



Climate Action Network Discussion Paper: Prioritization Criteria for the Climate Technology Centre and Network

8 August 2013

Climate Action Network (CAN) is the world's largest network of civil society organizations working together to promote government action to address the climate crisis, with more than 700 members in over 90 countries. www.climatenetwork.org

It may be deduced that because the "the identification of technology needs will be based on a country-driven approach..."[1] the priority with which the CTCN accepts requests from developing countries should be based on developing country needs. The inference is that priorities for allocation of CTCN resources should be based on those technology needs. But this begs two questions:

1. How do developing countries voice their collective needs?
2. Are the needs that are voiced representative of global needs in the sense that they lead to a fair distribution of CTCN resources and are consistent with the requirements of science?

This discussion paper considers potential proxies for "country demand", but also suggests that, in addition to providing what countries need, it is the values of the Convention itself, that need to be made an integral part of any prioritization criteria. The paper leverages current thinking on equity to suggest some potentially applicable metrics. It also suggests that the outcome of the requests to CTCN should be reviewed for adequacy against the latest climate science.

1. How do developing countries voice their needs?

If we interpret the "country-driven approach" to mean that priorities should be based on the statistical distribution of country requests, the clear flaw in the thinking is that it would tend to favor the richer over the poorer nations simply because they are more likely to have the capacity to make requests, as was the experience in the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM). Moreover, the technologies they ask for may well be different from those most suitable to poorer nations so that support services for the more requested technologies may not be very helpful to lower income nations. To side step this issue, CAN asserts that there are reasonable "proxies" for country demand that could complement actual requests when they begin to arrive.

Proxies for Country Needs:

A number of proxies for the technology needs of developing countries could be found, but each has its own set of issues. The list below contains some ideas on available proxies and their limitations.

Decision text from the COP:

It may be that the Parties will decide to negotiate on priorities for the CTCN in which case the political decision is taken at the highest level. This would be definitive, but seems unlikely since the COP is currently focused to a great extent on the 2015 ADP deal, and also because of unexpected stumbling blocks in the discussions such as what happened in Bonn, in May 2013.

Data from "survey" tools such as Technology Needs Assessments:

The Third Synthesis of TNAs is now in preparation for submission to COP19. It is based on the TNAs/TAPs of 21 countries out of 132 developing country Parties. While this synthesis delivers much valuable data, response was self-selected, so it does not represent a statistically valid sample. Even the best-designed and carried out survey would depend on information volunteered by Parties.

Submissions from developing country Parties:

Any needs information that developing country parties choose to share with the UNFCCC should certainly be considered valid needs statements no matter its form from a formal submission to a non-paper.

Formal requests to the CTCN by developing country Nationally Designated Entities:

This is the most formal procedure for submitting needs and comes with the assurance that this is the official communication of the Party. However, as mentioned earlier, using requests to decide the top needs of all Parties disadvantages lower income countries. To date no requests exist.

Experience from CDM or other development activity:

Lessons learned from historical and current development activity is a strong basis for guiding work in new projects, but success of a technology in one environment does not imply appropriateness or success of that technology in another, in light of differences in country capacities and the fact that CDM projects are solely on mitigation efforts.

Advice from Advisory Board developing country members:

The eight developing country members of the Advisory Board are representatives of the developing world's regions and advice by these Parties should be considered representative input. A process that would ensure ample opportunity for every developing country to give input through their Advisory Board representative could provide even better confidence that the input would be representative of developing country needs as a whole.

Of the most likely and most representative sources above the combination of TNA data with the advice of developing country members of the Advisory Board might be most useful in articulating "the collective developing country needs" because it would be based on the best available data (though it may be subjective by nature and is potentially biased in a statistical sense) and overlays it with the political judgment of high level regional representatives (who could help to correct any sampling bias). Adding developing country submissions on needs could also be useful in expanding the base of the data. However, it remains an open question whether the distribution of resources resulting from this combined wisdom of country needs would actually be "fair" in the sense of the values of the Convention and whether it actually meets the global need in the sense of providing adequate emissions reductions and

resilience. The next step would be to interpret these priorities through the “global needs” lens of fairness and adequacy.

2. Are the voiced needs fair and adequate?

Fairness:

The objective of the Technology Mechanism is “to accelerate action...on mitigation and adaptation...”[2] To judge its fairness we would need to judge how fairly it accelerates action on mitigation and adaptation in developing countries in a manner that is consistent with the values of the Convention such as common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capacities (CBDR-RC) and the sovereign right to sustainable development including the universal right to energy access and the expectation that consideration will be given to the most vulnerable populations including those induced by gender or age.

Metrics by which CTCN allocations could be measured: (For more detail see the Annex)

Mitigation: For mitigation metrics of sustainability may include:

- Emissions of carbon dioxide and other climate forcers
- Change in forested land area

Adaptation: For adaptation metrics of resilience may include:

- Resilience to health impacts of climate change
- Resilience to sea level rise
- Resilience to food security challenges

Sustainable Development: For development, metrics of progress could include:

- Progress toward educational goals
- Progress in raising income levels
- Change in forested land area, and
- The number of people who live on degraded land
- Contributes to the narrowing of income inequality

Vulnerability: For impact on vulnerable populations metrics could include:

- Percentages of women and children at lowest income levels, on degraded land, at lowest education levels, impacted by climate illnesses, or participating in the paid labour force
- The same as above for cultural minorities, those living in an area exceptionally impacted by sea level rise, exceptionally stronger storms, or extreme flooding and drought.

In addition to addressing fairness of the allocation of resources, we need to also be concerned with the actual results on the ground: Did the resources get to where they were intended, did they have the intended effect, and were there any unintended consequences? These considerations could be addressed by appropriate MRV and a Redress mechanism for Stakeholders.

Adequacy: Adequacy for mitigation technologies can be best understood by determining the likelihood that the Parties are on a pathway that will, in view of the latest science, contribute an appropriate share of the effort to get us to the stated 2/1.5 degree C goal (alongside emissions reductions from developed countries). In conjunction with the adequacy Review Process the Technology Mechanism can assess whether the outcomes of its effort are on track to aid Parties

in meeting their country goals. On the basis of that review it can suggest technologies that can help to close any gap.

For adaptation technologies, adequacy could be measured by whether the allocation of CTCN resources are in line with what is needed to help developing countries, particularly the least developed ones, cope with the impacts of climate change that are already in evidence and that are projected to happen based on the most likely global emissions trajectory.

[1] For example, see the third paragraph of the Chapeau for Section V of 2/CP.17, Technology Development and Transfer.

[2] 1/CP.16 paragraph 115

Annex: Sample Indicators

1. Health
 - a. Focused on the contribution to key climate-related health risks, including access to food, water and building resilience e.g. – (20%)
 - i. Progress/rate of change in Deaths due to malaria per 100,000 population per year for women, men, boys, girls
 - ii. Progress/rate of change for boys and girls under-five who are under weight for their age (moderate and severe)
 - b. Focused on the contribution to key technology-related health risks (20%)
 - i. Progress/rate of change deaths and illness of women, men, boys and girls due to indoor and outdoor air-pollution
2. Capacity building (20%)
 - a. Graduates (broken down by sex) in science and engineering (as a percentage of population)
 - i. For example we might want to shoot for a particular ratio e.g. at least 50/50, measured in terms of progress/rate of change towards that goal
 - ii. Progress/rate of change in Population with at least secondary education, including
 - iii. Progress/rate of change in female/male ratio (Ratio of female to male rates)
3. Sustainable Development (20%)
 - i. Progress/rate of change in forest area,
 - ii. Progress/rate of change Women, men, boys, girls, living on degraded land (%) (including breakdown of how many women, boys, men and girls)
 - iii. Progress/rate of change in Carbon dioxide emissions per capita (tons)
4. Income (20%)
 - i. Paid labor force participation rate, female-male ratio (progress in Ratio of female to male shares)
 - ii. Personal Care work participation rate, female-male ration (Ratio of female to male shares)
 - iii. Measures (to be instituted within the TM) that track the impact of technology diffusion on income inequality to ensure it is not exacerbated