



Possible Future Directions for the APP

It has been just over two years since the APP was launched by Ministers in Sydney as a tool to advance Partners' respective clean development and climate objectives. In this short time the APP has proved agile, and – due in large part to the efforts of the Task Forces and particularly to the enthusiastic engagement and support of their private sector members – has shifted rapidly from the January 2006 launch to the implementation stage of our collaborative efforts ten months later, and to the continued evolution and progress in cooperating together since then. The now-seven Partners have undertaken 118 collaborative projects across the eight Task Forces, including 5 projects that do not fit clearly within a single Task Force, and more projects are currently in the planning stage. A tremendous amount of work has taken place in a short time, and the Task Force teams in particular have risen to the ambitious challenge posed by the Ministers. While much has been accomplished, more work still lies ahead. This paper very briefly explores key topics relevant to the PIC and its work, and is intended to provide a starting point for possible discussions on these topics during the PIC meeting in Seattle 19-20 May 2008.

Task Forces

When the group first discussed the creation of Task Forces, numerous topics were explored, ultimately resulting in the eight Task Forces established by the Ministers via the Work Plan. In Jeju, the PIC agreed that the Task Forces were useful and should be continued even after completion of their initial assigned task of developing the Action Plans. Now that the APP has transitioned fully into its implementation phase, it may be useful to revisit the concept of the Task Forces and explore whether they continue to represent the direction in which the Partners wish to proceed. Are these still the correct ones for the group? Are there any Task Forces whose collaboration has reached a point where it might be concluded? Are there any that might usefully be combined to maximize their synergies? Are there any additional topics that could benefit the group's work by adding new Task Forces? Are there additional tasks or duties the PIC would like to assign to the Task Forces?

The Task Forces have all responded to the Ministers' request and created Action Plans. Some Task Forces have already initiated the process of updating their Action Plans. Is this the right time for the PIC to request that all Task Forces undertake such an effort? Are there any additional elements that the PIC would wish to request the Task Forces add into their Action Plans if they are revisited? Is it the right time to explore whether any of the Task Forces have been able to make progress in shifting from the baselines captured in those Action Plans?

When the Task Forces were agreed, Partners volunteered serve as Chairs and Co-Chairs. Four Partners are chairing eight Task Forces. Since the Task Forces were established, another Partner has joined, and some Partners have not had an opportunity to serve as the Chair of a Task Force. Is it useful to explore shifts in Partners serving as Chairs? All Chairs and Co-Chairs have served well and worked hard and helped the Partnership make an excellent start, but is it the right time to explore whether changes might bring new ideas and dynamics to the Task Forces?



Projects

As above, Partners have endorsed 118 projects. Some have been completed successfully, and some are to be cancelled. The Task Forces continue to make progress on the existing projects, and also to explore additional opportunities for collaboration. Is there any additional guidance the PIC would like to provide to the Task Forces to guide their future efforts at considering further possible cooperative efforts? The PIC has agreed that projects need two Partners to qualify. Many though certainly not all projects on the roster are bilateral in nature, in part likely because Partners have experience and existing relationships that lend themselves to those types of efforts. Does the PIC want to signal for future projects an interest in having more multilateral projects as a way to recognize the additional benefit they may bring to the group's work? Does the PIC wish to encourage the Task Forces actively to explore the potential for expanding some existing bilateral projects, where appropriate, to include additional interested Partners? Some existing projects have not made progress. Is it useful to explore the reasons for this? Are there changes to the proposed activities within some of those projects that could help them to begin to make progress? For those lacking resources, are there funding opportunities that could usefully be investigated through outside sources? Could this be facilitated in some way? Or is it most efficient to simply cancel projects that have not made progress after a certain amount of time and refocus efforts on the existing work and the most immediately promising opportunities?

In October 2007 in New Delhi, Ministers recognized 18 flagship projects. Some of those have already been successfully completed. Have the flagships served as solid illustrations of the scope and breadth of the work of the Partnership? Could Partners make more effective use of them to tell the story of the APP? Does the PIC want to consider identifying additional projects as flagships? If so, would the same criteria as before be used, and how frequently might this addition of projects usefully occur?

Barriers

The initial work of the APP has focused on all of the functions described in the Charter, with the notable exception of the barriers component contained in paragraph 3.1.3 ("Identify, assess, and address barriers to the promotion and creation of an enabling environment for development, diffusion, deployment, and transfer of existing, emerging and longer term cost-effective, cleaner, more efficient, and transformational technologies and practices in accordance with the Partners' priorities.") However, some of the Task Forces have begun to experience or recognize barriers to their efforts. Is it the right time to begin to explore how we might approach this topic? If so, would it be useful to request that the Task Forces identify barriers relevant to their respective sector or focal area? Would it be helpful to request that the Task Forces be prepared to report at the next PIC meeting on their group's initial findings? Such information could form the basis for a discussion by the PIC of any barriers identified. The PIC might decide after those reports whether to explore opportunities for assessing any barriers identified during a future session, and if any further information would be usefully provided by the Task Forces to assist in that effort.



The Role of the Private Sector

In creating the Task Forces, the APP undertook the innovative approach of incorporating representatives of those organizations that will ultimately deploy the technologies needed to enable all Partners to meet both our increased energy needs and associated challenges, including those related to air pollution, energy security, and greenhouse gas intensities. Is engagement of the private sector through the Task Forces an effective means to accomplish this goal? Are there additional approaches to involve the private sector that might also be usefully explored? Would it be useful to seek the views of senior private sector representatives from Partners to help inform the work of the PIC? If so, what form might such interaction take? Would a broad approach or a sector/focal area specific approach be beneficial? How often might this be useful and practical?

These are only a few topics that might be of interest to PIC members for a discussion regarding the future of the APP. Nonetheless, it is hoped that this paper could be a tool to facilitate initiation of a discussion on these and other topics during the Seattle PIC meetings.