



International Partnership
on Mitigation and MRV

Summer School 2015

*‘Transparency and Implementation –
Future Proof Rules for International Climate Policy’*

Cuernavaca, Mexico
9-15 September 2015



SEMARNAT
SECRETARÍA DE
MEDIO AMBIENTE
Y RECURSOS NATURALES



giz Deutsche Gesellschaft
für Internationale
Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH

On behalf of:



Federal Ministry for the
Environment, Nature Conservation,
Building and Nuclear Safety

of the Federal Republic of Germany



Table of Contents

Introduction	1
The International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV	1
Summer Schools	1
Participants	1
Main findings	2
Schedule and methods.....	2
Negotiating rules.....	3
INDCs	3
Ambition.....	3
Mitigation.....	4
Accounting.....	4
MRV	5
MRV/monitoring and evaluation of adaptation.....	5
MRV of support.....	6
Flexibility on implementing MRV requirements	6
Capacity for MRV.....	6
Promoting implementation	7
Stimuli for the Partnership	7
Annex I – Agenda	9
Annex II – List of participants.....	15

All pictures: Miguel Angel Reza Urueta



Introduction

The International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV

The International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV was launched within the context of the Petersberg Climate Dialogue in May 2010 by Germany, South Africa and South Korea. The objective of the Partnership is to support a practical exchange on mitigation-related activities and MRV between developing and developed countries in order to help close the global ambition gap. Over 90 countries have taken part in the Partnership's various activities, and more than half of these are developing countries. The Partnership has no formalised arrangements, and is open to new countries.

Summer Schools

The Summer Schools of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV are one of the Partnership's key formats for supporting negotiations towards an ambitious climate deal. These meetings bring together a range of negotiators and practitioners from around the world. They provide a space for discussing some of the most pressing issues in the negotiations, gather inputs from the latest work by specialists and experts in the field, and learn from one another in a trusting and collaborative spirit. Topics vary from year to year and are based on the members' needs and interests as well as on the discussions within the international negotiations.

Overview of the previous Summer Schools:

- Berlin, Germany from 15-23 October 2012: 'MRV - today, tomorrow and the future'
- Hanoi, Viet Nam from 20-28 August 2013: 'Tracking Progress and MRV for GHG emission reductions'
- Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, from 3-10 September 2014: 'Intended Nationally Determined Contributions: Preparation and implementation'

The purpose of the 2015 Summer School was to discuss potential elements of the rules base for Measurement, Reporting and Verification (MRV), accounting and implementation, which will be decided upon during the next Conference of the Parties (COP) in Paris, and the capacities needed to fulfil the respective requirements. Inputs, working groups and discussions focused on participants' views about the necessary elements of the rules base, the technical procedures and instructions that need to be developed for implementation, as well as issues related to MRV capacity.

Participants

The 2015 Summer School included participants from 14 different countries, namely: Angola, Argentina, Colombia, Brazil, Dominican Republic, the EU, Germany, Ghana,



Mexico, South Africa, South Korea, Thailand, United Kingdom and Viet Nam. Speakers from the World Resources Institute (WRI), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH and independent consultancies contributed to the exchange.

Main findings

The agenda of the summer school was tailored around the following topics: negotiating rules for a new climate regime, mitigation and ambition, accounting, MRV and flexibility, MRV of adaptation and support, MRV capacity, and promoting implementation.

Schedule and methods

Wednesday, 9 Sept	Thursday, 10 Sept	Friday, 11 Sept	Saturday, 12 Sept	Sunday, 13 Sept	Monday, 14 Sept	Tuesday, 15 Sept
Setting the scene: Climate negotiations on rules under a new global climate regime	Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDCs) and mitigation	Accounting	Field trip OR day off	MRV and flexibility	Capacities for MRV	Results of Summer School
	INDCs and ambition	Carbon markets; Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU) Rules for MRV		MRV of adaptation and support	Rules to promote implementation and the cycle of improvement	Wrap-up, Departure

The Summer School was based on a combination of expert inputs, group work and facilitated discussions. The speakers' inputs provided a good starting point for very interesting discussions among participants. The group work activities were particularly dynamic and productive, bringing many new ideas and experiences to the table and constituting important added value of the Summer School.

Most presentations and some pictures from the Summer School can be found at:
<http://mitigationpartnership.net/summer-school-2015-%E2%80%93-transparency-and-implementation>.

A brief account of the main discussion topics is provided below.



Negotiating rules



The discussion about negotiation rules set the stage for talking about the post-2020 regime and the role of the Paris agreement. The conversation centred on the idea that the agreement would be sending a **signal via a long-term collective goal** prior to the definition of principles, caveats and rules, creation of a **common floor** for mitigation, MRV, adaptation and means of implementation that is raised over time.

The rules should include the right **incentives** for those who want to move more swiftly than the common floor. The agreement should also include quantified or quantifiable mitigation commitments or contributions, and should set up an MRV framework based on current experience, and under which all parties report in the same manner.

INDCs

Since many Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDCs) have already been submitted, the participants used some examples as a basis for discussing how these are contributing to a shared objective as well as how the differences and commonalities across the INDCs could set the stage for reaching an agreement. In general, working groups concluded that the introduced INDCs **lack some of the clarity needed in order to evaluate ambition and fairness**, as well as with regard to **conditionalities**. Climate change **vulnerability** was regarded as a key indicator for assessing the fairness of INDCs. There were also some considerations about linking the type of selected target with the level of ambition, hinting at the expectation that a certain economic development would correspond to a certain type of commitment (e.g. a country with a highly developed economy should choose an absolute target in order to demonstrate their level of ambition).

Groups also found that INDCs can provide more than numbers, i.e. **the foundation and a narrative for improving the national framework for climate change actions**.

By inspecting some INDCs, it became clear that individual goals reflected in the INDCs should be aligned with the common goals via rules.

Ambition

The level of ambition of individual actions is key to achieving the global 2° target. The discussion on how to increase ambition focused around the word **'leadership'**, which was described as encompassing much more than just rules. Questions that were addressed included: Has leadership been sufficiently demonstrated in the past (by developed countries)? Should there be a new perspective on leadership? Can



(mitigation) leadership be more broadly distributed? What is the role of the most vulnerable parties? Should the least emitting, most vulnerable majority of countries be ambitious in their mitigation actions? Will the big emitters, which are less vulnerable, follow this lead? What are other areas where leadership could be demonstrated, e.g. on adaptation, MRV and support? Is it possible to build **strong groups/‘clubs’** of countries to frame leadership?

Regarding ambition, there is a need for countries to consider action/ambition as an **opportunity for which it is worth to take the risk**, rather than a burden, because this will put them in a leading position at a later stage. International rules would be necessary in order to drive up ambition over time and increase national interest in formulating more ambitious goals and actions.

To **drive up ambition, rules** should address the following issues: transparency, CBDR-RC (principle of Common but Differentiated Responsibilities and Respective Capabilities), comparison of circumstances and comparability of efforts, incentives for early movers, recognition of efforts, implementation, capacity, competition, solidarity and cooperation, and national interests.



Mitigation

The diversity of national circumstances is reflected in the different types of INDCs, but there is a **need for more national long-term goals** to provide greater certainty on national contributions towards the long-term global goal.

In relation to mitigation, **rules in the agreement** should recognise and respect national circumstances and diversity, promote convergence towards targets that span the entire economy as well as comparability and consistency across these targets, operationalise the 2° goal (by defining the processes and parameters for tracking collective progress towards the long-term goal, timeframe, milestones, etc.) and promote alignment of INDCs with the global goal.

Accounting

The discussion on accounting was first based on basic questions about the differences, linkages and overlaps between accounting, MRV and tracking processes. Accounting rules are perceived as being specifically and deliberately created to function as the connecting link of a bottom-up system.



If it is not deemed possible to include accounting rules in the agreement (and/or its accompanying decisions), it is expected that it should at least include key **accounting principles** (e.g. 'once in, always in').

This discussion led to the identification and proposition of an interesting **link between accounting and transparency**: the less detailed and stringent the accounting rules, the greater the need for stringent transparency requirements.

MRV

MRV in general needs to cater to **domestic purposes** and policies in order to be framed as an opportunity and not a burden for the country. MRV requirements are important in order to argue for domestically strong and stable MRV institutions backed up by solid institutional arrangements. Current biennial reporting (and National Communications, NC) seems adequate for all the Parties, while taking into account the



need to prevent backsliding from current yearly MRV requirements (a potential need for reporting at the end of a 5-10 year cycle may also be considered).

The **role of verification** should be facilitative and aim to enhance TACCC (transparency, accuracy, comparability, completeness and consistency). Potential links to compliance could even distract countries from embarking on more ambitious MRV.

MRV/Monitoring and evaluation of adaptation

Discussion started with the topic of whether the concept of MRV applies to adaptation or if the concept of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) is more suitable. Some argued that, if the implementation of adaptation action is addressed, it falls within the scope of MRV. Discussions related to reduced vulnerability or enhanced resilience will fall within the scope of M&E and thus largely outside the MRV framework (expect, perhaps, in relation to reporting the results of M&E).

In any event, there was agreement that an **improved balance is needed between MRV of mitigation and adaptation** (e.g. include adaptation in biennial reporting).

Additionally, the **level of understanding of adaptation MRV/M&E** is lower than for mitigation or even support. There is a need for learning by doing as capacity in countries is enhanced. MRV/M&E of adaptation is an important tool for efficient resource allocation, but there is also a need for a **methodological framework** that contains guidelines for collecting and reporting information on progress towards implementing adaptation actions and defining indicators for outcomes of adaptation actions, as well as adaptive capacity, vulnerability and resilience.



Since adaptation happens at local level, M&E indicators for adaptation need to be tailored to national or local contexts. However, there should be indicators at global level (e.g. vulnerability) that promote comparison and evaluation of contributions towards a global resilience goal. The development of these global indicators can be achieved through cooperation among the different parties.

MRV of support

Matching information on support provided and support received is important for building trust among parties as well as providing transparency about domestic and international climate finance flows. However, participants agreed that there are several challenges associated with tracking the different sources of climate finance, in particular from the private sector. It was noted that due to such challenges, practical methodologies are needed.

Regarding MRV of support, a **methodological framework** developed by parties should contain: mapping of actors and flows, definitions, common metrics, and institutional arrangements.

Flexibility on implementing MRV requirements

There was a discussion about whether the current **Cancun** framework reflects different country capacities. This is a bifurcated **framework**, and therefore provides some flexibility. However, irrespective of flexibility, the Cancun framework is not dynamic, as it lacks an element of progression.

While there is broad agreement on **the need for flexibility** in implementing the

MRV requirements, it is also widely recognised that there is a trade-off between flexibility and comparability. There was an extensive discussion in this regard about a **common MRV floor** from which all Parties should start by 2020 at the latest (no backsliding), complemented by a set of **incentives to promote progression** through a number of tiers towards a high level of TACCC, although the path and speed of parties to get there will vary.



MRV capacity

All countries need national capacity in order to strengthen ownership for their national MRV systems as well as to ensure that these are implemented sustainably and continuously deliver high-quality information. However, there is an urgent need to move from a project approach to capacity building to a **programmatic step-wise approach**. Such a change is important for improving national planning as well as discussions with cooperation partners, and may constitute an important approach to



promoting equal access to capacity building support. Many countries would require assistance to develop such MRV capacity building programmes.

There is also a need for better **coordination among different support initiatives** (under the convention, multilateral and bilateral) and an improved understanding of the human, institutional, technical and financial capacity gaps and needs. One key challenge that was identified and needs to be addressed is the recruitment and retention of skilled professionals.

Promoting implementation

Promoting implementation does not mean the same thing as enforcement. There should be a **facilitative** space with a differentiated approach regarding the capacities of the countries.



In order to promote implementation at national and international levels, there is a need for creativity in regards to providing incentives by promoting an understanding of **the intrinsic value of actions** (mitigation and adaptation) as well as MRV, particularly in the absence of clear and immediate economic or financial incentives. It might be possible to create an appetite for implementation and **leadership by creating**

groups of countries with exclusive benefits. Finally, having **shorter cycles for reviews** could promote implementation and a higher level of ambition by bringing countries to the table on a more regular basis.

Stimuli for the Partnership

At the end of the summer school, participants were asked to provide some ideas about possible topics that could be included in upcoming summer schools or other capacity building formats of the Partnership. Some of the topics that were mentioned included:

- MRV
 - Institutional arrangements (donor coordination)
 - Tools for MRV of policies and actions
 - How to include NAMAs in MRV (esp. BUR)
 - Helping to improve countries' MRV agreements
 - Identifying gaps and needs in relation to establishing and maintaining MRV systems and how to fill gaps – provide tools, training workshops
 - Support related to designing an MRV system to track implementation of the INDC



- Steps towards a comprehensive national MRV system (also INDC)
 - Biennial Update Reports (BUR)
 - Biennial Reports (BR)
 - International Consultation and Analysis (ICA)
- Inventories
 - Improving GHG inventories
 - Inventories at local government level
 - Disaggregated inventories
 - Development of emission factors
- NAMAs
 - Pre-2020 engagement in NAMAs – technology transfer
- M&E of adaptation
 - Sharing knowledge related to M&E of adaptation indicators
 - Developing indicators
 - Developing capacity-building indicators for adaptation
- 2015 agreement
 - Implementation
 - MRV and mitigation
- Other topics
 - Integrated Regional Assessment (IRA)
 - Having representatives from the Green Climate Fund (GCF) as participants during a summer school
 - Lessons learned to strengthen ownership and increase public awareness
 - Template / toolkit on policies and actions (data and impacts)
 - Preparation of working programmes 2016-2020



Annex I – Agenda

Wednesday, 9 September 2015		
Introduction and background/update on recent climate negotiations		
9:00	Welcome	Beatriz Bugada, Mexico
9:15 30'	Introduction to the Summer School and its objectives, introduction to the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV	Steffen Menzel, Germany and Thapelo Letete, South Africa
9:45 15'	Introduction of trainers, experts, support team and logistics	Hanna Reuter, GIZ
10:00 60'	Group exercise/ game: Introduction of participants including their expectations and special interests	Gonçalo Cavalheiro
11:00	Coffee break	
11:30 15'	Input: Re-cap and main take-aways from last year's Summer School	Gonçalo Cavalheiro
11:45 45'	Input: Where are we standing on the way to Paris in the UNFCCC negotiations? Q&A/discussion	Claudio Forner, UNFCCC Secretariat
12:30	Lunch	
13:30 15'	Time for an interactive group exercise	
Rules in the international climate regime		
13:45 45'	Input: Rules for a new climate regime: What rules in what context do we need? Q&A	José Alberto Garibaldi
14:30 60'	Group work: How would the perfect regime look like to you? (groups on mitigation, adaptation, support, MRV and compliance)	Facilitation: Gonçalo Cavalheiro, José Alberto Garibaldi
15:30	Coffee break	
16:00 30'	Presentation of outcomes of group work	Participants
16:30 1h	Facilitated discussion: negotiation position on the minimum set of rules that needs to be agreed in Paris in relation to ambition, mitigation and MRV	Facilitation: Gonçalo Cavalheiro
17:30	Wrap-up of the day	Gonçalo Cavalheiro



Wednesday, 9 September 2015		
19:00	Welcome dinner	

Thursday, 10 September 2015: Mitigation and ambition		
Mitigation		
9:00	Start of the day: Summary of previous day and preview of the day's programme	Co-management committee / Gonçalo Cavalheiro
9:15 30'	Input: What do INDCs say about mitigation? What options for the negotiation text on mitigation derive from that? Q&A	Kelly Levin, WRI
9:45 30'	Country presentations: on mitigation as per submitted INDC Q&A	Vietnam
10:15 1h 30min	Group work: Based on submitted INDCs and previous considerations, what rules for mitigation should the 2015 agreement contain?	Facilitation: Sofía Muñoz Alarcón, Kelly Levin WRI
Coffee break (groups decide when to hold the break)		
11:45 30'	Presentation of outcomes of group work	Participants
12:15 Lunch		
INDCs and ambition		
13:15 15'	Time for an interactive group exercise	
13:30 45'	Input: Ambition level of INDCs submitted so far: Where do INDCs leave us? Facilitated discussion	Claudio Forner, UNFCCC Secretariat
14:15 1h 30 min'	Group work: Assessing the level of ambition of submitted INDCs (ambition, fairness, 2°C)	Facilitation: Gonçalo Cavalheiro, Claudio Forner
Coffee break (groups decide when to hold the break)		
15:45 30'	Presentation of outcomes of group work	Participants



Thursday, 10 September 2015: Mitigation and ambition		
16:15 60'	<p>Panel discussion: Taking us where we need to go: How and what rules in the 2015 agreement would drive up ambition?</p> <p>Facilitated discussion</p>	<p>Panel: José Alberto Garibaldi, country representatives (EU, Mexico, South Africa)</p> <p>Facilitation: Gonçalo Cavalheiro</p>
17:15	Wrap-up of the day	Sofía Muñoz Alarcón

Friday, 11 September 2015: Mitigation and Accounting		
Accounting		
9:00	Start of the day: summary of the day before, and preview of the day's programme	Co-management committee / Sofía Muñoz Alarcón
9:10 30'	<p>Input: What role does accounting play to manage global ambition?</p> <p>Q&A</p>	Daniel Blank, GIZ
9:40 35'	Game playing: trading apples and oranges	Daniel Blank, GIZ, and Sofía Muñoz Alarcón
10:15 '45	<p>Input: Can accounting in the post-2020 regime be simpler than Kyoto accounting? Technical challenges of accounting.</p> <p>Q&A</p>	Kelly Levin, WRI
11:00	Coffee break	
Carbon markets and AFOLU		
11:30 30'	Input: What do INDCs say about carbon markets and AFOLU? What options for the negotiation text derive from that?	AFOLU: Kelly Levin, WRI Carbon markets: Miriam Faulwetter, GIZ
12:00 40'	<p>Country presentations: on approaches to use and accounting of carbon markets (1 country case) and AFOLU (1 country case)</p> <p>Q&A</p>	AFOLU: Colombia Carbon markets/ETS: South Korea
12:40	Lunch	
Rules for MRV		
13:40 30'	<p>Input: MRV in the negotiation text</p> <p>Q&A</p>	Gonçalo Cavalheiro



Friday, 11 September 2015: Mitigation and Accounting		
14:10 80'	Group work: Elements of an MRV framework	Facilitation: Gonalo Cavalheiro and Kelly Levin
Coffee break (groups decide when to hold the break)		
15:30 30'	Presentation of outcomes of group work	Participants
16:00	Wrap up of the day	Gonalo Cavalheiro
18:30	Evening reception hosted by the German Embassy and SEMARNAT in Mexico City	

Saturday, 12 September 2015		
	Field trip to Tepoztlán / Day off (optional)	

Sunday, 13 September 2015		
MRV and flexibility		
10:00	Start of the day: summary of previous day and preview of the day's programme	Co-management committee / Gonalo Cavalheiro
10:15 1h15min	Group Work: One MRV framework for all?	Facilitation: Gonalo Cavalheiro
Coffee break (groups decide when to hold break)		
11:30 30'	Presentation of outcomes of group work	Participants
MRV of adaptation and support		
12:00 60'	Country presentations and facilitated discussion: MRV of adaptation	South Africa, Mexico; facilitation: Sofía Muoz Alarc3n
13:00	Lunch	
14:00 15'	Group picture	
14:15 45'	Input: MRV of support Q&A	Sofía Muoz Alarc3n and Dana Dana Raluca Iliescu, EU
15:00 30'	Input: How does having a robust MRV system helps in accessing funding from the Green Climate Fund?	Sofía Muoz Alarc3n
15:30	Coffee break and set up of market place	



Sunday, 13 September 2015		
16 1h15'	Market place with country cases: Presentation of MRV systems in place	Brazil, South Korea , Thailand, UK
17:15	Wrap up of the day	Gonçalo Cavalheiro, Sofía Muñoz Alarcón

Monday, 14 September 2015		
Capacities for MRV		
9:00	Start of the day: summary of previous day and preview of the day's programme	Co-management committee / Sofía Muñoz Alarcón
9:15 60'	Country presentations and facilitated discussion: What capacities are needed to set up and maintain a MRV system?	Dominic Republic, Ghana; facilitation: Allison Towle
10:15	Coffee break	
10:45 60'	Individual work + discussion in small groups: Reflection of MRV capacities and support needed in each country	Facilitation: Gonçalo Cavalheiro and Allison Towle
11:45 30'	Presentation of outcomes of group work	Participants
12:15	Lunch	
13:15 15'	Time for an interactive group exercise	
13:30 45'	Input: Capacity Building for MRV post 2020 Facilitated discussion	Yamide Dagnet, WRI, and Neta Meidav, UK
14:15 30'	Input: Presentation of different resource and tools that support setting up & maintaining an MRV system (i.a. GIZ's MRV tool)	Hanna Reuter
14:45	Coffee break	
Rules to promote implementation and the cycle of improvement		
15:15 45'	Input: How can MRV promote the cycle of improvements within the architecture of the agreement? Facilitated discussion	Yamide Dagnet, WRI
16:00 30'	Country presentation on rules for implementation	UK, Columbia



16:30 60'	Input: How to ensure implementation of the requirements of a future climate agreement? Facilitated discussion	Yamide Dagnet, WRI and Gonçalo Cavalheiro
17:30	Wrap up of the day	Gonçalo Cavalheiro, Sofía Muñoz Alarcón
19:00	Farewell dinner	

Tuesday, 15 September 2015		
Results of Summer School		
9:00	Start of the day: summary of previous day and preview of the day's program	Co-management committee / Gonçalo Cavalheiro
9:15 60'	Group work: What MRV and accounting rules should be included in the 2015 agreement and what needs to be developed afterwards?	Facilitation: Sofía Muñoz Alarcón
10:00 '45	Presentation of outcomes of group work	Participants
11:00	Coffee break (short)	
11:15 45'	Input: Overview of main findings during Summer School <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What should be the elements of the rules base to be decided in Paris in order to stay within the 2° limit? What kind of support is needed to fulfil respective requirements? Additional points from participants	Gonçalo Cavalheiro and Sofía Muñoz Alarcón
12:00 15'	Stimuli for the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How do we work together towards the Paris Agreement? How can the Partnership support ambitious mitigation actions and cooperation between countries? What are relevant topics for future exchange? 	Steffen Menzel, Germany / Brian Mantlana, South Africa
12:30 15'	Feedback and evaluation session	Sofía Muñoz Alarcón
12:45	Closing and farewell	Hanna Reuter, Steffen Menzel
13:00	(optional) Lunch	
Departure		



Annex II – List of participants

Country	Name	Organisation	Position
Participants			
Angola	Carla Balca	Ministry of Environment	UNFCCC National Focal Point
Argentina	Camila Rodríguez Taylor	Secretariat of Environment and Sustainable Development	Advisor
Colombia	Aura Robayo Castaneda	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development	Specialised professional
Brazil	Ricardo Vieira Araujo	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development	Specialised professional
Brazil	Marcela Aboim Raposo	Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation	Technologist
Dominican Republic	Karen Josefina Hedeman Luberes	National Council for Climate Change and Clean Development Mechanism	Technical Assistant
Germany	Steffen Menzel	Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety	Advisor



Country	Name	Organisation	Position
Participants			
Ghana	Joseph Amankwa Baffoe	Environmental Protection Agency	Principal Programme Officer
Mexico	Beatriz Bugeda	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (SEMARNAT)	General Director on Climate Change Policy
Mexico	Gloria Cuevas	SEMARNAT	Deputy General Director for Climate change Projects
Mexico	Mónica Echegoyen	SEMARNAT	Deputy General Director for Climate change Projects
Mexico	Thania Eloina Félix	SEMARNAT	Deputy General Director for Climate change Projects
Mexico	Lorena Berenice Gonzáles López	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Director of Environment Affairs
EU	Dana Raluca Iliescu	European Commission	MRV Policy Officer
South Africa	Brian Khanyisa Mantlana	Climate Change and Air Quality, Department of Environmental Affairs	Chief Director Monitoring and Evaluation
South Africa	Thapelo Clifford Morale Letete	Department of Environmental Affairs	Director Mitigation Monitoring & Evaluation



Country	Name	Organisation	Position
Participants			
South Korea	Lee Seohyeon	Greenhouse Gas Inventory & Research Center (GIR)	Deputy Director
South Korea	Park Ji Hyae	Korea Environment Corporation	Manager
Thailand	Chontichaprin Nitthitsuttibuta	ONEP – UNDP Thailand	Technical Coordinator
United Kingdom	Neta Meidav	Department of Energy and Climate Change, UK Government	MRV Policy & Negotiations Lead
Viet Nam	Hoang Yen Pham	Department of Meteorology, Hydrology and Climate Change, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment	Official

Name	Organisation	Position
Speaker / consultants / support team		
Sofia Munoz Alarcon		Consultant
Goncalo Cavalheiro	CAOS sustentabilidade	Consultant



Name	Organisation	Position
Speaker / consultants / support team		
Allison Towle	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)	Programme Analyst
Yamide Dagnet	World Resources Institute (WRI)	Research Analyst
Kelly Levin	World Resources Institute (WRI)	Research Analyst
José Alberto Garibaldi	energeia	Consultant
Claudio Forner (via Skype)	UNFCCC Secretariat	Team leader
Miriam Faulwetter	GIZ Mexico	Advisor
Daniel Blank	GIZ Mexico	Advisor
Ximena Aristizabal	GIZ Mexico	Advisor
Miriam Larissa Frisch	GIZ Mexico	Advisor





Name	Organisation	Position
Speaker / consultants / support team		
Hanna Reuter	GIZ Germany	Advisor
Sylvia Acevedo		Consultant