



Partnership on Transparency  
in the Paris Agreement

## Annual Partnership Retreat (APR) 2017

*'The Enhanced Transparency Framework, Ambition  
and National Implementation'*

Kakheti, Georgia, 5 – 11 September 2017





## Contents

<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
The Partnership on Transparency in the Paris Agreement.....	1
Annual Partnership Retreat (APR) .....	1
Participants .....	3
<b>Topics, schedule and methods .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Major findings .....</b>	<b>6</b>
Status of international negotiations, with a special focus on the Enhanced Transparency Framework (ETF).....	6
Leadership and climate ambition: Pathways and gaps .....	6
Global Stocktake and Enhanced Transparency Framework (EFT) .....	8
NDCs: Features, I-CTU and accounting .....	8
Flexibility and capacity .....	10
Domestic MRV systems .....	10
MPGs for tracking progress under Article 4 and for GHG inventories .....	11
Adaptation communications and MPGs for transparency and adaptation.....	12
MPGs for transparency of support.....	14
MPGs for verification.....	15
<b>Stimuli for the Partnership.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Annex I – List of participants .....</b>	<b>17</b>

Authors of report: Konstantine Magradze, GEPPA; Gonçalo Cavalheiro, CAOS; Hanna Reuter, GIZ

All photos: © GIZ / Giorgi Gogichaishvili





## Introduction

### The Partnership on Transparency in the Paris Agreement

In May 2010, during the Petersberg Climate Dialogue, three nations – South Africa, South Korea and Germany – launched the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV. Their aim: to promote ambitious climate action through policy dialogue and practitioner-based exchanges. This alliance has since been renamed the 'Partnership on Transparency in the Paris Agreement' – a move that reflects the 2015 launch of the Paris Agreement's transparency mechanism which is tasked with facilitating and catalysing the implementation of the Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs). The overarching goal is to keep the increase in average global temperature well below 2 °C above pre-industrial levels, and to even limit it to 1.5 °C, while steadily raising NDC targets.

Today the Partnership is addressing the new challenges posed by the transparency rules while continuing to provide support for practical exchanges between developing and industrialised countries and to serve as a discussion forum for topics tabled in climate negotiations.

### Annual Partnership Retreat (APR)

The Annual Partnership Retreat is one of the Partnership's key formats for supporting negotiations on ambitious climate action. This meeting brings together a mix of negotiators and practitioners from developing and developed countries from around the globe. The retreats provide approximately 35-50 professionals with a space to discuss some of the most pressing issues tabled at the negotiations and give them an opportunity to find out about the latest inputs by specialists in the field. Lasting seven days, this event enables participants to learn from each other in an open, non-committing and collaborative atmosphere.

Below is an overview of past retreats<sup>1</sup>:

- 15 to 23 October 2012, Berlin, Germany: 'MRV – Today, tomorrow and the future'
- 20-28 August 2013, Hanoi, Viet Nam: 'Tracking progress and MRV for greenhouse gas emission reductions'
- 3-10 September 2014, Punta Cana, Dominican Republic: 'Intended Nationally Determined Contributions: Preparation and implementation'

---

<sup>1</sup> Information on all retreats can be found here: [www.transparency-partnership.net/activities-database](http://www.transparency-partnership.net/activities-database).







- 9 to 15 September 2015, Cuernavaca, Mexico: 'Transparency and implementation – Future proof rules for climate policy'
- 31 August to 7 September 2016, Cape Town, South Africa: 'From MRV to an Enhanced Transparency Framework in the context of NDC implementation'

This year's Annual Partnership Retreat (APR) focused on the Enhanced Transparency Framework (ETF) under the new climate regime. Participants discussed the transparency arrangements under the Paris Agreement and exchanged their experiences with national level implementation of transparency systems. The agenda underscored the links between negotiations within the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and national implementation and vice-versa. Consequently, negotiators and domestic policy practitioners took part.



The 2017 APR specifically aimed to:

- Build up trust among UNFCCC Parties by providing space for an open exchange of viewpoints and experiences
- Analyse the latest developments in UNFCCC negotiations and assess their ramifications for national policy implementation





- Provide a platform for an open exchange of viewpoints and in-country experiences with the national implementation of the Paris Agreement
- Share and disseminate best implementation practices and transparency systems, including for mitigation, adaptation and support and, consequently, foster increased ambition
- Feed lessons learned back into UNFCCC negotiations

Organised by the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH on behalf of the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety (BMUB), the Annual Partnership Retreat was hosted by the Georgian Ministry of Environment Protection and Natural Resources (MOE).

## Participants

The APR 2017 achieved the highest level of attendance to date, welcoming some 39 participants from the following 23 countries: Argentina, Australia, Chile, China, Colombia, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Mexico, Norway, Republic of Korea, Singapore, South Africa, Sweden, UK, USA and Viet Nam, plus the EU Commission. Also engaged in retreat activities were a total of 10 experts representing the following organisations: World Resources Institute (WRI), Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), UNEP DTU Partnership, UNFCCC Secretariat, Initiative for Climate Action Transparency (ICAT), International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), Environmental Resources Management (ERM).

## Topics, schedule and methods

During the intense six-day workshop, all inputs, discussions and group work centred on the following topics:

- Status of international negotiations, focusing on the Enhanced Transparency Framework (ETF)
- Leadership and climate ambition: Pathways and gaps
- Global Stocktake and Enhanced Transparency Framework
- NDCs: Features, I-CTU and accounting
- Flexibility and capacity
- MPGs for GHG inventory
- MPGs for tracking progress under Article 4
- Adaptation communication and MPGs for adaptation action
- MPGs for support
- MPGs for verification
- Domestic MRV systems





- Support options, tools and knowledge products for enhancing capacity for transparency

On Friday, 11 September, the German Embassy and the Georgian Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources Protection hosted a lunch reception where participants and other guests from Georgia's climate community were able to learn about various climate initiatives Georgia is implementing at different levels.<sup>2</sup> Solomon Pavliashvili, First Deputy Minister of the MoENR, and Monika Lenhard, Deputy Head of Mission in the German Embassy, opened the reception. In his speech, Deputy Minister Pavliashvili highlighted the challenges Georgia is currently facing regarding climate change and reiterated the government's commitment to climate action as well as to the Partnership on Transparency in the Paris Agreement. Ms Lenhard emphasised the close nature of cooperation between the German and Georgian governments in a number of areas, especially climate change.

---

<sup>2</sup> Lasha Nakashidze (Project Manager of Green Cities, Georgia): [Integrated Sustainable Mobility Plan of Batumi](#)

Vakhtang Berishvili (Project Manager at UNDP): [Promotion of biomass production and utilisation in Georgia](#)





	<b>Tuesday 5th</b>	<b>Wednesday 6th</b>	<b>Thursday 7th</b>	<b>Friday 8th</b>	<b>Saturday 9th</b>	<b>Sunday 10th</b>	<b>Monday 11th</b>
<b>Morning</b>	Welcome, introduction, recap from last year	Taking stock of NDCs, ambition, link with the ETF  GST and FD – inputs and outputs	Accounting  Adaptation communica- tions: link with the ETF and the NDCs	Lunch	MPG for emissions and mitigation action	MPGs for support	Support options for transparency- related capacity building  Wrap-up & closure
<b>After- noon</b>	Update on the negotiations, international outlook  Leadership	NDC features, information for CTU and accounting	Differentiation and flexibility  Benefits of domestic MRV systems	Field trip	MPGs for adaptation	MPGs for verification, link to compliance	Departure

The agenda for the 2017 APR addressed the key aspects of transparency as discussed under the Paris Agreement. This also included opportunities for in-depth exchange among the participants. The methodology underpinning the agenda required all participants to actively engage in exchanges about their experiences, challenges and solutions.

The retreat was designed as a combination of expert inputs, presentations of country experience, group work and facilitated discussions. The speakers' inputs were intended as the starting point for facilitated and open discussions among the participants. Particularly dynamic and productive, group work activities generated a great many new ideas and experiences, leading to significant value creation for the retreat.

**See the following link for all presentations by experts, country representatives and speakers as well as a number of photos from the retreat:** <https://www.transparency-partnership.net/6th-annual-partnership-retreat>





## Major findings

### Status of international negotiations, with a special focus on the Enhanced Transparency Framework (ETF)

Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) are the key mechanism for achieving the goals of the Paris Agreement (PA). NDC negotiations mostly focus on defining their features, on providing information to foster clarity, transparency and understanding (CTU) and on accounting. There is also a need for greater clarity on the scope of NDCs (mitigation only or full scope), their timeframe and on how apply of differentiation.

Key questions relating to the ETF in negotiations concern the topic of differentiation and whether there will be integrated or separate MPGs for different topics. Furthermore, negotiations also debate the specific form the 'sunset provisions'<sup>3</sup> should take. Negotiations have already made some headway with technical issues and have also stipulated headings and sub-headings for each of the thematic areas:

- GHG inventories
- Progress towards implementing and achieving NDCs
- Adaptation
- Financial, technology transfer and capacity-building support provided
- Financial, technology transfer and capacity-building support received
- Technical review
- Multilateral facilitative consideration of progress

These MPGs need to build on existing provisions and thus capitalise on experience with existing MRV processes. They also need to accommodate flexibility in a balanced and dynamic way, taking into account different starting points and the different pace of progress amongst the various Parties.

Related presentation:

- Ruta Bubniene (UNFCCC Secretariat): [Status of international negotiations related to NDCs and the Enhanced Transparency Framework](#)

### Leadership and climate ambition: Pathways and gaps

A presentation on the findings for the upcoming UNEP Gap Report confirmed that **current collective ambition is not enough** to meet the 2°C goal, let alone the 1.5°C target. Without greater ambition, the projected global average temperature increase will be in the range of <2.9 - 3.4°C by the end of the century. New emission scenarios show that more stringent and urgent emission

<sup>3</sup> The term 'sunset provisions' relates to the transition between the current framework for measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) and the ETF.





reductions are needed than previously estimated. The **emission pathways** for 1.5 and 2° C scenarios are similar – it is just the pace and timeframe that differ. However, enhanced action needs to start now for both scenarios.

The main milestones are:

- Achieving a peak GHG emissions by 2030 at the latest, although most scenarios indicate a need to peak by 2020
- Net zero emissions by 2050 (for 1.5°C)
- Negative emissions before 2100



Against this backdrop, participants reflected on the concept of leadership and its role in closing the global emissions gap. Generally speaking, they stressed that modern **climate leadership** has to be about pushing boundaries and that it is critical to lead by action. In a changing global landscape, leadership can be observed at different levels (international, regional,

national, local) and involve various actors. Below are some of the different types of leadership identified:

- a) In the negotiations:
  - Moral leadership
  - Ambitious long-term visions
  - Bridge-makers / pacifiers
- b) In domestic policy: Delivering on international commitments and beyond
- c) On different aspects: Mitigation and adaptation (as a whole or in specific sectors), support, transparency
- d) Sub-national and non-state actors

**Enhanced transparency is a critical driver** for global climate leadership, raising ambition and reducing the emission gap as stipulated in the PA's global long-term goal. Its main functions are:

- Analyse national and global trends, efforts and ambition more accurately
- Improve policy scenarios and analysis
- Build trust
- Identify policies and options for enhancing ambition and
- Provide a platform for actors to showcase their ambition

However, the retreat's discussions made it clear that many countries still face significant **challenges with regard to gathering and processing the data** needed for NDC operationalisation and review. One major challenge is that the institutional arrangements for transparency must be improved over time. In many countries, for example, line ministries, sub-national entities or the private



sector do not have any reporting obligations they have to comply with. This has a significant impact on the availability and quality of data and constitutes a barrier to leadership.

Related presentations:

- Anne Olhoff (UNEP DTU): [The link between transparency and ambition / UNEP Gap Report](#)
- Anne Olhoff (UNEP DTU): Understanding the global goal – its meaning, paths and timeframes (not published)
- Subhi Barakat (IIED): [A new world order: searching for climate leadership](#)
- Wafa' Daibes, (Ministry of Environment, Jordan): [Key methodological transparency issues in preparing and operationalising the NDC](#)

## Global Stocktake and Enhanced Transparency Framework (ETF)

It was highlighted that the Global Stocktake (GST), is understood as a process and not as a single event. Therefore, improvements can be made over time through a learning process by both, the Parties and the UNFCCC Secretariat. There are three main aspects related to the GST currently under discussion in the negotiations: **inputs, process and outcomes**. Since the ETF constitutes an important input to the GST, the retreat repeatedly highlighted the need to design MPGs in a way that **ensures the ETF generates the information the GST requires** while concomitantly facilitating aggregation. Generating aggregatable data is a major challenge however, especially when it comes to transparency in adaptation. Participants highlighted that, it is highly probable that the data used in the first GST will not be entirely complete. ETF evolution should therefore take account of experience and lessons learnt with GST.

The Facilitative Dialogue (FD) could function as a blueprint for GST design. A suggestion was made to divide the FD into a technical phase, starting in May 2018, and a political phase during COP 24.

Related presentation:

- Ruta Bubniene (UNFCCC Secretariat): [The inputs and outcomes of Facilitative Dialogue \(FD\) and the Global Stocktake \(GST\): The link to the ETF and to enhanced nationally determined ambition](#)

## NDCs: Features, I-CTU and accounting

There are still some unanswered questions concerning the concepts and **boundaries of NDC features** and also regarding **information for clarity, transparency and understanding (CTU)**. Work on further guidance is





progressing however.<sup>4</sup> Participants acknowledged the importance of guidance, but stated it should not pose an additional burden or reduce flexibility.

Participants mentioned that for economy-wide NDCs and NDCs with GHG metrics, inventories are key components of accounting. In turn, the development of guidance for non-economy-wide, non-absolute emission reduction targets was considered more challenging, as there is less experience with such target types.

Participants reflected on the various crucial functions that **accounting** and accounting rules fulfil nationally and internationally. They recommended harnessing existing approaches established under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol for the purpose of developing further guidance. However, it must be remembered that the PA also poses some new accounting challenges. Progress- tracking should always relate to the NDC submitted. Thus, **applicability to NDC type** is a key principle of accounting guidance. Participants suggested integrating an accounting balance into the NDC, i.e. a structured summary of quantifiable information in a tabular format. Reflecting on experiences with similar tabular formats (e.g. tables in existing (I)NDCs, tabular formats in BURs or reporting under the Montreal Protocol), they agreed that this would facilitate CTU. At the same time, there were others who mentioned the fact that such a format might not fit the purpose of some NDCs or the political process under which they were developed. In this context it was explained that it is important to ensure the national political support for the respective NDC and that this could be achieved through national stakeholder consultations. Here, the details of the NDC would be presented and discussed in order to decide what it is relevant for a particular country.



Related presentations and country inputs:

- Gonçalo Cavalheiro (CAOS Sustentabilidade): [NDC features and information for clarity, transparency and understanding \(CTU\) – presentation of the 2016 APR Knowledge Product](#)
- Cynthia Elliott (World Resources Institute): [Accounting under the Paris Agreement](#)
- Anke Herold (Öko-Institut, Germany): [Accounting under the Paris Agreement](#)

<sup>4</sup> The Partnership has published a [discussion paper on 'NDC Features, Transparency and Ambition'](#) that addresses the distinction between features and information for CTU.





- Jae Jung (Greenhouse Gas Inventory & Research Center of Korea, Korea): [Using accounting for policy planning and decision-making](#)
- Diana Camila Rodriguez Vargas and Paula Andrea Lopez Arbelaez, (Ministry of Environmental and Sustainable Development, Colombia): [Using accounting for policy planning and decision-making](#)

## Flexibility and capacity

Participants agreed that flexibility needs to be granted in relation to **specific** MPG provisions and not at a general level. This should not hinder aggregation and should not constitute a disincentive for improvement. Since the PA establishes a clear **link between flexibility and capacity**, it was argued that flexibility can only be granted, if the ability to report on a given requirement is affected by the capacity of a country. It thus follows that if a country's capacities improve, it would need to move to a higher tier of transparency for the aspects concerned. This led to the idea of a 'flexibility zone' that becomes smaller the higher the level of capacity.

Since the level of capacity will most likely be **self-determined**, participants went onto debate whether some accompanying explanation might be necessary or whether this would pose an undue burden and overload the reporting process. The discussion concluded that countries do not need to improve in all aspects of transparency at once but should select their own priorities. A transparency improvement plan was considered to be an important element of country reporting.

Related presentation:

- Thapelo Letete (Environmental Resources Management - ERM, South Africa): [Providing flexibility to countries taking into account their capacities](#)

## Domestic MRV systems

Throughout the retreat, several participants emphasised that the actual act of participating in the transparency framework also **builds capacities** and, hence, reporting should not be seen as an obligation and a burden, but rather as a chance to improve national systems and institutional capacities. However, it was also pointed out that setting-up and strengthening sustainable institutional structures and increasing capacities for MRV / M&E remains a major **challenge** for many countries.

Currently, many existing or planned national transparency systems do not yet capture the information national policies and / or international requirements demand of them.

Countries explained that engaging a wide range of **stakeholders** in the MRV system is both a necessity and a benefit the system can deliver. It was widely



agreed that reporting needs to become more accessible and beneficial for different stakeholders, especially at the national level.

In several inputs, **domestic MRV systems were shown to provide benefits** to different stakeholders in that they:

- Informed and supported policy design and activity planning on the domestic level
- Evaluated alternative policy instruments and their design
- Identified economic instruments
- Identified best practices and areas of replication
- Identified co-benefits and synergies
- Identified priorities, challenges, opportunities and support needs etc.
- Assessed performance and demonstrated the impact of activities / resources on different stakeholders (e.g. other ministries, private sector, donors)
- Promoted the climate agenda and built trust & confidence
- Supported stakeholder coordination
- Facilitated understanding and enabled adaptive learning

Country examples showed that various channels and instruments can be used to communicate information generated by the MRV system to different groups of stakeholders, e.g. different types of reports, web-based platforms, presentation at specific committees/events etc., media.

- Thapelo Letete (Environmental Resources Management (ERM), South Africa): [How will domestic MRV systems need to evolve in order to prepare for the ETF?](#)
- Azwimpheli Mac Makwarela (Department of Environmental Affairs, South Africa): [How to use domestic MRV for planning processes and stakeholder engagement](#)
- Rafael Martínez Blanco (Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources, Mexico) and Yutsil Sanginés Sayavedra (National Institute of Ecology and Climate Change - INECC, Mexico): [How to use domestic MRV for planning processes and stakeholder engagement](#)

## MPGs for tracking progress under Article 4 and for GHG inventories



Participants discussed that there is more to **tracking progress** than accounting – the narrative is also fundamental. This means it is necessary to capture **qualitative and quantitative information** on policies and measures and to identify best practices, areas for replication, priorities, capacity gaps, and support needs etc. It was further agreed that





developed countries should maintain the quality and frequency of reporting and that developing countries should improve their capacities and reporting quality overtime.

Reflecting on the different **NDC types**, participants reiterated their conviction that MPGs should stipulate the collection of information applicable to the actual type of NDC concerned. Having said this, all NDCs are obliged to report on progress in GHG emissions and removals. Hence, the **GHG inventory** is considered a core feature of reporting for all countries. At the same time, developing countries could be accorded flexibility to report on certain elements within the inventories.

In response to the question as to whether progress reporting should consist of just one or several documents covering different aspects (submitted at different times), several participants thought that one document would be too long and complex. However, if information is communicated through a variety of documents, care must be taken to avoid duplication.

**GHG projections** and time series were deemed key to evaluating progress for some types of NDC targets. They also allow countries to control the narrative on their progress. However, for many countries this constitutes a new element and one that might pose an extra burden.

Since the **scope** of NDCs is still under discussion, it was also unclear whether MPGs for tracking progress under Article 4 also include adaptation.

Related presentations and country inputs:

- Ana Danila (EU Commission, DG-CLIMA): [MPGs for transparency of emissions and mitigation action – key elements](#)

## Adaptation communications and MPGs for transparency and adaptation

Participants found that more **clarity is needed with respect to adaptation communications**, especially since the PA does not provide much guidance on this matter and the GST introduces new information needs. The adaptation components in the NDCs could indicate areas where there is a need for more clarity and transparency.

Most participants interpreted adaptation communication as a concept that does not necessarily require a new communication vehicle or a new type of report. This means that information concerning adaptation could be communicated via **different channels and tools**, inter alia, NDCs, National Communications (NCs), and National Adaptation Plans (NAPs). However, since it is vital that the GST receives key information on time, having different timelines for the various reporting vehicles could prove a challenge. Another challenge for the GST is that currently many countries only report on processes (adaptation strategies



and actions) and not on outcomes, which constitute an important source of information for the GST.

While **comparing transparency on mitigation with transparency on adaptation**, some crucial differences were identified: A key aspect in this context is the role of international verification which is more of an issue for mitigation than for adaptation. Also, many adaptation outcomes can only be realised in a much longer time period than those of mitigation action. It was concluded that it is unlikely that it will be possible to define a common methodological approach for tracking adaptation (as opposed to the IPCC guidelines for mitigation).



Some countries shared their experiences with collecting information on adaptation and stressed that it is important to build on existing reporting processes, tap into existing data sources and not create additional burdens. They also highlighted the strong domestic need for monitoring and evaluating adaptation (M&E), since this helps match up vulnerabilities with adaptation actions.

Related presentations and country inputs:

- Anne Ohlhoff (UNEP DTU): [The adaptation communication: link with the ETF and the NDCs](#)
- Timo Leiter (GIZ): [Is there a difference between M&E and MRV?](#)
- Ekaterine Mikadze, (Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources Protection, Georgia): [National adaptation action, adaptation in the NDC: approach to reporting](#)
- Michael Onwona-Kwakye (Environmental Protection Agency, Ghana): [National adaptation action, adaptation in the NDC: approach to reporting](#)

Participants asked for more **guidelines on transparency of adaptation**. Some were of the opinion that it might be useful to have templates for sharing specific types of information. It was pointed out that GST information requirements should be key for determining **MPGs for adaptation transparency** and these MPGs do not need to mirror those for mitigation, since they have a different purpose.

Participants found that the heading and sub-headings included in the **Informal Note** from the Bonn session in May 2017 appeared to cover all key elements, but made different suggestions as to how aspects might be streamlined. In the process, some headings were merged and/or demoted to sub-headings. Loss & Damage was seen by many as an optional element for reporting.



It was recommended that MPG development could build on available guidance for the National Adaptation Plan (NAP) process and for M&E for adaptation: <http://www.adaptationcommunity.net/>.

Presentations on available or planned **M&E systems in countries** revealed that some countries have already devised processes and indicators for tracking adaptation action. However, participants also said that it took a lot of time and effort to set up this kind of system.

Related presentations and country inputs:

- Timo Leiter (GIZ): [MPGs for transparency of adaptation – Key elements](#)
- Nicole Kranz (BMUB Germany): [Domestic M&E Systems. Insights from the German Adaptation Strategy](#)
- Tran Thuc and Nguyen Khac Hieu (Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, Viet Nam): [Transparency for adaption: Domestic M&E systems – processes and indicators](#)

### MPGs for transparency of support

The group reflected on the different **forms** climate support can take (financial resources, capacity building, technology transfer) and on the different **sources** and **channels** it can be provided through (bilateral/multilateral; direct/indirect). Also, it was explained that different stakeholders define, calculate and report on climate support in different ways – which can lead to significantly diverging figures. Therefore, it was concluded that reporting on a **disaggregated level** would play a very important part in making the approaches used transparent.

Monitoring and reporting on support provided and received is very complex. Data collection is generally patchy and governments have a very incomplete picture of climate finance flows. **Mobilised climate finance** in particular is something most countries do not track. In order to improve data availability, participants looked at a possible role for non-state actors, such as multilateral development banks.

It was suggested that **voluntary guidance** on methods and reportable information, along with a format that captures all forms of support provided, might assist countries with data collection and reporting. Country experience shows how information relating to support can be collected and presented.

Related presentations and country inputs:

- Jane Ellis (OECD): [Key methodological issues for transparency of support](#)
- Jane Ellis (OECD): [MPGs for transparency of support – Key elements](#)
- Felipe Jose Osses McIntyre (Ministry of Environment, Chile): [Good practices in transparency of support](#)
- Erik Adriansson (Swedish Environmental Protection Agency, Sweden): [Good practices in transparency of support](#)



## MPGs for verification

Participants observed that **current experience** with review and analysis provides a good basis for defining future processes. However, given the expected increase in the number of reports to be reviewed, they did state there was a risk of overloading the process and also the teams of technical experts. Against this background, they discussed several **options for adjusting the process**. These focused on scope, frequency/timing, and modalities (desk reviews, centralised reviews, in-country reviews, group reviews). Also, they suggested dividing the process into different steps entailing different scopes and/or frequencies that build on one another. Moreover, participants highlighted the link between transparency-related capacity-building needs and the technical expert review.

The participants critically reflected on the links and boundaries with **compliance** provisions. Here, it was emphasised that compliance is not punitive but forward-looking and focused on facilitating implementation and building capacities.

Related presentation:

- Gonçalo Cavalheiro (CAOS Sustentabilidade): [MPGs for verification](#)

## Stimuli for the Partnership

At the end of the retreat, participants provided feedback on options for future cooperation under the Partnership. They also put forward suggestions for the next retreat or other Partnership formats.

### 1. Suggestions for further cooperation within the PATPA framework:

- Continue promoting informal policy dialogue (as in existing formats)
- Establish (virtual) exchange platforms to enhance and further complement this dialogue
- Satisfy demand for case studies (what works, what does not?)



### 2. Recommendations for the APR:

- Increase the number of practical case studies (in order to stimulate the negotiation process)
- Subject negotiating positions to a 'reality check'
- Continuously inform participants about support and other tools
- Allocate more time for in-depth discussions



- Involve invited countries in the agenda-setting process (recommendations for sessions/inputs, comments on the agenda)
  - Enhance the mixture of participants (key decision-makers and NDC implementers, transparency, accounting, more international organisations); further involve countries with divergent and critical viewpoints
3. Topics for APR (and PATPA) in general:
- 2018: Focus on details of MPGs, especially on controversial points; after COP24, shift focus to implementation issues
  - Transparency of adaption
  - Transparency of support







## Annex I – List of participants

Country	Mr/ Ms	Name	Organisation	Position
<b>Country participants</b>				
Argentina	Mr	Hugo Matias Almang	Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Worship	Embassy Secretary
Argentina	Ms	Macarena Moreira Muzio	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development	GHG Inventory Coordinator
Australia	Ms	Kathryn Sangster	Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade	Transparency Negotiator
Chile	Mr	Felipe Jose Osses McIntyre	Ministry of Environment	Negotiator; NCD implementation support
China	Mr	Xiang Gao	National Development and Reform Commission (NDRC)	Deputy Director
Colombia	Ms	Diana Camila Rodriguez	Ministry of Environmental and Sustainable Development	Advisor
Colombia	Ms	Paula Andrea Lopez Arbelaez	Instituto de Hidrología, Meteorología y Estudios Ambientales (IDEAM)	Global Change Coordinator
Ecuador	Ms	Daysy Alexandra Cardenas Bautista	Ministerio del Cambio Climatico en los sectores de agricultura y USSCUS	Especialista de Mitigacion del Cambio Climatico
Ecuador	Ms	Gabriela Jeanneth Vargas Luna	Ministerio del Ambiente del Ecuador	Coordinadora de la Unidad de Politicas de Cambio Climatico
Ethiopia	Mr	Binyam Yakob Gebreyes	Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change	National Climate Change Negotiator





Country	Mr/ Ms	Name	Organisation	Position
<b>Country participants</b>				
EU Commis- sion	Ms	Ana Maria Danila	European Commission, DG Climate Action	Policy Officer Monitoring, Reporting, Verification
Fiji	Mr	Mahendra Kumar	Melanesian Spearhead Group (MSG)	Climate Change Technical Specialist
Georgia	Ms	Ekaterine Mikadze	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources Protection	Senior Specialist
Georgia	Mr	Gizo Chelidze	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources Protection	Head of Integrated Management of Environment Department
Georgia/ USA	Mr	George John Gigounas	DLA Piper	Partner Litigation
Georgia/ USA	Mr	Jesse Medlong	DLA Piper	Attorney
Germany	Ms	Kirsten Orschulok	Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building und Nuclear Safety	Advisor to the Ministry
Germany	Ms	Nicole Kranz	Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building und Nuclear Safety	Advisor to the Ministry
Germany	Ms	Anke Herold	Öko-Institut – Institute for Applied Ecology	Research Coordinator International Climate Policy
Ghana	Mr	Michael Onwona-Kwakye	Environmental Protection Agency	Principal Programme Officer
Japan	Ms	Emiko Matsuda	Overseas Environmental Cooperation	Senior Researcher



Country	Mr/ Ms	Name	Organisation	Position
<b>Country participants</b>				
Jordan	Ms	Wafa' Daibes	Ministry of Environment	Head of Mitigation Section
Jordan	Ms	Maha Abu Mowais	Ministry of Environment	Technical Assistant in Mitigation Section
Lebanon	Ms	Mary Awad	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources	Transparency Negotiator and NDC Coordinator
Lebanon	Ms	Yara Daou	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources	NAP Coordinator
Mexico	Mr	Rafael Martínez Blanco	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources	Deputy General Director for Climate Change Projects
Mexico	Ms	Yutsil Guadalupe Sanginés Sayavedra	National Institute of Ecology and Climate Change	Deputy Director of Measurement, Reporting and Verification
Norway	Ms	Ella-Havnevik Giske	Norwegian Ministry of Climate and Environment	Advisor
Republic of Korea	Mr	Jae H. Jung	Greenhouse Gas Inventory & Research Center of Korea	Deputy Director
Republic of Korea	Mr	Beomwoong Park	Korea Environment Corporation	Manager
Singapore	Mr	Santhosh Manivannan	National Climate Change Secretariat, Strategy Group Prime Minister's Office	Assistant Director (International Policy)
South Africa	Mr	Andrew Marquard	Energy Research Centre, University of Cape Town	Senior researcher, Energy Research Centre





Country	Mr/ Ms	Name	Organisation	Position
<b>Country participants</b>				
South Africa	Mr	Azwimpheleli Mac Makwarela	Department of Environmental Affairs	Director - Climate Change Mitigation Policy, Regulation and Planning
Sweden	Mr	Erik Adriansson	Swedish Environmental Protection Agency	Scientific Officer
UK	Ms	Felicity Morrison	Department of Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy	Senior Policy Advisor, Transparency Negotiations
USA	Mr	Andrew Rakestraw	U.S. Department of State	Foreign Affairs Officer
USA	Ms	Christine Dragisic	U.S. Department of State	Foreign Affairs Officer
Viet Nam	Mr	Hieu Nguyen Khac	Department of Climate Change, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment	Deputy Director General
Viet Nam	Mr	Thuc Tran (Professor)	Vietnamese Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment	Vice Chairman, Vietnam Panel on Climate Change

Mr/ Ms	Name	Organisation	Position
<b>Speakers/ Experts/ Organisational staff</b>			
Mr	Edgar Endrukaitis	GIZ	Programme Head
Mr	Klaus Wenzel	GIZ	Project Head
Ms	Hanna Reuter	GIZ	Policy Advisor
Mr	Timo Leiter	GIZ	Policy Advisor
Ms	Barbare Rukhadze	GIZ	Intern
Ms	Tea Melanashvili	GIZ	Project Manager





Mr/ Ms	Name	Organisation	Position
<b>Speakers/ Experts/ Organisational staff</b>			
Mr	Gonçalo Cavalhero	CAOS	Consultant
Mr	Konstantine Magradze		Consultant
Ms	Cynthia Elliott	World Resources Institute (WRI)	Associate
Ms	Jane Ellis	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)	Team Leader
Ms	Anne Olhoff	UNEP DTU Partnership	Programme Head
Ms	Ruta Bubniene	UNFCCC Secretariat	
Ms	Monica Echgoyen	Initiative for Climate Action Transparency (ICAT)	Coordinator
Ms	Galle Abeysekara Pathiranage Achala Chandani Abeysinghe	International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED)	Principal Researcher, Climate Change; Team Leader
Mr	Subhi Barakat	International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED)	Senior Researcher
Mr	Thapelo Letete	Environmental Resources Management (ERM)	Technical Director: Climate change & Air quality
Ms	Ani Khutsishvili	BTL	Consultant

