Climate Change and Air Quality

South Africa's Experience on ICA

Annual Partnership Retreat (PATPA) 16 October 2018





Overview of the Presentation

- Background
- BUR -1 ICA
- BUR-2 ICA
- Key messages and Conclusion

Background

- South Africa submitted its first BUR on 17 December 2014. This BUR was developed through a consultant.
- The technical analysis of the BUR took place from 18 to 22 May 2015 in Bonn, Germany, 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,
- Technical analysis included clarifications via emails as well as identification of capacity building needs with the TTE
- SA's summary report on BUR-1 was finalised with the TTE finalised on 5
 November 2015
- South Africa submitted its second BUR on 28 December 2017, which is more than two years since the submission of its first BUR. This BUR was developed internally within the DEA
- The technical analysis of the BUR took place from 5 to 9 March 2018
- Conference call with the TTE to identify capacity building needs for both reports
- SA is currently finalising the summary report with the TTE

BUR-1 ICA (Technical Analysis)

- 1st experience with BUR ICA
- Clarifications provided through email between SA and the TTE via the UNFCCC secretariat
- Process was non-intruisive but the team thought some of the clarifications requested was beyond the mandate of the TTE
- Extend to which elements of info was included in the GHG, mitigation actions and effects as well as finance, technology and cb needs and support received was included
- Generally a few of missing elements in ghg inventory and mitigation chapters (mostly partly) but met all provisions on elements of info on support needs and provided
- In most cases, this was due to data gaps (quantification of impacts, (GHG) reporting on a consistent time series back to the years reported in the previous NC, reporting on units of mass on the gases)
- Generally, SA reported transparently in its 1st BUR

BUR-2 ICA (Technical Analysis) 2nd experience with BUR ICA

- Process still underway
- Clarifications provided through email between SA and the TTE via the **UNFCCC** secretariat
- Process was non-intruisive. TTE made use of the checklist prepared by CGE. We found it to be very helpful as it also included the clarifications provided in the 1st BUR
- TTE noted improvements in the quality of reporting from 1st to 2nd BUR
- Extend to which elements of info was included in the GHG, mitigation actions and effects as well as finance, technology and cb needs and support received was included (Also, NC as well domestic MRV)
- Improvements in quantifying some mitigation actions, documenting methodologies used as well as providing progress
- GHG Inventory, still could not report back to 1990 as reported in INC of SA (also flagged in 1st ICA). SA also notes that this is an encouragement but will look into reporting back on the consistent time series in the future. Currently using 2000 as a base year and is reputing o a time series. May use splicing or back extrapolation

Key messages and Conclusion

- Support has been provided for some of the CB identified in BUR-1
- GEF funding for determining country specific EF and moving to higher tiers for our key sectors and sus-subsectors as well as doing recalculations
- Norwegian funding for the development of the NGHGIMS
- SA aims to improve its reporting with subsequent reports
- Experience from reporting, cb initiatives and training materials as well as undergoing the ICA does help in improving the quality and transparency of subsequent reports
- It also notes that there is still room for improvement and capacity is still required to improve the transparency and quality of reporting. SA values and recommends the continued the cb support provided by the CGE and other international organisations
- SA has found CGE training materials very useful in preparing both 1st and 2nd BURs
- CGE Checklist used by TTE is also very helpful and made interaction with the TTE easier
- SA is also of a view that in doing the technical analysis "shall " requirement should be treated differently with "may, should and encouraged" requirements



- International Reporting (BURs & NatComs)
- National Department of Environmental Affairs (South Africa)
- Email: smotshwanedi@environment.gov.za
- <u>Tel:+27123999155</u>
- www.environment.gov.za



