

The 14th Workshop on GHG Inventories in Asia (WGIA14)
- Capacity building for MRV

Experiences on ICA: TA and FSV

ZHU Songli

Energy Research Institute, NDRC, China

26th - 29th July, 2016; Best Western Premier

Tuushin Hotel, Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia

Content

1. Experience from 1st Technical Analysis (TA) of BUR;
2. Observation on 1st workshop for the Facilitative sharing of views (FSV)
3. General comments

1. Experience on TA

My role in the 1st TA

- ▶ Time: May 18-22, 2015.
- ▶ Party analyzed: South Africa, Korea and Vietnam;
- ▶ My role: expert on GHG inventory; one of co-leads.



General feeling

1. Very fresh!
2. 3 Key points from UNFCCC are very helpful:
 - ▶ Make both TTE and Party fruitful and enjoyable;
 - ▶ Your personal capacity \neq party's opinion; seek party's agreement.
 - ▶ Capacity building identification.
3. The Secretariat is well-prepared for the process.
 - ▶ Organization of the training and exams of the experts;
 - ▶ The expanded team of the Secretariat assisting the TTEs (2-3 coordinator for each team);
 - ▶ Stocktaking meetings among groups; mitigation part
 - ▶ Telephone conference with analyzed parities
 - ▶ Time-keeping of the summary report
 - ▶ QA/QC of the summary report

Major findings and feedback to the TA process

1. The capacity among non-annex I parties are very differentiated.
2. The way that the party involve in the process is different:
 - ▶ The way to raise the questions;
 - ▶ the response of analyzed parties to the raised questions;
 - ▶ Provision of additional material/information;
 - ▶ The comments from parties should be well-considered and incorporated into the SR.
3. The draft of summary report is very different
 - ▶ No recommendation but capacity building identification;
 - ▶ Wording!
4. The challenges to GHG experts are significant;
 - ▶ Scope;
 - ▶ Analysis VS Review
5. Analysis of effects of mitigation are of complex; the submitted reports are too different to have a uniform storyline.
6. The guidelines on cross-cutting issues are not quite clear.

How parties can better prepare

- ▶ **Before the analysis:**
 - ▶ In-depth understanding on the reporting guidelines
 - ▶ a good BUR (complete and transparent) meeting the requirements of guidelines, as detailed as possible;
 - ▶ (Reporting guidelines(decision 2/cp17) are not perfect)
- ▶ **During the analysis week:** it is always good to response to the questions raised by TTE for a better understanding on national circumstance, capacity building needs and better reporting next time.
- ▶ **After the analysis:** pay attention to the points to be improved.

How TTE analyze BUR: Modalities and procedures of the TTE

1. Annex IV to decision 2/CP.17 (Modalities and guidelines for ICA)
2. Annex to Decision 20/CP.19 (Composition, modalities and procedures of the team of technical experts under ICA)
3. Para.15 of 20/CP,19
 - a) Identify the extent to which the elements of information listed in paragraph 3(a) of the guidelines contained in decision 2/CP.17, annex IV, are included in the BUR of the party concerned; **(completeness)**
 - b) Undertake a technical analysis of information contained in the BUR as outlined in the annex III to decision 2/CP.17, and any additional technical information that may be provided by the party concerned; **(transparency, as well as the choice and application of IPCC methods)**
 - c) In consultation with the party concerned, identify capacity-building needs in order to facilitate reporting in accordance with annex III to decision 2/CP.17, and participating in ICA in accordance with annex IV to decision 2/CP.17, taking into account Article 4, paragraph 3, of the Convention. **(capacity building needs identification)**

Taking GHG inventory as an example: First step: completeness check

1. Completeness checklist table provided by the Secretariat.
2. Choices:
 - Yes
 - No: need explanation
 - Partly: need explanation
 - NA (not applicable): need explanation: using 2006 Guidelines for instance
- ▶ points tending to be “incomplete”
 - ▶ Updated data on AD by category;
 - ▶ Table 1, table 2, Sectoral tables;
 - ▶ Emission reported in unit of CO₂-eq, but not in physical unit;
 - ▶ International bunker;
 - ▶ Uncertainty analysis
 - ▶ Emission of indirect GHG and other gases;
 - ▶
- ▶ In some cases, the party concerned provided relevant information during the analysis week or even after, without containing in submitted BUR. It helps but will not change our conclusion.

Second step: in-depth analysis (general)

1. Has the party provided an adequate description of the methodologies it used?
 - ▶ IPCC GPG should be used: Decision tree, key category should be reported;
 - ▶ KCA: very helpful for application of tier method and mitigation actions and their effects;
 - ▶ The application of IPCC 2006 guidelines are commended; results should be presented by table 1 and table 2 for comparability.
 - ▶ GWP used?
2. Has the party provided an adequate description of sources of AD, EFs?
 - ▶ Points: NIR?
3. Using of notation keys? And any improvement plan?
4. If time-series data and/or summary information on previous inventory years are reported, are methods, data source and output consistent? Has the recalculation done or plan to do?
 - ▶ Comparison with previous NC report;
5. Any QA/QC plan is incorporated?

Second step: in-depth analysis (sector-specific)

1. Sectoral approach and reference approach for CO2 emission?
2. Disaggregation of domestic and international bunker emission?
3. Allocation of energy emission and IP emission?
4. Coverage of IP
5. F gases emission by type of gas?
6. Cross-check agriculture data with FAO
7.

Third step: Capacity building identification

1. The capacity building needs will be determined by close collaboration with party and will vary depending on national circumstances;
2. Any identified deficiencies are treated as potential area for future capacity-building, to be confirmed by the party.
3. VNM as an example:
 - ▶ Moving to higher tier for key categories by developing country-specific data and identification more data sources.
 - ▶ Improvement of reporting;
 - ▶ Conducting and reporting uncertainty analysis;
 - ▶ Improving completeness

Difference with inventory review for Annex I parties

1. Scope
2. Depth: TTE will not go in-depth to detailed data, only if the deficiencies are quite significant;
3. Methodologies applied are key
4. Requirements on TACCC;
5. Report drafting:
 - ▶ Strictly following the guidelines: completeness and transparency of the information reported in the BUR;
 - ▶ Wording:
 - ▶ Keep in mind the voluntary nature of some of the information, as well as the capacity constraints faced by the Party.

Interaction with party concerned

1. Very important!
2. In cases where issues regarding completeness or transparency arise, it is always advisable to first seek clarification with the party concerned
3. Good response from Parties → in-depth understanding → good capacity building identification;
4. Comments from party concerned on draft SR should be seriously considered.

Observation on 1st FSV

1. Time: May 20-21, 2016 (SB44);
2. Parties joined: Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Chile, Ghana, Namibia, Peru, Korea, Singapore, South Africa, Macedonia, Tunisia, Viet Nam



General feeling

1. Very fresh!
2. Similar to MA for Annex I parties;
3. The atmosphere is very friendly; questions are focusing on capacity building.
4. Time slot is quite flexible: 20-60 min;
5. Presentations cover both main content of BUT and answers to written questions.

Major questions on institutional arrangements

1. What efforts have been made to ensure the submission of BUR (and GHG inventory)? How to make all these work institutionalized?
2. How to make sure the engagement of all stakeholders?
3. What are the challenges for the institutional arrangement? How were they addressed and what are the experiences?

Major questions on GHG inventory development

1. How were the applied methodologies selected?
2. If 2006GLs were used, what were the challenges that have been addressed and how? If 2006GLs were not used, what are the major challenges?
3. If time-series inventory were provided, what are the experiences that could be shared for other developing countries?
4. How did the GHG inventory support the design of mitigation policies?
5. How to establish the stable data-flow? How to coordinate the work among different ministries and departments? How to ensure the involvement of private sectors?
6. How to organize the QA/QC procedure?
7. What are the major improvement plan?
8. How to development country-specific EFs?

Major questions mitigation policies and its effects

1. What are the progress of NAMAs ? How to ensure the transition of NAMAs to INDC;
2. Which policies are the most important?
3. How the provide more quantified reduction estimation in future? What are the major challenges?
4. How the ensure the participation of all stakeholders?
5. What are the co-benefits and trade-off the mitigation policies?

3. General comments

1. ICA is a learning by doing process.
2. The purpose of ICA is to help and make improvement, not let you down.
3. Active participation is crucial to make the process improved, including guidelines and quality of BUR and inventories.

Thanks for your attention.

zhusongli@eri.org.cn