

TCP Modernisation:

Strengthening communications, operations, and impact

3rd TCP Universal Meeting, 18-19 June 2019

At the TCP Universal Meeting, the IEA Legal Office organized a series of small group discussions among meeting participants to provide opportunities for sharing of TCP experiences and best practice. This document provides a summary of the key takeaways and messages from these discussions. Specific comments by TCP representatives are attributed only where relevant. Please contact the Secretariat at TCP.legal@iea.org for more information.

Task development models

Discussion leads: Robin Wiltshire, DHC TCP, and Paul Ruyssevelt, EBC TCP

- **There are many variations between cost-sharing with task-sharing**
 - DHC TCP: traditionally cost-sharing only, added task-sharing recent years
 - IETS TCP: mostly task-share, but low cost annual fee to cover management costs
 - HEV TCP: cost-share fee covers work in up to 3 task-shared tasks; additional fees for more tasks or for cost-shared tasks
 - EBC TCP: task-shared for traditional projects, and “Working Groups” that can be established for short-term, flexible efforts
 - AMT TCP: task-shared only; no common fund
- **The process for task development varies between TCPs**
 - Traditional model: technical committee that receives proposals from members and works to develop into full proposal; full ExCo considers only complete proposals
 - ExCo may or may not be involved in early stage to approve whether to move proposal to task definition stage
 - Different levels of ExCo involvement in Task development
 - Top-down approach: all Tasks are developed at ExCo level to match strategic direction of TCP
 - Hybrid: ExCo sets a clear strategy with specific high priority areas and asks the proposers of new annexes to address these topics
 - Bottom-up: countries propose individual Tasks and ExCo reviews proposals
 - Hybrid approach where ExCo sets a clear strategy with specific high priority areas of research, which proposers of new annexes are asked to address
- **Choice of task- versus cost-shared depends on nature and needs of the project**
 - Cost-sharing can be especially helpful where there is a specific deadline – examples include short time scales on the order of 6 months.

- Some TCPs use common funds for communications purposes even for task-shared projects (i.e. preparing slide decks, executive summaries, translations, etc.)
- **Most TCPs appoint a single individual to be responsible for the Task, although specifics vary**
 - Different terminology—some TCPs use “Operating Agent” for task-shared projects and use “Project Manager” for cost-shared tasks
 - For cost-shared, manager can be funded directly through common funds or through a combination of in-kind and common funds
 - For task-shared, often provided 100% by host country (or split between several)
- **Some TCPs allow non-members to participate on an informal basis at Task level**
 - Organisations may join an Annex without joining the ExCo if they provide a “sponsorship” fee to the Annex (essentially paying into Task-level common-fund)
 - Could fund an advisor to speed up and improve the quality of the work
 - Some TCPs allow non-member countries to join one annex as an “observer”
 - If country wishes to join more than one, ExCo encourages to join the TCP
 - TCPs requested assistance from IEA in identifying contacts in government

Synergies with the IEA Secretariat

Discussion leads: Paul Lucchese, Hydrogen TCP, and Carol Burrelle, HEV TCP

- **Chair of Hydrogen TCP was seconded to IEA in 2019 to work on the G20 Hydrogen Report**
 - Up until now, there had been a weak relationship between Hydrogen TCP and IEA
 - Paul spent 3 days per week at the IEA, fully integrated into the team
 - There is a very different knowledge-set within IEA compared to within the TCP
 - Paul supplemented the IEA’s research experience with external perspectives
 - Paul reported that it was a good learning experience to better understand the IEA
 - There are ongoing discussions on future collaboration opportunities
 - IEA noted there may be opportunities for this type of arrangement in the future
- **HEV TCP has worked closely with CEM EVI initiative, which is coordinated by the IEA**
 - HEV and EVI have 9 overlapping members (18 HEV, 12 EVI)
 - Desire to work together driven by desire to connect with the CEM Initiative
 - Meetings were held back-to-back for a period of time (not for previous meeting)
 - IEA Desk Officer for HEV and EVI happened to be the same
 - Separately, HEV and IEA have developed common templates for data gathering on charging infrastructure
- **There is a strong desire for greater and consistent participation by Desk Officers (DOs)**
 - Current level of engagement varies based on topic and based on individual
 - Some TCPs noted consistent participation, others noted low engagement
 - Holding meetings in Paris leads to higher participation from IEA
 - DOs can play a key role in involving TCPs on relevant IEA publications
 - TCPs not in a position to know what’s going on at IEA; DO could be a bridge
- **There are some examples of TCPs providing direct input into IEA reports**

- However, there is desire for additional opportunities to support with data and review
- Current opportunities can be somewhat limited
 - Desire to provide input on structure and design early in the process
- Timeframes can be an obstacle – for example, timelines for peer review of IEA reports are not generous enough
- **There is potential for IEA to do more to coordinate and connect TCPs**
 - TCP Universal Meeting and Coordination Groups valuable in this regard
 - But could be more focused, perhaps fewer topics
 - Potential for IEA to use its communication platforms to disseminate TCP work
 - TCPs would like better transparency for how and when IEA uses TCP reports
 - IEA is developing a new role to allow the IEA to act as “Coordinator” for a TCP task
 - Would allow a deeper relationship in certain circumstances

Best practices on communications

Discussion leads: David Shipworth, DSM TCP, and Pearse Buckley, Bioenergy TCP

- **The DSM TCP has undertaken a complete, ground-up rebranding**
 - Desire to increase membership and increase value to existing members
 - Perception that “Demand Side Management” is out of date
 - Desire to refocus the TCP around the role of people in the energy system
 - New strategy includes...
 - New strategic focus reflected in a range of new TCP activities—i.e. new tasks
 - New management, creation of an “Operating Agent” role
 - New mission statement, new name, new logo
 - Multistep process to consider the *process of communication*
 - 18 months of internal discussion among ExCo on strategic focus of TCP
 - Commissioned an external review of subject areas and TCP processes
 - Hired an external re-branding consultant to help agree to new name
 - Final steps focus on process of rebranding and relaunch
 - Advice to other TCPs: Follow principles of good governance: independence; openness and transparency; accountability; integrity; clarity of purpose and effectiveness before embarking on the process to ensure all are satisfied with the outcome
 - Allow a long lead-in period, consider using a consultant—could be a full review of all TCP processes or something more specialized
- **The Bioenergy TCP recently developed a new communications strategy with a consultant**
 - Identified a need to be more effective in communications, needed external expertise
 - Hired external consultant in Aug. 2018 after tender process; strategy delivered and approved by ExCo in Nov. 2019
 - Need to set specific communication goals and identify the target audiences
 - 5 topline messages, 4 aimed at general public, 1 at scientific community
 - Diversifying outreach channels, using social media
 - In addition to technical reports, need short messages and more of them
 - Currently entering second phase of implementation strategy

- Most work so far done under phase 1 implementation by consultant to tailor the specific messages
 - Next phase to better integrate the approach into all activities of TCP
- **There are many variations for how TCPs have addressed improving their communications**
 - Some have hired external consultants for specific tasks (e.g. ISGAN, SolarPACES)
 - Can be especially helpful for social media, revamping TCP websites.
 - Some use freelance journalists to prepare communications for general audience
 - If no common fund, must rely on the individual Tasks
- **Who is the target audience? Different tools are suited to different target audiences**
 - TCP Member governments, including research funding agencies
 - Websites, Annual Reports, workshops highlighting outcomes
 - Policymakers in general
 - Features in IEA publications (such as ETP2020)
 - Summaries of technical reports in non-technical language
 - Slide decks, websites, webinars, social media
 - Technical audiences, including public researchers, academia, industry
 - Technical reports, traditionally the main output of TCPs
 - Workshops to bring in experts in the field that aren't part of TCP
 - Webinars in particular may help reach this group in emerging economies
 - Newsletters (particularly for the "extended" TCP network in Annexes)
 - General public
 - Social media, including Instagram, Facebook, Twitter, and LinkedIn
 - Websites with more digital content: videos, animations, infographics, etc.
- **TCPs are recognising the need to move to new formats and move to "digital-first" outputs**
 - Move to more digital communications, including slide decks with embedded links
 - Designed to be read on a screen, not printed
 - Infographics designed as part of websites
 - Videos, animations to reach lay public (including kids)
 - Websites designed to filter audiences to different messages from the beginning
 - Technical people find technical pages, policy makers find policy messages
 - Webinars (examples, DSM University, ISGAN Academy)
 - Interactive, can be tailored to different audiences, have been very successful
- **Potential for new electronic tools for internal communications—within TCPs and between**
 - Mixed results with Slack, difficult for people to change from what they are used to
 - When using, need to find a way to maintain the face-to-face human factor
 - Idea to form joint communication approach for multiple TCPs?
 - Can pool resources to achieve common communication goals
 - Is IEA able to do this? (particularly to reach policy-makers)
- **How do we measure progress and success of communication strategy?**
 - Use keywords to see how much your topic is being talked about
 - Are we actually bringing together the relevant players at TCP events?

Collaboration models*Discussion leads: Daniel Mugnier, SHC TCP, and Karin Widegren, ISGAN TCP**Collaboration between multiple TCPs*

- **The SHC TCP has a well-developed collaborative task policy with 4 levels**
 - Minimal – TCP A develops and manages; TCP B sends experts to participate
 - Moderate – TCP A develops and manages; TCP B provides input in task definition
 - Maximum – TCP A and B jointly develop task, TCP A responsible for management
 - Joint – TCP A and B jointly develop Task, management is joint responsibility
- **TCPs have identified several challenges that have been addressed in different ways**
 - Double reporting - For full joint tasks, could be two OAs dividing the work; each TCP's OA reports back, eliminating the need for double reporting
 - Differing membership – What if country membership is different for two joint Tasks? How do you handle different funding, different obligations, etc.?
 - Task-shared vs cost-shared – Are there any examples of aligning different work styles?
- **Important to identify possible joint tasks as early as possible**
 - Many TCPs require consulting with other TCPs whenever a new task is in development
 - Important to identify the gaps where work *isn't* being done
 - Multiple TCPs can jointly host workshops in a particular country, gathering experts from across all involved TCPs (and beyond)
 - Take advantage of national TCP coordination days—opportunities for TCP delegates to learn about work of other TCPs and report back to ExCo
- **There are several areas where the IEA Secretariat could provide assistance**
 - Common templates for joint annexes and jointly developed tasks
 - Increased access to information about tasks in development in other TCPs, facilitated by the Secretariat

Multilateral initiatives

- **Initiatives of the Clean Energy Ministerial (CEM) can help TCPs connect to policymakers**
 - ISGAN is “dual hatted,” being both a TCP and a CEM Initiative
 - Focus is policy advice on smart grids, dissemination, and knowledge exchange
 - Provides access to policy makers through CEM reporting and CEM side events
 - And benefits of TCP legal structure to organise work programme
 - Disadvantages of this arrangement
 - Different audiences require different messaging approaches
 - Leadership can be drawn elsewhere for other types of work
 - Nexus between technical expertise and policy advice
 - CEM can provide an important outlet to make this bridge
 - TCP is ultimately responsible for packaging its messages in the form of policy advice or in an otherwise policy-relevant form

- **Potential for TCPs and Mission Innovation Challenges to help each other**
 - TCP Framework could provide a concrete structure for work under the MI Challenges
 - MI Challenges have a lot of scope to collaborate and are looking to take advantage of TCP work and expertise wherever possible (i.e. MI Challenge 7 on Heating and Cooling)
 - ISGAN entered into Letter of Intent with MI Challenge 1 on Smart Grids – Letter sets out a framework for collaboration including potential areas for work. Concrete first steps include development of energy storage and flexibility fact sheets and a common workshop during CEM10 in Vancouver.
- **Desire to explore other initiatives, but limited experience so far**
 - For example, desire to work with IRENA, but no clear mechanism to do so
 - Are there are other e examples of existing and functioning collaborations?
- **Request for the IEA to provide guidelines on how to approach multilateral collaboration**
 - Model Letters of Intent, MoUs, or other organizational structures

Legal structures

Discussion lead: Detlef Stolten, AFC TCP

- **Need for more clarity for how to contract with third parties**
 - TCP is not a legal entity, so the Secretary enters into contract on behalf of TCP.
 - Secretary takes on the risk of third-party breach of contract. TCPs requested guidance on how to protect the Secretary from this risk. Note that most TCP legal agreements require the Secretary/OA to carry insurance.
 - TCPs with no common funds cannot enter into contracts with third parties. An individual contracting party must enter into a contract and provide the output as an in-kind contribution.
 - TCPs do not have capacity to draft contract provisions given national variations
 - TCPs requested standard, template contracts that TCP Secretaries/OAs can use for third-party contracts. Important to also include intellectual property provisions
- **There is no common approach to voting rights**
 - For multiple organisations from same country, usually have a single vote, but some provide one vote for Contracting Party, even if from same country
 - For Sponsors, some TCPs allow them to vote, others do not
- **Several TCPs have adopted a competitive procedure for selecting Secretariat**
 - AFC drafted a document outlining the procedure for changing the Secretariat, which they are happy for the Secretariat to share with other TCPs to serve as a template.
- **There is a need for an updated, more user-friendly legal handbook/webpage**
 - Current legal handbook is out of date (last update in 2014)
 - Note that the Secretariat is exploring moving the legal handbook to a simple and easy-to-use website on the private section of the IEA website
 - Would be useful to have an introductory document explaining the IEA and the TCPs for new ExCo members

Industry engagement

Discussion lead: Keith Burnard, GHG TCP

- **GHG TCP has a well-developed approach to working with industry**
 - Membership is roughly 50% countries (including the European Commission and OPEC), 50% industry and research organisations as Sponsors.
 - Sponsors are drawn from countries beyond IEA and GHG country membership.
 - Sponsors cannot be Chair or Vice-Chair, but otherwise have same rights as countries, including equal voting and the right to host events, such as conferences workshops and network meetings, and to propose new studies.
 - GHG has a cost-shared structure, where expert third parties conduct all studies, with the role of ExCo members to define the work programme, propose study topics and advise on events, but not to carry out the work.
 - Countries derive a lot of value from industry engagement, with the opportunity, for example, to see industry practice (and best practice), take part in fieldtrips to industry facilities, hear the industry point of view in meetings and to appreciate first-hand industry's investment priorities.
 - It can be time consuming to get industry members to join the TCP, but once they join, they are keen and active participants.
- **Balance can be managed to avoid industry having too much influence**
 - GHG TCP experience has been that Sponsors do not tend to seek to exert influence
 - Country members (Contracting Parties) play an active role here by raising concerns (and reasserting equitable rights) if this starts to happen
 - Some TCPs do not offer voting rights to Sponsors
 - Cost-shared versus task-shared structure is relevant; for the GHG TCP, Sponsors cannot set up their own separate Annex with no country participants (the GHG TCP undertakes the whole of its work programme under a single Annex)
- **Possibility to seek informal industry input through an "industry advisory board"**
 - In general, it is possible to establish an advisory board independent of the ExCo
 - The board could meet once a year to discuss and comment on the TCP's work plan
 - TCP would obtain industry input and engage with industry without providing the same level of input (and, possibly, influence) as it does to countries
 - (Note that IEA's Energy Business Council has some similarities to this role)