

UNFCCC greenhouse gas inventory desk review 2016 - experiences

Riitta Pipatti
8 March 2017

Contents

- Desk review of two Parties' 2016 GHG inventory submissions
 - Party A: 2016 UNFCCC submission
 - Party B: 2015 and 2016 KP submissions (Party B does not have a QELRC for the KP second commitment)
- ERT and how we worked
 - What could/should be improved in the process
- Identification and treatment of finding and issues
 - How could we improve
 - Focus on key issues
 - Consistency across reviews

2016 Desk review

— ERT:

Generalist	Ms. Valentina Idrissova	Kazakhstan
	Ms. Riitta Pipatti	Finland
Energy	Mr. Ralph Harthan	Germany
	Mr. John Watterson	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
IPPU	Ms. Anke Herold	Germany
	Mr. Predrag Novosel	Montenegro
Agriculture	Mr. Abdulkadir Bektas	Turkey
	Ms. Olga Gavrilova	Estonia
LULUCF	Ms. Andrea Brandon	New Zealand
	Mr. Giacomo Grassi	European Union
	Ms. Kimberly Robertson	New Zealand
Waste	Ms. Juliana Bempah	Ghana
	Mr. Kai Skoglund	Finland
	Ms. Tatiana Tugui	Republic of Moldova

- Experienced, skilled and professional team
- Suvi Monni RO – very competent, thorough and helpful
- The desk review week: 17 – 22 October 2016

Preparations / work before the review week

- Tasks divided among Parties largely by Party
 - in the IPPU sector by categories
- One phone conference before the review week, communication otherwise by email
- Many questions to both Parties, more to Party A – both responded quickly, and mostly with sufficient detail – used iVTR for this
- Party A: all deliverables needed for the review in time
- Party B: 2016 NIR plus resubmitted CRF tables were received only a few days before the review week, and SEF tables during the week
 - No issues related to the NIR in the AR for 2016 and NIR-related questions before the review week based on the 2015 NIR, some questions during the review week sent later than planned
- GLs: ERT should not perform an individual review if a NIR is not submitted
 - *What is a reasonable timeline before the review start to make the decision not to review, were we too flexible?*

Use of review tools

- Questions sent using iVTR, most responses were received during the review week
 - iVTR worked very well most of the time 😊
 - Not all experts had access to it and the RO and other experts helped in transfer of questions/responses
- Draft ARRr were also prepared in the iVTR
 - All ERT members were not able to use the iVTR for drafting => sometimes confusing, additional work especially for RO & LRs
 - Not always possible to see who had commented, importance of daily backups done by RO saved us when some text was deleted from the draft due to a misunderstanding

iVTR – a good tool but more effort needed to ensure that all experts can use as it (better guidance, Windows version needed “too new”).

iVTR – equally important for all types of reviews

Use of review tools

- Webex conferences every morning during the review week
 - Not all present, experts spread from Canada to NZ and timing that would have fit all was seldom found => also much email communication
 - Technical problems: Not all experts could speak, chat did not work always, etc.

Webex very good when it works (e.g. sharing of documents possible). More effort to resolving problems with those who cannot access it or use it fully – or search for another similar tool.

Experts geographical location matter

- Locator – all experts could not access it
 - Key review tool – has to work for all ! It is necessary to improve the tool and put effort to resolve the problems.*
- RITS – not used – easier to work on excel files. Also some access problems

Review tasks and deliverables – prioritization

- Priority given to mandatory task in a desk review (decision 13/CP.20 para 76)
 - Issues raised in the AR
 - How recommendations from previous reviews implemented
 - Recalculations
- Also new issues raised, some as follow-up from the priority tasks, some because reviewer want to do a good job
- The review process has become ever more complex, with duplication of material in the list of main finding, the ARR, the review transcripts and the iVTR.
 - A review and rationalisation of these processes is needed?
 - Suggestions to reduce duplication of work:
 - Transcript redundant – the information in the ARR and iVTR
 - ICR – presentation to replace list of main findings

Review tasks – addressing recommendations

- Inherited many (too many?) recommendations from previous reviews to be able to effectively focus on other issues
- Party A: > 80 recommendations from previous reviews of which about half were "resolved" in the 2016 submission, around 10 "no longer relevant", the rest "not resolved" or "addressing"
- Party B: 41 recommendations from the previous review, 28 of which were "resolved" in the 2015/2016 submission, 6 "no longer relevant", 4 "not resolved" and 3 "addressing"

Review tasks – addressing recommendations

- Addressing recommendations from previous reviews was very time consuming, when:
 - The NIR was not clear on how recommendations from previous reviews have been addressed => took additional time to find all necessary information (NIR, questions to Party)
 - The recommendations were not clear and explicit (had to go back to old NIRs and review reports)
 - The recommendations included little or no guidance how to resolve the issue (needed to complement the recommendations)
- and frustrating, when:
 - The previous recommendations were not following the guidance raising issues in accordance with the review guidelines
 - We had to address many issues relating insignificant sources
- Our aim – to clarify the recommendations were needed and to give more guidance on how to resolve issues.

Repeated recommendations

- Not resolved vs. addressing
 - We used “addressing” when the Party had provided information that it had started addressing the issue (the information could be that the issue was included in the improvement plan, studies had been initiated, data collection was underway, etc.) preferably in the NIR but information provided during the review was also taken into account
 - Some issues are not easily resolved and may take years to resolve – acknowledged this by using addressing in the ARR
 - If the issue was of small importance (e.g. lack disaggregation of fuels with small share in the category) also the Party’s prioritization in implementing improvements was considered
- Related recommendations => prominent paras (Table 4)
 - Did not include the issue in Table 4 if it was classified as “addressed”

Review tasks – AR and recalculations

- A lot of work also checking findings in the AR – many findings in especially the energy sector (are they all needed/meaningful?)
- CRF recalculation tables provide good quantitative input, but not always easy to identify individual recalculations larger than the threshold
 - Parties explanations often too general for assessing if the recalculations are justified – new issues/findings
- What could be improved:
 - Secretariat to redesign the comparison and outlier analyses to make them more meaningful and provide sufficient data to the Party on the comparisons to enable better responses
 - ERTs - be specific on what kind of information Parties should provide on the recalculations taking into account that error correction, updates need different kind of information than changes in methods, AD sources and EFs – for the latter reasoning how accuracy, comparability and consistency improved, significant changes may also need justified/verified (Tier 3)

Identification of other issues / findings

- Party A: 46 new issues; Party B: 32 new issues
- Implementation of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines – still some issues where the implementation is not yet completed by the Parties, guidance misinterpreted, corrigenda not applied, AD not available for more disaggregated reporting, etc.
- Insignificant categories reported “NE” (UNFCCC Reporting GLs, para 37(b))
 - Inclusion of the issue in Table 2 – puts too much emphasis on these insignificant issues
 - Guidance on how and where to report is not fully clear – ERT consideration should be pragmatic, additional information received during the review should be sufficient to resolve issues (recommendation to improve transparency a different issue)
- Other missing categories

Identification of other issues/findings

- Allocation – use notation key (“IE”) not an issue when properly reasoned even if allocation different from CRF; issues only when different allocation is not explained/justified or accuracy/accounting under KP affected, examples where issues were raised:
 - Party A intentionally used different allocation, reasoning not related to the possibility to allocate correctly – raised as a comparability issue
 - Different allocation not justified in the NIR, but explained during the review – raised a transparency issue
- No longer relevant – we used this when our interpretation whether the finding was an issue differed from previous ERT’s and when changes in requirements due to implementation of the 2006 IPCC GLs no longer warranted the issue
- Transparency – issues raised on AD and EF trends missing from the NIR, information on recalculations (details of changes, reasoning, etc.)
- Issues raised also on errors identified (e.g. land use matrix, choice of EF, inconsistencies, etc.)

Preparation of the draft ARR to the Party

- Preparation of draft ARR by the ERT – many iterations due to comments from RO/LRs (took a lot of time)
- ERT finalized draft ARR for editing and QA: Party A 19 Dec and Party B 16 Dec
 - 2 months after end of review week (2 weeks more than scheduled in the review GLs)
- Draft ARR to Party: Party on 24 Feb and Party B on 3 March
 - 2 months (4 weeks more than scheduled in the review GLs)
- Too many times of going back and forth with how to formulate issues/finding and deciding on how to classify these (guidance should be clearer)
- Editing and QA takes too long
 - Improved the draft ARR, but timing still disproportionate to changes/improvements made
 - QA partly overlapping with RO's and LRs' work, start QA earlier, e.g. when a good FOD ready; minimize editing

Conclusions and good practices in DRs

- Our review was a comprehensive and high-quality desk review prioritizing the mandatory tasks for this type of reviews
- Experienced and well-motivated experts - prerequisite for successful outcome, but this applies to all types of reviews
- Timely and responsive RO and LRs – also important
- Travel time not needed and costs can be reduced – allow participation of more experts
- Also no jet-lagged experts at the review and also experts with other obligations can participate as they have more flexibility in timing to work
- One expert thought centralised reviews were better (valued direct communication, too much time spent on emails, other obligations at home did not allow full commitment to the review)

Desk reviews work well, the type of review not the key factor for the quality of the review – but the type impacts expert availability, in both ways

Conclusions and good practices in DRs

- Desk review of two Parties vs. one Party
 - Pros: more experts for discussion of difficult issues/findings, also consistency can be improved
 - Cons: too much work for RO and LRs, more time needed for communication as oral discussions or guidance not possible all the time (more time spent on emails), also the more experts the more difficult to organize common time for tele / web conferences
- ==> One Party/desk review preferred
- iVTR – worked well for questions/responses, less well for drafting the ARR – but still better than merging files from several experts

Conclusions and good practice (all types of reviews)

- Tools – to ensure good communication and effective conduct of the review all experts need access/be able to use the tools
- Division of tasks by category has advantages (can improve consistency and distribute expertise better)
- LRs should ensure that focus will change to key issues – too much time spent on insignificant sources and small issues
 - Secretariat to support by ensuring that minor issues/non-issues (small inconsistencies with international data sets, issues clarified in earlier reviews, etc.) are not included in the AR
- Identification of issues
 - Issue or other finding – we should all study the UNFCCC and IPCC GLs more to be able to do this distinction better
 - Describe issues with more clarity and in an explicit way to facilitate that Parties know what they need to do
- Be pragmatic on what can be done within the review timeframe