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The 2015 Paris Agreement calls for an ‘enhanced transparency framework’ to make visible country climate actions

**Key assumptions:** Transparency will help enhance **accountability** and **mutual trust**, and thereby also stimulate **climate actions**

**But does transparency deliver on these promises?**

- Very little empirical study: What are transparency’s effects in practice? In UNFCCC context & in diverse national settings?

- Crucial to ask: Transparency gets ever more attention within UNFCCC and infrastructures of reporting & review are expanding!
TRANSGOV: Key research themes

(1) Mapping **nature and extent of country engagement** in UNFCCC transparency arrangements

(2) Analyzing effects on **accountability, trust and ambition**: transformative or a distraction or a site of politics?

(3) Political effects of **capacity building** initiatives for climate transparency

(4) **Transparency about climate finance**: what are country reports making visible about finance provided and received?

(5) Impact of **digitally-enabled radical transparency** on multilateral climate politics and action? e.g. Climate TRACE

Details at: TRANSGOV website: https://trans-gov.org/
Emerging findings

Theme I: Are countries adhering to transparency obligations?
- Article in Climate Policy developing a ‘Transparency Adherence Index’: showing that full (or lack) of adherence tells us relatively little about link to action

Open access: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/14693062.2021.1895705

Theme 3: Politics of capacity building for climate transparency
- Article in Climate Policy on political effects of capacity building for transparency: showing that priority is to build domestic capacity to report on GHG inventories & mitigation actions (mandatory UNFCCC transparency requirements)

Open access: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14693062.2021.1986364
Research agenda: Where does the light shine?

Who is to be transparent about what:

-> What: Politically negotiated narrow scope of transparency prioritizes reporting on emissions & mitigation (rather than adaptation, finance needed, L&D)

-> Who: Burden of such ‘enhanced’ transparency more on developing countries (even those with very low emissions)

Transparency as a site of politics:

- Contestation: Contested political issues get hammered out in specific ways in seemingly technical transparency negotiations
- What’s left in the dark: Comparative overview of whose actions are fair or ambitious (or how to assess this); production-side

Will transparency transform? And who benefits? Jury is still out!
Our TRANSGOV team looks forward to furthering this research agenda, in collaboration with others!
R. R. Rashmi
The Energy and Resources Institute (TERI)
Enhanced Transparency Framework (ETF) as building block to Global-Stock-take (GST)
Main transparency issues under negotiation at COP26 in Glasgow:

- Completion of modalities, procedures and guidelines for the Enhanced Transparency Framework (ETF)
- Support to developing country Parties to implement the ETF
Equity based ETF

• Transparency in actions and support is the foundation of GST.
• Equity in all aspects of ETF is critical to raising ambition of GST-complaint actions.
• Information provided by parties should be *country specific*.
• Equity defines fairness in ambition and actions reported under ETF. Includes:
  • Analysis of fair share in the *provision* and *mobilization* of support, as well as the
  • Extent to which climate finance meets financial needs across countries and sectors.
• Fair share calculations for finance have never gained traction under the UNFCCC;
• Analysis limited to independent actors. Important that it is articulated in ETF.
• First GST to rely on the existing biennial reporting system created under the Paris Agreement and Cancun Agreements for Transparency.
### Elements of ETF need equity and fairness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting</th>
<th>Review/Monitoring</th>
<th>Capacity Building</th>
<th>Finance/ Support need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Common tables</td>
<td>• Should there be common pattern and method of measurement of progress? Should it follow differentiated obligations and capacities to facilitate measurement and achievement of targets.</td>
<td>• Developing nations need capacity building for reporting and monitoring like GHG inventory calculations, etc. • Also, training programs for technical review is required</td>
<td>• The CBDR&amp;RC principle is applicable. ETF must ensure financial and technological transfer to developing countries in a transparent manner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Purpose of Article 13: To provide understanding and clarity on:

• **Paragraph 5:**
  - climate change action in the light of the objective of the Convention as set out in its Article 2;
  - tracking of progress towards achieving Parties’ individual NDCs under Article 4,
  - adaptation actions under Art 7, including good practices, priorities, needs and gaps,
  - **to inform the global stocktake under Article 14.**

• **Paragraph 6:**
  - support provided and received by relevant individual Parties in the context of climate change actions under Articles 4, 7, 9, 10 and 11, and,
  - aggregate financial support provided,
  - **to inform the global stocktake under Article 14.**
EQUITY-BASED GLOBAL STOCKTAKE

- CO2 development and emission curve at GDP per capita in different era is shown in the figure.
- GDP per capita of developed countries on an average remains more than that of developing countries, with an increasing gap.
- Hence, equity considerations must be adequately addressed in GST. Developed countries to undertake a larger share of the global mitigation efforts, in response to their historical responsibility for contribution to the largest share of global GHG emissions.

Source: South Centre, 2019
Operationalizing Equity in the ETF and GST:

Equity is about:

• reflecting on and including fairness in both, the process of the ETF and the outcome of the GST.
• link the GST to the purpose of the Paris Agreement (Art. 2.1) and;
• Flexibility in reporting and review of ETF in accordance with the goals of the NDC;
• principles under which ETF/GST should be implemented (Art. 2.2); and
• a cross-cutting and overarching consideration in the GST;
THANK YOU
Transitioning from BURs to BTRs
“Challengers and Opportunities for South Asian Countries”

Dr. Md. Masumur Rahman, Director General, SACEP

South Asia Co-operative Environment Programme (SACEP)
www.sacep.org
South Asia- Overview..

- Consists of 8 countries; Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka.

- Makes less than 5% of the world’s land area and hosts nearly a quarter of the world population.

- Home for about 1.9 billion people with different civilizations sharing diverse geological, cultural, political, economical and environmental patterns.

- About 14% of the region’s urban population, totaling about 400 million, live in coastal and major river delta areas that are 10 meters or less above sea level.

- Although rapidly urbanizing, South Asia is still predominantly an agrarian society, where a majority of the population is dependent on agriculture for their livelihoods.

- Even though the eight countries are located in a contiguous region, they differ greatly both in terms of geographic characteristics as well as demographic, political, social, and economic characteristics.
Observed Climate Trends in South Asia

• Climate change is one of the most important environmental, social and economic issues faced by the countries in South Asia today,

• It is one of the most vulnerable regions to the impacts of climate change.

- Sea level rise
- Increases of frequency and severity of floods
- Rapid desertification
- Increase of incidents in wild forest fire
- Melting of the Hindu Kush and Himalayan glaciers
- Loss of biodiversity and increasing food insecurity
SACEP and its Priorities

• South Asia Co-operative Environment Programme (SACEP) is an inter-governmental organization, established in 1982

• To promote and support protection, management and enhancement of the environment in the region.

• SACEP priority areas
  • Climate Change
    ➢ Waste Management
    ➢ Sustainable Consumption and Production
    ➢ Biodiversity
    ➢ Air Quality
    ➢ Environmental Governance

➢ Climate Change is one of the key areas concerned in the region and since then, it has been in the SACEP’s work programme as a priority area
The Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) are at the heart of the Paris Agreement. They constitute each country’s approach to emission reduction and climate change adaptation,

All SACEP member countries through their National Focal Points to the UNFCCC, have submitted their first NDCs

Bangladesh (Updated), Bhutan (Second), India (Updated), Maldives (updated), Nepal (Second), Pakistan (updated), Sri Lanka (updated)
Biennial Update Reports (BURs)

- In South Asia 04 countries including Afghanistan, India, Maldives, and Pakistan have submitted their BURs.
- Among these, India has submitted its Third BUR whereas Afghanistan, Maldives and Pakistan have submitted their first BUR.

Biennial Transparency Report (BTR),

- MPG's adopted at the COP24 call for Parties to submit Biennial Transparency Reports (BTRs) including the NIR, to be submitted every two years
- The BTR will supersede the BUR for Parties to the Paris Agreement, at the latest by the end of 2024
- Transitioning to the Enhanced Transparency Framework (ETF) requires developing countries to enhance their national reporting systems to be more systematic and sustainable
Common gaps identified in the existing institutional arrangements in South Asia

➢ lack of stable and permanent institutional arrangements at the national level
➢ Lack of coordination between the relevant stakeholders and the national coordination body
➢ Lack of clearly defined roles and responsibilities
➢ In-country technical and Institutional capacity limitations
➢ Lack of communication between stakeholders
➢ Lack of political will
➢ Lack of Awareness/Information base
Challenges with quality and quantity of data

➢ Lack of data
➢ Lack of availability of data that is inconsistent or not sourced properly.
➢ Lack collection, storage, and retrieval of data
➢ Higher costs for data processing and analysis
➢ Complexities regarding the ownership of data
➢ No common platform for data sharing
Role of SACEP as a Regional Organization

• An effective transparency mechanism under the Paris Agreement requires accurate and precise MRV of GHG emissions from all participating Parties.

• A regional approach is considered an effective

• With the assistance of UNFCCC, ICAT, PATPA and other donor agencies SACEP provides an ideal platform for South Asian countries to
  • Share information and experiences among different countries to enable completeness and quality of information and effectiveness in transparency reporting.
  • Strengthen national institutions for transparency-related activities in line with national priorities.
  • build capacities of member countries on understanding and applying tools and approaches to measure, report and verify (MRV) greenhouse gas emissions reductions and adaptation action.
  • Provide relative training and assistance to member states to strengthen existing institutional arrangements and processes for MRV of policies and actions.
  • Provide peer-to-peer learning opportunities in preparing for the submission of the BTRs by the deadline of 2024
Thank You
Emily Ojoo-Massawa
Mott MacDona and African Climate and Development Initiative (ACDI) at the University of Cape Town (UCT)
Towards transformative climate action & the enhance transparency framework inclusive NDCs in Africa
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Emily Massawa & Britta Rennkamp,
African Climate and Development Initiative
University of Cape Town
TRANSPARENCY UNDER THE UNFCCC AND ITS AGREEMENTS

- The UNFCCC (Article 12) requires all Parties to submit regular national reports, in the form of National Communications (NCs). Parties to pursue mitigation efforts following to their “Common but Differentiated Responsibilities and Respective Capabilities” (CBDR-RC).
- Distinction between the information required for Annex I and non-Annex I. Kyoto Protocol introduced more transparency requirements for developed countries, given the crucial role of emissions accounting for the environmental integrity of the treaty.
- PA puts in place ETF for reporting and review. This supersedes over time the existing transparency arrangements. Parties must communicate successive NDCs that represent a progression in ambition and reflect the “highest possible ambition” with respect to their CBDR-RC. Developed countries (not named) to take the lead in mitigating economy-wide emissions and in mobilizing climate finance.
- Framework for transparency of Action (13.5)-Aims to provide clarity on the climate actions taken by Parties, including progress made towards achieving NDCs.
- The framework for transparency of support (Article 13.6) aims to provide clarity on support provided and/or received by individual countries in the context of climate actions.
- Impacts of climate variability and change are exacerbating global inequalities between countries and within societies. Vulnerabilities to the impacts of climate change differ significantly between and within the countries.
- In Africa recurring droughts and extreme weather events jeopardize socio-economic development and vulnerable livelihoods. Provision and access to basic services is affected as new climate technologies have not been diffused at large scale to ensure security in supply of essential services.
- NDCs- climate action plans that were submitted to the UNFCCC during the lead-up to the Paris Agreement in 2015 and now being updated. They are ‘nationally determined’-plan to limit the growth of GHG emissions and adaptation plans, an outline of national circumstances, and a description of the funds needed to carry out their plans.
- Few countries have indicated which equity principle they used to derive their mitigation contributions, simply declared their NDCs are “fair and ambitious’. No effort-sharing mechanism to determine the contribution of each country.
- Participation?
Transforming Social Inequalities through Inclusive Climate Action

"Enhancing climate action" requires understanding multi-dimensionality in climate governance and inequalities
→ Actors, relationships, political representation
→ Multi-dimensional inequalities in space and time
→ Place based evidence

Recognitional Inequalities: Who is in and who is left out of the climate policy arena?

Procedural Inequalities: Who is recognised as an actor in climate policy processes? Who has access, who is left out?

Distributional inequalities: Who benefits from NDCs? Who experiences disadvantages from climate action?
Transforming Social Inequalities through Inclusive Climate Action

- Building evidence for “national determination” in support of the reporting under the Transparency mechanism.

- Understanding in inequalities in representation and vulnerability.

- Enhance climate action through transparency in the implementation of the NDC

www.tsitica.uct.ac.za
www.arua.cd.org
www.aceir.uct.ac.za
www.arua.org.za
Romain Weikmans
Finnish Institute of International Affairs (FIIA) and Université Libre de Bruxelles (ULB)
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Ex-post transparency (on past provision of climate finance)
Ambitious mitigation action by developing nations depends on many factors… but it certainly partially depends on broadly-held perceptions of equitable action by developed countries.

→ So if transparency can help bring clarity on and confidence in the validity of the claims of climate finance amounts delivered, it could certainly stimulate climate ambition…

→ But if transparency reveals that the amounts delivered are not aligned with expectations/promises/needs, it could also lead to less climate ambition in the future! (In that sense, transparency is a double-edged sword!)
Transparency and Ambition

By revealing information on climate finance provisions, the general expectation is that transparency could stimulate developing countries to increase the ambition of their Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs). But how?

Ex-ante transparency (on future provision of climate finance)

→ Transparency on the future provision of climate finance may encourage developing countries to strengthen the ambition of their future NDCs if they have confidence that their climate action will receive support.

→ But it could also discourage more ambition if it is clear that future climate finance provisions will be insufficient.
Two questions

• Does the current transparency framework brings confidence in the validity of the claims of climate finance amounts delivered?

• Will the Paris Agreement’s Enhanced Transparency Framework improve that confidence?
Two questions

- Does the current transparency framework brings confidence in the validity of the claims of climate finance amounts delivered? No!

- Will the Paris Agreement’s Enhanced Transparency Framework improve that confidence?
Rich Nations Use ‘Dishonest’ Climate Finance Claims, Oxfam Says

- Contributions to poor countries are overstated, report finds

Global climate action needs trusted finance data

An agreed system for measuring funding of green projects in poorer nations will be vital to achieving action on climate change in 2021.

Paris climate talks: Indian officials accuse OECD of exaggerating climate aid

Economic ministry paper says OECD claims about the amount of money mobilised to help developing nations adapt to climate change are ‘deeply flawed’
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OECD (2022)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>68.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex II Parties’ Biennial Reports to UNFCCC (2020)</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.1*</td>
<td>35.3*</td>
<td>36.2*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfam (2020)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11-21*</td>
<td>15-19.5*</td>
<td>19-22.5*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Ministry of Finance (2015)</td>
<td>1-2.2*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All figures in US$ billion. *Yearly average.
Updated from Roberts et al. (2021). Last updated on November 15th, 2022.
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The huge differences in numbers are mostly linked to three issues:

1. Most developed countries count all financial instruments (loans, grants, investments, insurance) at face value in their reporting to the UNFCCC.

   • This means that a US$50 million loan appears equal to a grant of US$50 million in OECD figures.

   • This is despite the fact that more than US$50 million might have to be repaid on even ‘concessional loans’ (that is, loans that are extended on terms more generous than market loans), and such repayments are not counted against the original flows.

   • In practice, this means that those developed countries that provide a large part of their climate finance in the form of loans get their figures “inflated” in comparison with those countries that mainly provide climate finance as grants.

   • Developing country negotiators and civil society representatives argue that only the grant equivalent of loans should be counted as actual support.
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2. Bilateral and multilateral funding flows are screened by completely different methods for whether they target climate objectives and should therefore count towards the annual US$100 billion per year pledge.

• Almost each developed country has its own accounting methodology.

• Multilateral development banks have their own accounting system.

• Current accounting methodologies tend to lead to huge overestimations: far fewer projects than developed countries report as “climate finance” can genuinely be considered as such.

• Accounting methodologies used by some countries have changed over time, complicating any assessment of trends.
Accounting Differently

3. The long-standing issue of whether funds are ‘new and additional’, as has been promised since 1992, has not been resolved.
Accounting Differently

3. The long-standing issue of whether funds are ‘new and additional’, as has been promised since 1992, has not been resolved.

- What is commonly referred to by developed countries as concessional public climate finance almost always counts towards the well-known 0.7% target of donors’ national income to be devoted to ODA.
Accounting Differently

3. The long-standing issue of whether funds are ‘new and additional’, as has been promised since 1992, has not been resolved.

- What is commonly referred to by developed countries as concessional public climate finance almost always counts towards the well-known 0.7% target of donors’ national income to be devoted to ODA.

- As most developed countries do not reach this 0.7% target, many developing country negotiators and civil society observers argue that a large proportion of reported climate finance cannot be considered ‘new and additional’ – an accusation frequently rejected by developed countries who have their own understandings of those terms.
There is no commonly accepted definition of this term, and it means many different things to different people.

In this presentation, I understand “climate finance” as the financial flows provided and mobilized by developed countries that derive from their obligations under the UNFCCC to help developing countries mitigate their greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the adverse effects of climate change.

### Accounting Differently

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taking into account the overreporting of the climate component of projects</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking into account the grant equivalence of reported flows</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking into account new and additional flows</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only taking into account actual disbursements</td>
<td>1–2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 1** Two examples of scaling down of OECD climate finance estimates. Values indicate billions of total US$ estimated to be actually flowing from developed nations to developing nations.

Source: Roberts et al. (2021, p. 181).
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Conclusion

- Does the current transparency framework bring confidence in the validity of the claims of climate finance amounts delivered? No!

- Will the Paris Agreement’s Enhanced Transparency Framework improve confidence in the validity of the claims of climate finance amounts delivered? No!

→ It seems unlikely that the new transparency arrangements on climate finance will stimulate developing countries to increase their climate ambition.
The 2009 pledge to mobilize US$100 billion a year by 2020 in climate finance to developing nations was not specific on what types of funding could count. Indeterminacy and questionable claims make it impossible to know if developed nations have delivered; as 2020 passes, opportunity exists to address these failures in a new pledge.
Recent Publications on Climate Finance


Thank you for your attention.

Dr Romain WEIKMANS

Email: romain.weikmans@fiiafellow.fi
Twitter: @RomainWeikmans
Webpage: romainweikmans.be
Laode M. Syarif
Partnership for Governance Reform (Kemitraan)
MAINSTREAMING GENDER IN ACCELERATING CLIMATE ACTIONS:
GRASS-ROOTS COLLABORATIONS, AS PART OF ENHANCED TRANSPARENCY FRAMEWORK

Laode M. Syarif, Ph.D
Executive Director
KEMITRAAN – Partnership for Governance Reforms
GENDER ASPECTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE

- Provision of sex aggregated data
- Comprehensive gender assessment
- Establishment of gender focal point at grass-root level
- Ensure full inclusion of women in decision making process
- Provision of information of accessible financing (capital, loan)
- Involve women in innovative technological application
- Effective gender related information strategies
GENDER MAINSTREAMING IN ETF

Essential: capacity and awareness building

Important: gender inclusion in climate change actions

Necessary: grass-roots collaboration

SPECIAL NOTE: LOOKS EASY IN DIAGRAMS BUT NOT EASY IN THE FIELD
Gender mainstreaming has been an important aspect for KEMITRAAN in implementing climate projects. To this, KEMITRAAN involve gender inclusion right from the beginning of project development process and throughout the project implementation through:

- Initial gender assessment,
- Provision of segregated beneficiaries’ data,
- Identification of existing women groups to involve in the project,
- Ensuring women involvement at least 30% of all participants,
- Related to the above, ensuring women involvement in the decision-making process,
- Establishment of women business groups and support with necessary skills and equipment,
- Strengthen involvement of youth and youth groups to accelerate climate action,
- Training of women and youth in the utilization of technological appliances,
- Provide room and assist women to speak amongst them in raising concerns and hopes for the future development.
### CHALLENGES VS OPPORTUNITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORMALITY PARTICIPATION</th>
<th>MEANINGFUL PARTICIPATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Letter of Acknowledgment</td>
<td>INFORM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Objection Letter</td>
<td>CONSULT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders mapping</td>
<td>INVOLVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guided Formal Meeting</td>
<td>COLLABORATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey/Questioner</td>
<td>EMPOWER (MAKING DECITION)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Meaningful participation is dependent on people being willing and able to participate and express their voice”. Alan Stanley: [https://www.eldis.org/keyissues/what-participation](https://www.eldis.org/keyissues/what-participation)
AF PROJECTS: CONCRETE ACTIONS

- Women Business Group, Saddang
- Home yard farming, Bulukumba
- Zalacca Chips
- Mangrove Planting, Pekalongan
“ENHANCE TRANSPARENCY FRAMEWORK (ETF) should not only obligated to the national governments up to project level, but the same requirement should also applied to the whole operation of all climate change management at international and regional levels”

Laode M Syarif, Ph.D
THANK YOU – TERIMA KASIH
Closing
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