

INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL  
ON CLIMATE CHANGE

EIGHTEENTH SESSION  
Wembley, UK  
24-29 September 2001

IPCC-XVIII/Doc. 4 (c).1  
(16.VIII.2001)

Agenda item: 4c  
ENGLISH ONLY

**Proposed Terms of Reference  
of the IPCC National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme**

**(Submitted by the Co-Chairs, Task Force on Inventories)**

This document has been prepared in response to the decision of the Panel taken at the Seventeenth Session (Nairobi, 4-6 April 2001), requesting the Task Force Bureau for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (TFB) to develop an options paper on Terms of Reference for the National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme (NGGIP) including options on the future status of the Task Force and appropriate procedures for agreement on its products. It is submitted to the Panel for decision.

The TFB considered, at its Sixth Session (Geneva, 9 August 2001) and subsequently endorsed the document.

## **A) Background Information**

1. At the 17<sup>th</sup> Session of the IPCC in Nairobi, in April 2001, a number of delegations expressed the view that the Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (TFI) should become a fourth Working Group of the IPCC. A range of views were expressed about the scope and terms of references of such a Working Group. It was also suggested that specific procedures for formal approval of methodology work and a clarification of responsibilities of the Panel and TFI/WG4 may be considered as addenda to the existing procedures. The Panel requested the TFB to develop an options paper on Terms of Reference (TOR) for the National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme (NGGIP) including options on the future status of the NGGIP and appropriate procedures for approval of its products. This paper discusses the different options on TOR and addresses the pros and cons of such options in relation to the following issues:

- **Scope of the work of the NGGIP**
- **Structure: Formalised TFI or Working Group4, and its Bureau membership**
- **Procedures (Scoping, Peer Review and Approval steps)**

## **B) Discussions at the NGGIP Task Force Bureau (TFB) at its sixth session (10<sup>th</sup> August 2001)**

2. TFB6 reviewed a options paper on the implications of a large variety of conceivable options for the issues as specified in para 1. above. The paper (revised after the TFB6) is annexed to this paper as a background information.
3. The TFB6 viewed that the NGGIP had unique features and tasks compared to the current IPCC's three WGs. The products (inventory guidelines and good practice guidance reports) are developed to meet the needs of both developing and developed countries around the world in estimating their anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions and removals by sinks. The IPCC guidelines and good practice guidance are also the basis for the annual inventory submissions by Annex I countries to the UNFCCC. The IPCC guidelines should therefore, although based on sound science, be pragmatic and versatile enough to take the different national circumstances into account. Thus, the methodology development has features that differ from usual IPCC work, i.e., the assessment of existing scientific knowledge. The TFB believes that to enhance transparency the procedures for the NGGIP should be defined more precisely, but taking the specific features of the methodological work into account.
4. TFB submits herewith for consideration by the Panel a simpler table, which contains only those options that appear realistic and feasible, and those that reflect the views expressed in the recent Panel session, IPCC Bureau, and the TFB itself.

**Table. NGGIP TOR: Feasible Options**

<b>Issue A: Scope of the work</b>	
<b>Status Quo</b>	<b>Option</b>
<b>A-1 (Status Quo)</b> Conventional Inventory Work.	<b>A-2</b> <b>Inventory-related methodology (including conventional inventory work).</b>

<b>Issue B: Organisational Structure</b>		
<b>Status Quo</b>	<b>Option</b>	<b>Option</b>
<b>B-1</b> Task Force, with its 15 Bureau members selected from IPCC bureau member or their countries.	<b>B-2</b> <b>A formalised TFI (in plenary, if it is held), with its Bureau members selected from the [IPCC Bureau members] / [or from their countries].</b>	<b>B-3</b> <b>New WG4<sup>1</sup>, with its Bureau members selected from the [IPCC Bureau members] / [or from their countries].</b>

<b>Issue C-1 Procedures: (Scoping process)</b>		
<b>Status Quo</b>	<b>Option</b>	<b>Option</b>
<b>C-1-1</b> Scoping to be endorsed by the Panel.	<b>C-1-1 (Status Quo)</b> <b>Scoping to be endorsed by the Panel.</b>	<b>C-1-2</b> <b>Scoping to be endorsed by WG4 or TFI</b>

<b>Issue C-2 Procedures: (Peer Review process)</b>		
<b>Status Quo</b>	<b>Option</b>	<b>Option</b>
<b>C-2-1</b> Simple Review process.	<b>C-2-1 (Status Quo)</b> <b>Simple Review process</b>	<b>C-2-2</b> <b>Full double Review process.</b>

<b>Issue C-3 Procedures: (Acceptance/Adoption/Approval process)</b>		
<b>Status Quo</b>	<b>Option</b>	<b>Option</b>
<b>C-3-1-1</b> Endorsed by TFB and accepted by the Panel.	<b>C-3-1-2</b> <b>Adoption by TFI/WG4, and subsequent acceptance by the Panel.</b>	<b>C-3-2</b> <b>Synopsis section to be approved by TFI/WG4, and the whole report to be accepted by the Panel.</b>

- Note**
- 1: Options shown in columns do not imply vertical linkages.**
  - 2. Please refer to the Annex for more detailed descriptions of options and implications.**

<sup>1</sup> The Working Group 4, if established, will have the same responsibilities and functions as the other IPCC Working Groups in terms of the IPCC Procedures (e.g., selection of authors, and adoption/acceptance/approval of reports).

**Implications of options: a background discussion paper**

**Issue A: Scope of the work of the NGGIP – 1) Should the NGGIP continue to limit its activities to assessment, development, refinement and dissemination of internationally-agreed methodologies for the estimation and reporting of national GHG emissions and removals? 2) Or, should the NGGIP to expand the work to cover other methodological issues?**

	<b>Options</b>	<b>Implications</b>	<b>Notes</b>
<b>A-1 Conventional Inventory Work.</b>	To assess, develop, refine and disseminate methodologies and practices for national greenhouse gas inventories, when requested by the Panel, or by UNFCCC or its Subsidiary Bodies.	Status quo.	
<b>A-2 Inventory- related Methodology.</b>	To expand the scope of the work to cover those methodological work that are closely related to GHG inventories, such as development and assessment of methods for baseline setting, or system boundary of project-based accounting..	Close collaborative working arrangements with the other WG will be required. Will require extensive case by case scoping work before initiation of new activities. Will have some financial implications depending on the scope of work.	[Clear demarcation of work between IPCC and UNFCCC will need to be maintained.]
<b>A-3 Wider “Methodology” Work.</b>	To expand the scope of the work to cover a wider range of methodological work such as trends predictions, impact/vulnerability assessments or general uncertainty management questions.	In addition to those listed above, this might infringe upon the work of the other WGs, and may degrade efficiency in IPCC work. Will have major financial implications depending on the scope of work	[TFB earlier expressed its reluctance to expand the scope of work. This question is very much contingent upon the future organisational structure of the IPCC.]

**Issue B: Structure – 1) Should the NGGIP TFI/TFB remain as a Task Force or should it be converted into a Working Group? 2) What is the modalities of holding TFI or WG? 3) What are the implications of TFB membership on the IPCC Bureau?**

	<b>Options</b>	<b>Implications</b>	<b>Notes</b>
<b>B-1 TF, Status Quo.</b>	TFI (in plenary, if it is held) and 15 member TFB. TFB members are nominated by the IPCC Bureau from its members or their countries) (One Co-chair is from TSU-hosting country and another from a developing country..)	Status quo.	Limited time-frame implied in “TF” has been considered problematic. Ambiguous TFB Co-chairs membership in the IPCC Bureau causes difficulties in liaison

			with the 3 IPCC WGs and the IPCC Bureau.
<b>B-2 TF, formalised by the Panel, . with its Bureau members selected from the [IPCC Bureau members] / [or from their countries].</b>	<p>A formalised TFI (in plenary, if it is held) and [6]/[7]/[8] member TFB.</p> <p>TFI/TFB Co-chairs are selected by the IPCC Panel from [IPCC Bureau members] / [IPCC Vice-chairs]. (One from TSU-hosting country and another from a developing country.)</p> <p>Other TFB members are nominated by the IPCC Bureau from its members or their countries.</p>	<p>Maintain the TF. Status of TF Co-chairs' will be regularised, and better linkage with the work of other WGs will be ensured.</p> <p>Negative, though minor, financial implication due to the reduction of TF Bureau membership.</p>	<p>TFB may opt to establish a project targeted steering group by enlisting the other experts, especially those from industry sector. This will have financial implications to the extent that travel support to the steering members is required.</p>
<b>B-3 New WG4<sup>2</sup>, with its Bureau members selected from the [IPCC Bureau members] / [or from their countries].</b>	<p>WG4 (in plenary, if it is held) and [6]/[7]/ [8] member WG4 Bureau.</p> <p>WG4/WG4 Bureau Co-chairs are selected by the IPCC Panel from [IPCC Bureau members] / [IPCC Vice-chairs] One Co-chair is from TSU-hosting country and another from a developing country.</p> <p>All WGB members are nominated by the IPCC Panel from IPCC Bureau members.</p>	<p>Clear status of WG Co-chairs and better linkage with the work of other WGs will be ensured.</p> <p>Negative, though minor, financial implication due to the reduction of WG Bureau membership.</p> <p>Result of IPCC Bureau election might not secure enough inventory expertise.</p>	<p>WGB may opt to establish a project targeted steering group by enlisting the other experts, especially those from industry sector. This will have financial implications to the extent that travel support to the steering members is required.</p>

**Issue C: Procedures: Will the NGGIP require a set of procedures for preparation of reports that are different from the IPCC Procedures? For; 1) Scoping process, 2) Review process, and 3) Acceptance/adoption/approval process?**

#### **C-1 Procedures: (Scoping process)**

	<b>Options</b>	<b>Implications</b>	<b>Notes</b>
<b>C-1-1 Scoping to be endorsed by the Panel.</b>	Scoping work to be done by TFB members and selected experts, and its results to be endorsed by the Panel.	Status quo.	Timing of the Panel session has some restraint on the urgent initiation of new activities.
<b>C-1-2 Scoping to be endorsed by WG4 or TFI</b>	Scoping work to be formally endorsed by the Working Group 4 or TFI (in plenary).	Convening WG4 or TFI (in plenary), if it is held independently from the Plenary Session of the Panel, for this purpose will	

<sup>2</sup> The Working Group 4, if established, will have same responsibilities and functions as the other IPCC Working Groups in terms of the IPCC Procedures (e.g., selection of authors, and adoption/acceptance/approval of reports).

		have major financial implications.	
--	--	------------------------------------	--

### Issue C-2: Procedures: (Peer Review process)

	Options	Implications	Notes
<b>C-2-1 Simple Review process.</b>	A simple review process by way of a combined Governments/experts review, unless the IPCC decides otherwise on a case by case basis.	In view of the technical nature of the NGGIP work, this simpler process will normally suffice.	This simpler process was allowed by the Panel in the preparation of the Good Practice Guidance report.
<b>C-2-2 Full double Review process.</b>	Full double review process used by the other WGs.	The normal process being applied in cases of IPCC Assessment Reports and Special Reports.	Governments may wish to see a more transparent and policy-sensitive review process for inventory work. Although urgency is often required from UNFCCC side, this would require 4-6 more months.

### Issue C-3: Procedures: (Acceptance/adoption/approval process)

	Options	Implications	Notes
<b>C-3-1-1 Endorsed by TFB and accepted by the Panel.</b>	NGGIP reports to be endorsed by TFB, and accepted by the Panel.	Status quo.	It has been considered that methodological reports without SPM do not require rigorous approval procedure. In the light of increasing political significance of NGGIP reports, Governments might wish to introduce a more detailed finalisation action by the Panel.
<b>C-3-1-2 Adoption by TFI/WG4.</b>	NGGIP reports to be endorsed by TFB/WG4B, adopted by TFI/WG4 (in plenary) and accepted by the Panel.	This “adoption” process might meet ensure more detailed Governments’ examination of the NGGIP products. Financial implications exist, pending the number of additional meetings required for adoption.	TFI/WG4 and the Panel can be held back to back. Otherwise there are major financial implications of holding an additional meeting in plenary.
<b>C-3-2 Synopsis section to be approved by TFI/WG4.</b>	If a synopsis section (e.g, Introductory Chapter or Executive Summary) is to be prepared for NGGIP methodological reports, TFI/WG4 (in plenary) to	Due to the technical nature of NGGIP’s methodological products, preparation of SPM might not be warranted. Financial implications	TFI/WG4 and the Panel can be held back to back. Otherwise there are major financial implications of holding an additional meeting in

	approve it, and the Panel to accept the whole report.	exist, pending the number of additional meetings required for approval.	plenary.
--	---	---	----------