

What are the experiences and challenges with the existing technical review and analysis and multilateral consideration processes?

- Need to make the **guidelines** clearer and more detailed. Existing tools available to address this (RPG and LRs meetings);
- Examples:
 - KP Party providing information on contribution to AF needs to explain. No explanations if no funds provided!
 - ‘Effectiveness’ of support ‘to the extent possible’
 - Capacity building support ‘shall’, ‘to the extent possible’
 - National approach to tracking finance
 - Technology, ‘shall’, ‘to the extent feasible’, ‘success and failure’ stories
- Limited pool of experts used for different reviews. More efficient review cycles would be helpful.

How the existing verification experience could serve as a basis for the new transparency framework, including flexibility?

- Current MAs do not include FTC issues, need for a reconsideration as part of new framework under PA.
- For recipient countries, opportunity to provide information on FTC provided;
- Need for greater clarity on definitions such as 'climate financing', 'additional 'climate finance, 'indicators' of FTC;
- Challenging for non Annex II Parties providing support. Need to reflect support from all Parties!
- Detailed report of support received similar to the reporting of support provided.