

## **Summary Report** **Technical Consultative Dialogue on** **Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency**

April 11, 2016  
Washington DC, USA

### **1. Background**

The Global Environment Facility (GEF) organized a Technical Consultative Dialogue on the Capacity-Building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT) with entities engaged in various aspects of enabling activities and transparency-related activities. The following questions were explored:

1. What are the steps required for the establishment of the CBIT by the GEF?
2. What are the key gaps associated with implementing transparency-related activities that could be supported by the CBIT?
3. What are emerging and existing initiatives with related objectives, and how to explore opportunities for potential collaboration?
4. How to facilitate CBIT alignment with relevant elements and workstreams in United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) related to transparency?

Participants, in person and through an online meeting platform, included representatives of the following: Center for Climate and Energy Solutions (C2ES); Coalition of Paris Agreement Capacity Building; Consultative Group on Experts on National Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention (CGE); Initiative for Climate Action Transparency (ICAT); International Partnership on Mitigation and Monitoring, Reporting and Verification (MRV); UNFCCC Secretariat; UNDP; and the World Bank. Representatives from Brazil and the United States also participated. The ICAT was represented by the World Resources Institute (WRI), UNEP DTU, and Verified Carbon Standard (VCS). The Coalition of Paris Agreement Capacity Building was represented by a number of individuals, on their personal capacity, from the Greenhouse Gas Management Institute (GHGMI), Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES), and the Carbon Institute.

### **2. Introduction**

The GEF CEO and Chairperson, Naoko Ishii, welcomed the participants to the meeting and thanked them for their interest in the CBIT. She highlighted that developing countries will need support in building and improving institutional and technical capacities for enhanced transparency to be able to participate in the Paris Agreement. She requested the participants to examine the key gaps that the CBIT could support and to explore the opportunities for potential collaboration with the transparency-related initiatives.

### **3. CBIT development**

Gustavo Fonseca and Chizuru Aoki of the GEF Secretariat presented the development of the CBIT. The GEF Secretariat is seeking a decision on the CBIT establishment at the 50<sup>th</sup> GEF

Council in June 2016. They outlined the process for the establishing a new Trust Fund for CBIT with voluntary contributions. The proposed CBIT Trust Fund would receive voluntary contributions until the end of GEF-6 (to June 2018) for programming. From GEF-7 (from July 2018), CBIT would be mainstreamed with the GEF Trust Fund. Regarding CBIT mandate, one participant recalled Article 13 from the Paris Agreement to guide the CBIT work.

### **3. Related workstreams by UNFCCC bodies and facilitating CBIT alignment**

Alejandro Kilpatrick of the UNFCCC Secretariat elaborated on the elements and workstreams related to transparency for developing country Parties, from the existing MRV arrangements to the Paris Agreement framework. He highlighted that the CBIT would need to cover broad areas of support such as enhancing institutional arrangements to support work on transparency at the national level on continuous basis, and putting in place technical expertise and financial resources to enhance effective participation of countries in the technical expert review and the facilitative multilateral consideration process.

Stephen King'uyu, the CGE Chair, described the CGE's approach to assist developing country in meeting their reporting obligations under the Convention, through building capacity for MRV and enhancing sustainability of Biennial Update Reports (BURs) and National Communications. He stated that the National Communications and BURs have evolved from being instruments that analyze climate change emissions and impacts, to raising national awareness on climate change and producing information that meet the needs for national development planning and decision-making. He suggested to collaborate to establish an effective national MRV system.

Reflecting on the presentations, one participant mentioned the need for the CBIT to avoid the perception as an additional reporting process to the Convention, as BURs and National communications already exist. In this line, participants commented on the importance of achieving continuous capacity at the national level.

### **4. Gaps in implementing transparency-related activities**

Two country representatives shared their perspectives on the capacity gaps and the possible ways to address them through CBIT. Mausami Desai from the US Environmental Protection Agency raised the importance of recognizing that capacity needs and gaps vary by national circumstances. In each country, capacity building can entail working on institutional arrangements as well as technical capacities. The challenges go from the limited frameworks and procedures for collecting and managing data to the limited integration of information between GHG inventory and projections, MRV, and nationally determined contributions (NDCs). She also touched on the weak donor coordination on capacity building efforts and the need for a forum to exchange on the implementation approaches and tools.

Marcelo Rocha, from Brazil, presented an analysis of the gaps in transparency-related activities such as the short-term approach to capacity building instead of a more steady approach to institutional arrangements. Capacity building is often difficult to be implemented in practice with constrained resources and timelines. He suggested a learning-by-doing approach that would allow people to participate in review processes and exchange practices with experts.

Participants commented on the possibilities to learn from countries' experience and lessons from the national communications and the BURs. Some proposed that the CBIT engage with countries to designate a national entity responsible for the CBIT and the transparency coordination, in order to enable a fast start of the process. Participants also suggested to open CBIT training to a larger audience beyond the experts registered with UNFCCC. Finally, it was recommended to the GEF that capacity should be mainstreamed into investments.

## **5. Dialogue with existing and emerging initiatives**

Representatives of programs in related fields shared their initiatives, including goals, expected results, and activities. The ICAT representatives, Yamide Dagnet, David Antonioli and Jerry Seager, explained ICAT is a multi-donor fund aiming to provide tools for policymakers and stakeholders to collect more robust and consistent data. ICAT is working with approximately 20 countries in improved national MRV systems supported by sustainable institutional and legislative arrangements. ICAT also works in providing guidance for determining the GHG emissions, sustainable development and transformational impacts of climate policies and actions, and link these results to sources of finance.

Lisa Hanle, representing the Coalition on Paris Agreement Capacity Building, explained the Coalition's mission to provide recommendations for a global capacity building strategy, provide an expert forum for the coordination and acceleration of improved capacity building activities, and provide advice to the CBIT and the Paris Committee on Capacity Building. She provided several recommendations to the CBIT, including: initiate fast start activities, support country-lead facilitative peer assessment, invest in pilot projects, provide IT tools and innovative mentoring processes, and integrate capacity building with national priorities.

Alexander Fisher, representing the International Partnership on mitigation and MRV, indicated that the Partnership was launched by South Africa, South Korea and Germany. The Partnership facilitates the exchange of good practice on mitigation-related experiences and MRV among climate negotiators, policymakers and practitioners and developed countries in order to share lessons, build trust and inform the UNFCCC negotiations. The Partnership organizes meetings back-to-back with climate negotiations to ensure regular exchange between the partnering countries as well as coordinating national implementation and international negotiations. In addition, it gives technical trainings and peer-to-peer exchange in regional groups.

Some participants mentioned the importance of having a 'mapping exercise' on capacity building regional needs that could report to the Conference of the Parties (COP) regarding available support and related finance needs. Others suggested that the GEF should engage the sub-national entities to assess their capacity building needs. In addition, participants recommended that the GEF should have a coordination role through the CBIT, bringing existing initiatives together.

## **6. Way forward**

The GEF Secretariat thanked the participants for an informative exchange of ideas, suggestions, and recommendations. As the need for coordination among the existing and emerging initiatives was raised by various participants, the GEF Secretariat will further elaborate on activities to enhance partnerships with the CBIT informed by the dialogue. The GEF Secretariat also requested the participating entities to continue dialogue and collaboration.