

Outcome of the discussion group 3 on issues related to policies and measures and provision of support

4th BRs and NCs lead reviewers meeting

6-7 March, 2017



Co-facilitators: Rob Sturgiss and Marcelo Rocha

Bonn, 6 March 2017



Transparency

The approaches supported by the LRs as they are in the RPG

2. How to assess information reported only on the new PaMs implemented or planned since previous NC/BR?

(Partially supported, except for bullet point 3)

Approach:

- If the Party reported only on the new PaMs, it should **provide the reference to the previous NC/BR** which describes the previously existing PaMs.
- The ERT should check and **verify the reference to the previous NCs/BRs** and **ensure that indeed the PaMs are new and complementary** to the ones reported in the previous NC/BR.



The approaches supported by the LRs as they are in the RPG

4. How to review overlapping information reported under paras 3, 7 & 24 on domestic institutional arrangements?

Approach:

- The ERTs should **review information addressing each of these paras**, recognising the differences in the requirements.
 - Information on **national inventory arrangements (para 3) should be consistent with the NIR** of the GHG inventory submission.
 - The ERT should review information on arrangements for domestic compliance, MRV and evaluation of progress (para 7) noting **a potential overlap** with information on self-assessment of compliance with emission reduction commitments (para 24) due to the overlapping technical essence of these two reporting requirements that are not precisely defined.
 - If there is an overlap or a lack of reporting, then the ERT should clarify with the Party how information corresponds to the three reporting requirements or why the information was not reported and **provide a relevant recommendation or encouragement based on which paragraph has not been addressed.**
-



The improved by the LRs

- **1. How to assess a significant difference in estimates of mitigation impacts in 2020 of the same PaMs compared to the previous BRs/NCs?**

Approach:

- If the ERT identifies a significant difference in mitigation effects of the same PaMs in two consecutive submissions without explanation in the BR, the ERT should:
- **The ERT should clarify with the Party the reasons for such differences (during the review week)**
 - *Note! Estimates of mitigation effects could be revised and PaMs may evolve over time.*
 - *Note!! The differences could be due to the changes in methods, assumptions, national circumstances and other factors influencing estimation of effects of mitigation actions.*
- The ERT may **take note of and record the differences** in the TRR.



The improved by the LRs

3. How to review estimates of mitigation impacts of individual PaMs reported as NE in CTF table 3?

Approach:

- According to the RPG 2016 and the LR1 conclusions, CTF tables are mandatory requirements and therefore quantification of the effects of individual PaMs **shall be provided in CTF table 3**. However, due to national circumstances, Parties may not be able to quantify some of the policy impacts.
- The Party has to explain the use of any notation key in the BR and justify the use.
- If there are empty cells **(or NE)** in CTF table 3 on the quantified impacts; the justification is provided in the BR as to why they are not quantified; and the ERT is satisfied with such justification, **then the ERT will not raise this as a completeness or transparency issue in the TRR.**
- If the Party uses the notation key without the justification, then the ERT can raise a transparency issue.



The improved by the LRs

6. How to review amount of financial resources not provided in domestic currency or in USD?

Approach:

- If a **Party does not provide financial information in its domestic currency or in USD**, the ERT should during the review:
 - Clarify why the Party did not provide that information in the CTF tables;
 - Make the Party aware of publicly available exchange rates (e.g. from the OECD);
 - Explain to the Party the importance of comparable financial information across Parties;
 - Request that the Party provide updated information in its domestic currency or in USD during the review.
 - In the TRR, the ERT should, as applicable:
 - Reflect the financial information in the currency reported by the Party;
 - Note that the Party failed to provide financial information in its domestic currency or in USD as requested during the review;
 - Include any explanations provided by the Party with regard to the currency used for reporting financial information;
 - Recommend that the Party provide the requested information in its domestic currency or in USD (whichever is not reported) [in CTF tables 7](#).
 - If a Party **provided financial information in its domestic currency or in USD**, the ERT should reflect that in the TRR.
-



5. How to review information on financial support provided by non-Annex II Parties (in CTF tables 8 and 9)?

- Approach:
- In case a non-Annex II Party submits blank CTF tables 8 and 9, the ERT may suggest to a Party that it **use a notation key 'NA (not applicable)'** and **include a footnote in both tables** to reflect that it is a non-Annex II Party and has no obligations to report on support.



New issues and their solutions suggested (if any)

- How to review intransparent reporting on FTC by non-Annex II Parties?

