

29 June 2017

English only

Record of the facilitative sharing of views during the fortysixth session of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation: Republic of Moldova

Note by the secretariat

I. Background and mandate

1. The Conference of the Parties (COP) decided by decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 63, to conduct under the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) international consultation and analysis (ICA) of biennial update reports (BURs) from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention (non-Annex I Parties) in a manner that is non-intrusive, non-punitive and respectful of national sovereignty. This process aims to increase transparency of the mitigation actions and their effects reported by non-Annex I Parties.

2. The COP, by decision 2/CP.17, paragraph 56, adopted the modalities and guidelines for international consultation and analysis contained in annex IV to the same decision (hereinafter referred to as the ICA modalities and guidelines). The COP further decided that the first round of ICA would be conducted for developing country Parties commencing within six months of the submission of the first round of BURs by developing country Parties.¹

3. According to the ICA modalities and guidelines, the ICA process consists of two steps: a technical analysis of the BURs of non-Annex I Parties by a team of technical experts, resulting in a summary report for each Party; and a facilitative sharing of views (FSV), with BURs and summary reports serving as input.²

4. Pursuant to the ICA modalities and guidelines, the SBI convened on 15 May 2017 in Bonn, Germany, at SBI 46, the third workshop for the FSV, open to all Parties, for 10 non-Annex I Parties, including Moldova, for which there was a BUR and a final summary report by 10 March 2017.³ Interested Parties were able to submit written questions in advance. As a result the Moldova received one written question in advance from the following Party: New Zealand.

5. The workshop, chaired by the SBI Rapporteur, Ms. Tugba Icmeli, comprised two three-hour sessions covering five Parties in alphabetical order.

¹ Decision 2/CP.17, paragraph 58(a).

² Decision 2/CP.17, annex IV, paragraph 3.

³ The BURs and the summary reports are available at <u>http://unfccc.int/8722.php</u> and <u>http://unfccc.int/10054.php</u>, respectively.

6. This record of the FSV for Moldova summarizes the proceedings and together with the summary report on the technical analysis of its BUR,⁴ constitutes the outcome of the first round of ICA for Moldova.

II. Summary of proceedings

7. At this workshop for the facilitative sharing of views, Moldova made a brief presentation on its BUR. The presentation was followed by a question and answer session.

8. In its presentation, Moldova provided an overview of its national circumstances and institutional arrangements, national inventory of anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks of all greenhouse gases (GHGs) not controlled by the Montreal Protocol. It highlighted that the total GHG emissions, including emissions and removals from the land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF) sector, decreased from 43.4 million tonnes of carbon-dioxide equivalent (Mt CO_2 eq) in 1990 to 12.8 Mt CO_2 eq in 2013, reflecting a reduction of 70.4 per cent during this period. Moldova presented information on its decreasing GHG emissions were from the LULUCF and energy sectors, by 98.3 per cent and 75.7 per cent, respectively. According to Moldova, the energy sector was the most significant source of GHG emissions, contributing 79.6 per cent and 65.5 per cent, respectively, for the years 1990 and 2013. The Party also presented information on the GHG emission on a gas-by-gas basis for the same period, identifying the most significant emissions from CO_2 , which takes up 81.4 per cent and 64.9 per cent, respectively, of the total GHG emissions for the years 1990 and 2013.

9. Moldova plans to achieve an economy-wide unconditional target of reducing its emissions by 2030, by between 64 and 67 per cent, below its business as usual 1990 level. Further, the Party presented that this commitment could be increased by up to 78 per cent subject to the availability of financial resources, technology transfer and technical cooperation. Information was also presented on five categories of mitigation actions and their effects, namely: agriculture, energy, forestry, industrial processes [and product use?] and waste sectors. The Party also reported 11 mitigation programmes, mainly focusing on areas related to the promotion of renewable energy sources and improvements in energy efficiency, the use of biofuels in the transport sector, and improved management in the agriculture and waste sectors. In addition, the Party reported information on selected and prioritized mitigation actions and their effects, within the context of the European Union and the United Nations Development Programme Low Emission Capacity-Building Program (2014-2016). Information was also presented on 11 clean development mechanism projects, which have been registered under its designated national authority. Moldova presented information on the national measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) system currently under development, with an emphasis on three MRV categories: GHG emissions, unilateral nationally appropriate mitigation action (NAMA) projects and supported NAMA projects, as well as mitigation actions.

10. Moldova also presented information on the barriers encountered in promoting mitigation in different sectors such as the uncertainty in regulations for the promotion of renewable energy sources; an underdeveloped waste sector, lacking a suitable legal and institutional framework and excessive fragmentation of agricultural lands. Information on financial support received from the Global Environmental Facility, donor commitments, and the European Union was presented as well as information on the financial support needed, including requirements to implement mitigation actions. Information presented on the positive national impacts of the ICA process included enhanced institutional arrangements to optimize procedures for gathering and processing information for its GHG inventories, BURs and national communications. Further, the Party presented information that the ICA process highlighted the relevance of institutional arrangements to establish an effective instrument to monitor the actions undertaken and to assess progress regarding compliance with economy-wide mitigation targets.

⁴ FCCC/SBI/ICA/2016/TASR.1/MDA.

11. Over the course of the presentation, Moldova addressed the written questions submitted in advance, through the secretariat, by Germany, Mexico and New Zealand.

12. Following the presentation, the following Parties made interventions commending Moldova for its efforts and asked questions seeking further clarification: Germany, Mexico and New Zealand. The questions and answers were mainly focused on the following areas: the use of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories in the preparation of the GHG inventories in subsequent BURs; and the extent to which the technology needs assessment served as the basis for prioritizing its NAMAs, the priority capacity-building needs to be addressed in the short term and those of highest priority for enhancing the preparation of its GHG inventory.

13. The full details of the presentation as well as the subsequent interventions are available in the YouTube broadcast of this workshop.⁵

14. In closing the workshop, the SBI Rapporteur congratulated the Republic of Moldova for successfully undergoing the FSV and completing the first round of its ICA process. She thanked the Republic of Moldova and all other participating Parties for engaging in the workshop in a truly facilitative manner. She also thanked the secretariat for its support.

⁵ https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PL-m2oy1bnLzpmdRpG2pTBzUeOH3qrXlZt.