



## UNFCCC greenhouse gas inventory desk review 2015 - experiences

Riitta Pipatti  
29 February 2016

# Contents

- Desk review of a 2015 greenhouse gas inventory - experiences
- Issues addressed based mainly on suggestions from the secretariat, views, conclusions and suggestions for improvement the presenter's

# Desk review under the Convention

- Desk review of a Party's greenhouse gas inventory 2015 inventory submission under the UNFCCC
  - The Party had also submitted supplementary information under the Kyoto Protocol. This was not reviewed as relevant decisions to implement the reviews for the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol had not been adopted.
- ERT: Hongmin Dong (agriculture) and Riitta Pipatti (waste) LRs, Tomas Gustafsson (generalist), Songli Zhu (energy), Ole-Kenneth Nielsen (IPPU) and Robert Waterworth (LULUCF) – Roman Payo, coordinator, secretariat
  - Experienced and knowledgeable team, all experts able to work independently
- The desk review week: 28.9 – 3.10.2015, the draft ARR has been sent to the Party mid February (delay compared to deadline in the review GLs 11 weeks)

# Preparations for the review

- Preparations before the review week worked well:
  - Questions from experts were received and sent to the Party before the review week
  - Party responded also quickly, both before and during the review week
  - Correspondence with Party only by the secretariat
- One phone conference before the review week – agreed how we would be working and discussed briefly the new reporting, review and methodological guidelines (focus)
  - Responsibilities clear, no need for additional allocation of tasks as in a Kyoto Protocol review
  - The focus of a desk review was addressed briefly
  - Lisa Hanle took part in the phone conferences (consistency in the use of the template)

# Preparations for the review

- Evaluation of the work before the review week:
  - The ERT was set up only in early September 2015, therefore we did not succeed in the sending questions to the Party two weeks before the review (late set up because of the problems with the CRF Reporter => late submissions, maybe also ADP resource demands?)
  - Preparing questions to the Party was not different from doing this before an ICR/CR, even if the scope of questions could have been narrower
  - All experts prepared questions
  - Party responses were received before or at the start of the review

# Work during review week

- Communication with the Party
  - Additional questions sent, responses to most during the week
- List of main findings sent to Party on Saturday (no Saturday paper, no resubmissions - as the review was not a KP review)
  - List finalized through email as the phone conference on Saturday did not work. The secretariat was updating its phone conference system that day, Roman and Efa had not been informed of this
  - This could have been a problem if we had been preparing a Saturday Paper – not all experts responded to the final version on the main findings (contents of findings were not changed from what was received from the experts)

# Work during review week

- Evaluation of the work during the review week:
  - Focus somewhat broader than set out in the review guidelines, changes due to new gls since 2014 submission received much attention
    - Implementation of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines – the checking of consistency required more time than usually – even experienced reviewers do not know every detail of the 2006 IPCC GLs
      - New issues identified
    - Insignificant categories (UNFCCC Reporting GlS, para 37(b))
      - Took time to find a common approach: recommendations for quantitative estimates (for most/all received during the review week in responses to questions)

# Work during the review week

- Evaluation of other issues discussed much during and after the review week
  - Allocation of estimates (aggregation, confidential data, etc) => recommendations when not justified and/or could affect the accuracy of the estimates
  - Interpretation of what is an issue, tried to follow strictly the definition in the review guidelines (TCCCA definitions, mandatory requirements) - recommendations for issues, encouragements for other findings
  - Template: the relationship between Table 3 (issues from previous reviews), Table 4 (“prominent para”) and Table 5 (new findings: issues, other findings and even commendments) – discussion continued after the review week



# Work during the review week

- Discussion by email and phone sufficient as experts experienced – different time zones limited time when phone conferences could take place (for Lisa the times were hard, around 4 am her time)
- VTR – used only sparingly, access sometimes difficult; secretariat uploaded most documents to the VTR
- More freedom for experts to schedule their work according to their needs than in CRs/ICRs

# Preparation of the draft ARR to the Party

- ARR template with information (general information, encouragements and recommendations from two most recent reviews) was received from the secretariat before the review week
  - After discussions whether encouragements should be included in the Table 3 on “issues” identified, no encouragements from the previous ARR were included in table 3
  - Issues – limited to TCCCA definitions and mandatory requirements consistent with the UNFCCC review guidelines, more strict with “recommendations” than in earlier reviews
  - Repeated recommendations => prominent paras (Table 4), clear when resolved or not resolved, we did not include the issues in the Table 4 if the issue was being addressed
  - Many iterations (experts drafts => secretariat => LRs => secretariat, who produced a compiled version => experts => ...

# Preparation of the draft ARR to the Party

- QA by the secretariat – some QA done throughout the process, final QA quick, suggestions good and improved the draft ARR, even if all suggestion were not implemented
  - Some identified issues with completeness had explanations why not addressed in the ARR
  - Wanted to keep more details in the recommendations than suggested by the QA
- First draft ARRs after the review week (all worked on the drafts before, during and after the review week)
- Draft to Party – delayed with 11 weeks, why:
  - ERT's informed when available – delays of only a few days
  - Many rounds of commenting, participation at COP21 delayed my commenting with a week and half => Xmas caused further delays (two – three weeks)

# Preparation of the draft ARR to the Party

- How to improve the timeliness in the preparation of the draft ARR:
  - We had only two dates set: time for delivery of the first drafts, and time for delivery of the draft to Party
    - The first time was kept, the second not
    - More detailed scheduling could have helped
    - Limiting the tasks to only to those set out in the review gls for desk reviews could also have shortened the time used
    - First review after update of reporting and review gls => new reporting format, new methodological issues and new template required additional time
    - The level of detail in commenting was mainly on substance, difficult to reduce time for this (format, language largely done as part of QA)

# Conclusions

- First desk review since a very long time (exception Malta 2013)
  - Worked well, only one Party to review – more time than in a CR with two to four Parties, or ICR with many presentations
  - Logistics for communication could be improved (Web-conferences instead of only phone, sharing documents, for communication with the Party also)
  - ERT composition needs to take time differences into account
- Experienced experts – essential
- Detailed timetable for finishing the work after the review could help
  - First review with new guidelines and template – needed more time than earlier
- Better possibilities for experts for time allocation for their activities before (limited for us due to the set up of the team), during and after the review week – important that all allocate sufficient time for the review week