



# 2018 Regional Training Workshop

## Anglophone Africa



9 & 10 April 2018

Dakar, Senegal

**ecbi**

European Capacity Building Initiative

[www.eurocapacity.org](http://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](http://www.international-climate-initiative.com)

Supported by:



based on a decision of the German Bundestag

## Partner Institutions

oxford  
climate  
policy

iiied



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Welcome remarks and opening speech	2
2018 UNFCCC negotiations: Outlining the year ahead	3
Becoming a better UNFCCC delegate: Tips and tricks	5
Adaptation and the Paris Agreement	8
Mock negotiations - Part 1	10
Group Scenario Position	10
Transparency framework for action and support	10
Mock negotiations - Part 2	12
Pre-2020 action and the Talanoa Dialogue	12
Global stocktake and the compliance mechanism	14
Group Work	16
<i>Adaptation</i>	16
<i>Mitigation</i>	16
<i>Finance</i>	17
<i>Capacity building</i>	17
Next steps and feedback	17

## WELCOME REMARKS AND OPENING SPEECH

The 2018 ecbi Regional Training Workshop for Anglophone Africa took place on 9 & 10 April 2018 in Sali, Senegal. The workshop was organised in collaboration with ecbi's regional partner Energie Environment Développement (ENDA), was attended by 29 negotiators from the region.

On behalf of the ENDA Executive Secretary and the Director of Environment, Emmanuel Seck opened the workshop, welcoming all participants and thanking them for their attendance. In his short opening remarks, he highlighted ENDA's partnership with IIED and ecbi and said that through it over 300 participants have benefited from the training workshops. He noted that a crucial milestone was reached at the Paris Agreement and those from least developed countries (LDCs) played an important role to achieve this. He reiterated the need for more action under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) as the effects of climate change continue to impact communities. He said that 2018 is an important year to review NDCs through the 2018 Facilitative Dialogue, or Talanoa Dialogue as it is now called, which will provide an inclusive participatory platform for LDCs to play their roles in sharing their contributions and their efforts on the ground. He mentioned the need for National Action Plans (NAPs) and Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) to be better aligned with intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDCs), and for countries to set up their own National Implementing Entities (NIEs) to have better access to funds. He went on to wish the participants a fruitful session where he hoped that they would use the time and opportunity to network and interact with one another.

Anju Sharma, head of the Publications and Policy Analysis Unit of ecbi, welcomed participants and provided a background and introduction to ecbi. She described the Fellowship Programme which aims to build trust between senior negotiators from developing countries and their European counterparts; and the Training and Support Programme (TSP) which is aimed at training new and junior negotiators from developing countries. She said ecbi have been successful in creating a level playing field at the UN negotiations and through its TSP many new negotiators have gone on to represent their countries.

Subhi Barakat, International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), described the different aspects of the TSP. He pointed out the three regional workshops: Anglophone Africa; Francophone Africa and the Asia Pacific region and the one-day seminar before every COP. He said the training workshops aim to equip participants with better skills and more up to date knowledge on the international negotiations. He also said that as well as the ecbi training workshops IIED focuses on supporting LDCs by providing technical advice; strategic legal advice; and research and logistical support.

Participants were then invited to introduce themselves, state their role at home, their experience in the UNFCCC negotiations, which issues they follow, and their expectations were the training workshop.

Brianna Craft, IIED, walked the participants through the programme agenda. She also informed them of the UN guidelines and said that under the guidelines the workshop will be operating in compliance with the UNFCCC policy of zero tolerance towards discrimination, harassment or abuse of authority. She finished by saying that the workshops aim to create a safe and secure environment where everyone is able to fully participate.

## 2018 UNFCCC NEGOTIATIONS: OUTLINING THE YEAR AHEAD

This session started with a presentation by Bubu Pateh Jallow, a senior negotiator from The Gambia. Jallow described what is at stake for the 2018 UNFCCC negotiations; what needs to be achieved; and major upcoming events relevant to the UN climate negotiations.

On the **implementation of the Paris Agreement**, he said this should include: the global negotiations working on structure; the Paris Agreement Work Programme (PAWP) to advance climate change action; the design of the 2018 Talanoa Dialogue; a stocktake of the pre-2020 implementation and ambition at COP24, including the mitigation efforts of parties and the provision of support in the pre-2020 period and exploring the potentials for the entry into force of the Doha Amendments of the Kyoto Protocol by the end of this year; and sufficient mobilisation of climate finance.

On the **transparency framework** of the Paris Agreement, he said negotiations will be sticky in 2018 and attention should be paid to bifurcated or differentiated guidance. Maintaining loss and damage in the transparency text may prove challenging as Article 18 is not referenced in Article 13. Reporting loss and damage is a priority for the LDC Group, he said, highlighting the need to ensure that linkages with the negotiations on Article 9.5 are maintained, and that all other agenda items are finished with adequate time to ensure that text from those items can be transferred to placeholders and then reviewed as a whole to ensure coherence.

On the **global stocktake**, he said LDC positions are most likely included within the Chairs' information note and this assurance must continue to the next iterations of the text. During the design and timeline of the global stocktake, it is important to ensure adequate time is allowed for the global stocktake to be conducted in a comprehensive and balanced manner with tangible outcomes. Loss and damage has been recognised in the Chairs' information note, but further integration is necessary throughout the entire global stocktake, along with mitigation, adaptation, finance etc. Operationalisation of equity needs to be well reflected, he said, so that it is not over-complicated or diluted.

On **adaptation** negotiations, he said there needs to be stress on the elaboration of the global goal for adaptation and guidance for adaptation communications as part of Paris Agreement. The Paris rulebook should address adaptation and mitigation in a balanced manner with respect to both action and support; and the NAPs recognised as one of the primary vehicles for LDCs to communicate their medium and long-term needs.

On **mitigation**, he said there needs to be quantifiable information on the reference point in the information note and subsequent negotiation text; a cross-reference to common time frames; and an emphasis on flexibility and capacity of developing countries, in particular, LDCs and small island developing States (SIDs), with support to develop and improve information necessary under the transparency framework.

On **finance**, he said 2018 is expected to set up accounting modalities of financial resources provided and mobilised through public interventions, including indicative quantitative and qualitative information of public financial resources to be provided. The preparatory work for the Adaptation Fund to serve the Paris Agreement would be addressed and the preparatory work of the Green Climate Fund's (GCF) replenishment would be completed. A long-term finance (LTF) workshop on sharing experiences and lessons for articulating and translating needs identified in country-driven processes into projects and programmes will be conducted in 2018, he said, and will provide recommendations for facilitating enhanced access.

On **loss and damage**, he said the Suva Expert Dialogue, focusing on risk assessment, reduction, transfer, and managing slow onset process and extremes will be conducted in 2018. Outcomes of the Expert Dialogue will inform the technical paper on sources of finance for loss and damage, which will serve as an input to the Review of the Warsaw International Mechanism on Loss and Damage at COP25 in 2019.

On **capacity building**, he said the second meeting of the Paris Committee on Capacity Building (PCCB) will be held at the 48th meeting of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI48) to elaborate mechanisms to further its work and deal with technicalities affecting its work. The 7th Durban Forum and the Action for Climate Empowerment (ACE) Dialogue to be held at SBI48 will continue as a means of effective and continuous sharing of information, good practices and lessons learned. Their outcome should be integrated into the works of PCCB.

He summed up what needs to be achieved by the end of 2018 by saying that essential steps would have been taken to ensure that the Paris Agreement structure and the Paris Agreement Work Programme are completed to advance the global climate change agenda; the design of the Talanoa Dialogue will be completed; and movement to fulfil pre-2020 commitments and ambition should be evident; A stocktake on pre-2020 implementation and ambition will be convened at COP24, including the mitigation efforts of Parties and the provision of support in the pre-2020 period.

He added that this will be a very important negotiation period, which will end up with important outcomes from the process, and it is essential to build the capacity of negotiators.

He then outlined the major upcoming events relevant to the UN climate negotiations. Jallow said the 48th Sessions of the UNFCCC Subsidiary Bodies (APA, SBI, SBSTA) will run from 24 April to 10 May 2018 in Bonn, Germany, and will include:

- Another in-session workshop on Long-term Climate Finance will be organised in 2018;
- The Suva Expert Dialogue on Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage associated with Climate Change Impacts will be organised at SB48 (April-May 2018);
- A multi-stakeholder workshop on implementing the local communities and indigenous peoples' platform has been proposed (Decision 2/CP.23);
- An in-session workshop on the impacts of the Gender Action Plan, will be convened in 2018; and the second PCCB meeting will take place.
- The 24th Session of the Conference of the Parties (COP 24) to the UNFCCC will take place from 3-14 December 2018 in Katowice, Poland, where:
- A stocktake on pre-2020 implementation and ambition will be convened, which will consider the inputs of the COP and its Bodies; the mitigation efforts of parties in the pre-2020 period; and the provision of support in the pre-2020 period.

He noted that an additional Subsidiary Bodies meeting is proposed from 31 August - 8 September 2018 in Bangkok, Thailand. A Pre-COP is also proposed for 22-24 October 2018 in Krakow, Poland.

He then listed the major events in 2018, the outcome of which will be reports on:

- The in-session workshop on Long-term Climate Finance in 2018;
- The Expert Dialogue on WIM;
- The multi-stakeholder workshop on the functions of the local communities and indigenous peoples' platform;
- The in-session workshop on the impacts of the Gender Action Plan, convened in 2018;
- The stocktake on pre-2020 implementation and ambition;

- The in-session Workshop on Long Term Climate Finance for consideration by COP 24 (December 2018); and
- The Suva Expert Dialogue.

## Discussion

In the discussion that followed, participants raised questions about Article 9.5 of the Paris Agreement; issues relating to loss and damage; and clarification on the balance between mitigation and adaptation, and whether one should be prioritised over the other.

A resource person said Article 9.5 is an obligation for developed countries to provide upfront information about support that they intend to provide in the future, but what is not clear is what this information should look like, and how it will be processed or used. That is where Article 9.5 is contentious in climate finance-related discussions.

Regarding loss and damage, Jallow said there is still a long way to go in reducing the impacts of climate change in general. Those in the developing world have done well in bringing this to the attention of partners. While partners do not want to tackle finance and the need for finance for loss and damage, progress has been made, with good support from the EU and some other developed countries.

He also said developing countries tend to focus on adaptation as the priority, but mitigation is of equal priority in the sense that although developing countries may not have a lot to reduce in terms of emissions compared to their developed country counterparts, it should remain in their interest to work hard to ensure that developed countries take up and prioritise mitigation. Capacity, finance, and technology on the other hand should be prioritised with adaptation where developing countries are concerned.

## BECOMING A BETTER UNFCCC DELEGATE: TIPS AND TRICKS

The session was led by Stella Gama, a senior negotiator from Malawi, who presented on the process under the UNFCCC; explained its governance structure; informed participants of what to expect from different meetings; and offered them practical tips.

She noted the importance of understanding the Convention itself when going into the climate change negotiations. She advised that participants read the document and use it as a reference guide for each thematic area.

She listed the following climate change treaties adopted so far:

- **1992:** UNFCCC, with 197 Parties, which make up the Conference of the Parties (COP). The Convention entered into force in 1994.
- **1997:** Kyoto Protocol, with 192 Parties to the Kyoto Protocol which make up the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP). The Protocol entered into force in 2005.
- **2015:** The Paris Agreement, with 147 Parties (so far) that make up Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA). The Agreement entered into force in 2016.

Gama explained that the ultimate objective of the UNFCCC is to achieve stabilisation of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system. Such a level should be achieved within a time-frame sufficient to allow ecosystems to adapt naturally to climate change, to ensure that food production is not threatened and to enable economic development to proceed in a sustainable manner. She described four key principles of the UNFCCC including: common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities (CBDR-RC); equity; precautionary principle; and sustainable development.

She said the Kyoto Protocol is mostly a mitigation-related agreement that commits developed country Parties to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by an average of 5% below 1990 levels during the first commitment period (2008-2012); and further reductions in second commitment period (2013-2020).

The Paris Agreement is a universal agreement, based on the principles of the UNFCCC, where all parties are responsible. She said it is legally binding; comprehensive and balanced; introduces a bottom-up approach; and has a built-in ambition mechanism. It aims to strengthen the global response to climate change by: holding global average temperature increase to less than 2°C, while aiming for 1.5°C; increasing the ability to adapt and foster low-carbon, climate-resilient development; and making finance flows consistent with low-carbon and climate-resilient development pathways.

### **Governance and Structure**

Gama then described the governance structure of the UNFCCC, explaining the role of the COP, CMP and CMA. These supreme decision-making bodies meet annually to adopt decisions and further the implementation of each of these agreements. There are two permanent bodies supporting the COP, CMP and CMA – namely the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) and the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA). She also described the role of the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Paris Agreement (APA), a non-permanent body under the COP, taking up matters related to the Paris Agreement.

She touched on the issue of gender and said that for most committees, the representation of women is below 40%. She encouraged female participants to consider joining the various committees under the UNFCCC by contacting their focal points.

She listed the following key negotiation groups under the UNFCCC process:

- Group of 77 and China (G77 and China), with 134 members mainly from developing countries.
- Africa Group of Negotiators (AGN), with 54 countries, a geographical grouping.
- Least Developed Countries (LDCs) with 48 countries categorised as 'least developed' according to UN criteria.
- Small Island Developing States (SIDS), with 39 members, negotiate as the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS).
- Alliance of Latin America and the Caribbean (AILAC), with Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Panama, Paraguay and Peru.
- Like-Minded Developing Countries (LMDCs), with about 25 members.
- European Union (EU), with 27 members.
- Umbrella Group, with Australia, Canada, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, and the US.
- Environmental Integrity Group (EIG), with Mexico, Liechtenstein, Monaco, Republic of Korea and Switzerland.

Gama further listed key people in the process, including: the UNFCCC Secretariat which supports the preparation of the agenda and facilitation of discussions; the President of the COP, CMP and CMA, SBI Chair, SBSTA Chair, and APA Co-Chairs collectively facilitate the negotiating bodies, and ensure that the negotiations are progressing; and observer non-governmental organisations, who provide support at the meetings and act as watchdogs.

She said the UNFCCC process has a variety of formal and informal meetings and briefly described what to expect. Formal meetings include the plenary and contact groups; while informal meetings include informal consultations, drafting groups, coordination meetings and bilateral meetings.

She then provided guidelines in relation to taking the floor, saying reading out prepared statements is more common in plenary settings, while interventions are better in negotiations. Normally, she said, groups will speak first, followed by individual Parties (if they wish to speak). She said it is good to voice support with previous speakers if your position aligns with theirs, and noted that a point of order (for a procedural issue) may be raised by making a 'T' sign with your country placard.

Describing the drafting of text, Stella said preambular paragraphs (PPs) highlight the status, in relation to the decision texts; they normally use terminology such as 'Recalling' or 'Reaffirming'; and are usually referred to as PP1, PP2 etc. Operative paragraphs (OPs) form the heart of the decision text, and start with numbers. She explained commonly used terms, such as 'agreed language', 'bracketing', 'bis', 'ter', etc.

Gama said that when drafting text, negotiators should know: the government's/regional group's policies and objectives on the issues, and if they are reflected adequately in the text; how the national position articulated; what options are available; Chair's text/conference room paper; past decisions and conclusions; other related UN resolutions; and suggestions from stakeholders (e.g. NGOs and other stakeholder groups).

To conclude, Stella provided practical tips and links to useful resources.

## **Discussion**

In the discussion that followed, participants sought clarification on the legal implications or penalties for pulling out of the Paris Agreement; taking the floor; the Kyoto Protocol's second commitment period; why fewer LDCs have ratified the Paris Agreement than the UNFCCC; and political input into the negotiations.

Gama responded that the Paris Agreement's Article 28 allows a party to withdraw – however there are processes and procedures that must be followed.

On taking the floor, she said lead coordinators can make interventions on behalf of a group, but non-coordinators can make a statement on behalf of their country so long as they make reference to what other lead coordinators have highlighted.

On the Kyoto Protocol second commitment period and Paris Agreement, she said the Paris Agreement will succeed the Kyoto Protocol and implementation will begin in 2020. In the meantime, the rules of the Paris Agreement are being developed but we are still in the second period of the Kyoto Protocol. The main difference between Paris Agreement and Kyoto Protocol is that the Protocol focuses on mitigation and financing, and the Paris Agreement looks at all the thematic areas.

On why 48 LDCs have ratified the convention but only 47 have ratified the Paris Agreement, Jallow noted that some LDCs have graduated to developing countries, and numbers will go down further in the future as more LDCs graduate.

On political input into COP, CMP and CMA sessions Jallow said high level political statements are delivered at the end of the COP sessions, by ministers or heads of states. The statements can be useful and are always recorded and available on the UNFCCC website. Negotiators support their ministers and heads of states in drafting statements in support of what has been negotiated at the technical level.

## ADAPTATION AND THE PARIS AGREEMENT

This session started with a presentation by Binyam Gebreyes, IIED. He started the session noting that climate change is already taking place, with drastic impacts all over the world, including heat waves, droughts, fires, floods, cyclones/hurricanes, and sea level rise.

He gave participants a chance to reflect on climate change impacts in their countries, which they believe cannot be reversed. Floods and droughts were the most commonly stated.

Gebreyes said adaptation refers to coping with climatic change – either taking measures to reduce the negative effects or exploit the positive ones by making appropriate adjustments. Developing countries will be most affected, and therefore strong adaptation policies and support need to be in place. Adaptation to climate change needs to be seen as an integral part of a country's development planning, rather than a separate issue. Coping strategies for climate change include crop and livelihood diversification; seasonal climate forecasting; community-based disaster risk reduction; famine early warning systems, insurance; water storage; and supplementary irrigation.

He said the definition of vulnerability in terms of adaptation has been open to debate, but in essence it is the risk of adverse things happening and is commonly a function of three factors:

- **Exposure:** What is at risk from climate change (population, resources etc).
- **Sensitivity:** Biophysical effect of climate change (such as changes in crop yield, runoff, energy demand, and the socioeconomic context).
- **Adaptive Capacity:** The capability to adapt, which is often a function of wealth, technology, education institutions, information and infrastructure. However, simply having adaptive capacity does not mean it is used effectively.

Gebreyes asked participants whether they thought climate negotiations will help the national adaptation effort. Participants responded that it helps to: provide a framework for experience sharing and access to information and technology for countries with the least capacity; share technological development and innovative solutions for specific country problems; and provide finance.

He said adaptation provisions under UNFCCC show that there is focus for adaptation and listed relevant Articles from the Convention:

- UNFCCC Article 4.1 (e) calls on all Parties to “*Cooperate in the preparing for adaptation to the impacts of climate change; develop and elaborate appropriate and integrated plans for coastal zone management, water resources and agriculture, and for the protect and rehabilitation of areas, particularly in Africa, affected by drought and desertification, as well as floods*”.
- UNFCCC Article 4.4 states that: “*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 adaption to those adverse effects.”*

He listed the evolution and timeline of the international framework for adaptation:

- **COP2 (1996)**: National Communication.
- **COP7 (2001)**: LDC Support; NAPAs, LDC Expert Group, LDC Fund, Special Climate Change Fund and Adaptation Fund.
- **COP11 (2005)**: Nairobi Work Programme (NWP)
- **COP13 (2007)**: Bali Action Plan.
- **COP15 (2009)**: Copenhagen Accord Financial Support for Adaptation.
- **COP16 (2011)**: Cancun Adaptation Framework (Adaptation Communications, NAPs and Loss and Damage).
- **COP17 (2012)**: NAP technical guideline proposed.
- **COP21 (2015)**: Global Goal for Adaptation.
- **COP24 (2018)**: Modalities, procedures and guidelines for Adaptation Communication.

On adaptation and the Paris Agreement, he pointed out that the more mitigation takes place, the less adaptation is needed. The Agreement establishes a global goal for adaptation to enhance adaptive capacity and resilience; to reduce vulnerability, with a view to contributing to sustainable development; and ensuring an adaptation response in the context of the goal of holding average global warming well below 2°C and pursuing efforts to hold it below 1.5°C.

He added that the Paris Agreement makes the link between finance and adaptation; it is set up as a vehicle for cooperation between countries to share experience and strengthen collective knowledge; and countries [will] be communicating periodically, reflecting their priorities through a registry that will be established.

He identified the next steps and needs, saying this should include robust methodologies to assess adaptation needs and costs; sharing knowledge and experience; building adaptive capacity; expediting international funding; and a focus on most vulnerable countries, regions and local communities.

## **Discussion**

During the discussion that followed, participants asked: how mitigation and adaptation can be balanced in relation to the Paris Agreement; what methodologies are available for assessing adaptation; and how Africa can better utilise local communities and civil society.

Gebreyes responded that balance between mitigation and adaptation depends on a variety of factors, including through discussions; strong commitments from every country; and making sure the agenda is on the table. On methodologies for assessing adaptation, he said the point is not to assess how much a country has adapted, but how much it has benefited. It is about taking national experiences internationally so that lessons can be learned. Recognition of efforts from the international community is important in motivating countries to better adapt and involve the community to build adaptive capacity, he said. On the role of local communities and civil society, he said while their involvement is mandatory, the challenge is how you involve them as well as stakeholders in the planning process. There are many elements to their participation, but they can be a very strong partner to help governments, as long as they are kept adequately informed.

## MOCK NEGOTIATIONS - PART I

During this session, participants were asked to select a nation state to represent, and negotiate a mock draft text. The exercise was aimed at allowing participants to understand the negotiating process, practice “negotiating etiquette”, follow the rules of procedure, and understand subtle differences. The draft text was on gender and climate change. Participants were to refer to the ecbi Pocket Guide to Gender Equality Under the UNFCCC as advanced reading. Stella Gama chaired the session and resource people acted as advisors only.

## GROUP SCENARIO POSITION

During the session, on 10 April, Brianna Craft, IIED, facilitated a game with the aim of getting the participants to form a group position on the following scenario:

*“Mr Bill Gates has died and let his entire US\$ 80 billion fortune to the UNFCCC. The money has been entrusted to the secretariat, who is awaiting a COP decision. Where should the money go and what should the money be allocated for.”*

Following discussions, the group decided that the money should be allocated to adaptation and adaptation-related activities and managed by the Global Environment Facility, with part of it in the LDC Fund only for LDCs, and part of it in the Special Climate Change Fund for all other countries to access.

## TRANSPARENCY FRAMEWORK FOR ACTION AND SUPPORT

This session started with a presentation by Subhi Barakat, IIED. He described how transparency is dealt with under the UNFCCC; and how it applies to means of implementation, which includes finance, technology and capacity building.

Barakat said transparency arrangements create understanding and more clarity; and provide opportunities for learning and improving performance, based on better information for decision-makers. Under the UN climate regime, it helps to create trust; provides information and makes clear what Parties are doing; promotes accountability; encourages ambition; increases participation; and allows us to gauge progress and understand where the gaps are, to achieve individual and global goals.

He described the key features of transparency arrangements under the UNFCCC, saying they include regular reporting and review (for instance, through GHG inventories, National Communications, Biennial Reports, Biennial Update Reports, NAPs and Technology Needs Assessments). The arrangements have evolved and become more complex over 20 years, taking on board several types of information – including ex ante (forward-looking) information; ex durante (progress during implementation); and ex post (backward-looking) information.

He highlighted the enhanced transparency framework under the Paris Agreement and its key features, including: more regular reporting by countries (at least biennially); an opportunity for countries to improve over time; an in-built flexibility based on national circumstances; and transparency of both action and support.

Barakat said a key issue relating to transparency is how to balance the quality of information with the potential burden on countries with lower capacity. In climate negotiations, information needs to be understandable and

comparable, but how standardised should it be? Also, what is the right level of flexibility, who needs it, and on what basis? In terms of transparency there are two options: set ambitions low so that everyone can meet them and raise the bar gradually; or set ambitions high and give those with lower capacity time to catch up. It is also important to consider the balance of having an opportunity to report information, even if it is not required, with the additional burden.

On the transparency of the adaptation action and support he said the following should be considered: what information should be provided (qualitative or quantitative, direct actions or policies and measures); how to communicate it and how to aggregate it; differentiate 'climate' and 'development', and if so how; how to review the information (should it be reviewed?); and is it the right place to include action or support for loss and damage.

He explained that transparency has linkages with international processes such as the global stocktake, which aims to provide a snapshot of collective efforts of action and support, and assess progress towards the Paris Agreement goals. Reliable information is essential for this process; along with an effective compliance mechanism to identify who is unable to comply or implement obligations and why; and international emissions trading and markets to avoid carbon leakage and low ambition based on buying cheaper implementation elsewhere.

Barakat then described the benefits of transparency arrangements at the national level. He said national transparency efforts can help identify priorities, gaps, needs and effectiveness; and also help countries comply with international reporting obligations and access finance and other support by having more reliable information and better articulated proposals. He noted the need for domestic institutions and expertise to collect and process all the information such as mandates, policies etc.

On means of implementation for finance, he said there is no agreed definition of climate finance or when it is provided, many countries count and attribute finance and other support they provide in different ways. Key financial institutions include the GCF, for large projects and programmes; Global Environment Facility (LDCF, SCCF); and the Adaptation Fund, which uses an innovative source of funding. He noted that there is a difference between availability and accessibility of funds. He highlighted some of the key issues: how to finance the US\$100 billion per year from 2020 commitment made in Copenhagen by developed countries; where should it come from; who provides it; and is it enough. He also noted that Article 9.5 (on up-front information on support) is contentious; and currently there is no finance promised for loss and damage due to climate impacts.

Discussing the practical realities of accessing financial support for NAPs, he said support is available from the GCF (under its readiness and preparatory support programme) for all developing countries to prepare NAPs, and additionally for LDCs from the LDC Fund. However, in general support is not easily accessible. This is evident from the low number of countries, in particular LDCs, who have submitted requests for funding to prepare their NAPs; the lower number who have secured funds; and the even lower number who have secured funds to actually implement their NAPs.

On means of implementation for technology he described the Technology Mechanism (TM), with the Technology Executive Committee (TEC), dealing with executive and administrative issues; and the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN) to provide capacity building, training and technical support. He said Technical Needs Assessments (TNAs) assist countries in: understanding their technology needs so that they can develop plans to address them; get technical support to implement them; and ultimately taking more effective action. Among key challenges he listed: intellectual property rights; challenges in developing

endogenous technology and capacity; and the need for better coordination between TM and LDC Expert Group (LEG).

On means of implementation for capacity building, he said the process has to be country-driven and based on learning-by-doing. It is not just about training but increasing the capacity of people and institutions and for planning and implementation. The key institutions are Paris Committee for Capacity Building (PCCB); Capacity Building Initiative for transparency (CBIT); and the Durban Forum on Capacity Building. Among the challenges he listed the fact that capacity building is often undervalued. He flagged, for instance, the challenges in mainstreaming the Gender Action Plan, and empowering local communities and indigenous peoples.

Showing participants, a graph of NAP submissions by LDCs, he highlighted that of the 47 LDCs, only 3 have submitted NAPs. Similarly for developing countries, only 9 out of 144 countries have submitted NAPs.

He ended by listing the following additional resources and further reading:

- [A guide to transparency under the UNFCCC and the Paris Agreement](#)
- [The 2018 edition of the Pocket Guide to Transparency under the UNFCCC](#)
- [Least Developed Countries' experiences with the UNFCCC Technology Mechanism](#)
- [Provisions for support to LDCs](#)
- [UNFCCC portal on finance](#)
- [UNFCCC portal on technology](#)
- [UNFCCC portal on capacity-building](#)

## **Discussion**

In the discussion, participants asked for further information on the CBIT. Barakat said CBIT will provide capacity-building specifically for transparency under the Paris Agreement.

## **MOCK NEGOTIATIONS – PART 2**

During this session, participants continued mock negotiations to reach a consensus on the text on gender.

## **PRE-2020 ACTION AND THE TALANOA DIALOGUE**

This session started with a presentation by Anju Sharma, Oxford Climate Policy. Sharma began the presentation by providing a brief background on the outcome of the Kyoto Protocol and the Copenhagen conference and then outlined pre-2020 ambition.

Sharma said under the Cancun Agreements, Parties agreed to keep average global temperature rise within 2°C, and considering the 1.5°C target in the near future. Developed countries agreed to take on economy-wide reduction targets; while developing countries agreed to take on Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs), subject to support. Developed countries also agreed to provide US\$ 30 billion as Fast Start Finance (over the 2010-2012 period), and US\$100 billion long term finance by 2020. In addition, the GCF, Technology Mechanism, and Cancun Adaptation Framework came into being. However, she said that pledges made under this agreement added up to only 60% of the emission reductions that were needed for a 50% chance of keeping temperatures below 2°C.

She then summarised the outcomes of the Doha Amendment, which she said called for an 18% reduction below 1990 levels between 2013-2020 for developed countries. Major countries such as Canada, Japan and Russian Federation opted out. 144 ratifications are necessary for the Kyoto Protocol second commitment period to come into effect, she said, but so far only 111 ratifications have been received.

On the Paris Outcome she said that decision 1/CP.21 addresses enhanced pre- 2020 action.

Sharma then presented a figure reviewing the fair shares versus 2030 pledged actions and highlighted the mitigation gap which is estimated to be 8-10 Gt CO<sub>2</sub>e in 2020 (for the 2°C goal). She said developing countries fear that this will shift the mitigation burden on to them in the post-2020 period.

Expanding on the negative consequences of not achieving the pre-2020 ambition, she explained presented a graph illustrating how low mitigation ambition impacts adaptation costs. Pre-2020 implementation is central to limiting adaptation costs, she noted.

Sharma also presented a figure showing different estimates of climate finance in the pre-2020 period.

She then briefly ran through the next steps for pre-2020 actions, saying Parties were invited to submit, by 1 May 2018, information on implementing pre-2020 action. A synthesis report will be prepared by the Secretariat. A stocktake of pre-2020 ambition will take place at COP24, in the format of the Facilitative Dialogue, to consider mitigation and provision of support. Pre-2020 action will also be considered as part of the 2018 Talanoa Dialogue.

### **Talanoa Dialogue**

Sharma said the Talanoa Dialogue is a facilitative dialogue which aims to take stock of action so far and help countries increase their NDC ambition by 2020. The Dialogue will consider three questions: where are we; where do we want to be; and how do we get there?

She said the dialogue will consist of two phases, a preparatory phase where countries can offer input and feedback and a political phase which will take place at COP24.

Sharma listed what is expected over 2018:

- Six Talanoa groups will meet on 6 May 2018, each with 35 participants (30 Party and 5 non- Party). They will work in parallel to address each of the three questions at a time. The questions will be taken up in sequence, so that all six parallel Talanoa groups will consider the same question at the same time.
- A synthesis report of the May discussions and of submissions from Parties will be prepared by the Secretariat, to inform the political phase at COP24.
- The IPCC Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5°C, due in October, will also serve as a key input.
- The specific outcome will be determined by Parties during the political phase at COP24.

She highlighted that the aftermath of the Dialogue will be very important, as this it will become clear whether the Dialogue has resulted in increased ambition in national action.

### **Discussion**

During the discussions, participants asked whether countries in Africa will be expected to increase their ambition, when there are other countries that have higher contributions and responsibilities. Sharma responded that this is a key concern for many countries – that is, whether they should increase their ambitions if they don't know whether the outcome will be equitable and fair. This concern will remain during the global

stocktake, and there are proposals to tackle this in future NDC cycles, for instance by asking countries to declare their future intentions through draft NDCs, to inform the ambition of other countries. However, equity is highlighted as a key concern for many countries.

Participants also sought further clarity on the overlap between pre-2020 ambition and the Paris Agreement; and the difference between a convention, protocol and agreement. Sharma and other experts clarified that although the Paris Agreement is already in force legally, the common assumption is that countries will start to implement it from 2020, in accordance with their NDCs. On the difference between different international agreements,

Barakat said they are all considered an international treaty, with the same legal weight and standing. In terms of the relationship between them, both the Paris agreement and the Kyoto Protocol are related to the UNFCCC – if a Party withdraws from the UNFCCC, it is forced to withdraw from the Protocol and Agreement.

## GLOBAL STOCKTAKE AND THE COMPLIANCE MECHANISM

This session started with a presentation by Bubu Pateh Jallow. He discussed the context of the global stocktake; its timing and purpose; other thematic areas of the Paris Agreement relevant to it; inputs; modalities, structure and process; and outcome and outputs.

Jallow said Article 14 of the Paris Agreement calls on the CMA to periodically take stock of the implementation of the Agreement to assess the collective progress towards achieving its purpose and its long-term goals. This "global stocktake" will be conducted in a comprehensive and facilitative manner, considering mitigation, adaptation and the means of implementation and support. It will be carried out in the light of equity and the best available science.

He cited Article 14.2 and 14.3 of the Paris Agreement in relation to the timing and purpose of the stocktake:

- The first global stocktake shall be undertaken in 2023 and every five years thereafter unless otherwise decided by the CMA (Article 14.2).
- The outcome of the global stocktake shall inform Parties in updating and enhancing, in a nationally determined manner, their actions and support in accordance with the relevant provisions of this Agreement, as well as in enhancing international cooperation for climate action (Article 14.3).

Jallow listed the following relevant provisions of the Paris Agreement:

- Article 4.9 and Decision 1/CP.21 (**NDCs**): *Each Party shall communicate an NDC every five years...[which will] be informed by the outcomes of the global stocktake.*
- Article 7.14 (**Adaptation**): *The global stocktake shall, (a) recognize adaptation efforts of developing country Parties; (b) enhance the implementation of adaptation action; (c) take into account the adaptation communication; (d) Review the adequacy and effectiveness of adaptation and support provided for adaptation; and (e) review the overall progress made in achieving the global goal on adaptation.*
- Article 9.6 (**Finance**): *The global stocktake...shall take into account the relevant information provided by developed country Parties and/or Agreement bodies on efforts related to climate finance.*
- Article 10.6 (**support and technology**): *Support, including financial support, shall be provided to developing country Parties for the implementation of this Article, including for strengthening cooperative action on technology development and transfer, achieving a balance between support for mitigation and adaptation. The global stocktake... shall take into account available information on efforts related to support on technology development and transfer for developing country Parties.*

- Article 13.5 & 13.6 (*Transparency framework*): *The purpose of the framework for transparency of action... clarity and tracking of progress towards achieving Parties' NDCs...and Parties' adaptation actions...including good practices, priorities, needs and gaps, to inform the global stocktake.*

The purpose of the framework for transparency of support is to provide clarity on support provided and received by relevant individual Parties in the context of climate change actions under Articles 4, 7, 9, 10 and 11, and, to the extent possible, to provide a full overview of aggregate financial support provided, to inform the global stocktake.

He said some inputs to conduct the stocktake have already been identified in paragraph 99 of decision 1/CP.21 and categorised into: transparency framework outputs- compilation report; communicated undertakings- synthesis report; and science and equity IPCC reports.

He said the modalities of the stocktake are still under discussion. However it will be undertaken by the CMA; in a comprehensive and facilitative manner; consider adaptation, mitigation and means of implementation (capacity building, finance and technology) and support; be conducted in light of equity and the best available science; take place every five years, beginning in 2023; and include a technical and political phase (still under debate).

He then outlined the stocktaking process:

- **Preparatory step:** Publication of approach and methodologies.
- **Technical process during SBs:** Synthesis reports for mitigation, adaptation, finance; clarification of assumptions used in synthesis; final report with the recommendation for closing the gap.
- **Diplomatic process at COP:** Consideration of recommendations for updating undertakings and international action.

He cited Article 14.3 of the Paris agreement to define the outcome and outputs of the stocktake: *“The outcome of the global stocktake shall inform Parties in updating and enhancing, in a nationally determined manner, their actions and support in accordance with the relevant provisions of this agreement, as well as in enhancing international cooperation for climate action”*.

## **The compliance mechanism**

Jallow then gave a presentation on the Paris Agreement’s compliance mechanism. He presented on the context of the mechanism; nature and composition of the Compliance Committee; basic functions of the mechanism and committee; and modalities, procedures and guidelines (MPGs) of the mechanism and Committee.

He said Article 15 of the Paris Agreement established a compliance mechanism to facilitate implementation of, and promote compliance with, the provisions of this Agreement. The mechanism consists of a committee that shall be expert-based and facilitative in nature and function in a manner that is transparent, non-adversarial and non-punitive. The committee shall pay particular attention to the respective national capabilities and circumstances of parties (Article 15.2). The committee will operate under the modalities and procedures adopted by CMA 1 and report annually to the CMA.

He described the nature and composition of the Compliance Committee of the Paris Agreement. According to Article 15.2, the Committee should be expert-based; facilitative; transparent; non-adversarial and non-punitive and pay attention to respective national circumstances and capabilities. According to paragraph 102 of Decision 1/CP.21, it must have equitable geographic representation and relevant expertise in scientific, technical, socioeconomic or legal fields.

Jallow highlighted the basic functions of the mechanism and committee by saying it should: have a vital role in ensuring the effectiveness of the Agreement; ensure the integrity of the Agreement, which requires not only the promotion of compliance with legal obligations but also the overall implementation of the Paris Agreement; help Parties implement the Agreement and encourage compliance with obligations; and complement rather than duplicate efforts of existing mechanisms and processes.

He said Parties are developing the MPGs for the effective operation of the Committee. An informal note was developed at COP23 that has a clearer structure, highlights issues needing further discussion and sufficiently captures the Parties' views. The Informal Note will be translated into negotiation text at the next meeting at SB48 in April/May 2018.

He said the MPGs must be designed to: ensure the effectiveness of the PA; serve as a tool for Parties to implement and comply with the Paris Agreement, without infringing on national sovereignty and polices; cover all provisions of the Agreement and issues affecting many Parties; provide a range of possible outputs focusing on technical issues and grounded in fact; be independent, impartial, apolitical, open and transparent; and maintain linkages with other mechanisms and frameworks under the Paris Agreement and Convention.

### **Discussion**

In the discussion that followed, participants queried what would trigger non-compliance; and why there were only 12 members on the Compliance Committee. On the former, Barakat responded that different Parties and groups have different suggestions for the trigger for the compliance mechanism, ranging from self-triggers by countries; an automatic self-trigger agreed by the committee; to a decision by the CMA. On the latter, Jallow said the number of committee members was decided to ensure representation of all UN regions.

## **GROUP WORK**

Participants were divided into thematic groups based on the issues they intend to follow in future, or are responsible for implementing at home. The discussion groups covered: adaptation; capacity building; finance and mitigation. Groups were asked to provide feedback on key issues, and strategies to support each other.

### **Adaptation**

This group discussed the following key issues: preparation and implementation of NAPs; monitoring and evaluation frameworks for adaptation; and vulnerable sectors to climate change, including agriculture, forestry, water, energy, health, transport, industries, and urban areas; and loss and damage. To support each other they agreed to: create a network to share information among members using different means of communications like group emails, and a WhatsApp group; participate actively and fully in each session; hold informal meetings among the group members where needed and possible for briefing, reporting and sharing experiences; and proper coordination among the team members to ensure effectiveness.

### **Mitigation**

The group discussed upcoming meetings for mitigation; ways they could support each other before and after negotiations through information-sharing via WhatsApp; and getting approval from their heads of department to attend meetings.

## **Finance**

This group mainly focused on fund accessibility, and the need to see more projects getting funds, and ensure more flexibility for LDCs in accessing funds. They discussed a status report on how much of the funds have been accessed and by who. They talked about the challenges of the LDC Fund where there have been proposals approved but insufficient funds available. They identified the need for innovation on different funding modalities particularly in the case of LDCs with no accredited entities. On supporting each other they agreed to set up communication through WhatsApp and email, to share country experiences, upcoming agenda items, etc.

## **Capacity building**

The capacity building group created a WhatsApp account and an email account, [capacitybuildinggroup@gmail.com](mailto:capacitybuildinggroup@gmail.com), to share information. The group was already very much involved with capacity building, focusing on youth and women. They discussed the idea of downloading all the submissions made by African countries on capacity building in order to understand the continents position as further homework; and to make contact with the Africa Group of Negotiators' focal point.

## **NEXT STEPS AND FEEDBACK**

At the end of the workshop, Seck urged participants to continue being active in the negotiations as they have been during the training workshop, and hoped that their countries will give them the opportunity to raise its voice/flag during negotiations. He thanked the participants for their involvement in the workshop and said that he hoped the workshop has strengthened and deepened their knowledge and information they already possess. Sharma also thanked participants for their engagement in the sessions and encouraged them to: network and persevere; not be intimidated by the complexity of the negotiations; and make the best use of all the resources available to them.

All participants received a certificate on completion of the workshop.