

**New Zealand submission to the SBI on  
Reporting and review of information submitted by Parties included in Annex I to  
the Convention that are also Parties to the Kyoto Protocol: experiences with and  
lessons learned from the review process, including recommendations for  
improvements**

**September 2008**

New Zealand welcomes the opportunity to provide a submission on the review process and suggestions for improvements (FCCC/SBI/2008/8 paragraph 93 refers).

Measurement and reporting of greenhouse gas emissions, and the subsequent inventory review process, fundamentally underpin international action to reduce emissions, through assessing Parties' implementation of the Convention and its Kyoto Protocol, and understanding global emission trends.

The success of the inventory review process itself is dependant on the continued commitment by experts, Parties and the Secretariat. New Zealand especially acknowledges the efforts made by the Secretariat to ensure the review process is transparent, review reports are consistent and the review process is resourced with people and tools.

New Zealand has supported the inventory review process through training New Zealand experts and funding reviewers to participate in reviews. New Zealand provided 5 reviewers in the 2008 calendar year.

New Zealand acknowledges that the training of reviewers is crucial to the review process and would also emphasize that training is fundamental to improving Parties inventories. Training increases the Party's understanding of reporting requirements of the Conference of the Parties and the IPCC Good Practice. The on-line training materials for inventory reviewers are very useful in this regard. New Zealand encourages the Secretariat to allow access to the online training materials to any names nominated by the Party and not restrict it to experts currently on the roster of experts.

A crucial aspect of the review process is assuring consistency of review findings across Parties and the consistent interpretation by reviewers of the UNFCCC reporting guidelines and the IPCC reporting guidelines and Good Practice Guidance. The continued meeting of lead reviewers and publishing of the meeting decisions is a key tool to ensuring consistency of interpretation. These initiatives should be continued. New Zealand considers that further guidance could be provided to review teams to ensure the reviewers focus their review on a Party's consistency with the reporting guidelines and IPCC guidance, and not the underlying IPCC methodologies.

New Zealand encourages all Parties to contribute experts to the review process. To help address the issue of reviewer availability, we suggest that the review experience and process could be improved. Suggestions include, but are not limited to:

- The Secretariat acknowledging the importance of the reviewer role. This could be through awards or certificates.

- Ensuring there is information available on the time commitment necessary for involvement as a reviewer - both in-country and follow up work.
- Review whether the time commitment can be reduced through improving the efficiency of the review process.
- Encouraging Parties to prioritise providing reviewers, fully cognisant of the real time commitment involved.

We note the difficulty the Secretariat has had in assembling review teams in the 2008 year, notably with LULUCF reviewers, and acknowledge that the review process can be demanding on reviewers. Recognising the additional workload on reviewers, it is important to ensure continued access and commitment from reviewers after an in-country or centralised review. New Zealand considers it is now appropriate for Parties and the Secretariat to discuss further ways to streamline the annual review process, make reviews more attractive and ensure an ongoing commitment from reviewers.

We anticipate that concluding negotiations on Decision 1/CP.13 (The Bali Action Plan) will add further pressure on reviewers and the review process. The measurable, reportable and verifiable aspects of paragraphs 1(b)(i) and 1(b)(ii) of that decision will necessitate greater accountability as between parties and new reporting requirements. This should be factored into future timetables, budgets and training.

Finally, New Zealand understands the mandated timelines of the review process but suggests the process would be improved by further consideration on the scheduling of reviews. As an example, New Zealand suggests that southern-hemisphere Parties should not be scheduled for feedback over the month of January, as this often coincides with the summer holiday season. In New Zealand's case, the national inventory office will officially be closed for two weeks of the four weeks designated for feedback on the draft review report. This timeline does not promote the opportunity for good dialogue between the ERT and the Party.

We look forward to participating in discussions on strengthening the review process.