

# Outcome of the discussion in Group 2 on PaMs – not EU-specific

6<sup>th</sup> BRs and NCs lead reviewers meeting

11–12 March 2019

Bonn



**Co-facilitators: *Laura Dawidowski and Nick Macaluso***

12 March 2019



Transparency

# RPG Update: 2019 RPG

---

- The approaches in the proposed RPG related to PaMs were supported by LRs with the following refinements:
- Emphasizing need for adequate explanations when impacts of PaMs are not estimated
- Clarification that an adequate explanation is needed for non-estimated impacts of PaMs reported with any notation key or 0
- ERT should take note, not make a recommendation, when when impacts of PaMs are reported in groups without explanation



# RPG Update: New issues for future discussion

---

- Use of  $>0$  in impacts of PaMs
- How should evolving PaMs be reported?
  - a) Building codes or energy taxes that can change significantly over time
- Guidance for reviewers on reviewing when there are differences in KP and Convention targets



# Experience using the tools (checklist/projections graph/report template)

---

- What worked well and what can be improved?
  - ✓ Standard template for Friday presentation would be helpful
  - ✓ Difficulties with simultaneous editing of report
  - ✓ Subdivide checklist by individual shalls, shoulds, etc
  - ✓ Can report template be more concise?
  - ✓ Combined template worked well
  - ✓ If there is a new understanding uncovered during review week, a lot of report may need to be rewritten if it was done in advance



## Experience doing case-studies

---

What worked well and what can be improved?

- ✓ Have a smaller number of issues
- ✓ Create abbreviated checklist
- ✓ Need guidance on issues to focus on
- ✓ Instructions on process and suggested times
- ✓ Can the team do things in advance of the meeting?

