



# Regional Training Workshop

South and South East Asia



6-7 June 2018  
Colombo, Sri Lanka

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:



Federal Ministry  
for the Environment, Nature Conservation,  
Building and Nuclear Safety

based on a decision of the German Bundestag

This report is written by Navam Niles, Janathakshan, and edited by Anju Sharma. Photo Credits: Janathakshan

## Partner Institutions

oxford  
climate  
policy

iiied



ecbi

European Capacity Building Initiative  
[www.eurocapacity.org](http://www.eurocapacity.org)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	2
Becoming a better UNFCCC delegate: Tips and tricks	3
2018 UNFCCC negotiations: Outlining the year ahead	4
Mock negotiations on gender and climate change - I	5
Adaptation and the Paris Agreement	6
Formulating group positions	8
Talanoa Dialogue and global stocktake	8
Means of implementation and the Paris Agreement	10
Enhanced Transparency Framework	11
Mock negotiations on gender and climate change - II	13
Compliance mechanism	14
Feedback and next steps	16

## INTRODUCTION



[L-R] Sri Lanka Climate Change Secretariat Director Sunimal Jayathunga, Janathakshan Chairperson B.M.U.D Basanayake, and Janathakshan CEO Ranga Pallawala light a lamp during the inaugural ceremony

The European Capacity Building Initiative's 2018 South and South East Asia Regional Training Workshop was held on 6 and 7 June in Colombo, Sri Lanka. It was attended by 28 government representatives from 13 countries in the region. The workshop was organised by Janathakshan, in partnership with the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), Oxford Climate Policy (OCP), and the Legal Response International (LRI).

B.M.U.D Basanayake, Chairperson, Janathakshan, opened the workshop and welcomed the participants. He said climate change is a critical focus for domestic and foreign policy in Sri Lanka, due to the rising frequency and intensity of climate events.

Sunimal Jayathunga, Director, Climate Change Secretariat, Sri Lanka, spoke on the importance of cooperation among developing countries to achieve the goals of the Paris Agreement. Noting the unequal negotiating capacities of countries, he praised ecbi for its contribution to creating a more level playing field. He highlighted the need for larger developing country negotiating teams to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) to keep up with the growing complexity of the negotiations, and called on ecbi to support the participation of negotiators.

Achala Abeysinghe, head of the ecbi Training and Support Programme, outlined the purpose and objectives of the training workshop. She said the goal of the ecbi training workshops is to iron out the inequalities between states and address the challenges that prevent developing countries from taking part proactively in the UNFCCC process. To this end, she said, the workshop is designed to help negotiators work together and build lasting partnerships based on trust. Addressing the request by Jayathunga, she noted that ecbi already



provides two bursaries for women negotiators, and it is hoped that these opportunities can be scaled up over time.

Anju Sharma, head of the ecbi Publications and Policy Analysis Unit, concluded the introductory session by elaborating on the origins of ecbi, and its three main components: the Fellowship Programme; Training and Support Programme (TSP); and Publications and Policy Analysis Unit (PPAU). She said ecbi's Fellowship Programme seeks to bring together negotiators from Europe and developing countries at the annual Oxford Seminar, to help improve their understanding of each other, and to nurture greater trust among them. TSP, meanwhile, is aimed at building the capacity of junior and new developing country negotiators, to level the playing field in the UN negotiations. The PPAU produces policy briefs, aimed mostly at senior negotiators, and background papers and guides for the TSP programme. She noted that international negotiations are the best way to mobilise collective action solutions that are beyond the scope of any single state. This is because unlike economic and ecological globalisation, political globalisation is yet to mature. To make the best of the UNFCCC, she said, developing country negotiators must master its forum, format, and structure, and develop the necessary skills to highlight their priorities. Sharma introduced the participants to the ecbi publications available for negotiators trying to navigate the international climate change negotiations, including, for instance, the Pocket Guides to the [Paris Agreement](#); [Capacity Building](#); [Transparency](#); [Loss and Damage](#); [Nationally Determined Contributions](#); and [Gender Equality](#).

## BECOMING A BETTER UNFCCC DELEGATE: TIPS AND TRICKS

This session was led by Manjeet Dhakal from Climate Analytics, Nepal. Dhakal addressed four broad themes: introduction to the UNFCCC; the Paris Agreement; the scientific consensus relevant to negotiations; and the daily routine and demands of a negotiator.

He began by briefly explaining the history and incremental evolution of the UNFCCC, noting that the UNFCCC is guided by a set of principles, including the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities; the precautionary principle; and support for sustainable development. He described three broadly defined country groups: Annex 1 (industrialised states), Annex II (economies in transition), and Non-Annex I (all other, mostly developing, states). The states that compose these groups come together and make decisions through the Conference of Parties (COP) of the UNFCCC, which is assisted by various subsidiary bodies, ad-hoc working groups, and constituted bodies.

Dhakal noted that the 1997 Kyoto Protocol established legally binding targets for Annex I countries. In addition, it established international market-based mechanisms and support systems to assist primarily developing states to achieve sustainable development and adapt to climate change. The Paris Agreement, in contrast, directs both developed and developing states to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions to keep global average temperature rise well-below 2°C, and ideally 1.5°C. Assistance for developing countries was set at US\$ 100 billion annually by 2020, with a new goal scheduled prior to 2025. While the Paris Agreement involves both market and non-market mechanisms to achieve its goals, the crucial vehicle for compliance comes in the form of Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs). In this regard, the 2018 COP will play an essential part in developing the Paris Agreement Work Programme (PAWP). The PAWP will outline the implementation guidelines, which will guide the form, substance, and transparency arrangements of the NDCs.

He noted, however, that pledges made through the NDCs thus far will fail to achieve the temperature goal of the Paris Agreement. The science behind climate change, best represented through the various reports of the

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), shows *inter alia*, that sea levels are rising, glaciers are melting, and oceans are warming. Thus, countries will need to be more ambitious in their NDCs.

In conclusion, Dhakal, drawing on his own experience, briefly outlined the life of a negotiator and advised the audience on how to prepare for negotiations and what they should expect during the COP. In particular, he outlined the need for participation in both formal and informal meetings.

In the discussion that followed, the ecbi team took turns to provide the participants with various tips when navigating through the various sessions. They noted: the importance of doing a lot of preparatory work to ensure that teams are ready to deal with the priorities and policies put forward by other states; working in teams to effectively follow different themes; and learning the technical and legal jargon that maybe used throughout the COP.



Gebru Jember Endalew, Chair of the LDC Group, orients participants on the year ahead

## 2018 UNFCCC NEGOTIATIONS: OUTLINING THE YEAR AHEAD

This session was led by Gebru Jember Endalew, Chair of the Least Developed Country (LDC) Group.

Endalew began by reiterating the purpose of the Paris Agreement: to ensure a global response to a global problem that involves both developing and developed states. He noted that while the Paris Agreement was designed for incremental progress, it is up to negotiators to bridge the ambition gap and ensure that the goals of the Agreement are achieved.

Endalew said the next COP in Katowice, Poland, will feature three key priorities: the Paris Agreement rulebook, the Talanoa Dialogue, and climate finance. Moreover, 2018 could prove pivotal in mobilising action for sustainable development, adopting the Doha Amendments to the Kyoto protocol, and focusing on various

other implementation issues. The key element will be the “rule book” dubbed the Paris Agreement Work Programme (PAWP), which has taken shape through lengthy informal notes but has yet to take the form of a negotiating text. Meanwhile, the Talanoa Dialogue is designed to help both parties and non-parties share their stories and increase their ambitions through facilitative dialogues, he said.

Endalew also highlighted to various upcoming events including the resumed session in Bangkok; the informal meetings such as the Petersburg Dialogue and the 73rd UN General Assembly Session; the ministerial engagement in the political phase of the Talanoa Dialogue; and the IPCC’s 1.5°C Special Report, which is currently open for government review and will be considered for adoption in October 2018.

In the discussion that followed, a participant asked how the NDCs can be mainstreamed. Endalew responded that it would be best to wait until the COP finalises the PAWP, with more guidance for mainstreaming, but highlighted the need to integrate the NDCs into national development cycles.

Another participant raised the question on the potential role of states with low GHG emissions. In response, the resource team said low-emitting countries have an important role in ensuring that the impacts of climate change are addressed by the global community, and the means of implementation to address these impacts is made available, even as they ensure that their future development continues to be low-emitting.

## MOCK NEGOTIATIONS ON GENDER AND CLIMATE CHANGE - I

In this session, the participants took part in mock negotiations on gender and climate change, using the *Pocket Guide on Gender Equality under the UNFCCC* as a resource to learn about the formal and informal procedures in place during COP deliberations. The mock negotiation sought to replicate many of the political stances, tactics, and relationships that exist between and amongst various negotiating coalitions.



Participants use the *Pocket Guide to Gender Equality under the UNFCCC* in the mock negotiations on gender



In the discussion that followed, the resource team clarified differences in the style of making interventions, such as making a regular intervention or raising a point of order. Informal negotiating tactics, such as huddles with coalition partners and other advisers were encouraged, as was speaking coherently and consistently with a unified voice. Participants were briefed on strategies to prepare for the negotiations in advance, including role-play, simulations of the positions of other parties and groups; reaching out to resource personnel; awareness of possible space for compromise and trade-offs; and above all, a good understanding of one's own position, to reach collective solutions with other parties.



"Saudi Arabia" takes the floor

## ADAPTATION AND THE PARIS AGREEMENT

The session was led by Thinley Namgyel, Chief of the Climate Change Division of the National Environment Commission, Royal Government of Bhutan. Namgyel covered four topics: adaptation and its evolution under the UNFCCC; adaptation under the Paris Agreement; and the challenges for adaptation moving forward.

Namgyel noted that adaptation has been a focus of the climate change negotiations since the establishment of the UNFCCC. Important milestones include the 2001 Marrakech Accords, the Nairobi Work Programme, the Cancun Agreements and, most recently, the Paris Agreement. National adaptation needs are conveyed through the National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPAs), which are mainly for LDCs; and the National Adaptation Plans (NAPs), which are for both LDCs and developing countries.

Adaptation is covered in Article 7 of the Paris Agreement, he said, and will also be part of the global stocktake, which will focus on the adequacy and effectiveness of adaptation in developing states. He noted, however, the difference in the stringency of obligations related to mitigation and adaptation. While states are directed to achieve the highest possible mitigation ambition, their obligation to adaptation is mostly focused on planning.



Thinley Namgyel, Chief of the Climate Change Division of the National Environment Commission, Royal Government of Bhutan, leads the session on adaptation

Namgyel concluded his presentation by briefly exploring the challenges that lie ahead for adaptation. The most important challenges revolve around the Paris rulebook, including the form and format of the adaptation communications. In addition, states will need to tackle questions of adaptation and development – if and how these different concepts can be disaggregated. Moreover, he said, parties will need to develop methods for measuring and recognising adaptation. He noted that while there is likely to be a fair degree of flexibility for countries, different country groups will have different priorities. In this context, negotiations could quickly lead to a race to the bottom, whereby states try to gain attention by posing as the most vulnerable and undermining collective negotiations.

In the discussion that followed, participants posed a variety of questions on the technical and substantive features of adaptation, including how to measure vulnerability and differences between coping, resilience, etc. In response, the resource team noted that ultimately adaptation is about maintaining or improving an agent's operating capacity despite climate shocks. Adaptation is related to resilience because the better the adaptive capacity, the greater the resilience. The final set of questions concerned the financial mechanisms for adaptation. The team noted that Green Climate Fund (GCF) finances the NAP readiness programme, but finance for implementation requires moving the adaptation planning process forward into viable projects and programmes.

A brief session on discussions and feedback followed, where participants were invited to ask questions of clarification on previous sessions, in particular the mock negotiations.



## FORMULATING GROUP POSITIONS



LDC Chair Endalew leads a session on formulating group positions

The participants were invited to participate in a mock session on formulating a group position. They debated a hypothetical suggestion from the Umbrella Group that the UNFCCC's Subsidiary Body on Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) should undertake work on geo-engineering techniques as a response to climate change.

At the end of the session, the resource team provided feedback on the performance of the participants. The team noted that negotiators must be adept in investing time and research to study the proposals put forward by other groups, because once these proposals gain momentum, it becomes increasingly harder to modify or resist them. The team also advised negotiators to pay attention to politics beyond the climate negotiations, which could influence the outcome of the negotiations.

## TALANOA DIALOGUE AND GLOBAL STOCKTAKE

This session was also led by Manjeet Dhakal. He said the Paris Agreement calls for “global stocktakes” to take place every five years, to review progress made towards the goals of the Agreement. Scientists have calculated that the intended NDCs (INDCs) put forward by countries are inadequate to reach the goals of the Paris Agreement – average global temperature will still rise by 3.2°C even if the ambition articulated in these INDCs is met. It is hoped that the global stocktakes that will begin in 2023, and the Talanoa Dialogue taking place through 2018, will encourage countries to bridge the mismatch between the ambition of their NDCs, and the ambition needed to realise the goals of the Paris Agreement.

Dhakal said the Talanoa Dialogue, taking place throughout 2018, is aimed at encouraging countries to increase the ambition of current NDCs. It will include three stages: a preparatory stage; a technical stage; and a political

stage. The preparatory stage involves gathering information; the technical stage involves matching the current state of affairs and the desired outcomes; while the political stage involves developing clear recommendations for moving forward. In addition to the formal Talanoa process taking place under the UNFCCC and through regional forums, publications such as the IPCC's Special Report on 1.5°C, due in October 2018, will also play a key role in providing a scientific basis for further political discussions. He directed participants to [www.talanoadialogue.com](http://www.talanoadialogue.com) for more information.



Manjeet Dhakal, Climate Analytics, on the global stocktake and Talanoa Dialogue

Dhakal concluded his presentation by focusing on the legal and technical features of the global stocktake. Mandated by Article 14 of the Paris Agreement, he said the global stocktake will provide a periodic and comprehensive stocktake to assess collective action. It will cover adaptation, mitigation, and the means of implementation and support in the light of equity and best available science. Parties are mandated to identify the sources of input for the global stocktake and provide recommendations on the modalities for global stocktake. The final outcome of the global stocktake remains unclear: it could take the form of an informal note on the progress made by the parties.

In the discussion that followed, a participant asked why a Talanoa Dialogue is necessary if the Paris Agreement's targets are clear. In response, the resource team noted that while the targets are clear, collective action is required to achieve those targets and the Talanoa Dialogue is one way of promoting sufficient collective action. Another participant asked if the Dialogue will also cover adaptation. In response, Dhakal said that while its mandate concerns mitigation, the global stocktake has a broader scope and will include adaptation and means of implementation, support, etc.



## MEANS OF IMPLEMENTATION AND THE PARIS AGREEMENT



Anju Sharma, head of ecbi's Publications and Policy Analysis Unit, presents during the session on means of implementation

The session was conducted by Anju Sharma, head of the ecbi Publications and Policy Analysis Unit. She asked participants to review the two-page briefing notes on climate finance, capacity building, and technology development and transfer that had been circulated before the training workshop and included in their information packs. Afterwards, each participant was asked to highlight a question or fact that s/he considered important, and a discussion followed to address these specific elements.

Most of the questions were focused on climate finance. In response to questions, Sharma noted that the issue of climate finance has been very controversial since the start of the climate negotiations, with differences centred on issues such as the definition of climate finance, governance, sources, disbursement procedures, and magnitudes of funding necessary. There has been an evolution in balancing the mitigation and adaptation needs of developing parties, and it is encouraging that the latter has steadily gained attention in the context of climate finance. However, a definition of climate finance remains elusive, and without an agreed definition, it will be impossible to agree on whether the promised US\$ 100 billion annually by 2020 is being delivered – among other things, because it includes private sector finance which is difficult to count, and official development assistance which includes overlaps and cannot therefore be considered fully “additional”.

As a result, Sharma said, there is a continuing dispute between developed and developing parties concerning the real climate finance gap. She noted that a possible way to agree on what should count as climate finance is to focus only on public sector contributions that flow through the UNFCCC financial mechanisms. While contributing countries could include private sector contributions in their national reporting, it is very difficult to count private sector contributions formally under the process.

She noted further difficulties in disaggregating climate finance from broader development finance, noting efforts by some international NGOs to discount large development grants that include only small climate components. Overall, she said, there is a greater sense of urgency to develop the necessary systems for transparency of support provided, under the transparency arrangements of the Paris Agreement.

On efforts to improve access to climate finance and build country ownership, Sharma described the direct access modality of the Adaptation Fund and the enhanced direct access (EDA) modality of the GCF. She said the direct access modality allows accredited national entities to access funds, while the EDA modality aims to improve sub-national access to finance from the GCF. She said that while any financial mechanism can be confusing at first, developing parties have a lot to gain by going through the process of accrediting a national agency as National Implementing Entity (NIE) – this has been described as a capacity building measure in its own right by some countries that have gone through the process, and it could help countries address their own needs better in future.

On the issue of sources, Sharma highlighted the need to explore innovative sources of finance which could include special levies, crowd funding, sub-national financing mechanisms, etc. She said while existing sources of funding were shrinking, needs were expanding – including, for instance, to address loss and damage due to climate change.

Briefly addressing the questions related to capacity building and technology, she noted the need for more sustainable approaches to ensure long-term effectiveness; reduce duplication; and genuinely address local needs.

In the discussion that followed, a participants asked about the sources of funding for the Adaptation Fund. Sharma said while the 2% levy on CDM projects that the Fund was expected to rely on had dried out, the fund is current reliant on bilateral sources of funding. Longer-term innovative options – such as crowdfunding or air travel levies – will need to be implemented. Another participant asked if government ministries could serve as NIEs. Sharma confirmed that this was indeed possible, and had already been done, for instance by Ethiopia.

## ENHANCED TRANSPARENCY FRAMEWORK

The session was conducted by Pascale Bird, Legal Response International. Bird began her presentation by emphasising the role of transparency, saying it covers reporting, actions, and implementation. Moreover, it can help decision-makers identify gaps and help implementation. For developing countries, transparency can also help them access international finance.

She noted that transparency is a critical element of the NDCs, given the bottom-up approach of the Paris Agreement, and the fact that it is not entirely legally binding. While some NDC related obligations are mandatory – states must prepare, communicate, and maintain NDCs (Article 4.2) – there is no legally binding obligation to achieve those commitments. The NDCs must be ambitious, progressive, and support developing states. In an effort to achieve this incremental improvement, the Paris Agreement relies on different mechanisms to promote implementation. It involves, *inter alia*, a ratcheting mechanism (through NDC submissions every five years) to increase ambition, a transparency framework, a periodic global stocktake, and a facilitative compliance mechanism.

Bird then outlined the evolution of the transparency mechanisms. She noted that key agreements – including the UNFCCC, Kyoto Protocol, and Cancun agreements – introduced regular reporting (national

communications, GHG inventories, Biennial Reports, Biennial Update Reports) and review (international assessment review and international consultation analysis). These agreements involved differentiated requirements for Annex 1 and non-Annex 1 parties, but have also become more complex over time, which is challenging for developing parties with limited resources. The Paris Agreement builds on these mechanisms, especially in terms of transparency.

While calling for the transparency mechanism to build on existing transparency arrangements (Article 13.3 and 13.4), the Paris Agreement calls for one framework for all, but with built-in flexibility (Article 13.1). This framework is designed to be facilitative, non-intrusive, non-punitive (Article 13.3). It provides for transparency of action (including mitigation and adaptation) (Article 13.5); and transparency of support (clarity on support provided and received for mitigation, adaptation and means of implementation actions) (Article 13.6). In this way, the transparency framework is also a valuable source of information for the global stocktake (Article 13.5 and 13.6).

Bird noted that transparency mechanisms cover both adaptation and mitigation. Parties “*shall*” provide GHG inventories and information to track progress on implementing and achieving mitigation contributions (Article 13.7). In contrast, parties “*should*” as appropriate, provide information on impacts and adaptation (Article 13.8). The reporting mechanisms also cover support provided for developing parties. Thus, developed parties “*shall*” provide information on support provided (others “*should*”); while developing countries “*should*” provide information on support needed and received (Article 13.9 and 13.10). These reports should be produced at least biennially (except for LDCs and small islands developing States or SIDs).

In terms of review and consultation, she said the Paris Agreement calls for technical expert reviews on information on mitigation action and support provided. This will also form the basis for multilateral facilitative consideration of progress with respect to efforts on means of implementation, and implementation and achievement of NDCs (Article 13.11). Despite the large reporting commitments, special circumstances for



Participants engage during the discussions



developing parties are recognised too, especially for LDCs and SIDs. The Agreement outlines support for implementing transparency related obligations and building capacity (Articles 13, 14 and 15). Separately, capacity-building initiatives for transparency have improved (1/CP.21, paras 84 and 85).

Concluding her presentation, Bird described the key challenges and next steps that await parties. She noted that there is an urgent need to address the interlinkages with mitigation, accounting and guidance for NDCs, adaptation, finance, global stocktake, cooperative approaches, loss and damage, and compliance mechanisms. There are also questions of how finance should be provided and mobilised for developing parties. Questions concerning conditionality and differentiation deserve more attention.

In the discussion that followed, participants asked questions to clarify the role of the transparency framework. Multiple participants called on the ecbi team to provide training in this regard and the team responded that while larger training schemes will depend on funding, there are existing training options available for negotiators. Another participant asked how NDC reporting will work within the broader development agenda. The resource team noted that NDCs need to align transparency with those elements and also avoid double counting.

## **MOCK NEGOTIATIONS ON GENDER AND CLIMATE CHANGE - II**

In the second part of the mock negotiations, the negotiators focused on finalising a proposed text. The session was chaired by LDC Chair Gebru Jember Endalew, and the ecbi team played the roles of the Secretariat and of advisers.



Brianna Craft, acting as the "Secretariat", reads out proposed textual changes during the mock negotiations



"Delegates" read out their proposals for textual changes

The negotiators, divided into different coalitions and randomly assigned to different states, pushed for changes and modifications based on their country positions. The negotiators debated various issues related to gender, including technology transfer, capacity building, and finance. Moreover, in this session the negotiators worked together as groups, represented by a particular country.

In the discussion that followed, the ecbi team praised the negotiators for acting on the comments made at the end of the previous mock negotiations session, and described the negotiations as uncannily realistic. The team encouraged negotiators to seek out resource personnel, NGOs, and voluntary consultants to get help with country positions; work together as groups to amplify their voice; and speak up in support for countries with similar positions, in order to be counted.

## COMPLIANCE MECHANISM

The session was led by Binyam Gebreyes, IIED. Gebreyes opened the session by starting a discussion amongst the participants on treaty compliance. A participant from Bhutan noted that compliance is important because climate impacts have a powerful effect on states such as Bhutan. The country is highly dependent on the climate for many facets of its security including food, water, and energy. Moreover, Bhutan is highly exposed to various climate hazards. In response, the state, which has limited resources for mitigation and adaptation, is keenly interested in the compliance mechanisms that are part of the international climate change institutions. While Bhutan itself has taken measures to ensure its own contributions – it has, for instance, a constitutional provision for maintaining forest cover at 60% – it would like to see similar efforts elsewhere. In this regard, compliance ought to be robust and accountable. But the main challenges for Bhutan are the lack of data to establish baseline figures, and limited resources to ensure compliance.

Gebreyes then turned his attention to the Paris Agreement's Article 15, which is dedicated to compliance. He said that while it is up to parties to comply with their obligations, an effective compliance mechanism can





Binyam Gebreyes, IIED, describes the Paris Agreement's compliance mechanism

help them implement the Agreement and encourage them to carry out their obligations. Some of the features of the compliance mechanism will include expert-driven evaluations, facilitative mechanisms, transparency, non-adversarial dispute resolution mechanisms, non-punitive response measures, and due consideration to national capabilities and circumstances.

He then explained that a lot of work needs to be done to design an effective compliance mechanism. Currently, parties are developing modalities and procedures for the effective operation of the compliance committee. Ideally, these proposals will be adopted at the COP this year. Some of the key issues that still need to be covered include the scope of the compliance committee; the trigger mechanisms that will activate a review; and the measures that the committee can take in response to review. In terms of scope, an important issue is how many provisions of the Paris Agreement the committee will be able to monitor and facilitate compliance for. This could range from all the provisions to only the legally binding provisions; if all else fails, it may be confined to just a few specific proposals. The triggers to activate a committee review could be based on routine and ad-hoc reports submitted to the secretariat. Once the information is verified, it could be submitted for further factual and legal evaluations. This leads to the issue of the measures available to ensure compliance. These measures should facilitate compliance but not be punitive and discourage parties from cooperating.

Gebreyes concluded the presentation by noting the upcoming challenges, visible in the informal note put forward by the co-facilitators at the end of the Bonn Session in May 2018. This informal note lists a variety of options for each issue. In a broader context, there is also a growing challenge in coordinating compliance across a variety of different issues, he said.

In the discussion that followed, participants asked about the effectiveness of the compliance mechanism. One participant asked if it is possible to create a compliance mechanism that meets all the requirements of the Paris Agreement. Gebreyes responded that while the Paris Agreement is very broad, it is possible to hold all the



A view of the room

requirements together. Other resource team members noted that developing parties need to work together and seek out multilateral compliance mechanisms, because bilateral mechanisms used by less powerful countries are unlikely to work against powerful countries.

## FEEDBACK AND NEXT STEPS

In the final session, participants and organisers exchanged their thanks and shared their thoughts and feedback on the entire workshop.

Participants thanked the organisers for providing a very realistic simulation of the negotiations. Some, who had actually attended the negotiations, pointed out that the mock sessions were very well managed and thanked the organisers for the resource material. All the participants urged ecbi to continue the training workshops in future. They also hoped they could attend the next workshop to strengthen the institutional capacity of their respective ministries.

The organisers thanked the participants for their attendance and agreed that developing countries need continued support for negotiations and research. Organisers also cautioned participants against trying to follow all the issues during negotiations – instead, they urged them to find issues and areas that are important and of particular interest to them/ their countries. In conclusion, they reminded participants that climate negotiations are critical because the stakes are very high. Negotiators, especially from the developing world, must work hard to improve their ability to represent their country's interests. They reiterated their commitment to the goal of the training workshops, and to provide a realistic and rewarding experience to create a virtuous cycle of capacity development.