



# ecbi Annual Report

2016-2017



ecbi

European Capacity Building Initiative

[www.eurocapacity.org](http://www.eurocapacity.org)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Message from the Director	2
Message from the Advisory Committee Co-Chairs	4
ecbi Activities	6
Fellowship Programme	6
2016 Bonn Seminar	6
2016 Oxford Fellowship and Seminar	9
Adaptation Fund Board Seminar on Resource Mobilisation and Potential Linkages with the GCF	13
Ad hoc Seminar on Enhanced Direct Access in Bangladesh	14
Dialogue on EDA in Nepal	15
2016 Finance Circle Meeting	15
Training	16
Regional Training Workshop for South and South East Asia	16
Regional Training Workshop for Francophone Africa	20
Regional Training Workshop for Anglophone Africa	23
Pre-COP Training Workshop	26
Publications and Policy Analysis Unit	29

Cover picture: *Detail from the Debating Room of the Oxford Union, a venue for the 2015 Fellowship and Seminar.*

## MESSAGE FROM THE DIRECTOR



**Benito Müller**

*Managing Director, Oxford Climate Policy*

This has been a busy year for all three branches of the ecbi: the Fellowship Programme, the Training and Support Programme, and the Publications and Policy Analysis Unit.

### **Publications and Policy Analysis Unit**

The ecbi Publications and Policy Analysis Unit (PPAU) has produced printed Pocket Guides on the Paris Agreement in English and in French; four policy briefs; one background paper; five discussion/options notes; two submissions; and five meeting reports this year.

Not surprisingly, the focus of most publications was on the Paris Agreement and its elements, notably its so-called 'ambition mechanism'. But we also published papers on 'old' topics, such as how to enhance multilateral climate finance and the role of smaller 'retail' funds in the financial mechanism of the multilateral climate change regime.

Notably, the PPAU branched out from its traditional activity to produce a Pocket Guide to the Paris Agreement, which proved to be very popular. It was translated into French which was very useful for our training workshop in West Africa, and for distribution during COP 22 in Marrakech, in November 2016.

### **Training & Support Programme**

The ecbi Training & Support Programme (TSP) continued its support for developing country negotiators to enable them to fully access and participate in the UNFCCC negotiations. Three regional and one pre-COP training workshop were organised for participants from Sub-Saharan Africa and South and South East Asia, as described more fully in the body of this report

The TSP also supported 4 bursary holders to attend UNFCCC negotiating sessions during the reporting period. Logistical support, as well as technical advice and capacity building were provided to each. In addition, they provided research support and advice to the LDC Technology Co-ordinator, and supported the LDC group generally on technology items.

The ecbi TSP also organised an informal networking event at the May 2016 Bonn Climate Change Conference for past workshop participants and partners who were attending the negotiations. Similarly, a reception was held following the ecbi pre-COP training workshop in Marrakech before COP22. These events allowed the alumni present to meet and exchange ideas.

### **Fellowship Programme**

Apart from the annual flagship events, the Bonn Seminar and the Oxford Fellowships and Seminar the ecbi Fellowship Programme again organised one-off Ad-hoc Seminars. The first one was in Dhaka, Bangladesh on the topic of Enhanced Direct Access to the Green Climate Fund. At COP 22 in Marrakesh, a Finance Circle Seminar was convened to discuss the role of the Adaptation Fund in the new financial architecture, an issue which proved to be highly controversial during the negotiations. This was followed in March 2017 by a Seminar for members of the Adaptation Fund Board on the topic of resource mobilization and a Seminar in Kathmandu again on GCF Enhanced Direct Access.

## MESSAGE FROM THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE CO-CHAIRS



Photo Courtesy: IISD



### Jan Cedergren and Tosi Mpanu-Mpanu

The idea of an Initiative to encourage leadership by, and understanding between, European and developing countries arose as a response to the US withdrawal from the Kyoto Protocol in 2001, under George W. Bush. More than a decade later, the European Capacity Building Initiative (ecbi) can claim concrete examples where this partnership has worked to resolve differences in the climate negotiations. The ecbi Fellowships have helped towards a constructive working relationship between Europe and developing countries, while the Training and Support Programme has worked to build the capacity of new developing country negotiators, and create a more level playing field in the negotiations. The Policy and Publications, meanwhile, has grown from playing a strong supportive role, to making ecbi publications instruments for collaboration and for capacity building.

Sadly, after the recent US elections we find ourselves in the same, if not worse, situation than the one that gave rise to the ecbi in the first place. The brief euphoria following the adoption of the Paris Agreement in 2015 has been replaced once again by the spectre of US withdrawal from the Agreement – or at the very least, non-compliance. US President Trump has already signed an executive order to roll back the climate policies put in place by his predecessor Barack Obama, to meet the limited ambition that the US signed on to in the Paris Agreement. Both ways, the non-participation of one of the world's biggest emitters will directly compromise the Paris goal of limiting global average temperature rise to 1.5 C. It will also have equally severe indirect impacts, both on mitigation and adaptation, if the US reneges on its climate finance promises.

One of the strengths of the ecbi in the past few years has been its ability to foresee impediments, and react quickly, to lead the way in finding solutions. The current crisis is no exception. Ecbi has already been working on ways to plug the gap in climate finance if the US withdraws, working innovatively to encourage sub-national contributions and crowdfunding. On the emissions front, it has already identified ways in which the limited ambition of the Paris Agreement can be strengthened and ratcheted up. While there is no substitute for strong action by the US and its allies, the ecbi is working on alternatives that might stop the collapse of the international negotiations.

Innovation does not stop only at finding ways to overcome differences in the negotiations in the ecbi. Over the years, they have also developed methods to encourage collaboration. For instance, the ecbi publications have become an instrument of collaboration, bringing together authors and contributors with differing opinions and presenting them with a forum to understand each other's concerns, and work towards constructive compromises where possible. They are also an instrument for capacity building, bringing global experts and lead negotiators together to work on background and policy papers.

This past year the ecbi's work on training new negotiators from developing countries particularly least developed countries, has continued in full swing thanks to financial support from International Climate Initiative (IKI) of the Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety (BMUB), Germany. With assured support over five years, ecbi can take on a more structured and sustained approach to its training and support activities. In the past, "junior" negotiators that trained by ecbi in regional and pre-COP workshops have risen not only to become senior negotiators in the process, but also leaders of regional groups and of UNFCCC bodies and committees, and ministers and envoys back home. These individuals are still part of ecbi's growing alumni, now capacity builders themselves, aiding the Initiative's efforts to train and mentor the next generation of negotiators.

The flexibility of ecbi's approach, and the Initiative's ability to react quickly, however, would not be possible without the flexibility and stability of support from its main donor, SIDA. On behalf of the growing ecbi community, we would like to take this opportunity to thank SIDA, IKI and other regular donors for their support. As the climate waters become choppy yet again, investing in a stronger relationship between the two main groups of countries that have not wavered in their commitment to address climate change becomes even more important.

## ECBI ACTIVITIES

### Fellowship Programme

The Fellowship Programme organised six events during the year: the Bonn Seminar; the Oxford Fellowships and Seminar; an ad hoc Seminar for the Adaptation Fund on Resource Mobilisation and Potential Linkages with the Green Climate Fund; a dialogue on Enhanced Direct Access (EDA) to the Green Climate Fund in Dhaka, Bangladesh; a workshop in Kathmandu on EDA; and a Finance Circle Meeting.

#### 2016 Bonn Seminar

The 2016 ecbi Bonn Seminar, supported by GIZ's Climate Policy Support Project on behalf of the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ), took place on 22 May 2016 in the Altes Rathaus, Bonn. It was attended by 34 participants, who discussed climate finance post-Paris, the ambition mechanism included in the Paris Agreement, and the Agreement's review mechanisms. The Seminar was opened by Gabriele Klingmüller, Mayor of Bonn.

#### Climate Finance

This session was chaired by Bo Kjellén, Co-Chair of the ecbi Advisory Committee. Presenting the issue, ecbi Director Benito Müller summarised the key decisions on finance in the Paris Agreement, which he said relate mainly to collecting information, developing accounting methodologies and institutional matters. He said the Paris Outcomes were weak compared to those of the last UN climate change agreement, from the 2010 Cancun climate conference. More ambitious elements put forward by some parties, such as the call by Least Developed Countries (LDCs) for a joint replenishment cycle for all entities serving the Financial Mechanism, had not made it into the Agreement.

Müller went on to describe the proposal for a joint replenishment. He said that a collective quantified goal for climate finance without a common understanding of how progress will be measured is a recipe for unhappiness on all sides. Instead, ways should be sought to genuinely enhance the predictability of public sector contributions to international climate finance, such as encouraging sub-national contributions to international climate finance. Facilitated by an ecbi initiative, the Quebec government had pledged CAD 6 million to the LDC Fund in Paris. Funds were also pledged by the city of Paris and three Belgian sub-nationals. Müller described efforts by ecbi to encourage contributions from other sub-national trading schemes in future, either as a share of emission allowance auction proceeds, or as a share of emission allowances that could then be auctioned by the Funds, as proposed by Norway in 2008. He said the ecbi was also exploring alternatives such as crowdfunding, and implementing a voluntary air passenger levy through the cooperation of airlines.

In the discussion that followed, participants discussed the usefulness of long-term financial goals and overall targets; the proposal for a replenishment cycle; the need for a common and mutually acceptable definition for climate finance; and ensuring predictability.

#### From Contribution Framework to Ambition Mechanism

This session was chaired by Achala Abeysinghe. Introducing the topic, Müller said the focus would be on how actions are sequenced under the Paris "Contribution Framework" for Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs), which would include "review cycles" and "communication and updating cycles". He noted lack of clarity on precisely how this sequencing will take place in the Agreement, saying the one thing that was certain was that there would be five-year "global stocktakes" starting from 2023. Müller then described an ecbi proposal to enhance ambition in NDCs, by ensuring that there is a moment in the cycle when all parties take stock of

progress at the same time in the context of the common overall goal, to compare like with like. He proposed harmonising the two tracks of the Paris Agreement to maximise the potential for ambition, simply by requesting, in 2025, all parties to communicate a 2035 NDC and update their 2030 NDC, and to do so every finance years thereafter.

In the discussion that followed, participants discussed the disadvantages of locking parties into different finance- and ten-year timeframes after they submitted their INDCs; common timeframes or at least common endpoints; and other elements essential to drive ambition.

*Coming [to the ecbi Fellowship] for the first time, I have to admit it was one of the most intellectually sophisticated discussions on finance experienced after Paris.*

**Przemyslaw Sobanski**

*Deputy Director of Air and Climate Protection, Poland*

### **Effective Review of Action and Support**

This session, on the three elements of the review mechanism in the Paris Agreement (the transparency framework, global stocktake and compliance mechanism) was chaired by Müller.

Abeyasinghe made the first presentation, on the transparency framework and compliance mechanism. She described the scope (action, support, implementation and achievement of NDCs), flexibility, principles, sources of input (based on existing regime, national reports and inventories to track progress), institutional arrangements (review by technical experts), and outputs. Asking if self-determination by countries, in light of capacities, would be sufficient, she noted that while flexibility could encourage participation, it could also limit the predictability and usefulness of the transparency framework going forward. Abeyasinghe said the frequency of reporting has been decided for all but LDCs and SIDS, but the frequency of review has not been decided. In terms of the scope of the review on action and support, she said they could focus on particular issue areas and themes, and asked if group reviews were an option. In terms of support and facilitation, Abeyasinghe said the Agreement does not clarify how support will be delivered, and to whom. She noted the need to identify barriers to implementation, such as gaps in funding and the capacity to track implementation.

On the compliance mechanism, Abeyasinghe said the scope was not very clear, as to whether only compliance with the legally binding elements would be sought, or the entire Agreement (including decisions). She said while “facilitating implementation” could focus on the non-legally binding elements, “promoting compliance” could focus on binding obligations. Abeyasinghe noted that there were no legally binding obligations to review action and support. She asked what would trigger a case of non-compliance and hence intervention.

During the discussion, participants discussed the most important elements of the review mechanism agreed in Paris; barriers to implementation and how they will be addressed; and the “forward-looking” nature of the compliance mechanism.



## Enhancing the scope and equity of stocktakes

Christian Holz from the Climate Equity Reference Project spoke on this topic, discussing proposals made before Paris; the ambition ratchet in the Paris Outcome; and suggestions on strengthening the ratchet and reviews.

Holz noted broad support for individual party reviews; the inclusion of elements of equity and fairness in the review process; and a strong ex ante review process for mitigation, adaptation and means of implementation, at least at the collective level. He noted that the stocktake was limited to collective ambition on mitigation, adaptation and means of implementation, rather than individual parties. The facilitative dialogue, meanwhile, would only be limited to the long-term goal, though at least means of implementation should be part of it. He proposed making a strong link between the 2018 dialogue and the 2023 stocktake by applying the 2023 modalities to the 2018 dialogue, and said the facilitative dialogue should also trigger some review and resubmit activities. Holz said certainty about the scale, delivery and scope of public climate finance; and a robust review mechanism at the level of individual parties (not just the aggregate) were still missing in the Agreement.

On the need for an equity assessment, Holz said climate change is a common problem, which can only be solved when all major actors see others doing their best to contribute fairly. He said civil society could take the assessment discussion beyond the limited space that the parties were willing to agree. Meanwhile, the space for formal review must be expanded as much as possible, for instance by applying the relatively expansive terms of reference of the Article 14 stocktake to the 2018 facilitative dialogue.

In the discussion that followed, participants discussed the need for governments to justify what constitutes a “fair share”; the need to include private sector resources; and making sure there is enough information available for discussions on equity to take place.

### The Long-Term View

The Seminar ended with a short presentation by Kjellén, on a long-term view of the climate negotiations. Kjellén reflected on the role of the Copenhagen Accord in shaping the process which ultimately led to the Paris Agreement; and the importance of the ongoing energy revolution.

A more detailed report of the Bonn Seminar is available [here](#).

*The discussions on sequencing contributions during the Fellowships and Seminar are the best example on how useful the meeting was, since reading the Paris Agreement gives an idea that does not necessarily reflect the positions and understanding of different Parties or groups of Parties. I feel better prepared to help developing a more realistic position for AILAC countries.*

**Alejandra Lopez Carbajal**  
Head, AILAC Support Unit

## 2016 Oxford Fellowship and Seminar

The 2016 ecbi Seminar took place at the Oxford Union on 1-2 September 2016, following the Fellows Colloquium from 29-21 August 2016. It was attended by 19 participants from developing countries, and 16 participants from Europe. Representatives of the current and future presidency of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), including Aziz Mekouar, Ambassador for the Multilateral Negotiations for the 22nd Conference of Parties (COP 22) in Marrakech in November 2016, participated in the Seminar.

Participants also included lead negotiators from several developing and European countries; the Chairs of the Least Developed Country (LDC) Group, African Group of Negotiators and of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA); members of the Green Climate Fund (GCF) Board; and representatives from the European Commission (see Annex 1).

Two formal dinners were held during the Seminar, on 31 August 2016 and 1 September 2016. At the dinner on 31 August, Ambassador Jan Cedergrén from Sweden was honoured for his role in the inclusion of “enhanced direct access” (EDA) as a modality of the GCF, and presented with a framed photograph taken during the GCF Board meeting in Barbados, in October 2014, where the Board decision on EDA was taken.

At the dinner on 1 September, Ambassador Mekouar addressed the participants, noting the role of the ecbi Seminar in promoting frank and honest conversations on the optimal, most ambitious way to operationalise the Paris Agreement. “When it comes to the mechanics of the operationalisation of the Paris Agreement, the design of the rule book, the steel that will strengthen the structure of the Paris Agreement, it is very important that we get off to a good start in Marrakech,” he said.

The seminar included sessions on six elements of the 2015 Paris Agreement, including: the sequencing of Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs); the global stocktake: transparency of action and support: finance; market-based approaches; and entry into force.

### Sequencing of Nationally Determined Contributions

Müller presented the discussions of the fellows on sequencing NDCs to kick off the discussion. Among other things, he noted that significant differences of opinion emerged during the Fellows Colloquium preceding the Seminar in the understanding of the phrase “a new NDC” in §23 of the Paris Agreement. While some understood this to mean an advance communication of entirely new 2025-2030 NDCs, others understood it as updating the 2020-2025 “intended” NDCs that have already been communicated. He emphasised the need for more commonality there is between what Parties are expected to do, to enhance ambition.

In the discussion that followed, participants discussed the length of NDC cycles; the need for convergence between the two tracks before 2020; and the need for synchronising finance. Differences arose between participants on interpretations of the Agreement, on whether NDC cycles should be synchronised post-2020, and the advantages and disadvantages of having five and ten year cycles.

*At the first reading, the Paris Agreement seemed very straightforward. However, it was amazing how many interpretations are possible on issues such as the global stocktake, length of NDCs, etc. This [Fellowship Colloquium and Seminar] provided an opportunity to understand these different interpretations ....All the presentations in the Fellowship component were very educational.*

**Carlos Fuller**  
SBSTA Chair

## **Global Stocktake**

This session started with a presentation by Xolisa Ngwadla, which covered finance elements of the global stocktake: context; key concepts; basic structure; inputs; process and outputs; and key issues for Marrakech.

Ngwadla noted that the Paris Agreement does not at all address the modalities of the stocktake, and noted the need to accommodate elements such as technology, capacity building and loss and damage, which do not currently have an explicit undertaking for Parties to communicate information that can be used in the stocktake. He described options for the basic structure of a stocktake; possible inputs; guidance on how the equity consideration can be operationalised; the information countries should provide in their NDCs and other communications; the process and timing of the stocktake; and key issues for the next COP in Marrakech. Ngwadla also highlighted elements that needed further clarity for consideration by the global stocktake, such as the international cooperation initiatives; and the length of the implementation period.

In the discussion that followed, participants discussed, inter alia, the time taken by the 2013-2015 review; benchmarks for the “backward looking” and “forward looking” elements of the stocktake; national stocktakes and the extent to which the international process could provide guidance to national processes; finance for NDCs; whether the stocktake should have a “forward-looking” element; whether the provision for 10-year NDCs should apply only to the first period; and the importance of making the stocktake useful in provoking thinking and ambition.

## **Transparency Of Action And Support**

This session was initiated by a presentation by Abeysinghe, who described the possible scope and coverage of the transparency framework; level of detail required and the frequency of reporting; flexibility provisions; input; institutional arrangements; and outputs. On the scope of reporting, she said this could vary on the basis of the type of NDC a country has submitted, including the type of mitigation or adaptation elements included. Among the key issues identified by the Fellows with regard to the transparency framework, she listed the modalities of the review; how to ensure the sovereignty of Parties while avoiding an undue burden; reporting requirements for adaptation; transparency of support; and support for transparency.

Among other factors for consideration for the review, Abeysinghe listed: time constraints; financial and human resources; the expertise of the existing roster of experts (focused on mitigation and inventories, with no expertise on adaptation and means of implementation); and sufficient support for the experts and the reviews.

On transparency of support elements, Abeysinghe discussed accounting modalities for support received; work on how to report non-financial support provided and received; and consideration of how developing countries can report on the use, impact and estimated results of the support received. On support for transparency, she said it should not only be limited to the Capacity Building Initiative on Transparency (CBIT), or only to mitigation, or to transparency of action. She said further discussion is needed on how to operationalise flexibility; how to build on the existing reporting and review system; how to operationalise transparency of support (including support received); and the modalities for review and multilateral considerations.

In the discussion that followed, participants discussed the importance of projections; the need for more downward accountability; support for CBIT; expectations from the transparency framework; and a graduation system or self-determination to operationalise flexibility; the advantages of in-country reviews; and the timetable for the discussions.

*To me the discussion on the global stocktake was particularly useful. I gained a deeper understanding of colleagues' positions.*

**Nicole Wilke**

*EU Lead Negotiator and Head, Division of International Climate Policy, Germany*

## **Finance**

Müller presented on the Paris outcomes on finance, comparing them to the Cancun outcomes, and addressing the way forward to collective quantified goals, public sector finance, and enhancing the coherence and complementarity of institutional arrangements for global climate finance.

He proposed moving away from setting targets without first agreeing on how to measure them; and described two “unconventional” sources of finance that ecbi was working on: shares of proceeds from sub-national emissions trading schemes; and crowdfunding. On institutional arrangements for finance,

Müller highlighted the need to enhance coherence and complementarity among the existing operating entities. He described an ecbi proposal to establish a joint replenishment for all the entities at the same time, and emphasised the importance of providing principal guidance to the financial mechanism, to ensure coherence and complementarity. Müller also proposed distinct roles of each of the operating entities, and described the Enhanced Direct Access (EDA) modality of the GCF.

In the discussion that followed, participants discussed the future role of the LDC Fund and Adaptation Fund and Special Climate Change Fund; principal guidance to the Global Environment Facility (GEF) in the context of its next replenishment in 2017; a more constructive approach to innovative sources and the possible role of the Standing Committee on Finance (SCF); the GCF’s business model and its role as a “wholesale” Fund; and engaging the private sector.

*It was an opportunity to explain and explore each other's views and provide practical, amicable solutions without taking into account regional or specific Party concerns, but rather collective pragmatic views of negotiators.*

**Anonymous**

## **Market-Based Approaches**

This session was initiated with a presentation by José Miguez on behalf of the Fellows. Miguez discussed the three mechanisms of the Paris Agreement (internationally transferred mitigation outcomes or ITMOs towards NDCs; the sustainable development mechanism or SDM; and non-market mechanisms or NMMs). He noted the voluntary nature of ITMOs; the role of SDM; and uncertainty on how the NMMs will function. He highlighted confusion over the concepts of emission reductions, emissions levels and units in the Paris Agreement. He called for consideration of: rules for how to establish assigned units; how to treat sub-national

emissions trading schemes; how to deal with hot air; how to set up an International Transaction Log; and whether the share of proceeds provision can also be applied to ITMOs. He listed several options under NMMs, including regulatory measures like efficiency of engines; standards for cars; pricing like Tobin tax; instruments like Green Quantitative Easing; international cooperation measures, for instance on regional biofuels or markets for renewables; forest conservation initiatives; and phasing out of hydrofluorocarbons.

In the discussion that followed, participants discussed the development of markets outside the framework of the Paris Agreement, including at the sub-national level; the role of International Civil Aviation Organization; the new context for market mechanisms, different from the Kyoto mechanisms; designing the markets to benefit developing countries that were left out of the Kyoto mechanisms; existing trading systems as models; additionality; hot air; robust tracking; verification under the transparency framework; and the potential of NMMs in protecting oceans as carbon sinks. Miguez concluded the session by noting that Article 6 is the only international aspect of the Paris Agreement – everything else is nationally determined.

### **Entry Into Force**

The final session, on entry into force of the Paris Agreement, was initiated with a presentation by Kishan Kumarsingh. He said the Agreement looked set to enter into force much earlier than anticipated, and this had resulted in some complications, as the work of the APA would not be completed in time. He described four options if the Agreement entered into force before the work of the APA is complete, listing the suspension of the CMA and work continuing under either the APA or COP as the preferred options. However, he said, the suspension of CMA1 should be limited to two one-year periods with specific progress objectives and deliverables; be based on fairness, inclusiveness and the principle of “no free-riding”; and not provide perverse incentives for late ratification. He said priority should then be given to developing the NDC cycles to facilitate confidence and mitigation planning by Parties, along with relevant Articles (such as those on transparency, finance and compliance). Adaptation elements under Article 7 should also be addressed for balance, along with any other legally binding provisions.

In the discussion that followed, participants discussed the dangers of a specific timeline to suspend CMA1; whether APA will have to be wrapped up before CMA convenes; inclusivity; the EU’s ratification timeframe; and the impact of Brexit on ratification by the EU.

A more detailed report of the 2016 Oxford Fellowship and Seminar is available [here](#).

*The exchanges helped get a sense of where we are and what we all expect on the implementation of several key elements of the Paris agreement.*

**Paul Watkinson**  
Chief Negotiator, France

## **Adaptation Fund Board Seminar on Resource Mobilisation and Potential Linkages with the GCF**

On the evening of 14 March 2017, the ecbi convened a seminar on resource mobilisation for the Adaptation Fund at La Redoute in Bad Godesberg, Germany. The seminar was co-hosted by Michael Kracht, incoming Chair of the Adaptation Fund Board, and Benito Müller, ecbi director. It was attended by members and alternates of the Adaptation Fund Board, as well as representatives of the Adaptation Fund Secretariat and Trustee.

After a welcome by the incoming Chair, Müller gave an introductory presentation on “Mobilising Resources for the Adaptation Fund”, discussing three problems facing the resource mobilisation efforts of the Adaptation Fund:

- the drying up of the original core funding source, the share of proceeds from the Clean Development Mechanism;
- the danger of voluntary donations being diverted to the GCF to make up for the shortfall, expected after the renegeing by the new US administration; and
- administrative overheads involved in national contributions to small funds.

Müller proposed that the Adaptation Fund receive core funding from the GCF, under programmatic access. In this context, he proposed that the Board, as soon as possible, request the Secretariat and the Trustee to prepare all the necessary documents necessary for a Board decision to speedily launch an accreditation process with the GCF, if it desired, after the issue of whether the Adaptation Fund “may serve the Paris Agreement” is resolved at the next climate conference in November 2017.

*I think [the Oxford Seminar] is a good opportunity to have a quick understanding of all the main issues under discussion with very well chosen and high quality Fellows... the current format is very good.*

**Jose Miguez**

*Director of Policies on Climate Change, Brazil*

The second presentation of the evening on “Potential linkages between the AF and the GCF” was given by David Eckstein, Climate Finance and Investments Policy Advisor, Germanwatch. This was followed by a presentation entitled “You’ve got the Power! Accrediting the AF to the GCF” by David Rossati, Lecturer at the Law Salford Business School, UK. Rossati explained the independent legal opinion he provided for a recent OCP/ecbi Discussion Note “Time to Decide! The Adaptation Fund after Marrakech”, regarding whether the Adaptation Fund Board has the power to initiate accreditation with the GCF, and he discussed some issues arising from the recent update of the Adaptation Fund Secretariat paper on Potential Linkages Between the Fund and the Green Climate Fund.

In the final presentation of the evening, Müller introduced the “Oxford Crowdfunding for Adaptation Initiative” that the ecbi team has initiated, to tap into socially responsible corporate air travel. Müller estimated that if properly marketed, the scheme could provide the Adaptation Fund with US\$ 125 million per annum.

Excerpt from a letter of appreciation from the AFB Chair

*I am grateful for your overall contributions during the event including your excellent presentation on the role of the Adaptation Fund in the new climate finance regime and its relationship with the GCF, as well as your facilitation of the lively discussion among the Board members and other participants. The discussion provided the Board with an excellent opportunity for brainstorming in a confidential setting before the formal discussion took place during the 29h meeting of the Board on 16-17 March. I am certain that the dinner seminar helped to inspire members' views and laid important foundation for future deliberations and decisions by the Board. Your insights and suggestions are very useful as we develop a strategy for the COP23/CMP13/CMA1.2 in Bonn as well as for our deliberations on the future of the Adaptation Fund. I would also like to use this opportunity to express my gratitude for your dedicated support and commitment with regard to the "Oxford Crowdfunding for Adaptation Initiative".*

**Michael Kracht**  
Chair of the Adaptation Fund Board

### **Ad hoc Seminar on Enhanced Direct Access in Bangladesh**

Over 20 key stakeholders in climate finance from Bangladesh attended an ecbi dinner discussion hosted by ecbi member International Centre for Climate Change and Development, in Dhaka on 13 April 2016. Participants included Mr. Kamal Uddin Ahmed, Secretary of the Ministry of Environment and Forests, Bangladesh, and member of the GCF Board; the Joint Secretary and Additional Secretary from the Economic Relations Division (ERD) of the Ministry of Finance – the National Designated Authority (NDA) for Bangladesh; and private and public sector representatives.

As guest speaker, Anju Sharma, Head of ecbi Publications and Policy Analysis Unit, presented the state of affairs with regards to the GCF's EDA modality.

A lively discussion followed. While there was a reasonable level of knowledge and understanding among most of the key actors within government (as well as to some extent in the private sector) on the GCF, there was also a sense of frustration among the first applicants for "National Implementing Entity" (NIE) status with the length and difficulties of the process of accreditation. Two organizations currently undergoing the accreditation process – the Palli Karma-Sahayak Foundation (PKSF) and the Infrastructure Development Company Limited (IDCOL), highlighted the problems they were facing, including having to change their auditing procedures, and change nationally accepted practices.

ERD is encouraging six public sector entities to apply for NIE status, while encouraging private sector companies to approach the Private Sector Facility (PSF) of the GCF. Projects are also being put forward through "multilateral implementing entities" (MIEs). As a result, a project submitted through the Local Government Engineering Department (LGED) on Climate Resilient Infrastructure Mainstreaming (CRIM) through KfW, an MIE, was one of the first 8 projects to be approved by the GCF Board.

There was a clear consensus at the meeting that the GCF Board should be asked to consider priority accreditation for least developed countries, and also for those entities that would like to submit EDA project proposals. Such entities would need to have the right sort of in-country channels and networks to allow for a devolution of funding decision to the local level – traditional NIEs and MIEs may not fit this role. Participants

also highlighted the need for capacity building and readiness support for procedures such as applying for accreditation to the GCF, to facilitate their access to funds.

It was highlighted that a longer-term strategy would include getting good projects ready for submission as soon as NIE status is achieved, including for EDA projects; and encouraging private sector entities to apply for accreditation under the PSF of the GCF.

Participants also highlighted the importance of demonstrating good systems of transparency and robust systems of accountability (both by government agencies as well as third parties and even citizens).

*The presentation on finance opened my mind on the issues and will help me in Marrakesh in November 2016.... I enjoyed so much the sharing with the Fellows.*

**Anonymous**

### **Dialogue on EDA in Nepal**

A dialogue with stakeholders on Enhanced Direct Access (EDA) was organised in Kathmandu, Nepal, by Oxford Climate Policy, Prakriti Research Centre and Helvetas on 24 March 2017. The three organisations are exploring the potential of EDA in Nepal, in collaboration with BothEnds in the Netherlands.

Anju Sharma made a presentation on the EDA modality, explaining its potential for sub-national devolution, and highlighting the Local Adaptation Plans of Action (LAPAs) in Nepal as the kind of activities that should be funded under the modality. During the discussion that followed, stakeholders discussed, among other things, the difficulties faced by LDCs like Nepal in getting accreditation for National Implementing Entities with the Green Climate Fund; the hurdles for NGOs to access GCF funding; and the different approaches taken by various proponents of the LAPA approach in Nepal.

### **2016 Finance Circle Meeting**

An ecbi Finance Circle meeting took place on 8 November 2016, during the 22nd Conference of Parties (COP 22) to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change. It was attended by 15 negotiators from developed and developing countries.

ecbi director Benito Müller made a presentation on the Adaptation Fund, saying its current lack of resources posed a grave danger to its future sustainability. With resources from the Clean Development Mechanism having dried up, it is now entirely dependent on voluntary bilateral contributions for its resources. He pointed to the need for the COP serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP) to respond to the request for guidance by the Fund's Board on whether the Board could consider accreditation with the Green Climate Fund (GCF). Müller argued that through such accreditation, the Adaptation Fund could become a "boutique" or "retail" outlet specialising on adaptation finance, allowing the GCF to remain a "wholesale" fund, and to function at scale without administrative bottlenecks. He pointed to Adaptation Fund's capacity to deal with nano and micro projects.

Müller said ensuring resources for the Adaptation Fund was even more important than the pending decision on whether the Fund should serve under the COP serving as the Meeting of Parties under the Paris Agreement



(CMA). The decision to let it serve under the CMA could bring in resources later, in the form of “shares of proceeds” from the trading mechanisms of the Paris Agreement, but there was a great deal of uncertainty on whether the mechanisms would yield sufficient resources, or indeed whether the shares of proceeds would be earmarked for the Adaptation Fund. In any case, he said, by the time the mechanisms are functional, the Adaptation Fund could already be rendered non-functional due to the lack of resources. Reminding participants that the Adaptation Board had specifically sought guidance from the CMP, he said not providing this guidance would also send a signal.

Participants then discussed the time it would take to get accreditation from the GCF; the suitability of the Adaptation Fund to get accredited; the existing fund raising strategy of the Adaptation Fund; and possible impacts by the share of proceeds from the CMA market mechanisms.

*The overall informal setting of the meeting was conducive to frank and open conversations. The visits, dinners, and functions created a positive mood and allowed people to discuss informally and agree to consider positions that go beyond the usual red lines.... Seamless arrangements, great organisation.... Excellent initiative. It should continue.*

**Anonymous**

## TRAINING AND SUPPORT PROGRAMME

The Training and Support Programme (T&SP) conducted one Pre-COP Training Workshop and three regional workshops, in addition to funding bursaries. ecbi supported four bursary holders to attend UNFCCC negotiating sessions during the reporting period. Logistical support, as well as technical advice and capacity building were provided to representatives from Mozambique, Angola, Nepal and Afghanistan.

### Training

#### **Regional Training Workshop for South and South East Asia**

The 2016 ecbi Regional Training Workshop for South and South East Asia took place on 14 & 15 April 2016 in Dhaka Bangladesh. It was attended by 16 government representatives from the region, and opened by Saleemul Huq, Director of the International Centre for Climate Change and Development.

*For me it is very simple. They give me the knowledge to raise my voice. And the opportunity to be a part of all this.*

**Female training participant and bursary holder**

## **Introduction to the Climate Negotiations**

Sharma presented on the history and politics of the climate negotiations. She noted that the opposition to global goal setting by some countries predates the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), and was voiced during the early days in the 1980's, soon after global discussions on climate change started.

Sharma said the principle of “common but differentiated principles” (CBDR) that was included in the UNFCCC was already seen as a dilution of the “polluter pays principle” by many developing countries. She described the politics leading up to the Berlin Mandate, and the adoption of the 1997 Kyoto Protocol.

She also highlighted early disagreements on the governance of climate finance, and described the genesis of the GEF, LDCE, SCCF, and Adaptation Fund.

## **Introduction to the Paris Agreement**

Abeyasinghe introduced participants to the Paris Agreement. She highlighted the temperature goal to keep global temperature rise well below 2°C above pre-industrial level, while pursuing efforts to limit it to 1.5°C; the aim to reach global peaking of emissions as soon as possible; the “nationally determined contributions” (NDCs) that describe national intentions related to mitigation, adaptation and means of implementation; the adaptation goal that links adaptation responses to the temperature goal, and adaptation communications; the commitment for developed countries to provide financial resources to developing countries, starting with a commitment of US\$100 billion annually until 2025; the emphasis on capacity building for (LDCs and small island developing states (SIDS); the transparency framework to enhance the transparency of action and support; and the global stocktakes every finance years, from 2023, to assess collective progress towards achieving the purpose of the Agreement and its long-term goals. Abeyasinghe also introduced the Ad hoc Working Group on the Paris Agreement (APA), formed to work on the modalities and procedures of implementing the Paris Agreement. In the discussion that followed, participants discussed market mechanisms under the new Agreement, and its withdrawal provisions, which state that a mandatory compliance period of three years applies to parties who ratify the Agreement.

## **Decisions Relating to the Pre-2020 Period**

Ziaul Haque from the Department of Environment, Bangladesh, emphasised the importance of pre-2020 action in reducing emissions to the levels needed to keep global average temperature rise within 2°C. At the Paris Conference, he said pre-2020 action decisions relate to: a continued technical examination process on mitigation; a technical examination process on adaptation; regular technical committee meetings on both mitigation and adaptation; the appointment of two “high level champions”; coordination of annual technical papers and corresponding reports for policymakers; annual high-level events during 2016 to 2020 for “new or strengthened” voluntary initiatives; facilitating dialogues to “enhance possible mitigation efforts by enhancing provision and mobilization of support and enabling environments”; urging developed countries to scale up financial support, and provide a concrete roadmap to achieve the climate finance goal of US\$100 billion annually by 2020; encouraging operating entities of the UNFCCC’s funding mechanism to engage in Technical Expert Meetings, and facilitate progress in implementation of policies, practices and actions; and welcoming non-party stakeholders to scale up climate actions and increase engagements.

He said a Technical Expert Meetings would be held in May in November 2016, and a Technical Examination Process would be launched for Adaptation.

## **Mitigation**

Subhi Barakat from the Legal Response Initiatives presented on mitigation. He described the Paris Agreement's mitigation provisions, including, inter alia, the NDCs; review and transparency measures; impact of response measures; and obstacles for developing countries.

## **Adaptation And Loss & Damage**

Hafij Khan, Director of the Centre for Climate Justice, Bangladesh, presented on adaptation and loss and damage. He noted adaptation could be both proactive and reactive. He listed five main approaches to shape policy responses for adaptation: observation; assessment of impacts from climate change and vulnerability; planning; implementation; and monitoring and evaluation. He described the National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPAs); the Nairobi Work Programme (NWP); the LDC Programme; the Cancun Adaptation Framework (CAF); the National Adaptation Plans (NAPs); and the LDC Expert Group (LEG).

On loss and damage, Khan described the work of the Warsaw International Mechanism (WIM) for Loss and Damage associated with Climate Change Impacts; and Article 8 of the Paris Agreement.

*When I came back to my country, I did a presentation for my colleagues in the Environmental Protection Agency. I translated all the documents in to our languages (we have two), and the Minister asked me how I did, and what the programme was.*

**Female training participant and bursary holder**

## **Terminology Game**

Abeysinghe lead a game session aimed at enhancing the knowledge of participants of the technical terminology in the climate negotiations. The game involved a multiple-choice test of legal language used in the negotiations under the UNFCCC. The results were scored by peers, and winners were awarded prizes on the final day of the workshop.

## **Legal Issues**

Abeysinghe presented on legal issues under the UNFCCC, describing, inter alia, the Paris Agreement's ratification process; compliance mechanism; entry into force provisions; and grounds for withdrawal.

## **Transparency and the Global Stocktake**

Dorji Tshewang, National Environment Commission, Bhutan, presented on this topic. He described the transparency framework and global stocktake of the Paris Agreement; flexibility for LDCs; and key issues surrounding the procedures, methodologies, guidance, and reporting requirements.

## **Discussion and Feedback from Day 1**

Participants said they had benefitted from the sessions on the history and science of the process and the explanation of how key principles were agreed, and the sessions on the Paris Agreement. They noted that the

participation of women in the workshop and sessions was particularly encouraging, as they are often excluded in national discussions.

### **Mock Drafting Session**

The second day started with a mock negotiating session. Participants were presented with a hypothetical situation, where US \$80 billion has been left to the UNFCCC, and asked to negotiate how the money should be divided for mitigation, adaptation, technology transfer, capacity building and transparency. This exercise helped participants understand diverse country priorities; the importance of influencing group positions; and the need for compromising to reach agreement.

### **Practical Negotiation Skills**

Barakat introduced participants to the rules of procedure under the UNFCCC in this session, describing the role of different bodies, and pointing participants to useful sources of information.

### **Finance**

Sharma presented on this session, describing the evolution of the provisions for finance under the UNFCCC. She introduced participants to the modalities of the GCF, in particular EDA. She then described the key finance provisions of the Paris Agreement, including on sources, MRV, and governance arrangements. Participants discussed possible options for streamlining the finance architecture in the aftermath of the Paris Agreement.

### **Capacity Building**

Huq presented on capacity building, emphasising the importance of establishing long-term systems. He noted that Article 11 of the Paris Agreement emphasises the need for appropriate institutional arrangements, which will be discussed by the CMA1. He also highlighted the need for collaborations between developing countries.

### **Technology Development and Transfer**

Brianna Craft, IIED, presented on this session. She helped participants understand the meaning of the terms “technology” and “transfer”; and described the Paris provisions, including the work of the Technology Mechanism; financial support; the “periodic assessment” of the effectiveness of the Technology Mechanism; and the work of the subsidiary bodies in elaborating the technology framework. In the discussion that followed, participants stressed the context-specific needs for technology, and the importance of adapting technology to local conditions.

### **Mock Negotiating Session**

The workshop ended with another mock negotiating session, where 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 in legal terminology.

A more detailed report of the training workshop is available [here](#).

## **Regional Training Workshop for Francophone Africa**

The 2016 ecbi Training and Support Programme Workshop for Francophone Africa took place on 15 and 16 June 2016 in Dakar, Senegal. The workshop, organised in collaboration with ecbi's regional partner Energie Environnement Développement (ENDA), was attended by over 30 negotiators from the region. Souleymane Diallo, Director of the Cabinet of the Minister of Environment and Sustainable development, welcomed participants on behalf of the Minister of Environment. He highlighted the need for capacity to understand climate change and its impacts, and to negotiate effectively. He noted the increased role that developing countries are playing in the negotiations as their negotiating capacity improves.

### **Introduction to the Climate Negotiations**

Madeleine Diouf, Head of the Climate Change Division of the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development in Senegal, presented a history of the climate negotiations, and described the key provisions of the Paris Agreement. She noted that a 1.2°C to 1.9°C rise by 2050 will increase the number of undernourished people in Africa by between 25 and 95%. The current cost to curb these impacts for African countries is estimated between US\$ 7-15 billion per year.

Diouf listed key priorities for developing countries, including support to establish GHG inventories, address their vulnerability, strengthen their research, and set up networks at the sub-regional and regional levels to share experiences and develop country-specific approaches, especially in important sectors such as forestry, agriculture, animal husbandry and waste.

### **Introduction to the Paris Agreement**

Abeyasinghe presented an overall analysis of the Paris Agreement, and listed its key provisions. She described the three main pillars of the Agreement: legal rigour; participation and effectiveness. She then described the key provisions of the Agreement, and governance elements.

In her concluding remarks, Abeyasinghe noted that the Agreement was not perfect – there was no actual commitment for countries to fulfil their NDCs; the 1.5°C target was viewed mainly as an aspirational goal; setting a new target for climate finance was postponed to 2025; and the methodologies, guidance and procedures for several mechanisms still had to be agreed. However, she said there was still a chance that ambition could be raised.

### **Mitigation**

Subhi Barakat from Legal Response Initiative (LRI) defined mitigation for the participants, and described the mitigation related provisions of the UNFCCC, Kyoto Protocol, and the Paris Agreement. He noted that the features of the NDCs will have to be further developed by the APA. Barakat provided participants a list of further reading and useful links related to mitigation, including the mitigation section of the UNFCCC website; a LRI document listing next steps; a UNFCCC document on tasks arising from the Paris Agreement; and a roadmap from Paris.

### **Acronyms in the Negotiations Game**

During this session, Brianna Craft, IIED, led a game to familiarise participants with common acronyms in the UNFCCC negotiations, such as CMA, SBSTA, APA, MRV, Biennial Update Reports (BURs), Paris Committee on

Capacity Building (PCCB), Technical Expert Meeting (TEM), common but differentiated responsibilities, and relative capabilities (CBDRRC) and Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP).

### **Adaptation and Loss and Damage**

Mamadou Honadia, head of the delegation from Burkina Faso and former Vice Chair of the Adaptation Fund Board, provided participants with a background to the adaptation negotiations, including the provisions of the UNFCCC and the Paris Agreement; the Nairobi Work Programme (NWP); the Cancun Adaptation Framework; the Adaptation Committee; and preparation of NAPs. He described the Warsaw International Mechanism (WIM) on Loss and Damage associated with climate change impacts and Article 8 of the Paris Agreement. Noting that LDCs were still seeking fund for adaptation projects, he proposed consideration of mitigation programmes, which attract more funding, that also provide adaptation co-benefits.

In the discussion that followed, participants discussed the need for greater clarity on definitions of the global goal for adaptation and loss and damage; challenges with the quantification of vulnerability reduction and resilience building; and the role of NAPs.

### **Legal Issues**

Abeyasinghe presented on legal issues related to the Paris Agreement, describing the nature of legally binding agreement; the subtle differences in language that could signal legal-bindingness or otherwise; the provisions for enforcement (compliance, monitoring, rights of action, dispute settlement); entry into force provisions; and withdrawal. She also described the next steps that should take place in-country, including starting the ratification process for the Agreement; engaging in the rule making process under the APA and other bodies; and ratifying the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol.

### **Transparency and the Global Stocktake**

Barakat described the transparency and global stocktake provisions of the Paris Agreement, and the linkages between the two. He said rules and guidelines will have to be developed by the APA for transparency, while the establishment and operation of the CBIT will be undertaken by the GEF. On next steps for the stocktake, he said the APA will now identify sources of input and develop modalities, while SBSTA will work on how the IPCC assessment reports can inform the global stocktake. The COP, meanwhile, will convene the 2018 facilitative dialogue.

Listing sources of information on transparency, Barakat pointed participants to the UNFCCC website; a LRI document listing next steps; and a UNFCCC document on tasks arising from the Paris Agreement.

### **Negotiation Game**

The second day started with a game, where participants were presented with a hypothetical situation, where they were asked to negotiate how to spend US\$ 80 billion between mitigation, adaptation, technology development and transfer, capacity building and transparency. At the end of the negotiation session, Abeyasinghe highlighted the importance of being proactive, building partnerships and seeking consensus. When seeking compromises, Müller noted the importance of not asking for too little, as its likely to be negotiated down, but also not asking for so much that it is completely dismissed.

## Practical Negotiating Skills

Honadia presented on negotiating skills, and preparing for the international negotiations, with a focus on LDCs. He described the role of international negotiations, and of negotiators and non-government actors. He described the role and timings of different Group coordination meetings; the formal numbering of official documents; the importance of team work and interaction with other members of the Group/ other Groups, including sharing of information; the give and take required; and advance preparation is critical. He concluded by reminding participants that a lot was at stake in the climate negotiations, as millions in LDCs are vulnerable and risk falling into further poverty.

In the discussion that followed, participants discussed situations where country positions do not align with group positions; the challenge of capacity for small delegations; and the role on NGOs in the negotiations. Honadia noted that countries have the right to defend their positions, and to note their objections to group positions. He said NGOs could play an important role in informing negotiators, and in lobbying other countries and groups.

Pa Ousman Jarju, Minister of Environment, Climate Change, Water, Wildlife and Fisheries in the Gambia, advised participants on the procedure to influence group positions in West Africa. Müller emphasised the need to be succinct while speaking at the UNFCCC meetings.

*Before the training I was more confused and had a lack of information about this process. So the training was very useful for me and I'm still learning by reading all the documents provided by IIED.*

**Female training participant**

## Climate Finance

Müller presented a brief history of the climate finance negotiations; the problem of the low volume of overall climate finance that is available and possible solutions; the problems of having a long-term collective goal for climate finance without clear definitions; and the governance of climate finance.

## Capacity Building

Penda Kante, Division of Climate Change of the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development, Senegal, noted the lack of a structured implementation work programme or other institutional arrangements for capacity building under the UNFCCC. She described the capacity-building related mandates of the Adaptation Committee, Standing Committee on Finance, Technology Executive Committee and the Consultative Group of Experts, saying capacity building would, at best, remain a secondary priority for them.

Noting that a Paris Committee on Capacity Building (PCCB) had been created in Paris, she recommended ensuring that: financial resources for implementing capacity building activities are available and flowing through the financial mechanism of the Convention; a pre-2020 work programme on enhancing capacity in developing countries is agreed; and indicators are established to monitor and review the effectiveness of efforts. She also called for a full-fledged mechanism consisting of a policy wing and an implementation wing,

with clarity on its relationship with other bodies working on capacity building. She invited participants to consider what strategies are needed to build national capacity, and how they could negotiate more efficiently for these strategies to find acceptance in the UNFCCC.

### **Mock Negotiating Session**

During this mock negotiating 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 in legal terminology.

### **Technology Development and Transfer**

Craft helped participants define what technology transfer means, and presented a history of technology development and transfer under the UNFCCC. Following on from the Paris Agreement, she said parties now must consider what the long-term vision means in practical terms; how progress will be measured; what guidance should be provided to the Technology Mechanism; what information is needed to periodically assess the effectiveness and adequacy of support to the Technology Mechanism; and how to initiate and encourage links between the Technology Mechanism and the Financial Mechanism. Craft concluded by listing key documents, including the Paris Agreement; the UNFCCC website and TT:CLEAR.

### **Concluding Session**

In the final session, participants broke into two groups to discuss their national priorities for the upcoming COP negotiations (if they plan to attend), and to develop a strategy for engaging together in the negotiations.

A more detailed report can be found [here](#).

### **Regional Training Workshop for Anglophone Africa**

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

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

Huq introduced the aim of ecbi workshop as promoting a more level playing field between government delegations in the UNFCCC negotiations, by providing training and support to developing countries. He added that ecbi also aims to facilitate and establish mutual understanding and trust between both European and developing countries, and amongst developing countries in the context of South-South cooperation.



## **Introduction to the UNFCCC Negotiations**

Sharma presented a history of the climate negotiations, and how some of the key positions of different groups developed over time. On the road to Paris, she said the main controversies were on differentiation and the application of CBDR principle; limiting global average temperature rise to 1.5°C; giving equal importance to adaptation and means of implementation (finance, technology transfer, capacity building), including providing a roadmap to the pledge of US\$ 100 billion by 2020; and loss and damage. She then described the elements of the Paris Agreement, followed by a description of the current political landscape of the negotiations.

## **Introduction to the Paris Agreement**

Sharma then presented in more detail on the key elements of the Paris Agreement, and pointed to a recent Pocket Guide to the Paris Agreement produced by ecbi (also available in French). She noted that critical elements relating to each of the substantive elements still need to be decided, including: guidance for NDCs; trading rules; recognising adaptation efforts; tracking finance; institutional arrangements for capacity building; methodologies to prepare emission inventories; how the transparency framework will work; how the global stocktake will work; and how the compliance mechanism will work.

## **Adaptation and Loss And Damage**

Richard Muyungi, Acting Director of Environment, Division of Environment, Vice President's Office, Tanzania, highlighted the need for country driven, gender responsive and transparent adaptation action, and the importance of means of implementation. He described efforts under WIM to address loss and damage. He concluded by encouraging participants to engage fully in the negotiations, and providing inputs for the upcoming COP.

*I only started my climate change work officially last January, and they were sending me to be a negotiations by May, so the workshops were the first time I got to delve into the negotiations and climate change. The workshop gave me confidence, a thorough understanding of what all this was about.*

**Female training participant**

## **Participant Research Session**

To familiarise participants with UNFCCC terminology, Craft asked groups to research the meaning of acronyms or technical terminologies, such as Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA), Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA), Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI), Ad-hoc Working Group for the Paris Agreement (APA), Measuring, Reporting and Verification (MRV), INDCs, and National Adaptation Plans (NAPs). The results were consolidated and discussed at the end of the session.

## **Practical Negotiation Skills**

Stella Gama, Department of Forestry, Malawi, got participants thinking about what “negotiating” means, and how they can be used to resolve points of difference, to gain advantage for an individual or collective, or craft

outcomes to satisfy various interests. She advised participants to register for the free Harvard School of Law Program on Negotiation to improve their negotiation skills.

### **Mitigation in the Paris Agreement**

Pascale Bird, Legal Response Initiative (LRI), presented on this topic. She provided a definition of mitigation and presented a brief history under the UNFCCC. Describing the Paris outcomes on mitigation, she noted flexibility for LDCs and SIDs. Noting that several elements related to mitigation still needed to be worked out, particularly for tracking progress, she described provisions calling on Parties to conserve and enhance emissions sinks and reservoirs, and reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD+), and the three mechanisms: cooperative approaches to transfer mitigation outcomes; a mechanism to mitigate emissions and support sustainable development; and a framework for non-market mechanisms to support sustainable development.

She listed next steps for the international process to operationalise the Paris Agreement. And presented the useful links for participants.

### **Mock Negotiating Session**

Craft asked participants to distribute US\$ 80 billion to mitigation, adaptation, loss and damage, technology development and transfer, transparency and capacity building, and explain the reasons why. A second session on mock negotiations, focusing on forming group positions, took place on the morning of the second day; and a third was held on the afternoon of the second day.

### **Nationally Determined Contributions**

Bird described a brief history of NDCs, and the related provisions of the Paris Agreement. She noted that while the Paris Agreement recognises the need for support for developing countries to implement their NDCs, this is not a precondition for implementation. She said the APA provisional agenda includes elements relating to providing further guidance on mitigation and adaptation elements of the NDCs. She listed next steps, including further guidance on features of NDCs and information to facilitate clarity and transparency; further guidance for accounting of NDCs; common timeframes; and guidance on adjustment of NDCs by Parties. Finally, she provided a list of useful links.

### **Terminology in the Negotiations**

Craft led a game to introduce participants to the UNFCCC terminology in this session.

### **Means of Implementation**

This session included three presentations: one on finance by Sharma, a second on capacity building by Huq, and a third on technology transfer by Gama. Sharma presented a brief history of finance in the climate context, and described the institutional arrangements. She presented the main finance elements of the Paris Outcome, and described an ecbi proposal for a joint replenishment for the financial mechanism, included in an earlier draft of the Paris Agreement, that was later dropped. She said this proposal presented by LDCs would have helped overcome a critical question that causes a great deal of distrust in the negotiations: what can count as climate finance? Finally, Sharma spoke of ways to increase the predictability of climate finance, describing two

“unconventional sources” – encouraging a share of proceeds from sub-national emissions trading schemes; and crowdfunding from individuals, such as corporate air passengers.

In the presentation on capacity building, Huq called for a more sustained effort for capacity building, such as universities in LDCs. He described the Paris Committee on Capacity Building.

In her presentation on technology, Gama noted its importance to meet the goals of the UNFCCC, Kyoto Protocol and Paris Agreement. She provided a brief history, and then went on to describe how technology was dealt with under the Paris Agreement, saying the Agreement anchors and strengthens the Technology Mechanism; and establishes a technology framework to provide overarching guidance to the Mechanism. Among next steps, she listed the need to elaborate the framework, saying countries have been requested to submit their views on its purpose, contents, features and characteristics to SBSTA.

### **Gender in the UNFCCC Negotiations**

Gama engaged participants in understanding the word “gender”, and thinking about its application in the climate context.

### **Mock Negotiations**

Participants were given a country to represent, and asked to negotiate a piece of text on the modalities for the submission and periodic update of adaptation communications.

### **Review Mechanisms in the Paris Agreement**

Bird described the Paris Agreement’s enhanced transparency framework; five-yearly global stocktake; and mechanism to facilitate implementation and promote compliance in this section.

### **Group Work**

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

### **Feedback**

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

### **Concluding Session**

Huq emphasised the importance of competent negotiators to defend developing country interests. He noted that it takes years to become an experienced negotiator, and participants should not be afraid to ask questions.

A more detailed report can be found [here](#).

*With the training, I know how to organise our delegation to participate in the negotiations, and provide a point of view on the draft of the decision text.*

## Pre-COP Training Workshop

The 2016 ecbi Pre-COP Workshop took place on 5 November 2016, at the Radisson Blu Hotel in Marrakech. It was attended by 19 negotiators from developing countries.

Abeysinghe welcomed participants. Ayman Cherkaoui, on behalf of the Moroccan COP 22 Presidency, expressed his appreciation for the ecbi workshop, saying it made a real difference in the capacity of negotiators to defend their national positions. Highlighting ambition as a necessity rather than as a choice, he called for constructive, transformational and positive negotiations, aimed at demonstrating concrete results. A round of introductions followed a brief welcome by Müller.

### Priorities for Marrakech

Honadia, an experienced negotiator from Burkina Faso, thanked ecbi for its successful efforts to build the capacity of LDCs in particular. He then described the process in Marrakech, saying six meetings will take place: COP 22; SBI; SBSTA; APA; the COP serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP); and CMA 1. He highlighted issues of concern in each of these meetings for LDCs. A discussion followed among participants.

*When I met colleagues from other countries [in the training], and they showed their continued follow up and dedication, I was really encouraged. I thought that these people like me, they are engaging so much - and the knowledge that I have already had, and that I gained from the negotiations and the training, I can utilise at national level in my country.*

**Female training participant**

### Introduction to the COP 22 Agendas

Ambassador Ian Fry from Tuvalu introduced participants to the provisional and annotated agendas on the UNFCCC website, and described key elements for developing countries on the agenda of each of the six meetings. He advised participants to prioritise a few issues that align with their national interests to follow, saying it will not be possible for one person to follow all these issues.

Subhi Barakat, IIED, facilitated a discussion on reconciling divergent views on mitigation and adaptation communications; the definition of a contact group; how differentiation can manifest itself in implementation of the Paris Agreement; and why an ad hoc group was not formed for the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol.

### A Guide to the UNFCCC Negotiations

This was an open question and answer session facilitated by Janna Tenzing, IIED, where participants were encouraged to ask questions for clarification, and answered by Honadia based on his experience.

### Loss and Damage

Ambassador Fry described the negotiations on loss and damage in Paris, and the work of the WIM. He said WIM had not been able to complete its work programme, however, and will report back in Marrakech to say

so. It was due to be reviewed, but it is not clear whether it would be preferable to have a short review, even if it doesn't say much; or to have a more structured review later. He listed several questions for COP 22 to address on loss and damage. In the discussion that followed, participants discussed the need for a solidarity fund to help countries to deal with losses; the role of insurance; the UN Secretary General's Climate Resilience Initiative — Anticipate, Absorb, Reshape; and the SCF forum on loss and damage.

### **Capacity Building**

Huq presented a history of capacity building in the climate context, described the Paris provisions, and proposed a way ahead on capacity building in Marrakech.

### **Mock Negotiating Session**

Ambassador Fry described the hierarchy of meetings within the UNFCCC. A “mock negotiating session” followed, where participants were asked to negotiate draft text on the PCCB. Each participant chose a country to represent, and argued on its behalf. A feedback session took place afterwards, where the more experienced negotiators highlighted the need for more coordination between regional and country groupings; the importance of letting a group spokesperson first articulate a group position and then to express support for this position; the importance of being active rather than reactive; and the importance of coming prepared to the negotiations. At the end of the session, participants commented on the realistic nature of the mock negotiation, with the domination of developed countries, and expressed their appreciation of the mock session as a learning process.

### **Finance**

Müller discussed ways to enhance complementarity within the financial mechanism of the UNFCCC; and the predictability of climate finance. He introduced the EDA modality of the GCF, saying the GCF should mainly play the role of a “wholesaler” that deals with medium and large projects while devolving decision making even further at the national level, right down to the local level; and outsourcing at the multilateral level, for instance to the LDCF and Adaptation Fund. He then described efforts by ecbi to seek funds from sub-national entities to widen the scope of who could be approached for multilateral funding. On issues related to finance at COP 22, Müller highlighted long-term finance, the SCF report, and the review of the SCF.

### **Paris Agreement Implementation, Pending Issues**

Barakat, IIED, discussed the Paris work programme; procedural issues such as entry into force of the Paris Agreement; substantive issues such as flexibility and differentiation; thematic areas of the Paris rulebook; and misconceptions around compliance. He highlighted the challenge of achieving balance in the work programme: for instance, a lot of Parties will focus on transparency of action, but will also need to consider transparency of support. Participants discussed the decision to open CMA on 15 November, and low emissions development strategies.

A more detailed report can be found [here](#).

*ecbi bursary has enhanced my negotiation skills by the exposing me to and enabling me to participate in the UNFCCC negotiation process. I have got knowledge of technical process of UNFCCC negotiation, as well as the theoretical concept of climate change.*

**Female training participant and Bursary holder**

## Publications and Policy Analysis Unit

This has been a busy year for PPAU, with the production of printed Pocket Guides on the Paris Agreement in English and in French; four policy briefs; one background paper; five discussion/options notes; two submissions; and five meeting reports.

*The [Oxford Seminar] was very useful, in particular due to the presentation of papers and the new ideas they contained. Discussions were rich and informal.*

**Julio Cordano**

Following the adoption of the Paris Agreement, we started the year with some quite reflection from a voice of experience, in a [discussion note](#) by Bo Kjellén. At the same time, we set about assessing the level of ambition in the Agreement, and how this can be further improved, in another discussion note on [A Dynamic Ambition Mechanism for the Paris Agreement](#). The latter was produced in a highly interactive manner – drafts were sent to negotiators from several regions and countries, and their interpretations were carefully considered. It became clear during the production of this note that even negotiators who were responsible for the drafting of the Agreement had different interpretations of the same text. The process of producing this note was also an attempt at reconciling or at least narrowing those differences, to the extent possible. Another “options note” on this issue followed in October 2016, on [The Paris Ambition Mechanism: Review and Communication Cycles](#).

it was felt that a Guide on the agreement would be very useful for our constituency – both senior and junior negotiators. We therefore produced the [Pocket Guide to the Paris Agreement](#). This guide, which was published in April 2016, when people were still trying to understand what was in the Agreement, proved to be very popular. We received requests for hard copies from around the world, and from a range of stakeholders – from negotiators of course, but also from bilateral agencies, universities and civil society organisations. The Guide was also accessible on the internet. At the request of the Chair of the LDC Group, the Guide was also translated to [French](#). This was extremely useful for our training workshop in West Africa, and for distribution during COP 22 in Marrakech, in November 2016. The popularity of the Guide has led us to consider a thematic series on key issues in the negotiations. This series will be initiated in the 2017-2018 period.

For our policy briefs, we were advised by our Advisory Committee to tackle the “new” issues that had arisen in the Paris Agreement. So we produced policy briefs on: [The Global Stocktake under the Paris Agreement](#); [Transparency of Action and Support under the Paris Agreement](#); and [From Contribution Framework to Ambition Mechanism: How to enhance mitigation ambition under the Paris Agreement](#). To ensure these addressed the questions that negotiators want answered, we timed the production of the first draft with the 2016 ecbi Fellowship in Oxford. The drafts were presented to the Fellows and European participants, and discussed before being finalised. This approach also worked well, ensuring wide ownership and use of the policy briefs.

“Old” issues, however, still had to remain a priority. The question of raising sufficient climate finance remained a problem and was not addressed in the Paris Agreement. We proposed [Two Unconventional Options to Enhance Multilateral Climate Finance](#) in another policy brief. This brief was used extensively to advocate for sub-national contributions of shares of proceeds on the one hand; and for crowdfunding for the Adaptation

Fund on the other. Both options are under consideration by relevant decision-makers, and we hope they will meet with some measure of success.

On the issue of climate finance architecture, a priority this year has been to influence the discussion on the future of the LDC Fund (LDCF), and the Adaptation Fund. In a discussion note on the [LDCF Business Model](#) we proposed that the Fund could play a vital role in building the capacity of LDCs to access international climate finance. The note accompanied efforts by the LDC Group, at COP 22 in Marrakech, to give written guidance to the Global Environment Facility, which manages the LDCF, to ensure this focus. Efforts were met with some amount of success, and the issue is still on the table.

The future of the Adaptation Fund appeared to be uncertain in the aftermath of the Paris Agreement, which only stated that this Fund “may” serve the Agreement. The fund is also threatened by a lack of resources, as its main source, a share of proceeds from the Clean Development Mechanism, has dried up. Both these issues were considered in a discussion note on [The Adaptation Fund after Marrakech](#).

Also regarding climate finance architecture, the modalities and procedures of the Green Climate Fund (GCF), which are still in the process of being defined, remained a top priority. Two submissions were made to the GCF Board in this regard: one on the [GCF Accreditations process](#), and another on [Devolved Programmatic Access](#).

With the renewal of the regional training workshops for junior negotiators, we also produced one background paper this year, on [Capacity Building under the Paris Agreement](#).

Finally, a number of meeting reports were produced by PPAU this year, for: the [ecbi Bonn Seminar](#); the [Regional Training Workshop in Francophone Africa](#); the [2016 Oxford Fellowship and Seminar](#); the [Regional Training Workshop for Anglophone Africa](#); the [Regional Training Workshop for South and Southeast Asia](#); and a [Pre-COP Training Workshop](#). These reports sought to provide a record for participants on the many interesting discussions at these meetings, and to reach a broader audience. The outreach mechanisms that have been most successful for ecbi policy analysis include presentations to senior negotiators at events organized by ecbi and others; distribution of the Policy Briefs at these events; and the inclusion of negotiators in the process of writing / reviewing the report to ensure better ownership.