

**DELHI MINISTERIAL DIALOGUE ON
“CLIMATE CHANGE: TECHNOLOGY MECHANISM”**

New Delhi, 9-10 November 2010

Chairs Summary

Ministers and representatives from 35 countries, regional groupings and UN organisations met in New Delhi to discuss the creation and operationalisation of a Technology Mechanism under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change [UNFCCC]. They recalled the central role of technology development and transfer in addressing climate change, and the importance accorded to this issue in the Convention. They also recalled the mandate provided in the Bali Action Plan towards developing, “effective mechanisms and enhanced means for the removal of obstacles to, and provision of financial and other incentives for, scaling up the development and transfer of technology to developing country parties”, as well as to “accelerate deployment, diffusion and transfer of affordable environmental technologies”, and promote “cooperation on research and development of current, new and innovative technologies”, while keeping in consideration the “effectiveness of mechanisms and tools for technology cooperation in specific sectors”.

The participants took note of the ongoing discussions in the Adhoc Working Group on the Long-term Cooperative Agreement [AWG–LCA], and noted that there was considerable convergence amongst Parties, and that there was substantial agreement that the early operationalisation of a technology mechanism is important. It was felt that Parties should aim for this to be a key deliverable at COP-16 in Cancun as part of a comprehensive and balanced package.

The participants focused their discussion on three critical elements of the technology mechanism, namely: (a) Structure and governance; (b) Work programme and priority in activities; and (c) Financing of activities supported by or under the Technology Mechanism.

There was a general view that the mechanism should address both adaptation and mitigation. It was felt that the technology mechanism should promote international cooperation both for dissemination and deployment of currently available technologies as well as the development of newly emerging technologies, particularly those that address the adaptation and mitigation needs of developing countries. Some participants expressed a strong view that the transfer and sharing of technologies had to be a key objective of the Mechanism, and that the mechanism should work to facilitate rapid diffusion of technologies in a cost-effective and affordable manner.

Some participants felt that the initial focus should be on technologies that are or could be in the public domain. The technologies for adaptation which are in the public domain could be one of the key activities undertaken by the technology mechanism in the early phase. The Technology Mechanism would also need to catalyze private-sector activities to meet the technology needs of developing countries to address climate change.

The participants agreed that the Technology Mechanism would consist of a Technology Executive Committee (TEC) and Climate Technology Centres and Networks (CTCN). There was general agreement that the TEC would be the main body providing advice on technology issues to the COP, and that the CTCN would be the operational arm of the Mechanism. Participants expressed a strong preference for a relatively small, nimble and efficient TEC, with professionals and experts as members, and with balanced representation. Some felt that the TEC could advise COP on activities eligible for financing, including on procedures for accelerated processing of proposals and disbursement of funding, while others felt that the TEC should function as a think-tank on technology issues for the COP. The TEC should capture the lessons on accelerated development and transfer of technologies in different contexts.

Participants felt that the CTCN should focus on strengthening appropriate organisations and national capacities across the world to provide a range of country-driven services. These could include *inter alia* (a) support for the identification of technology needs and priorities, and preparation of projects and programmes; (b) facilitation of technology innovation to fulfil needs and priorities identified that are unable to be met by existing technologies; and (c) enabling human and institutional capacity-building for technology utilisation, support and outreach.

Several participants felt that the mandate of both these bodies would derive from guidance provided by the COP and that they would periodically report back to the Convention on their activities. Other participants saw the CTCN as being parallel and complementary to TEC.

A variety of views was expressed on the role of intellectual property in the negotiations. Several participants stressed that the intellectual property issue is an important issue that needs to be resolved. However, considering the current state of discussions on this issue, participants expressed the urgent need to find a way forward to operationalise the Technology Mechanism in the interim. Some participants felt that while it is important to reach an agreement on technology mechanism in Cancun, it is also important to continue the dialogue on resolving the intellectual property issue at Cancun and beyond.

Participants believe that the technology mechanism should address the needs for technology at various levels: local, national, regional, and global. The institutional structure of the mechanism should be designed to address these diverse needs. Participants felt that while “mitigation is global, adaptation is local”. This implies

that the mechanism should focus on building bottom-up absorptive capacity in developing countries to facilitate uptake of technologies which are in line with local needs and circumstances.

The participants stressed the need to draw upon the successful examples of government-supported/funded initiatives (e.g., CGIAR) which have resulted in positive technological impacts. However, it was also emphasized that the mechanism should reflect current and future needs and circumstances. References were made to several government-funded technology initiatives which provided a publicly available platform on which further innovation could occur. References were also made to the necessity of harnessing the power of the private sector, both in technology and finance, to address the mitigation and adaptation challenges, especially in developing countries.

The participants emphasised the important role of finance in enabling the technology mechanism to achieve its objectives successfully. In this context, participants recalled the commitment of the Parties to generate resources of USD 100 billion per annum by 2020. In the discussion on the relationship between the Technology Mechanism and the Financial Mechanism, many participants felt that the COP should provide guidance to the Financial Mechanism for the provision of financial support to activities relating to technology development, transfer and its deployment. In developing this guidance, the COP would take into consideration advice provided by the TEC and the proposals developed by the CTCN. Some participants stressed that the Financial Mechanism would be responsible for, *inter alia* the processes related to the development and review of proposals, funding, implementation oversight and monitoring and verification relating to eligible technology development and transfer activities. Some participants also expressed the opinion that the Financial Mechanism should draw upon the expertise and skills of the Technology Mechanism when appropriate.

The participants looked forward to the discussions on technology development and transfer at the COP-16 in Cancun, Mexico in November-December 2010, and reiterated the importance of a positive result in form of an agreed decision on the Technology Mechanism, as part of a balanced package of outcomes.
