

Review process - first experiences

Klaus Radunsky

Umweltbundesamt - Wien

Bonn, 4 - 6 December 2001

Outline

- Centralized review Bonn, May 2001
- Desk review, Oct - Nov 2001
- In-country review Austria Oct - Nov 2001
- Next steps?
- Conclusions

Centralised Review - plus

- PLUS
 - Quick and easy exchange of views/information between the review team and between the review team and the secretariat
 - dedicated period of time for review
 - easier to organise compared to in-country-visits or a desk review
 - it should be possible to prepare 5 reports in a week by a team of 10 experts

Centralised Review - minus

- MINUS
 - differences in expertise between experts
 - differences in style between experts
 - significant amount of time lost to learn the process, become familiar with resources
 - lack of resources after week in Bonn (still no reports on the web)
 - no exchange of views (dialogue) with the country under review
 - process as planned did not happen

Desk review - plus

- No travel costs and therefore less cost
- less difficult to find a team?
- More flexibility with respect to experts who are in reality contributing

Desk review - minus

- Strongly dependent on functioning of communication
- risk of delay due to higher priority work
- no personal communication between members of the review team
- more difficult to produce review reports which are comparable in style in comparison to reports based on other approaches

Desk review: important issues

- Need for a good organisation of work
 - define mandates and timetables for groups of experts
 - stimulate work by sharing information on progress
 - stepwise approach in order to prepare a report of the ERT (and not just a compilation of chapters)

Desk review: important issues

- Process need to be clear before the review starts
- Strong commitment by all needed to implement the process as planned
- experts should have some training before (special training for those who did not participate in a review before and who have no experience with the CRF)
- alternative: Parties should nominate experts and send copies of contracts to secretariat - secretariat may only choose nominated and contracted experts
- additional information should be provided by the secretariat/the Task Force on Emission Inventories via Internet

In-country review - plus

- Personnel communication between ERT and staff
- best basis for review reports of the ERT
- contribution to capacity building
- important for confidence building between Parties

In-country review - minus

- More resource intensive than centralised or desk review
- difficult to organise (availability of experts)
- need for additional resources within the country under review

In-country-review: important issues

- Good working environment
- presence of national experts
- CRF and NIR need to be available some time before the review starts to allow for proper preparation of the review
- first feedback from country to zero order review report at the end of the visit

Improvements for the review process

- Standardise outline of the NIR
- all relevant information should be included in each submission
- permanent support to provide clarification if needed (either by lead authors or the secretariat)
- each year the secretariat might inform Parties about questions raised and answers given
- improve/guide process of preparing the review report (stepwise approach needed)

Criteria for the review report

- The less comments by a Party the better
- another ERT would not find additional inconsistencies, neither with the Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines nor with the Good Practice Guidance
- secretariat may assess the comments by Parties, differences between analysis of ERTs in order to improve performance of ERTs and to improve guidelines

Next steps

- Describe process for all three types of review
- Training for experts and co-chairs of ERTs
- Discuss whether or not to harmonise style of reports - if yes, how to improve
- Prepare for review under the Kyoto Protocol (e.g. initial assigned amount, adjustments)

Conclusion

- Reviews need to be comprehensive and shall address all information included in the CRF and the NIR
- It becomes more difficult to prepare good review reports by centralised and desk reviews compared to in-country reviews
- In-country reviews add value to desk- or centralised reviews
- centralised reviews offer the opportunity of additional training and may better guarantee reports of the ERT in time
- desk reviews may produce good reports with a trained ERT which has a strong commitment to do the work in time

Proposal for training of ERTs (1)

- COP decisions relevant for review
- 1996 Revised IPCC Guidelines
- Good Practice Guidance
- Common Reporting Format
- National Inventory Report
- Steps of review process - products
- Tools, additional information from secretariat
- Tasks of ERT-members
- Expected outcome
- Adjustments

Training may need 4 to 5 days.

Proposal for training of ERTs (2)

- Experts should first participate in centralised review before participating in desk review or in-country review.
- Trial period should be used to develop a robust practice in implementation of Art.5(2) related to adjustments