



Outcome Report

Joint Australia-Singapore-UNDP/UNEP GSP Regional Capacity-Building Workshop on the International Measurement, Reporting and Verification Framework 8-9 December 2016 in Nadi, Fiji

Summary of Proceedings

1 The Joint Australia-Singapore-United Nations Development Program/United Nations Environment Program Global Support Programme (UNDP/UNEP GSP) Regional Capacity-Building Workshop on the International Measurement, Reporting and Verification (MRV) Framework took place in Nadi, Fiji on 8-9 December 2016. Trainers from the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) Secretariat, UNDP/UNEP GSP, Australia's Department of Environment and Energy and Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, and Singapore's National Climate Change Secretariat, Strategy Group and Ministry of Foreign Affairs facilitated the workshop. The list of participants and trainers is at **Annex A**.

2 The objectives of the workshop were:

- (i) To provide an in-depth understanding of the international MRV/transparency framework to help Parties better prepare for it;
- (ii) To build capacity with a view to assisting Parties in submitting national communications (NCs), biennial update reports (BURs), and greenhouse gas (GHG) inventories where appropriate; and
- (iii) To provide a safe environment to let participants brainstorm solutions to problems and issues faced in their national experiences.

3 The workshop consisted of eight substantive sessions covering: (i) an overview of MRV obligations under the Convention; (ii) reporting on national circumstances, institutional arrangements and GHG inventory; (iii) reporting on mitigation; (iv) reporting on adaptation; (v) reporting on constraints and gaps and support; (vi) support available to Parties for MRV obligations; and (vii) how to move forward with capacity-building for MRV in the region. The sessions were carried out through presentations by trainers and national experts, breakout discussions and Q&A segments. The format was designed to encourage a participant-driven process in an interactive and facilitative setting. The agenda of the workshop is at **Annex B**. Presentations from the workshop can be accessed online at: <http://www.un-gsp.org/event/capacity-building-workshop-mrvtransparency-framework-pacific-islands>. Key elements of the discussions follow.

Opening

4 Mr Jigme from the UNFCCC Secretariat, Ms Kate Sangster from Australia's Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Mr Syed Nouredin from Singapore's Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Mr Damiano Borgogno from the UNDP/UNEP GSP delivered opening remarks. Their remarks laid out the strategic relevance of MRV for Pacific Small Island Developing States (PSIDS). The notion of MRV/transparency has been embedded as a core commitment of the Convention from its inception, and was reinforced by Parties' adoption of the Paris Agreement, which established an enhanced transparency framework (ETF). In the international context, MRV promotes mutual trust and confidence. It facilitates the implementation of international agreements on climate change, including efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels under the Paris Agreement. It will inform the global stocktake. MRV under UNFCCC guidelines is an effective international platform for PSIDS to highlight the challenges they face and highlight the support they need. PSIDS will also gain leverage in terms of encouraging the compliance of others with international obligations. If they are prepared to voluntarily participate in the MRV process despite their limited obligations due to their capacity constraints, they will send a strong message to larger economies.

5 At the domestic level, MRV will help to build and sustain capacity and institutional arrangements. Participating in the MRV process will assist to increase knowledge about climate change and promote country ownership of climate change measures. PSIDS could gain an overview of their climate change policies and discover ways to improve these policies and their implementation. The international and domestic benefits of participation in MRV processes were the key takeaway from the workshop.

Session 1: FAQ Activity

6 Participants worked in groups to generate the main questions and concerns they had about the MRV processes. Some participants having their first brush with MRV wanted to find out more about what it entailed and its timeline. Others raised technical questions about the choice of Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) guidelines, the best ways to establish or improve GHG inventories, reporting tools appropriate for the region, and support for the development of emission factors and improved data management. During groups' report back, one participant pointed to the Pacific Regional Data Repository for the energy

sector as a possible data management tool, although it was not targeted at climate change. Participants also asked about means of implementation, including how to access financial support for MRV and optimise regional assistance. They identified human resource challenges, such as staff not having sufficient technical knowledge to prepare GHG inventories and other components of reporting.

Session 2: Overview of MRV Obligations under the Convention

7 A trainer from the UNFCCC Secretariat presented an overview of the components and timeline of MRV obligations under the Convention. A side-by-side comparison of the reporting guidelines for NCs and BURs illustrated the similarities and differences between the two documents. Explaining the evolution of the MRV framework, the trainer pointed out that the guidelines for NCs and BURs were developed about a decade apart. Some might consider the reporting guidelines for BURs more mitigation-centric, as they were the product of negotiations on enhancing mitigation actions. He also introduced reporting on reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD), which is voluntary and mainly undertaken by those developing countries seeking to qualify for results-based incentives. The trainer then introduced the international consultation and analysis (ICA) process. He pointed out that the objectives of the technical analysis include identifying the capacity-building needs of the country. He emphasised the facilitative nature of the ICA process and the fact that the submitting Party is actively engaged throughout the process.

8 During the Q&A session, participants sought clarity on whether nationally appropriate mitigation actions (NAMAs) would undergo international MRV as well. The Secretariat responded that in essence, NAMAs were activities Parties implemented that had emission reduction benefits and other co-benefits. When reporting on emission reduction in the BUR, Parties were not limited to their NAMAs. The Secretariat added that taking a broader perspective, the MRV process is intended to provide oversight of the collective progress made by Parties.

9 On a question about the link between BURs and nationally determined contributions (NDCs), the Secretariat explained that the BUR guidelines were adopted before the Paris Agreement, hence there was no explicit link with NDCs. However, since most NDCs build on existing national climate change strategies, what is reported in the mitigation

chapter of a Party's BUR would naturally have links to the mitigation component of its NDC.

10 To a question of whether the Secretariat had a dedicated unit for reviewing draft NCs and BURs before submission, the Secretariat responded affirmatively and also encouraged Parties to approach the UNDP/UNEP GSP to review their draft NCs, BURs, GHG inventories or other components of reporting. Participants suggested that the Secretariat organise more sub-regional training for PSIDS on NCs, BURs and GHG inventory, noting that training was currently conducted in larger regional groupings. The Secretariat said it is mindful of resource constraints, but will continue to work with partners to enhance its outreach.

11 A trainer from Singapore's National Climate Change Secretariat, Strategy Group then presented on Singapore's experience undergoing the ICA for its first BUR. Singapore takes a whole-of-government approach to its ICA preparations. This ensures that all relevant agencies are involved during the ICA process. This has also allowed Singapore to present its climate change strategy and efforts in a coherent fashion in its BUR. While Singapore faced challenges such as the lack of clarity in the reporting guidelines on the scope of the facilitative sharing of views (FSV) presentation, the UNFCCC Secretariat responded promptly when approached for clarification. Singapore's key takeaway was that "learning by doing" is a good way to build its capacity and improve its reporting over time. Based on its experience, Singapore's impression was that the ICA is facilitative, non-intrusive and respectful of national sovereignty. The ICA is not aimed at criticising, but at finding ways for the Party to overcome its challenges, identify capacity-building needs and share best practices and lessons learnt.

Session 3: National Circumstances, Institutional Arrangements and GHG Inventory

12 A trainer from the UNFCCC Secretariat presented on establishing and maintaining institutional arrangements for NCs/BURs. Key takeaways were, firstly, that there is no "one-size-fits-all" model for institutional arrangements. It is most important that the arrangements be fit for purpose, sustainable and cost effective in the long run, and promote improvement over time. Secondly, quality is a function of time. If a country is just starting to build up its institutional arrangements, it should focus on establishing a system that can meet the minimum reporting requirements, rather than try to achieve a higher quality product from the

first try. The notion of improving over time also means that documentation is important. Looking ahead, robust and sustainable institutional arrangements will be necessary to respond to the ETF.

13 A trainer from the UNDP/UNEP GSP presented on GHG inventories and reporting requirements. The GSP encouraged Parties to prepare GHG inventories using the 2006 IPCC guidelines, as these already incorporate the earlier set of guidelines and other input, and have enhanced coverage in some sectors. The GSP also encouraged developing countries to prepare a national inventory report (NIR) on GHG emission, separate from the NC/BUR.

14 A trainer from Australia's Department of Environment and Energy presented on Australia's experience with GHG inventory. Australia found that GHG inventories underpinned a country's response to climate change, and developed a GHG inventory system that uses a range of methods to meet its needs. The National Greenhouse and Energy Reporting Act 2007 established a legislative framework for GHG reporting which requires corporations that emit above a certain threshold to report. This has strengthened Australia's capacity for reporting, as previously, it relied on national-level statistics and information provided by corporations on a voluntary basis. A key feature of the Australian Greenhouse Emissions Information System is that it integrates international, national, state and project-level methods. This means the system can feed data seamlessly into domestic and international records.

15 Participants broke into groups to discuss their experiences with GHG inventories, particularly challenges faced and opportunities for capacity-building and support. Firstly, participants pointed out human resource constraints. There are not enough officials to do the work, and officials are often not sufficiently trained. For example, knowledge of IPCC guidelines is currently not at the level where officials feel comfortable undertaking the work on GHG inventories. High turnover makes retention of staff with adequate experience and knowledge difficult. Many PSIDS hire external consultants, which can further entrench their lack of domestic capacity. They are also not in a position to store and maintain data, such as maps, generated by partners. For support on this front, participants suggested training through dedicated courses. Participants also acknowledged that officials had learnt a lot through working on their initial and subsequent NCs, and should continue to build upon and share this expertise.

16 Secondly, there are difficulties sustaining institutional arrangements. Some participants pointed to the lack of a clear political framework to guide their work. One possible solution is to maintain a project management unit with a constant flow of projects. PSIDS could look among themselves for models of institutional arrangements to follow. For example, Papua New Guinea has institutionalised the NC/BUR processes in its operations.

17 Thirdly, participants pointed out challenges in data collection and management. In some cases there is no data, due to the reluctance of private companies and state-owned utilities to comply with data collection requests. Legislation could address this. After receiving the data, developing countries still face challenges managing and processing it in useful ways, such as disaggregating energy data by fuel type. Participants suggested training in the use of software to build and maintain GHG inventories and to institutionalise data archival systems. PSIDS could also learn from peers' successful data management models, such as Papua New Guinea and Vanuatu's models for REDD.

Session 4: Mitigation

18 A participant from Vanuatu's Energy Department and a trainer from Singapore's National Climate Change Secretariat, Strategy Group presented on their countries' approaches to mitigation reporting. Vanuatu shared best practices such as the establishment of its National Advisory Board for Climate Change and Disaster Reduction to improve coordination and governance on the two interrelated issues. Vanuatu is mindful of aligning its mitigation planning with its sustainable development agenda. It plans to achieve its development objectives through integrating mitigation efforts with other social, environmental and economic priorities. Participants followed up with questions to find out more about the countries' national circumstances and future plans. In response to a question of the challenges Singapore faced when establishing its interagency taskforce for MRV, the trainer said that initially there was resistance, as some agencies did not know what MRV entailed or what its significance was. However, Singapore was able to overcome this and its MRV taskforce was now in place. The key message here is that some resistance should be expected, but with time, it can be overcome.

19 In group discussions on challenges and opportunities for capacity-building in mitigation reporting, participants pointed to shortcomings in data collection and monitoring systems. For example, it

is difficult to obtain data on usage of renewable energy and its impact on mitigation due to incomplete grid monitoring systems. In terms of REDD reporting, while Parties can track deforestation from satellite images, it is more difficult to track forest degradation perpetrated through small-scale actions. Data on mitigation projects in the private sector is often not shared voluntarily, but has to be purchased. Participants said they would benefit from technical transfer and development and capacity-building to establish and maintain robust monitoring systems and standardised databases.

Session 5: Adaptation

20 A trainer from the UNFCCC Secretariat presented on reporting information on adaptation in NCs. The bottom line is that it is up to each country to make the most suitable choice of reporting methodology for itself, based on its national circumstances. He emphasised the importance of having a clear and coherent narrative that can deliver key messages effectively. He also noted that the development of countries' project proposals for support is usually based on the information they report in their NCs, because it is a document that reports information systematically and scientifically. This reiterates the usefulness of NCs and BURs.

21 A trainer from Australia's Department of Environment and Energy and a participant from Niue's Meteorological Service presented on their countries' experiences reporting on adaptation activities. Australia's presentation noted that compared to mitigation and GHG emission, the impact of adaptation activities is more difficult to measure and attribute. Some indicators that Australia uses include community perceptions, direct beneficiaries of the reduced vulnerability of physical assets and economic evaluation. Niue takes a bottom-up approach to adaptation, combining a range of methodologies and primary and secondary data to meet its needs. The presentation underscored the need for "no regrets" actions that would reduce vulnerability to climate change, but also advance sustainable development regardless of climate change. In terms of evaluating its adaptive capacity, Niue considers financial resources, governance (i.e. how well society can steer the adaptation process and how legitimate the process is), the ability to anticipate climate risk, social resources and infrastructure and technology. Some constraints that it faces are other agencies lacking an understanding of climate change and being constrained in their ability to report to the Meteorological Service in their respective sectors. PSIDS are actively looking for solutions to such

problems, including by seeking support to produce documents on climate science to bolster their domestic capacity, through the negotiations on research and systematic observation under the Convention.

22 During the Q&A session, a participant from the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) emphasised that the thorough consultation process involved in reporting made it a good launching pad for adaptation activities. He recounted that this was why Parties had fought hard for the inclusion of adaptation during the development of the NC and BUR guidelines. Participants also asked about future plans for the Pacific-Australian Climate Change Science Adaptation Programme (PACCSAP), which was cited as a source of support for robust reporting by PSIDS.

23 To a question seeking views on the current reporting guidelines and how they could be improved, a trainer from the UNFCCC Secretariat responded that in the context of international negotiations, there are still differing views on what the objective of reporting on adaptation should be. Some see the objective as exchanging lessons learnt and best practices. Others see the objective as defining a pathway of commitments to provide support. He added that it is challenging to design and deliver training for adaptation because adaptation actions cover a vast range of issues and are diverse across countries and regions.

24 Participants asked about MRV of financing for adaptation, specifically how to assess financial resources against the results achieved. Assessment is complicated by the fact that one adaptation project can have aspects that fall under different sectors of government. A participant responded that they use stories with qualitative information and indicators such as area of land protected, whether a country's ability to respond to natural disasters improved and co-benefits to assess the use of financial resources. Another participant said that they use a matrix of actions and results developed by UNDP. They also track financial performance by describing the percentage of financial resources used and the number of targets achieved through the climate action.

25 During the breakout session, participants reiterated constraints they face in human resources and data management. They also identified challenges in prioritising adaptation actions, the lack of a formal "clearing house" mechanism to act as a depository for information, and the differences in methodologies for reporting required by development partners and under the Convention. The last point raised the question of how coordinated development partners were. Touching on the wider

context of national and regional circumstances, participants called for efforts to ensure that university programmes in environmental studies give graduates adequate training for the roles that they would take up. They also pointed to the practice of communal land ownership in some PSIDS, which is at times a challenge to the implementation of adaptation activities, since landowners' permission has to be obtained before activities can be carried out.

Session 6: Constraints and Gaps and Support

26 A trainer from the UNFCCC Secretariat gave a presentation on reporting information on constraints and gaps, and support needed and received in the BUR. He delivered insights based on BURs submitted so far. It is important for the submitting Party to define what it means by "financial support", so as to avoid double-counting. Terms that Parties tend to use interchangeably, such as "technical"/"technological" support, should be defined. Parties also have to make a decision on the nature (e.g. qualitative or quantitative) and level of detail (e.g. national or sectoral) for reporting. Parties should avoid making cross-references to the NC without providing a summary of that information in the BUR.

27 A participant from the Federated States of Micronesia presented on their experience reporting on constraints, gaps and support in the NC. They found that it is a platform to make known the constraints and gaps that are unique to the country and the region. For example, Micronesia experiences logistical obstacles to MRV due to the long and expensive commute between many remote islands. However, Micronesia found that reporting has the potential to improve domestic circumstances. Reporting provides opportunities to address gaps in domestic measures, consolidate political will to act on climate change and forge a stronger partnership with development partners.

Session 7: Support Available for Parties for MRV Obligations

28 A trainer from UNDP/UNEP GSP introduced the financial and technical support available to developing countries for MRV. In addition to national-level support, the GSP is increasingly looking to work with developing countries in regional or sub-regional networks in order to take advantage of economies of scale. They welcome PSIDS' expressions of commitment or interest in participating in a regional network for support for MRV. The GSP is also addressing emerging gaps in support, such as

by working with technical experts as well as senior policy-makers to build political will, integrating MRV and NDC practitioners, increasing use of virtual tools to improve in-person training, increasing engagement of non-state actors on MRV, improving coordination among donors and producing more evidence-based research on capacity-building. The trainer noted that the Capacity-Building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT) established by the Paris Agreement is a new source of financial support for MRV, and urged participants to approach their implementing agencies if interested in accessing support from the CBIT.

29 Responding to participants who said that they were evaluating whether or not to undertake their first BUR, trainers from the UNDP/UNEP GSP and Singapore said that the reasons for doing so are strong from the domestic perspective. Developing countries should look to NCs and BURs as means to access additional funding and as opportunities to build domestic capacity and resources, to improve domestic implementation of climate actions. If there are concerns, developing countries can start working on their first BUR, assess the costs and benefits and then decide whether to continue. Participants asked what the consequences would be if a Party decides not to continue, and does not submit the next BUR two years after its first BUR. The UNFCCC Secretariat responded that SIDS and least developed countries (LDCs) continue to have discretion over their submission of subsequent BURs, even after they have submitted a first BUR.

Session 8: How to Move Forward with Capacity-building in the Region

30 Summarising the discussions, the UNFCCC Secretariat identified two key areas of constraints and gaps: (i) institutional arrangements, including funding and human resource issues; and (ii) technical expertise and capacity. Some of the challenges and solutions identified are more able to be directly addressed, such as improvements in data management systems and a request to develop guidance material specific to the circumstances of PSIDS. However, there is a need to better understand and effectively address the root causes of Parties' constraints and gaps, which is an ongoing process. Participants agreed that developing countries should give serious consideration to what they want from capacity-building and other types of support. Specifically, with regard to the Internet as a medium for training and guidance, there was some agreement that a "webinar" that brings together technical experts and PSIDS officials would be useful. A representative from the UNDP

asked whether training could be conducted through Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs), which are a good way to engage working professionals. As an example, the University of the South Pacific, World Bank and GHG Management Institute make use of MOOCs.

31 Participants and trainers discussed the possibility of building a regional community of MRV practitioners, to maximise the impact of capacity-building and cultivate depth of expertise. Participants were receptive to the idea. They raised points to be mindful of, such as the necessity of identifying and sustaining engagement with the individual practitioners responsible for MRV, and taking into account the differing national circumstances and priorities of PSIDS. The UNDP/UNEP GSP broached the idea of working through regional organisations such as SPREP to build this regional community. An electronic mailing list based on the attendance at this workshop could be the first step towards establishing a regional pool of experts.

32 In closing remarks, the UNFCCC Secretariat updated participants on its capacity-building plans for 2017. Representatives from Australia and Singapore acknowledged the feedback that participants had given on the workshop, such as for the inclusion of more hands-on technical exercises. The organisers will take these comments into account when developing the agenda for the next workshop. The participants noted that they found the workshop useful and looked forward to future workshops and collaboration to further improve their MRV capacity.

.

List of Participants

S/N	Country	Name	Designation
1	Cook Islands	Anna Elizabeth Tiraa	Director of Climate Change, Office of the Prime Minister
2	Federated States of Micronesia	Cynthia H. Ehmes	Assistant Director, Office of Environment and Emergency Management
3	Fiji	Mikaele Belena	Department of Energy, Ministry of Infrastructure & Transport
4	Fiji	Elenoa Waqanibaravi	Department of Water & Sewerage, Ministry of Infrastructure & Transport
5	Kiribati	Kireua Bureimoa	Energy Planner, Ministry of Public Works
6	Kiribati	Choi Being Yeeting	Energy Planner, Ministry of Public Works
7	Marshall Islands	Jennifer M. Debrum	Coordinator, Joint National Action Plan, Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation, Office of the Chief Secretary
8	Marshall Islands	Clarence Samuel	Assistant Secretary, Ministry of Finance
9	Nauru	Reagan Moses	Director for Climate Change, Commerce, Industry & Environment
10	Nauru	Marlaina Karni Aroi	INDC Project Coordinator, Commerce, Industry & Environment
11	Nauru	Darice Bari	TNC Project Coordinator, Commerce, Industry & Environment
12	Niue	Daniel Vilikoka Camira Makaia	Environment Officer
13	Niue	Dion Paki Taufitu	Associate Minister, Ministry of Natural Resources
14	Niue	Rossy Pulehetoa Mitiepo	Acting Director, Niue Meteorological Service

S/N	Country	Name	Designation
15	Niue	Susana StClair	Office Manager, Treasury Department
16	Palau	Lorraine Rrongel Rivera	Climate Change Mitigation Coordinator, Office of Climate Change
17	Papua New Guinea	Sherlyn Weplu	National Communication Manager, Climate Change and Development Authority
18	Papua New Guinea	Isaac Marabe Makiba	Principal Accountant, Department of Finance
19	Papua New Guinea	Sissiou Gwen	General Manager, REDD+ & Mitigation, Climate Change Development Authority
20	Papua New Guinea	Jason Paniu	Acting MRV Officer, Climate Change and Development Authority
21	Samoa	Mose Tasesa	Renewable Energy Research Officer, Ministry of Finance
22	Solomon Islands	David Tufi	Climate Change Officer, Ministry of Environment
23	Solomon Islands	Nelly Kere	Chief Programme Coordinator, Project Management and Coordination Unit, Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology
24	Solomon Islands	Hudson Kauhiona	Deputy Director, Climate Change Division, Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology
25	Tonga	Ilaisaane Lieti Sili	Principal Economist, Ministry of Finance and National Planning
26	Tonga	Lilu Moala	Project Coordinator for Third NC, Department of Climate Change, Ministry of Meteorology, Energy, Information, Disaster Management, Environment,

S/N	Country	Name	Designation
			Climate Change and Communication
27	Tonga	Akesiu Leua	Assistant Secretary (National Communication, Technical Officer), Ministry of Meteorology, Energy, Information, Disaster Management, Environment, Climate Change and Communication
28	Tuvalu	Loloma Homasi	Climate Change Policy Coordinator, Office of the Prime Minister
29	Tuvalu	Jamie U. Ovia	Project Development Officer, Climate Change Policy Unit, Office of the Prime Minister
30	Tuvalu	Lototasi Kauga Morikao	Evaluation and Coordination Administrator
31	Vanuatu	Antony Garae Liu	Director, Ministry of Climate Change
32	Vanuatu	Joseph Temakon	Energy Efficiency Officer, Department of Energy

List of Trainers and Other Participants

S/N	Country/ Organisation	Name	Designation
33	SPREP	Espen Ronneberg	Climate Change Advisor
34	UNFCCC Secretariat	Jigme	Climate Change Specialist
35	Australia	Kate Sangster	Sustainability and Climate Change Branch, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
36	Australia	Elizabeth Buchan	Sustainability and Climate Change Branch, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
37	Australia	Mark Hunstone	Assistant Director, National Inventory Systems and International Reporting, Department of Environment and Energy
38	Singapore	Syed Nouredin	Deputy Director-General, Climate Change Office, International Organisations Directorate, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
39	Singapore	Santhosh Manivannan	Assistant Director, International Policy, National Climate Change Secretariat, Strategy Group, Prime Minister's Office
40	Singapore	Davina Tham	Desk Officer, Climate Change Office, International Organisations Directorate, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
41	UNEP	Stanford Mwakasonda	UNDP/UNEP GSP
42	UNDP	Damiano Borgogno	Coordinator, UNDP/UNEP GSP
43	UNDP	Eva Huttova	UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub, Global Environment Facility
44	UNDP	Michael Comstock	UNDP New York

S/N	Country/ Organisation	Name	Designation
45	UNDP	Emma Mario	UNDP Regional Office in the Pacific (Fiji)
46	UNDP	Merewalesi Laveti	UNDP Regional Office in the Pacific (Fiji)

.

AGENDA

**Capacity-building Workshop
on the MRV/Transparency Framework for the Pacific Islands**

8 and 9 December 2016

Nadi, Fiji

(Regional dialogue on NDCs held on 6-7 December in same venue)

Location: Tanoa International Hotel,
Votualevu Road, Namaka

CONCEPT AND OBJECTIVES

Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change are obliged to communicate to the Conference of the Parties (COP), through the secretariat, information on the actions they have taken or envisage they will take to implement the Convention. This is seen as a key implementation aspect of the Convention, as it allows Parties to inform one another of their national level actions and serves as a basis for the COP to assess the implementation of the Convention by Parties.

For developing country Parties, the existing MRV framework encompasses submitting national communications (NCs) every four years and biennial update reports (BURs) every two years. Developing country Parties have also agreed to undergo an international consultation and analysis (ICA) process for information submitted in their BURs. While LDCs and SIDS have special circumstances that require them to be exempt from these processes if needed, improved MRV capacity can be useful for identifying both opportunities and capacity gaps.

This event is conceptualised to provide countries in the Pacific region with tools, technical expertise and lessons learnt on the implementation of the national communications and biennial update reports, with a clear focus on building institutional arrangements to report, greenhouse gases inventories, mitigation and adaptation actions in accordance with the relevant UNFCCC Guidelines.

The workshop is co-organized by the UNDP/UNEP Global Support Programme (funded by the Global Environment Facility -GEF) and by the Governments of Australia and Singapore.

The proposed objectives are:

- a) To provide an in-depth understanding of the international MRV/transparency framework to help Parties better prepare for it;
- b) Build capacity with a view to assisting Parties in submitting NCs, BURs, and GHG Inventories where appropriate and
- c) To provide a safe environment to let participants brainstorm solutions to problems and issues faced in their national experiences.

Participants to this workshop are also welcome to attend the NDC regional dialogue on 6- 7 December, as well as those invited to the dialogue are encouraged to attend this event. Both events will be held at the Tanoa International Hotel.

Day 1 – December 8	
0830-0900	Registration
0900-0945	<p>Opening and Overview of the Workshop</p> <p><i>Opening remarks (5 min each)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Mr. Jigme, Team Lead, Transparency Implementation Support Unit, UNFCCC Secretariat</i> • <i>Ms. Kate Sangster, Sustainability and Climate Change Branch, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Australia</i> • <i>Mr. Syed Nouredin Bin Syed Hassim, Deputy Director-General, Climate Change Office, International Organisations Directorate, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Singapore</i> • <i>Mr. Damiano Borgogno – Coordinator, UNDP/UNEP GSP</i> <p><i>Overview of the workshop: objectives and agenda</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Mr. Stanford Mwakasonda – GSP (10 min)</i>
0945- 1020	<p>Session 1: FAQ Activity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Participants to be divided into 3 groups of about 10 participants each to throw up the main questions and concerns on the BUR/NC process (15 mins)</i> • <i>Experts to try and group the questions and concerns on the BUR/NC process according to content of BUR/ content of NC/ capacity or financial needs/ institutional arrangements</i> • <i>Presentation of key questions and discussion with all participants (15min)</i>
Session chair: Mr. Damiano Borgogno	

<p>1020-1130 <u>Session</u> <u>chair:</u> Ms. Kate Sangster</p>	<p>Session 2: Overview of MRV obligations under the UNFCCC <u>NC and BUR context and guidelines</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Jigme - UNFCCC (30 min) • Q&A (10 min) <p><u>International consultation and analysis – process and outcome</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Jigme – UNFCCC (10 min) <p><u>ICA and the experience from Singapore</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Santhosh Manivannan - Singapore (10 min) • Q&A (10min)
<p>1130-1150</p>	<p>Tea break</p>
<p>1150-1300 <u>Session</u> <u>chair:</u> Mr. Santhosh Manivannan</p>	<p>Session 3: National Circumstances, Institutional Arrangements and GHG inventory <u>Building sustainable institutional arrangements for the submission of BURs and NCs</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Jigme – UNFCCC (10 min) • Q&A <p><u>GHG inventories and reporting requirements</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Stanford Mwakasonda – GSP (20 min) <p><u>GHG inventories and experience from Australia</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr Mark Hunstone – Australia (15 min) • Q&A
<p>1300-1415</p>	<p>Lunch</p>
<p>1415-1530 <u>Session</u> <u>chair:</u> Mr. Santhosh Manivannan</p>	<p>Continuation of Session 3: Institutional Arrangements and GHG inventory</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Break into 4 groups (2 on IAs and 2 on GHG) for participants to elaborate further on their respective country's GHG inventory preparation and IAs (40 min)</i> • <i>Each group should: (i) highlight challenges (institutional, technical) and (ii) identify areas for capacity-building/support.</i> • <i>Presentation of summary of discussion by each break-out group</i> • <i>Interactive discussion</i>
<p>1530-1600 <u>Session</u> <u>chair:</u> Mr. Stanford Mwakasonda</p>	<p>Session 4: Mitigation <i>Experiences in relation to reporting on mitigation actions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Santhosh Manivannan - Singapore (10 min) • Joseph Temakon - Vanuatu (10 min) • Q&A
<p>1600–1610</p>	<p>Tea Break while breaking out into groups</p>

<p>1610-1730 <u>Session</u> <u>chair:</u> Mr. Stanford Mwakasonda</p>	<p>Continuation of Session 4: Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Break into 3 groups for participants to discuss mitigation reporting in their countries (50 min)</i> • <i>Each group should: (i) highlight challenges (institutional, technical, QA/QC) faced in tracking mitigation actions; and (ii) identify areas for capacity-building/support.</i> • <i>Presentation of summary of discussion by each break-out group</i> • <i>Interactive discussion</i>
<p>1730-1745 <u>Session</u> <u>chair:</u> Mr. Jigme</p>	<p>Summary and wrap up for the day</p>

Day 2 – December 9	
<p>0845-0945 <u>Session</u> <u>chair:</u> Mr. Syed Noureddin Bin Syed Hassim</p>	<p>Session 5: Adaptation NC reporting guidelines on adaptation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jigme – UNFCCC (15 min) <p>Presentations on country experiences in relation to reporting on adaptation actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr Mark Hunstone – Australia (10 min) • Mrs. Rossy Mitiepo – Niue (10 min) • Q&A
<p>0945-1100 <u>Session</u> <u>chair:</u> Mr. Syed Noureddin Bin Syed Hassim</p>	<p>Continuation of Session 5: Adaptation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Break into 3 groups for participants to discuss adaptation reporting in their countries (50 min)</i> • <i>Each group should: (i) highlight challenges reporting information on adaptation actions; and (ii) identify areas for capacity-building/support.</i> • <i>Presentation of summary of discussion by each break-out group</i> • <i>Interactive discussion</i>
1100-1120 Tea Break	
<p>1120-1230 <u>Session</u> <u>chair:</u> Ms. Kate Sangster</p>	<p>Session 6: Constraints and gaps and support Reporting requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jigme– UNFCCC (10 min) <p>Presentations on country experiences in relation to reporting on constraints and gaps and support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cynthia Ehmes – Micronesia (10 min) • Q&A

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Break out into 3 groups for participants to discuss on ways to best report on constraints and gaps (30 min)</i> • <i>Presentation of summary of discussions by each break-out group</i> • <i>Interactive discussion</i>
1230- 1300 <u>Session</u> <u>chair:</u> na	Session 7: Support available for Parties for MRV obligations <i>Support available for Parties for MRV obligations and status of disbursement of support so far</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Damiano Borgogno – GSP (15 min) • Q&A (10 min)
1300-1415	Lunch
1415-1530 <u>Session</u> <u>chair:</u> Mr. Jigme	Session 8: How to move forward with capacity building in the region <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Break into 3 groups for participants to analyse and discuss the best approach for moving forward and for improving MRV capacity building in the region (30 min)</i> • <i>Presentation of summary of discussions by each break-out group</i> • <i>Interactive discussion</i>
1530-1600	Overall Wrap-up and Summary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Participants’ feedback on lessons learnt and questions raised at Session 1: Go around the table and have each participant share one thing that they have learnt and one thing that they will do when they get back home (20min)</i> • <i>Closing remarks by co-hosts</i> • <i>Presentation of workshop certificates</i>
1600	Tea Break and Adjourn