



**UNITED
NATIONS**



**Framework Convention
on Climate Change**

Distr.
GENERAL

FCCC/SBI/2008/INF.8
17 November 2008

ENGLISH ONLY

SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR IMPLEMENTATION

Twenty-ninth session

Poznan, 1–10 December 2008

Item 10 of the provisional agenda

Reporting and review of information submitted by Parties included in Annex I to the Convention that are also Parties to the Kyoto Protocol

**Status of submissions and review of initial reports submitted
in accordance with decision 13/CMP.1**

Note by the secretariat

Summary

This document describes the status of submissions of the initial reports under the Kyoto Protocol pursuant to decision 13/CMP.1 and the status of reviews of these reports undertaken during 2007 and 2008. It provides information on the application of the review procedures under Article 8 of the Kyoto Protocol and the procedures for the training and participation of experts in the review process.

CONTENTS

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. INTRODUCTION	1–11	3
A. Mandate	1–3	3
B. Background.....	4–8	3
C. Scope of the note	9–10	4
D. Possible action by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation .	11	4
II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEW OF INITIAL REPORTS.....	12–42	4
A. Status of submissions and review of initial reports.....	12	4
B. Review activities	13–38	6
C. Training of experts	39–42	10
III. FURTHER APPROACHES FOR STRENGTHENING OF THE REVIEW PROCESS.....	43–45	11

I. Introduction

A. Mandate

1. In accordance with decision 13/CMP.1, Parties included in Annex I to the Convention that are also Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (hereinafter referred to as Annex I Parties) shall facilitate the calculation of their assigned amounts pursuant to Article 3, paragraphs 7 and 8, of the Kyoto Protocol and demonstrate their capacity to account for their emissions and assigned amounts. To this end, each Party shall submit to the secretariat a report containing this information (hereinafter referred to as the initial report), prior to 1 January 2007 or one year after the entry into force of the Kyoto Protocol for that Party, whichever is later.
2. In accordance with Article 8 review guidelines,¹ each Annex I Party shall be subject to review prior to the first commitment period or within one year after the entry into force of the Kyoto Protocol for that Party, whichever is later.
3. In accordance with decision 26/CMP.1, the secretariat should organize the initial reviews under Article 8 of the Kyoto Protocol, in conjunction with the review of the greenhouse gas (GHG) inventories submitted in 2006, while exercising a certain degree of flexibility in applying the agreed timelines, provided that each initial review is completed no later than one year from the date of the submission of the initial report and that Parties are accorded the time to comment on the draft review report as inscribed in the Article 8 review guidelines.

B. Background

4. The Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI), at its twenty-eighth session, took note of document FCCC/SBI/2008/INF.2 prepared by the secretariat, containing information on the status of the reviews of initial reports, the publication of the review reports and the forwarding of these reports to the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP) and the Compliance Committee as of 1 May 2008.
5. In its conclusions at its twenty-eighth session,² the SBI reiterated that, in accordance with decision 22/CMP.1, Annex I Parties may start reporting, on a voluntary basis, information under Article 7, paragraph 1, of the Kyoto Protocol with the inventory submission due under the Convention from the year following the submission of the initial report, and that this information shall be reviewed in accordance with the Article 8 review guidelines and conducted in conjunction with the annual review of GHG inventories under the Convention.
6. The SBI also reiterated that the review process needs further strengthening, in particular through the participation of an increased number of well-trained review experts. The SBI encouraged Parties to continue to nominate new experts to the roster of experts and to update this roster and to continue to ensure that experts nominated to the roster participate in the training programmes under the Convention and its Kyoto Protocol and that these experts are made available to participate in the review process. The SBI recalled the request of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) to the secretariat to update the training programme under the Convention and reiterated its request to the secretariat to update and complement the training programme under the Kyoto Protocol.
7. The SBI urged Parties to continue to ensure effective reporting and review processes under both the Convention and its Kyoto Protocol, emphasizing that improvement of these processes is of critical importance. It further invited Parties to submit to the secretariat, information on their experiences with

¹ "Guidelines for review under Article 8 of the Kyoto Protocol".

² FCCC/SBI/2008/8, paragraphs 89–94.

and lessons learned from the review process, including recommendations for improvements, for compilation by the secretariat into a miscellaneous document.

8. The SBI agreed to continue its analysis of the effectiveness of the review process under Article 8, taking into account the annual report on the technical review of greenhouse gas inventories from Parties included in Annex I to the Convention³ to be considered by the SBSTA at its twenty-ninth session as well as the conclusions and recommendations from the meetings of lead reviewers.

C. Scope of the note

9. This document provides information on the status of submissions of initial reports by Annex I Parties, the reviews thereof and submission of the review reports to the CMP and the Compliance Committee. It suggests possible future approaches aimed at further improving the effectiveness, efficiency and consistency of the review process under the Article 8 review guidelines, considering some of the recommendations submitted by Parties for improvements to the review process, in order to ensure that the information submitted to the CMP, the Compliance Committee and the subsidiary bodies on GHG emissions and other relevant issues relating to the implementation of the Kyoto Protocol by Annex I Parties is complete, consistent and reliable. This document also provides information on the actions taken by the secretariat to implement the conclusions by the SBI at its twenty-eighth session regarding updating and complementing the training programme under the Kyoto Protocol.

10. The review under the Kyoto Protocol builds upon the review under the Convention. The majority of lessons learned and problems encountered in the review process in 2007 and 2008 are the same for the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol. This document focuses on the specific Kyoto Protocol elements of the review process and should be read in conjunction with the “Annual report on the technical review of greenhouse gas inventories from Parties included in Annex I to the Convention” in accordance with decision 12/CP.9 (document FCCC/SBSTA/2008/INF.4).

D. Possible action by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation

11. The SBI may wish to consider the information in this document and, if necessary, provide guidance to Parties and the secretariat, and recommendations to the CMP.

II. Submissions and review of initial reports

A. Status of submissions and review of initial reports

12. The table below provides information on the submission and review of initial reports and the status of preparation of the review reports, and shows the dates when Parties became eligible to participate in the Kyoto Protocol mechanisms.

³ FCCC/SBSTA/2008/INF.4.

Submission of initial reports, review dates and status of review reports

Party	Initial report received	Language of initial report	Review dates	Status of review report	Document symbol	Eligible for mechanisms ^a
Australia	11 Mar. 2008	English	7–12 Apr. 2008	In preparation		
Austria	5 Dec. 2006	English	12–17 Feb. 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/AUT	5 Apr. 2008
Belarus ^b	31 Oct. 2006	English and Russian				
Belgium	22 Dec. 2006	English	4–9 June 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/BEL	22 Apr. 2008
Bulgaria	25 July 2007	English	15–20 Oct. 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/BGR	– ^c
Canada	15 Mar. 2007	English and French	5–10 Nov. 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/CAN	16 Jun. 2008
Croatia	27 Aug. 2008	English	20–25 Oct. 2008	In preparation		
Czech Republic	24 Oct. 2006	English	26 Feb.–3 Mar. 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/CZE	24 Feb. 2008
Denmark	20 Dec. 2006	English	16–21 Apr. 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/DNK	20 Apr. 2008
Estonia	15 Dec. 2006	English	4–9 June 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/EST	15 Apr. 2008
European Community	18 Dec. 2006	English, summary in English and French	2–7 July 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/EC	18 Apr. 2008
Finland	22 Dec. 2006	English	28 May–2 June 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/FIN	22 Apr. 2008
France	21 Dec. 2006	French	28 May–2 June 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/FRA	21 Apr. 2008
Germany	27 Dec. 2006	English	11–16 June 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/DEU	27 Apr. 2008
Greece	29 Dec. 2006	English	23–28 Apr. 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/GRC	– ^d
Hungary	30 Aug. 2006	English	5–10 Mar. 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/HUN	30 Dec. 2007
Iceland	11 Jan. 2007	English	18–23 June 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/ISL	11 May 2008
Ireland	19 Dec. 2006	English	16–21 Apr. 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/IRL	19 Apr. 2008
Italy	19 Dec. 2006	English	4–9 June 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/ITA	19 Apr. 2008
Japan	30 Aug. 2006	English	29 Jan.–3 Feb. 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/JPN	30 Dec. 2007
Latvia	29 Dec. 2006	English	21–26 May 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/LVA	29 Apr. 2008
Liechtenstein	22 Dec. 2006	English	11–16 June 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/LIE	22 Apr. 2008
Lithuania	22 Dec. 2006	English	21–26 May 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/LTU	22 Apr. 2008
Luxembourg	29 Dec. 2006	English	11–16 June 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/LUX	29 Apr. 2008
Monaco	7 May 2007	French	15–19 Oct. 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/MCO	7 Sep. 2008
Netherlands	21 Dec. 2006	English	16–21 Apr. 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/NLD	21 Apr. 2008
New Zealand	31 Aug. 2006	English	19–24 Feb. 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/NZL	31 Dec. 2007
Norway	22 Dec. 2006	English	23–28 Apr. 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/NOR	22 Apr. 2008
Poland	29 Dec. 2006	English	11–16 June 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/POL	29 Apr. 2008
Portugal	28 Dec. 2006	English	21–26 May 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/PRT	28 Apr. 2008
Romania	18 May 2007	English	8–13 Oct. 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/ROU	18 Sep. 2008
Russian Federation	20 Feb. 2007	Russian	16–21 July 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/RUS	20 Jun. 2008
Slovakia	04 Oct. 2006	English	19–24 Mar. 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/SVK	4 Feb. 2008
Slovenia	22 Dec. 2006	English	21–26 May 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/SVN	22 Apr. 2008
Spain	19 Dec. 2006	Spanish	23–28 Apr. 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/ESP	19 Apr. 2008
Sweden	19 Dec. 2006	English	23–28 Apr. 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/SWE	19 Apr. 2008
Switzerland	10 Nov. 2006	English	5–10 Mar. 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/CHE	10 Mar. 2008
Ukraine	29 Dec. 2006	English	16–21 Apr. 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/UKR	29 Apr. 2008
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	11 Dec. 2006	English	12–17 Mar. 2007	Published	FCCC/IRR/2007/GBR	11 Apr. 2008

^a Initial eligibility is based on decision 3/CMP.1, annex, paragraph 32; decision 9/CMP.1, annex, paragraph 22; and decision 11/CMP.1, annex, paragraph 3. Parties become eligible to participate in the Kyoto Protocol mechanisms 16 months after the submission of their initial report, subject to successful completion of the review and compliance cycle.

^b At the time of preparation of this document, the initial report submitted by Belarus had not been reviewed. The quantified emission reduction commitment for Belarus in Annex B to the Kyoto Protocol (92 per cent) was established through an amendment to Annex B (decision 10/CMP.2). As at 1 November 2008, this amendment had not yet been ratified by enough Parties to allow it to enter into force and the review of the initial report has been postponed. Belarus submitted an update of its initial report on 30 December 2006.

^c At the time of publication of this note, 16 months had not elapsed since Bulgaria submitted its initial report. This Party will become eligible to participate in the Kyoto Protocol mechanisms on 25 November 2008.

^d Greece is not considered by the Compliance Committee to meet the eligibility requirements under Articles 6, 12 and 17 but may issue and transfer emission reduction units for joint implementation projects implemented under the verification procedure under the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee for which it is the host Party.

B. Review activities

1. Reviews of initial reports

13. In response to decisions 22/CMP.1 and 26/CMP.1, the secretariat organized the reviews of the initial reports during 2007 and 2008. As at 1 November 2008, individual inventory reviews had been conducted or were planned for 39 Annex I Parties, as follows:

- (a) **Completed reviews:** Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, European Community, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;
- (b) **Review of the initial report of Belarus:** this will be scheduled closer to the date when the relevant amendment to the Kyoto Protocol has been ratified by enough Parties to allow it to enter into force.

14. The review of the initial reports under the Kyoto Protocol is more complex than the review of the annual GHG inventories under the Convention, because additional elements which are new to the experts are reviewed. These are the national system for estimation of GHG emissions of Annex I Parties; the national registry; the calculation of the Party's assigned amount and commitment period reserve; the selection of the base year for hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons and sulphur hexafluoride; the selection of land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF) parameters in accordance with decision 16/CMP.1 for activities under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol; the selection of activities under Article 3, paragraph 4, of the Kyoto Protocol; and the selection of the accounting period for the activities under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol. This puts more pressure on the expert review teams (ERTs) as the amount of information to review and the expertise needed are greater than in the reviews under the Convention. In addition, ERTs reviewed these additional elements for the first time during 2007 and 2008.

15. As described in document FCCC/SBI/2008/INF.2, there is another important difference between the review of the initial reports under the Kyoto Protocol and the review under the Convention relating to the GHG inventory. Under both the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol, the ERT identifies problems with the inventory, and areas where improvements should be made. However, for reviews under the Kyoto Protocol, there is a separate procedure for dealing with potential problems relating to national systems, national registries and adjustments identified by the ERT during the review. In accordance with the procedures and time frame set out in the Article 8 review guidelines, if the ERT identifies potential problems pertaining to language of mandatory nature for the national systems and national registries and regarding the inventory as a failure to follow agreed guidelines under Article 5, paragraph 2, of the Kyoto Protocol in preparing GHG inventories – that is, an emission estimate that is not in line with the requirements in the UNFCCC reporting guidelines,⁴ the Article 7 reporting guidelines⁵ and the Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines⁶ as elaborated by the IPCC good practice guidance⁷ as well as the IPCC good

⁴ “Guidelines for the preparation of national communications by Parties included in Annex I to the Convention, Part I: UNFCCC reporting guidelines on annual inventories”.

⁵ “Guidelines for the preparation of the information required under Article 7 of the Kyoto Protocol”.

⁶ *Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*.

⁷ *Good Practice Guidance and Uncertainty Management in National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*.

practice guidance for LULUCF⁸ – the ERT will notify the Party of the problems. The Party then has six weeks to respond to the notification. If the ERT considers that the response of the Party to the notification of potential problems relating to national systems and national registries does not resolve the problem, the ERT shall list that problem as a question of implementation. If the ERT considers that the response of the Party to the notification of potential problems relating to adjustments is not in line with the reporting requirements and the Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines and the IPCC good practice guidance, the ERT will proceed with calculating and recommending an adjustment in accordance with Article 5, paragraph 2, of the Kyoto Protocol (decision 20/CMP.1).

16. During the initial reviews, the majority of the potential problems identified were resolved by the Parties within the stipulated time frame provided in the Article 8 review guidelines. In a few cases, the number and complex nature of the identified potential problems made the provision of revised estimates and/or additional information an intensive and time-consuming activity for the Party and caused problems in meeting the strict deadlines established both for the Party to provide the required information and for the ERT to assess it and prepare the review report.

17. In a few cases, the ERT proceeded with calculating and recommending adjustments. The experience from the initial reviews suggests that the calculation of adjustments is a time-consuming activity for Parties and the ERTs and can cause problems in meeting the strict deadlines established by the Article 8 review guidelines, including difficulties in complying with the internal deadlines for the preparation of the review reports and with the requirement to complete the review within one year of submission of the initial report.

18. Another important difference between the review under the Convention and the review under the Kyoto Protocol is related to the nature of the established deadlines. Under the Kyoto Protocol, meeting the established deadlines is crucial as the review process is linked to Parties becoming eligible to participate in mechanisms; if the deadlines are not met, the eligibility of Parties may be affected. The review guidelines under the Convention are strict and should be met, but there are no commitment implications for Parties if deadlines are not met.

19. The 38 reports of reviews conducted up to October 2008 were, or are expected to be, published in accordance with the deadlines established by the Article 8 review guidelines and the one-year deadline from the date of submission of the initial report established by decision 26/CMP.1, except for two reports which were published with a small delay.

20. In accordance with the Article 8 review guidelines, all completed final review reports shall be published and forwarded by the secretariat, together with any written comments on the final report by the Party which is the subject of the report, to the CMP, the Compliance Committee and the Party concerned. With two exceptions, the reports published so far do not contain questions of implementation as the Parties have been able to resolve potential problems. The Compliance Committee took note of the forwarded reports during its meetings in September 2007⁹ and October 2008¹⁰, and will take note of the remaining two reports that are to be published October 2008. The Enforcement Branch of the Compliance Committee considered the question of implementation in one of the reports during its

⁸ *Good Practice Guidance for Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry*.

⁹ Document CC/EB/2/2007/3 <http://unfccc.int/files/kyoto_protocol/compliance/enforcement_branch/application/pdf/cc-eb-2-2006-3_report_on_the_meeting-rev1.pdf>.

¹⁰ Document CC/EB/6/2008/3 <http://unfccc.int/files/kyoto_protocol/compliance/enforcement_branch/application/pdf/cc-eb-6-2008-3_report_on_the_6th_mtg_of_the_eb.pdf> .

meetings in March 2008¹¹ and April 2008¹² and considered the question of implementation in another of the reports during its meeting in June 2008.¹³

21. As of 31 October 2008, 35 Parties became eligible to participate in mechanisms under Articles 6, paragraphs 12 and 17, of the Kyoto Protocol as 16 months had elapsed since submission of their initial reports or, as in the case of one Party, when the Compliance Committee considered that the Party had met the eligibility requirements before 16 months had elapsed since submission of its initial report.

2. Expert review teams

22. The information provided in the initial reports, including the GHG inventory, is examined by international teams of experts with a focus on the base year emission estimates. The secretariat selects experts for these teams from nominations by Parties to the roster of experts. Invitations to participate in the review are copied to the national focal point. For more information on the participation of experts in the reviews, see document FCCC/SBSTA/2008/INF.4.

23. In 2007 the secretariat invited 24 new experts, who had completed the training and passed the examinations but had not previously participated in inventory reviews, to participate as members of ERTs. In addition, many experts had to participate in more than one review, and some even in three or four reviews. As noted in document FCCC/SBI/2008/INF.2, the number of experts is increasing, but may not be sufficient to conduct the reviews effectively in accordance with Article 8 guidelines.

24. In addition, as indicated in document FCCC/SBSTA/2008/INF.4, it was very difficult to ensure complete teams for the centralized reviews of the 2007 and 2008 inventory submissions, which were conducted in September 2008, (except for two Parties, for the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol, the latter submission was also their first annual submission under the Kyoto Protocol). Furthermore, to be able to have complete teams for these reviews, the secretariat had to invite a few experts who had not taken the Kyoto Protocol training or passed the exams, and many experts, in particular experts from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention (non-Annex I Parties), to participate in more than one review.

25. Nonetheless, owing to the lack of available review experts in five of the centralized reviews in 2008, the secretariat invited only two energy sector experts in each ERT, and not three experts as was previously possible when reviews were organized only under the Convention. Another sector, for which the review is complex and demanding, is the LULUCF sector. The review could benefit from having three experts; however the experts available from the roster do not allow for this. In addition, owing to lack of funds, the secretariat could not organize training courses for review of the activities under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol. Altogether, this made it impossible for the secretariat to organize reviews of inventory information submitted on voluntary basis of these activities in accordance with SBSTA conclusions at its twenty-second session.¹⁴

26. Another important aspect to be considered in future is that the requirements of the Article 8 review guidelines with respect to the expert review of national registries and the assigned amount information will in some cases require an additional member to the ERTs. Such registry experts will be needed in the very limited number of cases when the ERT will have the need for an in-depth review of

¹¹ Document CC/EB/3/2008/2 <http://unfccc.int/files/kyoto_protocol/compliance/enforcement_branch/application/pdf/cc-eb-3-2008-2_report_on_the_3rd_meeting_of_the_eb.pdf>.

¹² Document CC/EB/4/2008/2 <http://unfccc.int/files/kyoto_protocol/compliance/enforcement_branch/application/pdf/cc-eb-4-2008-2_report_on_the_4th_meeting_of_the_eb.pdf>.

¹³ Document CC/EB/5/2008/2 <http://unfccc.int/files/kyoto_protocol/compliance/enforcement_branch/application/pdf/cc-eb-5-2008-2_report_on_the_5th_meeting_of_the_eb.pdf>.

¹⁴ FCCC/SBSTA/2005/4, paragraph 38.

the national registry, and the roster of experts¹⁵ should be expanded to include expertise on national registries.

3. Meeting of inventory lead reviewers

27. The Article 8 review guidelines require that expert teams should be led by two experts with substantial inventory review experience and/or the management of national institutional arrangements for inventory preparation. For each team, one lead reviewer should be from a non-Annex I Party and the other from an Annex I Party. Lead reviewers have a special role in guiding the review teams to ensure the consistency, quality and objectivity of the reviews. Recognizing this role, the CMP, by its decision 23/CMP.1, requested that lead reviewers regularly attend scheduled meetings to be better able to perform the duties described in the Article 8 review guidelines. To that end, and in accordance with decision 12/CP.9, the secretariat organize meetings of lead reviewers to promote a common approach to methodological and procedural issues encountered in the inventory reviews, and to make recommendations to the secretariat on ways to further improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the review process.

28. During recent years, lead reviewers have established themselves as an important group under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol with a critical role in the review process, ensuring the consistency, quality and objectivity of the reviews. The most recent, fifth meeting of inventory lead reviewers took place in Dublin, Ireland, on 21–22 April, 2008, with the support of and financial contribution by the Government of Ireland. The meeting addressed both procedural and technical issues relating to the reviews of GHG inventories of Annex I Parties under the Convention and similar reviews under the Kyoto Protocol. The main issues related to reviews under the Kyoto Protocol are cited below.

29. The lead reviewers recognized the substantial effort undertaken by experts, Parties and the secretariat to finalize the in-country reviews conducted in 2007 of the initial reports and the 2006 GHG inventory submissions in a timely, consistent and transparent manner, despite the insufficient number of experts needed for the review process and the complexity of the tasks involved. The experience gained and lessons learned from these reviews provide a solid basis for future reviews under both the Convention and its Kyoto Protocol.

30. The lead reviewers acknowledged that, notwithstanding the lack of resources, each ERT consistently applied the Article 8 review guidelines and procedures across Parties. Even in cases where differences have been identified in the final review reports, this does not necessarily imply inconsistencies in the approaches applied, and could reflect, inter alia, different national circumstances. The lead reviewers noted that the review tools and the review report templates prepared by the secretariat helped to facilitate a consistent approach across Parties and recognized that strengthening the capacity of expert reviewers and involving more secretariat staff in future reviews is required to ensure consistency.

31. The lead reviewers recognized that the experience gained during the initial reviews has proven that the technical guidance on adjustments contained in the annex to decision 20/CMP.1 provides an adequate set of methods and approaches to calculate adjustments. The lead reviewers acknowledged that the implementation of adjustments entails a significant amount of work and that good communication and cooperation between national experts and ERTs during the review process are crucial for solving most of the potential problems identified.

32. The lead reviewers noted that the ERTs should continue to apply the agreed guidelines for adjustments in a consistent manner across reviews and reaffirmed that all experts should continue to enhance their understanding of decision 20/CMP.1, as well as of the technical guidance on

¹⁵ For more information on the roster of experts, see document FCCC/SBSTA/2008/INF.4.

methodologies for adjustments. The lead reviewers recommended that all experts continue to enhance their understanding of the Article 8 review guidelines, in particular the procedures for adjustments.

33. The lead reviewers noted with concern that to implement the review process effectively and efficiently, more than 40 new review experts are needed, and requested the secretariat to explore further options to identify new review experts, in particular from non-Annex I Parties. Lead reviewers encouraged the secretariat to raise awareness of the importance of the review process and the work of the expert reviewers by informing decision makers and relevant institutions at the national level. The lead reviewers further encouraged the secretariat to inform decision makers of the implications of the review process as regards the implementation of and eligibility under the Kyoto Protocol.

34. During the meeting the secretariat presented the approach for conducting the reviews of the 2007 and 2008 GHG inventory submissions, under both the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol, including the availability of all standard review tools and updated review report templates for review of both the 2007 and the 2008 inventory submissions. The lead reviewers endorsed this approach and noted that for Parties to the Kyoto Protocol that had the review of their initial reports in 2007, the 2008 and 2009 inventory submissions could be voluntary submissions under the Kyoto Protocol and that, in accordance with decision 22/CMP.1, the review guidelines under Article 8 should be used when reviewing these submissions.

35. For the review of GHG inventories, the lead reviewers reiterated that both the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol require reporting Parties to continue to improve their GHG inventories as part of the established quality assurance and quality control system and continue to work on the implementation of the recommendations for improvements arising from the inventory review. The ERTs should ascertain that methodological changes and recalculations are carried out only to improve accuracy, completeness and/or time-series consistency and should be well justified and documented, in accordance with the UNFCCC reporting guidelines.

36. The lead reviewers requested the secretariat to explore the possibility for the ERTs to apply procedures for adjustments, where relevant, on a trial basis during the 2007 and 2008 reviews for activities under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol. However, it was not possible to conduct such trial procedures were not possible to conduct during the reviews in 2008 because of the lack of resources for training on review of these LULUCF activities (see para. 25).

37. On the review of changes to national registries, the lead reviewers noted that the scope of this review will be defined by the scope and nature of changes in the registry, including changes in the software, platform and change of host of the database. In the case of major changes to the national registry, the ERT may use additional expertise from the Registry System Administrators Forum for the review and may use a standardized technical assessment of these changes to facilitate the review.

38. The full text of the conclusions of the lead reviewers' meeting is available on the UNFCCC website.¹⁶

C. Training of experts

39. Decision 24/CMP.1 requested the secretariat to develop training courses on national systems for estimation of GHG emissions of Annex I Parties, on adjustments under Article 5, paragraph 2, of the Kyoto Protocol, and on modalities for accounting of assigned amounts under Article 7, paragraph 4, of the Kyoto Protocol. These courses were developed and have been offered to experts online since 2006. The majority of experts completed the training courses and passed the examination in 2006.

¹⁶ <http://unfccc.int/files/national_reports/annex_i_ghg_inventories/review_process/application/pdf/con_rec5.pdf>.

Nine experts passed one or more exams during 2007. Fifteen more experts have enrolled for the courses since December 2007 and nine passed one or more exams in October 2008.

40. Training activities are important to ensure the quality of the review process. This is particularly true in the case of experts from non-Annex I Parties as they usually do not work on inventories on a daily basis. In addition, they are not involved in activities for which Annex I Parties report supplementary information under Article 7, paragraph 1, of the Kyoto Protocol, subject to annual reviews, such as national registry and assigned amount.

41. The experience from the initial reviews suggests that not all experts were sufficiently prepared for the review of the national registries and of some of the elements of the national system and that there is a need to further strengthen the capacity of experts to deal with Kyoto Protocol issues through training courses and to implement refresher courses for experienced reviewers, including on particular aspects such as review of complex process models used for inventories estimates and to ensure consistency of reviews. The SBI at its twenty-seventh session requested the secretariat to develop new training courses under the Kyoto Protocol covering activities under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, and to further develop the course on the modalities for accounting of assigned amounts, in particular in relation to the national registry, including the standard electronic format (SEF). However, it should be noted that some Parties provided supplementary resources for training activities only after the twenty-eighth session of the SBI and the secretariat has therefore been able to start work on such training courses only very recently.

42. Another important aspect regarding reporting of LULUCF activities under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol, which has an impact on the review process and the training of review experts for this task, is that decision 6/CMP.3 requested the secretariat to develop a new module of the CRF Reporter software that includes reporting on these LULUCF activities. Recognizing the importance of the requirement of Parties to report on these LULUCF activities, beginning with the mandatory submission in 2010, the secretariat has commenced work on this task. However, the task of developing this module of the CRF Reporter software is resource intensive and is not funded from the core budget. The secretariat has requested funding from all Parties included in Annex II of the Convention that are also Parties to the Kyoto Protocol to support this activity. To date, insufficient funding has been received for this activity to complete the work requested by Parties.

III. Further approaches for strengthening the review process

43. Keeping in mind the legally binding commitments of Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol, it is important that the review process under the Kyoto Protocol function as intended. Paragraph 44 below identifies some challenges and further approaches for future reviews under the Kyoto Protocol. Most of these challenges and possible future approaches are similar to those identified in document FCCC/SBSTA/2008/INF.4 for reviews under the Convention.

44. The review process established under the Kyoto Protocol worked successfully, but with each passing year it is becoming increasingly difficult to have complete ERTs. Parties anticipate that concluding negotiations on decision 1/CP.13 (the Bali Action Plan) will add further pressure on reviewers and the review process. The measurable, reportable and verifiable aspects of paragraphs 1 (b) (i) and 1 (b) (ii) of that decision will necessitate greater requirements for Parties in the context of the reporting and review process. This should be factored into future timetables, budgets and training. Ways of overcoming the current and foreseen future problems relating to the review process are clearly linked to the nominations to the roster of a sufficient number of experts; training of new experts and refresher courses for experienced reviewers; Parties' support for participation of experts in the review process; and strengthening the secretariat's resources to deal with the review process.

45. Further information on the ways of overcoming the current and foreseen future problems relating to the review process, including ways to ensure a rigorous review process under Article 8 of the Kyoto Protocol, is provided in document FCCC/SBSTA/2008/INF.4. In addition, recommendations for further improvements to the review process – such as strengthening the role of the secretariat, additional funding for reviews from the core budget for reviews, establishing a formal feedback mechanism for the reviews, a separate formal mechanism to facilitate dialogue between Parties and reviewers, and training of experts for reviews of complex tier 3 models – are contained in the submissions by Parties¹⁷.

- - - - -

¹⁷ FCCC/SBI/2008/MISC.7.