



ecbi Annual Report

2013-2014



ecbi

European Capacity Building Initiative

www.eurocapacity.org

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Message from the Director	2
Messages from the Advisory Committee Co-Chairs	4
Bo Kjellén	4
Pa Ousman Jarju	5
ecbi Governance Structure	6
The Executive Committee	6
The Advisory Committee	6
ecbi Activities	7
Fellowship Programme	8
<i>Bonn Seminar 2013</i>	8
<i>ecbi Fellowship Colloquium and Oxford Seminar</i>	10
<i>GCF Caucus Meeting</i>	14
<i>Finance Circle Meeting</i>	14
Support and Training Programme	15
<i>Training</i>	15
<i>Support</i>	15
Publications and Policy Analysis Unit	16

MESSAGE FROM THE DIRECTOR



Benito Müller

Managing Director, Oxford Climate Policy

FY 2013-2014 marked the penultimate year of the current Phase III of the ecbi, a time for taking stock in order to plan for the future. A Sida funded independent evaluation of the activities between 2011 and 2013 found that the ecbi has achieved its overall outcomes. The ecbi was found to fulfil a need not met by other initiatives and to have become an established presence in the climate change negotiation field – set apart by its participatory, impartial, developing country-led approach, which is rooted in negotiation experience.

Respondents also communicated strongly that they believed the ecbi is enabling trust building between participating negotiators and enabled developing country negotiators to collaborate and develop joint positions, which has impacted negotiation decisions. Examples were identified of how the ecbi initiative has led to a more level playing field for developing country negotiators and women negotiators.

During this period, the Fellowship Programme organised four events in the course of the past year: the traditional **Bonn Seminar** and **Oxford Fellowships and Seminar**, and **two Ad-hoc Seminars**.

These events were characterised by a high-profile attendance, with representatives of the key negotiating groups in the international negotiations under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). The Oxford Seminar, for instance, was attended by special envoy for climate change from the Presidency of the UNFCCC Conference of Parties; the developing country Co-Chair of the Ad-Hoc Group on the Durban Platform (ADP); the Chairs of the G77+China Group and Africa Group; lead negotiators from Europe; senior representatives from Least Developed Countries (LDCs); and key office holders in UNFCCC bodies, including the developing country Co-Chair and members of the Standing Committee on Finance (SCF), and members of the Green Climate Fund Board (GCFB) and the Advisory Board of the Climate Technology Centre and Network.

Two events took place under the Training and Support Programme: a two-day training workshop for Asian LDC climate change negotiators in Dhaka, with support from GIZ Bangladesh and Bangladesh's Ministry of Environment and Forests (MoEF); and a negotiators workshop on legal issues and challenges related to climate change, organised by the Centre for Climate Justice-Bangladesh in collaboration with the MoEF and the Legal Response Initiative (LRI).

The support provided by ecbi was enhanced last year by the provision of support for "ecbi Caucuses" for the SCF and GCFB. These caucuses are informal groups centred around members from particularly vulnerable countries that are interested in sharing experiences and exchanging views on issues of common interest pertaining to the respective body. I have been attending the meetings of these bodies as adviser to LDC members, interacting with caucus members during the meetings. I also organised the Paris GCF Caucus Ad-hoc Seminar, and was directly involved in organising the Pre-GCF Board Meeting Luncheon Discussion "Country Ownership and Enhancing Direct Access" convened by the Indonesian host of the GCFB meeting. We have had positive feedback for this engagement, with specific decisions attributed to the advice provided, as you will see in the main body of the Annual Report.

I am very pleased to be able to say that the ecbi Publications and Policy Analysis Unit (PPAU) has had an excellent year, not only with more publications than ever before, but public recognition of the quality of its work. Thus, on 28 May, the ecbi Policy Brief '*Crowdfunding for Climate Change: a new source of finance for climate action at the local level?*' was presented by the authors to the first Forum of the Standing Committee on Finance in Barcelona. Two months later, the authors won the Popular Choice Award in the 2013 MIT Climate Co-Lab "Scaling renewables in major emerging economies" contest for an idea based on their ecbi Brief. PPAU produced 21 papers in total during this year, including two policy briefs, one background paper, nine LDC Papers and a number of Discussion Notes.

As ecbi approaches its tenth anniversary, its role remains as crucial as ever. The next two years will need trust-building and bridge-building in the UNFCCC negotiations as never before, if the 2015 agreement is to materialise. The ecbi will use the strong network it has built over the past decade to facilitate this process.

MESSAGES FROM THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE CO-CHAIRS



Picture Courtesy: M. Staas, IISD Reporting Services

Bo Kjellén

Senior Research Fellow, Stockholm Environment Institute and Chair of the Swedish Research Council on Environment, Agricultural Sciences and Spatial Planning

Climate negotiations are now focusing on another decisive conference. The twenty-first Conference of Parties in Paris in late 2015 is designed to agree on a new long-term climate regime, to begin in 2020 and hopefully to cover the major part of the next two decades.

The consolidated Summary for Policymakers of the Fifth Assessment report of the IPCC will be made public in the autumn of 2014. The reports of the three working groups have already been released, and demonstrate clearly that climate is a major issue, engaging the global responsibility of our generation.

As climate negotiations have accelerated over the last three years, the ecbi role in capacity-building has been of increasing importance to the negotiation process. Negotiators are faced with technically complicated matters and more and more people are drawn into the process. The need for capacity building is essential. Seminars and training workshops have clarified complicated issues and facilitated the mutual understanding of positions. ecbi and in particular its director have made important contributions through policy briefs and background papers.

Successful capacity building creates the basis for trust-building. ecbi action to bring key negotiators together through the annual Fellowship Colloquium and the Oxford Seminar have made direct contributions to moving the negotiations forward. As a former negotiator, I have been able to appreciate the very concrete effects of these well organized and friendly exchanges of views. Furthermore, the ecbi Finance Caucuses have facilitated understanding between Parties on some of the most difficult and decisive issues in the negotiations.

As ecbi moves forward into a new Phase next year, I am pleased that the independent evaluation of Phase III has been very positive. In my own view ecbi has an indispensable role to fulfil in supporting the difficult negotiations over the coming years.



Pa Ousman Jarju

Special Envoy on Climate Change, Republic of the Gambia

I have been associated with ecbi for nine years – from my early years in the climate negotiations when I was a junior negotiator for the Gambia, attending one of the ecbi capacity building workshops during the Montreal conference in 2005. The ecbi has been a constant and indispensable companion through my journey since then, first as a negotiator for my country, then Chair of the Group of Least Developed Countries (LDC), and now as Gambia’s Special Climate Envoy.

The Initiative has played a key role in building my own capacity, and that of many of my developing country colleagues. It has also helped us develop personal relationships with negotiators from other countries, regions and groups, to enable us to communicate as friends, and hence raise the trust quotient in a process that is otherwise fraught with distrust. This is manifested through the annual Bonn seminars and Oxford fellowships.

The LDC Group, in particular, has benefitted from the activities of the ecbi. The Initiative has helped the Group cultivate experts in each complex strain of the UNFCCC negotiations through its workshops and bursaries. The constant support provided to the LDC Chair over the past ten years (both before and after my tenure as Chair) has helped the Group grow from strength to strength, and institutionalise many essential activities such as preparatory meetings and the LDC Paper Series, which I started during my time as LDC Chair.

Critical support has also been provided to LDC representatives in key climate-related processes such as the Green Climate Fund Board and the Standing Committee on Finance, hence ensuring that the concerns of the most vulnerable countries are not bypassed or forgotten.

In order to build such a close working relationship with many groups, the ecbi has had to demonstrate, first and foremost, that it is worthy of the trust placed in it by negotiators. The success of the Initiative is proof that it has managed to achieve this trust.

I am pleased to serve on the Advisory Committee, and see a critical role for the Initiative in the years to come, as we negotiate the perilous months and years towards a 2015 climate agreement, and its implementation in 2020.

ECBI GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

The ecbi governance structures and modalities have evolved over time to reflect programming changes, and to ensure maximum transparency and country-drivenness of the ecbi outputs. The governance structure comprises two Committees; three Lead Member Institutions including Oxford Climate Policy (OCP), the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), and the Legal Response Initiative (LRI); two Programmes (the Fellowship Support Programme and the Training and Support Programme, or TSU); and a cross-cutting Publications and Policy Analysis Unit (PPAU).

The Executive Committee

The Lead Member Institutions nominate a representative for the ecbi Executive Committee, which in turn appoints the ecbi Director and the Programme and PPAU heads. The PPAU, which serves a crosscutting function by meeting the policy needs of both Programmes, is jointly managed.

The Executive Committee includes the ecbi Director and the Programme and PPAU Heads as ex officio members. This Committee has the following tasks:

- Allocate ecbi core funding to the three funding windows, with advice from the Advisory Committee.
- Elect the ecbi Director. The ecbi Director is the spokesperson for the ecbi, and is responsible for common activities. S/he chairs the Executive Committee, and is an ex officio participant at Advisory Committee meetings.
- Provide guidance, if requested, to the two Programme Heads for day-to-day Programme management.
- Appoint the Head of the PPAU, and take decisions on PPAU activities.

The Executive Committee is collectively responsible for the overall administrative and financial management of ecbi. It takes decisions by consensus. Where that is not possible, the decision is referred to the Advisory Committee.

The Advisory Committee

An Advisory Committee provides strategic guidance for the content of the initiative. The Executive Committee appoints the Advisory Committee members, keeping in mind the need to have both gender and North-South balance in addition to proven expertise in international climate negotiations. Funders can also nominate a representative to the Advisory Committee (although the Committees may set a minimum contribution in this context). Membership is for the duration of the funding Phase, and can be renewed.

The Advisory Committee has two Co-Chairs (one from a developing country and the other from Europe) chosen by the Committee members from within the membership. The Director is responsible for operational support to the two Co-Chairs.

The Advisory Committee also oversees the external monitoring and evaluation of the ecbi activities and may, with approval from ecbi funders, approve changes in budget lines. The Advisory Committee and the Executive Committee meet at least once annually, usually during the June meetings of the Subsidiary Bodies to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in Bonn, Germany.

BOX: Extracts from the Independent Evaluation of the European Capacity Building Initiative Phase III

- The ecbi is now in Phase III of its operations, and has become an established presence in the climate change negotiation field. It is set apart by its participatory, impartial, developing country-led approach, which is rooted in negotiation experience. ecbi input has enabled developing country negotiators to collaborate and develop joint positions. This has led to impacts on negotiation decisions, where the contribution of ecbi activities can be reasonably inferred.
- One of the key underpinning goals of the ecbi is to build trust between negotiators, both amongst developing country participants, and between those from the developing country and Europe. Respondents communicated strongly that they believed the ecbi is enabling trust building between participating negotiators, and were able to give examples of how this is manifest.
- The evaluation found that participants did feel they were better informed as a result of the ecbi. Useful examples were identified of how this resulted in a more level playing field, as developing country negotiators and women negotiators often have less access to information resources than other stakeholders in the climate change negotiations. The ecbi also considers gender in its programming and is fulfilling its gender objectives.
- The ecbi was found to fulfil a need not met by other initiatives. This was attributed to the fact that the ecbi does not push a specific agenda, and allows open discussion amongst negotiators in a setting separate from the negotiations process.
- In answer to the question 'what is the most important component of the Fellowships and Seminar', the highest number of responses related to 'informal and open personal interaction, building relationships with other negotiators, fostering friendships' in all of the feedback forms reviewed. As one interviewee put it, "It makes a huge difference to strike a view with friends! I listen in a different way if I'm talking with friends, rather than just a negotiator. It's great value added."
- Various reasons were given as to why the ecbi occupied a unique position amongst climate change initiatives. "Other groups try to get involved... [and] if we try to set boundaries it's difficult," said one interviewee. "I think the ecbi and Benito have already set their own boundaries on how they want to work. You don't feel he's in your space as a delegate".
- Most interviewees were able to state the advantages of the location [Oxford], with some mentioning that it provided an academic and neutral slant to discussions, with others stating that "it takes us away from the negotiating context", and "it provides a setting where ideas are more important".
- A similar amount of interviewees mentioned that the ecbi's policy of open discussion as a key part of its unique position. Some also stated that they chose to participate in the ecbi over other initiatives because they trusted in the ecbi's accuracy and integrity. When unpacking this accuracy and integrity, commonly given examples were "they do not cross the line", "open discussion, reflected in documents produced", and "they have been in the negotiations since the beginning".
- The ecbi has now been operating for eight years, and some stakeholders referred to the capital that has been built over this time. This is seen to have led to both increased trust in, and credibility of, the ecbi by external stakeholders, but also the increased influencing ability of the participating groups. "The ecbi has evolved over time," one interviewee explained. "They were initially helping a vulnerable group of countries. It's now less about capacity building, more about capacity utilising... the LDC Group has become a major player."

ECBI ACTIVITIES

Fellowship Programme

The Fellowship Programme organised four events in FY 2013-2014: the traditional **Bonn Seminar**, the **Oxford Fellowships and Seminar**, and **two Ad-hoc Seminars**.

Bonn Seminar 2013

The ecbi Bonn Seminar was held on 9 June 2013 in the Altes Rathaus in Bonn, with over 35 senior participants from developing and European countries. After listening to a welcoming speech by the Lord Mayor of the host city, the participants discussed the work of the Standing Committee on Finance (SCF), the Ad hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform (ADP) and loss and damage.

The session on the Standing Committee on Finance (SCF) was chaired by ecbi Advisory Committee member Bo Kjellén. The discussion was initiated by a presentation by SCF Co-Chair Diann Black-Layne. Black-Layne noted that the SCF is entrusted with a range of functions, such as ensuring coherence of the UNFCCC financial architecture; feedback on biannual assessments; assisting in providing information on financial needs; and clear guidance to the operating entities. The arrangements between the COP and Green Climate Fund (GCF) were a key area for the SCF, she said, listing other substantive issues on the SCF's agenda such as the levels of funding needed for climate change; monitoring, reporting and verification (MRV) of finance; and the financial implications of capacity building activities, and activities related to Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries (REDD). She called for feedback on how the SCF can continue to improve.

In the discussion that followed, participants noted the importance of the SCF members functioning as experts, instead of negotiators representing national viewpoints. A member of the SCF said that while he was not originally in favour of setting up the SCF, he now sees the value of having a dedicated committee that can spend time on the important issue of finance without having to focus on the other areas of work under the COP.

SCF Co-Chair Stefan Schwager agreed with a comment that the SCF should work on coherence of finance, but highlighted the complications of ensuring coherence between the public, private, multilateral and bilateral funding. He said existing organisations that have been trying this for several years, such as the OECD's Development Assistance Committee, have to make several assumptions. He also agreed with the importance of engaging Small and Medium Entrepreneurs, and of clear and simple procedures with national and sub-national options for accessing funds. Session chair Kjellén concluded that he felt optimistic about the work of the SCF, and the discussion indicated a sense of commonality and joint responsibility.

The session on the ADP was chaired by Black-Layne. The discussion was initiated by a presentation of an ecbi Policy Brief on lessons for the work of the ADP by co-authors Adéyemi Freitas and Xolisa Ngwadla. Freitas said the effectiveness of the ADP would be decided by its ability to address the overall goal of the UNFCCC, which is to stabilize greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system, within a timeframe that will allow ecosystems to adapt naturally to climate change. This effectiveness will be a function of the overall ambition of the future treaty; the level of participation by countries; and of compliance measures to ensure that the commitments are met.

Ngwadla said there has been a paradigm shift in the global climate discourse, from top-down to bottom up. Under the 'top-down' approach of the Kyoto Protocol, Parties followed a multilateral process to decide commitments, and to assess the adequacy of these commitments. More recently, however, the process has

become more bottom-up, and refers to commitments “as communicated by” countries. This bottom-up process may have attracted broader participation, he said, but did not show adequate ambition and national pledges are not based on science or multilateralism. He concluded by saying that fairness, equity and commitments will define the ambition and strength of the future agreement.

In the discussion that followed, a participant noted that while a voluntary approach will not work, a system like the annexes and schedules of the General Agreement on Trade in Services could be used in the climate context, where an annex could prescribe emissions reductions for countries and schedules allow them to interpret how they define and implement the elements. The challenge would then be to identify the equitable responsibility of countries. Ngwadla responded that any schedules-based approach would have to be tested against action on providing support, which could lead to a WTO-style negotiation. He also said if responsibilities under a compact between nations are devolved to non-state actors, it could lead to incoherence and to difficulties in quantification and MRV.

Another participant called for a more dynamic system than the Kyoto Protocol, to allow for later adjustments and modifications. Freitas remarked that the Kyoto approach did not work sufficiently, and nor does pledge and review. She said models that include both approaches are needed, and highlighted the importance of talking about commitments rather than pledges; ensuring broad participation; transparency; dynamism; and durability. She also highlighted the importance of minimum criteria to decide commitments; addressing adaptation as an integral part of sustainable development; and stable sources of funding.

This session on loss and damage was initiated with a presentation by Saleemul Huq, Director of the Bangladesh-based International Centre for Climate Change and Development (ICCAD). Huq said the issue of loss and damage has been raised by the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS) for many years in the negotiations, as they have the most to lose, but other countries also face loss and damage from slow or rapid onset disasters. The challenge so far has been attribution. The decision to address loss and damage in the negotiations, which was taken in Durban, was a breakthrough, and should be viewed as an opportunity for Annex I countries to engage rather than resist, looking for common ground before negotiating more politically sensitive elements. He said it is wrong to think of loss and damage as only a developing country issue, citing the case of the recent floods in Germany, where a compensation fund of €100 million for loss and damage had been created.

In the discussion that followed, a participant agreed that loss and damage is an issue for all countries, but said there are some countries with special circumstances that face higher risks and have lower incomes. He proposed the establishment of a Board made up of the private sector actors to look at options for addressing these special circumstances – for instance through an international insurance mechanism – and of a clearinghouse mechanism.

Another participant said there are a large number of other institutions, including non-government institutions, working on disaster management. He felt the institutional architecture to address may already exist, but lack coordination, streamlining and exchange of information. Huq responded that loss and damage is a much larger issue than simply mechanisms, given that we are knowingly locking ourselves, and future generations, into a future where global temperatures could rise by 2,3 or 4 degrees centigrade. Another participant agreed that existing institutions did not fill in the current vacuum, saying the natural disasters framework have a limited mandate, and a holistic institutional approach to climate change is lacking.

A more detailed report of the Bonn Seminar 2013 can be found [here](#).

ecbi Fellowship Colloquium and Oxford Seminar

The ecbi Fellowship Colloquium took place from 5-7 August in Merton College, Oxford, followed by the Oxford Seminar on 8 and 9 August 2013. During the Fellowship Colloquium, 17 senior negotiators from developing countries discussed key areas of concern. They were joined by 13 colleagues from Europe during the Oxford Seminar, and discussed contentious issues such as the legal form of a future outcome, equity, mitigation, adaptation, technology transfer, finance, and the governance and accountability of operating entities (including the Green Climate Fund, or GCF).

As the participants at the Seminar this year, the ninth in the series, included a number of key office holders in the UNFCCC process, a discussion on the priorities for the next conference of parties in Warsaw also took place. Participants included the COP Presidency's special envoy for climate change; the developing country co-chair of the Ad-Hoc Group on the Durban Platform (ADP); the Chairs of the G77+China Group and Africa Group; lead negotiators from Europe; senior representatives from Least Developed Countries (LDCs); and key office holders in UNFCCC bodies, including the developing country Co-chair and members of the Standing Committee on Finance, and members of the GCF Board and the Advisory Board of the Climate Technology Centre and Network.

The discussion on **equity and legal form** was initiated by Benito Müller, ecbi Director. He noted that a durable but flexible international treaty/agreement under the UNFCCC is the desired outcome of the ADP negotiations. This new agreement should cover specific goals and obligations on all core aspects of the negotiations (including mitigation and finance). While Fellows agreed that some other areas may be dealt with outside the new legal instrument (for instance, in COP decisions and through unilateral declarations), opinions differed on the extent to which these other issues can be meaningfully addressed by other formal tools outside the new treaty.



On equity, Müller noted that differentiation can be applied either through categorisation through organisational memberships, or through categorisation through graduation parameters such as the poverty intensity of GDP, which is a measure of capability. He posed two questions for discussion:

- How does the “spectrum of commitments” fit into this legal picture?
- How does the spectrum of commitments deal with equity

In the discussion that followed, participants discussed the merits and demerits of ex ante and post ante application of a spectrum of commitments; the need for explicit, reasonable and fair criteria that allow for dynamic graduation; and the need for clarity on ways in which equity, ambition and engagement can emerge from the process.

The discussion on **mitigation** was initiated by a presentation by Seyni Nafo on behalf of the Fellows, highlighting the following key points for discussion:

- How can science and equity be reflected in the future agreement?
- What is the optimal mix between top-down and bottom-up? How can top-down elements be integrated into the bottom-up architecture that emerged from Cancun?
- What about means of implementation for developing country mitigation?
- What happened to compliance in the system?

In the discussion that followed, participants discussed, inter alia: the need for countries to set their own targets instead of looking over their shoulders to see what others were doing; flexibilities that might be needed to accommodate the “elephant in the room, across the Atlantic”; the need for incentives to promote broader participation and more ambition, and trust and transparency; and the need for the process to be informed by science.

The discussion on the “**Framework for Various Approaches**” (FVA – market or non-market based approaches to address mitigation) was initiated by a presentation on behalf of the Fellows by Ian Fry. Fry posed the following questions to the group:

- Will the FVA approach consider fungibility with other schemes?
- Where will credits generated by Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD) fit in?
- Where do sub-national schemes fit in (for instance, the trading scheme in California, USA), and how can consistent measurements for sub-national and global schemes be achieved?
- What will be the crediting system for baselines? The experience with LULUCF has shown how complicated and scientifically unsound this process can be, and setting assumptions of business as usual and crediting below that are problematic.
- Offset mechanisms do not contribute to a net emission reduction globally, so how much should we rely on them?
- How is the architecture of the FVA envisaged considering the low value of carbon?
- How can non-market mechanisms (such as efficiency standards for products or policy initiatives like feed in-tariffs) fit within the FVA?

In the discussion that followed, participants highlighted the need to establish a process for standard setting, develop the rules for emissions trading, and further develop non-market mechanisms.

Müller proposed a broader discussion on **how to make the future agreement global**, and whether the Kyoto architecture should be discarded because some countries are constitutionally challenged. Participants

highlighted the challenge of creating a middle path between the Cancun Agreement as the point where the maximum level of participation was reached so far but ambition was low, and the Kyoto Protocol where ambition was higher but participation and compliance was low.

The discussion on **means of implementation** was initiated by a presentation by Yeb Saño, reflecting the discussion during the Fellowship Colloquium. Saño noted that the finance architecture has evolved into three pillars that complement each other: oversight (Standing Committee on Finance), mobilization of finance (e.g. long-term finance, fast-start finance) and delivery mechanism (operating entities, bilateral and multilateral agencies). He described the following components that were discussed by the Fellows, and considered critical to the 2015 agreement:

- Abundant clarity on finance commitments
- Pathways
- Sources
- Measurement, Reporting and Verification (MRV)
- Clear definition of what constitutes climate finance
- Mitigation and adaptation ambition nexus and balance
- Strong political outcome for adaptation and loss and damage
- Proposal to differentiate between funding windows
- Institutions – capacity and effectiveness to be established
- Role of National Funding Entities (NFEs)
- Integrating the role of market and non-market mechanisms
- Right price tag for carbon
- Greening the financial stream as a primary objective, including the removal of fossil fuel subsidies
- Current issues related to the transparency and accountability of the financial mechanisms, including the fifth review of the financial mechanism, and an ombudsman for redress.

In the discussion that followed, participants highlighted, inter alia: the need to review lessons from Fast Start Finance; the importance of NFEs in creating ownership, ensuring that climate-related activities become a priority at the national level, and leveraging public and private funds at the national level; and the need for transparency and measurement, reporting and verification of developed country commitments.

The session on **adaptation** was initiated by a presentation from Achala Chandani Abeysinghe, who listed the following key questions:

- What elements of adaptation should be in the 2015 agreement, and does this include loss and damage?
- What should be the provisions for MRV of support for adaptation?
- How do we reference the existing institutions in the new agreement?

BOX: ecbi's impact on gender

In addition to highlighting the importance of gender concerns in the climate negotiations, the 2013 evaluation found that the ecbi model allows women to participate on a level playing field to men by providing briefing and support that is not accessible due to time commitments in the home. "For female negotiators it's more difficult," a Fellowship participant commented to the evaluator. "I get home, I'm with the kids. Then I get on the plane again, now I'm reading the documents. The playing field is even less level... it's hard for them to prepare for something like this." [So the ecbi fulfils that for you?] "Yes it does. It really does."

The Seminar also helps build relationships with male negotiators that might otherwise be difficult due to perceived cultural barriers. A European Seminar participant noted, for instance, that the ecbi Seminars make it easier for a young woman like herself to approach older men from a more patriarchal society.

This was followed by a presentation on **loss and damage** (L&D) by Fry, who noted the need for a work programme and a mechanism for L&D, to address risk reduction, risk management and compensation and to help countries rebuild after climate change impacts and deal with slow onset events. He proposed a board, executive or directive to draw together various initiatives on insurance. Such a body, he noted, should include not negotiators but experts on insurance and should be aimed mainly at establishing a collective global insurance mechanism for low-income high impact countries. Fry said although countries were nervous about use of the term compensation in the climate context, there are several models that could be drawn upon, such as compensation funds for oil spills. He said a process is needed to ensure that L&D is part of the 2015 agreement, and interim measures will be needed before the agreement comes into effect in 2020.

In the discussion that followed, participants highlighted the need to link mitigation and adaptation through a metric that linked higher emissions to the need for more adaptation finance; the potential dangers of putting L&D in a separate silo; and earmarking finance for adaptation.

The discussion on **technology transfer** was initiated by Spencer Thomas, who listed six key areas: provision and access to finance; removal of barriers such as IPR; access, transfer, development, scale and quality; capacity building for technology adoption; institutions and enabling frameworks; and MRV frameworks. He listed the following two questions for discussion:

- How can technology transfer in the agreement ramp up mitigation ambitions/ actions and outcomes?
- How can tech transfer be incorporated in the MRV framework in the new agreement?

Participants noted that the current institutional framework for technology transfer was still in its infancy, and it is not clear how they will interact with each other, and with institutions such as the GCF.

The remainder of the Oxford Seminar focused on the two Workstreams of the ADP. Kishan Kumarsingh initiated the discussion on the **ADP Workstream 1**. He summarised the latest outcomes of the negotiations, noting that Parties had highlighted the need for a 2015 agreement that would be applicable to all, with contributions from all Parties in accordance with CBDR. In addition, there were calls for science and equity, broad participation, flexibility and sensitivity to national circumstances, environmental effectiveness; and an international rules-based system. However, there was less clarity on finance, adaptation, capacity building, technology transfer, and the links between adaptation and mitigation.

On mitigation, Kumarsingh said Parties had called for internationally agreed, comparable commitments, with ex ante clarity. He noted there was more emphasis on MRV of mitigation than MRV of support. He said more clarity is needed on the relationship to the 2013-2015 review; role of markets and non-market mechanisms; role of forests/ land use; and linkages. He noted that Parties had called for a more formal and focused mode of work going to Warsaw and beyond; and for balance. Kumarsingh listed the following two questions for discussion:

- Bearing in mind Warsaw is one COP short of 2015, it should feature some guidance on how to get to 2015. What should be the priority issues for discussion?
- In light of the above, and the 2015 timeline, what should be/ could be a significant outcome of Warsaw to build confidence and keep on track to Peru and then Paris in terms of both Workstream 1 (WS1) and Workstream 2 (WS2)?

In the discussion that followed, participants discussed, inter alia, the risks and benefits of timelines and milestones; the need to have the past, present and future Presidencies of the COPs working together to facilitate the process; and the need for clarity on finance as well and mitigation commitments.

The discussion on **ADP Workstream 2** was initiated by a presentation by Seyni Nafo, who noted that the mandate of WS2 is to identify and explore options for a range of actions that can close the ambition gap. He noted that developed country submissions were focused on clarifying existing pledges or making pledges if they had not done so already; and emphasizing international cooperative initiatives (ICIs), the importance of addressing hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), and the need for clarity on the role of international carbon markets. Developing country submissions meanwhile were focused on closing the mitigation and finance gap, and the importance of implementing the agreed outcomes of the Bali Action Plan.

Nafo listed the following questions for discussion:

- How to manage the scope of WS2 and linkages with other elements to be addressed before 2020 for a successful outcome?
- What are the expected outcomes under WS2 and how to get there (process)?

In the discussion that followed, participants discussed, inter alia, the importance of Workstream 2 as a key to a future compromise, and the challenge of reconciling the technical and political elements to drive ambition.

The Seminar was closed by Bo Kjellén, Co-chair of the ecbi Advisory Committee, who noted the role of the ecbi in establishing informal contacts between delegations and promoting diplomacy. A more detailed report of the Seminar can be found [here](#).

GCF Caucus Meeting

On 6 October 2013, the eve of the fifth meeting of the GCF Board (GCFB) in Paris, the ecbi organised an Ad hoc Seminar for the GCF Caucus on the topics of resource allocation and Enhanced Direct Access through National Funding Entities. There were participants from Brazil, France, Guinea-Bissau, India, Norway, Pakistan, Switzerland, and the UK.

Finance Circle Meeting

Another Ad hoc Seminar for the ecbi Finance Circle was held on 13 November during the nineteenth Conference of Parties to the UNFCCC in Warsaw. There were 26 participants from Algeria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Botswana, the DRC, the EU, France, the Gambia, Germany, Mexico, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, Uganda, the UK, and the US including two co-chairs of the expert group on Long Term Finance and the Standing Committee on Finance. The meeting focused on two key questions:

- How to continue the work on LTF, possibly in the context of the SCF and/or other committees?
- Securing political commitments to ensure mobilization of resources for the GCF.

“The impact of the ecbi and its director is unquestionable. The ecbi staffing-intensity report, for example, had a significant impact on our thinking. It led us to examine core questions about the GCF business model – at which level are funding decisions made and at what level of aggregation (project, program, etc). These are some of the key questions in fund design, yet Dr Muller and the ecbi have been the only group from the research/NGO community to consistently focus on them. Their persistence and analytical approach have certainly helped the Board keep its eye on the ball during a critical phase of fund design.”

- Paul Bodnar, Director for Climate Finance, U.S. State Department

Support and Training Programme

Training

In September 2013, with support from GIZ Bangladesh and Bangladesh's Ministry of Environment and Forests, ecbi hosted a two-day training workshop for Asian LDC climate change negotiators in Dhaka. The workshop was attended by 40 participants and took place at the Sonargaon Hotel. Participants were introduced to the UNFCCC negotiations process and the work of the LDC Group through various presentations, which included interactive sessions on legal drafting, open discussion on the upcoming COP in Warsaw, and LDC priorities for a 2015 agreement. A briefing paper on the UNFCCC and COP 18 outcomes was produced as a background document for the meeting.

A negotiators workshop on the legal issues and challenges related to climate change was held in Bangladesh on 22 September 2013. It was organised by the Centre for Climate Justice-Bangladesh (CCJ-B) in collaboration with the Department of the Environment (DoE), Ministry of Environment and Forest and the Legal Response Initiative (LRI). The aim was to build and strengthen legal capacity on climate change in the country; focusing on the complex legal issues involved with ongoing UNFCCC negotiations, in particular the legally binding instrument to be adopted by 2015 by the Parties of UNFCCC and legal approaches to loss and damage. The workshop also looked at developing a domestic legal framework to deal with climate change impacts at the national level.

Support

The support provided by ecbi was enhanced last year by the provision of support for "ecbi Caucuses" for the SCF and GCFB. These caucuses are informal groups centred around members from particularly vulnerable countries that are interested in sharing experiences and exchanging views on issues of common interest pertaining to the respective body.

The ecbi Director has been attending the meetings of these bodies as adviser to LDC members. In this function, he informally interacted with the caucus members during the meetings. In this context he also organised the Paris GCF Caucus Ad-hoc Seminar, and he was directly involved in organising the Pre-GCF Board Meeting Luncheon Discussion "Country Ownership and Enhancing Direct Access" convened by the Indonesian host of the GCFB meeting.

As regards outcomes facilitated by this support, feedback mentioned that "advice provided on the following themes resulted in influencing on decisions: country ownership, access modalities and resource allocation. For example, the resource allocation for LDCs, small island developing states and African countries was adjusted upward following the GCF LDC Board member's submission resulting from the advice provided. Also based on advice provided, a GCF board member submitted the need for further work to be undertaken on the issue of enhanced direct access including through funding entities."

"I am grateful that you make this effort as you have always tried to facilitate the interaction between different Board groupings. It is a great job you are doing and I fully support your efforts."

- Jan Cedergren, Member of the Green Climate Fund

Publications and Policy Analysis Unit

The PPAU produces mainly Policy Briefs, Background Papers, ecbi event reports, and the LDC Paper Series in addition to organizational documents such as this Annual Report.

Policy Briefs focus on the UNFCCC negotiations; they are aimed directly at senior negotiators, particularly ecbi alumni. This powerful dedicated target group for the Policy Briefs has, in the past, resulted in direct impacts on the negotiations. Feedback from negotiators is often compiled and incorporated in the final draft, in an attempt to record different views and identify possible compromises. The finalized Policy Briefs are then disseminated through the Internet.

Background Papers are prepared for use in the regional workshops organized by the Training and Support Programme, are aimed at junior negotiators to help them come up to speed with the negotiations, and to inform regional and national policy actors of the potential outcome of the UNFCCC negotiations on their work.

ecbi Event Reports often contain detailed information on the views of senior negotiators and negotiating groups, and are a useful update on the current state of the negotiations.

The LDC Paper Series is relatively new (it is in its second series). It is managed by the PPAU head and an LDC Series Editorial Board, which comprises three LDC members, fund contributors, and ecbi members. LDC participants submit topics they would like to see covered in the papers. This list is reviewed by the Series Editorial Board, which then votes on a shortlist of topics. An expert author is identified for each paper through a call for Expressions of Interest, and the LDC Chair nominates an LDC co-author to work with the expert. This process is designed to generate a sense of ownership by the LDC Group, and to build the LDC Group's capacity for analysis.

The PPAU team also produces the ecbi Annual Reports and reports of all key ecbi meetings – in particular the Oxford Seminar and the Bonn Seminar. The meeting reports follow Chatham House rules, providing broader access to the rich and very frank discussions that take place among senior negotiators in these meetings.

In addition, LRI's legal briefing papers aim to translate often complex legal content into accessible language. They provide background and legal information on issues relevant to the UNFCCC negotiations, depending on demand indicated by climate negotiators.

Presentations, exercises, and other training materials used during the regional workshops will be compiled in training manuals. They will be made available free of charge to other negotiators and can be used by the participants in connection with further national and local capacity building efforts.

During the FY 2013-2014, PPAU produced more publications than ever before with 21 publications in total, and got public recognition for the quality of work. Apart from a Background Paper and two Policy Briefs, the PPAU produced a number of Discussion Notes in conjunction with the support for the ecbi Finance Caucuses, and it was in charge of producing the LDC Paper Series for the LDC Group. On 28 May, the ecbi Policy Brief 'Crowdfunding for Climate Change: a new source of finance for climate action at the local level?' was presented by the authors to the first Forum of the Standing Committee on Finance in Barcelona. Two months later, the authors won the Popular Choice Award in the 2013 MIT Climate Co-Lab "Scaling renewables in major emerging economies" contest for an idea based on their ecbi Brief.

The Phase III ecbi external evaluation notes that stakeholders find the ecbi publications useful and informative, and “many interviewees [for the evaluation] thought that the ecbi meetings and publications moved ideas forward in the climate change negotiation process. A few stated explicitly that they thought the ecbi had direct impact on negotiations, particularly on finance decisions”. The evaluation captured several instances of such direct impact of ecbi publications on the UNFCCC negotiations, including the following:

- ecbi publications such as the 2010 Post Copenhagen Architecture and Governance Brief and (also in 2010) National Funding Entities: Their role in the transition to a new paradigm of global cooperation on climate change played a key role in the eventual inclusion of the concept of “enhanced direct access” in the Governing Instrument of the Green Climate Fund.
- The 2011 Policy Brief on Operationalizing the Standing Committee: What Functions? What Form? contributed to the UNFCCC Decision 2/CP.17, and text from the paper was echoed in the Decision.
- The 2008 Policy Brief on Implementing the Bali Action Plan: What Role for the CDM? led to the concept of a CDM Support Fund, which was put forward by India at the 2012 Doha COP. The concept was then endorsed by the High Level Panel on the CDM Policy Dialogue, which put forward recommendations to a Ministerial Dialogue on the role of market mechanisms under the UNFCCC.

Feedback was sought from LDC Negotiators on the LDC Paper Series. The respondents marked the Series as “very useful” or “useful”. Some comments from the feedback are copied below:

- In the run up to the Warsaw in 2013, the Uganda Vulnerability and Adaptation (V&A) group held a series of preparatory meetings under my leadership. Loss & Damage (L&D) was a major negotiating element at Warsaw. Among the key papers / documents that informed the preparatory meetings was the paper on L&D under the LDC paper series. Effective negotiation on adaptation calls for evidence-based facts, not sweeping statements. These are obtained from researched work, assembled particularly from referenced (scientific) sources. The LDC paper series are very pertinent in this regard. I highly commend the LDC Chair and his team for coming up with the idea of the LDC paper series.
- The LDC Paper Series really helps us a lot in staying updated with what is happening, and also guiding our thinking - especially for new climate change negotiators.
- [The Series] is very useful. It helped me to understand different issues under climate change negotiations, and to link the issue I am following with ongoing discussion and negotiation on other climate change issues. The Series should be continued, and continue to involve LDC core team members and coordinators.
- [The Series] provided excellent background details about different topics of discussions. It really helped me to have an in depth understanding of various issues.

The LDC paper on REDD+ prospects in LDCs is to be presented by the LDC co-author at a regional meeting of the REDD+ Partnership in Ghana in May. The paper was praised by the Co-Chair of the REDD+ group in the negotiations, who described it as “a very clear and well focused study, that really helped me to see how LDCs fit into the total REDD+ picture”, and “really a high quality study that could be useful for the REDD+ Partnership”.

“You continue to play an important through ecbi to find appropriate solutions to this global challenge. I remain confident of continued actions and especially the multifaceted support of various partners. It is your responsibility to ensure that LDCs can get more involved in this process for better decision making.”

- Birama Diarra, Agence Nationale de la Météorologie du Mali

European Capacity Building Initiative

57 Woodstock Road, Oxford, OX2 7FA, UK

Phone +44 (0) 1865 889 128 Fax: +44 (0) 1865 310 527

e-mail: adm.n.ocp@gmail.com