

IEA comments to the draft Report of the Expert Group Meeting on Energy Balances (email by Mr. Tostensen, May 28)

- a) **Session 4, paragraph 1:** We would just like to remind that the table shown in the linked excel file was a starting point for discussion, not a final agreed version.
- b) **Session 4, paragraph 2:** As mentioned in the report, all the matrix nomenclature was used for discussion during the meeting, not for final use in the chapter.
- c) **Session 4, last paragraph:** During the meeting, there was not any agreed conclusion on the use of SI units.
- d) **Session 4, last paragraph:** It is not the specific use of SI that implies the need for submission of conversion factors. We would more generally state that the submission of conversion factors - whatever energy units are chosen for the balance - would increase the balance transparency.
- e) **Session 5:** the linked UNSD proposal for the energy balance chapter has a section on "International reporting". The content of this section (and implications for international organizations) was not agreed on during the discussion.

IEA comments to the UNSD proposed changes (email by Mr. Markhonko, June 3)

- a) **Conclusion list, "transport":** It was agreed that transport should be left as a flow within total final consumption, even if this does not correspond to the ISIC classification - we wonder if rephrased conclusion still implies the same message.
- b) **Conclusion list, "transport":** On the added sentence about supplementary tables. There was a discussion on these tables (intended to ask for extra data such as "industrial sector - transport", "residential - transport", i.e. transport within each economic activity, and not separately). We restate here our position that these tables should be included if anywhere in the annex chapter (bridging between energy balances and accounts). In the energy balance chapter, the two approaches should not be mixed.