



WORLD
RESOURCES
INSTITUTE

Working Paper

THE INTERNATIONAL PARTNERSHIP ON MITIGATION AND MEASUREMENT REPORTING AND VERIFICATION (MRV): LESSONS AND NEXT STEPS

REMI MONCEL, TOM DAMASSA, LETHA TAWNEY, AND KIRSTEN STASIO

November 2011

This paper was originally written as an input into the sixth meeting of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV in Panama City in October 2011. The document attempts to summarize the views expressed by the participants of the Partnership in past meetings and therefore does not necessarily represent the views of WRI. Contact: RMoncel@wri.org

World Resources Institute Working Papers contain preliminary research, analysis, findings, and recommendations. They are circulated to stimulate timely discussion and critical feedback and to influence ongoing debate on emerging issues. Most working papers are eventually published in another form and their content may be revised.

OVERVIEW

The International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV was launched by the Governments of Germany, South Africa and South Korea at the Petersberg Climate Dialogue I, in May 2010, in Germany. It aims to support practical exchange and sharing of experiences between developing and developed countries, and to support in particular developing countries around three themes: the design and implementation of National Low Carbon Development Strategies (LCDS), Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) and the set up of systems to measure, report and verify (MRV) mitigation actions.

Lessons from previous meetings: The first five meetings of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV offer a wealth of country and programmatic experiences related to LCDS, NAMA, and MRV systems. These real world experiences provide lessons in both the capacities needed for an enabling environment and the strategies that support mitigation-related activities.

The necessary capacities include:

- High-level political and policy support
- Coordination and cooperation
- Financial resources acquisition and distribution
- Technical expertise
- Data and methods

Strategies that can support these activities:

- Ensure flexibility in the approaches in order to achieve co-benefits of action
- Learn by doing
- Focus on scalable but ambitious initiatives

Input to the UNFCCC negotiations: Among several objectives for the Partnership, participants have expressed a desire to use the domestic experiences shared in the forum to inform the UNFCCC climate negotiations. The Partnership has the opportunity to use the insights from its constructive discussions, such as distilled above, to better understand the issues and choices in the negotiations and ensure that international rules align with domestic priorities and capacities. For example:

- The design elements, status, and function of LCDS under the UNFCCC remain fairly open-ended.
- Several questions also remain open on NAMAs,
 - including the extent to which guidance should be given for countries on how to create and report on NAMAs,
 - how to link them to support, and how to operate the NAMA registry.
- Detailed provisions for both developed and developing countries around enhanced reporting in National Communications, biennial (update) reports, international assessment and review (IAR), and international consultations and analysis (ICA) have yet to be agreed.
- A number of issues cut across the three themes of the Partnership, including the need to take into account developing country priorities and capacities, the need for international support, the establishment of the 2013-2015 periodic review, the sequencing and prioritization of issues, and the institutions and entities needed to support LCDS, NAMAs, and MRV.

Implications for the Partnership: Participant deliberations in the first five meetings suggest that the Partnership could focus on a variety of issues and audiences. It can also play several roles in a constellation of related processes and initiatives. Participants might consider which role(s) would provide the greatest added value in the future and could discuss whether the Partnership should pursue one or several of the following activities: continue to exchange national-level best practices and challenges through case studies presented at the Partnership meetings; design or test new tools or methodologies to address the technical issues faced by countries and relayed in Part 1 or inform the design of international rules and bodies in the UNFCCC; act as an “international hub” for international initiatives related to NAMAs, LCDS and MRV to maximize coordination assess gaps and launch new initiatives where relevant; inform decisions by the UNFCCC COP to ensure that they are most in line with the needs of countries on the ground with regard to NAMAs, LCDS and MRV. In addition, participants may consider which format would make future efforts most effective (e.g. frequency, duration, inputs).

INTRODUCTION

The International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV (the Partnership) was launched by the Governments of Germany, South Africa, and South Korea at the Petersburg Climate Dialogue, in May 2010. It aims inter alia to support the practical exchange and sharing of experience between developing and developed countries, and to support, in particular, developing countries around three themes: the design and implementation of Low Carbon Development Strategies (LCDS), Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs), and the establishment of systems to measure, report, and verify (MRV) mitigation actions. Participants in the meetings were primarily government negotiator experts, head of delegations and national government practitioners.

This paper aims to take stock of what was discussed at the Partnership meetings and draw lessons learned from the first five meetings. It also aims to help further develop the Partnership's activities and enhance its value to the international climate community. Part I summarizes presentations and discussions from the first year of Partnership sessions (June 2010 – June 2011), providing an overview of major themes, principles, and lessons that emerged with respect to national LCDS, NAMAs, and MRV. Part II outlines key issues in the negotiations that relate to the themes of the Partnership. Building on Parts I and II, Part III asks participants which roles the Partnership should play in the future to support progress domestically and internationally. These questions stem from the structure and lessons of previous meetings, the views expressed by participants, and outstanding questions in the UNFCCC negotiations.

PART I—Lessons Learned

Presentations and interventions made during the Partnership's first five meetings highlight a diverse suite of country and programmatic experiences related to LCDS, NAMA, and MRV systems. The planning and development of capacity building programs, carbon markets, and national GHG inventories, among others, provide numerous real world examples of the successes and challenges associated with national GHG mitigation activities. Although these case studies are not comprehensive, several cross-country and cross-issue themes emerged. These main themes can be generally grouped into two categories:

- **Capacities** required for an enabling environment that supports low carbon development and mitigation-related activities.
- **Strategies** that support the implementation of mitigation-related activities.

Note, however, that these categories, as well as several of the main themes, are not mutually exclusive; indeed, many of the themes are intricately related.

Capacities

High-level political and policy support

Governments have found that technical analyses must intersect with political and policy-making processes and be supported by those decision makers in order to have an impact. For example, in South Africa, the Cabinet has endorsed the Long Term Mitigation Scenarios as a part of the larger climate policy process that is still ongoing.¹ This endorsement has been powerful even though it is not formal law. Taking a different approach, the EU and UK have embedded their technical emissions goals in domestic legislation.²

¹ "From Scenarios to NAMAs - the South African Experience" (presented at The 2nd Meeting of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV, Bangkok, Thailand, August 7, 2010), 5. Australia has also found that political support is critical to developing an LCDS. "Australia's Mitigation Actions and Low Carbon Development Strategy" (presented at The 1st Meeting of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV, Bonn, Germany, June 2010), 6.

² The UK has written their goals and their interim carbon budgets into domestic law and there is a political coalition to be the 'greenest Government ever' despite the fiscal crisis. ("Experience from the UK: carbon budgets" (presented at The 5th Meeting of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV, Bonn, Germany, June 18, 2011). The EU has embedded their Kyoto Protocol

This suggests that explicit links between technical and political processes should be considered from the outset, though their actual form can differ depending on the political context and domestic policy processes. In the country examples presented to the Partnership, these links have been made repeatedly throughout the process of developing the LCDS and have involved participants from across several ministries. The Partnership has also discussed strategies for involving ministries more effectively, including involving the highest ministerial level, engaging across ministries, and particularly involving the finance ministry to ensure political and policy support.³

Coordination and cooperation

There are numerous LCDS-, NAMA-, and MRV-related activities already underway, both domestically and internationally within those countries participating in Partnership dialogues. In order to make best use of available resources and maximize results, there is a clear need for effective coordination of activities and approaches that promotes collaboration and avoids duplication. This need, however, applies to a variety of situations, involving a diverse set of stakeholders. Those recognized and discussed by the Partnership include:

- Coordination between government and private sector and/or NGOs during the design and implementation of NAMAs or LCDS⁴.
- Coordination among national or local agencies/ministries (e.g., for data collection, reporting, policy design and implementation⁵).
- Coordination between countries and within regions (e.g., for policy implementation and harmonized MRV, such as in the EU⁶; for sharing of best practices and lessons learned in NAMAs planning, such as in Latin America⁷).
- Coordination within planning processes (e.g., for LCDS and NAMAs; for climate-specific and non-climate-specific initiatives⁸).
- Coordination among donors (e.g., experience from Colombia⁹).

Consequently, examples of best practices on coordination have been slow to take form. The active exchange of tools, best practices, and experiences (in this forum and elsewhere) can facilitate some amount of coordination, as can formalizing MOUs or other collaboration arrangements. The Partnership also identified strong project management and having well-defined roles and responsibilities as an important means to promote coordination and cooperation¹⁰.

Financial resource acquisition and distribution

Several presenters identified the need for finance to support domestic initiatives in developing countries. However, those needs will be

commitments in domestic legislation as well. Artur Runge-Metzger, “MRV - The European experience” (presented at The 2nd Meeting of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV, Bonn, Germany, August 7, 2010), 4.

³ *5th Meeting of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV - Summary* (Bonn, Germany, June 18, 2011).

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ See, for example, “Concept for a MRV system in Thailand” (presented at the 4th Meeting of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV, Bangkok, Thailand, 9 April, 2011) and “India: Greenhouse Gas Emissions 2007” (presented at the 2nd Meeting of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV, Bonn, Germany, 7 August, 2010).

⁶ “MRV in Practice – The European Experience” (presented at the 4th Meeting of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV, Bangkok, Thailand, 9 April, 2011).

⁷ “Regional Dialogues to Stimulate Ambitious NAMAs in Developing Countries” (presented at the 4th Meeting of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV, Bangkok, Thailand, 9 April, 2011).

⁸ *5th Meeting of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV - Summary*.

⁹ “Colombia’s LCDS” (presented at the 5th Meeting of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV, Bonn, Germany, 18 June, 2011).

¹⁰ *5th Meeting of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV - Summary*.

nationally and project specific. This financial support could be deployed in a way that builds capacity, provides incentives for mitigation, and builds on existing systems.¹¹ It has also been recognized in Partnership discussions that the scope and scale of NAMAs could be affected by uncertainties regarding the sustainability of international support.¹²

The level of MRV necessary for NAMAs is clearly tied to the type of financial support provided.¹³ However, MRV guidelines can also impact the overall cost of a NAMA. Clear MRV methodologies have the potential to minimize costs and maximize efficiency though flexibility is also necessary.¹⁴ MRV methodologies can build on existing IPCC material and expertise developed through participation in the CDM. One strategy that was suggested at one Partnership meeting would reshape international funding approaches for MRV, for example moving away from project-funded, consultant-based development of GHG inventories as seen in the CDM.¹⁵

Technical expertise

The importance of involving the appropriate climate change specialists from the government in mitigation policy planning, implementation, and reporting processes cannot be understated. For example, several Partnership presentations (e.g. on experience from India, Australia, the EU and Chile) demonstrated the value of leveraging sectoral or cross-agency expertise in producing a national GHG inventory¹⁶

However, there are often insufficient technical personnel, particularly in developing countries. In some cases, technical expertise on particular issues simply does not exist, or it lies outside of relevant government ministries (e.g., with consulting groups, civil society and universities).¹⁷ In other instances, country climate change experts are so in-demand that their time is spread thinly across multiple projects.¹⁸ In addition, many current planning and reporting processes are not regular enough to retain critical individuals and knowledge over time.

The long-term success of LCDS, NAMAs, and MRV systems requires technical expertise throughout the multi-year implementation. Therefore, there is a need for effectively building and sustaining in-country technical capacity and ensuring that the next generations of practitioners are well trained. Within the Partnership, ideas presented for developing technical expertise included additional training, ensuring broad engagement during domestic peer review processes, and staff mentoring and other employment incentives.¹⁹

Data & methods

The utility and effectiveness of LCDS, NAMAs, and domestic MRV systems are underpinned by robust data and analysis. Existing data collection and management priorities, processes, tools, and institutions, as well as domestic data applications are extremely diverse among Parties. For example, the Partnership has highlighted the importance of good data and sound analysis for establishing

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² *3rd Meeting of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV - Summary* (Tianjin, China, October 10, 2010).

¹³ Ned Helme, “Conceptualizing LCDS and NAMAs” (presented at The 5th Meeting of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV, Bonn, Germany, June 18, 2011), 5.

¹⁴ Andrew Marquard and Emily Tyler, “Defining NAMAs seeking support - examples from South Africa” (presented at The 2nd Meeting of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV, Tianjin, China, October 10, 2010); *3rd Meeting of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV - Summary*.

¹⁵ *5th Meeting of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV - Thomas Damassa notes* (Bonn, Germany, June 18, 2011).

¹⁶ See, for example, “India: Greenhouse Gas Emissions 2007” (presented at the 2nd Meeting of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV, Bonn, Germany, 7 August, 2010) or “Domestic System to Track GHG Emissions in New Zealand” (presented at the 4th Meeting of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV, Bangkok, Thailand, 9 April, 2011).

¹⁷ Alexa Kleysteuber, “Current MRV practices and experiences in Chile” (Bangkok, Thailand, April 9, 2011).

¹⁸ Dennis Tirpak, “Measurement and Performance Tracking: A Post-Cancun Outlook” (presented at The 4th Meeting of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV, Bangkok, Thailand, April 9, 2011).

¹⁹ *5th Meeting of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV - Summary*.

credible estimates of “Business as Usual” baselines (BAU), developing GHG inventories, tracking non-GHG indicators, and sectoral policy modeling or quantification of NAMA emission reductions, among other uses²⁰.

Although data systems within countries will need to be based on national circumstances, some harmonization is likely to be beneficial, either to support useful international reporting or to reduce data collection and analysis costs domestically. Taking both views into consideration, several general principles related to data and methods were discussed by the Partnership²¹:

- New, appropriate (e.g., sector-specific) tools, guidance, and methods are needed and should build on existing materials.
- The ‘right’ amount or type of data enables the achievement of policy goals but minimizes data collection and reporting burdens.
- Institutions engaged in data collection, management, and reporting oversight should seek to improve coordination, data documentation, and archiving.
- Incentives for data collection, management, and reporting need to be aligned with broader domestic goals (e.g., a mandate for climate action that goes beyond completing a report and capitalizes on the co-benefits of MRV) and take into account other interests (e.g., private sector competitiveness issues).
- The country-driven nature of mitigation activities and benefits of flexibility suggest that data and methods should be comparable while not perhaps being identical.

Strategies

Ensure flexibility to achieve co-benefits

There have been many efforts to point to the co-benefits, particularly the economic opportunities, which can be reaped from mitigation actions. Identifying these and ensuring they are achieved has been crucial to building support for action in the Partnership countries.²²

In order to best identify and achieve co-benefits, Partnership countries have identified that there are advantages to allowing for a variety of approaches.²³

- Activities are country-driven and country-specific. Organizations providing support – from the Global Green Growth Institute, to the WRI Open Climate Initiative to the EU-UNDP Climate Change Capacity Building Programme—are already trying to respond to this diversity of approaches but flexibility will continue to be needed to ensure activities can draw domestic support.²⁴
- It can be helpful to frame mitigation activities in the larger scheme of development (i.e., green growth). As Colombia has found, the LCDS process brings stakeholders together to envision the future development of the country.²⁵

²⁰ See, for example, “From Scenarios to NAMAs - the South African Experience” (presented at the 2nd Meeting of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV, Bonn, Germany, 7 August, 2010); “Experience from Brazil: Voluntary Actions to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions” and “Experience from the UK: Carbon Budgets” (presented at the 5th Meeting of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV, Bonn, Germany, 18 June, 2011); “Overview of Annex I Inventory Reporting and U.S. Facility-level Reporting” (presented at the 2nd Meeting of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV, Bonn, Germany, 7 August, 2010).

²¹ Several sources, but particularly *3rd Meeting of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV - Summary. 5th Meeting of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV - Summary.*

²² Ibid., 3.

²³ Marquard and Tyler, “Defining NAMAs seeking support - examples from South Africa.”

²⁴ Mattia Romani, “Global Green Growth Institute” (presented at The 2nd Meeting of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV, Bonn, Germany, August 7, 2010); “EU-UNDP Climate Change Capacity Building Programme” (presented at The 3rd Meeting of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV, Tianjin, China, October 10, 2010); Helme, “Conceptualizing LCDS and NAMAs.”

²⁵ Ministerio de Ambiente, Vivienda y Desarrollo Territorial, “Colombia’s LcDS” (presented at The 5th Meeting of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV, Bonn, Germany, June 18, 2011).

Learn by doing

Undertaking any mitigation activity involves significant uncertainty. The Partnership has repeatedly returned to the value of learning by doing in this context. This learning happens in several ways, at different points in the mitigation process, and potentially among different audiences:

- The development of LCDS and NAMAs needs to be an interactive learning process. Thus there will be a need to adjust implementation strategies over time.²⁶
- It is important to launch pilot projects launched to inform the ongoing efforts to develop standards and learn what can be scaled up effectively. For example, a pragmatic approach to prioritizing NAMAs may be more effective than seeking a theoretical ideal.²⁷
- Undertaking the activities provides the opportunity to improve. India, for example, made significant improvements in GHG Inventory methodologies used between the 1994 assessment and the 2007 assessment.²⁸
- Opportunities to share experiences and learn from successes and failures are crucial. This can include peer-to-peer sharing, networks, central databases, and efforts to capture and publish the lessons from pilots.

While learning by doing is clearly crucial to the long-term effectiveness and efficiency of mitigation activities, there are transaction costs related to learning. It can take both financial and human resources to evaluate actions, capture lessons, and share them. Efforts to support mitigation activities may need to address this issue.

Focus on scalable, ambitious initiatives

There are many reasons to undertake initiatives that can be scaled-up over time, including the need to learn by doing and the difference between unilateral and supported NAMAs. However, Partnership countries are also choosing to be ambitious in their long-term plans as seen in several LCDS. For example, South Africa's fast-start NAMA to launch fledgling wind and solar programs are linked to large-scale NAMAs that stretch out to 2020.²⁹

To pursue this strategy, Partnership countries have identified that it is important to:

- Identify the 'low hanging fruits of transformational change' and those that have the best chance of success.
- Build on previous experiences and existing information and systems when effective. For example, drawing from past experience in the CDM may be useful for shaping a NAMA that attracts support both domestically and internationally.
- Create opportunities for replication, as replication is what changes a scalable pilot to an ambitious action and this requires the capacities discussed above but the pilot offers the opportunity to begin to put those capacities in place.

²⁶ *5th Meeting of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV - Summary*, 3.

²⁷ *5th Meeting of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV - Summary*, Romani, "Global Green Growth Institute"; Helme, "Conceptualizing LCDS and NAMAs."

²⁸ Subodh Sharma, "India: Greenhouse Gas Emissions 2007" (presented at The 2nd Meeting of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV, Bonn, Germany, August 7, 2010), 18.

²⁹ "From Scenarios to NAMAs - the South African Experience."

PART II—Key Issues in the Negotiations^{30 31}

In addition to a practical exchange and sharing of domestic experience between developed and developing countries, another stated goal of the Partnership is to inform the UNFCCC negotiations. Participants have expressed a desire to make sure that the rules and institutions that are being designed internationally align with in-country practices and respond to country-specific needs of the types identified in Part I. On the three focus areas of the Partnership, participants therefore have an opportunity to use the insights from their discussions to inform the negotiations. The Partnership could also explore innovative ways in which the international climate negotiations can help address and build the capacities in developing countries mentioned in Part I, as well as facilitate robust and scalable strategies for domestic mitigation activities. This section outlines some of the key issues and questions that Parties to the UNFCCC are facing on LCDS, NAMAs and MRV. It does so in an attempt to help participants assess areas of overlap between outstanding issues in the negotiations and the role that they see for the Partnership. However, the section does not make recommendations as to which of these questions should be prioritized or the extent to which they should be taken up by the Partnership.

Low-Carbon Development Strategies and Plans (LCDS)

The term ‘low-carbon development strategy’ was introduced into the international climate negotiations in 2008, particularly by Parties such as the EU, Australia and Ghana. Since then, several countries put this idea into practice in their own way at the domestic level and the concept has increasingly been recognized in the international context. Most recently, the Cancun Agreements (2010) established that developed countries “should” develop LCDS, while developing countries are “encouraged” to do so. While there is currently no formal process under the UNFCCC for expanding on the LCDS provisions of the Cancun Agreements, there are a number of questions left unanswered in the Cancun Agreements that domestic experience can help shed light on. Some of these include:

- Is there a minimum set of elements that should be included in an LCDS? Should any form of guidance (informal or formal) be developed to assist Parties in the development of their LCDS?
- What kind of support (technical, financial or other) is needed for developing countries to develop useful and robust LCDSs?
- Will LCDS be communicated or reviewed internationally (if so how?) or will they simply stand as a domestic documents to inform national decision-making?

Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs)

The term ‘NAMA’ first emerged in 2007 in the Bali Action Plan, which called for “nationally appropriate mitigation commitments or actions” by developed countries. It also called for “nationally appropriate mitigation actions” by developing country Parties in the context of sustainable development, supported and enabled by technology, financing and capacity building, in a measurable, reportable and verifiable manner. In December 2010 in Cancun, Parties to the UNFCCC agreed that “developing countries will take nationally appropriate mitigation actions in the context of sustainable development, supported and enabled by technology, financing and capacity-building,” (paragraph 48). Parties also decided the establishment of a NAMA registry that will record NAMAs in two separate sections of the registry, and facilitate the matching of NAMAs to support. Key remaining questions include:

- Will there be guidance (informal or formal) to assist Parties in developing and communicating their NAMAs, as well as their effects? What kind of guidance would be useful to support meeting national goals? How might the characteristics and submission guidance differ for supported versus unsupported NAMAs?
- What kind of information would be helpful to better implement NAMAs domestically, and communicate and understand

³⁰ The elaboration of key issues in the negotiations is based on a read of the December 2010 Cancun Agreements, informal discussions and facilitators’ notes from the UNFCCC June 2011 Bonn negotiations, Party submissions, and other informal meetings and negotiations.

³¹ Where a reference to a paragraph number is indicated in parentheses, this refers to relevant provisions in the Cancun Agreements (Decision 1/CP.16).

them internationally? What medium should be used to support better understanding and exchange of information of NAMAs at the international level, for example through additional workshops or through a technical paper by the UNFCCC Secretariat?

- Aside from the process for establishing a registry, the UNFCCC workshops on assumptions and the discussions on finance and reporting, should there be another process under the UNFCCC to consider further work on NAMAs?
- On the registry of NAMAs,
 - What kind of information would be most helpful to include in the registry for domestic and international purposes? What specific information will be recorded in the different sections of the registry, and how? Would a template be a useful tool for countries to submit NAMAs to the registry, including for information on “estimated costs and emission reductions” (paragraph 54) for NAMAs seeking support?
 - How should the matching function work, practically?
 - What institution should be responsible for operationalizing the NAMA registry?
 - What role, if any, should the registry play with regard to MRV of actions and MRV of finance?

Measurement, Reporting, and Verification (MRV)

As discussed in the previous Partnership meetings, many countries do see an opportunity for national systems to assist them in keeping track of both the co-benefits of mitigation actions and of the GHG emissions reductions. Domestic systems under development or being utilized already provide insights for the design of international rules relating to the reporting and review of mitigation actions. These domestic institutions can also form the basis of a future enhanced MRV framework. The international discussion on these issues began in Bali and continued through to Cancun where an initial enhanced framework for transparency and accountability was agreed. Both developed and developing countries are to report with increased frequency and detail on their mitigation actions, commitments and support, and undergo new or enhanced review procedures. These transparency provisions build extensively on existing provisions and tools from the UNFCCC and the Kyoto Protocol. The success of these provisions in facilitating improved transparency and accountability and in building developing country capacity will depend on the design and operationalization of the various components of an MRV system in the coming months and years. Key issues to be addressed include:

- For developed countries,
 - When will the guidelines for Annex I reporting in National Communications be ‘enhanced’, including the development of enhanced common reporting formats and methodologies for finance, and supplementary information on targets? How will this process relate to the development of guidelines for biennial reports? How will national communications and biennial reports relate to each other?
 - For biennial reports,
 - What level of information will developed countries be required to report in their biennial report guidelines, in particular with regard to their “mitigation actions to achieve their quantified economy-wide emission targets and emission reductions achieved, projected emissions and the provision of...support,” (paragraph 40a)?
 - How will financial information be reported? Should the common reporting format be used for national communications as well as for biennial reports?
 - How to strike a balance between the level of detail required for an effective MRV process and the desire to have biennial reports be succinct?
 - What will be the timing for the submission of the first biennial report, particularly taking into account the 2013-2015 review?
 - How will guidelines for the review of national communications be ‘enhanced’? For example, how can “progress made in achieving emission reductions,” and the provision of financial, technology and capacity-building support to

developing country Parties” be more effectively reviewed (paragraph 42)?

- For international assessment and review (IAR),
 - How will IAR relate to existing review procedures for inventories and national communications under the UNFCCC and the KP?
 - What will be the scope of IAR? For example, will IAR include considerations of emissions projections or past emissions only?
 - What should be included in a decision in Durban? What could be decided during negotiations in the coming year(s)?
 - What activities, inputs and human resources will be required to conduct IAR? Should IAR be carried out more frequently for some developed countries than for others?
 - What should be the relationship between IAR and ICA?
- What procedures will ensure that the progress made by developed countries in implementing their quantified economy-wide emission targets is tracked and accounted for comprehensively, consistently and accurately? For example, will the information needed (e.g. on offsets, LULUCF, sectors, gases and surplus AAUs) be integrated in the pledge/commitment themselves? Will this information be reported in biennial reports and national communications? Will the IAR process conduct such an assessment? What is required and possible by Durban?
- For developing countries,
 - How will the guidelines for non-Annex I reporting in National Communications, including inventories, be ‘enhanced,’ including for reporting on needs and support received? Will non-Annex I countries reporting on support received be comparable or harmonized with Annex I reporting on support provided?
 - For biennial reports,
 - What level of information and methodologies will developing countries be required to report and use for their biennial reports, in particular with regard to “national greenhouse gas inventories, including a national inventory report, and information on mitigation actions, needs and support received” (paragraph 60c)? How will biennial reports differ from and relate to National Communications?
 - How to strike a balance between the level of detail required for an effective MRV process and the desire to have biennial reports be succinct?
 - How can we build a process that is flexible and builds the capacity of developing countries to produce biennial reports of gradually higher quality over time?
 - What will be the timing for the submission of the first biennial report, particularly taking into account the 2013-2015 review?
 - For international consultations and analysis (ICA),
 - What will be the scope of ICA?
 - How can ICA build capacity through a “learning by doing” approach? What flexibility might be introduced, for example on the level of reporting required?
 - What activities, inputs and human resources will be required to conduct IAR? Could ICA be carried out more frequently from some countries than others?
 - What should be included in a decision in Durban? What could be decided during negotiations in the coming year(s)?
 - What guidelines will be developed for domestic MRV and international MRV? How will they differ? What financial and other capacity building support is needed in order to support enhanced reporting and review in developing countries? What guidance needs to be given to the GEF in Durban? Can we rely on existing institutions and initiatives (e.g. Consultative Groups of Experts, other bilateral and multilateral initiatives) or do we need to

create new ones?

Cross-Cutting Issues

In addition, there are several issues that cut across the themes of LCDS, NAMAs, and MRV, including:

- **International support:** What mechanisms, institutions and funds need to be in place or available to ensure adequate support for developing countries for NAMAs, LCDS and MRV?
- **2013-2015 periodic review of the adequacy of the long-term climate goal:** In Cancun, Parties decided to “periodically review the adequacy of the long-term global goal...in light of the ultimate objective of the Convention, and overall progress towards achieving it...” (see paragraphs 138-140). Parties also established a process for the AWG-LCA to further elaborate the scope and modalities of the review, including inputs. Remaining questions include:
 - To what extent and in what way will NAMAs, LCDS, biennial reports, national communications, IAR and ICA serve as input into the periodic review?
 - How can the timing of the first biennial reports and enhanced national communications, IAR and ICA align with the timing of the periodic review?
- **Sequencing, priorities, and linkages between issues:** Given the ambitious work plan the COP set out for itself in Cancun, what should be achieved or prioritized for COP-17, COP-18 and for COP-19? What will be the sequence of the resolution of the various issues, and is resolution on certain issues dependent on resolution of other issues?_
- **Institutions:** What institutions or entities are required both to operationalize the provisions of the Cancun Agreements and to carry out the functions required for LCDS, NAMAs, and MRV, both at the international and the domestic level? Will additional institutions or entities need to be created?

PART III-Conclusions and recommendations

As noted in Part I, during the first five meetings of the Partnership, participants were able to share experiences and identify a range of important lessons that are relevant to NAMAs, LCDS, and MRV both at the national and international levels. For example, at the national level, participants presented successes and challenges associated with identifying, developing, and mustering political support for NAMAs and low carbon strategies and plans. Clear goals and activities could be articulated by Participants to continue to inform part or all of these national issues. At the international level, the Partnership has created an informal space on the sidelines of the UNFCCC negotiations to discuss issues relevant to international rules and institutions associated with NAMAs, LCDS, and MRV. Participants will have to decide whether they want to continue to inform the UNFCCC negotiations as one of the objectives of the Partnership. If it is the case, Part II of the paper suggests that there are areas of overlap between the lessons and interests expressed so far by participants and outstanding questions in the negotiations relating to NAMAs, LCDS, and MRV. Participants could decide to inform part or all of these questions.

Apart from clarifying **which of the various thematic areas and audiences the Partnership wants to address**, one question to consider is **what types of activities participants want the Partnership to undertake**. The discussions relayed in Part I suggest that the Partnership could play one or several of the following roles:

1. Continue to exchange national-level best practices and challenges through case studies presented at Partnership meetings. For example:
 - How best to garner domestic political support for an LCDS both at the design and implementation phases?
 - How best to coordinate activities for domestic MRV and international reporting among national ministries and agencies?
 - How best to craft mandatory reporting programs for the private sector while minimizing the impact on SMEs?

2. Design or test new tools or methodologies to address the technical issues faced by countries and relayed in Part 1 or inform the design of international rules and bodies in the UNFCCC. For example:
 - Develop or test new guidance to help countries establish BAU baselines.
 - Develop or test proposed guidance for identifying and reporting NAMAs.
 - Create a pilot of the NAMAs registry to inform its design under the UNFCCC.

3. Act as an “international hub” for international initiatives related to NAMAs, LCDS, and MRV to maximize coordination assess gaps and launch new initiatives where relevant. For example:
 - Coordinate donor interest and activity in “hotspots” like Colombia to ensure that activities are complementary and that other regions or countries are not overlooked.
 - Inform the design of existing and new international financing programs for NAMAs and LCDS by responding to the needed capacities of developing countries, such as technical expertise and data.
 - Through a learning platform, facilitate the creation and coordination of bilateral or regional training programs, including workshops and secondments. Countries could respond to the ad-hoc needs expressed by developing countries, for example in the course of compiling a GHG inventory.

4. Inform decisions by the UNFCCC COP to ensure that they are aligned with the needs of countries on the ground with regard to NAMAs, LCDS and MRV. For example:
 - Making sure any COP decision that includes guidance on the development of NAMAs is most useful and effective given varying political contexts.
 - Inform a COP decision that would give guidance to the GEF, the CGE and bilateral initiatives to ensure that future financing and capacity building programs for MRV are in line with the challenges and needs of developing countries.
 - Inform UNFCCC MRV guidelines by, for example, identifying the frequency with which developing countries facing important capacity constraints could undergo ICA or the level of detail they could reasonably provide in their first biennial reports and national communications.
 - Assess what added value the NAMA registry can provide from a national perspective, for example by clarifying its relationship with processes and institutions on MRV and finance, such as biennial reports, national communications, the Standing Committee and the Financial Mechanism.

Finally, in their attempt to create an effective forum with a clear value added, participants may consider **what format the Partnership should adopt to meet its goals**. For example:

- How frequently should the Partnership meet in the future (e.g. once a year, twice a year or more)?
- How long should the meetings of the Partnership be (e.g. half day, full day, several days)?
- Where and when should the Partnership meet (e.g. before future UNFCCC negotiating sessions, after future UNFCCC negotiations, at a time and place not connected to a UNFCCC negotiations)?
- What format should future meetings follow (e.g. chairing, number of speakers, amount of discussion time)?
- What preparatory activities should be undertaken in advance of future meetings (e.g. working group deliberations; input papers by governments or research organizations; conference calls)?
- To what extent should the Partnership communicate its work to non-members (e.g. invite government officials that are not negotiators; invite observer organizations; organize a side event in Durban or future COPs to share lessons from the Partnership’s work)?

- What other design features would enhance country participation and effectiveness?

When exploring how the Partnership might further develop its activities and discussions, the Partnership should not only take stock of what is happening under the UNFCCC negotiations, but also in other initiatives, such as the Coordinated Low Emissions Assistance Network (CLEAN), which is, among other activities, identifying capacity building activities in developing countries on low-emissions strategies and activities that its members can collaborate on. The LEDS Global Dialogue is also spearheading, among other initiatives, a project with its members to document and disseminate LEDS policy best practices. The Mitigation Action Implementation Network (MAIN) is identifying best practices and supporting regional dialogues around NAMAs and LCDS. These are just some examples of other initiatives (see Annex 1 for additional initiatives, and more details). Moving forward, the Partnership should ensure that they are maximizing synergies with these other initiatives and dialogues, rather than duplicating efforts.

During the first year of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV, participants exchanged best practices, challenges and views related to LCDS, NAMAs, and MRV. Several interesting insights emerged from this work (summarized in Part I). Several of the Partnership's activities relate to the questions faced by government officials at the domestic level. Similarly, they relate to several of the outstanding questions faced by negotiators in the UNFCCC negotiations (summarized in Part II). The meeting in Panama provides a good opportunity to assess the value of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV and enhance its effectiveness in the future. Based on their experience in the first year and their knowledge of domestic and international issues related to NAMAs, LCDS, and MRV, participants might clarify the purpose and audience of the Partnership, which issues it will focus on, the types of activities it will undertake, and the modalities of its operations.

Annex A - International Dialogues and Partnerships

Initiative	Conveners	Participants	Objective(s)	History and Activities	Main contact(s)
International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV	Germany, South Africa, South Korea	UNFCCC negotiators from developed and developing countries which focus on mitigation and/or MRV	Facilitate a practical exchange and sharing of experiences between developed and developing countries, and support developing countries in the development and implementation of their LCDS, NAMAs, and MRV systems by generating lessons learned. This work may be beneficial for the negotiation process.	The International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV is an initiative launched by the Governments of Germany, South Africa, and South Korea at the Petersburg Climate Dialogue in May 2010. They have hosted 5 meetings to date: (1) in Bonn in June 2010, (2) in Bonn in August 2010, (3) in Tianjin in October 2010, (4) in Bangkok in April 2011, (5) in Bonn in June 2011.	Julia Wolf, Anna Pia Schreyögg, Nicole Wilke (BMU) and Alf Wills (DEA)
Green Growth Planning Best Practice Initiative	World Bank	Intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, mainly from developed countries, including CIFF, CDKN, GGGI, OECD, World Bank, UNEP, UNDP and UN ECLAC/ CEPAL	Comprehensively review, assess, and synthesize the current knowledge (i.e., existing tools, data, and guidelines) on Green Growth policies and implementation, based on existing experiences and applying a best practices approach.	The Initiative is still in its planning phase. Whereas its purpose is already clear, several organizational and financial issues are yet to be solved. Meetings of the targeted organizations and a Steering Committee work on the remaining questions, including the link with the Green Growth Knowledge Platform (who will participate in the Steering Committee).	
Coordinated Low Emissions Assistance Network (CLEAN)	NREL, with the support of UNEP	Organizations helping developing countries to prepare and implement low greenhouse gas emission development strategies (including CIFF, CDKN, UNEP, GIZ, ESMAP, WRI, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Foster Collaboration - among international technical organizations supporting preparation of low emission development plans and programs • Improve Quality – of the delivery of planning and implementation technical assistance • Build Capacity - to conduct 	All of the CLEAN partners collaborate on a set of core activities, including: (1) Activities Inventory: Develop an inventory of activities (http://en.openei.org/wiki/CLEAN_Inventory) that CLEAN partners are conducting at country, regional, and global levels to support low carbon development assessment and plans. This inventory will be used to promote coordination of activities and to enhance the quality of support provided to developing countries.	Sadie Cox at sadie.cox@nrel.gov

and implement low emission development plans

- Share Information – about projects, tools, & best practices and help inform the design of new initiatives

(2) Information, Tools, and Knowledge Sharing: Develop common forums for sharing of data, tools and methods, experiences and best practices with low carbon development analysis and plans among developing and developed countries officials and experts. This may include on-line forums, regional networks, and information exchange meetings. Make available technology data and analysis methods and tools to each other and to developing country stakeholders.

(3) Methods Development and Harmonization: Cooperate on improving analysis methods and tools to support low carbon plan preparation. This includes evaluation of clean energy and other technology potentials and dissemination of this data, incorporation of development priorities, multi-criteria impact analysis, and economic benefits assessment, prioritization of technologies and options, and policy analysis.

(4) Collaborative Training and Technical Assistance: Coordinate across members' training and technical assistance programs that will transfer knowledge and skills to developing countries. This includes engaging common regional developing country technical institutions, conducting joint training workshops and on-line forums, and tapping a roster of experts across CLEAN members to provide technical assistance.

(5) Harmonized Country Support: Enhance implementation of assistance to specific countries by integrating delivery of assistance to countries among CLEAN partners. This could also include cooperation among CLEAN partners (and other international organizations) in piloting new programs, methods, and tools with countries.

<p>LEDS Global Partnership</p>	<p>Rotating (the Secretariat is still being determined)</p>	<p>(1) International donors (including governments, foundations or other international donor organizations), (2) technical organizations, (3) developing country representatives</p>	<p>Advance low emissions development through ongoing coordination, information exchange, and cooperation among programs that support LEDS and country institutions that are undertaking LEDS. In particular, tentative goals include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Promote ongoing information exchange and coordination among LEDS programs and country institutions undertaking and supporting LEDS b. Foster North South, North North and South South learning c. Reduce the burden on developing countries with regard to LEDS coordination d. Identify and disseminate best practices and lessons learned, that will enhance the quality of LEDS activities undertaken in various countries e. Build awareness and support for LEDS development and implementation. 	<p>Following its first meeting in 2010, the LEDS Global Dialogue (formerly the LEDS Donor Coordination Group) held its second meeting in February 2011, hosted by the U.S. Government, the European Commission, the German Ministry of Environment, the Children’s Investment Fund Foundation, and the World Resources Institute. Since then it has worked to expand its membership (in particular to developing country governments) and has held monthly teleconferences. The LEDS Global Dialogue has laid out four major tasks for itself, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) A 'hot and cold spot' analysis to identify those developing countries where there is potential for overlapping activities (hot spots) and countries where there is not significant LEDS activity (cold spots) and will develop a coordinated plan across programs to address these hot and cold spots. CDKN, working with NREL and others, is leading this work by refining and putting in place a process for continual updates of the existing inventory of LEDS activities in developing countries. (2) A pilot of harmonizing activities across programs within one country. CIFF, with others, will pilot such work in Colombia. (3) Conduct a needs and gaps assessment of capacity building and peer learning activities and programs, create a process for coordination of existing programs, and propose expanded activities where needed. Such work will be merged with ongoing work under CLEAN. (4) Document and disseminate LEDS policy best practices. ClimateWorks is leading on this with the European Climate Foundation and other organizations.
---------------------------------------	---	--	--	---

Climate Policy Initiative (CPI) Global Survey on MRV	CPI		Identify, compare, and evaluate current systems for MRVing emission levels and mitigation action across the major emitters. Identify best practice, gaps, and opportunities for improvement. The project could also include climate finance.	The initiative is still in its planning stages. The initial product would be a “survey” rather than a narrowly focused deep dive into a specific aspect of MRV systems, including governmental and institutional capacity. It would provide a clear framework for describing and comparing current system performance, and – depending upon the findings – may help identify a number of specific topics for further work. It will provide for international experience exchange.	
Global Green Growth Institute (GGGI)	South Korea	Developed and developing countries, multilateral and unilateral public institutions, non-governmental organizations, private sector companies	Provide scientific knowledge and best practices to developing countries embarking on LCD and assistance in drawing up of 'Green Growth Plans', bringing together theory and practice of LCD. No direct link to UNFCCC process, but can facilitate progress in it.	The Global Green Growth Institute was founded on 16 June 2010 and is open to access by new states and organizations. Headquartered in Seoul, the GGGI has opened two regional offices in Abu Dhabi and Copenhagen. GGGI organizes the Global Green Growth Forum which will be held for the first time in October 2011, and hosts the Global Green Growth Summit, first held in June 2011. It is planned to convert the Institute into an international organization by 2012.	Hee Kyung Son (Program Manager, Communications)
Cartagena Dialogue (for Progressive Action)	Rotating	UNFCCC negotiators of approximately 30-35 countries willing to decisively promote ambitious solutions in the UNFCCC process	The Cartagena Dialogue is an informal forum that is intended to permit UNFCCC negotiators from ambitious states an open exchange on positions and propositions. It aims at advancing the negotiations and low-carbon growth issues beyond traditional blocs and coalitions which it does not intend to replace.	So far, the Dialogue has held five official meetings: 1) in Cartagena, Colombia in March 2010, 2) in Male, Maldives in July 2010, 3) in San José, Costa Rica in October 2010, 4) in Malawi in March 2011, 5) in Apia, Samoa in July 2011. Additionally, informal meetings were organized in 2010 in Bonn and Tianjin. All meetings of the Dialogue are closed and informal. The Dialogue has several areas of focus, including on (1) MRV, led by New Zealand and Costa Rica; (2) the 2013-2015 Review, led by the Marshall Islands, Denmark and Germany; (2) low carbon development, led by the Maldives and Sweden; (5) legal options, led by the Maldives and Australia; (6) adaptation, led by the Netherlands and Grenada; (7) market mechanisms, led by the EU and Indonesia; and (8) mitigation, led by Chile and the UK.	

The Mitigation Action Implementation Network (MAIN)	CCAP, WBI, INCAE Business School	Government officials, negotiators, climate experts, private sector representatives	Encourage the implementation of ambitious LCDS and NAMAs in developing countries. Identify best practices; initiate a learning process based on South-South dialogue and offer assistance in the design of LCDS and NAMAs.	MAIN held the first regional dialogue for Latin America in March 2011. Since May 2011, it has been organizing monthly regional video conferences between relevant experts. Furthermore, it convenes regional dialogues and global workshops on technical issues. E-learning modules are currently being set up.	Michael Comstock (CCAP), Marcos Castro (WBI)
Measurement and Performance Tracking Project (MAPT)	WRI	National government officials, UNFCCC negotiators, climate experts, universities, private sector representatives.	Build the capacity of developing countries to track progress towards meeting domestic climate, energy, and development goals.	The MAPT project recently completed its scoping phase to assess the key measurement and performance tracking capacity gaps in six countries – Brazil, Colombia, Ethiopia, India, South Africa, and Thailand. MAPT is now working with in-country partners on a range of activities spanning national inventories, accounting for policies/actions and goals, strengthening corporate reporting, tracking policy implementation, measurement of land use change and associated emissions, and institutional arrangements for measurement and performance tracking. The project also seeks to bring lessons learned from MAPT and other countries into the international negotiations related to MRV and assist countries in implementing related guidelines. MAPT will develop tools and case studies, as well as convene key stakeholders nationally and across MAPT countries, to develop best practices and build capacity in country around these areas of work.	Kelly Levin (WRI)
The Energy Sector Management Assistance Program (ESMAP)'s Low Carbon Development Project	World Bank (ESMAP)	Partner countries: Brazil, China, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Poland, South Africa	Focused on low-carbon development, the Project aims at creating awareness and building capacities in this field. To this end, ESMAP supports studies on low-carbon growth in seven developing countries, in order to identify best practices and disseminate lessons learnt.	Since 2007, the Project supports several countries' LCDS. In 2010, the survey of Brazil's strategy was finalized, whereas the others are still in progress. Briefing papers and development tools drawing on the experiences made are published on the Project's homepage.	

High-Level LEDSEvent	The World Bank, France, Mexico, South Africa, UN Energy, Clean Energy Ministerial and ClimateWorks Foundation	High-level researchers, policymakers, donors, implementers and advocates on LEDSE, including, for example, Nicholas Stern, Christiana Figueres, Todd Stern, Kandeh Yumkella, and Steven Chu.	Find ways to best support the exploding demand from countries for a low carbon future. Promote coordination and coherence around LEDSE activities.	The High-Level LEDSE initiative met for the first time on July 13, 2011 at the World Bank. Five potential next steps were proposed, including: Five Action Items from July 13th High Level LEDSE Event <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of Existing Networks, Gaps, and Options (potentially coordinated by NREL, with input from CLEAN work) • Deployment of Best Practice Policies (potentially coordinated by ClimateWorks, with input from the work they are doing with the European Climate Foundation for the LEDSE Global Dialogue) • Open-source tools and capabilities for low emission development (McKinsey and the World Bank to potentially coordinate this work to develop an open source set of analysis tools and capacity building materials to support LEDSE planning and implementation) • Enhanced Coordination Among Donors (potentially coordinated by DFID) • Sector and Country Focused Pilots (potentially coordinated by UN-Energy with 6-10 countries) 	Jane Ebinger at the World Bank, jebinger@worldbank.org
Global Green Growth Platform	World Bank, UNEP, OECD	Governments, international aid agencies, and other development partners (TBD)	Foster green growth by bringing together proponents of sustainable development to promote and implement green growth policies by exchanging knowledge, information, and experience.	Launched on 7 March 2011.	Jakob Kopperud (World Bank Paris, Media Contacts) jkopperud@worldbank.org

Climate Change Expert Group (CCXG)	OECD, IEA	Officials and experts mainly from the OECD and Annex I-countries, and some non-Annex I countries	Catalyze information sharing and dialogue on technical issues of the UNFCCC process. By fostering a common understanding of problems and their solutions, the CCXG aims at further developing the UNFCCC process.	Founded in 1993, the CCXG usually meets twice a year and organizes yearly seminars on current issues. In its work, it is supported by the OECD and the IEA that serve as a secretariat and regularly provide the partnership with input papers. In 2010, the group's name was changed from AIXG (Annex I Expert Group) to CCXG. In 2011 it met in March, and will meet again in September. Discussions in the March 2011 seminar identified key areas and/or areas of agreement and disagreement on specific issues such as biennial reports, climate finance, and ICA. Meetings are closed and present an informal forum for officials and experts to meet and converse.	Marie-Christine Tremblay (OECD), Richard Bradley (IEA)
---	-----------	--	---	---	--

Note that other ad-hoc Informal meetings are often convened with UNFCCC negotiators and experts on an ad-hoc basis. For example, New Zealand convened two informal negotiator meetings on MRV, once in May 2011 and another in July 2011. Other examples include a meeting on ICA convened by Pew, Mexico and South Africa on the sidelines of the June 2011 Bonn negotiations, or informal dinners hosted by the World Resources Institute on MRV.

About WRI

The World Resources Institute (WRI) is an environmental think tank that goes beyond research to create practical ways to protect the Earth and improve people’s lives.

Copyright 2011 World Resources Institute. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivative Works 3.0 License. To view a copy of the license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>

Supported by:



Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety

based on a decision of the Parliament of the Federal Republic of Germany