



International Partnership
on Mitigation and MRV

African Regional Workshop

Peer-to-peer exchange on Biennial Update Reports (BURs)

15-17 Oct 2014 – Berlin, Germany

Summary report





Workshop Background

The **International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV** considers itself to be a knowledge broker between the international climate negotiations and national actions on climate change. The overall aim of the Partnership is to support practical exchange on mitigation-related activities and MRV between developing and developed countries in order to help close the global ambition gap. The Partnership seeks to work with various partners in regional groups in order to generate added value for the negotiations at global level as well as from the negotiations concerning practical implementation at regional, national and sub-national level.

Hence, recent Partnership activities in the African region embarked on a vigorous regional cooperation and peer-to-peer activities on MRV systems. The workshop held in South Africa in May 2013 was the starting point where at the invitation of the where policy-makers from eight African countries (Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Mali, Tunisia, South Africa, and Zambia) were invited by the Government of South Africa to discuss respective strengths and challenges in their national reporting systems and shared their experiences within the regional group.

Rationale

Biennial Update Reports (BURs) are considered as one of the central pieces of the global mitigation architecture and the upcoming 2015 agreement because they improve transparency through tracking mitigation progress and thereby reinforce ambition at a global level. In addition, BURs and the required national MRV system are supposed to enhance transparency and increase ambition at national level by providing the information basis for planning and implementing mitigation action. The first BURs are expected to be submitted to the UNFCCC in December 2014.

In this context, the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV, in cooperation with the Environmental Protection Agency of Ghana, organized the second meeting of the African Regional Group. The focus of the workshop was on BURs and the required national system. Both Ghana and South Africa are highly involved in Partnership activities. Both countries are currently in the process of preparing their first national Biennial Update Report. This workshop provided the opportunity to share their national experiences in an expert forum, enabling other countries to draw on the lessons learnt.

Summary

The second African Regional Workshop *Peer-to-peer-exchange on BURs* took place on October 15-17 in Berlin, Germany, with participants from Egypt, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, Nigeria, South Africa, Swaziland, Zambia and Zimbabwe. It was hosted by the Environmental Protection Agency of Ghana, together with the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV on behalf of the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety.

The African Regional Workshop provided a unique opportunity for African countries to benefit from the knowledge base of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV by sharing experiences and expert inputs. These equipped the participating countries with relevant information and approaches for their upcoming Biennial Update Reports (BURs), its preparation process, the latest MRV system developments, as well as related institutional arrangements among the African region.



Key takeaways acquired by the participants

- The participants described the workshop as **cooperative**, informative, illuminating and productive. The **high engagement** during group work and the intensive discussions during the breaks and in the evenings reinforce these impressions. The participants expressed a strong sense of ownership.
- A lot of **progress** could be seen within the countries since the last workshop in May 2013.
- Regional **peer-to-peer** workshops are considered as being a very effective format for supporting the knowledge exchange (lessons learnt, best practices etc.) within a region and further meetings are welcome.
- To enable a **more frequent exchange**, web-based tools such as webinars, online training courses, mailing lists and e-discussions have been confirmed as further suitable tools to share experiences between the countries. The decision on which format is best to use depends on the circumstances and the specific content and should be decided case-by-case.
- The countries of the African Regional Group are at different stages of preparing their BURs. Front-runner countries were identified for certain related topics and showed a high willingness in **sharing their lessons learnt**.
- One of the main tasks is to **set up institutional arrangements** for sustainable reporting systems (including clear mandates and policies) to help ensure a continuous workflow. These should be built on existing systems.
- **Commitment and ownership** ideally **serve as a starting point** for all stakeholders at all levels – on the political level as well as for sector actors and civil society. One way to address this challenge is to **provide knowledge** on the topic and its relevance as well as getting stakeholders on board by including them in discussions. .
- Teams should be **cross-sectoral and multidisciplinary** including representatives of the line ministries. It is beneficial to have a national working team involving relevant stakeholders that can receive **regular training** and develop a sense of ownership.
- MRV, GHG inventories, BURs, and NCs should be perceived to be of **national importance** as the acquired data can not only be used for reporting but also for **planning and decision-making** (national ownership).
- Considering the existing **national strategies** for the country is a promising basis for developing and selecting NAMAs.
- A lot of challenges are related to data collection, analysis, management and archiving. **Proper documentation** including the documentation of applied methodologies can improve the process. This prevents e.g. the major issue of data loss often occurring as a result of external consultants leaving after their contract has ended. .
- A system of **institutional memory** should be set up and maintained without relying on individuals to prevent loss of capacities and data when staff changes.
- The **BUR template** was considered a helpful tool for the BUR compiling process. More guidance on it was requested.
- Further **financial, technical and capacity related resources** are **needed** to face the challenges related to **tackling climate change**.



Introduction and global context

Welcome and Purpose of the Workshop

Ms. Nicole Wilke, German Federal Ministry of Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety, BMUB

Ms. Kirsten Orschulok, GIZ

Mr. Nathaniel Mjema, Facilitator

Ms. Nicole Wilke welcomed the participants on behalf of the German Federal Ministry of Environment, Nature Conservation, Buildings and Nuclear Safety (BMUB). She presented the main purposes of the workshop and presented the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV, emphasising the concept of peer-to-peer exchange.

The welcome speech by Mr. Kyekyeku Yaw Oppong-Boadi from the Environment Protection Agency, Ghana, had to be postponed due to unexpected travel obstacles.

Ms. Kirsten Orschulok and Mr. Nathaniel Mjema introduced the participants and the organisational team.

Why do we need to MRV? Why BUR?

Ms. Suzanne Lekoyiet, UNEP

Ms. Maude Veyret-Picot, UNDP

Ms. Suzanne Lekoyiet and Maude Veyret-Picot held a co-presentation aiming at setting the stage for technical aspects coming up later in the workshop.

Ms. Suzanne Lekoyiet provided information on the importance and urgency of BURs, giving a brief overview of the history and the genesis of BURs as an effort to improve NC (National Communication) reporting. She outlined the objectives and what is expected in BURs as well as related constraints and gaps.

Ms. Maude Veyret-Picot presented how GEF funds can be accessed, the requirements, what kind of funding is available for BUR support. She introduced the role of international consultations and analysis (ICA) and the team of technical experts (TTE) conducting the technical analysis of BURs, which will be consist of a roughly balanced number of Annex 1 and Non-Annex 1 party experts. On this occasion Ms. Veyret-Picot pointed out that UNFCCC is still looking for experts, inviting the workshop participants to apply for membership of the UNFCCC roster of experts. She then referred to the topic of MRV as a means to support the implementation of the Convention, giving some details about MRV of REDD+ and domestic MRV.

For more information on Ms. Lekoyiet's input please download the complete presentation [here](#).
For more information on Ms. Veyret-Picot's input please download the complete presentation [here](#).

The following lively Q&A session jointly addressed the presentations of Suzanne Lekoyiet and Maude Veyret-Picot. Some of the key messages were:



International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV

- The BUR can be seen as a small update of the NC, including more technical details in tablet formats including summaries, focussing on emissions, mitigation actions and support. Adaptation can be included in the last part on additional observations.
- In comparison to the NC, a BUR is biennial and goes through the ICA review process including the technical analysis. The ICA feedback process is supposed to help countries improving their work on BURs for next preparation round. The guidelines for ICA will be revised by 2017 as a result of the experience.
- The BUR emphasises on creating institutions and systems to reduce the effort of reporting in the long run. It aims to be viewed as a nationally valuable tool that includes national policy making and activities.
- The BUR is a single document that cannot be submitted in parts. However, it is possible to submit the NC and the BUR in one year, so the BUR is the Annex of the NC every four years. In the meantime, the BUR is a standalone document.
- The GHG inventory in the BUR must not be older than four years; nevertheless, more recent data is appreciated.
- For BURs, countries can access up to US\$ 352,000 through a GEF agency or through direct access to the climate change focal area set aside fund. If countries require additional resources, they can utilize resources from their respective STAR allocation.
- REDD+ funding can only be accessed if there is a strong MRV system in place.
- UNDP and UNEP are starting up an umbrella programme for BUR support for LDCs and SIDS.

For further details on the GEF guidelines for the financing of BURs for Non-Annex 1 Parties please go to: http://www.thegef.org/gef/guideline/biennial_update_reports_parties_UNFCCC

Where do we stand in the process of preparing BURs and what are the challenges? Discussion an experience sharing of the on-going BUR preparation process and lessons learnt

Break Away Group Discussion

Stock taking: Where does each country stand? What activities have already been undertaken with regards to BURs? What instruments / support / capacity training do we need?

Plenary Discussion on how to address these topics

The participants split into two groups. As for all the following break away sessions, each group nominated one person to facilitate the group discussion and one person to report the results to the plenary. Furthermore, one resource person joined each group. The key outcomes were:

- South Africa drafted a BUR that is approved by the ministry and currently available for public comments. The GHG inventory covered is from 2010. The BUR was sponsored by GIZ as the approval for GEF funds was delayed and no upfront funding by GEF was provided. Therefore a misalignment concerning the deadline for submitting the BUR occurred. The next step will be to include an independent review and the public comments which they received earlier. Afterwards, a brief summary for policy makers in the five official languages of the country will be published. In terms of institutional arrangements South Africa created a continuous project steering committee that oversees the work of BURs and NCs, consisting of members of the relevant departments. The second BUR will be drafted internally without the help of external consultants.



International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV

- Namibia is also intending to submit its BUR by the end of this year. They are already at the compilation stage. For further details please see below (“Sharing African Experience”, Mr. Ferdinand Mwapopi, Ministry of Environment, Namibia).
- Ghana’s initial BUR is 90% accomplished. Their GHG inventory rounds are already institutionalized and can be prepared every two years. Ghana will finalise the GEF funded BUR within the next month.
- The other participating countries are either at the initial stages of preparing a proposal to the GEF, or have submitted a proposal, or have recently received funding for BUR approved by the GEF.
- Main challenges and cross-cutting issues that need to be addressed:
 - A general lack of data; the accessibility and credibility of the data is not always easy to verify (e.g. because of unclear agreements with the departments); some sectors are especially difficult to access, e.g. the private sectors because of confidentiality issues a need to build trust in institutions and with the civil and private sector regarding the use of the data.
 - Capacity constraints, a need for capacity building on data collection and data analysis, e.g. a lack of internal capacity to transform the data into useful information including the problem of data being provided in different formats and the need for capacity building on the IT tools.
 - Lack of commitment and ownership from different stakeholders; lack of knowledge concerning the value of GHG inventories; a need to include the stakeholders into the discussion.
 - Problem of budget allocation; the challenge of GEF funding being provided on time.

Welcome speech

Mr. Kyekyeku Yaw Oppong-Boadi, Environmental Protection Agency, Ghana

Mr. Oppong-Boadi welcomed the participants on behalf of the Ministry of Environment, Science, Technology and Innovation and the Environmental Protection Agency of Ghana. He explained that the workshop was moved from Accra, Ghana, to Berlin, Germany, because their ministry had stopped all international meetings due to the outbreak of Ebola in West Africa. Mr. Oppong-Boadi emphasised the importance of MRV and mitigation actions and underlined the usefulness of the information that would be provided through the workshop for BURs and NCs.

Presentation of the GIZ BUR template

Ms. Kirsten Orschulok

Ms. Kirsten Orschulok introduced the GIZ BUR template that has been developed based on the UNFCCC guidelines for BURs, the stock taking tool and input from partners of the Information Matters project such as Ghana as well as global partners. It is important to remember that the BUR template is just a recommendation rather than an obligation and that it is supposed to support the process of compiling a BUR. The template is explicitly supplied in a word format so it can be adjusted to the individual national circumstances. The guiding questions within the template can be used as sub-chapters.

You can find the BUR template online: [Link](#)



Sharing African Experience

*Mr. Peter Tarfa, Federal Ministry of Environment, Nigeria, Department of Climate Change
Mr. Ferdinand Mwapopi, Ministry of Environment and Tourism, Namibia*

Mr. Peter Tarfa presented Nigeria's experience on the development process of the BUR. The BUR proposal was developed assessing the SNC (Second National Communication) in terms of gaps and its impact with regards to climate change response, considering national circumstances and ownership. The multi-disciplinary team of experts integrated experiences from other advanced developing countries. The draft has been submitted to UNDP for review.

Mr. Ferdinand Mwapopi presented Namibia's experience on the preparation of the BUR that will be submitted by December 2014. While previous communications had been mainly outsourced to consultants, the approach for the TNC (Third National Communication) and the BUR was to establish a National GHG Working Group and institutional arrangements for the GHG inventory. He also provided a deeper insight into the methods used for collecting the data as well as estimating the emissions for the AFOLU sector.

For more information on Mr. Tarfa's input please download the complete presentation [here](#).

For more information on Mr. Mwapopi's input please download the complete presentation [here](#).

The following Q&A addressed both presentations. The key findings are:

- It is beneficial to have a national working team/group involving relevant stakeholders that can receive adequate training and develop a sense of ownership.
- There needs to be a focus on capacity building.
- One way to ensure quality is to analyse the collected data by doing cross checks (e.g. in case of waste in Namibia, comparing the collected data with available population data for the different municipalities).
- While BUR and NC share some overlapping components, a possible distinction could be the GHG inventory: NC covering data from 2000-2010; BUR covering only year 2010.
- It is possible to submit the NC and BUR in the same year; in that case the BUR would be an Annex of the NC. This would have the benefit of the same GHG inventory. After two years, the next BUR would be submitted to the UNFCCC and after another two years both documents can again be prepared in one. However, this is only a suggestion.

Break Away Group Discussion

BUR Template – comments of participants on mitigation, GHG inventory, and support

The participants split into three working groups to discuss:

1. How beneficial is the template?
2. What is useful?
3. What can be improved?

The overall impression of the participants was that the template is useful but more guidance is needed, for example, a web-based Q&A (Questions and Answers document / FAQ) or a guidance note. Further suggestions for improvements made by the participants will be incorporated by the Information Matters team as well as suggestions made within the four weeks following this workshop. The revised version of the BUR template is due to be ready for the upcoming COP and will be published on the website of International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV (<http://mitigationpartnership.net>).



Reporting and Update of GHG Inventory

MRV of Emission

Sharing Africa experience on GHG inventory and MRV of emissions

Mr. Jongikhaya Witi, Department of Environmental Affairs, South Africa

Mr. Kyekyeku Yaw Oppong-Boadi, Environment Protection Agency, Ghana

Mr. Jongikhaya Witi presented the South African approach on developing its national GHG inventory system and the applied tools. He outlined the importance for developing countries to build on existing institutions that have been setup to carry out mandates which impact the GHG inventory compilation.. The National Climate Change Response Policy (NCCRP) provides an important base for data collection as it was adopted not only by the government but also by a broad range of relevant stakeholders.

Mr. Kyekyeku Yaw Oppong-Boadi presented Ghana's experience on GHG inventory and MRV of emissions focussing on the role of integrated climate data management. He introduced the national system for GHG inventory, outlining the involved stakeholders. Mr. Oppong-Boadi emphasised that the data is not only used for reporting but also for planning and decision-making. Proper documentation was mentioned as a key element in data management. Ghana has three data management interfaces in place. Main challenges are data confidentiality (e.g. industry), data sharing and funding for data generation and management. .

For more information on Mr. Witi's input please download the complete presentation [here](#).

For more information on Mr. Oppong-Boadi's input please download the complete presentation [here](#).

The following Q&A was addressing both presentations. Key messages:

- A project steering committee, which involves all relevant government bodies can raise ownership and motivate the line departments.
- A mismatch of collected data can be addressed by talking to the concerned stakeholders, involving them by sharing the results of the differences in order to initiate a discussion.
- Sector policies that specify the means of data collection facilitate a sustainable and smooth process as they clarify the responsibilities for delivering data.



Break Away Group Discussion

How to prepare the national GHG inventory on a regular basis?

- Possibilities and barriers, with regards to capacity, data quality and availability as well as timeline.
- Lessons learnt.
- Plenary Discussion on peer-to-peer review of national GHG inventories.
- Expert exchange on QA/QC in the region on the whole report as well as on planning processes, lessons learnt etc.

The main common findings of the lively group discussions were:

Barriers:

- Systems are in initial stages, change is a time consuming process;
- Limited personnel, experience and expertise;
- Funding;
- Inadequate format of data; data confidentiality; loss of data;
- Lack of political will; lack of cooperation and trust; lack of understanding why it is important; lack of ownership;
- No clear mandate.

How to proceed:

- **Institutionalisation** of the GHG inventory compilation; setting up regulations and a policy (that includes the obligation to provide data); clear mandates for the institutions needed; focal and contact persons in national ministries needed.
- **Funding/financial support**; understanding financial needs before budgeting them; building a business case, what needs to be involved at what costs? Sector experts need to be paid as well; bankable proposals; mapping of different sources of funding necessary, check what funds are available internally, then check external funds; people need to get paid properly to be motivated; commercialise data to cover costs.
- **Stakeholder involvement** and motivation; stakeholder map; training for all stakeholders, also the data providers; need to create trust among all stakeholders; try to involve instead of punish; awareness rising for the bigger picture; enhancing trust for data providers concerning the handling of sensible data.
- **Data and knowledge management**; general knowledge management not attached to individual people; create an institutional memory; working with external consultants often resulted in a loss of data when they left - contracts should contain archiving and handing over the data as well as a detailed documentation including the methods used; generally a good documentation of the process is necessary; data provider need to supply how they received the data as there are often assumptions included; agree with the sectors on the process and methodologies; manage information confidentially; triangulation in data collection and independent reviews for QA/QC; establish electronic data systems.
- **Tools** needed: software, IT infrastructure, archiving and spread sheets.
- **Data quality** through cross checking of data.

One of the main challenges is how to get the high level commitment that is needed to institutionalise the processes.



Reporting of Mitigation Actions MRV of NAMAs / mitigation actions as part of the BUR

Break Away Group Discussion / World Café

Integration of NAMAs into national MRV framework:

- How to link reporting on emission reduction and inventories in a BUR?
- How to support the set-up of sustainable systems (procedural, institutional, cross-sectoral etc.)?
- What are related (capacity building) needs?

The questions on *the integration of NAMAs into national MRV framework* were addressed by the workshop participant, rotating in three groups by using the method *World Café*. The following issues resulted out of this intensive group work:

How to link reporting on emission reduction and inventories in a BUR?

- Integrate the bigger picture
 - Engage LEDs
 - Link NAMAs with the priorities
 - Watch the on-going activities with a potential for GHG emission reduction
- Strengthen institutional capacities
- Management and technical issues
 - Development of an overarching strategy / roadmap (who, when, why)
 - Distinguish between what has been planned and what has happened (timeline)
 - Proper procedures for the cooperation with institutions and stakeholder
 - Set up an information sharing platform
 - Up-scaling of successful actions
 - Key category analysis – which sector is relevant and which sector has priority
 - Analyse the emission reduction potential in a sector
 - Attribution of mitigation to actual mitigation activities / causal chain / assessing impacts
 - Develop impact indicators for high level and bottom level
 - Capacity building on how to assess the impacts of economic tools e.g. carbon tax
 - Accounting of rebound effects
 - Find out the role of REDD+ and CDM
 - Consider cost and benefits
 - Enhancement of M&E

How to support the set-up of sustainable national systems (procedural, institutional, cross-sectoral etc.)?

- Political will and general engagement is needed!!
- Develop regulations and a clear policy
- Strengthening of institutions and institutional arrangements
- Mainstreaming with/into national development plans
- Guidelines on procedural issues, e.g. a roadmap for sustainable support
- Financing mechanism to foster sustainable systems (underlying necessity)
- Budgetary support, cost benefit analysis, business case, budget allocation
- Stakeholder engagement, stakeholder map awareness raising



International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV

- Capacity building around mitigation actions and MRV
- Internal management arrangements
- Clarify mandate, MoUs (manage expectations)
- Technical guidance, baseline setting
- National registry; archiving
- Creating institutional memory through documentation
- Annual review process (involve management, make it public, web based) including annual report to be improved

What are the related (capacity building) needs?

- Capacity needs assessments
- Establish a roster of experts
- Strengthening of the national Article 6 UNFCCC focal point (education, training and public awareness)
- Need for IT infrastructure
- Training on:
 - How to set up robust institutional framework; how to develop policies
 - Understanding of the various guidelines
 - M&E systems, MRV of NAMAs and other mitigation actions
 - Identifying and assessing mitigation actions, their reduction potential and co-benefits; assessing and tracking (private) finance
 - Scenario development and projections
 - IT skills
 - How to link BURs into the bigger picture (BUR compiling persons should also be trained on GHG compilation and NC)
- Stakeholder and communication:
 - Evoke interest of policy makers and get them involved
 - Stakeholder engagement and communication strategies (raising awareness on importance of climate information and data collection processes for stakeholders)
 - Accessing and sharing of best practices and LL
 - Information / knowledge sharing strategy

GHG Protocol Mitigation Accounting Standard to support BURs

Ms. Marion Vieweg, Current Future

Ms. Marion Vieweg presented the new WRI GHG protocol mitigation accounting standards as a tool to support BUR reporting. She outlined how the standards provide useful procedures for estimating the impact of mitigation actions ex-ante and ex-post. Furthermore, they provide useful guidance on reporting of methodologies and assumptions, which are rather new requests. The standards support good practice policies of contemplating what effects the measures will have or what would happen without the policy. Individual elements of the standards can be used as appropriate, e.g. it can be applied on a simplified level depending on the availability of data and resources / capacity. It is meant to empower the stakeholders related to the reports.

For more information please download the complete presentation [here](#).

Further links: <http://www.ghgprotocol.org/mitigation-accounting>



Sharing African Experience on mitigation actions and their reporting

Mr. Excellent Hachileka, UNDP Zambia

Mr. Tarek Shalaby, Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency, Egypt

Mr. Excellent Hachileka presented some of the actions Zambia has taken to tackle climate change, which are framed by the National Policy of Climate Change. He outlined specific MRV efforts such as the designing of a sustainable National GHG Inventory Management system, the transition from a project based to an institutionalised GHG inventory system, and the designing of an MRV system to support the implementation and evaluation of Zambia's pilot NAMAs.

Mr. Tarek Shalaby presented mitigation activities in Egypt. In terms of institutional arrangements, a national team of experts was established, responsible for the follow up of the negotiations and the assessment and survey of mitigation potential in relevant sectors. The need to develop a Low Emission Development Strategy as a framework for mitigation actions was identified and actions to integrate the stakeholders were initiated. Furthermore Mr. Shalaby gave an update on the NAMA activities, the BUR situation and the main challenges Egypt is facing.

For more information on Mr. Hachileka's input please download the complete presentation [here](#).

For more information on Mr. Shalaby's input please download the complete presentation [here](#).

The Q&A was directed to both presenters. Key findings were:

- It is difficult to assess the impact of single emission reduction actions in terms of what can be seen is the absolute change of emissions. For the estimation of the mitigation effect of one single activity good assumptions and baseline scenarios are needed.
- Considering the existing strategies for the country and government trends is a promising basis for developing and selecting NAMAs.

Workshop Day 3

Reporting of Climate Finance

MRV of Support

Overview and requirements of GEF funded projects BUR/NC

Ms. Suzanne Lekoyiet, UNEP

Ms. Suzanne Lekoyiet presented different kinds of support countries can receive from GEF for UNFCCC reporting and how to access them. The GEF provides financial as well as technical / capacity building support. There are two strings of relevant funding, the Focal Area Set-aside funds (FAS) and the GEF-6 (STAR (System Transparent Allocation of Resources) allocation, and/or funding through partnerships with other organisations and Annex I Parties. If applying for BUR funding of up to 352.000 USD, the money comes from the FAS rather than the country's STAR allocation FAS. The GEF has a project cycle with three stages of collaboration between the GEF agencies and the countries.

For more information please download the complete presentation [here](#).

Further information on the GEF can be found online. <http://www.thegef.org/gef/STAR>



International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV

The following Q&A session was led by Ms. Suzanne Lekoyiet and Ms. Maud Veyret-Picot and brought up the following key findings:

- More than 180 countries are members of the GEF (e.g. all of the workshop participants). Detailed country profiles (including focal point contacts) can be found on the GEF website.
- The funding amount allocated to the country does not change if they go through an agency.
- If the received funding is not within the given time-frame, it returns to the GEF. The funding has to be used for the purpose it was requested for. Possible ways to spend leftover money are e.g. workshops on lessons learnt.
- In addition, there is a GEF cancellation policy through which the money can be withdrawn from the recipient countries if certain milestones are not met.
- If a country wants to receive additional funding to the 352.000 USD for BURs / 500.000 USD for NCs, because of planned extended activities, it is considered a full size proposal and the extra money will come from the country's STAR allocation. One of the preconditions is the clarification of country policies on a national level.

Sharing African Experience on MRV of Support

Mr. Stephen King'uyu, National Climate Change Secretariat, Ministry of Environment, Water & Natural Resources, Kenya

- How is the coordination of national and international support organised?
- Is there an agreed upon established reporting process (data flow) and institutional arrangement?

Mr. Stephen King'uyu introduced the participants to Kenya's National Performance and Benefit Measurement Framework (NPBMF) / MRV+ system as one of the deliverables of Kenya' National Climate Change Action Plan (NCCAP). It is an integrated framework for monitoring, evaluating and reporting mitigation and adaptation actions, synergies between them, and includes a component to MRV climate finance.

He noted that the baseline information developed as part of the NCCAP reviewed not only climate specific initiatives, but also the broader scope of climate relevant initiatives. It turned out to be quite challenging to track flows of the latter as well as the direct support to non-state actor initiatives.

For more information please download the complete presentation [here](#).

Findings of the Q&A were:

- Having a central platform where all the funding is tracked was a request by the Kenyan stakeholders. One of the implementation steps was to try to give legal backing to the support tracking system through policy and legislation (already in Parliament), making it mandatory to report to the coordinating authority. In addition the NCCAP proposed Kenya Climate Fund, which is a great help in the tracking, has been included in the Medium Term Plan for 2013-2017.
- Getting a wide range of stakeholders involved (also the donors) was part of the NCCAP. Even private sector actors express ownership of the NCCAP, as they have been involved in the process. This has enhanced the alignment of funding preferences by the donors and other developing country-partners to national development objectives in relation to climate change. In many instances applicants for support are now being required to indicate what elements of the NCCAP they intend to address.



International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV

- Analysis has indicated a significant difference between pledges and actual disbursement. Reporting that is based on the actual disbursements is therefore preferable, as these represent the actual flows.

Break Away Group Discussion

Assistance for tracking support with the relation to the BUR

- How do you understand “support”?
- How to get the required information for the BUR?
- Is the available template helpful?

Reporting back to plenary / open discussion on MRV of support and tracking climate finance Plenary discussion on the input for the BUR check list and BUR template

The group work and the following plenary discussion led to the following findings:

How do you understand “support”?

- Support can be financial, technical or related to capacity building
- It means being enabled to support the convention
- For the BUR a country has to report on needs and funds received so far (tracking).
- Criteria have to be developed to define what kind of support it includes in particular.
- Look at the whole support in a first step, then define what is climate change related support in a second step
- Private sector support needs to be included
- To understand the landscape of all the actors involved is a prerequisite to collect information on the required support
- Establishing a policy, legal and institutional framework that makes it mandatory for all the support to be reported facilitates tracking support
- Technical support needed to build a robust MRV system at national level to be able to track all forms of support

How to get the required information for the BUR?

- Information from NCs and from the other sectors; through cooperation with other stakeholders, e.g. treasury ministries
- Proper institutional arrangements (relevant sectors to be included, data provision MoUs); coordinate each focal point for the different UNFCCC topics in one and coordinate focal points with departments
- Exchanging information on a regular basis; establish information systems / framework for information sharing
- Mapping of support
- Double check the funds received with the information of the treasury
- Gaps could be filled by commissioning studies; a gap analysis can show what funds are remaining, and identify the needs and the actual amount received in comparison to the numbers planned/targeted
- Take into account that mitigation assessment is not only technical but also includes policy analysis
- Capacity building for defining needs e.g. to avoid under or over estimations of costs and to be able to align support requirements according to their needs



Is the available template helpful?

- The template is a very good start and needs to get updated periodically
- It helps to provide completeness for the BUR preparation
- More guidance is required (e.g. on which exchange rate to use, how to identify priority needs)

National Systems for BURs

Institutional arrangements of national MRV systems

Break Away Group Discussion / World Café

- Identification of responsible institution(s) and coordination
- Existing resources and how to improve them?
- Technical, capacity, and financial requirements for the regular reporting

During the second world café group work, the participants came up with the following findings:

Identification of responsible institution(s) and coordination

- Map of existing key institutions
- Build a coordination structure
- Establish a committee to build national ownership
- MoUs and non-disclosure agreements etc.
- Raise awareness (political level, technicians, and other stakeholders)
- Identify and coordinate a national roster of experts
- Establish a forum for information exchange
- Create institutional memory

Existing resources and how to improve them?

- SWOT analysis of existing resources
- Scale up existing human and financial resources, improve quality and quantity
- Move from project based to a more programmatic system of MRV
- Sustained partnership platforms (global, regional or national) to share information, best practices and lessons learned web based or peer-to-peer
- The International Partnership is an important resource
- Incorporate existing national M&E and management systems into MRV
- Improve institutional memory (effective documentation of procedures and archiving)
- Set incentives to retain experts and create networks that when an expert leaves, you can still “tap” their knowledge
- Financial resources have to be sustainable (improve internal planning and budgeting and aim for high level commitment)
- More involvement of governmental agencies
- Ownership on all levels required

Technical, capacity, and financial requirements for the regular reporting:



International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV

- Development of policies and strategies
- Need for archiving procedures, guidelines, systems (including collection and dissemination of data)
- Financial support to sustain the institutions (internal and external)
- Capacity in terms of manpower and skills (institutions to be managed by more than one person)
- Development of MoUs with relevant stakeholders
- Clear institutional mandates
- Capacity building at all levels as well as for data collection, data management, data analysis, data archiving
- Budget line for M&E needed (continuous flow of funds needed to continuously compile data)
- Increase awareness
- Evoking interest of policy makers and getting them more involved
- Create sense of ownership
- Provide incentives for reporting, increase transparency and quality of reports
- Sharing of experiences between countries
- Capacity building in terms of national guidelines e.g. for line ministries so that they can report on what is needed
- Enhancement of public-private partnerships
- Independent reviewers to provide confidence in terms of transparency and accountability
- Engage with civil society
- IT capacity

Next Steps

Outlook and next steps

Mr. Kyekyeku Yaw Oppong-Boadi, Environmental Protection Agency, Ghana

Mr. Oppong-Boadi invited the participants to spread the word and engage with other actors. share information, among the African countries so that the colleagues who could not join the workshop can also benefit from the information that has been collected here. Engage with the relevant stakeholders and institutions. Involve the experts in the discussion. Engage with peers and higher levels. Engage with politicians and the civil society. Receive national ownership in order to keep the momentum going so that what has been started now will be of the benefit for the African countries and for the world.

Outlook, agreement on next steps and ideas:

In each country? In the regional collaboration? Which needs require support, which needs may be addressed by each country individually? Appropriateness of levels of ambition? Feedback on international negotiations?

The country representatives spent some time reflecting on the questions above, taking into consideration the information that has been collected during the workshop. Afterwards they presented their ideas to the other participants.

Some of the relevant key topics that were addressed are:

- Setting up sustainable institutional arrangements
- Setting up national knowledge sharing platforms / institutional memory and data management
- Capacity building / training of experts and other stakeholders



International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV

- Creating ownership and awareness rising
- Strengthen MRV as a subject of national importance

A wide range of possible partnerships for regional knowledge exchange on the relevant topics emerged from this reflection. Additionally, a follow up on how to best ensure a flow of information between the countries was very welcomed.

A detailed list of the individual country responses can be found in Annex 1.

African Regional Group of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV – objective and opportunities for supporting capacity building

Mr. Sven Egbers, International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV

Mr. Jongikhaya Witi, Department of Environmental Affairs, South Africa

Group work on useful methods for capacity development and knowledge sharing

The guiding questions during the presentation were:

- How can the African Regional Group support individual and/or regional needs with regards to the possible topics of BUR, GHG inventories, institutional arrangements, mitigation policies and mitigation actions, INDC as well as MRV?
- Which capacity development activities and/or knowledge sharing platforms can the Partnership provide?

Mr. Sven Egbers gave an overview of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV. The partnership is supporting the design, set-up and effective implementation of LEDS, NAMAs, INDCs, and MRV systems, and is open for any country to become a member. It focuses on peer-to-peer exchanges, which are organised in four regional groups: African Regional Group, Asian Regional Group, Latin American Regional Group, and the Cluster Francophone (French speaking African countries as well as France and Belgium).

Mr. Jongikhaya Witi introduced the activities of the African Regional Group. He referred to the first African Regional workshop, which was held in South Africa, May 2013 on the topic of *Tracking Mitigation Actions in Africa*. Further exchange within the regional group took place through webinars and e-discussions on institutional arrangements and legal frameworks for MRV. The two ways to actively engage into information and knowledge sharing within the region have been based on direct peer-to-peer exchange and web-based formats.

The participants were asked to reflect on the presented methods for capacity development and/or knowledge sharing in relation to their feasibility and to the need for support that was identified earlier on. The following take-away lessons were identified:

- Web-based formats:
 - Mailing lists for general basic information should be established. These should be linked to e-discussions for more technical details, where people can explicitly decide to join if they are interested in the topic (to reduce the flood of emails).
 - The e-learning format can be tested as soon as the NAMA e-learning project will be finalised. If the format proves successful, further e-learning topics could be developed according to the needs (e.g. on institutional arrangements).
 - Webinars might be a problem because of technical difficulties, but as it is possible to look at the recording, they are still considered as a valuable tool.



International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV

- Online forum with frequently asked questions and an exchange opportunity like an open blog.
- Peer-to-peer exchange is appreciated and should continue. It can be difficult in terms of approval, which might be easier if the exchange takes place on a regional level.

Wrap-up, Closing and Next Steps

Mr. Nathaniel Mjema, who smoothly guided the participants through these three intense days, pointed out that the most challenging task as a moderator was to get people out of group work again, as everybody was highly engaged and passionate about the topics discussed.

Mr. Alexander Fischer (BMUB) emphasised the importance of the MRV subject and the power regional groups may have when voicing their concerns. He pointed out that the International Partnership is there for the people's needs and can be approached at any time. Furthermore he encouraged the participants to try to access international finance through direct access (e.g. looking at Ethiopia who just set up a direct success fund through the Ministry of Finance).

During the previous working groups specific suggestions for next steps were made, including topics to tackle, formats to use, and identifying knowledge holders to exchange their lessons learnt:

Topic	Format	Who to address
Tracking climate finance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Webinar 	Kenya
Training on GHG inventories (e.g. new guidelines)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Online training course ● Followed by peer-to-peer exchange / visits 	Namibia
BUR review amongst countries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Peer-to-peer exchange ● Mailing list and e-discussions 	South Africa
MRV of mitigation actions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Webinar with technical experts ● Followed by on-site-training ● E-learning platform from WRI (with regional training) 	International Partnership
Institutional arrangement and setting up of expert teams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Webinar with general guidance on designing ideal institutional set ups ● Peer-to-peer partnership ● Mailing list, e-learning, e-discussions 	Ghana
IT reporting system / processing of information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Webinar with experts ● On-site training ● Peer-to-peer ● Mailing lists 	South Africa, International Partnership
Establishment of climate change fund	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Peer-to-peer 	Nigeria, Kenya, Rwanda

- The next steps of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV will be to revise the BUR template including a guidance document and to create an extendable web-based FAQ format addressing the main questions that came up during the workshop.



Annex 1: Proposed

immediate actions

Country	Next Steps	Needs for support and partnerships for next steps
Egypt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparing NAMA proposals in relevant sectors / international partners • BUR proposal and institutional arrangement • Allocation of experts for BUR • Regional collaboration with lessons learnt (e.g. cooperation with Tunisia, Morocco) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish national inventory system • Establish MRV system • Capacity building for governmental employees, technicians and other stakeholders on the topics of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ MRV ▪ GHG inventory ▪ BUR reporting ▪ Preparing mitigation / NAMA proposal ▪ Archiving • For the BUR more funds are needed to improve MRV and more time to prepare (one year is not enough)
Ghana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Unfortunately Mr. Opong-Boadi had to leave prior to this item of the agenda.</i> 	
Kenya	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share the BUR template with colleagues for feedback by Nov 16, 2014 • Follow up on arrangements for the preparation of BUR 1 • Finalise and submit SNC by end of 2014 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to clarify what is meant by “regional” • Exchange with South Africa on BUR • Information exchange between countries – platform needed • Networking amongst workshop participants / countries • Technical and financial support in all parts of BUR preparation needed (GIZ and others)
Malawi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify key stakeholders • Identify experts in different sectors • Develop ToRs for different sectors • Share template with experts • Establish a core-team from existing team • Establish a work-programme on capacity building 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learn from all countries who are ready to share information • Capacity building needs on all levels



International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV

Mozambique	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity building (sector) on GHG inventory • Establishing national MRV system (including sectoral) • Capacity building on policies development • Development of a national platform to share information and data • Development of BURs / NAMAs / GHG inventories • Development of a national documentation system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing partnership with South Africa, Swaziland, Zambia etc. • Technical and financial support needed
Namibia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthen institutional arrangements and capacities for the NAMA MRV (technical and financial support needed) • Develop a mechanism for data storage and archiving 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information sharing activities and networking within Southern African Region • Kenya: tracking on climate finance • Financial and technical resources on capacity building
Nigeria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share outcome of the workshop with national team • Subject draft BUR to new template • Seek engagement of key stakeholders in preparation of BURs and MRV • High level political buy-in into the process to ensure ownership • Vigorously pursue finalisation and submission in order to obtain approval for BUR proposal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuous keying into the Partnership resources • Seeking technical support towards strengthening institutional framework for mitigation activities • Capacity building for MRV, BUR and reporting • Up scaling networking for sharing lessons learnt, best practices and challenges
South Africa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review on draft BUR • Summary for policy makers • Business case for BUR compilation (resources analysis) • Development of a web-based M&E system (support needed) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engagements with Kenya on tracking climate finance • Training on GHG inventories and tools / BUR compilation / NC compilation • Sharing experiences on web-based MRV tools with other countries • Further support needed on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Climate finance ▪ Need for indicators for the BUR chapter on national circumstances ▪ Study tour to learn about the M&E / MRV outside the region ▪ GHG improvement programme ▪ Further analysis of draft BUR with BUR template (to identify gaps and areas for improvement) ▪ Review of institutional arrangements



International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Move up on Tier-level
Swaziland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raising awareness (political, sectoral, civil society) • Stakeholder mapping • Linking stakeholders to strategy / action • Development of coordination investments • Institutionalise reporting / GHG inventory unit • Finalise climate change policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical capacity on GHG methodologies and tools • Development of guidelines for reporting • Identification of mitigation actions • Scenario development, data collection and analysis • Information management system (IT) • Development of MRV system • South Africa: peer-to-peer review GHG; learning reporting / data collection; institutionalisation • GIZ: archiving; manuals • Kenya: tracking climate finance
Zambia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brief relevant authorities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNFCCC focal point ▪ Climate change secretariat ▪ GHG inventory coordinator • Hold stakeholder workshop to raise awareness and to develop a roadmap for BUR • Develop a concept on institutionalisation of BUR • Develop a proposal on BUR process • Follow-up on BUR funding request 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Africa and Kenya for IT infrastructure and information flow • Capacity building on reporting • Financial support to institutionalise data and information collection (GIZ)
Zimbabwe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High level buy-in • Submit BUR proposal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MRV and NAMAs best practices of Kenya, Egypt, Zambia • GHG inventory – South Africa and Namibia expertise • Institutional arrangements – Zambia • BURs – engage with Namibia and Nigeria • Assistance developing, linking and MRV (M&E) – International Partnership