

Informal coordination group for capacity-building under the Convention and the Paris Agreement (ICG)

-

Summary Report of the Second Meeting

(held on 11 November 2021, 13:15-14:45 GMT)

I. Background

ICG establishment and objective

In line with the workplan of the Paris Committee on Capacity-building (PCCB) for 2021-2024¹, the informal coordination group for capacity-building under the Convention and the Paris Agreement (ICG) was established in early 2021.

The ICG currently meets twice per year on the margins of existing sessions. A first meeting was held virtually in June 2021 in conjunction with the fifth meeting of the PCCB.²

The purpose of the ICG is to create a conducive space for representatives of constituted bodies, operating entities and relevant processes under the Convention and the Paris Agreement to coordinate climate change-related capacity-building plans and activities, and allow for better sharing of information, coherence, and identification of opportunities.³

ICG membership

The ICG currently (as at November 2021) comprises 30 members from 15 constituted bodies, operating entities and relevant UNFCCC processes. The full list of members is available on the dedicated [ICG website](#).

Second ICG meeting

The second ICG meeting (ICG 2) was held on Thursday, 11 November 2021, 13:15–14:45 GMT, on the margins of the 3rd Capacity-building Hub hosted by the PCCB at the 26th session of the Conference of the Parties (COP 26) in Glasgow. The meeting was conducted in a hybrid manner with virtual participants connected through Webex. The agenda of the meeting can be found in the annex to this document. ICG 2 was moderated by Roberta Ianna, PCCB co-chair and lead of PCCB working group 1 on coherence and coordination of capacity-building.

Anticipated participants were the members of the ICG, including members of PCCB working group 1 and nominated representatives of the Action for Climate Empowerment (ACE)

¹ FCCC/SBI/2020/13 Annex I

² Meeting summary available here:

https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/1st%20ICG%20Meeting_Summary%20Report_final.pdf.

³ FCCC/SBI/2020/13 Annex II

process, Adaptation Committee, Adaptation Fund Board (AFB) secretariat, Consultative Group of Experts (CGE), Climate Technology Centre and Network, Executive Committee of the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage (WIM ExCom), Facilitative Working Group (FWG) of the Local Communities and Indigenous Peoples Platform (LCIPP), Global Environment Facility secretariat, Green Climate Fund (GCF) secretariat, Katowice Committee of Experts on the Impacts of the Implementation of Response Measures, Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG), Lima Work Programme on Gender, Standing Committee on Finance (SCF), and Technology Executive Committee (TEC). The final list of participants of ICG 2 is contained in the annex of this report.

To aid members in preparing for the meeting, the PCCB updated the forward-looking overview of capacity-building activities undertaken by constituted bodies, operating entities and relevant processes represented in the ICG. ICG members actively contributed to the updating of this document. This document, as well as other ICG-related documents, are available on the dedicated [ICG webpage](#).

II. Meeting Summary

Update on developments since ICG 1

Following welcoming remarks by Roberta Ianna (PCCB) and a round of introductions, the ICG members turned to agenda item 2, which focused on an update by the PCCB on developments since ICG 1.

Roberta Ianna recalled that after an informal virtual meet-up in May, the first ICG meeting was held in conjunction with the 5th meeting of the PCCB in June 2021, and identified several avenues for coordination and collaboration. She noted that the full outcomes of the first meeting were captured in the published meeting report and highlighted some of the opportunities identified at the meeting, including related to:

- coordination and collaboration with regard to the SCF Forum on “Financing nature-based solutions” and the SCF’s first report on the determination of needs of developing countries;
- coordination on the CGE’s work related to needs assessments;
- collaboration and coordination between the PCCB and the WIM ExCom through the work of the latter’s Expert Group on Action and Support, of which the PCCB is a member; and
- sharing of information on the capacity-building elements in the work of the FWG, including a 2021 training series.

Roberta Ianna then briefed the meeting participants of activities conducted since the conclusion of ICG 1.

As agreed during ICG 1, the PCCB invited a representative of the Lima Work Programme on Gender to join the ICG, given the strong focus on capacity-building under the Gender Action Plan.

Another activity after ICG 1 was the provision of comments on the PCCB's draft recommendations to the COP and the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting to the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA) for 2021 by ICG members at the invitation of the PCCB. Initial comments had already been provided by ICG members at the ICG meeting itself. The PCCB aims to establish this as an annual practice to ensure its recommendations to COP and CMA are also reflective of the capacity-building-related experience of other UNFCCC bodies, entities and processes.

Furthermore, the PCCB circulated a survey in July to identify efforts by ICG members to address capacity gaps and needs in their areas of work, with a particular focus on identifying lessons learned and good practices that could be applied by other bodies, entities or processes represented in the ICG. Roberta Ianna thanked the ICG members who provided consolidated inputs on behalf of their bodies, entities or processes and noted that the survey will be analysed intersessionally and findings of that analysis will be disseminated and published next year.

Further substantive follow-up activities after ICG 1 included informal exchanges between the PCCB, FWG and SCF representatives respectively, to further explore and develop the coordination and collaboration opportunities identified at the first ICG meeting.

As regards the coordination with the FWG, this included exploring together the co-production of guidance on how to strengthen the integration of indigenous peoples' knowledge into capacity-building-related activities.

Regarding the coordination with the SCF, two follow-up exchanges were held to concretize coordination and collaboration opportunities between the SCF and PCCB in the upcoming SCF Forum to utilize capacity-building-related synergies, as well as to explore the co-organization of a joint virtual event on the basis of the capacity-building-related findings of the SCF's first needs determination report.

The final update under agenda item 2 concerned the PCCB's technical session on coherence and coordination of capacity-building, which was held on Monday 8 November 2021 at the 3rd Capacity-building Hub at COP 26. The session aimed to share information with Parties and non-Party stakeholders on work undertaken by the ICG and its progress to date, and to collect feedback from Parties and others as regards the recent and future work of the ICG. ICG member Fleur Newman participated in the session on behalf of the ACE process and the Lima Work Programme on Gender.

Key take-aways from the session included the remarks of a Party representative that the ICG exemplifies the shift of paradigm in capacity-building since COP 21 in Paris in the sense that capacity-building issues can no longer be addressed in isolation, but need to be looked at in a comprehensive manner. The same Party delegate saw the ICG as well-placed to support this

transformative approach by enabling a comprehensive overview of capacity-building work undertaken by all bodies, entities and processes represented in the group.

A further suggestion made by a Party representative was for the forward-looking overview to have a more accessible format than the current Word document format, including possibly a search function, to also enable Parties and others to use the document for planning. The PCCB will explore which changes are feasible and will inform ICG members of any suggested amendments prior to undertaking them.

With regard to a further suggestion by the Party delegates at the technical session for the ICG to have more frequent meetings, for instance monthly virtual meetings, to ensure the group can be operative and effective, Roberta Ianna noted at ICG 2 that in the light of the busy schedules of ICG members year-round, it would likely be difficult to meet more frequently. She recalled that at ICG 1 the group had a consensus on meeting twice per year in conjunction with the official UNFCCC sessions and proposed to continue this schedule for the time being.

She further noted that in practice, the PCCB is already conducting meetings with ICG members in the form of follow-up exchanges that are undertaken to concretize the specific coordination and collaboration opportunities identified at the two official meetings each year. She closed by reiterating the offer the PCCB made at ICG 1 that the PCCB can be approached anytime during the year by individual ICG members to organize any smaller, follow-up meetings and exchanges with one or several members to advance coordination on specific topics or to plan any concrete, collaborative efforts.

Coordination efforts in the ICG

Under agenda item 3, ICG members had a coordination-focused discussion on the basis of the forward-looking overview of capacity-building-related activities of bodies, entities and processes represented in the ICG.

Fleur Newman, who represents ACE and the Lima Work Programme on Gender in the ICG, noted the importance of having the semi-structured, informal space the ICG provides in order to be deliberate about coordinating plans and activities and about planning any collaborative engagements. Having a means to informally coordinate on similar work undertaken by other bodies creates a moment in time to reflect on areas where there are overlaps and synergies. She further noted that, while it may take some time to determine how to conduct this coordination most effectively, the existence of the ICG is critical for both ACE and the Lima Work Programme, as it facilitates the work to be undertaken under both processes.

Roberta Ianna responded by highlighting the successful efforts already undertaken to integrate ACE and gender into the Capacity-building Hub programme and the PCCB Network activities. She also highlighted the PCCB's interest to further strengthen coordination and collaboration and to discuss at the next ICG meeting the Glasgow Work Programme on ACE and potential synergies.

Clement Yow Mulalap, representing the FWG, focused his remarks on the second three-year workplan of the FWG for the period of 2022-2024 that seeks to support the implementation of the three main functions of the LCIPP, one of which is capacity-building. He noted that capacity-building is a two-way street for the FWG, one with a focus on building the capacity of indigenous peoples and local communities to effectively engage in UNFCCC processes, both at the COP and at national and subnational levels, and one with a focus to build the capacity of Parties to better engage with indigenous peoples and local communities in the UNFCCC process. He highlighted that a number of training workshops will be held next year and that it would be desirable to explore the involvement and contributions of the PCCB and other ICG members in these trainings. The FWG workplan also includes reference on engagement with the gender action plan, and there also is interest on the side of the FWG to discuss finance-related issues pertaining to challenges and concerns encountered by indigenous peoples in their engagements with different financial entities. It is hoped that the ICG process can support these efforts. He concluded by notifying the meeting participants that his term as FWG and ICG member will end shortly.

Kenel Delusca, chair of the LEG, highlighted three capacity-building activities targeted at least developed countries (LDCs) and undertaken by the LEG. The first is the Open NAP initiative, which provides technical guidance and support to LDCs in order to advance the formulation and implementation of NAPs. The second activity he referred to is a writing workshop for LDCs aimed at helping them to present bankable projects to the GCF. Finally, he mentioned a training programme by the LEG to help LDCs to navigate the Paris Agreement. The LEG successfully collaborated with the CGE and TEC on this programme, including with a view to avoiding duplication of work. The training programme thus constitutes a good practice in terms of coordinating a capacity-building activity with other constituted bodies. Roberta Ianna noted that the PCCB would be keen to support the LEG in further disseminating its capacity-building resources and will reach out to the LEG on this matter.

Silvia Mancini, representing the AFB secretariat at ICG 2, noted that the AFB secretariat finds the forward-looking overview document a very well-structured document, well suited for the purpose of coordination within the ICG. With regard to the suggestion of a Party stakeholder at the PCCB's technical session to make the overview and its contents more accessible to non-ICG members, Ms. Mancini noted that indeed the document may be difficult to locate for non-ICG members, and making it available to external Parties on a digital platform should be explored.

Roberta Ianna responded that the PCCB will explore making the document more accessible by not only posting it on the ICG website but also in other more prominent places, such as the PCCB main website or the capacity-building portal. Further digitalization (e.g. adding a search function) could also be explored but may not be feasible due to technical and/or financial reasons.

Gervais Itsoua from the CGE noted that a capacity-building needs assessment conducted by the CGE revealed that a large majority of the countries participating in the assessment need

support with regard to national inventories and other transparency-related aspects. As countries are moving towards implementing the enhanced transparency framework under the Paris Agreement, it will be important to look at how to best assist countries as well as to ensure the support covers all regions and encourages regional networks to build on experience. In light of limited resources, it is important to avoid duplication of work. Mr. Itsoua suggested that the PCCB could contribute to the process of assessing the specific capacity gaps and needs in this area, as well as to support the identification of capacity-building resources countries may be able to use.

Cornelia Jäger from WIM ExCom expressed her appreciation that the ICG provides regular opportunity to see what is happening on capacity-building across UNFCCC bodies, entities and processes and to break silos. The ICG's function with regard to avoiding duplication of efforts and the usefulness of the forward-looking overview was also highlighted by her. She joined calls to have the forward-looking overview placed prominently on the web for other actors to retrieve it more easily. As the ExCom provided detailed inputs to the forward-looking overview and the survey that was sent to ICG members, Ms. Jäger did not go into any further detail on specific activities. She did note, however, that all five expert groups under the WIM Excom have a capacity-building component in their plans of actions, thus there will be more feedback on these activities next year from ExCom. She concluded by informing members that this was her last ICG meeting, as her ExCom membership ended at COP 26. Another ExCom member will be replacing her on the ICG in 2022.

Following interventions of ICG members, Claire Holzer Fleming, capacity-building negotiator for the UK, provided the ICG with an update on the work undertaken under the COP 26 Catalyst, a capacity-building framework convened by the UK COP 26 Presidency. It was designed to understand the capacity-building challenges of developing countries with regard to implementing the Paris Agreement and to identify common solutions. The initiative focused on four key themes, namely access to finance, adaptation action, transparency and reporting, and carbon markets participation. Throughout 2021, four action groups led by key parties, including ICG members Mattias Frumerie and Tshewang Dorji, met and discussed challenges, and a much wider range of stakeholders was consulted at the regional climate weeks. The action groups developed recommendations (available [here](#)), which were presented at the COP 26 Catalyst Day at the Capacity-building Hub. Ms. Holzer Fleming closed by inviting the ICG members to the reception of the initiative that took place the same evening in the UK Pavilion at COP 26.

Other matters

The meeting concluded with a short agenda item on “Other matters”, where Roberta Ianna raised an issue concerning the format of the ICG meetings.

Originally, ICG meetings were foreseen to be hybrid meetings to combine the benefits of live and virtual interaction between in-person attendees, and virtual attendees. The PCCB considers

the in-person element to be important, as it gives those members attending the sessions the chance to connect face-to-face. However, in organizing ICG 2 as a hybrid meeting at COP 26, some challenges were encountered. Because ICG meetings are not officially mandated events, it is difficult to receive permission to schedule them during official sessions, as well as to receive technical support for setting up the virtual component via Webex.

In light of the above-mentioned constraints, the secretariat and PCCB will explore intersessionally whether it will still be feasible to organize future meetings as hybrid meetings, or whether organizing them as fully virtual meetings would be the more suitable option. Virtual meetings may also present a more feasible option due to the fact that they could be held shortly before the official sessions. This could facilitate higher participation rates at ICG meetings, given the busy schedules and competing demands of many ICG members during sessions. A proposal will be sent to members in due course, and any views by members on this matter are welcome and can be sent to pccb@unfccc.int.

Closing

PCCB working group 1 lead Roberta Ianna closed the meeting by notifying members that the meeting report would be shared in due course for their review and that the PCCB intended to follow up with individual ICG members on their coordination or collaboration proposals made during the meeting.

The third meeting of the ICG is planned to be held on the margins of the UN climate change conference in June 2022. Further information will be shared with ICG members in due course.

Annex: Agenda and List of Participants of the second ICG meeting

Agenda

1. Welcome remarks and round of introductions.
2. Update on developments since ICG 1.
3. Informal coordination based on the forward-overlooking overview of activities.
4. Other matters.
5. Closure of the meeting.

List of Participants

Name	Body/entity/process
Kenel Delusca	LEG
Christina Dengel	AFB secretariat
Claire Holzer Fleming	COP 26 Presidency (not a member of the ICG)
Roberta Ianna	PCCB
Gervais Itsoua	CGE
Cornelia Jäger	WIM ExCom
Silvia Mancini	AFB secretariat
Clement Yow Mulalap	FWG
Renilde Ndayishimiye	PCCB
Fleur Newman	ACE & Lima Work Programme on Gender
Capacity-building Team	UNFCCC