

Final report of the 2012 technical
review of the greenhouse gas emission
inventory of The Netherlands
to support the determination of annual emission
allocations under Decision 406/2009/EC

17 August 2012

Reference: DG CLIMA.C.1/SER/2011/0019

Umweltbundesamt GmbH
Spittelauer Lände 5
1090 Vienna
Austria

Content

Introduction	3
Review Objectives	3
Review approach and scope	4
ESD 2012 technical review conclusions	5
Table 1. Main conclusions from the TERT	5
Statement from The Netherlands on the conclusions of the TERT	5
Table 2. Summary of national totals, including any revised estimates or technical corrections identified during the review	6
Annex 1 – Recommendations, revised estimates and technical corrections	7
Table 3. Recommendations of the TERT	7
Annex 2 – Detailed technical corrections	15
Annex 3 – Checks and tests completed	16
Annex 4 – Correspondence references.....	18

Introduction

Pursuant to Article 3.2 of Decision 406/2009/EC⁽¹⁾ (the 'Effort Sharing Decision' – ESD), the European Commission shall determine the annual emission allocations (maximum allowed greenhouse gas emissions) of Member States for the period from 2013 to 2020 in tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂ eq.), using reviewed and verified emission data.

Complete sets of greenhouse gas (GHG) emission estimates for the reference years (2005, 2008, 2009 and 2010) were submitted by each Member State by the 15th of May, 2012 as part of the 2012 national inventory submission under Decision 280/2004/EC (the 'Monitoring Mechanism Decision' – MMD). These estimates must have been reviewed to allow the determination in 2012 of the annual emission allocations for the period from 2013 to 2020.

The 'Guidelines for the 2012 technical review of greenhouse gas emission inventories to support the determination of Member States' annual emission allocations under Decision 406/2009/EC' were endorsed by the Climate Change Committee on 19 May 2011 and published as a European Commission Staff Working Document on 26 April 2012⁽²⁾. The 2012 greenhouse gas emission inventory of The Netherlands was reviewed in accordance with these guidelines.

This report presents the findings of the 2012 technical review of the greenhouse gas emission inventory of The Netherlands to support the determination of annual emission allocations under Decision 406/2009/EC.

Review Objectives

The purpose of the technical review of Member States' GHG inventories is to support the determination of the annual emission allocations by:

- a) ensuring that the European Commission has accurate, reliable and verified information on annual GHG emissions for the years 2005, 2008, 2009 and 2010 to determine the annual emission allocations under Decision 280/2004/EC;
- b) providing the European Commission and its Member States with a consistent, transparent, thorough and comprehensive technical assessment of GHG emissions, with a focus on data for the years 2005, 2008, 2009 and 2010 reported in 2012;
- c) examining, in a facilitative and open manner, the reported inventory information for consistency with the 'Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories', with the 2000 'Good Practice Guidance and Uncertainty Management in National Greenhouse Gas Inventories', and with the requirements of Decision 280/2004/EC (the 'Greenhouse Gas Monitoring Mechanism' Decision)⁽³⁾;

⁽¹⁾ Decision No 406/2009/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 April 2009 on the effort of Member States to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions to meet the Community's greenhouse gas emission reduction commitments up to 2020. OJ L 140, 5.06.2009, p. 136.

⁽²⁾ Commission Staff Working Document of 26 April 2012: Guidelines for the 2012 technical review of greenhouse gas emission inventories to support the determination of Member States' annual emission allocations under Decision 406/2009/EC. SWD(2012) 107 final.

⁽³⁾ Decision No 280/2004/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 February 2004 concerning a mechanism for monitoring Community greenhouse gas emissions and for implementing the Kyoto protocol. OJ L 140, 5.06.2009, p. 136.

- d) assisting Member States in improving the quality of their GHG inventories.

Review approach and scope

The technical review of the 2012 GHG inventory estimates of The Netherlands for the years 2005, 2008, 2009 and 2010 was performed by a Technical Expert Review Team (TERT) under service contract 2011/S 234-378130 to the Directorate General for Climate Action of the European Commission. The review was conducted by the following experts: Kristien Aernouts & Tomas Gustafson for Stationary combustion (CRF categories 1.A.1, 1.A.2, 1.A.4, 1.A.5) + Reference approach; Maria Liden & Tinus Pulles for CRF categories 1.A.3 Transport + 1.C International bunkers; Ralph Harthan & John Watterson for CRF category 1.B Fugitive; Anke Herold & Ils Moorkens for CRF categories 2.A Mineral products + 2.B Chemical industry + CRF sector 3 Solvents; Kristina Saarinen & Dusan Vacha for CRF categories 2.C Metal production + 2.D Other production + 2.G Other; Maria Jose Lopez & Karin Kindbom for CRF categories 2.E Production of Halocarbons and SF₆ + 2.F Consumption of Halocarbons and SF₆; Michael Anderl & Steen Gyldenkaerne for CRF categories 4.A Enteric fermentation + 4.B Manure management; Sorin Deaconu & Etienne Mathias for CRF categories 4.C Rice cultivation + 4.D Agricultural soils, 4.E Prescribed burning of savannas, 4.F Field burning of agricultural residues; Juraj Farkas & Celine Gueguen for CRF sector 6 Waste. Ole-Kenneth Nielsen, Suvi Monni, Klaus Radunsky and Tatiana Tugui acted as lead reviewers. The review was coordinated by Bernd Gugele and Justin Goodwin. The TERT acknowledges the support of the EEA review secretariat Martin Adams, Francois Dejean and Melanie Sporer.

This technical review was performed on the basis of GHG emission data and the national inventory report (NIR) officially reported by Member States by the 15th of April, 2012 under the MMD. Resubmissions reported by Member States were taken into account until the 15th of May, consistent with the reporting practice for resubmissions under Decision 280/2004/EC. Emissions from international transport and land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF) were not reviewed. The review was performed with a focus on data for the years 2005, 2008, 2009 and 2010, reported in 2012.

The technical review process for GHG inventories comprised three stages, each of which considered different aspects of the inventories in such a way that the purposes described above were achieved by the end of the process. The three stages were:

- Stage 1, completed by 15 April 2012 – initial completeness checks of each Member State GHG inventory (submitted by 15 January and by 15 March);
- Stage 2, completed by 15 April 2012 – initial consistency and comparability checks of each Member State GHG inventory (submitted by 15 January and by 15 March);
- Stage 3, to be completed by the end of August 2012 – detailed *technical review* of each Member State GHG inventory (submitted by 15 May).

The detailed timeline of the review, including a summary of the correspondence with The Netherlands, is presented in Annex 3.

ESD 2012 technical review conclusions

Table 1. Main conclusions from the TERT

Findings
1. The TERT considers that the GHG emission inventory estimates of The Netherlands for the years 2005, 2008, 2009 and 2010 submitted in 2012 under the MMD do not include emission overestimates .
2. The TERT identified inconsistency issues between the reported GHG emission inventory estimates and verified emission data under the EU ETS. However, those inconsistencies do not result in overestimates.
3. During the course of the technical review, the TERT did not receive any revised GHG emission inventory estimate from The Netherlands in response to its initial findings.
4. The TERT suggests that it is not necessary to implement any technical correction to the GHG emission inventory estimates and to amend the reported GHG total.
5. As stated beneath Table 1, The Netherlands accepts the aggregated GHG emission inventory estimates presented in Table 2.
6. The TERT identified non-binding recommendations for improvements of The Netherlands' GHG inventory (see Table 3 in Annex 1) which were accepted by the Netherlands.
7. The TERT considers that it received a response from The Netherlands that was sufficient in order to undertake the review appropriately.

Statement from The Netherlands on the conclusions of the TERT

The Netherlands agrees with the TERT's conclusions and accepts the aggregated GHG emission inventory estimates presented in Table 2.

The Netherlands envisage to use the TERT's observations to improve the NIR 2013.

Table 2. Summary of national totals, including any revised estimates or technical corrections identified during the review

Data / Category	Reference	Status of GHG emission revision or correction	2005 Gg CO ₂ eq.	2008 Gg CO ₂ eq.	2009 Gg CO ₂ eq.	2010 Gg CO ₂ eq.
Total GHG emissions as reported in the 2012 submission under the MMD	14 April 2012, NLD-2012-v1.1 (generated 5 April 2012)		210 963.697	204 568.960	198 931.065	210 053.016
Total GHG emissions including any accepted revised estimate received from The Netherlands and/or technical correction as proposed by the TERT			210 963.697	204 568.960	198 931.065	210 053.016
CO₂ emissions from 1.A.3.a Civil aviation	14 April 2012, NLD-2012-v1.1 (generated 5 April 2012)		41.083	41.083	41.083	41.083

Note: National totals exclude emissions from LULUCF and emissions reported under memo items (e.g. international aviation and maritime transport).

Annex 1 – Recommendations, revised estimates and technical corrections

Table 3. Recommendations of the TERT

Key category	Gas, fuel, activity	Observation	Recommendation	Revised estimate ⁽⁴⁾	Technical correction ⁽⁵⁾
Yes	1.A.3.b. Road transportation Gaseous 2008–2009	Emissions from natural gas used for road transport are only partially included in CRF 1.A.3.b., while most of these emissions are included in CRF 1.A.4.a. According to information from the Netherlands in response to a question raised by the TERT, Statistics Netherlands (CBS) is working on a new time series for natural gas in road transport, which will be reported in the NIR 2013.	The TERT recommends that the Netherlands continues with efforts to separate the use of natural gas for road transport and stationary combustion, develops a complete and consistent time series for emissions from natural gas used for road transport and reports accordingly.	No	No
No	Energy: Feedstocks and non-energy use of fuels CO ₂ /Liquid, Solid 2005–2010	The Netherlands uses the same value for fraction stored (0.78) for almost all liquid fuels in CRF 1.A.d. (non-energy use of fuels and feedstocks), with no reference provided in the NIR. In addition, the NIR does not explain where the remaining 22 % of the liquid fuels are allocated (i.e. to what industry) and how its emissions are calculated.	The TERT recommends that the Netherlands provides information on how the fraction stored values are derived and where the remaining fuel is allocated to, especially for natural gas liquids, other petroleum products, residual fuel oil and bitumen.	No	No
No	Energy: Comparison RA	The Netherlands does not report apparent consumption (excluding feedstocks and non-energy	The TERT recommends that the Netherlands reports apparent consumption (excluding feedstocks and non-	No	No

⁴ The GHG emission estimate for this category was revised by The Netherlands during the technical review.

⁵ The GHG emission estimate for this category is subject to a technical correction proposal by the TERT.

Key category	Gas, fuel, activity	Observation	Recommendation	Revised estimate ⁽⁴⁾	Technical correction ⁽⁵⁾
	versus SA	use of fuels) in the CRF table 1.A(c).	energy use of fuels) in the CRF table 1.A(c).		
No	2.A.7.a. Glass production CO ₂ 2005–2010	From the description in the NIR it is not clear whether the methodology used for CO ₂ emissions from glass production took into account that glass makers usually use a certain amount of recycled scrap glass (cullet), which should be subtracted in the emission estimation independent of the methodological tier as this fraction does not cause CO ₂ emissions. The NIR only states that gross glass production was used as input data. During the review it was not clarified whether the estimation was corrected because of the fact that a portion of recycled glass (cullet) is likely to be used in the glass manufacturing process. However, the IEF used is still considerably lower than the default EF from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. Therefore, no technical correction was applied. In addition, the monitoring protocols available at www.agentschapnl.nl explain this issue in a satisfactory way.	The TERT recommends that the Netherlands clarifies in the NIR whether the methodology used for CO ₂ emissions from glass production took into account that glass makers usually use a certain amount of recycled scrap glass (cullet), which should be subtracted in the emission estimation.	No	No
No	2.A.7.a. Glass production CO ₂ 2005–2010	From the description in the NIR (page 73f) it is not clear which sector's emissions are reported under 2.A.3. limestone and dolomite use and whether there is a potential double-counting with the emissions from glass production under 2.A.7. There was no further information provided. However, the 'Monitoring Protocol: Other process emissions and product consumption emissions of CO ₂ , N ₂ O (direct and indirect) and CH ₄ ' for this inventory estimation, which	The TERT recommends that the Netherlands adds further information from the monitoring protocol in the NIR related to the coverage of the source category 2.A.3. and the estimation methodologies used.	No	No

Key category	Gas, fuel, activity	Observation	Recommendation	Revised estimate ⁽⁴⁾	Technical correction ⁽⁵⁾
		is available online, explains this issue. According to the monitoring protocol an underestimation is more likely than a double-counting of emissions.			
Yes	2.B.1. Ammonia production CO ₂ 2005–2010	For Ammonia production, the NIR, page 77, states that ‘Only prompt process emissions from the ammonia/urea production are included in this source category.’ The additional document from Hurman 2006a provided to the TERT states that: ‘The storage factor is determined by dividing the carbon stored in the produced urea by the carbon content of the natural gas used as feedstock’ (page 20). It is not in line with the Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines to account for the carbon stored in urea and to subtract these amounts from ammonia production (Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines, page 216: ‘The CO ₂ from ammonia production may be used for producing urea or dry ice. This carbon will only be stored for a short time. Therefore, no account should consequently be taken for intermediate binding of CO ₂ in downstream manufacturing processes and products.’). Thus, it seems that in the Dutch estimation the carbon stored in urea is subtracted from the CO ₂ emissions from ammonia production, which results in an underestimation of emissions.	The TERT recommends that the Netherlands does not subtract the CO ₂ emissions used for urea production from the emissions from ammonia production, and should correct the estimation accordingly if such subtraction has been made.	No	No
Yes	2.B.1. Ammonia production CO ₂	The reporting of the key category CO ₂ emissions from ammonia production is not transparent. No additional confidential information was provided during the	The TERT recommends that the Netherlands checks the reported emissions from ammonia production in the inventory with the verified emissions reported for	No	No

Key category	Gas, fuel, activity	Observation	Recommendation	Revised estimate ⁽⁴⁾	Technical correction ⁽⁵⁾
	2005–2010	review week. However, other independent estimates for this source category that were conducted in another project point to an underestimation of emissions from ammonia production and not to an overestimation.	the allocation of EU allowances in the third phase of the EU ETS.		
Yes	2.B.5. Other (chemical industry) CO ₂	For ethylene oxide production only capacity data are available. Therefore, a default capacity utilisation rate of 86 % is used to estimate CO ₂ emissions (based on Neelis et al., 2005). Other data sources show strongly varying production levels, e.g. periodic shut-downs of the plants, and that the assumption of a constant production level is incorrect. Nevertheless, other data sources for ethylene production do not indicate an overestimation of emissions. Therefore, no technical correction was performed.	The TERT recommends that the Netherlands checks the reported emissions from ethylene production with the verified emissions reported for the allocation of EU ETS allowances in the third EU ETS phase and, if possible, also verifies the calculation with the ethylene production reported to EUROSTAT for the Prodcum database.	No	No
Yes	2.B.5. Other (chemical industry) CO ₂ All years	No transparent methodological descriptions including data sources used, AD and EFs used are provided in the NIR for the source categories related to petrochemical production – neither in the energy nor the IP sector. During the review, the Netherlands explained that in the 2.B.5. category the emissions from manufacturing of basic chemicals, graphite and ethylene production are reported. The related activity data come from the Dutch energy statistics and are earmarked as feedstocks. Combustion emissions from the above activities are reported in 1.AA.2C. The total energy use, which forms the basis for the estimates of the	The TERT recommends that the Netherlands improves on the transparency of the method used to achieve consistent reporting of emissions from petrochemical feedstocks.	No	No

Key category	Gas, fuel, activity	Observation	Recommendation	Revised estimate ⁽⁴⁾	Technical correction ⁽⁵⁾
		emissions reported under 1.AA.2C and 2.B.5., corresponds to the energy use for the chemical industry as reported in the energy statistics. Use of this consistent dataset prevents under- or overestimations. As chemicals production will be included under the EU ETS in the future, the Netherlands should have verified emissions available from the initial allocation under the EU ETS that should be of higher quality than the current inventory estimate.			
Yes	2.B.5. Other (chemical industry) CO ₂ All years	The Dutch NIR, page 80, states: 'Industrial gases: CO ₂ emissions are estimated based on the use of fuels (mainly natural gas) as chemical feedstock. An oxidation fraction of 20% is assumed, based on reported data in environmental reports from the relevant facilities.' This storage factor could not be further confirmed during the review.	The TERT recommends that the Netherlands provides additional information in the NIR how the oxidation fraction of 20 % has been derived.	No	No
Yes	2.B.5. Other CO ₂ 2005–2010	The reporting of the key category CO ₂ emissions under 2.B.5. Other – Other chemical industry (432 Gg CO ₂ in 2010) is not transparent. The NIR very roughly describes on page 80 which categories are included and provides some assumptions, while the CRF uses Confidential for AD and EFs. No additional confidential information was provided during the review week. However, other independent estimates for this source category conducted in another project point at an underestimation of emissions in category 2.B.5. and not to an overestimation.	The TERT recommends that the Netherlands checks the reported emissions from the chemical industry in the inventory with the verified emissions reported for the allocation of EU ETS allowances in the third EU ETS phase.	No	No

Key category	Gas, fuel, activity	Observation	Recommendation	Revised estimate ⁽⁴⁾	Technical correction ⁽⁵⁾
Yes	2.B.5. Other N ₂ O 2008, 2009, 2010	For 2.B.5. caprolactam production decreased by 48 % during 2004 and 2008, emissions increased by 25 % in 2008–2009 and by 13 % in 2009–2010. During the technical review, the Netherlands explained that emission fluctuations during the period 2003–2010 are mainly caused by the uncertainty of the measurements within the plant and that the annual emissions are actually based on only a few emission measurements per point per year (source: AER Caprolactam producer). The response from the Netherlands indicated IEFs between 14.4 and 8.5 kg N ₂ O per tonne caprolactam, which is a very strong fluctuation and for some years far above the IPCC default of 9 kg N ₂ O/tonne. However, a comparison with other (confidential) data sources indicated that N ₂ O emissions from caprolactam production are underestimated and not overestimated and thus no technical correction was applied. As caprolactam will be included under the EU ETS in the future, the Netherlands should have verified emissions available from the initial allocation under the EU ETS that should be of higher quality than the current inventory estimate.	The TERT recommends that the Netherlands checks the reported N ₂ O emissions from caprolactam with the verified emissions from the caprolactam producer reported for the allocation of ETS allowances in the third ETS phase and, if possible, also checks the calculation with the caprolactam production reported to EUROSTAT for the Prodcum database to cross-check the reported emissions.	No	No
Yes	2.C.1.b. Pig iron CO ₂ All years	The Dutch NIR states that there is an integrated iron and steel production plant in the Netherlands; in the Dutch CRF tables however the notation key NO for pig iron production is used. In response to a question	The TERT recommends that the Netherlands either reports emissions from the molten iron from the blast furnace under 2.C.1.1. (instead of 2.C.1.5.) or changes the notation key from NO to IE in order to improve the	No	No

Key category	Gas, fuel, activity	Observation	Recommendation	Revised estimate ⁽⁴⁾	Technical correction ⁽⁵⁾
		raised by the TERT the Netherlands responded that they use NO for pig iron because the molten iron from the blast furnace (emissions reported in 2.C.1.5.) is transferred directly to the steel converter process (emissions reported in 2.C.1.). Thus no intermediate pig iron emissions occur. However, for the TERT it is not clear why the emissions from the molten iron from the blast furnace are reported under 2.C.1.5. (and not under 2.C.1.1.).	transparency and comparability of the CRF tables. In addition, the TERT recommends that the Netherlands includes the explanation provided during the review in future NIRs.		
No	2.D.2. Food and drink CO ₂ All years	The Dutch NIR is not transparent and does not provide any description for this category. Therefore, the TERT asked the Netherlands during the review to specify and describe the processes/activities emitting CO ₂ emissions from the food industry. In addition, the TERT asked for additional information confirming that emissions (from coke use) are not double-counted. The Netherlands responded that CO ₂ emissions from the food industry originate from sugar production. With regard to the potential double-counting, the Netherlands informed that they use a country-specific top-down method based on the Dutch energy statistics. Within these statistics the coke use in the sugar industry is earmarked as feedstock and the emissions are reported in CRF category 2.D Food and Drink. Combustion emissions from sugar production are reported in CRF category 1.A.2.e.	The TERT recommends that the Netherlands reports CO ₂ emissions from coke combustion in the 1.A.2.f. category instead of 2.D.2.	No	No
No	2.G. Other	From the NIR it is not fully clear which emissions are	As the methodology, activity data, EFs, other	No	No

Key category	Gas, fuel, activity	Observation	Recommendation	Revised estimate ⁽⁴⁾	Technical correction ⁽⁵⁾
	(industrial processes) CO ₂ All years	reported under this category. During the technical review the Netherlands informed the TERT that this category includes emissions from lubricant use in transport, from burning candles and fireworks, and from economic sectors not covered in other categories.	parameters and assumptions used are only very briefly described in the NIR, the TERT recommends that the Netherlands provides basic parameters and other relevant information to understand the calculations and EFs in the NIR.		
Yes	4.D.3.1. Atmospheric deposition AD All years	By using data provided in Table 4.Ds1 and the parameters $Frac_{GASF}$ and $Frac_{GASM}$, the TERT did not manage to recalculate the reported AD for indirect atmospheric deposition. In response to a question raised by the TERT during the review, the Netherlands explained that the $Frac_{GASM}$ only included NH ₃ and NO emissions from manure management and the Netherlands confirmed that the contribution of pasture was not taken into account. As the AD for indirect atmospheric deposition is derived from models, the $Frac_{GASM}$ is not actually used in the calculations but assessed separately for filling in the CRF completely. The TERT concludes that this represents no underestimation of emissions and the Netherlands accepted to correct this issue in the next inventory submission.	The TERT recommends that the Netherlands includes the contribution of pasture into the $Frac_{GASM}$ in accordance with 2000 IPCC GPG.	No	No

Annex 2 – Detailed technical corrections

There are no technical corrections applied to the Netherlands's estimates of emissions.

Annex 3 – Checks and tests completed

The initial checks (stage 1 and 2 checks), which cover the national inventory submissions, informed the stage 3 technical review with a view to:

- a) assess whether all emission source categories and gases are reported as required under Decision 280/2004/EC;
- b) assess whether sub-category sums are consistent with sectoral and national totals;
- c) assess whether emission data time series are consistent;
- d) assess whether implied emission factors across Member States are comparable;
- e) assess the use of 'Not Estimated' notation keys where IPCC Tier 1 methodologies exist;
- f) compare with the previous year's inventory submission of the Member State;
- g) limited sector-specific checks performed by ETC/ACM sector experts.

The EU initial checks were extended in 2012 to address additional elements needed for the 2012 technical review. The extended checks included:

- a) a detailed analysis of recalculations performed for the 2012 inventory submissions, in particular if recalculations are based on methodological changes.
- b) a comparison of the verified emissions reported under the EU ETS with the greenhouse gas emissions reported in GHG inventories. The verified emissions under the EU ETS are not fully comparable with the emissions reported in the GHG inventories. This comparison may only highlight areas where some Member States' data and trends deviate considerably from those of other Member States.
- c) a comparison of the results from Eurostat's reference and sectoral approach, based on energy data reported under Regulation (EC) No 1099/2008, with the Member States' reference and sectoral approach.

The specific activities of the 2012 technical review included:

- a) an analysis of the Member States' implementation of recommendations related to improving inventory estimates in accordance with the Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines and the 2000 IPCC good practice guidance (GPG) as listed in the UNFCCC Annual Review Reports from the 2010 and 2011 UNFCCC review processes. Where UNFCCC recommendations have not been implemented, the analysis included an assessment as to whether the Member State provided adequate justification for this;
- b) an assessment of the time series consistency of the greenhouse gas emissions estimates, with a particular focus on the 2005 and 2008-2010 estimates;
- c) checking whether problems identified for one Member State in UNFCCC reviews might also have been a problem for other Member States (whether identified by the UNFCCC expert review team or not);
- d) an assessment of any recalculations made by a Member State in its inventory since the previous submission, and an assessment as to whether these were transparently reported and were in accordance with IPCC good practice guidance;
- e) a follow-up on any outstanding findings from existing and extended stage 1 and 2 checks;
- f) the inclusion of revised estimates as provided by Member States in response to the review, and as accepted by the TERT during the review;
- g) the provision of an estimate for any 'technical correction' to emission estimates reported by a Member State where it is believed that emissions reported by the Member State are

overestimated, and a statement of the significance of these 'technical corrections' in comparison to the overall reported inventory estimates;

- h) the provision of recommendations where problems have been identified that do not require technical corrections.

Material from previous UNFCCC inventory reviews was used to inform the technical review, including the previous years' Annual Review Reports, which provide an indication of the overall quality of the inventory.

The TERT used additional technical information in the review process, such as EU ETS data, information from Eurostat, and F-gas data from the 'Preparatory study for a review of Regulation (EC) No 842/2006 on certain fluorinated greenhouse gases (⁶), as well as data from other international organisations.

⁶ Service contract 070307/2009/548866/SER/C4 to the European Commission

Annex 4 – Correspondence references

Date	Reference
14 April 2012	Final CRF and NIR submission under the MMD, version NLD-2012-v1.1
21, 23 May 2012	Initial questions raised by the TERT during the desk review
7, 11 June 2012	Additional questions raised by the TERT during the centralised review
23, 30, 31 May, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13 June 2012	Responses from the Netherlands to TERT questions
13 July 2012	Draft review report from TERT to the Netherlands
3 August 2012	Response from the Netherlands to draft review report
13 August 2012	Draft final review report from TERT to Netherlands
13 August 2012	Response and additional information from Netherlands to final review report
17 August 2012	Final review report to European Commission