Framework Convention on Climate Change

FCCC/WEB/2022/FSVR.1/EGY

Distr.: General
4 January 2023

English only

Record of the facilitative sharing of views at the fifty-sixth session of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation: Egypt

Note by the secretariat

Abbreviations and acronyms

2006 IPCC Guidelines	*2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*
BTR	biennial transparency report
BUR	biennial update report
CO_2 eq	carbon dioxide equivalent
COP	Conference of the Parties
ETF	enhanced transparency framework under the Paris Agreement
FSV	facilitative sharing of views
GHG	greenhouse gas
ICA	international consultation and analysis
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
MRV	measurement, reporting and verification
non-Annex I Party	Party not included in Annex I to the Convention
SBI	Subsidiary Body for Implementation

I. Background and mandate

1. COP 16 decided to conduct, under the SBI, ICA of BURs from non-Annex I Parties, in a manner that is non-intrusive, non-punitive and respectful of national sovereignty, with the aim of increasing the transparency of the mitigation actions and their effects reported by those Parties.[1]

2. COP 17 adopted the ICA modalities and guidelines[2] and 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.[3]

3. According to the ICA modalities and guidelines, the ICA process consists of two steps: technical analysis of non-Annex I Parties' BURs by teams of technical experts,

[1] Decision 1/CP.16, para. 63.
[2] Decision 2/CP.17, annex IV.
[3] Decision 2/CP.17, para. 58(a).

resulting in a summary report for each Party; and FSV, to which the BURs and summary reports serve as input.[4]

4. Pursuant to the ICA modalities and guidelines, the SBI convened on 7 and 8 June 2022 in Bonn at SBI 56 the twelfth FSV workshop, open to all Parties, for the following nine non-Annex I Parties for which there was a BUR and final summary report[5] by 21 March 2022: Chile, Cuba, Egypt, Malaysia, Namibia, Panama, Singapore, Thailand and Zambia.

5. The workshop, chaired by the SBI Vice-Chair, Juan Carlos Monterrey Gomez, comprised two two-hour sessions and one 90-minute session.

6. As one of the participating Parties, Egypt received 18 written questions in advance of the FSV workshop[6] from Australia, the European Union, Japan, New Zealand, Switzerland, Thailand and the United States of America and addressed them in the course of its presentation. This FSV record for Egypt summarizes the proceedings and, together with the summary report on the technical analysis of its first BUR,[7] constitutes the outcome of the first round of ICA for the Party.

II. Summary of proceedings

7. On 7 June 2022 Egypt made a brief presentation on its first BUR. The presentation was followed by a question and answer session.

8. Egypt was represented by Wael Farag Keshk from the Ministry of Environment.

9. Egypt presented an overview of its national circumstances and institutional arrangements, national inventory of anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks of all GHGs not controlled by the Montreal Protocol, mitigation actions and their effects, barriers and support needed and received and its transition to the ETF.

10. Egypt presented its national climate change strategy 2050, which, among other matters, focuses on renewable energy. It includes a USD 10 billion investment to produce 10 GW electric power and upgrade its thermal power plants. Egypt also presented information on its current initiatives for enhancing its institutional arrangements for compliance with requirements under the ETF. The initiatives relate to piloting a four-track comprehensive national system with a view to enabling MRV of the GHG inventory; mitigation policies and actions; support received; and adaptation policies and actions. It is also in the process of restructuring its institutional set-up into three main structures: ministerial climate change focal point; quality assurance working group; and technical support working group.

11. Egypt highlighted that its total GHG emissions in 2015 were 325,614 Gg CO_2 eq and they increased between 2005 and 2015 by 31 per cent without emissions and removals from land and harvested wood products, owing mainly to the energy, industrial processes and product use and waste sectors. The Party explained that the main drivers of the emission trends are annual growth of energy consumption to meet increasing demand, steady growth of the industry sector reflecting the improving national economic conditions and increased incineration of waste due to systematic improvements in the collection systems, as well as the increase in the number and improved performance of incineration plants.

12. Egypt presented key policies and measures for achieving its target, including various mitigation actions in the energy, industry, agriculture, land use and waste sectors. Egypt is planning to increase the share of renewable energy in the generation of electricity from 4 per cent (2010) to 20 per cent by 2022 and 37 per cent by 2035. Egypt is also implementing a sustainable transport programme and the expansion of its metro network generated an estimated GHG emission reduction of 1 Mt CO_2 eq in 2015. In addition, the Party achieved

[4] Decision 2/CP.17, annex IV, para. 3.
[5] The BURs and summary reports for each ICA cycle are available at https://unfccc.int/BURs and https://unfccc.int/ICA-reports, respectively.
[6] As per decision 2/CP.17, annex IV, para. 6.
[7] FCCC/SBI/ICA/2020/TASR.1/EGY.

considerable mitigation impact with its clean development mechanism project activities, which led to a total estimated annual emission reduction of 4.2 Mt CO_2 eq.

13. Furthermore, Egypt provided information on support received, gaps and needs and capacity constraints. Support received included support for adaptation, mitigation and cross-cutting programmes and support for preparation of its BUR. Its capacity constraints included data availability, access and quality; institutional barriers to MRV; and lack of competent personnel to prepare funding proposals. The Party highlighted its adaptation gaps and needs in the three areas most vulnerable to climate change – water resources and irrigation, the agriculture sector and coastal zone protection. Its mitigation gaps and needs are related to energy and renewable energy, agriculture, transport and solid waste management. The current MRV system covers the energy, industrial processes and product use, agriculture, waste, water resources and coastal zone protection sectors. The roles of ministerial entities in reporting the sectoral data required for preparing national climate change reports have been redefined to ensure that their reporting responsibilities align with requirements under the ETF.

14. Following the presentation, the following Parties made interventions commending Egypt on its efforts and asked questions seeking further clarification: Australia, Austria, China, Denmark, European Union, India, Malawi, New Zealand, Saudi Arabia, Singapore and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

15. Questions on the GHG inventory related to the challenges faced when using the 2006 IPCC Guidelines; lessons learned from the use of IPCC software to prepare the GHG inventory; and the decrease in emissions in the agriculture sector in 2014.

16. In response, Egypt explained that the lack of data available at the different ministries posed a challenge to the use of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. Egypt documented all the lessons learned and data gaps at the sector level and conducted a comparison of the GHG data presented in its third national communication and first BUR. The Party also acquired knowledge in the areas of data accuracy and bridging data gaps in a statistically sound way. Providing feedback to the ministries and relevant stakeholders involved in the process was key to success. Regarding the use of IPCC software, the Party explained that initially it took the national experts some time to familiarize themselves with the workings of the software. Egypt developed capacity-building programmes on the use of the IPCC software for all the ministries involved and multiple workshops were organized. In addition, there were data-related challenges (e.g. how data were collected and how they were reviewed and how the relevant sources of data were identified) and as a result the preparation of the BUR took longer than originally planned. In addition, the Party explained that the decrease in emissions in the agriculture sector was not a direct result of mitigation actions. Use of synthetic fertilizers decreased during Egypt's slow economic growth.

17. Questions on the mitigation actions and their effect related to the Industrial Energy Efficiency Programme; sources of biogas in the biogas project; and specific activities under the national solid waste management programme.

18. In response, Egypt explained that the Industrial Energy Efficiency Programme was introduced by the United Nations Industrial Development Organization in Egypt in 2013. A number of national experts received hands-on training over the course of a year. Training included identification of criteria for the selection of energy-intensive industries, the concept of an integrated energy management system, including how to develop the energy efficiency plan. The programme continued until 2018 when national capacity was built. In addition, the biogas project was piloted in small-scale for individual households in the rural areas, with manure and agricultural waste being the input. Egypt is assessing the feasibility of scaling up this pilot project (e.g. a large-scale project to be implemented in industrial facilities). Regarding the national solid waste management programme, the Party explained that Phase I of the programme has been completed and phase II has started. Phase I mainly focused on capacity-building and policies and strategies. Phase II is more about implementation, which includes designing and implementing engineered landfills and handling different types of waste, such as hazardous and clinical waste, in addition to municipal solid waste.

19. The question on constraints and gaps, and related needs related to constraints faced in the transition to the ETF.

20. In response, Egypt explained that it has already started developing and implementing the pilot MRV system. The waste sector has been selected to pilot the system and some barriers and constraints have been identified concerning Egypt's ability to cope with or to prepare reports under the ETF. However, the resources required to implement this MRV system are still lacking.

21. Other questions related to lessons learned from the preparation of the first BUR; and from the development and implementation of the pilot MRV system. In response, Egypt explained that the preparation of its first BUR has been a learning experience for all who were involved in the preparation, including the national experts. Use of the IPCC software and relevant training were well received by all stakeholders. Building on the training received during the preparation of the first BUR, Egypt will move to the extent possible to the use of IPCC higher tiers and develop country-specific emission factors. Regarding the data reported in the BUR, putting in place a central agency involved in the collection of data proved to be sustainable and successful. In addition, the lesson that Egypt learned from the development of its MRV system involves the capacities on the ground not being as expected, in particular challenges encountered by the data collectors in using complex forms. Hence, Egypt went through another round of developing and simplifying the data collection forms in order to facilitate their use by the data collectors on the ground. However, the overall process of MRV remains the same.

22. The presentation and subsequent interventions are accessible via the webcast of the workshop.[8]

23. In closing the workshop, the SBI Vice-Chair congratulated Egypt for successfully undergoing FSV and completing the first round of its ICA process. He thanked Egypt and all other participating Parties for engaging in the workshop in a facilitative manner. He also thanked the secretariat for its support.

[8] Available at https://unfccc.int/event/12-th-workshop-for-the-facilitative-sharing-of-views-part-1.