



Co-Chairs' Summary of the Presidencies' Informal Meeting on Technology Development and Transfer - 7 October 2021

Introduction

We held an [informal multilateral meeting on 7 October 2021](#), focussing on technology development and transfer. We were encouraged by the active participation and productive discussions among Parties. Parties emphasised the importance of a successful technology outcome in Glasgow. We also appreciated the active participation and collaboration of negotiating groups with whom we have consulted bilaterally prior to this multilateral consultation to discuss how to advance informal work on technology development and transfer issues, making best use of the time available to us ahead of COP26. We were also grateful for contributions from observer organisations.

Prior to this informal multilateral meeting, we issued two discussion questions to act as a guide for Parties' interventions and to structure the conversation. These questions were based on the feedback received through our informal introductory discussions with Parties. These questions focused on Parties' main priorities and expectations for technology development and transfer at COP26; in particular, what they saw as the key issues that Parties need to come to agreement on; and, what outcomes Parties expected to see on the three items due to be discussed under the COP and CMA.

Main Priorities, Expectations and Key Issues for Agreement

Regarding the chief priorities for technology development and transfer at COP26, we heard Parties acknowledge the central importance of technology for efforts to mitigate and adapt to the adverse impacts of climate change. Many Parties noted the crucial role of technology development and transfer in underpinning collective efforts to keep 1.5°C within reach, with some calling for this to be better articulated in terms of what keeping this temperature goal in reach means in relation to technology. Several Parties also expressed the urgent need to align discussions on technology development and transfer and the objectives within items relating to this with the goals of the Paris Agreement and the Convention. Some Parties expressed the need to deliver technologies to developing countries, with some Parties specifically noting the need for this support to come from developed countries and be transferred to developing countries, especially those most vulnerable and the Least Developed Countries. Requests were also made for resources to support National Designated Entities.

Many Parties stated that a main priority should now be to enter into implementation mode and to shift focus in discussions away from processes towards delivery of climate technologies. We heard Parties call for the implementation of Technology Needs Assessment results, of adaptation and mitigation technologies to deliver on NDC ambitions, and implementation of the technology transfer framework more broadly. A call was also made to assign a target and a timeline for the transfer of technology to developing countries and to evaluate the results of TNAs, technology transfer and receipt of support. Many Parties also noted replenishment of the Climate Technology Centre and Network trust fund and adequate, predictable support for the CTCN as a key priority. Parties expressed the need to further explore options for resource mobilisation with some Parties asking how to increase the development of bankable projects.

Regarding the agenda, some Parties suggested consolidating several technology issues under the Joint Annual Report to streamline the agenda. Other Parties noted that they viewed the number of technology agenda items to be discussed during COP26 as a positive reflection of the importance of technology development and transfer. In terms of priorities across the agenda items, some Parties viewed the three governing bodies' agenda items with equal importance. Furthermore, some Parties stated that all agenda items were of importance to them, adding that no item should be left behind.

It was remarked that the technical assistance provided by the CTCN only provides countries with technical support, and that current activities were not in the right place. Other Parties mentioned how the CTCN's operating model had garnered interest in other areas, but that it could do more to fulfil and realise its full potential.

Many Parties reiterated the importance of balance between adaptation and mitigation technologies. References were also made to indigenous and endogenous platforms for technological mainstreaming, partnerships with academia and the private sector as a means to accelerate and promote investment potential in the Technology Mechanism.

Expected Outcomes on COP and CMA Items

On the issue of the review of the constitution of the Advisory Board of the Climate Technology Centre and Network, some Parties called for allocated membership of the Advisory Board for LDCs and SIDS. Also on membership, some Parties noted that they were open to the inclusion of additional admitted NGOs, namely YOUNGO, WGC, and IPO, in the CTCN's Advisory Board. Whilst many Parties noted the importance of inclusivity, some added that any modifications to the constitution should be enacted on the basis of improving the function of the CTCN alongside efficiency, cost effectiveness, independence, transparency, balance, inclusiveness and good governance. Interest was also expressed in information to help contextualise previous discussions and considerations relating to the constitution of the Advisory Board of the CTCN.

In relation to the second independent review of the effective implementation of the CTCN, some Parties recalled the usefulness of the first independent review and welcomed the finalisation of the second independent review. Some Parties noted the need for a more systematic way to consider and incorporate the recommendations presented in the second independent review into the CTCN's next four-year work plan. It was felt amongst some that

there was a recurrence in some of the recommendations and issues presented in previous reviews and reports which points to a need for a system to help implement recommendations emerging from the Joint Annual Reports for 2020 and 2021, as well as, the second independent review. In discussions on the second independent review, some Parties noted their preference for renewal of the memorandum of understanding with UNEP and UNIDO as host agencies for the CTCN. Some noted the stability of the CTCN's operations as a primary motivation for continuing the current hosting arrangement.

With regards to the first periodic assessment referred to in paragraph 69 of decision 1/CP.21, some Parties noted that given the scope and modalities have already been discussed, it is now time to initiate this assessment. Within this item, some expressed a desire to discuss in detail the adequacy of support for the CTCN. A call was also made for clear guidance to be given to the Secretariat so that they can conduct specific work in relation to the assessment. Some Parties shared their optimism that agreement could quickly be reached to move this process forward.

Additional Points Raised

Whilst the focus of this informal meeting was on the items under the authority of the Governing Bodies, some Parties shared their thoughts on items under the Subsidiary Bodies. On alignment between processes pertaining to the review of the CTCN and the periodic assessment, some Parties highlighted the discussions that took place during the May-June session, some even stated their preference for Option B (to keep the two processes separate and standalone but to align the periodicity to every five years). Some hoped to build on the progress made with a view to agreeing this item whilst some Parties suggested that this item might be deprioritised. On Linkages between the Technology Mechanism and the Financial Mechanism, there were calls for strengthened links between National Designated Entities and Green Climate Fund focal points to improve the implementation of TNAs and addressing the coordination needs between National Designated Authorities and National Designated Entities. Some Parties highlighted the work of the CTCN's liaison office in Songdo and welcomed the new cooperative relationship established with the Adaptation Fund.

Regarding the Poznan Strategic Programme, support for LDCs and SIDS that have not yet completed their TNA was raised. Some Parties recalled the historical importance of the Poznan Strategic Programme for technology transfer.

Some Parties recognised the steps taken by the CTCN to address the sustainability of funding for the implementation arm of the Technology Mechanism. More specifically, Parties welcomed the CTCN's organisation of its donor roundtable at COP26 and looked forward to sharing views on ways forward in this forum. Parties also encouraged the CTCN to take steps towards broadening its donor base and suggested looking to the private sector and multilateral development banks as sources of support. Some Parties commented on the CTCN's effective role as a climate technology matchmaker in relation to other mechanisms, initiatives and the CTCN's new programme of work.

Observer organisations - YOUNGO, WGC and IPO - noted their gratitude that several Parties had expressed their support for the three respective constituencies to become

Advisory Board members of the CTCN. They requested Parties to consider this request to become members and invited Parties to reach out bilaterally if they wish to hear more about this request and the motivation behind it.

Next Steps

We encourage Parties to continue to share their views with one another as we prepare for substantive discussions on technology development and transfer agenda items at COP26. Parties remain welcome to submit views informally and in writing by informing the Secretariat through Magdalena Wegrzyniak (mwegrzyniak@unfccc.int). These written submissions have been made available for Parties to view on the [Presidencies' informal consultations portal page](#).

We look forward to welcoming Parties to Glasgow for further fruitful discussions on technology development and transfer.