



UNITED
NATIONS



**Framework Convention
on Climate Change**

Distr.
GENERAL

FCCC/SBI/2009/INF.8
4 November 2009

ENGLISH ONLY

SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR IMPLEMENTATION

Thirty-first session

Copenhagen, 7–18 December 2009*

Item 10 of the provisional agenda

Reporting and review of information submitted by Parties included in Annex I to the Convention that are also Parties to the Kyoto Protocol

**Status of submission and review of the initial reports submitted
in accordance with decision 13/CMP.1 and the annual information required
under Article 7 of the Kyoto Protocol**

Note by the secretariat

Summary

This document describes the status of submissions of the initial reports under the Kyoto Protocol pursuant to decision 13/CMP.1 and the status of reviews of these reports undertaken during 2007, 2008 and 2009. The document also describes the status of submission, on a voluntary basis, of the annual information required under Article 7, paragraph 1, and the status of reviews of this information in conjunction with the review of the greenhouse gas inventories in 2009. It provides information on: the application of the review procedures under Article 8 of the Kyoto Protocol; the training programme under the Kyoto Protocol and its activities; and the participation of experts in the review process.

* Exact dates within the sessional period are subject to confirmation.

CONTENTS

		<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I.	INTRODUCTION	1–11	3
	A. Mandate	1–5	3
	B. Background.....	6–8	3
	C. Scope of the note	9–10	4
	D. Possible action by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation..	11	4
II.	SUBMISSION AND REVIEW OF INITIAL REPORTS	12–46	4
	A. Status of submission and review of initial reports.....	12	4
	B. Review activities.....	13–42	4
	C. Training of experts.....	43–46	12

I. Introduction

A. Mandate

1. In accordance with decision 13/CMP.1, Parties included in Annex I to the Convention that are also Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (hereinafter referred to as Annex I Parties) shall facilitate the calculation of their assigned amounts pursuant to Article 3, paragraphs 7 and 8, of the Kyoto Protocol and demonstrate their capacity to account for their emissions and assigned amounts. To this end, each Annex I Party shall submit to the secretariat a report (hereinafter referred to as the initial report) containing this information, prior to 1 January 2007 or one year after the entry into force of the Kyoto Protocol for that Party, whichever is later.
2. The “Guidelines for review under Article 8 of the Kyoto Protocol” (hereinafter referred to as the Article 8 review guidelines) state that each Annex I Party shall be subject to review prior to the first commitment period or within one year after the entry into force of the Kyoto Protocol for that Party, whichever is later.
3. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP), by its decision 26/CMP.1, requested the secretariat to organize the initial reviews under Article 8 of the Kyoto Protocol, in conjunction with the review of the greenhouse gas (GHG) inventories submitted in 2006; a certain degree of flexibility should be exercised in applying the agreed timelines, provided that each initial review is completed no later than one year from the date of the submission of the initial report and that Parties are accorded the time to comment on the draft review report as inscribed in the Article 8 review guidelines.
4. In accordance with decision 15/CMP.1, each Annex I Party 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, but may start reporting this information from the year following the submission of the initial report on a voluntary basis.
5. In accordance with decision 22/CMP.1, the annual review should start in the year following the submission of the initial report for those Annex I Parties that started reporting information under Article 7, paragraph 1, on a voluntary basis earlier than required under Article 7, paragraph 3.

B. Background

6. The Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI), at its twenty-ninth session, took note of document FCCC/SBI/2008/INF.8 and Corr.1 containing information on the status of the reviews of initial reports, the publication of the review reports and the forwarding of these reports to the CMP and the Compliance Committee.
7. At its twenty-ninth session¹ the SBI requested the secretariat to organize a meeting of the lead reviewers in the first half of 2009. The SBI noted that issues relating to the review of higher tier methodologies and consistency between reviews under the Convention may also apply to reviews under the Kyoto Protocol and therefore requested the lead reviewers to include consideration of these issues in the context of the Kyoto Protocol in their discussion at their next meeting.
8. The SBI acknowledged the importance of the training programme for inventory review experts under the Kyoto Protocol, which builds on the training programme for new GHG inventory reviewers under the Convention. The SBI also acknowledged that managing the review process, including the training of inventory review experts, planning and conducting the reviews and organizing the lead

¹ FCCC/SBI/2008/19, paragraphs 110–113.

reviewer meetings, is placing considerable demand on the secretariat and requires considerable resources. The SBI further acknowledged the urgent need to prioritize these fundamental activities, notably the completion of the training course on the review of activities under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol and the training course on the modalities for the accounting of assigned amounts under Article 7, paragraph 4, in particular the review of the national registry and the standard electronic format (SEF).

C. Scope of the note

9. This document provides information on the status of submission of initial reports by Annex I Parties, the reviews thereof and submission of the review reports to the CMP and the Compliance Committee. It also provides information on: the status of submission, on a voluntary basis, of the annual information required under Article 7, paragraph 1; the review of this information, including the GHG inventories of Annex I Parties; and the status of submission of the review reports to the CMP and the Compliance Committee in 2009. This document further provides information regarding the training programme under the Kyoto Protocol and its activities.

10. In accordance with the Article 8 review guidelines, the review under the Kyoto Protocol encompasses the existing review under the Convention. The majority of lessons learned and problems encountered in the review process in 2007, 2008 and 2009 under the Convention and under the Kyoto Protocol have many common elements. This document focuses on the specific Kyoto Protocol elements of the review process 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"² prepared by the secretariat in accordance with decision 12/CP.9.

D. Possible action by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation

11. The SBI will be invited to take note of the information contained in this document.

II. Submission and review of initial reports

A. Status of submission and review of initial reports

12. Table 1 provides information on the submission of initial reports and the status of the preparation of the review reports, and shows the dates when Parties became eligible to participate in the Kyoto Protocol mechanisms.

B. Review activities

1. Reviews of initial reports

13. In response to decisions 22/CMP.1 and 26/CMP.1, the secretariat organized the reviews of the initial reports during 2007 and 2008. As at 1 November 2009, individual inventory reviews had been conducted for 39 Annex I Parties, as follows:

- (a) **Completed reviews:** Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, European Community, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

² FCCC/SBSTA/2009/INF.4.

- (b) **Review of the initial report of Belarus:** this will be scheduled closer to the date when the relevant amendment to the Kyoto Protocol has been ratified by enough Parties to allow it to enter into force.³

Table 1. Submission of initial reports, review dates and status of review reports

Party	Initial report received	Language of initial report	Review dates	Status of review report	Document symbol	Eligible for mechanisms ^a
Australia	11 Mar. 2008	English	7–12 Apr. 2008	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/AUS	11 Jul. 2009
Austria	5 Dec. 2006	English	12–17 Feb. 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/AUT	5 Apr. 2008
Belarus ^b	31 Oct. 2006	English and Russian				
Belgium	22 Dec. 2006	English	4–9 June 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/BEL	22 Apr. 2008
Bulgaria	25 July 2007	English	15–20 Oct. 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/BGR	25 Nov. 2008
Canada	15 Mar. 2007	English and French	5–10 Nov. 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/CAN	16 Jun. 2008
Croatia	27 Aug. 2008	English	20–25 Oct. 2008	Published	FCCC/IRR/2008/HRV	– ^c
Czech Republic	24 Oct. 2006	English	26 Feb.–3 Mar. 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/CZE	24 Feb. 2008
Denmark	20 Dec. 2006	English	16–21 Apr. 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/DNK	20 Apr. 2008
Estonia	15 Dec. 2006	English	4–9 June 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/EST	15 Apr. 2008
European Community	18 Dec. 2006	English, summary in English and French	2–7 July 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/EC	18 Apr. 2008
Finland	22 Dec. 2006	English	28 May–2 June 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/FIN	22 Apr. 2008
France	21 Dec. 2006	French	28 May–2 June 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/FRA	21 Apr. 2008
Germany	27 Dec. 2006	English	11–16 June 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/DEU	27 Apr. 2008
Greece	29 Dec. 2006	English	23–28 Apr. 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/GRC	14 Nov. 2008
Hungary	30 Aug. 2006	English	5–10 Mar. 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/HUN	30 Dec. 2007
Iceland	11 Jan. 2007	English	18–23 June 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/ISL	11 May 2008
Ireland	19 Dec. 2006	English	16–21 Apr. 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/IRL	19 Apr. 2008
Italy	19 Dec. 2006	English	4–9 June 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/ITA	19 Apr. 2008
Japan	30 Aug. 2006	English	29 Jan.–3 Feb. 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/JPN	30 Dec. 2007
Latvia	29 Dec. 2006	English	21–26 May 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/LVA	29 Apr. 2008
Liechtenstein	22 Dec. 2006	English	11–16 June 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/LIE	22 Apr. 2008
Lithuania	22 Dec. 2006	English	21–26 May 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/LTU	22 Apr. 2008
Luxembourg	29 Dec. 2006	English	11–16 June 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/LUX	29 Apr. 2008
Monaco	7 May 2007	French	15–19 Oct. 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/MCO	7 Sep. 2008
Netherlands	21 Dec. 2006	English	16–21 Apr. 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/NLD	21 Apr. 2008
New Zealand	31 Aug. 2006	English	19–24 Feb. 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/NZL	31 Dec. 2007
Norway	22 Dec. 2006	English	23–28 Apr. 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/NOR	22 Apr. 2008
Poland	29 Dec. 2006	English	11–16 June 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/POL	29 Apr. 2008
Portugal	28 Dec. 2006	English	21–26 May 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/PRT	28 Apr. 2008
Romania	18 May 2007	English	8–13 Oct. 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/ROU	18 Sep. 2008
Russian Federation	20 Feb. 2007	Russian	16–21 July 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/RUS	20 Jun. 2008
Slovakia	04 Oct. 2006	English	19–24 Mar. 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/SVK	4 Feb. 2008
Slovenia	22 Dec. 2006	English	21–26 May 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/SVN	22 Apr. 2008
Spain	19 Dec. 2006	Spanish	23–28 Apr. 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/ESP	19 Apr. 2008
Sweden	19 Dec. 2006	English	23–28 Apr. 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/SWE	19 Apr. 2008
Switzerland	10 Nov. 2006	English	5–10 Mar. 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/CHE	10 Mar. 2008
Ukraine	29 Dec. 2006	English	16–21 Apr. 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/UKR	29 Apr. 2008
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	11 Dec. 2006	English	12–17 Mar. 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/GBR	11 Apr. 2008

^a Initial eligibility is based on decision 3/CMP.1, annex, paragraph 32; decision 9/CMP.1, annex, paragraph 22; and decision 11/CMP.1, annex, paragraph 3. Parties become eligible to participate in the Kyoto Protocol mechanisms 16 months after the submission of their initial report, subject to successful completion of the review and compliance cycle.

^b At the time of the preparation of this document, the initial report submitted by Belarus had not been reviewed. The quantified emission reduction commitment for Belarus in Annex B (92 per cent) was established through an amendment to Annex B to the Kyoto Protocol (decision 10/CMP.2). As at 1 April 2008, this amendment had not yet been ratified by enough Parties to allow it to enter into force and the review of the initial report has been postponed. Belarus submitted an update of its initial report on 30 December 2006.

^c The initial report of Croatia had been submitted to the Compliance Committee with questions of implementation on 26 August 2009. At the time of publication of this note, the Compliance Committee determined that Croatia is not eligible to participate in the mechanisms under Articles 6, 12 and 17, of the Kyoto Protocol pending the resolution of the questions of implementation (CC-2009-1-6/Croatia/EB).

³ FCCC/KP/CMP/2007/9, paragraphs 159–160.

14. The review of the initial reports under the Kyoto Protocol is more complex than the review of the annual GHG inventories under the Convention because it involves additional elements, which were reviewed by the expert review teams (ERTs) for the first time during 2007 and 2008. This puts more pressure on the ERTs, as the amount of information to review and the expertise needed are greater than in the reviews under the Convention.

15. During the initial reviews, the majority of the potential problems identified were resolved by the Parties within the stipulated time frame provided in the Article 8 review guidelines. In a few cases, the number and complex nature of the identified potential problems made the provision of revised estimates and/or additional information an intensive and time-consuming activity for the Party and caused problems in meeting the strict deadlines established both for the Party to provide the required information and for the ERT to assess it and prepare the review report.

16. The 38 reports of reviews conducted up to November 2009 were published in accordance with the deadlines established by the Article 8 review guidelines and within the one-year deadline from the date of submission of the initial report established by decision 26/CMP.1, with the exception of two reports whose publication was slightly delayed.

17. In accordance with the Article 8 review guidelines, all completed final review reports shall be published and forwarded by the secretariat, together with any written comments on the final report by the Party that is the subject of the report, to the CMP, the Compliance Committee and the Party concerned. With three exceptions, the reports published so far do not contain questions of implementation because the Parties have been able to resolve potential problems during the review process. As reflected in its second annual report⁴ and third annual report⁵ to the CMP, the Compliance Committee, through its Enforcement Branch, took note of the forwarded reports in 2007 and 2008, and is expected to take note of the two remaining reports that were published in 2009 at the end of this year in its fourth annual report to the CMP. The Enforcement Branch of the Compliance Committee considered the question of implementation in one of the reports during its meetings in March,⁶ April⁷ and October 2008⁸ and considered the question of implementation in the second report during its meeting in June 2008.⁹ The Enforcement Branch considered the question of implementation in the third report during its meetings in October 2009.

18. By October 2009, 37 Parties had become eligible to participate in mechanisms under Articles 6, 12 and 17, of the Kyoto Protocol, either because 16 months had elapsed since the submission of their initial reports or, as in one case, when the Compliance Committee considered that a Party had met the eligibility requirements before the 16 months had elapsed and because there is no longer any question of implementation with respect to another Party, which therefore became eligible to participate in the mechanisms under Articles 6, 12 and 17, of the Kyoto Protocol.

2. Reviews of annual inventory submissions

19. In 2009 the secretariat received 39 annual submissions from Annex I Parties of the information required under Article 7, paragraph 1, of the Kyoto Protocol, including information on GHG inventories (see table 2). Status reports for all 39 submissions had been prepared, published on the UNFCCC

⁴ FCCC/KP/CMP/2007/6, paragraph 25.

⁵ FCCC/KP/CMP/2008/5, paragraph 16.

⁶ <http://unfccc.int/files/kyoto_protocol/compliance/enforcement_branch/application/pdf/cc-eb-3-2008-2_report_on_the_3rd_meeting_of_the_eb.pdf>.

⁷ <http://unfccc.int/files/kyoto_protocol/compliance/enforcement_branch/application/pdf/cc-eb-4-2008-2_report_on_the_4th_meeting_of_the_eb.pdf>.

⁸ <http://unfccc.int/files/kyoto_protocol/compliance/enforcement_branch/application/pdf/cc-eb-6-2008-3_report_on_the_6th_mtg_of_the_eb.pdf>.

⁹ <http://unfccc.int/files/kyoto_protocol/compliance/enforcement_branch/application/pdf/cc-eb-5-2008-2_report_on_the_5th_meeting_of_the_eb.pdf>.

website¹⁰ and forwarded to the Compliance Committee by June 2009. All these submissions were made as voluntary submissions under the Kyoto Protocol. The secretariat is coordinating 39 reviews of these reports as required under the Article 8 guidelines. Eight of the individual reviews of these submissions, those of Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia and the Russian Federation, were conducted as in-country reviews and the rest were conducted as centralized reviews. Altogether, eight centralized reviews were organized between 31 August and 26 September, 2009 in Bonn, Germany. The reports from these reviews are expected to be finalized and published in February–March 2010.

Table 2. Submission of annual information required under the Kyoto Protocol, review dates and status of review reports

Annex I Party	NIR and CRF submission dates	Language of NIR	Status report symbol	Review dates	Status of review report
Australia	NIR – 26 May 09 CRF – 26 May 09	English	FCCC/ASR/2009/AUS	21–26 Sept. 09	In preparation
Austria	NIR – 15 Apr. 09 CRF – 15 Apr. 09	English	FCCC/ASR/2009/AUT	31 Aug.–5 Sept. 09	In preparation
Belarus	NIR – 19 May 09 CRF – 15 Apr. 09	Russian	FCCC/ASR/2009/BLR	14–19 Sept. 09	In preparation
Belgium	NIR – 15 Apr. 09 CRF – 15 Apr. 09	English	FCCC/ASR/2009/BEL	7–12 Sept. 09	In preparation
Bulgaria	NIR – 13 Apr. 09 CRF – 13 Apr. 09	English	FCCC/ASR/2009/BGR	28 Sept.–3 Oct. 09	In preparation
Canada	NIR – 17 Apr. 09 CRF – 17 Apr. 09	English	FCCC/ASR/2009/CAN	14–19 Sept. 09	In preparation
Croatia	NIR – 27 May 09 CRF – 26 May 09	English	FCCC/ASR/2009/HRV	7–12 Sept. 09	In preparation
Czech Republic	NIR – 14 Apr. 09 CRF – 14 Apr. 09	English	FCCC/ASR/2009/CZE	12–17 Oct. 09	In preparation
Denmark	NIR – 15 Apr. 09 CRF – 15 Apr. 09	English	FCCC/ASR/2009/DNK	31 Aug.–5 Sept. 09	In preparation
Estonia	NIR – 15 Apr. 09 CRF – 15 Apr. 09	English	FCCC/ASR/2009/EST	28 Sept.–3 Oct. 09	In preparation
European Community	NIR – 15 Apr. 09 CRF – 15 Apr. 09	English	FCCC/ASR/2009/EC	21–26 Sept. 09	In preparation
Finland	NIR – 8 Apr. 09 CRF – 8 Apr. 09	English	FCCC/ASR/2009/FIN	14–19 Sept. 09	In preparation
France	NIR – 6 Apr. 09 CRF – 6 Apr. 09	French	FCCC/ASR/2009/FRA	31 Aug.–5 Sept. 09	In preparation
Germany	NIR – 15 Apr. 09 CRF – 8 Apr. 09	English	FCCC/ASR/2009/DEU	31 Aug.–5 Sept. 09	In preparation
Greece	NIR – 14 Apr. 09 CRF – 14 Apr. 09	English	FCCC/ASR/2009/GRC	21–26 Sept. 09	In preparation
Hungary	NIR – 16 Apr. 09 CRF – 15 Apr. 09	English	FCCC/ASR/2009/HUN	21–26 Sept. 09	In preparation
Iceland	NIR – 26 May 09 CRF – 27 Apr. 09	English	FCCC/ASR/2009/ISL	14–19 Sept. 09	In preparation
Ireland	NIR – 9 Apr. 09 CRF – 9 Apr. 09	English	FCCC/ASR/2009/IRL	7–12 Sept. 09	In preparation
Italy	NIR – 15 Apr. 09 CRF – 15 Apr. 09	English	FCCC/ASR/2009/ITA	7–12 Sept. 09	In preparation
Japan	NIR – 30 Apr. 09 CRF – 30 Apr. 09	English	FCCC/ASR/2009/JPN	7–12 Sept. 09	In preparation
Latvia	NIR – 15 Apr. 09 CRF – 15 Apr. 09	English	FCCC/ASR/2009/LVA	12–17 Oct. 09	In preparation
Liechtenstein	NIR – 2 Apr. 09 CRF – 2 Apr. 09	English	FCCC/ASR/2009/LIE	31 Aug.–5 Sept. 09	In preparation
Lithuania	NIR – 9 Apr. 09 CRF – 9 Apr. 09	English	FCCC/ASR/2009/LTU	31 Aug.–5 Sept. 09	In preparation
Luxembourg	NIR – 28 May 09 CRF – 19 May 09	English	FCCC/ASR/2009/LUX	21–26 Sept. 09	In preparation
Monaco	NIR – 9 Apr. 09 CRF – 9 Apr. 09	French	FCCC/ASR/2009/MCO	31 Aug.–5 Sept. 09	In preparation

¹⁰ <http://unfccc.int/national_reports/annex_i_ghg_inventories/inventory_review_reports/items/4401.php>.

Table 2 (continued)

Annex I Party	NIR and CRF submission dates	Language of NIR	Status report symbol	Review dates	Status of review report
Netherlands	NIR – 15 Apr. 09 CRF – 15 Apr. 09	English	FCCC/ASR/2009/NLD	7–12 Sept. 09	In preparation
New Zealand	NIR – 15 Apr. 09 CRF – 15 Apr. 09	English	FCCC/ASR/2009/NZL	21–26 Sept 09	In preparation
Norway	NIR – 15 Apr. 09 CRF – 15 Apr. 09	English	FCCC/ASR/2009/NOR	7–12 Sept. 09	In preparation
Poland	NIR – 15 Apr. 09 CRF – 15 Apr. 09	English	FCCC/ASR/2009/POL	7–12 Sept. 09	In preparation
Portugal	NIR – 15 Apr. 09 CRF – 15 Apr. 09	English	FCCC/ASR/2009/PRT	31 Aug.–5 Sept. 09	In preparation
Romania	NIR – 13 Apr. 09 CRF – 13 Apr. 09	English	FCCC/ASR/2009/ROU	21–26 Sept. 09	In preparation
Russian Federation	NIR – 14 May 09 CRF – 15 Apr. 09	Russian	FCCC/ASR/2009/RUS	7–12 Sept. 09	In preparation
Slovakia	NIR – 14 Apr. 09 CRF – 14 Apr. 09	English	FCCC/ASR/2009/SVK	31 Aug.–5 Sept. 09	In preparation
Slovenia	NIR – 15 Apr. 09 CRF – 15 Apr. 09	English	FCCC/ASR/2009/SVN	14–19 Sept. 09	In preparation
Spain	NIR – 14 Apr. 09 CRF – 14 Apr. 09	Spanish and English	FCCC/ASR/2009/ESP	14–19 Sept. 09	In preparation
Sweden	NIR – 7 Apr. 09 CRF – 7 Apr. 09	English	FCCC/ASR/2009/SWE	21–26 Sept. 09	In preparation
Switzerland	NIR – 15 Apr. 09 CRF – 15 Apr. 09	English	FCCC/ASR/2009/CHE	31 Aug.–5 Sept. 09	In preparation
Ukraine	NIR – 25 May 09 CRF – 25 May 09	Russian	FCCC/ASR/2009/UKR	14–19 Sept. 09	In preparation
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	NIR – 15 Apr. 09 CRF – 15 Apr. 09	English	FCCC/ASR/2009/GBR	14–19 Sept. 09	In preparation

Abbreviations: CRF = common reporting format, NIR = national inventory report.

20. The review of the voluntary annual submissions of the information required under Article 7, paragraph 1, of the Kyoto Protocol is, like the review of the initial reports, more complex than the review of the annual GHG inventories under the Convention, because further additional elements that are new to the experts are reviewed. These include: information on activities under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol (submitted in 2009 by 10 Parties on a voluntary basis); information on accounting of Kyoto Protocol units reported in the SEF and reports from the national registry, including the SEF comparison report); changes to the national registries; changes to the national systems; calculation of the commitment period reserve; and the minimization of adverse impacts in accordance with Article 3, paragraph 14, of the Kyoto Protocol. This puts additional pressure on the ERTs as the amount of information to review and the expertise needed are greater than in the reviews under the Convention and the reviews of the initial reports.

21. In addition, during the 2009 reviews, the ERTs conducted an exercise to gain experience with the methods and procedures for adjustments of estimates of GHG emissions by sources and removals by sinks resulting from activities under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol, using real inventory data submitted voluntarily by Parties. This exercise was implemented in accordance with the conclusions of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice at its twenty-second session,¹¹ subject to the consent of the Party concerned and on a voluntary basis.

3. Expert review teams

22. The information provided in the initial reports and in the annual submissions under Article 7, paragraph 1, of the Kyoto Protocol, including the GHG inventory, is examined by international teams of experts, who are selected by the secretariat from nominations by Parties to the roster of experts.

¹¹ FCCC/SBSTA/2005/4, paragraph 38.

For more information on the participation of experts in the reviews, see document FCCC/SBSTA/2009/INF.4.

23. 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 to review complex sectors such as energy and land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF). Although the number of experts is increasing, it is still not sufficient to conduct the reviews effectively in accordance with Article 8 review guidelines. As indicated in document FCCC/SBSTA/2009/INF.4, it was very difficult to ensure complete teams for the in-country and centralized reviews of the 2009 inventory submissions, which were conducted in September and October 2009. For the purpose of having complete teams for these reviews, the secretariat had to invite some experts who had not taken the new Kyoto Protocol courses or passed all examinations (see paras. 43–46 below). In addition, it should be noted that time is needed for newly trained experts to gain enough experience to be able to conduct reviews independently.

4. Meeting of inventory lead reviewers

24. The Article 8 review guidelines require that expert teams should be led by two experts with substantial experience of inventory reviewing and/or the management of national institutional arrangements for inventory preparation. For each team, one lead reviewer should be from a Party not included in Annex I to the Convention (non-Annex I Party) and the other from a Party included in Annex I to the Convention. Lead reviewers have a special role in guiding the review teams to ensure the consistency, quality and objectivity of the reviews. Recognizing this role, the CMP, by its decision 23/CMP.1, requested that lead reviewers 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 decision 12/CP.9, the secretariat organizes meetings of lead reviewers. 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. During recent years, lead reviewers 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 most recent, sixth meeting of inventory lead reviewers took place in Bonn on 16–17 March 2009. 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. Further information on other issues and recommendations from this meeting is contained in document FCCC/SBSTA/2009/INF.4. The main issues related to reviews under the Kyoto Protocol are referred to in paras. 26–41 below.

26. The lead reviewers recognized that the increased complexity of the review process undertaken in 2008, comprising the reviews of both the 2007 and the 2008 submissions of Annex I Parties, required a substantial effort by experts, Parties and the secretariat in order to finalize these reviews in a timely, consistent and transparent manner. This was achieved in spite of the insufficient number of experts currently involved in the review process and the increased complexity of the tasks involved.

27. At the same meeting, the lead reviewers acknowledged the need for prioritization and time management, in particular during the centralized reviews, and recommended that in centralized reviews priority be given to reviewing the implementation by the Party of recommendations from the previous review and any recalculations that were undertaken. As a minimum, the ERT should ensure during the review that the quality of the GHG inventory and other elements reported under Article 7, paragraph 1, of the Kyoto Protocol has been maintained by the Party over time.

28. The lead reviewers acknowledged that the experience gained and lessons learned from the reviews of supplementary information submitted under Article 7, paragraph 1, of the Kyoto Protocol

provide a basis for Parties to improve the reporting of such information in their 2009 annual submission, and for annual reviews under the Kyoto Protocol.

29. They also acknowledged that each ERT consistently applied the Article 8 review guidelines under the Kyoto Protocol, as well as relevant procedures. The lead reviewers noted that consistent application of the Article 8 review guidelines is essential, but recognized that the different national circumstances of Parties must be taken into account and that there will always be a need for the ERT to use its own judgement.

30. The development by the secretariat of new online training courses on activities under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol and on modalities for the accounting of assigned amounts under Article 7, paragraph 4, of the Kyoto Protocol, including the review of the national registry and the SEF, was welcomed by the lead reviewers. They urged experts on LULUCF to take the course on activities under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol, and generalists and lead reviewers to take the course on modalities for the accounting of assigned amounts under Article 7, paragraph 4, of the Kyoto Protocol, in particular the modules on the national registry and the SEF.

31. The lead reviewers also welcomed the draft updated training programme under the Kyoto Protocol prepared by the secretariat for consideration by the SBI at its thirtieth session, which outlines the ongoing training activities, including the new Kyoto Protocol courses. They noted that the implementation of this programme would enhance the expertise of the reviewers and, hence, contribute to the quality and consistency of the review process.

32. The lead reviewers noted the development, in accordance with decision 6/CMP.3, of a new CRF Reporter module for reporting activities under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol. They expressed support for the work undertaken and planned by the secretariat to further develop the review tools, such as incorporating data and information on activities under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol into the current set of review tools, and agreed to establish a working group to assist the secretariat in establishing the scope of data and information reported by Annex I Parties on these activities.

33. The lead reviewers welcomed the information presented by the secretariat on the standard independent assessment report (SIAR) that will be prepared by the international transaction log (ITL) administrator in support of the expert review of information on the accounting of Kyoto Protocol units, SEF and changes in national registries reported under Article 7, paragraph 1, of the Kyoto Protocol. They noted that the SIAR will greatly facilitate the review of the information reported under Article 7, paragraph 1, and therefore the overall review process. The lead reviewers requested that the secretariat prepare before their next meeting information on the experiences and lessons learned in the use of this review tool by ERTs. They also requested that the secretariat explore how to make publicly available on the UNFCCC website information on the work of the Registry System Administrators Forum (RSA Forum) related to the support of the SIAR process.

34. During the meeting, the secretariat presented the overall approach to conducting the reviews of the 2009 annual inventory submissions under the Convention and supplementary information submitted under Article 7, paragraph 1, of the Kyoto Protocol. The lead reviewers noted the increased volume of information that is expected to be reported by Parties under Article 7, paragraph 1. They also noted that the updated review report template takes this into account and contains specific sections for the recording of relevant findings, conclusions and recommendations of the review. The lead reviewers further noted that the template helps to minimize the duplication of information and facilitates consistency across review reports, and endorsed the overall approach to the reviews in 2009, including the review template.

35. The draft annotated outline for the national inventory report (NIR) prepared by the secretariat, which includes reporting elements of the annual inventory required under both the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol, was welcomed by the lead reviewers. They requested that the secretariat finalize the

annotated outline for the NIR, taking into account comments received during the meeting, and post it on the UNFCCC website. They encouraged Parties to use the annotated outline for the NIR as a model for the annual inventories, with a view to ensuring complete, transparent and consistent reporting of annual inventories, including supplementary information required under Article 7, paragraph 1, of the Kyoto Protocol.

36. The lead reviewers reiterated that for Annex I Parties the 2008 and 2009 inventory submissions could be their voluntary submissions under the Kyoto Protocol and that, under decision 22/CMP.1, paragraph 5, the Article 8 review guidelines should be used. It is expected that Parties will continue to report information under the Kyoto Protocol on a voluntary basis in the lead-up to 2010, when reporting becomes mandatory.

37. Concerning the review of GHG inventories under the Kyoto Protocol, the lead reviewers noted that in cases where potential problems relating to meeting the methodological and reporting requirements have been identified, the ERTs should clearly indicate these problems at the end of the review week and should clarify the nature of the problem in accordance with the principles of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change *Good Practice Guidance and Uncertainty Management in National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*, namely transparency, consistency, comparability, completeness and accuracy. The ERTs should provide clear recommendations to the Party on how to solve the problem and indicate to the Party that it is possible to submit revised estimates, with a view to addressing identified potential problems within the deadlines established by the Article 8 review guidelines. The ERTs should clearly state in the review report whether or not the problems were resolved; if not, they should formulate recommendations on how and when these problems should be resolved and on the further steps to be taken by the Party. When major potential problems relating to methodological requirements for the annual inventory remain unresolved and can be attributed to the functions of the national system, the ERT may raise a question of implementation regarding how the national system performs its functions.

38. The lead reviewers expressed support for the ERTs to apply procedures for adjustments, where relevant, on a trial basis during the 2009 reviews for activities under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol, subject to the availability of resources and the consent of the Party concerned.

39. Regarding the review of the functions of the national system, the lead reviewers noted a number of reports from the 2008 reviews indicating that some problems with national systems identified during the initial reviews have not been resolved. They welcomed the plans by the secretariat to organize in-country reviews for most of these Parties in 2009. During the 2009 reviews, ERTs should assess whether such information has been provided. If the outstanding problems have not been resolved, the ERT may raise a question of implementation regarding the national system.

40. Regarding the review of changes in national registries, the lead reviewers noted that this should be defined by the scope and nature of changes to the national registry. In the case of major changes in the national registry requiring a thorough technical review, the ERT may use additional expertise from the RSA Forum, and may use a standardized technical assessment of these changes, including the SIAR.

41. The ERT may use the SIAR to conclude on its assessment of information reported under Article 7, paragraph 1, of the Kyoto Protocol; in addition to the assessment of the changes in national registry, the SIAR contains an assessment of the accounting of Kyoto Protocol units and the SEF, and comparison of the SEF data with data from the ITL. For a finding that indicates a major problem, the secretariat will initiate a process of thorough technical review that may, depending on the nature of the problem, involve an in-country visit. If the major problem remains unresolved the ERT can list a question of implementation in the annual review report.

42. The full text of the conclusions of the sixth lead reviewers' meeting is available on the UNFCCC website.¹²

C. Training of experts

43. Decision 24/CMP.1 requested the secretariat to develop training courses on: national systems for the estimation of GHG emissions of Annex I Parties; adjustments under Article 5, paragraph 2, of the Kyoto Protocol; and modalities for accounting of assigned amounts under Article 7, paragraph 4, of the Kyoto Protocol. These courses were developed in and have been offered to experts online since 2006. The majority of experts completed the training courses and passed the examination in 2006. Nine experts passed one or more examinations during 2007. Fifteen more experts have enrolled for the courses since December 2007 and nine passed one or more examinations in October 2008. In July 2009, 19 experts enrolled for these courses and in August 2009, 18 experts passed one or more examinations.

44. Training activities are important to ensure the quality of the review process. This is particularly true in the case of experts from non-Annex I Parties as they usually do not work on inventories on a daily basis. In addition, they are not involved in activities for which Annex I Parties report supplementary information under Article 7, paragraph 1, of the Kyoto Protocol, related to national registries and assigned amounts, that are subject to annual reviews.

45. At its twenty-seventh session, the SBI requested¹³ the secretariat to develop two new training courses under the Kyoto Protocol covering activities under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, and the modalities for accounting of assigned amounts, in particular in relation to the national registry, including the SEF. The secretariat developed these training courses during 2009 and in July–August of the same year offered them online for experienced and new experts. Fifty-six experts enrolled for these courses and 51 passed one or more examinations in August 2009. In addition, the secretariat developed an updated training programme, including the two new training courses, for members of ERTs participating in annual reviews under Article 8 of the Kyoto Protocol that the SBI at its thirtieth session recommended for adoption by the CMP at its fifth session.¹⁴

46. The secretariat continues to strongly encourage all experts from the UNFCCC roster of experts nominated for inventory review activities to take the relevant Kyoto Protocol training courses and examinations, because only experts that pass these examinations are able to participate in the reviews under the Kyoto Protocol as of 2010.

- - - - -

¹² <http://unfccc.int/files/national_reports/annex_i_ghg_inventories/review_process/application/pdf/sixth_meeting_of_inventory_lead_reviewers.pdf>.

¹³ FCCC/SBI/2007/34, paragraph 100.

¹⁴ FCCC/SBI/2009/8, paragraph 91.