4th Meeting of the Editorial Board of the
IPCC EMISSION FACTOR DATABASE

10-12 October 2006

Address Cidade Jardim Executive Flat
Sao Paulo, Brazil

Meeting Report

1. The 4th meeting of the IPCC Emission Factor Database (EFDB)) Editorial Board was held on 10-12 October 2006 with the following objectives:

    - To share a common understanding of the role of the EFDB Editorial Board

        i.   Its objectives and responsibilities;
        ii. Its procedures and working practices.

    - To finish evaluation of any pending emission factor proposals

    - To consider strategies for population and improvement of the EFDB including

        i.   To identify and make concrete proposals for data for the EFDB;
        ii.   Cooperation with other organisations;
        iii. To evaluate the development of the database since the 3rd meeting of the Editorial Board, and to discuss EFDB further development;
        iv.   To discuss issues in relation with the procedures to include in the EFDB the new/revised emission factors and parameters contained in the 2006 Guidelines;
        v.   To improve user friendliness.

2. The participants were members of the IPCC EFDB Editorial Board (EB members) and the representative from the UNFCCC secretariat (list of participants attached). The meeting was hosted by Government of Brazil and organised by the Technical Support Unit of the IPCC National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme.

3. The current EB members were selected by the IPCC Task Force Bureau (TFB) on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme at its 16th Session (18 December 2005) on recommendation from their governments/IPCC focal points. This was the first meeting for the new EB members, therefore it was considered important to share a common understanding of the role of the EFDB Editorial Board.

4. The agenda was adopted noting that there would be plenary sessions and sectoral breakout group sessions, and that the EFDB Management Group[1] would meet, if necessary, alongside the meeting[2]. It was also noted that the main activities of sectoral breakout groups should be:

    - To consider outstanding data proposals.
    - To consider concrete actions to actively collect new data for the EFDB.
    - To consider other actions to improve EFDB.

---

[1] The EFDB Management Group consists of the two Editorial Board Co-Chairs, the two TFB Co-Chairs and two members of the TSU. Its role is to provide strategic direction; to give advice and oversight of TSU and EB; to make decisions on database developments; to propose developments; and to publicise EFDB.
[2] There was no question at this session of the EB, which required consideration by the MG.

- To extract default data from the 2006 Guidelines into data input forms (if possible).

5. Tinus Pulles (Netherlands) and Nagmeldin Elhassan (Sudan) were elected Co-Chairs of the new editorial board. They commenced chairing the meeting.

6. Presentations by the TSU covered the aims and objectives of the meeting; the role and responsibilities of the Editorial Board; progress since the 3rd meeting of Editorial Board; on-going development of the EFDB; issues surrounding the incorporation of the default data from the *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*[3]; and identifying new data for the EFDB and publicity.

7. Throughout the meeting (both in plenary sessions and in breakout sessions), the following issues were discussed and concluded:

Requests received to change data records.

- Data from Appendix 3a.3, on Wetlands, of the *Good Practice Guidance for Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry* (*GPG-LULUCF*) were entered into the EFDB as "IPCC default" data. The TSU received an e-mail about these data with suggestion to remove them in view of the nature of "Appendix" in the IPCC Methodology Reports. The TSU requested the EB to evaluate the issue. The EB agreed that these data were not "IPCC default" but should be retained in the EFDB indicating the authors of the Appendix as the source of data.

- The TSU had also received a request for deletion of data records that were submitted by the other experts and already accepted by the EB. The EB considered this issue, and agreed that data in the EFDB should not be deleted (except for errors) but references to alternative data can be included.

Additional sources of data

- Additional sources of data were considered. The EU Emission Trading Scheme (EUETS) was noted as a potential source of data for the EFDB.

- The UNECE/TFEIP had developed a similar EFDB for the Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution (CLRTAP). The EB agreed that links to this database need to be considered. Also, links to other large databases should be considered as an alternative to incorporating large amounts of data.

- It was also noted that the EFDB is publicised through the UNFCCC CGE Training Workshops and participants in those workshops may be a source of data.

- Project activities registered under the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) under the Kyoto Protocol[4] were also found to be a possible source of data for the EFDB.

- It was noted, however, that the data used in EUETS and CDM projects may be conservative and may not be considered as "*good practice*". Therefore due care should be taken when data are input from these sources.

---

[3] The *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories* were adopted/accepted by the IPCC at its 25th Session in Mauritius in April 2006. The electronic files are available through the Internet at: http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/2006gl/index.htm
[4] The information on registered CDM projects is available at http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/registered.html.

- It was deemed important to prioritize data to be found in order to effectively enhance the usefulness of EFDB. In this context, it is useful to identify data gaps by, for example, analyzing geographical distribution of data records currently contained in the EFDB.

Publicity and promotion

- It was agreed that every EB member as well as the TSU should make effort to publicise and promote the EFDB at various occasions.

- The EB requested the TSU to make publicity material (leaflets and posters) available on the web site.

- The importance of incentives for potential data providers to submit data was recognized. One suggestion was to announce successful data proposals and the name of the providers through the "What's new" section in the web site.

- Sectoral breakout groups came up with various suggestions, for example:

  ✓ EB should draft and send a letter to ask industrial trade organizations to provide data/information. Similar letters could be drafted to the appropriate contact(s) for CDM and JI projects.

  ✓ TSU/EFDB co-chairs should contact national bodies who give grants for research in developing countries, and ask them to write submission of data to EFDB into their research priorities (medium to long term).

  ✓ TSU should contact inventory compilers and those at UNFCCC responsible for compiling all inventories – raising awareness, spotting suitable data and asking them to submit it to EFDB.

Consideration of data proposals

- The meeting confirmed the evaluation procedure revised after the 3rd EB meeting. According to that, sectoral groups no longer need a lead member, although the TSU will ask an individual to lead the consideration of data proposals.

- It was agreed that the EB should aim to minimise requests of the data provided to speed up the evaluation process in view of the fact that a significant cause of delay in considering data proposals was waiting for responses form data providers. However, it was recognised this may not always be possible.

- It was also noted that uncertainty assessments can be based on expert judgements.

- Public review of data proposals was not deemed necessary as in most cases the data are already public anyway and have been reviewed (e.g., peer review by a journal) prior to evaluation by the EB.

- Sectoral groups considered all the outstanding proposed data and reached decisions on them all (some of these decisions were pending additional information from data providers). As to those decisions pending additional information from data provides, follow-up actions (i.e., communication with the data providers and final consideration after that) should be taken as early as possible.

Input of default data from 2006 IPCC Guidelines

- The TSU requested each sectoral group to input default data from 2006 IPCC Guidelines into the EFDB input form in expectation that:

  - ✓ The update of EFDB will progress efficiently.

  - ✓ The EB members will get more familiarized with details of EFDB.

  - ✓ The EB will have the chance to examine the EFDB input form and to make suggestions for improvement.

- Three input forms were presented by TSU, namely: Mini-batch input form (in MS-Excel), Off-line single input form (in MS-Excel) and much simpler format prepared for authors of 2006 IPCC Guidelines (in MS-Word). It was agreed that either of the Excel input forms could be used. The Word input form was not found to be adequate because it cannot be directly imported into the EFDB.

- During the course of the work, the EB members came up with various comments aiming to improve the Excel input forms. In consequence, an improved input form (off-line multiple data input form) was developed during the meeting.

- The 3rd EB meeting held in March 2005 had agreed that where the data in 2006 IPCC Guidelines supersedes data from the 1996 IPCC Guidelines or Good Practice Guidance reports, the earlier entries need to be revised to include a note indicating they are "obsolete", "updated" or "revised in 2006 Guidelines" as appropriate. However, concern about political implications on this matter was raised at this meeting, and it was agreed that the words should be reconsidered carefully. (At least, "obsolete" should not be used.)

- The work to input default data from 2006 IPCC Guidelines would be taken over by the TSU, and would be completed in early 2007.

8. The next EB meeting is tentatively scheduled for September 2007. The exact dates and venue will be informed to all the EB members when determined.

Attachment: List of Participants