Framework Convention on Climate Change

FCCC/WEB/2020//FSVR.3/NAM

Distr.: General
8 April 2021

English only

Record of the facilitative sharing of views under the Subsidiary Body for Implementation at the UNFCCC Climate Dialogues 2020: Namibia

Note by the secretariat

Abbreviations and acronyms

AFOLU	agriculture, forestry and other land use
BUR	biennial update report
CO_2 eq	carbon dioxide equivalent
COP	Conference of the Parties
FOLU	forestry and other land use
FSV	facilitative sharing of views
GHG	greenhouse gas
ICA	international consultation and analysis
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[2] the ICA modalities and guidelines,[3] according to which the ICA process consists of two steps: technical analysis of non-Annex I Parties' BURs by teams of technical experts, resulting in a summary report for each Party; and FSV, to which the BURs and summary reports serve as input.[4]

3. Pursuant to the ICA modalities and guidelines, the SBI convened remotely, from 24 to 27 November 2020 at the UNFCCC Climate Dialogues 2020, the ninth FSV workshop, open to all Parties, for the 17 non-Annex I Parties, including Namibia, for which there was a BUR and final summary report by 31 July 2020.[5] Interested Parties were able to submit

[1] Decision 1/CP.16, para. 63.
[2] Decision 2/CP.17, para. 56.
[3] Decision 2/CP.17, annex IV.
[4] Decision 2/CP.17, annex IV, para. 3.
[5] The BURs and the summary reports are available at https://unfccc.int/BURs and https://unfccc.int/ICA-cycle3, respectively.

written questions in advance through the secretariat. Namibia received 17 written questions in advance from Australia, the European Union, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America.

4. The workshop, chaired by the SBI Vice-Chair, Yeonchul Yoo, and SBI Rapporteur, Constantinos Cartalis, comprised five sessions and covered the 17 Parties.

5. This FSV record for Namibia summarizes the proceedings and, together with the summary report on the technical analysis of its third BUR,[6] constitutes the outcome of the third round of ICA for the Party.

II. Summary of proceedings

6. On 27 November 2020, Namibia made a brief presentation on its third BUR. The presentation was followed by a question and answer session.

7. The Party was represented by Reagan Chunga from the Ministry of Environment, Forestry and Tourism of Namibia.

8. 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 GHGs not controlled by the Montreal Protocol, mitigation actions and their effects, barriers, support needed and received, and experience with the ICA process.

9. Namibia presented its nationally determined contribution target under the Paris Agreement, which is to reduce GHG emissions by approximately 89 per cent by 2030 compared with the 'business as usual' scenario, to be revisited by 2020. Namibia reported that the projected GHG emissions avoided by 2030 amount to around 20,000 kt CO_2 eq per year, including sequestration in the AFOLU sector, when compared with the 'business as usual' scenario.

10. Namibia highlighted that its total GHG emissions in 2014 were 21,180 Gg CO_2 eq (without removals) , and that they increased between 1994 and 2014 by 12.1 per cent, owing mainly to the agriculture sector (65.7 per cent of total emissions) followed by the energy sector (28.3 per cent), the industrial processes and product use sector (4.6 per cent) and the waste sector (1.3 per cent). Namibia explained that the main drivers for the increase in emissions were increased fuel combustion activities and the commencement of zinc production in 2003 and cement in 2011. Namibia also reported that it remained a net GHG sink over the period 1994 to 2014 as the land category removals exceeded emissions from the other categories. The net removal of CO_2 increased by 26.3% over these 21 years.

11. Namibia presented key policies and measures for achieving its target, including national policies, strategies and action plans such as the National Policy on Climate Change, the National Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan, the nationally determined contribution, the National Integrated Resource Plan for the electricity supply industry, the National Energy Policy, the National Renewable Energy Policy and the National Independent Power Producer Policy; and mitigation actions in the energy, AFOLU, industrial processes and product use and waste sectors, including nationally appropriate mitigation action and clean development mechanism projects. Namibia expects to achieve the following emission reductions by 2030 : (a) 17 kt CO_2 eq per year through the Namibia Energy Efficiency Programme in Buildings; (b) 1,200 kt CO_2 eq per year by 2030 through more investments in the energy sector; (c) 740 kt CO_2 eq by increasing the renewable energy share; (d) 43 kt CO_2 eq per year by using biomass in cement manufacturing plants; (e) 510 kt CO_2 eq per year through sustainable urban transport; (f) 18,492 kt CO_2 eq per year through forest and land management; and (g) 201 kt CO_2 eq through livestock feed management. In addition, Namibia provided information about the clean development mechanism projects in the waste sector and nationally appropriate mitigation action projects in the energy sector.

12. Furthermore, Namibia provided information on obstacles and barriers, support received and needed, and capacity-building needs. The key barriers were lack of data;

[6] FCCC/SBI/ICA/2019/TASR.3/NAM.

insufficient capacity and awareness in key institutions, including the Ministry of Environment and Tourism to fully understand the importance of reporting and taking over reporting responsibilities; high turnover of staff; and lack of formal arrangements between stakeholders to collaborate for reporting. Namibia reported its support needs primarily for the implementation of mitigation actions and tracking their progress. The Party received the following international support: (a) USD 352,000 from the Global Environment Facility, through the United Nations Development Programme Country Office in Namibia, to support the preparation of its third BUR; (b) capacity-building and technical support from the United Nations Development Programme to facilitate use of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories* and software to prepare its sixth national GHG inventory; (c) capacity-building support from the UNFCCC, the Global Support Programme for Preparation of National Communications and Biennial Update Reports by non-Annex I Parties and the Consultative Group of Experts through regional workshops on the preparation of BURs and national communications.

13. Namibia identified several capacity-building needs with respect to applying the "UNFCCC biennial update reporting guidelines for Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention" and the "Guidelines for the preparation of national communications by Parties included in Annex I to the Convention, Part II: UNFCCC reporting guidelines on national communications" and the *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*, strengthening cooperation between relevant agencies for data collection, reporting on international market mechanisms, assessing mitigation actions and their effects, enhancing the national process for technology needs assessments and technology transfer, and strengthening the domestic measurement, reporting and verification system.

14. Following the presentation, the following Parties made interventions commending Namibia on its efforts and asked questions seeking further clarification: Australia, China, European Union, India, Luxembourg, Singapore and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. The questions were related to (a) the difference between earlier and current calculations regarding removals in the AFOLU sector; (b) measures for converting biomass into other forms of energy; (c) the status and trend of the solar thermal technology road map; (d) the most suitable renewable energy technologies for implementation in Namibia; (e) any remaining challenges regarding the national GHG inventory; (f) the most helpful capacity-building activities to better estimate fluorinated gases; (g) lessons learned in shifting from total reliance on external consultants to a collaboration between consultants and national experts; (h) the effectiveness and sustainability of using invasive bush for power production; (i) collaboration with local universities to improve national emission factors; (j) challenges and lesson learned on building a consistent time series of GHG inventories; and (k) the progress made in relation to the target set in the National Renewable Energy Policy.

15. Namibia provided responses, explaining in particular that it used better land-use and cover maps to recalculate emissions and removals from the AFOLU sector in its third BUR. This resulted in different but more accurate results compared with the second BUR. In terms of estimating emissions from fluorinated gases, Namibia highlighted the capacity-building needs with respect to collecting accurate data from the facilities. The availability of good-quality data for 1994 enabled Namibia to construct a consistent time series of GHG inventories. The 1994 data were extrapolated to fulfil the data gaps. Namibia collaborated with research institutions through local universities to develop country-specific emission factors for the livestock sector, especially for dairy cattle. The Party is planning to develop country-specific emissions for the transport sector as well. In terms of the GHG inventory, Namibia highlighted that the limited availability of data and lack of formal arrangements between institutions to ensure effective information flow are the key challenges.

16. Regarding the most suitable renewable energy technologies, Namibia explained that the solar power technologies have the most potential in the south-central part of Namibia and wind power technologies in the coastal areas. In the case of small-scale power generation projects using invasive bush, Namibia explained that the bush can be harvested sustainably for hundreds of years without degrading the land; however, detailed feasibility studies are yet to be carried out for large-scale projects. Regarding the solar thermal technology road map, Namibia indicated that it was recently approved by the Cabinet of Ministers and is currently being implemented by the Ministry of Mines and Energy. In addition, Namibia

reported that it achieved a 60 per cent share of renewables in electricity production compared with the target mentioned in the National Renewable Energy Policy (30–70 per cent share of renewables in electricity production). In order to reduce total dependency on external consultants for the preparation of BURs and national communications, Namibia suggested engaging the same team of national experts from one report to the next, which would ensure consistency among the reports, build the capacity of national experts by working closely with the external consultants for a longer period of time and retain institutional memory and capacity.

17. The presentation and subsequent interventions are accessible via the webcast of the workshop.[7]

18. In closing the workshop, the SBI Rapporteur congratulated Namibia for successfully undergoing FSV and completing the third round of its ICA process. He thanked Namibia and all other participating Parties for engaging in the workshop in a facilitative manner. He also thanked the secretariat for its support.

[7] Available at https://vimeo.com/485520651.