



26 February 2019

English only

Record of the facilitative sharing of views during the forty-ninth session of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation: Namibia

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 ICA modalities and guidelines contained in annex IV to the same decision. 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 teams of technical experts, resulting in a summary report for each Party; and a facilitative sharing of views, with the BURs and summary reports serving as input.¹
3. Pursuant to the ICA modalities and guidelines, the SBI convened on 3 and 7 December 2018 in Katowice, Poland, at SBI 49, the sixth workshop for the facilitative exchange of views, open to all Parties, for the 10 non-Annex I Parties, including Namibia, for which there was a BUR and a final summary report by 30 September 2018.² Interested Parties were able to submit written questions in advance. As a result, Namibia received 14 written questions in advance from the following Parties: the European Union, Japan, New Zealand, Switzerland and the United States of America.
4. The workshop, chaired by the SBI Chair and the SBI Vice-Chair, Mr. Emmanuel Dlamini (Eswatini) and Mr. Naser Moghaddasi (Islamic Republic of Iran), comprised two three-hour sessions and covered the 10 Parties.
5. This record of the facilitative sharing of views for Namibia summarizes the proceedings and together with the summary report on the technical analysis of its second BUR³ constitutes the outcome of the second round of ICA for Namibia.

II. Summary of proceedings

6. On 7 December, Namibia made a brief presentation on its second BUR, including updated information since its first BUR. The presentation was followed by a question and answer session.

¹ Decision 2/CP.17, annex IV, paragraph 3.

² The BURs and the summary reports are available at <https://unfccc.int/BURs> and <https://unfccc.int/ICA-cycle2>, respectively.

³ FCCC/SBI/ICA/2017/TASR.2/NAM.

7. In its presentation Namibia 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; and information on the sectoral trends and key drivers, mitigation actions and effects, technological and capacity-building support needed and received, challenges in the preparation of national communications and BURs, and lessons learned from participating in the ICA process.

8. Total GHG emissions indicated that there was a net emission since 2011, owing to the decrease of the removals, and net emissions were 3,088 Gg carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂ eq) in 2011 and 5,240 Gg CO₂ eq in 2012. Namibia, however, highlighted that in its latest GHG inventory, produced in 2018, emissions were still a net sink. The latest GHG inventory covers the period 1994–2014 and shows an improvement in completeness compared to the previous reporting in the second BUR, which covered the period 2000–2012.

9. Namibia provided a summary of mitigation actions in relation to the implementation of its nationally determined contribution, in which the Party set a target to reduce GHG emissions by 89 per cent by 2030 compared with the ‘business as usual’ scenario. The GHG emissions to be avoided by those mitigation actions in 2030 are projected as around 20,000 kt CO₂ eq annually. The quantification of the effects of mitigation actions is one of the major improvements achieved by the Party through its experience participating in the ICA process.

10. For its mitigation actions, Namibia placed a primary focus on the activities under the land use, land-use change and forestry sector and on reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries. The largest contribution to GHG emission reductions is expected from the REDD-plus⁴ activities, such as by reducing the deforestation rate by 79 per cent in 2030, for which expected GHG emissions avoided are estimated to be 14,238 kt CO₂ eq per year. The ongoing and planned afforestation/reforestation programmes cover 5,000 ha per year afforestation, planting of 5,000 ha of arboriculture per year, 20,000 ha per year reforestation and restoration of grasslands. These programmes are estimated to result in avoided emissions amounting to 4,074 kt CO₂ eq per year in 2030 (conditional on the support provided).

11. Namibia also focused on the mitigation actions for enteric fermentation under the agriculture sector, as it is one of the key categories for GHG emissions, and the effect from these mitigation actions is estimated to be 201 kt CO₂ eq per year in 2030. The industrial sector of Namibia is small, and the available data on waste management are limited to three municipalities. Yet, the Party plans to increase its share of the use of waste for energy, for example through a project to recover methane for electricity generation under the clean development mechanism of the Kyoto Protocol.

12. For the energy sector, Namibia highlighted recently adopted policies, including a national integrated resource plan for electricity supply, a national renewable energy policy and an independent power producer policy, aiming for the promotion of renewable energy technologies to increase the share of renewable energy generation by 70 per cent in 2030. As a part of its nationally appropriate mitigation action, Namibia aims to provide access to off-grid electricity with renewable sources in the rural areas, instead of extending the grid network of fossil fuel based electricity. The renewable sources expected to be used include solar photovoltaic, wind, hydro and biomass, and these measures are expected to contribute to avoiding GHG emissions in the future.

13. The presentation by the Party also covered the experience and lessons learned from its participation in the two rounds of the ICA process. Namibia indicated that the process helped improve documentation in national communications and BURs. Comments from the team of technical experts helped improve data archiving and reporting of the GHG inventories, such as on fluorinated gases.

14. In addition, Namibia provided information on its capacity-building, technological needs and support received for preparing the BURs. The support provided included funds from the Global Environment Facility for resource persons for the preparation of the BUR and technical support to improve the domestic capacity for GHG inventory development. Namibia indicated that further support is sought for obtaining data, increasing the capacity to analyse data, training for mitigation assessment and formalizing institutional arrangements for domestic measurement, reporting and verification. However, the Party highlighted the

⁴ In decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 70, the COP encouraged developing country Parties to contribute to mitigation actions in the forest sector by undertaking the following activities: reducing emissions from deforestation; reducing emissions from forest degradation; conservation of forest carbon stocks; sustainable management of forests; and enhancement of forest carbon stocks.

challenges in the process, including the timeliness of obtaining necessary funds and the availability and capacities of staff.

15. Over the course of the presentation, Namibia addressed written questions submitted in advance, through the secretariat, by interested Parties.

16. Following the presentation, the following Parties made interventions commending Namibia for its effort and asked questions seeking further clarification: the European Union, India, Sweden, Switzerland and the United States. The questions and answers were mainly focused on the following areas: experience and efforts on data management, progress in increasing the capacity of national experts for the measurement, reporting and verification system and improving institutional arrangements, any efforts to develop country-specific emission factors and experience from the two rounds of the ICA process.

17. The full details of the presentation and subsequent interventions are available in the webcast of this workshop.⁵

18. In closing the workshop, the SBI Vice-Chair congratulated Namibia for successfully undergoing the facilitative sharing of views and completing the second round of its ICA process. He thanked Namibia and all other participating Parties for engaging in the workshop in a truly facilitative manner. He also thanked the secretariat for its support.

⁵ <https://unfccc-cop24.streamworld.de/webcast/6th-workshop-of-the-facilitative-sharing-of-view-3>.