



Regional Training Workshop

Anglophone Africa



14-15 September 2016
Dar es Salaam, Tanzania

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 report is edited by Anju Sharma.

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

Partner Institutions

oxford
climate
policy

iied



INSTITUTE FOR ENVIRONMENT
CLIMATE CHANGE AND
DEVELOPMENT SUSTAINABILITY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	2
Introduction to the UNFCCC Negotiations	2
Introduction to the Paris Agreement	4
Adaptation and Loss and Damage	6
Participant Research Session	6
Practical Negotiation Skills	6
Mitigation in the Paris Agreement	7
Mock Negotiating Session	8
Nationally Determined Contributions	9
Terminology in the Negotiations	10
Means of Implementation	10
Gender in the UNFCCC Negotiations	13
Mock Negotiation	13
Review Mechanisms in the Paris Agreement	13
Group Work	14
Feedback	15
Concluding Session	15

INTRODUCTION

The 2016 European Capacity Building Initiative (ecbi) Training and Support Programme Workshop for Anglophone Africa was held on 14-15 September 2016 in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. The workshop was organised in collaboration with ecbi's regional partner, Institute for Environment, Climate and Development Sustainability (IEDS), with the aim of building capacity and skills for negotiators in Anglophone Africa. It brought together 32 government representatives from the region.

Sixbert Mwanga, IEDS, initiated the workshop with welcome remarks on behalf of IEDS and the organising team. He thanked ecbi, and noted that the workshop is an opportunity to develop contacts and discuss solutions of mutual interest with delegates from member countries of the region. Reminding participants that the agenda of the training workshop covers a wide range of very interesting topics related to the UNFCCC negotiations, he requested their full participation over the two days.

In his opening speech on behalf of the Government of Tanzania, Baraka M. Baraka, Director of Union Affairs from the Vice President's Office, said the ecbi training workshop for Anglophone Africa is an important capacity building initiative to enable their effective participation in the UNFCCC negotiations.

Saleemul Huq, Director of the International Centre for Climate and Development (ICCAD) and Senior Fellow of the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), introduced the aim of ecbi workshop as promoting a more level playing field between government delegations in the UNFCCC negotiations, by providing training and support to developing countries. He added that ecbi also aims to facilitate and establish mutual understanding and trust between both European and developing countries, and amongst developing countries in the context of South-South cooperation.

INTRODUCTION TO THE UNFCCC NEGOTIATIONS

Anju Sharma, Head of the ecbi Publications and Policy Analysis Unit, presented a brief history of the climate negotiations from 1979, when the first World Climate Conference was held, to the 2015 Paris Agreement.

Sharma described the opposition of some key developed countries, particularly the US, to legally binding targets to reduce greenhouse gas emissions – instead, they supported “pledge and review”, or nationally determined action from the very beginning of the negotiations. This led to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) being adopted in 1992, at the Rio Conference, without any legally binding targets. The Convention was described by civil society as “lameduck” and “neutered” after it was adopted.

The Small Island States, most threatened by climate change, continued to push for binding cuts after Rio, Sharma said. They succeeded in getting the Berlin Mandate at the first Conference of Parties (COP) to the UNFCCC with the support of other developing countries, calling for protocol with a schedule for reductions to be adopted by 1997. It was also agreed in Berlin that there would be no new commitments for developing countries in this protocol.

This eventually led to the adoption of Kyoto Protocol in 1997, where the EU agreed on an 8% reduction below 1990 levels by 2008-2012; Japan 6%; and US 7%. Australia got an 8% increase; Iceland for a 10% increase; Norway a 1% increase; and the Russian Federation and New Zealand got a zero-reduction target. Three “flexibility mechanisms” were included for emissions trading, to help developed countries meet their targets: the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM); Emissions Trading (ET); and Joint Implementation (JI).

An adaptation levy for the CDM was also agreed. The Protocol included a compliance mechanism with both a facilitative and enforcement branch, Sharma said.

After a brief description of the rule-making process for the Kyoto Protocol, which lasted till COP 11 in Montreal, in 2005, when the Protocol entered into force, she described negotiations in the post-Kyoto period, beginning at COP 13 in Bali, in 2007. She said developed countries were now keen to get rid of the “firewall” created under the Convention and the Protocol, and the Bali Action Plan included carefully worded text to negotiate commitments and contributions from *all* countries to emissions reductions, adaptation, technology and financing up to and beyond 2012, to be concluded at COP 15 in Copenhagen. An Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention (AWG-LCA) was established to discuss the successor to the Kyoto Protocol, when its first commitment period ended in 2012.

However, the 2009 conference in Copenhagen, which was to decide on the successor to Kyoto, proved to be a failure. The Copenhagen Accord, which was merely “noted” instead of “adopted”, included the following elements:

- Developing countries agree to take on voluntary measures, conditional to finance.
- Developed countries promise up to US\$ 30 billion as “fast start finance” from 2010-2012, and US\$100 billion annually by 2020.
- The Green Climate Fund was launched, in addition to a Technology Mechanism and REDD+ mechanism for (reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation).

The AWG-LCA continued its discussions. In 2010, in Cancun, Sharma said, the Copenhagen elements were turned into official decisions, developed further and operationalised in the Cancun Accord. Parties agreed on the 2°C target; mitigation commitments from developed and developing countries; and the establishment of Green Climate Fund (GCF). The Adaptation Committee and the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN) were created.

In 2011 at COP 17 in Durban, Parties agreed to develop “*a protocol, another legal instrument or an agreed outcome with legal force under the Convention*” applicable to all Parties, Sharma said. They also agreed on a second commitment period for the Kyoto Protocol and created the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP).

In 2012, in Doha, 27 EU Member States along with Norway, Iceland, Lichtenstein, Monaco, Croatia, Switzerland, Ukraine, Kazakhstan and Australia entered a second legally binding commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol.

The notion of “Intended Nationally Determined Contributions” (INDCs) was agreed in Warsaw in 2013, followed by controversies on what they should include. The Warsaw International Mechanism (WIM) for Loss and Damage associated with Climate Change Impacts was also established at this meeting.

On the road to Paris, Sharma said the main controversies were on differentiation and the application of the principle of “common but differentiated responsibilities” (CBDR); a temperature goal limiting global average temperature rise to 1.5°C; giving equal importance to adaptation and means of implementation (finance, technology transfer, capacity building), including providing a roadmap to the pledge of US\$ 100 billion by 2020; and loss and damage.

The following main elements were finally agreed as part of the Paris Agreement:

- A temperature limit to “*well below*” 2°C, while pursuing 1.5°C.
- “Nationally determined Contributions” (NDCs) for all countries.
- An adaptation goal, linking adaptation with mitigation efforts.
- Loss and damage provisions in a separate Article, and the inclusion of WIM in the Agreement.
- The deadline for the US\$100 billion pledge was extended to 2025 – a figure will be decided later for the post-2025 figure.
- CBDR and differentiation is recognised, but it is not clear how it will be operationalised.

Sharma then briefly described the political landscape of the negotiations, listing the following key negotiating groups and highlighting their key concerns:

- The G77 group of (133) countries, with the following sub-groups:
 - Africa Group (54)
 - Least Developed Countries (48)
 - Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS) (37)
 - Independent Association of Latin America and the Caribbean AILAC (6)
 - Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America – socialist and social democratic with Venezuela, Ecuador, Bolivia, Nicaragua and Cuba (ALBA) (9)
 - Brazil, India, China, South Africa (BASIC)
 - Like-Minded Developing Countries (26 countries pushing “traditional” G77 views)
- Organisation of the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) (12)
- European Union (EU) (28)
- Japan, US, Canada, Australia and New Zealand (JUSCANZ)
- Umbrella Group (US, Canada, Australia, Norway, Russia, Japan, New Zealand) Kazakhstan?
- Environment Integrity Group (Mexico, Switzerland, South Korea, Liechtenstein and Monaco)
- Cartagena Dialogue (27 countries including Norway, Switzerland and Mexico)
- Land-locked Developing Countries (LLDCs) (32 - 16 in Africa, 10 in Asia, 4 in Europe (not the EU), and 2 in South America)

In the discussion that followed, participants discussed the reasons for the failure of developed countries to meet their emission targets.

INTRODUCTION TO THE PARIS AGREEMENT

Sharma then presented in more detail on the key elements of the Paris Agreement. Pointing to a recent [Pocket Guide to the Pocket Agreement](#) produced by ecbi (also [available in French](#)), she said the Agreement could be divided into the following five elements: **general articles** (Articles 1-3); **main substantive elements and commitments** (Articles 4-12); **reporting, review and compliance** (Articles 13-15); **institutional arrangements** (Articles 16-19); and **final articles** (Articles 20-29).

Among the general articles, Article 2 lays out the **long-term goal** of the Agreement: holding the increase in the global average temperature to well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels and pursuing efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels.

Among the main substantive elements, she described the Agreement’s provisions on mitigation, adaptation, loss and damage, means of implementation, transparency and the global stocktake and compliance.

On **mitigation**, she said Article 4.1 agrees that Parties will aim to “*reach global peaking of greenhouse gas emissions as soon as possible, recognizing that peaking will take longer for developing country Parties, and to undertake rapid reductions thereafter ...to achieve a balance between anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks of greenhouse gases in the second half of this century, on the basis of equity...*”. This goal will be achieved through the Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) and Long-term Low Emissions Development Strategies (LEDS).

On **adaptation**, she said Parties had agreed to establish a global goal on adaptation. Each Party was expected to submit and update periodically an adaptation communication, including its priorities, implementation and support needs, plans and actions, without creating any additional burden for developing country Parties.

On **loss and damage**, it was decided in Article 8 that the WIM “*shall*” be subject to the authority and guidance of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA) and may be “*enhanced and strengthened*”. Eight specific areas of cooperation were agreed. However, paragraph 52 of the adopting decision of the Paris Agreement agrees that Article 8 does not involve or provide a basis for any liability or compensation.

On **means of implementation**, it was agreed that developed countries “*shall*” provide financial resources to assist developing country Parties with respect to both mitigation and adaptation in continuation of their existing obligations under the Convention, while other Parties “*are encouraged*” to provide or continue to provide such resources voluntarily. It was agreed that the Technology Mechanism established under the UNFCCC will serve the Paris Agreement. On capacity building, a Paris Committee on Capacity Building was established, the needs of those with least capacity were recognised, and it was decided that capacity building activities shall be enhanced through appropriate institutional arrangements.

On **transparency**, it was agreed to establish a transparency framework for action and for support, with built in flexibility that takes into account the different capacities of Parties.

It was also agreed that a **global stocktake** will take place every five years, considering mitigation, adaptation and means of implementation, in the light of equity and the best available science.

On **compliance**, Sharma said, a non-punitive, non-adversarial and transparent compliance mechanism was established, consisting of an expert-based committee.

Finally, Sharma noted that critical elements relating to each of these substantive elements still need to be decided, listing the following:

- Guidance for NDCs: what information is needed and how should it be formatted? Five year or ten year cycles or both?
- Trading rules.
- How to recognise adaptation efforts?
- What information is needed to track finance?
- Institutional arrangements for capacity building.
- What methodologies will be used to prepare inventories of emissions?
- How will the transparency framework work?
- How will the global stocktake work?
- How will the compliance mechanism work?

ADAPTATION AND LOSS AND DAMAGE

This session was facilitated by Richard Muyungi, Acting Director of Environment, Division of Environment, Vice President's Office, Tanzania. He started by noting that enhancing adaptive capacity, strengthening resilience and reducing vulnerability are priority issues for LDCs. He further noted that the long term global response to climate change has to consider adaptation as a key component, along with mitigation, to reduce the vulnerability of the LDCs.

He said adaptation actions should be country driven, gender responsive and transparent, focusing on vulnerable groups. As Alternate member of the Green Climate Fund (GCF) Board, Muyungi emphasised the importance of means of implementation. He said technical support for adaptation could come from Adaptation committee and the LDC Expert Group.

Muyungi explained loss and damage as those impacts of climate change that cannot be adapted to, and cause loss of lives, livelihoods and environment, He noted that the WIM will be reviewed in November 2016, and direction will be provided on actions that need to be carried out within the context of the Paris Agreement. He concluded by encouraging participants to engage fully in the negotiations, and providing inputs for the upcoming COP.

PARTICIPANT RESEARCH SESSION

This session aimed to familiarise participants with UNFCCC jargon. Brianna Craft, IIED, grouped participants and gave each group a task, asking them to research the meaning of acronyms or technical terminologies used in climate change negotiations and meetings, such as Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA), Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA), Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI), Ad-hoc Working Group for the Paris Agreement (APA), Measuring, Reporting and Verification (MRV), INDCs, and National Adaptation Plans (NAPs). The results were consolidated and discussed at the end of the session.

PRACTICAL NEGOTIATION SKILLS

Stella Gama, Department of Forestry, Malawi, presented on this issue. She asked participants to write down their definition of the word “negotiation” on cards. Participants provided various definitions, from defining negotiation as “knowledge” to “communication skills”. Gama concluded by defining negotiation as a “strategic discussion that resolves an issue in a way that is acceptable to all parties”.

When asked by Gama when parties need to negotiate, participants described negotiations for price, and for peace as examples. Gama said negotiations are needed when parties need to resolve conflict or reach an agreement on an issue of global interest. Every negotiation has its objective, but most of all negotiations are aimed at resolving points of difference, to gain advantage for an individual or collective, or craft outcomes to satisfy various interests. Gama described five stages of negotiation:

- Preparation and problem analysis, including determining key tasks or goals; collecting pertinent facts; and studying past negotiations, decisions and conclusions.
- Discussions, presenting positions on the table, getting and giving information, listening and questioning.
- Clarification of goals, interests and making proposals.

- Negotiating for a win-win outcome that considers alternatives, compromises and flexibilities.
- Reaching agreement.

Gama asked participants what they do to convince someone to accept their point of view. Different responses were received, including the ability to negotiate, exposure, the way you communicate, knowledge etc.

Concluding the session, Gama advised participants to register for the free [Harvard School of Law Program on Negotiation](#) to improve their negotiation skills.

MITIGATION IN THE PARIS AGREEMENT

Pascale Bird, Legal Response Initiative (LRI), presented on this topic. She defined mitigation as a response to climate change by reducing, limiting and controlling greenhouse gas emission and enhancing sinks and reservoirs.

Describing a brief history of mitigation under the UNFCCC, Bird said the Convention called on all Parties to formulate and implement programmes with mitigation measures, and for developed country Parties to adopt national policies to limit emissions and protect and enhance sinks.

The Kyoto Protocol, meanwhile, called on developed country Parties to achieve quantified emission reduction targets with a view to overall emission reduction of 5% below 1990 levels. It included market-based mechanisms to help developed countries meet this goal.

Bird said that Article 2 of Paris Agreement aims to strengthen the global response to the threat of climate change, in the context of sustainable development and efforts to eradicate poverty, to increase the ability to adapt to the adverse impacts of climate change and foster climate resilience and low greenhouse gas emissions development, in a manner that does not threaten food production. The main vehicle for mitigation action under the Paris Agreement are the “Nationally Determined Contributions” (NDCs). In addition, all Parties are encouraged to formulate long-term low emission development strategies.

The Agreement seeks to address the ambition gap between commitments to-date and the long-term temperature goal by agreeing that countries will work to: reach global peaking of greenhouse gas emissions as soon as possible; and to achieve a balance between anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks of greenhouse gas in the second half of this century. It recognises that peaking will take longer for developing country Parties. The efforts also need to ensure that finance flows are consistent with a pathway towards low greenhouse gas emissions and climate-resilient development.

Bird noted that flexibility was built in for LDCs and SIDs, who “*may*” prepare and communicate strategies, plans and actions for low emissions development. Although support for developing country Parties for mitigation action is mentioned, it is not a precondition for action, she said.

She noted that several elements related to mitigation still needed to be worked out, particularly for tracking progress, including information to be submitted when communicating NDCs, developing accounting guidance, and providing national inventories and progress reports.

Describing other relevant provisions for mitigation, Bird listed the provision calling on Parties to conserve and enhance emissions sinks and reservoirs, and reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation

(REDD+) in developing countries through the existing REDD+ framework. She said the Agreement also provided for three mechanisms: cooperative approaches to transfer mitigation outcomes; a mechanism to mitigate emissions and support sustainable development; and a framework for non-market mechanisms to support sustainable development.

Bird said “response measures”, or measures to mitigate emissions and address climate change, disproportionately affect developing countries with economies that are less diversified, presenting a double-edged problem for some countries: restricting economic activities can hurt them, but less stringent mitigation activities from developed countries can result in greater impacts of climate change, affecting them more severely. Describing the problem of Parties most affected by response measures, she said a Forum on Impact of the Implementation of response measures had also been set up as part of the Agreement.

She noted that emissions from aviation and marine bunker fuels were not covered under the Paris Agreement, though they represent a large share of greenhouse gas emissions globally – this was left up to the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO) and the International Maritime Organisation (IMO).

Bird listed the following next steps for the international process to operationalise the Paris Agreement:

- Elaborate accounting guidance for NDCs.
- Cooperative approaches:
 - develop accounting guidance to avoid double counting.
 - develop rules for the mitigation and sustainable development mechanism.
 - designate body to supervise the mechanism.
 - undertake a work programme under the framework for non-market approaches to sustainable development.
- Develop modalities and functions of the forum on impact of implementation of response measures.

Finally, she presented the following useful links for participants:

- On mitigation generally: On tasks arising from the Paris Agreement:
- http://unfccc.int/files/bodies/cop/application/pdf/overview_1cp21_tasks_.pdf
- <http://legalresponseinitiative.org/legaladvice/next-steps-in-the-climate-negotiations-concerning-the-paris-agreement/>
- On the roadmap from Paris: http://www.wri.org/sites/default/files/uploads/16_roadmap.png

MOCK NEGOTIATING SESSION

This session was facilitated by Craft. Participants were asked to distribute US\$ 80 billion to mitigation, adaptation, loss and damage, technology development and transfer, transparency and capacity building. In the discussion that followed, participants explained the reasons for their allocation, mainly saying they were guided by specific national demands.

A second session on negotiations, focusing on forming group positions, took place on the morning of the second day; and a third was held on the afternoon of the second day.

NATIONALLY DETERMINED CONTRIBUTIONS

This session was initiated with a presentation by Bird, who explained that NDCs are the foundation of the Paris Agreement's structure. Parties determine at the national level what actions they are prepared to take to achieve the aims of the Convention/Agreement, and communicate them through these NDCs.

Describing a brief history of NDCs, she said COP19 in Warsaw had called on Parties in a position to do so to submit “intended” NDCs (INDCs) by March 2015, in a manner that “... facilitates the clarity, transparency and understanding of the intended contributions, without prejudice to the legal nature of the contributions”. The Lima Call for Action from COP 20 then called on Parties to submit INDCs that are fair and ambitious and “will represent a progression beyond the current undertaking of that Party”.

A synthesis of the INDCs presented, carried out in October 2015, noted their inadequacy and highlighted the need for more ambition. At COP 21, Parties who had not submitted INDCs were encouraged to do so, well in advance of COP 22. It was also decided that countries who had already submitted their INDCs could submit them as NDCs when joining the Paris Agreement.

In Paris, it was also decided that NDCs would include ambitious efforts related to Articles 4 (mitigation), 7 (adaptation), 9 (finance), 10 (technology development and transfer), 11 (capacity building) and 13 (transparency framework). They are expected to represent a progression over time. The Paris Agreement recognises the need for support for developing countries to implement their NDCs, but this is not a precondition for implementation.

Bird noted that the APA provisional agenda includes elements relating to providing further guidance on mitigation and adaptation elements of the NDCs. She explained that whereas Article 4 relates to mitigation NDCs, Article 3 covers all elements. The issue was raised at the inter-sessional meeting in May 2016, when some developing country Parties expressed concern that the APA provisional agenda, as originally prepared, was too mitigation centric. A compromise was eventually found, by adding an express reference to further guidance on adaptation in the agenda that was eventually adopted.

She said there is no clear formula for the Paris Agreement to bridge the ambition gap, and Parties are bound to process rather than outcomes: they *shall* prepare and communicate NDCs; *shall* pursue measures with aim of achieving NDC objectives; and *shall* communicate an NDC every five years. The NDC should be submitted at least 9-12 months before a relevant CMA. Parties with a current five-year framework should submit a new NDC by 2020; while those with a ten-year framework should submit a new one, or update their existing NDC by 2020.

Bird listed the following next steps on NDCs:

- Further guidance on features of NDCs and information to facilitate clarity, transparency.
- Further guidance for accounting of NDCs.
- CMA 1 to consider common timeframes.
- CMA to adopt guidance on adjustment of NDCs by Parties.

She highlighted the following useful links:

- INDC Portal: http://unfccc.int/focus/indc_portal/items/8766.php
- NDC Registry: http://unfccc.int/focus/ndc_registry/items/9433.php
- After Paris: What is next for Intended Nationally Determined Contributions? <https://>

During the discussions that followed, Bird explained that while INDCs are the contributions announced by countries at COP 20 in Lima, NDCs refer to contributions that have been finalised and approved for the implementation stage.

Participants discussed the focus on mitigation of most NDCs, and the challenges this would pose to LDCs to implement interventions without sufficient resources. They highlighted the need to ensure that adaptation and mitigation was given sufficient attention in the process beyond Paris.

TERMINOLOGY IN THE NEGOTIATIONS

This session was facilitated by Craft. She led a game to introduce participants to the following terminology, which is commonly used in the climate negotiations:

- Should or ought: An action is advised but not obligation
- Shall: Action is obligatory and is a commitment
- As appropriate, necessary: Applicable Conditional phrases and allows discretion in determining whether the action is necessary
- Decide: Action to be taken by the COP
- Recognise and Acknowledge: These are synonyms
- Require, Urge, Request: Words arranged from the strongest to the weakest
- Inter alia: Including other things
- Mutatis mutandis: Having changed what must be changed
- COP adopts: Accepts and incorporates documents
- Text enter into force: Negotiate-Adopt-Sign-Ratify-Enter into force
- Will: It has flexibility (you can do it or not)

MEANS OF IMPLEMENTATION

This session included three presentations: one on **finance** by Sharma, a second on **capacity building** by Huq, and a third on **technology transfer** by Gama.

During the presentation on **finance**, Sharma presented a brief history of finance in the climate context, and described the institutional arrangements.

Sharma said UNFCCC Article 11 describes the Convention's financial mechanism as a mechanism for the provision of financial resources on a grant or concessional basis, that will be accountable to the COP, although its operation was entrusted to the Global Environment Facility (GEF).

In 1997 the Kyoto Protocol agreed to allocate a "share of proceeds" from the Clean Development Mechanism for adaptation in developing countries.

In 2001, in Marrakech, two funds were established:

- the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF) was established to finance activities, programmes and measures, relating to climate change, that are complementary to those funded by the resources allocated

- to the climate change focal area of GEF and by bilateral and multilateral funding; and
- a Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) was established, to support a work programme for the LDCs, including the national adaptation programmes of action.

It was later agreed that both these will be managed by the GEF, despite the fact that developing countries were not happy with the GEF's performance – the procedures for applying for GEF funding were complicated, and the project approval cycle was very long.

Difficult negotiations led, however, for different governance arrangements for the Adaptation Fund, which was created to govern the funds from the CDM share of proceeds. A Board, with balanced representation from developed and developing countries was created, and enhanced access through a new modality called “direct access” was agreed.

Then, in Copenhagen, developed countries pledged “fast start finance” of US\$ 30 billion for 2010-2012, and announced the longer-term target of US\$ 100 billion annually by 2020. The Copenhagen Accord also mentioned a green climate fund. However, and the Accord was only noted, it wasn't until the following COP in Cancun that the Green Climate Fund (GCF) was established. A Transitional Committee was set up to design the Fund.

The COP's oversight of the financial mechanism was proving ineffective, and hence developing countries called for, and got, a Standing Committee on Finance (SCF), to assist the COP in improving coherence and coordination in the delivery of climate change financing, rationalisation of the financial mechanism, mobilisation of financial resources and measurement, and reporting and verification of support provided to developing country Parties.

ecbi worked with members of the Transitional committee to ensure that the governance of the GCF was also balanced, and that the Fund operationalised its mandate of “enhancing” direct access. As a result, after the GCF Board was created, in 2014, a pilot phase for “Enhanced Direct Access” (EDA) was launched. Sharma described the key purpose of this modality as ensuring devolved access to funds, with decision-making shifting not just to the national level, but right down to the sub-national level.

Sharma then described the main finance elements of the Paris Outcome (which includes the Agreement and its adopting decision):

- Developed country Parties shall biennially communicate, “*as available*”, projected levels of public financial resources to be provided to developing country Parties.
- Developed countries “*intend*” to continue their existing collective mobilisation goal through 2025. Prior to 2025 the CMA shall set a new collective quantified goal from a floor of US\$100 billion per year.
- The Financial Mechanism of the Convention, including its operating entities, shall serve as the financial mechanism of this Agreement.

Sharma described a proposal for a joint replenishment for the financial mechanism, included in an earlier draft of the Paris Agreement, that was later dropped. She said this proposal presented by LDCs would have helped overcome a critical question that causes a great deal of distrust in the negotiations: what can count as climate finance? She said a definition of climate finance would be difficult to negotiate – it will be easier if countries agree simply to count what flows through the financial mechanism.

Finally, Sharma spoke of ways to increase the predictability of climate finance, describing two “unconventional sources” – encouraging a share of proceeds from sub-national emissions trading schemes, like the Western

Climate Initiative and the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative in North America; and crowdfunding from individuals, such as corporate air passengers.

In the presentation on **capacity building**, Huq noted that capacity building has not received adequate funding, despite being one of the most important areas for developing countries. Explaining the situation and challenges facing capacity building funding, Huq said that most of the funds are provided to consultants and to international organisations to provide training.

He noted the lack of investment in organisations that could provide a more sustained effort for capacity building, such as universities in LDCs. He said universities as learning institutions are in a good position to capacitate communities using their various programmes, but this opportunity has not been used by the UNFCCC process.

He said the Paris Outcome had established a Paris Committee on Capacity Building. The selection of members for this committee was already underway, and will be finalised during COP 22 in Marrakesh. He said the push on capacity building was among the strongest initiatives championed by LDCs during COP 21.

In her presentation on **technology**, Gama noted its importance to meet the goals of the UNFCCC, Kyoto Protocol and Paris Agreement. She said it was an enabler for development, and at the same time important for mitigation and adaptation. This was recognised in the UNFCCC – Article 4 calls for the promotion of, and cooperation in, technology development, application and diffusion. Developed countries are asked to take all practicable steps to promote, facilitate and finance the transfer of, or access to, environmentally sound technologies and know-how, particularly for developing country. It also calls for the needs of countries in special situations, like LDCs, to be considered.

The Kyoto Protocol, meanwhile, calls on all Parties to *“cooperate in the promotion of effective modalities for development, application and diffusion of, and take all practicable steps to promote, facilitate and finance, as appropriate, the transfer of or access to environmentally sound technologies”*.

A Technology Framework was agreed in 2001 to further these goals, Gama said, and focus on five themes: technology needs and needs assessment; technology information; enabling environments for technology transfer; capacity building for technology transfer; and mechanisms for technology transfer.

In 2010, a Technology Mechanism was created, with a Technology Executive Committee (TEC) and a Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN), Gama said. TEC is the policy arm, providing advice and recommendations on technology policy issues. CTCN is the implementation arm, which provides technical assistance at the request of developing countries; creating access to knowledge on climate technologies; and fostering collaborations among climate technology stakeholders.

Gama then went on to describe how technology was dealt with under the Paris Agreement, saying the Agreement anchors and strengthens the Technology Mechanism; and establishes a technology framework to provide overarching guidance to the Mechanism. Among next steps, she listed the need to elaborate the framework, saying countries have been requested to submit their views on its purpose, contents, features and characteristics to SBSTA.

In general, Gama noted slow progress on implementation on technology issues, including on harnessing the results of the Technology Needs Assessments; limited finances, especially to procure technology on market terms from the private sector; and the need for enabling environments in recipient countries.

Gama summed up the provisional agenda items on technology for SBI and SBSTA, saying the former would look at joint annual TEC and CTCN report; consider the scope and modalities for the periodic assessment of the Technology Mechanism in relation to supporting the implementation of the Paris Agreement; and consider the Poznan strategic programme on technology transfer. SBSTA, meanwhile, will also look at the joint TEC and CTCN report, and consider the Technology Framework in the context of the Paris Agreement.

During the discussion that followed, participants discussed the overwhelming focus on mitigation-related technology; the low negotiation capacity by developing countries; and the lack of information and knowledge on adaptation-related technologies. The need for developing countries to incorporate their technology needs in their NDCs, in line with their local development plans, was highlighted.

GENDER IN THE UNFCCC NEGOTIATIONS

This session started with a presentation by Gama, who began by asking participants what they understood of the word “gender”. She then highlighted the following points:

- Gender refers to all people in the community (men, women, children, girls, boys, elderly etc.).
- In Lima, a two-year work programme on gender was established under the UNFCCC.
- Training has been taking place to capacitate women negotiators.
- Gender issues should be integrated into capacity building, adaptation, technology transfer, loss and damage etc.
- Gender concerns should be integrated into the NDCs.
- Gender and climate change issues should be taken to the grassroots levels.

MOCK NEGOTIATION

During this session, participants were given a country to represent, and asked to negotiate a piece of text on the modalities for the submission and periodic update of adaptation communications. Huq served as Chair of the negotiations, and Craft served as the UNFCCC Secretariat. The exercise was aimed at allowing participants to understand the negotiating process, practice “negotiating etiquette”, follow the rules and procedure, and understand subtle differences in legal terminology.

REVIEW MECHANISMS IN THE PARIS AGREEMENT

This session started with a presentation by Bird. She noted that the “bottom up” approach of NDCs and non-binding targets will need to be backed up by robust review mechanisms if the Paris Agreement goal is to be achieved. There are three review processes in the Agreement:

- Enhanced transparency framework.
- Five-yearly global stocktake.
- Mechanism to facilitate implementation and promote compliance.

Regarding the **transparency framework**, Bird said the purpose was to provide clarity and understanding of climate action and support. The framework would be applicable to all countries, with flexibility for some. It will build on the existing transparency arrangements under the Convention, including Biennial Reports (BRs) and Biennial Update Reports (BURs), International Assessment and Review (IAR) and International Consultation

and Analysis (ICA). The framework would be facilitative, non-intrusive and non-punitive. The special circumstances of LDCs and SIDs are recognised, and a Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT) has been established to provide support to developing countries.

Bird said the purpose of the **global stocktake**, meanwhile, is to take stock of the implementation of the Paris Agreement and assess collective progress towards achieving its purpose. It will cover mitigation, adaptation and means of implementation; and take place every five years starting from 2023. It will consider only “collective purpose”, she said, not individual assessments. The outcome of the stocktake will inform Parties in updating and enhancing actions and support.

Describing the compliance mechanism, Bird said its purpose is to facilitate implementation and promote compliance. This will be done by a Committee of 12 experts. The approach will be non-adversarial and non-punitive. No guidance is included on the operation of the mechanism in the Agreement, but the APA will develop modalities and procedures.

Bird listed the following next steps for each of the elements of the review mechanism:

Transparency

- Develop recommendations for modalities procedures and guidelines on transparency of action and support and report on progress.
- Establish CBIT.
- Support establishment and operation of CBIT and report on progress to COP.

Stocktake

- Identify sources of input and develop modalities.
- Provide advice to APA on how assessments of IPCC can inform global stocktake.
- Convene facilitative dialogue in 2018 to take stock of collective efforts towards achieving the long-term goal and to inform preparation of NDCs.

Compliance

- Develop modalities and procedures for operation of committee.

She recommended the following links for further reading:

- [Understanding Transparency and Accountability](#)
- [LDC Group submission on compliance:](#)

GROUP WORK

During this session, participants were given the chance to form groups to discuss national priorities, and make suggestions for developing a support strategy for participants.

Among national priorities, groups listed adaptation; technology development and transfer; climate finance; loss and damage; and capacity building. Only one group listed mitigation.

Among the support strategies listed, participants highlighted implementation plans; resource mobilisation; private partnership strategies; support on legal issues; strategies on renewable energy; building coalitions; sharing information; and preparing for COPs.

It was observed that since all the participants have common priorities, it was time to have negotiation strategy for African countries.

FEEDBACK

During this session, participants provided oral and written feedback on the training workshop.

CONCLUDING SESSION

During the concluding session, Huq emphasised the importance of competent negotiators to defend developing country interests. He noted that it takes years to become an experienced negotiator, and participants should not be afraid to ask questions. He also encouraged participants to become specialists in specific topics, rather than generalists. He offered the participants his and ecbi's help in the future, to represent their countries and regions.