



Regional Forum for National Designated Entities

Region: Pacific SIDS

24-26 February 2016

Tungi Colonnade Hotel, Nuku'alofa, Tonga

Day One - Wednesday 24 February

Opening of Regional Forum for NDEs

The Master of Ceremonies for the official opening of the Pacific Regional Forum for National Designated Entities (NDEs) was Ms Lu'isa Tu'i'Afitu-Malolo, LU'ISA, Director for Climate Change from the Ministry of Meteorology, Energy, Information, Disaster Management, Environment, Climate Change and Communications (MEIDECC) of Tonga.

The workshop was blessed with an opening Prayer.

The Honourable Siaso Sovaleni, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister responsible for Climate Change welcomed participants on behalf of the Kingdom of Tonga. He noted that the Government of Tonga was privileged and happy to host the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN) meeting for NDE's from around the Pacific.

The Minister also offered condolences to families in Fiji, dealing with Cyclone Winston, noting that Tonga has also been affected but without severe damage. Cyclone Winston was one of the strongest tropical cyclones experienced in the Pacific, and in recent years the Pacific has seen cyclones intensify and occur more frequently – indicating clearly the adverse impacts of climate change. Four cyclones have visited Tonga to date, in this season alone.

The Minister noted that the workshop was well timed to look at climate change issues, particularly noting the outcomes of Paris. Tonga submitted an Intended Nationally Determined Contribution (INDC) in Paris, which is not only ambitious but also signifies that this is not only about meeting targets but is also about survival.

The Pacific promotes the development of low carbon technologies. Tonga believes that in order to strengthen systems of national technology for climate in the Pacific, we must strengthen and involve all stakeholders and institutions, and hopes that CTCN will assist us to support climate technology action in the Pacific. It is very important to network with stakeholders, share knowledge and develop a shared vision. Climate innovation is a driver of economic growth. Climate technology improvement is one way to ensure that our national securities are protected from the adverse impacts of climate change.

The Minister also reiterated that the Government of Tonga is committed to addressing global issues of climate change, and declared the workshop open.

Mr Jukka Uosukainen, Director for CTCN noted that it was an honour to come from Copenhagen to Tonga and the Pacific. He also now appreciated the long distances that the Pacific makes to attend meetings in Europe, for the climate meetings. It shows the vastness and smallness of the world, that we can reach all populations of the world.

Mr Uosukainen also gave sincere sympathy to the people of the Pacific, who have been impacted by Cyclone Winston. The Pacific has been telling the climate community for years that this has been coming, yet we have not been listening. Cyclone Winston was in the global news around the world.

Pope Francis also released his important climate change letter last year, and cautioned that technology should serve the good of the people and the better good of mankind and not the other way around.



Technology must serve us and is not the master. In climate change, however, technology has started to become a master of people and mankind.

Mr Uosukainen also acknowledged the importance of the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS) and Small Island Developing States (SIDS) in the climate change process. AOSIS have been pushing the global goals, and he commented the activities of the SIDS governments on getting global attention.

The workshop will talk about outcomes of Paris, in later days, but because of the efforts of the Pacific and other delegations, technology and the Technology Mechanism (TM) of the Convention were recognised, receiving over 20 different references in the various parts of the Paris text. CTCN is grateful for the support of SIDS and AOSIS.

CTCN will now be working on more Technology Assessments (TAs) and Technology Action Plans (TAS) and will have more technology expert meetings in the future. The CTCN is looking to promote the capacity for research, development and deployment including of indigenous technologies, as well as the linkages with the finance institutions.

The CTCN was the baby of Copenhagen (COP 15) and Cancun (COP 16) Conference of the Parties (COP), and was established by the Parties. It was announced three years ago that CTCN was open to serve countries. The CTCN currently has over 85 requests from over 50 countries. CTCN has over 130 network members and hosts an intensive website where visitors come every day to see what the CTCN is doing.

CTCN was never intended to be a large technology house in the United Nations system, or under the Convention. The Parties were thinking that no one body can have so much wisdom and knowledge on climate that it can be done in one institution. Rather, a network needed to be created, and this has been built. This network includes NDES from both the north and the south. The presence of the Australia NDE at this workshop was recognised, as an opportunity for North South NDE dialogue and exchange.

The CTCN is also partly about capacity building. The CTCN has launched a programme for Lead Developed Countries (LDCs), and is thinking about how it can also give sustained support to SIDS. The CTCN needs to do this in collaboration with other bodies under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

The objective of the UNFCCC Technical Mechanism is to empower NDE's and technology focal points to look at all the possible local solutions for technology innovation. The team for this workshop includes the CTCN Technology Manager, Mr Rajiv Garg. The CTCN want to understand the needs and concerns of countries on climate technologies, and what possible solutions can be taken forward.

The Director acknowledged that SIDS have many partners. The CTCN, however, is not a partner but a servant. It is a body decided and established by Parties of the Convention, so is more humble than partners. Whatever countries bring to the CTCN is taken as a starting point. This is a country driven process, therefore country requests are the founding documents driving our assistance.

The Director gave special thanks to the Kingdom of Tonga, noting that the CTCN had an official request for assistance from the Government of Tonga, and look forward to discussion on how to take this forward. The Director then expressed his wish to see more Pacific governments also put in such requests to the CTCN.



Dr Netatua Pelesikoti, Director of Climate Change, from the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) provided some opening remarks.

Dr Pelesikoti noted that it was a privilege to represent SPREP in this CTCN Regional Forum for NDEs, and thanked the Deputy Prime Minister of Tonga for his presence at this regional forum. Both UNEP and CTCN were thanked for this timely NDE regional forum to develop and strengthen regional networks, especially after the Paris Agreement. Dr Pelesikoti shared greetings from SPREPs new Director General Mr Kosi Latu, as well as a commitment to genuine partnerships in the SIDS Samoa Pathway.

What technology is covered in the UNFCCC, and the Paris Agreement. Technology includes skills, knowledge, expertise and know-how, as well as what we are most familiar with - equipment, tools and machinery. The term is very cross cutting and the concept is relevant, as referred to by the UNFCCC and the Paris Agreement. Both the Paris Agreement and decisions of the UNFCCC Conference of the Parties (COP) how that technology and capacity building are crucial. The Subsidiary Body on Science and Technological Advice (SBSTA) also refers to technology, in its work on Research and Systematic Observations (RSO), looking specifically at improving Global Climate Observation Systems (GCOS). It is important for the Pacific to continue engagement with the UNFCCC.

Technology is not a stand-alone issue, and won't make an impact unless it supports adaptation and mitigation. For example, it can be used to support ones Nationally Determined Contributions and adaptation aspirations. It is important to note that there is a Technology Mechanism (TM) under the Paris Agreement. SPREP would urge all Pacific SIDs to participate in this.

Technology is not just about hard structures but also includes soft structures such as skills and knowledge. Article 12 of the UNFCCC calls for Parties to cooperate in the taking measures as appropriate, to enhance education, training and public awareness, and technology can support this also.

The Nukualofa Declaration on meteorology for the Pacific identifies priorities such as marine weather services, ocean issues and ARGO programmes. SPREP is committed to support Pacific Island Countries (PIC) to effectively implement the Paris Agreement. SPREP and other regional partners will develop a programme, together with Pacific Island countries on the implementation of the Paris Agreement.

SPREP will continue to support and strengthen existing mechanisms, such as the Pacific Meteorological Council (PMC), which provides scientific information to improve sector decision making and support adaptation and mitigation. SPREP in partnership with the governments of Japan and Samoa are building the Pacific Centre on Climate Change. SIDS Dock has also recently come into force and the Pacific office will be located in Apia, Samoa. SPREP, therefore, looks forward to strengthening SPREP's partnership with CTCN and maximising the presence of the UNEP sub regional office in the SPREP campus, in Apia.

The Pacific needs partnerships and CTCN was humble enough to call themselves a servant. SPREP is also happy to follow up on this to and build the capacity to ensure the successful transfer of technology for adaption and mitigation. The Pacific needs to develop strong projects to provide resilient development at the appropriate scale not only for the implementation of the Paris Agreement but also to meet national aspirations of its member countries.

Sefanaia Nawadra, Coordinator, United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP Pacific Sub Regional Programme in his opening remarks noted that the Pacific office of UNEP was formed as one of the key



outcomes of Rio plus 20, to strengthen UNEP. UNEP has opened eight sub-regional offices globally, two being in Small Island Developing States (SIDS), one each in the Pacific and Caribbean.

The Pacific office is annexed to the Asia Pacific regional office (Bangkok), and was officially launched at the 2014 SIDS conference. The office currently has two staff, the Coordinator, plus the Global Environment Facility (GEF) manager.

UNEP Pacific office is there to increase the engagement of UNEP in the Pacific and to increase the engagement of the Pacific in UNEP. It is a two way stream to ensure that UNEP engages effectively and to make sure Pacific issues are raised and addressed by UNEP at Global and regional Asia Pacific level.

Climate Change is such a cross cutting issue in the Pacific, can almost substitute CC for sustainable development in the Pacific context.

The United Nations Environmental Assembly (UNEA) was formed, and had its first meeting in 2014. The idea behind this is for countries to have more direct input into the governance of UNEP. Previously only governments with missions located in Nairobi had any say in UNEP. The UNEA brought all countries together and allows them more influence. At the 2014 meeting, the Asia Pacific and Pacific regions were ill prepared and didn't have any resolutions. This has now changed. The next UNEA will be in May, 2016. The Asia Pacific region now has the most resolutions and two are from the Pacific – on the Samoa Pathway and the continuation of the Asia Pacific forum. We have started to set up the structures now for this region to influence UNEP, and it is up to the Pacific region to use these structures to our advantage. UNEP works on four year cycles.

UNEP has worked hard on partnerships. UNEP Pacific's primary partnership is with SPREP (where the UNEP Pacific office is housed). UNEP was initially a parent of SPREP with the South Pacific Commission (SPC), when SPREP was initially set up in Noumea. Now that UNEP has come back and set up a sub-regional office in the Pacific, SPREP has become the guardian. UNEP now use a lot of the SPREP networks to try and engage better in the region. That is the role of the Pacific office, to facilitate these linkages between CTCN and other UN bodies in the Pacific, as the Pacific is not an easy region to come in to. It is better to use existing mechanisms that are already in place to engage effectively.

When UNFCCC was being negotiated, we had 13 negotiating sessions in New York, in the mid 1990s. One of the key things we needed to argue was to maintain the clause on technology transfer and it is now encouraging to see that this has gained traction. UNEP would urge all countries to make use of these opportunities now provided by the CTCN.

Session 1: An Introduction to the CTCN, Mr Jukka Uosukainen, CTCN Director

Mr Uosukainen provided an overview of his history and engagement in the climate change negotiations, starting from the Kyoto Protocol (adopted at the third conference of the Parties (COP 3) to the UNFCCC, as well as other multilateral environmental agreements.

Mr Uosukainen is the first director of the CTCN. The issue of technology is covered in Article 4.5 of the Convention. Having a decided article on the issue of technology in the Convention has been instrumental in the progress on this issue.

In 2001, Marrakesh (COP 7) the developing countries were calling for a dedicated technology fund. The Technology framework was established at this time. Issues of capacity building, needs assessments and enabling environments were being discussed at this time. At this time, Mr Uosukainen was the



first chair of the Expert Group on Technology Transfer (EGTT). Developed countries were not supportive of technology being a separate element. Developing countries, however, saw technology as critical and deserving its own mechanism.

The issue of intellectual property rights has also come up. This has been in the context of addressing barriers to accessing technology, due to high intellectual property (IP) charges. Examples have been cited from the medical industry, where costs of medicines can be excessive due to intellectual property rights. It has been more difficult to prove IP as a barrier in climate change technology. It should be remembered that technology transfer is not just about equipment, but is about skills and transfer of knowledge also.

The work of the EGTT ended in Copenhagen at COP 15 (2009). The Copenhagen package offered 100 billion by 2020, establishing the Green Climate Fund (GCF), the Technology Mechanism (TM) and the Adaptation Committee (AC). This was not accepted in Copenhagen, but was adopted a year later (2010) at COP 16 in Cancun. CTCN was therefore established in Cancun, 2010 (COP 16). Relevant technology decisions are on the UNFCCC website (TT: Clear). CTCN also has a link through TT: Clear.

Technology negotiators then started to think about establishing something to serve developing countries in a rapid way. They set up a rapid response mechanism for technology. This idea matured within the negotiations and became the CTCN. The CTCN works at the request of developing countries, to provide advice and guidance and lead to bankable climate change actions, which would be financed by other agencies. CTCN is not a financing mechanism itself but can help to access public or private finance.

Parties established this centre by opting it out through international bidding. In Durban (COP 17), Parties agreed to a process for international bidding. Durban did not manage, however, to agree to the composition of the advisory board of the CTCN – i.e. how big it would be, what type of representation would be on the board, etc.

The Group of 77 and China wanted the EGTT to be the board of the CTCN. This was not accepted by developed countries, so CTCN was put in parallel. The Board is made up of 25 representatives of governments. The Board also contains businesses, NGOs and private sector representatives. There is also representation of the Special Climate Change Fund (SCF), Green Climate Fund (GCF) and Adaptation Fund (AF) (where as the early EGTT was only made up of governments).

Three bids were received to host the CTCN, and Parties selected UNEP UNIDO as a host for the first five years (commenced in 2013 –to 2018). In 2017, the Parties will review whether or not UNEP UNIDO has met the bid requirements or whether or not new arrangements are needed. This programme is country driven and countries plan what they want the CTCN to do.

Session 2: The Regional Perspective, Facilitated by Rajiv Garg, CTCN

Session two saw a series of case studies on climate change work in the Pacific presented. Ahead of these presentations, Mr Garg reminded participants that the case studies presented could be examples of work to be further duplicated and supported by CTCN.

Case studies of regional climate mitigation in the Pacific region, Solomone Fifita, SPC

Mr Fifita reminded countries of their targets under their Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDCs) under the UNFCCC. He looked at the current baseline of renewable energy (RE) against a

common year of 2025 for their targets. He also looked at the concept of a regional RE target. For example, the Caribbean as a region have a target of 47% RE by 2027. The EU also has regional targets.

At the world scale, Oceania has a lower percentage of the population with access to electricity. In terms of percentage of RE, Oceania does well compared to other regions.

Mr Fifita provided an overview of regional projects that SPC has been involved in. For example, 'North REP' is a project in the North Pacific which looks at solar photo voltaic (PV) home systems (hardware). It also provides stand-alone systems to schools and rural centres. The project also involved rehabilitating an old hydro power project in the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM).

A project on energy efficiency has focused on retrofitting buildings through the development bank.

The Pacific Environment Community Fund funded through Palm 6 (Japanese Government) provided a total of 66 million USD. This provided for an average of four million USD per island country and was used mainly for solar electrification and solar desalination for countries such as Nauru, Vanuatu, Papua New Guinea (PNG) and FSM and the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI).

A UAE Pacific Partnership fund has supported the Pacific, to a total of 50 million USD. Each country received five million USD as grant aid. Most projects were solar, except for Samoa who focused on wind.

An Appliance Labelling and Standards project was funded by the government of Australia, to adopt legislation where countries will control the import of electronic appliances to meet certain standards. This also provides for capacity building to border control agencies.

EU Pac TVET – provides for training, to help monitor and maintain sustainable energy systems.

PIGGAREP Plus – was implemented by SPREP. This provided for solar water pumping in Tonga, and an energy efficiency demonstration house in Tuvalu.

A lesson learned as been the need to take into account damage from extreme events – eg cyclones, in the project design. In Vanuatu the infrastructure providing wind power was saved from the cyclone, as it was dismantled prior to the event. We have yet to find out what the status is after Tropical Cyclone Winston in Niue, Vava'u (Tonga) and Fiji. Tonga should have survived Tropical Cyclone Winston as their infrastructure has been built to Japanese standards.

We are seeing more use of grid connected systems versus standalone systems. These are more often for the urban areas or more densely populated islands. Standalone systems, on the other hand, are more for rural households and outer islands.

For energy work in the Pacific, we need to understand that there are two objectives: a) saving fuel and reducing greenhouse gases (GHGs) and b) providing people in the rural areas with electricity.

A key challenge has been grid stability. We have looked at battery storage to address this (for example, in Niue). The technologies used have mainly been solar (stand alone, mini grids, grid connected); Solar electrification, water pumping and desalination; wind, hydro, biofuel; gasification; geothermal and with some interest in ocean based energy.

The Pacific Centre for RE and EE (PCREEE) is an initiative supported by UNIDO and the Government of Australia. SPC is discussing with Tonga having this centre located in Tonga (in the same building as

climate change, energy and national emergency management). The purposes of this is to accelerate the deployment of RE and EE with investment from the Pacific business community. This will be a part of the global centres of excellence that UNIDO is putting throughout small island developing states (SIDS). The Caribbean opened their office in Nov 2015. The Pacific are hoping to have the Pacific Center opened by June or August 2016.

Comments/questions:

Mr Uosokainen noted the INDCs which provide the level of ambition for the Pacific. Access to electricity is so low, that the Pacific would have reason to not address climate before energy is accessed, but despite this, the Pacific is contributing to the climate community. The Pacific share of RE is significant. The Pacific is ready to take on new technology and avoiding the mistakes of other countries in the use of old fossil based technology. The main donors are active in this region (i.e. the European Union (EU), Japan, Australia), the question to the region is, RE is a very crowded space in the region, so what more can the CTCN do in this region?

Donors need to be aware of the conditions and circumstances of the region. If their proposals are risky (ie prone to cyclones) then they need to take the responsibility for this. IF there is still room for CTCN we are very happy to engage. The list of technologies in the Pacific is very sound. PV has crossed the technology barrier and is into the markets. Wind and hydro are also ready. It was noted that technology has to be risk proof, for example cyclone proof.

With regards to ocean based energy, the Caribbean SIDS came to CTCN for ocean energy (Dr Al Binger). This request was taken seriously, as the CTCN Caribbean meeting asked for OTEC and waste to energy technologies (addresses solid waste issues also). The CTCN went to Japan, as the only pilots are in Japan. Japan was pessimistic and said that this technology is not yet mature enough. Needed more information on the temperature gradients. With regards to PCREEE, the CTCN will support this ,as UNIDO is a host of the CTCN also.

Owen Woldrin (Australia) commented on energy storage through batteries. Since Tesla announced the lower price of batteries, this has become an enabling technology with a wide range of uses. This will allow solar and wind to be used for up to 100% energy consumption. This is a very exciting development. China and Apple have also developed storage units. This is a major area for investment.

Dr Pelesikoti (SPREP) asked for clarification on what CTCN can fund and what they cannot? For example, can it fund implementation or just technical assistance? Would the CTCN be able to support a regional organisation? A lot of the work highlighted involved partnerships of regional organisations, so does CTCN only go directly to countries or would the CTCN also support regional organisations and partners?

Mr Uosokainen responded that this is a Party decision. The CTCN is a facilitator. It is not a funder or an implementation agency, and can only fund technical assistance. It does work through regional organisations. The CTCN works with the 11 organisations which make up the consortium. These institutions that have signed with CTCN, and committed to providing technical assistance (as per a contract).

The CTCN also works through a Network, and has invited other institutions, especially regional institutions, to be a part of the network (SPREP is a network member). Most technical assistance (TAs) will be run through the network. Under the UN rules of procurement there is a need for open bidding, vs bilateral agreement. Joint efforts are also possible.

Australia welcomed the frank examples which had been presented and commented that the CTCN can play an important part in supporting the development of feasibility studies, before projects are taken to a donor. The question was also asked of why is the Pacific looking so seriously at RE to fill the energy access gap (ie due to economics of energy, given Fossil fuel costs) or is there another reason that makes RE attractive?

Mr Fifita responded that the access figures are low due to the larger Pacific islands countries such as Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu, which have lower access to energy, versus Samoa which has 99.9% access. The Pacific preference for RE is due to various reasons, including a need or energy security (reduce reliance on fossil fuel); credibility (i.e. reduced GHG emissions); and a preference from the donor community to fund RE (e.g. Japan solar electrification and solar desalination; UAE prefers RE). This also matches the wish of countries to diversity energy sources for economic and environmental impacts.

For the EU GIZ project the CTCN could play a key role in knowledge transfer and assisting Pacific Island countries to develop proposals to donor agencies, as proposals require a lot effort to development, i.e. community consultations; community surveys, technical analysis, financial analysis, to ensure that the projects are sustainable. This could fill gap in helping countries to address sustainability issues.

The question was asked of countries - the Pacific had a CTCN NDE workshop in 2014, but what was the barrier to countries to then access the CTCN's support? Could a regional organisation play a role in helping countries to access the CTCN?

The Cook Islands explained that their drive for RE is because it is a responsibility and obligation to our Pacific neighbours, to reduce our emissions, given that we are seeing impacts. There are also links to the four pillars of the Cook Islands national sustainable development plan.

Samoa shared that they have very small land areas to produce resources for gasification. Samoa have more ocean than land, hence their interest in RE versus fossil fuels. Fossil fuels are not helping our economies. Samoa spends up to 50% of its national budget on importing fossil fuels, which could be better spent on health and education.

The representative from the Green Climate Fund (Ms Coral Pasisi) noted that on the issue of energy efficiency, there are huge gains to be made through addressing inefficient infrastructure. There is a need to look at the demand side of appliances coming into the region. Does the Pacific have sufficient technical expertise to address these aspects or this is a gap that CTCN can plug?

There are also opportunities outside of the power sector, in transport, for example. Inter island and within country transport is a large fuel cost for countries. The North Pacific are looking at innovations for transport between islands, i.e. energy efficient boats. Can the CTCN assist in this?

There are also several existing technical assistance networks within the Pacific and it is important for CTCN to look at these. Strong energy partnership networks bring together all partnerships in the region. Could the CTCN be an active member in these existing arrangements? Projects that come from the Pacific to the GCF, for example, require a lot of feasibility work, so there is significant potential here.

Mr Gurag made the following observations. There is potential to explore geo-thermal energy. CTCN is helping a country in Africa (Uganda) develop their regulations to deal with geo-thermal energy. Waste is also an issue. For example, countries are importing CFLs (vs LEDs) but these have a high mercury



content, which is a problem for disposal. What are the types of batteries being used in the Pacific? How are they disposed of (ie lead acid?). These issues need to be addressed. CTCN can help empower countries to understand some of these issues ahead of final policy decisions being made.

Mr Uosokenein asked countries how the CTCN might best support Pacific NDE's in their work? This work can't necessarily be done from Copenhagen. There is a need to discuss how the CTCN might work with regional organisations. The CTCN is looking to form a long term relationship with the Pacific. Parties have established this as sustained support to countries and the CTCN is a long term mechanism.

The meeting broke in the afternoon, to allow for the workshop attendees to participate in a field trip hosted by the Government of Tonga, to Tongan sites of historical interest.

All participants were also hosted by the Government of Tonga at a welcoming reception.

DAY Two - Thursday 25 February

Session 3: The Regional Perspective – Case studies of regional climate adaptation in the Pacific, Dr Netatua Pelesikoti, SPREP

Dr Pelesikoti presented a some of the adaptation activities happening in the Pacific. She noted that there are many adaptation activities around the region.

Prioritising adaptation response needs is done through adaptation planning processes. This is done at the national level, linked to National Adaption Plans of Actions (NAPA) National Adaptation Processes (NAP) and other national planning processes. Community participatory 3D mapping is also used as a process.

Assistance has been provided to countries to build their enabling environments to support their adaptation activities. For example, in Vanuatu, a National Adaptation Board was established. Increasingly in the Pacific, climate change is being placed in centralised agencies (e.g. offices of the Prime Minister) noting that climate change is a cross cutting area that links across a wide range of sectors. Climate resilient development is a key goal of the Paris Agreement.

There have been attempts to provide common regional methodologies and frameworks, as tools for Pacific island countries. UNDP, SPREP, and the Pacific Island Forum Secretariat (PIFS), amongst others conducted a joint climate public expenditure and institutional review in Samoa. This was carried out to assist countries to accredit to international funds (i.e. the GCF). It is important to note that accessing the funds is not the end result. The end result should be the successful delivery of climate change projects on the ground.

A mainstreaming guide was developed, to assist practitioners on the ground in countries. Much regional mainstreaming work has been through policies and action plans. Disaster risk management and climate change have been incorporated into national sustainable development plans.

A gender and climate change tool kit has also been developed for the region.

Countries are also being supported in the integration of disaster and climate change and social economic information, as well as geological and biological information, so that the solution does not trigger vulnerability in another area. The solutions that we recommend, or work with countries to identify must be sustainable in the long term.

Climate services and climate scenarios are provided for the region. Climate change science information is used to inform adaptation planning and implementation. This includes, for example, information on long term seasonal rainfall patterns; temperature variability etc. An example was shared from the Solomon Islands, where future projections were used to assess whether or not solutions proposed today would be appropriate for the longer term.

It is important to have integration across a wide range of sectors, and not simply focus on only the one sector when addressing adaptation.

A regional partnership on ocean acidification has started recently, to fill information gaps. This is coordinated by Pacific regional agencies (i.e. SPREP and SPC) and the governments of New Zealand and the United States of America.

There are significant opportunities in the Pacific region to leverage international assistance in adaptation. While there are excellent opportunities to implement adaptation, there is no one size fits all approach. Mal-adaptation (increasing vulnerability) is also an increasing risk in the region. This can come about from work which may have the best intentions, but may be poorly designed or planned.

We need to be sensitive to the socio economic impacts of adaptation. For example, the prevention of sand mining has an impact on the local community livelihoods in Kiribati.

The Regional Technical Support Mechanism (RTSM) was established to provide technical assistance to member countries in climate change and disaster risk reduction. This facility while coordinated by SPREP is accountable to all the Council of the Regional Organisations of the Pacific (CROP) agencies, including PIFS, the University of the South Pacific (USP) and SPC etc. The RTSM has a roster of experts, and a simple application form for countries to access this through. Applications are vetted by a committee known as the 'WARD'. Expertise can either come from CROP organisations or through private consultants (through the roster of experts).

Dr Netatua asked the question to participants, how can we work with the CTCN? She reminded countries present that both doors are open to them, i.e. RTSM and CTCN. The RTSM is a very small mechanism, so there are opportunities for collaboration. For example, the RTSM could share its expert roster with the CTCN.

Comments and discussion:

Mr Uosokenein noted that when the GEF found out that they didn't get the contract to host the CTCN, they took their 40 million and placed these into the regional banks (10 million into each regional bank). As a result, ADB received 10 million, and 1 million went to the Pacific. CTCN has met with regional banks and agreed to collaborate and coordinate, as this is the Parties preference. The CTCN have agreed not to overlap and compete at the country level. The CTCN also has funding limitations. It was noted that RTSM is a limited grant based mechanism, while CTCN will be a permanent institution.

The CTCN also needs to build a roster of experts. The current 'roster' is made up of the Network (which has a bidding process). The CTCN would be interested in how to build a lighter and quicker process, such as the RTSM roster, but noted that the UN system can be slower.

Australia's work on Climate Technologies, Byron Fay, Government of Australia

Mr Fay shared condolences from the Australian government to the region on cyclone Winston, which is a serious reminder of our vulnerability to climate change. For the donor countries, this underlines the need for us to focus on this work, in this region.

Australia's climate finance – Overview.

The Australian Prime Minister announced in Paris that Australia will contribute 1 billion in climate finance from 2016 – 2020. This will have a strong focus on the Pacific. Australia's Pacific division is developing a strategy on how to develop climate targets for the Pacific. This will build on the Australian \$599 million fast start finance, with a 50/50 split between adaptation and mitigation, and with one third earmarked to go to SIDS.

Australia also pledged 200 million to the GCF from 2015 – 2018. Australia is a Co-Chair of the GCF board and has a commitment to seeing the Pacific receive its fair share of support.

Examples of Australia's Pacific Climate Technology support in the Pacific:

1. COSPAC
2. Mapping exposure to SLR in the Pacific
3. Tonga outer island RE project
4. Pacific appliance labelling standards programme

The COSPAC project

This project works to enhance capacity of Pacific Island countries to manage and mitigate the impacts of climate variability through access to technology and web based tools developed by Australia's Bureau of Meteorology. The project had a total budget of 32 million AUD from 2012 – 2017. Seasonal Climate Outlooks for the Pacific web-portal is an example of these tools, which generates seasonal outlooks for the Pacific. The Oceans Portal is also being developed (open access) but is still under development. This provides access to information on salinity, current, sea levels, sea surface temperature and tidal gauge data.

Mapping Exposure to sea level rise in the Pacific.

This ended in 2014, but there are still projects rolling out under this broader programme. It assists Pacific island countries to adapt and prepare for sea level rise. Provides data and provides training on the use of tools to make planning decisions. Phase one was collecting bathometric data and phase two was about training governments to use this information. The project focused on Tonga, Vanuatu, Samoa and PNG.

Tonga Outer Island RE Energy Project.

This project is installing solar PV systems with a total capacity of 1.25 MWs in 9 outer islands (4.5 Australian million).

Pacific appliance and labelling standards programme

This project assists Pacific island countries to enact and implement standards and labelling regulation for appliances such as refrigerators, air conditioners and lighting. This is an example of how information from Australia can be used to assist in other countries.

Lessons learned:

- It is very important to focus on projects that satisfy multiple objectives. This improves sustainability and has whole of government buy in. We need to look beyond the climate adaptation benefits to broader development benefits, making it more attractive to donors too.
- To Australia it is clear that technology transfer and capacity building are very interlinked and cannot be separated. These two areas must go hand in hand.

Advice to Pacific island countries:

Most donors draw climate finance from their aid programmes – this has an impact on the recipient countries. Countries should think about how they communicate their priorities to the donors. If you want to have climate work supported, this must be made clear to their development partners. It must be articulated at the highest levels nationally –i.e. show that this is a national priority. Climate officers need to work through the donor reps who are posted in the countries.

Countries should recall the Australia 1 billion Paris commitment. This will put pressure on Australian posts to do more climate work, so this is an opportunity to utilise.

There is a strong focus in the donor community to work with the private sector, so where possible, look for projects that tick this box. There are many opportunities for this in the RE sector, for example. This is similar for the GCF, the private sector element is key (although this can be harder for adaptation). Revenue generating components are key.

There are a lot of great resources and expertise in the region, so make full use of these resources where ever possible

Questions/comments:

In Niue, the Australian Bureau of Meteorology (BOM) installed a tide gauge, and telecom Niue assisted with this. The question is – can Telecom tap into this data? The data is currently closed to the government of Niue also.

Dr Pelesikoti noted that COSPAC is winding down and many of the products are being transitioned to agencies such as SPREP and SPC. Niue can direct their question to SPREP and SPC who may be able to provide more information in this area, through the Pacific Met Desk.

Ms Pasisi from the GCF noted that the Pacific has amongst the highest level of overseas development assistance (ODA) per GDP in the world (Tuvalu has about 70%). How ODA is delivered to countries has a significant impact on how countries achieve their national development plans. Donors are looking at how to better coordinate this.

Session 4: Presentation of network members on case studies related to climate technologies in the region

Sirikul Prasitpianchai, International Institute for Energy Conservation (IIEC), Energy Efficiency Technology: Knowledge Transfer and Capacity Building in PEEP 2 Project

The PEEP 2 project is financed by the Asian Development Bank (ADB) Global Environment Facility (GEF), Government of Australia, JICA and Asian Clean Energy Fund. It covers five countries: PNG, Vanuatu, Samoa, Tonga and Cook Islands. It looks at energy efficiency in the residential, commercial and public sectors.

The projects total investment is 2.68 USD million, and it will save 7.47 million in life time cost savings. Energy efficiency technology is very cost effective in the Pacific, due to high costs of power. 34 energy efficiency projects in the Pacific in total are being implemented under this initiative. Some examples of these are provided below:

Lamp Waste Management Technology

The project procured a lamp crushing or bulb eater machine, to dispose of the old fluorescent lamps safely (noting their mercury content).

Energy Efficient (EE) Air Conditioner Project (4 projects) are being carried out in hotels and public buildings. This looks at energy efficiency performance standards. Energy audits have shown that the

majority of the Chinese air conditioning units used in the Pacific have low EE ratings. Average daily savings from the inverter air conditioning was about 66% of energy used.

Fridge and Freezer replacement Programme in the Cook Islands.

Refrigeration was on average 40% of the household electricity costs. On average, households had 3 stars (out of 6). 55% of fridges were more than seven year old. Retailers sell lower star products because they were cheaper. It is very important to advertise the programmes to the consumers. Initial savings was 40 – 60 NZD a month on electricity bills for those who purchased new refrigerators. Contractors were hired to dispose of the old units.

Energy Efficient street lighting projects (8 projects).

This project looked at the replacement of existing street lights.

Solar LED Street lighting. Control system can select when to use more lighting capacity in the Cook Islands.

Solar Hot water for hospital – Cook Islands. More ideal to put solar systems on the ground vs roofs, in cyclone prone areas.

Energy Audit training courses. Noted gender imbalance in the training participants in the Pacific.

Project outputs:

- Energy use data base
- National EE targets for the 5 countries
- Developed guidelines to support EE best practices (for hotels, public buildings and street lighting)
- EE saving tips in electric bill inserts
- Home energy guides in local and English language
- Developing an EE tool for androids – available in March 2016

Lessons learned:

- Procurement must take into account long shipping delays in the Pacific
- Not many suppliers were interested in the bidding process to meet ADB requirements
- Installation – capacity of local partners in co-financing
- Local contractor should be checked with credibility if possible
- Commitment and capacity of local partners
- Capacity building – try to engage local entity such as staff of Depts of Energy or utilities to be involved in the training, but utilities in some countries may not be interested
- Need repetitive training to reaffirm knowledge transfer

Replicability and sustainability

- A UNDP project is being replicated in Tokelau
- Sustainability through knowledge transfer and capacity building, and publication and tools

Email: iecbangkok@iiec.org

Questions and comments:

The CTCN noted that they would like to see this projects up-scaled massively, and the lessons learned applied. These have been tried and tested so why do we not upscale these? There are great opportunities for savings to house hold electricity bills

SPREP asked if we could change legislation rather than spend efforts trying to re-educate the consumers and retailers and importers? Would this have a larger impact?

Comments – note that there are different labelling systems nationally, so its difficult to control labels. Regulations are also different.

It was also noted that much of the technology that comes into the region comes in through aid packages, often giving governments less control over what comes in (technology dumping). Perhaps national legislation need to be put in place to prevent such dumping, as aid packages should be compliant to national laws.

Renewable Energy in the Pacific Region: Opportunities for the CTCN, Oliver Woldring, IT Power

Ideas for the sorts of TA projects that NDE's could pitch to the CTCN.

IT Power was established in 1981; a global leader in renewable energy and energy efficiency consulting and project management. IT Powers expertise spans the breadth of renewable energy and energy storage technologies. It has over 2,000 consultancy contract in over 100 countries. IT Power works regularly for New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT), the World Bank, UNDP etc. and also works directly for Pacific Island electricity utilities.

Renewable energy on small islands has become popular with the need for electrification, especially in the outer islands. Larger islands (capital centres) have well established grids, but this is changing very fast. A few years ago the focus was on household systems, but we are now moving towards mini grids. Technology is improving; costs are falling and we are learning more about how we are doing this. There is also an increasing imperative to reduce GHG's.

Economic benefits include reductions in vulnerability to economic price fluctuations, improved balance of payments, reliability in inexpensive electricity boosts economic growth, improved power quality (which reduces life span of appliances), and local employment.

There are also social benefits. Electricity saves time, provides opportunities for communication, is good for schools and hospitals, improves indoor air quality, and provides benefits of employment.

Environmental benefits can include reduced GHGs, avoided diesel spills, and greatly reduced noise.

Diesel imports often are 20 – 40% of a national outgoings. Solar is now out competing diesel. Independents power produces are seeking power purchase agreements.

Grid stability is a real issue, but for most areas there is still much potential to add intermittent technologies, and even if there are risks, there are solutions available (i.e. battery storage).

Some of the challenges can include:

- High up front cost (i.e. solar buys 25 years of electricity in the first year, with low operations costs)
- Intermittency
- Tropic environment issue – salt water spray or salt in the air
- Lack of local engagement in a grant funded project
- Weak governance
- Poor regulatory framework to attract private sector investment
- Difficulty in long term maintenance planning – should be putting revenue aside to pay for batteries in ten years
- Lack of local capacity and brain drains

Less well known challenges:

- Pacific logistics are very complicated – distances are great and data is not always available
- Getting accurate data and information is difficult (eg power house data, shipping schedules)
- Limited market for companies with experience in this area

The future:

- Very high penetration of RE – 90% RE is technically available
- Costs are coming down rapidly
- Capital costs of displacing diesel with a range of complementary RE tech is falling
- Levelised Cost of Energy already better than diesel
- ITP was involved in a study of 100% RE for Samoa
- Falling cost of battery storage in particular may lead to a paradigm shift away from diesel

A series of case studies were presented, from Tonga (Tonga Energy Road Map Institutional Strengthening project), Tokelau (Solar PV project), Samoa (Renewable Energy Road Map), the Cook Islands (RE feasibility in the Southern Islands) and Tuvalu.

IT Power saw opportunities for the CTCN to provide support in a number of areas. These included: Technology assessments: generation, storage, energy efficiency, demand side management, networks; energy demand analysis and projections; network stability studies, how much RE capacity can be added and when; strategic and policy advice; regulatory regime reviews; assessment of financing options; governance reform; legislative drafting; asset management and capacity building and training.

Comments and Questions:

Niue noted that they would follow up bilaterally with IT Power.

Mr Guraj noted that power quality is an important issue. As more systems are integrated into the grid, this does have an impact on the quality of power, particularly for the Pacific where grids are small and don't have highly absorptive capacities. With new technologies coming on board, power quality is more crucial. A study looked at the impact of the power distortions and the costs are very high, particularly for electronic based industries. What does ITP see for the future, if we have more up to date technology in the islands – how crucial will power quality be?

ITP responded that this is increasingly important. Intermittent generators can create problems. Utilities need to consider this carefully. This has been done well in Tonga and resolves problems

produced by PV and wind generators. Power quality will become an increasingly a problem but there are solutions to this.

Session 5: CTCN Introduction and Updates

Presentation on CTCN history, mission, structure, Rajiv Garg, CTCN

Rajiv asked participants for their understanding of CTCN. CTCN are an enabler of technologies and can support country requests for technologies.

What is a technology? A combination of hard ware and soft-ware, policies and strategies and the skill sets and institutions that come with it. The definition of technology is very broad.

CTCN is the operative arm of the UNFCCC Technology Mechanism. CTCN works for National designated entities (NDE) in partnership with UNEP, UNIDO, and 11 independent regional and global consortium partner organisations with expertise in climate change technologies. It has an international network of 135+ academic, multilateral, NGO and private sector institutions. This list continues to grow.

There are currently no existing consortium partners in the Pacific, but there are two in Asia. Each partner brings in own expertise.

Some of the Services of the CTCN include:

- Technical assistance and support to countries on their demand through the NDE's (mitigation and adaptation technology)
- Knowledge sharing – host a knowledge management system, which provides information and knowledge to stake holders
- Collaboration and networking

CTCN technical assistance is provided through a country driven process. NDES's work with the different project proponents to identify technologies best suited for the country, according to national priorities. NDEs submit a request to the CTCN which must be signed by the NDE. Once a request is received, a team of experts will develop a response plan. A response plan is the terms of reference (TOR) for what needs to be done. Once this is defined then CTCN will enter into an agreement between CTCN and the NDE. CTCN will do the implementation either through a consortium partner or a network member.

CTCN currently have over 86 requests under consideration, from more than 50 developing countries. The number of requests per country is not fixed. For example, Thailand put in six requests at one time, three on adaptation and three on mitigation. There is currently only one request from the Pacific (Tonga) and CTCN are in discussion with Nauru. There has been an imbalance with more requests being for mitigation. Some requests have co-benefits for both adaptation and mitigation.

The Dominican republic has put in a request for an early warning communication protocol. Requests can be classified as either rapid response (up to 50,000 USD) or as larger requests of up to 250,000 USD.

Antigua and Barbuda have put in a request for technical assistance for the establishment of a sustainable financial mechanism for gaining energy independence. Tonga would like assistance for the development of an energy efficiency master plan. Nauru would like to develop Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMA) for their energy sector, to be linked to their Nationally Determined



Contribution (NDC). There are currently over 135 network members, who have expertise on both mitigation and adaptation.

There are benefits to being a network member. This includes opportunities for partnerships; commercial opportunities; allows for experience sharing, visibility and outreach etc. NDE's are also network members.

CTCN also covers knowledge sharing and capacity building. The CTCN has a technology library of proven low carbon and climate resilient technologies, showcased by a target sector. The number of users increases daily (1000+ website hits per day).

The CTCN provides for capacity building, including programmes to build capacities of the NDE's. The CTCN has a targeted capacity building programme for Least Developed Countries (LDC). The incubator programme provides tailored support to LDCs. CTCN plans to extend this programme to SIDS. CTCN has developed modules to assist countries do stakeholder consultations, to short list a technology for a priority sector etc.

The CTCN is actively engaging with development finance institutions (GCF, GEF, and multi lateral development banks (MDB)) and private sectors as well. De-risking climate technology options for implementation, and enabling clean energy solutions.

Questions and comments:

When asked what percentage of proposals sent to CTCN have been rejected, the CTCN responded that the CTCN can't reject proposals. It will instead work with countries to revise and further develop their proposals until they are successful.

It was also noted that countries cannot submit a proposal unless they have a nationally designated entity (NDE). Currently 135 countries have nominated their NDE.

Samoa asked what are the time lines for implementing requests? The CTCN target is that within 6 weeks a response plan should be developed. If requests are not clear, these might require additional time to refine. Experience within the CTCN has found on average though that it can take up to three to four months. The CTCN could consider a Roster of Experts system, but would it still be slowed down by need for at least three bids, to meet UN procurement standards.

The current Incubator programme modules provide support for LDC's to put up a request. This includes support for national consultations, to carry out an analysis of national programmes and planning documents, how to do an analysis of a priority technology, and on locating a financial institution to fund the request.

SPC noted that they have just completed a training needs and gaps analysis. SPC asked if there any chance that SPC could use the CTCN LDC modules and integrate them into their own programmes. The CTCN modules are currently on the CTCN website.

Countries were asked to identify what type of support they might be interested in requesting from the CTCN. Countries wanted to know if when the CTCN evaluates bids and application tenders, will the NDE be involved in this process? The CTCN clarified that this follows the UNIDO procurement process, which does not allow for NDE involvement in the evaluation. Evaluation is based on technical criteria first, and once bids qualify technically; they are then selected based on financial criteria. The CTCN

reassured countries that they would then check with NDE's to ensure that they are comfortable with the bidder.

The CTCN assured countries that they also have a major say in the development of the TOR. The TOR is signed off as final by both the NDE and the CTCN Director. The actual procurement is then done by UNIDO procurement process (not CTCN).

Countries asked for clarification on the reporting progress. Are the quarterly reports the role of the NDE? The CTCN responded that the NDEs role is to do the monitoring and evaluation, and reporting. NDE should also report on the impact of the project after it has been completed. The reports are not as complicated as the GEF formats.

Countries asked if CTCN could provide assistance to countries, by having experts participate on national evaluation panels. For example, can a country request advisors with technical expertise to provide advice on what is a sound and suitable technology, and what is not? The CTCN confirmed that this is possible. Countries can request the CTCN to provide support to independently review a project. The Cancun COP 16 decisions provide a very wide mandate to the CTCN.

Samoa noted that the evaluator should also be involved in the development of the actual TORs and request for tenders, and not just come in at the end and help to evaluate those bids.

ITP supported the idea of a rapid response panel. Some of this work would only require a short period, while other tasks may require up to a week of work. Some TA only takes only 5 minutes to answer, so this could be facilitated through an on line networking approach, to provide immediate support. Clean Solutions Centre could provide such support. A panel that has wide level expertise including from the Pacific/SIDS would be useful.

It was agreed that there needs to be a way to include regional agencies into the list of consortium partners. The CTCN was asked if they would consider putting resources into the Pacific RTSM. It is also important to think about what the added value of CTCN would be.

Session 6: The Paris Outcomes

Mr Jukka Uosakainen, CTCN Director, Paris Outcomes

2015: Was historic by any measure. It was the most ambitious year for sustainable development and climate technology in history.

Prior to Paris, the legacy of multilateral environment agreements (MEA) was for a top down approach, where legally binding targets were agreed. This was the prevailing idea of the time. But this has now changed, due to the resistance of both developing and developed countries (e.g. US made it clear they could not ratify a Kyoto type protocol).

The agreement now being a 1.5 to 2 degrees target, and a call for post 2015 decarbonisation. It allows for ambitious bottom up approaches. It also includes a Technology facilitation mechanism. The CTCN/Technology mechanism has multiple references in the Paris Decisions, with a mandate to engage, leverage partnerships to deliver results.

The Paris Agreement (PA) contains all critical elements:

- Mitigation: 1.5 – 2 degree target, binding NDC with five year renewal; reporting; global stock take
- Adaptation: global goal, efforts and reporting from all parties, five year review of support.
- Loss and damage: The Warsaw International Mechanism (WIM) on loss and damage has been extended.
- Support – finance, capacity building and technology.

Paris gave a strong technology mandate. It created a Technology Framework to serve the Paris Agreement. It also strengthened the Technology Mechanism links to the GCF. It enhanced action prioritising technologies that are substantial, scalable and replicable (pre 2020), and provided for a greater focus on research and development, and endogenous/native technologies.

The Paris Outcomes - Implications for the Financial Mechanism, Coral Pasisi, Pacific Advisor to the Green Climate Fund.

Decisions which provide guidance to the GCF come from the United Nations Framework Convention for Climate Change (UNFCCC) COP, which are then mapped by the GCF Secretariat, who identify those relevant to the GCF. These are then put forward to the Board to consider how to take these forward. The Board then provides the GCF with a mandate to take these decisions forward. The GCF Secretariat would then operationalize these decisions, and would work with key partners (ie CTCN, SB's etc); and would report back to the COP, at COP 22.

Relevant Decisions of COP 21 include:

- Decision 1/CP.21 – Adoption of the Paris Agreement
- 7/CP.21 Report of the GCF to the COP

1/CP.21 Paris Agreement that's that:

- The GCF and GEF shall serve the Agreement
- One must aim to ensure efficient access to financial resources through a) simplified approval procedures and b) enhanced readiness support for developing country parties (in particular LDCs and SIDS)

Guidance provided to the GCF calls for:

- Formalise the replenishment process
- Operationalize the redress mechanism, evaluation and integrity units
- Risk management framework
- Strategic plan (meet investment target) – will go to the GCF board at the March meeting
- Simplification of processes (in particular small sized)
- Streamline of accreditation and seek balance
- Streamline readiness
- Support funds through expert and tech advice
- Operationalize the results based payments for REDD+
- Invites the board to facilitate access to environmentally sound technologies
- Develop mechanisms to engage expert technical assistance from strategic bodies

It was noted that in the past Pacific island countries have fought hard at UNFCCC COPs, but have not always followed through with the implementation of these decisions in the financial mechanism governing councils.

The next steps, post Paris will be for the Board to consider the Paris decisions (in March) and to then provide guidance on their implementation. The GCF representative at this workshop will gather feedback on possible areas or collaboration. The GCF will continue to consult with the Technology Expert Committee (TEC) and CTCN at the upcoming in-session workshop at SB 44 (May). The GCF will continue to explore practical linkages and report back to COP 22.

Questions and comments:

The Solomon Islands asked if there are there any provisions that are guaranteed within the GCF for technology transfer? The GCF representative responded that there are no resource allocations to any thematic area, apart from fifty percent split between adaptation and mitigation, with 50% of adaptation funding going to SIDS, LDCs and Africa.

Mr Fifita asked about the conversion from INDC's to NDCs, and if there a time line against this? It was noted that this is every 5 years with additional flexibility provided for SIDS and LDCs.

The CTCN put a question to both the GCF and Pacific island countries present. Some PICs have put forward ambitious INDCs, due to political willingness of countries to do this. But, this has not been supported through real feasibility studies or cost benefit analysis. These assessments need to take place for these to be implemented. It might be that these countries come to CTCN for the technical base line work so that they can bring this to the GCF for funding. The CTCN could take this on a country by country basis, or could consider multi country request from countries with similar targets and investment needs. CTCN would require every NDE to sign for a multi-country request. Are countries willing to consider this type of investment proposal? Through an accredited entity. Would the GCF be interested in this approach?

The GCF response was that multi country projects would have be agreed to the board, but should be do-able. The board has allowed funds, through readiness programmes to develop adaptation plans in the past, so is likely that this can be done for INDC conversion. Whether or not this can be a multi country approach would need to be considered by the Board.

Australia responded that the board will look in the future at the idea of regional programming. To date, all approvals have been at programmatic levels, but the board will consider regional approaches in the future. Thee currently diverse views in the board with regards to the idea of regional projects.

The CTCN has experience with multi country requests, for example in Africa.

Session 7: Linking the Technology and Financial Mechanisms

The Green Climate Fund: updates and perspectives on linkages to CTCN assistance, Coral Pasisi, GCF Pacific Regional Advisor

The GCF is a Financial mechanism of the Convention (UNFCCC). In terms of governance its board it made up of 24 board members, with equal representation between developed and developing countries. The GCF was established on 11 December 2010 (COP 16). Its stakeholders are 194 countries.

The mandate of the GCF is to promote low emission and climate resilient development in developing countries. Its headquarters are in Songdo, Korea. The fund structure has a board, a Secretariat and the Independent Accountability Unit. Its resources are split 50/50 between adaptation and mitigation, with half of adaptation funds going to SIDS, LDCs and Africa. Thus far the GCF has received 10.3 billion USD in pledges, with 70% in signed contributions (6.9 billion USD).

The value added by the GCF is through its country ownership through NDAs and focal points. It also ensures a balance between adaptation and mitigation, and provides an equal voice for developed and developing countries. It has a diversity of accredited entities and financial instruments. It has a dedicated private sector facility, and is the largest dedicated climate fund globally.

In order for countries to engage with the GCF, key steps that they must take include establish and maintain a NDA or focal point; strategic engagement through country programmes (optional but desirable); identify and seek accreditation of entities, develop projects and apply.

The roles of NDAs and focal points are to convene national stakeholder forums; sign nomination letters for direct access; provide no objection letters for projects/programmes; approval of readiness support, and ensure strategic alignment to national priorities.

Strategic framework and country programme focus on supporting NDA's/focal points to work with national sub national and international stakeholders to develop country work programmes tailored to their needs that set out national priorities and work plans for engagement with the fund (in an NDA/focal point led process that take a gender sensitive approach).

Fit for purpose accreditation allows any entity that is legally established and has a three year track record and a climate change interest to apply for accreditation. Criteria is based around three areas (some can be accredited at lower levels of responsibility, depending on capacity and track records)

- Fiduciary functions
- Environment and social risk capacity
- Project size (Micro >10 mil; small 10 – 50 mil; medium, 50 – 250 mil; large >250 mil)
- Mandate and track record.

The GCF Financial instruments include a wide range of instruments, from grants, to equity to concessional loans and guarantees.

Project approval process goes from the an idea, through to a concept, submission and analysis and recommendations, to board decision and finally results in legal arrangements. More information is available on www.greenclimatefund.org

The Getting ready – Readiness programme has funds that the Secretariat can approve for countries to be able to prepare for proposals. It allows for up to one million USD per country, per year (this may increase). These funds can be used for strengthening NDAs; developing strategic frameworks (300,000 per year limit for these first two); preparing entities for accreditation, developing concepts, sharing information and experiences.

SPREP, SPC can also access up to 10% of a project cost to develop a project proposal (only available for direct access entities at this point, for Developing concepts). Funds can be accessed either directly, or via an accredited entity. Countries can also use different delivery partners for different activities.

If a country wants to develop a larger project (ie SPREP is limited to 50 million USD) then there are limited options of where to go through (ie ADB, World Bank). It was noted that SPREP wont be able to handle a project at the scale large enough to make transformational change. The Fiji National Development Bank is also applying for accreditation.

Potential linkages were identified between the GCF and CTCN:

- Connect NDA's with NDE's in country level consultative arrangement;
- CTCN could assist to test concepts distilled in country programmes;
- CTCN could support TA for assessments, feasibility studies required to support project development. Could use CTCN funding for less than 25k and seeking GCF Readiness funding for greater than that;
- CTCN could support roster of experts GCF is developing.

Questions and comments:

One of the key negotiations ask of SIDS was for the special considitions of SIDS to be recognised – ie capacity issues. It was noted that the fund encourages a mix of modalities, including loans. Issues identified may not be caused by climate change, but what about future projections of climate change, and future generations paying back loans for today's impacts?

Is there a check list for each strategic area to spell out clearly what type of assessment needs to be done ahead of a proposal?

Is there a possibility for an organisation like SPREP to implement up to the amount allowed (ie 50mil) but then another organisation to also come in and take the project to the higher phase – ie SPREP could do the assessment and the smaller areas of work and then the larger entity come in and build the infrastructure?

If we do the maths on what is required, 100 billion for climate change is not enough, so how do we generate more? The GCF looks at how to bring other funds in, for example from the private sector engagement, and through concessional loans etc.

The economics of renewable energy projects are good, but the problem is the upfront capital investment. Once the facility is up, it can repay its own costs. IF the business plan is sound and is certain of a return, then a concessional loan is attractive.

A comment was made that some of the currently accredited entities (eg SPREP, Conservation International) have no previous experience in these other instruments (ie loans etc). It was noted that organisations are only accredited to instruments which they have experience in. Only the World Bank and ADB, for example, have experience with loans.

The CTCN noted that the Pacific gets the same amount for preparedness as larger countries. The CTCN was working at the level of 25 million USD per year, but this has not come through yet. 2016 is planned at 20 million USD, but to date only 12 million is guaranteed (8 million USD gap). Contributions are voluntary (Norway, Denmark, European Union, United States of America and Japan are the current donors). It was noted that the entire technology mechanism of the UNFCCC has less than 20 million USD per year, and financial mechanism has 2 billion USD per year.



There was a strong wish of Parties to get multilateral funding for technology. The GEF refused to fund CTCN (and gave 40 million USD instead to regional development banks. There was a question of the GCF financing CTCN , but this was turned down in Lima (COP 20). The Paris COP (COP 21) agreed to 'linkages' between the CTCN and GCF. We now have to find a role of CTCN that makes sense for the GCF and for NDAs and NDEs.

The GCF representative proposed that NDE's to the CTCN engage with their GCF NDAs as part of their national consultation processes, and noted that there are still large amounts of finance available bilaterally.

DAY Three - Friday 26th of February

Session 8: The Crucial Role of an NDE, Rajiv Garg, CTCN

The role of the NDC is of paramount importance. NDEs are responsible for CTCN's success in accelerating climate technology transfer. The NDE is the climate technology champion, and the NDE roles and responsibilities are in built in the COP decisions.

Origins of NDEs:

4/CP.13: invites Parties in a position to do so to identify and designate their national entity for the development and transfer of technology.

2/CP.17 states that CTCN shall manage the process of receiving and responding to requests from developing Parties and shall work with the network to respond to such requests. The CTCN will receive these requests from NDEs only.

14/CP.18 Invites Parties to nominate their NDEs for the development and transfer of technology.

Possible NDE roles include:

- Act as national CTCN focal point in country.
- Coordinate CTCN activities in the country
- Act as an active member of the global CTCN Network
- Go beyond CTCN activities and become a climate technology champion.
- Environmentally sounds technologies are deployed.
- Expand NDE role beyond CTCN activities; mainstream climate technology issues in national plans, policies and strategies.

It is also up to country NDEs to decide what role their envision for themselves?

The COP has never officially defined the roles of the NDEs. There is a mutual responsibility of Parties to also report to the COP on what Party priorities are for the CTCN. It is not envisioned that all requests handed to CTCN must be from government. CTCN also expects requests to be channelled from the private sector. Other stakeholders can also use the NDE to access the CTCN (requires NDE endorsement).

Countries need to understand their obligations from the Paris Agreement and how the CTCN can help them to meet these obligations. Post Paris it became clear that CTCN can be used to help countries meet NDC obligations, as well as adaptation needs.

A number of NDE's have changed at the national level. The process of appointing an NDE is through a letter or email, from the national UNFCCC focal point (either to CTCN or UNFCCC Sec).

Participants suggested the following roles for NDEs:

- Advocate and coordinate activities of CTCN at national level
- Coordinate CTCN activities
- Advise government on CTCN issues
- NDE as an office and not an individual
- Engage stakeholders regarding CTCN services

- Call stakeholder meetings
- Analyse existing national planning documents, ie NAPS, NAMAs, Nat Coms etc – mapping out the technology needs of these plans
- Know national priorities
- Prioritise requests as they are received nationally
- Implementation and monitoring of climate technology requests
- NDE to monitor and evaluate requests, determine impacts and report these back to the CTCN

More specific roles can include:

1. Act as CTCN focal point:
 - Engage national stakeholders in CTCN related activities
 - Stay informed about CTCN
 - Stay informed about domestic efforts on climate change and climate technologies
 - Disseminate information about CTCN with in country stakeholders
 - Channel to the CTCN relevant info on climate technology related programmes, initiatives, policies etc
 - Facilitate interactions between CTCN and in country stakeholders
 -
2. Coordinate CTCN activities: TA
 - Manage the national submission process of technical assistance requests
 - Select high priority requests, submit them to CTCN and help refining requests
 - Support implementation of technical support by liaising with national stakeholders and the CTCN
 - Contribute to increased information and knowledge sharing through knowledge management systems
 - Provide CTCN with documents and information that are relevant to the knowledge management systems
 - Showcase in knowledge management systems best practices and case studies developed by national actors from public and private sectors
 - Serve as a Network member.

Some suggested areas for NDEs to start with included:

- Identify planned events related to climate change and technologies where you can promote the CTCN at no cost (climate change committees; donor groups; ministerial events; chamber of commerce, conference etc.)
- Identify on-going projects and processes that could need CTCN assistance in removing a specific barrier
- Get in touch with focal points of other mechanisms (GEF, GCF, AF etc)
- Take a look at key documents that can inform your country priorities related to climate technologies, to identify possible request needs (TNA, national strategy for climate change, national communications, INDC etc.)

LDCs have requested operational support for accessing CTCN. It was noted that the incubator programme for LDCs doesn't have specific funds attached to it. There is a need to recognise the specific circumstances of both SIDS and LDCs, in particular the capacity constraints and very limited pool of

staff available. For SIDS there is also an opportunity, because while the focal points are all in one person, that person often has a broader understanding of their national priorities. There may need to be some operational support for SIDS. This issue can be raised through climate change focal points through the UNFCCC COP meetings.

CTCN is considering an incubator programme for SIDS, in the form of technical assistance. This will not necessarily provide funds directly to countries for operational costs.

Where the CTCN can help includes:

- Can provide information materials to promote CTCN
- Provide with training tools to map policies, projects and stakeholders (modules)
- Look at draft requests and provide feedback before submission (support TA formulation)
- Regional meetings where you get to meet other NDEs, GCF focal points and climate technology stakeholders (linkages with the Financial Mechanism)
- Increase knowledge of the CTCN through the Secondment programme (6 months, DSA provided for developing countries) (Information)
- Enhance your understanding of climate technologies through CTCN webinars (capacity building)

Countries were asked to provide information on how their NDE is structured at the national level.

Questions to countries included:

- How is your NDE structured?
- What is your NDEs work on climate technologies?
- Any planned or on-going actions related to CTCN?

Palau's NDE is a person in the office within the Ministry of Finance (which also contains climate change). The NDE has no time (is very busy), so the office will need to further discuss how these responsibilities can be taken on.

The UNEP representative noted that each country does own sector planning, for example through Joint National Action plans (JNAPs). The CTCN can be used as a tool to bring in additional assistance. Additionally, countries have UNFCCC National Communications, Technology Needs Assessments (TNAs) and their INDCs as additional starting points. UNEP will be approaching countries to invite them to participate in the TNAs. Some countries have requested CTCN to carry out their TNA. Countries might wish to do a TNA against ones NDC. We need to also remember that the CTCN is not only about mitigation and NDCs but also includes adaptation.

The CTCN has noted that some countries present have asked for written information materials to help with their national awareness raising on the CTCN.

Session 9: Accessing Technical Assistance through CTCN. Technical Assistance Process and Success Factors, Rajiv Garg, CTCN

A request process has a request proponent, who submits a request and submits it to the NDE. For example, a private sector player, another ministry, and NGO etc. The request then goes through the NDE (who prioritises and endorses) who submits it to CTCN. The CTCN has set a deadline of a response within 1 – 2 weeks. The CTCN then designs a response plan (with experts), within 2 – 8 weeks. Within 3 months, one would expect to see the request move to the implementation phase.

Some of the main barriers to technology transfer include:

- Technological: Limited capacity to assess, adopt, adopt and absorb.
- Financial – lack of access to financing, commercial viability of technologies, lack of instruments.
- Institutional - uncertain government policies; lack of infrastructure, lack of information and awareness, lack of consumer awareness.

CTCNs approach to technical assistance is country driven. Requests have to be results based. They must include the identification of results and a specific plan. Barriers should be removed. Requests need to be integrated, providing a missing component leveraging existing resources and capacities, complimenting existing efforts. They should catalyse action.

CTCN eligibility criteria looks at how would the request contribute to increase resilience and/or mitigation emissions. Is it aligned with national plans? Does it strengthen national capacities? Processes are in place in the country to monitor and evaluate any support provided.

Eligibility criteria include:

- The request must be clear
- It must be in line with national strategies and plans (eg NAPA, NAP, TNA, NC, INDC etc)
- The support will strengthen endogenous capacities. Eg ensures assistance is adapted to local circumstances; ensures local stakeholder interest; strengthen in-country capacity; ensure efficient use of national resources, ensures sustainability.
- Processes are in place in the requesting country to monitor and evaluate any support provided.

Products or services are delivered by a third party, but to ensure that this is done properly, the project proponent will be in the loop. This will be reported by the project proponent, through the NDE to CTCN.'

Prioritization criteria includes:

- Demonstrated project readiness
- Replication or scaling up nationally
- Leverage public or private financing
- Endogenous and appropriate tech
- Multiple benefits
- Gender equality
- Collaboration amongst stakeholders, south south collaboration
- Multi country approaches

TA response plan design must include the following Response plan objectives:

- Convert brief request in to an action plan
- Clarify the strategic barrier/challenge to be addressed
- Articulate 'terms of reference'
- Estimated budget
- Ensure shared ownership

The response plan is approved by CTCN and NDE. The sections of the response plans include: request summary; objective and expected impacts; CTCN assistance (activities and products); planning and

milestones of key deliverables; main partners and synergies; estimated budget; monitoring of response.

TA response is classified as a rapid response. Rapid response can be for up to 50,000 USD and is delivered by consortium partners.

Larger response projects are between 50 – 250, 000 USD and tendering is open for competition amongst network members.

Countries asked what are the opportunities for a CTCN post to be located in the Pacific? It was noted that there is a CTCN representative in Bangkok. The UNEP Pacific sub regional office will also provide support. The CTCN has a representative in Latin America (Marta Morneo). CTCN will have one in Nairobi (Africa). There is a need to look at how a post might be in the Pacific. It was also noted that UNIDO will be opening an office in Tonga.

Network membership is still open, membership is free, and would allow for national organisations to also become members.

Workshop Close.

Closing words from SPREP, Dr Netatua Pelesikoti, SPREP

Dr Pelesikoti thanked UNEP CTCN for the workshop in the region. She remembered days from working in the national government. The times of there being no money or resources is now gone. CTCN and other mechanisms now exist, but it is time now for countries to do their part. Countries should also collaborate with their national NDA, AF, and GEF focal points. Countries were reminded to ensure that they are not duplicating work that other focal points are doing. Dr Pelesikoti encouraged countries to sit down with existing policies, national development strategies, JNAPs, climate and sector policies etc, and to go over these to identify technology needs and gaps and use these to consult their stakeholders. The Pacific is known for consultation fatigue, so it is important to do assessments of existing strategies and information first, and to look at already identified priorities.

Technology is more than hardware, but is also includes skill sets, knowledge gaps and what can be replicated to outer islands etc. CTCN is about addressing climate change. Countries need to be familiar with climate change data, not only historical but also future projections. Countries were encouraged to work with national meteorological services, disaster management offices and all key sectors in country. Countries can also look at the RTSM in the region as well as other existing organisations (www.pacificclimatechange.net or www.sprep.org). IF the requests are above and beyond RTSM capacity we can also share with CTCN.

Finally, Dr Pelesikoti thanked SPC and USP for being at the Forum, and encouraged both agencies to also register within the CTCN network.

Closing words from CTCN, Jukka Uosukanien, Director of the CTCN

The Director thanked participants for attending. CTCN has learned a lot in this forum. The CTCN is the newest of the institutions that are here. Countries have good friends from many bilateral agencies (ie Australia, Japan, EU). CTCN now has a problem on how to work in this crowded place.

There is a challenge with the CTCN being limited to only technical assistance. Bilateral donors have larger funds behind them, and CTCN understand that countries will use them. It is up to countries to



define exactly where CTCN can help. If there are any gaps, and if urgent help is needed this is a good place to use CTCN. CTCN are humble.

It was noted that the Pacific have made very ambitious pledges in their INDCs. CTCN would be happy to help with these. The CTCN has now discussed with Tonga deputy Prime Minister on a high level very senior prominent expert advice – i.e. from whom countries would take technologies from, consequences of certain technologies (ie maintenance etc) – a neutral expert to assess the implications of this.

Samoa NDE thanked the CTCN and other organisations on behalf of the country participants. Samoa will make an effort to share this information with other departments also. Samoa also gave thanks to the government of Tonga for their good accommodation, setting and food. INDCs are ambitious but this is as our leaders wish – as the Pacific wishes to be ambitious and show leadership.

Participant Evaluations

Nine participants in total completed the evaluation forms (with one participant not completing all of the questions).

The responses from the evaluations were positive over all, with no major problems or dissatisfaction reported. Overall, the majority reported the workshop positively, with 5 stating it was 'very good' and 3 stating it was excellent.

All presentations were found to be useful, and only two participants were unhappy with the length of the workshop, finding it too short. A detailed analysis of participants responses is found in Annex 3, below.

Annex 1: Participants list

Regional Forum for National Designated Entities
Region: Pacific SIDS
24-26 February 2016
Tungi Colonnade Hotel, Nuku'alofa, Tonga

Final List of Participants

Cook Islands

1. Mr. William Tuivaga
SRIC Manager
Climate Change Cook Islands
Office of the Prime Minister
Private Bag, Avarua
Rarotonga
Cook Islands
Phone: (682) 25 494 ext 7010
Fax: (682) 20 856
Email: William.tuivaga@cookislands.gov.ck

Kiribati

2. Mr. Michael Foon
Office of Te Beretitenti
PO Box 68
Bairiki, Tarawa
Kiribati
Phone: (686) 21 183
Fax: (686) 21 902
Email: mfoon@ob.gov.ki

Marshall Islands

3. Mr. Warwick Harris



Deputy Director

Office of Environment Planning & Policy Coordination (OEPPC)

PO Box 975

Phone:

Majuro

Fax:

Republic of Marshall Islands

Email: warwick47@gmail.com

Niue

4. Mr. Scanland Mitiepo

Manager

Information Technology Services, Networks and Engineering

Niue Telecommunication Department

Ministry of Infrastructure

Government of Niue

Phone:

Alofi

Fax:

Niue

Email: scan.mitiepo@mail.gov.nu

Palau

5. Ms. Lorraine Rivera

Climate Change Mitigation Coordinator

Office of Climate Change

PO Box 6011

Phone: (680) 767 8681 Mob: (680)775-7030

Ngerulmud, Melekeok

Fax: (680) 767 1006

Republic of Palau 96940

Email: lorraine.rivera@gmail.com

Samoa

6. Suluimalo Mr. Amataga Penaia

Chief Executive Officer

Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources

PO Box 3020

Phone: (685) 23800

Apia

Fax: (685) 23176

Samoa

Email: amataga.penaia@mnre.gov.ws

Solomon Islands

7. Mr. Hudson Kauhiona

Deputy Director

Climate Change Division

Ministry of Environment

PO Box 21

Phone:

Honiara

Fax:

Solomon Islands

Email: hkhiona@gmail.com

Tonga

8. Mr. Paula Ma'u

Chief Executive Officer

Ministry of Lands, Environment, Energy, Climate Change,

Disaster Management, Meteorology, Information & Communication

PO Box 1380

Phone: (676) 28170

Nukualofa

Fax:

Tonga

Email: paulm@mic.gov.to

9. Ms. Luisa Tuiafitu-Malolo

Director of Climate Change



Ministry of Lands, Environment, Energy, Climate Change,

Disaster Management, Meteorology, Information & Communication

PO Box 1380

Phone: (676) 28170

Nukualofa

Fax:

Tonga

Email: tuiafitumalolo@gmail.com

10. Dr. Tevita Tukunga

Director of Energy

Department of Energy

Ministry of Lands, Environment, Energy, Climate Change,

Disaster Management, Meteorology, Information & Communication

PO Box 1380

Phone: (676) 28170

Nukualofa

Fax:

Tonga

Email:

11. Mr. Kakau Foliaki

Principal Energy Planner

Ministry of Lands, Environment, Energy, Climate Change,

Disaster Management, Meteorology, Information & Communication

PO Box 1380

Phone: (676) 28170

Nukualofa

Fax:

Tonga

Email:

12. Mr. Sione Fulivai

Climate Change

Ministry of Lands, Environment, Energy, Climate Change,



Disaster Management, Meteorology, Information & Communication

PO Box 130

Phone: (676) 28170

Nukualofa

Fax:

Tonga

Email: talo_is@hotmail.com

13. Ms. Ofa Kaisamy

Principal Policy & Planning Analyst

Department of Climate Change

Ministry of Lands, Environment, Energy, Climate Change,

Disaster Management, Meteorology, Information & Communication

PO Box 1380

Phone: (676) 26514

Nukualofa

Fax:

Tonga

Email: okaisamy@gmail.com

14. Ms. Losana Latu

Climate Change Officer

Vulnerability & Adaptation Section

Department of Climate Change

Ministry of Lands, Environment, Energy, Climate Change,

Disaster Management, Meteorology, Information & Communication

PO Box 1380

Phone: (676) 26514

Nukualofa

Fax:

Tonga

Email: latulosana@gmail.com

15. Mr. Hikaione Loumoli

Department of Climate Change

Ministry of Lands, Environment, Energy, Climate Change,



Disaster Management, Meteorology, Information & Communication

PO Box 1380

Phone: (676) 778 44542

Nukualofa

Fax:

Tonga

Email: kaionelou@gmail.com

16. Mr. Finau Hufanga

Communication Advisor

Ministry of Lands, Environment, Energy, Climate Change,

Disaster Management, Meteorology, Information & Communication

PO Box 1380

Phone: (676)

Nukualofa

Fax:

Tonga

Email:

Tuvalu

17. Mr. Jamie Ovia

Project Development Officer

Climate Change Policy Unit

Office of the Prime Minister

PO Box

Phone:

Funafuti

Fax:

Tuvalu

Email: jammin.ovia537@gmail.com

Organisations

Australia Government

18. Mr. Byron Fay
Adviser
Green Climate Fund Taskforce
Multilateral Development & Finance Division
Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
RG Casey Building
John McEwen Crescent
Barton, ACT 0221
Australia
- Phone: (61) 02 6178 5185
Fax: (61) 0466 359 06
Email: byron.fay@dfat.gov.au

Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)

19. Mr. Pau Likiliki
Representative
FAO
Nukualofa
Tonga
- Phone: (676)
Fax:
Email: Pau.Likiliki@fao.org

Green Climate Fund

20. Ms. Coral Pasisi
Regional Adviser for Pacific
Green Climate Fund
175, Art center-daero
Yeonsu-gu, Incheon 22004
- Phone: (683) 4106
Fax:



Republic of Korea

Email: cpasisi@gcfund.org

International Institute for Energy Conservation (IIEC)

21. Ms Sirikul Prasitpianchai

Senior Project Manager

International Institute for Energy Conservation (IIEC)
Asia Regional Office 12th Floor,
United Business Center II Bldg., (UBC II) Suite 1208, 591
Sukhumvit Rd. (Corner Soi 33),
Wattana, Bangkok 10110
Thailand

Phone: (66) 2 662 3460 5

Fax: (66) 2 261 8615

Email: sprasitpianchai@iiec.org

ITP Renewable Energy Consulting

22. Mr. Oliver Woldring

Senior Consultant – International Development

ITP Renewable Energy Consulting

Southern Cross House

6/9 McKay St

PO Bo 6127

O'Connor, ACT 2602

Australia

Phone: +61 (0) 2 6257 3511

Fax: +61 (0) 2 6257 3611

Email: oliver.woldring@itpau.com.au

Pacific Community (SPC)

23. Mr. Solomone Fifita

Deputy Director (Energy)

Economic Development Division

Pacific Community

Private Mail Bag

Phone: (679) 337 9413



Suva

Fax: (679) 337 9416

Fiji

Email: solomonef@spc.int

24. Ms. Sarah Hemstock

Team Leader EU-PacTVET

Economic Development Division

Pacific Community

Private Mail Bag

Phone: (679) 337 0733

Suva

Fax: (679) 337 0146

Fiji

Email: sarahh@spc.int

Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP)

25. Dr. Netatua Pelesikoti

Director, Climate Change Division

SPREP

PO Box 240

Phone: (685) 21929 (direct) 66209

Apia

Fax: (685) 20231

Samoa

Email: netatuap@sprep.org

26. Ms. Diane McFadzien

Climate Change Adaptation Adviser

Climate Change Division

PO Box 240

Phone: (685) 21929 ext 242

Apia

Fax: (685) 20231

Samoa

Email: dianem@sprep.org

27. Ms. Joyce Tulua

Division Assistance

Climate Change Division



PO Box 240

Phone: (685) 21929 ext 240

Apia

Fax: (685) 20231

Samoa

Email: joyct@sprep.org

United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)

28. Mr Jukka Uosukkainen

Climate Technology Center and Network (CTCN)

United Nations Environment Programme

UN City, Mammorvej 51

Phone: (45)

2100 Copenhagen

Fax:

Denmark

Email:

29. Mr Rajiv Garg

Network and Capacity Building Manager

Climate Technology Center and Network (CTCN)

United Nations Environment Programme

UN City, Mammorvej 51

Phone: (45) 4533 5378

2100 Copenhagen

Fax:

Denmark

Email: rajiv.garg@unep.org

30. Mr. Sefanaia Nawadra

Coordinator, UNEP Pacific Office

SPREP Campus

PO Box 240

Phone: (685)

Apia

Fax:

Samoa

Email: Sefanaia.nawadra@unep.org

University of the South Pacific (USP)

31. Dr. Morgan Wairiu

Deputy Director

Pacific Centre for Environment and Sustainable Development

The University of the South Pacific

Laucala Bay Road

Phone: (679) 323 2578

Suva

Fax: (679) 323 291

Fiji

Email: wairiu_m@usp.ac.fj

Annex 2: Workshop Agenda

Regional Forum for National Designated Entities

**Region: Pacific SIDS Date:
24-26 February 2016**

Venue: Tungi Colonnade Hotel, Nuku'alofa, Tonga

Language: English

Objectives

Develop and strengthen the regional network of National Designated Entities (NDEs), and their relationship with other technology stakeholders;

- Share experiences on:
 - o NDEs set-up and activities at national level
 - o Use of CTCN Technical Assistance, and other CTCN services

- Discuss the Paris Outcome in relation to Technology Transfer and its implications for the Technology Mechanism;

- Present the CTCN and its services; describe and clarify NDE roles and responsibilities, as well the processes to submit requests for technical assistance to the CTCN;

- Present best practices regarding technical assistance from the region and from other island states

- Facilitate linkages between CTCN technical assistance and financial mechanisms, financiers and institutions that are relevant to Climate Technologies, with a view to identify matchmaking opportunities to secure funding for follow-up actions to CTCN requests or other climate technology activities;



Participants (*approx. 40*)

- NDEs from SIDS and other countries in the Pacific
- CTCN Staff and Consortium partners
- Representatives from Financial Institutions
- Climate Technology Network members from within the region, and potential members
- Host Government representatives

Methodology

- Presentations, group exercises, and group discussions – possibly supplemented by e-courses, and/or webinars in the following months.
- PLEASE NOTE that all discussions and presentations of the forum will be conducted in English
- Developing country government representatives are entitled to travel support and a daily subsistence allowance as per UN rules

Agenda

DAY 1		
Time	Session	Presenter/Facilitator
9:00- 10:00	Opening of Regional Forum for NDEs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Official opening by Hon. Siaosi Sovaleni, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister responsible for Climate Change - J. Uosukainen, CTCN - N. Pelesikoti, SPREP 	J. Uosukainen, CTCN Hon. Siaosi Sovaleni, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister responsible for Climate Change, Tonga
10:00 – 10:30	Group and Tea/Coffee Break	
10:30 – 11:00	Session 9 – The Regional Perspective <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Case studies of regional climate mitigation/ adaptation in the Pacific region/island countries <p>Group discussion on technology needs in the region and</p>	S. Fifita, SPC N. Pelesikoti, SPREP M. Diubanova, FAO
11:00 – 11:15	Session 8 – Australia’s work on Climate Technologies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Australia’s work on Climate Technologies in the region and 	J. Uosukainen, CTCN NDE from Australia
11:15 – 13:00	Bilateral meetings with CTCN Director and Network and Capacity Building Manager <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Upon request. Please write to Giulia Ferrini 	J. Uosukainen, CTCN R. Garg, CTCN
13:00 – 14:00	Lunch	
14:00 – 15:00	Bilateral meetings with CTCN Director and Network and Capacity Building Manager <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Upon request. Please write to Giulia Ferrini 	J. Uosukainen, CTCN R. Garg, CTCN
15:00 – 15:15	Tea/Coffee	
15:00 – 17:00	Bilateral meetings with CTCN Director and Network and Capacity Building Manager <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Upon request. Please write to Giulia Ferrini 	J. Uosukainen, CTCN R. Garg, CTCN
17:00 – 17:15	Wrap-up day 1	J. Uosukainen, CTCN
17:30 – 19:30	Networking Cocktail	

DAY 2		
Time	Session	Presenter/Facilitator
9:00 – 10:00	Session 1- CTCN Introduction and Updates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation on CTCN history, mission, structure - Updates and achievements under the 3 core services of the CTCN: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Technical Assistance ✓ Information & Knowledge: The CTCN Knowledge 	R. Garg, CTCN
10:00 – 10:30	Individual Exercise Current impressions/understanding/expectations of what the CTCN will provide as services	All NDEs
10:30- 10:45	Tea/Coffee	
10:45 – 12:00	Session 2 - The Paris Outcome <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implications for the Technology Mechanism - Implications for the Financial Mechanism - Implications for Pacific Island countries 	J. Uosukainen, CTCN D. McFadzien, SPREP C. Pasisi, GCF
12.00 – 13:00	Session 3 - The Crucial Role of NDEs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation of CTCN vision on roles, responsibilities and structure 	R. Garg, CTCN S. Nawadra, UNEP All NDEs
13.00 – 14.00	Lunch	
14.00 – 14.30	Session 4 - Accessing Technical Assistance through CTCN <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Generating and Submitting Requests for Technical Assistance - Technical Response Planning and Implementation 	R. Garg, CTCN
14.30 – 15.00	Session 4 – Accessing Technical Assistance through CTCN (cont.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation on NDE’s experience on requests development/generation Discussion / Q&A	S. Nawadra, UNEP NDEs from Tonga and Nauru
15.00 – 15.15	Tea/Coffee	

15.15 - 16.00	<p>Group exercise on request template</p> <p>Participants are divided into groups and given a draft narrative of two different requests and are asked to complete the CTCN request submission form.</p>	<p>All NDEs</p> <p>R. Garg, CTCN</p>
16:00 - 17:00	<p>Session 7 - Linking the Technology and Financial Mechanisms</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Green Climate Fund: updates and perspectives on linkages to CTCN assistance 	<p>J. Uosukainen, CTCN C. Pasisi, GCF</p>
17:00 - 19:00	Closing reception	

DAY 3		
Time	Session	Presenter/Facilitator
9:00 - 10:00	Group Exercise - Examples of requests countries plan to submit to the CTCN that would help removing mitigation or adaptation-related technology barriers based on	S. Nawadra, UNEP R. Garg, CTCN
10:00 - 10:30	Session 6 - The Climate Technology Network - Presentation on the CTCN Climate Technology Network - Presentation of network members on case studies related to climate technologies in the region	R. Garg, CTCN O. Woldring, IT Power Australia Sirikul
10:30- 10:45	Tea/Coffee	
10:45 - 11:30	Session 6 - The Climate Technology Network - Presentation on the CTCN Climate Technology Network - Presentation of network members on case studies related to climate technologies in the region	R. Garg, CTCN O. Woldring, IT Power Australia Sirikul
11.30 - 13.00	Wrap-up and way forward	J. Uosukainen, CTCN
13.00- 14.00	Lunch	
14.00 - 15.00	Bilateral meetings with CTCN Director and Network and Capacity Building Manager	J. Uosukainen, CTCN R. Garg, CTCN
15.00 - 15.15	Tea/Coffee	
15.15 - 16:30	Bilateral meetings with CTCN Director and Network and Capacity Building Manager	J. Uosukainen, CTCN R. Garg, CTCN

Upon request, Please write to Cecilia Ferrini



Annex 3: Participants Evaluation forms

1. In what capacity did you attend this regional Forum

NDE	Network Member	Climate Change Focal Point	Other
4			5
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consortium member • Support officer to the NDE • Prospective network member

2. The presenters and trainers were knowledgeable and prepared

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Slightly agree	Neither agree or disagree	Slightly disagree	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree
6	3					

3. The materials presented in the forum (PPTs, hand outs) were well designed, readable and useful for future work.

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Slightly agree	Neither agree or disagree	Slightly disagree	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree
6	3					

4. The forum contributed to my understanding of the Paris Outcome and of its implications for the region, the Technology Mechanism and the Financial Mechanism.

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Slightly agree	Neither agree or disagree	Slightly disagree	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree
1	5	3				



CTCN
CLIMATE TECHNOLOGY CENTRE & NETWORK



**SPREP
PROE**

5. The forum contributed to my understanding of the CTCN and its services

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Slightly agree	Neither agree or disagree	Slightly disagree	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree
6	3					

6. The forum contributed to my understanding of the NDE role and responsibilities.

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Slightly agree	Neither agree or disagree	Slightly disagree	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree
6	3					

7. The forum contributed to my understanding of the CTCN request – response process

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Slightly agree	Neither agree or disagree	Slightly disagree	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree
6	3					

8. The forum contributed to my understanding of the linkages between CTCN and other UNFCCC mechanisms.

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Slightly agree	Neither agree or disagree	Slightly disagree	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree
3	4	2				

9. The forum enhanced my capacity to access finance for climate technology projects.

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Slightly agree	Neither agree or disagree	Slightly disagree	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree
4	2	3				



10. The forum increased my understanding of opportunities and mechanisms for climate technology transfer in the region.

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Slightly agree	Neither agree or disagree	Slightly disagree	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree
3	4	2				

11. The length of the forum was:

Much too long	Too long	long	Neither long or short	short	Too short	Much too short
			7	2		

12. The facilities added to a positive learning experience

Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Slightly agree	Neither agree or disagree	Slightly disagree	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree
4	3	2				

13. What specifically did you like most?

- Adaptability
- I liked the presentations that reflected our country's views
- Good practical presentations and simple processes
- Open discussions and the question and answer sessions. Presentations were ok.
- Presentation of the NDE role and submission of request process (and lunch)
- Presentation on request submissions form, clarifying what is required from NDEs
- Chance to talk one on one to CTCN staff about services offered and possibility of uptake
- Elaboration of direct and indirect roles of NDE in the country and its link with the CTCN
- Presentations re CTCN services and response process, network members presentations, GCF presentation, overall the opportunities to meet and network with other NDEs and representatives from the region

14. What specifically did you like least?

- I think it needed more regional points of views from the Pacific
- Nothing
- How cyclone Winston interfered with the programme
- It was all ok
- Too brief of a presentation regarding the Paris outcomes



15. What would you recommend be improved for NDE regional Fora in other parts of the world?

- To have an expert in the region that can relate to the regions circumstances
- Right format
- Work through a regional partner
- Include more than one participant per country that that NDEs and a support officer can both attend
- Strengthen CTCN presence in the region
- I think all was ok, also coped well due to circumstances of cyclone Winston. Maybe more recognition of regional differences and similarities.
- More interactive dialogue with NDEs to provide issues and matters they are not well versed about their roles and the application process for national proposals and requests
- Maybe one more day to cover everything

16. What would you recommend be topics of a future NDE forum in the region?

- Projects that have been completed and positive lessons learned
- OK as it is. Good to have regional context updated so have an understanding of the playing field
- Operationalizing the CTCN in country, the specifics
- Focus more on type of activities or level of clarity needed in order for a request to be considered
- Status of CTCN projects in the Pacific
- Equal emphasis of climate change adaptation and RE
- Discuss their climate TNA and how to assist with the prioritisation of options
- More on developing the Technical Assistance requests, and more on the NDE roles and responsibilities

17. What are things that you will do differently based on what you learned by participating in the Forum?

- I would have shown more views that related to my country
- Ok as it is
- Nothing differently. I will start doing something to assist our CTCN work in country
- Raise awareness in country on CTCN, especially as there are a lot of requests for activities that could qualify under the CTCN
- Not sure, depends on results of our CTCN support
- Start with engagement of our national stakeholders and firm up the NDE roles in our national structure/organisation
- I will do more stakeholder consultations to identify opportunities to utilize the CTCN



18. What is your overall assessment of the NDE regional Forum?

Excellent	Very good	good	average	Barely acceptable	poor	Very poor
3	5					

Why?

Excellent - good short presentations, clear and lots of interaction.

Excellent – for some countries there is very little awareness of NDEs on the processes. You will definitely see applications from my country (Kiribati)

Excellent – the forum provided me with the knowledge to actually use the CTCN effectively. I learned more than I expected. Very informative and excellent presenters, facilitators and coordinators.

Very good – It was very good in the sense that the presenters were very informative and the discussions, especially the projects and GCF regional examples

Very good – I enjoyed sharing my experiences and hearing the experiences of others from the region. The workshop was the right time. Hearing from the representatives of the CTCN was great.

Very good – for the first time it is helpful to have CTCN officers in the region and an explanation of their functions and support.

Very good – Programme had to be changed as a result of Tropical Cyclone Winston so maybe more time for going into details would have been good.

Contact details for feedback:

Jamie Ovia; Tuvalu Office of the Prime Minister, jovia@gov.tv

William Tuivaga. Cook Islands Office of the Prime Minister, William.tuivaga@cooislands.gov.ck

Michael Foon, Office of the President, Kiribati, mfoon@ob.gov.ki

Sarah, SPC/USP, sharh@spc.int

Ametaga Penaia, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, Samoa, amataga.penaia@mnre.gov.ws

Lorraine Rivera, Palau Office of Climate Change, Lorraine.rivera@gmail.com