

## Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay

### Scope and modalities for the periodic assessment of the Technology Mechanism

FCCC/SBI/2016/L.27

The Governments of Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay welcome the opportunity to submit their comments and suggestions regarding the scope and modalities for the periodic assessment of the Technology Mechanism, in response to the SBI invitation (Document FCCC/SBI/2016/8, paragraph 96).

Firstly, we would like to refer to the previous work on the matter, namely the evaluation of the Technology Transfer Framework under the Convention which was done between 2008 and 2009. To that purpose, the EGTT was asked to elaborate a proposal so as to establish the basis for that evaluation. As a response, the EGTT developed a complex indicators system which could never be appropriately implemented (See Document FCCC/SB/2009/4).

With that lesson learnt, the evaluation of the Technology Mechanism currently under discussion should be based on simple tools and with the participation and direct opinion of the final recipients of the actions undertaken by the bodies of the Mechanism, namely the Parties to the Convention. This should be extended to non-Party stakeholders involved in the Mechanism, as well as to members of the CTCN Advisory Board and CTCN and TEC observers. We also suggest an evaluation of the TNA to be carried out, as it is a fundamental element for the functioning of the Technology Mechanism.

The performance evaluation of CTCN should include, *inter alia*:

- Quantity and quality of technical assistance provided;
- Level of satisfaction with the assistance by recipient country, and geographical distribution of the assistance;
- Number of countries assisted;
- Quantity and quality of the capacity-building initiatives;
- Number of members of the network;
- Number of members of the network that took part in assistance initiatives and other activities;
- Quality of the services provided by members of the network; and
- Amount, predictability and adequacy of the financial resources received by the CTCN, as well as financial resources made available to each technical assistance and capacitation activity.

With regard to TEC, we suggest its evaluation should include, *inter alia*:

- Relevance, number and quality of the recommendations made to the Conference of the Parties, through the Subsidiary Bodies;
- Relevance, number and quality of activities such as thematic dialogues and workshops; and
- Relevance, number and quality of reports and other documents generated by TEC.

As far as new activities are created in the CTCN and TEC working plans – both mandated by the COP or as a product of their own initiative – the evaluation of these new activities shall be included as well.

For the case of the TNA, we suggest to evaluate the following:

- Number of countries and geographical areas participating;
- Number of completed TNAs;
- Number of supporting documents issued;
- Level of satisfaction of the participating countries (through a survey); and
- Number of projects included in Technology Action Plans (TAPs) that were executed and the corresponding financing.

Regarding the modality of the evaluation, the variables under analysis – which result from an objective analysis of undertaken activities (e.g. number of technical assistances provided by CTCN) - should be reported by the secretariats of CTCN and TEC, accordingly. As for the variables which require a more subjective analysis or opinion, we suggest to implement polls that include each of these points, with pre-established options for the answers (e.g. very good, good, regular, bad, very bad) so as to allow statistical analysis. Fields for other open comments should also be included, in order to improve the performance of the Mechanism.

These polls should be addressed to:

- UNFCCC Focal Points;
- National Designated Entities (NDEs) of each Party to the Technology Mechanism;
- Representatives of civil society organizations represented in the CTCN Advisory Board (e.g. RINGO, BINGO, ENGO);
- TEC and CTCN observing organizations, and
- Network's member institutions.