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Optimizing the Technology Executive Committee/
Climate Technology Centre and Network Relationship

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

The text of the draft Doha decision, Agreed outcome pursuant to the Bali Action Plan, asks
COP 19 to “initiate ... the elaboration and consideration of the relationship of the
Technology Executive Committee and the Climate Technology Centre and Network, in order
to ensure coherence and synergy within the Technology Mechanism...”¹ Climate Action
Network (CAN) is very pleased for the opportunity to offer this submission which focuses on
supporting that goal, under items 2 and 3 of the TEC’s rolling work plan, by describing an
efficient cooperative vision for the relationship and by providing additional detail, by
example, of where, in our view, the relationship might benefit from further elaboration.

CAN’s vision for an optimally responsive Technology Mechanism

In CAN’s view the value of the Technology Mechanism (TM) will be judged by how well it
serves its ultimate goal of providing optimally responsive technology diffusion to meet the
climate technology needs of developing country Parties that results in emissions reduction
and resiliency on the ground.

Our vision is of a TM whose internal bodies, the Technology Executive Committee (TEC), the
Climate Technology Centre and network (CTCN), and its Advisory Board, work hand-in-hand
through efficient, well-defined interfaces and open, transparent information flows that are
inclusive of all stakeholders, inviting to both technology providers and developing country
users, and that embody effective and efficient review and adjustment mechanisms which
are thoroughly grounded in the principles of equity and open communication.

In particular, we believe that the TEC/CTCN relationship should be characterized by
- Rich discussion of issues and ideas that are archived and open to all constituencies;
- Clear understanding of the roles of each body; and
- Careful cooperation to harmonize the bodies’ work.

¹ Draft decision -/CP.18, Agreed outcome pursuant to the Bali Action Plan, paragraph 59.
Leveraging the structure

How can we best leverage the established structure to reach the optimum outcomes that could flow from such a vision? CAN suggests that the answer rests to a large degree in ensuring that the key outcomes of the relevant work of each body of the TM is optimally deployed to support functions and processes on the ground in developing countries. This would mean that the work of the TEC, for example, would, in or through the CTCN and its Advisory Board, be communicated as far down the chain of providers as needed to make the appropriate difference on the ground. Each body, in turn, would reliably receive the latest assessment of needs from developing countries to support its mandates and rolling work plans. This would require active, well-defined communication among all of the TM’s bodies and the on-the-ground processes that they support.

Thought experiment: Prioritization Criteria
CAN believes that among the most important issues currently facing the TM is the question of how to prioritize the requests received by the CTCN from developing country Parties. Let’s consider this issue as an example of how TEC and CTCN might interact.

The Durban decision\(^2\) gives the Advisory Board of the CTCN a mandate to provide guidance on prioritization criteria taking into account the “strategic considerations and recommendations” provided by the Technology Executive Committee in relation to the Cancun decision\(^3\). However this begs the question of exactly what types of strategic considerations and recommendations will be given by the TEC, when and how they will be given and how they will be incorporated into CTCN policy. These prioritization criteria are of fundamental importance to stakeholders from developing country Parties, to public and private innovators, to donors and investors. CAN believes that timely, transparent and predictable decisions are required, and that there is no substitute for clarity and transparency in the roles that each body will play in the process.

As a thought experiment, let’s assume that there is agreement that the TEC should set the overarching parameters of the priorities for projects. And let’s say that the TEC determines, based on relevant science and input from ADP that in order to meet the UNFCCC pre-2020 ambition goals the TM should give priority to the development and diffusion of appropriate power sector technologies. What process would the TEC use for making such a recommendation? How would that recommendation be transmitted? In what manner would the CTCN Advisory Board assimilate it?

For example, it could be decided that the TEC would commission studies and convene an open process in which stakeholders could also submit considerations that would be vetted and analyzed by the TEC members, other actors within the TM, a team of expert consultants, or some combination. The process might include experts from the CTCN who could, together with the TEC’s Chair and Vice-chair, relay the latest progress to the Advisory Board. But to ensure that a broader audience of stakeholders can be engaged, it might also be beneficial to establish a cycle for when key guidance can be expected to be reviewed and a location, consistent across the TM, where further policy information of this kind can be found. Carefully defining the process to appropriately set stakeholder expectations within and without the TM would be key to optimizing their engagement.

---

\(^2\) Decision 2/CP.17 Annex VII, paragraph 9 a) ii
\(^3\) Decision 1/CP.16 paragraph 121
Turning our thought experiment to the Advisory Board, how might it integrate the new priority into the prioritization criteria that may have been already established based on Technology Needs Assessments (TNAs) and/or other data including that related to the country requests it received. How might the policy integration be made and how might it be communicated?

The Advisory Board might begin by consulting within the open process initiated by the TEC to get broad views of how this new priority could be integrated with existing CTCN policy. For example, let’s say that the Advisory Board has already established highest priority for adaptation technologies because it was seeing more availability of mitigation technologies than those for adaptation. It may decide to recommend implementation of the highest priority for new power projects that support resilience as well as mitigation, say, by prioritizing off-grid renewable power projects for un-served or under-served communities or grid protection systems against flooding and storms. Describing the decision taken and posting information on the TM website on how stakeholders might offer comments would provide opportunity for timely, valuable feedback with the potential to save resources and avoid unforeseen concerns. Again, properly setting stakeholder expectations would improve their engagement.

What this “thought experiment” suggests is that combining the strategic considerations of the TEC with the operational policy of the CTCN could mean extensive interaction between the bodies, and may be best done by opening the interaction to a broader stakeholder base.

Other examples:
CAN sees many opportunities for further defining the relationship between the TEC and CTCN that might result in better coherence and synergy between the bodies of the TM. Below are some cases where we could foresee better outcomes through cooperation based on clear understanding of roles.

- Defining standard timeframes and venues for the TEC to update the strategic overview of technology needs as well as a specific procedure for making them available to complement the processes for Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) via the CTCN [TEC work plan 5];
- Designing an information platform that might serve as a one-stop stakeholder information source for high level ongoing decision processes within the TM [TEC work plan 9];
- Integrating Technology Assessment into the TM, including TEC technology briefs and CTCN implementation [TEC work plan 11];
- Promoting and catalyzing the research, development, and demonstration of key technologies for diffusion via the CTCN based on project data [TEC work plan 14];
- Initiating the preparation of TEC technical papers that support guidance and recommendations to increase the efficiency of support for activities related to the development and transfer of technologies via the CTCN [TEC work plan 15];
- Notification to the TEC by Parties or by the CTCN of the identification of opportunities for facilitated development of secondary technology innovation for countries that lack markets to support such development;
- Requests by the CTCN for study on newly identified barriers to technology transfer;
Conclusion:
CAN believes that the effectiveness of the TM hangs on the coherent definition of the relationship between the TEC, the CTCN and the processes that they support. Examples of issues in which the TEC and the CTCN have distinct but complementary roles make clear that this definitional work is needed.

A strong well-defined role for each component is in CAN’s opinion the most likely means of making the TM a coherent whole able to reap the synergies of cooperative work. But to make the definition wieldy we need to structure it in a way that embodies the overarching role of each component and takes advantage of the strength of a two-entity architecture.

In CAN’s view the overarching role of the TEC is a strategic one. Its experts create and continually update the long term vision of the pathway that will lead the TM to best serve it’s ultimate goal of providing optimally responsive technology diffusion to meet the climate technology needs of the developing country Parties that results in emissions reduction and resiliency on the ground. To create that vision the TEC conducts the outreach and studies in its mandate. But just as importantly it communicates that ongoing vision to the processes on the ground via the CTCN and its Advisory Board.

In CAN’s view the overarching role of the Advisory Board and the CTCN is operational. It facilitates implementation on the ground. The Advisory Board sets operational policy based on strategic input from the TEC and it monitors, assesses and evaluates policy implementation. The centre interprets that policy and coordinates its use in projects. The network delivers project assistance on the ground in accordance with that policy.

These roles are clear and distinct, though many of the issues the TM will face will likely need to be addressed by both the TEC and the CTCN. By considering their overarching roles and how those roles would be implemented for some of the key issues we can set precedent that will serve future coherence and synergy.

CAN appreciates the opportunity to make a submission in this matter.