

Training programme for technical experts participating in the technical expert review

Informal note by the co-facilitators

25 June 2019

Note: The draft elements contained in this paper have been prepared by the co-facilitators of the negotiations on this agenda item under their own responsibility. The elements have been drawn from views submitted by Parties prior to this session¹ and further discussions among Parties during the session. These elements are preliminary, are not exhaustive and have no formal status, and should not be considered as final in any way. They are offered to assist us in advancing the discussions on this matter and do not prejudice further work or prevent Parties from expressing their views at any time.

Overview of the informal consultations on this item

The informal consultations on agenda item 10(e) on training programme for technical experts participating in the technical expert review were co-facilitated by Mr. Harry Vreuls (Netherlands) and Mr. Jae Hyuk Jung (Republic of Korea). The group held informal consultations between 17 and 25 June 2019.² The co-facilitators prepared, under their own responsibility, this informal note for Parties' consideration. This informal note reflects the views provided in submissions on relevant matters by Parties and groups of Parties by 22 June, and the views shared at the informal consultations on 18, 20 and 22 June.

In general, the training programme should be based on existing training programmes, while it is foreseen that new training courses should become available in accordance with the MPGs. The training courses need to address, where applicable, the outcomes from the consultations under agenda items 10a, b, c and d.

Several new training courses were suggested (e.g. dealing with flexibility, tracking progress of the NDCs and experts new to the review process).

The training courses on inventory review should continue to be based on the sectors.

There are possibilities to differentiate the development of training courses. Some courses could be developed in a fast track, as (almost) all information is available for these, while for others the final outcomes from the consultation under agenda items 10a, b, d and d are needed.

Specific elements were raised, such as ensuring good access to the training courses (including fair participation of all regions and taking into account limited Internet access), year-round availability of the courses, English in a form appropriate for non-native English-speaking experts, potential courses in more languages than English and including enough practical examples.

With regard to examinations, the general opinion was that trainees should be allowed to take multiple examinations.

It was discussed which organization(s) should be responsible for the development and implementation of the training programme. Overall, three potential situations have been discussed. In the first, the CGE takes the lead, with input/contributions from the secretariat and the lead reviewers. In the second, the secretariat takes the lead, with input/contributions from the CGE and the lead reviewers. In the third, only

¹ The submissions of the Parties and groups of Parties can be found on the UNFCCC submission portal: <https://www4.unfccc.int/sites/submissionsstaging/Pages/Home.aspx>.

² This note does not contain information from the meetings on 24 and 25 June 2019.

the secretariat has responsibility. During the exchange of views, it became obvious that a distinction should be made between the development of the training programme mandated by the CMA to the SBSTA and the implementation of the training programme (including the development of training courses, attracting experts and conducting the training programme examination).

Parties started to discuss potential timelines on the development and implementation of the training programme with a view to having at a certain moment in the future enough eligible review experts available (see annex below). To assist this discussion, a possible timeline was presented. During the discussion, it became obvious that a number of Parties would appreciate having more information on experience with the existing training programmes (time to develop courses, number of experts taking a training programme in the start, pass rates, etc.), which could be covered, for example, in a technical paper by the secretariat prior to the next SBSTA meeting.

Annex: Timeline

