# Outcome of the discussion of group 1 on issues of cross-cutting nature

4th BRs and NCs lead reviewers meeting

*Helen Plume and Jongikhaya Witi*

Bonn, 6-7 March 2017

# 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")

Transparency

**How to review resubmissions of the BR and BR CTF tables?**

> **Approach:**
>
> - If the resubmission is provided <u>later than two weeks</u> after the review week, the ERT notes the resubmission in the TRR, without any technical examination.
>
> - If the resubmission is provided <u>within two weeks</u> after the review week, the ERT notes the resubmission in the TRR, examines it and presents the results of the analysis in order to include the updated information, to the extent possible,  in the technical review report. The ERT may ask the Party to clearly identify the changes made to the original submission.

**Notation Keys**

**Approach:**

- The ERT cannot recommend that the Party use notation keys.

- Instead, the ERT <span style="color:red">may consider using, for example</span>, 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" …".

**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.

**When can the ERT commend the Party?**

---

**Approach:**

- The ERTs can commend a Party only for reporting <span style="color:red">relevant</span> 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.

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

**Approach:**

- If a Party does not substantiate in its report the non-provision of an element of a mandatory reporting requirement in which the clause "where appropriate" is used, the ERT should raise questions to clarify the issue during the review and reflect the answers provided in the TRR. Lack of reporting on a given element does not necessarily lead to a recommendation by the ERT.

# Thank you!!