30 Sept. to 5 Oct. 2013	In preparation
Belarus <sup>a</sup>	NIR – 18 Apr. 2013 CRF – 18 Apr. 2013	Russian	FCCC/ASR/2013/BLR	16–21 Sept. 2013	In preparation
Belgium	NIR – 15 Apr. 2013 CRF – 15 Apr. 2013	English	FCCC/ASR/2013/BEL	23–28 Sept. 2013	In preparation
Bulgaria	NIR – 15 Apr. 2013 CRF – 15 Apr. 2013	English	FCCC/ASR/2013/BGR	9–14 Sept. 2013	In preparation
Croatia	NIR – 15 Apr. 2013 CRF – 15 Apr. 2013	English	FCCC/ASR/2013/HRV	16–21 Sept. 2013	In preparation
Czech Republic	NIR – 15 Apr. 2013 CRF – 15 Apr. 2013	English	FCCC/ASR/2013/CZE	2–7 Sept. 2013	In preparation
Denmark	NIR – 15 Apr. 2013 CRF – 15 Apr. 2013	English	FCCC/ASR/2013/DNK	16–21 Sept. 2013	In preparation
Estonia	NIR – 15 Apr. 2013 CRF – 15 Apr. 2013	English	FCCC/ASR/2013/EST	2–7 Sept. 2013	In preparation
European Union	NIR – 15 Apr. 2013 CRF – 15 Apr. 2013	English	FCCC/ASR/2013/EU	30 Sept. to 5 Oct. 2013	In preparation
Finland	NIR – 15 Apr. 2013 CRF – 15 Apr. 2013	English	FCCC/ASR/2013/FIN	2–7 Sept. 2013	In preparation
France	NIR – 9 Apr. 2013 CRF – 9 Apr. 2013	French	FCCC/ASR/2013/FRA	23–28 Sept. 2013	In preparation
Germany	NIR – 15 Apr. 2013 CRF – 11 Apr. 2013	English	FCCC/ASR/2013/DEU	9–14 Sept. 2013	In preparation

<sup>16</sup> See <[http://unfccc.int/national\\_reports/annex\\_i\\_ghg\\_inventories/inventory\\_review\\_reports/items/6617.php](http://unfccc.int/national_reports/annex_i_ghg_inventories/inventory_review_reports/items/6617.php)>.

<i>Annex I Party</i>	<i>NIR and CRF submission dates</i>	<i>Language of NIR</i>	<i>Status report symbol</i>	<i>Review dates</i>	<i>Status of review report</i>
Greece	NIR – 16 Apr. 2013 CRF – 15 Apr. 2013	English	FCCC/ASR/2013/GRC	16–21 Sept. 2013	In preparation
Hungary	NIR – 15 Apr. 2013 CRF – 15 Apr. 2013	English	FCCC/ASR/2013/HUN	23–28 Sept. 2013	In preparation
Iceland	NIR – 15 Apr. 2013 CRF – 15 Apr. 2013	English	FCCC/ASR/2013/ISL	9–14 Sept. 2013	In preparation
Ireland	NIR – 15 Apr. 2013 CRF – 15 Apr. 2013	English	FCCC/ASR/2013/IRL	9–14 Sept. 2013	In preparation
Italy	NIR – 15 Apr. 2013 CRF – 16 Apr. 2013	English	FCCC/ASR/2013/ITA	30 Sept. to 5 Oct. 2013	In preparation
Japan	NIR – 12 Apr. 2013 CRF – 12 Apr. 2013	English	FCCC/ASR/2013/JPN	30 Sept. to 5 Oct. 2013	In preparation
Kazakhstan <sup>b</sup>	NIR – 15 Apr. 2013 CRF – 15 Apr. 2013	Russian	FCCC/ASR/2013/KAZ	9–14 Sept. 2013	In preparation
Latvia	NIR – 15 Apr. 2013 CRF – 15 Apr. 2013	English	FCCC/ASR/2013/LVA	16–21 Sept. 2013	In preparation
Liechtenstein	NIR – 15 Apr. 2013 CRF – 15 Apr. 2013	English	FCCC/ASR/2013/LIE	2–6 Sept. 2013	In preparation
Lithuania	NIR – 15 Apr. 2013 CRF – 15 Apr. 2013	English	FCCC/ASR/2013/LTU	23–28 Sept. 2013	In preparation
Luxembourg	NIR – 15 Apr. 2013 CRF – 15 Apr. 2013	English	FCCC/ASR/2013/LUX	9–14 Sept. 2013	In preparation
Monaco	NIR – 15 Apr. 2013 CRF – 9 Apr. 2013	French	FCCC/ASR/2013/MCO	16–20 Sept. 2013	In preparation
Netherlands	NIR – 15 Apr. 2013 CRF – 15 Apr. 2013	English	FCCC/ASR/2013/NLD	9–14 Sept. 2013	In preparation
New Zealand	NIR – 12 Apr. 2013 CRF – 12 Apr. 2013	English	FCCC/ASR/2013/NZL	2–7 Sept. 2013	In preparation
Norway	NIR – 12 Apr. 2013 CRF – 12 Apr. 2013	English	FCCC/ASR/2013/NOR	23–28 Sept. 2013	In preparation
Poland	NIR – 12 Apr. 2013 CRF – 12 Apr. 2013	English	FCCC/ASR/2013/POL	9–14 Sept. 2013	In preparation
Portugal	NIR – 15 Apr. 2013 CRF – 15 Apr. 2013	English	FCCC/ASR/2013/PRT	16–21 Sept. 2013	In preparation
Romania	NIR – 12 Apr. 2013 CRF – 12 Apr. 2013	English	FCCC/ASR/2013/ROU	2–7 Sept. 2013	In preparation
Russian Federation	NIR – 23 May 2013 CRF – 13 Apr. 2013	Russian	FCCC/ASR/2013/RUS	16–21 Sept. 2013	In preparation
Slovakia	NIR – 15 Apr. 2013 CRF – 15 Apr. 2013	English	FCCC/ASR/2013/SVK	2–7 Sept. 2013	In preparation

<i>Annex I Party</i>	<i>NIR and CRF submission dates</i>	<i>Language of NIR</i>	<i>Status report symbol</i>	<i>Review dates</i>	<i>Status of review report</i>
Slovenia	NIR – 15 Apr. 2013 CRF – 11 Apr. 2013	English	FCCC/ASR/2013/SVN	16–21 Sept. 2013	In preparation
Spain	NIR – 15 Apr. 2013 CRF – 15 Apr. 2013	Spanish	FCCC/ASR/2013/ESP	16–21 Sept. 2013	In preparation
Sweden	NIR – 12 Apr. 2013 CRF – 12 Apr. 2013	English	FCCC/ASR/2013/SWE	2–7 Sept. 2013	In preparation
Switzerland	NIR – 15 Apr. 2013 CRF – 15 Apr. 2013	English	FCCC/ASR/2013/CHE	2–7 Sept. 2013	In preparation
Turkey <sup>c</sup>	NIR – 15 Apr. 2013 CRF – 12 Apr. 2013	English	FCCC/ASR/2013/TUR	16–21 Sept. 2013	In preparation
Ukraine	NIR – 15 Apr. 2013 CRF – 15 Apr. 2013	Russian	FCCC/ASR/2013/UKR	9–14 Sept. 2013	In preparation
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	NIR – 15 Apr. 2013 CRF – 15 Apr. 2013	English	FCCC/ASR/2013/GBR	9–14 Sept. 2013	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.

<sup>a</sup> 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 2013 annual submission is made under the Convention.

<sup>b</sup> 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.

<sup>c</sup> Turkey is a Party included in Annex I. Turkey indicated that its 2013 annual submission is made under the Convention.

### III. Expert review teams and lead reviewers

12. 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.<sup>17</sup>

13. 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

<sup>17</sup> For more information on the training of review experts, see chapter V of document FCCC/SBSTA/2013/INF.8.



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.

14. 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. 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,<sup>18</sup> 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 2013 annual submissions (see paras. 16–18 below). This situation may be indicative that this problem is of a serious and recurrent nature and needs to be 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 LRs.

15. 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 2013 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.

16. In 2013 the secretariat invited 256 experts in total to participate in the reviews.<sup>19</sup> Of these, 44 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, 27 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

---

<sup>18</sup> FCCC/SBSTA/2009/INF.4, paragraph 14, FCCC/SBSTA/2010/INF.8, paragraph 49 and FCCC/SBSTA/2011/INF.13, paragraph 56.

<sup>19</sup> The figures provided in this paragraph and paragraphs below referred to participation of experts in the 2013 review cycle, include the experts that participated in an in-country review of an Annex I Party.

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.

17. Overall, these issues had a negative impact on and increased the difficulty of the secretariat's planning of ERTs for the 2013 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, six declined and one informed the secretariat of the willingness to participate in reviews on different dates; finally, 13 experts were available to participate in that review supported by one desk reviewer, instead of the expected 14 ERT members, including an additional LULUCF expert. In addition, some experts declined their participation in the reviews at very short notice. Some of these experts agreed to perform their tasks as desk reviewers. In one in-country review, it was not possible to find a replacement or an expert to perform the review task as a desk reviewer. This meant that one of the experts in that in-country review team had to review one additional sector. Overall, one in-country review and one centralized review had to conduct the review tasks with incomplete teams, not taking into account that one in-country review 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 2014 review cycle earlier and to issue an earlier call for the participation of experts, as it was made for the 2013 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.

18. 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. In order to incorporate new reviewers to the ERT the secretariat invited four energy experts to each centralized review. This worked for six of the eight centralized reviews, for which four energy-sector experts participated. 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 2013 and there were three LULUCF experts in only three centralized reviews. At the same time, the secretariat was able to secure only one LULUCF expert for all 11 in-country reviews. Also, in one centralized review it was only one generalist, who reviewed three Parties under this review, facing significant challenges in performing all review tasks, with one energy expert acting as generalist for one Party. In 2013 the secretariat was able in all eight centralized reviews to reinforce ERTs with new review experts. In 2013, 34 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.

19. 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 2013 a total of 175 individuals from 69 Parties served as inventory experts on review teams. Of these experts, 67 were from non-Annex I Parties, 27 were from Annex I Parties with economies in transition and 78 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 (six experts from non-Annex I Parties and two from Annex I Parties). This puts additional pressure on the experts and may influence the quality and level of detail of the reviews.

20. Table 2 provides a breakdown of the participation of experts by nominating Party in 2013. It shows that experts from Cyprus, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco and Spain were not involved in the review process in 2013. 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 2013 review cycle the secretariat received 12 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: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Brazil, Canada, China, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America.

Table 2

**Number of inventory review experts participating in the 2013 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 – 5	New Zealand – 4	Belarus – 2
Austria – 2	Norway – 2	Bulgaria – 4
Belgium – 5	Poland – 1	Croatia – 1
Canada – 3	Portugal – 1	Czech Republic – 2
Denmark – 2	Sweden – 5	Estonia – 1
European Union – 2	Switzerland – 3	Hungary – 1
Finland – 5	Turkey – 1	Kazakhstan <sup>a</sup> – 3
France – 3	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland – 3	Latvia – 1
Germany – 5	United States of America – 3	Lithuania – 1
Greece – 1		Romania – 3
Ireland – 4		Russian Federation – 4
Italy – 6		Slovakia – 1
Japan – 12		Slovenia – 1
Netherlands – 4		Ukraine – 5
		Algeria – 1
		Argentina – 3
		Benin – 2
		Bhutan – 1
		Brazil – 9
		Chile – 2
		China – 6
		Colombia – 1
		Cuba – 1
		Egypt – 2
		Ethiopia – 1
		Georgia – 3
		Ghana – 3
		India – 2
		Lebanon – 2
		Liberia – 1
		Mexico – 1
		Mongolia – 1
		Montenegro – 1
		Pakistan – 1
		Republic of Korea – 1
		Republic of Moldova – 3
		San Marino – 1
		South Africa – 2
		Swaziland – 3
		Thailand – 4
		The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia – 1
		United Republic of Tanzania – 1
		Uruguay – 2
		Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) – 1
		Viet Nam – 1
		Zimbabwe – 1

<sup>a</sup> Kazakhstan is a Party included in Annex I for the purposes of the Kyoto Protocol.

21. 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 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (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 2013, a total of 38 individuals from 25 Parties served as inventory LRs. Of these experts, 18 were from non-Annex I Parties, four were from Annex I Parties with economies in transition and 16 were from other Annex I Parties. Owing to the insufficient number of LRs or the unavailability of LRs to participate in a review, two experts from a non-Annex I Party had to participate as an 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 LR 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.

22. Since 2000, when the individual reviews were first conducted during the trial period, up to 2013, 397<sup>20</sup> individual experts from 100 Parties (41 Annex I Parties and 59 non-Annex I Parties) have participated in GHG review activities.

23. 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 2013 it was not possible to ensure full 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**

24. 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 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.

25. 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

---

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

this role. The most recent, the 10<sup>th</sup> meeting of inventory LRs took place in Bonn from 18 to 20 March 2013. Seventy-two experts, 34 from non-Annex I Parties and 38 from Annex I Parties, were invited to the meeting, which was attended by only 47 experts, 24 from non-Annex I Parties and 23 from Annex I Parties. In addition, two members of the enforcement 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 2013 is presented in paragraphs 26–70 below.

## **1. Statistics and follow-up of the 9<sup>th</sup> lead reviewers' meeting**

26. The LRs noted, as at the 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> meetings 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 for the secretariat and ERTs, led by the LRs, to conduct better and earlier planning of and preparation for the reviews. In addition, the LRs recognized that improving the work of the ERTs before the review week, including improved communication between the ERTs and the Parties, could also help to improve timeliness and efficiency.

27. The LRs also recognized that there are constraints affecting the review process, including the limited number of experts and secretariat staff participating, the limited time available for the reviews and limited funding. Improving the review process, including the drafting of the review reports, to accommodate those constraints would have a positive impact on the efficiency and timeliness of the process.

28. The LRs welcomed the increase in the number of experts participating in the 2012 review cycle. Compared with the 2011 review cycle, in which 126 experts participated in the review activities, the number of participating experts increased to 157.

29. The LRs noted that the increase in the number of participating experts was especially marked in relation to the centralized reviews, with the result that all of the ERTs involved in centralized reviews in the 2012 review cycle were complete, in the sense that for each review there were at least two experts for each sector. However, they also noted that there were incomplete teams conducting some in-country reviews and that some reviewers participated in more than one review.

30. The LRs further noted that the 38 new experts that participated in the reviews in 2012 constituted one quarter of the total participating experts. The LRs recognized that they should provide important support to the new reviewers, but also recognized that their dual role as LRs and experts, especially if not acting as generalists, leaves limited time to coach the new experts.

31. The LRs also recognized that the centralized reviews would benefit from an increased number of participating experts and from limiting centralized reviews to four Parties. This could potentially decrease the workload of each expert, improve the integration of new experts and improve quality and timeliness. The LRs requested the secretariat and Parties to further increase their efforts to ensure that a sufficient number of review experts participate in the 2013 review cycle.

## **2. Consistency and timeliness of reviews**

32. The LRs welcomed the information provided by the secretariat on the analysis of the consistency of the reviews under the Kyoto Protocol during the 2012 review cycle.

33. They recommended that the secretariat enhance the guidance provided to the ERTs, including those performing in-country reviews, such as by providing explanations in the template for the annual review report and by making presentations at the beginning of the review week clarifying the types of issues that should be included in the review report and in the list of potential problems and further questions raised by the ERT during the review week (hereinafter referred to as the Saturday paper).

34. The LRs noted with concern that as at 20 March 2013 there were only six published review reports. In order for Parties to have enough time to implement the recommendations made in the review reports, the LRs agreed to improve communication with the Parties having centralized reviews by informing them of the provisional main findings and recommendations at the end of the review week.

35. The LRs recognized the complexity of the review of the information on LULUCF activities under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol (KP-LULUCF activities), being aware that the vast majority of Parties have chosen commitment period accounting. Therefore, the LRs recommended that the ERTs provide a strong message to the Parties in the review reports that any outstanding issues related to the reporting of KP-LULUCF activities must be addressed at the latest in the 2014 annual submission. The ERTs should ensure that all issues that could potentially lead to an adjustment at the end of the first commitment period should be brought to the attention of the Parties through a list in the Saturday paper.

### **3. Planning and preparation for the 2013 review cycle**

36. The LRs noted that the 2013 reviews of the annual submissions of Parties to the Kyoto Protocol will focus on 2011, which is the penultimate 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 emissions and removals from KP-LULUCF activities, before the last review for the first commitment period. In that respect, the LRs encouraged the ERTs to identify the remaining problems and, as appropriate, to strongly recommend that Parties resolve these issues as a matter of priority.

37. The LRs also noted that there is limited time available during centralized reviews to analyse each Party. Therefore, they reiterated the recommendation made at their 8<sup>th</sup> meeting that, during centralized reviews, special attention should be paid, by review experts and LRs, to following up on the recommendations made in previous review reports and on significant recalculations, while still ensuring that all review requirements are covered during the review.

38. 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 further clarified within the Stepwise Guide for Managing GHG Inventory Reviews for Annex I Parties (hereinafter referred to as the Stepwise Guide), including a timeline and tasks for the preparation prior to the actual review week.

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

40. The LRs endorsed the overall approach to the annual reviews in 2013, as presented by the secretariat during the meeting, including the prioritization for an in-country review of all Annex I Parties that are also Parties to the Kyoto Protocol that have not yet had an in-country review during the first commitment period.

41. The LRs agreed to the procedure presented by the secretariat for the preparation of the annual report by the LRs to the SBSTA in 2013, which is the same as that followed in 2010–2012, including suggestions on how to improve the review process in accordance with the “Guidelines for review under Article 8 of the Kyoto Protocol”.

#### **4. Improvements in documents and tools**

##### *Annual review report template*

42. The LRs noted with concern the length of time that it takes to send the draft review report to the Party and to publish the final annual review report. With this in mind, the LRs agreed to modify the annual review report template, along with the quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) checklists, in order to improve the efficiency and timeliness of the completion of the annual review process. Timeliness in the 2013 review cycle is particularly important, as this will be the last annual submission reviewed prior to the final annual submission within the first commitment period.

43. The LRs requested the secretariat, in cooperation with a small group of LRs, to improve the annual review report template. They agreed that, in identifying possible improvements to the annual review report template, the decisions of the CMP should be referred to and the required elements of the annual review report identified, while recognizing the needs and requirements of the users reading the annual review reports. The LRs recommended that the secretariat and the working group explore the possibility of using checklists and tables in the annual review report template.

44. The LRs welcomed the distribution of the annual review report template to the ERTs one week prior to the 2012 annual review cycle and recommended that the secretariat continue this practice for future reviews.

#### **5. Review tools**

45. The LRs welcomed the work undertaken by the secretariat to further develop the review tools for the review cycle in 2012. They noted that there is no need to develop new tools for the 2013 review cycle and that the focus should be on the utilization of the review tools during the review process to the extent possible. The LRs also noted that the review tools facilitate and increase the consistency of the annual reviews, and that providing feedback on the review tools is crucial for the further development of the tools. The LRs also welcomed the presentation provided during the LRs’ meeting on review tools at each review stage, which made the function and aim of the review tools at the different review stages clear to them. They recommended that the LRs of each ERT, with the help of the secretariat, provide further guidance to the ERT during the review week and help the team to use the tools effectively.

46. The LRs requested the secretariat to prepare guidance for the ERTs on the review tools by providing a short description of their use, aiming for the full utilization of the review tools by the ERTs, including some examples of using the review tools, before, during and after the review week, and encouraged the secretariat to include this guidance in an annex to the Stepwise Guide.

47. They also requested the secretariat to improve the usefulness of the synthesis and assessment report, part II, by including information on the time-series consistency of the total land areas reported for LULUCF and for KP-LULUCF activities by the Parties.

48. The LRs welcomed the secretariat’s improvement of the introductory presentation to the ERTs performing centralized reviews, including specific guidance on the review tools available to facilitate the review process. The LRs also welcomed the secretariat’s provision of a tool that examined the notation keys in each inventory. They considered that

the further consolidation, and better knowledge and use, of these tools could improve the efficiency of the review process, and therefore encouraged the secretariat to brief all ERTs on the review tools.

#### **6. Virtual Team Room**

49. The LRs noted the ongoing work being undertaken by the secretariat on the development of the Inventory Virtual Team Room (I-VTR) to support the review of the information on annual GHG inventories and welcomed the achievements made in concluding the Reference Library and the ERT Workspace components of the I-VTR, which were presented during the LRs' meeting. The LRs also noted the results of testing these components during the 2012 review cycle, which show that the tool could be a valuable resource in supporting the review, management and recording of the information generated in the process increasing the traceability and safety of the review materials, and encouraged the secretariat, for the next review cycle, to promote the Reference Library and the ERT Workspace as the major source of information for all centralized reviews and to test it in a limited number of in-country reviews.

50. The LRs also encouraged the secretariat to continue to undertake work on the development of the remaining components of the I-VTR, the review issues tracking system and the document management system, and to test them in a limited number of reviews as soon as they are available.

#### **7. Suggested further improvements to the review process**

51. The LRs took note of the draft decision trees that were presented during the refresher seminar on good practice approaches to inventory issues, which was held in 2012 back to back with the 9<sup>th</sup> meeting of LRs.

#### **8. Stepwise Guide**

52. The LRs welcomed the completion of the Stepwise Guide for trial use during the 2012 review cycle. They noted that the Stepwise Guide could be beneficial for LRs, ERTs and new reviewers to provide an overview of the timelines and tasks before, during and after the review week, thereby facilitating better time management of the reviews. They also noted that the Stepwise Guide could help to integrate new review experts by clarifying the roles and expectations during each phase of the process. The LRs encouraged the secretariat to update the Stepwise Guide on the basis of feedback received during the trial use in 2012 and during the 10<sup>th</sup> meeting of LRs and to distribute it with the review materials at least four weeks prior to the start of the review week.

53. The LRs welcomed the inclusion of the workflow and QA/QC checklists in the Stepwise Guide as a means of improving the efficiency and timeliness of the review process.

54. They noted that use of the QA/QC checklists, in particular in combination with the annual review report template, enhances the technical quality, accuracy, consistency and timeliness of the draft annual review reports.

#### **9. Training of review experts**

55. The LRs welcomed the information on the training activities in 2012, and ongoing and planned training activities in 2013, including the organization of an annual training seminar in April 2013, the refresher seminar for experienced reviewers and a regional training seminar, subject to the availability of resources, in the second half of the year. They requested the secretariat to continue organizing regional training seminars and



refresher seminars, subject to the availability of resources, and encouraged Parties to provide such resources.

56. The LRs participated in the refresher seminar held on 18 March 2013, in conjunction with the 10<sup>th</sup> meeting of LRs, which focused on the Stepwise Guide to inventory reviews and best practices for the review process. They noted that the seminar helped to refresh the knowledge and best practices needed for the different steps of the review process and to enhance the common understanding of how to implement these review steps within the framework of the Stepwise Guide developed by the secretariat.

57. The LRs also noted the need to increase the number of review experts who actively participate in the review process, in order to ensure the completeness and balance of expertise of the ERTs, in particular by increasing the participation of review experts from non-Annex I Parties. They reiterated the need for the Parties nominating experts to the UNFCCC roster of experts to ensure that the experts can devote enough time to studying the required training courses and are fully available during the complete review process. The LRs requested the secretariat to continue reminding all Parties once a year to update the UNFCCC roster of experts on a regular basis, and also reiterated the need for Parties to continue nominating experts to the roster, in particular experts from non-Annex I Parties. The LRs also requested the secretariat to provide Parties with summary information on the required profile of experts to be nominated to the roster, in order to help Parties to identify experts who have the sufficient skills to be trained as review experts and to join future ERTs.

58. The LRs noted the need to update and supplement, in the future, the training programme for the review of GHG inventories from Annex I Parties, in order to meet the requirements of review experts arising from the adoption of the revised “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), the use of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories* and the future revised UNFCCC review guidelines launched under the SBSTA work programme on the revision of the guidelines for the review of biennial reports and national communications, including national GHG inventory reviews, for developed country Parties. The LRs also noted the need to supplement and update the current training programme for reviews under the Kyoto Protocol with new or updated courses in the light of the implementation of the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol, particularly related to supplementary IPCC guidance. The LRs further noted that the updating and supplementing of the training programmes should address the training needs of both new and experienced experts.

59. The LRs noted the need for Parties to support the work on updating and supplementing the current training programmes, including possible contributions through the direct support of experienced qualified experts, with the purpose of retaining the existing knowledge and experience of the experts currently participating in the reviews.

#### **10. Options for improving the cost-effectiveness, efficiency and practicality of the review process**

60. The SBSTA requested the LRs to discuss, at their meeting in 2013, options for improving the cost-effectiveness, efficiency and practicality of the review process, and requested the secretariat to make the outcome of their discussions available as input to the discussions at SBSTA 38 on the revision of the guidelines for the review of national communications, biennial reports and national GHG inventories.

61. The LRs noted that the implementation of the existing review process of national communications and national GHG inventories is very resource-intensive and has resulted

in increasing pressure on Parties, experts and the secretariat in recent years. They also noted that the newly established international assessment and review (IAR) process for developed countries, which will be launched in early 2014, will significantly increase the volume of work.

62. The LRs agreed on the need to have a cost-effective, efficient and practical review process that does not impose an excessive burden on Parties, experts or the secretariat. They discussed a range of options for addressing that need, including combining different types of reviews and modifying their format and frequency.

63. On consideration of the issue outlined in decision 2/CP.17, annex II, paragraph 6, the LRs recommended that the reviews of biennial reports should not be conducted in conjunction with the GHG inventory reviews, because of the different timing and content of the reports.

64. The LRs considered the options of professionalizing the review process by introducing a service fee system and establishing a standing group of experts at the secretariat, and concluded that these options should be further explored. They noted that introducing a service fee may increase the availability of experts but not necessarily improve the quality and timeliness of the reviews. The LRs agreed that the option of supplementing the current ERTs with a standing group of experts or other hybrid solutions should be further explored.

65. Based on the experiences of the LRs with reviews, they noted that there is value in providing training to experts on the IAR process.

66. The LRs recommended that Parties update and expand the UNFCCC roster of experts in order to meet the particular needs for expertise of the upcoming IAR process.

#### **11. Development of the new CRF Reporter**

67. The LRs welcomed the information on the development of the new CRF Reporter software and welcomed the demonstration of the CRF Reporter software as deployed to Annex I Parties for testing on 22 October 2012. The LRs noted that one of the most important features of the new software is the possibility of importing existing data into the software. Without that prerequisite, it would be difficult to test the CRF Reporter software. The LRs also noted that the deadline for submissions of views on experiences with the UNFCCC reporting guidelines and with the updated CRF Reporter is 3 May 2013 and encouraged Annex I Parties to submit their views.

#### **12. Issues related to the second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol**

68. The LRs welcomed the presentation by the secretariat on the preparations for a second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol and noted that the work has progressed since the 9<sup>th</sup> meeting of LRs. However, the LRs also noted that a lot of work remains to be done before the secretariat's processes and systems to support the second commitment period are ready.

69. The LRs further noted that the CMP, at its eighth session, agreed on the timing and reporting of the initial report for the second commitment period, as well as on the annual requirement for reporting on KP-LULUCF activities, with the exception of the common reporting format KP-LULUCF tables. They noted that a lot of work remains to be done under the SBSTA before all reporting and review guidelines for the second commitment period have been finalized. Such work will also have an impact on the secretariat's processes and systems to support the second commitment period.

### 13. Financial implications

70. The LR's noted that supplementary funding is needed for some of the secretariat's activities to support the review process and emphasized the importance of Parties supporting such work with financial resources. This relates to the following:

- (a) I-VTR development;
- (b) CRF Reporter development;
- (c) Work on the preparation of processes and systems for the second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol.

## 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

71. The CMP, by its decision 15/CMP.1, requested<sup>21</sup> 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.

72. 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.<sup>22</sup>

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

73. 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.

74. The only Party that notified The Conference of the Parties (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 2013 annual submission,<sup>23</sup> Iceland reported the information required by decision 14/CP.7 indicated in paragraph 73.

<sup>21</sup> Decision 15/CMP.1, annex, paragraph 26.

<sup>22</sup> See <<http://unfccc.int/resource/webdocs/art314/2013.pdf>>.

<sup>23</sup> 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](http://unfccc.int/national_reports/annex_i_ghg_inventories/national_inventories_submissions/items/6598.php)>.

75. 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 2013<sup>24</sup> to allow comparisons with the information submitted by Iceland in its 2013 annual submission.

---

---

<sup>24</sup> See <<http://unfccc.int/resource/webdocs/sai/2013.pdf>>.