



Global Workshop on Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDCs)

14-17 April 2015
Berlin, Germany

MEETING REPORT



Programme Office
**International
Climate Initiative**



Executive Summary

Following a series of Regional Technical Dialogues by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) Secretariat, the first Global Workshop on Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDCs) was held in Berlin from 14-17 April 2015. The objectives of the workshop were to provide a forum for exchanging country experiences with the design and preparation of INDCs; to discuss technical issues and political processes related to INDCs; to identify INDC-related challenges that are arising in countries; and to discuss lessons learned and possible solutions for timely submission of INDCs.

In Berlin, approximately 80 government representatives from more than 50 countries from all regions of the world came together for the first time to exchange their experiences in preparing their INDCs. About 25 experts from international organisations such as UNDP, United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the UNFCCC Secretariat, and the World Bank, as well as from implementing organisations, renowned research institutes, and consultancies also contributed their expertise. The workshop was organised by the UNDP Low Emission Capacity Building (LECB) Programme and Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH and financed by the German Federal Ministry of Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety (BMUB), the European Commission, and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Australia. Participants acknowledged the timeliness of this workshop, given countries' on-going preparations of their INDCs and recent submissions by some countries.

The workshop included three days of thematic presentations on issues such as design options for INDCs, prioritization of sectors, upfront information, INDCs in the context of national development, adaptation, and quantification of greenhouse gas (GHG) and non-GHG outcomes, among others. Participants also took part in plenary discussions, peer-to-peer exchanges, and interactive work in breakout groups.

Key takeaways of the workshop include:

- As a centerpiece of the legally binding agreement to be finalized in Paris, INDCs should be ambitious yet realistic in terms of implementation; should be transparent in explaining assumptions; and should clearly describe why they are fair and ambitious. As a precondition for the points listed above, INDCs should be backed by high-level political support.
- Strong political leadership is an enormous advantage in accelerating the design and development of an INDC, as well as in linking technical work with the political coordination and approval process. Many countries are still facing challenges in linking these processes and securing stakeholder participation because INDC leadership at a high level is yet to be secured. Addressing these challenges is even more critical when considering the short time left to complete their INDCs – especially for those countries that intend to submit their contributions by June 2015 prior to the Bonn sessions of the UNFCCC.
- As the UNFCCC secretariat will be compiling a synthesis report of INDCs submitted by 1 October 2015, countries are encouraged to submit their INDC in due time in order to secure a meaningful compilation that could inform Parties on the progress towards the below 2 degrees objective.
- INDCs should be embedded into existing domestic development strategies to ensure political buy-in and advance development goals. Further, quantification of non-GHG benefits such as employment, air quality, and economic growth can help increase political support.

- The Lima COP decision and INDC submissions to date provide guidance for countries on the types of upfront information that facilitate transparency of INDCs.
- The nationally determined nature of INDC design leads to different “contribution types” and is reflective of different national circumstances and should allow for every country to submit a contribution.
- While many countries plan to include an adaptation component in their INDCs, some do not consider INDCs to be the right vehicle for communicating adaptation efforts.
- Countries can build on past efforts (Low Emission Development Strategies (LEDS), Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs), national communications, technology needs assessments, etc.) to design their INDCs. In some cases, existing information can be used, requiring little new data and analysis.
- Monitoring, Reporting and Verification (MRV) in relation to INDCs should build on past efforts, such as GHG inventories, Biennial Update Reports (BUR), and MRV systems for NAMAs.
- Linking GHG emissions reductions with cost assessments and finance options is seen as a challenge by many countries but is considered essential to ensure implementation of INDCs.
- Synergies between adaptation and mitigation can offer countries win-win opportunities in the context of INDC design.

Day 1 – 14 April 2015

Day 1 of the workshop provided participants with an overview of INDCs in the global climate change framework, focusing on their importance as a mechanism to both report intended contributions and communicate ambition. The preliminary sessions were used to set the stage for subsequent sessions and included presentations and discussions on the relevance of INDCs in the Climate Change Framework before launching into an overview of the UNDP/WRI Guidance Document on INDCs and presentations by countries that have already submitted their INDCs to the UNFCCC Secretariat (EU and Mexico) and Chile who has developed a draft INDC that is currently under review by stakeholders.

Session 1: Welcome, Workshop Objectives, and Scene-Setting

Mr. Steffen Menzel welcomed participants on behalf of the Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety (BMUB) of Germany. He noted that the large number of participants underscored the importance of Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDCs) as the cornerstones of the upcoming climate change agreement in Paris.

Ms. Anja Wucke (GIZ) gave an overview of German INDC support activities and the Global INDC Project in particular, which provides in-depth support for 16 countries and short-term support for 10 countries upon request. The project is financed by the International Climate Initiative (IKI) of the BMUB and carried out by GIZ. The means of implementation at the national level include technical workshops, stakeholder dialogues, and donor coordination activities, whereas at the global level, peer-to-peer exchange, conceptual guidance, and webinars are facilitated.

Subsequently, Mr. Yamil Bonduki (UNDP) shared the key takeaways from UNDP’s six Regional Technical Dialogues on INDCs, which involved more than 500 participants in total. The main challenges in the preparation of INDCs include the short time frame, decisions of scope, securing high level endorsement, the “when” and “how” of stakeholder involvement, and the lack of data. Peer-to-

peer exchange and the sharing of lesson learnt have proven to be valuable in increasing participants' understanding of INDCs and in addressing challenges encountered during the course of INDC preparation.

Session 2: Global Context of INDCs

Ms. Rita Schwarzelühr-Sutter (Parliamentary State Secretary of BMUB) emphasized that INDCs and the global agreement are key to combatting climate change successfully and keeping global warming below 2°C. She emphasized the importance of this workshop as a milestone towards a new climate change agreement at COP 21. Germany is prepared to accept its responsibility in the international climate process. It was among the first countries actively supporting partner countries in its INDC preparation and will continue to make a fair contribution to climate financing in the future, too. She referred to the "Energiewende's" (main strategy: 80% of electricity generation from renewable energy sources by 2050) multiple co-benefits, such as employment, technological change, and competitiveness. She also encouraged participants to see climate action not as a burden, but rather as an opportunity for investment and technological innovation that can lead to a sustainable development path and long-term competitiveness.

Session 3: INDC Preparation Guidance and Link to National Contexts

Dr. Dennis Tirpak (World Resources Institute, WRI) gave an overview of the UNDP/WRI Guidance on Designing and Preparing INDCs. There exist a variety of options for expressing contributions (most broadly under the categories of actions and outcomes); this variety provides flexibility for countries with diverse circumstances to submit meaningful INDCs. Data and analysis serve as the foundation of INDCs and can help ensure that contributions are achievable/realistic, aligned with national priorities, and in line with the below 2 degrees objective. Countries often have a considerable amount of data and analysis already available (e.g., GHG inventories, national communications, studies, etc.) and should begin with this information before initiating new, sometimes-unnecessary efforts. Dr. Tirpak explained methodologies contained in the guidance, elaborated on the Lima COP decision on upfront information to be included in INDCs, and provided recommendations on how to build political buy-in for INDCs. Participants were also invited to join WRI's Open Book project, an initiative to enhance transparency of INDCs (contact: Kelly Levin).

Discussion

Participants discussed the time constraint of submitting INDCs prior to 1 October 2015 in order to be included in the UNFCCC Secretariat's synthesis report of submitted INDCs. Appealing to countries for a timely submission, Mr. Claudio Forner (UNFCCC) mentioned that countries that do submit their INDCs in time can use this opportunity in order to communicate to their national development priorities as well sending a positive signal in regard to the international climate process.

Participants mentioned that the preparation of INDCs should build on existing political priorities and processes, institutional arrangements, and data and make the best use of available resources. To come forward with INDCs, a pragmatic approach should be chosen that strives for reliable substance and transparent information on the one hand, and one that enables timely submission on the other hand. The UNFCCC process on INDCs will most likely allow for adapting the INDCs after the first round of formal submissions has taken place.

Dr. Tirpak encouraged countries not to delay the INDC just because of missing data. Mr. Bonduki suggested communicating those gaps clearly and indicating how they could be filled. The underlying assumptions could be proved later with additional international expertise.

To keep momentum beyond the climate negotiations in Paris, high-level political backing is crucial. In addition, having the legislative body on board will help to make the implementation of INDCs real regardless of any administrative changes. According to Dr. Höhne (NewClimate Institute) and a

recent survey, sign-off on INDC processes in countries will mostly come from the parliament, minister, or head-of-state level.

Session 4: Learning from Countries' Experiences in Preparing INDCs

Mr. Jacob Werksman (European Commission) presented the European Union's submitted INDC. Facing the challenge of global warming, he pointed out that all countries should be as ambitious as possible, but that rich countries must take the lead. He emphasized that the process of agreeing on the INDC within the EU had not been easy due to the diversity of the 28 member states. Mr. Werksman underlined that the EU target is perceived as fair and ambitious because it puts the EU on a pathway to a low-carbon economy.

The respondent Mr. Stephen M. King'uyu (Kenya) was surprised that the EU had not included adaptation in their INDC even though some member states are highly vulnerable. He highlighted the different circumstances between the EU and developing countries in preparing their INDC. For instance, the EU already has legally binding rules for their 2020 targets in place, while other countries do not have those provisions in place. Kenya is in a position to build their INDC on various climate change measures (e.g., a comprehensive climate change policy currently under development) and is receiving sufficient funding from donors in contrast to some other developing countries. Mr. King'uyu also underlined in this context, that any mitigation measures in developing countries need to be aligned with development plans and priorities at the national level, including adaptation.

Mr. Fernando Farías from Chile presented that analytical and technical work done in the past years (e.g., baseline emission trajectories and scenarios for 2013-2030, as well as macroeconomic modelling results) have served as an important cornerstone for developing its draft INDC and emphasized the importance of sectoral approaches. Key to success was the mandate for the national INDC-process on the highest political level in combination with a concrete timeline to ensure that data collection and analysis, as well as public consultation, stay within a certain timeframe. In addition to the Spanish version, French and English translations of the draft INDC are available.

As a respondent to Chile, Mr. Samir Tantawi (Egypt) attested to the importance of sectoral approaches for INDC development; Egypt has developed NAMA options resulting from sectoral analysis that will be used for INDC development. Mr. Tantawi further underlined the importance of including adaptation in INDCs to signal to the international community the level of vulnerability. Means of implementation, finance, and capacity building were also deemed important elements of INDCs. The strong link between Biennial Update Reports (BURs), National Communications (NCs), and INDCs was pointed out – Egypt will publish its 3rd NC by the end of 2015.

In presenting Mexico's submitted INDC, Dr. Daniel Buirra (Mexico) provided insight into methodological considerations: the choice between a static and a dynamic Business-as-Usual (BAU) scenario, Mexico's consideration of Black Carbon in its INDC as important short lived pollutant, and the consideration of LULUCF in the mitigation target (but not in the baseline due to a lack of data). The presentation highlighted a target of unconditional reduction of GHG emissions by 22% compared to the BAU by 2050, which could reach 36% with certain conditions, with net emission reductions starting in 2016. Mexico's INDC also include adaptation goals.

Lesson learnt from Mexico's process include that deeper cuts in emissions are difficult to agree upon at the national level but need involvement of local levels and require investment in structural changes in order to avoid harm to economic growth in the long run.

Discussion

Inclusion of adaptation into INDC: The EU position is that INDCs are not necessarily a good vehicle for including adaptation because the processes of comparing and aggregating, including MRV, make sense for mitigation, but not necessarily for adaptation.

One participant expressed concern about the lack of clear agreements regarding upfront information (UFI) (“may include”), which may lead to significant differences in the types of information provided. An agreement regarding UFI would be needed in order to build trust.

Group work

Participants split into four breakout groups to analyze the upfront information of two fictional INDCs, specifically evaluating their ambition, and clarity.

Key takeaways:

- To be transparent and clear, INDCs should specify information on: sectors included, definition of sectors (IPCC 1996 or 2006), which GHGs are included, period of implementation, underlying assumptions and methodology, and, in cases where BAU scenarios are used, to explain whether these are static or dynamic scenarios. Scenarios should indicate which measures they take into account.
- In order to increase mitigation commitments, more information on statistical forecast and on other macroeconomic drivers (not only GDP) is needed. Some countries need new inventories or better data.
- Many countries agreed that fairness and ambition should be explained in relation to indicators such as other countries’ targets, per-capita emissions, the country’s current share of global GHG emissions, the countries historical shares, etc.
- Needed support (not only financial) should be mentioned explicitly if possible. It should be defined what can be done with and without additional support, including the required circumstances to make the conditional offer work.

Day 2 – 15 April 2015

During Day 2 of the workshop presenters and participants dove deeper into technical themes related to INDC preparation, including examining INDCs in the context of national development priorities, covering the prioritization of sectors, quantification of emissions reductions in the context of INDCs, selecting reference points, assessing costs of mitigation actions, and assessing INDCs in the context of advancing national development. Each presentation was followed by a reaction from a peer who briefly explained their experience, before opening the floor for questions and discussion. The day culminated in a panel of colleagues who presented additional INDC resources and then engaged the audience in a discussion of what further resources are needed.

Session 1: Prioritization of Sectors for INDCs

Mr. El Hadji Mbaye Diagne (Senegal) presented the process of prioritization of sectors for INDCs in his country. It was principally based on information contained in existing documents such as technology needs assessment (TNA), BURs, and National Communications, as well as on projections of GHG emissions taking into account existing plans, programmes and projects, thereby demonstrating the ability and importance of building off of existing foundations instead of reinventing the wheel. He gave the advice to take into account interactions of policies, plans and projects, and particularly effects on the development objectives (energy access and food self-sufficiency). Careful economic and social analysis is needed to assess cost of measures (low marginal abatement cost and high acceptance among people and government).

The respondent Mr. Vahakn Kabakian (Lebanon) emphasized the importance of an inter-ministerial committee with high-level endorsement and relevant stakeholders. Apart from stocktaking of existing programmes, technical studies, and an analysis of co-benefits, he advised to include only

sectors that can be monitored and to take into account future macroeconomic scenarios such as that Lebanon might become an oil and gas producing country.

Discussion:

- A representative from Clima East was pleased to hear that apart from Senegal two more countries linked TNA with their multicriteria analysis for the INDC prioritization of mitigation measures.
- To achieve a smooth political process, political buy-in is critical. It is advisable to launch the INDC preparation at a very high level and to have the technical committee based on existing institutional arrangements.
- An inclusive process is key to balancing development and climate change objectives.
- Some countries expressed the opinion that low-emission development strategies (LEDS) and nationally appropriate mitigation actions (NAMAs) should be aligned with the INDC. Senegal explained that due to a lack of resources they had previously (based on the TNA) assessed only two sectors for mitigation and two for adaptation, but would take more sectors into consideration for the INDC.

Session 2: Quantification of Emission Reductions in the Context of INDCs

In Costa Rica, as presented by Mr. Pascal Girot, the national strategy for climate change, NAMAs, NAP, and the National Development Plan are the starting points for INDC preparations. With the aim of tracking emission reductions Costa Rica's INDC is merged with the MRV architecture to the National Information Registry (SINAMECC). He presented a general timeline and milestones that may be considered to assess emission reductions achieved by sector in the context of Costa Rica's Carbon Neutrality goal. This included simulations and emissions scenarios to 2030 under a hypothesis of carbon neutrality.

The respondent Mr. Tsaranu from Moldova explained that their emissions followed the typical pattern of former soviet states with a massive decrease after 1990. He elaborated how Moldova had developed three emission scenarios (a BAU, a scenario with measures already decided, and a scenario with additional measures) and set targets for each of the seven main mitigation sectors. A cumulative reduction target has been developed and needs to be approved on the basis of a stakeholder consultation.

Subsequently, the US and Norway gave insights into the preparation process of their submitted INDCs. The US' INDC (26-28% reduction below 2005 levels by 2025) seeks mitigation principally based on regulations (e.g. transport/fuel standards, building efficiency, HFCs). In each sector all relevant institutions were brought together to define the maximum mitigation potential.

Taking a participatory approach to INDC development, Norway tried to reach a consensus in parliament for their INDC to ensure continuity, sustainability, and public backing of climate actions. The relevant ministries wrote a white paper which was submitted to parliament. Eighty percent of emissions are already subject to allowances or other regulation. Norway has the same target as the EU (-40%) and envisages engaging in an agreement with the EU.

Discussion:

- Asked for further explanation on how the different targets (C-Neutrality, sectoral reduction targets, etc.) were integrated, Costa Rica stated that this was the key challenge and that they had therefore built a new institutional structure to engage all sectors. The overall political goal of C-Neutrality was however useful to galvanize public action and private investment.
- Regarding calculating the impact of additional regulations, the US stated that projections are not certain especially in the long term. Targets had to be set despite uncertainty regarding

the impacts of policies/regulations, which are hard to assess upfront. As a consequence, the US chose to provide a 2025 target against a 2030 target because of greater short-term confidence on impact of regulations.

Session 3: Selecting INDC Reference Points and Assessing Costs of Mitigation Actions

Mr. Kakhaber Mdivani from Georgia explained that his country is considering combining two kinds of targets to increase accuracy and comparability, as they are facing the special situation of former soviet countries with declining emissions after 1990. With the aim of enhancing the political feasibility of the process, a multi-stakeholder platform for internal and external communication within the entire institutional set-up was established.

The respondent Mr. Mohamed Boussaid (Morocco) elaborated on how his country moved from its National Communication and Green Investment Plan to its INDC by developing scenarios with previously selected mitigation actions that had been validated by the sectors. This was done by refining economic analyses and projections, and by determining the contribution from the national budget as well as the need for international support (international finance in general and foreign direct investments in climate change projects specifically). He concluded that economic analyses are useful for the level of ambition, but that ambition is ultimately a political decision. As the INDC needs political validation and commitment, one lesson learned was that the validation process itself is a capacity building for all involved actors.

Discussion

- Morocco's approach of working with experts from sectors, then approaching the decision makers, and discussing again with stakeholders was useful to have an informed decision making process. Many participants agreed that it is crucial to link the political and the technical process.
- Moldova reduces the risk by establishing working groups that prepare proposals and submit them to the decision making process, which encompasses five stages. The first draft is scheduled to be finished at the end of May, followed by one month of political approval.
- In Chile, six ministries shared the mandate for the technical work. The steering committee with members from all of them met every four months to guide the process. A public sector round table started to meet and transformed the technical results into the INDC.
- The European Commission shared that, after identifying with models where the EU needs to be in 2030 (-40%), an impact assessment and interaction between the governance levels including public consultation were undertaken.

Session 4: INDCs in the Context of Advancing National Development

Ms. Syamsidar Thamrin (Indonesia) provided insights into her country's experience in embedding its INDC into their LEDS. The main components of the National Mitigation Action Plan (based on the national development strategy) are being revised and used as a basis for the political process between the president and the ministries to finalize the INDC. A holistic systems perspective, implications over time and constraints are included in the scenarios to avoid negative impacts on people's welfare.

In the Dominican Republic, as presented by Moisés Álvarez, the focus is on three sectors of the LEDS (energy, transport, and forestry) with sectoral action plans each and three "quick win" sectors: cement, waste, and tourism. For the selection of major programs for these sectors, an assessment of the abatement impact and the co-benefits such as new permanent jobs, economic impact, and other

non-GHG-benefits is undertaken to guide the selection, ensure the alignment with national development goals and increase political buy-in.

Discussion:

- Indonesia plans to track the implementation of its INDC through an MRV system that involves all levels of government. In order to ensure political support, Indonesia has involved stakeholders (including the private sector) early and throughout the process, including in prioritizing sectors.
- Mr. Bonduki (UNDP) emphasized the importance of linking co-benefits. The Philippines shared that a Cost-Benefit-Analysis is being finalized to put value on non-GHG-indicators. For the prioritization the Climate Change Commission together with governmental agencies weighed according to the criteria GHG mitigation potential, costs, and co-benefits.

Session 5: Other INDC-Related Resources

- A Guide to INDCs by the Climate & Development Knowledge Network (CDKN) and Ricardo-AEA
 - Provides guidance for LDCs on what could be included in INDCs, including practical examples and references to the UNFCCC text
- Process guidance for Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDCs) published by the International Partnership for Mitigation and MRV, developed by Ecofys, also in French and Spanish
 - Outline of technical and political processes, incl. guidance on how to engage key political decision-makers.
 - Provides a variety of steps, activities and options according to capabilities/ circumstances of countries.
 - Provides convincing arguments for pushing ambition.
- Guiding Questions for INDC Development to be published by GIZ
 - For development and review of INDCs along steps in the technical and political processes (double helix model), incl. best practice examples
 - Developed by the GIZ INDC Project together with Öko-Institut, available for download from the website International Partnership for Mitigation and MRV.
- Checklist for Establishing Post-2020 Emission Pathways by the Partnership for Market Readiness (PMR) (to be published soon)
 - Four building blocks: Country context, baseline pathways, alternative emissions pathways, and results presentation;
 - Includes guiding questions and some suggestions on how to choose available models/ methodologies to approach problems, how to deal with uncertainty, and how to report results.

Day 3 – 16 April 2015

Day 3 focused on the inclusion of Adaptation components in the INDC, before moving into presentations and discussions on MRV in the context of INDCs. Directly following lunch, participants were introduced to the results from a UNDP commissioned study by the NewClimate Institute which is actively assessing collective progress toward the 2°C Goal and Options for Revising INDCs to Enhance Ambition in the future. The 3-day workshop came to a close with a plenary discussion focused on International Cooperation on INDCs, the needs of countries, and how best to improve resources to respond to countries' needs.

Session 1: Adaptation Components in INDCs

In his presentation of the **UNDP/WRI Guidance on possible adaptation components**, Mr. Michael Comstock (UNDP) highlighted the high degree of flexibility for including adaptation in INDCs. In addition, he encouraged countries to use information that best fits their rationale for including adaptation and not to reinvent the wheel. Where a National Adaptation Plan (NAP) exists, this can be a prime source of information for the INDC. In countries without NAPs, elaborating an adaptation component for the INDC can also lay the groundwork for adaptation planning.

Discussion

- Participants discussed whether or not to include adaptation in INDCs. Mr. Forner (UNFCCC) mentioned the option of communicating adaptation information apart from the INDC. The EU sees INDCs as a vehicle for communicating commitments, as other channels (e.g. National Communications and BURs) are available for sharing policies and efforts. The EU would, however, respect if countries wish to include adaptation components. Ecuador stated that adaptation is not a commitment but a need and therefore would fit best in the INDC chapter on equity and fairness.
- The question was raised of whether INDCs are voluntary or firm commitments, the latter of which would require a strategic decision on what information to include. This differentiation is crucial, as it is not clear who will bear the cost of the adaptation measures. It was clarified by Mr. Comstock that the guidance stresses the informational character of the adaptation component.
- Another set of questions focused on the role of loss and damage in the adaptation component of INDC. Viet Nam included loss and damage in their adaptation chapter.
- More guidance in terms of what to include as a LDC was requested by Chad. They asked for guidance on how the local/communal level can be integrated into the INDC process.

The next presentation by Mr. José Garibaldi from Energía focused on the **synergies between adaptation and mitigation** (e.g. forestry, climate smart agriculture, animal husbandry, landscape and water management, ecosystem management, etc.), based on a comprehensive modeling exercise. His main finding was that there are actions that countries can undertake to increase resilience while also lowering emissions (win-win efforts). To reach the 2°C goal substantial changes are needed – these changes are easier for lower emission countries with less developed fossil-based infrastructures as they are not as “locked-in” as countries with CO₂-intensive infrastructure in place.

Dr. Than Thuc (Vietnam) presented the **adaptation component of Vietnam’s INDC**, which includes detailed information on impacts, vulnerabilities, planned adaptation measures until 2020 as well as adaptation needs after 2020, an assessment of economic benefits from adaptation investments and a section on loss and damage. In Viet Nam the INDC presented to the ministries contained an additional chapter on the advantages and disadvantages of the selected approach (adaptation and mitigation) to convince the government. This chapter will not be part of the official submission but was perceived as beneficial for the political process.

Discussion:

In the following discussion, other countries shared their experiences and challenges.

- For Senegal, the timeframe of the INDC is insufficient for the different complex steps (e.g. downscaling of global climate models), which Vietnam undertook in preparation of the INDC.

- South Africa reviewed existing policies, plans etc. and then analyzed adaptation needs and corresponding costs in prioritized sectors in relation to selected extreme weather events. A summary of these reports will be included in South Africa's INDC.
- Ecuador asked for consideration of the fact that mitigation and adaptation can be intertwined in a way that the mitigation potential is affected by the impacts of climate change (e.g. hydro energy could suffer from a lack of precipitation).
- As countries showed a high interest in sharing experience, UNDP offered to organize a webinar. Countries willing to present are invited to contact Mr. Bonduki.

Session 2: Monitoring, Reporting and Verification (MRV) and Accounting for INDCs

Mr. Daniel Benefoh Tutu (Ghana) shared insights into Ghana's use of an existing Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system to build their MRV system, which may be used for tracking the INDC. The main lessons learned included:

- 1) There is no need to start from scratch, which means that already existing reporting systems should be used.
- 2) Countries should start with a basic MRV system paying attention to what is already working and then extend and improve it gradually.
- 3) Existing Annex 1 reporting to UNFCCC can serve for learning.

Ms. Anke Herold (Öko-Institut) gave an overview of the current debates concerning accounting rules and MRV. Depending on the form of the INDCs, further development of accounting rules after Paris may be necessary, e.g. for black carbon. MRV will remain an important issue. Transparent documentation of the accounting rules and assumptions used is important for clarity of INDC.

Discussion:

- Experience shows that it is beneficial to have a stronger role of the government / a governmental organization in the execution of the MRV system. If the MRV is carried out in projects only there is a risk of losing expertise and data. Therefore capacity building is needed. In the case of Germany, the Federal Environmental Agency has the lead for MRV, but refinements of the methodologies are done by Öko-Institut, who in turn sends new results and data to the Federal Environmental Agency.
- To keep it simple the main focus should be to appoint one institution that pulls the information together and is capable of responding where the country stands in terms of INDC implementation.
- In the absence of nationally determined rules for MRV as part of the INDC, South Africa asked for clarity in on accounting rules. In addition, a representative from Clima East noted the gap in terms of linkage between MRV and INDC. Ms. Herold stated that the INDCs would determine the MRV approaches and that probably several cycles of UNFCCC negotiation would be needed to clarify this aspect.
- Senegal elaborated that they had used the CDM methodologies for including NAMAs and projects in the inventory. They asked other countries to state clearly whether they plan to include market mechanisms.
- Ukraine showed interest in how to measure co-benefits. Öko-Institut is currently working on a study to offer some substantial advice in this regard.

Session 3: INDCs in the Context of the 2°C Goal and Revision of INDCs to Enhance Ambition after Paris

Dr. Höhne (NewClimate Institute) highlighted in his presentation that achieving the 2° C target means phasing out global GHG emissions by the middle or end of this century. The INDCs submitted so far have the potential to significantly change the estimated temperature rise. But in this scenario emissions are still too high and leading to a 3°C range instead of 2°C. Multiple options are available to assess the fairness and ambition of INDCs. A set of various indicators would make the assessment more transparent.

Discussion:

- Costs of preparing and implementing INDCs need to be compared to the costs of inaction. The later climate actions are implemented, the higher the costs for adaptation.
- In addition, there are many benefits of mitigation, for instance reduced fossil fuel combustion leads to health benefits. Significant price drops and technological change will make mitigation actions easier in the future.
- Communicating how fairness and ambition of an INDC are assessed is key to understanding the rationale behind it. On the other hand, it was questioned whether using metrics for justifying fairness and ambition is the most useful way forward.
- Several participants saw possibilities for revisiting INDCs after Paris to increase ambition. Dr. Höhne concluded that it was preferable to have ambitious INDCs before Paris, as this means less risk of not finding an agreement.

Breakout Group Discussion

Working groups were established to answer the following 3 sets of questions.

Question 1: What options are countries considering to track progress toward their national contributions? How can we facilitate understanding of INDC implementation progress in countries after Paris? Participants expressed that:

- Nationally and internationally, existing processes and structures should be used and/or built upon (e.g. GHG inventories, national communications, NAMAs, etc.).
- In case of INDCs requiring international support for implementation the support provided needs to be identified and tracked separately.
- Tracking progress of actions and “co-benefits” can be useful at the national level (e.g., showing improvements in health, mobility, job creation, etc.).
- The way of tracking progress could be integrated into upfront information.

Question 2: What are the key factors that countries will consider when deciding whether to implement additional mitigation measures after Paris (or when deciding whether the right mitigation measures have been included in INDCs)? How can mitigation measures further align with national priorities and processes in order to unlock additional efforts? Participants expressed that:

- A clear understanding of financing needs is crucial to determine whether and what share of INDCs can be implemented with domestic resources and what actions can be undertaken with additional support.
- After Paris the ratification will be key; the way forward as well as additional support needs will be identified.

Question 3: What will need to happen at the national level to be able to revise INDCs? What options are most feasible for countries? Participants expressed that:

- Political acceptance is key to strengthening INDCs and ensuring their implementation.
- At the international level, there should be an intensive revision process prior to 2020. From 2020 onwards reporting cycles taking place every 5 years should be agreed on.
- There were various positions on the question of whether countries should revise their INDCs. It was discussed whether a revision process could even result in countries submitting less ambitious INDCs. In addition, some participants criticized an international review process as not being in line with the concept of being nationally determined.

Session 5:

Key takeaways:

- Sharing various experiences in preparation of the INDCs results in the opportunity to improve the own draft and to have a better INDC in the end.
- Existing tools and guidance are valuable resources that help to structure INDCs conceptually and in terms of the process to elaborate an INDC.
- To keep the political momentum within the countries and on international level strong, further actions need to be defined for increasing ambition for the period after 2020.
- Further support will be needed for making INDCs more ambitious. Predictability of the expected support will help raising the level of ambition.
- The preparation of the INDCs follows a two tier approach that run in parallel: The technical process needs to be complemented by a political process to ensure high-level political backing.

Resources

Chile's draft INDC: <http://portal.mma.gob.cl/consultacontribucion/>

Designing and Preparing Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDCs) – WRI:
http://www.wri.org/sites/default/files/uploads/Designing_and_preparing_INDCs_Advance_Unedited_Version_April_9.pdf

WRI's open book project: <http://www.wri.org/our-work/project/open-book>

Process guidance for Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDCs) - International Partnership for Mitigation and MRV:
http://mitigationpartnership.net/sites/default/files/ipmm_2014_process_guidance_for_intended_nationally_determined_contributions_indcs.pdf

Checklist on Establishing Post-2020 Emission Pathways – PMR:
<https://www.thepmr.org/content/checklist-establishing-post-2020-emission-pathways>

Guide to INDCs - CDKN and Ricardo-AEA: <http://cdkn.org/indc/>

INDC website of the International Partnership for Mitigation and MRV:
<http://mitigationpartnership.net/intended-nationally-determined-contributions-indcs>

