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OBJECTIVE

- Building an understanding of the socio-economic co-benefits of mitigation actions in the MAPS countries to better inform their selection and prioritisation.
- Developing an approach to quantify co-benefits in the MAPS countries.
- Learning from the experiences of the MAPS countries.

DESCRIPTION

The lab brought together 27 experts from 10 countries in Bogota, Colombia from the 6-9th of May 2013 to exchange, discuss and develop new ideas around the socio-economic co-benefits of mitigation actions (co-benefits) in the MAPS context. Representatives from all four MAPS countries (Brazil, Chile, Colombia and Peru) were present. Keynote speakers from India, Brazil and South Africa joined the group as well as experts from the MIND Centre in Sri Lanka, the Gold Standard Foundation’s office in South East Asia and the Energy Research Centre in South Africa.

The Lab focused on the first three steps in the ‘project cycle’ of mitigation actions, namely the planning, prioritisation and selection stages.

- Experts from India, Brazil and South Africa shared their knowledge in dealing with co-benefits and mitigation.
- A space was provided for facilitated peer-to-peer exchanges of experiences to stimulate learning and the development of new ways of thinking about co-benefits.
- Mini-training in the Action Impact Matrix (AIM), Multi-criteria analysis (MCDA) and the Gold Standard Methodology were offered with the intention of developing tangible skills and collectively crafting new approaches to maximising developmental co-benefits of climate change mitigation.

OVERVIEW

- Brett Cohen led a presentation on the use of Multiple-Criteria Decision Analysis (MCDA) and its potential for application in MAPS-type processes. From the outset, it was identified that MCDA is not a single tool, but rather a “meta discipline” – referring to a host of tools. The various tools were identified as being useful in the context of complex problem solving with multiple stakeholders.

- Ellen Zanoria presented on the application of the Gold Standard (GS) Methodology. The GS Foundation has developed a comprehensive way of assessing carbon projects for socio-economic benefits or drawbacks.

- It was discovered that the Action Impact Matrix (AIM) methodology, a type of multi-criteria analysis, could help to structure complex decision making, because it contributes to the understanding of the highlights of any given action. The AIM could be applied to identify challenges in climate change adaptation and mitigation in overall development planning and insodoing help with the selection of mitigation actions.

- Country teams discussed and incorporated new learning’s from the lab into proposals for their country processes. A short round of presentations of take-home messages concluded the three day lab.
REFLECTIONS

- The first day showed very clearly that there is no single “recipe” to analyse co-benefits. Yet there are many common challenges and lessons to share. The Lab contributed to an increased understanding amongst the participants on how to formulate a co-benefits analysis methodology tailored to their respective country's individual and specific needs.

- The group identified the need for methodologies to quantify the value of co-benefits both for individual mitigation actions and for packages of measures in specific sectors.

- Participants highlighted the value of presenting a co-benefit in financial terms. This allows for comparison of different co-benefits by converting them to a common value, and is in a language that is easier for decision-makers to understand and to motivate for. It was found that the drawbacks to using this method were that some co-benefits are difficult to attach a monetary value to and that for a number of co-benefits a financial value will not adequately capture the complexity or adequately represent the true value of the impact. The challenge is in balancing these trade-offs and the group highlighted the need to move forward on a case-by-case basis.

- Discussions took place around the assessment of the ‘net cost’ of climate mitigation policies. This was understood as the climate policy implementation cost, minus the avoided cost of achieving a similar level of co-benefit with a policy directly addressing this goal — thereby representing an opportunity benefit. It was felt that this approach could be useful in discussions with decision makers as it focussed attention on the medium-term benefits, those of co-benefits, as opposed to the direct benefits of GHG mitigation policies (avoided climate change damage) which will only happen in the long term.

NEXT STEPS

- Development of a manual outlining possible methods and tools available (including experiences of practitioners) in analysing co-benefits.
- Conduct a research lab on the visualisation of complex results including those from co-benefits analysis.
- Engagement with theory and experts to enhance knowledge around the quantification and monetisation of co-benefits.
- Development of ideas for collaborative research and action fostering innovative ways of dealing with co-benefits when planning mitigation actions.
QUOTES FROM PARTICIPANTS

“Before the workshop, I thought the discussion on co-benefits would have a more qualitative approach. I did not expect to learn about how co-benefits could be precisely quantified and I was surprised by that, specially with the Chilean team poster presentation. I consider this important to me because I left the workshop with several ideas on how to implement co-benefits assessment on our model (IMACLIM).”

“As a low-carbon project developer, I always assessed mitigation projects based on investment and carbon finance. But when the mitigation actions are originated at governmental levels, these two criteria cannot be the only ones to be considered, this [is] because governmental LEDS are highly political. ... During the Co-benefits Lab I confirmed this view exposed above, and hence realised the crucial importance of having a methodological framework to assess co-benefits of mitigation actions. Mainly in order to give policy makers and politicians in the climate field a tool to support their arguments and decisions.”

“A good thing from the Lab was the opportunity to interact with specialists from other countries with similar projects to the MAPS programme in Peru-PlanCC. Specifically the poster session with presentations from Colombia and Chile was very helpful because they are in a more advanced stage in their MAPS programmes. I especially liked the poster from Chile where they presented their efforts to monetise the impact on health. So, what changed in my thinking was that, in Peru, we already have some previous efforts and I do not realized [sic] that [these] can be related- I remembered that we also had some research about it.”