



Regional Training Workshop

South and South East Asia



31 July - 1 August 2019

Kathmandu, Nepal

ecbi

European Capacity Building Initiative

www.eurocapacity.org

The contents of this report do not necessarily represent the views of the European Capacity Building Initiative (ecbi), any of its Members, or its supporting partners.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior permission of the ecbi.

This project is part of the International Climate Initiative (IKI). The German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety (BMUB) supports this initiative on the basis of a decision adopted by the German Bundestag.

For more information on IKI see www.international-climate-initiative.com

Supported by:



based on a decision of the German Bundestag

This report is written by Doma Tshering Sherpa, and edited by Anju Sharma.

Partner Institutions

oxford
climate
policy

iiied



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	2
The UNFCCC Negotiations and the Paris Agreement	2
Climate Diplomacy: Outlining the Year Ahead	5
Mock Negotiations	7
Mitigation and the Paris Agreement Rulebook	7
Legal Language	8
Cooperative Approaches	9
Climate Finance and the Paris Agreement Rulebook	10
Group Position	12
Reporting and Compliance Framework of the Paris Agreement	12
<i>Article 13: Enhanced Transparency Framework for Action and Support</i>	12
<i>Article 14: Global Stocktake</i>	13
<i>Article 15: Compliance Mechanism</i>	13
Group Work	14
Feedback and Closing Session	14

INTRODUCTION

The 2019 ecbi Regional Training Workshop for Asia and the Pacific was held on 31 July and 1 August in Kathmandu, Nepal. The workshop, attended by 31 participants from the region, was organised by International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) and Prakriti Resources Centre (PRC) and hosted by the Ministry of Forests and Environment (MoFE), Nepal.

Benito Müller, Director, ecbi and Oxford Climate Policy (OCP), described the origins of ecbi, saying the initiative was established in 2005 for negotiators from Europe and developing countries, to help improve their understanding of each other and to build trust among them. He described the Initiative's Fellowship Programme, focused on trust-building among senior negotiators; and the Training and Support Programme, to build the capacity of new negotiators for the UN negotiations.

Claudia Hiepe, Head of Development Cooperation, Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany, Kathmandu, said the government of Germany is proud to be associated with Least Developed Country (LDC) Group through support for the training workshops. She shared her experiences of participating in the UN negotiations in Bali and Poznan, saying they are challenging at some points. She encouraged participants to gain an in-depth understanding of the negotiations, and engage with development workers, representatives from government agencies, civil society organisations, and the private sector. She highlighted the many co-benefits of mitigation, including enhanced potential for least developed countries (LDCs) to access climate finance.

Sonam P. Wangdi, Secretary, National Environment Commission, Bhutan, and Chair of the LDC Group in the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), highlighted weaknesses in the LDC Group in terms of institutions and negotiating capacity. He noted the important role of the ecbi Training and Support Programme in building capacity in this regard and called on national focal points to send young negotiators for the training workshops. He encouraged participants to take the training seriously, and to become leaders and a voice for the next generation in the UNFCCC. He thanked the organisers and resource persons, and urged their continued support in the future.

Maheshwar Dhakal, Head of the Climate Change Management Division of the Ministry of Forests and Environment (MoFE), Nepal, and national focal point for the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and UNFCCC, highlighted the importance of the training in giving negotiators a platform for learning and interaction. He also gave an overview of the revised draft climate change policy of Nepal, including thematic and crosscutting areas. He concluded the opening session by thanking participants for attending the workshop.

THE UNFCCC NEGOTIATIONS AND THE PARIS AGREEMENT

This session was led by Manjeet Dhakal, Climate Analytics, whose contribution to the training workshop was covered by the Capacity Building for International Negotiation (CaBIN) programme, funded by the UK government's Department for Business, Energy, and Industrial Strategy.

Dhakal addressed five broad themes in his presentation: introduction to the UNFCCC; the Kyoto Protocol and the Paris Agreement; the science behind climate change; structure of the negotiations; and practical tips for negotiators.



LDC Chair Sonam Wangdi addresses the opening of the Training Workshop

Dhakal briefly explained the history of the UNFCCC and its key principles, including the principle of equity and common but differentiated responsibilities, the precautionary principle, and support for sustainable development. He explained the three main groupings under the UNFCCC: Annex I (industrialised countries and countries with economies in transition); Annex II (Annex I, excluding countries with economies in transition); and non-Annex I (mostly developing countries). He noted that the Conference of the Parties (COP) is a supreme decision-making body of the UNFCCC, and is supported by various subsidiary bodies, ad-hoc working groups, and constituted bodies.

Dhakal said the 1997 Kyoto Protocol established legally-binding targets for developed countries to reduce six major greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions between 2008-2012; created three new international market-based mechanisms; and provided additional support to developing countries on adaptation. The Doha Amendment, which established the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol up to 2020, has been ratified by 130 Parties till 15 July 2019. It needs 14 more ratifications to enter into force.

He described the Paris Agreement, which was adopted in 2015 and came into force in 2016, with the aim of holding global temperature rise to well below 2°C, while pursuing efforts to limit warming to 1.5°C. He said the Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) are the key component of the Agreement, which have to be submitted by Parties every five years. The Agreement calls for: progression and highest possible ambition in the NDCs; economy-wide absolute emission reduction targets for developed countries; and enhancing of mitigation efforts by developing countries, towards economy-wide emissions reductions or limitation targets. The NDCs can also include an adaptation component. So far, 191 Parties have submitted 163 NDCs, most of which include quantified mitigation targets; cover a majority of sectors; and include an adaptation component.

Describing the NDC cycle under the Agreement, Dhakal said Parties are expected to report on progress every two years, and these reports will undergo a technical expert review and multilateral consideration of progress through the transparency framework. A global stocktake will take place every five years to review aggregate progress. A compliance committee also exists to facilitate implementation and promote compliance. Developed countries are asked to provide US\$ 100 billion annually by 2020 in the Agreement, with a new goal to be set prior to 2025.

Dhakal then described the major country alliances in the UN negotiations:

- The Group of 77 and China (G77 and China) with 134 members, and including other groups like the LDC Group with 47 members, Africa Group with 54 members, the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS) with 44 members, and the Independent Alliance of Latin America and the Caribbean (AILAC) with eight members.
- The European Union, with 28 member countries.
- The Umbrella Group, with nine countries.
- The Environmental Integrity Group with five countries.

Describing the structure of the UNFCCC negotiations, Dhakal said the Kyoto Protocol is governed by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP); while the Paris Agreement is governed by the Conference of Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA). In addition, he said two permanent bodies, the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) and the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI), support COP, CMP, and CMA. The operating entities of the UNFCCC financial mechanism include the Green Climate Fund (GCF) and the Global Environment Facility (GEF). Other financial arrangements include the Adaptation Fund, LDC Fund, and Special Climate Change Fund.

Dhakal then described the work of the IPCC since 1990, highlighting the key findings of its five assessment reports. He noted the significant gap highlighted by the IPCC between 1.5/2°C consistent scenarios and the NDCs submitted by countries so far, saying this pointed to the need for countries to increase their mitigation ambition significantly. Without this ramping up of ambition, he noted that the impacts would be greatest in LDCs and small island states (SIDS), with some LDCs like Nepal suffering a GDP reduction of up to 50%.

He concluded his presentation with information and practical tips for negotiators, such as the timings of key Group coordination meetings.

In the discussion that followed, a participant asked about reporting requirements under the UNFCCC. Dhakal responded that there are several, such as National Communications to be submitted every four years with flexibility for LDCs and SIDS; Biennial Transparency Reports (BTRs) to be submitted every two years from 2024; GHG Inventory Reports to be submitted annually; National Adaptation Plans; technical need assessments; and long-term strategies for climate-resilient development.

Another participant queried the difference between NDCs and Biennial Update Reports (BURs). In response, Dhakal said NDCs are a formal communication of what countries plan for the future, while the BUR (replaced by BTRs in the Paris Agreement) reports on what countries have already done in the past. The BTRs will include information on mitigation, adaptation, and means of implementation.

A participant asked about the future of credits being registered by projects under the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) of the Kyoto Protocol. Dhakal responded that this question is still under consideration in the negotiations (and will be further discussed in the Workshop during the session on Article 6).

CLIMATE DIPLOMACY: OUTLINING THE YEAR AHEAD

This session was facilitated by Anju Sharma, Oxford Climate Policy. Sharma highlighted the following key priorities for climate diplomacy in 2019:

- **Increase pre-2020 ambition**, including through an enhancement of mitigation pledges at the 2019 Climate Action Summit organised by the UN Secretary-General; and by delivering the US\$ 100 billion climate finance pledge.
- **Encourage and facilitate post-2020 ambition**, including by enhancing post-2020 NDCs and adopting rules for the remaining elements of the Paris Agreement, including Common Time Frames (CTFs), Article 6 cooperative mechanisms, and post-2020 climate finance.

She described the process for the UN Climate Action Summit that will be held in September 2019 and explained its plan to inspire a leap in collective national political ambition. She outlined and explained in detail the three main goals of the Summit:

- **Raise national ambition:** Countries to present concrete, realistic plans, compatible with IPCC Special Report on *Global Warming of 1.5°C*, to enhance their NDCs by 2020, reduce greenhouse gas (GHGs) emissions by 45% over the next decade, and to net zero by 2050.
- **Prompt transformative changes:** In energy transition; infrastructure, cities and local action; industry transition; resilience and adaptation; nature-based solutions; climate finance; and carbon pricing.
- **Generate political momentum:** Enhanced social and political drivers, youth, and public engagement.

Sharma said the Summit will focus on nine tracks, each led by two countries:

- **Mitigation Strategy**, led by Japan, Chile
- **Social and Political Drivers**, led by Peru, Spain
- **Youth and Mobilisation**, led by the Marshall Islands, Ireland
- **Energy Transition**, led by Denmark, Ethiopia
- **Resilience and Adaptation**, led by Egypt, UK
- **Nature-based Solutions**, led by China, New Zealand
- **Infrastructure, Cities and Local Government**, led by Turkey, Kenya
- **Climate Finance and Carbon Pricing**, led by France, Jamaica, Qatar
- **Industry**, led by India, Sweden

The outcomes from the Summit will include a Chair's summary, and arrangements to track progress, ensure accountability, and facilitate implementation, she said.

Describing progress on the pre-2020 finance pledge of US\$100 billion, she noted the absence of mutually agreed metrics to measure progress, which could result in a further erosion of trust in the negotiations between developed and developing countries. As a result of the lack of common metrics, the calculations made by different actors on the climate finance delivered so far differ considerably, she noted. For instance, the Standing Committee on Finance (SCF), in its 2018 *Biennial Assessment and Overview of Climate Finance Flows* report, estimates that total public financial support reported by Annex II Parties in October 2018 amounts to US\$ 45.4 billion in 2015 and US\$ 49.4 billion in 2016. Climate-specific finance, provided mostly through bilateral channels, amounts to US\$ 37.5 billion in 2016. However Oxfam's *Climate Finance Shadow Report 2018* estimates "net climate specific assistance" in 2015-2016 at only US\$16-21 billion. "Net climate specific assistance" takes into account how loans are counted, and how funds for projects that only partially cover

climate action are counted. Sharma said this pointed to the need for mutually agreed rules for measuring climate finance, as a critical step towards greater trust among countries.

On post-2020 climate action, Sharma noted that COP24 was unable to agree rules on two critical elements that would have a bearing on overall ambition: a common timeframe for all NDCs, and Article 6 on cooperative mechanisms.

Sharma said the discussion on a common timeframe could have a bearing on how ambitious countries are in updating their NDCs, and how fair the NDCs are, in relation to responsibility for emissions and capacity to address them. She said shorter, five-year common timeframes will create a common “pressure point” on all countries to update their ambition; and to also take into account a rapidly evolving technological landscape. At the same time, the submission of “indicative” NDCs for the subsequent five-year period will give time to Parties and non-Party stakeholders to assess the fairness of country contributions and allow countries to revisit their indicative NDCs before finalising them.

Sharma then briefly described the three cooperative mechanisms laid out in Paris Agreement Article 6.2, 6.4, and 6.8. She said the rules for these mechanisms could also have an important bearing on overall ambition of mitigation contributions.

On post-2020 climate finance, Sharma described Article 9.3 of the Paris Agreement, saying it calls for the setting of a new collective long-term quantified goal for climate finance by 2025, with the current pledge of US\$ 100 billion as the floor. Despite differences before Katowice, it was agreed at COP24 that the discussion on this long-term goal will begin in 2020, and include discussions on Paris Agreement Article 2.1(c), on “*making finance flows consistent with a pathway towards low greenhouse gas emissions and climate-resilient development*”.

Finally, Sharma listed the challenges that are likely to impact agreement on these remaining issues:

- 14 Parties have not yet ratified the Paris Agreement, including the Russian Federation, Iran, and Turkey (although discussions are underway in the Russian Federation on ratification).
- There is uncertainty over Brazil’s role in the future, following the election of Jair Bolsonaro as President.
- The absence of the US will impact overall mitigation ambition, and the availability of climate finance.
- A key challenge will be for countries to update their NDCs in 2020.

Sharma noted some opportunities and silver linings as well, including that the new host of COP25, Chile, could play a critical role in making it an “ambition COP” and driving progress on the critical issue of loss and damage (particularly finance for loss and damage) as the Warsaw International Mechanism on Loss and Damage will be reviewed in 2019. She said rising protests around the world as the impacts of global warming become more and more tangible, including by school students, could empower governments to take action.

In the discussion that followed, a participant asked a question on South-South cooperation. In response, Sharma said this refers to political collaboration among countries of the South in economic, financial, environmental, and other domains. It can be advantageous in some contexts related to implementation, given that countries in the South face similar challenges. However, it could also be controversial, for instance in the case of climate finance, where developing countries prefer to keep South-South collaboration and contributions separate from the global climate finance commitment by developed countries. She also noted that new and innovative sources of finance will be needed to raise the “trillions of dollars” that some studies predict will be needed for climate action.

MOCK NEGOTIATIONS

In this session, participants took part in “mock negotiations” on loss and damage associated with climate impacts, using the *Pocket Guide on Loss and Damage*, to learn about formal and informal procedures under the UNFCCC. Draft text was circulated among the participants, and LDC Chair Wangdi chaired the negotiation that followed. Brianna Craft, IIED, acted as the UNFCCC Secretariat. Following the first session, “Group chairs” were appointed, to negotiate for their groups in the second session on the next day.

After the first session, resource persons noted that the mock negotiation was realistic, and participants made logical interventions. They encouraged participants to come prepared for the next session, by understanding the negotiating text and reading the rules of procedure.

After the second session, a participant asked if Parties are allowed to raise questions during negotiations. In response, Craft said they can, but the Secretariat can only respond to technical questions.

In conclusion, resource people highlighted the importance of preparation, networking, and the importance of being able to reach compromises to further the negotiations.

MITIGATION AND THE PARIS AGREEMENT RULEBOOK

This session started with a presentation by Gabrielle Swaby, IIED.

Swaby discussed the evolution of mitigation under the UNFCCC, the current status, and challenges and next steps.

Describing mitigation as the reduction of GHG emissions and enhancing of carbon sinks, she noted that the 1997 Kyoto Protocol opted for a top-down approach to mitigation, by setting targets for developed countries. In the aftermath, however, many countries argued that mitigation actions should be determined by countries, through a bottom-up approach, leading to the “Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions” (NAMAs) which were introduced in 2007.

The Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP) was launched in 2011 to develop a protocol, or another legal agreement, applicable to all Parties, under the Convention. In 2013, countries were invited to initiate and intensify their efforts towards creating intended nationally determined contributions (INDCs). In 2015, many countries submitted their first INDCs to show how they will deal with GHG emission through climate actions.

In the same year, Swaby said, the Paris Agreement was adopted, where Parties agreed to a long-term goal to keep global average temperature rise well below 2°C, while pursuing efforts to keep it below 1.5°C. All countries were called on to submit NDCs, where mitigation targets are not optional. All LDCs and many developing countries have submitted NDCs, some with elements that are conditional to the provision of means of implementation (finance, capacity building, and technology).

The Paris Agreement also invites countries to submit long-term low GHG emissions development strategies (LTS) by 2020, Swaby said – one LDC (Benin) has already submitted this. In addition, 11 LDCs have submitted NAMAs, and there is a question about how these will relate to NDCs.

In 2018, Swaby highlighted important events like the release of the IPCC Special Report on *Global Warming of 1.5°C*; and the adoption of the Paris Agreement Work Programme (PAWP), also known as the Paris rulebook, which includes a set of decisions meant to operationalise the Paris Agreement. The Talanoa Dialogue also took place in 2018.

Swaby then described future challenges and next steps, including:

- The on-going negotiations for a common NDC time frame for the implementation of NDCs.
- The role of science in the negotiations, with differences between Parties on how science can be manifested in the negotiations.
- Submission of enhanced NDCs and LTS by 2020, given the massive emissions gaps between the ambition of the current NDCs, and the long-term goal of the Paris Agreement.

Noting the co-benefits between mitigation and adaptation, with more mitigation resulting in a lower need for adaptation, Swaby asked if mitigation is a priority for LDCs, since their GHG emission profile is negligible. A participant responded that adaptation is important, while others agreed that mitigation can have adaptation co-benefits, and so should be a priority for LDCs. Swaby said politically, LDCs have a moral high ground to appeal to high emitters and show the world a better approach to development. Legally, she said, the Paris Agreement says each Party “*shall*” prepare and communicate NDCs and each successive NDC should show progress and the highest possible ambition.

Swaby concluded her presentation by inviting participants to discuss their country’s NDC; current successes and challenges; plans to submit an enhanced NDC and/or long-term strategy by 2020, if any; and whether mitigation will be a priority over the coming decades.

In the discussion that followed, participants queried the difference between LTS and NDCs. They shared information on their national plans before 2020, highlighting challenges like the lack of inter-ministerial coordination, institutional capacity to measure GHG emissions, and monitoring of NDC targets. A participant highlighted the role of integrating NDCs into national development plans for effective implementation. Some participants raised concerns regarding financial resources for implementing NDCs in the future.

A participant from Bhutan asked how countries that are already carbon neutral can enhance their NDCs. In response, Müller said countries should consider NDC enhancement to also mean enhancing the resilience of a country, and not only enhancement of mitigation ambition.

LEGAL LANGUAGE

This session, organised at the request of participants, was led by Christoph Schwarte, Legal Response Institute (LRI). He presented on legal language used under the UNFCCC, and used word games to help participants understand how the choice of words can influence the degree of commitment, legal bindingness, etc.

COOPERATIVE APPROACHES

This session started with a presentation by Benito Müller. He said Article 6 creates opportunities for international cooperation in implementing NDCs, through market-based and non-market based approaches.

Market-based approaches include transfer of mitigation outcomes through bilateral cooperation (Article 6.2) or trading of mitigation outcomes credited by the UNFCCC (Article 6.4), he said. Non-market based approaches (Article 6.8) include climate finance, technology transfer, capacity building, identification of synergies, development of tools, and institutional coordination. Protecting environmental integrity, raising ambition in NDCs, and promoting sustainable development are key principles of Article 6.

Article 6.2 states that:

*Parties shall, where engaging on a voluntary basis in cooperative approaches **that involve the use of internationally transferred mitigation outcomes (ITMOs) towards nationally determined contributions**, promote sustainable development and ensure environmental integrity and transparency, including in governance, and shall apply robust accounting to ensure, inter alia, the avoidance of double counting, consistent with guidance adopted by the CMA.*

Müller said Article 6.2 approaches are designed and implemented to promote direct cooperation between Parties, and guidance on accounting of ITMOs is included in the Article. He noted that the main objective of this guidance is to prevent double counting of mitigation outcomes through a corresponding adjustment. He listed key political unresolved issues under Article 6.2:

- There are no internationally-defined characteristics of ITMOs. Are they credits or pure accounting units? Can they be created for any form of mitigation, or are some kinds of sectors and activities excluded? For instance, should forest mitigation outcomes qualify as ITMOs?
- It is not clear whether ITMOs can be used outside the UNFCCC, by private companies and other compliance schemes such as the Carbon Offsetting and Reduction Scheme for International Aviation (CORSIA).
- Corresponding adjustments for ITMOs. There are two possible approaches: a target-based approach; and a tally based approach. It is not yet decided which one will be used for the adjustments for ITMOs inside and outside NDCs.

Moving on to Article 6.4, he said according to the Paris Agreement:

***A mechanism to contribute to the mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions and support sustainable development is hereby established** under the authority and guidance of the CMA for use by Parties on a voluntary basis. It shall be supervised by a body designated by the CMA...*

Under this mechanism, there is a supervisory board that oversees and approves the issuance of Article 6.4 Emission Reductions (A6.4ERs). He emphasised that the activities must be additional and promote sustainable development, and emissions reductions should be calculated and verified against crediting baselines. The host country must approve the activity and authorise the international transfer of the A6.4ERs. This mechanism also generates finance for adaptation through the share of proceeds.

Müller listed key issues that are still unclear under Article 6.4:

- Scope of the REDD+ activities

- Use of A6.4ERs through private companies or in other compliance schemes (e.g. CORSIA)
- Can they be generated from outside the NDC sector?
- Must they involve corresponding adjustments?

On Article 6.8, he said the Paris Agreement states:

*Parties recognize the importance of **integrated, holistic and balanced non-market approaches** being available to Parties to assist in the implementation of their nationally determined contributions, in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication, in a coordinated and effective manner, including through, inter alia, mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology transfer and capacity building, as appropriate.*

Müller said Parties are negotiating a work programme to implement a framework on non-market based approaches. However, there are unresolved issues on the objective of the work programme, and whether it should be a mechanism, or an instrument for the sharing of experiences. Similarly, the governance of the framework for the implementation of work programme is not yet decided.

In the discussion that followed, participants discussed the generation and transfer of ITMOs, reporting on emissions reductions, carbon taxes, certified emissions reductions, importance of rules for submitting NDCs, joint NDCs, relationship between the Paris Agreement approaches and the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) of the Kyoto Protocol, and environmental integrity.

CLIMATE FINANCE AND THE PARIS AGREEMENT RULEBOOK

Raju Pandit Chhetri, Executive Director, Prakriti Resources Centre led this session.

He said commitments made under Article 4 of the UNFCCC mandates developed countries to assist developing countries by providing financial resources for climate action. He listed the following Articles related to finance in the UNFCCC:

- **Article 4.3:** *The developed country Parties... shall provide new and additional financial resources to meet the agreed full costs incurred by developing country parties in complying with their obligations under Article 12, paragraph 1.*
- **Article 4.4:** *The developed country Parties... shall also assist the developing country Parties that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change in meeting costs of adaptation to those adverse effects.*
- **Article 4.9:** *The Parties shall take full account of the specific needs and special situations of the least developed countries in their actions with regard to funding and transfer of the technology.*
- **Article 11.3 (d):** *Determination in a predictable and identifiable manner of the amount of funding necessary and available for the implementation of this Convention and the conditions under which that amount shall be periodically reviewed.*

Chhetri then highlighted some of the key finance-related elements of the Paris Agreement:

- Article 9, the key finance related Article of the Agreement, states that developed country Parties *shall* provide financial resources to assist developing country Parties. Other Parties are *encouraged* to provide support.
- *The provision of scaled-up financial resources should aim to achieve a balance between adaptation and mitigation, taking into account ... the priorities and needs of developing country Parties, especially those that*

are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change and have significant capacity constraints, such as the least developed countries and small island developing States, considering the need for public and grant-based resources for adaptation.

- Institutions such as the GEF and GCF serving the Paris Agreement *shall* aim to ensure efficient access to financial resources through simplified approval procedures and enhanced readiness support for developing country Parties, in particular for LDCs and SIDS.
- Under Article 9.5, developed countries are asked to communicate indicative quantitative and qualitative information biennially, on the projected level of public financial resources to be provided to developing countries. Others are encouraged to provide this information on a voluntary basis.
- Under Article 9.7, developed countries *shall* provide transparent and consistent information on support for developing countries provided and mobilised through public interventions biennially in accordance with the modalities, procedures and guidelines adopted by CMA.
- In the Paris Decision that gives effect to the Paris Agreement, it was agreed that a new collective climate finance goal will be agreed prior to 2025 by CMA, from a floor of US\$100 billion per year.
- Under Article 2.1 (c), finance flows should be consistent with a pathway towards low GHG emissions and climate resilient development.

Chhetri briefly discussed the long-term finance (LTF) goal of providing US\$ 100 billion per year by 2020. He said an “in-session” workshop on LTF in the recent Subsidiary Bodies meeting in Bonn focused on the effectiveness of climate finance, and the provision of financial and technical support to developing countries for their adaptation and mitigation actions. The outcomes of this workshop will feed into the discussions in the next conference in Santiago.

Chhetri then described the Adaptation Fund, which used to serve only the Kyoto Protocol, but now also serves the Paris Agreement. It is hoped that a share of proceeds from the cooperative approaches and market mechanism established under Article 6 of the Paris Agreement will flow to the Adaptation Fund soon, he said, though there are currently ongoing discussions on the governance of the Fund.

Chhetri said developing common tabular formats for the electronic reporting of the information on financial, technology development and transfer, and capacity-building support provided and mobilised, as well as support needed and received, are under discussion. Similarly, the determination of needs for the financial resources by developing countries requires attention.

In the discussion that followed, Sharma elaborated on the governance of climate finance and the evolution of processes to access funds from the Adaptation Fund and GCF. She discussed the difficulties in assessing the additionality of climate finance, and of counting private sources of finance.

A participant asked if LDCs and SIDS have the capacity to become accredited entities to get access to international finance resources. In response, Chhetri said that there are lots of challenges for LDCs at the initial stage but it is also an opportunity for developing countries to build their institutional capacity through readiness programmes. Participant also suggested having efficient and effective climate finance tracking tools to provide transparent and consistent information on support for developing countries.

Another participant raised concerns on the basis for project selection by the GCF, saying this could make it more difficult for vulnerable countries to access funds. In response, Chhetri said the GCF is allocating funds on a “first come, first served” basis. Participants also discussed the availability of funds, access to the Adaptation Fund and GCF, and determination of needs for financial resources.

GROUP POSITION

During this session, chaired by Manjeet Dhakal and facilitated by Brianna Craft, participants were asked to formulate a group position to respond to proposal from the Umbrella Group, asking for the UNFCCC sessions to take place every two years, instead of every year. Following an animated session, it was agreed that COP sessions should be conducted every year until 2025, and reviewed thereafter.

REPORTING AND COMPLIANCE FRAMEWORK OF THE PARIS AGREEMENT

Christoph Schwarte, LRI, presented in this session. He described the enhanced transparency framework for action and support (Article 13), global stocktake (Article 14), and the mechanism to facilitate implementation and promote compliance (Article 15).

Article 13: Enhanced Transparency Framework for Action and Support

The enhanced transparency framework (ETF) of the Paris Agreement covers reporting, on both action and means of implementation, Schwarte said.

Listing the benefits of reporting under the Paris Agreement, he said it can help demonstrate efforts, needs, compliance and implementation; assess effectiveness of actions, learning and good practice; allow scrutiny and accountability; help understanding of status and trends, and aid future planning and decision-making; and mobilise support and increase in ambition.

The following elements of the ETF were agreed at Paris, Schwarte noted:

- The framework should build on the existing arrangements and have flexibility (Article 13.1), and it should be facilitative, non-intrusive, and non-punitive (Article 13.3).
- There should be clarity on mitigation and adaptation actions and transparency of support provided and received by the countries (Article 13.5).
- The information and report shall feed into the global stocktake (Articles 13.5 and 13.6).
- Every country shall develop a GHG inventory to track progress on implementing and achieving mitigation NDC (Article 13.7).
- Countries should provide information on adaptation and impacts as appropriate (Article 13.8).
- Developed countries *shall*, others *should*, provide information on support (Article 13.9) and developing countries on needs and support received (Article 13.10).
- Information *shall* be submitted at least on biennial bases except for LDCs and SIDS, who may submit at their discretion.
- There will be review of the submitted report by technical experts, and multilateral consideration of progress on finance (Article 13.11).
- There should be support for implementing Article 13 and building capacity (Articles 13.14 and 13.15).
- An ad hoc working group of the Paris Agreement should develop the common modalities, procedures and guidelines (MPGs) for reporting (Article 13.13 and paragraphs 91-95 of Decision 1/CP.21).

Schwarte noted that NDCs and National Adaptation Plans are two reports that should be communicated to the UNFCCC. For transparency of support, reporting requirements are different for developing and developed countries, and developed countries should report on what support they have contributed in terms of finance, technology transfer, and capacity building.

He elaborated on the provisions for technology development and transfer under the Article 10, which acknowledges that developing countries require transfer of technology to address climate change. However, he said, this is contentious topic in the negotiations in terms of intellectual property rights. He said that the Technology Framework consists of a Technology Executive Committee to discuss policy and a Climate Technology Centre and Network to focus on implementation. He emphasised that a system to identify and communicate technology needs and priorities should be established where support needed by developed country Parties and support received by developing country Parties should be defined.

Likewise, Schwarte said the Paris Committee on Capacity Building (PCCB) developed under the Paris Agreement is responsible for capacity building (Article 11) to enhance capacity of developing countries to take effective action on mitigation, adaptation, and technology development, access to finance, education, and reporting. He noted that capacity building was reflected in other Katowice decisions and the SBI should develop and adopt terms of reference for the PCCB.

Elaborating on the MPGs adopted in Katowice, Schwarte said they are a set of common rules of reporting, with flexibility for the countries that need it. Requirements on action are common, but those in relation to support are different for developed and developing countries. The first Biennial Transparency Reports (BTRs) must be submitted by 31 December 2024, with flexibility for LDCs and SIDS. It was decided in Katowice that countries are encouraged to nominate experts that can participate in the review process. Then, the secretariat will publish the synthesised reports. However, he said, the discussion on developing common reporting tables and formats is still continuing.

Article 14: Global Stocktake

Schwarte said the Paris Agreement calls for global stocktakes to take place every five years from 2023 (Article 14.2), to review collective progress made towards the goals of the Agreement. Specifically, he described the Article 14 under the Paris Agreement:

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to this Agreement shall periodically take stock of the implementation of this Agreement to assess the collective progress towards achieving the purpose of this Agreement and its long-term goals (referred to as the “global stocktake”). It shall do so in a comprehensive and facilitative manner, considering mitigation, adaptation and the means of implementation and support, and in the light of equity and the best available science.

Schwarte said the stocktakes will start in 2023, and the outcomes are expected to inform the preparation of NDCs. He described the three stages of global stocktake agreed to in Katowice:

- **Stage I:** Information collection and preparation (including general information of transparency review, Party submissions, and UN reports).
- **Stage II:** Technical assessment (through technical dialogue with assistance of joint contact group of the Subsidiary Bodies).
- **Stage III:** Consideration of outputs at high level events. Outputs should identify opportunities and challenges, summarise key political messages, and be referenced in a CMA decision and/or declaration.

Article 15: Compliance Mechanism

Finally, Schwarte described the compliance mechanism under the Paris Agreement’s Article 15, as a mechanism to facilitate implementation and promote compliance. The mechanism is facilitative, transparent, non-adversarial and non-punitive – unlike the compliance mechanism of the Kyoto Protocol.

Schwarte said the Compliance Committee, which includes 12 experts, can initiate consideration of a Party's compliance with the legally binding reporting requirements (only related to "if" the requirements are met or not, and not "how" they are met). The Committee may initiate consideration of significant and persistent inconsistencies with the ETF's MPGs with the consent of the Party. Also, the committee can bring systemic issues faced by a number of Parties to the attention of the CMA – without singling out an individual Party. The Committee needs to develop its own rules of modalities and procedures, which will be reviewed at CMA7 in 2024.

Schwarte concluded his session by encouraging participants to participate in the process of developing templates and nominating experts; building capacity; recording national adaptation efforts, climate impacts and loss and damage; streamlining reporting under MEAs, to coordinate and cooperate at the national level; manage environmental data; and involve stakeholders in the process of reporting.

GROUP WORK

Participants were divided into three thematic groups based on the themes they chose to follow: finance, adaptation, and mitigation. They were asked to discuss key issues for their countries in these areas, and ways of keeping in touch after the workshop to support each other and share information.

The group on finance said food security, adaptation, capacity building, energy, technology, and mitigation are key issues for their countries. They highlighted the need for a financial mechanism for loss and damage, and for the establishment of national clean energy funds and climate change trust funds.

The adaptation group said flood, droughts, sea level rise, and issues related to water resources are key issues for their countries. They highlighted the need for technology, finance, capacity building, and financial incentives.

The mitigation group said energy efficiency, transport, and application of renewable energy are key priorities for their nations. They highlighted the need for support in technology development and finance.

All the groups decided to stay in touch through email and WhatsApp.

FEEDBACK AND CLOSING SESSION

In the final session, participants and organisers shared their feedback on the workshop.

Participants thanked organisers for organising a very useful training, saying it has definitely helped them to gain more confidence to negotiate in COP meetings. They appreciated the flexibility of the organisers in organising a session on legal terminology in response to a request made during the workshop. All the participants urged ecbi to conduct the training workshop more frequently, with specific requests to conduct such training in SIDS in the future. They also requested an increase in the number of days of the training.

A participant shared that even after attending the UNFCCC negotiations twice, he found it confusing, but the training has made things much clearer. Participants also thanked for the comprehensive presentations by resource persons. They noted that training and resource materials would also help them to submit various reports to the UNFCCC. Finally, they said that they look forward to participating in future negotiations with more confidence.

The organisers thanked the participants for their attendance and active participation. They noted that the participants performed well in the mock negotiations. While there are time constraints for the training workshops, the resource people will be present at the negotiations, and can always be called on for help. They encouraged networking between participants in the current and previous workshops, and participation in the ecbi alumni. They cautioned participants against trying to follow all the issues during negotiations – instead, they urged them to find issues and areas that are important and of particular interest to them/their countries.

Maheshwor Dhakal concluded the workshop with closing remarks. He thanked the Chair of the LDC Group, the German government, the organisers, resource persons, and MoFE colleagues for making the training workshop successful. In conclusion, he wished participants good luck in demonstrating the skills and knowledge gained from this training in future UNFCCC sessions.