



# Seventh Meeting of Lead Reviewers for the Review of Biennial Reports and National Communications of Annex I Parties

9–10 June 2020  
VIRTUAL MEETING – LIVE

## Draft Agenda – Live Session

| Day 1: Tuesday, 9 June 2020        |   |
|------------------------------------|---|
| 12:00 – 12:30<br><i>30 minutes</i> | <b>Welcome and opening</b><br><i>Donald Cooper, Director, Transparency Division<br/>Katia Simeonova, Manager, MRV/ETF sub-division<br/>Ruta Bubniene, Team lead, Unit for Biennial Reports and National Communications</i>  |
| 12:30 – 13:15<br><i>45 minutes</i> | <b>Experience of IAR as a foundation for the ETF</b><br><i>Ruta Bubniene, Team lead, Unit for Biennial Reports and National Communications<br/>Moderator: Katia Simeonova, Manager, MRV/ETF sub-division</i><br><br><i>A few years before the launch of the technical expert review under the ETF, the BR reviews provide for opportunities to test review approaches and tools, that may be helpful for reviews of biennial transparency reports. Secretariat’s analysis of technical review reports of BR3 (TRR3) show that the consistency of the assessment of completeness and transparency of information reported in BR3s has further improved. Secretariat’s analysis also shows that some Parties face challenges in assessing the impact of their PaMs, thus sharing good practice on this matter is helpful. The lessons-learned in BR3/NC7 review cycle were taken into account while preparing for the BR4 review cycle.</i><br><br><i>Streamlined BR4 review approach aims at further improving timeliness, consistency and efficiency of review, as well as providing review experiences for more new experts. Centralised reviews of BR4 of 16 Parties were conducted remotely in March–April 2020 due to the global pandemic of COVID-19. The remote reviews demonstrated the commitment of the Parties and the review experts to continue the MRV process, yet challenges of collaboration, learning and internet connectivity were faced.</i><br><br><i>The participants are invited to endorse the BR4 review approach.</i><br><br><b>Questions and answers</b> |
| 13:15 – 13:45<br><i>30 minutes</i> | <b>Break</b>  |
| 13:45 – 14:25<br><i>40 minutes</i> | <b>Navigating the transition to the Enhanced Transparency Framework</b><br><i>Lisa Hanle, Programme officer, Unit for Biennial Reports and National Communications<br/>Moderator: Katia Simeonova, Manager, MRV/ETF sub-division</i><br><br><i>Parties and the secretariat are increasingly engaged in establishing the necessary arrangements to implement the ETF. As these efforts advance, questions are arising related to the operationalization of the ETF, and enhancing the current MRV under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol to meet the requirements of the ETF. To assist Parties and other stakeholders in enhancing their understanding of the ETF the secretariat has developed a list of FAQs available</i>   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>on the website<sup>1</sup>. To assist reviewers, the secretariat has prepared a draft ETF Reference Manual available on the website<sup>2</sup> for your consideration.</p> <p>The participants are invited to provide feedback on and acknowledge these materials .</p> <p><b>Questions and answers</b></p>   |
| <p>14:25 – 14:40<br/>15 minutes</p>          | <p><b>Proposal for conclusions and recommendations</b></p> <p>Katia Simeonova, Manager, MRV/ETF sub-division<br/>Davor Vesligaj, Programme officer, Unit for Biennial Reports and National Communications</p> <p>Proposal for conclusions and recommendations is based on the materials published by the secretariat before the meeting; information provided and discussed during the meeting; and suggested approach for preparing and adopting conclusions and recommendations as communicated to the LRs in the document attached to invitation for this meeting. Given the extraordinary circumstances under which the meeting is organized, proposal will be concise and procedural. It will be posted on the web site after the end of Day 1 of the meeting for LR's comments.</p>   |
| <p>14:40-15:00<br/>20 minutes</p>            | <p><b>Lead Reviewers Awards 2019</b></p>  |
| <p>15:00</p>                                 | <p><b>End of the meeting</b></p>  |
| <p><b>Day 2: Wednesday, 10 June 2020</b></p> |   |
| <p>12:00 – 12:15<br/>15 minutes</p>          | <p><b>2020 Review Practice Guidance</b></p> <p>Veronica Colerio, Programme officer, Unit for Biennial Reports and National Communications</p> <p>The review practice guidance (RPG) launched in 2016 is a “living” tool, which facilitates consistency among the reviews and across the review cycles. It reflects the collective and cumulative NC/BR review practices and approaches to resolving critical issues raised during the reviews. The RPG2019 has been updated and fine-tuned after the completion of the BR3/NC7 reviews(2018–2019), reflecting the issues raised by the ERTs. This draft RPG2020 is available for your consideration<sup>3</sup>.</p> <p>The 2020 Update of the “Completeness and Transparency Assessment of Information Reported in Technical Review Reports of 3rd Biennial Reports” and the “Assessment of information related to impacts of PaMs reported in TRR of BR3” are available<sup>3</sup>.</p> <p>The session aims to discuss the practice applied by the ERTs to resolve those issues with the view to agree and endorse review approaches for use during the BR4 reviews.</p> |
| <p>12:15 – 12:45<br/>30 minutes</p>          | <p><b>Review issues of cross-cutting nature</b></p> <p>Lisa Hanle, Programme officer, Unit for Biennial Reports and National Communications<br/>Facilitator: Maria Gutierrez (Mexico)</p> <p>Issues for discussion (see draft RPG 2020 for proposed approach):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How to distinguish between completeness and transparency?</li> <li>2. How to review cross-references to other information reported by a Party?</li> </ol>  |
| <p>12:45 – 13:15<br/>30 minutes</p>          | <p><b>Break</b></p>   |

<sup>1</sup> Available at <https://unfccc.int/enhanced-transparency-framework>

<sup>2</sup> Available at <https://unfccc.int/event/seventh-meeting-of-lead-reviewers-for-the-review-of-biennial-reports-and-national-communications-5>

<sup>3</sup> Available at <https://unfccc.int/event/seventh-meeting-of-lead-reviewers-for-the-review-of-biennial-reports-and-national-communications-5>

|                             |  |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 13:15 – 13:55<br>40 minutes | <p><b>Review issues related to policies and measures</b><br/> <i>Jamie Howland</i>, Programme officer, Unit for Biennial Reports and National Communications<br/> Facilitator: <i>Hans Kolshus (Norway)</i> (tbc)</p> <p><i>Issues for discussion (see draft RPG 2020 for proposed approach):</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>How should the ERT formulate its findings when the quantified estimate of mitigation impact (not cumulative) of individual mitigation actions in 2020 and any other optional years deemed relevant by the Party is reported in groups?</i></li> <li>2. <i>How to assess the reporting of PaMs as planned for the purposes of projections, but have since been implemented or adopted?</i></li> <li>3. <i>Do Parties need to report all PaMs in the textual portion of the BR or CTF table 3?</i></li> <li>4. <i>Do Parties need to report PaMs that impact sectors (i.e. LULUCF) not covered in their 2020 target?</i></li> </ol> |
| 13:55 – 14:35<br>40 minutes | <p><b>Review issues related to target, progress to target and projections</b><br/> <i>Davor Vesligaj</i>, Programme officer, Unit for Biennial Reports and National Communications<br/> Facilitator: <i>Amr Osama Abdel-Aziz (Egypt)</i></p> <p><i>Issues include:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>How to assess the lack of a WAM scenario when a Party has no planned measures?</i></li> <li>2. <i>How to assess the lack of complete set of historical data about key underlying assumptions and variables used for projections in the CTF table 5?</i></li> <li>3. <i>How to assess the cut-off date for currently implemented and adopted PaMs used for preparation of WEM projections?</i></li> </ol>   |
| 14:35 – 15:00<br>25 minutes | <p><b>Adoption of conclusions and recommendations</b></p> <p><b>Closing remarks</b><br/> <i>Katia Simeonova</i>, Manager, MRV/ETF sub-division</p>   |
| 15:00                       | <b>End of the meeting</b>  |

The following presentations will be recorded and saved on the UNFCCC web site before the LRs meeting.

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Recorded Presentations</b>   |  |
| <b>Key outcomes of COP 25 on MRV and the ETF and way forward</b>  |  |
| <i>Katia Simeonova</i> , Manager, MRV/ETF sub-division  |  |
| <i>While Katowice Rulebook provides clarity on the design of the common ETF with embedded flexibilities for developing Parties, negotiations on technical details of the reporting and training of review experts should be completed at COP26. The COP25 adopted the revised reporting guidelines for National Communications, aligning them with the BR reporting guidelines. Multilateral Assessment and Facilitative Sharing of Views proven to be the key vehicle for showcasing Parties’ great efforts and success in climate policies, and how this success can translate in more ambitious action in the future. While the ETF will commence in 2022–2024, the supporting processes, procedures and tools should be arranged ahead of that. Sufficient resources should be secured for a smooth transition from the current MRV system to the ETF. Due to the global pandemic, SBs52 are planned to take place in October and SBs53 and COP26 is postponed to 2021.</i> |  |
| <b>Experience of the international consultation and analysis (ICA) as a foundation for the ETF</b>  |  |
| <i>Xuehong Wang</i> , Team lead, Unit for Biennial Update Reports   |  |

*Since the ICA process was launched in 2015, about one third of developing country Parties submitted biennial update reports (BUR). In addition, an increasing number of national GHG inventory report (NIR) and REDD+ technical annex have been submitted as part of the BURs. Experience shows that the ICA process has become the key platform to provide developing country Parties with one-on-one capacity building. The ICA implementation demonstrates that the process has contributed to improved reporting, enhanced implementation of climate actions as well as the shift towards a more consolidated domestic MRV system in developing countries. The capacity building needs, identified and prioritized through the ICA process, also helped developing country Parties to prioritize resource use and domestic planning which enabled the smooth transition to the ETF*

---