

Outcome Report – Enhancing coordination on climate transparency Rome, Italy, May 21st, 2019

Background	1
Introduction	2
Overview of the Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency	2
On coordination among donors and organisations	2
On monitoring	3
Conclusions	4
Annex 1	5
Mentimeter: Insights for concrete coordination in the near future	5
Annex 2 List of Participants	6

Background

The Coordination Meeting provided an informal space to discuss CBIT implementation to date and to facilitate communication and coordination among donors and implementing organisations within the framework of the Global Coordination Platform and the MRV Group of Friends.

51 participants (Please see Annex 2) attended the coordination meeting, including representatives from Parties that made contributions to the CBIT Trust Fund, international organisations and other institutions involved in the provision of support to the enhanced transparency framework.

The Coordination Meeting was generously funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and co-organized by United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Environment Programme (UN Environment), UNEP DTU Partnership and the UNDP/UNEP Global Support Programme (GSP) for National Communications (NCs) and Biennial Update Reports (BURs), with the additional support of the Italian Ministry of Environment, Land and Sea Protection.

The Coordination Meeting was held on 21 May 2019 in Rome, Italy.

In collaboration with:



Introduction

After welcoming words by Mrs. Roberta Ianna, from the Ministry for the Environment, Land and Sea Protection of Italy, participants were invited to get to know each other by sharing relevant information for others in the room.

Overview of the Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency

The meeting then followed with 2 presentations:

- [CBIT progress on operationalization](#) by Mrs. Chizuru Aoki from the GEF
- [The CBIT Global Platform and its benefits](#) by Mr. Frederik Staun from UNEP DTU

In the following Q&A some points emerged:

- CBIT is a growing force in the landscape of transparency initiatives.
- The potential the platform has in enhancing the work of donors and implementing organisations, for example by influencing donors in their choices on transparency topics and countries to support.
- An interest to highlight better the added values receiving countries can generate by using continuously the CBIT platform.

On coordination among donors and organisations

Two presentations were given as a starter for the discussion on coordination for strengthening country support for the enhanced transparency framework.

- [Enhanced coordination](#): the results from the call for inputs to enhance the coordinating network by Mr. Jigme from UNFCCC
- [Provision of support on MRV and transparency](#): an analysis at the inputs collected by the MRV Group of Friends by Mr. Damiano Borgogno from UNDP

UNFCCC presented the high interest of the organizations in using the MRV GoF platform as a way to get informed of upcoming events and projects organized by the other entities. Also, most of the GoF platform members would like to receive a summary/ synthesis of ongoing/ planned activities of each entity on a regular basis (e.g. quarterly or biannual).

It was noted that coordination is a loaded word, but in a simple form it could mean just sharing information between stakeholders. GSP presented the information collected by the organizations, which still needs further work to do to become more specific and to add value in enhancing coordination, as the end goal is providing a clear mapping on what is happening in terms of provision of support on transparency among the countries and entities. Moreover, it can become a useful instrument for donors or implementing organisations that want to make choices on how, when and where to support.

Several comments during the Q&A were made on how the coordination should take form. A few threads emerged from this:

- Information should flow easily between stakeholders. The lines for informal cooperation should be kept open.
- Sharing basic information (e.g. the titles of projects) was seen as a first step, as this would give a first entry point to start creating an overview on a specific topic or country.
- It was also noted that in any case the information should be sufficiently specific to be valuable. Titles usually have a certain degree of specificity, thus the more specific the data, the easier to categorize and understand initiatives, activities, impacts and results.
- It was suggested to work towards encouraging coordination by the country itself. Though a laudable objective, this was also seen as problematic as many countries are far from ready to organise the coordination by themselves. Therefore, providing support for countries to do their own coordination as part of developing their institutional arrangements should be considered.
- The work done by UNDP and UNFCCC has been supply driven till now. These two organisations asked the donors and implementing organisations to continue to supply them with updated information. Still, the coordination should work also towards demand driven compilation of information. As a suggestion, before engaging in any new project, it could be relevant to ask the country itself, but also other donors and implementing organisations, what projects are ongoing or have been implemented in the past as well as results and lessons learned achieved.

On monitoring

A presentation on how monitoring and evaluation can deliver on transparency and capacity building was the introduction of this session:

- [How enhanced results monitoring & evaluation can deliver on transparency and capacity building](#) – by Mr. Gillenwater from GHGMI & IGES

The following key points emerged:

- We need to challenge ourselves to stop “hoping” we are having an impact and start proving we are.
- Monitoring, evaluation & impact assessment needs to be a larger part of international capacity building efforts.
- For having a better understanding on how and what is monitored, it will be useful to define common capacity building typologies and indicators. Afterwards, rigorously gather the data and do deeper analysis to create a credible effectiveness evidence base.
- Allocating some funds for doing M&E should be a priority: as this is the norm in international public health, projects should consistently entail dedicated funding to their own rigorous M&E. A suggestion was made that each project should allocate ideally up to 20 % of their resources on M&E.

- An idea is that donors/implementing entities should contribute part of their resources to a collective pool to research impacts across projects and programs.

Conclusions

The meeting was adjourned with the following conclusions:

- Coordination among all interested organizations has a valuable benefit, however this may face several barriers. For instance, the coordination can be done on different levels: by each country, regional (e.g. not overlapping in the workshops done), and global level (e.g. global workshops and guidelines or any other technical material elaborated).
- For enhancing coordination, it is also recommendable to consider and understand each organization and each country's framework and background. For instance, each organization may have its own methodologies and different scopes, as well as developing countries may have diverse starting points on MRV/transparency, with different gaps and needs and capacities on tracking and coordinating the resources and support received. These can be viewed as an opportunity for bringing together and linking the organizations with the countries, as needed.
- While the CBIT Coordination platform [website](#) is a useful tool, several other transparency websites exist, so synchronization efforts will be needed. This will include having in place the human resources to ensure information gatherings and dissemination on a regular basis, to promote coherency and clarity without making this process too complex. The MRV/Transparency Group of Friends can also be instrumental in facilitating this effort.
- A continuous work and an active participation of all members of the MRV Group of Friends and the CBIT platform will permit a collaborative work on mapping all the initiatives, decreasing the overlapping between projects, supporting the identifications of need and gaps for each country and thus increasing the efficiency in the work done by all the organizations.
- It will be important to provide stakeholders with clear guidance on the information that will be submitted to the CBIT platform and the allocation of resources needed so that each country uploads appropriate information, in a continuous manner, on the website.
- Coordination could further take place with the already successful "Istanbul model" in which meetings would be organised around regions or themes and the entities that are interested are welcome to participate.
- The current group would convene again on 21st June during the SB for the 7th Meeting of the MRV/Transparency Group of Friends.

Annex 1

Mentimeter: Insights for concrete coordination in the near future

13 participants filled in this question. Underneath you will find the answers. Due to poor internet quality many participants were not able to use the application and fill in their answers.

1. Talk more directly with the relevant agency you would like to work with
2. Support counties do their own coordination as part of “Institutional Arrangements” support, structure that information and make it available to global coordination/MRV support groups (e.g. GSP, MRV group of friends etc.)
3. Coordinating at donor level can also be considered & focal points across ministries at national level - inter ministerial coordination can be an issue
4. Keep trying, it will get better the more we try
5. Encourage NDC partnership to include transparency activities in their country plans
6. Keep open lines of informal communication
7. What about the CBIT coordination platform, can it be used?
8. Face to face meeting as first step and after that willingness to collaborate at country level.
9. It is critical to make the information to be useful for other countries. This could be done by some research institutes/consultants to undertake studies as an intermediate to apply one's lessons learned to be useful to others.
10. Further investigate most effective and efficient means of coordination efforts: database vs. roundtables, donor vs recipient coordination
11. Agencies need to talk and share more amongst themselves - Agencies in each country to be proactive -work together to organize agency meetings (involve country GEF focal point)
12. Useful to have information about impact of activities in the countries, other than a proxy like BUR
13. We should ask countries which relevant projects are going on/have been implemented in the past, before engaging concretely with a new project

Annex 2 List of Participants

The list of participants contains personal identification data and hence is not published.