



Annual Partnership Retreat (APR) 2018

Enhanced transparency –
learning from implementation, facilitating negotiations

Seoul, Republic of Korea, 12 to 17 October 2018





Contents

Introduction	3
7 th Annual Partnership Retreat, 2018.....	3
Participants	3
Topics, schedule and methods	4
Major findings.....	5
Status of the UNFCCC negotiations, particularly those on the ETF	5
Transparency and ambition	5
Flexibility	6
Transparency of adaptation	7
Transparency of support.....	8
Inventories.....	8
Tracking of progress.....	9
Technical expert review (TER).....	10
Marketplace for capacity-building support.....	12
Recommended reading	13
Background.....	15
The Partnership on Transparency in the Paris Agreement.....	15
Annual Partnership Retreat	15
Annex I. List of participants.....	17
Country participants.....	17
Speakers, experts and organisational staff	20

Authors of the report: Johanna Bergmann of Stadt Land Wandel, Gonçalo Cavalheiro of CAOS, and Hanna Reuter and Mijako Nierenköther of GIZ.

All photos: © GIR/Jinhwan Park.



Introduction

7th Annual Partnership Retreat, 2018

The 2018 Annual Partnership Retreat took place in Seoul, in the Republic of Korea, on 12–17 October. The Retreat focused on the modalities, procedures and guidelines (MPGs) of the Enhanced Transparency Framework (ETF) for action and support under the Paris Agreement (PA), which are currently under negotiation.

The event's agenda underscored the interrelation between negotiations under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and national implementation. As in all previous years, a good mix of negotiators, domestic policy-makers and experts attended the retreat, enabling a lively and productive exchange of experiences.

Building on last year's discussions on the ETF, the 2018 APR focused on decisive issues in the negotiations. The participants shared their specific experiences of national implementation, which helped negotiators to understand what kind of clarification and guidance would be beneficial and how future MPGs can support effective implementation. The exchange also helped attendees to understand each other's negotiation positions and priorities and to find the common ground needed to facilitate an agreement at the 24th Conference of the Parties (COP24) in Katowice, Poland, later this year.



Organised by the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH on behalf of the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU), this year's Annual Partnership Retreat was hosted by the Greenhouse Gas Inventory and Research Center of Korea.

Participants

APR 2018 welcomed 44 representatives of the following 27 countries as well as one representative of the European Commission: Argentina, Australia, Bhutan, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Georgia, Germany, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, Mexico, Morocco, Norway, the Philippines, Saudi Arabia, the Republic of Korea, Singapore, South Africa, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America.

In addition, the retreat was attended by a total of 12 experts from the following organisations: the Council on Energy, Environment and Water (CEEW), GIZ, the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the UNFCCC Secretariat, and the World Resources Institute (WRI).





Topics, schedule and methods

Topics addressed this year included: the status of UNFCCC negotiations; the link between ambition, transparency and capacity-building; transparency of adaptation; transparency of support; GHG inventories; progress tracking; and technical expert reviews (TERs).

	Fri. 12 th	Sat. 13 th	Sun. 14 th	Mon. 15 th	Tue. 16 th	Wed. 17 th	Thu. 18 th
AM	Opening and introductions Transparency	Transparency of adaptation	Free day	GHG inventories	Tracking progress (cont.)	Wrap-up and closure	Excursion to the Korean Demilitarised Zone (DMZ)
PM	Flexibility and capacity	Transparency of support		Tracking progress	Technical expert review	Excursion to the Zero Emission Housing Area	

The Retreat featured a combination of expert inputs, presentations of individual country experiences, group work, and facilitated discussions. The speaker presentations that provided insight on the negotiations and on implementation served as inputs for the subsequent group activities and facilitated discussions. The group activities in particular provided an important opportunity for in-depth discussion and greatly contributed to the value of the Retreat.

In addition to the content-related discussions, the Retreat provided a number of opportunities for participants to spend time together in a more informal setting, creating trust and friendship and promoting continued exchange during the free time and even after the retreat.



You can find all the presentations and a gallery of photos from the Retreat at <https://www.transparency-partnership.net/news/7th-annual-partnership-retreat-discusses-how-achieve-enhanced-transparency>



Major findings

Status of the UNFCCC negotiations, particularly those on the ETF

The Bangkok Climate Change Conference, held in September 2018, considerably advanced readiness for the negotiations on Article 13 of the Paris Agreement (PA) at COP24, where the most important expected outcome is the adoption of implementation guidelines for the PA. Although many options were tabled in Bangkok and decisions still remain to be taken regarding individual transparency arrangements in the ETF, the Conference brought discussions on the various issues to maturity. Retreat participants generally regarded the adoption of a Paris rulebook as feasible if it is accompanied by some follow-up technical work. Some of the transparency issues that still need to be solved at COP24 include:

- the tracking of progress towards Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) targets (Article 4 of the PA);
- information on adaptation, especially streamlining between Ad Hoc Working Group on the Paris Agreement (APA) item 4 and APA item 5;
- information on support (provided and mobilised, as well as needed and received);
- the operationalisation of flexibility and its link to capacity building for transparency;
- the transition from current provisions for measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) to the future ETF MPGs;
- the design (scope, frequency, timing, flexibility) and resources of the facilitative multilateral consultative process (FMCP).

Article 13 of the PA requires that the ETF be based on collective experience and built on existing arrangements. The ETF will need to provide information to the global stocktake (GST), with technical reviews being key for mutual learning and steady improvement, even in advanced stages of reporting.

Related presentation

Katia Simeonova, UNFCCC Secretariat: [Negotiations on the Paris Agreement Work Programme \(PAWP\) with focus on Transparency MPGs](#)

Transparency and ambition



Inputs and discussions highlighted the key role transparency plays for promoting ambitious climate actions, in that the availability of data opens up the space for honesty and dialogue: If we have information on other people's or country's situation and intentions, we are more likely to act in the common interest (PA goals) instead of based on self-interest, which is likely to be the case when little or no information is available (prisoner's dilemma). Transparency therefore turns the prisoner's



dilemma into an assurance game by removing distrust and thus allowing enhanced cooperation.

For the PA to succeed, its pledges must therefore be transparently fulfilled. To this end, the PA already contains all the elements of a complete information system, namely:

- an information collection and publication system to let us know what is going on (biennial transparency reports – BTRs);
- the promotion of adherence to reporting requirements/compliance mechanisms (technical review along with multilateral discussion);
- a mechanism for evaluating effectiveness (GST to assess collective progress).

Once this information system has been operationalised at COP24, it could eventually provide the level of transparency required regarding pledge fulfilment.

In addition to the topics addressed in the negotiations, it was suggested to consider the role of sub-state and non-state actors in collecting and making information available and to find ways in which these actors can transparently secure recognition of their own pledges and efforts.

Related presentation

Arunabha Ghosh (no PowerPoint presentation)

Flexibility

Flexibility should not be thought of as a blanket, but rather as a pillow. This means that flexibility does not apply to all developing countries irrespectively of their capacity, but rather it applies only to those that require some support over time in order to facilitate the implementation of the transparency requirements. Flexibility is, therefore, strongly linked to capacities and is self-determined. At the same time, it should facilitate improvement and collective stocktaking and should decrease as capacities increase. Flexibility does not, therefore, equate to inaction. Rather, it needs to be a route towards enhanced transparency, with developing countries reporting based on their capacities and receiving adequate support to improve these capacities over time.

Key questions that need to be resolved when it comes to flexibility include: to whom it should be given, which aspects of transparency it should be applied to, what kind of flexibility should be granted, and how the provision of capacity building can ensure the enhancement of transparency. In this discussion, a distinction should be drawn between flexibility (which requires that capacity gaps be taken into account), applicability (certain requirements are only applicable to certain countries – e.g. taking into account the NDC type) and discretion (provided through the use of ‘shall’, ‘should’ or ‘may’).

Related presentations

Gonçalo Cavalheiro, CAOS: [Flexibility and capacity building towards enhanced transparency under the Paris Agreement](#)



Marcia Rocha, OECD: [Tracking progress under the Paris Agreement – linkages and operationalising flexibility to flexibility](#)

Transparency of adaptation

Most countries, in particular least developed countries (LDCs), have submitted NDCs with a strong adaptation component. Progress on the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of adaptation, including institutional set-up, is being made in countries around the world.

However, the policy and technical complexity of adaptation issues, coupled with a lack of capacity, currently creates major M&E challenges for all parties and particularly for the most vulnerable parties, who have a greater need to ascertain their progress on adaptation yet have the least capacity to assess and report it. Challenges include demonstrating impacts, linking adaptation to vulnerability and resilience, identifying needs, and distinguishing regular 'development' activities from adaptation action.



When addressing future MPGs on adaptation transparency, participants discussed and highlighted the pros and cons of different approaches for reporting, looking in particular at a single-document versus a two-document approach. This was necessary because the relationship between adaptation communication and reporting on adaptation in BTRs still remains to be decided. Accordingly, it also remains unclear whether there should be one set of guidelines or two. Some countries see adaptation communication and adaptation reporting as having different purposes, drawing a distinction between prospective and retrospective information. Some of this information might not need to be reported as often, which raises the question of the periodicity of reporting, especially if a single document approach is chosen.

It is important for developing countries, especially those with limited capacities, to report on adaptation in a way that does not impose undue burden (keeping in mind that reporting on adaptation under the Paris Agreement remains a 'should' provision) and to be able to select the most suitable vehicle for their communications (National Adaptation Plans, NDCs or National Communications) as well as the periodicity of reporting.

At the same time, unbounded flexibility also creates challenges for the reporting party and for the system as a whole, because the minimum amount of information required for the GST should at least be reported and, depending on which vehicle is chosen by a country, the periodicity might become a critical issue.

In conclusion, no universal adaptation metric, methodological guidance or indicators are to be expected because adaptation reporting is very country and context specific. Even so,



countries found that consistency in reporting over time was useful, serving both national purposes and international requirements.

Related presentations

Timo Leiter, GIZ: [Adaption M&E: insights from practice](#)

Rafael Martinez Blanco, Mexico: [M&E of adaptation: An approach from Mexico](#)

Illari Aragon, IIED: [Transparency of adaptation: Insights from the negotiations](#)

Rinchen Penjor, Bhutan (no PPT)

Transparency of support

So far, little experience has been gained in tracking the support provided or received, both in developing and developed countries. Those who are providing non-financial support find it difficult to provide specific monetary values for this kind of support (capacity building and technology transfer projects or parts thereof) because it is often embedded in broader projects with several components. Also, different definitions of climate finance persist and the ways in which different actors report is not aligned. One of the greatest challenges is perceived to be reporting on finance mobilised through public interventions, which recipient countries might actually be better able to track than providers. Matching support provided and received is commonly perceived to be impracticable and not worth pursuing.

Some experience has been gained in using marker systems (e.g. Rio markers, budget codes) that are suitable for statistical purposes. Granularity (detailed information on individual projects) seems to be valued. As there is so little experience, it is hard for many countries to identify needs and gaps when it comes to support and transparency of support. A more in-depth exchange of experiences on this topic is necessary.

A common understanding is broadly held regarding the importance of tracking and reporting on (a) status, channels, areas of support, sectors and subsectors, capacity building and technology transfer and (b) the finance mobilised and the amounts disbursed to each beneficiary country.

Related presentations

Laurence Ahoussou, Canada: [Canada's approach to reporting on support provided](#)

Moses Omedi Jura, Kenya: [Coding tracking and reporting on climate finance in Kenya](#)

Inventories

The improvement of inventories was determined to be potentially limitless, because further improvements are always possible – e.g. by way of adding new emission sources or improving calculation methodologies. These improvements could have a substantial impact on whether NDC targets are perceived to and are hence reported to have been achieved or not. Important drivers identified for improving GHG inventories over time were international reporting requirements and guidelines, frequent and regular reporting, and feedback from reviewers and national stakeholders.





Some of the issues to be tackled at COP24 in Katowice include the starting year and the most recent year of reporting, time series and time series consistency, completeness, and the use of (the most recent) IPCC Guidelines.

Submitting the most recent information is of the utmost importance for tracking progress nationally (NDC targets) and globally (GST). However, no agreement was reached on how the MPGs should define the most recent year of reporting for developing countries. One suggestion was that the guidelines should require the submission of inventories for the year X-2 (where X is the submission year), which is mandatory for developed countries. Developing countries where capacity limitations are a factor could, however, have the flexibility for reporting up to X-4.



In all, 30 out of 42 (or 70%) of the biennial update reports (BURs) analysed by the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES) include emissions estimates that to some extent use the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. Several countries are currently working through the transition process from the 1996 to 2006 IPCC guidelines. Overall, many countries recognize that 2006 guidelines are more complete and user friendly for compilers, with no great challenges experienced in the

transition from one to the other. However, both time and capacity-building are required for such a transition, and this should be reflected in the MPGs.

Related presentations

Chisa Umemiya, Japan/IGES: [Trends in GHG inventory reporting for BURs](#)

Takashi Morimoto, Japan: [Japan's experience in improving GHG inventories over time](#)

Vaibhav Gupta, CEEW: [GHG inventories – insights from negotiations](#)

Wang Tian, China (no PPT)

Panel discussion with Christine Dragisic (USA), Mary Awad (Lebanon), Matias Almag (Argentina) and Patricia Abreu (Brazil)

Tracking of progress

When it comes to tracking progress towards achieving the NDCs under Article 4 of the PA, developed countries have gained extensive experience from implementing the Kyoto Protocol while developing countries have some experience in the scope of the Cancun pledges. However, the tracking of progress is important for informing the GST. This is why the MPGs, taking into account the diversity of NDCs, must provide clarity on

- what each Party needs to track and report – e.g. updates, information to facilitate clarity, transparency and understanding (ICTU), etc., and



- when to do this – with the NDC, in the first BTR or subsequent BTRs of the NDC cycle, etc.).

The information required for tracking progress will depend on the type of target a Party chooses in its NDC. However, to achieve transparency under all target types, it is crucial to have information on: GHG emissions and removals (time series from base to target year or period); internationally transferred mitigation outcomes (ITMOs), when used; land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF), where relevant; and methodological aspects, assumptions, coverage and data sources. For many NDCs, the provision of an inventory is vital for tracking progress.

Information on policies and measures, projections, and national context/circumstances could also be provided, although projections are considered to be more useful for planning than for tracking progress.

Some target types have been found to be much more complex than others, requiring a range of information and assumptions that are sometimes difficult to predict or collect, with significant impacts on the target and target achievement.



Whichever type of target has been chosen, indicators to track progress should be self-determined and relevant to the NDC type. Values for the reference year, reporting year(s) and target year(s) should be provided, and calculations, assumptions and approaches should be explained.

Related presentations

Julia Gardiner, Australia: [Tracking progress to Australia's 2020 target](#)

Patricia Abreu, Brazil: [Implementing the Brazilian National REDD+ Strategy](#)

Cynthia Elliott, WRI: [Tracking progress on mitigation targets: Insight from negotiations](#)

Jae H. Jung, Republic of Korea (no PPT)

Technical expert review (TER)

In the past, while countries found technical analysis very useful (e.g. for enhancing reports, increasing political buy-in, building capacity), they also saw the potential to improve the process (e.g. to deliver a more concrete, technical identification of capacity-building needs and other areas). Similarly, the Facilitative Sharing of Views (FSV) approach and the Multilateral Assessment (MA) proved to be very important tools for building trust among Parties. However, the modalities may need to be enhanced to extract the full potential from these exercises.



Experiences to date show that review and consultation processes are perceived to be generally non-intrusive, facilitative and comprehensive – as per Article 13.11 of the PA – and have proved to be a major enabler for improvement. Nonetheless, clearer guidelines were determined to be necessary for the technical team of experts (TTE) and for facilitating the TTE's work and relationship with the Party (e.g. the differentiated treatment of shall/should/may requirements).



So far, the different options for interaction with the Party (video call, virtual team, etc.) have proved very useful for both the team and the Party and should be kept. Generally speaking, the review (report) should be the result of a dialogue between the review team and country experts. However, demands were made to promote and ensure the consistency of subsequent reviews. The review team should also have sufficient reviewers with the capacity required to carry out this work.

A checklist-only approach is not seen as very helpful for countries. MPGs should therefore provide guidance and encouragement to ensure useful and constructive dialogue between the experts and reviewers. In so doing, they should focus the review on the real improvement achieved so far and also on highlighting what the country is doing well.

To assist the improvement of the process, BTRs could include information on follow-up actions planned or taken (including support needs) to address the previous reviewers' feedback, as well as a history of how the country is improving its reporting over time (including planned improvements, priorities set and indicative timelines).

To help establish a good review system, it was considered useful for the UNFCCC Secretariat to compile feedback from the reviewers and feed it into a potential future revision of reporting guidelines. Meetings between reviewers were also considered important to ensure the consistency of reviews. In general, with the number of reviews going up, a system is needed that can handle the volume of reports and thus comprises a critical mass of reviewers from developing countries.

Related presentations

Felipe Osses, Chile: [Chile's experience in participating in the ICA](#)

Sandra Motshwanedi, South Africa: [South Africa's experience on ICA](#)

Oscar Zarzo Fuentes, Germany: [Experiences with the review processes under the UNFCCC](#)

Ana Danila (as a Lead Reviewer): [Experiences with the review processes from a lead reviewer perspective](#)



Marketplace for capacity-building support

During the retreat, participants and experts were also given the opportunity to briefly present interesting tools or capacity-building initiatives to the other participants:

- Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT): www.thegef.org/topics/capacity-building-initiative-transparency-cbit
- NDC Helpdesk: <https://www.ndc-cluster.net/helpdesk>
- Climate Action and Support Transparency Training (CASTT): <https://unfccc.int/process/transparency-and-reporting/reporting-and-review-under-the-convention/support-for-developing-countries/climate-action-and-support-transparency-training-CASTT>
- Information Matters' knowledge products and ad hoc facility: <https://www.transparency-partnership.net/network/information-matters>
- Tracking and Strengthening Climate Action (TASCA) webinar series: <https://www.wri.org/2018-tasca-webinar-series>

WRI and PATPA are hosting a series of webinars on a range of topics related to climate transparency that feature insights, tools and experiences from practitioners and implementers.

- Project for Advancing Climate Transparency (PACT): <https://www.wri.org/our-work/project/project-advancing-climate-transparency-pact/publications>
Consortium-based research with reflections and recommendations on topics related to the transparency negotiations.
- ClimateWatch: <https://www.climatewatchdata.org>
Global and country-specific open-source climate data, visualisations and analysis.
- Initiative for Climate Action Transparency (ICAT): <https://climateactiontransparency.org>
Providing in-country support and developing guidance and methodologies based on the GHG Protocol Policy and Action Standard for measuring the GHG impacts of policies and measures.
- ResourceWatch: <https://resourcewatch.org>
Monitoring the planet's pulse with real-time global data on environmental indicators (fires, water risk, forest cover, power plants, and many more).
- The representatives from the United States discussed ideas for a potential project to support developing countries in their application of the IPCC 2006 Guidelines (project link not available at the time of writing).





Recommended reading

General

- Website of the Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT):
<https://www.thegef.org/topics/capacity-building-initiative-transparency-cbit>

Flexibility and capacity building

- Cavalheiro, G. and Letete T., *Flexibility and capacity building towards enhanced transparency under the Paris Agreement*, GIZ and CAOS, April 2018:
<https://www.transparency-partnership.net/system/files/document/2018-discussion%20paper-flexibility%20and%20capacity%20building%20towards%20enhanced%20transparency.pdf>

Adaptation

- AdaptationCommunity.net policy briefs on adaptation metrics, :
<https://www.adaptationcommunity.net/monitoring-evaluation/policy-briefs/>
- Christiansen, L., Martinez, G. and Naswa, P. (eds), *Adaptation metrics: perspectives on measuring, aggregating and comparing adaptation results*, UN Environment DTU Partnership, Copenhagen, March 2018: <http://www.unepdtu.org/newsbase/2018/03/new-publication-on-adaptation-metrics-released?id=2ee1a180-9012-47a2-a50a-d5316246a814>
- Factsheets on national adaptation M&E systems:
<https://www.adaptationcommunity.net/monitoring-evaluation/national-level-adaptation/examples-of-national-me-systems/>
- Garrett, J. and Moarif, S., *Reporting on capacity-building and technology support under the Paris Agreement: Issues and options for guidance*, OECD and IEA, April 2018:
https://www.oecd.org/environment/cc/Reporting_on_capacity-building_and_technology_support.pdf
- Guidance on the development of national adaptation M&E systems:
<https://www.adaptationcommunity.net/monitoring-evaluation/national-level-adaptation/>
- IIED, 'How integrated monitoring and evaluation systems can help countries address climate impacts', *Briefing*, August 2018: https://www.transparency-partnership.net/system/files/document/IIED_how%20integrated%20monitoring%20and%20evaluation%20systems%20can%20help%20countries%20address%20climate%20impacts_August%202018.pdf
- Leiter, T. and Pringle, P., *Pitfalls and potential of measuring climate change adaptation through adaptation metrics*, March 2018:
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/323838261_Pitfalls_and_potential_of_measuring_climate_change_adaptation_through_adaptation_metrics#page=141
- UN Environment, *Adaptation Gap Report*, November 2017:
<https://www.unenvironment.org/resources/adaptation-gap-report>

Support

- Vallejos, L., Moarif, S. and Halimanjaya, A., *Enhancing mitigation and finance reporting*.





Building on current experience to meet the Paris Agreement requirements, OECD and IEA, November 2017: <https://www.oecd.org/environment/cc/Enhancing-mitigation-and-finance-reporting.pdf>

Tracking of progress

- GIZ and Öko-Institut, *Accounting of Nationally Determined Contributions. Guidance for the Establishment of an Accounting for NDCs for absolute or relative mitigation targets with a baseline*, July 2018: https://www.transparency-partnership.net/system/files/document/Guidance%20Accounting%20NDC_eng.pdf (also available in French and Spanish via <https://www.transparency-partnership.net/documents-tools/ndc-accounting-rules>)
- Hood, C. and Soo, C., *Accounting for mitigation targets in Nationally Determined Contributions under the Paris Agreement*, OECD and IEA, November 2017: <https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/docserver/63937a2b-en.pdf?expires=1540468662&id=id&accname=quest&checksum=628B844A59F30A65D17320C6D7330441>
- Levin, K., Rich, D. and Elliott, C., *Recommendations for Accounting for Mitigation Components of Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) under the Paris Agreement*, WRI, September 2018: <https://www.wri.org/publication/recommendations-accounting-mitigation-components-nationally-determined-contributions>
- OECD/IEA Climate Change Expert Group, *Common time frames: Summary of discussions at the March 2018 Climate Change Expert Group Global Forum*: <https://www.oecd.org/environment/cc/Common-time-frames-summary.pdf>
- Vaidyula, M. and Hood, C., *Accounting for baseline targets in NDCs: Issues and options for guidance*, OECD and IEA, April 2018: https://www.oecd.org/environment/cc/Accounting_for_baselines_targets_in_NDCS.pdf

Inventories

- IGES, *Greenhouse gas emissions inventory capacity: An assessment of Asian developing countries*, November 2016: <https://pub.iges.or.jp/pub/GHG-Inventory-Capacity>

Technical expert review

- WRI, *Designing the Enhanced Transparency Framework, Part 2: Review under the Paris Agreement*, November 2017: <https://www.wri.org/sites/default/files/designing-enhanced-transparency-framework-part-2-review-under-paris-agreement.pdf>





Background

The Partnership on Transparency in the Paris Agreement

During the Petersberg Climate Dialogue held in Berlin in May 2010, three countries – Germany, the Republic of Korea and South Africa – launched the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV with the aim of promoting ambitious climate action through policy dialogue and practitioner-based exchanges. This alliance has since been renamed the Partnership on Transparency in the Paris Agreement, reflecting the 2015 launch of the Paris Agreement’s transparency mechanism, which is tasked with facilitating and catalysing the implementation of the Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs). The overarching goal of the Agreement is to keep the increase in average global temperature well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels, possibly limiting it to 1.5°C. Effective implementation of the NDCs is essential to achieve this goal. The new enhanced transparency system is of particular importance in this context, as it helps build mutual trust, encourages partner countries to grow their ambitions and, in so doing, helps to limit global temperature rise to well below 2°C and ideally to 1.5°C.

Today, the Partnership on Transparency in the Paris Agreement is addressing the new challenges posed by the transparency rules, while continuing to provide support for practical exchanges between developing and industrialised countries and to serve as a discussion forum for climate negotiation topics.

More than 120 countries have already participated in the Partnership’s various activities, the Annual Partnership Retreat being one of its key forums for exchange, peer learning and policy dialogue.

Annual Partnership Retreat

The Annual Partnership Retreats support negotiations on ambitious climate action. Each Retreat brings together negotiators and practitioners from developing countries, emerging economies and industrialised nations from all corners of the globe. Typically, around 50 to 60 professionals attend each event, where they are provided with a forum to discuss some of the most pressing issues arising in the negotiations and to exchange with practitioners and experts in the field. The Retreat enables participants to learn from each other in an open and collaborative environment and free from the pressure to make commitments.

To date, six retreats have taken place:¹

- 15 to 23 October 2012, Berlin, Germany: ‘MRV – Today, tomorrow and the future’
- 20 to 28 August 2013, Hanoi, Viet Nam: ‘Tracking progress and MRV for greenhouse gas emission reductions’

¹ More information on all the Retreats is available at www.transparency-partnership.net/activities-database



- 3 to 10 September 2014, Punta Cana, the Dominican Republic: 'Intended Nationally Determined Contributions: Preparation and implementation'
- 9 to 15 September 2015, Cuernavaca, Mexico: 'Transparency and implementation – Future proof rules for climate policy'
- 31 August to 7 September 2016, Cape Town, South Africa: 'From MRV to an Enhanced Transparency Framework in the context of NDC implementation'
- 5 to 11 September 2017, Kakheti, Georgia: 'The Enhanced Transparency Framework, Ambition and National Implementation'





Annex I. List of participants

Country participants

No	Mr/ Ms	Family name	First name	Country/ organisation	Organisation	Position
1	Mr	Almang	Matias	Argentina	Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Worship	Delegation to the UNFCCC
2	Ms	Gardiner	Julia	Australia	Department of the Environment and Energy	Delegation to the UNFCCC – transparency lead
3	Mr	Penjor	Rinchen	Bhutan	National Environment Commission Secretariat	Environment Officer
4	Mr	Wangdi	Jigme	Bhutan	Ministry of Agriculture and Forests	Executive Specialist III
5	Ms	Abreu	Patrícia	Brazil	Ministry of Environment	Environmental Analyst
6	Mr	Rodrigues Mendes	Mario Henrique	Brazil	Ministry of Environment	Environmental Analyst
7	Ms	Ahoussou	Laurence	Canada	Environment and Climate Change Canada	Senior Policy Analyst
8	Mr	Angulo	Juan	Chile	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Deputy Director, Directorate of Environment and Oceanic Affairs
9	Mr	Osses McIntyre	Felipe	Chile	Ministry of the Environment	Delegation to the UNFCCC – AILAC coordinator for transparency
10	Ms	Wang	Tian	China	National Center for Strategic Studies and International Cooperation	Assistant Professor
11	Mr	Mbuyi Kalombo	Aimé	Democratic Republic of the Congo	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development	Head of Climate Change Division
12	Mr	Mugula Cirhala	Florentin	Democratic Republic of the Congo	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development	Assistant, Forest Landscape Restoration
13	Ms	Barba Bustos	Irina Alexandra	Ecuador	Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Human Mobility	First Secretary, Climate Change Desk, Directorate of



No	Mr/ Ms	Family name	First name	Country/ organisation	Organisation	Position
						Environment and Sustainable Development
14	Mr	Proaño	Ricardo	Ecuador	Ministry of the Environment	Climate Change Politics Specialist
15	Mr	Adam	Habtamu	Ethiopia	Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change	Climate Change Negotiation Coordination Expert
16	Ms	Danila	Ana Maria	European Union	European Commission	Policy Officer on MRV
17	Mr	Machavariani	Giorgi	Georgia	Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture	Senior Specialist
18	Ms	Lichte	Rocío	Germany	Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety	Policy Advisor
19	Mr	Zarzo	Oscar	Germany	German Environment Agency	Advisor
20	Mr	Morimoto	Takashi	Japan	Mitsubishi UFJ Research and Consulting Co., Ltd	Chief Analyst
21	Mr	Nagamori	Kazu-masa	Japan	Ministry of the Environment	Deputy Director
22	Ms	Umemiya	Chisa	Japan	Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES)	Policy Researcher
23	Ms	Abu Aboud	Nerdeen	Jordan	Ministry of Environment	Mitigation Specialist
24	Ms	Alhaleeq	Sara	Jordan	Ministry of Environment	Head of Adaptation Section
25	Mr	Jura	Moses Omedi	Kenya	Ministry of Environment and Forestry	Advisor to National Focal Point
26	Ms	Awad	Mary	Lebanon	Ministry of Environment	Project Assistant
27	Mr	Martínez Blanco	Rafael	Mexico	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources	Deputy General-Director for Climate Change Projects





No	Mr/ Ms	Family name	First name	Country/ organisation	Organisation	Position
28	Mr	Balaghi	Riad	Morocco	National Institute for Agricultural Research	Head of Department
29	Ms	Klokkeide	Kristin Madsen	Norway	Norwegian Environment Agency	Senior Advisor
30	Mr	Taperla	Roald Ray	Philippines	National Economic and Development Authority	Economic Development Specialist II
31	Ms	Al-Attas	Mona	Saudi Arabia	Ministry of Energy, Industry and Mineral Resources	International Policy Advisor
32	Ms	Alhinai	Bushra	Saudi Arabia	Ministry of Energy, Industry and Mineral Resources	International Policy Advisor
33	Ms	Alotaibi	Nura	Saudi Arabia	Ministry of Energy, Industry and Mineral Resources	International Policy Advisor
34	Mr	Manivannan	Santhosh	Singapore	National Climate Change Secretariat	Assistant Director
35	Mr	Marquard	Andrew	South Africa	University of Cape Town	Acting Director
36	Ms	Motsh- wanedi	Sandra	South Africa	Department of Environmental Affairs	Deputy Director, International Reporting
37	Mr	Jung	Jae H.	Republic of Korea	Greenhouse Gas Inventory and Research Center	Deputy Director
38	Mr	Lee	Gil	Republic of Korea	Greenhouse Gas Inventory and Research Center	Associate Researcher
39	Ms	Kim	Jaein	Republic of Korea	Greenhouse Gas Inventory and Research Center	Associate Researcher
40	Ms	Lee	Eun Jung	Republic of Korea	Greenhouse Gas Inventory and Research Center	Associate Researcher
41	Mr	Adriansson	Erik	Sweden	Swedish Environmental Protection Agency	Special Advisor, climate change reporting





No	Mr/ Ms	Family name	First name	Country/ organisation	Organisation	Position
42	Ms	Barfoot	Christina	United Kingdom	Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy	Analyst, emissions reporting
43	Ms	Tremain	Rebecca	United Kingdom	Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy	Policy Advisor
44	Ms	Dragisic	Christine	United States	US Department of State	Transparency Lead/ Land Sector Team Lead

Speakers, experts and organisational staff

No	Mr/ Ms	Family name	First name	Organisation	Position
1	Ms	Aragon Noriega	Illari	International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED)	Researcher
2	Ms	Bergmann	Johanna	Stadt Land Wandel	Consultant
3	Mr	Cavalheiro	Gonçalo	CAOS	Consultant
4	Ms	Elliott	Cynthia	World Resources Institute (WRI), Climate Program	Associate
5	Mr	Ghosh	Arunabha	Council on Energy, Environment and Water (CEEW)	Chief Executive Officer
6	Mr	Gupta	Vaibhav	Council on Energy, Environment and Water (CEEW)	Senior Programme Lead
7	Mr	Leiter	Timo	GIZ	Advisor
8	Ms	Lu	Na	GIZ	Advisor
9	Ms	Nierenköther	Mijako	GIZ	Advisor
10	Ms	Reuter	Hanna	GIZ	Advisor



11	Ms	Rocha	Marcia	Climate Change Expert Group, OECD	Climate Policy Analyst
12	Ms	Simeonova	Katia	UNFCCC Secretariat	SBI Coordinator

