



29 June 2017

English only

Record of the facilitative sharing of views during the forty-sixth session of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation: Montenegro

Note by the secretariat

I. Background and mandate

1. The Conference of the Parties (COP) decided by decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 63, to conduct under the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) international consultation and analysis (ICA) of biennial update reports (BURs) from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention (non-Annex I Parties) in a manner that is non-intrusive, non-punitive and respectful of national sovereignty. This process aims to increase transparency of the mitigation actions and their effects reported by non-Annex I Parties.
2. The COP, by decision 2/CP.17, paragraph 56, adopted the modalities and guidelines for international consultation and analysis contained in annex IV to the same decision (hereinafter referred to as the ICA modalities and guidelines). The COP further 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 by developing country Parties.¹
3. According to the ICA modalities and guidelines, the ICA process consists of two steps: a technical analysis of the BUR of non-Annex I Parties by a team of technical experts resulting in a summary report for each Party; and a facilitative sharing of views (FSV), with BURs and summary reports serving as input.²
4. Pursuant to the ICA modalities and guidelines, the SBI convened on 15 May 2017 in Bonn, Germany, at SBI 46, the third workshop for the facilitative exchange of views, open to all Parties, for 10 non-Annex I Parties, including Montenegro, for which there is a BUR and a final summary report by 10 March 2017.³ Interested Parties were able to submit written questions in advance. As a result, Montenegro received one written question in advance from New Zealand.
5. The workshop, chaired by the SBI Rapporteur, Ms. Tugba Icmeli, comprised two three-hour sessions covering five Parties in alphabetical order.

¹ Decision 2/CP.17, paragraph 58(a).

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

³ The BURs and the summary reports are available at <http://unfccc.int/8722.php> and <http://unfccc.int/10054.php>, respectively.

6. This record of the FSV for Montenegro summarizes the proceedings and together with the summary report on the technical analysis of its BUR,⁴ constitutes the outcome of the first round of ICA for Montenegro.

II. Summary of proceedings

7. At this workshop for the facilitative sharing of views, Montenegro made a brief presentation on its BUR. The presentation was followed by a question and answer session.

8. In its presentation, Montenegro provided an overview of its national circumstances and institutional arrangements, national inventory of anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks of all greenhouse gases (GHGs) not controlled by the Montreal Protocol, mitigation actions and effects, and support needed and received. It highlighted that total GHG emissions in 2013 were 956.67 gigagrams of carbon dioxide equivalent (Gg CO₂ eq), including removals from the land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF) sectors, and 3,178.28 Gg CO₂ eq without the LULUCF sector. According to Montenegro, the emissions were mainly from a small number of stationary installations. Compared with the 1990 levels, GHG emissions in 2013 represented a decrease of 74 per cent including the LULUCF sector and 49 per cent excluding the LULUCF sector. As explained by Montenegro, the decrease in GHG emissions during the period 1990–2013 was owing to the high levels of net CO₂ removals from forests occupying a large proportion of the national area and due to the negative economic trends and the continuous decline of industrial production. Also, low emissions estimates from the agriculture sector reported in the inventory are partly due to the incomplete estimation of emissions as a result of the lack of statistical data. The energy and industrial process [and product use?] sectors represented the greatest source of emissions, with 76 per cent and 9 per cent, respectively, followed by the waste sector at 6.3 per cent.

9. Montenegro also provided an overview of its mitigation actions and their effects, developed under two scenarios: the with measures (WM) scenario, which includes those measures that are laid down by national and/or European Union (EU) legislation and strategies; and the with additional measures scenario, which includes the original WM scenario extended by additional measures that are not required by EU legislation and/or measures for which EU legislation allows flexibility regarding certain requirements. The WM scenario includes 14 measures under the following categories: energy (6), transport (2), forestry (1), agriculture (1), waste (1), tourism (1) and cross-cutting (3). The total expected emission reductions of these 14 measures is estimated at 375 Gg CO₂ eq to be achieved by 2024.

10. During the session, Montenegro provided information on its identified needs in terms of finance, technology and capacity-building. The main areas being identified include: technology required for implementing mitigation actions such as energy efficiency technology in the housing and commercial sectors, for enhancing the use of renewable sources, for efficient resource management (water, land, forest, coastal areas), and low carbon technology; financial needs for implementing mitigation measures in the transport sector; and capacity-building for consolidating existing technical and institutional capacities along with efforts to integrate climate change into national policies, programmes and plans.

11. Over the course of the presentation, Montenegro addressed the written question submitted in advance, through the secretariat, by New Zealand.

12. Following the presentation, the following Parties made interventions commending Montenegro for its efforts and asked questions seeking further clarification: Brazil, the European Union, Germany, Mexico, New Zealand and the United States of America. The questions and answers were mainly focused on the following areas: the highest priorities to improve the GHG inventory; the experience gained and lessons learned from participating in the ICA process; specific examples of the technology needs for resource management (water, forestry, coastal); the priorities of capacity-building needs identified during the

⁴ FCCC/SBI/ICA/2016/TASR.1/MNE.

technical analysis; institutional arrangements for reporting on GHG inventories; and the main areas of Montenegro's climate change strategy.

13. The full details of the presentation as well as subsequent interventions are available in the YouTube broadcast of this workshop.⁵

14. In closing the workshop, the SBI Rapporteur congratulated Montenegro for successfully undergoing the FSV and completing the first round of its ICA process. She thanked Montenegro and all other participating Parties for engaging in the workshop in a truly facilitative manner. She also thanked the secretariat for its support.

⁵ <https://youtu.be/dZ0AVSkZkL8?list=PL-m2oy1bnLzpmdRpG2pTBzUeOH3qrXlZt>.