

Group 1: Review issues of cross-cutting nature

4th BRs and NCs lead reviewers meeting



**Veronica Colerio and Nalin Srivastava, Mitigation, Data and Analysis
programme, UNFCCC secretariat**
Bonn, 6-7 March 2017



Transparency

List of review issues for group work

1. Resubmission of BR
2. Notation Keys
3. CTF tables (missing information and inconsistencies)
4. Commending a Party
5. Para. 17 (“where appropriate”)



1. How to review resubmissions of the BR and BR CTF tables?



Requirement:

Review Guidelines: “If additional information is requested during the review week, the Annex I Party should make every reasonable effort to provide the information within **two weeks** after the review week.”

Example:

Japan

Review Week: 6-11 June 2016

Resubmission CTF table: “Japan submitted a revised BR2 and revised CTF tables on 22 June 2016...” **[within the two weeks]**

The ERT examined the CTF tables and presented the results of the analysis in the technical review report.



1. How to review resubmissions of the BR and BR CTF tables?



Approach:

- If the resubmission is provided later than two weeks after the review week, the ERT notes the resubmission in the TRR, without any technical examination.
- If the resubmission is provided within two weeks after the review week, the ERT notes the resubmission in the TRR, examines it and presents the results of the analysis in the technical review report.

2. Notation Keys



Requirement:

The use of the notation keys is not prescribed in the reporting guidelines.

Example:

EU

“In order to increase transparency, the ERT recommends that the EU complete all relevant parts of CTF table 4 in accordance with the assumptions related to the target. This can be done, **for example, by using the notation key “NA”** (not applicable) if the requested information is not applicable ...”



2. Notation Keys



Approach:

- The ERT cannot recommend that the Party use notation keys.
- Instead, the ERT can use the following phrases:
 - ✓ “The ERT considers that transparency of reporting could be improved by indicating in the table “NA” ...”;
 - ✓ “The transparency can be improved, for example, by using the notation key “NA” ...”

3. CTF tables (missing information and inconsistencies)



Requirement:

Providing information in the BR CTF tables is a mandatory reporting requirement. The reporting guidelines request some information to be reported under the mandatory requirement in textual and tabular format.

Example:

EU

“ ... the ERT noted that for some PaMs ... the EU has reported estimates of mitigation impacts in its BR2, but not in CTF table 3” “The ERT **recommends that the EU improves the transparency** of its reporting in its next biennial report and/or CTF tables by: reporting consistent information on its mitigation actions in the biennial report and CTF table 3 ...”



3. CTF tables (missing information and inconsistencies)



Approach:

- When the reporting guidelines request that information be reported under the mandatory requirement in textual and tabular format, but the information is reported solely in the textual part of the BR and not in the CTF tables, the ERT should make a recommendation on transparency.
- When there is inconsistency between the information relating to the same reporting requirement reported in the textual part of the BR and in the CTF tables, the ERT should make a recommendation/encouragement on transparency, as appropriate.

4. When can the ERT commend the Party?



Requirement:

Reporting information under Articles 4 and 12 of the Convention is part of Parties' commitments.

Examples:

“Slovenia is not a Party included in Annex II to the Convention ... However, as reported in its BR2, Slovenia provided information on its provision of support to developing country Parties. The ERT **commends** Slovenia for reporting this information and suggests that it continue to do so in future BRs.”



“In section 4.3 of the BR2, Spain included detailed non-mandatory additional information on the potential economic and social effects of its mitigation measures in third countries ... The ERT **commends** Spain for including the results of the study in the BR.”



4. When can the ERT commend the Party?



Approach:

- The ERTs can commend a Party only for reporting information going beyond the reporting requirements. A clear example of such a case is reporting on support by non-Annex II Parties.
- To recognize improvements in reporting, the ERTs can note significant improvements compared to the previous round of reporting and thorough implementation of all previous recommendations and encouragements to improve the completeness and transparency of reporting.



5. Information of financial support for mitigation, adaptation and response measures (Para. 17)



Requirement:

According to the BR reporting guidelines (para. 17), providing information on the financial support provided for mitigation, adaptation and response measures is a “shall” reporting requirement, “where appropriate”.

Example:

- “The ERT noted that in chapter 6 of the BR2 there is no information on the financial support Norway has committed and/or pledged for the purpose of assisting non-Annex I Parties to adapt to any economic and social consequences of response measures, where appropriate. However, in annex 3 to the BR2, Norway clarified that it has no such activities to report on. The ERT recommends that Norway include this information, or any changes to this information, in its next BR, in the chapter on financial support, in order to enhance the Transparency of its reporting.”



5. Information of financial support for mitigation, adaptation and response measures (Para. 17)



Approach:

- “where appropriate” provides discretion to the Party to report on all or any components of the reporting requirement (support for mitigation, support for adaptation or support for response measures) depending on how its financial support is structured.
- Lack of reporting on any of the three elements (finance for mitigation, adaptation or response measures) does not necessarily lead to a recommendation by the ERT, as it is the reporting Party that deems what is appropriate.
- If a Party does not substantiate in its report the non-provision of an element under this reporting requirement, the ERT should raise questions to clarify the issue during the review and reflect the answers provided in the TRR.

Thank you!!

