United Nations

FCCC/SBI/ICA/2021/TASR.1/HND

Framework Convention on Climate Change

Distr.: General
28 September 2022

English only

Technical analysis of the first biennial update report of Honduras submitted on 19 November 2020

Summary report by the team of technical experts

Summary

According to decision 2/CP.17, paragraph 41(a), Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention, consistently with their capabilities and the level of support provided for reporting, were to submit their first biennial update report by December 2014. As mandated, the least developed country Parties and small island developing States may submit biennial update reports at their discretion. This summary report presents the results of the technical analysis of the first biennial update report of Honduras, conducted by a team of technical experts in accordance with the modalities and procedures contained in the annex to decision 20/CP.19.

Abbreviations and acronyms

2006 IPCC Guidelines	*2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*
AD	activity data
AFOLU	agriculture, forestry and other land use
AR	Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
BUR	biennial update report
CBIT	Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency
CDM	clean development mechanism
CH_4	methane
CO_2	carbon dioxide
CO_2 eq	carbon dioxide equivalent
EF	emission factor
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GHG	greenhouse gas
GWP	global warming potential
HFC	hydrofluorocarbon
HWP	harvested wood products
ICA	international consultation and analysis
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IPCC good practice guidance	*Good Practice Guidance and Uncertainty Management in National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*
IPCC good practice guidance for LULUCF	*Good Practice Guidance for Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry*
IPPU	industrial processes and product use
LULUCF	land use, land-use change and forestry
MRV	measurement, reporting and verification
N_2O	nitrous oxide
NA	not applicable
NAMA	nationally appropriate mitigation action
NC	national communication
NDC	nationally determined contribution
NE	not estimated
NIR	national inventory report
non-Annex I Party	Party not included in Annex I to the Convention
PFC	perfluorocarbon
QA/QC	quality assurance/quality control
REDD+	reducing emissions from deforestation; reducing emissions from forest degradation; conservation of forest carbon stocks; sustainable management of forests; and enhancement of forest carbon stocks (decision 1/CP.16, para. 70)
Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines	*Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*
SF_6	sulfur hexafluoride
TNA	technology needs assessment
TTE	team of technical experts
UNFCCC guidelines for the preparation of NCs from non-Annex I Parties	"Guidelines for the preparation of national communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention"
UNFCCC reporting guidelines on BURs	"UNFCCC biennial update reporting guidelines for Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention"

I. Introduction and process overview

A. Introduction

1. The process of ICA consists of two steps: a technical analysis of the submitted BUR and a facilitative sharing of views under the Subsidiary Body for Implementation, resulting in a summary report and a record, respectively.

2. According to decision 2/CP.17, paragraph 41(a), non-Annex I Parties, consistently with their capabilities and the level of support provided for reporting, were to submit their first BUR by December 2014. The least developed countries and small island developing States may submit at their discretion.

3. Further, according to paragraph 58(a) of the same decision, the first round of ICA is to commence for non-Annex I Parties within six months of the submission of the Parties' first BUR. The frequency of developing country Parties' participation in subsequent rounds of ICA, depending on their respective capabilities and national circumstances, and the special flexibility for small island developing States and the least developed country Parties, will be determined by the frequency of the submission of BURs.

4. Decision 14/CP.19, paragraph 7, outlines that developing country Parties seeking to obtain and receive payments for results-based actions can submit relevant information and data through the BUR in the form of a technical annex as per decision 2/CP.17, annex III, paragraph 19.[1] Decision 14/CP.19, paragraph 8, outlines that the submission of the technical annex is voluntary and in the context of results-based payments. As mandated by decision 14/CP.19, paragraphs 10–14, the technical annex submitted by Honduras has been subject to technical analysis by two LULUCF experts who are included as members of a TTE. The results of the technical analysis are captured in a separate technical report.[2]

5. This summary report presents the results of the technical analysis of the first BUR of Honduras, undertaken by a TTE in accordance with the provisions on the composition, modalities and procedures of the TTE under ICA contained in the annex to decision 20/CP.19.

B. Process overview

6. In accordance with the mandate referred to in paragraph 2 above, Honduras submitted its first BUR on 19 November 2020 as a summary of parts of its NC3.

7. During the technical analysis, the Party clarified that financial support for elaborating its first BUR was obtained in 2015, resulting in the BUR being submitted after the deadline stated in paragraph 2 above.

8. A desk analysis of Honduras' BUR was conducted remotely from 8 to 12 March 2021 and was undertaken by the following TTE, drawn from the UNFCCC roster of experts on the basis of the criteria defined in decision 20/CP.19, annex, paragraphs 2–6: Remi D'Annunzio (France), Adriana Coppola Gonzalez (Costa Rica), Fernando Farias (former member of the Consultative Group of Experts from Chile), Agustín José Inthamoussu (Uruguay), Maria Jose Lopez (Belgium), Marcela Itzel Olguin-Alvarez (Mexico), Jose Manuel Ramirez Garcia (Spain), Virginia Sena Cianci (member of the Consultative Group of Experts from Uruguay), Alexander Valencia (Colombia) and Craig Wayson (United States of America). Ms. Lopez and Ms. Sena Cianci were the co-leads. The technical analysis was coordinated by Karen Ortega and Luca Birigazzi (secretariat).

9. During the technical analysis, in addition to the written exchange, through the secretariat, to provide technical clarifications on the information reported in the BUR, the TTE and Honduras engaged in consultation[3] on the identification of capacity-building needs for the preparation of BURs and participation in the ICA process. Following the technical

[1] The technical annex on the results of the implementation of REDD+ activities.

[2] FCCC/SBI/ICA/2021/TATR.1/HND.

[3] The consultation was conducted via videoconferencing.

analysis of Honduras' first BUR, the TTE prepared and shared a draft summary report with Honduras on 17 June 2021 for its review and comment. Honduras, in turn, provided its feedback on the draft summary report on 12 August 2022.

10. The TTE finalized the summary report in consultation with the Party on 26 August 2022.

II. Technical analysis of the biennial update report

A. Scope of the technical analysis

11. The scope of the technical analysis is outlined in decision 20/CP.19, annex, paragraph 15, according to which the technical analysis aims to, without engaging in a discussion on the appropriateness of the actions, increase the transparency of mitigation actions and their effects and shall entail the following:

(a) The identification of the extent to which the elements of information listed in paragraph 3(a) of the ICA modalities and guidelines (decision 2/CP.17, annex IV) have been included in the BUR of the Party concerned (see chap. II.B below);

(b) A technical analysis of the information reported in the BUR, specified in the UNFCCC reporting guidelines on BURs (decision 2/CP.17, annex III), and any additional technical information provided by the Party concerned (see chap. II.C below);

(c) The identification, in consultation with the Party concerned, of capacity-building needs related to the facilitation of reporting in accordance with the UNFCCC reporting guidelines on BURs and to participation in ICA in accordance with the ICA modalities and guidelines, taking into account Article 4, paragraph 3, of the Convention (see chap. II.D below).

12. The remainder of this chapter presents the results of each of the three parts of the technical analysis of Honduras' BUR outlined in paragraph 11 above.

B. Extent of the information reported

13. The elements of information referred to in paragraph 11(a) above include the national GHG inventory report; information on mitigation actions, including a description of such actions, an analysis of their impacts and the associated methodologies and assumptions, and information on progress in their implementation; information on domestic MRV; and information on support needed and received.

14. According to decision 20/CP.19, annex, paragraph 15(a), in undertaking the technical analysis of the submitted BUR, the TTE is to identify the extent to which the elements of information listed in paragraph 13 above have been included in the BUR of the Party concerned. The TTE considers that the reported information is partially consistent with the UNFCCC reporting guidelines on BURs. Specific details on the extent of the information reported for each of the required elements are provided in annex I.

C. Technical analysis of the information reported

15. The technical analysis referred to in paragraph 11(b) above aims to increase the transparency of information reported by the Parties on mitigation actions and their effects, without engaging in a discussion on the appropriateness of those actions. Accordingly, the focus of the technical analysis was on the transparency of the information reported in the BUR.

16. For information reported on national GHG inventories, the technical analysis also focused on the consistency of the methods used for preparing those inventories with the appropriate methods developed by the IPCC and referred to in the UNFCCC reporting guidelines on BURs.

17. The results of the technical analysis are presented in the remainder of this chapter.

1. Information on national circumstances and institutional arrangements relevant to the preparation of national communications on a continuous basis

18. As per the scope defined in paragraph 2 of the UNFCCC reporting guidelines on BURs, the BUR should provide an update to the information contained in the most recently submitted NC, including information on national circumstances and institutional arrangements relevant to the preparation of NCs on a continuous basis. In their NCs, non-Annex I Parties report on their national circumstances following the reporting guidance contained in decision 17/CP.8, annex, paragraphs 3–5, and they could report similar information in their BUR, which is an update of their most recently submitted NC.

19. Honduras reported in its first BUR information on its national circumstances, including a description of national and regional development priorities, objectives and circumstances, including features of geography, climate and economy that might affect the Party's ability to deal with mitigating and adapting to climate change, as well as information regarding national circumstances and constraints on the specific needs and concerns arising from the adverse effects of climate change and/or the impact of the implementation of response measures, as referred to in Article 4, paragraph 8, and, as appropriate, Article 4, paragraphs 9–10, of the Convention.

20. Honduras transparently reported in its first BUR information on its existing institutional arrangements relevant to the preparation of its NCs and BURs on a continuous basis. The description covers key aspects of the institutional arrangements, including the roles and responsibilities of the overall coordinating entity, the National Climate Change Directorate; plans for improvements to the arrangements; the roles of committees on mitigation and adaptation; mechanisms for information and data exchange; and provisions for public consultation and other forms of stakeholder engagement.

21. Honduras reported in its first BUR information on its lack of MRV arrangements. The Party reported that some of the components of its MRV system are being planned and it intends to develop an integrated system through a CBIT project. All the work in relation to MRV so far has been accomplished using existing platforms such as the National Environmental Information System and the National Climate Change Observatory for Sustainable Development. Honduras also reported that the funding required to establish an MRV system and meet periodic reporting requirements is lacking, as is relevant national technical expertise. The TTE noted planned improvements to the information reported in the BUR, which will be achieved by, inter alia, systematizing information collection, establishing institutional arrangements and the necessary organizational framework, and implementing capacity-building targeted at various stakeholders, including civil society organizations.

2. National greenhouse gas emissions by sources and removals by sinks

22. As indicated in table I.1, Honduras reported information on its GHG inventory in its BUR partially in accordance with paragraphs 3–10 of the UNFCCC reporting guidelines on BURs and paragraphs 8–24 of the UNFCCC guidelines for the preparation of NCs from non-Annex I Parties, contained in the annex to decision 17/CP.8.

23. Honduras submitted its first BUR in 2020 and the GHG inventory reported is for 2005–2015. The latest reported inventory year is more than four years prior to the date of submission of the Party's BUR. During the technical analysis, Honduras clarified that, although the draft BUR was ready in March 2019, it could not be approved until November 2020 owing to institutional changes, planning issues and the concurrent preparation of the NC3.

24. Honduras submitted an NIR in conjunction with its first BUR. The relevant sections of the NIR were referenced in the BUR and the document was also made publicly available on the UNFCCC website.[4]

[4] www.unfccc.int/BURs.

25. GHG emissions and removals for the BUR covering the 2005–2015 time series were estimated using tier 1 methodology from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, and default EFs from national and international sources were applied, as appropriate. The same AD and EFs used for calculating the REDD+ forest reference emission level were used for estimating emissions and removals for the forest land converted to other land categories under the AFOLU sector.

26. Information on AD and their sources was not reported in Honduras' BUR and the reason for this was not clear to the TTE. During the technical analysis, the Party clarified that, as reporting on AD and EFs is not mandatory, it focused its limited resources on reporting emissions and removals. The Party also clarified that it has planned improvements to ensure that information on AD and EFs used and their sources will be included in its next BUR.

27. Information on the Party's total GHG emissions by gas for 2015 is outlined in table 1 in Gg CO_2 eq. It shows an increase in emissions of 130.1 and 89.8 per cent with and without land (category 3.B) respectively since 2005 (3,804.04 and 8,531.02 Gg CO_2 eq with and without land respectively).

Table 1
Greenhouse gas emissions by gas of Honduras for 2015

Gas	*GHG emissions (Gg CO_2 eq) including land*	*% change 2005–2015*	*GHG emissions (Gg CO_2 eq) excluding land*	*% change 2005–2015*
CO_2	2 506.70	204.0	9 948.81	38.1
CH_4	3 705.39	–10.7	3 705.38	236.0
N_2O	1 857.14	–10.0	1 857.14	720.7
HFCs	683.92	NA	683.92	NA
PFCs	NE	NA	NE	NA
SF_6	NE	NA	NE	NA
Other	NA	NA	NA	NA
Total	**8 753.15**	**130.1**	**16 195.25**	**89.8**

[a] 2006 IPCC Guidelines AFOLU category 3.B (land) and, if reported, 3.D (HWP (3.D.1) and other emissions (3.D.2)).

28. Information on precursor gases was not completely reported. For the category food and beverages industry (2.H.2), emissions of non-methane volatile organic compounds were estimated but HFC emissions were estimated for 2010–2015 only and PFC and SF_6 emissions were not estimated. During the technical analysis, the Party clarified that the reporting gaps arose owing to the limited resources available for preparing the BUR. The Party confirmed that it will evaluate the possibility of including these emission estimates in its next BUR, while noting that doing so will depend on resources being available.

29. Honduras applied notation keys in tables where numerical data were not provided. The use of notation keys was not consistent with the UNFCCC guidelines for the preparation of NCs from non-Annex I Parties and the reason for this was not clear to the TTE. The Party provided several reasons in its BUR and NIR for not estimating or not including some activities in its GHG inventory, such as the lack of some AD, and explained how this led to the incorrect use of notation keys in the reporting tables.

30. Honduras reported comparable information to the sectoral reporting tables annexed to the Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines but did not report comparable information addressing the tables included in annex 3A.2 to the IPCC good practice guidance for LULUCF.

31. The shares of emissions that different sectors contributed to the Party's total GHG emissions excluding land (category 3.B), as reported by the Party, in 2015 are reflected in table 2.

Table 2
Shares of greenhouse gas emissions by sector of Honduras for 2015

Sector	*GHG emissions (Gg CO_2 eq)*	*% share*[a]	*% change 2005–2015*
Energy	9 596.68	59.3	37.1
IPPU	1 532.84	9.5	183.7
AFOLU	–3 727.76	NA	21.2
Livestock (category 3.A)	2 205.91	13.6	–30.1
Land (category 3.B)	–7 442.10	NA	22.7
Aggregate sources and non-CO_2 emissions sources on land (category 3.C)	1 588.44	9.3	–13.5
HWP and other emissions (category 3.D)	NE	NA	NA
Waste	1 351.38	8.3	35.7

[a] Share of total without 2006 IPCC Guidelines AFOLU category 3.B (land).

32. Honduras reported information on its use of GWP values consistent with those provided by the IPCC in its AR2 based on the effects over a 100-year time-horizon of GHGs.

33. For the energy sector, information was clearly reported on CO_2, CH_4 and N_2O emissions, methodological tier levels and key categories. Emissions were calculated for major sources, namely the categories electricity and heat production (1.A.1.a), manufacturing industries and construction (1.A.2), civil aviation (1.A.3.a), road transportation (1.A.3.b), commercial/institutional (1.A.4.a) and residential (1.A.4.b). The Party clearly identified sources that do not occur, such as petroleum refining (1.A.1.b), manufacture of solid fuels and other energy industries (1.A.1.c), railways (1.A.3.c), fugitive emissions from fuels (1.B) and CO_2 transport, injection and storage (1.C). The Party provided other sector-specific information; that is, it noted data gaps in the national energy balance (categories 1.A.3.d and 1.A.4.c) and included a brief explanation of the sectoral emissions. In addition, the Party explained that the data gaps will be resolved and QC improved for its next BUR and NIR.

34. For the industrial processes sector, information was clearly reported on CO_2, CH_4 and N_2O emissions, methodological tier levels and key categories. Emissions were calculated for major sources, namely the categories cement production (2.A.1) and lime production (2.A.2), and the Party clearly identified sources that do not occur, such as glass production (2.A.3), chemical industry (2.B) and metal industry (2.C), because Honduras imports all these products. In its BUR, the Party reported that data regarding lime production were not available for 2005–2013 and the reasons for this were not clear to the TTE. During the technical analysis, the Party clarified that lime production emissions were estimated and reported for 2014–2015 only owing to lack of data, adding that emissions for more years of the time series will be estimated for its next BUR and NIR.

35. Regarding the information on product uses, information was clearly reported on CO_2 and HFC emissions, methodological tier levels and key categories. Emissions were calculated for major sources, namely the categories lubricant use (2.D.1) and refrigeration and air conditioning (2.F.1), and the Party clearly identified sources that do not occur, such as electronics industry (2.E) and other product manufacture and use (2.G), because Honduras imports all these products. The Party reported that the starting year for reporting emissions from the use of products as substitutes for substances that deplete the ozone layer (category 2.F.1) is 2010 owing to Honduras' reporting commitments under the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer; however, the reasons for this were not clear to the TTE. During the technical analysis, the Party clarified that emissions from refrigeration and air conditioning were estimated and reported for 2010–2015 only owing to lack of data, adding that emissions for earlier years of the time series will be estimated for its next BUR.

36. For the agriculture sector and categories 3.A and 3.C under the AFOLU sector from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, enteric fermentation (CH_4) and agricultural soils (N_2O) were identified as key categories and the most relevant emissions sources in the sector.

37. For land (category 3.B), Honduras reported annual GHG emissions and removals for 2005–2015. Overall, the net removals from land (category 3.B) fluctuated between a maximum of –9,630.14 CO_2 eq in 2005 and a minimum of –7,442.10 CO_2 eq in 2015.

38. For the waste sector, information was clearly reported on CO_2, CH_4 and N_2O emissions, methodological tier levels and key categories. Emissions were calculated for major sources, namely the categories solid waste disposal (4.A), open burning of waste (4.C.2) and wastewater treatment and discharge (4.D), and the Party clearly identified sources that do not occur, such as biological treatment of solid waste (4.B) and waste incineration (4.C.1). Honduras reported in its BUR that it used population as the main AD owing to lack of information regarding the amount of solid waste and effluents produced.

39. The TTE noted that estimated emissions for category 4.C.2 are much higher than those for category 4.A, which is quite unusual. The reasons for this were not clear to the TTE and no information was provided regarding the AD or EFs used for any category. During the technical analysis, the Party explained that information on waste is managed by local authorities, which frequently encounter technical and budgetary problems when attempting to gather the information required. In addition, reliable information exchange with the national GHG inventory has not been established. The Party also explained that the waste sector needs a plan to improve both the process for collecting information and the accuracy of that information. The Party has clarified that this plan must also include a better system for liaising with the local stakeholders responsible for waste management, and a system for information exchange among the focal point for the national GHG inventory, the national focal point for solid waste management and local waste sector focal points.

40. The NIR and the BUR provide an update to some of the GHG inventories reported in the Party's previous NC. The information reported does not provide an update of the Party's NC1 or NC2, which addressed anthropogenic emissions and removals for 1995–2000. The update was carried out for 2005–2015 using the methodologies contained in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, thus generating an 11-year time series. The Party reported that it did not recalculate emission estimates from previous inventories owing to lack of some required AD and the limited resources available, which were focused on the period of analysis.

41. Honduras described in its BUR the institutional framework for the preparation of its 2005–2015 GHG inventory. The Party reported that the National Climate Change Directorate, as part of the Secretariat of Natural Resources and Environment, is the governmental body responsible for its climate change policy and GHG inventory, which was prepared with the support of the United Nations Development Programme, which assisted Honduras in designing its GHG inventory system. The Party identified improvements in the information reported. Additionally, Honduras explained that one of the aims of its national inventory improvement plan is to strengthen the existing institutional framework and establish a dedicated data-collection and archiving system to improve coordination and enable continuous preparation of inventories.

42. Honduras clearly reported that a key category analysis was performed for the level of emissions for 2005 and 2015. For 2015, 12 key categories including land categories were identified by the level assessment, while 15 key categories excluding land categories were identified. The top three key categories including land categories were CO_2 from forest land remaining forest land (removals), CO_2 from land converted to other land and CO_2 from road transport, which accounted for 38.7, 18.9 and 10.7 per cent respectively of the Party's total emissions in 2015. The top three key categories excluding land categories were CO_2 from road transport, CO_2 from electricity and heat production and CH_4 from enteric fermentation, which accounted for 25.3, 19.2 and 12.7 per cent respectively of the Party's total emissions in 2015.

43. The BUR provides information on QA/QC measures for all sectors. The information reported includes a description of the involvement of sectoral stakeholders in QC measures (namely that they review the sectoral emission estimates), a description of the QC applied (including the development of the reference approach for the energy sector), a confirmation of AD used, an analysis of year-on-year variation and a comparison (where possible) of sectoral estimates with other estimates and information sources. However, there is no specific information on QA/QC measures by sector. The TTE commends the Party for identifying the

specific requirements for integrating and streamlining QA/QC to be included in future reporting, such as the systematic implementation and documentation of general and sector-specific QA/QC plans that include timelines and allocated responsibilities.

44. Honduras reported information on CO_2 fuel combustion using both the sectoral and the reference approach. The information reported indicates that the difference between the combustion emissions estimated using the two approaches is under 5 per cent, except for three years: 16.0, 6.8 and 10.5 per cent was reported for 2006, 2010 and 2014 respectively. The Party reported that these differences are due to the uncertainty associated with the data used for these years; some of the data sources have not been validated. In addition, the Party reported that data for 2015 were not available so it could not estimate the reference approach for that year, and that many energy categories were not included in the national energy balance owing to lack of data. The Party identified as a planned improvement to the information reported the use of a complete national energy balance for the whole inventory period.

45. Information on international aviation was not clearly reported. During the technical analysis, the Party clarified that emissions from international aviation were estimated but not reported as part of the memo items in reporting tables. Information on marine bunker fuels was not reported in Honduras' BUR or NIR.

46. Information on the uncertainty assessment (level and trend) of its national GHG inventory was not reported in Honduras' BUR. However, the Party provided relevant clarification in its BUR. The Party reported that, while preparations are under way for performing the uncertainty assessment using approach 1 (as described in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines) as part of inventory compilation, it was not possible to estimate the uncertainty in time for the first BUR. The Party clarified that an uncertainty assessment will be included in its next BUR.

47. The TTE noted that the transparency of the information reported on GHG inventories could be enhanced by addressing the areas noted in paragraphs 26, 28–30, 35, 39 and 45 above, which could facilitate a better understanding of the information reported on GHG inventories.

3. Mitigation actions and their effects, including associated methodologies and assumptions

48. As indicated in table I.2, Honduras reported in its BUR, partially in accordance with paragraphs 11–13 of the UNFCCC reporting guidelines on BURs, information on mitigation actions and their effects, to the extent possible.

49. In its BUR, Honduras reported information on its national context, a set of mitigation initiatives implemented, some priority NAMAs in the planning stage and CDM projects and activities, and presented the main objectives of the 2015 NDC with summary information on the results obtained in preliminary assessments undertaken for the NDC. Honduras' NDC (which was submitted in 2015) stipulates that by 2030 a reduction of 15 per cent in emissions will be achieved compared with the 'business as usual' level in the energy, IPPU, agriculture and waste sectors. This contribution is conditional upon receiving international finance support through financial climate mechanisms. In the LULUCF sector, Honduras is committed to afforesting or reforesting 1 million ha before 2030 and reducing household fuelwood consumption by 30 per cent, through a NAMA on efficient cookstoves, the aims of which are to reduce deforestation and improve the well-being and health of families.

50. Honduras launched a national strategy on climate change in 2010 and established a climate change law in 2014. The Party's approach to mitigation to date has focused on projects that generate certified emission reductions under the CDM. Honduras' Climate Agenda, launched in 2017, includes a national mitigation plan that is currently at the draft stage. The main objective of the plan is to define mitigation measures that will enable the Party to comply, through its NDC, with commitments under the Paris Agreement. The plan is being developed in line with the mitigation objectives of the National Strategy on Sustainable Development to put the country on a sustainable, low-carbon pathway in the medium and long term and with a view to the Party establishing a national low-carbon strategy. The draft national mitigation plan contains a technology action plan that promotes

implementation of GHG mitigation technologies that have adaptation co-benefits. The TNA performed in 2015–2018 resulted in the prioritization of the agriculture and energy sectors (specifically organic agriculture, biodigesters, biogas energy, hydropower (micro hydro systems) and efficient wood burners).

51. The Party reported its mitigation initiatives and CDM projects and activities in tabular format in accordance with decision 2/CP.17, annex III, paragraph 11. The Party also reported information on its mitigation actions, including progress on its REDD+ activities and five prioritized NAMAs, in narrative format.

52. Consistently with decision 2/CP.17, annex III, paragraph 12(a), Honduras clearly reported the names of mitigation actions and coverage by sectors but the GHGs covered were not reported. A set of mitigation actions financed by multilateral and bilateral funds was presented in the BUR, for which reported information included the institutions involved and the implementation period. Most of the mitigation actions are in the energy and AFOLU sectors.

53. Information on quantitative goals was provided in Honduras' BUR for NAMAs only. During the technical analysis, the Party clarified that the chapter in the BUR on mitigation actions and their effects was drafted using information obtained during workshops held in different regions of Honduras and complete information was not available at the time of preparation of the BUR. However, during the TA, Honduras provided detailed descriptions of each mitigation action that will be used to report in the future.

54. Honduras did not clearly report information on methodologies and assumptions, the objectives of the actions and steps taken or envisaged to achieve those actions for any mitigation actions.

55. The Party reported information on progress of implementation of actions and underlying steps taken or envisaged to achieve them, and results achieved, such as estimated outcomes and estimated emission reductions, for CDM projects and activities and five planned NAMAs (three in the energy sector, which were prioritized in the 2015 NDC, and two in the agriculture sector). The NAMA on urban transport has the highest expected mitigation impact, with a reduction in emissions of 200,000 t CO_2 eq per year. However, the Party did not provide that information for other listed actions and the reasons for this were not clear to the TTE. During the TA, Honduras clarified that there was limited information about all mitigation actions at the time of preparing the BUR, adding that detailed information will be provided in the future.

56. Honduras provided information on its involvement in international market mechanisms as a Party to the Kyoto Protocol. Honduras documented 30 CDM projects and three CDM programmes of activities approved by its designated national authority under the UNFCCC CDM process. Similarly, Honduras reported on voluntary market-based mechanisms, namely on its three registered projects under the Verified Carbon Standard and five projects under the Gold Standard. The statistics include information, by project, on the sectors and periods covered and annual CO_2 emission reductions. All the reported market-based mechanisms focus mainly on renewable energy (hydropower in particular) and energy efficiency (improved cookstoves).

57. Honduras reported information on its domestic MRV arrangements in accordance with decision 2/CP.17, annex III, paragraph 13. The information reported indicates that Honduras is in the process of developing and designing a domestic MRV system for mitigation actions. Honduras outlined the steps on a proposed pathway to establishing an enhanced MRV system through a CBIT project in the near future, including establishing institutional arrangements, building institutional capacity and coordination, monitoring data collection responsibilities, defining reporting obligations and defining verification approaches and roles.

58. The TTE noted that the transparency of the information reported on mitigation actions could be enhanced by addressing the areas noted in paragraphs 53–55 above, which could facilitate a better understanding of the information reported on mitigation actions.

4. Constraints and gaps, and related technology, financial, technical and capacity-building needs, including a description of support needed and received

59. As indicated in table I.3, Honduras reported in its BUR, fully in accordance with paragraphs 14–16 of the UNFCCC reporting guidelines on BURs, information on finance, technology and capacity-building needs and support received.

60. Honduras clearly reported information on constraints and gaps, and related financial, technical and capacity-building needs in accordance with decision 2/CP.17, annex III, paragraph 14. In its BUR, Honduras identified a general lack of funding and low level of technical know-how in the area of MRV of mitigation as constraints. Honduras reported that its financial, technical and capacity-building needs are primarily in the areas of building technical capacity to diffuse new mitigation technologies and establishing an MRV system.

61. Honduras reported information on financial resources, technology transfer, capacity-building and technical support received in accordance with decision 2/CP.17, annex III, paragraph 15. In its BUR, Honduras reported that it received USD 852,000 from the GEF, which included an allocation for preparing both its first BUR and its NC3, but it did not receive any further financial resources. The information reported indicates that Honduras received capacity-building and technical support from the United Nations Development Programme to facilitate its use of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for preparing its GHG inventory.

62. Honduras reported information on nationally determined technology needs with regard to the development and transfer of technology in accordance with decision 2/CP.17, annex III, paragraph 16. In its BUR, Honduras reported that the TNA was nationally determined. The TNA was the basis for the technology needs reported in the BUR, and these needs were also captured in its technology action plan.

D. Identification of capacity-building needs

63. In consultation with Honduras, the TTE identified the following needs for capacity-building that could facilitate the preparation of subsequent BURs and participation in ICA:

(a) Designing and implementing the planned national GHG inventory system;

(b) Enhancing understanding of methodologies for estimating emissions and removals;

(c) Improving data collection, including stakeholder coordination in data collection;

(d) Enhancing understanding of the provisions in the UNFCCC reporting guidelines on BURs in order to improve reporting on the GHG inventory, such as by improving capacity to:

(i) Report on AD used, particularly for the energy, IPPU and AFOLU sectors;

(ii) Report a consistent time series;

(iii) Report on EFs and other parameters used for estimation, particularly for the AFOLU and waste sectors;

(iv) Report on QA/QC measures and improvement plans;

(v) Undertake and report an uncertainty analysis;

(e) Enhancing the technical capacity of institutions involved in sector-level mitigation action to carry out informed policymaking and play a leading role in proposing and designing mitigation initiatives, including the technical capacity to:

(i) Conduct assessments of mitigation policies and actions;

(ii) Monitor and report on actions, in line with the UNFCCC reporting guidelines on BURs;

(f) Increasing the capacity to coordinate mitigation actions by establishing the necessary institutional arrangements, including assigning clear roles and responsibilities; to

compile and report information in a centralized information system on a continuous basis; and to establish procedures to be followed by stakeholders for reporting key information to the coordinating entity and monitoring implementation of the mitigation actions under their responsibility;

(g) Enhancing the capacity to obtain funding and enhancing the expertise of sector-level institutions such that the BUR may be prepared on a continuous basis and in a timely manner.

64. The TTE noted that, in addition to those identified during the technical analysis, Honduras reported several capacity-building needs in its BUR (tables 5-1–5-3), covering the following areas:

(a) Updating the NDC and tracking progress towards targets therein;

(b) Assessing, implementing and monitoring technologies for the agriculture, waste, IPPU and energy sectors;

(c) Implementing NAMAs;

(d) MRV.

III. Conclusions

65. The TTE conducted a technical analysis of the information reported in the first BUR of Honduras in accordance with the UNFCCC reporting guidelines on BURs and concludes that the information reported is partially consistent. It provides an overview of national circumstances and institutional arrangements relevant to the preparation of NCs on a continuous basis; the national inventory of anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks of all GHGs not controlled by the Montreal Protocol, including an NIR; mitigation actions and their effects; constraints and gaps, and related financial, technical and capacity-building needs, including a description of support needed and received; the level of support received to enable the preparation and submission of BURs; and domestic MRV. During the technical analysis, additional information was provided by Honduras on its GHG inventories and mitigation actions. The TTE concluded that the information analysed is partially transparent.

66. Honduras reported information on the institutional arrangements relevant to the preparation of its BURs. The coordinating entity for preparing the BUR is the National Climate Change Directorate under the Secretariat of Natural Resources and Environment. It has taken significant steps to design institutional arrangements that allow for the sustainable preparation of its BURs, and implementation of these arrangements is under way. The arrangements include making organizational improvements and establishing knowledge-sharing procedures to facilitate sectoral information transfer. The Party currently lacks an MRV system to ensure reporting on a continuous basis but has identified gaps and constraints as well as capacity-building and financial needs required to enhance its institutional framework, procedures and data management.

67. In its first BUR, submitted in 2020, Honduras reported information on its national GHG inventory for 2005–2015. This included GHG emissions and removals of CO_2, CH_4 and N_2O for all relevant sources and sinks but not of the precursor gases, except for HFCs, which were reported for 2010–2015. The inventory was developed on the basis of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for all categories. Total GHG emissions excluding land categories were reported as 8,531.02 and 16,195.25 Gg CO_2 eq for 2005 and 2015 respectively. Total GHG emissions including land categories were reported as 3,804.04 and 8,753.15 Gg CO_2 eq for 2005 and 2015 respectively. In total, 12 key categories including land categories and 15 key categories excluding forestry and other land use were identified by the level assessment. The top three key categories including forestry and other land use were CO_2 from forest land remaining forest land (removals), CO_2 from land converted to other land and CO_2 from road transport. The top three key categories excluding forestry and other land use were CO_2 from road transport, CO_2 from electricity and heat production and CH_4 from enteric fermentation. Estimates for lime production for 2005–2013, marine bunkers, PFCs, SF_6 and HFCs for

2005–2009, emissions from biomass burning and emissions and removals for land uses and land-use changes other than forest land were not provided owing to time constraints and difficulties in obtaining the necessary data, as clarified by the Party in its BUR and during the technical analysis.

68. Honduras launched a national strategy on climate change in 2010 and established a climate change law in 2014. The Climate Agenda launched in 2017 includes provision for developing and implementing a national mitigation plan, which is now at the draft stage, and the REDD+ initiative is well developed in Honduras. The Party reported information on mitigation actions implemented through international cooperation and on five NAMAs, all at the planning stage. The actions cover all sectors, but are focused on energy and AFOLU, which are the main sources of GHG emissions in Honduras and were the prioritized sectors in the TNA performed in 2015–2018. The three planned NAMAs addressing the energy sector are prioritized in the NDC. The Party did not report on progress of implementation, quantitative goals, progress indicators, steps taken or envisaged, or results achieved in relation to its mitigation actions, except for some NAMAs and CDM projects. As the numerous initiatives are being implemented by different actors in various parts of the country, the information able to be gathered was primarily descriptions of the mitigation actions, their implementation periods and the institutions involved. Further, the impacts are not centrally reported or monitored.

69. Honduras reported information on its international market mechanisms (30 CDM projects and three CDM programmes of activities) and voluntary market-based projects (three under the Verified Carbon Standard and five under the Gold Standard), all of which focus on renewable energy and energy efficiency. Honduras also reported on its plans to develop and implement an integrated MRV system, including MRV for mitigation, with the help of a CBIT project, and highlighted its need to establish appropriate institutional arrangements and reinforce the institutional and technical capacity of institutions operating at the sector level.

70. Honduras reported information on key constraints, gaps and related needs, including a general lack of funding and low level of local technical capacity in the area of MRV of mitigation. Information was reported on the technical, technology transfer and capacity-building support received, including the assistance received from the GEF. The Party also reported that it received financial support of USD 852,000 from the GEF for preparing its latest BUR. The Party further reported information on the transfer of technology received, including in the energy and agriculture sectors, as prioritized in its TNA.

71. The TTE, in consultation with Honduras, identified the 12 capacity-building needs listed in chapter II.D above and needs for capacity-building that aim to facilitate reporting in accordance with the UNFCCC reporting guidelines on BURs and participation in ICA in accordance with the ICA modalities and guidelines, taking into account Article 4, paragraph 3, of the Convention. Honduras prioritized all the capacity-building needs.

Annex I

Extent of the information reported by Honduras in its first biennial update report

Table I.1
Identification of the extent to which the elements of information on greenhouse gases are included in the first biennial update report of Honduras

Decision	*Provision of the reporting guidelines*	*Assessment of whether the information was reported*	*Comments on the extent of the information provided*
Decision 2/CP.17, paragraph 41(g)	The first BUR shall cover, at a minimum, the inventory for the calendar year no more than four years prior to the date of the submission, or more recent years if information is available, and subsequent BURs shall cover a calendar year that does not precede the submission date by more than four years.	No	Honduras submitted its first BUR in November 2020; the GHG inventory reported is for 2005–2015.
Decision 2/CP.17, annex III, paragraph 4	Non-Annex I Parties should use the methodologies established in the latest UNFCCC guidelines for the preparation of NCs from non-Annex I Parties approved by the Conference of the Parties or those determined by any future decision of the Conference of the Parties on this matter.	Yes	Honduras used the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.
Decision 2/CP.17, annex III, paragraph 5	The updates of the section on national inventories of anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks of all GHGs not controlled by the Montreal Protocol should contain updated data on activity levels based on the best information available using the Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines, the IPCC good practice guidance and the IPCC good practice guidance for LULUCF; any change to the EF may be made in the subsequent full NC.	No	The Party produced inventories for 1995 and 2000 using the Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines. It has not updated the inventories for those years using the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.
Decision 2/CP.17, annex III, paragraph 6	Non-Annex I Parties are encouraged to include, as appropriate and to the extent that capacities permit, in the inventory section of the BUR:		
	(a) The tables included in annex 3A.2 to the IPCC good practice guidance for LULUCF;	No	Comparable information was not reported.
	(b) The sectoral report tables annexed to the Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines.	Yes	Comparable information was reported.
Decision 2/CP.17, annex III, paragraph 7	Each non-Annex I Party is encouraged to provide a consistent time series back to the years reported in its previous NCs.	No	The time series are not consistent because the Party partly updated the inventory submitted as part of its NC3.
Decision 2/CP.17, annex III, paragraph 8	Non-Annex I Parties that have previously reported on their national GHG inventories contained in their NCs are encouraged to submit summary information tables of inventories for previous submission years (e.g. for 1994 and 2000).	Yes	This information was reported for 1995 and 2000.
Decision 2/CP.17, annex III, paragraph 9	The inventory section of the BUR should consist of an NIR as a summary or as an update of the information contained in decision 17/CP.8, annex, chapter III (National greenhouse gas inventories), including:	Partly	
	(a) Table 1 (National greenhouse gas inventory of anthropogenic emissions by sources and	Yes	Comparable information was reported in the BUR (table 2-5

Decision	*Provision of the reporting guidelines*	*Assessment of whether the information was reported*	*Comments on the extent of the information provided*
	removals by sinks of all greenhouse gases not controlled by the Montreal Protocol and greenhouse gas precursors);		and annex I). The NIR contains the same tables (tables 5 and 14).
	(b) Table 2 (National greenhouse gas inventory of anthropogenic emissions of HFCs, PFCs and SF_6).	Partly	Comparable information was reported in the BUR (annex I), but HFC emissions were estimated and reported for 2010–2015 only.
Decision 2/CP.17, annex III, paragraph 10	Additional or supporting information, including sector-specific information, may be supplied in a technical annex.	Yes	The Party submitted an NIR and a REDD+ technical annex as separate files with its BUR.
Decision 17/CP.8, annex, paragraph 12	Non-Annex I Parties are also encouraged, to the extent possible, to undertake any key source analysis as indicated in the IPCC good practice guidance to assist in developing inventories that better reflect their national circumstances.	Yes	
Decision 17/CP.8, annex, paragraph 13	Non-Annex I Parties are encouraged to describe procedures and arrangements undertaken to collect and archive data for the preparation of national GHG inventories, as well as efforts to make this a continuous process, including information on the role of the institutions involved.	Partly	The Party described arrangements in place and procedures followed to collect data, and its efforts to make data collection a continuous process. The Party reported that in the future it will include an archiving system.
Decision 17/CP.8, annex, paragraph 14	Each non-Annex I Party shall, as appropriate and to the extent possible, provide in its national inventory, on a gas-by-gas basis and in units of mass, estimates of anthropogenic emissions of:		
	(a) CO_2;	Partly	Reported for some categories as "NE".
	(b) CH_4;	Partly	Reported for some categories as "NE".
	(c) N_2O.	Partly	Reported for some categories as "NE".
Decision 17/CP.8, annex, paragraph 15	Non-Annex I Parties are encouraged, as appropriate, to provide information on anthropogenic emissions by sources of:		
	(a) HFCs;	Yes	The Party reported HFC emissions for 2010–2015 only, explaining in its NIR that there are no data for 2005–2009.
	(b) PFCs;	No	
	(c) SF_6.	No	
Decision 17/CP.8, annex, paragraph 16	Non-Annex I Parties are encouraged, as appropriate, to report on anthropogenic emissions by sources of other GHGs, such as:		
	(a) Carbon monoxide;	No	
	(b) Nitrogen oxides;	No	
	(c) Non-methane volatile organic compounds.	Partly	Reported for some activities.

Decision	*Provision of the reporting guidelines*	*Assessment of whether the information was reported*	*Comments on the extent of the information provided*
Decision 17/CP.8, annex, paragraph 17	Other gases not controlled by the Montreal Protocol, such as sulfur oxides, and included in the Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines may be included at the discretion of Parties.	No	The Party did not report on any other gases.
Decision 17/CP.8, annex, paragraph 18	Non-Annex I Parties are encouraged, to the extent possible, and if disaggregated data are available, to estimate and report CO_2 fuel combustion emissions using both the sectoral and the reference approach and to explain any large differences between the two approaches.	Partly	The information was reported using both the sectoral and the reference approach, and, while the differences between the two approaches were reported, the explanations of the differences should be more detailed to improve the transparency of the report.
Decision 17/CP.8, annex, paragraph 19	Non-Annex I Parties should, to the extent possible, and if disaggregated data are available, report emissions from international aviation and marine bunker fuels separately in their inventories:		
	(a) International aviation;	Yes	The Party confirmed during the technical analysis that emissions from international aviation were estimated but not reported as part of the memo items in the reporting tables.
	(b) Marine bunker fuels.	No	
Decision 17/CP.8, annex, paragraph 20	Non-Annex I Parties wishing to report on aggregated GHG emissions and removals expressed in CO_2 eq should use the GWP provided by the IPCC in its AR2 based on the effects of GHGs over a 100-year time-horizon.	Yes	The Party used the GWP values provided in the AR2.
Decision 17/CP.8, annex, paragraph 21	Non-Annex I Parties are encouraged to provide information on methodologies used in the estimation of anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks of GHGs not controlled by the Montreal Protocol, including a brief explanation of the sources of EFs and AD. If non-Annex I Parties estimate anthropogenic emissions and removals from country-specific sources and/or sinks that are not part of the Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines, they should explicitly describe the source and/or sink categories, methodologies, EFs and AD used in their estimation of emissions, as appropriate. Parties are encouraged to identify areas where data may be further improved in future communications through capacity-building:		
	(a) Information on methodologies used in the estimation of anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks of GHGs not controlled by the Montreal Protocol;	Yes	Honduras used the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. Tier 1 methodology was used for all categories.
	(b) Explanation of the sources of EFs;	No	
	(c) Explanation of the sources of AD;	No	
	(d) If non-Annex I Parties estimate anthropogenic emissions and removals from country-specific sources and/or sinks that are not part of the Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines, they should explicitly describe:	NA	

Decision	*Provision of the reporting guidelines*	*Assessment of whether the information was reported*	*Comments on the extent of the information provided*
	(i) Source and/or sink categories;		
	(ii) Methodologies;		
	(iii) EFs;		
	(iv) AD;		
	(e) Parties are encouraged to identify areas where data may be further improved in future communications through capacity-building.	Partly	The Party identified some areas where data may be further improved but did not identify some areas with data gaps or inconsistencies that also require further improvement.
Decision 17/CP.8, annex, paragraph 22	Each non-Annex I Party is encouraged to use tables 1–2 of the guidelines annexed to decision 17/CP.8 in reporting its national GHG inventory, taking into account the provisions established in paragraphs 14–17. In preparing those tables, Parties should strive to present information that is as complete as possible. Where numerical data are not provided, Parties should use the notation keys as indicated.	Partly	Notation keys were used in most cases, but there are some gaps in reporting tables where specific notation keys were not used.
Decision 17/CP.8, annex, paragraph 24	Non-Annex I Parties are encouraged to provide information on the level of uncertainty associated with inventory data and their underlying assumptions, and to describe the methodologies used, if any, for estimating these uncertainties:		Honduras did not estimate any uncertainties owing to lack of time, but will do so for its next BUR.
	(a) Level of uncertainty associated with inventory data;	No	
	(b) Underlying assumptions;	No	
	(c) Methodologies used, if any, for estimating these uncertainties.	No	

Note: The parts of the UNFCCC reporting guidelines on BURs on reporting information on GHG emissions by sources and removals by sinks in BURs are contained in decision 2/CP.17, paras. 3–10 and 41(g). Further, as per para. 3 of those guidelines, non-Annex I Parties are to submit updates of their national GHG inventories in accordance with paras. 8–24 of the UNFCCC guidelines for the preparation of NCs from non-Annex I Parties, contained in the annex to decision 17/CP.8. The scope of such updates should be consistent with the non-Annex I Party's capacity and time constraints and the availability of its data, as well as the level of support provided by developed country Parties for biennial update reporting.

Table I.2
Identification of the extent to which the elements of information on mitigation actions are included in the first biennial update report of Honduras

Decision	*Provision of the reporting guidelines*	*Assessment of whether the information was reported*	*Comments on the extent of the information provided*
Decision 2/CP.17, annex III, paragraph 11	Non-Annex I Parties should provide information, in tabular format, on actions to mitigate climate change by addressing anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks of all GHGs not controlled by the Montreal Protocol.	Yes	
Decision 2/CP.17, annex III, paragraph 12	For each mitigation action or group of mitigation actions, including, as appropriate, those listed in document FCCC/AWGLCA/2011/INF.1, developing		

Decision	*Provision of the reporting guidelines*	*Assessment of whether the information was reported*	*Comments on the extent of the information provided*
	country Parties shall provide the following information, to the extent possible:		
	(a) Name and description of the mitigation action, including information on the nature of the action, coverage (i.e. sectors and gases), quantitative goals and progress indicators;	Partly	The description of NAMAs is not complete as numerous projects and initiatives listed as mitigation actions implemented lack description of the action, GHGs covered, quantitative and qualitative goals, and progress indicators.
	(b) Information on:		
	(i) Methodologies;	No	
	(ii) Assumptions;	No	
	(c) Information on:		
	(i) Objectives of the action;	No	Only the title and sector covered were reported for the mitigation actions, and not their objectives and outcomes.
	(ii) Steps taken or envisaged to achieve that action;	Partly	Information on the steps envisaged to develop NAMAs was provided in the BUR, but not on the steps taken to achieve them. No information on the steps taken to achieve the actions or project objectives was provided.
	(d) Information on:		
	(i) Progress of implementation of the mitigation actions;	Partly	The Party reported on the status of the NAMAs proposed in the NDC, but reported only the implementation period for the numerous other initiatives and projects.
	(ii) Progress of implementation of the underlying steps taken or envisaged;	Partly	The Party reported that the proposed NAMAs are at the planning stage or are awaiting financial support, but did not provide any information on the progress of the other initiatives and measures developed.
	(iii) Results achieved, such as estimated outcomes (metrics depending on type of action) and estimated emission reductions, to the extent possible;	No	The Party did not report any information on the results achieved for the projects, actions or measures implemented.
	(e) Information on international market mechanisms.	Yes	
Decision 2/CP.17, annex III, paragraph 13	Parties should provide information on domestic MRV arrangements.	Yes	There are no MRV arrangements in place for implementing and tracking mitigation actions. The Party plans to implement an integrated MRV system through a CBIT project but there is currently no centralized, coordinated system defining roles, responsibilities and

Decision	*Provision of the reporting guidelines*	*Assessment of whether the information was reported*	*Comments on the extent of the information provided*
			procedures in monitoring and reporting on mitigation actions.

Note: The parts of the UNFCCC reporting guidelines on BURs on the reporting of information on mitigation actions in BURs are contained in decision 2/CP.17, annex III, paras. 11–13.

Table I.3
Identification of the extent to which the elements of information on finance, technology and capacity-building needs and support received are included in the first biennial update report of Honduras

Decision	*Provision of the reporting requirements*	*Assessment of whether the information was reported*	*Comments on the extent of the information provided*
Decision 2/CP.17, annex III, paragraph 14	Non-Annex I Parties should provide updated information on:		
	(a) Constraints and gaps;	Yes	
	(b) Related financial, technical and capacity-building needs.	Yes	
Decision 2/CP.17, annex III, paragraph 15	Non-Annex I Parties should provide:		
	(a) Information on financial resources received, technology transfer and capacity-building received;	Yes	
	(b) Information on technical support received from the GEF, Parties included in Annex II to the Convention and other developed country Parties, the Green Climate Fund and multilateral institutions for activities relating to climate change, including for the preparation of the current BUR.	Yes	
Decision 2/CP.17, annex III, paragraph 16	With regard to the development and transfer of technology, non-Annex I Parties should provide information on:		
	(a) Nationally determined technology needs;	Yes	
	(b) Technology support received.	Yes	

Note: The parts of the UNFCCC reporting guidelines on BURs on the reporting of information on finance, technology and capacity-building needs and support received in BURs are contained in decision 2/CP.17, annex III, paras. 14–16.

Annex II

Reference documents

B. Reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change

IPCC. 1997. *Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*. JL Houghton, LG Meira Filho, B Lim, et al. (eds.). Paris: IPCC/Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development/International Energy Agency. Available at https://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/gl/invs1.html.

IPCC. 2000. *Good Practice Guidance and Uncertainty Management in National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*. J Penman, D Kruger, I Galbally, et al. (eds.). Hayama, Japan: IPCC/Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development/International Energy Agency/Institute for Global Environmental Strategies.
Available at http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/gp/english/.

IPCC. 2003. *Good Practice Guidance for Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry*. J Penman, M Gytarsky, T Hiraishi, et al. (eds.). Hayama, Japan: Institute for Global Environmental Strategies.
Available at http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/gpglulucf/gpglulucf.html.

IPCC. 2006. *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*. S Eggleston, L Buendia, K Miwa, et al. (eds.). Hayama, Japan: Institute for Global Environmental Strategies. Available at http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/2006gl.

C. UNFCCC documents

First BUR of Honduras. Available at https://unfccc.int/BURs.

NC1, NC2 and NC3 of Honduras. Available at https://unfccc.int/non-annex-I-NCs.

D. Other documents

Detailed description of mitigation initiatives per sector (provided to the TTE during the technical analysis).