
U.S. Experience with the UNFCCC Inventory Review Process

Michael Gillenwater

U.S. EPA

Greenhouse Gas Inventory Program

gillenwater.michael@epa.gov

Status of U.S. Reviews...

- In-Country
 - Late May 2001
 - Final draft awaiting U.S. approval
 - Interaction with review team very valuable
- Desk
 - May 2001
 - Initial draft awaiting U.S. comments
- No Central review
- Other experience
 - U.S. experts participated on teams for all 3 types of review processes and S&As

Review Process Issues

- Time commitment required from reviewers
- Cost of performing reviews
- Difficulty in coordinating review team
- Benefits from review team capacity building
- Availability of interaction with and feedback from country experts
- Benefits from country experts capacity building

Review Process Issues (continued)

- Dependence on transparency and detailed documentation by Party in NIR and CRF
- Economies of scale in terms number of inventories reviewed in fixed amount of time
- Amount of information for reviewers to digest, evaluate, and summarize
- Consistency across reviews (time and Parties)
- More...?

Trade-Offs

Issues with Review	Desk	Central	In-Country
Time commitment	3	2	1
Cost	1	2	3
Team coordination/interaction	3	2	1
Country interaction/feedback	3	3	1
Review team capacity building	3	2	1
Country experts capacity building	3	3	1
Transparency/documentation	3	3	1
Economies of scale	2	1	3
Information processing burden	2	3	1
Consistency across reviews	2	2	3

(3 – High 2 – Medium 1- Low) [preliminary evaluation]

Recommendations

- Need to view as a cumulative process occurring over multiple review years
 - Declining marginal costs (effort)
 - But also declining marginal benefits for Party (assuming improvements made by Party)
 - Will enable S&As to add more value
- More objective and detailed review guidelines and check lists
 - Help define minimum requirements
 - Provide comparability
 - Source category-specific checks

Recommendations (II)

- More standardized NIR guidelines
 - Transparent and complete NIR and CRF critical to Desk and Central reviews!
- CRF content and software improvements
 - Create separate input/output format
 - Tables created by “report generator”
 - Parties provided with error checker before submission (updated regularly with better checks)
 - Guidelines for efficiently cross-referencing NIR

Recommendations (III)

- Need efficient process for communication between country experts and review team during desk and central
 - Formally put Party on alert during review period for response to questions
 - Allow all review team members to directly contact pre-identified list of Party experts
 - Indicate in review report where documentation was insufficient and Party had to be contacted

Recommendations (IV)

- Reviewers need to prioritize desk reviewers
 - Require full time commitment “at desk”
 - Set up communication channels and protocols between members of review team ahead of time
- Application of review types
 - In-Country reviews should be thorough, rigorous, and include full report
 - (Special attention paid to first In-Country review to set foundation for future reviews)
 - Desk reviews could then focus on changes and problems, and include short report only
 - (Performed in-between in-country review years)