

# Climate Change Expert Group (CCXG)

Global Forum on the Environment and Climate Change

## Draft Annotated Agenda

15-16-17 March 2021

Virtual Forum

### Overview

The Climate Change Expert Group (CCXG) is a forum for promoting dialogue and enhancing understanding on key issues in the international climate negotiations, and supporting implementation of the Paris Agreement. The Secretariat for this group is jointly provided by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the International Energy Agency (IEA).<sup>1</sup> The CCXG develops analytical papers and holds regular Global Forums that bring together practitioners and negotiators from a wide range of developed and developing countries as well as delegates from inter-governmental organisations, the private sector, research organisations and other relevant institutions. Discussions take place under Chatham House rules.

While the COVID-19 pandemic continues to have a significant effect on people's lives and the global economy, addressing the climate challenge remains as pressing as ever in order to reduce vulnerabilities and build resilience to future risks. In the lead up to COP26, this virtual Global Forum aims to actively engage participants in discussions important to the international climate negotiations and to support implementation of countries' climate responses. The Forum will focus on issues relating to implementing Article 6 of the Paris Agreement, how a sustainable recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic can support implementation of the NDCs, and how to enhance transparency. Participants will also hear about recent OECD and IEA analysis in the area of climate finance.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Secretariat would like to thank Australia (Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade), Canada (Ministry of Environment and Climate Change), the European Commission, Finland (Ministry of the Environment), Germany (Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety), Italy (Ministry for the Environment and Protection of Land and Sea), Japan (Ministry of the Environment), the Netherlands (Ministry of Economic Affairs and Climate Policy), New Zealand (Ministry for the Environment), Norway (Ministry of Climate and Environment), Sweden (Swedish Environmental Protection Agency), Switzerland (Federal Office for the Environment) and the United Kingdom (Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy) for their direct funding of the CCXG in 2020-21, and the OECD and IEA for their in-kind support.

## Agenda

15 MARCH 2021	
12:30 - 13:00 CET	<b>Welcome and opening</b>
13:00 – 14:30 CET	Session 1 <b>Implementing Article 6.4: Design options and the role of different actors in the possible transition of CDM activities</b>
14:30 - 14:45 CET	Break
14:45 – 16:15 CET	Session 2 <b>Implementing Article 6.4: Options for the Host Party relating to the registration of any transitioning CDM activities, and for new activities</b>

16 MARCH 2021	
13:00 - 14:30 CET	Session 3 <b>Implementing Article 6.4: Options for baseline methodological approaches</b>
14:30 – 14:45 CET	Break
14:45 – 16:30 CET	Session 4 <b>Sustainable COVID-19 recovery and implications for NDCs</b>

17 MARCH 2021	
13:00 – 14:00 CET	Session 5 <b>OECD and IEA presentation of recent work on climate finance</b>
14:00 – 14:15 CET	Break
14:15 – 16:15 CET	Session 6 <b>Electronic reporting of information to the UNFCCC: Possible lessons from current reporting experience and formats for Articles 6 and 13</b>

*Annotated agenda*

**Monday 15 March 2021**

<b>12:30 – 13:00 CET</b>	<b>Welcoming remarks</b>
Remarks	Helen Plume, CCXG Chair Mechthild Wörsdörfer, IEA Rodolfo Lacy, OECD Alyssa Ng, Singapore, CGE Secretariat

<b>13:00 – 14:30 CET</b>	<b>Session 1: Implementing Article 6.4: Design options and the role of different actors in the possible transition of CDM activities</b>
Focus	The possible transition of CDM activities to the Article 6.4 mechanism was among the unresolved issues of Article 6 negotiations at COP25. Several actors at both the international level and national level will need to be involved in the possible transition. However, the role of and work needed by each actor are currently unclear since the rules, modalities and procedures for Article 6 have not yet been agreed. Different design options will have different implications for the possible transition. In this session, speakers and participants are invited to discuss the possible interaction between different actors, and different options for the design of the possible transition of CDM activities, and exchange views on their implications.
Relevant documents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Operationalising the Article 6.4 mechanism: options and implications of CDM activity transition and new activity registration”, L. Lo Re and J. Ellis (2021, draft)</li> <li>• <a href="#">“Designing the Article 6.4 mechanism: Assessing selected baseline approaches and their implications”</a>, L. Lo Re, J. Ellis, M. Vaidyula, A. Prag (2019)</li> </ul>
Co-Facilitators	Gebru Jember Endalew, Ethiopia and LDC Group Hyunsoo Yun, Republic of Korea
Speakers	Luca Lo Re, CCXG/IEA Sandra Greiner, The Gambia Duan Maosheng, Tsinghua University China Simon Fellermeier, Switzerland
Discussion questions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How could the interaction between different actors (e.g. CMA, CMP, 6.4EB, CDM EB, host Parties, etc.) affect the ease of a possible transition?</li> <li>2. What are the implications of different design options on the possible transition?</li> </ol>

<b>14:30 – 14:45 CEST</b>	<b>Break</b>
---------------------------	--------------

14:45 – 16:15 CET	Session 2: Implementing Article 6.4: Options for the Host Party relating to the registration of any transitioning CDM activities, and for new activities
Focus	<p>The context for Host Party participation in the CDM and Article 6.4 is different. The situation of different Host Parties also varies widely between different countries, e.g. in terms of number of domestic CDM activities that could potentially transition. Furthermore, the extent of any modification of domestic procedures (e.g. to approve activities) for the CDM and for Article 6.4 may also vary widely between different countries. In this session, participants will discuss the tasks that are needed in order to participate in Article 6.4, and whether some work could be started before the adoption of rules for Article 6.</p>
Relevant documents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Operationalising the Article 6.4 mechanism: options and implications of CDM activity transition and new activity registration”, L. Lo Re and J. Ellis (2021, draft)</li> <li>• <a href="#">“Designing the Article 6.4 mechanism: Assessing selected baseline approaches and their implications”</a>, L. Lo Re, J. Ellis, M. Vaidyula, A. Prag (2019)</li> </ul>
Co-Facilitators	<p>Gebru Jember Endalew, Ethiopia and LDC Group Hyunsoo Yun, Republic of Korea</p>
Speakers	<p>Jane Ellis, CCXG/OECD MJ Mace, AOSIS Martin Hession, European Commission Ayman Shasly, Saudi Arabia</p>
Discussion questions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What actors, procedures, standards and infrastructure are needed to register transitioning or new activities in the Article 6.4 mechanism?</li> <li>2. What work is needed by each actor involved and when could it start?</li> </ol>

## Tuesday 16 March 2021

13:00 – 14:30 CET	Session 3: Implementing Article 6.4: Options for baseline methodological approaches
Focus	<p>Methodological approaches for setting baselines applicable to Article 6.4 activities are currently under discussion in Article 6 negotiations. Approved baseline methodologies will be needed for both new and transitioning activities. Different methodological approaches as well as different assumptions and parameters can greatly affect the level of crediting from activities, the attractiveness for private sector participation, and the role of the new mechanism in supporting Parties in meeting their NDCs. However, reviewing and potentially revising the 250+ methodologies approved in the CDM would require significant resources. In this session, speakers and participants will discuss options available and lessons learned from other mechanisms (including the CDM) that could inform the way forward for baseline setting in the Article 6.4 mechanism.</p>
Relevant documents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Operationalising the Article 6.4 mechanism: options and implications of CDM activity transition and new activity registration”, L. Lo Re and J. Ellis (2021, draft)</li> <li>• <a href="#">“Designing the Article 6.4 mechanism: Assessing selected baseline approaches and their implications”</a>, L. Lo Re, J. Ellis, M. Vaidyula, A. Prag (2019)</li> </ul>
Facilitator	Felipe de León, Costa Rica
Speakers	Kazuhisa Koakutzu, Japan Marina Carrilho Soares, Brazil Thomas Forth, Germany
Discussion questions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What are the implications of different options available for setting baselines in the Article 6.4 mechanism?</li> <li>2. What lessons can be learned from i.a. baseline methodologies developed under the Kyoto Protocol mechanisms and other mechanisms?</li> </ol>

14:30 – 14:45 CET	Break
-------------------	-------

14:45 – 16:30 CET	Session 4: Sustainable COVID-19 recovery and implications for NDCs
Focus	<p>Governments are developing COVID-19 recovery measures and mobilising unprecedented resources to restart their economies. These measures will shape the direction of economies and societies for decades and will have important implications for meeting commitments under the Paris Agreement. At the same time, many countries are preparing new or updated Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) and developing long-term low emission development strategies (LT-LEDS). This provides an opportunity to align COVID-19 recovery packages with ambitious climate objectives to deliver multiple benefits. This session will highlight the experience of different countries in integrating climate and other concerns in their COVID-19 recovery measures and how this links to and impacts on their existing, updated or new NDC and LT-LEDS.</p>
Relevant documents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">“Addressing the COVID and climate crises: Potential economic recovery pathways and their implications for climate change mitigation, NDCs and broader socio-economic goals”</a>, S. Buckle, J. Ellis, A. Aguilar Jaber, M. Rocha, B. Anderson, and P. Bjersér (2020)</li> <li>• <a href="#">“Sustainable Recovery”</a>, IEA (2020)</li> </ul>
Facilitator	Simon Buckle, OECD
Speakers	<p>Himanshu Sharma, UNEP  Rafael Matos Martínón, Spain  Michael Ochieng’Okumu, Kenya  Diane Simiu, France  Rocío Rodríguez, Argentina  Arunabha Ghosh, CEEW India</p>
Discussion questions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is the impact of COVID-19 recovery measures on the ambition of current and future NDCs?</li> <li>2. How can COVID-19 recovery measures address both short-term economic and social needs and contribute towards mid- and long-term climate objectives?</li> </ol>

**Wednesday 17 March 2021**

<b>13:00 – 14:00 CET</b>	<b>Session 5: OECD and IEA presentation of recent work on climate finance</b>
Focus	During this session participants will have the opportunity to hear insights from recent OECD and IEA publications focusing on climate finance investments and mobilisation.
Co-facilitators	Helen Plume, CCXG Chair
Speakers	Raphaël Jachnik, OECD Michael Waldron, IEA

<b>14:00 – 14:15 CET</b>	<b>Break</b>
--------------------------	--------------

<b>14:15 – 16:15 CET</b>	<b>Session 6: Electronic reporting of information to the UNFCCC: Possible lessons from current reporting experience and formats for Articles 6 and 13</b>
Focus	Information will need to be reported under different Articles of the Paris Agreement (Articles 6 and 13). These reports will encompass quantitative information (e.g. GHG emissions, information on transfers under Article 6, information on climate finance) as well as qualitative information. Experience with electronic reporting of both qualitative and quantitative information under existing reporting provisions could provide useful lessons on how to report. During this session, speakers and participants will discuss lessons from current reporting experience and formats, issues around <i>how</i> reporting formats and software can be used to meet these various reporting requirements in a simple, coherent and transparent way.
Relevant documents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Draft discussion paper: Towards common GHG inventory reporting tables for Biennial Transparency Reports”, C. Falduto and S. Wartmann (draft, 2021)</li> <li>• <a href="#">“Reporting national GHG inventories through Common Reporting Tables (CRTs): An assessment of CRT reporting options through worked examples”</a>, C. Falduto, S. Wartmann and M. Rocha (2020)</li> <li>• <a href="#">“Reporting progress towards Nationally Determined Contributions: Exploring possible common tabular formats for the structured summary”</a>, M. Rocha and J. Ellis (2020)</li> <li>• <a href="#">“Reporting Tables - potential areas of work under SBSTA and options - Part II: Financial support provided, mobilised and received”</a>, C. Falduto and J. Ellis (2019)</li> </ul>
Facilitator	Outi Honkatukia, Finland
Speakers	Chiara Falduto, CCXG/OECD Lydia Cavasin, Canada Mary Awad, Lebanon Jae Jung, Republic of Korea
Discussion questions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How can electronic reporting of information influence the time and resources needed by countries to report under the UNFCCC?</li> <li>2. What lessons can be learned from experiences with current electronic reporting of information?</li> </ol>