



Outcome Report – Third Technical CBIT Implementation Workshop Rome, Italy, May 22nd and 23rd, 2019

Background	1
1. Introduction	2
2. The enhanced transparency framework after Katowice	2
3. The Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency	3
4. The CBIT Global Coordination Platform	4
5. Solid institutional arrangements	4
6. The Paris Committee on Capacity Building (PCCB) and CBIT	5
7. Building sustainable domestic MRV systems	6
8. Market Place on support options and tools for transparency	6
9. Climate change mitigation scenario's	7
10. Monitoring and tracking climate finance and financial flows	7
11. Group work	8
Conclusions	9
Annex- List of participants	9

Background

The third technical workshop on Capacity Building for Transparency (CBIT) implementation was held on May 22nd and 23rd, 2019 in Rome, Italy. Around 100 participants attended the meeting, including representatives from developing and developed Parties, international organisations and experts engaged in the enhanced transparency framework. The list of participants and trainers is at **Annex A**.

In collaboration with:



The objective of the workshop was to strengthen national transparency capacities by:

- Analysing and supporting enhanced understanding of key elements and components of national CBIT projects already approved,
- Identifying common approaches to existing challenges in the implementation of the enhanced transparency framework and
- Presenting the support available through the CBIT Global Coordination Platform.

The meeting was funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and co-organized by United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Environment Programme (UN Environment), UNEP DTU Partnership and the Global Support Programme (GSP) for National Communications (NCs) and Biennial Update Reports (BURs), with the additional support of the Italian Ministry of Environment, Land and Sea Protection.

1. Introduction

The host country, funding organisations and organisers courteously opened the meeting with a couple of welcoming words.

- Mrs. Federica Fricano from the Ministry of Environment, Land and Sea Protection in Italy
- Mrs. Chizuri Aoki from the GEF
- Mr. Yamil Bonduki from UNDP
- Mrs. Ruth Couto from UN Environment

The main topics of the meeting were presented. The first steps included to get an overview of the enhanced transparency framework after Katowice and the status of the CBIT, including the Global Coordination Platform. Next, the topic of solid institutional arrangements was discussed. This ended the first day. The second day was devoted to a presentation of the Paris Committee on Capacity Building, a market place and three themes: building sustainable domestic MRV systems, climate change mitigation scenario's and monitoring and tracking climate finance and financial flows.

2. The enhanced transparency framework after Katowice

This session provided an overview of the existing MRV arrangements under the Convention, as well as the new enhanced transparency framework established by the Paris Agreement and further defined by the Katowice Agreement approved in December 2018. Three presentations were given:

- The enhanced transparency framework after Katowice by Mr. Jigme from UNFCCC
- Submission status of the NCs, BURs and updated NDCs by Mr. Damiano Borgogno from UNDP

- [Transparency framework in Chile](#) by Mrs. Jenny Mager from Chile

Mr. Jigme explained a couple of changes from COP24 in Katowice for the enhanced transparency framework. The transparency framework builds upon the existing MRV arrangements. The existing MRV arrangements make it possible for Parties to do a 'dry run', meaning that the work on the current BUR is still valuable (before making a BTR). He also highlighted that enhancing institutional arrangements, political buy-in, access to support, ownership are still key success factors in the implementation of the enhanced transparency framework.

Mr. Damiano Borgogno gave an overview of the actual status of NCs, BURs and NDCs. Though Parties are still moving onwards, there is still much work to be done by most countries. Mr. Borgogno stressed the fact that the current pace of NCs, BURs and NDCs submissions is not high enough to achieve the aim laid down in the Paris Agreement.

Mrs. Mager presented the CBIT project in Chile, explaining the transparency framework in place. Chile has submitted 3 BURs and has built a permanent mechanism of voluntary reporting as a result of establishing strong institutional arrangements for national and international reporting. Chile will also host the next COP with ambition as the core subject.

3. The Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency

This session provided an overview on the implementation status of CBIT, as well as first-hand experience from developing countries and GEF agencies in implementing and supporting the CBIT.

Two presentations were given as a starter for the discussion on coordination for strengthening country support for the enhanced transparency framework:

- [Status of the CBIT](#) by Mrs. Chizuru Aoki from GEF
- [Kenya's CBIT project experience](#) by Mr. Peter Omeny from the Ministry of Environment and Forestry and presented by Mrs. Charity Nalyanya from Conservation International

Mrs. Aoki gave an overview of the current status of CBIT initiative, i.e. the number of projects approved (44 will be in implementation by the end of 2019), their geographical repartition, the programming priorities and resources invested. Some early findings suggest that countries do make significant progress on MRV and transparency by enhancing institutional arrangements and internal capacity, by linking MRV and transparency to the national development agenda. This progress is leading to new domestic policy tools and improved agency coordination, NDC implementation and trust and resource utilisation.

Ms. Nalyanya guided the meeting through the different components of the CBIT project in Kenya addressing the different levels at which capacity is being built. Ms. Nalyanya also pinpointed a couple of challenges such as the weak coordination between the GHG sectors, the limited and low-quality data available for modelling, the access to data from the private sector and the high turnover of staff. These challenges also point the way forward for the Government of Kenya (like strengthening human resources, structures, institutional capacities, coordination and the use of the available knowledge and documents).

4. The CBIT Global Coordination Platform

Purpose of the session was to have a renewed presentation of the CBIT platform and the possibilities it provides for coordination, learning opportunities and knowledge sharing among countries implementing CBIT

One presentation was given:

- [The CBIT platform and the results of the self-assessment questionnaires on transparency gaps](#) by Mrs. Ana Cardoso and Mr. Frederik Staun from UNEP-DTU

The presentation on the CBIT platform was done in an interactive way. To get themselves acquainted with the platform, participants were asked to do a couple of researches. This showed the possibilities of the platform and how participants could benefit from it. These benefits range from information, webinars and a yearly self-assessment. The latter is of high importance as it makes it possible to compare projects, capacities and needs between countries, themes and regions. Indeed, this also requires from the Country Focal Points to regularly bring up-to-date the country page in order to stay updated.

5. Solid institutional arrangements

This session stressed the importance of solid institutional arrangements as key to an enhanced transparency framework. Transparency is not the end goal but a means to reach the goal set out in the Paris agreement. For this session, Mr. Gutierrez, a former minister and negotiator in the climate talks, was invited to elaborate his views.

- [The importance of solid institutional arrangements](#) by Mr. Edgar Gutierrez from Costa Rica
- [Strengthening institutional arrangements through CBIT in North Macedonia](#) by Mrs. Ana Petrovska and Mrs. Natasa Markovska

In his presentation, Mr. Gutierrez discussed the way Costa Rica manages to be one of the only 7 countries in the world complying with the goal of the Paris Agreement. For that a solid institutional arrangement was built in Costa Rica based on political will, long term planning strategies, state policies and transparency. The latter is key in building trust between the partners. It also implies that knowledge and skills have to be retained within the system. With this at the back of the participant's minds, Mr. Gutierrez talked us through the steps Costa Rica has taken the past decades.

The ingredients necessary for a solid institutional arrangement were presented in the North Macedonian case with three distinct outcomes: strengthening of national institutions, training and tools for people and institutions and shifting from a project base to a continuous cycle for the data collection and processing.

Participants were then invited to work in five different subgroups. Three English-speaking, one Spanish-speaking and one French-speaking group were created to discuss the successes and barriers of their own national institutional arrangements. Many of the elements that were brought forward by Mr. Gutierrez came back in the smaller groups. In terms of barriers, the chronic shortage of resources was mentioned in all the groups. Also, sufficient coordination was still lacking in most countries, meaning intersectoral connections were not always made and the level of detail in the data was not sufficient. A third element was the lack of political will, which usually comes with resistance to transparency and lack of long-term planning. Despite this, there were definitely positive points to report too. A common understanding of the importance of MRV is emerging, collaboration between sectors is starting to take place, agreements (e.g. on data-sharing) are being agreed upon, committees are being set-up at different levels, and much more. These discussions lead to a couple of opportunities and learning points:

- It remains necessary to work actively on the will and buy-in at each level. Not only on political level, but also on policy, expert and stakeholder level.
- Working on the regulatory framework would help a long-term approach to setting up solid institutional arrangements
- Starting with short and easy examples is key in building the institutional arrangements. This also means being pro-active in preparing the BUR/BTR.

6. The Paris Committee on Capacity Building (PCCB) and CBIT

The PCCB co-chairs, Mrs. Chodor Marzena and Mrs. Rita Mishaan, presented the work done so far by the [Paris Committee on Capacity Building](#) and proposed potential collaboration opportunities between the Committee and the work implemented under CBIT.

Mrs. Marzena and Mrs. Mishaan proposed collaboration on three different levels:

- Analysing of information from CBIT projects relevant for the PCCB focus areas
- Strengthening of the PCCB workgroup with lessons from countries from CBIT projects
- Creating possible linkages between CBIT platform and CB portal.

7. Building sustainable domestic MRV systems

This session provided additional clarity on the main elements a domestic MRV system should have for tracking and reporting NDC achievement. Two presentations were given:

- [How to set up a domestic MRV system](#) by Mr. Justin Goodwin from Aether
- [Strengthening a national MRV system through CBIT](#) by Mrs. Anand Tsog

Mr. Goodwin first explained the importance of and the need for a domestic MRV system. Domestic MRV systems are based on sustained teams of experts and reliable data flows and an organised, flexible 'archive'. A functioning MRV system could then help to develop the right climate policies and to fulfil international obligations. Mr. Goodwin then delved into the elements necessary for the National system, the Monitoring, the Reporting and Verification parts. He ended his presentation with two recommendations. The first one being to give technical people a chance to become valued long-term teams of experts, analysts, advisors and negotiators. The second one was to develop outputs that would accelerate action and positive change.

In the following country presentation by Mrs. Anand Tsog these elements were elaborated for the AFOLU sector in Mongolia. Institutional arrangements for a national system are being put into place establishing a coordination mechanism and a monitoring and reporting roadmap. Next to this the capacity to assess and report emissions from the AFOLU sector is being strengthened, to design and monitor emission reduction activities and to monitor and report adaptation activities.

8. Market Place on support options and tools for transparency

During the Market Place participants could learn more about the support options and tools for transparency from eleven different organisations. In three different rounds participants were invited to join one of the tables where the organisations presented and explained their support.

These organisations were:

- Aether
- Climate Policy Institute

- Conservation International
- FAO
- Greenhouse Gas Management Institute
- PATPA
- Stockholm Environment Institute
- UNDP
- UNEP and UNEP-DTU
- WRI

9. Climate change mitigation scenario's

This session introduced how climate scenario analysis can help countries improve climate mitigation planning and transparency. Two presentations were given:

- [Climate Change Mitigation Scenario's: planning the future](#) by Mr. Charlie Heaps, Stockholm Environment Institute,
- [Enhancing climate mitigation scenario's through CBIT](#) by Mrs. Stefania D'Annibali from Argentina

Mr. Charlie Heaps started laying out the current climate trends thereby explaining that the existential threat climate change is posing requires us to think differently about the future and the way we plan. However, planning in developing countries is a huge challenge because of low quality data, limited human capacities, complex tooling, and more. The SEI provides a [scenario tool](#) in which it's possible to do a holistic planning useful for modelers but also for analysts and planners. Thus, it helps countries crafting their climate change response.

In Argentina the National Climate Change Response plan was drafted is a thorough process for which LEAP has also been used. A draft law on climate change should be ready to be presented by the end of the year. After that a climate change bill should be adopted, national plans should be made and implemented and the financing covered through carbon taxation and access to climate financing.

10. Monitoring and tracking climate finance and financial flows

This session introduced the main concept of climate finance, including why, how and what to track. Two presentation were given:

- [Monitoring and tracking climate finance](#) by Mrs. Chavi Meattle from the Climate Policy Initiative,
- [Strengthening the monitoring of climate finance into the enhanced transparency framework](#), by Mr. Bariz Mehdiyev from Azerbaijan

Mrs. Meattle first presented the landscape of the global climate finance, showing that vast majority of climate finance is spent domestically. Also, more work needs to be done in tracking climate finance because domestic climate expenditures from national and subnational level are not readily available. Data is not collected regularly and consistently across countries. Tracking national climate finance is not only important for the global landscape but also interesting for national purposes: identify finance gaps and opportunities, aligning investments to climate objectives and measure progress and show efficient and effective use to public finance to mobilise private investments. Mrs. Meattle then showed the different elements to take into consideration when tracking climate finance.

To close the presentations, Mr. Bariz Mehdiyev from Azerbaijan explained their CBIT project. One of the main institutional changes was setting up a committee for inter-ministerial cooperation thereby closing the gap of lack of coordination. Likewise, financial strategy is being developed outlining the means to identify sources of funding needed and to track financial support received.

11. Group work

In the final sessions the participants were asked to form 7 groups and discussing either the topic of MRV systems, climate change scenario's or tracking climate finance.

Four out of seven groups discussed the tracking of financial flows. A couple of issues emerged. Financial tracking can be very challenging, as it requires a stakeholder engagement especially from the private sector and accessing to the private sector data is not always easy. So, trust is needed there. Furthermore, indicators for climate versus non-climate financial flows should be developed as, at the moment, the distinction is not clear. This creates a risk for double counting. To be able to achieve this requires strong institutional arrangements with a more prominent role taken by the ministry of finance. And would also often require some changes in the national budget system to allow for tracking.

Three out of seven groups discussed the topic of climate change scenario's and the use of LEAP (some groups discussed more than one theme). There clearly is a need to develop capacity to be able to use LEAP and to link this to climate policies and international obligations (NDCs). This also means that there should be a realisation that this is a national

process and not an issue for one single ministry. It was also suggested it could be interesting to start a south-south cooperation around this topic.

And last but not least, three out of seven groups discussed the topic of MRV systems. A key take is that for transparency to work it is necessary to have working domestic MRV systems and policy makers should understand the importance of such systems. These MRV systems facilitate the performance and effectiveness of climate related activities at local level. The MRV systems should be set up through a bottom-up approach, thus also making it a capacity building and a coordination exercise.

Conclusions

The meeting was closed with a couple of thank-you notes by:

- Mrs. Roberta Ianna from the Ministry for the Environment, Land and Sea Protection, Italy,
- Mrs. Milena Gonzalez from the GEF
- Mr. Damiano Borgogno from the UNDP

Annex A- List of participants

The list of participants contains personal identification data and hence is not published.