



Experience, lessons learned and best practices in conducting reviews of various arrangements under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol relevant to the periodic assessment of the Technology Mechanism

Technical paper by the secretariat

Summary

This technical paper describes experience, lessons learned and best practices in conducting reviews of various arrangements under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol. It looks at experience from the reviews of 10 such arrangements, including constituted bodies, frameworks and mechanisms, and identifies common elements that, by extrapolation, may in some cases be considered best practices for future reviews. Bringing those elements together, it may be noted that the Conference of the Parties (COP) generally undertakes the review, with the support of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI). In addition, the secretariat often prepares official documents to support the process. Frequently the review is qualitative, drawing on inputs from Parties and observer organizations and reports of bodies. In some cases, terms of reference are prepared, with sections on the review's scope, methodology, principles or criteria. On average a review takes one year to complete and is undertaken every four years. Finally, the review generally results in a COP decision. The SBI may consider the findings contained in this report as it continues to elaborate the scope of and modalities for the periodic assessment of the Technology Mechanism.



Contents

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction	1–7	3
A. Mandate	1–4	3
B. Scope of the technical paper	5–6	3
C. Possible action by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation	7	4
II. Experience, lessons learned and best practices in conducting reviews of various arrangements under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol	8–18	4
A. Experience	8–9	4
B. Lessons learned.....	10–16	4
C. Best practices	17–18	6
III. Issues for further consideration	19	6
 Annexes		
I. List of reviews of various arrangements under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol relevant to the periodic assessment of the Technology Mechanism.....		7
II. Compilation of elements of reviews of various arrangements under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol relevant to the periodic assessment of the Technology Mechanism.....		9

I. Introduction

A. Mandate

1. At its twenty-first session, the Conference of the Parties (COP) decided to undertake a periodic assessment of the effectiveness and adequacy of the support provided to the Technology Mechanism in supporting the implementation of the Paris Agreement on matters relating to technology development and transfer.¹ It requested the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) to initiate, at its forty-fourth session, the elaboration of the scope of and modalities for the periodic assessment, taking into account the review of the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN),² and the modalities for the global stocktake referred to in Article 14 of the Paris Agreement, for consideration and adoption by COP 25.³

2. SBI 44 initiated the elaboration of the scope of and modalities for the periodic assessment. It noted that the scope will be in the context of Article 10 of the Paris Agreement and will focus on:

(a) The effectiveness of the Technology Mechanism in supporting the implementation of the Paris Agreement on matters relating to technology development and transfer;

(b) The adequacy of support provided to the Technology Mechanism in supporting the implementation of the Paris Agreement on matters relating to technology development and transfer.⁴

3. SBI 46 requested the secretariat to prepare a technical paper on the experience, lessons learned and best practices in conducting reviews of various arrangements under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol that are relevant for the periodic assessment, including a list of such reviews, by SBI 47 with a view to informing the deliberations of the SBI on elaborating the scope of and modalities for the periodic assessment.⁵

4. SBI 46 agreed to continue elaborating the scope of and modalities for the periodic assessment, taking into account Parties' deliberations at SBI 46 and the information contained in this technical paper, at SBI 48.⁶

B. Scope of the technical paper

5. This technical paper describes experience, lessons learned and best practices in conducting reviews of various arrangements under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol relevant to the periodic assessment of the Technology Mechanism. It draws on 10 completed reviews, as listed in annex I. It also describes the experience of the independent review of the CTCN.

6. Chapter II below provides information on experience, lessons learned and best practices. A description of experience in undertaking reviews of various arrangements is provided in chapter II.A below, followed by a synthesis of lessons learned in undertaking those reviews in chapter II.B below. Chapter II.C below extrapolates from the lessons learned common elements of previous reviews that may, in some cases, be considered best practices. Issues for further consideration are identified in chapter III below.

¹ Decision 1/CP.21, paragraph 69.

² As referred to in decision 2/CP.17, annex VII, paragraph 20.

³ Decision 1/CP.21, paragraph 70.

⁴ FCCC/SBI/2016/8, paragraph 94.

⁵ FCCC/SBI/2017/7, paragraph 60.

⁶ FCCC/SBI/2017/7, paragraph 61.

C. Possible action by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation

7. The SBI may wish to consider the information contained in this paper as it continues to elaborate the scope of and modalities for the periodic assessment of the Technology Mechanism.

II. Experience, lessons learned and best practices in conducting reviews of various arrangements under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol

A. Experience

8. Since the adoption of the Convention, the UNFCCC process has accumulated significant experience in undertaking reviews of arrangements under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol. This paper considers the experience of the UNFCCC in reviewing the following 10 arrangements (see also annex I):

- (a) Adaptation Committee;
- (b) Adaptation Fund;
- (c) Framework for capacity-building in developing countries established under decision 2/CP.7;
- (d) Framework for capacity-building in countries with economies in transition established under decision 3/CP.7;
- (e) Consultative Group of Experts on National Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention;
- (f) Expert Group on Technology Transfer;
- (g) Financial Mechanism;
- (h) Least Developed Countries Expert Group;
- (i) Special Climate Change Fund;
- (j) Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage associated with Climate Change Impacts.

9. The arrangements considered comprise four constituted bodies, two funds, two frameworks and two mechanisms. Only reviews completed before COP 23 were considered. Where multiple reviews of an arrangement have been undertaken, for instance in the case of the Financial Mechanism, emphasis was placed on the experience of the most recent review.

B. Lessons learned

10. To identify lessons learned from undertaking reviews of arrangements, elements of the reviews of the 10 arrangements were compiled. The results of that compilation are contained in annex II, while a synthesis of the compilation is provided below. Boxes 2 and 3 each provide an example of a review that featured some of the identified elements.

1. Who undertook the review?

11. In most cases, the COP was mandated to undertake the review. Furthermore, for all reviews the SBI assisted the COP, often by conducting work at its May/June sessions. On two occasions the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice also provided assistance. For one review a constituted body was mandated to support the process (see box 1). For several of the reviews the secretariat was mandated to support the process, often by preparing technical papers, compilation and synthesis reports or other official documents.

Box 1

Supporting the fifth review of the Financial Mechanism

The Conference of the Parties (COP) mandated the Standing Committee on Finance to provide expert input to the fifth review of the Financial Mechanism. The committee prepared draft updated guidelines and a technical paper, supporting the COP in concluding the fifth review at its twentieth session. Further information may be found in decisions 8/CP.18, 8/CP.19 and 9/CP.20.

2. How was the review undertaken?

12. All reviews had qualitative elements, often including considering reports and gathering inputs from key stakeholders. For one review, an event was held to support the process. A few reviews were quantitative; in those cases, the reviewer collected data and analysed it over different time periods.

13. For some reviews terms of reference or similar were prepared, providing further information on the scope of and modalities for the review. All of them had sections on the review's objectives and its sources of information. Some had other sections, such as on the review's scope, methodology, general principles or criteria.

3. What were the sources of information for the review?

14. Most of the reviews drew on the inputs of Parties and observer organizations. In addition, often the reviewer considered annual reports or other reports on the arrangements under review.

4. When was the review undertaken?

15. The time taken to undertake the review varied between those that were initiated and concluded at the same session of the COP and those that took up to three years. On average, the time taken to complete a review was one year (i.e. initiated at one COP session and concluded at the subsequent one). Almost all the reviews were periodic and the review frequency varied between two and five years. The average frequency was every four years.

5. What was the outcome of the review?

16. All reviews resulted in a COP decision. One review also resulted in a decision of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol.

Box 2

The review of the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage associated with Climate Change Impacts

In 2016, the Conference of the Parties (COP), at its twenty-second session, conducted a review of the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage associated with Climate Change Impacts. As part of it, the COP identified elements for subsequent reviews of the mechanism. In this context, it recommended, inter alia, that:

- Such reviews should be periodic and no more than five years apart;
- The next review be held in 2019;
- Future reviews should consider the progress of the mechanism's Executive Committee in implementing its workplan and long-term vision, as appropriate;
- The subsidiary bodies finalize terms of reference for each review at least six months before it is to be undertaken;
- The subsidiary bodies take into consideration inputs and submissions from Parties and relevant organizations, as appropriate, when developing the terms of reference;
- As an input to the 2019 review, the secretariat prepare a technical paper with the assistance of the mechanism's Executive Committee.

Further information may be found in decision 4/CP.22.

Box 3

Independent review of the Climate Technology Centre and Network

The Conference of the Parties (COP), at its seventeenth session, requested the secretariat to commission an independent review of the effective implementation of the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN) four years after its inception. It noted that subsequent periodic independent reviews will be conducted every four years. In 2016, following a procurement process in accordance with United Nations regulations, the secretariat selected a consultant to conduct the review. The consultant developed and implemented the following methodology to undertake the review:

- Inception phase;
- Data collection and analysis phase, including the following activities:
 - Literature review;
 - Interviews with CTCN stakeholders;
 - Three electronic surveys;
- Participation at a CTCN Advisory Board meeting;
- Review and recommendations phase.

The consultant worked between October 2016 and August 2017. The review process was both qualitative and quantitative, based on consideration of reports and interviews and also data analysis. Following this, the consultant delivered a final report and the secretariat submitted it for consideration at COP 23. The report, inter alia, identifies findings and provides recommendations on enhancing the performance of the CTCN. Further information may be found in decision 2/CP.17, annex VII, and document FCCC/CP/2017/3.

C. Best practices

17. Each review was a unique process assessing a unique subject. Thus it is inherently difficult to identify best practices for undertaking reviews of arrangements. However, one may extrapolate from the aforementioned findings what, in some cases, may be considered best practices.

18. As previously noted, the COP generally undertakes the review, with the support of the SBI. Occasionally the COP also mandates a constituted body to support it. The secretariat often provides support, generally by preparing official documents. Frequently the review is qualitative, drawing on inputs from Parties and observer organizations and reports of bodies. In some cases, it has been helpful to prepare terms of reference for the review, identifying elements such as scope, methodology, principles or criteria. A review generally takes one year to complete and the frequency of review is every four years. The review generally results in a COP decision.

III. Issues for further consideration

19. As the SBI continues to elaborate the scope of and modalities for the periodic assessment of the Technology Mechanism, it may wish to consider the following:

(a) Are the common elements of previous reviews, as identified in chapter II.C above, relevant to the elaboration of the scope of and modalities for the periodic assessment? If so, in what way?

(b) Are there any elements missing from chapter II.C above that are important in the context of the scope of and modalities for the periodic assessment? If so, what are those elements?

(c) Should the scope of and modalities for the periodic assessment be similar to or different from the elements identified in chapter II.C above?

Annex I

List of reviews of various arrangements under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol relevant to the periodic assessment of the Technology Mechanism

<i>Arrangement under review</i>	<i>Review mandate</i>	<i>Mandate description</i>
Adaptation Committee	Decision 2/CP.17, paragraph 119	The Conference of the Parties further decides to review the progress and performance of the Adaptation Committee at its twenty-second session, with a view to adopting an appropriate decision on the outcome of this review
Adaptation Fund (second review)	Decision 1/CMP.3, paragraph 33	The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol decides to undertake, at its sixth session, a review of all matters relating to the Adaptation Fund, including the institutional arrangements, with a view to ensuring the effectiveness and adequacy thereof, and thereafter every three years, in order to adopt an appropriate decision on the outcome of such a review; the review shall take into account the outcome of performance reviews of the secretariat and the trustee servicing the Adaptation Fund, submissions by Parties and other interested intergovernmental organizations and stakeholders
Framework for capacity-building in developing countries established by decision 2/CP.7 (third review)	Decision 13/CP.17, paragraph 7	The Conference of the Parties also decides to conclude the second comprehensive review and to initiate the third comprehensive review of the implementation of the framework for capacity-building in developing countries, taking into account decisions 1/CP.16 and 2/CP.17 as they relate to capacity-building, at the forty-second session of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (June 2015) with a view to completing the review at the twenty-second session of the Conference of the Parties (November–December 2016)
Framework for capacity-building in countries with economies in transition established by decision 3/CP.7 (third review)	FCCC/SBI/2007/34, paragraph 86	The Subsidiary Body for Implementation decided to review the status of the implementation of decision 3/CP.7 at its thirty-sixth session, making use of the information referred to in paragraph 82 above; information provided by Parties with economies in transition and Parties included in Annex II to the Convention in their national communications; and information to be provided by the Global Environment Facility and its implementing agencies, and multilateral and bilateral agencies and other international organizations
Consultative Group of Experts on National Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention (fourth review)	Decision 19/CP.19, paragraph 8	The Conference of the Parties decides to review, at its twenty-second session (November–December 2016), the mandate and terms of reference of the Consultative Group of Experts, with a view to adopting a decision at the same session
Expert Group on Technology Transfer	Decision 4/CP.7, paragraph 2	Agreeing on the need to develop a process for the review of the progress of the work and terms of reference, including, if appropriate, the status and continuation, of the Expert Group on Technology Transfer by the Conference of the Parties at its twelfth session as mandated in decision 4/CP.7, paragraph 2
Financial Mechanism (fifth review)	Decision 3/CP.4, paragraph 2	The Conference of the Parties also decides, in accordance with Article 11, paragraph 4, of the Convention, to review the Financial Mechanism every four years, on the basis of the guidelines as contained in the annex to decision 3/CP.4 or as they may subsequently be amended, and to take appropriate measures
Least Developed Countries Expert Group (fourth review)	Decision 6/CP.16, paragraphs 8 and 9	The Conference of the Parties decides to review, at its twenty-first session, the progress, need for continuation and terms of reference of the Least Developed Countries Expert Group, and to adopt a decision

<i>Arrangement under review</i>	<i>Review mandate</i>	<i>Mandate description</i>
		thereon
		The Conference of the Parties also decides on the following actions and steps necessary for the Subsidiary Body for Implementation to initiate the review at its forty-second session, with a view to completing the review at its twenty-first session
Special Climate Change Fund	Decision 1/CP.12, paragraph 3	The Conference of the Parties decides to assess, at its fifteenth session, the status of implementation of paragraph 2 above, with a view to considering further guidance on how the fund shall support concrete implementation projects in accordance with paragraphs 22–29 of decision 5/CP.7
Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage associated with Climate Change Impacts	Decision 2/CP.19, paragraph 15	The Conference of the Parties decides to review the Warsaw International Mechanism, including its structure, mandate and effectiveness, at its twenty-second session, with a view to adopting an appropriate decision on the outcome of this review

Annex II

Compilation of elements of reviews of various arrangements under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol relevant to the periodic assessment of the Technology Mechanism

Table 1

Compilation of elements of reviews – part 1

<i>What?</i>	<i>Who?</i>				<i>How?</i>			<i>Information sources</i>		
<i>Arrangement under review</i>	<i>Body mandated to undertake review</i>	<i>Subsidiary body assisted the review? Which one?</i>	<i>Work undertaken by constituted body? If yes, which one?</i>	<i>Work undertaken by the secretariat?</i>	<i>Qualitative review</i>	<i>Quantitative review</i>	<i>Workshop or another event</i>	<i>Inputs by Parties and observer organizations</i>	<i>Inputs by others</i>	<i>Consideration of reports on arrangement under review</i>
Adaptation Committee	COP	SBI and SBSTA	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Adaptation Fund (second review)	CMP	SBI	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
Framework for capacity-building in developing countries established by decision 2/CP.7 (third review)	SBI	SBI	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Framework for capacity-building in countries with economies in transition established by decision 3/CP.7 (third review)	SBI	SBI	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No

Consultative Group of Experts on National Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention (fourth review)	COP	SBI	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Expert Group on Technology Transfer	COP	SBI	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
Financial Mechanism (fifth review)	COP	SBI	Standing Committee on Finance	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Least Developed Countries Expert Group (fourth review)	COP	SBI	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Special Climate Change Fund	COP	SBI	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No
Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage associated with Climate Change Impacts	COP	SBI and SBSTA	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No

Abbreviations: CMP = Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol, COP = Conference of the Parties, SBI = Subsidiary Body for Implementation, SBSTA = Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice.

Table 2

Compilation of elements of reviews - part 2

<i>What?</i>	<i>Terms of reference for the review? Did they have the following sections?</i>							<i>Timing</i>			<i>Outcome</i>
<i>Arrangement under review</i>	<i>Terms of reference (or similar)</i>	<i>Objective</i>	<i>Scope</i>	<i>Sources of information</i>	<i>Methodology</i>	<i>General principles</i>	<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Time taken to undertake review</i>	<i>Periodic review or another review to take place</i>	<i>If periodic, what frequency?</i>	
Adaptation Committee	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	Started and concluded at COP 22 (2016)	Yes	Every five years	COP decision
Adaptation Fund (second review)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Second review: two years. Started at CMP 8 (2012), finished at CMP 10 (2014) First review: three years. Started at CMP 5 (2009), finished at CMP 8 (2012)	Yes	Every three years	COP decision
Framework for capacity-building in developing countries established under decision 2/CP.7 (third review)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Third review: 18 months. Started at SBI 42 (June 2015), concluded at COP 22 (2016) Second review: two and a half years. Started at SBI 28 (June 2008), concluded at COP 17 (2011) First review: 18 months. Started at SBI 18 (June 2003), concluded at COP 10 (2004)	Yes	Every three to four years	COP decision
Framework for capacity-building in countries with economies in transition established under decision 3/CP.7 (third review)	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	Third review: six months. Started at SBI 36 (June 2012), concluded at COP 18 (2012) Second review: started and concluded at COP 13 (2007) First review: started and concluded at COP 10 (2004)	Yes	Every five years	COP and CMP decisions

What?	Terms of reference for the review? Did they have the following sections?							Timing	Periodic review or another review to take place		Outcome
Arrangement under review	Terms of reference (or similar)	Objective	Scope	Sources of information	Methodology	General principles	Criteria	Time taken to undertake review	Periodic review or another review to take place	If periodic, what frequency?	
Consultative Group of Experts on National Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention (fourth review)	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	Fourth review: started and finished at COP 22 (2016) Third review: two years. Started at COP 17 (2011), finished at COP 19 (2013) Second review: two years. Started at COP 13 (2007), finished at COP 15 (2009) First review: started and concluded at COP 8 (2002)	Yes	Every two to five years	COP decision
Expert Group on Technology Transfer	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	Two years. Started at COP 11 (2005), finished at COP 13 (2007)	Yes	Every five years	COP decision
Financial Mechanism (fifth review)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Fifth review: two years. Started at COP 18 (2012), finished at COP 20 (2014) Fourth review: three years. Started at COP 13 (2007), finished at COP 16 (2010) Third review: started and concluded at COP 12 (2006) Second review: started and concluded at COP 8 (2002) First review: one year. Started at COP 3 (1997), finished at COP 4 (1998)	Yes	Every four years	COP decision
Least Developed Countries Expert Group (fourth review)	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	One year. Stocktaking meeting (March 2015), continued at SBI 42 (June 2015), finished at COP 21 (2015)	Yes	Every five years	COP decision

<i>What?</i>	<i>Terms of reference for the review? Did they have the following sections?</i>							<i>Timing</i>			<i>Outcome</i>
<i>Arrangement under review</i>	<i>Terms of reference (or similar)</i>	<i>Objective</i>	<i>Scope</i>	<i>Sources of information</i>	<i>Methodology</i>	<i>General principles</i>	<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Time taken to undertake review</i>	<i>Periodic review or another review to take place</i>	<i>If periodic, what frequency?</i>	
Special Climate Change Fund	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	One year. Started at COP 15 (2009), finished at COP 16 (2010)	No	-	COP decision
Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage associated with Climate Change Impacts	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	Started and concluded at COP 22 (2016)	Yes	Not specified	COP decision

Abbreviations: CMP = Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol, COP = Conference of the Parties, SBI = Subsidiary Body for Implementation.