Climate Action Network

CAN Submission:
The Periodic Assessment of the Technology Mechanism

January 2017

Climate Action Network International (CAN) is the world's largest network of civil society organizations working together to promote government action to address the climate crisis, with more than 1100 members in over 120 countries. www.climatenetwork.org

I. Introduction

CAN thanks the Parties for the opportunity to present our initial thinking on the scope and modalities for the Periodic Assessment (PA) of the Technology Mechanism (TM).

Our **KEY IDEAS**:

1. **The Technology Framework should provide guidance for the regular evaluation of the TM through the Periodic Assessment (PA).** The Assessment must include metrics and indicators developed from the mandate of the TM.
2. The TM has the opportunity to play a **central role in supporting the Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) of developing countries** within its existing mandate, but in order to meet the scale of Parties' needs, the **TM must further build cooperation** among institutions that have capacity to work in this space.
3. The PA should assess the mandates of the TEC in terms of **how its guidance is actually having influence on appropriate technology decisions in developing countries** and how well the outcomes of Technology Needs Assessments (TNAs) and Technology Action Plans **(TAPs) are mainstreamed into planning at various levels, and translated into bankable projects**.
4. The PA should assess the ability of the CTCN to meet its mandate in providing technical assistance to NDEs, ensuring that the knowledge generated is accessible and actionable by others, and provides adequate support for developing country NDCs.
5. The PA should assess the effectiveness of the TM to create and maintain the linkages with other institutions needed to ensure that technology-related climate action can be implemented at scale.

II. Principles for the PA

1. As an ongoing assessment tool for the TM, the Technology Framework should prepare the PA to do assessment of its own modalities and procedures to ensure the most accurate and relevant data is continually reassessed, captured and made useful.
2. The impact of the work of the TM should be **measured by the combined results of its direct and indirect mitigation and adaptation efforts in developing countries**. Those results should include, *inter alia*, attention to:
    - Equitable use of resources;
    - Support for indigenous knowledge and technologies;
    - Appropriate capacity building for communities most affected by climate change;
    - Gender considerations, and opportunities for women to be empowered agents of change;
    - Effectiveness of protections for human rights and mechanisms for consultation with stakeholders;
    - Impact on other relevant institutions; and support for building national climate technology innovation and R&D capacity.

3. The impacts of climate technology can be positive or negative, or even both with differentiated impacts on differing communities. When countries and communities intend to adopt technologies, not well understood in the local implementation environment, a well thought-through plan for vetting the technology should be adopted by the full stakeholder community, including suppliers, government and all varieties of local stakeholders. **Where emerging and untested technologies are involved, Technology Assessment is critical**.

III. TEC aspects of the PA

1. **Providing recommendations to other stakeholders and bodies:** A major component of the TEC's mandate is to recommend action or guidance. Therefore one of the **priorities for the PA** would be to assess if these recommendations are timely, accessible (including in multiple languages), actionable, based on sound evidence, allow effective protections for human rights and mechanisms for consultation with stakeholders, support for building national climate technology innovation and R&D capacity; and **are actually being taken up by the target institutions/entities**.
2. **Technology Needs Assessments (TNAs), and Technology Action Plans (TAPs)** form other key aspects of the TEC's mandate. The PA should assess the effectiveness of the means by which TNAs and TAPs have been translated into policy action and the capacities of member states to design climate technology actions. This should build upon the existing monitoring and evaluation work for TNAs analyzed by the TEC.
3. **Use of surveys with NDEs, NDAs and relevant institutions** such as the GCF and GEF is suggested as a component of the PA. This more qualitative assessment can enable the Periodic Assessment to clarify the impact of the TEC and its outputs on the effectiveness of climate technology activities, projects, plans, and financing. Without this information, the Periodic Assessment would fail to fully elucidate how the Technology Mechanism, in particular the TEC, is fulfilling its mandate.

IV. CTCN aspects of the PA

1. **Mandate and Institutional Design of the CTCN:** Operation of the CTCN over the past few years has raised questions about the structural capacity to respond to large-scale requests for technical assistance and the quality of assistance provided. The Periodic assessment needs to ask key questions around the capacity of the CTCN to manage

large numbers of requests, the standards it uses for assessing quality, and effectiveness of the technical and policy advice. It should also address means for raising the ambition of the parties when they request CTCN technical and policy advice.

2. **Finance and Finance Linkages**: A key challenge for the CTCN has been the predictability and the scale of funding to allow it to properly fulfill its mandate, and to budget and plan appropriately. The periodic assessment should ask questions around the predictability of the funding process, and its impacts on meeting the necessary scale of funding to support NDCs, the adequacy of its linkages with the Financial Mechanism.

V. Linkages to support the mitigation, adaptation and loss and damage goals of the TM

1. The assessment of the TM should address the linkages between it and other relevant institutions that could be categorized as:
    - The internal linkages within the TM, between the TEC and CTCN;
    - The linkages with its reporting structure, the SBs and the COP as well as the linkage among the Parent consortium of the CTCN;
    - The linkages to other thematic bodies of the UNFCCC, such as the Green Climate Fund, the Standing Committee, the Adaptation Fund, the Adaptation Committee, the Capacity Building Committee, and the Warsaw Implementation Mechanism;
    - As well as linkages to institutions or organizations outside the UNFCCC including other UN organizations, climate–focused Business organizations, Research Institutions, and Civil Society.

2. These linkages should be both informal, with information sharing among staff, and more formal, institutionalized connections, including but not limited to joint workshops, possible funding mechanisms, and collaboration on projects where appropriate. Evaluation of these linkages should ask key questions:
    - Are the linkages serving to further the missions of the CTCN and the TEC, under the technology mechanism?
    - Are they leveraging each institution's strengths and resulting in enhanced efforts to fulfill the mission of the TM?
    - Are the **linkages** serving, beyond what individual institutions would be able to do on their own, to **assist and support** countries?

We thank the Parties for attention to this submission and would be happy to answer further questions.