

Responses to Comments

LGMA Working Group Terms of Reference Consultation

I. Various comments on the purpose of the LGMA

→ *Since this text comes from the TOR of the LGMA Steering Committee, we will take up a revision of the text at a future Steering Committee meeting, and bring in all comments into that discussion.*

II. Comment by Shelley Nania, C40 Cities: We suggest there could be additional language on how these working groups can serve as an intel-sharing platform on specific thematic issues where different LGMA members may have specific ongoing work and/or access to other fora/constituencies similarly working on the issue of focus.

→ *Added to II.4.*

II. Comment by Oscar Nzirera, RALGA: I suggest that as part of key objectives of the working group one can add: Provide adequate communication to working groups members regarding international and regional events and opportunities where effective participation and voice of LGMA constituency members is crucial as part of LGMA annual advocacy agenda. In the same line provide update to members regarding outcome of contribution of LGMA constituency member advocacy to such events.

→ *These elements are contained in Section V. on the Role and Responsibilities of the Working Groups.*

II.4. Comment by Toby Walker, Under2: Can this more explicitly say: identify relevant experts or negotiator contacts that the WG should speak with to strengthen our impact.

→ *Now contained in II.4.*

II.6. Comment by Kale Roberts, ICLEI: Either by adding to this bullet or making one additional, it is helpful to differentiate the purpose of Working Group vs Steering Committee: "Whereas the Steering Committee serves to X, the Working Groups serve to Y."

→ *Link to the SC TOR has been added as a more comprehensive explanation of the SC's purpose.*

III.2 Comment by Clarissa Kees, the Association of German Cities: Should there be a process that allows others which are not part of the Steering Committee to suggest new working groups?

→ *This is now added.*

III.2 Comment by Shelley Nania, C40 Cities: Comments on the process, timeline and criteria for evaluating new and existing Working Groups:

→ *This is contained in Term III.2. and the LGMA Steering Committee TOR.*

III. Various comments on composition of Working Groups

→ *To clarify participation requirements, we will prioritize leadership of WGs for accredited representatives. Non-accredited experts are welcome to participate as Members. There is no distinction on their level of participation (e.g., advisory vs. decision-making roles).*

VI: Comment by Toby Walker, Under2: Can we have a point on WG co-leads/leads operating their own mailing list / invite list for WG convenings.

→ *Now contained in V.7.*

IV.2. Comment by Shelley Nania, C40 Cities: will they just include those that represent local government voices?

→ *The intention is that Working Groups can include those with other topical expertise, as relevant.*

IV.3.e. Comment by Anonymous: What happens if there is only one or no expression of interest? Would the steering committee appoint? Or would the working group dissolve?

→ *This term has been added: f.Where no expressions of interest for leads are received, the Steering Committee may seek a lead from the Members, appoint a lead or dissolve the Working Group.*

IV.4. Comment by UDD Makati: We welcome the emphasis on balanced geographic and gender representation. However, it may be beneficial to further encourage participation from cities and local governments in the Global South, as well as ensure representation from different tiers of subnational governments (e.g., small and medium-sized cities, Small Island Developing States). This recommendation aims to ensure that LGMA advocacy is informed by the perspectives of those most affected by climate change, while also addressing existing participation imbalances and strengthening the legitimacy, inclusivity, and practical relevance of Working Group outputs.

→ *These goals and considerations have been added into the text of IV.4.*

IV.4. Comment by Toby Walker, Under2: Also type of govts represented? e.g. cities / states

→ *Added to IV.4.d.*

IV.4.a Comment by Rebecca Wessinghage, ICLEI: Is there a recommendation re: the size of a working group, and number of representatives per network/organization?

→ *No recommendation on the size of the Working Group, but the following has been added: Organizations are encouraged to have no more than 2 representatives per Working Group.*

V.1.c. Comment by Martina Juvara, ISOCARP: Suggested Support efforts towards communication and endorsement of the Advocacy Position.

→ *Included as V.2.c.*

V.2.a. Comment by Shelley Nania, C40 Cities: Is there an expectation for the Steering Committee to approve each submission made by different Working Group, or just the two main positions (Bonn and COP)? we recommend the latter - given the usually tight timeline we're given to draft these submissions - but it would be good to clarify.

→ *No, Steering Committee does not approve submissions. Focal Point review added to VII.4.*

V.2.b. Comment by Anonymous: When appointing spokespersons for the different opportunities to speak we should also consider spokespersons/politicians to involve small and medium - size cities, which are usually forgotten. Usually most spokespersons for these big events, negotiations are from big capital cities but the other ones have also a lot to share.

→ *Added to considerations for interventions in V.2.b.*

V.3. Comment by Heloise Chicou, Regions4: An important function of the working group is to identify relevant cities and regions representative that can speak and represent LGMA position within dedicated negotiation for example adaptation dialogue, the working group should identify spokesperson, connect with LGMA for confirming opportunity and support intervention by providing briefing

→ *Now contained in V.2.b*

V.3.a Comment by Oscar Nzirera: One can suggest to have somewhere in the document indication on who represent the working group as part of the LGMA delegation at the UNFCCC. such representation should be rotational and governed by clear guidelines.

→ *Added to V.3.a. When opportunity for representation is limited (for example, when the Constituency can only send a limited number of representatives to an event), the LGMA Focal Point will work with Working Group (co-)Leads and/or the LGMA Steering Committee to identify a fair approach to representation.*

VI. Various comments on timing of drafts of the LGMA Position:

→ *We will leave the dates as they are now but adjust if necessary (as stated in V.1.c.)*

VI. Comment by Shelley Nania, C40 Cities: Also - what if there is a Working Group that needs to be established due to the priority topic but nobody in the LGMA who is willing to take this on?

→ *Addressed in IV.3.f.*

VI. Comment by Shelley Nania, C40 Cities: Opportunity to put in place a mechanism for WG to feedback to SC eg : 1. Quarterly meetings with the steering committee and WG co-leads to ensure internal information flow 2. Regular meeting between the LGMA focal point and the co-leads 3. transparent sharing of meeting minutes (both ways: SC <--> WGs)

→ *Addressed in V.4., V.5., VI.4, VII.6.*

VI. Comment by Anonymous: We need to find a mechanism that the WGs are somehow also a bit autonomous and that the full power is not on the Steering Committee

→ *Reduced to revising the TOR for WGs in VI.2.c.*

VI.2.d. Comment by Agathe Cavicchioli, GCoM: confirming SG would not approve individual submissions to UNFCCC? Will LGMA FP do quality control check of these for tone etc?

→ *Correct, Steering Committee does not approve submissions. Focal Point review added to VII.4.*

VII. Comment by Heloise Chicou, Regions4: A key function of focal point is to allow for working groups to know of available speaking opportunities and LGMA seats within dedicated strand of negotiation and coordinating with working group lead who should intervene, preferably ahead of time so have time to intervene

→ *Addressed in VII.4*

Other comments:

Comment from Eva Baños de Guisasola, from CEMR-PLATFORMA: I think it is good that the WGs work on their own, and they inform the SC on a regular basis. But it should not be the SC having all the mandate to establish, close groups, decide which ones to set up without some kind of consultation /information of the broader LGMA group. I am aware that this might be difficult to manage at the beginning, but the LGMA group should also be consulted, and not only informed of decisions.

→ *Now addressed in II.2.d. And III.4.*

Outputs and deliverables section suggested by UDD Makati: While timelines for inputs to the LGMA Position are provided, the TOR could further specify expected outputs (e.g., policy briefs, submissions, technical notes) to guide Working Group contributions throughout the year.

→ *Timelines and submissions requirements vary widely depending on the negotiations topic and process. Unfortunately it is not possible to collect them all here.*

Additional Working Group topics to be considered at the 29 April Steering Committee meeting.