



International Consultations and Analysis: Key Questions and Design Options

Based on:

“Design Options for IAR and ICA” (Draft Discussion Document 1)

Jane Ellis (OECD), Gregory Briner (OECD), Yamide Dagnet (UK DECC)
and Nina Campbell (IEA)

Global Forum on MRV and Carbon Markets
19 September 2011



Outline of presentation

- Context
- Possible principles
- Options for design of ICA
 - ◆ Scope, inputs, frequency and outputs
 - ◆ Process
- Key questions

Context



- **Pre-Cancun**

Non-Annex I Parties submit national communications on an irregular basis, no international examination of reports

- **Post-Cancun**

Non-Annex I Parties will submit national communications every four years and biennial reports; ICA of biennial reports will be conducted (consistent with the level of support provided and with flexibility for LDCs and SIDSs)

Possible principles



- **Principles referred to in Cancun Agreements**

Non-intrusive

Non-punitive

Respectful of national sovereignty

Facilitative

- **Other potentially desirable principles**

Robust

Transparent

Scope



Review of NCs

National circumstances

IAR

GHG inventory review

GHG inventory information

Information on GHG units

Emissions projections

Mitigation actions

Support

Vulnerability

Adaptation actions

RSO

National circumstances

ICA

GHG inventory

Mitigation actions

Support received ...

... and needed

Emissions projections

GHG units

Vulnerability

Adaptation actions

RSO

Possible inputs



Possible inputs for IAR

- Biennial reports
- National communications
- Annual GHG inventory (CRF)
- Annual NIR
- SEF tables
- Supplementary info on LULUCF
- Previous technical review report
- Compilation and synthesis report
- Written questions from other Parties
- Other (e.g. stakeholder input, country assessment of market mechanism use)

Possible inputs for ICA

- Biennial reports
- National communications
-
-
-
-
- Previous technical analysis report
- Compilation and synthesis report
- Written questions from other Parties
- Other (e.g. stakeholder input , Technology Needs Assessment)

Process: IAR

Technical review

- Completeness check
- **Timeliness check**
- Assessment of transparency and accuracy
- **Provisions to ensure rigorous and robust process**
- Check for consistency with guidelines

International assessment

- **Comparability: technical element (accounting “converter”)**
- **Comparability: political element**
- Questions of clarification to Party
- Response by Party

Further consideration of outputs

- 2013-15 review
- Finance and technology mechanisms
- Participation in current and new market mechanisms

Process: ICA

Technical analysis

- Completeness check
- --
- Assessment of transparency and accuracy
- --
- Check for consistency with guidelines

International consultations

- --
- --
- Questions of clarification to Party
- Response by Party

Further consideration of outputs

- 2013-15 review
- Finance and technology mechanisms
- Participation in new market mechanisms

Possible outputs



Outputs: IAR

Technical review

- Technical review report
- GHG inventory review report

International assessment

- Summary report
- Written proceedings of assessment

Outputs: ICA

Technical analysis

- Technical analysis report
-

International consultations

- Summary report
- Written proceedings of consultations

Summary



- Many open questions remain
- ICA could have three stages:
 1. Analysis by technical experts
 2. International consultations
 3. Further consideration of outputs
- ICA should be less onerous than IAR
- ICA could be flexible in terms of scope and frequency

Key Questions



- What incentives could be provided to encourage improved reporting over time?
- What sort of capacity building will be most needed?
- How much flexibility is required in terms of frequency and scope of ICA?
- What should be the outputs, and which bodies or groups should consider the outputs?

Thank you!

For further information:

www.oecd.org/env/ccxg

For comments on the discussion document:

gregory.briner@oecd.org