

29 August 2002

ENGLISH ONLY

UNITED NATIONS FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE

SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE

Seventeenth session

New Delhi, 23–29 October 2002

Item 4 (b) of the provisional agenda

METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES

GUIDELINES UNDER ARTICLES 5, 7 AND 8 OF THE KYOTO PROTOCOL

Views on characteristics of training, subsequent assessment after completion of training and/or other means to ensure competence of experts for participation in expert review teams

Submissions from Parties

1. By its decision 23/CP.7 the Conference of the Parties (COP), at its seventh session, requested the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA), at its seventeenth session, to elaborate the characteristics of the relevant training the subsequent assessment after completion of the training, and/or any other means needed to ensure the necessary competence of experts for participation in expert review teams, and to forward any draft decision on this issue to the Conference of the Parties at its eighth session, with a view to recommending it for adoption by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol at its first session after the entry into force of the Kyoto Protocol (FCCC/CP/2001/13/Add.3).
2. By the same decision, the COP invited Parties to submit their views to the secretariat on this issue, by 15 September 2002, and requested the secretariat to compile these views in a miscellaneous document for consideration by the SBSTA at its seventeenth session. The SBSTA, at its sixteenth session encouraged Parties to submit their views on this matter by 1 August 2002, to facilitate the consideration of this issue at its seventeenth session (FCCC/SBSTA/2002/6, paragraph 24 (m)).
3. The secretariat has received four submissions. In accordance with the procedure for miscellaneous documents, these submissions are attached and reproduced in the language in which they were received and without editing.*

* These submissions have been electronically imported in order to make them available on electronic systems, including the World Wide Web. The secretariat has made every effort to ensure the correct reproduction of the texts as submitted.

Parties making submissions

	Page
1. Canada (on behalf of Canada, Australia, Japan and New Zealand) (Submission received 9 August 2002)	3
2. Denmark (on behalf of the European Community and its member States and Croatia, Czech Republic, Hungary, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia) (Submission received 1 August 2002)	6
3. Myanmar (Submission received 12 August 2002)	8
4. Switzerland (Submission received 3 July 2002)	9

PAPER NO. 1: CANADA
(ON BEHALF OF CANADA, AUSTRALIA, JAPAN AND NEW ZEALAND)

**SUBMISSION ON ASSESSMENT AND TRAINING OF EXPERTS FOR PARTICIPATION IN
EXPERT REVIEW TEAMS UNDER ARTICLE 8 OF THE KYOTO PROTOCOL**

Introduction

In accordance with Decisions 23/C.P.7, as elaborated by FCCC/SBSTA/2002/L.6, Parties were invited to submit their views on characteristics of the relevant training, the subsequent assessment after completion of training, and/or any other means needed to ensure the necessary competence of experts for participation in expert review teams under Article 8 of the Kyoto Protocol.

Canada, along with Australia, Japan and New Zealand are pleased to provide views on these issues. We believe that transparent and rigorous procedures for assessing and training experts will promote the consistency, comparability, impartiality and overall integrity of the expert review process under Article 8 of the Kyoto Protocol. As we view this submission as being, in part, an extension of an earlier submission on terms of service for lead reviewers of expert review teams (ERT), these two submissions should be read in conjunction with one another.

This submission provides specific comments on the requisite competences of experts, the assessment of those competences, and any necessary training. It concludes with some views on timing issues.

Competences of ERT members and Lead Reviewers

The competences required of Expert Review Team members, in their collectivity, to perform a review under Article 8 are contained in paragraphs 29 and 30 of the Annex to draft decision -/CMP.1 (Article 8). We would note, however, that these paragraphs only make reference to the areas in which competence is required and fall short of providing guidance on the requisite level of competence itself. We believe that in order to properly elaborate training and assessment characteristics, it will be essential to have a gauge of minimum competence requirements for ERT members, including qualifications and experience. This will provide a clear objective for those undergoing training and clear criteria to undertake assessments and thereby promote the consistency, comparability, impartiality and overall integrity of the expert review process.

In that regard, we recall our submission on terms of service for lead reviewers. That submission elaborated minimum competence requirements for lead reviewers, including in relation to areas of technical expertise contained in paragraph 29. We believe that the minimum competence requirements we have proposed for lead reviewers in relation to technical expertise can apply equally to ERT members. Consistent with their role, however, ERT members should not need to demonstrate additional competences in the tasks unique to the position of lead reviewer, such as extensive management experience and sufficient degree of fluency in the English language.

Assessment of Competences

We believe that an assessment of competences should be undertaken as part of an initial selection process as well as following the completion of any necessary training.

The initial assessment should evaluate candidates against a set of qualifications consistent with their requisite competence. The assessment could be undertaken by the Secretariat and be comprised of two parts:

Part I would be an assessment required of all expert candidates to the ERT and would test technical competence in each of the areas of review under paragraph 29. For the periodic review, competences in areas under paragraph 30 would also be assessed. To facilitate the assessment process and as part of the process of nomination to the UNFCCC roster of experts, candidates nominated by Parties would be required to provide information relating to their primary area of competence, academic achievements and work experience relevant to that area. The UNFCCC roster of experts may need to be updated to accommodate the provision of such information.

Quantitative and qualitative criteria could be developed by the Secretariat to ensure that the assessment procedure promotes objectivity. For example, the academic background test could stipulate a requirement for a university degree in a specific discipline or disciplines. The experience test could include a requirement to have been part of the preparation and review of a given number of relevant reports under either the Convention or the Protocol. Such criteria may need to be periodically revised as experience is gained in their use.

As applied skills such as knowledge base and ability may be difficult to assess solely on the basis of information provide in the nomination form to the UNFCCC roster of experts, we look forward to exploring with other Parties whether other assessment mechanisms need to be utilized. For example, Parties may also be able to assist the process by providing their own assessment of their nominated candidates, including views on any training that may be required. During the assessment process, an exam employing case study exercises to simulate competence application in an Article 8 review setting and/or personal interviews conducted by the Secretariat could be utilized.

Part II would be an additional assessment required only of candidates vying for the position of lead reviewer and would test competence in those elements unique to the position of lead reviewer. Qualitative and quantitative criteria for lead reviewers could also be developed by the Secretariat to assess these competences. To minimize the number of Part II assessments required, Parties could be required to indicate which nominated experts they want to have considered for a lead reviewer position.

If Part I or Part II of the assessment finds that the candidate does not meet the necessary qualifications, the Secretariat should provide a written explanation to the candidate indicating why the candidate does not meet the qualifications and to recommend the nature and extent of training deemed necessary to pass the assessment.

The subsequent assessment following the completion of training should focus on assessing those areas for which training was deemed necessary in the initial assessment. Where candidates were involved in on-the-job training, lead reviewers who had overseen the candidates' training and performance could assist in the assessment process.

Training

We believe that training for experts should focus on enhancing existing skills to ensure comparable levels of competence across experts. Training should not concern itself with imparting skills where they are absent. There are also certain expertise gaps that training will not be able to fill such as university degrees, sufficient language capabilities and years of relevant experience. For this reason, we believe that training should concern itself principally with enhancing the skills of ERT members and lead reviewers in the technical areas listed in paragraphs 29 and 30.

In that regard we believe that the training program should be a specialized one, tailored to the specific area where the candidate was deemed lacking suitable skill during the initial assessment. The curriculum for the program would include all UNFCCC and IPCC guidelines relevant to that particular area and could be supported by a training manual summarizing all of the relevant guidelines in a clear and concise manner, with exercises in their application. The training manual would also facilitate independent study by experts in their home country, but this may need to be augmented by a short course in a central location. Given the range of technical areas under paragraphs 29 and 30, several manuals/courses may need to be developed. Only one manual/course should be developed for each specific area to promote consistency across trainees.

On-the-job training, such as participation in centralized review, should also be utilized where possible.

We would also be interested in exploring with other Parties the utility of a general training program for all experts, irrespective of performance on the initial assessment. By providing an overview of all UNFCCC and IPCC guidelines, general training would ensure that experts have an appreciation of the larger review process outside their designated areas of expertise. This could be supplemented by a general reference manual and/or short course, but would not have a testing component.

Recognizing that the assessment and training of experts will carry with it financial implications, we look forward to exploring with other Parties potential funding sources as well as means to promote the efficiency of the process. Synergies with Decisions 2/CP.7 and 3/CP.7 (capacity building) should also be explored.

Conclusion

As Parties seek to further elaborate characteristics of training and assessment of experts, we believe it is important to bear in mind that these will need to be consistent with the emerging competences required of experts. In that regard, we note that the specific competences related to assigned amount information and registries are still somewhat uncertain, given outstanding negotiations on reporting, review and, specific to the case of registries, technical standards and any necessary subsequent work. Methodologies related to adjustments under Article 5.2 as well as IPCC LULUCF Good Practice are also outstanding. With that in mind, we believe that Parties should focus their efforts initially on establishing a framework for training and assessment. Any subsequent work dealing with the development of specific competence testing or training procedures should reflect the status of the negotiations on the relevant area within the UNFCCC and/or IPCC. It will be important to complete the entire package of procedures relating training and assessment in a few years time, recognizing that some Parties who have ratified the Protocol may choose to submit their pre-commitment period report for review under Article 8 prior to January 1, 2007.

PAPER NO. 2: DENMARK
(ON BEHALF OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY AND ITS MEMBER STATES AND
CROATIA, CZECH REPUBLIC, HUNGARY, LITHUANIA, POLAND, SLOVAKIA
AND SLOVENIA)

VIEWS ON CHARACTERISTICS OF TRAINING, SUBSEQUENT ASSESSMENT AND/OR OTHER
MEANS TO ENSURE COMPETENCE OF EXPERTS FOR PARTICIPATION IN
EXPERT REVIEW TEAMS

Denmark on behalf of the European Community and its Member States and Croatia, Czech Republic, Hungary, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia welcomes the opportunity to send views on characteristics of training, subsequent assessment and/or other means to ensure competence of experts for participation in expert review teams.

The views of the EU and Croatia, Czech Republic, Hungary, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia build upon the experience gained from participation in reviews of national communications and especially from participation in technical reviews of annual inventories during the trial period for assessing the existing reporting and review guidelines on annual inventories. Regarding the latter, the EU and Croatia, Czech Republic, Hungary, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia stresses the importance of the discussions at the expert meeting on the methodological and operational aspects of the reporting and review guidelines held in Bonn, in December 4-6 2001; the conclusions by SBSTA, at its sixteenth session, on revisions to the guidelines for the preparation of national communications by Parties included in Annex I to the Convention, part I: UNFCCC reporting guidelines on annual inventories; and revisions to the UNFCCC guidelines for the technical review of greenhouse gas inventories from Parties included in Annex I to the Convention (FCCC/SBSTA/2002/L.5 and its Add.1 and Add.2).

The EU and Croatia, Czech Republic, Hungary, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia believes that the thoroughness and comprehensiveness of the technical assessment depends to a large extent on the level of expertise of the members of the Expert Review Teams. This submission includes several proposals to increase and check the competence of those experts, which have been nominated by Parties to the roster of experts.

Training

The EU and Croatia, Czech Republic, Hungary, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia believes that a specific training programme for inventory review should be developed with the objective of training experts in the use of 1996 IPCC guidelines for inventory preparation and IPCC Good Practice Guidance for annual inventories, and training in the use of the UNFCCC reporting guidelines on annual inventories and UNFCCC guidelines for the technical review of greenhouse gas inventories.

The training programme should provide an in-depth understanding of IPCC methodologies and should focus on specific problems for inventory preparations (e.g. double counting, recalculations to achieve consistent time series), as well as on verification procedures (e.g. comparison of reference approach and sectoral approach). The training programme should provide knowledge with regard to the general approach of inventory preparation and reporting, and could be selective with regard to the main sectors where experts seek training, i.e. not all experts need to train on all IPCC sectors, but training should be related to their general experience.

The training programme should be web-based and available on CD-rom in order to be accessible to as many experts in different countries as possible.

The web-based training programme should be generally open to all interested experts who feel the need to improve their knowledge on greenhouse gas inventories.

In addition to the web-based training programme, training seminars could be held, as appropriate, where experienced inventory reviewers (or experts preparing inventories) are involved in the training of new experts. Experts for the seminar should be selected on the basis of their general expertise in inventory preparation, or in areas related to at least one IPCC sector. In addition, sufficient knowledge of English should be another prerequisite for participation in the seminars. One seminar per training cycle may be sufficient, but it seems premature to fix the numbers or the time of the seminars at this stage.

Another training option besides the seminars could be that experts who have passed the web-based training programme could assist the centralised review process as “observers”.

At the end of each training cycle feedback from the experts trained and/or assessed should be gained as an important element of quality assessment and quality control of the training process. The feedback should be evaluated systematically and, if necessary, future training cycles should be adapted on the basis of this evaluation.

Assessment of competence

Experts wanting to participate in review activities should pass the web-based training programme, the seminar(s), and a test at the end of the web-based training programme that assesses if training objectives were achieved. Such a test could, for example, be performed as a review of a certain “constructed” inventory sector where problems are included that have to be identified by the experts. In general, the test should focus on the knowledge with regard to IPCC and UNFCCC guidelines and good practice. The test could qualify for participation in expert review teams.

New experts

New experts who pass the training programme test should always be accompanied by an experienced review expert when they perform their first inventory review under the UNFCCC. The first review should be a centralised review because this review approach provides sufficient possibilities for exchange with other experts and - as several inventories are reviewed at the same time – provides a good overview of problems that may occur. Participation in reviews seems to be an efficient tool for training experts in new issues regarding reporting and accounting.

Experienced experts

Review experts who pass the training programme, including the seminars and the test, should participate as teaching experts in subsequent training seminars for other experts, after they have gained some experience as reviewers.

Experienced experts should regularly be asked to provide feedback or input to the training programme.

The training programme and its budget implications

The UNFCCC secretariat should develop a proposal for a training programme including the characteristics mentioned above and the related budget implications for such a programme.

PAPER NO. 3: MYANMAR

VIEWS ON CHARACTERISTICS OF TRAINING SUBSEQUENT ASSESSMENT AFTER
COMPLETION OF TRAINING AND/OR ANY OTHER MEANS TO ENSURE COMPETENCE OF
EXPERTS FOR PARTICIPATION IN EXPERT REVIEW TEAMS

Regular trainings and ad hoc trainings are unavoidable parts of the UNFCCC. International Environmental Studies/Universities should be encouraged to cosponsor the conduct regular trainings and UNFCCC can arrange ad hoc trainings to develop younger generations in various centres.

PAPER NO. 4: SWITZERLAND

TRAINING OF REVIEW EXPERTS

In response to the invitation contained in decision 23/CP.7, Switzerland submits the following views on means to ensure competence of experts for participation in expert review teams.

1. Switzerland reaffirms the great importance it attributes to the competence of ERTs in assessing information submitted for review by Parties and in safeguarding the credible implementation of the Kyoto Protocol.
2. The means provided to ensure competence of experts for participation in expert review teams should serve two main purposes: 1) to assure the availability of experts, to facilitate broad participation in the review process, and to promote consistency of reviews across Parties; 2) to assure the high quality of reviews taking into account any relevant guidelines and other guidance from the Convention bodies to review experts. Training should serve the first purpose while the subsequent assessment should serve the second purpose.
3. Regarding the focus of training offered, in a first phase, priority should be given to areas related to compliance with Article 3.1 of the Kyoto Protocol as well as needs identified by the Secretariat relating to lack of competence and/or experts for specific areas of the GHG inventory review. Other areas of review should be integrated in the training programme as soon as feasible.
4. The option to undergo training should be open to any expert officially nominated to the Roster of experts by a Party. Available funding for non-Annex II Party experts should be allocated in order to assure balanced representation of experts in line with the agreed provisions regarding the composition of ERTs.
5. Training may make use of decentralized or individualized means of education (e.g. on-line courses, work units for self-study) but should include at least one centralized meeting of participants, e.g., in conjunction with the assessment following completion of the training course.
6. Notwithstanding previous experience in the review process, and in line with footnote 5 relating to paragraph 24 of the guidelines for review under Article 8 of the Kyoto Protocol as contained in document FCCC/CP/2001/13/Add.3, all experts wishing to participate in review team activities should have successfully undergone an assessment of their skills in order to assure a common minimum standard of expertise. This assessment should take place before or as soon as practicable after the Kyoto Protocol has entered into force. Expert assessments should always take place in a centralized examination context.
7. Assessment of competence should be based, to the extent possible, on case studies that correspond to real life review situations. Experienced experts should oversee the standards applied in the assessment of experts.
8. Feedback from those participating in the training and/or assessment process should be gained and systematically evaluated as an element of quality assessment and quality control.
9. Development of training modules should be initiated under the supervision of the Secretariat as soon as practicable with a view to starting training activities on a trial basis in 2003 and assessing first experience no later than 2005. This assessment should be based on, i.a., submissions from Parties,

feedback from experts participating in or overseeing the training and assessment process, and experience gained by the Secretariat.

10. The training and assessment of experts should be under the supervision of the Secretariat and the guidance of the COP/MOP.
