


# Challenges in Reporting on Support

Randy CARUSO | U.S.  
7 March 2017 | Bonn, GERMANY



# Challenges

1. Poor systems
2. Flows via Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs)
3. Finance, tech, & capacity building (FTC) interlinkages

# 1. Poor systems

- Challenges - reporters:
  - Rows limited to 500 (U.S. had 1,376 activities over 2014-15.)
  - Can't copy / paste (!) or import from other systems or existing .xls files.
  - Can't change order of entries (e.g., alphabetical order).
  - doesn't facilitate granular reporting. This applies to **metadata** (definitions + methods) and **data** (projects / activities).

# 1. Poor systems

Table 7(b)

Provision of public financial support: contribution through bilateral, regional and other channels in 20XX-3<sup>a</sup>

<i>Recipient country/ region/project/programme/activity<sup>b</sup></i>	<i>Total amount</i>		<i>Status<sup>c, 3</sup></i>	<i>Funding source<sup>4</sup></i>	<i>Financial instrument<sup>5</sup></i>	<i>Type of support<sup>6</sup></i>	<i>Sector<sup>d, 7</sup></i>	<i>Additional Information<sup>e</sup></i>
	<i>Domestic currency</i>	<i>USD</i>						
		<i>Climate-specific<sup>d, 2</sup></i>	<i>Committed</i>	<i>ODA</i>	<i>Grant</i>	<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>Energy</i>	
				<i>OOB</i>	<i>Concessional loan</i>	<i>Adaptation</i>	<i>Transport</i>	
			<i>Disbursed</i>	<i>Other<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>Non-concessional loan</i>	<i>Cross-cutting<sup>6</sup></i>	<i>Industry</i>	
					<i>Equity</i>	<i>Other<sup>8</sup></i>	<i>Agriculture</i>	
					<i>Other<sup>8</sup></i>		<i>Forestry</i>	
							<i>Water and sanitation</i>	
							<i>Cross-cutting</i>	
							<i>Other<sup>8</sup></i>	

500 row limit...

# 1. Poor systems

Table 7(b)

USA\_BR2\_v1.0

## Provision of public financial support: contribution through bilateral, regional and other channels in 2013<sup>a</sup>


Recipient country/ region/project/programme <sup>b</sup>	Total amount		Status <sup>c</sup>	Funding source <sup>e</sup>	Financial instrument <sup>x</sup>	Type of support <sup>z, h</sup>	Sector <sup>d</sup>	Additional information <sup>e</sup>
	Climate-specific <sup>f</sup>							
	American dollar - USD	USD						
Honduras /	28,000,000.00	28,000,000.00	Committed	OOF	Non-Concessional Loan	Mitigation	Energy	
India /	1,910,866.00	1,910,866.00	Committed	ODA	Grant	Adaptation	Cross-cutting	
India /	4,220,454.00	4,220,454.00	Committed	ODA	Grant	Mitigation	Energy	
India /	2,866,299.00	2,866,299.00	Committed	ODA	Grant	Mitigation	Forestry, Agriculture	
India /	32,000,000.00	32,000,000.00	Committed	OOF	Non-Concessional Loan	Mitigation	Energy	
India /	40,000,000.00	40,000,000.00	Committed	Other ()	Other (Loan Guarantee)	Mitigation	Energy	
Indonesia /	3,238,288.00	3,238,288.00	Committed	ODA	Grant	Adaptation	Cross-cutting	
Indonesia /	4,113,065.00	4,113,065.00	Committed	ODA	Grant	Mitigation	Energy	
Indonesia /	7,872,767.00	7,872,767.00	Committed	ODA	Grant	Mitigation	Forestry, Agriculture	
Afghanistan /	54,447,000.00	54,447,000.00	Committed	ODA	Grant	Mitigation	Energy	
Africa, Multiple Countries /	21,664,089.00	21,664,089.00	Committed	ODA	Grant	Adaptation	Cross-cutting	
Africa, Multiple Countries /	12,913,617.00	12,913,617.00	Committed	ODA	Grant	Mitigation	Energy	
Africa, Multiple Countries /	25,904,583.00	25,904,583.00	Committed	ODA	Grant	Mitigation	Forestry, Agriculture	
Africa, Multiple Countries /	4,000,000.00	4,000,000.00	Committed	OOF	Non-Concessional Loan	Mitigation	Energy	

# 1. Poor systems

- Implications: countries with > 500 activities can't report at the activity level; lack of more detailed sub-sectors makes it difficult to assess alignment with country strategies and priorities; etc.
- Future:
  - Metadata - should hopefully improve following SBSTA 10 (a) improvements. Still need more granular options for sector.
  - Data - expand number of entries, align CTF reporting parameters with existing international standards (e.g., ISO for sector, geography.) [NB: not even consistent across tables...]

# 1. Poor systems

- Challenge - end-users: data is reported in rigid, “donor-oriented,” individual .pdf files.



Developed country Parties	Second Biennial Reports (BR2) (due 1 January 2016)
Australia	BR2 (3039 kB) Submission date: 23 Dec. 2015 BR2 CTF (1127 kB) Submission date: 23 Dec. 2015
Austria	BR2 (479 kB) Submission date: 29 Dec. 2015 BR2 CTF (1013 kB) Submission date: 29 Dec. 2015
Belarus	BR2 (872 kB) Submission date: 30 Dec. 2015 BR2 (1061 kB) (English, informal translation) Submission date: 16 May 2016 BR2 CTF (1042 kB) Submission date: 30 Dec. 2015
Belgium	BR2 (3420 kB) Submission date: 17 Dec. 2015 BR2 CTF (1623 kB) Submission date: 17 Dec. 2015
Bulgaria	BR2 (1427 kB) Submission date: 29 Dec. 2015 BR2 CTF (1004 kB)



# 1. Poor systems

- Implications: difficult for countries and other interested parties to report, access, manipulate, and synthesize data in a meaningful way.
- Future: user-friendly systems. open-data. web-based platforms.


# 2. Flows via MDBs

- Challenge: MDBs are a critical channel, but climate-relevance of MDB flows is difficult to assess on an inflow-basis.

Table 7(a)  
Provision of public financial support: contribution through multilateral channels in 20XX-3<sup>a</sup>

	Total amount		Status <sup>b,3</sup>	Funding source <sup>4</sup>	Financial instrument <sup>5</sup>	Type of support <sup>6</sup>	Sector <sup>c,7</sup>
	Core/general <sup>d,1</sup>	Climate-specific <sup>e,2</sup>					
Donor funding	Domestic	USD	Committed	ODA	Grant	Mitigation	Energy
	currency	Domestic					
		currency		Other <sup>f</sup>	Non-concessional loan	Cross-cutting <sup>g</sup>	Industry
					Equity	Other <sup>f</sup>	Agriculture
					Other <sup>f</sup>		Forestry
							Water and sanitation
							Cross-cutting
							Other <sup>f</sup>
							Not applicable
Multilateral climate change funds							
1. Global Environment Facility							
2. Least Developed Countries Fund							
3. Special Climate Change Fund							
4. Adaptation Fund							
5. Green Climate Fund							
6. UNFCCC Trust Fund for Supplementary Activities							
7. Other multilateral climate change funds							
<b>Subtotal</b>							
Multilateral financial institutions, including regional development banks							
1. World Bank							
2. International Finance Corporation							
3. African Development Bank							
4. Asian Development Bank							
5. European Bank for Reconstruction and Development							
6. Inter-American Development Bank							
7. Other							
<b>Subtotal</b>							

# 2. Flows via MDDBs



## 2. Flows via MDBs

- Implications: inhibits ability to understand the role that MDBs play in a country's efforts to channel climate finance. Leads to misinterpretation.
- Future: utilize outflow data from MDBs (e.g. from SCF Biennial Assessment) as opposed to inflow data from countries.

# 3. FTC interlinkages

- Challenge: Finance, technology, and capacity building are not mutually exclusive.
- Implications: countries are requested to report duplicative information in different formats; lose sight of synergies.
- Future: “tags” vs. / alongside “buckets.”