

Outcome of the discussion in Group 3 on Projections

6th BRs and NCs lead reviewers meeting

11–12 March 2019

Bonn



Co-facilitators: Anna Sikharulidze and Ioannis Sempos

12 March 2019



Transparency

RPG Update: 2019 RPG

- **The approaches supported by the LRs as they are in the RPG:**
- LULUCF and NF3: included in the projections
- **The improvements made by the LRs:**
- WAM projections on a gas-by-gas basis
- **New issues and their solutions suggested (if any):**
 - a) Inclusion of International bunker fuels
 - b) Assessment of completeness related to multiple embedded elements in reporting provision
 - c) Clarification on “to the extent possible” and “where feasible”



RPG Update: 2019 RPG – Suggested improvements

- Adding more information to treating WAM on gas-by-gas basis:
- According to the UNFCCC reporting guidelines on NCs (para. 28), reporting ‘with additional measures’ projections is a “may” requirement; however, if the WAM projections were reported presenting the projections by gas is a “shall” reporting requirement (para. 35).
- The ERT should first establish whether the Party reported the ‘with additional measures’ projections and, if such projections were not reported and the Party has planned PaMs, the ERT should formulate an encouragement for the Party to report such information in its next submission. However, if the WAM projections were reported, the ERT should check whether they were presented on a gas-by-gas basis. If the WAM scenario was not presented on a gas-by-gas basis, the ERT should make a recommendation on completeness.



RPG Update: 2019 RPG – Suggested improvements

- Adding more clarity to reporting GHG emissions from international bunkers:
- According to the UNFCCC reporting guidelines on NCs, reporting GHG emission projections related to fuel sold to ships and aircraft engaged in international transport (“international bunker fuels”) separately and not including them in the national totals is a “shall” reporting requirement to be carried out “to the extent possible”.
- The ERT should formulate a recommendation for the Party to report the projections separately to the extent possible.



RPG Update: 2019 RPG – Suggested improvements

- Adding a sentence to C. Assessment of completeness and transparency (section 1, dot-point 2):
- The ERT should treat completeness issues independently from transparency issues and should therefore always provide separate recommendations/encouragements for completeness and for transparency in relation to each reporting requirement.
- If a requirement has not been addressed, this is an issue of completeness and not of transparency (even though missing information might also lead to a lack of transparency); if a requirement has multiple embedded issues (e.g. a to e) each element must be addressed otherwise this is an issue of completeness).



RPG Update: 2019 RPG – Suggested improvements

- Adding a footnote to A: Recommendations, encouragements and other review findings (section 1 sub-para d):
- Footnote: There are some mandatory and non-mandatory requirements that include the term: “to the extent possible” or “where feasible”, if the information is not reported, the ERT should try to find an explanation or rationale in the report as to why (e.g. whether the Party does not have available of data or other resource constraints).



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

- What worked well and what can be improved?
 - ✓ Checklist was helpful in focusing attention in articulating issues
 - ✓ The tables of findings in the report template are very helpful in drafting the report
 - ✓ The structure of the report template makes preparing the report much easier – (e.g. how to add recommendations or where to add the storyline)



Experience doing case-studies

What worked well and what can be improved?

- ✓ The case study worked well and discussion gave useful insights to the improvement of the RPG.
- ✓ It was a fun, interesting discussion
- ✓ Would be helpful to provide guidance on how to write a good recommendation/encouragement
- ✓ Next LR's meeting: provide some good examples of well written recommendations and encouragements and in the break-out groups apply these.
 - ✓ show a badly written finding and ask the group to improve the finding.
- ✓ The case study was rushed and more time needed and there wasn't enough time to compare analysis by different sub-teams



General comments on review tasks

- ✓ Projections expert needs to understand Party's projections well
- ✓ Projections experts must ensure that they also understand the PaMs chapter and how it relates to the projections
- ✓ The interaction between experts in the teams is very important
- ✓ The role of Review Officers is crucial to ensure that projections expert and PaMs expert interact well, for example:
 - Other expertise of each expert identified in checklist and identified before and during the review
 - Peer reviewing is a good practice during the review – particular from experts who have expertise across issues

