



04 July 2018

English only

---

## **Record of the facilitative sharing of views during the forty-eighth session of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation: Chile**

**Note by the secretariat**

### **I. Background and mandate**

1. The Conference of the Parties (COP), by decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 63, decided to conduct under the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) an 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 the transparency of 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 decided that the first round of ICA would be conducted for developing country Parties and would commence within six months of the submission of the first round of BURs by developing country Parties,<sup>1</sup> and that the frequency of participation in subsequent rounds of ICA by developing country Parties, based on their respective capabilities and national circumstances, and [with] special flexibility for small island developing States and the least developed country Parties, will be determined by the frequency of the submission of BURs.

3. According to the ICA modalities and guidelines, the ICA process consists of two steps: a technical analysis of the BURs 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.<sup>2</sup>

4. Pursuant to the ICA modalities and guidelines, the SBI convened on 4 May 2018 in Bonn, German, at SBI 48, the fifth workshop for the facilitative exchange of views, open to all Parties, for two non-Annex I Parties, including Chile, for which there was a BUR and a final summary report by 4 December 2017.<sup>3</sup> Interested Parties were able to submit written

---

<sup>1</sup> Decision 2/CP.17, paragraph 58(a).

<sup>2</sup> Decision 2/CP.17, annex IV, paragraph 3.

<sup>3</sup> The BURs and the summary reports are available at <https://unfccc.int/process/transparency-and-reporting/reporting-and-review-under-convention/biennial-update-reports-0> and

questions in advance. As a result, Chile received 17 written questions in advance from the following Parties: the European Union, Japan, New Zealand, Switzerland, Turkey and the United States of America.

5. The workshop, chaired by the SBI Rapporteur, Ms. Tugba Icmeli (Turkey), comprised a two-hour session covering the two Parties in alphabetical order.

6. This record of the FSV for Chile summarizes the proceedings and, together with the summary report on the technical analysis of its second BUR,<sup>4</sup> constitutes the outcome of the second round of ICA for Chile.

## II. Summary of proceedings

7. At the workshop, Chile made a brief presentation on its BUR. The presentation was followed by a question and answer session.

8. In its presentation Chile provided an overview of its 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, carbon pricing, measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) systems for mitigation actions, support needed and received, experiences and lessons learned through participating in ICA.

9. Chile highlighted that its total GHG emissions for 2013 were 70,054.4 kilotonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq) including forestry and other land use (FOLU) and 109,908.8 kt CO<sub>2</sub> eq (excluding FOLU). Total GHG emissions for 2013 excluding FOLU have increased by 113.4 and 19.3 per cent since 1990 and 2010, respectively.

10. It also provided an overview of its mitigation actions and their effects, including those implemented as projects under the clean development mechanism of the Kyoto Protocol. Chile highlighted its sectoral mitigation policies and actions such as: its energy policy (Energy 2050), the Wastes Law, the National Strategy for Climate Change and Vegetation resources; nationally appropriate mitigation actions in the transport, energy, forestry and waste sectors; cross-cutting actions and instruments associated with GHG mitigations such as the Huella Chile Programme, mitigation action plans and scenarios and the Low-Emission Capacity Building Chile project; and mitigation efforts in the private sector, such as the voluntary actions developed by the cement, mining and steel industries. In addition, Chile presented information on green taxes, because the Government of Chile has approved a tax on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions applied to sources (boilers or turbines) with a thermal power greater than or equal to 50 MWt.

11. Chile provided information on support received on climate change mitigation in the areas of, inter alia, agriculture and forests, energy, biodiversity, infrastructure and cross-cutting and also explained which donors had provided funding for each of these sectors. In addition, Chile also presented information on its experience with the preparation of the BUR and how it overcame the challenges from the first BUR to the second BUR, such as aspects related to national inventory systems and working with the latest methodologies of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, and understanding the common definitions for mitigation actions and support received. Some of the challenges from the preparation of the second BUR, which have already been addressed, include those related to reporting on specific gases, those related to reporting on the private sector, and information related to the

---

<https://unfccc.int/process/transparency-and-reporting/reporting-and-review-under-the-convention/biennial-update-reportsand-international-consultation-and-analysis/international-consultation-and-analysis-process/ica-documents-cycle-1> respectively.

<sup>4</sup> FCCC/SBI/ICA/2017/TASR.2/CHL.

process of mitigation actions (policies) and how to calculate those impacts. There are also ongoing challenges such as the sustainability of the current arrangements for reporting, the integration of climate change indicators and MRV as an assessment tool for sectoral institutions, and how to improve capacity and tools to estimate mitigation impacts.

12. Over the course of the presentation, Chile addressed written questions submitted in advance, through the secretariat, by interested Parties.

13. After the presentation, the following Parties made interventions commending Chile for its efforts and asked questions seeking further clarification: Brazil, European Union, Germany, India, Nigeria, Netherlands, Malaysia, Switzerland and United States of America. The questions and answers were mainly focused on the following areas: GHG inventory data; what capacity-building support is still needed and how support received had assisted in the preparation of the report; experiences and lessons learned from the previous round of ICA, including strengthening the institutional arrangements and the capacity-building of national experts; the domestic relevance of the BUR report; and issues related to the carbon tax system, including the revenue generated.

14. The full details of the presentation as well as subsequent interventions are available in the Skype Broadcast of the workshop.<sup>5</sup>

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

---

---

<sup>5</sup> <https://join-emea.broadcast.skype.com/unfccc365.onmicrosoft.com/b0e30302a2b8488f87b3970577edd7d1>.