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Overview

• Some statistics on the review cycle for 2013
• Observations
• Conclusions – some elements
GHG inventories & annual submissions reviewed in 2013

44 Parties reviewed
• 11 Parties reviewed in-country
• 32 Parties in 8 centralized reviews
  ▪ No CR with 5 Parties ✓
    • (2011: 6 CRs with 5 Parties)
• 1 desk review for 1 Party
Experts participating in GHG reviews in 2013

• 175 experts from 69 Parties
  ▪ FCCC: 195 Parties
• 256 experts invited → 84 experts declined/unable
• 8 experts participated in more than one review
• 34 new experts: motivated but inexperienced
• Not all ERTs complete: 1 in-country, 1 CR, experts doubling (2 reviews or 2 sectors)

Ensuring a sufficient number of experienced LRs and experts remains a challenge
### Experts participating in reviews: 2010–2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviews</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-country</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralized Desk</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp. (Parties)</td>
<td>163 (63)</td>
<td>126 (54)</td>
<td>157 (67)</td>
<td>172 (69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp. doubling</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New experts</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20% new experts: good and bad news
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Saturday papers</strong></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annex A adjustm.</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5 (2 also in 2010)</td>
<td>2 (1 for the third time)</td>
<td>3 (1 for the fourth time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KP-LULUCF adjustm.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ARRs publication: 2010-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drafts to Party</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by 31 January</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by 28 Feb</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARRs published</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by 31 January</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by 28 February</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by 14 April</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16-22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Timing improving but <100% by 14 April**
Review reports 2013 for editing

• Editing usually marks the end of the substantial changes to reports

• By 31 January
  ▪ 16 reports not sent

• By 28 February
  ▪ 12 reports not sent
LRs and ERTs – Observations (I)

• **LRs:**
  - Improve quality and consistency
  - Occasional imbalance in level of effort

• **ERTs**
  - Big majority experts work well
  - ... But occasional problems:
    - Quantity & quality work
    - Communication (team & secretariat)

1 sector can delay entire ARR
LRs and ERTs – Observations (II)

LRs and ERTs

Before review week → Review week → After review week
LRs and ERTs – Observations (III)

Multiple rounds of comments spread across months

1 week of very hard work is not enough
Conclusions – some elements

• Better and earlier planning?
• Improving the work ERT before review week?
• Increased number of participating experts?
• 34 new experts?
• [12] reports published by 6 March – improvement but not enough?
Follow-up of 10th meeting of lead reviewers

11th Meeting of Lead Reviewers
Bonn, Germany, 3 – 6 March 2014

Roman Payo, Programme Officer
UNFCCC secretariat, Mitigation, Data and Analysis Programme
Overview

• Recommendations of the 10th meeting of LRs
  ▪ To LRs and ERTs
  ▪ To secretariat (review)
  ▪ To secretariat (training)
  ▪ To Parties
• Conclusions: some suggestions
Recommendations 10th meeting LRs

to LRs and ERT

to Secretariat (review)

to Secretariat (training)

to Parties
Recommendations to ERTs and LRs (I)

• Improving work before review week  ✔ ☹
  ▪ Role of LRs  ✔ ☹
• LRs to coach new reviewers
  ▪ Limited time  ✔ ☹
• Send to Parties at the end of review week:
  ▪ list main recommendations  ✔
  ▪ list KP-LULUCF issues  ✔
Recommendations to ERTs and LRs (II)

- Problems with national systems and KP-LULUCF: not much time left to fix them
  - Identify them ✓
  - Focus Parties attention ✓
- During centralized, special focus on previous recommendations and recalculation
- LRs and secretariat to improve ARR template
  - More tables ✓
  - Checklists ✓ 😞
Recommendations to ERTs and LRs (II)

• LRs, with help of secretariat, provide guidance on available review tools

• LRs to explore option of supplementing ERTs with standing group of experts or other hybrid solutions
### Recommendations 10th meeting LRs

- to LRs and ERT
- to Secretariat (review)
- to Secretariat (training)
- to Parties
Recommendations to secretariat (review)

- Better and earlier planning ✔
- Increase number participating experts ✔
- Limit 4 Parties per centralized ✔
- Improve explanations ARR template
  - Improved explanations ✔
  - …but new template 😞
- Improve presentation beginning review week ✔
Recommendations to secretariat (review)

- Status report: secretariat drafts, LRs comment ✓
- Improve ARR template and checklists ✓
- Distribute template 1 week before reviews ✓
- Prepare short description on review tools ✓
- Improve SA2: consistency areas LULUCF and KP-LULUCF
  - Done ✓
  - ... manually 😞
Recommendations to secretariat (review)

• VTR:
  ▪ Major source of information during centralized ✔ ☹
  ▪ Pilot for in-country ✔
  ▪ Develop
    ▪ RITS ✔
    ▪ Document management system ☹
Recommendations to secretariat (review)

• Stepwise guide ✅
  ▪ Update it ✅
  ▪ Distribute it 4 weeks before review ✅
Recommendations 10th meeting LRs

to LRs and ERT

to Secretariat (review)

to Secretariat (training)

to Parties
Recommendations to secretariat (training)

• Continue organizing
  ▪ Regional training seminars ✓
  ▪ Refresher seminars ✓

• Continue reminding Parties to update roster ✓

• Inform Parties required profile of experts to be nominated ✓
Recommendations 10th meeting LRs

- to LR and ERT
- to Secretariat (review)
- to Secretariat (training)
- to Parties
Recommendations to Parties

• Provide resources to
  ▪ Organize regional training seminars ✓
  ▪ Support experts in ERTs ✓ 😞
  ▪ Update and supplement training programmes GHG Inv (N.A., review GL not approved, no mandate)
  ▪ Continue developing VTR ✓ 😞 (no more funds)
  ▪ Continue developing CRF Reporter ✓
  ▪ Prepare secretariat’s processes and systems for CP2 ✓
Recommendations to Parties

• Update and expand RoE  ✔️ 😞
• Ensure experts in roster are available  ✔️ 😞
• Submit views on updated CRF Reporter  ✔️