



United Nations

FCCC/SBI/2017/INF.2



Framework Convention on
Climate Change

Distr.: General
25 April 2017

English only

Subsidiary Body for Implementation

Forty-sixth session

Bonn, 8–18 May 2017

Item 10 of the provisional agenda

Development and transfer of technologies: scope and modalities for the periodic assessment of the Technology Mechanism in relation to supporting the implementation of the Paris Agreement

Views on the scope and modalities for the periodic assessment of the Technology Mechanism

Compilation and synthesis report by the secretariat


Summary

This report synthesizes the views expressed in eight submissions from Parties, representing 98 Parties, and three observer organizations on the scope of and modalities for the periodic assessment of the effectiveness and adequacy of the support provided to the Technology Mechanism in supporting the implementation of the Paris Agreement on matters relating to technology development and transfer. These views were submitted in response to an invitation by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI). The Conference of the Parties mandated the SBI to initiate the elaboration of the scope of and modalities for the periodic assessment. This report provides insight into ideas on this matter that are shared by Parties and observer organizations, and highlights the areas where different ideas exist and which the SBI may need to further explore.

GE.17-06603(E)



* 1 7 0 6 6 0 3 *

Please recycle 



Contents

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction	1–8	3
A. Mandate	1–3	3
B. Scope of the report.....	4–7	3
C. Possible action by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation	8	4
II. Synthesis of views.....	9–29	4
A. Scope of the periodic assessment.....	9–19	4
B. Modalities for the periodic assessment	20–29	6
III. Issues for further consideration	30–31	8

I. Introduction

A. Mandate

1. At its twenty-first session, the Conference of the Parties (COP) decided to undertake a periodic assessment of the effectiveness and adequacy of the support provided to the Technology Mechanism in supporting the implementation of the Paris Agreement on matters relating to technology development and transfer.¹ It requested the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) to initiate, at its forty-fourth session, the elaboration of the scope of and modalities for the periodic assessment, taking into account the review of the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN),² and the modalities for the global stocktake referred to in Article 14 of the Paris Agreement, for consideration and adoption by the COP 25.³

2. SBI 44 initiated the elaboration of the scope of and modalities for the periodic assessment. It noted that the scope will be in the context of Article 10 of the Paris Agreement and will focus on:

(a) The effectiveness of the Technology Mechanism in supporting the implementation of the Paris Agreement on matters relating to technology development and transfer;

(b) The adequacy of support provided to the Technology Mechanism in supporting the implementation of the Paris Agreement on matters relating to technology development and transfer.⁴

3. SBI 44 invited Parties and observer organizations to submit their views on the scope of and modalities for the periodic assessment by 25 January 2017. In addition, it requested the secretariat to prepare a compilation and synthesis report of those views for consideration at SBI 46.⁵

B. Scope of the report

4. This report compiles and synthesizes the views of Parties and observer organizations on the scope of and modalities for the periodic assessment, as submitted in response to the invitation of the SBI referred to in paragraph 3 above.

5. The secretariat received eight submissions from Parties, on behalf of 98 Parties, as follows:⁶

(a) Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay;

(b) Canada on behalf of Australia, Japan and Norway;

(c) Ethiopia on behalf of the least developed countries (LDCs);

(d) Guatemala on behalf of the Independent Association for Latin America and the Caribbean;

¹ Decision 1/CP.21, paragraph 69.

² As referred to in decision 2/CP.17, annex VII, paragraph 20.

³ Decision 1/CP.21, paragraph 70.

⁴ FCCC/SBI/2016/8, paragraph 94.

⁵ FCCC/SBI/2016/8, paragraph 96.

⁶ The original submissions are available at

http://unfccc.int/documentation/submissions_from_parties/items/5900.php.

- (e) Indonesia;
 - (f) Malta and the European Commission on behalf of the European Union and its member States;
 - (g) Republic of Korea;
 - (h) South Africa.
6. The secretariat received submissions from the following observer organizations:⁷
- (a) Climate Action Network International;
 - (b) Global CCS Institute;
 - (c) Women's Environment & Development Organization.
7. A synthesis of the views received is provided in chapter II below. Views on the scope of the periodic assessment are separated into those related to the effectiveness of the Technology Mechanism and those related to the adequacy of support provided to the Technology Mechanism.⁸ This is followed by a synthesis of views related to the modalities for the periodic assessment. Issues for further consideration are identified in chapter III below.

C. Possible action by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation

8. The SBI may wish to consider the information contained in this document as it continues to elaborate the scope of and modalities for the periodic assessment.

II. Synthesis of views

A. Scope of the periodic assessment

1. Effectiveness of the Technology Mechanism

9. In considering the scope of the periodic assessment, many Parties referred to the assessment's purpose or objectives. In line with the COP mandate, most Parties said that it should assess the work of the Technology Mechanism in supporting the implementation of the Paris Agreement on matters relating to technology development and transfer. In this context, some Parties said that it should consider the impact of the Technology Mechanism in achieving the transformational changes as envisioned by the Paris Agreement and its long-term vision on technology development and transfer.⁹ Other Parties noted that the assessment should consider what the Technology Mechanism has done well, identify any gaps, opportunities for improvement and challenges, and consider how to address these. Furthermore, some Parties noted that the assessment should consider the work of the Technology Mechanism in relation to the technology framework established under Article 10, paragraph 4, of the Paris Agreement. One group of Parties said that the assessment should consider how the Technology Mechanism has responded to the challenges faced by the LDCs in accessing its support. They also noted that it should evaluate the extent to which the implementation of the Technology Mechanism is linked to nationally determined contributions.

⁷ The original submissions are available at http://unfccc.int/documentation/submissions_from_non-party_stakeholders/items/7481.php.

⁸ In accordance with document FCCC/SBI/2016/8, paragraph 94. See paragraph 2 above.

⁹ Paris Agreement, Article 10, paragraph 1.

10. One observer organization noted that the periodic assessment should evaluate the Technology Mechanism's direct and indirect mitigation and adaptation efforts in developing countries. Another observer organization noted that it should evaluate the capacity-building efforts of the Technology Mechanism and whether the mechanism has supported the training of women for climate technology development and transfer.

11. Most Parties said that the periodic assessment should consider the extent to which the two bodies of the Technology Mechanism, the Technology Executive Committee (TEC) and the CTCN, deliver on their mandates. It should evaluate their work under the specific COP mandates and workplans or work programmes, as well as their institutional arrangements.

12. For the TEC, some Parties noted that the periodic assessment should consider the relevance, number and quality of:

(a) Its recommendations to the COP. In addition, one observer organization noted that the assessment should consider how the guidance of the TEC has supported developing countries in making technology decisions;

(b) Its activities, such as thematic dialogues and workshops;

(c) Its reports and other documents.

13. For the CTCN, many Parties noted that the periodic assessment should evaluate the effectiveness of the three key services¹⁰ of the CTCN in supporting the implementation of the Paris Agreement. Some Parties noted that this should include assessing the following:

(a) **Responding to requests from developing countries:** the quantity and quality of the technical assistance provided to developing countries at their request, including the geographical distribution of the assistance and the number of countries assisted. Some Parties noted that this should include consideration of the capacity of the CTCN to manage large-scale requests and its support to the LDCs on hardware and software technology requests;

(b) **Fostering collaboration and access to information:** the quantity and quality of knowledge services;

(c) **Strengthening of networks, partnerships and capacity-building:** the quantity and quality of its capacity-building initiatives, including support to the LDCs for preparing technology action plans;

(d) **Network:** the diversity of the network's composition, the number of network members, the number that took part in technical assistance and other CTCN activities, and the quality of the network's member services;

(e) **Institutional arrangement:** the adequacy of the institutional structure of the CTCN, its personnel (skills and competencies) and its working modalities;

(f) **National designated entities (NDEs):** the skills and competencies of NDEs.¹¹ An observer organization noted that the assessment should also assess the support that the CTCN gives to NDEs.

14. Some Parties noted that the periodic assessment should also evaluate the benefits of linkages and collaboration between the TEC and the CTCN, and between these bodies and

¹⁰ The three key services of the CTCN are: responding to requests from developing countries; fostering collaboration and access to information; and the strengthening of networks, partnerships and capacity-building.

¹¹ NDEs are UNFCCC country focal points for technology development and transfer and they are responsible for sending requests to the CTCN for technical assistance.

other bodies under and outside the Convention. One Party noted that this should include the consideration of linkages between the Technology Mechanism and the Financial Mechanism.

15. Technology needs assessments (TNAs) were also highlighted by some Parties as an element that should be included in the periodic assessment. One group of Parties noted that TNAs are a key element for the functioning of the Technology Mechanism, and that the assessment should consider:

- (a) The number of countries and geographical areas that undertake TNAs;
- (b) The number of completed TNAs;
- (c) The number of TNA supporting documents issued;
- (d) The level of satisfaction of the countries undertaking TNAs;
- (e) The number of technology action plan projects that were implemented.

16. An observer organization noted that the periodic assessment should also consider how successfully the outcomes of TNAs, including technology action plans, are mainstreamed into planning at various levels.

2. Adequacy of the support provided to the Technology Mechanism

17. On the adequacy of support, some Parties noted that the periodic assessment should evaluate the adequacy of the financial and in-kind support made available to the bodies of the Technology Mechanism to fulfil their mandates in implementing the Paris Agreement. A few Parties noted that it should evaluate the adequacy of support to the Technology Mechanism for both mitigation and adaptation actions, and for all stages of the technology cycle. For some Parties, the assessment should also consider the resource mobilization efforts of developed countries and the private sector for the Technology Mechanism.

18. With regard to the TEC, one Party noted that the periodic assessment should evaluate support for TEC task forces, events and studies. Support for TEC members should also be considered. On the CTCN, a few Parties said that the assessment should evaluate the amount, predictability and adequacy of the financial resources received by the CTCN. It should also consider the financial resources made available to each technical assistance and capacity-building activity. One group of Parties noted that the adequacy of support to the CTCN will be addressed in the independent review of the CTCN. One Party noted that the assessment should evaluate the support provided for the work of NDEs, including the support that countries provide to their own NDE. An observer organization noted that the assessment should evaluate the predictability of funding to the CTCN.

19. One group of Parties noted that there is no clear benchmark for assessing the adequacy of support. Another Party highlighted the need for further discussion on the scope of support.

B. Modalities for the periodic assessment

1. General

20. Some Parties noted that the modalities for the periodic assessment should facilitate a lean process which avoids duplication and minimizes extra costs and efforts. One group of Parties noted that the assessment should use simple tools rather than complex indicators. Another group of Parties noted that the best practices in evaluation under and outside the Convention should be reviewed when defining the assessment's scope and modalities.

2. Who undertakes the assessment?

21. A few Parties noted that an independent expert group should support the COP in undertaking the periodic assessment. Some Parties indicated that the secretariat should play a role in the periodic assessment by drafting technical papers. One Party noted that such papers should synthesize the joint annual reports of the TEC and the CTCN submitted during the assessment period and extract messages for the consideration of the COP.

3. How is the assessment undertaken?

22. One group of Parties noted that the periodic assessment should be retrospective, considering the work of the Technology Mechanism and its alignment with the Paris Agreement objectives. One Party noted that the assessment should be both formative and summative. A formative assessment would ensure that the COP identifies ways to improve or refine the Technology Mechanism on an ongoing basis. Through a summative assessment, the COP would consider the effectiveness of the Technology Mechanism and its impact on a periodic basis. One Party noted that the assessment's scope and modalities should draw on the experience of the COP in undertaking its review of the Financial Mechanism. It also noted that a guideline for the assessment should be created which includes a list of possible elements for the assessment.

23. Many Parties said that the periodic assessment should be qualitative, with some noting that it should be undertaken by reviewing existing reports and gathering information from stakeholders. This qualitative information should be collected through meetings, workshops, interviews and questionnaires. Some Parties noted that it should also be quantitative, by collecting data and undertaking a statistical analysis. One group of Parties noted that the assessment should not need external evaluation studies.

4. What are the sources of information for the assessment?

24. Many Parties noted that the joint annual report of the TEC and the CTCN to the COP is a central source of information for the periodic assessment. One group of Parties noted that this report should be elaborated to address the support for the implementation of the Paris Agreement. Some Parties noted that the assessment should also draw on other existing UNFCCC reporting relevant to technology development and transfer, including developing country TNA reports.

25. Information provided by stakeholders on their experiences with the Technology Mechanism was seen by many Parties as a key information source. One group of Parties noted that the periodic assessment should draw on the input of the recipients of the support provided by the Technology Mechanism. Some Parties noted that the stakeholders to be consulted should include UNFCCC focal points, the coordinators of UNFCCC negotiating groups, TEC members, CTCN Advisory Board members, TEC and CTCN observers, the financial community (under and outside the Convention), the private sector, academia and civil society. Some Parties noted that the assessment should also source information from NDEs and CTCN members. One group of Parties said that the secretariats of the CTCN and the TEC should also provide information. An observer organization noted that the assessment should draw on information from the Green Climate Fund, including from national designated authorities, and the Global Environment Facility.

26. Some Parties said that the periodic assessment should also draw on information emerging from processes currently being undertaken under the Convention, including:

- (a) The CTCN review;
- (b) The global stocktake referred to in Article 14 of the Paris Agreement;

(c) Work on transparency of action and support as referred to in Article 13 of the Paris Agreement;

(d) The elaboration of the technology framework established under Article 10, paragraph 4, of the Paris Agreement.

5. When will the assessment be undertaken?

27. Some Parties highlighted the importance of synchronizing the sequencing and frequency of the periodic assessment with those of other relevant processes under the Convention, such as the processes referred to in paragraph 26 above. Such synchronization would allow the assessment to provide input to these processes or to draw on their outputs. One Party said that the assessment should also be synchronized with the frequency of the COP review of the Financial Mechanism. Another said that the CTCN review should be integrated into the assessment in the long term.

28. While noting the need to synchronize the periodic assessment with other processes, one group of Parties said that the assessment should not be undertaken more often than every five years, while another Party said every four years. With regard to when the first assessment should be undertaken, one Party said that it should occur in 2021 so that it would coincide with the seventh review of the Financial Mechanism.

6. What is the outcome of the assessment?

29. Some Parties noted that the outcomes of the periodic assessment should be a report and COP recommendations. They also noted that the outcomes should serve as sources of input for the global stocktake referred to in Article 14 of the Paris Agreement.

III. Issues for further consideration

30. The views of Parties and observer organizations serve as helpful inputs for the SBI as it continues to elaborate the scope of and modalities for the periodic assessment. This document, by compiling and synthesizing these views, provides insights into where Parties and observer organizations share common ideas on the scope of and modalities for the assessment. It also highlights the areas where different ideas exist and which the SBI may need to further explore.

31. As the SBI continues to elaborate the scope of and modalities for the periodic assessment, it may wish to consider the following:

(a) Do the views contained in chapter II.A above capture all possible elements of the scope of the assessment? Or are there further elements that need to be considered?

(b) Do the views contained in chapter II.B above capture all possible elements of the modalities for the assessment? Or are there further elements that need to be considered?
