

Introduction to Major Issues for Discussion

**2nd Technical workshop on the review guidelines of BR and NC,
including National Inventory Reviews
8-10 April 2014, Bonn**



Possible questions: Frequency and stages of the review process

1. Should the individual technical review occur on an annual or biennial basis?

- a. If biennial, how to structure?
- b. Relationship with other review process (e.g. BR, NC)?
- c. Ability for ERTs to request ICR in subsequent years?
- d. Frequency of the ICR review?

2. Should the initial checks and synthesis and assessment be combined into a single set of standardized checks?

- a. Thoughts on scope of standardized checks?
- b. Timing of checks?
- c. Need for periodic updating of checks?
- d.. How to update checks?



Possible questions on structure: desk, centralized, in-country?

1. Is there a role for desk reviews?

- a. If so, subject to certain conditions?
- b. Does this change with annual versus biennial reviews?

2. Does the scope of the review change depending on the type of review (e.g. desk versus centralized)?

3. Should the balance of desk versus centralized versus in-country reviews change over time ? (e.g. move towards more desk reviews)



Possible questions: National Inventory Arrangements

1. Is additional review guidance needed beyond current language in decision 19/CP.8?

In addition to the tasks mentioned in paragraph 21 above, expert review teams conducting in-country reviews will consider the “paper trail” of the inventory from the collection of data to the reported emission estimates and will examine procedures and institutional arrangements for inventory development and management, including quality assurance and quality control, record-keeping and documentation procedures. During subsequent desk or centralized reviews, the expert review teams will identify any changes that may have occurred in these procedures and institutional arrangements, based on the information provided in the NIRs of Annex I Parties.

2. Does decision 22/CMP.1 provide useful guidance?



Additional possible questions for consideration?

1. Are there additional elements from current review processes under the Convention and/or the Kyoto Protocol that should be introduced into the review guidelines under the Convention?

2. Are there additional elements that should be considered to *ensure a cost-effective, efficient and practical review process that does not impose excessive burden on Parties/secretariat?*

a. Composition of ERTs?

b. Role of lead reviewers? Role of the secretariat?

c. Timing of ARRAs?

d. Content of ARRAs?



THANK YOU!

