



MRVA Peer-review 2014

High level findings and key outputs

Edoardo TURANO
Rob GEMMILL

**5th EU ETS Compliance Conference,
Brussels, 7 November 2014**

Motivation for peer reviews

- *Article 21 (3) of the EU ETS Directive:*
 - The Commission shall organise an exchange of information between the competent authorities of the Member States [...]
- *Article 21 report: focussed "one way" information*
- *WG3, TWGs:*
 - Good for exchanging views, but not always focussed on specific MRVA implementation issues
- *Compliance Cycle Review:*
 - Scrutiny by Commission, no free exchange of experience
- *An additional mechanism for Member States (and the Commission) to improve and learn from each other would be useful*

History

- *Pilot peer-reviews 2011 - Conclusions:*
 - Success due to mutual trust, mutual learning and cooperative atmosphere
 - Allows the sharing of best practices and increase in harmonisation, creating constructive discussions
 - Recommended to define objectives, scope, duration, criteria
- *New project commissioned for 2014*

Objectives of the 2014 peer-reviews

- *Mutual learning and sharing best practices (“How to do it correctly and more efficiently”)*
- *Foster common understanding of EU ETS implementation between ETS users.*
- *Provide recommendations to the host country*
- *Peer-reviewers gain insight to host countries’ best practices*
- *Collect best practices from participants to be disseminated*
- *Set-up a methodology to be used for future peer-reviews*
- *Contribute to harmonised implementation across EU ETS countries*

Peer reviews carried out

- *July 2014: Preparatory workshop at SEPA*
- *July 2014: Host: UK / Scottish EPA ("SEPA")*
 - Review team: BE, BG, DE, IT, NL
 - Observer: Compliance Forum M&R TF Manager
 - Coordinator: Umweltbundesamt
- *September 2014: Host: Portugal*
 - Review team: BG, DE, IT, NL, UK
 - Observer: DG CLIMA
 - Coordinator: Umweltbundesamt

Other ways of MS involvement

- *Discussion of the project in WG3*
 - January 2014
 - May 2014
- *Methodology sent out to TWG for comments*
 - May 2014
- *Webinar (virtual TWG meeting)*
 - September 2014
- *Presentation at Compliance Conference*
 - November 2014

Peer review experience – Highlights

- *Interesting and lively discussions*
- *Everybody contributed, and everybody at some time got new information / ideas*
- *Both host countries showed impressive quality of MRVA implementation*
- *Approaches often similar in MS*
- *Different approaches may lead to similar results*

Some Best practices identified (UK/SEPA)

- *IT system as a useful tool to increase:*
 - Efficiency for CAs
 - Harmonisation among CAs
 - Completeness and timeliness of operators submissions
- *Internal "peer review" system (4-eyes principle) applied by SEPA staff (MP and AER assessment etc.)*
- *Legal obligation to share emissions report data with inventory people*
- *Regular meetings among CAs, meetings with operators and verifiers*
- *Clear assignment of a coordinator for tasks which involve several CAs (e.g. Article 21 reporting)*

Some Best practices identified (PT)

- *Distribution of sectors to experts; regular internal meetings to ensure harmonised approaches to cross-cutting issues*
- *Close connection between experts and operators (operators know whom to contact on certain issues)*
- *On-site inspections: Training program for inspectors given by the ETS team;*
- *Feedback on inspection report findings to operator*
- *Good cooperation between CA and NAB*

Useful input for future work

- *Peer reviews highlighted some issues where still more guidance (or FAQs) could be useful, e.g.:*
 - Guidance for CRF category reporting
 - Some clarification of VR template Annexes
 - Article 21 explanatory note to be updated and improved
 - Possible improvements to the user-friendliness of the Article 21 reporting tool?
 - Guidance on site inspections
 - Add labels in reporting templates for indicating the need for confidentiality

Overall feedback

- *The hosts, the review teams, and the Webinar's participants (16 MS) agreed on usefulness and successful implementation of the peer reviews*
- *Webinar participants also agreed that peer reviews should become a regularly established common practice in the future*
- *However, on the methodology document, more feedback would be desirable*

Open issues for future peer review

- *Difficulty to get host MS to volunteer*
 - Should participation become mandatory?
 - Identify hosts by “need”, e.g. as follow-up to Article 21 reporting?
 - Or define a sequence in which MS will (have to) be the host?
 - For some MS a more formal (written) invitation would be helpful
 - Should the mutual learning effect be even more advertised? (e.g. by avoiding the word “review” → “in-country visit”)

Open issues for future peer review (2)

- *Finding volunteers for the peer review expert team is slightly easier than finding hosts*
 - **Webinar participants agreed that remuneration of *at least* travel costs would be helpful**
- *Difficult to find a volunteer for lead reviewer*
 - **Main argument: Workload of preparing report**
 - **Coordinator stepped in**
- *Webinar participants agreed that the existence of a "coordinator" is considered essential – could that be a role for the Compliance Forum?*

Open issues for future peer review (3)

- *For reducing the resource requirements, a system of "peer review light" could be created:*
 - One-day reviews with reduced scope (focus on fewer topics); or
 - Without meeting in the concerned MS, but e.g. in Brussels back-to-back with other meetings
 - (Even) stronger emphasis on mutual learning → could be e.g. organised as break-out session in compliance conference (as annual "*jour fixe* of mutual learning")

Summary and next steps

- *Overwhelming support of peer reviews for the EU ETS in general – however, further ways of increasing participation to be explored*
- *Methodology documents by the consultants appreciated – one more round of comments by MS for refinement envisaged*
- *DG CLIMA is encouraged to further facilitate this instrument – all your contributions welcome!*

Thank you for your attention

Contact:

Robert.Gemmill@ec.europa.eu

Edoardo.Turano@ec.europa.eu

Consultant contact:

Hubert.Fallmann@umweltbundesamt.at