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Background

In December 2011, at the 17th Conference of the Parties (COP) in Durban, Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) decided to launch a process to develop a protocol, another legal instrument or an agreed outcome with legal force under the Convention applicable to all Parties, to be completed no later than 2015.

At COP 19 in Warsaw, Parties were invited to initiate or intensify domestic preparations for their intended nationally determined contributions and to communicate them well in advance of COP 21 (by the first quarter of 2015 by those Parties ready to do so), in a manner that facilitates the clarity, transparency and understanding of the intended nationally determined contributions. Consequently, countries will begin to prepare their intended nationally determined contributions (hereafter referred to as INDCs) under some degree of uncertainty, but likely based on past experiences under the Convention.

COP 19 also decided to urge and request developed country Parties, the operating entities of the financial mechanism and any other organizations in a position to do so to provide support for developing country Parties to initiate or intensify domestic preparations of their INDCs, as early as possible in 2014.

In response to this request, in April 2014, the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) in cooperation with the UNFCCC Secretariat launched a series of Regional Technical Dialogues to support countries in the process of preparing and putting forward their INDCs. This project is receiving financial support form Austria, Belgium, the European Union, France, Germany, Norway, the United Kingdom and the United States.

The Regional Technical Dialogues on INDCs have the following objectives:

• To ensure that participants understand the scientific context and UNFCCC origins of INDCs;
• To share experiences and best practices in developing INDCs, and to identify solutions to challenges that countries are facing;
• To address issues related to the underlying technical basis required to prepare robust, realistic and achievable INDCs;
• To identify support needs required to reach domestic agreement on INDCs and follow-up actions.

Summary

The African Regional Technical Dialogue on INDCs was held in Accra, Ghana from 14-16 May 2014. A total of 67 participants attended, representing 30 countries from the African Region (19 of which were Least Developed Countries), six developed countries and the European Union. Country delegates were joined by a number of representatives from multilateral and bilateral agencies, regional organizations and think tanks. The complete list of participants and each attendee’s contact information can be found in Appendix I of this report.

The agenda of the two-and-a-half day Dialogue included sessions on the scientific and political context for INDCs, lessons learned from past efforts under the UNFCCC, as well as on the key
considerations when preparing INDCs, specifically the scope of INDCs, ensuring a consultative process, the underlying technical basis, critical information to be included, transparency and measurement, reporting and verification (MRV). Participants were also given the opportunity to engage in breakout group discussions on scenarios related the domestic preparation of INDCs and to respond to focused questions related to the content, packaging and transparency of INDCs. A panel discussion on the last day featured organizations with initiatives or programs that could concretely promote and support developing countries in the preparation of their contributions. The Dialogue concluded with participants exchanging ideas on how to ensure momentum in the preparation of INDCs, including possible next steps.

Most sessions consisted of country presentations from national experts who shared their perspectives on INDCs and discussed national progress to date, challenges, lessons learned and needs related to INDCs. Participants were then given a chance to ask questions, followed by general discussion and exchange of views. The agenda for the African Dialogue can be found in Appendix II of this report.

This report chronologically summarizes the information presented and discussed throughout the Dialogue, with the intent of capturing the key messages and ideas put forward during the discussions. The messages highlighted here should not be considered an exhaustive account of all interventions, nor do they indicate that consensus was reached on any specific point.

**Key Takeaways**

1. The African Region is actively seeking to engage on INDCs and there is widespread interest from countries in the preparation of INDCs.

2. Capacity to develop INDCs is limited, due to a lack of financial and technical resources to carry out the preparation of INDCs and the challenges of attaining high-level political support. The short timeframe for preparing contributions also presents a significant challenge for the Region.

3. For the African Region, INDCs should contribute to the ultimate objective of the Convention of reducing dangerous anthropogenic climate change and be linked to other national priorities such as sustainable development, poverty reduction and an increase in climate resilience. Adaptation is a priority for the Region, and it is critical that the 2015 agreement increase the importance of adaptation, as well as finance, technology transfer and capacity building. There is interest in more technical work on adaptation.

4. Many African countries are increasingly mainstreaming and prioritizing climate change into their development plans and green growth strategies. These countries could begin preparing their INDCs by identifying components of these plans, strategies and policies, etc. that could
be packaged into a contribution. Countries could also consider “scaling-up” their Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) in the post 2020 period as an INDC.

5. Stakeholder processes, and in particular high-level political leadership and engagement are critical to the success of INDCs. Participants suggested the following ideas for generating such leadership: approaching contributions as catalysts of development and poverty eradication, linking climate change to domestic policy issues and/or having a domestic political champion to secure national resources and sectorial engagement. Participants also suggested increasing high-level political engagement on INDCs at the regional level, for example through the African Ministerial Conference on the Environment (AMCEN).

6. National GHG inventories are a critical starting place for preparing a contribution as they allow a country to identify the highest emitting sectors and subsequently consider possibilities for reductions in priority sectors. However, issues of data availability and data quality are a significant concern for countries in the Region, especially for Least Developed Countries (LDCs). Additionally, many countries lack the capacity and/or national expertise to carry out the technical analysis needed to prepare INDCs.

7. Participants discussed ideas about the level of information that Parties should include with their INDCs to make them transparent and aggregatable. The World Resources Institute presented a range of possible types of mitigation contributions and the critical information needed to provide transparency, by contribution type.

8. Financial and technical support is critical for the preparation and implementation of INDCs. Technical cooperation should not only help provide the analytical basis required to develop a contribution, but also support government agencies in linking contributions to national development and in convening stakeholder consultations to secure national support.

9. Many participants arrived at the Dialogue seeking clarity on the scope and legal format of INDCs. Participants were able to propose and discuss their various views on these matters. One regional participant specifically described INDCs as “the reductions that countries will bring to the table for the 2015 agreement”.

10. A number of participants requested guidance materials on INDC design and preparation. There is also interest in attending subsequent technical dialogues to continue sharing experiences, progress made, challenges, and needs related to INDCs.

11. Participants discussed the issue of ambition, in the context of building an effective and fair 2015 agreement. Participants discussed how countries might tell a story of ambition and low-carbon development pathways as part of their INDCs. They also emphasized that ambition should be framed in the context of the objective and principles of the Convention and based on transparent information about what other countries are doing.
Workshop Proceedings

Opening Session
During the opening session, participants were welcomed by Mr. Fredua Agyeman, Director of Environment of the Ministry of Environment, Science, Technology and Innovation, Mr. Donald Cooper, Coordinator of the Mitigation, Data and Analysis Program of the UNFCCC Secretariat and Mr. Jeremias Blaser, UNDP Deputy Country Director in Ghana. Ms. Rebecca Carman from the UNDP Energy and Environment Group presented a summary of the UNFCCC results from Durban, Doha and Warsaw and explained the UNFCCC context for INDCs, as well as the objectives and expectations for the African Technical Dialogue.

Session 1: Scene-setting on INDCs: the Scientific Basis and Lessons From Past Efforts Under UNFCCC

Objective
The objective of this session was to ensure that all participants had a common understanding of the scientific basis for INDCs and to share lessons learned under the UNFCCC that could support the preparation of INDCs.

Presentations
UNEP Risoe Centre
Mr. Emmanuel Ackom presented the main findings of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Emissions Gap Report.

Key messages include:
• Even if the Cancun pledges are fully implemented, the emissions gap in 2020 will be 8–12 GtCO2e per year, assuming least-cost emission pathways. Limited available information indicates that the emissions gap in 2020 to meet a 1.5°C target in 2020 is a further 2–5 GtCO2e per year wider.
• The application of strict accounting rules for national mitigation action could narrow the emissions gap by 1–2 GtCO2e. In addition, moving from unconditional to conditional pledges could narrow the gap by 2–3 GtCO2e and increasing the scope of current pledges could further narrow the gap by 1.8 GtCO2e. These three steps can bring us halfway to bridging the gap. The remaining gap can be bridged through further national and international action.
• There is a tradeoff between mitigation and adaptation action, and the costs associated with this action, as the world approaches 2°C of warming. The less the world acts and spends on mitigation, the more it will have to act and spend on adaptation, and most likely disproportionately so.

Malawi
Mr. Evans Njewa shared Malawi’s general understanding of INDCs:
• INDCs are determined nationally based on national circumstances.
• For developing countries, INDCs should be supported by developed countries and other organizations.
• The scope of INDCs includes mitigation, adaptation, technology transfer and capacity-building efforts to be carried out at a country level.
• The African Region includes most of the world’s LDCs, and should therefore be viewed in a particular context when it comes to the preparation of INDCs.

Malawi has a wide scope of existing climate change efforts to build on, including its First and Second National Communications (NCs), National Adaptation Program of Action (NAPA), Technology Needs Assessment (TNA), National Climate Change Policy and its National Climate Change Investment Plan. Malawi is currently developing NAMAs, a National Adaptation Plan (NAP) and a national climate change fund. These efforts have been supported solely by Global Environment Facility (GEF) funding. Malawi is planning to take all of this work and align it as part of its INDC.

Lessons learned from the experience in Malawi include:
• NCs and NAMAs have generated capacity and knowledge relevant to the preparation of INDCs.
• There is a need to consult with all relevant stakeholders from the beginning of the process.
• There is a need to ensure that decision-makers support the concepts being elaborated.
• Involve multi-sectorial teams to generate ownership and build capacity, rather than just employing consultants.
• Develop an implementation plan with assigned roles and responsibilities for key stakeholders.

Some of the key challenges related to preparing INDCs include:
• Limited technical capacity at national level and difficulties finding national consultants with the ability to carry out modeling and analysis of climate impacts.
• Generating interest and buy-in from sectorial actors, decision-makers and politicians.
• Most of the recommendations made on climate change in various reports are not implemented fully due to a lack of funding.
• Extreme poverty hinders the prioritization of climate change at all levels of government.

Suggestions for the way forward for supporting the development of INDCs include: offering training to UNFCCC Focal Points that can allow them to take the lead on INDCs nationally, sharing information/experience on technical models that could be useful for preparing INDCs and providing developing countries with financial support to initiate their preparations.

Discussion
The following key messages emerged from the question and answer session and the discussion among participants:

Political framework:
• Importance of engaging ministers in the preparation of INDCs, especially the finance minister.
• Existing policies provide a general framework for implementation in Malawi, as they set guiding principles for addressing adaptation, mitigation and means of implementation.
• Prioritizing climate change in development plans can elevate climate change as a relevant issue for a number of ministries, in addition to the ministry of environment.

Technical and support needs:
• NCs are an excellent starting point for technical work on baselines, projections and modeling.
• Additional funding is needed to attract experienced local consultants.
• Funding sources should be expanded to avoid a high dependence on GEF funding.

On INDCs:
• Participants from many countries stated that INDCs should touch upon adaptation, finance, technology transfer and capacity building, in addition to mitigation. However, some participants expressed concerns about how to include adaptation in the INDCs, as these may end up as legally binding commitments.
• LDCs would likely focus their INDCs on agriculture and forestry, given the importance of these sectors for their economies and contribution to their overall GHG emissions.
• Some participants emphasized the need for more understanding, analysis and collaboration before beginning work on INDCs.
• Countries that have not yet started preparing their INDCs expressed interest in seeing what other countries plan to submit. One participant suggested that the UN Secretary General’s Climate Change Summit in September 2014 be centered on the tools and approach to INDCs, and specifically what needs to be included in the submission of INDCs.

Session 2: Key Considerations When Preparing INDCs – Ensuring a Consultative and Development-Oriented Process

Objective
The objective of this session was to learn how countries are engaging a broad range of stakeholders, building consensus and leveraging other relevant national activities to prepare INDCs that are aligned with national development goals.

Presentations
Ghana
Mr. Kyekyeku Oppong-Boadi presented Ghana’s approach to formulating its INDCs. Ghana is committed to a low-carbon growth path and climate resilient programs, as established in its National Climate Change Policy.

Ghana’s work plan to develop its INDC includes the following steps:
• Internal consultations starting in June 2014.
• Preparation of an initial consultation paper and organization of a national technical brainstorming session, which would both address baseline information.
• Preparation of a strategy note to be used in meetings with key ministries and ministers.
• The national formulation process is estimated to begin in July 2014. This will require the mobilization of domestic and external funding and technical support.

Ghana is working internally to decide which elements to include in its INDC, to define the tools and methodologies for developing their baseline and other scenarios and for setting a target, as well as to develop a national MRV and implementation structure. The presenter stressed that the Government is moving forward with the preparation of their INDC based on existing information. To date, Ghana has faced challenges in carrying out technical work, engaging public
participation, creating high-level awareness and visibility, convening internal political consultations and mobilizing funding from domestic and external sources.

**Gambia**
Mr. Alpha Jallow described how the Gambian Government is working towards mainstreaming climate change and development, including through the integration of climate change into the country’s medium-term development plan. The Gambia is also incorporating climate change into sectorial policies and has developed an agriculture NAMA.

In the Gambia, challenges for the preparation of INDCs include the limited capacity of national experts to develop and analyze:
- Emissions scenarios
- Mitigation scenarios for different sectors
- Economic modeling
- How to translate NAMAs into specific country contributions

The Gambia is also interested in developing more detailed sectorial analysis to assess the economic impact and budgetary requirements for sectors to put forward a contribution that is economically sustainable. This will require international economic and mitigation experts.

**Mali**
Mr. Drissa Doumbia stated that while Mali has not yet formally started preparing its INDCs, the country is currently developing a roadmap for doing so. The country’s INDCs will likely emerge from the following initiatives:
- A National Climate Change Action Plan with eight sectorial policies and 146 actions related to mitigation, capacity building and finance
- The country’s Investment Plan
- Climate Fund of Mali, which started in 2013 with $3.5 million Euros of funding from Sweden for energy, forestry and agriculture projects
- The existing carbon portfolio of approximately 50 projects, since 2011
- Planned actions on adaptation

Mali also described plans for its consultative process to develop its INDC, highlighting that the country intends to use its existing institutional framework, including a stakeholder committee with 120 members from ministries, NGOs and others, with sub groups working on mitigation, adaptation, capacity-building and other topics. The government is currently developing a draft agenda and drafting framework documents to begin discussions with various ministries and with this committee.

To date, Mali has identified the following challenges to preparing its INDC: a lack of scientific analysis on climate change scenarios and impacts, the need to measure and quantify these impacts and a general insufficiency of data.

**Egypt**
Mr. Hamdy Darrag shared Egypt’s expectations for a 2015 agreement and approach to INDCs. Egypt is seeking a fair agreement that recognizes that the country’s main priorities are adaptation and social development and includes financial and capacity building support,
including for technology transfer. Those responsible for the majority of emissions should take responsibility for their share of reductions. Mr. Darrag referenced the latest IPCC report, which states that to avoid a global increase of 2°C, total emissions must not exceed 40 billion tons of CO2 by 2030.

Egypt’s actions on climate change will be aligned with the country’s socioeconomic development plans. Egypt is currently preparing its Third National Communication and is starting to prepare its First Biennial Update Report. The country is also developing NAMAs in an effort to modify its business as usual (BAU) emissions.

Norway
Ms. Karine Hertzberg explained Norway’s understanding of INDCs and described the country’s current approach to preparing its INDC. For Norway, mitigation is at the core of INDCs, as joint international efforts are the only way to meet the 2°C target. Mitigation commitments should be quantifiable and comparable, driving the need for common information requirements and rules. Norway also mentioned the need for a process to review INDCs after they have been communicated by Parties and before concluding the agreement in Paris.

Norway’s process for preparing its INDC is well underway. Work is being led by the Ministry of Climate and Environment, which convenes a ministerial working group that includes the Ministries of Finance, Petroleum and Energy, Transportation, Agriculture, and Foreign Affairs. This group will report its progress to Parliament this May, with the aim of having a government decision by the end of the year so that Norway can submit its INDC by the first quarter of 2015.

Norway also presented an overview of the issues that the country is addressing related to its INDC. These are summarized below:

• **Type of commitment**: Science driven approach, build on previous experiences under Kyoto, flexibility in implementation, promotes a price on carbon, in-line with long term goal of Norway becoming a low emission society. Will use a carbon budget as their main approach.

• **Time period**: Looking for long-term predictability – analyses and options will look at both 2025 and 2030.

• **Forest and land use**: This is an important accounting issue. Approach needs to be scientifically sound, predictable, verifiable and comprehensive.

• **Market mechanisms**: The level of Norway’s contribution will be dependent on access to flexible mechanisms that are cost effective, raise ambition, ensure real reductions and avoid double counting.

Norway already has a number of climate instruments in place, including its emissions trading system and carbon tax. However, the country has limited measures to address sectors such as agriculture and waste and intends to tackle more difficult issues such as transportation and land-use planning in order to reduce emissions further and transition to a low emissions society.

Discussion

**National context for preparing INDCs:**

• Countries in the region are working to integrate climate change into policies at the national level. One way to do this is to look at a country’s development agenda and to identify which initiatives have an effect on reducing or avoiding greenhouse gas emissions and/or increasing climate resiliency.
• Many participants expressed the idea that INDCs can and will originate from existing laws, strategies, plans, and/or policies that have already been established. In this sense, developing INDCs could simply involve identifying and estimating the emissions reductions that a country will achieve through planned national initiatives and “contributing” them to the international process.

• Adaptation is the priority for developing countries. Therefore, adaptation and mitigation should be undertaken together, if possible – e.g. undertake adaptation actions that have co-benefits in mitigation and vice versa.

• Some participants emphasized the importance of considering equity, responsibility, and the accountability of each country when determining their INDCs.

• On the relationship between NAMAs and INDCs, one participant noted that NAMAs have been put forward voluntarily by developing countries to mitigate in the pre-2020 period, generally with a sectorial focus. In contrast, INDCs will feature the level of reductions that each country determines it will put forward internationally, with a national context.

• Countries expressed interest in continuing efforts associated with NAMAs beyond 2020 (for example in the agriculture sector) and including these efforts as part of their INDCs.

Political process of preparing INDCs:
• Politicians can “make or break” the INDC process. Technical professionals need to be able to describe INDCs to politicians. Some countries are trying to develop materials to inform politicians to generate political buy-in.

• It helps to have a domestic political champion that can make the case for allocating national resources to climate change and can secure engagement from all relevant sectors.

• Stakeholder consultations are critical to developing transparent, credible INDCs. Countries will use existing institutional arrangements, when possible, to engage stakeholders.

• Some participants suggested that Africa should have a joint or regional approach to the preparation of INDCs.

• Some suggested engaging the African Ministerial Conference on the Environment (AMCEN) on the issue of INDCs and the 2015 agreement. Participants suggested that the UNDP and UNFCCC reach out to AMCEN to explore ways to share information and help raise political interest in INDCs.

Technical process for preparing INDCs:
• Many participants suggested using the most recent national GHG inventory and other information on mitigation in the NCs as a critical reference point for starting the preparation of INDCs. The inventory, in addition to other information in the NC, can also be used for developing baseline scenarios and identifying sectors with mitigation potential.

• Countries don’t want to commit to an unachievable contribution in the new agreement. This will require robust technical analysis (inventories, baseline projections, mitigation options and scenarios, cost analysis) that can generate confidence and buy-in from policy makers and civil society.

• Once an emissions baseline is developed, countries can define a subset of that information to include in the submission of the country’s INDC.
Challenges:

- Access to data was identified as a major challenge for the African Region. In many cases, baseline information exists for key sectors but is not publicly available for use by the government for the development of INDCs.
- One country mentioned having a roadmap on climate change, but is facing the challenge of generating political buy-in to elaborate and implement the roadmap.
- Securing high-level political engagement is a major challenge for INDCs – in both developing and developed countries. At the international level, discussions focus on the global picture and specifically avoiding dangerous anthropogenic climate change. However, at the national level building political will involves linking climate change to domestic policy issues, for example reduced air pollution, reduced dependency on energy imports, energy efficiency and competitiveness, etc.

Needs:

- Some countries need help understanding INDCs before feeling prepared to start the national preparation process or to officially submit their INDCs.
- Countries need support to establish permanent national GHG inventory systems (beyond one-off inventories prepared in the context of the NCs) that could help inform the preparation of INDCs and generate national confidence in a country’s ability to track its contributions.
- Participants identified the need for technical and financial support to develop mitigation scenarios for key sectors (agriculture, energy, forestry, etc.) and economic analysis to determine the economic viability of mitigation measures -- including levels and sources of investment needed for implementation. This is a major deliverable to convince ministers of the need to act.
- A number of participants requested the UNDP to develop general reference materials on INDCs. One participant suggested a study to highlight the concept of INDCs and their importance to African countries.

Remaining questions:

- Will countries need to ratify their INDCs?
- Are developing countries planning to include support in their INDCs?
- Will INDCs include both mitigation and adaptation? If so, will the process for preparing these contributions be different?
- Is it possible to have common rules for INDCs but also flexibility that can sufficiently reflect the variety of contributions?

Role Play Group Exercise

Objective

Participants broke into groups to discuss specific challenges in the preparation and development of INDCs with the goal of sharing their relevant national experience and brainstorming possible solutions and ways forward. In particular, participants were asked to identify what support might be useful for assisting countries in overcoming these types of challenges. Below is a summary of the key messages stemming from the group discussions.
Key Messages
Recommended steps for preparing INDCs:

• Start by defining the institutional arrangements that will be used to coordinate the preparation of INDCs. This could be an existing or new group/committee.
• Generally need a high-level committee to drive the process, with some involvement from technical experts or with support from a separate technical working group.
• Information presented to the committee should be tailored to the members and their level of understanding of climate change and the 2015 agreement.
  o High-level representatives need concise information on the importance of addressing climate change at the international and national levels. Relate action on climate change to economic costs and benefits and to national development.
  o Technocrats will need robust, credible analysis to support their recommendations – and will need to translate their findings into politically relevant messages.
• Use existing information included in the NCs and national GHG inventories to identify the highest emitting sectors and to prioritize key sectors for action. If the existing national information is too outdated, consider updating or using external information from other initiatives, such as REDD+, for example.
• Develop a BAU scenario or scenarios. Identify, analyze (quantify mitigation potential, costs, co-benefits, etc.) and validate mitigation options at the national level. Consider addressing equity, fairness and developing short-term and long-term priorities.
• Carry out high-level consultations and present findings to seek political guidance on the scope, form and magnitude of INDCs to be submitted to the UNFCCC.
• Identify and/or elaborate an MRV system that enables quantifiable follow-up on implementation and work to broadly enhance national capacities for implementation and reporting (can be done before or after political consultations and definition of INDCs).

On how to address adaptation:

• When addressing adaptation at the high political level, highlight consequences of climate change to the country, using concrete examples.
• Raise awareness on needs to address adaptation, including at the international level.
• On INDCs, keep the focus on an ambitious 2015 agreement. INDCs could also include adaptation but it will be difficult to arrive at something quantifiable or that references specific actions.
• 2015 agreement should continue work on adaptation and develop processes for easing access to climate finance for adaptation, specifically for supporting national adaptation strategies.

Lessons learned from NAMA development:

• Involve as many stakeholders as possible, as early as possible.
• Mobilize high-level political support to drive the INDCs process.
• Support is key to developing and implementing action.
• Countries that have gone through the process of developing NAMAs understand their capacity and needs for preparing their INDCs. They also have experience in linking climate change action to development benefits.
Session 3: Key Considerations When Preparing INDCs– The Underlying Technical Basis

Objective
The objective of this session was to discuss and identify solutions to the technical challenges being faced in developing the underlying technical basis of INDCs.

Presentations
World Resources Institute
Mr. Jared Finnegan from presented WRI’s work on the technical basis for INDCs. He highlighted some of the major inputs into the contribution design process, including: a country’s development objectives, its national GHG inventory, mitigation assessments (including, business as usual emissions projections and marginal abatement cost curves) and stakeholder engagement.

WRI proposed three broad categories, or types, of mitigation efforts that countries may consider when developing their INDCs: goals, policies and projects. These options are not necessarily mutually exclusive and some countries may choose to have a goal as well as specific policies or projects as different components of their INDCs.

Possible goal types include:
- Change from a historical base year
  - Pros: Easy to formulate based on existing GHG inventories and do not require a country to develop baseline projections. Simple tracking based on comparison with historical emissions level.
- Fixed level goal
  - Pros: Easy to formulate based on existing GHG inventories and do not require a country to develop baseline projections.
- Emissions intensity goal
  - Pros: May be preferable to countries with a high growth conditions.
  - Cons: May be more complex to formulate and track, as it requires GHG and GDP data.
- Baseline scenario goal
  - Pros: May be preferable to countries that expect future growth in emissions and want to focus on limiting emissions.
  - Cons: Most complicated to design and MRV, as they require modeling and emissions projections based on a wide range of data and assumptions, information which may be difficult to gather.

Additional goal design features that countries should consider include: goal timeframe, use of transferable emissions units (e.g., carbon credits and tradable allowances), and the treatment of emissions and removals from the land sector.

Possible options for policies include:
- Regulations, standards, taxes, subsidies, permits, research, power procurement, infrastructure programs
  - Pros: The diversity of different policy types offers countries flexibility, as these can be economy wide or sectorial and can target large or small sources.
Cons: It is generally more difficult to MRV specific policies.

For countries with limited capacity, a contribution could simply include individual projects that lead to the reduction of greenhouse gasses. Examples of projects include fuel-switching projects, reforestation projects, and energy efficiency projects.

Pros: The diversity of project options offers countries flexibility and a more concrete objective

Cons: Individual projects tend to have a narrow scope (i.e., they cover one emissions source) and MRV is typically more complex, requiring baseline development and data, which may or may not be readily available. Specific projects are also less likely to have transformative economy-wide effects and be able to link into green growth strategies.

European Commission
Ms. Ariane Labat presented the EU’s technical and political process for preparing its INDC. The development of the EU’s INDC is being driven both by international factors like the 2°C goal under the UNFCCC, as well as challenges within Europe such as rising energy prices and concerns over energy security and competitiveness. To inform its INDC, the EU is currently carrying out a detailed process of stakeholder consultations and outreach to political leaders.

In June, the EU made an initial proposal to reduce emissions by 40% by 2030, which includes a renewable energy goal and a new governance system for the energy sector. In developing this proposal, the EU drew upon technical information from member countries, including NCs, GHG inventories and trends, information on policies that have been successful at decoupling emissions from economic growth, as well as sectorial emissions data and per capita emissions data. The EU also used the recommendations in the IPCC’s Fifth Assessment Report to model emissions pathways in line with science and compared it to the EU’s long-term expected path to see if their policies will deliver sufficient reductions. While the EU’s BAU modeling shows a 60% reduction in emissions by 2050 (with all proposed policies), the EU is considering an ambitious 80% reduction by 2050 if means for international cooperation, such as market mechanisms, were available to achieve it. Next steps include further refining the headline economy-wide target for 2030 to further align it with an ambitious 2050 target and to develop a carbon budget, which the EU believes is the best approach to provide ambition, certainty and environmental integrity. A final decision on the EU’s INDC is planned for October to allow for on-time presentation to the UNFCCC.

Ms. Labat also briefly described the technical assistance that the EU makes available to partnership countries, specifically through the Global Climate Change Alliance, Clim-Dev, the UNDP’s Low Emissions Capacity Building Programme, Clima South, and the EU REDD Facility.

Discussion
Participants reacted to the presentations and further discussed their overall approach to INDCs and technical considerations.

On framing and national context for INDCs:
• Countries may want to draw upon themes in their national development plans as a starting place for developing INDCs.
• The land use and forestry sector and the agricultural sectors could be a focus for INDCs by LDCs given their national priorities.
• There are significant mitigation opportunities with significant benefits for sustainable development, for example energy efficiency measures for industry and measures in the building sector. These actions are ideal for including in INDCs.

Timing and resources:
• Many participants highlighted the limited amount of time for countries to develop INDCs if they are to put something forward by the first quarter of 2015 or even before COP 21. Some countries will not have enough time to undertake exhaustive technical analysis.
• Countries need support to prepare and develop the technical basis for INDCs.
• The EU recognized that preparing a technical base does take a long time and that it is useful to have political leaders set a timeline for this type of work.
• For countries at the start of their technical process, preparing a credible and up-to-date inventory could be a valuable first step.

On the content/scope of INDCs:
• The African Group expects INDCs to cover all aspects of the convention, including mitigation, adaptation, support, technology transfer and capacity building.
• Would be useful to discuss the technical basis of preparing INDCs on adaptation, in addition to mitigation.
• INDCs are nationally determined, so if a country wants to focus on adaptation, that can come across strongly in their INDCs. However, that shouldn’t replace the mitigation component of INDCs.
• Countries whose development requires emissions growth should focus on limiting the growth in their emissions, for example by adopting goals framed around a controlled increase in emissions.
• Some participants noted that the approach presented in this session is similar to the approach to NAMAs, and that they would like to see a new, distinct approach to INDCs that goes further on building institutional frameworks and capacities.
• Some stated that the experiences from REDD+ and NAMAs are useful and emphasized that there are examples of NAMAs that integrate adaptation and mitigation benefits, such as Africa’s agriculture NAMA. In this sense, countries could think about scaling up their NAMAs or REDD+ activities after 2020 as component to be included in their INDCs.

Needs
• One participant suggested that the organizers of the Dialogue develop technical guidance that details the technical aspects of INDCs related to adaptation.
• One participant identified the need for more information on how to scale up agricultural activities, and specifically the benefits in terms of carbon stock and GDP.

Session 4: Key Considerations When Preparing Intended INDCs – Critical Information to be Included

The objective of this session was to discuss the most likely information anticipated for INDCs, and how to quickly generate the required information.
Presentations

World Resources Institute

Mr. Jared Finnegan presented WRI’s work on transparency and GHG accounting related to mitigation goals, policies and actions. He described WRI’s recent work to develop two new GHG Protocol Standards for quantifying the GHG effects of policies and actions, as well as for providing guidance on tracking progress toward national and subnational GHG reduction goals. These standards aim to help promote ex-ante and ex-post transparency of mitigation efforts, which can lead to increased understanding of countries’ actions, enable more accurate tracking of GHG emissions, and facilitate GHG management. The standards provide a list of information that should be reported alongside goals and policies to maximize transparency.

Based on the standards, critical information needed to enhance the transparency of INDCs framed as goals includes:

- Goal type and goal level
- Target year or period
- Sectors and gases covered
- Use of units
- Unit of output (for intensity goals)
- Additional information for baseline scenario goals that describes the development of the baseline scenario (e.g., model, key drivers and assumptions, and included policies)

For INDCs framed as policies and actions, critical information needed to enhance transparency includes:

- Type of policy/action
- Sectors and gases covered
- Estimated change in GHGs from the policy/action
- Methodology
- Identification of drivers
- Baseline scenario
- Potential overlaps and uncertainty

Additionally, through their “Open Book” project, WRI is developing a template to help interested countries submit information on their INDC contributions in a transparent manner.

Kenya

Mr. Stephen King’uyu presented Kenya’s perspectives on INDCs to date. He emphasized that INDCs must be backed by a high-level political decision, be informed by scientific evidence, and not compromise a country’s right to development. He mentioned a number of outstanding questions related to INDCs, such as the legal status of contributions, how to apply the principles of the Convention and the sources for financing the design and implementation of INDCs.

Kenya has analyzed its emissions by sector based on information developed for its NCs and Biennial Update Report. The country has identified the main sectors with the highest potential and lowest cost reductions, noting that Kenya would like to transition to a middle-income country by 2030. Kenya has developed scenarios relating to the country’s development objective, identified development-oriented actions that deliver GHG benefits and assessed the level of investment required to realize them.
For Kenya, necessary technical up-front information is different at the national and international levels. At the national level, countries should specify how much they are contributing and identify a time frame, a base year, sectors covered, and “low-hanging fruit”. They should also present information on how they will measure and report, and how the actions impact sustainable development and adaptive capacity. At the international level, up-front information could include a formula for equitable sharing, base year, how to ensure comparability, information on the process for verification and rules for transparency, assessment, reporting and support.

**United States**

Mr. Reed Schuler presented the United States’ perspective on INDCs, mainly that these should reflect a country’s contribution to the global effort to limit or reduce GHGs in the post 2020 period and be determined individually by Parties using the factors each considers relevant. INDCs should be quantified or quantifiable for all but those with limited capacities or insignificant global emissions. INDCs should also include basic information so that the level of mitigation efforts can be understood. The US recognizes that adaptation is the priority for many countries but thinks that this issue can be adequately addressed in other parts of the 2015 agreement.

For the US, preparing INDCs involves three general steps: identifying and prioritizing mitigation opportunities, goals and actions; seeking stakeholder engagement and buy-in; and turning the selected mitigation actions into a nationally determined contribution with necessary informational elements. These informational elements include the relevant time period, base year, gases and sectors covered, overall emissions reductions anticipated and information on how the land sector will be accounted for, if included.

Mr. Schuler also briefly described the technical resources that the US makes available to developing countries, specifically through the UNFCCC Climate Technology Center and Network and the LEDS Global Partnership.

**Discussion**

Participants asked a number of clarifying questions to the presenters on the following issues:

- How to ensure that the INDCs add up to the 2°C target.
- Clarity on the legal status of INDCs – are they voluntary or legally binding?
  - Legal form is not yet determined, that is why they are INDCs are “intended”. It was suggested that countries could submit their views on the legal status of their contributions as part of their INDCs.
- The concept of responsibility as a factor for countries in determining contributions.
  - Participants suggested that countries could demonstrate that their contributions adequately reflect their responsibilities during a consultation process that would take place after the first quarter of 2015 and up to COP 21.
- How countries plan to “package” their contributions.
  - Developing countries mentioned packaging their contributions as a “bottom-up” compilation of actions or a “top down” plan/strategy/target, or a mix of both.
- Whether developed countries are planning to make their contributions conditional.
  - Some mentioned having specific conditions (for example, related to market mechanism) while others said they should be unconditional.
What were the main factors leading to the success of Kenya’s National Climate Change Action Plan?
  - The most important factor is that the government decided for the first time to work with a wide range of stakeholders. You can’t afford to leave anyone in the government off the stakeholder list. The Ministry of Planning was particularly critical.

Session 5: Recent Technical Discussions on INDCs

The objective of this session was to inform participants about recent instances where countries have come together to share experiences and lessons learned on the preparation of INDCs.

Presentations
UNFCCC
Mr. Claudio Forner shared the main messages that emerged from the workshop on INDCs held at the March session of the Ad-hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform. The workshop included an opportunity for some Parties to share information on their domestic preparations of INDCs, as well as presentations on existing programs to support the preparation of INDCs. Parties were also able to have a first exchange on the possible elements to be included in INDCs.

Parties who presented their experiences described their ongoing preparations of INDCs, including activities to gather necessary data, evaluate existing climate legislation, prepare the technical basis (scenarios, modeling, cost estimation) and undertake national consultations. Most of the countries that presented described basing their efforts on existing or on-going national processes. Developing countries stressed the need for technical and financial support to prepare their INDCs. Mr. Forner also summarized the main messages presented by Ghana, the EU, UAE, LDCs, China and Costa Rica.

UNDP
Ms. Alexa Kleysteuber shared the main messages that emerged from the first Latin America and Caribbean (LAC) Regional Dialogue on INDCs held in Bogota, Colombia in from April 28-30. Over 90 participants attended the LAC dialogue, including representatives from 23 LAC countries, 6 developed countries and 12 institutional representatives. Ms. Kleysteuber shared example country experiences from Mexico, Colombia, Costa Rica and the Dominican Republic.

Lessons learned emerging from the LAC dialogue include:
  - High-level political support is critical for developing INDCs. This can be generated by a high-level mandate (president, congress, ministers), by integrating climate change into national laws, regulations and/or national strategies for sustainable development, or through the development of a national strategy to coordinate national policies related to climate change.
  - The need for stakeholder involvement, through a highly inclusive and participative process, to lend credibility and robustness to national decisions on climate change.
  - The need for technical capacity, including strengthening institutional capacity, transferring knowledge to sectorial institutions and using solid GHG inventories as a basis for action.
  - Many countries need financial and technical support to carry out the activities described above. South-south cooperation is also an important vehicle for building capacity.
Working Group Discussions
Participants broke into groups to discuss expectations about INDCs and identify what specific support might be useful in assisting countries overcome any challenges. In particular, participants answered the following questions:

1. What do countries plan to include in their INDCs?
2. What is the minimum level of information that countries should include in their contributions?
3. How should support for implementation be considered in the INDCs that countries put forward. (i.e. national budgets and international support, etc.)

Key messages:

Countries generally plan to include the following information in their INDCs:

• Goals, targets, actions and policies together with supporting descriptive information.
• Targets for each action or goal, timeframe, reference levels, the cost of the particular action, methodologies and the capacity needs, technology requirements, GHG estimates and sustainability criteria.
• National circumstances, emissions tendencies, particularly for sectors with the highest emissions; identify and assess mitigation and adaptation measures, which would be quantified to the extent possible.
• Some countries would also include adaptation as a part of the contributions, in the form of goals, policies, targets, and actions plans, as decided by each country. Some mentioned the need to quantify adaptation to be able to include it in the agreement.
• Participants provided the following country examples of what could be included in their INDCs: Nigeria could include gas flaring projects and REDD+ activities in their INDCs, and would try to provide a quantified reduction of GHGs. Kenya and Zambia have already identified priority sectors on based on their GHG inventories and have begun to assess mitigation potential and the possibilities for implementing action.

Minimum level of information in INDCs:

• Relevant national circumstances.
• Base year and a time period, sectors and gases covered, priority sectors.
• Reference level.
• Percentage of emissions to be reduced or limited, the time frame, and non-CO2 impacts.
• Quantity of GHG reduction, expressed as a percentage or as an absolute reduction.
• Some suggested inclusion of a chapter on adaptation.

Support for implementation of INDCs:

• Some participants indicated that information on financial support for implementation, capacity building and technology transfer should be included in INDCs from developed countries.
• Some suggested that developing countries should provide information on the level of finance available from national budgets and support needed from international sources, separately.
• One participant mentioned that national development priorities be supported nationally, while incremental costs be supported with international resources – and that this could be reflected in the INDCs.
Session 5: Key Considerations on Transparency and MRV

Objective
The objective of this session was to discuss challenges that countries may face with respect to transparency and MRV-related aspects of their INDCs.

Presentations
Ethiopia
Ms. Ghrmawit Haile Gebrehiwot presented Ethiopia’s national perspective and experience on INDCs and on challenges related to transparency and MRV. Ethiopia is a highly vulnerable country with low emissions, but nevertheless is developing a climate change program that will address both adaptation and low carbon development. Ethiopia has established a strategy for green development to achieve middle-income status by 2025, with net-zero emissions growth and increased climate resilience.

Ethiopia has been making progress on this strategy by working to establish sound institutions and identify key sectors, including: industry, forestry, agriculture, energy and possibly mining. The green economy strategy contains 150 initiatives for the country to deviate from its business-as-usual scenario, which has now been refined to 60 priorities for implementation. The green growth plan is currently being updated and will be released next year, with the goal of mainstreaming climate change into the country’s national development plans.

High-level political leadership from the Prime Minister’s office has been critical for promoting the climate change agenda in Ethiopia, establishing the Climate Resilient Green Economy Facility (a financial vehicle to mobilize finance from domestic, international, public and private sources) and creating the Sector Reduction Mechanism (SRM). The SRM will result in the preparation of sectorial reduction action plans by all priority sectors, starting with agriculture. The country is also working to submit NAMA proposals to the UNFCCC Registry.

Ethiopia is also developing a number of systems and tools that will promote transparency and MRV of their strategy and initiatives on climate change, including: a national web-based registry of actions, an MRV system for REDD+, tools for measuring GHG emissions and trends from public and private mitigation actions. The country is also working with the World Resources Institute on transparency and the World Bank on safeguard frameworks.

Ethiopia has identified the following challenges in preparing its INDCs: financial constraints, a lack of well established baseline data in most sectors, knowledge management and outreach and a lack of clarity on MRV in the 2020 regime. Ethiopia plans to take all the information from this meeting and use it to initiate a national consultation process on INDCs. A possible way forward is to look at all the priority sectors and see how they will contribute.

Germany
Mr. Sebastian Wienges presented Germany’s perspective that INDCs should serve to meet the global 2°C objective and must consist of GHG reduction targets that are quantifiable and accountable, ideally through a quantifiable headline number, but recognizing that different forms of contributions may be appropriate for different countries. He highlighted that contributions from all countries are needed to avoid free riding by more responsible and
capable countries, and that even small national efforts help foster the ambition of the global regime.

Germany emphasized that up-front information is needed to quantify and aggregate the mitigation efforts and that transparency can also serve to enhance ambition by fostering peer-to-peer learning, helping countries identify opportunities and sparking a race-to-the-top. Transparent contributions are also more likely to be realistic and feasible. Germany proposed a spectrum of relevant information for INDCs with common information on base year, target year/period, gases and sectors covered, GWP values, inventory methodology, use of units, land use approach, conditions and fairness and ambition indicators.

Germany suggested that countries foster ambition by talking these three steps: generate a BAU scenario, take actions that are doable and push for additional actions that are possible. Countries could reflect this through a target range with conditions on the upper bound of the target. Germany continues to push for transformational change that promotes sustainable, low carbon economic development patterns. GIZ has just contracted UNEP to develop indicators for transformational change.

Discussion
On ambition:
Participants used the presentations to discuss ambition in the 2015 agreement. It was suggested that all countries, when presenting their INDCs, should explain why their INDCs are ambitious – specifically, how their INDC represents an effort beyond business as usual and the effects on emissions intensity and emissions per capita. Countries could select indicators that they believe best tell the story of ambition and give concrete examples, for example through the use of indicators such as GDP per capita, total cost to the economy, or specific abatement costs.

Participants from the African Region noted that the ambition of developing countries depends partly on the extent of financial, technological and capacity building support being provided. They also highlighted the importance of historic responsibility when discussing ambition and the challenge of assessing ambition in isolation, without knowing what other countries will be doing.

WRI suggested three scenarios with which to evaluate whether contributions are ambitious:
• Low ambition – a country contributes its business as usual emissions, independent of the type of target.
• Medium ambition – a country’s goal is aligned with mitigation opportunities that are economically and technically feasible and all mitigation opportunities are exploited.
• High ambition – a country’s goal goes beyond technically feasible efforts to achieve reductions completely aligned with what is required by science.

On support:
Some participants emphasized that support should be provided to countries to prepare national climate change programs, as INDCs will likely be derived from these types of plans, programs and national strategies. Participants also re-emphasized the need to improve GHG inventories for Africa to have a solid, robust basis for preparing INDCs. Ethiopia added that they have estimated that they will need $100 billion USD to carry out its green economy strategy and $50 billion USD for bolstering climate resilience over 10 years.
Green Economy Examples:
One participant requested practical examples of how a country can develop based on the concept of a green economy and Ethiopia responded with the following examples: Ethiopia plans to export clean energy to Sudan, Kenya and Djibouti, which will bolster the countries export industry while also contributing greatly to reduce GHG emissions. Ethiopia is also developing its transport infrastructure using renewable energy, which will foster development and reduce emissions. Afforestation efforts will create jobs and increase carbon capture, clean the water supply and keep dams clean for sustained use.

Session 6: Sharing Experiences from Selected Relevant Initiatives

Objective
The objective of this session was to allow panelists from relevant initiatives/programs to present how their work and support to countries could concretely support the preparation of INDCs.

UNDP, Rebecca Carman
Email: rebecca.carman@undp.org
UNDP supports the preparation of INDCs through organizing this series of Regional Technical Dialogues, and is also helping countries prepare GEF projects related to INDCs. UNDP also supports 77 countries on the preparation of their NCs and 35 countries on the preparation of their BURs. The UNDP’s Low Emissions Capacity Building Program supports 25 countries, eight of which are in Africa, with the development of mitigation actions, low emissions development strategies (LEDS), inventory systems, and targeted support for preparing INDCs (just approved). Countries interested in working with the UNDP should contact their local UNDP office to request support. UNDP headquarters can facilitate this interaction, if needed.

German Government, Sebastian Wienges
Email: sebastian.wienges@giz.de
The German Government supports the preparation of INDCs mostly through the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV and the International Climate Initiative. To support countries at the national level, the German Government has just launched a new global project to support developing countries with the preparation of INDCs, specifically to support technical analysis and studies related to defining INDCs, inter-ministerial consultations and working groups, as well as multi-stakeholder dialogues. There are also plans to develop a process tool on how to develop INDCs. The International Partnership is working to set up sub-regional conference calls to facilitate peer exchange on INDCs, and this year’s Summer School will focus on INDCs.

GEF, George Manful (for Rawleston Moore)
At the request of the GEF panelist who could not attend the meeting, the UNEP representative reported on the support activities being undertaken by the GEF. The GEF has recently approved an additional $650,000 USD to the Global Support Program on NCs and BURs to enable UNDP and UNEP to provide targeted support for INDCs. The project should be approved by mid-June, and funding would be available for the second half of 2014. Additionally, countries that have remaining funds in their STAR allocation from GEF 5 can use those funds for the preparation of their INDCs. Countries that have used their STAR allocation can still write proposals effective July 1 under GEF 6.
UNEP, George Manful  
*Email: George.Manful@unep.org*

The Global Support Program (GSP) funded by the GEF will have resources for the following:
- Use input from these technical workshops to redefine additional support under the GSP.
- Organize workshops that build off of this Regional Technical Dialogue series.
- Provide support for online sharing and technical advice/consultation.
- Short-term, in-country support for assistance on specific tasks related to preparation of INDCs.
- Organize online training program on INDCs.

European Commission, Ariane Labat  
*Email: Ariane.labat@ec.europa.eu*

The EC currently supports the preparation of INDCs through the following initiatives:
- The Global Climate Change Alliance – A network with three contact people responsible for eastern, southern and western Africa. These three experts respond to requests immediately and provide targeted support on adaptation and mitigation, for example on mainstreaming climate change or setting up a climate fund.
- The CTCN has experts that can support the preparation of INDCs.
- The EU recently decided that 20% of budget should be climate relevant. As a result, financial support for climate change activities, including INDCs, should soon increase through bilateral channels.

WRI, Jared Finnegan  
*Email: JFinnegan@wri.org*

WRI provides technical support to developing countries on INDCs in four ways:
- Open Book – A new WRI project to support countries in putting forward transparent INDCs. This project will convene interested countries to develop a table of upfront information and a supporting handbook that provides guidance on how to complete the table that countries can use as an input into the design of their INDC and as the basis for submitting their INDCs to the UNFCCC.
- WRI is developing guidance and methodologies for designing ambitious yet feasible INDC packages.
- Methodologies for MRV – Finalizing two new standards. The *Mitigation Goals Standard* provides guidance on designing, tracking, and reporting progress toward mitigation goals. The *Policy and Action Standard* provides guidance for assessing and reporting the GHG effects of policies and actions. Both will be released by October. Trainings on each standard will begin in fall 2014. For more information visit: [http://www.ghgprotocol.org/mitigation-accounting](http://www.ghgprotocol.org/mitigation-accounting).
- WRI is developing an implementation framework that can help countries assess the status of implementation for existing policies and understand opportunities for strengthening them in the context of INDCs.

LEDS Global Partnership, Edward Awafo  
*Email: awafoe@hotmail.com*

The LEDS Global Partnership coordinates information exchange between countries on climate change, LEDS and climate resilience. The LEDS GP Secretariat coordinates all programs and receives direct requests for support from the Partnership. The Partnership’s next meeting will be in Nairobi to share experiences on LEDS.
CDKN, Karen Sutherland  
*Email: karen.sutherland@cdkn.org*  
CDKN’s mission is to support decision makers in climate resilient development. CDKN has 100 million pounds of funding and supports 160 projects in 70 countries. Their major programs include: 1) Country programs 2) Support to negotiators and 3) Research and knowledge management partnerships. CDKN will support its partner countries in preparing their INDCs. Partners in the African Region include: Kenya, Uganda, Ethiopia and Rwanda. CDKN plans to support technical analysis (mitigation potential), help lead formal and informal consultations with stakeholders, determine funding needs and help countries package and prepare INDCs.

CILLS, Sebastien Subsol  
*Email: s.subsol@agrhymet.ne*  
CILLS offers a training on the integration of climate policies into national budgets and hosts a forum for exchange on issues of climate on the CILLS website.

**Session 7: Next Steps**

**Objective**  
Participants shared their ideas on how to ensure momentum on the preparation of INDCs and proposed concrete activities that could support developing countries with the preparation of their INDCs.

**Feedback from participants**  

*Follow-up activities:*  
- A number of participants suggested the need for further dialogue on INDCs to continue to clarify the concepts surrounding INDCs, to share experiences (especially with those who were not able to attend the first Dialogue), and to discuss progress made and difficulties encountered. Some suggested the next Technical Dialogue take place in the run up to the Secretary General’s Summit on Climate Change, while others said the meeting should take place after COP 20, to give countries time to progress on their INDCs.
- The next African Ministerial Conference on the Environment (AMCEN) will likely take place in early September. Participants suggested that UNDP work with AMCEN to include INDCs in the agenda in order to increase high-level political awareness on INDCs.
- Dialogue participants from countries interested in seeking support to start or scale-up their efforts to prepare INDCs should follow-up directly with the donors and support organizations present at the meeting. The UNDP is also available to help link-up countries seeking support with possible donors.
- One participant suggested that the support organizations attending the Dialogue each support a few of the countries at the meeting, in an effort to cover a broad range of countries in the preparation of their INDCs.
- One participant mentioned the need to further engage National Focal Points to the UNFCCC on Article 6 of the Convention (education, training and public awareness) in domestic efforts to prepare INDCs.

*Follow-up documents:*  
- A number of participants requested that UNDP/UNEP produce some form of guidance on the preparation of INDCs. Suggestions for contents of the guidance included: substantial and
convincing arguments for countries to undertake INDCs, a section on the implications of INDCs for Africa and a mapping of possible effort sharing arrangements, with figures.

• Participants thought it would be helpful to have a mapping of support available for the preparation of INDCs.
• Participants are interested in using the report of this meeting to brief their institutions.

Closing Remarks
Brief closing remarks, including general reflections on the Dialogue and expressions of gratitude to the hosts, organizers, donors and participants were given by Mr. Don Cooper on behalf of the UNFCCC, Mr. Kyekyeku Oppong-Boadi on behalf of the Government of Ghana and Ms. Rebecca Carman on behalf of the UNDP.

Participants were asked to fill out an evaluation of the meeting. A total of 37 participants responded and the results of this evaluation are presented in Appendix III of this report.
## Appendix I: Participant List (67 total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>Abdelghani Merabet</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ath.mehadjii@gmail.com">ath.mehadjii@gmail.com</a>; <a href="mailto:abdelghanimerabat@hotmail.com">abdelghanimerabat@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>Dorcas Masisi</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dmasisi@gov.bw">dmasisi@gov.bw</a>, <a href="mailto:ntikim@yahoo.com">ntikim@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>Diomède Nyengayenge</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dionyeng2@rocketmail.com">dionyeng2@rocketmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>Denis Beina</td>
<td><a href="mailto:d_beina@yahoo.fr">d_beina@yahoo.fr</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Mahamat Hassan Idriss</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mhi1962@yahoo.fr">mhi1962@yahoo.fr</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td>Wahadi Madi</td>
<td><a href="mailto:madi287@yahoo.fr">madi287@yahoo.fr</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo (Democratic Republic of)</td>
<td>Nicky Kingunia Ineet</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ineetnicky@gmail.com">ineetnicky@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo (Republic of)</td>
<td>Gervais Ludovic Itsoua Madzou</td>
<td><a href="mailto:imadzous@yahoo.fr">imadzous@yahoo.fr</a>; <a href="mailto:Dzabadirk@yahoo.fr">Dzabadirk@yahoo.fr</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Mohammad Darraj</td>
<td><a href="mailto:M.darrag@eeaa.gov.eg">M.darrag@eeaa.gov.eg</a>; <a href="mailto:Darraj313@yahoo.com">Darraj313@yahoo.com</a>; <a href="mailto:hesham27963@windowslive.com">hesham27963@windowslive.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equatorial Guinea</td>
<td>Nicanor Ona Nze Anguan</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nicanorona@gmail.com">nicanorona@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Ghrmawit Haile Gebrewirot</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ghrma_h@yahoo.com">ghrma_h@yahoo.com</a>; <a href="mailto:esid@ethionet.et">esid@ethionet.et</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>Georges Bayonne Mboumba</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gbayonne@hotmail.fr">gbayonne@hotmail.fr</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambia</td>
<td>Alpha A.K. Jallow</td>
<td><a href="mailto:a_jallow2010@yahoo.com">a_jallow2010@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana (MESTI)</td>
<td>Mr. Fredua Agyeman</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fredua_agyman@hotmail.com">fredua_agyman@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana (EPA)</td>
<td>Mr. Kyekyeku Oppong-Boadi</td>
<td><a href="mailto:koppongboadi@gmail.com">koppongboadi@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana (EPA)</td>
<td>Mr. Daniel Tutu Benefoh</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dbenefor2000@yahoo.com">dbenefor2000@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Mr. Robert Bamfo</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bamforobert@yahoo.com">bamforobert@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana (MOFA)</td>
<td>Kingsley Agyemang</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kingsleyagyemang@yahoo.co.uk">kingsleyagyemang@yahoo.co.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana (EPA)</td>
<td>E. T. Obeng</td>
<td><a href="mailto:etachieobeng@gmail.com">etachieobeng@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana (Energy Commission)</td>
<td>Joseph Issandrah-Yeddu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana (MLHR)</td>
<td>Macdana Yumus</td>
<td><a href="mailto:macdanayumus@yahoo.com">macdanayumus@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Peter Acquah</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pcacquah@hotmail.com">pcacquah@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>Joseph Sylia</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Joesyilla2002@gmail.com">Joesyilla2002@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Stephen Kinguyu</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stephen.kinguyu@gmail.com">stephen.kinguyu@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>Mookho Monnapula</td>
<td><a href="mailto:monnapula21@gmail.com">monnapula21@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>Mr. Benjamin S. Karmorh</td>
<td><a href="mailto:benkarmorh@yahoo.com">benkarmorh@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>Evans Davie Njewa</td>
<td><a href="mailto:njewae@yahoo.com">njewae@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>Drissa Doumbia</td>
<td><a href="mailto:drissd2@gmail.com">drissd2@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>Jonathan Kamwi</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mutauk@yahoo.co.uk">mutauk@yahoo.co.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>Moussa Gousmane</td>
<td><a href="mailto:imgousmane@yahoo.fr">imgousmane@yahoo.fr</a>; <a href="mailto:kmaazou@gmail.com">kmaazou@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Samuel Adeoye Adejuwon</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jareadejuwon@yahoo.com">jareadejuwon@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>Dusabeyezu Sébastien</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dusabeseba@yahoo.fr">dusabeseba@yahoo.fr</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>Mohamed Dorwie</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mohmeddorwie4u@yahoo.com">mohmeddorwie4u@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>Hana Hamadalla</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hanahamadalla2@yahoo.com">hanahamadalla2@yahoo.com</a>; <a href="mailto:hcen2005@yahoo.com">hcen2005@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaziland</td>
<td>Hlobsile Sikhosana</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hlobshkos@yahoo.com">hlobshkos@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>Tomyeba Komi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>Bouzghaya Fethi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>United Republic of Tanzania</td>
<td>Freddy Manyika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>Richard Mfumu Lungu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>United Kingdom (British High Commission, Ghana)</td>
<td>Tanya Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>Reed Schuler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Karine Hertzberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Wolfgang Dierhofer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>Ariane Labat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Sebastian Wienges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Pierre Kervennal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>CDKN</td>
<td>Karen Sutherland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>CILSS</td>
<td>Sebastien Subsol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>CILSS</td>
<td>Magguette Kaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>LEDS GP</td>
<td>Edward Awafo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>UNEP</td>
<td>George Manful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>UNEP Risoe</td>
<td>Emmanuel Ackom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>WRI</td>
<td>Jared Finnegan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>Isabel Abreu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>UNFCCC</td>
<td>Donald Cooper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>UNFCCC</td>
<td>Claudio Forner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>UNDP HQ</td>
<td>Rebecca Carman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>UNDP HQ</td>
<td>Alexa Kleysteuber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>UNDP Ghana</td>
<td>Jeremias Blaser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>UNDP Ghana</td>
<td>Paolo Dalla Stella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>UNDP Ghana</td>
<td>Abena Baafi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>UNDP Ghana</td>
<td>Christy Ahenkora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>UNDP Ghana</td>
<td>Namho Oh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>UNDP Ghana</td>
<td>Adjekai A Ankomentah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>UNDP Ghana</td>
<td>Stephen Kansuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>UNDP Ghana</td>
<td>Pamela Blackman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>UNDP Ghana</td>
<td>Mustapha-Sey Abdallah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix II: Agenda

**AFRICA TECHNICAL DIALOGUE ON INTENDED NATIONALLY DETERMINED CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE 2015 AGREEMENT UNDER THE UNFCCC**

Accra, Ghana  
14-16 May 2014

### AGENDA

**Participants:** Country representatives from the African Region, developed countries, multilateral and bilateral agencies, regional organisations, and resource experts.

**Objectives:**
- Ensure that all participants understand the scientific context and UNFCCC origins of intended nationally determined contributions (hereafter referred to as contributions)
- Share experiences and best practices in developing contributions, and identify solutions to challenges being faced
- Address issues related to the underlying technical basis required to prepare robust, realistic and achievable contributions
- Identify support needs required to reach domestic agreement on contributions and follow-up actions in this regard

### WEDNESDAY, 14 MAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.30-9.00am</td>
<td>Registration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9.00-10.00am  | **Opening Remarks**  
- Fredua Agyeman, Director of Environment of the Ministry of Environment, Science, Technology and Innovation  
- Donald Cooper, Coordinator of the UNFCCC Mitigation, Data and Analysis Programme  
- Jeremias Blaser, UNDP Deputy Country Director in Ghana  

**UNFCCC context and objectives of the workshop**  
- Rebecca Carman, UNDP Environment and Energy Group

*Participants will introduce themselves to the colleagues at their table.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 10.00-11.15am | **Session 1: Scene-setting on intended nationally determined contributions: the scientific basis and political context**  
The objective of this session is to ensure that all participants have a common understanding of the political and scientific context for contributions.  
- Emmanuel Ackom, UNEP Risoe Centre

Presentation: The scientific context: The UNEP *Emissions Gap Report 2013:* A global context on how the Cancun Agreement pledges relate to the 2°C target

- Evans Njewa, Malawi

Presentation: What have we learned from past efforts under the UNFCCC that may provide lessons learned for the preparation of contributions

Questions and plenary discussion |
| 11.15-11.45am | Coffee break                                                               |
Session 2: Key considerations when preparing contributions – Ensuring a consultative and development-oriented process

The objective of this session is to learn how countries are engaging a broad range of stakeholders, building consensus, and leveraging other relevant national activities to prepare contributions that are aligned with national development goals.

11.45am-1.00pm

Three countries will present on their experiences to date in preparing their contributions, focusing on the lessons learned & best practices from the design process.

Country Presentations:
- Kyekyeku Oppong-Boadi, Ghana
- Alpha Jallow, Gambia

Questions and plenary discussion

1.00-2.00pm

Lunch

2.00-3.15pm

Session 2 (continued): Key considerations when preparing contributions – Ensuring a consultative and development-oriented process

Three countries will present on their experiences to date in preparing their contributions, focusing on the lessons learned & best practices from the design process.

Country Presentations:
- Drissa Doumbia, Mali
- Hamdy Darrag, Egypt
- Karine Hertzberg, Norway

Questions and plenary discussion

3.15-4.30pm

Role-play exercise in groups

Participants will break into groups to discuss specific scenarios surrounding the preparation and development of nationally determined contributions, with the goal of brainstorming possible ways forward. In particular, participants will be asked to identify what support might be useful for assisting countries facing these scenarios.

4.30-5.00pm

Coffee break

5.00-5:45 pm

Report back from working groups

Each group will have 5-10 minutes to report back followed by plenary discussions.

6.00-7.30pm

Welcome cocktail/mixer event

THURSDAY, 15 MAY

9.00-9.15am

Brief introduction by moderators

Session 3: Key considerations when preparing intended nationally determined contributions– The underlying technical basis

The objective of this session is to discuss and identify solutions to the technical challenges being faced in developing the underlying technical basis of contributions.

9.15-10:45am

This session will explore underlying technical requirements for preparing robust, realistic and achievable contributions, including elements such as:

1. Potential data challenges for the preparation of contributions: How to identify and address these challenges at the outset
2. How to make use of the best available information/improve basic information to support contributions?
3. How to link baseline information with contributions?

Scene-setting presentation:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.45-11.15am</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.15-12.45pm</td>
<td><strong>Session 4: Key considerations when preparing intended nationally determined contributions—Critical information to be included</strong>&lt;br&gt;The objective of this session is to discuss the most likely information anticipated for contributions, and how to quickly generate that information, if required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.45-2.00pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00-3.00 pm</td>
<td><strong>Session 5: Recent technical discussions on intended nationally determined contributions</strong>&lt;br&gt;<em>Participants will hear about recent instances where countries have come together to share their experiences and lessons learned on the preparation of their contributions.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00-4:15pm</td>
<td><strong>Working group discussion</strong>&lt;br&gt;Participants will split into working groups to discuss expectations about the contributions and to identify what specific support might be useful in assisting countries in overcoming these challenges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.15-4.45pm</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.45-5.30pm</td>
<td><strong>Report back from working groups</strong>&lt;br&gt;Each group will have 5-10 minutes to report back followed by plenary discussions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FRIDAY, 16 MAY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.00-9.15am</td>
<td>Brief introduction by moderators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.15-10.30am</td>
<td><strong>Session 5: Key considerations when preparing intended nationally determined contributions—Transparency and MRV</strong>&lt;br&gt;<em>The objective of this session is to discuss challenges that countries may face with respect to MRV-related aspects of their contributions.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country Presentations:&lt;br&gt;•  Ghrmawit Haile Gebrehiwot, Ethiopia&lt;br&gt;•  Sebastian Wienges, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questions and plenary discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30-11.00am</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Session 6: Sharing experiences from selected relevant initiatives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The objective of this session is to allow relevant initiatives/programmes to present how their work and support to countries could concretely promote collaboration and constructive dialogue in the preparation of contributions.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00am-12.15pm</td>
<td>Panel discussion on how relevant initiatives/programmes may provide inputs to contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Panelists: CDKN, CILSS, EU, GIZ, LEDS GP, UNDP, UNEP, WRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questions and plenary discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.15-12.45pm</td>
<td><strong>Next steps</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants will discuss how to ensure momentum in domestic preparation of contributions as well as other follow-up actions and recommendations to initiate or further support to developing countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45-1.00pm</td>
<td><strong>Closing remarks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Vote of thanks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix III: Results from the participant evaluation

A total of 37 participants filled out an evaluation of the meeting. Below is a graphical summary of participants’ responses, as well as a transcript of participant’s comments. Transcribed comments were not modified.

To what extent were your expectations for the workshop met?

- Fully met 37% (n=13)
- Partially met 63% (n=22)
- Not at all met (n=0)

Opinion on overall approach used for the workshop

- Very useful 51% (n=24)
- Useful 43% (n=20)
- Somewhat useful 6% (n=3)
- Not at all useful (n=0)

Please rank the overall usefulness of the workshop

- Very useful 49% (n=23)
- Useful 40% (n=19)
- Somewhat useful 11% (n=5)
- Not at all useful (n=0)
What could be done differently to improve the usefulness of the workshop?

Views on usefulness of various session formats