Draft revised guidelines for the technical review of GHG inventories from Parties included in Annex I to the Convention (FCCC/SBSTA/2014/INF.14)

> Second technical workshop on the revision of the guidelines for the review of national GHG inventories from Parties included in Annex I to the Convention 4–6 November 2014, Bonn



Lisa Hanle and Roman Payo, Programme Officers UNFCCC secretariat, MDA Programme

Outline of presentation







Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice Forty-first session Lima, 1–6 December 2014

Item X of the provisional agenda

Draft revised guidelines for the technical review of greenhouse gas inventories from Parties included in Annex I to the Convention: input to the second technical workshop



Structure of the draft review guidelines

Decision 23/CP.19

I. Structure

II. General approach

III. Guidelines review Annex I GHG inventories

IV. Guidelines review biennial reports

V. Guidelines review national communications





Development of INF.14

- FCCC/SBSTA/2014/2, para. 113: The SBSTA requested the secretariat to prepare an updated draft of the revised UNFCCC Annex I inventory review guidelines, with tracked changes, based on the discussion that took place at this session and the submissions from Parties...
- Navigating INF.14
 - Additions and deletions during SBSTA 40 in double-underlined text and double-strikethrough text, respectively.
 - Additions and deletions proposed in the submission received in single-underlined text and single-underlined square brackets, respectively.
 - "placeholders"-- issue needs further attention or additional text needed
 - "notes"-- explanatory text providing rationale for proposed change
 - Gray highlights: language from 19/CP.8 as reference.
 - Yellow highlights: paragraph cross references to be updated.



A. Purpose of the review

• Relationship, if any, between the GHG inventory review, and the review of biennial reports and national communications

B. General procedures

- Three stages (initial checks, S&A, and individual inventory review) or two stages (standardized checks and individual review)?
- Will the last stage (individual review) occur annually or biennially?
 - If biennially, how does the timing relate to the review of BR and NC?
- Role of the desk review (DR)? Balance between DR, centralized review (CR) and in-country review (ICR) ?
- How many inventories should be reviewed in a given approach?



C. Scope of the review (1)

- Two options to reflect three stages of the review (initial checks, S&A and individual review) or two (standardized checks and individual review)
- What are the checks to be carried out during each stage; are some checks no longer necessary (e.g. reviewing reporting of KCA) ?
 - What is the role of lead reviewers in reviewing/updating checks?
 - Should there be a communication tool to document Qs&As over time.



C. Scope of the review (2)

- Two major options included in the text for the role of ERT
 - ✓ Option 1: ERT role the same in DR, CR and ICR
 - ✓ Option 2: Different focus for DR than for a CR/ICR.
- Individual review as either annual or biennial event
- Balance among DR, CR, ICR (Note: this was also in "General procedures")
 - Should there be a move to DR if in past 3 years no significant issues identified?
- For identification of issues: refer to reporting guidelines, or add specific checks?
- Should a list of potential issues be developed at the end of the review week?



D. Timing

- When should checks for first stage(s) be complete?
 - Option 1 (separate stage 1 and 2)
 - Status reports: 7 weeks of "date of receipt of submission"
 - S&A: part I: 10 weeks; part II: four weeks prior to review
 - Option 2 (standardized checks): Completed within 8 weeks "after the submission due date".
- What is timing for completion of DR, CR, ICR of the individual inventory?
- Is an additional timeline needed to reflect resubmissions due to potential problems/issues?



E. Reporting

- Reporting requirements depend on option selected (initial checks and S&A, or standardized checks)
 - Will outcome of standardized checks be reported via web, or as standing report(s)?
- Does the format and content of the report vary depending on the type of review (DR, CR, ICR)?
- What are the page limits for the reports?

F. Annual report of emissions and trends of GHGs

• General agreement to removing it from the guidelines and inserting it in conclusions or a COP decision.



Summary (1)

- One mandate was for Parties to take into account their experience and the need to have a cost-effective, efficient and practical review process that does not impose an excessive burden on Parties, experts or the secretariat (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/5).
- The proposed deadlines in INF.14 are ambitious compared to current practice. Bearing in mind the mandate, participants may wish to consider how the guidelines can be drafted to facilitate achieving such outcomes.

	2010	2011	2012	2013	INF. 14
# of weeks to Party	21.6	28.5	26.1	23.6	
for DR	NA	NA	NA	6.6**	10-11
for CR	23.0	31.4	26.7	25.0	10-14
for ICR	17.4	17.6	24.4	22.9	7-8
# of weeks b/w Party					
and publication	8.8	9.4	9.8	7.7	
for DR	NA	NA	NA	7.0**	6-8
for CR	9.0	9.5	9.6	8.0	8-9
for ICR	8.1	8.8	10.2	7.2	3-4
# of weeks to					
publication	30.5	37.9	35.9	31.3	
for DR	NA	NA	NA	13.6**	15-20
for CR	31.4	40.1	35.7	32.5	20-25
for ICR	28.9	29.2	34.7	29.1	14-25

** This was an exceptional case and may not reflect typical practice.



Summary (2) of the annual review cycle

Options for stages in the annual review cycle	Options for frequency
3 stages: I. initial checks II. S&A III. individual review	Initial checks and S&A: annual Last stage (individual review): annual or biennial
2 stages: I. standardized checks II. individual review	Standardized checks: annual Last stage (individual review): annual or biennial



Summary (3)

- Issues to clarify independent of decision regarding the # of stages and the frequency of the last stage.
 - Which checks should be conducted during each stage? Is there a role for LRs?
 - What is the balance between a DR/CR/ICR?
 - Is the role of the ERT the same in a DR/CR/ICR or different?
 - Should ERT's identify potential problems/issues?
 - Timing of the outputs of each stage of the review?
 - Does the scope and content of the report depend on the approach to the review (DR/CR/ICR?)
- Unique issues to clarify.
 - If individual review is biennial, any considerations for timing of GHG inventory, BR, NC reviews?

