

CEEW Submission on Enhanced Transparency Framework

Background

Ad-hoc Working Group on the Paris Agreement (APA) has been mandated (paragraph 99 and 100 of decision 1/21) to develop the modalities, procedures, and guidelines (MPGs) for an enhanced transparency arrangement. So far, APA has held three engagements with Parties on this subject matter: in Bonn (16-26 May 2016), Marrakech (7-14 November 2016), and Bonn (8-18 May 2017). Also, the secretariat organized an intersessional workshop at Bonn (16-18 March 2017), where 95 experts from 84 Parties and 11 regions participated. As seen below in table 1, six technical (brainstorm) sessions were held at this workshop on the broader set of ideas coming out from Agenda-5 submissions.

Table 1: Key areas of discussion during intersessional workshop at Bonn (16-18 March)

Aspects	Key Areas
Reporting	National inventory report on anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks of greenhouse gases
	Information necessary to track progress made in implementing and achieving its nationally determined contribution under Article 4 of the Paris Agreement
	Information related to climate change impacts and adaptation under Article 7 of the Paris Agreement, as appropriate
	Information on financial, technology transfer and capacity-building support provided, needed and received under Articles 9–11 of the Paris Agreement
Technical expert review	Information to be reviewed, Format and Steps, Roles and responsibilities of the technical expert review team and the secretariat, Composition of the technical expert review team, Frequency and timing, Technical expert review report
Facilitative, multilateral consideration of progress	Information to be considered, Format and steps, including events to be convened, the roles of Parties and the secretariat, Frequency and timing, Summary report

Source: UNFCCC (2017), APA – informal note on Agenda Item 5¹

The informal note of APA 1.3 (i.e. third part of the first session) identifies some plausible “headings and subheadings” which could be useful in guiding Party responses in a formal submission (by September 30). Based on these upcoming submissions, the secretariat would organise a pre-session round table (4-5 November 2017) to discuss the issues identified.

On the basis of guiding questions provided by APA informal note, CEEW has formulated specific responses that would help facilitate the process and add value to the discussions.

¹http://unfccc.int/files/meetings/bonn_may_2017/in-session/application/pdf/apa2017_i5_informal_note_by_the_co-facilitators_.pdf, accessed 22 August 2017

Overarching considerations and guiding principles

The current transparency arrangement under the convention has different obligations for Annex I and Non-Annex I Parties². Annex I Parties have a **comprehensive** reporting obligation in-terms of annual inventory reporting, biennial reports and national communications, which is followed by technical review and multilateral assessment under International Assessment and Review. Non-Annex I parties, on the other hand, follow comparatively **simpler** reporting obligation in-terms of biennial update report and national communications which is followed by technical analysis (identifies improvement areas and capacity building needs) and facilitative sharing dialogues under International Consultation and Analysis.

The existing transparency regime offers significant flexibility to Non-Annex I Parties (factoring in their capacity and development priorities), and it is unlikely that any new provisions under a new (envisioned) transparency regime that is being discussed, will offer increased ‘flexibility’. However, it is necessary for Parties to meaningfully drive the discussions on an enhanced transparency framework – both to hold the developed world accountable to their commitments, and also to ensure that those elements of the transparency framework that were hitherto not the focus, do end up getting their due³.

Also, the existing transparency regime (which was setup pre-Paris) **does not** have the necessary provisions to **report on activities under the Paris agreement** in its entirety. One such aspect is the transparency in tracking progress made in implementing and achieving its NDCs (article 4). The first global stock take (which is due in 2023) would require a more consistent approach, common reporting guidelines and timelines in order to be effective. A new regime must establish a high level of transparency from the developed countries, on the provisions that directly impact the support required by the developing countries, and hence overall achievement of climate mitigations pledged under the Paris agreement³.

The enhanced transparency framework must promote effective implementation of the Paris agreement and be able to accommodate the rapidly changing landscape – both in terms of global climate change related priorities and the national priorities. It should address the needs of developing countries and build mutual trust and confidence among the parties. Specifically, it must focus on **reducing the uncertainty of action and support**, and **strengthen the existing arrangement** by identifying the lacunae that have resulted in an overwhelming feeling that developing and developed country parties are at odds on the extent of support received and extended. It should **build upon** and **eventually** supersede the existing transparency arrangement under the convention. To facilitate the transition of developing countries from existing to enhanced transparency regime in phased manner, there is need to a develop a **capability matrix** that will help in determining capabilities of the developing countries for

² Annex I Parties include the industrialized (developed) countries and Non-Annex I includes developing countries; Source: http://unfccc.int/parties_and_observers/items/2704.php

³ Sumit Prasad, Karthik Ganesan and Vaibhav Gupta (2017); ‘Enhanced transparency framework in the Paris Agreement: Perspective of Parties

availing flexibilities in a rational manner. Developing countries would then report on their plans of improvement that would ensure a phased capacity development plan, subject to receiving a commensurate level support – both domestic and international.

Objective

- Enhance transparency to understand climate change mitigation action and track progress in achieving Nationally Determined Contributions
- Bring clarity on support offered and received by Parties and;
- Inform the Global Stock-take

Guiding principles

- Facilitative, non-intrusive, non-punitive, respectful of national sovereignty, not imposing *undue* burden for Parties, build on and enhance existing transparency arrangements by providing adequate flexibility to those developing countries that need it in the light of their capacity.

Building upon the existing transparency arrangements under the Convention, recognizing that the transparency arrangements under the Convention shall form part of the experience drawn upon for the development of the MPGs

- Identifying gaps and shortcomings of existing systems⁴, bring clarity to key definitions (such as capacity, support and climate finance) and ensuring methodological consistency.
- Utilising and building upon the existing reporting guidelines (Inventory Report/CTF, BR/BUR, NCs) & process (ICA - FSV; IAR – MA) and **converging to common reporting obligations** and **review** through a facilitative process.
- Avoiding undue burden – cross-linking the various reporting obligations and process in order to avoid duplication of effort.

Structure and design of the MPGs

- Converging towards a common structure for all Parties with embedded flexibilities based on the experiences⁵ of the Parties:
 - I. Reporting obligation: Inventory Reporting (common tabular format based on threshold reporting on the basis of capabilities); a common Biennial Transparency report for all the Parties that would cover - inventory, progress on NDCs, adaptation, support needed and provided and improvement plans that layout next steps for augmenting reporting
 - II. A need for a technical expert review for all reporting
 - III. Facilitative, multilateral consideration of progress

⁴ India's Submission to APA on item 5 (Transparency); 30 September 2016;

http://www4.unfccc.int/Submissions/Lists/OSPSubmissionUpload/176_281_131197144601542950-India%20-%20Transparency%20of%20action%20and%20Support.docx

⁵ Note - experience and not capacity, as it is important to factor in how parties have fared while implementing various provisions of transparency in their respective national systems.

Flexibility

- A **capability matrix** must be put in place to objectively help determine the capacity within developing countries to fulfil obligations of an enhanced transparency framework. It would also help determine the efficacy of capacity building effort and **availing flexibility** in a transparent and objective manner.
- Developing countries to report on **improvement plans** that would ensure **phased capacity development**, subject to commensurate support for the same. Such plans must be outcome driven and must not merely focus on the capacity building inputs that are required or must be provided.

Procedural aspects

- **Evaluate transition phase** for developing country Parties, from existing transparency obligation to an enhanced transparency obligation, based **on adequate support** available to bring their capacity up to the mark.
- Reporting:
 - A common tabular format (CTF) inventory report (subject to capability of Non-Annex I Parties), and minimum (threshold) reporting requirements for Non-Annex I Parties to satisfy the needs of the GST process.
 - **Biennial transparency report**⁶ – Consider all existing aspects along with additional elements such as reporting progress of NDCs; improvement plans for developing Parties; reporting on consistent financial flow and others. After the capabilities are built, developing Parties to gradually shift towards the **Biennial Transparency report** which would result in common reporting formats for all the Parties at a later stage.
- SBSTA or SBI, through a dedicated committee, should conduct technical expert review of the reporting obligation followed by a facilitative multilateral consideration of progress.
- Compliance committee as mentioned in Article 15 of the Paris Agreement shall ensure that these procedures are followed and commitments in-terms of support and reporting are met.

⁶ As per the submission by Brazil, Argentina and Uruguay on APA Agenda Item 5, 25 February 2017; http://www4.unfccc.int/Submissions/Lists/OSPSubmissionUpload/525_323_131324648255521982-Bra%20Arg%20Uy%20-%20Submission-Art13%20Transparency%20Framework%20FINAL.pdf

A. National inventory report on anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks of greenhouse gases

For an effective global stocktake, common minimum thresholds of reporting of inventory would be necessary. Hence, each party should cover common reporting heads (providing what is deemed as absolutely essential) and this will reflect the common elements of the MPG. The Biennial Report (BR) and Common Tabular Format (CTF) (for Annex I) and Biennial Update Report (BUR) (Non-Annex I) are already designed to provide a comprehensive view of anthropogenic emissions and efforts to abate climate change impacts. Also, most of key aspects such as description of national circumstances and institutional arrangements; inventory planning: preparation and management; information on methodologies; uncertainty assessment; quality assurance/quality control, and other relevant aspects are already covered under these existing guidelines. Hence, under the enhanced transparency regime there is space for technical discussions to happen that would identify key reporting areas under inventory and develop a methodology for identifying minimum threshold reporting till the capabilities for developing countries are built. This would facilitate the convergence towards the common reporting formats.

Aspects to be covered

National circumstances and institutional arrangements; inventory planning: preparation and management; information on methodologies; uncertainty assessment; quality assurance/quality control, assessment of completeness, coverage of sectors and gases, times-series data and other relevant aspects

Existing Instrument

Annex I Parties submit National GHG inventories (annually) and Non-Annex I Parties submit national GHG inventories as a part of their national communications and biennial update reports for different reporting years.

Approach

- Aim towards defining convergence in reporting obligation for Annex I & Non-Annex I Parties on these existing guidelines (NIR, BUR) that would cover all above aspects.
- Base year of inventory to be that of NDCs, ensure methodology consistency for all the Parties, and clearly define specific terminology used such as boundary and scope.
- Minimum threshold reporting of inventory for developing countries that fill in the information gaps which can be used to track global trends of GHG emissions and eventually feed it into GST.

Flexibility to Non-Annex I Parties

- Capacity to be determined through capability matrix (in turn driven by a robust competency framework that defines the kinds of capacity required). Minimum threshold reporting must represent a level that would satisfy needs of GST while also ensuring those with least capacity can still fulfil the minimum obligations.

- Lag in reporting of inventory, the tiers associated with activity data and EF must be driven by the needs of GST. Developed country requirements are already stringent and must be maintained at current levels. LDC and SIDS may require some exemptions outside of what the capability matrix provides.

Linkages

Work of APA on defining the modalities, inputs, and the outputs of Global Stock-take to collectively assess the progress made.

Challenges and Issues

- Ensuring that Parties improve and reach to the same level in a short-time span, in terms of quality of reporting, coverage, scope and level of details.
- For comparability of information: Adherence to common methodology (IPCC guidance and tiers levels) and reducing assumptions (uncertainty).
- Transition of Parties from minimum threshold reporting to comprehensive inventory reporting (realised via improvement plans) by providing targeted support towards capacity building exercise for the Parties that need it.

B. Information necessary to track progress made in implementing and achieving nationally determined contributions

NDCs are at the core of the Paris agreement. They represent the pledges taken by all parties in order to achieve the long-term goal of keeping temperature rise within 2 degrees Celsius. Article 4 (para 13) requires all parties to account for the progress on NDCs. This accounting requires specific modalities (to be established) around reporting formats and associated frequency of submissions. NDC accounting must ensure methodological consistency (ex ante and ex post)⁷ and enable a clear reporting on the targets proposed within the stated NDCs. In order to avoid any unnecessary duplication with these processes and to capitalize on existing reporting processes, NDC reporting could be subsumed within the scope of biennial reporting (whatever form it might take). It will be a specific case of reporting on NDC within the broader mitigation actions (covered in BUR/BR) and help in highlighting NDC achievements and progress.

In addition, it would facilitate a seamless reporting of action on mitigation, adaptation and support and accord equal importance to all elements. Transparency under Paris agreement mandates reporting on economic wide emission reduction targets while making adaptation reporting a soft-obligation. Modifications/ enhancement in existing reporting guidelines (BUR/BR) could be further considered to capture any other missing or supporting elements. Utilising this existing reporting modality would avoid the burden of any systemic changes required for both parties – developing and developed³. An enhanced level of support shall be extended to developing countries, as per their capacities, to accommodate proposed reporting protocols.

Aspects to be covered

National circumstances and institutional arrangements; description of a Party's NDC; indicators to track progress made in implementation and achievement of the Party's NDC; mitigation policies and measures, actions, and plans, and other actions with mitigation co-benefits, related to the implementation and achievement of an NDC including effects (historical and expected), barriers and costs; summary and projection of greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) and removals; information related to internationally transferred mitigation outcomes (ITMOs); other relevant information.

Existing Instrument

There is no existing provision made for NDC reporting under the convention, as it was newly introduced with the Paris Agreement. However, many existing reporting guidelines e.g. biennial reports/biennial update report or national communication cover mitigation aspects, MRV and market based mechanism guidelines for reporting which could be utilized and enhanced for designing the MPGs of NDCs.

⁷ Climate Change Expert Group (CCXG), Global Forum on the Environment and Climate Change: Accounting - Key takeaways, 13 September 2017

Approach

- Define guidelines that would enable reporting on different types of NDCs in a **Biennial Transparency Report (a likely common biennial reporting mechanism that may emerge, in place of BUR/ BR)**.
- Guidelines to come up with a tabular format that would clearly identify: commitment, conditional/unconditional component, coverage, scope, reference year, adjustments, changes/additional decisions and indicators to track NDC.
- Tabular format guidelines for information on domestic mitigation policies, measures and progress with their implementation as well as on sharing the best practices and monitoring reporting and verification of the same.

Flexibility to Non-Annex I Parties based on rationale

- Flexibility in reporting quantitative progress of NDCs based on its type (longer term mitigation nature of NDC), as the impact of few NDCs could not be quantified during short term period (more than two years).

Linkages

- Work of APA on features of NDCs, guidance in relation to the mitigation sections, information to facilitate clarity, transparency and understanding of nationally determined contributions and accounting for Parties' NDCs.
- Work of APA on defining the modalities, inputs and outputs of Global Stock-take to collectively assess the progress made.
- Work of Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technology Advice (SBSTA) discussion on guidance relating to internationally transferred mitigation outcomes.

Challenges and Issues

- Ensuring adherence to the common guidelines as Parties do not have common understanding of the scope of NDCs (as parties have different types of NDCs).
- Identifying some common set of information to track progress against NDCs would be difficult because of different types of NDCs.
- Ensuring methodological consistency between the communication of NDCs and information on implementation.
- Avoiding double counting for ITMO – change in reporting of base year data would result in complex process for Non-Annex-I Parties.

C. Technical session on information related to climate change impacts and adaptation under Article 7 of the Paris Agreement

It is important to incorporate efforts towards climate adaptation into the global stocktake. Adaptation is a key component of climate change management and is codified under the Cancun Adaptation Framework. Despite this, there is not enough recognition within the NDCs and reporting provisions within the PA, on the importance of adaptation efforts (to the needs of) developing country parties³. A comprehensive reporting is essential for ensuring balance between mitigation and adaptation aspects. This will result in equal importance to adaptation actions by recognising the adaptation efforts (sharing best practices) and help in understanding the impacts of climate change. Once again, in order to avoid duplicity and intricate reporting systems, BR/BUR should be actively considered as a mode of reporting for all-inclusive details on vulnerabilities, adaptation support received or provided (as applicable), and national adaptation plans. For the reason that adaptation impact/plans are not as dynamic relative to mitigation strategies, suggested frequencies of reporting shall be considered between two to four years, in light of capacity-building and flexibility requirement of developing countries. However, without any flexibility, a consistent line of reporting shall be followed by developed countries on their adaptation support provisions.

Aspects to be covered

National circumstances; vulnerabilities, risks and impacts, and methodologies used to measure; adaptation policies, strategies, plans and actions and efforts to mainstream adaptation into national policies and strategies; information related to loss and damage; adaptation priorities, barriers, costs and needs; progress on implementation of adaptation; social and economic consequences of the response measures; monitoring and evaluation of adaptation actions and processes; cooperation, good practices, experiences, and lessons learned; recognition of adaptation efforts

Existing Instrument

National Communication, the national adaptation plan process and its reporting provisions

Approach

- **Biennial transparency report** as means of reporting mechanism for adaptation as well.
- Develop a guidance that links different communication provisions in a complementing manner. This is to avoid dual work, reduce burden and meet multiple objectives without through unified reporting.
- Since reporting on adaptation is soft obligation under enhanced transparency, suggested frequencies of reporting for this information (adaptation chapter in biennial transparency report) could be every two years (if possible) or every four years, based on the new information available.

Flexibility to Non-Annex I Parties based on rationale

- Adaptation needs are very country and context (geographic for one) specific. Flexibility is paramount and it is difficult to expect standardisation in reporting. Establishing key inputs and outcomes to adaptation process is crucial.

Linkages

- Work of APA on agenda item 4 for adaptation communication
- Work of SBSTA on agenda item 9 on national adaptation plans
- Work of the Nairobi work programme on impacts, vulnerability and adaptation to climate change, the Adaptation Committee, the Least Developed Countries Expert Group, the national adaptation plan process, and support arrangements
- Work of APA on agenda item 6 for information necessary for global stocktake
- Linkages with nationally determined contributions

Challenges and Issues

Capability of the Parties to capture the information required

Quantification of adaptation impacts

D. Information on financial, technology transfer and capacity-building support provided, needed and received

A sustained and adequate level of support (financial, technical, and capacity-building) is fundamental for developing countries, least-developed countries (LDCs), and Small island developing States (SIDS). There is no room for uncertainty either in the timelines or quantum of support, that is finally agreed upon. The withdrawal of the United States from the Paris Agreement brings in political uncertainty, and raises a key question on how such support can developing countries, LDC, and SIDS, actually expect? While the PA establishes a floor (USD 100 Billion) for international support reporting on support is a soft-obligations under the Paris agreement “support shall be provided” – and does not specify ‘by who, how, and when?’ This is clearly seen in Article 13 (para 14, 15), Article 4 (Para 5), Article 7 (para 13), Article 10 (Para 6), and Article 11 (Para 5).

While we aim at collective action towards enhanced climate mitigation under the Paris Agreement, we should certainly emphasize an enhanced level of transparency for the reporting on support committed (by developed countries, as applicable), and support received (by developing countries, SIDS, LDC). Taking cues from the Article 2 (Para 1c), finance flows must be consistent with the pathways towards low carbon development and climate-resilient development. Hence, it is important that developed countries reflect on the process of deciding support and report on ‘**specific policies**’ and actions on their part, that **would contribute to making finance flows consistent** with the needs of developing country parties.

One of the primary expectations from the APA is to arrive at a working definition of ‘climate finance’, as various parties account for it differently – to suit their obligations. Secondly, a centralised and transparent system needs to be developed to track all financial flows (targeted at climate change) between parties, after cross-validation reporting from donors and recipients.

There is little clarity on the framework for technology development and transfer, under Article 10 of the Paris Agreement. While the article does refer to the inclusion of efforts in technology development and transfer, reporting and documentation of such efforts is important, and should be the first step, in enabling an effective stocktake of collaboration on technology development.

Aspects to be covered

Information on financial support technology transfer support, capacity-building support provided and mobilized by developed country Parties and other Parties that provide support; Information on financial support, technology transfer support, capacity-building support received by developing country Parties, including the use, impact and estimated results; Information on financial support, technology transfer support, capacity-building support needed by developing country Parties; Improvement plans for Non-Annex I Parties.

Existing Instrument

National communications, Biennial reports and Common tabular format tables, and Biennial update report

Approach

- Biennial transparency report guidelines to define the tabular formats for financial support provided/received that would have indicators channels, amount, type, sector, status, financial instruments and recipients/provider.
- Non-Annex – I Parties to report (quantify) support needed for **conditional components** of NDC and identify priority needs for technological and capacity building.
- Guidelines for **inclusions of improvement plans** for Non-Annex - I Parties to improve quality of reporting over time.
- Annex – I Parties to report on **specific policies** that would contribute to making finance flows consistent with the needs of Non-Annex -I Parties within a defined timeframe along with “**ex post**” and “**ex ante**” information on support.

Flexibility to Non-Annex I Parties based on rationale

Use of should obligation for this provision already provide sufficient flexibility to Non-Annex I Parties.

Linkages

- Work of SBSTA agenda item on modalities for the accounting of financial resources provided and mobilized through public interventions and other ongoing support-related discussions
- Work of APA on agenda item 6 for information necessary for global stocktake
- Work of the Paris Committee on capacity-building and capacity-building initiative for transparency

Challenges and Issues

- Reaching to a common understanding on what is reported as climate finance.
- Identifying how any climate finance is new and additional finance.
- Enhancing capabilities of Non-Annex I Parties as presently their reporting is inconsistent and not comparable.

E. Technical expert review

Presently, International consultation and analysis (ICA) and International assessment and Review (IAR) consists of two stages: a country-level assessment undertaken by technical experts, followed by an open discussion with their peers about the efforts and progress made. **Non-Annex I** Parties undergo **technical analysis** (TA) under ICA process for the biennial update reports (BURs) and any additional technical information submitted. A **team of technical experts** (TTE) in consultation with the Party concerned **identify capacity-building needs** in order to facilitate improve reporting over the time. While submissions (greenhouse gas inventories, biennial reports and national communications) from **Annex I Parties** undergo **technical review** under IAR. These reviews are co-ordinated by the secretariat and conducted by international expert review teams (ERTs) to provide a thorough and **comprehensive technical assessment** of the implementation of the Convention by Annex I Parties. There are three operational approaches for conducting reviews: desk reviews (sending information to experts), centralised reviews (experts meeting in a single location) and in-country review (experts visiting the country being reviewed). From the experiences of the Parties, **In-country reviews** have **helped parties** in communicating their challenges and identification of improvement areas⁸. Also, these reviews lend credibility to the submission and increases its acceptability among the Parties. Hence, the enhanced transparency framework should be built upon these experiences of the Parties. Article 13 proposes a ‘technical expert review’ that would bring transparency into the reporting provisions for developed and developing parties. For developing countries there is an element of flexibility, as it says that “the review process shall include assistance in identifying capacity-building needs”. Hence, it is essential to have **review of improvement plans** for developing countries and ensure support for them during review.

Aspects to be covered

Scope of information to be reviewed (Inventory, NDCs, support provided, improvement plans); composition of technical expert review team; procedures - format and steps; frequency and timing; review reports

Existing Instrument

Annex – I Parties: A technical review of the national reports submitted by Annex I Parties which is a part of International assessment and review (IAR). IAR process is conducted under the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) and aims to promote the comparability of efforts among all developed country Parties with regard to their quantified economy-wide emission limitation and reduction targets.

Non-Annex -I Parties: Team of technical experts (TTE) conduct a technical analysis of the BURs submitted by non-Annex I Parties, and any additional technical information that may be provided by the Party concerned. This technical analysis of BUR is the process of the international consultation and analysis (ICA) for Non-Annex-I Parties.

⁸ Climate Change Expert Group (CCXG), Global Forum on the Environment and Climate Change: Transparency of reporting on mitigation, 13 September 2017

Approach

- Define the process based on the following principles: Facilitative, non-intrusive, non-punitive, respectful of national sovereignty and avoid placing undue burden on Parties and the secretariat.
- Should be based on the current review process and have team of technical experts to conduct technical analysis/review before facilitative, multilateral consideration of progress. SBSTA or SBI could facilitate the process.
- Team should be composed in a balanced manner that would ensure equal representation of experts from developed and developing countries.
- Frequency and timing of review should be based on the availability of reports (information) from the Parties.
- Focus of the technical review should be balance, the review of financial, technology and capacity-building support provided and review of mitigation actions are to be treated equally.
- Review of the improvement plans for developing countries should be consider and ensure support for them during summaries.
- Summary report from technical analysis/review shall consider the inputs needed for Global Stock-take.

Flexibility to Non-Annex I Parties based on rationale

- Flexibility must be based entirely on the scoring as per capability matrix. There must be a correspondence between capability level and ability to undergo TER on various metrics. These could be objectively established as part of the FD in 2018.
- Timelines for implementation of recommendations decided during the review of improvement plans should be flexible as these are to be supported.

Linkages

- Work of the Paris Committee on Capacity-building and Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency for ensuring support towards improvement plans
- Work of APA on agenda item 6 for information necessary for global stocktake

Challenges and Issues

- Review of information that could be confidential/not disclosed by the Parties.
- Issue on how technical process would facilitate quality of reporting overtime by identifying/prioritizing key capacity building needs in the report.
- Review process would require a large number of competent experts and adequate secretariat support for ensuring it is being conducted in a timely manner.

F. Facilitative, multilateral consideration of progress (FMCP)

It is important to have scrutiny of commitment and its achievement among the peers as it would play a critical role for ensuring the progress against long term goal of Paris agreement. It would foster a greater transparency and supportive environment to help Parties in achieving their climate goals. Facilitative Sharing Views (FSV) is one such process under ICA that nudges non-annex I Parties to move forward by enhancing the spirit of good intentions. It helps to focus on identified capacity building requirements for non-Annex I Parties based on the summary report by team of technical experts. On the other hand, Multilateral Assessment (MA) under IAR for annex-I Parties involves engagement of other Parties and stakeholders that help in establishing a rigorous and comprehensive assessments⁹. It is important to utilise these existing modalities under the enhanced transparency arrangement. Above all, FMCP must ensure strict adherence to the principles shrouded under the Paris Agreement i.e. “nonintrusive, non-punitive and respectful of national sovereignty”. The workshops/meetings under FMCP should be open for the observers to attend with proceedings be available online in public domain.

Aspects to be covered

Scope (Parties effort, Sharing experiences), Procedure, Frequency and timings, Summary reports

Existing Instrument

Annex – I: Multilateral assessment (MA) process which is a part of the international assessment and review (IAR) process.

Non-Annex - I: Facilitative sharing of views (FSV) under the international consultation and analysis (ICA) process.

Approach

- Define a process similar to the existing instrument that would be a trust-building exercise, enhances mutual understanding and learning, and promote international cooperation.
- SBSTA/SBI could facilitate the process, considered summary report of technical expert review; Conduct Parties presentation on their experiences and ways ahead (via round-table setting) followed by question from other Parties.
- Define a finite timespan within which (FMCP) is to be conducted and ensure that the information provided in the reports are not outdated.
- Entire discussions should be publicly available.

Flexibility to Non-Annex I Parties based on rationale

Flexibility based on capability matrix scoring. However, for those parties that have emissions lower than a threshold level could opt to do this jointly with other such parties, in order to use resources more efficiently.

⁹ Melissa Low and Rajesh Rangarajan, Post-Paris COP21: ‘Facilitative Sharing of Views’, Transparency and Climate Action in Southeast Asia; Policy Brief – 22 September 2016; weblink: <http://esi.nus.edu.sg/docs/default-source/esi-policy-briefs/post-paris-cop21--facilitative-sharing-of-views%27-transparency-and-clim-.pdf?sfvrsn=2>

Challenges and Issues

Ensuring that the process is completed for all the parties in a timebound manner and improving the feedback and response process. There is a need to augment the capacity of the Secretariat in being able to handle such a large demand on its limited resources – human and financial. It is important that developing countries play an important role in this capacity augmentation of the Secretariat.