



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.



International Partnership
on Mitigation and MRV

Training Workshop on Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDCs) - Anglophone & Lusophone Countries -

Entebbe, Uganda
23-24 September 2015

MEETING SUMMARY

Overview

This technical training workshop on Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDCs), held in Entebbe, Uganda, was co-organized by the UN Development Programme (UNDP) and the International Partnership on Mitigation & MRV. The training was held in collaboration with the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) Secretariat as part of the joint UNDP-UNFCCC INDC Regional Dialogues funded by a number of donors.¹

The workshop provided representatives of Anglophone and Lusophone African countries with in-depth technical training on INDCs; offered a forum for learning from INDC submissions to date; addressed pending technical questions related to INDC preparation; and sought to improve participants' capacity to prepare and submit INDCs to the UNFCCC Secretariat. The workshop was organized primarily around four clinics on thematic areas related to INDC preparation. These clinics were run by resource experts, included practical exercises, and relied on case studies of submitted and advanced INDCs in order to illustrate "good practices" or different options related to the clinic topic. The workshop was attended by 33 participants from 18 African countries, as well as a number of resource experts and representatives of other organizations.

Welcome and Opening

Mr. Chebet Maikut, the head of the Climate Change Department of the Ugandan Ministry of Water and Environment, welcomed all participants to Uganda. He expressed gratitude to the organizers for choosing Uganda as the host of this INDC event and also mentioned that Uganda is honored to double as the host of the UNFCCC Regional Collaboration Centre Kampala for the past two and half years. Mr. Maikut highlighted that Africa can be seen as a key area to demonstrate commitment to fight climate change. He noted that the INDC for Uganda at the time of the workshop was close to finalization and submission following an extensive stakeholder engagement process in the country. In conclusion, Mr. Maikut wished the participants fruitful deliberations and declared the workshop open.

¹ This series of INDC dialogues is funded by Australia, Austria, Belgium, European Commission, France, Germany, Japan, Norway, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

Ms. Almaz Gebru, UNDP Uganda Country Director, opened by emphasizing Uganda's vulnerability to climate change and its impact on food availability and water security, which negatively affects social and economic progress. She mentioned that African countries are most susceptible to the effects of climate change and therefore a new ambitious agreement on climate change is necessary. The formulation of INDCs can show to the international community Least Developed Countries' (LDCs) commitment to combatting climate change. She noted that the training would be an opportunity to learn from submitted INDCs and experts, and that submitting INDCs is only the beginning of a long process.

Mr. Sven Egbers, International Partnership on Mitigation & MRV, started by introducing GIZ and the International Partnership on Mitigation & MRV, which currently supports global mitigation activities in 26 African countries. He mentioned that it aims to support a practical exchange on mitigation-related activities and monitoring, reporting, and verification (MRV) between developing and developed countries thereby providing a space where countries can exchange their existing knowledge and experiences. Mr. Egbers introduced the organizers of the INDC workshop and mentioned the African Regional Group (framework in which this very workshop takes place), which was started in 2013 to allow exchanges among policy makers in the region.

Brief Update on INDC Process & Submissions to Date

Mr. Claudio Forner, UNFCCC Secretariat, presented the current status of INDC submissions, which stood at 65 at the time of the workshop – 40 from Annex I and 25 from non-Annex I Parties. He mentioned that submitted INDCs covered 70% of global emissions and that 57% of Parties had communicated an adaptation component in their INDCs. Mr. Forner mentioned that 40 more INDC submissions were expected before the 1 October cut-off date for inclusion in the Secretariat's synthesis report. He also highlighted that some INDCs contain limited information, necessitating assumptions by the Secretariat (e.g., regarding conditional targets, use of economic instruments, etc.). Mr. Forner went on to explain that the level of ambition of submitted INDCs varies with respect to past efforts, conditionality levels, reference to the IPCC, and other elements. He emphasized the need for more clarity in INDCs to further facilitate estimations of aggregate emission reductions in 2025 and 2030. During the discussions, Mr. Forner distinguished between "intended" contributions and final commitments made by countries.

Learning from Submitted/Advanced INDCs

Ms. Ghirmawit Haile, Ethiopia, presented on Ethiopia's INDC, which was submitted in June, highlighting that the choice of base year (2010) was an important part of the process. She went ahead to share the INDC preparation approach used by Ethiopia, emphasizing that the INDC will be integrated into the national development plan, GDP growth forecasts, and renewable energy strategy. She also highlighted that adaptation was also a very important consideration for Ethiopia. Ethiopia looks to reduce emissions by 64% by 2030 from business as usual (BAU) (base year 2010). Ms. Haile finished by mentioning Ethiopia's need for public and private financing up to USD 150 billion by 2030 – including international support – to achieve the set targets.

Mr. Stephen King'uyu, Kenya, started by mentioning that INDCs are in response to national circumstances such as the impacts of climate change. Kenya's INDC, submitted in July, is in line with the nation's blue print for development (Vision 2030) and other national policies. He noted that the INDC contains both adaptation and mitigation components, including what the government is expected to do by law. The INDC is also based on Kenya's five-year National Climate Change Action Plan. He emphasized that various stakeholders were engaged in the process through the national INDC task force. Kenya

seeks to abate GHG emissions by 30% by 2030 relative to BAU scenario of 143MtCo2e. Mr. King'uyu explained the emissions profile for Kenya with the highest percentage being from LULUCF and the energy sector. The INDC also lays out priority adaptation actions, based on risk and vulnerability assessment across various sectors. In addition to existing international support, Kenya seeks further support to implement its mitigation and adaptation actions.

Ghana's INDC was developed based on the country's National Development Plan and national economic circumstances. **Mr. Emmanuel Tachie-Obeng** explained that Ghana is a service-led economy and is an LDC. The INDC process was stakeholder-oriented, with consultations performed in various sectors. He highlighted that the government is currently producing promotional materials on their INDC in order to increase public awareness on the INDC's components and goals. The INDC process involved creating a GHG emissions profile for the country, developing MRV aspects, and assessing vulnerability for the adaptation component of the INDC. Ghana looks to reduce its emissions by 45% below BAU by 2030, of which 15% would be achieved unconditionally. Mr. Tachie-Obeng pointed out that Ghana requires USD 10.11 billion for mitigation efforts and USD 12.2 billion for adaptation. He highlighted the challenges faced during the INDC preparation process and also mentioned that Ghana formulated its INDC internally with limited external support in order to build institutional capacity.

Uganda's INDC process is anchored in policies such as Vision 2040, the National Development Plan, national climate policies, and its cost implementation strategy. **Mr. Chebet Maikut** pointed out that Uganda's per-capita emissions are among the lowest globally, at 1.39 tCO2e/capita. Uganda has applied a two-approach procedure, the political approval process supported by UNDP, and technical development centered on the baseline data and projections. One of the challenges encountered was the lack of sufficient data to calculate the baseline. Mr. Maikut mentioned priority sectors (water, agriculture, infrastructure, and energy) and explained that the INDC process has involved political consultations through regional discussions. Uganda seeks to achieve a 22% reduction in BAU emissions by 2030. From the INDC preparation experience, Mr. Maikut noted that the timeline for preparing INDCs was very tight, but that Uganda was in the final stages and planned to submit its INDC by 1 October. Finally, he mentioned that the source of funds to achieve Uganda's INDC targets is yet to be established for the various sectors.

Mr. Ousmane Sowe, the Gambia, explained the process of developing his country's INDC. He mentioned that as part of the process, regional workshops were held and stakeholders were engaged at different levels (policy, technical, and regional). The targeted priority sectors for the Gambia are agriculture, waste, forestry, and energy. As a lesson learned, he underscored the importance of high-level participation from all sectors during the process. The Gambia looks to reduce its emissions by 50.8% by 2030 in the high baseline scenario and by 65.4% in the low baseline scenario.

Following the country presentations, speakers participated in a panel discussion. The following key points emerged from discussion:

- Mitigation actions should be considered together with adaptation actions to help reduce adaptation costs. Undertaking mitigation now means less costly adaptation in the future.
- Progress on INDCs will offer African countries a more robust platform in the climate negotiations. African countries seek to show their commitment and willingness to be part of the universal action on climate change, and through this, attract support from developed countries.
- African countries are eager to move away from an unsustainable development pathway and are implementing green growth strategies. It was also pointed out that African countries are most vulnerable to climate change thereby prompting action to abate the impacts of climate change.

- Participants noted that some of the African countries are bound/guided by national and regional development plans containing climate change policies, for example, those of the East African Community and the African Union.

Monitoring of INDC Implementation & Co-Benefits

This session was facilitated by **Ms. Deborah Murphy, International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD)**, who began with an overview presentation on the importance of and approaches to monitoring co-benefits within INDCs. She noted that INDCs will become Nationally Determined Contribution (NDCs) after the Paris COP, which means that targets and actions put forward in INDCs will become countries' commitments to the global effort to meet the goals of the UNFCCC. Monitoring of INDCs is considered an important element that has been highlighted in submitted INDCs (e.g., Benin and Tunisia). However, there is still a need for support to monitor INDCs and develop indicators and methodologies, backed by strong institutional arrangements. She highlighted that monitoring of mitigation, adaptation, and international support can be facilitated by linking to established processes such as GHG inventories, national communications, and national adaptation plans (NAPs). She listed examples of co-benefits (e.g., reduced air pollution, increased health benefits, energy security, access to energy, employment creation, etc.) and tools to measure these benefits.

Ms. Murphy pointed out that there are significant gains to be made from highlighting co-benefits in INDCs, as countries such as Kenya have done. These can include, for example, mobilization of line ministries and economic actors by justifying investments and linking INDC measures to national development goals. The overall message was that highlighting co-benefits can support mitigation actions by increasing the understanding and strategic buy-in of stakeholders. She noted that stakeholder groups could be engaged by emphasizing the link to the existing national policy framework, national development goals, and even the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

Ms. Khetsiwe Khumalo, Swaziland, shared her country's experiences in considering co-benefits (e.g., food and energy security) and within their INDC and importantly their aspiration to include MRV within the broader context of climate change actions within Swaziland. This was linked to their efforts to mainstream climate change considerations through low-emissions development pathways. She mentioned that in this context, co-benefits are seen as a key tool in raising public awareness and getting the buy-in of policymakers. The aim is also to link these interventions to broader results based on the monitoring framework that is being implemented at the country level. The emphasis for Swaziland will be to monitor the "effectiveness of response" and will include monitoring of GHG emission reductions, risks and vulnerability, implementation of adaptation actions, and climate finance. Ms. Khumalo underscored that due to the short timeframe of INDC preparation, there was limited time to establish detailed MRV systems, but this has been identified as an important element for stakeholder engagement. She pointed out that further support is required to develop MRV systems for INDCs, with strengthened stakeholder coordination underpinning this process.

In discussion, participants raised some key points with regards to Swaziland's approach, including the significance of their approach to embed the INDC monitoring process within the existing national-level monitoring structures for climate change, as was also done in Ghana. Mozambique also presented its national climate change monitoring and evaluation framework, which was embedded into national policy and into which the INDC monitoring structure will be built. On ensuring high-level buy-in to INDC development, Swaziland explained that a climate change committee with representatives from all key ministries was involved in the process to enhance awareness, understanding, and buy-in. Zimbabwe also

mentioned that their existing climate change steering committee was utilized in this process and also hoped for standardization on the international level with regards to monitoring. Participants noted the need for standardized monitoring of INDCs, and that effort would be needed to standardize monitoring processes, including indicators, reporting frameworks, and timelines.

Clinic A: INDC Baseline & Data Issues

Ms. Emelia Holdaway of Ricardo Energy & Environment facilitated Clinic A, which discussed key technical challenges in determining INDC baselines and addressing data issues. The clinic opened with an introductory presentation from Ms. Holdaway, which covered data needs for baselines and mitigation scenarios; key choices to make when determining baselines and modeling mitigation scenarios; data sources and how to address data gaps (i.e., data filling techniques); and various methods for checking results. During facilitated discussion, country representatives discussed implications of conditional and unconditional INDC targets, as well as the challenge of coordinating across various ministries in the INDC decision-making process. Other key issues discussed in the clinic include:

Selecting a reference year for INDCs when most recent data is not considered representative (e.g., because of economic or political instability): Solutions discussed include averaging emissions over a number of years or selecting a more representative year as the base year. The importance of transparency in explaining the choice of reference year was emphasized (e.g., why the selected year is more representative of emissions).

Projecting emissions amidst growth uncertainties (e.g., due to political instability or other factors): Solutions discussed include extending the time period for the emissions projections. Despite difficulties in estimating emissions or economic growth beyond 5 years, identifying likely growth rates over the next 15-20 years based on the country's long-term economic aspirations and planning may be possible. Countries can also provide a range of scenarios for emissions growth (e.g., best case, worst case, etc.).

Choosing mitigation measures to include in baseline or "business as usual" scenarios (e.g., whether to include partially implemented measures): It was generally agreed that already-implemented measures should be part of a country's baseline, and measures that have yet to be implemented should be part of a mitigation scenario. However, there was less consensus on how to handle measures that have not yet realized their full potential (e.g., due to partial implementation) or have yet to be implemented but are otherwise firmly committed to and funded. The importance of taking a consistent and transparent approach was discussed, as well as the political nature of the decision regarding which measures to include in the baseline versus mitigation scenario. With this in mind, participants discussed the possibility of creating a number of baseline scenarios for policy-makers to review (e.g., ambitious baseline scenario with more implementation assumed, a conservative scenario with less implementation assumed, etc.).

Recalculating dynamic baseline scenarios: Participants discussed acceptable triggers for recalculating dynamic baseline scenarios, in the case of a country choosing a dynamic instead of fixed/static baseline. It was discussed that acceptable triggers could include changes in emission drivers such as economic growth (e.g., in the case of an economic recession or natural disaster), which are independent of energy and climate change policy decisions. However, if a country decided to depart from a green growth pathway due to the discovery of new domestic fossil fuels, this would represent a change in energy policy priorities and is unlikely to be considered an acceptable basis for recalculating the baseline.

Pro/cons of different types of software for emissions modeling (e.g., “off the shelf” models like LEAP and GACMO versus Excel): Participants favored the use of LEAP (Long-Range Energy Alternatives Planning System) and GACMO (Greenhouse Gas Costing Model), especially where data is limited, since these “off the shelf” models include a range of built-in proxy data. In general, GACMO was considered easier to use compared to LEAP, since it requires less input of data. One country reported using a mix of the two models: GACMO for the sectors where less data is available and LEAP for the sector with the highest emissions and most available data.

Clinic B: Options for Packaging INDCs & Information for INDC Submissions

Clinic B was facilitated by **Mr. Revocatus Twinomuhangi, Climate and Development Knowledge Network (CDKN)**, and **Ms. Janie Rioux, Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)**. The facilitators presented options for packaging INDCs and information for INDC submissions. They stressed that there is no official format for submissions but that guidance documents from organizations like CDKN and WRI/UNDP, which were drawn on for the presentation, cover key considerations (e.g., presenting INDCs as outcomes, actions, or a combination of both). The session addressed the choice of contribution and target year in countries where emissions are historically low. Participants also discussed prioritization of sectors for INDCs based on national circumstances and potential co-benefits within these sectors, for both mitigation and adaptation. Discussions focused in particular on the land use and forestry sector, given the importance of the sector in African countries’ emissions profiles, the large carbon sink potential, and the potential for co-benefits. Participants also discussed challenges involved during INDC development, such as determination of the target year, defining the baseline, and limited data availability in most sectors.

Ms. Rioux presented on AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Land Use) and provided recommendations on how to include this sector in INDCs. AFOLU is the second-highest GHG-emitting sector globally, after energy, and is especially relevant for African countries. In Africa, emissions from AFOLU increased by 243% in the last 50 years – mainly from deforestation and changes in crops/livestock, and this is projected to increase with population increase and diet change. AFOLU is a source of emissions but is also an important carbon sink. Ms. Rioux underscored the synergies between AFOLU and adaptation, and opportunities to tap into international funding.

There exists a diversity of approaches for integrating AFOLU into INDCs, depending on data availability (e.g., forest coverage, growth rates, etc.). However, even without sufficient data it is possible to include mitigation and adaptation actions in this sector, and to look at improving data over time. Ms. Rioux pointed out that existing FAO tools can help with data issues and gave examples of how countries were including AFOLU in their INDCs. For example, Ethiopia reports explicit contributions from agriculture, based in improved livestock, afforestation, and forest conservation; Kenya has afforestation targets, with adaptation and mitigation co-benefits to climate-smart agriculture; and Morocco discusses the role of forests and land management.

Mr. Emmanuel Tachie-Obeng, Ghana, provided a case study for discussion. He discussed the input of existing documents on mitigation and adaptation to arrive at Ghana’s INDC. Given that AFOLU is the sector with the highest emissions (followed by energy then waste), the country focused on those sectors in the mitigation component of its INDC, using data from 1990 to 2012 and BAU projections. It was established that Ghana could achieve 15% emissions reductions unconditionally, but that a further 30% could be achieved with international support (total of 45% reduction from business as usual). For adaptation, they identified current adaptation gaps and devised options. Mr. Tachie-Obeng mentioned

that contributions are based on actions they are going to take, including actions in renewable energy and reforestation (particularly with cocoa farmers and in areas vulnerable to flooding). \$26bn is needed for implementation of the INDC, of which Ghana is contributing \$9bn.

Discussions in the clinic emphasized the difficulty of coordinating this sector as it is often split across different parts of government and multiple stakeholders, as well as difficulties caused by lack of forestry inventories. Participants also mentioned synergies between AFOLU and other sectors (referring back to the co-benefits discussion). For example, moving away from charcoal has benefits for both energy and forestry. It was noted that there is an opportunity for REDD+ funds to improve data around forests.

Clinic C: Adaptation Components in INDCs

Facilitated by **Ms. Deborah Murphy, IISD**, this clinic focused on incorporating adaptation components into INDCs, including linking adaptation with national development goals and ensuring political acceptance of INDCs. Countries discussed the need to identify synergies between adaptation and mitigation, monitoring of INDC targets, and translating plans and strategies for the INDC to ensure realistic goals. Other key points discussed were the political processes and strategies used by countries to gain approval of the INDC development. Most countries highlighted that to have a successful process, they needed to speak the language of politicians, secure high-level engagement during the process, and stress the synergies and co-benefits of the planned actions.

Ms. Murphy provided an introductory presentation focused on the rationale for including adaptation, and the linkages between adaptation components of INDCs and NAPs and National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPAs). The presentation also reviewed information that could be included in adaptation sections of INDC submissions, drawing on guidance developed by WRI and UNDP: climate change trends, impacts, and vulnerabilities; long-term goals or vision (outcome-based, process-based, need-based); current/near-term planning and action; gaps, barriers, and needs; and monitoring plans.

Mr. Stephen King'uyu, Kenya, provided a case study for adaptation discussions by describing the adaptation component in Kenya's INDC and the process used to develop it. He noted that the adaptation component includes high-level adaptation goals in the country's national planning sectors. The decision was made to include high-level goals to enable all sectors to consider adaptation and climate impacts on achieving sectoral goals. Additionally, Mr. King'uyu noted the importance of formulating ways to engage ministers and politicians in the process to enable smooth approval. Part of this high-level engagement included translating the language of science into the language of politicians. Additionally, identifying the linkages between adaptation and development goals also helped build buy-in. Kenya is developing a methodology for monitoring adaptation action, as well as a tracking tool for monitoring progress on adaptation (and mitigation) actions prioritized in the National Climate Change Action Plan.

At the time of the workshop, two countries present in the adaptation clinic had submitted INDCs to the UNFCCC (Ethiopia and Kenya), several had completed their INDCs and were at the approval stage (Gambia, Ghana, Liberia, Malawi, Mauritius, Mozambique, Sierra Leone, Swaziland, Uganda, and Zimbabwe) and others were still at the development stage (South Sudan, Sudan, and Somalia).

In discussion, country representatives stressed the following points related to including an adaptation component in INDCs:

- The importance of articulating a long-term vision for adaptation planning and action through linking adaptation with national development goals.

- Many country representatives remarked that their countries were agricultural-based economies and economic growth is closely tied to this sector. Adaptation is critical in the agricultural sector where climate change is expected to have negative impacts on food security and economic growth.
- Including an adaptation component is also important for international recognition of the importance of adaptation. Emission levels of African countries are low relative to other regions, and adaptation is a priority in most countries.
- Participants emphasized that including adaptation can help the INDC gain political approval.
- The INDC offers an opportunity to describe needed support. Country representatives noted the need to think about the cost implications of INDCs and potential sources of funding.

Clinic D: Procedural Issues & Domestic Validation of INDCs

Mr. Claudio Forner, UNFCCC Secretariat, Mr. Sven Egbers and Mr. Heiner von Luepke, International Partnership for Mitigation & MRV, facilitated clinic D, which looked at procedural issues and domestic validation of INDCs, including internal approval processes (e.g., by parliament or cabinet). In the opening presentation, Mr. von Luepke mentioned that these processes are similar in most countries and must involve relevant stakeholders. Coordination and agreement are the heart of the process since it brings together all stakeholders and political decision-makers. He highlighted success factors for successful INDC preparation and validation, including securing political commitment, clearly defined roles and responsibilities, clear timelines, coordination, awareness raising, and access to resources for knowledge and management.

He mentioned the example of the Dominican Republic, which held 25 coordination meetings during the process of preparing its INDC. He also mentioned that COP21 is just the beginning and that countries should be thinking about how to institutionalize INDC actions and secure budgets to run stakeholder processes (as well as tools and approaches available for review and implementation). For most countries, full stakeholder engagement is required in the INDC drafting and validation process. Almost all the INDCs of countries in Clinic D were at an advanced stage of approval, and were looking to be submitted by the end of the September. Success factors for the development of INDCs were discussed, including, the need for strong leadership at country level, coordination between right ministries, and the need for resources post INDC submission.

Ms. Ghrmawit Haile, Ethiopia, noted that her country did not face political leadership issues, considering Ethiopia's familiarity with and strong commitment to climate change action. Following Lima, all ministries were part of an inter-ministerial committee formed to discuss the development of the country's INDC, which made it easier to ensure commitment. While Ethiopia undertook a top-down process in planning and developing its INDC, a bottom-up process is planned for INDC implementation. She also mentioned that discussions would be conducted to interpret the INDC to enable better public understanding for easier implementation of actions by all stakeholders.

Mr. Forner emphasized that the UNFCCC is a contract that functions as a framework with no deliverables or rules. Compared to the Kyoto Protocol, which was a top-down instrument, INDCs are bottom-up; countries can choose their type of target nationally. Implementation will take place as national actions, as well as part of a new agreement coming out of COP 21 that embeds all INDCs in a collective effort to reach the two-degree goal. Finance can be used as an incentive and MRV as a reporting mechanism for achieving the goals that were set. He also discussed options for monitoring progress toward the two-degree goal (i.e., multilateral aggregate review), as well as for reviewing national INDCs.

During discussion of the state of the carbon market in the negotiation process, Mr. Forner highlighted that carbon markets may or may not become part of the agreement. This is based on the political process making it hard to predict despite the fact that some countries want markets to be explicitly stated. He also mentioned that even if no agreement were reached, many countries would go along with market mechanisms that already exist. He predicted that most countries would not agree to an obligation. In response to a question regarding frequency of INDC review, Mr. Forner explained that no decision had been made but that perhaps collective efforts would adopt five-year cycles while review of individual INDCs may differ (e.g., every two years).

Participants were also keen to know what funding could be expected from the international community. So far there is no proposal for compliance, and existing support may not be sufficient. However, countries also need to consider available national resources. Participants stressed that LDCs expect support for means of implementation from the major emitters and that the international community must work together in order to achieve a win-win situation. They must engage in a multilateral review and more actions should be enforced by the international community.

Closing Remarks

Mr. Michael Comstock, UNDP, and **Mr. Sven Egbers, International Partnership on Mitigation & MRV**, conveyed their gratitude to all countries for their active participation in the workshop. They expressed hope that the workshop was useful and provided additional clarifications on mitigation and adaptation aspects of INDCs and other insights on the INDC validation process, even though many are at the final stages of finalizing their INDCs. As part of the closing remarks, **Mr. Claudio Forner, UNFCCC Secretariat**, echoed the importance of ambition at international stage and mentioned that INDCs are the start of new capacities and opportunities for Africa, including after the Paris COP, as African voices need to be heard. As a final note, the organizers thanked the presenters and facilitators for their valuable contributions to the workshop's success.