

Report of the Scoping Meeting on a Climate Change Knowledge Network¹

Ottawa, May 29-30, 1998

Introduction

Recognizing that knowledge creation and dissemination is crucial to advancing sustainable development, the International Development Research Centre (IDRC), the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD), and the North-South Institute (NSI) have formed a strategic partnership to promote the creation and strengthening of knowledge networks for development. As a contribution to defining the issues, in the fall of 1997 they commissioned a scoping study that described the need for, and elements of, a developing country-focused knowledge network to address climate change and development issues. As a next step, the three sponsoring institutions brought together about 20 senior representatives of institutes from around the world to discuss the possible scope, focus and operation of such a knowledge network. The scoping meeting was held in Ottawa from May 29-30.

Participants

Roy Culpeper	<i>North-South Institute (NSI)</i>
Sid Embree	<i>Clean Commodities Inc</i>
Sushma Gera	<i>Dept. of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, Canada</i>
Joyeeta Gupta	<i>Institute for Environmental Studies, Netherlands</i>
Arthur Hanson	<i>International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD)</i>
Victoria Kellett	<i>IISD</i>
Nicholas Lapham	<i>United Nations Foundation</i>
Jim Leslie	<i>IISD</i>
Kerry Max	<i>NSI</i>
R. S. Maya	<i>Southern Centre for Energy and Environment, Zimbabwe</i>
Rohinton Medhora	<i>International Development Research Centre (IDRC)</i>
Caroline Pestieau	<i>IDRC</i>
Lasse Ringius	<i>CICERO, Norway</i>
David Runnalls	<i>IDRC / IISD</i>
Katsuo Seiki	<i>Global Industrial and Social Progress Research Institute, Japan</i>
Geir Sjoberg	<i>United Nations Development Programme</i>
Youba Sokona	<i>Environnement et développement du tiers-monde, Sénégal</i>
Leena Srivastava	<i>Tata Energy Research Institute, India</i>
Bill Stanley	<i>Center for Sustainable Development in the Americas</i>
Pavlo Zamostyan	<i>Kiev-Mohyla Academy, Ukraine</i>
Zhou Fengqi	<i>Energy Research Institute, China</i>

¹ The Scoping Meeting was jointly funded by the International Development Research Centre, the International Institute for Sustainable Development, and the North-South Institute.

Purpose of the Meeting

Caroline Pestieau chaired the opening session. David Runnalls outlined why IDRC, IISD, and NSI had invited participants to attend the meeting. He noted that the three institutes commissioned Sid Embree to conduct the scoping study to assess the level of interest and need for an international knowledge network on climate change. She concluded that there is significant interest in and need for such a network, and that possible themes would focus on instruments such as the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM), technology transfer, and engaging the private sector. However, it was emphasized that the scoping study was intended solely to stimulate discussion; it was not intended to be a prescriptive document or a project proposal. The task of the meeting was to assess the need for a knowledge network on climate change, begin to formulate the research agenda, identify the members, design the network's *modus operandi*, and develop a timeline, preliminary estimated budget and a fundraising strategy.

Developments since Kyoto

Sid Embree presented an update on developments since Kyoto. She noted that the Subsidiary Bodies of the Framework Convention on Climate Change (FCCC) are meeting in Bonn from June 2-12. Both the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technical Assistance (SBSTA) and the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) will address aspects of national communications and mechanisms for cooperative implementation. So far only eight national communications have been received from developing countries, while the deadline was March 1998.

SBSTA will also discuss cooperation with international organizations and methodological issues such as emissions inventories and land use and forestry (sinks). She noted that sinks are likely to be a key issue due to major differences in national positions, and to the fact that several paragraphs in the Protocol relating to sinks are inconsistent. SBI will address the financial mechanism, the second review of the adequacy of commitments and arrangements for COP-4 in Buenos Aires.

She pointed out that 23 presentations related to flexibility mechanisms will take place at Bonn, but only one of these will be made by a developing country organization. This indicates a significant gap in the capacity and resources of developing countries to contribute to and shape the debate.

The private sector has shown a great deal of interest in the implications of the Kyoto Protocol. Some companies are conducting "gap analyses" to identify potential liability related to baseline emissions. Companies are under pressure to plan how to reduce their emissions in the time frame provided. They generally look at three areas where emissions can be reduced: internal operations, investments and corporate strategy, and offset-type projects domestically and internationally. Given the risks and uncertainties related to investing in some foreign countries, and related to how the CDM might work, many companies are focusing on the first two areas.

A roundtable discussion on developments and initiatives since Kyoto ensued. It was noted that:

- Sustainable development is now one of the OECD's five priority areas and includes climate change, technology transfer, indicators, and economic incentives.
- UNEP recently hosted a meeting on economic instruments for environmental conventions.
- Canada's priorities for Bonn include how to assign the studies of the cooperative implementation mechanisms between the various UNFCCC bodies, and carbon sequestration.
- Canada will conduct consultations to inform its position on the CDM, and will support developing country compensation (particularly for small island developing states) and a Saudi initiative to support diversification for petroleum producing economies.
- UNDP has developed a comprehensive climate change program that looks at climate change as one aspect of a broader set of development issues; programs include Energy, Forests, Enabling Activities, and Pilot Projects related to the CDM.
- The Nordic countries are exploring the issue of trade and climate change and are concerned about forests and sinks.
- The European Union's DG-11 and DG-12 have been holding joint meetings to discuss the EU's position; the EU had underestimated the potential of emission trading until Kyoto, and is now trying to rectify that.
- There is a joint UNEP/UNCTAD proposal to establish what would resemble another IPCC to look at economic instruments and MEAs.
- The Climate and Energy Working Group of the World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD) focuses on flexibility mechanisms such as joint implementation (JI); WBCSD has an extensive international private sector network, and an agreement with IISD to work on these issues.

Discussion on General Themes for the Network

The goal of the proposed Network as stated in the scoping study was "to support developing country efforts to define workable approaches to designing and implementing economic instruments and market-based approaches, such as certified emissions reduction offset credits and emissions trading, to limit the growth of global GHGs."

The stated objectives were to:

- Facilitate developing country efforts to develop efficient and workable market-based approaches and economic instruments to reduce GHG emissions;
- Provide a focal point and vehicle for bringing together and leveraging developing country-based, bottom-up, collaborative research, and promoting knowledge generation, learning through action, and information dissemination;
- Demonstrate concrete actions to implement the Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Kyoto Protocol, particularly emissions limitation activities involving the private sector consistent with market-based mechanisms and economic instruments; and
- Provide support for developing countries to explore and contribute to the design of the Clean Development Mechanism of the Kyoto Protocol, which has been designated as the mechanism through which crediting of GHG emissions reductions in developing countries will occur after the year 2000 and which is the only mechanism by which developing countries would formally limit GHG emissions in the near term.

There was general agreement on the spirit of the goals and objectives while stressing the need to focus on building preparedness to implement the instruments. Regarding the fourth proposed objective, it was agreed to cut the sentence after “Kyoto Protocol”.

It was suggested that the network might wish to consider how one crafts the flexibility mechanisms to be compatible with the international trading system. Although various aspects of the Kyoto Protocol may conflict with the international trading system, the trade community has paid very little attention to climate change. An example of potential conflict might be the Swedish government’s climate-friendly procurement program, which the EU might use as a model. Such a procurement program could impact on developing country exports. In addition, the FCCC contains provisions not found in most other multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs). The Montreal Protocol, for instance, contains trade-related provisions and imposes the same obligations on every signatory. The Kyoto Protocol does not. Unless international climate change negotiations take into consideration the trading system, they risk serious clashes with the WTO.

Several participants advocated a balance between a focus on emissions reduction and a focus on development, noting that the CDM is about reducing emissions AND development. It was noted that the idea of the draft study was to put ideas on the table for helping developing countries play a major role in designing these mechanisms to promote development, rather than merely to limit emissions. The study implies that these issues exist, and there is a need quickly to build capacity in developing countries or the mechanisms will be designed without their input. Participants recalled that the CDM emerged from a Brazilian proposal, which originally proposed to create a fund out of penalties from the compliance mechanism. Certainly it was negotiated very quickly, but with buy-in from developing countries which should now play a role in designing it in their interests.

It was proposed that the goal could be to build capacity in developing countries to make reasonable judgement in negotiations in ensuring the linkages between development and climate change and to take full and maximum advantage of what emerges. Participants agreed that this formulation was extremely useful in avoiding conflict between network members and their governments.

Discussion returned to themes proposed in the scoping study.

A) How to operationalize emissions reductions credit creation and trading in developing countries.

Participants clarified what the study meant by emissions trading, viz. emissions reductions creation by certification and the exchange of those certified emissions reductions (CERs). Participants raised important questions including how to identify, create, and trade emissions reductions as well as the effects of credit creation on future negotiations. Regarding the CDM, it was noted that while elaborate mechanisms have been established to ensure reductions additionality, there is nothing parallel to ensure financial additionality.

B) How to facilitate private sector participation in emissions trading in developing countries.

Participants were reminded that “emissions trading” here meant any kind of emissions trading (credits, cap and trade, etc.). Using the term “participation and cooperation mechanisms” was suggested as this would cover all three flexibility mechanisms.

The initial project design included a significant role for the private sector in the network. Participants were asked to think about to what extent and how one involves the private sector. Some participants were cautious of potential for conflict between private sector interests and governments interested in promoting the more development-related aspects of Kyoto implementation. Responding to a caution that focusing on SD might reduce the attraction for the private sector, it was suggested participants were forming too much of a distinction between the two, given the inherent overlap between climate change related activities and SD.

C) Lessons learned from AIJ, JI, and existing emissions and commodities trading markets.

It was suggested since other themes might come up for discussion, this particular theme might be implicit and could be dropped from the list. However, some cautioned that since developed countries are likely to dominate emissions trading for at least the next decade, it is important that developing countries participate in the discussions and design of the system. Participants regretted that a representative of UNCTAD was not able to attend due to illness, but noted that UNCTAD’s participation in the network might assist in providing developing country input into the design of the regime.

D) Designing credit and emissions trading to promote technology transfer.

Concern was expressed about the considerable political issues associated with technology transfer. Using the term “transfer of clean technology” was proposed. Participants were reminded that Article 4.5 of the FCCC states that technology transfer should also take place outside the emissions trading system. While it was agreed that technology transfer could be an intractable issue, and that the only way for developing countries to move forward may be to focus on certain sectors and technologies, it was thought inappropriate to be so focused in the network proposal.

It was observed that technology transfer is very different from the other themes, which deal primarily with market-based instruments. More work is needed to develop this theme, especially as it has the potential to focus specifically on the mechanics of technology transfer, which is a key issue for developing countries. Participants recalled that technology transfer should meet development needs rather than just being a vehicle for developed country exports.

It was agreed that this important issue should be further elaborated in the proposal, focusing on the value-added of technology transfer and how this can be enhanced.

E) Macro-economic and policy implications of GHG emissions limitation for developing countries.

Some felt that while this theme was comprehensive and important, it was not essential for the immediate priorities of the network and could be dealt with properly under other themes by ensuring sustainable development indexing is built into other mechanisms. However, one issue that might be particularly worth studying is the balance of payments implications of emissions trading.

One participant noted that this theme seemed to be addressing the issue of voluntary commitments by developing countries. Among developing countries there is no political consensus on voluntary commitments, so this would be an academic exercise. However, it was pointed out that developing countries do not have access to an OECD-type forum where issues can be studied thoroughly before a decision is made. This network might fill that gap. It had been suggested that the questions in this theme need to be answered before developing countries engage in flexibility mechanisms. It was added that this is an important theme for countries in transition, which are facing different issues than developing and developed countries. Participants agreed that this theme was crucial, because it would provide increased legitimacy for the more implementation-focused themes.

The Chair asked participants to identify important issues that might be missing in the list of themes. These included:

- Defining sustainable development (SD). It was noted that the key difference between the CDM and JI/AIJ is the SD potential of the CDM. However, SD is difficult to define and site-specific. One participant noted that SD should be defined at a national level, and that it should be integrated into theme A. Participants were reminded that the FCCC is based on the principles of SD and common but differentiated responsibilities, and that the network should keep SD as an over-arching principle.
- Measurement and criteria. Participants noted that emission reductions can be measured, but it is difficult to measure SD. There may be a role for the network in developing criteria for CDM project selection. Criteria would depend on different countries' development priorities.
- Defining "demonstrable progress" (required to be shown by Annex B countries by 2005) and monitoring compliance with the provision that actions taken to meet commitments do not have a negative impact on developing countries.

The Chair asked the group to avoid dichotomising development and climate change mitigation. She challenged participants to be aware of the broad range of issues, but to narrow down the themes enough to ensure an effective network that meets its goal and objectives.

Prioritization of Themes and Development of the Research Program

Roy Culpeper chaired the second session. He reminded participants that the five theme areas map out the terrain that might be useful to work in, but there is not yet clarity on how they might be prioritized. It was noted that prioritization will depend on the context (local conditions and region-specific issues, capacity of participating institutions, etc.) and would be necessary 1) where resources need to be allocated and 2) where it is desirable to have specific inputs into the negotiations. Timing and urgency would have some bearing on prioritization.

It was generally agreed that theme A, operationalizing emissions reductions credit creation and exchange, was one of the most crucial and urgent, and was related to the other themes. A key aspect of this was making flexibility mechanisms acceptable to governments. It was noted that the implications of the various flexibility options, and the timing of their establishment, are still unclear. If the CDM were operational first, it would create an opportunity for resources to flow to developing countries, without competition from JI. However, there are several advantages to not starting the CDM first. For example, it is possible that technology transferred under the CDM would quickly become obsolete.

Although there were differences of opinion on the importance on theme B, private sector participation, it was agreed that this theme should be extended to all three flexibility mechanisms and that it was highly interrelated with theme A. It was noted that the private sector sees significant longer-term opportunities while it is constrained in the short term. There is a great deal of interest in the CDM from the private sector in Canada because as yet there are no other incentives for early action. Some countries, on the other hand, place less importance on the role of the private sector. One participant proposed re-wording theme B as follows: "how to facilitate various modes of participation including private sector participation."

Participants agreed there is much work already being carried out on theme C (lessons learned) and it will be done with or without the network. However, it was necessarily linked to other themes. It was proposed that the network act as a clearinghouse, using the Internet, to track lessons learned. There might be a role for a full-time "knowledge broker" to keep members informed without overloading them with information. The knowledge brokering function could serve to identify gaps, which can help in the setting of priorities. Interns and graduate students might play a role in gathering, filtering, synthesizing, and archiving available information for the use of the network. It was pointed out that much of that knowledge and experience exists in the developed world, and what is needed is knowledge that is specific and relevant to developing countries. It was generally agreed that members from developing countries would benefit from the sharing of this information, given their desire to influence negotiations. However, this sort of information dissemination pre-supposes technological capacity. One of the components of the network should be the building of technical capacity (Internet access, web site design, hardware and software).

On themes D and E (technology transfer and macro-economic issues), participants generally agreed that they could be treated either as framework type issues implicit within the other research themes, or as themes that would serve the broader goal of capacity building. Some suggested these two themes might be less attractive to funders than the first three.

One participant suggested there might not be a need for total agreement on prioritization, since every institution has different priorities, and various network members can take the lead on different themes. Another agreed and stressed the network would have to begin with something that is fundable. That may include a phased approach focusing on certain aspects in turn. Participants should try to agree on at least one priority area to begin with, by focusing on what needs to be done immediately and what could attract funding. The Chair emphasized that the idea of the network was also to bring out work that is being done, and it was conceivable that priorities would shift along the way as long as the network continued to add value. Another

participant suggested priorities would be clearer after COP-4. She noted the difference between a strict project approach and the more flexible, fluid program approach.

The Chair proposed differentiating between research (creating new knowledge) and knowledge brokering. He asked a contact group to propose new language for the goal and themes. Participants agreed on the following language:

Revised Goal

The goal of the proposed network is to enhance developing country capacity to design, implement, and assess the impacts of economic instruments and market-based approaches, such as certified emissions reductions and their exchange, with a view to limiting the growth of global GHG emissions while addressing development priorities.

Revised Themes

1. Priorities for Capacity Building

- a) Assessing macro-economic and policy implications of GHG emissions limitations
- b) Assessing the priorities for and impacts of technology transfer, and facilitating this transfer

2. Priorities for Research

- a) How to operationalize emissions reductions and their exchange
- b) How to facilitate productive sector participation in the three flexibility mechanisms
- c) Identifying lessons from AIJ, JI, and past experience with existing emissions and commodities exchange markets through monitoring and dissemination of existing knowledge and creation of new knowledge.

Refining the Research Program

Leena Srivastava chaired the third session. Participants were asked for their help in further refining the research program.

One participant questioned the methodology that would be used to address the questions in the priorities for research. It was noted that the aim would be to involve other institutions in research and capacity building, while the member institutions take the lead. This would include governments and interested stakeholders. It was pointed out that in Africa's case, a regional approach is more appropriate than a national approach. The private sector, government, and intergovernmental agencies have to be involved.

The Chair reminded participants that each network member might not necessarily use a common framework to address each of the research issues. Some factors are international; others are very specific to countries and regions. Participants brainstormed on what sort of activities might be undertaken by network members. Suggestions included:

- All – information sharing and networking

- CICERO – modelling projects, involving OECD and some developing countries; linkages with other organizations; and a project on dissemination of technology in Asia.
- IVM – work on inventories, sectoral modelling, institutional and stakeholder analysis, focusing on themes A, B, and C while keeping capacity building issues in mind.
- CSDA – transfer of Costa Rica experience on operationalizing projects, lessons learned, development of a template for national infrastructure for AIJ, co-operation with IGOs, and regional networking and capacity building in Central America.
- TERI – web sites and research on climate change developments in Asia and on methodological and policy issues around the CDM.
- ENDA – focus on criteria for the CDM and how it would nest in the international system, effects of conditionality, and incremental costs of implementation.
- Southern Centre – targeting decision makers, investors and policy makers to promote win-win solutions, conducting macroeconomic analysis, and identifying economic costs and benefits.
- Kiev Mohyla Academy – focusing on themes A and B and their application to countries in transition, with a particular interest in energy sector restructuring including legislative mechanisms for market-based instruments; and conducting case studies on JI in Eastern Europe.
- Energy Research Institute – identifying baselines, monitoring and verification.
- GISPRI – building links with the private sector in Japan, information dissemination, and research on the CDM.
- NSI – feeding into the development of the Canadian government position.
- IISD – knowledge brokering, helping with the interconnectedness of the network including hardware and software, connecting members to CLIMATE-L (an ENB-run listserv on climate change), and building on private sector linkages through the WBCSD and the Solutions for Business Program.
- IDRC – building on its regional networks to bring in additional partners, providing a reality check, assisting with network connectivity, building coalitions.

It was noted that most organizations represented have the capacity to do this work but the real value-added would be in their interaction and in translating capacity into action and results.

The need was stressed for a common understanding of the shape and mechanism of the CDM. This requires inputs from non-Annex 1 countries and should be a priority for the network. Possible differences were mentioned between the CDM and JI/AIJ, for example, unilateral developing country actions might count for credit. Related research questions included the possibility of using revenue from JI for CDM or adaptation, and the implications on pricing and types of projects selected.

Participants felt that the political impact of getting such a diverse group of institutes to agree on elements of the CDM would be significant. Most of the developed country discussion of the CDM has focused on its potential as a climate change mechanism; the network could examine how to use it as a mechanism to promote sustainable development. A strong case could be made that there should be some development criteria applied to projects approved by the CDM. In addition, there are questions, such as how the credits are shared and how long they last, that have profound development implications.

The Chair noted that there is already discussion on the CDM on the TERI web site and she invited comments and reactions to that from the group. She elaborated that one of the questions being addressed is how to treat unilateral actions versus trans-national corporation and joint venture projects. Can CERs be retained by host country governments or only by the private sector? How would industry react to a mechanism whereby the government may trade CERs? Should the CDM begin before or after JI?

Canadian participants commented that there is a great deal of interest in Canada in understanding what the developing country perspective is on the CDM. The rationale for Canadian funding would be to find out what developing countries would find acceptable for the CDM, to help develop the Canadian position. Other participants underscored the possible differences between official developing country positions and genuine developing country interests, and thus the need to include stakeholders.

It was also noted that in least developed countries, the major source of development funding is the World Bank, which entails conditionality. The issue was raised of financial additionality and the implications for World Bank funding of the CDM.

One participant suggested that the priorities of countries in transition would be on the design of the flexibility mechanisms and the role of the private sector. Especially important is energy sector restructuring and legislative mechanisms for market-based instruments. Developing case studies of JI activities between Annex 1 countries might provide useful lessons for the CDM, although it was pointed out that the two instruments are fundamentally different.

It was added that key technical questions for developing countries include calculating and monitoring baseline emissions and tracking emissions reductions.

IISD offered to play a role in establishing the interconnectedness of the network and in knowledge brokering, building on the Earth Negotiations Bulletin as a basis to build a clearinghouse for climate change information. In addition, IISD could connect members to the ENB-administered Climate-L email list on climate change. It was added that the linkage to the WBCSD might be useful. At the regional and national levels, especially in Latin America, there is an opportunity to use the networks to share information and as a communication channel. As an initial step, participants agreed to link members' web sites. Finally, they agreed that IISD would create an electronic mailing list for potential members to facilitate the development of the network. Other participants offered to link their knowledge sharing activities with those of the network.

Membership of the Network

The Chair noted that agreement is needed both on the size of the network and on the criteria for membership. Participants heard who was invited but was not able to attend the meeting despite significant interest in the network. These included the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, the Stockholm Environment Institute, the World Resources Institute, and the Woods Hole Research Centre as well as international organizations such as UNCTAD, UNEP and the World Bank. It

was also suggested that the Wuppertal Institute and other developing country organizations might be interested.

Participants agreed that for international organizations, an observer role rather than full membership was appropriate.

It was noted that the ability to work closely with governments is important, but that members should have freedom of thinking.

The question was also raised on how the private sector could be involved in the network. The Chair suggested that networking within countries should be the responsibility of the member institution. For example, some organizations might prefer to work with industry associations rather than with private companies. Some participants supported private sector observer status, while others preferred that the private sector be fully involved. Most agreed on the need for a stakeholder approach involving private sector and civil society actors.

One participant stressed the need for flexibility and that the issue of government and private sector involvement should be left up to the core membership. He suggested deferring the issue of official private sector membership status while involving companies and associations informally. He proposed that: the initial core membership of the network be the institutes represented at the scoping meeting plus some others; international organizations be included as observers; and methodological issues of stakeholder involvement be addressed during the proposal re-drafting. He encouraged participants to consider other potential members, bearing in mind the need for balance. It was decided not to have governments as formal members but to have as one of the criteria for membership, the ability to collaborate with government and the private sector.

Participants agreed with the scoping study criteria for selecting developed and developing country members are but needed clarification on criteria for international organizations. In addition, they suggested removal of the separate treatment of Canadian participation.

Network Design and Operation

It was agreed to take time zero as COP-4 or even later (January 1999). Time zero would be largely dependent on fundraising. A phased approach with partial funding seemed to be acceptable. Canadian members could immediately undertake to link up members' web sites.

Questions were raised on the issue of assigning at least one full-time person from each network member. This was considered ambitious and it was pointed out that each member should define its priorities and then consider necessary resources. It was clarified that funding would be necessary for each institute to allocate human resources. The point was to make membership a serious commitment and allocate resources accordingly. That would be made more explicit in the re-draft.

Suggested revisions to the proposal included:

- using less specific language requiring each organization to take the lead on defined aspects of the research program;
- building in scope for the network to evolve, as each organization considers its own expertise and resource availabilities;
- distinguishing between the research activities and networking, especially for fundraising purposes; and
- removing points 5 and 7 in section 5.1 and referring to a new section on methodology.

On frequency of meetings, it was pointed out that semi-annual meetings require major resources. On the other hand, two meetings per year provide a milestone function for setting goals and achieving results, so that outputs would be produced regularly to feed into international negotiations. Some participants advocated only one annual meeting as they have frequent opportunities to interact at various other events. Taking advantage of the latter would require effective coordination. Irrespective of routine meetings, outputs should be targeted for maximum impact. For budgeting purposes it would be assumed that annual meetings would take place concurrent with the COPs or other important meetings, and some additional meetings may be required.

However, it was noted that there are two types of meetings – strategic and operational – so semi-annual meetings might be required. In addition, it was cautioned that meeting around the COPs might detract from the network agenda. It was proposed that “semi-annual” be removed from point 6 of section 5.1, keeping in mind the need to be very active, especially in the first year.

IISD committed to setting up an electronic mailing list for the network immediately, and perhaps establishing a web site. It was thought that this early presence would be useful for fundraising and proposal development.

Timeline and Funding

It was noted that the proposal should differentiate between long- and short-term priorities, and consider the immediate opportunity to influence the shaping of the CDM. Regional activities might influence the network’s timeline. While the research on the flexibility mechanisms was considered an early priority, the capacity building aspect is longer-term. Participant agreed on the following rough timetable for re-drafting the proposal:

June 5	report of meeting distributed to participants and absent colleagues
June 12	proposed structure for new proposal distributed for comments
Mid July	final proposal and budget completed

Many participants advocated preparing for a formal network launch at COP-4 in Buenos Aires, although work might begin before then. COP-4 would be a good opportunity for interviews and research. IISD outlined its information gathering activities in Bonn and suggested the same could be done in Buenos Aires.

Participants from developed countries were optimistic that funding for the network could be obtained through foundations, aid agencies, and the private sector. They agreed to investigate

possibilities in their home countries and spheres of influence. One suggestion was to approach technology companies to get access to hardware or software on a testing basis. IISD could conduct a needs assessment using a questionnaire approach. All participants agreed on the importance of getting the network operational as quickly as possible and building it in phases.

**SUMMARY OF MEETING EXPENSES
SCOPING MEETING FOR KNOWLEDGE NETWORK ON CLIMATE CHANGE
OTTAWA, MAY 29-30, 1998**

PARTICIPANTS / PAYEE	ORGANIZATION	AIRFARE	ACCOM.	MEETING ROOM	CATERING	PRE-MTG DINNER	DINNER	PER DIEMS	COMMS.	CONSULTING	TOTAL
1 Youba Sokona	EDTM, Sénégal	3,089.95	374.33		61.11	67.12	42.17	128.60			3,763.28
2 Zhou Fengqi	ERI, China	3,782.32	374.33		61.11	67.12	42.17	213.48			4,540.53
3 Pavlo Zamoshtyan	KMA, Ukraine	2,233.40	873.43		61.11	67.12	42.17	334.46			3,611.69
4 R. S. Maya	SCEE, Zimbabwe	4,869.07	468.55		61.11	67.12	42.17	143.59			5,651.61
5 Leena Srivastava	TERI, India	3,896.56	249.55		61.11	67.12	42.17	143.22			4,459.73
6 Roy Cuipeper	NSI				61.11	67.12	42.17				170.40
7 Lasse Ringius	CICERO, Norway		140.30		61.11	67.12	42.17	157.60		3,726.00	170.40
8 Sid Embree	Clean Commodities In	341.06	370.30		61.11	67.12	42.17	11.78			4,535.36
9 Bill Stanley	CSD in the Americas	560.86			61.11	67.12	42.17	11.78			1,113.34
10 Sushma Gera	DFAIT, Canada				61.11	67.12	42.17				170.40
11 Katsuo Seiki	GISPRI, Japan				61.11	67.12	42.17				1,777.18
12 Caroline Pestieau	IDRC	1,595.00			61.11	67.12	42.17				170.40
13 Rohinton Medhora	IDRC				61.11	67.12	42.17				170.41
14 David Runnalls	IDRC / IISD				61.11	67.13	42.17	29.07		8,994.15	9,193.63
15 Joyeeta Gupta	IES, Netherlands		374.33		61.11	67.13	42.17	11.78			556.52
16 Arthur Hanson	IISD	1,741.52			61.11	67.13	42.17				1,911.93
17 Jim Leslie	IISD	1,574.00	249.55		61.11	67.13	42.17	11.78			2,005.74
18 Victoria Kellett	IISD	327.10	249.55		61.11	67.13	42.17	494.03			1,241.10
19 Kerry Max	NSI				61.11	67.13	42.18	29.07			199.49
20 Geir Sjoberg	UNDP				61.11	67.13	42.18				170.42
21 Nicholas Lapham	U.N. Foundation				61.11	67.13	42.18				170.42
Telecommunications									202.83		202.83
SHERATON				1,325.99							1,325.99
EQUIPMENT RENTAL				156.10							156.10
TOTAL		24,318.24	3,724.32	1,462.09	1,253.51	1,059.61	1,655.61	1,721.27	207.83	12,776.15	47,438.99

47,438.99

1,409.52

This is to certify that the summary above provides the true and correct details of how the IDRC grant for the scoping meeting was expended:

Seymour
Jan K. Seymour CA
 Secretary - Treasurer and
 Chief Financial Officer

18 non IDRC participants
 Total 24 people 47,438.99
 New IDRC staff 24 people (9,534.44)
 Balance 37,904.37
 IDRC contribution 35,000.00