



Partnership on Transparency
in the Paris Agreement



Partnership on Transparency
in the Paris Agreement

Workshop of the Asia Regional Group 2019

*'Tracking progress on NDCs and reporting under the Enhanced
Transparency Framework'*

Jakarta, Indonesia

24-26 April 2019





Table of Contents

.....	1
Introduction	3
The Partnership on Transparency in the Paris Agreement	3
Workshop context	3
Workshop scope.....	3
Participants and speakers.....	4
Main findings	4
Welcome remarks and introductions.....	4
Workshop expectations	4
Understanding climate transparency and outcomes of COP24.....	5
Sectoral working groups.....	7
<i>Energy</i>	7
<i>AFOLU</i>	9
Case clinics.....	11
Basis Takeaway points.....	12
Main takeaways.....	12
Annex I – Agenda	13
Annex II – List of participants.....	16
Country participants.....	16
Further experts and organizational staff	18
Annex III – Summary of ‘Case Clinics’	20

All pictures: © GIZ



Introduction

The Partnership on Transparency in the Paris Agreement

The Partnership on Transparency in the Paris Agreement aims to promote ambitious climate action through practical exchange in order to achieve the goal of keeping the global temperature rise well below 2° Celsius and to pursue efforts to limit the increase to 1.5° Celsius.

The main focus of the Partnership is on transparency issues related to the different building blocks of global climate governance, in particular the Enhanced Transparency Framework (ETF) of the Paris Agreement. It serves as a platform for dialogue and peer-to-peer exchanges between countries, thus helping to build mutual understanding and trust.

Through its regional groups the Partnership seeks to enhance cooperation and exchange with various partners in a specific region.

Workshop context

The Climate Conference in Katowice in December 2019 agreed the Katowice Rulebook, which included the modalities, procedures and guidelines (MPGs) – effectively the rules – for the ETF that will replace the existing reporting framework from 2024. Coming a few months after that, the 2019 workshop of the Asia regional Group of the Partnership was an opportunity to review these and to share ideas and thinking on what this means for countries in the region and what the appropriate next steps might be as countries prepare for the ETF.

It was also an opportunity to carry out some deep dives in key sectors to think through what the practical implications might be of reporting on specific sectors under the ETF.

Workshop scope

The aim of the workshop was to bring together government representatives working on MRV and transparency to share experiences, challenges and potential solutions related to transparency under the Paris Agreement, to facilitate regional networking and to promote capacity building on transparency. The agenda had three broad elements to it:

- Overview of the ETF and consideration of what this means for national transparency systems, as well as of the guidance and other support available to countries on transparency.
- Parallel sectoral sessions on the energy and AFOLU¹ sectors. This was important as sectoral line ministries will have a key role to play in implementing NDCs and collecting data for the ETF.
- Case clinics, to work collectively to address specific challenges facing participating countries.

¹ Agriculture, Forestry and Land Use.



Participants and speakers

The workshop included [40] participants from [18] countries. Participants came from a range of government institutions engaged as coordinators or experts of the respective National Communication (NC) and/or Biennial Update Report (BUR) processes, as well as experts of the Energy and AFOLU sectors..

The workshop was facilitated by Ricardo Energy & Environment, and speakers included them, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH, the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) and the secretariat of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change UNFCCC). The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) was also represented by two members of their secretariat.

Main findings

All presentations and some pictures from the workshop can be found at:

<https://www.transparency-partnership.net/news/tracking-progress-implementing-ndcs-asia>.

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

Welcome remarks and introductions

Welcome remarks were given by Dr. Ir. Ruandha Agung Sugardiman, Director General of Climate Change at the Ministry of Environment and Forests in Indonesia, and Philipp Schukat of GIZ Indonesia. Dr Sugardiman welcomed everyone to Jakarta and reminded participants that networking for future collaboration was a key aim of the workshop. He emphasises the importance of the ETF in reaching the temperature goals in the Paris Agreement, as it would help understand ambition and progress being made by the different Parties to the agreement, and collectively.

Workshop expectations

After participants introduced themselves, they were asked to set out what their expectations from the workshop were. Responses included the following:

- To understand what is new under the ETF and what is similar to the existing reporting framework, and hence what to build upon.
- To act as a melting pot for different nationalities to meet, to boost and augment networking.
- To create innovative ideas by exchanging ideas for improved climate action.
- To discuss link between mitigation action and GHG inventories. For example how inventories can better reflect mitigation activities, and capacity building for collecting activity data and improving the GHG inventory.
- To learn how tracking progress of implementing NDCs can be operationalized under the existing national system (also including adaptation action).
- To improve MRV in transportation and AFOLU sector; GHG measurement of mitigation actions, data collection.



Understanding climate transparency and outcomes of COP24

James Harries (Ricardo Energy & Environment) gave an initial introduction to climate transparency. At its simplest, transparency is “Reporting on climate-related activities and/or tracking progress towards a target”. Whilst it is a new term that is used under the Paris Agreement, the concept is not new and effectively covers previous concepts such as MRV of mitigation, M&E of adaptation and tracking climate finance. It is useful to see transparency not as an end in itself but as a means to an end and as part of a wider process of policy development, implementation and learning. There are international drivers for transparency, such as improving trust, ensuring international recognition for national performance and providing lessons learned, as an input to the Global Stocktake. But just as important are national drivers for transparency, including informing policy planning and prioritisation, improving policy coherence and monitoring implementation and effectiveness of policies. Before designing and implementing a transparency system it is helpful to consider key questions such as who the audience is, what information they are likely to want to see and how the information coming out of the transparency system might be used, as all these considerations will allow for the transparency system to be tailored to these needs.

Download the PPT by James Harries, Ricardo Energy & Environment, [here](#).

Jigme (UNFCCC) then gave a presentation on an overview of the ETF under the Paris Agreement. This ran through the key elements of Article 13 of the Paris Agreement (on transparency), the enhanced transparency framework and the outcomes of COP24 at Katowice, in particular the modalities, procedures and guidelines (MPGs) that provide the rules for Parties to report under the ETF. He emphasised how the ETF builds on the existing reporting framework and is not something entirely new (although there will undoubtedly be some new elements, especially for developing countries). He also reminded participants that the existing reporting arrangements provide a good opportunity for Parties to prepare for the ETF, which comes in from 2024. Developing countries will continue to require support, both technical and financial, as they prepare for the ETF. But they are also aided by the fact that the MPGs recognise different starting points for different Parties and offer flexibilities in certain areas for developing countries. The subsequent discussion covered in more detail the requirements of the BTR with respect to the current MRV framework. It was clarified that the BTR would cover mitigation, adaptation and support received/provided, would require reporting in a bit more detail than currently and would mandate to use the IPCC 2006 guidelines for GHG inventories². REDD+ activities for result based incentives will be reported as a technical annex attached to the BTR with technical analysis of the expert review included (provided by the experts doing the review). As currently, notation keys can be used to ensure completeness even where data does not exist, and it was mentioned that the GEF has already started internalizing the COP24 outcomes, with guidelines due out by end 2019.

Download the PPT by Jigme, UNFCCC, [here](#).

² For GHG projections, the MPGs do not specify the methodology, with the choice depending on the national circumstances.



After lunch, the focus turned to support for transparency-related work. First, a mapping exercise was carried out where participants discussed and recorded what support they are already receiving on transparency and their main existing support needs for building capacity on transparency. Support was already being received (or was in the process of being requested) from a range of sources. The most commonly used was the Global Environment Fund (GEF) which provides support for development of Biennial Update Reports and National Communications under the existing MRV framework. Next most commonly accessed was GIZ and domestic sources of funding from the countries themselves. This was followed by FAO, GGGI and developing country government ministries. Other less frequently used sources included UNDP, NDC Partnership, JICA, French Development Agency and World Bank Partnership for Market Readiness. However it should be noted that this was a relatively small sample size and so does not necessarily reflect the wider picture of support for transparency-related work. It is positive to see that domestic sources of funding was one of the more commonly used sources, reflecting that even developing countries are looking more to fund such work under the Paris Agreement under their own resources.

In terms of support needed, the most commonly cited area was that of data management, processing and coordination and methodological issues (e.g. calculating emissions factors, quality assurance/quality control etc). Other areas of support needs, in order of frequency that they were mentioned by participants, include capacity building on specific sectors (e.g. AFOLU) or sub-sectors (e.g. renewables), MRV of support, data collection, development of MRV systems, institutional structures and processes, reporting issues (e.g. developing BURs, online data portals etc), legislation for MRV/transparency, link between GHG inventory and mitigation and M&E of adaptation.

There were then a series of presentations and 'market stalls' that gave participants information on support on transparency that is available. This included:

- Initiative for Climate Action Transparency (ICAT), <http://www.climateactiontransparency.org/>: ICAT integrates guidance, capacity building and knowledge sharing to engage countries in the use of a common framework to assess the impacts of their policies and actions and report progress, fostering greater transparency, effectiveness and ambition.
- Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT), under the Global Environment Facility (GEF), <https://www.thegef.org/topics/capacity-building-initiative-transparency-cbit>: CBIT was established under the Paris Agreement to strengthen the institutional and technical capacities of developing countries to meet the ETF requirements.
- Information Matters, <https://www.transparency-partnership.net/network/information-matters>: The project implemented by GIZ strengthens the in-country capacities for enhanced climate reporting under the UNFCCC in the selected partner countries. It has produced various knowledge products for that aim and provides ad-hoc support for further developing MRV systems in developing countries.



- FAO E-Learning course on the national greenhouse gas inventory for land use and agriculture. These courses provide the necessary knowledge to build a sustainable National Greenhouse Gas Inventory (NGHGI) and assess GHG emissions and removals from the land use and the agriculture sector. They furthermore focus on the biological and physical processes that lead to GHG fluxes from land use-related and agriculture activities. The two course are available at the following link - <https://elearning.fao.org/course/index.php?categoryid=34>.
- Good Practice Database, <https://www.transparency-partnership.net/good-practice-database> A central hub for case studies on learning and leadership in climate action. It's a easy searchable repository of good practise examples with
 - a) Cases where climate action is being effectively designed and implemented
 - b) Cases in which countries have overcome obstacles to implementationThe database is jointly established by PATPA, NDC Support Cluster, UNDP NDC Support Programme, LEADS GP and NDC Partnership and the full content is accessible through all partners' websites
- The NDC Partnership, <https://ndcpartnership.org/about-us>: The NDC Partnership is a coalition of countries and institutions working to mobilise support and achieve ambitious climate goals in NDCs. It does this by ensuring that countries have easy, quick access to climate data, climate finance, essential tools, technology platforms, help desks and other technical resources, highlights of members' experiences with tools and technologies, including links to knowledge resources and platforms developed by NDC Partnership members.
- UNFCCC-CASTT (Climate Action and Support Transparency Training), <https://unfccc.int/process/transparency-and-reporting/reporting-and-review-under-the-convention/support-for-developing-countries/climate-action-and-support-transparency-training-CASTT>: a capacity-building programme designed to cater to stakeholders at all levels of competencies within national climate governance and implementation.

Sectoral working groups

For the remainder of the afternoon of day 1 and the afternoon of day 2, participants split into two parallel sessions that covered the energy and AFOLU sectors. These sessions took a deeper dive into these sectors and discussed specific approaches, challenges and methodologies.

Energy

The energy working group took a deep dive into the sector and considering what the ETF and the MPGs mean for the sector. It started with an exercise where participants were asked to get into groups according to their answers to questions designed to better understand their background and interests. For example:



- Do you work directly in the energy sector? Most participants actually did not work in the sector but were interested in it as it was a key emitter in their country, and strategically important.
- What parts of the energy sector are you interested in? Participants were split fairly uniformly between transport, energy supply, energy efficiency and 'other'.
- Does your country have specific energy sector targets? All countries did, but these differed – some were emissions targets for the sector whilst others included renewable energy targets (e.g. % of generation mix that is from renewable sources) and energy efficiency targets (e.g. % improvement in energy efficiency).

James Harries (Ricardo Energy & Environment) then gave a presentation on how energy features in NDCs and a short recap of what the MPGs say and could also give some ideas about possible indicators for the energy sector.

Download the PPT by James Harries, Ricardo Energy & Environment, [here](#).

Nguyen Quang Huy (Ministry of Industry and Trade of Viet Nam, Climate Change and Green Growth Office) then gave a presentation on how the energy sector will contribute to the implementation of Viet Nam's NDC, plans for the MRV system for tracking progress in NDC implementation in the energy sector and challenges faced in setting up the MRV system and how Viet Nam plans to address these. He explained that MRV of the NDC target was the responsibility of MONRE (Ministry of Natural Resources and Energy). For the energy sector, some existing reporting duties already exist, for example the Viet Nam National Energy Efficiency Programme (VNEEP3) sets targets for all sectors and the Law of Energy Efficiency sets minimum energy performance standards for 6 sectors, along with the required data collection to support these. Challenges included overlaps between different existing reporting requirements and the need to synchronize. For example, such overlaps existed between the VNEEP3 reporting and annual reporting by energy-using establishments.

Download the PPT by Nguyen Quang Huy, Viet Nam, [here](#).

The day 2 session started with a presentation from Jan Ralph Eborá (Climate Change Commission, Philippines). He covered the main targets for the Philippines in the energy sector, how the Philippines tracks progress in moving towards these targets, what data is collected, how the data is reported and lessons learned. Central to MRV/transparency in the Philippines is the National Integrated Climate Change Database Information and Exchange System (NICCDIES), an integrated climate information portal to track climate actions. It consists of four modules – GHG inventory, transparency for mitigation and adaptation actions, transparency of support and climate change expenditure tagging. The GHG inventory is underpinned by legislation, specifically Executive Order 174 (s. 2014) which established the Philippine GHG Inventory Management and Reporting System in relevant government agencies. The Philippines is working towards a relatively



decentralised system whereby individual sectoral ministries are responsible for the GHG inventory for their sectors (compared to other countries where the sectoral ministries often provide data to the central GHG inventory team to estimate emissions). The Department of Energy is responsible for the energy sector and the Department of Transportation for the transport sector. This ensures that GHG inventory capacity is built where the expertise for the sector lies, and can be considered effective mainstreaming of climate transparency. But Jan Ralph cautioned that the downside was that it did take a long time and that this needed to be factored in by those countries wishing to take that approach.

Download the PPT by Jan Ralph Ebor, Philippines, [here](#).

James Harries (Ricardo Energy & Environment) then gave a presentation on the WRI Policy and Action Standard and how it can be applied in the energy sector to assess the GHG mitigation impacts of individual policies and measures. This covered issues such as how to develop causal chains that show the different impacts from the policy in question, examples of indicators in the energy sector and the development of ex-ante and ex-post GHG scenarios for the policy.

Download the PPT by James Harries, Ricardo Energy & Environment, [here](#).

The participants then undertook an exercise to develop causal chains for their preferred energy sector policies. The policies selected by the different break-out groups were a buildings energy efficiency policy, a modal shift policy in the transport sector (private to public transport) and a policy to increase hydropower in the energy mix. These considered unexpected as well as expected impacts, short term impacts (such as increased emissions from construction of hydropower dams) and negative impacts (such as a rebound effect of more private cars due to congestion improving from people moving to public transport).

AFOLU

The AFOLU working group started with a presentation from Alessandro Ferrara of FAO, giving information on requirements under the MPGs and how the reporting on the AFOLU sector will be affected. In the following Q&A, various issues were clarified such as the extent to which provisions in the MPGs are mandatory, what guidelines should be followed and frequency of reporting the GHG inventory under the ETF.

Download the PPT by Alessandro Ferrara, FAO, [here](#).

Presentations were also given by Indonesia (Dr. Joko Prihatno, Ministry of Environment and Forestry) and Thailand (Ratana Lukanawarakul, Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation), giving case study examples of how they currently report in the AFOLU sector, along with challenges and opportunities in aligning AFOLU MRV with the MPGs as well as strengths and gaps in the data collection and management.



Download the presentations from Indonesia and Thailand [here](#) and [here](#) respectively.

These points were further explored in group work, looking at challenges to align with MPG requirements in the AFOLU sector and possible solutions to overcome these challenges. Challenges included data management (availability, collection), resources (financial, technical, human) and institutional arrangements. Possible solutions included i) scaling up institutional arrangements and encouraging better cooperation between agencies in order to set up a national inventory system, ii) development of an online data portal at country level to capture relevant data and allow easy access to it, iii) capacity building to comply with the new recommendation of the MPGs to use the 2006 IPCC Guidelines; iv) a move towards country specific emission factors (Tier 2) that take into account the factors that control GHG fluxes in agricultural processes, and thereby lead to a reduction in the associated uncertainty

The second day started with a session on tracking NDCs and a presentation from Beau Damen of FAO giving an analysis of NDCs in Asia. This looked at the Asia regional context for climate action in agriculture, regional NDC contributions in agriculture and gaps and opportunities in the agriculture sector. This concluded that there is a strong need for countries in Asia to better articulate potential ambition and a need for support to take action on climate change in agriculture. NDC contributions from the region are significant – but gaps and missed opportunities do exist. Data and information for comparing, accounting and reporting against NDC contributions could open up opportunities for finance and enhanced action. In the Q&A it was noted that only Indonesia has a quantifiable AFOLU target included in the NDCs in this region

Download the presentation from Beau Damen, FAO, [here](#).

Jong-Su Yim from the National Institute of Forest Science in the Republic of Korea gave a presentation on the role of the AFOLU sector in their NDC. This covered the GHG inventory process in Korea and results, an update on their NDC status, information about AFOLU GHG inventory and emission factors, and tracking progress. In the following Q&A, it was clarified that the technology used was mostly GPS. A regulation is in place to govern the collection of data, but private sector was challenging to get engaged.

Download the presentation from Jong-Su Yim [here](#).

Group work was carried out on NDCs in Asia, looking to identify (a) quantifiable policies, (b) appropriate indicators and (c) what the impact is of the policy (for tracking progress). One of the main conclusions drawn from this exercise was that a lot of policies in the AFOLU sector seem to be not quantifiable and consequently not possible to track in terms of GHG emission reductions. It is important to look at different factors, such as whether the targets are GHG or non-GHG and whether policies are quantifiable or non-quantifiable. Formulation of indicators is therefore paramount as well as it is important to be more precise in formulating policies so to ensure a more realistic possibility of being adopted, implemented and tracked in the future.



Case clinics

The case clinics were an opportunity for the various participants to work together in a collaborative manner to tackle specific challenges or problems that certain countries were facing. Three case clinics were run in parallel, addressing the following challenges:

Case 1: How to enhance the collection of activity data to improve the GHG inventory in the livestock sector? (Sri Lanka)

Case 2: How to collect data to support a bottom-up approach for GHG estimation in the energy sector (e.g. use of appliances, distances travelled etc)? (Indonesia)

Case 3: How to increase participation of sub-national government and private sector in providing information in the Philippines integrated MRV system (NICCDIES)? (Philippines)

More information on the outcomes of the discussions can be found at Annex III.

Reporting under the ETF and lessons learned from BURs and NCs

The session after lunch on day 3 looked at the MPGs again in more detail and considered (a) what flexibilities exist and (b) the extent to which current reporting (in the form of Biennial Update reports/Biennial Reports (BURs/BRs) and National Communications (NCs), provide a basis for future reporting under the ETF. This emphasised that there are many links between current and future reporting and most countries will already be meeting some aspects of the ETF through their current reporting. This shows that continuing to report under the existing framework, e.g. through BURs and NCs, is an excellent way to prepare for the ETF, and will help build technical skills and capacity. At the same time, the presentation also showed where there are flexibilities for developing countries.

Download the PPT by Jigme, UNFCCC, [here](#).

Norzarifah Ismail (Malaysian Green Technology Corporation) then gave a presentation their experiences of the challenges lessons learned from BURs and the International Consultation and Analysis (ICA) process.

Download the PPT by Norzarifah Ismail, Malaysian Green Technology Corporation, [here](#).

An exercise was then carried out in which participants were split into groups and given an extract from the MPGs (Section III.D on reporting mitigation policies and measures) and an extract from the BUR of Armenia, and asked to consider the extent to which the country is already meeting certain MPG provisions. One of the conclusions was that many requirements from the MPGs had already been met. In some cases it was not fully clear – information was perhaps provided or alluded to but not in the right format to allow participants to conclude that the provisions of the MPGs were being met. This showed the importance of trying to be as precise as possible in the reports and to follow the structure and format of the MPGs so that expert reviewers can easily see whether the provisions are being met.



Basis Takeaway points

At the end of the workshop, participants were asked to comment on their main 'takeaways' and to provide recommendations for the Partnership. Some of the topics are mentioned below. Participants were also asked to think about their next steps and actions that they would take forward following the workshop. These were not reported back to the workshop, but were for each participant to take back to their country and to ensure some concrete outputs from the workshop.

Main takeaways

A lot requirements of the MPGs are already being met by countries under the current MRV framework. This is perhaps not surprising as the ETF very much builds on the current framework.

That said, the ETF is enhanced and does contain some new provisions (e.g. NDC progress tracking) or some provisions that were not previously mandatory but now are. It is therefore to be expected that all countries will have some gaps where further work is needed before being ready to report under the ETF, both to meet new requirements under the ETF and to address existing capacity constraints under the existing MRV framework.

But there are five years to go before the first BTR has to be submitted under the ETF, so there is plenty of time to prepare. Now is an opportune time for countries to take stock of current reporting, look at what more is needed under the MPGs and plan out the work that they will carry out between now and 2024 to become 'ETF-ready'. This information on what needs to be done, by when and by whom could be set out in a roadmap, ideally integrated into the wider NDC implementation plans. The roadmap should focus on the priority areas, recognizing that the MPGs contain certain flexibilities for developing countries that need them, and take a step-wise approach to capacity building and continuous improvement (including beyond 2024).

There are key areas that will continue to be important under the ETF, as they are now under the current framework. For example, putting in place the appropriate institutional structure and processes is key.

Continuing to report under the current framework is a way of gaining further experience and building capacity. Therefore important that countries still plan forthcoming BURs and NCs.



Annex I – Agenda

Wednesday, April 24th

Time	Session	Speaker/s and facilitator/s
8:30	Registration for workshop	
9:00 10'	Welcome remarks	Dr. Ir. Ruandha Agung Sugardiman, Director General of Climate Change, MOEF
9:10 5'	Welcome remarks GIZ	Philipp Schukat, GIZ
09:15 10'	Introduction to the Partnership on Transparency in the Paris Agreement and to the Regional Group	Hanna Reuter, GIZ
09:25 15'	Introduction of agenda, facilitators, support team and logistics	Hanna Reuter
09:40 35'	Group exercise/ game: Introduction of participants	James Harries, Ricardo Energy & Environment
10:15 15'	Group picture	
10:30 30'	Coffee break	
11:00 30'	Small groups: Expectations for workshop	James Harries
11:30 60'	Input: Understanding climate transparency and outcomes of COP24 Q&A	James Harries Jigme, UNFCCC
12:30 60'	Lunch	
	Energizer	
13:30 90'	Support needs and existing support for transparency <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mapping exercise - Market place 	Video Input by CBIT Hanna Reuter and Kirstin Hücking, GIZ Mirella Salvatore, Alessandro Ferrara and Beau Damen, FAO Jigme, UNFCCC
15:00 15'	Introduction to sectoral sessions	
15:15	Coffee break	
15:45 105'	Parallel sessions for tracking progress on NDCs in two sectors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Group 1: AFOLU topic - Group 2: Energy 	AFOLU: Mirella Salvatore, Alessandro Ferrara, Beau Damen and Kirstin Hücking Energy: James Harries <i>Country inputs tbc</i>
17:30	Wrap up and information on dinner and field trip	



18:15	Departure for welcome dinner
-------	------------------------------

Thursday, April 25th

Time	Session	Speaker/s and facilitator/s
8:00	Field trip (incl. lunch) Meeting in the Lobby: 7:50 Return to hotel: approx. 13:10	
13:30 125'	Parallel sessions continued - Group 1: AFOLU - Group 2: Energy	
	Groups decide when to make a coffee break	
16:15 15'	Preparation of report back (in the groups)	
16:30 30'	Report back from sectoral groups	Selected participants
17:00	Wrap-up and look ahead to day 3	

Friday, April 26th

Time	Session	Speaker/s and facilitator/s
9:00 10'	Welcome and agenda for the day	
09:10 20'	Introduction to case clinics (method & pitches)	Hanna Reuter
9:30 150'	Peer advise sessions – case clinics hosted by different country representatives	NN, Indonesia Jan Ralph Ebor, Philippines Kirupamoorthy Mylvaganam, Sri Lanka
	Groups decide when to make a coffee break	
12:00 15'	<i>BUFFER TIME FOR CHECK-OUT AND PRAYER</i>	
12:15 60'	Lunch	
13:15 45'	Input: Reporting under the ETF and lessons learned from BURs and NCs Q&A	Jigme Norzarifah Ismail & Yusmazy Md Yusup, Malaysia
14:00 45'	Exercise on reporting	all
14:45	Coffee break and walk through gallery of case clinics (<i>case givers are requested to position themselves at their flip charts and report on their case to those interested</i>)	
15:15 30'	Action planning: Countries' next steps in improving transparency and preparing for the ETF	all



15:45 30'	Input: workshop results Short discussion: Lessons learnt from the workshop	James Harries
16:15 25'	Input for Transparency Partnership, evaluation and outlook	Hanna Reuter, Kirstin Hücking
5'	Farewell	Dr. Ir. Ruandha Agung Sugardiman, Director General of Climate Change, MOEF (tbc)



Annex II – List of participants

Country participants

Country of Residence	Surname	First Name	Organisation	Position
Bangladesh	Momin	Shah	Ministry of Industries	Deputy Secretary
Bangladesh	Ahmed	Md. Mokhtar	Bangladesh Climate Change Trust	Director
Bhutan	Dendup	Tashi	National Environment Commission Secretariat	Environment Officer
Bhutan	Chhoedron	Dawa	Ministry of Economic Affairs, Department of Hydropower and Power Systems	Chief Engineer
Brunei Darussalam	Haji Suut	Nur Salilah Amalina	Forestry Department	Forestry Officer
Brunei Darussalam	Haji Mohd Salleh	Sufina	Ministry of Energy, Manpower and Industry	Special Duties Officer
Cambodia	Tep	Sokpanha	Department of Climate Change, National Council for Sustainable Development	Climate Policy Officer
Cambodia	Phoeuk	Reasey	Department of Climate Change, General Secretariat for Sustainable Development	Deputy Head of GHG Inventory and Mitigation Office
Indonesia	Sugardiman	Dr. Ir. Ruandha Agung	Ministry of Environment and Forestry	Director General
Indonesia	Rachmawaty	Ir. Emma	Ministry of Environment and Forestry	Director of Climate Change Mitigation
Indonesia	Prihatno	Dr. Ir. Joko	Ministry of Environment and Forestry	Director of GHG Inventory dan MRV
Indonesia	Marjaka	Dr. Ignatius Wahyu	Ministry of Environment and Forestry	Director of Sectoral and Regional Resource Mobilization
Indonesia	Arundhati	Dra. Tantri	Ministry of Environment and Forestry	Director of Climate Change Adaptation



Country of Residence	Surname	First Name	Organisation	Position
Indonesia	Widianto	Raden Ari	Ministry of Transport	Head of Center for Sustainable Transportation Management
Lao PDR	Sensathith	Khatthaneth	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, Department of Climate Change	Climate Policy Officer
Lao PDR	Khounvixay	Phouthathay	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, Department of Climate Change	Technical Officer
Malaysia	Md Yusup	Yusmazy	Ministry of Energy, Science, Technology, Environment and Climate Change	Principal Assistant Secretary
Malaysia	Ismail	Norzarifah	Malaysian Green Technology Corporation	Senior Analyst
Maldives	Amjad	Abdulla	Ministry of Environment	Director
Maldives	Shareef	Ali	Ministry of Environment	Director
Maldives	Khaleel	Zammath	Ministry of Environment	Assistant Director
Mongolia	Shaariibuu	Gerelmaa	Environment and climate fund of the Ministry of Environment and Tourism	GHG Inventory Specialist
Mongolia	Sanjjav	Dolgorsuren	Ministry of Environment and Tourism of Mongolia, Department of Climate change and International Cooperation	Climate Policy Officer
Myanmar	Ni Ni	Thin	Ministry of Natural Resource and Environmental Conservation, Environmental Conservation Department	Assistant Director
Myanmar	Htin Aung	Kyaw	Minsitry of Natural Resource and Environmental Conservation, Environmental Conservation Department	Assistant Director
Nepal	Neupane	Shiva Raj	Ministry of Forests and Environment	Undersecretary
Nepal	Bhatta	Arun Prakash	Ministry of Forests and Environment, Climate Change Management Division	Undersecretary
Pakistan	Khan	Imran	Ministry of Climate Change	Assistant Director



Country of Residence	Surname	First Name	Organisation	Position
Pakistan	Ijaz	Muhammad	Ministry of Climate Change, Global Change Impact Studies Centre	Senior Scientific Officer
Philippines	Soyosa	Eugene	Forest Management Bureau, Department of Environment and Natural Resources	Economist
Philippines	Ebora	Jan Ralph	Climate Change Commission Philippines	Scientific Officer
Republic of Korea	Yim	Jong Su	National Institute of Forest Science	Research Scientist
Singapore	Ng	Shu Hui	Prime Minister's Office, Strategy Group, National Climate Change Secretariat, Policy and Planning Division	Assistant Manager (International Policy)
Singapore	Ibrahim	Hassan	National Parks Board, International Biodiversity Conservation	Deputy Director
Sri Lanka	Mylvaganam	Kirupamoorthy	Land Use Policy Planning Department	Deputy Director (Agronomy)
Sri Lanka	Mudugamuwe Gamachchige	Ajith Pushka Kumara	Ministry of Agriculture	Director (Agri Services)
Thailand	Lukanawarakul	Ratana	Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation	Manager, Office of Forest and Climate Change
Thailand	Chantes	Seetala	Office of Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and Planning	Government Official
Vietnam	Pham	Nam Hung	Department of Climate Change	Environment Officer
Vietnam	Nguyen	Huy	Ministry of Industry and Trade of Vietnam, Climate Change and Green Growth Office	Secretary

Further experts and organizational staff

Surname	First name	Organisation	Position
Murti	Putri Ari Hendra	ASEAN Secretariat	Environment Officer
Saputro	Tri Sulistyono	ASEAN Secretariat	Environment Officer
Jigme		UNFCCC secretariat	Team Lead



Surname	First name	Organisation	Position
Damen	Beau	FAO	Natural Resource Officer
Ferrara	Alessandro	FAO	Consultant
Salvatore	Mirella	FAO	Climate Change Officer
Harries	James	Ricardo Energy & Environment	Principal Technical Consultant
Hücking	Kirstin	GIZ	Policy Advisor
Lubis	Nela Anjani	GIZ	Technical Professional
Susanti	Dina	GIZ	Administrative Professional
Reuter	Hanna	GIZ	Policy Advisor
Schauss	Verena	GIZ	Policy Advisor



Annex III – Summary of ‘Case Clinics’

Case 1: How to enhance the collection of activity data to improve the GHG inventory in the livestock sector? (Sri Lanka)

Goal

To have better activity data to allow for more accurate and robust emissions estimates.

Context

Presentations were given on the status of the national GHG inventory in Sri Lanka. The limited availability of data on the AFOLU sector is the main cause for a non-accurate estimation of the emissions, in particular from the livestock sector.

Challenges/barriers:

- There is lack of data due to the unavailability of regular data collection mechanism.
- The institutional arrangements are not very well defined in term of roles and responsibilities.
- Agricultural data are scattered in various departments and institutes with unclear ownership.
- Most of the data are unusable due to lack of accuracy and consistency, mainly in terms of scale and unit.

Possible approaches:

- Clarity on data ownership.
- Learn more on template for data collection.
- Awareness raising for data collection at local level.
- Stakeholder consultation and awareness training courses to understand the new needs in terms of data requirements.
- Establish a policy for farms on data collection
 - o Political buy-in important
 - o Need to identify co-benefits of data collection
 - o Registration system could be established.
- Assign focal points.



Case 2: How to collect data to support a bottom-up approach for GHG estimation in the energy sector (e.g. use of appliances, distances travelled etc)? (Indonesia)

Goal

To have better bottom-up data in the energy sector to better understand the drivers for changes in emissions levels and the impacts of specific policies.

Context

Presentations were given on both the energy sector and transport sector. Information was provided on emissions trends, targets (e.g. 17% energy saving target by 2025), key mitigation actions and GHG projections.

Challenges/barriers:

- Collecting data on the demand-side is difficult – for example, how to collect data from a large number of sources, on how energy is being used, how many people are using public transport etc?
- A related challenge is that collecting data from other institutions, e.g. other ministries, agencies etc, can be difficult.
- Finally, the data that is collected is not being collected for climate change purposes so may not be ‘fit for purpose’.

The focus of the case clinic was agreed to be on the first of the points above.

Possible approaches:

- Prioritize – only focus on priority sectors, emissions sources and policies. Don’t attempt to collect bottom-up data for all.
- Combine this with continuous improvement – so over time, the approach for bottom-up data collection can be extended out to include other sectors, emissions sources or policies.
- In the meantime, in advance of new data being collected, assumptions based on expert judgement can be used. Important to consult extensively on this.
- Surveys are a good way to collect new data to support a bottom-up calculation approach but it was noted that they can be expensive. Consider how frequently surveys are needed – not necessarily every year.
- One approach could be to use existing non-climate surveys and expand to include the required climate data.
- Where possible, work with intermediary organisations, e.g. industry associations, consumer groups etc. This has the benefit that they tend to have greater trust from the targeted data suppliers, and also this approach can be more efficient.



- It will be important to consider any data confidentiality issues around surveys and around the collection of more bottom-up data.

Case 3: How to increase participation of sub-national government and private sector in providing information in the Philippines integrated MRV system (NICCDIES)? (Philippines)

Goal

More data from sub-national level and private sector, leading to a richer data base within NICCDIES.

Context

A presentation was given on the Philippines' National Integrated Climate Change Database Information and Exchange System (NICCDIES) and the challenges related to including information from the private sector and subnational governments.

Challenges/barriers:

- Communicate purpose of providing the data to private sector stakeholders and local government units (LGUs)
- Clearly defining the scope and target for including these stakeholders (which companies and LGUs -> costs vs. usefulness)
- Incentives for providing data
- Capacities of private sector stakeholders and LGU's

Possible approaches:

Several approaches were suggested and the following ones prioritized:

- Raising awareness and understanding of greenhouse gases and their impacts + why data is needed; communicate benefits of climate action (e.g. increasing energy efficiency)
- Providing public recognition for early movers/champions, e.g. through awards, public ceremonies, certificates)
- Creating a step-wise roadmap: identify potential champions -> set-up pilot activities -> assess challenges/barriers and solutions how to overcome them -> public recognition -> scale up

The group then choose to discuss the third approach in more detail:



Roadmap

National level			Sub-national level / private sector
		Communication of process & milestones / M&E of pilots	
Assess key sources and actors	MOUs		
Define outcomes			
Allocate resources. As part of this, engage with development partners and consider long-term funding options.			
Develop a communication plan			
Set up a steering committee task force consisting of key associations and line ministries	Dialogue process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - challenges, what already exists, focal points... - “MPGs”: timeframes, frequency, scope, formats, QA/QC... - Feedback on training programme - Feedback on NICCDIES 		
Design a training programme			
Further develop NICCDIES			
Further develop feedback mechanism (technical; share calculations, analysis etc.)			
Improve process	Communicate results & provide public recognition for champions		



National level			Sub-national level / private sector
	(involve highest level)		
Scaling up			

-