

Jos Olivier

The Netherlands' experience with reviews of the NIR/CRF 2000:

1. S&A; 2. Desk; 3. Centralised

Netherlands' NIR 2000: history

- Own inventory system for long time, including about 400 point sources, partially confidential
- National System did not include archiving activity data and does not split industry and energy sector emissions by fuel type (not in individual company data); QC done at other source level than CRF
- National System performs recalculations not for whole time series; only for 1990, 1995 and last 3 years, also causing different source labellings

Netherlands' NIR 2000: approach

- Focus on Inventory Improvement Programme, started Jan 2000: collect/split data as required for CRF; improve most uncertain sources; document methods in English
- Limited capacity for filling CRF: phased approach
- NIR/CRF 2000 not yet in compliance with Guidelines; NIR/CRF 2001 of April 2001 is much more complete

Reviews: planning, types, pages

- NIR/CRF 2000: April 2000
 - **NIR/CRF 2001: April 2001**
 - S&A NIR 2000: May 2001; 6 pages;
 - Desk review, June 2001; 15 pages+5 pages
Ex. Summ.
 - Centralised Review, September 2001; 16
pages
- **42 pages to check/comment !** (on obsolete
info)

S&A Review (5 p.):

- Both CRF and NIR reviewed
- Time series consistency: some subsources show large annual changes
- Many background tables/trend tables not filled or not complete → no trend analysis with CRF data
- Some errors in IEF found and some ?? placed
- Key - Non-Key sources distinguished
- **NLD Comments:** different source allocations used in different years; some errors correctly identified; trend tables are NIR; some EF are correct

Desk Review (20 p.): general

- NIR limited to trend analysis, little information on methodologies used
- For various sources: lack of information on data collection
- Some errors in IEF found and some ?? placed
- No information on QA/QC; NIR does contain information on uncertainties
- Notation keys often missing

Desk Review: per sector

- Key - Non-Key sources distinguished
- Time series consistency: some subsources show large annual changes
- Some errors in IEF found and some ?? placed
- Comparison made of AD with international statistics
- Recommendations on additional data in NIR

Desk Review: general comments

- Incompleteness caused by limited capacity and limited data availability in proper CRF format
- Some tables, e.g. trend tables are redundant, and could be filled by linking to other CRF tables
- Q. is how extensive explanations in the NIR should be, given that the NIR to be submitted annually
- Comparison with international statistics: good for checking order of magnitude and trends; however, these data need not be identical due to definition and responsibility issues

Desk Review: sectoral comments

- Key sources: identification not always cf. IPCC GPG report; Q. of consistency & responsibility
- Different source allocations used in different years; some errors correctly identified; trend tables are NIR; some EF are correct

Centralised Review (16 p.):

- Lot of duplication with previous reviews
- Lot of copying from S&A report
- Structure somewhat different from Desk Review report
- However, in this form a of statements, apparently without clear purpose
- Recommendations on adding sources in NIR based on international statistics.

Centralised Review: comments

- Essentially the same as for the other reviews
- Recommendation on addition of sources neglects the fact that the Netherlands has a long tradition in emission inventory compilation as well as an improvement programme for greenhouse gases

3 Reviews: +

- A lot of technical issues already flagged in the S&A report
- Desk and Central Review: different formats but essentially the same issues flagged;
- All reports correctly mention that the CRF is far from complete and that the NIR is missing many required paragraphs

3 Reviews: --

- Too late; new NIR available but not used
- Central Review gives lot of statements, without clear purpose
- Non-key sources separated, but still in main text, which make the reports looking less focussed
- A lot of text on items partially due to initial stage of CRF reporting; not one review checked the most recent NIR !

Issues (1): insertion: time/errors

- **Starting** with CRF requires very, very much time, which was largely underestimated, in particular for countries with own inventory systems → conversion/insertion/checking tool would: a) increase efficiency greatly; b) reduce errors of inserting in wrong places; c) facilitate elimination of errors prior to submission/review
- Instructions missing on which year(s) to report, how to report trends (redundant in yearly files), or priorities in case of limited capacity

Issues (2): errors/timing of reviews

- The Netherlands created its own trend consistency check file for AD, EF and emissions, and sometimes also for key additional data
- Netherlands decided on a phased approach: first key years (1990 and recent years); next filling time series for 'easy' sources; then more difficult ones, resulting from dedicated effort to generate the data required for the CRF
- Thus many (not all) review comments included in NIR 2001 → these reviews are largely **obsolete**

Issues (3): ambiguity

- **Ambiguity** in IPCC Guidelines affect & confuse CRF Guidelines even more:
- IPCC: flexible & only warning for possible inconsistencies across source categories
- CRF: same ambiguity or even inconsistent guidelines
- **Examples**: non-energy use of fuels; coke consumption in steel production - RA suggests reporting them within '1A'; fugitive emissions; where to use notation keys; many links

Issues (4) : redundancy

- **Redundancy**, also causing ambiguity:
 - a) trends in ALL files?
 - b) methods in ALL files?
 - c) notation keys in ALL files?
 - d) notation keys EVERYWHERE or only at level of sectoral tables?
 - e) more linking would reduce errors & handling time
 - e) what documentation in CRF and what in NIR
 - f) extent of documentation in NIR vs. in background reports, to limit trees cut/repetition of text in NIR's

Areas for improvement by UNFCCC

- CRF Guidelines more consistent, less ambiguous
- Clear separation what to document in CRF and what in NIR report
- Assist with data insertion tool
- Assist with trend/unit check tool
- Keep review reports concise, separating clearly key and non-key issues; include learning element (over time)
- Co-operation with IPCC-TSU on consistency (guidelines!), tool development (EF DB)

Extra: Areas of improvement by NLD

- NIR 2001 much more complete in data and documentation
- Improvement programme helps filling in reporting detail gaps (EF, AD, F-gases, unknown sources, LUCF) and improving the National System (QA/QC, methodology documentation)
- Difficulties remain in distinction CO₂ from energy and from feedstock: in domestic ER & in reporting in CRF