

## Informal note by the co-facilitators

Parties constructively engaged in the informal consultations on the alignment between processes pertaining to the review of the CTCN and the periodic assessment of the effectiveness and adequacy of the support provided to the Technology Mechanism in supporting implementation of the Paris Agreement on matters relating to technology development and transfer, as mandated at SBI 51.<sup>1</sup>

Parties discussed possible options, and their implications, for aligning processes pertaining to the review of the CTCN and the periodic assessment of the Technology Mechanism. On the basis of the discussions, we have prepared possible elements of draft conclusions on this matter under our own responsibility. These elements are not exhaustive, have no formal status and should not be considered final in any way. They are offered to assist us in advancing the discussions on this matter and do not prejudge further work or prevent Parties from expressing their views at any time.

### *Note by the secretariat*

During the informal consultations, Parties welcomed the information note prepared by the secretariat, as requested at SBI 51,<sup>2</sup> on possible options, and their implications, for aligning processes pertaining to the independent review of the CTCN and the periodic assessment of the Technology Mechanism.<sup>3</sup>

### *Key elements*

Parties highlighted effectiveness, efficiency, complementarity and avoiding duplication of work as important elements in considering such alignment.

### *Options*

Parties considered the following options for aligning the processes, some of which are described in the above-mentioned note prepared by the secretariat:

(a) Maintaining stand-alone processes for the CTCN review and the periodic assessment of the Technology Mechanism under the COP and the CMA, respectively, in accordance with their respective relevant decisions;

(b) Maintaining stand-alone processes for the CTCN review and the periodic assessment of the Technology Mechanism under the COP and the CMA, respectively, but aligning their periodicity (every five years);

(c) Conducting the CTCN review as a component of the periodic assessment of the Technology Mechanism;

(d) Maintaining stand-alone processes for the CTCN review and the periodic assessment of the Technology Mechanism under the COP and the CMA, respectively, but aligning their scope, elements and periodicity (every five years).

Many Parties expressed their preference for option (b), while some Parties preferred option (c). Some Parties proposed applying option (b) up to 2026 and then reconsidering further alignment of the processes when the COP reviews the functions of the CTC and decides whether to extend its term.<sup>4</sup>

### *Implications*

Parties acknowledged the possible practical and financial implications of the above options, such as efficiency gains and cost-effectiveness. They also acknowledged the possible

---

<sup>1</sup> FCCC/SBI/2019/20, para. 62.

<sup>2</sup> See footnote 1 above.

<sup>3</sup> FCCC/SBI/2020/INF.5.

<sup>4</sup> Decision 2/CP.17, annex VII, para. 23.

procedural implications of the above options, as described in the above-mentioned information note prepared by the secretariat, including the need to change the periodicity of the review of the CTCN from every four to every five years and to seek the agreement of the host of the CTC to extend the duration of its hosting by one year.

---