



Snapshots of IO Practices

Emergency Response Reviews (ERRs)

Organisation(s): International Energy Agency (IEA)

The Snapshots of IO Practices present examples of specific efforts undertaken by an international organisation to work towards more effective international instruments. They aim to highlight examples of practices within the five focus areas of the Partnership of International Organisations for Effective International Rulemaking (IO Partnership), namely the variety and development of international instruments, their implementation, evaluation, ensuring stakeholder engagement, and co-ordination among IOs. The snapshots are submitted by the secretariats of the relevant international organisations implementing the relevant practice. The practices were compiled by the OECD Secretariat and focal points of the IO Partnership (UNCITRAL, OIE, WHO, ISO, WCO, BIPM, and SIECA), with a brief review to ensure consistency and comparability of the information provided within the snapshots. The inclusion of a practice in these snapshots implies no endorsement or assessment of that practice on the part of the OECD Secretariat or the focal points of the IO Partnership.

1	Overview of the Practice	Answers	Comments and intersections
1.1	Organisation	International Energy Agency (IEA)	
1.2	Area of relevance among the IO partnership focus themes (variety of instruments, implementation, stakeholder engagement, evaluation, co-ordination)	Implementation - monitoring mechanisms	
1.3	Name of the Practice	Emergency Response Reviews (ERRs)	Most answers filled in from IEA History, Standing Group on Emergency Questions (SEQ) documents (i.e. IEA/SEQ(2017)4), and the Energy Supply Security reviews (2014 version here: https://webstore.iea.org/download/direct/428)
1.4	Name of person(s) completing the template		

Compendium of International Organisations' Practices

Working Towards More Effective International Instruments



2	Description of the Practice	Answers	Comments and intersections
2.1	Please describe the practice shortly, providing information on its core features.	<p>The IEA conducts periodic peer reviews—known as Emergency Response Reviews (ERRs)—of all member countries to assess the readiness of each country to respond to an emergency related to an oil supply disruption. The ERRs also consider responses to natural gas and electricity supply disruptions. The ERRs assess each country's emergency response policies for oil, natural gas and electricity as well as data reporting capabilities. ERRs are now carried out in conjunction with the IEA's In-Depth Reviews, which are peer reviews that focus more broadly on assessing each IEA members' energy policies. ERRs are peer reviews and Review teams include not only IEA Secretariat staff but also representatives from other IEA member countries. Following the review, the IEA Secretariat prepares a report containing the assessment based on the review and recommendations and presents this to the IEA's Standing Group on Emergency Questions (SEQ). The country under review is called upon by the SEQ to accept the recommendations from the review, and each review includes an assessment of the steps taken by the country to address recommendations of the previous review. Due to the potential sensitivity of the subject matter of the ERR report and recommendations, they are not made publicly available beyond the SEQ and administration of the country reviewed.</p>	

Compendium of International Organisations' Practices

Working Towards More Effective International Instruments



2.2	What are the objectives of the practice?	<p>The objective of the ERRs is to monitor compliance with the IEA's emergency oil stockholding and data reporting requirements set out in the IEA treaty (the Agreement on an International Energy Program (IEP Agreement)), in addition to assessing the country's emergency response policies in the areas of oil, natural gas, and electricity supply. The ERR recommendations aim to enhance the reviewed country's emergency preparedness and support mutual learning through the proactive exchange of best practices via members of the Review team and SEQ.</p>	
2.3	What have been the key results of the practice?	<p>In addition to being a key mechanism for the IEA Secretariat and IEA Members to monitor compliance with emergency response requirements set out in the IEA treaty, the ERRs have been an important source of knowledge sharing and support for countries in maintaining and improving their emergency response practices.</p>	
2.4	In what year was the practice introduced?	1979	

Compendium of International Organisations' Practices

Working Towards More Effective International Instruments



2.5	Has the practice been updated/reformed since then? If yes, when and how has it evolved over time?	<p>The IEA has conducted reviews of IEA members in some form since the very early days of the Agency. The initial cycle of reviews took place from 1979 to 1981 and focused on the countries' ability to implement demand restraint in the event of a global supply disruption. Over subsequent cycles, the scope of the reviews progressively evolved alongside member priorities and to reflect the changing global energy market to assess emergency preparedness more generally. The specific subjects have also evolved as the IEA members have shifted emphasis from the emergency sharing system to a co-ordinated stockdraw response in the event of an oil supply disruption.</p> <p>In terms of procedures, the IEA moved to streamline its peer-review processes in 2017 and align the ERR cycle with the cycle for the In-Depth Reviews (IDRs), which are peer reviews covering all aspects of a country's energy policies. Although the two reviews remain formally separate, for efficiency, they are now carried out in a co-ordinated fashion with an integrated questionnaire used to respond to both the ERR and IDR and with in-person reviews taking place in the same week or back-to-back.</p>	<p>Sources:</p> <p>[IEA History, Volume 2, at 153] [IEA History, Volume 4, at 187] [IEA History, Volume 5 (forthcoming)]</p>
2.6	What do you consider to be the primary strengths of the practice?	The exchange of experience and best practices among experts from different countries as they delve deeply into very specific aspects of a country's energy security; the outcomes from the peer reviews are useful more broadly than for just the country under review.	
2.7	What do you consider to be the main challenges faced during the implementation of the practice?	Language barrier can sometimes create a challenge, particularly when documentation (e.g. legislation, studies, research, etc.) is not readily available in English, although relevant legislation is translated to the extent possible.	

Compendium of International Organisations' Practices

Working Towards More Effective International Instruments



2.8	<p>Does the practice have a formal/normative basis within the organisation or is it conducted informally? Does this basis make the practice mandatory or voluntary?</p> <p>If there is formal basis, please provide the relevant link or documentation.</p>	<p>Yes. The IEA's constitutive treaty, the IEP Agreement, established a Standing Group on Emergency Questions (SEQ) which was mandated to review members' actions and measures to ensure a member country is able to meet its obligations in the event of a global oil supply disruption. Over time, the ERR has broadened to cover other areas of emergency preparedness, but it retains a focus on compliance with these obligations.</p> <p>See articles 4.1, 5.2 and, 6.2 of the Agreement on an International Energy Program; https://iea.blob.core.windows.net/assets/c6be6d60-1ca8-4b99-b8c7-7ac508ec157c/IEP.pdf</p>	
2.9	<p>At what frequency is the practice applied? i.e. is it conducted once or on an iterative basis?</p>	<p>ERRs are carried out in cycles that have varied in length. In general, each country will now undergo an ERR every 5-6 years.</p>	
2.10	<p>Is this practice applied systematically, (e.g. with respect to every normative instrument, according to specific criteria or on an ad hoc basis)?</p>	<p>Yes, each review systematically follows a standard set of agenda items and is based on the country's responses to a standard questionnaire which has been formally adopted by the SEQ.</p>	
2.11	<p>Please provide specific details or examples to illustrate the practice (including supporting links and documents).</p>	<p>Individual ERR reports are confidential and are not made public. However, the IEA has periodically published public summaries of the the findings of the ERRs following the end of a cycle.</p> <p>See, e.g., IEA, <i>Energy Supply Security: Emergency Response of IEA Countries 2014</i>. https://www.iea.org/reports/energy-supply-security-the-emergency-response-of-iea-countries-2014</p>	

Compendium of International Organisations' Practices

Working Towards More Effective International Instruments



3	Design of the Practice	Answers	Comments and intersections
3.1	Who designed the practice (e.g. Was it developed internally, in collaboration with other organisations, etc?)	The ERR process was designed in 1979 between the IEA and its members country SEQ delegates.	
3.2	Which stakeholders were engaged with in the design of the practice?	See 3.1	
3.3	How long did it take to design the practice?	The ERRs have undergone continuous evolution since the first cycle of ERRs carried out by the Agency since 1979. Each cycle draws from the lessons learned from previous iterations.	
3.4	What resources were needed to design the practice initially (i.e., staff, budget etc.)?	[n/a, as this is an ongoing activity since 1979]	
3.5	What challenges were encountered during the design of the practice and how were they overcome?	[n/a, as this is an ongoing activity since 1979]	
3.6	Has the practice been tested before implementation (i.e. pilot phase)? If yes, please describe.	No, practice developed in iterative fashion.	

Compendium of International Organisations' Practices

Working Towards More Effective International Instruments



4	Implementation of the Practice		Comments and intersections
4.1	Which units are responsible for implementing the practice within your IO?	IEA Directorate of Energy Markets and Security, Energy Policy and Security Division	
4.2	Are IO members involved in implementing the practice? If so, how?	Yes. In addition to the member being reviewed, each review involves representatives from two or three other IEA members in the Review team. These government representatives accompany the officials from the Secretariat for the in-person (or virtual) review. The European Commission typically also participates in reviews of IEA Member countries that are also members of the European Union.	
4.3	Are external actors beyond the organisation or its membership involved in implementing the practice? If so, how?	Yes, the IEA carries out ERRs for those countries that are seeking membership in the IEA's part of the accession process. Other countries, including the IEA's Association countries and other key partners may have an ERR upon request.	
4.4	Which resources are needed to implement the practice (e.g., staff and budget)?	<p>Each ERR involves weeklong meetings, held either in-person in the country being reviewed, or virtually. This typically involves IEA staff and officials from two or three other IEA members. Where the meetings are held in-person, each participant covers their own travel and accommodation costs.</p> <p>Each ERR typically requires 1 month preparation of staff time from IEA Secretariat plus additional time from the member being reviewed to fill out an advance questionnaire and organise and participate in the week-long review. Each IEA member also participates in approximately four ERRs of other members over the course of a five-six year cycle.</p>	

Compendium of International Organisations' Practices

Working Towards More Effective International Instruments



5	Outputs and Evaluation of the Practice	Answers	Comments and intersections
5.1	Has the practice been evaluated or reviewed?	Yes	
5.2	If yes, who carried out the evaluation (please specify whether it was done internally or externally)	The review process is evaluated on an ongoing basis by the SEQ.	
5.3	If yes, please describe the evaluation methodology? (e.g. were any quantitative or qualitative indicators/criteria used to measure/assess the outcomes of the practice?).	The IEA Secretariat generally reports on at least one review at each meeting of the SEQ, which are held 3-4 times a year. In addition, SEQ; delegates are regularly asked to approve changes to the questionnaire and provide comments on the process.	
5.4	If yes, what were the conclusions of the evaluation, and has the practice evolved subsequently? If possible, please attach related documents or provide a link.	The ERRs continue to be positively evaluated, with suggested improvements from SEQ delegates incorporated into the review cycle on a continuous basis.	
6	Additional comments and information	Answers	Comments and intersections
6.1	Is there any more information or documentation that would be valuable to share in relation to the practice (e.g. links, reports, meeting minutes, supporting documents)?		The reviews are confidential and so cannot be shared directly.
Sources			