



**Dedicated Meeting on Ways and Means to
Advance the Technical Examination Process in 2015
10 February 2015**

**Further Comments by the Republic of Maldives on behalf of
the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS)**

In structuring the work of the Technical Examination Process (TEP) in 2015, we must understand how WS2 can increase implementation of policy options in areas of high mitigation potential in the pre-2020 period.

We think that there are four ways that WS2 drives action:

First, state and non-state actors are incentivized to take action individually by the informational outputs of the TEPs. This information, which is collected in the technical papers, put into an online menu of policy options, and disseminated through a summary for policy makers works to overcome the barrier of a lack of readily accessible and digestible information.

Despite significant information existing in the wider policy world, this outside information has significant limitations in that it is focused on pre-2030 and not pre-2020 action, and it often lacks detailed examination of the barriers faced by developing countries in deploying policy options. This means that there is still a barrier to action, which the informational outputs from better structured TEPs can fill. This is why AOSIS has been pushing hard for an online menu of policy options.

Second, existing multilateral/multi-stakeholder cooperative initiatives can use the TEP (including TEMS and high level meeting) in order to gain new institutional or Party partners and attract new resources in order to scale up. As we have mentioned before, these initiatives would not then come under the UNFCCC. Rather, they would use the platform of the TEP to capitalize on the convening power of the UNFCCC and the financial and technical resources that exist in the UNFCCC.

Third, interested actors can form new initiatives, which capture opportunities for multilateral/multi-stakeholder cooperation in policy areas that are not currently being addressed by existing initiatives. Again, the TEP wouldn't take control of these initiatives, but rather be a launching point for them.

Fourth, convention bodies and mechanisms would modify their work plans to take into account information that results from the TEP. These bodies and mechanisms could be given direction from COP decisions. However, we believe that through their engagement with the TEP, and in particular their participation in the TEMs, they can organically take forward the solutions that are discussed and incorporate them into their workplans and identify opportunities for more coordinated action among them.

We think that the first mechanism can be fulfilled by better informational outputs from the TEP, on which we have made multiple recommendations in previous AOSIS submissions. We wish to focus in these further comments on how we can enhance collaborative action under the second and third mechanisms, and then support that action through the convention bodies.

Driving New Collective Action Under WS2

There are five parts to this process, and currently, we are only doing two of them:

First, a broad TEM, like the ones that we held last year on renewable energy, that identify and explore opportunities and good practices, including costs and barriers across an entire sector. This could be organized by the secretariat, but we think that there should be greater involvement of outside expert organizations.

Second, there should be intersessional work, which results in a technical paper, updates to the online menu of policy options, and a summary for policy makers. This should be done through consultation with parties, parties and observer submissions, and collaboration with outside expert organizations, and should contain the following:

1. Analysis of opportunities and existing good practices
2. Analysis of barriers
3. Analysis of existing entities and mechanisms supporting implementation

Third, following on the call of many parties for TEMs to be iterative, and building on the information contained in the technical papers, there should be more focused TEMs. For example, if the topic of the broad TEM was renewable energy, then a focused TEM could be deployment of renewables in small-grid environments. Supported by the Secretariat, these TEMs should be organized by a “lead organization” that has an interest in taking forward an initiative in this area. These lead organizations could be parties, UN agencies, IGOs, civil society, or private sector actors. The outcome of the focused TEM would be an actionable policy option(s), or initiative(s), that the lead organization and/or others would continue to work on in the intersessional periods. These initiatives could be like those that were discussed from the UN SG’s Summit, such as the IRENA SIDS Lighthouses or the African Clean Energy Corridor, or it could be an innovative financial instrument, a specialized capacity building task force, or maybe a narrow technology sharing agreement.

We would expect that the Convention Bodies would be significantly engaged in the focused TEMs, and could support the initiatives that result from them and/or modify their own work plans.

There may be multiple focused TEMs that result from a single broad TEM. Also, there might need to be multiple meetings (not all at the UNFCCC) of a focused TEM to hone in on an actionable policy option.

Fourth, there should be intersessional work by the lead organization and other interested actors to flesh out the initiative, attract other actors and attract the needed resources.

This intersessional work is essential. At this point of the process, the UNFCCC, through the secretariat and the Executive Secretary, may support the lead organization, potentially by using its convening power to help engage the correct actors. The Executive Secretary's Office and/or the secretariat may require additional resources to secure the necessary capacity and expertise in the relevant topic areas. Further, the Convention Bodies should consider, individually and collectively, how they might coordinate and support. To this end, it might be appropriate to consider developing an inter-Convention task force to help the Convention Bodies to coordinate their work.

We recognize that much of this intersessional work may happen outside of the UNFCCC and under the direction of the lead organizations.

Fifth, the initiative could then be launched at the annual high-level segment. This high level segment will act as a political moment, which may itself attract more participants or resources. The initiatives would then continue outside the UNFCCC, but by being launched from within the UNFCCC, it provides a signal to parties and non-parties that action is happening. In addition, they would be invited back to future high-level segments when ready to announce significant milestones and achievements, providing soft accountability for demonstrating progress. This progress could also be demonstrated through technical submissions and participation in future TEMs throughout the existence of the initiative.

We think that these five steps are the way that we can operationalize moving from technical information to action.