

Changes in the design and delivery of climate compatible policies and practices globally	
1. Changes in the influence that poorest and most climate vulnerable countries have over international climate change negotiations	
'Mount Everest'	An international agreement receiving support from poorest and most climate vulnerable countries
Love to see	Agreements trumpeted as triumphs in poorest and most climate vulnerable countries' domestic arenas
	Groups/countries/constituencies supported by CDKN secure outcomes from international climate change negotiations that reflect their interests
	Final negotiation texts for international climate change negotiations include submissions from the poorest and most climate vulnerable countries
	Groups/countries/constituencies supported by CDKN apply skills in other kinds of international negotiations
	Groups/countries/constituencies supported by CDKN are increasingly cited in the press, internationally or domestically
Like to see	A Country supported by CDKN hosts international climate change negotiations, for example the UNFCCC
	Groups/countries/constituencies supported by CDKN are increasingly sought after or courted during final negotiations
	The agendas of meetings within international climate change negotiations are influenced by Groups/countries/constituencies supported by CDKN
	Groups/countries/constituencies supported by CDKN contribute to changes in discourse around climate change issues

	2. Changes in capacity of the poorest and most climate vulnerable countries to influence international climate change negotiations	3. Changes in co-ordination, collaboration and mobilization of the poorest and most climate vulnerable countries in international climate change negotiations	4. Changes in quality and relevance of knowledge and skills to support poorest and most climate vulnerable country negotiators	5. Changes in the ability of the poorest and most climate vulnerable countries to leverage and channel climate change-related resources strategically
Love to see	Increased proportion of delegates have technical background and/or have been selected to attend meetings due to their technical background rather than their seniority.	Groups/countries/constituencies (e.g. LDC Group, AOSIS, etc) present consistent and united position on key negotiating themes.	Donors other than CDKN, including wider professional constituencies, support negotiation capacity, and collaborate with CDKN in providing support.	The poorest or most climate vulnerable countries actually access needed resources from climate change channels.
	Delegates increasingly Chair or provide lead input into an increased proportion of working groups or meetings	There are a high number of "joint submissions" or "joint press conferences" made by groups/countries/constituencies or collaborations among groups / progressive countries, relating to key technical issues and negotiating tracks.	Groups/countries/constituencies supported by CDKN are increasingly asked to give support to other least developed or most vulnerable country delegations.	The development of a climate finance system in such a way that it results in better quality proposals and submissions to the fund by the poorest and most climate vulnerable countries.
Like to see	Groups/countries/constituencies are asked to enter formal links with other (influential) groups	Delegations join appropriate groups or form cross-group coalitions based on shared progressive interests during international climate change negotiations.	Groups / countries supported by CDKN develop their own ability to support their (or others') negotiating efforts.	
	Delegates or countries send sufficient delegations to CoPs and intersessionals	Groups/countries/constituencies demonstrate good organisation of attendance at meetings (e.g. diary control during COPs and intersessionals, co-ordination of attendance to parallel negotiation tracks with other relevant delegations).	Donors other than CDKN that support negotiation capacity, including wider professional constituencies, use methodologies for training and support developed by the Climate Window of the Advocacy Fund.	Groups/countries/constituencies from the poorest and most climate vulnerable countries are informed about the various funds that are available and accessible to them.
	Delegates make a greater number / proportion of interventions and submissions in areas relevant to their national or group interests	Groups/countries/constituencies produce joint records or minutes of meetings.	Groups/countries/constituencies seek other support to complement CDKN training.	The poorest and most climate vulnerable countries have awareness of the climate-change related resources they require.
	Delegates in group/country/constituency delegations are supported by more/better working level analysts	Increased numbers of groups/countries/constituencies have media support.	Groups/countries/constituencies increasingly access real time support around major conferences etc.	
	Groups/countries/constituencies give more / better press conferences	Responsibilities for attending events or communicating developments is clearly defined and adhered to by supported groups/countries/constituencies.	Countries and donors are accessing, using, and applying the learning that has been produced and disseminated by CDKN, to allocate resources to types of support that improve the ability of least developed and most vulnerable countries to influence climate negotiations.	
	Groups/countries/constituencies increasingly access available advice and support during CoPs	Groups/countries/constituencies develop knowledge management systems that allow institutional memory to be captured and that support, for example, the rotation of roles such as Chair, or the tracing of developments in negotiating tracks over time.		
	Groups/countries/constituencies delegates ask more sophisticated legal or technical queries to advisors or support services			
	Delegates increasingly stand up for their opinions, confront other delegations and their positions, and/or constructively disagree with other delegations			
	Delegates cite relevant legal precedents or technical research to support their positions or to challenge the wording in agreements			
Expect to see	Groups / countries increasingly identify and agree priorities or desired outcomes in advance of meetings within international climate change negotiations.	Delegates within negotiation groups/countries/constituencies are able to meet virtually or in person well before international climate change negotiation meetings to discuss strategic or technical issues.	Groups/countries/constituencies access knowledge from CDKN sources.	The poorest or most climate vulnerable countries sit on the formal mechanism that allocate resources.
	Delegations are able to attend more parallel negotiation tracks at COPs	Negotiating groups submit well-written submissions on strategic negotiation themes.	Delegates representing groups or countries supported by CDKN are adequately briefed well before the start of international climate change negotiation sessions.	
	Group / country delegations plan attendance at different sessions (e.g. based on a full understanding of the linkages between them)	Groups / individuals supported by AF increasingly prepare strategy documents / position statements prior to CoPs.	Delegates representing the negotiating groups or countries that have received support from the CDKN feel that they have more information with which to approach the negotiation process.	
	Groups / countries spend longer in preparation before international climate change meetings		Groups/countries/constituencies supported by CDKN increasingly identify gaps in their own knowledge increase their commissioning of research.	
			Funding decisions draw down from CDKN insight or results about what the best interventions are to support capacity to influence international climate change negotiations.	

Baseline statement
 (based in interviews at COP17 (Dec '11)
 and focus group in London (Jan '12))

<p>Over half of those interviewed validated that poorest and most climate vulnerable countries appear to be prevented from contributing to international climate change negotiations by a lack of finance to cover travel costs and human resources.</p> <p>There was not a consensus on the single most important barrier to be addressed, although human resources was most frequently cited.</p> <p>The following were also validated as specific barriers, but to a lesser extent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Capacity of delegates to negotiate successfully - Availability of personnel with adequate time to attend - Availability of information - Lack of expertise to help gather evidence in advance of negotiations <p>Stakeholders also identified the following specific barriers to least developed and most vulnerable countries participating in negotiations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of sufficient number of, and expertise amongst, delegates to follow and contribute to all of the main negotiating streams - Challenges in conceptualising linkages between issues and recognising interdependencies and trade-offs - Membership of delegations is determined by rank rather than by technical competency - Insufficient time at negotiations to discuss every issue thoroughly. <p>In addition, another barrier identified is the language in which negotiations take place (i.e. not all negotiators from LDCs are fluent in English). However, we recognise that this barrier cannot be addressed by the Advocacy Fund.</p>	<p>The constraints faced by least developed and most vulnerable countries to co-ordinate, collaborate and mobilise varied – financial resources, followed by a lack of knowledge about which countries to negotiate with and political issues, were the biggest constraints that were validated.</p> <p>Mobilisation</p> <p>The constraints faced by LDCs and vulnerable countries to mobilise and attend the negotiations varied:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Financial resources to support travel costs was the most commonly validated constraint - by half of interviewees - Several interviewees noted that a lack of knowledge about which countries to collaborate with served as a constraint, along with political issues, e.g. domestic instability. <p>There was a lack of consensus among interviewees over whether or not the level of seniority and expertise within least developed and most vulnerable country delegations was a constraint</p> <p>This may be explained in part by the observations that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The make-up of delegations varies between countries, being heavily influenced by ownership of climate change in countries - particularly when these delegations are small - Lead negotiators may not be supported at the working level. <p>Co-ordination and collaboration</p> <p>There was a lack of consensus over whether least developed and most vulnerable countries had co-ordinated and collaborated effectively in advance of Durban:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Examples were cited where countries had improved their pre-summit coordination and collaboration within negotiating groups - However, it was highlighted that there was room for improvement. 	<p>Interviewees found it difficult to assess the contribution of particular initiatives to date which have supported poorest and most vulnerable country negotiations, however, they felt support that covered administrative, technical and strategic issues had been beneficial.</p> <p>There was no consensus around whether any particular types of support were most effective, though several types were identified as important:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Administrative support - Technical support - Strategic support <p>The following types of technical support were identified by stakeholders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Basic technical content and context - Practical negotiation skills - Real time technical support - Negotiation planning <p>The following were identified as general principles to guide the support provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Tailored support</i>: It was suggested that the design and evaluation of support should be relevant to individual contexts. - <i>Integrated support</i>: Support that integrates negotiators, technical practitioners and other stakeholders, rather than dealing with these groups in isolation, was highlighted as potentially effective - <i>Sustainable support</i>: Ongoing support that allows least developed and most vulnerable countries' delegations to determine their own priorities, was also perceived to be important <p>The difficulty in measuring the quality and relevance of support was recognised.</p>	<p>There were mixed views as to the extent to which least developed and most vulnerable countries have been able to leverage resources strategically – having the right structures in place to attract finance was considered to be important; though setting those structures will require support.</p> <p>There was recognition that the ability of the poorest and most vulnerable countries to leverage and channel climate change-related resources is limited by the design of existing funds.</p> <p>Issues identified were not only in relation to leveraging additional finance, but having the right structures in place to attract finance in the first place.</p> <p>In addition, it was perceived that certain kinds of support may be short-term, resulting in uncertainty over the feasibility of longer term initiatives.</p>
--	--	--	--