

Outcome of the discussion in Group 1 on PaMs

5th BRs and NCs lead reviewers meeting

28 February-1 March 2018



Co-facilitators: Sina Wartmann and Amit Garg

Bonn, 1 March 2018



Experience using the tools

- What worked well and what can be improved?
 - ✓ Good template – questions arise when you start working
 - ✓ Improved over the years to steer ERTs better
 - ✓ In the template, in the table on the findings, the instructions for the ERT should be revised:
For example, the ERT findings – ERT assessment;
Additional information provided by the Party
 - ✓ In the checklist, in the cells with the lists additional click cells and rows could be added to cover each bullet in the list, e.g. A, B, C, D...



Experience doing case-studies

What worked well and what can be improved?

- ✓ Excellent initiative
- ✓ Good learning on the process, outcome may be irrelevant
- ✓ Personal expertise of reviewers came to the fore resulting in higher level of team work
- ✓ Testing of tools was interesting and useful
- ✓ More time should be allocated for the team work
- ✓ The case study will naturally lead to some open questions and requests for more information



Key substantive issues that came out from the case studies

Case 2: PaMs on energy

- ✓ A few completeness issues were identified, for example, no quantified impacts for some PaMs were provided and no justification was provided
- ✓ A few transparency issues were also identified, for example, inconsistency between mitigation figures in the text and in the tables.

Case 1: PaMs on transport

- ✓ A few completeness issues were identified, for example, missing table on PaMs in the NC7
- ✓ A few transparency issues were also identified, for example, inconsistency between the text and table in the BR3, the reporting of BR2 numbers in the NC7 text, but referring to the BR3 table



Ways to ensure that reports are ready during the review week

- ✓ At the moment, the report preparation is a voluntary system – some kind of draft, there is no deadline, no check, left open before the review week
- ✓ The ERT has to begin the work 6-8 wks before the RW (right after the notification of the ERT)
- ✓ The secretariat would allocate Parties to reviewers in CRs at the time of notification, in consultation with LRs
- ✓ In the 1st teleconference – discussion on checklists and questions asked to the Party
- ✓ The template should be provided to the ERT early on



-
- ✓ Have 2nd teleconference to discuss major issues, including the response from the Party – more steps in preparation in advance, encouragement to work
 - ✓ Set a clear deadline on preparation of the review report before the RW
 - ✓ The report could be prepared after the answers to questions from the Party have arrived
 - ✓ Reminders to the Party under review in case the questions are not answered on time
 - ✓ Cooperation between the ERT and ROs on the early draft of the report - changes in the language and monitoring of progress

