



2018 Regional Training Workshop

Francophone Africa



12 & 13 April 2018

Dakar, Senegal

ecbi

European Capacity Building Initiative

www.eurocapacity.org

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

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

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

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

Supported by:



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

based on a decision of the German Bundestag

Partner Institutions

oxford
climate
policy

iiied



ecbi

European Capacity Building Initiative
www.eurocapacity.org

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	2
Bridging Day	2
<i>Mitigation and the Paris Agreement</i>	2
<i>National experiences accessing climate finance</i>	4
Francophone workshop opening session	5
Becoming a better UNFCCC delegate: Tips and tricks	6
Outlook for 2018 in the UNFCCC negotiations	8
Adaptation and the Paris Agreement	9
Mock negotiations - Part I	11
Group Scenario Position	11
Transparency framework for action and support	12
Mock negotiations – part 2	14
Pre-2020 action and the Talanoa Dialogue	14
Global stocktake and the compliance mechanism	16
Next steps and feedback	18

INTRODUCTION

The 2018 ecbi Regional Training Workshop for Francophone Africa took place on 12 & 13 April 2018 in Saly, Senegal. The workshop, organised in collaboration with ecbi's regional partner Energie Environment Développement (ENDA Energie), was attended by 27 negotiators from the region.

BRIDGING DAY

The Anglophone Training Workshop was held during the same week as the Francophone workshop in Saly, on 9 & 10 April 2018. This year, the ecbi Anglophone and Francophone Training Workshops for Africa included a “bridging day”, to provide an opportunity to the participants of the two workshops to meet and engage with each other. During a morning session of the bridging day, a speed networking session between the 29 participants of the Anglophone workshop and 27 participants of the Francophone workshop was followed by an exchange of experiences on Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs); and a discussion on climate finance.

During the speed networking session, participants from the Anglophone workshop were encouraged to share what they learned in the past two days, and the Francophone participants were asked to share what they hope to gain from the next two days.

Mitigation and the Paris Agreement

This session was facilitated by Gebru Endalew, Chair of the least developed countries (LDCs) Group. He provided a short background on mitigation and pre-2020 ambition in the climate negotiations, followed by Ethiopia's experience with its intended NDC (INDC).

Endalew said Ethiopia was one of the first African countries to submit its INDC, which was ratified in March 2007. The country developed its Climate Resilient Green Economy (CRGE) strategy in 2010 and launched during the Conference of Parties (COP) in Durban in 2011, to incentivise other Parties to follow the same approach. The INDC is based on long-term strategies to reduce greenhouse gases (GHGs) by 145 metric tonnes of CO₂ by 2030, and includes an adaptation component.

He remarked that from a developing country's perspective, it is challenging to differentiate between development, adaptation and mitigation, and that the focus should be on an integrated development plan rather than raising mitigation, adaptation and development separately.

One of the big lessons that Ethiopia had learned from testing its CRGE strategy via fast-track projects, he said, was that the mitigation and adaptation targets could not be met through projects alone. As a result, CRGE was integrated into Ethiopia's development plan. Endalew said his country aims to reduce per capita emission as well as aggregate emissions through changes in key sectors, including agriculture; forestry; transport; industry and buildings, for which baseline figures are available.

He then invited a few participants to share lessons, challenges and successes in relation to the planning and implementation of their NDCs.

Participants from Somalia said their NDC focuses on adaptation and mitigation. Among challenges, they highlighted lack of infrastructure; implementation through line ministries; and the need for more baseline information. They said Somalia hoped to combine its INDC with its national action plan (NAP).

Benin said their INDC was prepared in response to the Lima Call for Action and was based on previous communications. No external consultant was involved in its preparation. National experts from each sector were commissioned on the basis of projects and plans in the pipeline within the country. A bottom-up approach was followed to identify measures within the INDC framework. Following problems with figures in the first INDC and due to change in the government, the NDC was aligned with the action plan of the government which already included some of the leading activities and submitted in October 2017. The activities are driven by sectoral agencies, and Benin is working with the UN Development Programme (UNDP) to transform its NDC into business plans.

Togo said its NDC was ratified in June 2017, and ready for implementation. A national monitoring committee is in place to facilitate implementation, and it is in the process of sensitising stakeholders in the different sectors involved. The country is also making efforts to mobilise resources to begin actual implementation. Togo developed and submitted its NAP in 2016 with support from GIZ, but the plan did not cover grassroots communities. In order to reach out to these communities, the country is developing and implementing local and regional climate change adaptation plans. The mitigation component is increasingly being taken on board in the NDC, through which Togo is making commitments to reduce its emissions by 11.14% by 2030.

Niger said its NDC and the budget for its implementation is distributed between adaptation and mitigation. The Green Climate Fund (GCF), development partners, the state and international corporations fund the implementation of the NDC. Niger is in the process of preparing its NAP. Niger has a National Implementing Entity accredited with the Adaptation Fund, and the same national institution is accredited with the GCF. Niger is putting in place an inventory to improve its future NDCs, and is in negotiations with GIZ to have a national base for the inventories to be prepared. Niger is also receiving assistance from Agence Française de Développement, along with 30 other countries, focusing on capacity building and support for planning in order to establish a link between NAPs and NDCs.

The Gambia developed its INDC through its national INDC team in collaboration with consultants funded by GIZ and CDKN. Most of the activities identified in the INDC came from the country's Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Action (NAMA), and it is mostly focused on adaptation. It has two unconditional activities: afforestation and the installation of solar PV systems that help to power water supply and telecommunication systems. This counts towards the national commitments of reducing emissions to 44% by 2025, and 45% by 2030. The Gambia has also developed mid- and long-term climate change and low emission climate resilience strategies as a result of its INDC, and activities are ongoing.

During the discussion that followed, participants asked if policies alone are effective enough; how will the contributions of countries that do not have quantified targets in their NDCs be counted; and what lessons can be learned from Ethiopia's baseline targets. Can countries start their baselines for the current year, or do baselines have to go back five to ten years earlier.

In response, Endalew said the setting of baselines depends on the availability of data, and countries can choose their baseline year. However, countries must be able to communicate progress on NDCs quantifiably, particularly in the post-2020 period when the implementation of the Paris Agreement begins, and when all NDCs will be aggregated and need to be clear and understandable at a global level to help the global stocktake process. He said the Paris Agreement rulebook should provide guidelines on how Parties will communicate quantifiable NDCs.

A participant asked for clarification on conditional and unconditional finance. Endalew said conditional finance is subject to the availability of resources from other sources. On synergies between NDCs, NAPs and NAMAs,

Endalew noted that this will be a challenging task, as each requires its own reporting cycles. He rounded up the discussion by emphasising that mid- and long-term strategies, including both mitigation and adaptation components are crucial, along with robust baselines and datasets to help with planning and communication.

National experiences accessing climate finance

This discussion, on national experiences with climate finance, was facilitated by Anju Sharma, head of the Publications and Policy Analysis Unit of ecbi.

Sharma provided a brief background on climate finance. She said the first entity of the UNFCCC's financial mechanism, the Global Environment Facility (GEF), faced the problems of complex access procedure; a long process for decision-making on proposals; and the requirement to use multilateral implementing entities such as the World Bank, UN Development Programme, UN Environment Programme etc. The LDCF and the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF), managed by GEF, also had similar problems with regard to access to funds.

The Adaptation Fund the GCF tried to address some of these issues through the direct access modality, which allow national implementing entities, she said. However, this came with its own set of problems, as countries faced problems in getting national institutions accredited. Like the GEF, funds from the GCF can mainly be accessed by those who have the wherewithal to write complex proposals, and funds are not accessible to communities at the grassroots who need them. Although the Adaptation Fund and GCF are governed by a Board that includes representation from developed and developing countries, the process of passing proposals still appears to be very politicised. She remarked that countries that most require funding because they are the most vulnerable, are often the ones who have the most difficulties in accessing the finance.

Sharma then called on Endalew to share the experience of Ethiopia in accessing GCF funding. Endalew said a proposal submitted to the GCF by Ethiopia followed a sector-wide approach in developing its proposal and clustered sectors into two groups: rural industries (afforestation, agriculture, livestock etc.); and urban industries (transport, housing etc.). Support was provided by partner institutions, and personnel allocated to facilitate ministries in developing their proposals. However, the proposal was not approved by the GCF Board at the first instance, on the basis that it did not differentiate adequately between climate and development activities. However, it was approved in a subsequent Board meeting. The biggest change made to make the proposal acceptable appears to be the reduction of the budget by half.

Sharing his personal experiences and those of The Gambia, Jallow recounted the efforts made to ensure that the LDCs would have access to the LDC Fund for adaptation, and the funds would be divided equally between the LDC countries on a first come first serve basis. The Gambia has a number of projects from its National Adaptation Plan of Action (NAPA) funded by the LDC Fund. He encouraged LDC participants to make whole-hearted efforts to access the funds available in the LDC Fund and other climate Funds, noting that The Gambia has also been successful in accessing funds from the GCF, although this remains a difficult process, and efforts are underway to improve accessibility.

Sharma said the LDC Fund was finding it increasingly difficult to get adequate replenishments, particularly since the attention shifted to the GCF, and alternative sources of finance may be necessary to ensure it remains well resourced. She noted that the LDC Chair was involved in initiatives to promote alternative sources of funding for the LDC Fund. She then invited Emmanuel Seck, ENDA, to share the experience of Senegal, one of the first countries to have a National Implementing Entity (NIE) accredited by the Adaptation Fund.

Seck said the NIE allowed Senegal to directly access the Adaptation Fund. He noted that the Fund relies on a 2% levy on the Clean Development Mechanism and on voluntary contributions from countries. Senegal

was also one of the first countries to receive support from the GCF. The country also has a National Climate Change Committee, which brings together government, civil society organisations, private sector and farmers networks to work in synergy to work on accessing these funds.

Sharma highlighted Seck's comment that it is well worth investing in NIEs, as it serves as an institutional building exercise for the country, and provides faster access to the funds from the Adaptation Fund and GCF.

The participant from Benin described an environmental national fund, accredited by the Adaptation Fund, called FNEC which introduced eco-taxes for project financing. Certain tax revenues are pooled nationally to support community projects.

Sharma concluded by saying that developing countries should lobby their representatives on the Board of the GCF, in particular, to ensure that the Fund is more accessible than the GEF. She said small steps are being taken to improve local access, through modalities such as enhanced direct access. However, the emphasis should shift from long project approval processes conducted by far-away Fund employees or even Board members who are not necessarily familiar with ground realities, to greater flexibility at the local level in deciding programme activities, along with a greater emphasis on monitoring and evaluation by communities, to ensure the funds meet their needs.

FRANCOPHONE WORKSHOP OPENING SESSION

On 12 April 2018, Emmanuel Seck, on behalf of the ENDA Executive Secretary and the Director of ENDA Energie, opened the Francophone workshop, welcoming all participants and thanking them for their attendance. In his opening remarks he said ecbi's Training Workshops have taken place for over a decade, and a number of participants have gone on to lead in UNFCCC negotiations. However, a lot remains to be done, as climate change and its consequences continue to affect the populations of least developed countries (LDCs) and of Africa. He said 2018 is an important year to enhance the commitment of countries through the Talanoa Dialogue planned in May, which will allow Parties to evaluate their climate efforts. He called for improved alignment between NAPs, NAMAs and NDCs; decentralised processes; and the involvement of stakeholders from civil society and the private sector.

Anju Sharma, head of Publications and Policy Analysis unit of ecbi, welcomed participants and provided a background and introduction to ecbi. She described ecbi's 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 has been successful in creating a more level playing field at the UN negotiations and through TSP, as many negotiators who started their training at the workshops have gone on to represent their countries, regions and groups.

Subhi Barakat, IIED, said IIED organises and runs TSP under the ecbi umbrella in three regional areas: Anglophone Africa; Francophone Africa and Asia Pacific. As well as training and technical support, IIED hosts a one-day Pre-COP Training Workshop during the Conference of Parties to the UNFCCC each year. The goal of the TSP is to provide participants with the opportunity to strengthen technical knowledge and practical negotiation skills. IIED also provides support for the LDC Chair and Group. He encouraged participants to be informal and participate as much as possible to get the most out of the sessions.

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

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

BECOMING A BETTER UNFCCC DELEGATE: TIPS AND TRICKS

The session was led by Mamadou Honadia, a senior UNFCCC negotiator from Burkina Faso. He explained climate change; the UNFCCC structure; what to expect from different meetings UNFCCC; and offered practical tips for negotiators.

Honadia began his presentation by briefly explaining global warming, saying the greenhouse effect is natural, as without it the average temperature of the globe would be -18°C. This phenomenon of energy exchanges between the atmosphere and the Earth gives us an average temperature of 15°C. The problem lies in this becoming more extreme. The high concentration of greenhouse gases (GHGs) in the atmosphere causes climate change and produces extreme climate events, which in turn dangerously compromise the existence of populations, and undermines production systems through loss of water resources and desertification.

He listed seven major GHGs responsible for changes in climate, their sources and percentage emissions in 2010:

- Carbon dioxide (CO₂): Combustion of fossil fuels, changes in land use, cement production etc; 76%
- Methane (CH₄): Exploitation and distribution of fossil fuels, cattle, rice growing, dumps; 16%
- Nitrous oxide (N₂O): Agriculture (fertiliser) and related changes land use; 6%
- Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs): Coolants; < 2%
- Perfluorocarbons (PFCs): Refrigerants, electronics industry, aluminium industry; < 2%
- Sulphur hexafluoride (SF₆): Insulators in the electronics industry and magnesium industry; < 2%
- Nitrogen trifluoride (NF₃): Electronics, photovoltaic industries etc; < 2%

Honadia said the main objective of the UNFCCC is to achieve stabilisation of GHGs 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. He added that of the seven gases mentioned above, six are regulated by the Convention.

He outlined the group of stakeholders responsible for negotiating in the UNFCCC process, which include: Annex 1 Parties, made up of 41 developed countries; Annex II Parties; Non-Annex 1 Parties, made up of all developing countries; and Least Developed Countries (LDCs), characterised by their strong vulnerability and need to adapt.

He said during the first COP in Berlin in 1995, the decision was taken to launch an intergovernmental process of negotiations in order to come up with a more focused treaty. The Kyoto Protocol was adopted in 1997 and came into force in 2005, after it was ratified by 192 Parties, with the objective of establishing reduction targets within two commitment periods (2008 - 2012 and 2013 – 2020), although the second commitment period under the Doha Amendment has not yet received enough ratifications to come into force.

The Copenhagen conference in 2009 was expected to be an important turning point. In reality, it did not deliver, as the Copenhagen Accord was only noted, and not adopted by Parties. Its proposals were eventually adopted under the Cancún Agreements in the following year, and included: Fast Start Finance of US\$ 30 billion (2010-2012) from developing countries; and long-term financing of US\$ 100 billion by 2020. The NAMAs were also part of the Cancún Agreement.

The Paris Agreement was adopted in 2015, where all states including the LDCs are expected to present NDCs. This led to the establishment of the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Paris Agreement (APA); NDCs; and the goal of limiting global average temperatures to 2°C, while trying to keep it below 1.5°C.

He listed the important elements of the Paris Agreement:

- **Mitigation:** NDCs; clarity, accounting and transparency; review every five years; NDC register.
- **Financing:** The annual US\$ 100 billion goal will be increased by 2025; and the funding entities include the Green Climate Fund (GCF), the Global Environment Facility (GEF), and the Adaptation Fund.
- **Technology transfer:** A Technology Mechanism, with a Technology Executive Committee (TEC) and Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN), will work towards supporting technology transfer and development.
- **Capacity building:** A Paris Committee for Capacity Building (PCCB) and a Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT) is established.

Governance structure

Honadia then described the governance structure of the UNFCCC, explaining the role of the Conference of Parties (COP), Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol; and the Conference of Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA). These supreme decision-making bodies meet annually to adopt decisions and further the implementation of each of these agreements.

In addition, there are two permanent bodies supporting the COP, CMP and CMA: the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI); and the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA). He also described the role of APA, a non-permanent body under the COP taking up matters related to the Paris Agreement.

Honadia listed the 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.

He outlined the key tools essential for negotiators:

- Psychological tools: Strong mind; endurance; good physical and mental health; secondary characteristics, not impulsive, keeping calm; team spirit; willingness to learn and make efforts; good communicator, to transmit the message, speak in professional terms; coordinator.
- Technical tools: Learn the English language, sit with Anglophones, write notes; have copies of the treaties and decisions handy; collect the daily agenda of the programmes and the sessions of the Subsidiary Bodies; collect technical documents from NGOs, UN agencies, international organisations or research institutes.
- Financial tools: Per-diem or expenses of stay; sponsorship with research organisations, private sector or corporate support; budgetary support, for participation in the negotiations, to overcome secretarial constraints or the management of a Presidency.

He said it is important for negotiators to understand their key goals, and these include: financial and/or technological support; recognition; better protection of the environment, the climate system, and countries in the face of a global ecological problem; equitable rights to resources; right to indemnity or compensation; reduced impacts of pollution and unfair trade rules; and the promotion of sustainable development.

Honadia pointed participants to a diagram representing the technical preparations involved in sessions, which also illustrated the internal preparation process.

He highlighted the key people to keep an eye out for during meetings, including: the UNFCCC Secretariat; the Presidency, currently held by Fiji; the COP, CMP and CMA Presidents; SBI Chair, SBSTA Chair and APA Co-Chairs collectively facilitate the negotiating bodies, and ensure that the negotiations are progressing; and observer organisations.

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

Discussion

Following the presentation, participants engaged in a lengthy discussion regarding the ratification of the Doha Amendment and the legal implications for developing countries when it comes into force; the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) registry; and etiquette in the negotiation rooms.

OUTLOOK FOR 2018 IN THE UNFCCC NEGOTIATIONS

This session was kicked off with a presentation by Gebru Endalew, LDC Group Chair.

Endalew provided a brief presentation on the key UNFCCC events and milestones; informal notes to draft negotiating text; scope of the Paris Agreement Work Programme (PAWP); and the COP24 decisions/package.

He said there will be a number of events running in parallel but the key events and milestones include the Talanoa Dialogue; the IPCC special report on the impacts of global warming of 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels and related global GHG emission pathways, to be finalised by October this year; the Global Climate Action Summit to showcase climate action and inspire deeper commitments from national and sub-national

governments in support of the Paris Agreement; and adoption of the implementation guidelines of the Paris Agreement at COP24.

On informal notes to draft negotiating text, he said two to three sessions remain before adopting the implementation guidelines for the Paris Agreement (with only 4-5 weeks of negotiation sessions and under nine calendar months remaining). He highlighted the need to move to negotiating text very soon to have sufficient time to address priorities and avoid a last-minute scramble for textual compromise. He said SB48 will likely be the last opportunity to shape elements of the guidelines and important linkages before moving to text. It is important to know LDC priorities, and recognise the benefits of being early movers, preparing and being proactive in proposing options.

Endalew said the main focus of the UNFCCC intercessional meeting in October in Bangkok will be to revisit the informal text to ensure positions are reflected, and that there is progress across all issues and in moving to a negotiating text; and to identify issues that are not moving forward and to build strategies to overcome these blocks.

He outlined the scope of Paris Agreement Work Programme (PAWP), saying the starting point will be Decision 1/CP.21 and the Paris Agreement provisions. Most but not all of the work under PAWP is mandated to be completed/adopted at COP24. Key issues include how/when should the elements not mandated for CMA1 be treated? Which (if any) so-called “orphaned” issues (in APA agenda item 8) should be part of the COP24 package?

Endalew said while the main outcome at CMA1 will be a decision adopting the implementation guidelines for the Paris Agreement, it is not clear what will be the minimum required technical detail under each element of the rulebook. He felt it would be good to have a complete and comprehensive work programme rather than gold standard rules. Gaps will emerge and updates to the guidelines should be anticipated. He said the option then will be to either agree a clear timeline for a review of the rulebook, or simply agree that a review will take place in future.

Discussion

In the discussion that followed, participants discussed the current APA text; whether the Talanoa Dialogue will address both mitigation and adaptation; the accreditation process for accessing the Adaptation Fund; systems for monitoring, review and verification (MRV); and revision of INDCs.

ADAPTATION AND THE PARIS AGREEMENT

This session was led by a presentation by Binyam Gebreyes, IIED.

Gebreyes invited two participants to share what their countries have done to adapt to climate change.

A participant from Comoros said in the absence of a NAP, the country relies heavily on projects. Drought, a major national concern, is dealt with through special water tanks to collect rain during the rainy season so that during the dry season farmers can use the water for agriculture. In addition, techniques for reforestation and agroforestry are in place.

A participant from Mali highlighted floods and droughts are key problems. Droughts are dealt with through a tree planting programme. With a very short rainy season due to drought, new seed varieties are needed for agriculture; and a number of projects and activities are also dealing with floods.

Gebreyes said adaptation is about coping with climatic change, either through measures to reduce negative effects, or to exploit positive effects through appropriate adjustments. Developing countries, which are most impacted by climate change, need strong adaptation policies and support. Adaptation to climate change should be seen as an integral part of a country's development planning, rather than a separate issue. He said 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

A participant asked for clarity on the difference between adaptation and development. Gebreyes responded that all adaptation work is part of the development plan, but when it comes to accessing funds, donor countries and international communities tend to want to separate the two. The criterion for this separation is not clear, including among the GCF Board. There is scope for countries to shape the debate and inform the discussions, instead of waiting for the GCF to decide what the differences are.

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. Madeleine Diouf Sarr chaired the session.

GROUP SCENARIO POSITION

This session was facilitated by Craft and chaired by Honadia. Participants were asked to form a group position on the following scenario:

“In light of recent technological developments, the Umbrella Group has tabled a new agenda. They would like the SBSTA to undertake work on geoengineering techniques, as they believe they will be an important component of addressing climate change. Form a group position on whether or not you will support the umbrella Group’s proposal and the reasons why or why not.”

Following discussions, consensus was not reached and therefore there was no group position. A resource person commented that in the real negotiations as well, groups don’t always come up with consensus on an agenda item and can resort to national positions if necessary.

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

During the discussion that followed the presentation, most participants highlighted the challenges of accessing GCF funds for LDCs. The resource people clarified that the GCF funds large-scale projects, to transform or change something they regard as being transformational. It is not always clear what they consider to be transformational. It is very difficult to provide proposals to access the GCF funds. The amount of resources and capacity required for a successful proposal are generally difficulty for LDCs to muster. Some LDCs with more capacity such as Ethiopia have faced challenges even despite the support of the UN Development Programme and others. Building and strengthening institutions at home and management of funds internally are important in strengthening the capacity to put forward proposals that will be accepted. In addition, it is good to have projects that meet national priorities, and which are compliant with the GCF rules and priorities.

A participant asked why only three LDCs have submitted NAPs, and whether this relates to access or lack of capacity. A resource person said the GCF has a support programme where every developing country can access US\$ 3 million to prepare NAPs. Similarly, the LDCF has funds specifically for LDCs, although it lacks adequate funds. These are the two avenues of funding to support NAP development.

Another resource person warned that NAPs shouldn't be viewed as fund-raising proposals or documents, but rather as an important part of national planning. It is important not to assume that preparing a NAP will automatically result in more funds to implement its contents.

MOCK NEGOTIATIONS – PART 2

Participants were asked to provide feedback on what transpired following part one of the negotiations, and then negotiations continued on the draft text.

Providing feedback after the session, resource persons noted that preparation, strategy, pace, and being proactive are all important for the negotiation process.

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 verses 2030 pledged actions and highlighted the mitigation gap which is estimated to be 8-10 Gt CO₂e 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

In the discussion that followed, participants discussed the overlapping of the Kyoto Protocol second commitment period and the Paris Agreement; what will happen after the second commitment period ends; and the review of NDC ambition and equity parameters following the Talanoa Dialogue.

GLOBAL STOCKTAKE AND THE COMPLIANCE MECHANISM

This session started with a presentation by Mamadou Honadia. He first described the global stocktake, the implications that it may have, and the prospects for the future.

Honadia presented three Paris Agreement Articles on the global stocktake:

- **Article 14.1:** The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to this Agreement shall periodically conduct a stock-take of the implementation of this Agreement to evaluate collective progress accomplished in the fulfilment of the purpose of this Agreement and in the overall long-term goals (hereinafter referred to as the global stocktake). It will be used in a global way, focusing on facilitation, taking into consideration mitigation, adaptation, means of implementation and support and taking into account fairness and the best scientific evidence available.
- **Article 14.2:** The conference of Parties acting as the meeting of the Parties to the present Agreement will undertake their first global stocktake in 2023 and every five years thereafter, unless a decision to the contrary is adopted.
- **Article 14.3:** 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.

He said the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Paris Agreement (APA) will develop modalities for establishing the global stocktake, first in 2023 and then every five years thereafter. The APA will need to identify the sources of data (such as reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Subsidiary Bodies, etc) to understand the effect of INDCs, the status of adaptation efforts and the means of implementation taking into account fairness and best scientific data.

He said APA Item 6 relates to the global stocktake. Paragraph 99-101 of Decision 1/CP.21 contains details of how to proceed in making Article 14 of the Paris Agreement a reality: the identification of sources of contributions for the global stocktake; and the development of modalities of the global stocktake, bearing in mind the work under the SBSTA regarding advice on how the IPCC assessment can inform the global stocktake.

He listed the other references to the global stocktake in the Agreement:

- Article. 4.9 Mitigation
- Article. 7.14 Adaptation
- Article. 9.6 Finance
- Article. 10.6 Technology
- Article. 13.5 Transparency of the Action
- Article. 11.4 Capacity building
- Article. 8.4 Loss and Damage

He said following COP23, negotiation groups were asked to make three sets of submissions to give their views on the different sources, modalities etc. to help inform the stocktake. A pre-session roundtable and nine hours of consultations addressed two key issues: major debates on the scope of the global stocktake and how to deal with the issue of fairness; and an Informal Note produced by the Co-Chairs to form the basis of future discussions.

Each negotiating group is working to reflect its position in the Co-Chairs' Note, Honadia said, and listed the main themes of the negotiations:

- The design and timetable of the global stocktake: Allocate more time to this subject so as to treat it in a way that is global, balanced and with tangible results.
- Loss and damage due to climate change should be part of the stocktake. More work is needed on this subject to make it a central point of the Report with mitigation and adaptation.
- Fairness: While within the G77 there is a consensus around fairness as a cross-sectoral and umbrella issue, important work remains on how to make it operational without complicating or diluting it.
- Debates are also ongoing with regard to the type of information to be requested, and the procedures for acquiring this information at all tiers of responsibility. What would be the roles and responsibilities of the Parties, the Secretariat, the Paris Agreement Bodies?

He emphasised the key messages and positions of LDCs and the Africa Group in particular, including: the need for a holistic stocktake that includes issues such as loss and damage and finance; a basis in equity and science. He said the stocktake should identify gaps and find ways to fill them. Listing strategies to achieve these goals in 2018, he highlighted working together with different groups; and creating strategic coalitions.

Discussion

A brief discussion followed, on loss and damage, submission of scientific reports, whether the research community could be part of delegations; and review of NDCs.

The compliance mechanism

Honadia then gave a presentation on the compliance mechanism of the Paris Agreement. He listed three paragraphs from Article 15 of the Paris Agreement:

- **Article 15.1:** A mechanism is hereby instituted to facilitate the implementation of the Agreement and promote compliance with its provisions.
- **Article 15.2:** The mechanism described in paragraph 1 of this article is made up of a committee of experts and intended for facilitation, to function in a manner that is transparent, non-accusatory and non-punitive. The Committee gives particular attention to the situation and national respective capacities of the Parties.
- **Article 15.3:** The committee undertakes its activities in accordance with the modalities and procedures determined by the Conference of Parties acting as the meeting of the Parties to the present Agreement at its first session, and will deliver a report every year.

He said a Compliance Committee, consisting of 12 experts (two per region, and one representing SIDs and one representing LDCs), will be part of a non-punitive and non-adversarial compliance mechanism for the Paris Agreement. The APA will develop modalities and procedures for the functioning of the Committee.

Comparing the Paris Agreement's compliance arrangements to those of the Kyoto Protocol, which has a facilitative as well as enforcement branch, he said the Paris Agreement's committee will try to help countries achieve their NDCs.

He highlighted progress at COP23 with respect to compliance, with two rounds of submissions on functions, triggers, results, linkages, and how to take into account national circumstances and capacities. A pre-session roundtable took place on linkages and relationships with support, and the transparency framework. An Informal Note was developed by the Co-Chairs at the end of this session, summing up the views of Parties.

He listed priorities for the LDCs and African countries, including that the compliance mechanism should: be effective, to ensure the effectiveness of the Paris Agreement; facilitate implementation and compliance

with the Paris Agreement and not to undermine the sovereignty of States; cover all the Articles of the Agreement without exception; focused on technical, independent, impartial, apolitical, open and transparent results; consider political barriers, legislation, etc.; and identify links with the transparency framework, the mechanisms of Articles 6, and the global stocktake.

He said the strategies for 2018 should encompass: research, to better understand how other similar mechanisms cope with the same concerns; alliances, for instance with AOSIS and AILAC; coordination, to detect links between the different topics under the Paris Agreement; and the identification of ways to tackle the issue of differentiation.

He ended by listing a host of other issues that need to be addressed, such as: what principles should be applied; what is punitive or not; how the Committee should conduct the compliance process; should meetings and deliberations be made public or kept private; what kinds of information should be taken into consideration; and whether differentiation should be on a case-by-case basis.

NEXT STEPS AND FEEDBACK

During this session, participant provided their feedback on the workshop. Participants who had attended the training session last year felt the workshop was better this year, and they stood to understand much more given that this was their second chance. A participant said the workshop has helped her with acquiring valuable techniques to take to the negotiations. While she learnt a lot last year, this year allowed for more opportunity to make efforts in overcoming the language barrier. The mock negotiation exercise was very useful which gave the chance to learn from more experienced negotiators.

Another participant said learning both the negotiation techniques and overcoming the language barrier during the mock negotiations was challenging and proposed conducting the negotiations in French for training purposes, or, to explain the methodology in French first. He also proposed inviting more participants per country, say three to four.

Another participant proposed extending the training period, saying two days was too packed to be able to do the mock negotiations justice. He proposed inviting Portuguese-speaking countries, and having more contact with Anglophone countries.

Another participant appreciated the tips from the resource people, saying the presentations on the global stocktake and Talanoa Dialogue, in particular, were very useful.

In closing, Emmanuel Seck said to be a good negotiator and have good negotiator values, self-confidence is important. He called on participants to think of themselves as climate soldiers; be generous in their commitment; come with conviction; be extremely patient and mentally strong; be focused in the choice of themes and areas of interest; and have a strong backbone. He thanked IIED, ecbi and ENDA for their efforts in organising the workshop.