

Summary Report

Good Practice Analysis 2.0 on INDCs, LEDS, NAMAs and MRV

New Cases | 2015



International Partnership
on Mitigation and MRV



LOW EMISSION
CAPACITY BUILDING
PROGRAMME

Summary Report Good Practice Analysis 2.0 on INDCs, LEDS, NAMAs and MRV

November 2015

International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV
www.mitigationpartnership.net

Low Emission Capacity Building Programme
www.lowemissiondevelopment.org

The analysis was supported by the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety (BMUB) in the framework of its International Climate Initiative (IKI).
www.international-climate-initiative.com

Summary Report

Authors

Marie-Jeanne Kurdziel, Frauke Roeser (NewClimate Institute)

Global Good Practice Analysis

Coordination

Frauke Roeser and Marie-Jeanne Kurdziel (NewClimate Institute),
Manish Kumar Shrivastava and Neha Pahuja (TERI), Natalie Harms (ECN), Aida Figari (Libélula)
www.newclimate.org · www.teriin.org · www.ecn.nl · www.libelula.com.pe

Steering Committee

Steffen Menzel and Dr. Alexander Fisher (BMUB), Sven Egbers, Daniela Boos and Inga Zachow (GIZ),
Allison Towle, Yamil Bonduki, Rebecca Carman, Susanne Olbrisch, James Vener and Alexandra Soezer (UNDP)

Contributing Authors:

Aida Figari (Libélula), Barath Mahadevan (TERI), Frauke Roeser (NewClimate Institute), Juan Sotés (Libélula), Manish Kumar Shrivastava (TERI), Marie-Jeanne Kurdziel (NewClimate Institute), Matthew Halstead (ECN), Natalie Harms (ECN), Neha Pahuja (TERI), Nimisha Pandey (TERI), Pía Zevallo (Libélula), Rita Effah (TERI), Swati Agarwal (TERI), Thomas Day (NewClimate Institute), Ximena Gómez (Libélula)

Design

webersupiran.berlin · Germany
Printed on 100% recycled paper, FSC certified/The Blue Angel

Contents

1.	Introduction	4
2.	Approach	5
3.	Key Elements of Good Practice	6
4.	Success Factors and Lessons Learned	6
	4.1 Commitment and Leadership at the Highest Political Level	6
	4.2 Participatory Process	7
	4.3 Scientific Analysis	7
	4.4 Embedding into National Frameworks	8
	4.5 Learning from International Best Practices	8
	4.6 Long-term Vision	8
5.	Conclusions	9
	Annex: Good Practice Criteria	10

1. Introduction

In 2014, the first Global Good Practice Analysis (GPA 1.0) was carried out to showcase well designed and effective mitigation activities, with a focus on Low Emission Development Strategies (LEDS), Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) and Monitoring, Reporting, Verification (MRV) in developing countries. This first GPA was a response to country requests for replicable experiences to learn from. The 21 case studies demonstrated a variety of interesting approaches to mitigation planning and policy design and were disseminated widely through the networks of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). In continuation of the successful GPA 1.0, a second edition has been commissioned, again in collaboration between the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH (as agents of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV¹) and the UNDP Low Emission Capacity Building Programme (LECB)². A consortium led by NewClimate Institute and including the Energy Research Centre of the Netherlands (ECN), The Energy and Resources Institute (TERI) and Libélula was asked to examine a new selection of cases which demonstrate how mitigation actions, ranging from LEDS over NAMAs and MRV to Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDCs), are being effectively designed and implemented across different national contexts, including developed and developing countries. The resulting good practice case studies provide rich insights from 19 countries on successes and lessons learned that can be disseminated internationally to support increased mitigation ambition.

The objective of this summary report is to synthesise key findings from the global good practices cases. The summary will draw out lessons learned and key elements of good practice for the four thematic areas LEDS, NAMAs, MRV and INDCs. These will also be considered across the different topic areas to understand good practices and success factors more broadly. The findings and conclusions of the second Global Good Practice Analysis (GPA 2.0) confirm and corroborate central outcomes of the previous study as published in the [Global Good Practice Summary Report 2014](#)³.

¹ The International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV which was launched in 2010 aims to advance mitigation activities through dialogue and knowledge sharing between developed and developing countries in order to help to close the ambition gap. To this end, the Partnership supports various activities, including capacity building and knowledge exchanges in the area of Low Emission Development Strategies (LEDS), Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs), Measurement, Reporting and Verification (MRV) systems as well as, more recently, Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDCs).

² UNDP's Low Emission Capacity Building Programme (LECB) supports 38 partner countries with the development of robust national systems and processes to allow the design and implementation of effective mitigation activities at the country level. This work includes global support in the development and preparation of countries' INDCs and the NAMAs that will enable Nationally Determined Contributions to become reality.

³ Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), Global Good Practice Analysis on LEDS, NAMAs and MRV. Summary Report, May 2014.

2. Approach

The GPA 2.0 builds on the methodologies of GPA 1.0, extending its coverage to developed countries as well as to INDCs. The research work conducted for GPA 2.0 comprised two phases:

1. Review of the methodology and good practice criteria: In a first step, the methodology and criteria for the identification of good practices as developed in GPA 1.0 were thoroughly reviewed and supplemented, particularly taking into account the expansion of the scope of GPA 2.0 to include developed countries and INDCs in the analysis. Criteria were identified which are generally applicable to both developed and developing countries. Findings from GPA 1.0 were revisited to check that all identified good practices were covered in the new set of criteria and to verify their continued validity as well as applicability to both developed and developing countries. The result is a set of generally applicable criteria regardless of country profile. In addition, a set of good practice criteria for the development of INDCs were identified.

2. Selection of countries and case analysis: In a second step, a long list of countries across five regions (Asia and the Caucasus, Africa and Middle East/North Africa (MENA), Latin America and the Caribbean, Europe and North America) and four different topic areas (LEDS, NAMAs, MRV, INDCs) was prepared. The long list was reviewed against the criteria to identify a selection of 19 good practice examples for an in-depth analysis. These 19 cases were individually analysed based on desk review of available information and data complemented with interviews of selected local stakeholders who were involved in the activity. Subsequent to a review through the project steering group, authors of the respective cases revised case drafts and verified the final content with interviewees to ensure accuracy. The results of the country research is captured in fact sheets which highlight key information on each country case. The selected country case studies include the following:

Country	Title
Burkina Faso	Burkina Faso Biomass Energy NAMA
Chile	Inclusive and Technically Sound INDC Development Process in Chile
China	Limiting Coal Consumption in China
Costa Rica	Linking LEDS and NAMA in the Livestock Sector in Costa Rica
Denmark	Transformational Change: Danish 100% Renewable Energy Policy
Dominican Republic	Stakeholder Involvement and the Consideration of Co-benefits in the Preparation of the Dominican Republic's INDC
Ecuador	Promoting Induction Cooking in Ecuador
European Union	The European Union Emission Trading System (EU ETS)
Germany	Institutional Arrangements for the National Greenhouse Gas Inventory System
Ghana	Ghana's Climate Ambitious Reporting Programme
Jordan	An Inter-sectoral Approach to Jordan's INDC Process
Morocco	Developing an INDC Aligning National and Sectoral Policy Objectives
Norway	Initiative and Innovation in the Norwegian INDC Preparation
Pacific Islands	100% Renewable Energy Targets in the Pacific Islands
South Africa	An Integrated MRV System in South Africa
South Korea	Web-based Greenhouse Gas Management System of the Republic of Korea
United States	Making Progress on President Obama's Climate Action Plan
Uruguay	Transforming the Energy Sector in Uruguay

Although not all approaches outlined in the case studies are transferable to every country and context, all cases assessed provide useful, practice-based insights for the effective design and implementation of mitigation actions at the country level.

The following pages provide a summary of conclusions drawn from the thorough analysis of the 19 cases, focussing on key elements of good practice, central success factors and lessons learned. More detailed information as well as further contacts and links are available online in the form of case factsheets at: www.mitigationpartnership.net/gpa.

3. Key Elements of Good Practice

The evaluation of individual cases against the good practice criteria developed for this analysis (see annex) allows to highlight those elements that are most represented in the implementation of mitigation activities and may provide inspiration for others to replicate.

Good practices in the implementation of LEDS

All (4) cases highlight **commitment and leadership at the highest political level** and **coordination across different key ministries** as important elements of good practice. Most (3) cases mention a **country-driven process** that is linked to existing national processes, and some (2) cases emphasise a **long-term vision** combined with the definition of short- and medium-term goals.

Good practices in the implementation of NAMAs

All (6) cases identify a **high-level political ownership** and a **participatory process involving key stakeholders** as elements of good practice. Most (5) cases highlight **broad scope and long-term character** and the **alignment with existing national strategies and policies** as good practice. Few (3) cases also highlight the importance of **stimulating private investment and contribution to sustainable development**.

Good practices in the implementation of MRV

Most (3 out of 4) cases highlight **established systems for regular tracking** of GHG emissions, the **alignment with international standards and guidelines**, and processes for **quality assurance and verification through external experts** as key factors. Half of the cases consider **adequate resourcing** and a **strong and effective collaboration between different stakeholders** (including clear outline of mandates, deliverables, timelines etc.) as essential.

Good practices in the implementation of INDCs

Agreement on good practices is highest across cases of INDCs. All (5) cases identify four central elements of good practice: 1) **commitment and leadership at the highest political level** throughout the process, 2) the **involvement and consultation of a wider group of cross-sector non-government stakeholders** (academia, civil society organisations, private entities) in the preparation process, 3) an **inter-ministerial process** with government participation and support across the whole vertical and horizontal spectrum of government, 4) the importance for the INDC to be **integrated in and build upon other climate related programmes, policies and strategies** (build on available information and established structures/existing practices). Most (4) cases also highlight the importance of **transparency and inclusiveness in the domestic preparation and approval process**.

4. Success Factors and Lessons Learned

Drawing on the case-based analysis of 19 country examples, a summary of key success factors and lessons learned is presented in order to inform the design and implementation of similar initiatives elsewhere. Each individual case study includes further details on success factors and lessons learned, as well as aspects to consider for the replication of activities.

4.1 Commitment and Leadership at the Highest Political Level

Across all cases, strong political commitment and leadership at the highest political level are identified as key success factors. This includes direct support from the President or Prime Minister (e.g. United States, Dominican Republic, Chile, South Korea), or endorsement by other state entities and ministries, in particular the Ministry of the Environment (e.g. Jordan, Norway).

Successful leadership and commitment had two main impacts across the cases studied:

Initiation of the process: A high-level political decision might be essential to start the processes related to mitigation activity and to give some initial direction. It is important that this initial commitment is maintained throughout the process, e.g. within an inter-ministerial working group. What is more, strong commitment by state entities or ministries might help to act as a door opener to establish contacts with relevant stakeholders (e.g. Norway, Germany). In particular in the case of developing countries, high-level political leadership can act as key drivers for the development of climate legislation (e.g. Mexico).

Advocacy and awareness-raising: The active involvement of a high-level political leader in outreach activities might increase the ability to gather multiple stakeholders and ensure broad public backing. In Ecuador, the President has been actively involved in the NAMA process by supporting the initiative publicly and invit-

ing citizens and other stakeholders to be part of the process. In the case of the EU, a team of highly skilled and dedicated experts played a critical role in advocating the EU ETS among decision makers and in passing the EU ETS Directive.

4.2 Participatory Process

Most (15) cases highlight the importance of an institutional set-up that allows for broad participation of a variety of stakeholders (ministry representatives and policy-makers, as well as various interest groups and non-governmental organisations). Stakeholder engagement tools include, amongst others, institutionalised dialogues, workshops or focus group meetings. The early involvement of relevant stakeholders in the process can provide important input and help to understand what is technically and politically feasible.

More specifically, a participatory process might take place on three levels that are partly interlinked: the political level (inter-ministerial coordination), the private sector level (public-private coordination) and the civil society level (public consultations).

Stakeholder dialogues: Particularly in NAMA related cases, the participation of multiple stakeholders is frequently mentioned as a central success factor. For example, Ecuador and Costa Rica highlight the importance to involve all relevant stakeholders from the public and private sectors, including industry and business representatives, in the NAMA design process in order to ensure adequacy and sustainability of the mitigation action. In the case of Burkina Faso, an emphasis is put on the engagement of sub-national stakeholders and organisations that are important to drive change at a community level. Denmark, on the other hand, attaches particular importance to the collaboration between the government and industry representatives.

Inter-ministerial coordination: In particular LEDS and INDC related cases highlight process coordination across different key ministries. Uruguay, for example, stresses the importance of a clear definition of mandates and resources among all involved ministries at an early stage. In the case of the Pacific Islands, the engagement of different ministries was meant to ensure the integration of all relevant activities and data in the LEDS process. In the INDC related cases, it is frequently said that the INDC preparation process should be closely linked to all line ministries and sectors to ensure full ownership of the INDC and its respective actions. In many of these cases, the Ministry of Environment plays a coordinating role. It is emphasised, in this context, that the early involvement of ministries in the process supports the buy-in of technical experts within the ministries and helps to ensure that decisions are taken promptly (e.g. Morocco, Jordan).

Engagement of the private sector: In the MRV related cases, a focus is laid on the particular collaboration between the government and the private sector. Involving the private sector directly in the design of the system through dedicated dialogues provides strong incentives for the private sector to actively participate and report

later on. This in turn supports the establishment of a robust GHG reporting system which is based on accurate, sector specific data and requirements (e.g. South Korea, Germany).

Public participation / public consultations: In particular the INDC related cases emphasise the importance of public consultations. These consultations ideally involve a large group of diverse stakeholders and aim at raising awareness at the general public as well as the political level. They might be conducted at different stages of the INDC process: either in parallel with the technical and political processes in order to obtain views on priorities for the INDC, as in Morocco, or to provide the public with the opportunity to review and comment on the final document, as in Chile. In the case of Chile, particular importance is given to the existence of clear mechanisms and channels for both policy makers and policy receptors to interact. This demonstrates general openness to feedback and has the potential to increase ownership.

4.3 Scientific Analysis

Many (11) cases emphasise the particular relevance of scientific and technical analysis in order to gather important data and identify potential barriers in the processes.

Building consensus: In particular in developed countries, scientific and technical analysis underpinning the planning and implementation of a mitigation action can help to build consensus. In the case of Denmark, a sound data basis allowed politicians to engage in an objective debate on a renewable energy policy and facilitated broad coalitions beyond party boundaries. In a similar way, central results from the IPCC's 5th assessment report as well as documents and analyses prepared by Norwegian agencies and research institutes provided scientific input for the development of the Norwegian climate commitment and provided the basis for strengthening the national cross-party agreement on climate policy.

Ensure feasibility: Especially in a least developed country (LCD) context, for example in Burkina Faso, it is crucial to invest time and resources into feasibility studies that analyse local market and socio-economic structures to provide information on value chains, financial instruments and potential implementation barriers. As such, scientific analysis and data collection helps to translate existing informal documentation into formal information and facilitate negotiations with decision makers at the local, national and international level (e.g. Burkina Faso, Pacific Islands). In the case of China, extensive research on clean energy alternatives was conducted and different scenarios for future GDP growth and the relationship between the economy and energy demand were analysed in order to define the goals and timeframes of reduced coal consumption and the respective means for achieving it. This rigorous analysis was vital to corroborate the technical feasibility of such an action vis-à-vis political decision makers and stakeholders.

Highlight co-benefits: In some cases, the analysis of sector level priorities and non-GHG related benefits is mentioned as a particular way to strengthen sector level buy-in and ensure ownership of the proposed measures (e.g. Costa Rica). The broad assessment of economic, social and environmental aspects of a mitigation action can furthermore provide important information for general development planning (e.g. Ghana).

Data management: In particular, many developing countries highlight the importance of reforming and centralising data processes, for example through the creation of web based systems. In the case of Ghana, for instance, a newly developed Online Climate Change Data Hub will serve as a central database for all climate related documentation, substantially improving data reporting, storage and integration at the national level. In the case of the Pacific Islands, the Secretariat for the Pacific Community has taken responsibility to establish a Pacific Regional Energy Repository, which builds upon existing web portals such as PRISM, GeoNetwork and the Pacific Hydrological Cycle Observing System and also links to other sites where Pacific energy data and information is stored. Both, developing and developed countries mention the importance to support continuous data generation and to mainstream data related processes into the routines of all relevant data handling institutions. The collection of data at the source helps to track and obtain accurate information on GHG-relevant activities and facilitates the elaboration of national GHG inventories (e.g. Germany, Ghana).

4.4 Embedding into National Frameworks

Many (13) of the NAMA, LEDS and INDC related cases stress the importance to align the mitigation activities with existing national strategies and embed them into a broader country context.

Align with national policies and strategies: The anchoring of mitigation activities in domestic policies and strategies is highlighted by both developed and developing countries. In a developing country context, emphasis is placed on the alignment with existing national development plans in order to ensure compatibility with other social and economic development goals (e.g. Ecuador, Costa Rica, Uruguay). In some cases, these national development plans provide a direct legal framework for implementation. In Mexico, for example, the General Climate Change Law paved the way for a comprehensive, integrated climate policy approach that is aligned to the National Development Plan (PND), the cross-sectorial programmes from the federal government and the sectorial programmes from Mexico's federal secretariats. This package includes a National Strategy on Climate Change (SINACC), the Special Climate Change Programme (PECC) and a Climate Change Fund. In a developed country context, the alignment of mitigation activities with existing policies is equally important. In Norway, for example, the INDC is anchored in a climate change white paper which ensures both governmental and parliamentary backing to the proposed activities. Also in the United States, already existing rules

and standards have provided an adequate starting point for the elaboration of a comprehensive Climate Action Plan that is recognised at the federal and state levels.

4.5 Learning from International Best Practices

Some (5) of the INDC and MRV related cases advocate the availability of international best practices that can offer additional orientation beyond existing national policy frameworks.

Consider international best practices and guidelines: Even though the assurance of country driven processes is a legitimate priority in most countries, international best practices can be useful in specific cases. If no rules or guidance for a new process – such as the INDC preparation process – are available at the national level, existing methodologies or practices at the international level can provide a good starting point and prevent that countries have to start from scratch. Consequently, some countries report that it was beneficial to build on existing and acknowledged international methodology (e.g. IPCC methodology) in order to develop a mitigation target (e.g. Norway). In a similar way, some MRV related cases highlight the relevance of international standards and guidelines for the establishment of national systems in order to ensure consistency and comparability across countries.

4.6 Long-term Vision

Some (7) cases – developing as well as developed countries – mention the potential benefits of a well-communicated long-term vision, ideally combined with the definition of medium- and short-term goals. A long-term vision is crucial for the development of a roadmap that includes strategies and expected outcomes, providing common ground for ambitious mitigation action.

Ensure a favourable investment and policy environment: In a developed country context, as is Denmark, setting long-term targets and sub-targets allows for long-term planning and fosters a favourable investment climate, incentivising private investment beyond legislative periods. Also in the case of the EU it is highlighted that long-term policy certainty can generate confidence in the marketplace, thus stimulating private investment in mitigation activities and low-carbon technologies.

Raise ambition and guide implementation: A commonly supported long-term vision that also takes into account economic, social and environmental criteria can be particularly important in a developing country context in order to raise ambition and guide implementation. In China, for example, mitigation initiatives are analysed in the near-, medium-, and long-term in order to prioritise actions according to anticipated results, thereby enhancing the promotion of and investment into clean energy solutions. Also in the case of Mexico the roadmap-character of the LEDS is considered to be of central relevance in order to drive ambitious and successful mitigation action.

5. Conclusions

The results of this year's analysis largely corroborate the findings of the previous Global Good Practice Analysis (GPA 1.0). As in the previous study, all cases confirm the importance of political leadership and commitment, of involving a wide range of stakeholders and of the need to mainstream mitigation activities into national processes. A more recent development across cases underlines the importance of scientific analysis to identify central barriers and to allow for informed decision making, as well as the relevance of enhanced data management systems for the effective processing and archiving of the information.

All the analysed cases exhibit many of the elements of good practice as identified in the criteria (see annex). Some of the good practice elements are more broadly represented across the different cases than others (e.g. political leadership, stakeholder involvement, country-driven processes), and a few cases rely on relatively unique context factors (e.g. the political context in the US or the low level of development in Burkina Faso). Many commonalities with regard to main success factors can be observed across LEDS, NAMA and INDC related cases (in particular those mentioned above). MRV related activities have a slightly different focus, highlighting, for example, the importance of quality assurance and external verification, adequate resourcing and the adoption of a stepwise approach for implementation.

Almost all cases represent mitigation activities and processes that are work-in-progress and the final impact may not yet be clear. Still, major challenges that came up in the process of designing and implementing the mitigation actions with regard to finance, capacity, information and other aspects provide useful insights and learnings for potential replications. Each challenge is addressed by an approach to overcome the barrier, offering practical solutions to several problems.

Additional insights are provided by the expansion of this year's study to also include INDCs as well as good practices from developed countries. In the INDC related cases, large similarities can be observed across different countries including both developed and developing countries. In particular the relevance of transparency and inclusiveness in the domestic preparation and approval process, including public consultation, is highlighted in these cases.

With regards to developed and developing countries, common features as well as major discrepancies can be noted. One of the key differences are the capacity gaps perceived in many developing countries, both with regard to technical and political capacities, and the basic need for financial support. Also the main drivers behind the initiation of mitigation activities and processes differ. In a developing country context, a major incentive for climate action is their alignment with general sustainable development benefits. For many developed countries, on the other hand, it is their international political commitments and pledges that drive action, supported by strong public awareness.

This year's Global Good Practice Analysis (GPA 2.0) again illustrates many positive developments on climate mitigation across a diverse set of countries. At the same time, significant gaps remain. In particular some good practice criteria related to, for example, clear finance plans and implementation strategies associated with LEDS, NAMAs and INDCs are not well evidenced. In this context, continued capacity building and knowledge sharing in combination with technical and financial support can help to address this gap in the future.

Although not applicable across all countries and contexts on a full scale, the successes and lessons learned as presented in this Global Good Practice Summary Report provide an opportunity for mutual learning that can inspire more widespread mitigation activity worldwide.

Annex: Good Practice Criteria

Mitigation Strategies Including LEDS

1	Country driven process, linked to existing processes, national strategies and measures (e.g. inclusion of priority sectors and social, environmental and economic (development) goals);
2	Commitment and Leadership at the Highest Political Level;
3	Coordination across different key ministries (e.g. finance, energy) clear mandates and dedicated resources available at leading ministry and/or involved line ministries;
4	Involvement of stakeholders across sectors (including the private sector and civil society) and aiming to build consensus amongst them;
5	Long-term Vision combined with clear definition of short and medium-term policy goals, targets and underlying measures;
6	Thorough and transparent national and sector level analysis of scenarios and reduction potential, costs and benefits, taking indirect costs/benefits into consideration;
7	Balance of different policy interventions including economic incentives, capacity building measures, information systems and technology deployment and use;
8	Reliable data based on robust, scientific analyses (e.g. GHG inventories, BAU scenarios)
9	Use of technical support, advice and peer-to-peer learning, both in government, non-government and private institutions;
10	Dynamic and sustainable process including a mandated and institutionalized mechanism for periodic review and update;
11	Clear implementation strategy, roadmap and plan including assigned resources and mandates
12	Have clear indication of costs of intervention, as well as of the sources to cover the costs.
13	Evidence of peer-to-peer knowledge exchange and technology sharing.

Mitigation Actions and Policies Including NAMAs

1	Aims to achieve significant GHG impact (e.g. targets key emission source/sector);
2	Contributes to sustainable development, e.g. to achieving SDGs or other social, environmental and economic (development) objectives;
3	Alignment with existing LEDS and/or national environment and climate strategies;
4	Includes a diverse set of interventions (including policies as well as financial, technical and economic instruments and mechanisms) developed from a thorough analysis of barriers;
5	Has a broad scope (e.g. sector-wide or national) and is replicable and/or scalable;
6	High level political ownership (e.g. evidenced through use of own financial resources; political champion; legal instruments);
7	Includes an MRV framework;
8	Stimulates private investment and leverage;
9	Resulted from a participatory process involving key stakeholders;
10	Evidence of inter-ministerial coordination and involvement;
11	Is fully integrated in national processes with clear institutional ownership to ensure sustainability of the actions over time and permanence (e.g. cannot be reversed);
12	Includes a well-defined finance plan, differentiating own and external resources, identifying potential public and private resources and including an indication from what sources to cover the costs concept for phase out of any international/public funds;
13	Includes a detailed, sufficiently resourced implementation plan with clear mandates, guidelines and procedures;
14	Is based on detailed technical analysis of mitigation options, costs and benefits


Monitoring Reporting Verification

- 1 **Measuring/Monitoring GHG emissions:**
 - a. Established systems for regular tracking of GHG emissions;
 - b. Covers all economic sectors and sources;
 - c. Includes the development of emission scenarios;
 - d. Adequate financial and human resources;
 - e. Quality assurance process;
 - f. Based on internationally recognised methodologies.
- 2 **Measuring/Monitoring measures and policies:**
 - a. Includes methods for quantifying direct, indirect, long-term emission reductions and sustainable development benefits/costs;
 - b. Includes baselines, indicators and results chains;
 - c. Adequate financial and human resources;
 - d. Quality assurance process;
 - e. Based on internationally recognised methodologies and sources (e.g. GHG Protocol, Policy & Actions Standard; IPCC)
- 3 **Measuring/Monitoring support:**
 - a. Includes all supported activities and support provided and received (financial, technical and capacity building)
- 4 **Reporting:**
 - a. Includes regular and substantiated reporting on the progress of reduction measures;
 - b. Includes most recent GHG inventories;
 - c. Meets the requirements of biennial reports (BRs) and biennial update reports (BURs).
- 5 **Verification:**
 - a. Independent experts verify the correctness and quality of the reported information;
 - b. Meets the standards of international assessment and review (IAR) or of international consultation and analysis (ICA) accordingly (Annex IV: <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2011/awglca14/eng/I04.pdf>).

Intended Nationally Determined Contributions

- 1 Integrated in long-term national development goals and objectives;
- 2 Includes expected GHG/non-GHG outcomes as well as planned actions.
- 3 Integrated in, and building upon, other climate related programmes, policies and strategies;
- 4 Based on a transparent and inclusive domestic preparation and approval process to ensure it is formalised as a national policy decision (and is non reversible)
- 5 Developed in an inter-ministerial process, with government participation and support across the whole vertical and horizontal spectrum of government;
- 6 Developed with the participation of a wider group of cross-sector non-government stakeholders, including academia, civil society organisations (CSO) and private entities;
- 7 Demonstrates commitment and leadership at the highest political level throughout the process;
- 8 Targets are ambitious and informed by well documented assessment of mitigation potential, sector prioritisation and associated technical studies (e.g. cost benefit);
- 9 Includes wide coverage of GHGs and emission sources, or prioritisation of the most relevant (current and projected) emission sources where necessary;
- 10 Considers the wider economic, social and environmental benefits and impacts of potential mitigation measures;
- 11 Includes a finance plan (efforts to be funded domestically) and indicates further actions that could be undertaken with additional support;
- 12 Clearly and transparently communicated (based upon international guidelines, and including key assumptions and methodological considerations);
- 13 Includes clear and transparent explanation of fairness and ambition considering the country's specific circumstances vis a vis globally agreed long-term goals;

Funding



Federal Ministry for the
Environment, Nature Conservation,
Building and Nuclear Safety



Australian Government

Coordination



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Carried out by



In collaboration with

