OUTCOMES SUMMARY AGENDA ITEM 3. ADMISSION AND REGISTRATION.

This is a summary of inputs from phase 2 to agenda item 3. The proposed solutions listed under the sub-themes reflect comments and suggestions made under focus group discussions, written submissions and bilateral meetings. Suggestions are not agreed upon for implementation and in several cases fall outside the purview of the review process. They should be read as a collection of ideas and possible actions that served as input for the spin-off discussions during Phase 3. The project report under phase 3 will consolidate the diverse inputs provided across all agenda items and present a list of agreed upon action points aimed at addressing the issues raised throughout the review process, whenever possible.

3.1	**Admission mechanism under the Convention & inclusion (non-structured stakeholders)**
3.1.1	**Should there be a way for citizen movements register to participate at the COPs in the future? What is the optimal way to balance the participation needs of admitted organizations and that of non-admitted citizen movements?**

I. Key Concerns:

(i) The current NGO Constituency system may be considered limiting or exclusive, and it allows for power dynamics within constituencies which may favor some individuals over others on account of personal proximity or alignment, leaving potentially relevant stakeholders out of the conversation (agenda item 1)[1].

(ii) When non-structured stakeholders request a badge from an admitted observer organization, it poses a twofold burden on the head of delegation: first, in deciding whether to include the non-structured stakeholder in the delegation and, if so, ensuring that the individual has sufficient capacity to participate effectively under their organization's name.

(iii) How to ensure representative and fair access of wider categories of stakeholders considering the current lack of transparency on who is actually attending (agenda item 2).

(iv) Difficulty in balancing opening space to individuals with the physical limitations of the process/venues. In the context of a "fixed pie", participation of non-structured stakeholders would come at the expense of admitted observer organizations.

(v) Green zone participation: while deadlines and admission process to blue zone (organized by UNFCCC) are generally more structured and transparent, availability and clarity of information regarding the green zone (organized by host country) varies. Also, it is necessary to consider the intended audience for this zone and resulting potential constraints to wider participation (e.g., language).

II. Shared understanding & secretariat clarifications:

(i) While most participants in focus groups were in favor of defining a way to include non-structured stakeholders, others highlighted that the participation of these individuals is already possible in the green zone, which has been open to registrations from the public in recent years.

(ii) A potential way to enable broader participation by civil society is to work on a smarter venue design. Establishing an intermediate zone ('teal/ turquoise' zone), for example, would not only allow for wider participation but also for a more organized participation by admitted observers, by assembling attendees in different areas according to their needs and purposes of participation – please see discussion below on a differentiated badge system (II.(ii) under 3.2.1).

(iii) It is necessary to encourage and ensure diversity of participants within NGO Constituencies and admitted organizations to allow for broader representation (agenda item 2).

(iv) Capacity-building can help non-structured stakeholders better understand and access the process. For a more general discussion and specific suggestions on capacity-building among observers, please refer to the outcome summaries for agenda items 1 and 4. The need for capacity-building was also mentioned in other agenda item discussions.

(v) Potential spin-off groups suggested during discussions: (1) best practices for capacity-building for non-structured stakeholders in observer delegations; (2) non-structured stakeholder participation in the green zone.

---

[1] Cross-references to other agenda items are in red font.

III. Proposed solutions:	Proposed ownership:
(i) Create spaces for representation at the regional level that allow improving the participation of the constituency in the meetings with the support of the secretariat by convening meetings to identify admitted Admitted NGOs, lines of work and scales of representation (national, sub-regional, regional) then form a selection panel of those who carry the voice by mandate of the rest of the organizations in the region to face-to-face meetings.	Constituency Focal Points (CFPs), secretariat
(ii) Establish a balance in the participation of the admitted observers at sessions and, above all, look for mechanisms to guarantee equitable accessibility to the processes, even when some cannot attend the meetings in person (Agenda item 2).	secretariat
(iii) Ask Parties to offer participation spaces to admitted observers, considering a balance in the constitutions, in the national and regional processes.	COP Presidency, SB Chairs
(iv) Encourage observer organizations to nominate grassroots, indigenous, women representatives (Agenda item 2).	Observers, secretariat
(v) Promote diversity reports within organizations (Agenda item 2).	Observers
(vi) Encourage local civil society organizations nominated by Presidency to be as diverse in representation as possible.	COP Presidency
(vii) Provide transparency on quota allocated to civil society organizations nominated by the Presidency.	COP Presidency
(viii) Consider hosting a 'pre-conference' meeting the week before with larger civil society participation.	Host country, secretariat
(ix) Provide a template with timelines (deadlines and admission process) for the green zone so that participants have some predictability while planning their attendance.	Host country, secretariat
(x) Offer a space for non-structured stakeholders and admitted organizations alike to submit video interventions ahead of COP, review and stream them during COP.	secretariat
(xi) Open opportunities for written interventions for the general public (precedence in the Oceans' Conference).	secretariat
(xii) Increase options for virtual participation (e.g., to non-accredited individuals) (Agenda item 6).	secretariat
(xiii) Consider decoupling the delegation offices from the pavilions so as to open pavilions/side events to the civil society (potentially transfer it to green zone).	Host country, secretariat
(xiv) Consider opening pavilions/side events to the green zone within the confine of security apparatus.	Host country, secretariat
(xv) Consider organizing high level events or inviting high level figures to the green zone to raise the profile there.	COP Presidency, Host country
(xvi) Arrange for representative and formal setup in green zone similar to blue zone, such as plenary, family photo area, media center, etc, so that similar activities can take place in green zone.	Host country
(xvii) Consider implementing smart design of the venue to enable observers' interaction with Parties as much as possible, within host country's budget and physical space constraints.	Host country, secretariat
(xviii) Consider creating an intermediate zone ('teal zone') to allow for different types of participation and interaction	Host country, secretariat
(xix) Organize spin off group on 'best practices for capacity-building for non-structured stakeholders in observer delegations' and report back to secretariat with feasible recommendations for action.	Observers, secretariat

(xx) Organize spin off group on 'non-structured stakeholder participation in the green zone' and report back to secretariat with feasible recommendations for action.	Observers, secretariat

3.2 Registration & purpose of participation (differentiated badge system)
3.2.1 Would a differentiated system that assigns badges according to participants' access needs hold value and be workable? How could potential barriers to its implementation be overcome?
3.2.2 What measures can ease the burden of both the observer organizations needing more quota for side-event and exhibition access and the secretariat assessing for admission when applicants are not interested in following the negotiation process, while ensuring the representation of the widest possible stakeholders?

I. Key Concerns:
(i) How to ensure inclusiveness without expanding blue zone and putting additional strain on security. If a differentiated system is put in place and the large majority of observers still request access to blue zone, strain remains unresolved.

II. Shared understanding & secretariat clarifications
(i) Most participants in focus group meetings supported a differentiated badge system, with tagging at the individual level, at the discretion and responsibility of the admitted organizations.
(ii) A potential intermediate zone ('teal/ turquoise' zone) within the restricted area aimed at concentrating pavilions, exhibits, events and fostering interaction would allow for more flexibility in (and therefore a higher number of) badges, with some restricted to the intermediate zone, for example. It would also allow for a better interaction among observers and between them and decision-makers in a restricted zone, but with less interference in negotiations.
(iii) Potential constraints to this idea: (1) venue and available space vary depending on host countries; (2) there is a likelihood that the large majority of observers would still want access to the blue zone; (3) such division of spaces could potentially create a 'class system' which would hinder cross collaboration and networking.
(iv) Potential spin-off group suggested during discussions: development of taxonomy of differentiated badges by purpose.

Proposed solutions:	**Proposed ownership:**
(i) Streamline nominations in ORS by: ● Secretariat: only allowing entry of participants that provide full details (not just name). Substitutions at the time of confirmation could still be made by new participants with full details after the quota has been set, but only to replace previous nominees who had full participant details entered. ● CFPs: (1) instructing Admitted NGOs to include full participant details in ORS, with attendance dates added at the time of confirmation and (2) suggesting to the board of their organizations to first draft a tentative delegation list with some standby options (as potential replacement in case a previous nominee cannot make it).	CFPs, secretariat
(ii) Provide transparency on quotas and clarification on how nomination works on registration process (flexibility to allow requests for a specific number of badges instead of providing names upfront).	secretariat
(iii) Provide clear guidelines on the registration limits for Admitted NGOs (observer participation in the blue zone and green zone).	secretariat

(iv)	Implement a differentiated badge system to enable people with different responsibilities/ tasks to have access to different zones within the COP complex based on their purpose of participation and resulting access needs. Suggested badge options: (1) Temporary badges for speakers in side events (one or two day entry badges that only allow access to the pavilion/side event area on specific dates); (2) Badges for accessing side events and pavilions only; (3) Full-access badges (side events, pavilions and negotiations); (4) Constituency badges for negotiations (to allow representation of a given constituency during negotiation sessions – CFPs responsible for internal distribution); (5) Virtual badges (access to a virtual platform to take part in negotiations through remote channels).	Observers, secretariat
(v)	In the admission and registration process, it is of great importance to make a distinction between participants from different organizations based on their purpose of participation and resulting access needs. In case of Admitted IGOs comprised from a group of countries with similarities and common approaches on specific topics and taking into consideration the coordinating ability of such organizations among their Member States at high levels, it is of great significance to ensure that these Admitted IGOs participants ability in following the negotiation process not to be restricted or impaired in any way.	secretariat
(vi)	Collaborate closely with the UNFCCC Secretariat to ensure convened meetings and events can accommodate the differentiated badge system.	COP Presidency, SB Chairs
(vii)	Request two tier registration for remote participation.	Observers
(viii)	Do not place caps on quotas based on previous attendance or unused previous quotas; circumstances at the institutional level from year to year cannot be shown in delegation listings (Agenda items 1 and 2).	secretariat
(ix)	Consider establishing the following: organizations with a quota number of 5 or less in-person delegates in the last 3 COPs should not have this number reduced in any way for any reallocation process.	secretariat
(x)	Provide day badges apart from delegation quotas for side event presenters.	COP Presidency, Observers, Parties, SB Chairs, secretariat
(xi)	Open the floor and allow other climate activists who are keen to attend the conference to raise their proposals if vacant quota is observed with organizations.	CFPs
(xii)	Provide the secretariat observer relations team with more resources to address these issues.	Parties
(xiii)	Organize spin-off group on differentiated badges taxonomy and report back to secretariat with feasible recommendations for action.	Observers, secretariat

3.3	**Revocation Process**
3.3.1	**Given the growing number of admitted organizations, if the majority remains active in the UNFCCC process, it will eventually become difficult to allocate even a quota of one per organization at COPs. Could this prompt a revocation process (reapplication and expression of interest) for administrative purposes?**
Key Concerns:	

(i) Such process should not place undue or additional burden on secretariat and observer organizations' resources.	
(ii) How to define 'inactiveness' of organizations and acts against UN values by organizations that can be placed under consideration of revocation.	

Shared understanding & secretariat clarifications:

(i) Most participants in focus group meetings were in favor of establishing a revocation process.

(ii) Precedent in UNEP, ECOSOC and UNCCD.

(iii) Process should be simple (e.g., online form, responding email, etc).

(iv) Revocation process should allow for exemption criteria (e.g., organizations with low activity could appeal from revocation based on low capacity/ resources), and potentially include an option for organizations to submit complaints/ whistleblowing.

(v) Potential spin-off taskforce suggested during discussions: revocation process modalities.

Proposed solutions:	**Proposed ownership:**
(i) Keep information up to date and relevant.	Observers
(ii) Ensure communication of rules of participation are conveyed to members and guidelines are followed by constituents of individual groups.	Observers
(iii) Ensure clear guidelines (as are present) are communicated and carried out on revocation process.	secretariat
(iv) Organize spin-off group on revocation process modalities. Potential points for discussion: ● Whether modality should be annual reporting; develop template; ● Establish a 'cleanup' process via requirement of report or responding email ('not a robot') – define how often; ● Develop a system for on-going feedback to the secretariat on observer engagement.	Observers, secretariat