

Outcome of the discussion in Group 4 on FTC Support

6th BRs and NCs lead reviewers meeting
11–12 March 2019
Bonn



Co-facilitators: *Thelma Krug and Harry Vreuls*

12 March 2019



Experience doing case-studies in groups

What worked well and what can be improved?

- ✓ Keep this practice as it is very useful;
- ✓ Rotational allocation of LRs in groups to have a mixture of experts and non-experts in order to get knowledge on other sections;
- ✓ Have sub-groups in the big group is a good approach;
- ✓ Great opportunity to share knowledge and views with experts dealing with the same section;
- ✓ Complexity of the FTC support review, due to lack of agreed definitions and the wording in the decision text. This was reflected in how the sub-groups understood differently the provisions in the requirements.



Experience using the tools

- What worked well and what can be improved?
 - ✓ The tools are very much appreciated.
 - ✓ Improve the user friendliness of the RPG by for example:
 - ✓ Adding examples;
 - ✓ Adding decision trees or pathway analysis;
 - ✓ Including reference of the RPG issues in the checklist.
 - ✓ Guidance on how to assess questions from experts on issues LRs are not familiar with.
 - ✓ Break-down checklist issues.



- The approaches supported by the LRs as they are in the RPG:
- **Success and failure stories:** The ERT should consider that this requirement has been fulfilled when the Party has clearly highlighted in the text and in the relevant tables the success or failure story(ies) related to at least one project.

- New issues and their solutions suggested
- **Additional guidance for Parties reporting support to Annex I Parties:** If financial support to Annex I Parties is included in the totals, then the ERT should provide a recommendation on transparency.
- **Cross-cutting:** When the reporting guidelines request that information be reported as a mandatory requirement in textual and tabular format, but the information is reported solely in the textual part of the BR and not in the CTF tables, **or vice versa**, the ERT should make a recommendation on transparency.