



ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/PPRC.10/3  
20 November 2012

---

Project and Programme Review Committee  
Tenth Meeting  
Bonn, Germany  
11-12 December 2012

## **OPTIONS FOR THE ENGAGEMENT OF THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY IN PROVIDING INPUTS ON TECHNICAL ISSUES**

## I. Background

1. The science of adaptation to climate change is in an actively evolving process, fuelled with increased knowledge on adaptation options in a wide array of sectors, but also with debates, linked to climate uncertainties, on vulnerability issues at people and ecosystem levels, costs and benefits of adaptation actions, and options to better assess adaptation impacts, among other areas.

2. Since its establishment, the Adaptation Fund Board (AFB) has been discussing during its meetings about the involvement of the scientific community in its activities, at several occasions, as follows.

3. During the 5th meeting of the AFB, the Board had invited Ms. Helen Plume, the Chair of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and technological Advice (SBSTA) of the UNFCCC. The SBSTA had been mandated by the Conference of the Parties to coordinate the implementation of the Nairobi Work Programme on Impacts, Vulnerability and Adaptation to Climate Change (NWP). During her presentation, she suggested that the AFB might wish to draw upon the technical support of the NWP in its efforts to prioritize adaptation programmes. She also said that the AFB might also wish to seek the advice of NWP on gaps and needs identified by adaptation stakeholders, as well as information on organizations, institutions and experts actively engaged in adaptation activities. The Chair of the SBSTA encouraged the Board to explore ways in which the NWP could assist the Adaptation Fund in its operations.

4. At the AFB 6th meeting, the Board adopted the Terms of Reference of the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC) and the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC), as well as the General Guidelines for Board Committees. In particular, the Terms of Reference of the PPRC stipulate that “the PPRC, in consultation with the Board Chair, may require assistance and/or advice from experts in the performance of its functions”.

5. Furthermore, at the 12th AFB meeting, in the context of initial funding priorities and resource allocation for the Adaptation Fund, the Chair circulated a proposal of his own, entitled “Draft Terms of Reference of the Adaptation Fund Board Advisory Panel,” which he said he hoped would help the Board move forward in the discussion on funding priorities for the AF. It provided for a new body of experts to be established with a view to develop criteria for prioritizing funding decisions on project and programmes and any other tasks the Board might request it to undertake in future decisions. The Chair offered to appoint a small committee, composed of selected Board members, to study the draft terms of reference and submit its views to the 13th meeting of the Board. Subsequently, the Board decided to defer further consideration of the subject until the 13th AFB meeting (Decision B.12/35).

6. However, at the 13th AFB meeting, the Board decided to approve a cap of US \$10 million for each country funded for support by the Adaptation Fund (Decision B.13/23), and the establishment of the AFB Advisory Panel was therefore not discussed.

7. Finally, in the margins of the 18th AFB meeting, the PPRC at its 9th meeting had discussed how to deal with comments received from the civil society. During the discussion, it was also pointed out that it would be important to engage the scientific community especially as the Adaptation Fund did not have a dedicated scientific assessment panel. Therefore, the following decision was made by the Board following the report from the PPRC:

Having considered the comments and recommendations of the Projects and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to:

- a) Issue a call for inputs from the public for comments on project/programme proposals for consideration in the technical reviews to be submitted no later than six weeks before each Board meeting using the comment function on the Adaptation Fund webpage;
- b) Make all substantive comments publicly available on the Adaptation Fund website and annexed to each relevant project/programme document; and
- c) Prepare a paper for consideration at the PPRC's 10th meeting on a strategy to engage the scientific community in providing inputs on proposals.

**(Decision B.18/24)**

8. Following on this decision, and based on the background information provided above, the purpose of this document is to propose options for an engagement of the scientific community in AFB activities. **As a preamble, the word “scientific” should be understood here as covering not only fundamental and applied sciences, but also social and economic sciences.**

9. Although the decision specifically refers to the role of this community in providing inputs to the reviews of proposals, the present document envisages its engagement in a broader manner. This could include: 1) inputs to the review process, 2) thematic guidance to the PPRC/AFB on issues identified, and 3) engagement without a pre-defined support function, from the point of view of inclusive and open governance.

10. The present document will be outlined as follows:

- a) Expected benefits from an involvement of the scientific community in AF project and programme assessments;
- b) Overview of existing Advisory Panels in climate change adaptation;
- c) Analysis of options submitted to the AFB so far;
- d) Additional options for scientific community engagement;
- e) Conclusions;
- f) Recommendations.

11. The establishment of a strategy to engage with the scientific community will also contribute to the AF KM strategy<sup>1</sup>, whose main goal is to improve the design and effectiveness of adaptation projects and programs by creating mechanisms that enable it to extract, analyze, learn and share lessons from the projects and programs it finances. Particularly, the workplan for the period 2011-2013 of the KM strategy seeks, under its

---

<sup>1</sup> [AF Knowledge Management Strategy and Work Programme](#), September 2011

Action 4, to “Promote collaboration and knowledge sharing on adaptation issues, enhancing the engagement with Civil Society”.

## **II. Benefits expected from the involvement of the scientific community in the assessment of the design of AF projects and programmes**

12. The technical reviews of project and programme proposals fall in the mandate of the Adaptation Fund Board (AFB) secretariat dedicated team within the Global Environment Facility (GEF) secretariat. The AFB secretariat is supported by the technical experts of the GEF secretariat, allowing for substantial economies of its financial resources, which are limited. The review of these experts is followed by recommendations to the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC) of the AFB, which makes the final recommendations to the Board on submitted project and programme proposals, during its periodic meetings.

13. In complement to the technical expertise of AFB and GEF secretariat officers, whose background ranges across different disciplines, additional input that could contribute to the overall body of knowledge and build some added value to the level of understanding of the adaptation issues worldwide, would benefit the projects and programmes funded by the AF.

14. Such inputs could provide more insight to proposals presenting some particularities. These particularities include but are not limited to projects/programmes that:

- present a risk of maladaptation, therefore requiring either a thorough scientific assessment of the climate change impacts, vulnerability and adaptation options (e.g. ecosystem based solutions) assumed for the project/programme, or inputs from experts who have had experience in the solutions proposed or the region/sector at risk,
- test innovative adaptation solutions,
- deal with a sector not covered by the AFB and GEF secretariats core expertise (e.g. health),
- deal with issues that are very country-specific, or
- deal with solutions that have been already successfully tested in other regions or sectors.

15. Under a framework that could be decided upon, the inputs that can be received from the public and more specifically the scientific community include:

- Share up-to-date scientific knowledge on all aspects relating to impacts, vulnerability and adaptation to climate change, to deal with uncertainties data and models,
- Provide information on existing or innovative adaptation solutions proposed by the projects/programmes,
- Share knowledge from experiences on adaptation in a specific country or in the different regions and sectors,

- Share knowledge on policies, plans, standards that are relevant to the projects/programmes, at national or regional level,
- Share knowledge on best methods for the economic and financial appraisals of projects and programs.

16. Such inputs can be provided through the involvement of a wide range of expertise, such as the academic scientific community, policymakers, NGO and private sector experts, technical, sociological and economical experts from all relevant sectors at country, regional or global levels.

17. In addition to supporting the assessment of project/programme design, the scientific community can participate in strengthening the AF Results framework with improved outcome and impact indicators, i.e. by sharing the latest knowledge on how to measure adaptation effectiveness or impact.

### **III. Overview of existing experiences of involvement of scientific community in environmental funds**

#### **1. *The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP)<sup>2</sup> of the GEF***

18. The STAP was established as an advisory body to the GEF. Its role is to provide objective, strategic scientific and technical advice on GEF policies, operational strategies, programs and on projects and programmatic approaches; and, maintain a database of institutions, networks and individual scientists to provide the necessary expertise and advice for the GEF. It should be noted that the GEF has a specific mandate of contributing to knowledge building under the four conventions for which it serves as “financial mechanism”.<sup>3</sup>

19. The STAP is hosted by UNEP and it is composed of seven members including a Chairperson, supported by a secretariat. STAP provides scientific and technical advice relevant to the GEF and the Trust Funds it manages, including GEF Trust Fund, the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF), the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF), and other trust funds as approved by the GEF Council.

20. The STAP provides strategic advice to the GEF and the trust funds that it manages, as follows:

- a) Advice on the state of scientific, technical and technological knowledge related to each focal area, or area of engagement of the GEF, highlighting policy and operational implications for the GEF;
- b) Advice on the scientific and technical aspects of specific strategic matters such as cross-cutting issues; scientific coherence of GEF operational strategies and programs, and their consistency with GEF policies and objectives; and integration of national and global benefits in GEF interventions;

<sup>2</sup> For more detailed TORs of the STAP, see Annex

<sup>3</sup> [http://www.thegef.org/gef/structure\\_conventions](http://www.thegef.org/gef/structure_conventions)

- c) Advice on research by identifying applied/targeted research which would improve the design and implementation of GEF programs and projects, and by reviewing the research work of the GEF Agencies and the GEF Secretariat.

21. The STAP also provides operational advice, contributing to the identification, design, structure, and periodic review of programming strategies in all areas of engagement, in consultation with the GEF Secretariat and the GEF Agencies. STAP commissions reports on scientific needs and demands in the program being considered, including recommended indicators and targets. It also contributes to ensuring the scientific soundness and technical quality of GEF projects through the provision of tools to the GEF Secretariat to apply in screening project concepts, enabling independent reviews and provision of objective scientific and technical advice, including responding to requests, from the GEF Secretariat and the GEF Agencies, to enhance the quality of projects at any stage during project development.

22. Finally, STAP is also involved in evaluation, providing timely and relevant advice on scientific and technical matters related to monitoring and evaluation activities, and providing advice on the work program of the GEF Evaluation Office related to evaluations with components on science and technology, and suggestions on such subjects to evaluate.

23. In the particular case of issues related to climate change adaptation, a STAP Panel Member specialist in Climate Change Adaptation has been recently recruited. That member will provide operational and strategic advice on the LDCF and SCCF adaptation project portfolio. Other STAP Panel Members will also provide advice on such projects as they relate to their focal areas and areas of expertise. In the context of climate change adaptation and resilience in projects and programs in focal areas funded by the GEF Trust Fund, the Climate Change Adaptation Panel Member will provide input to other STAP Panel Members and identify possible areas of synergies.

## **2. *The Pilot Program for Climate Resilience of the Climate Investment Funds<sup>4</sup> (CIF)***

### The Partnership Forum

24. As governments and institutions undertook to design the Climate Investment Funds (CIF) in 2007-2008, it was recognized that if the CIF are to contribute to an effective global solution to climate change, it would be crucial for their lessons and experiences to be shared in an inclusive, transparent and strategic manner.

25. With that purpose in mind, it was agreed to incorporate into the CIF process a Partnership Forum to serve as a regular venue in which all stakeholders could share CIF-related ideas and experiences and engage in dialogue on the CIF's strategic directions, results and impacts.

26. The Forum is designed as an annual gathering of the spectrum of all stakeholders engaged in the CIF. The stakeholders who convene together at the Forum include

---

<sup>4</sup> The Climate Investment Funds are a pair of funds to help developing countries pilot low-emissions and climate-resilient development. With CIF support, 46 developing countries are piloting transformations in clean technology, sustainable management of forests, increased energy access through renewable energy, and climate-resilient development. For more information: <http://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/>

representatives of donor and eligible recipient countries, Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs), UN and UN agencies, Global Environment Facility (GEF), UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the Adaptation Fund, bilateral development agencies, NGOs, Indigenous Peoples, private sector entities, and scientific and technical experts.

The roster of experts for independent quality review

27. The PPCR is the first program developed and operational under the Strategic Climate Fund (SCF), which is one of two funds within the CIF. The SCF Trust Fund Committee (TFC) agreed at its November 2010 meeting that a focused independent technical review of proposed investment plans and strategies proposed for funding under the SCF targeted programs could contribute to enhancing the quality of the plans and strategies. Therefore, it was decided to create a roster of experts to undertake an independent technical review of SCF investment plans and strategies.

28. The aim of such function is to contribute to the independent review of the strategic investment plans, within the country. Hence, the review should:

- a) add value to the design process of the investment plan;
- b) be part of the country-led preparation process of an investment plan;
- c) reflect the objectives and investment criteria of the relevant program under the SCF; and
- d) provide knowledge and experience for interested stakeholders, including the members and observers to the SCF governing bodies.

29. The responsibilities of the reviewer will include:

- e) conducting a review of the first complete draft version of the investment plan in accordance with the criteria contained in Annex A and using the template contained in Annex D.
- f) submitting the review to the pilot country, the relevant MDBs, and CIF Administrative Unit.
- g) discussing with representatives from the government and MDBs the findings of the review and, if necessary, submit a final version of the review after this discussion has taken place. The purpose of this meeting will be to advance understanding of how the findings of the review may be incorporated into the investment plan.

**3. *The Assessment Panels of the Ozone secretariat under the Montreal Protocol*<sup>5</sup>**

Scientific Assessment Panel (SAP)

30. The Scientific Assessment Panel (SAP) assesses the status of the depletion of the ozone layer and relevant atmospheric science issues. Pursuant to Article 6 of the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, a report is prepared every three or

<sup>5</sup> For more information, see [http://ozone.unep.org/new\\_site/en/assessment\\_panels\\_main.php](http://ozone.unep.org/new_site/en/assessment_panels_main.php)

four years by the SAP which consists of hundreds of top scientists from around the world. Any emerging scientific issues of importance are brought to the attention of the Parties by the SAP Co-Chairs for consideration at the Meetings of the Parties.

#### Technology and Economic Assessment Panel (TEAP)

31. The Technology and Economic Assessment Panel (TEAP) provides, at the request of Parties, technical information related to the alternative technologies that have been investigated and employed to make it possible to virtually eliminate use of Ozone Depleting Substances (such as CFCs and Halons), that harm the ozone layer. TEAP provides reports and documents produced by itself and its specific Technical Options Committees (TOCs) and Task Forces. TEAP, along with the other two panels, carries out a periodic assessment at least every 4 years. It is also tasked by the Parties to yearly assess and evaluate various technical issues including evaluating nominations for essential use exemptions for CFCs and halons, and nominations for critical use exemptions for methyl bromide.

#### Environmental Effects Assessment Panel (EEAP)

32. The Environmental Effects Assessment Panel assesses the various effects of ozone layer depletion. It consists of members who are scientists working in photobiology and photochemistry, mainly in universities and research institutes. The Panel members write the different chapters, sometimes helped by co-authors for special topics. The chapter authors review each other's chapters, and the Panel takes responsibility for the entire assessment. A draft assessment is sent out to external scientific reviewers all over the world. Between major assessments, the Panel meets at least once a year and informs the Parties about new developments.

33. It is worth mentioning that these three panels are not directly involved with projects funded by the Multilateral Fund but rather deal with scientific and technical issues related to the phasing out or management of the numerous substances under the Montreal Protocol. Another important feature of these panels is that their members are all volunteers and therefore are not paid for their tasks, except for their travel expenses and subsistence allowance during the meetings.

#### **IV. Analysis of options submitted or available to the AFB so far**

##### **1. *The option of the PPRC to require assistance and/or advice from experts in the performance of its functions***

###### **1.1. Background**

34. The Terms of Reference of the PPRC stipulate that:

*1. The Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC) shall be responsible for assisting the Board in tasks related to project/programme review in accordance with the Provisional Operational Policies and Guidelines for Parties to access resources of the Adaptation Fund (the Operational Policies and Guidelines), and for providing recommendations and advice to the Board thereon.*



2. *In this regard, the PPRC shall:*

- a) *Consider and review projects and programmes submitted to the Board by eligible Parties in accordance with the Operational Policies and Guidelines;*
- b) *Address issues arising from projects and programmes submitted to the Board, including outstanding policy issues;*
- c) *Review the project and programme reports submitted by National Implementing Entities (NIEs) and Multilateral Implementing Entities (MIEs) in accordance with paragraph 46 of the Operational Policies and Guidelines, with the support of the Secretariat; Report and make recommendations to the Board on project and programme approval, cancellation, termination, suspension and on any other matter under its consideration; and*
- d) *Consider any other matter the Board deems appropriate.*

3. *Representatives from NIEs and MIEs may be invited by the Chair of the PPRC to attend the meetings in order to explain details of the projects and programmes before the PPRC and provide information to assist in the deliberations.*

4. *The PPRC, in consultation with the Board Chair, may require assistance and/or advice from experts in the performance of its functions.*

#### 1.2. Analysis of the option

35. Under paragraph 4 of the TORs above, the PPRC has been given the option to call on the assistance or advice of experts, in the performance of its functions, which include points a) to d) under paragraph 2 of the TORs. So far, this option has not been used, but may be deemed appropriate in the case, for example, of proposals that would cover sectors for which expertise does not exist within the AFB and GEF secretariats, i.e. health, migration, etc., or proposals specifically requiring expertise on sociology, human sciences, and economics. Also, in the case of policy or strategic issues related to projects and programmes and for which the Board may require assistance or advice (e.g. scaling up strategies or issues), that option may be triggered. To that effect, the secretariat may be asked to develop a roster of experts that would be called on to support the work of the PPRC. **Option 1A.**

## **2. *The possibility for the public (including the scientific community) to comment on project/programme proposals posted on the AF website***

### 2.1. Background

36. Projects and programme proposals submitted to the secretariat are posted on the AF website for comments by the public. So far, only a few comments have been received, and those have for the most part been from local NGOs.

### 2.2. Analysis of the option

37. The Board may request the secretariat to explore the ways to spread the information on the possibility to comment on AF proposals, using existing scientific networks and other relevant channels. This may include:

- Diffusing more widely the call for submission of proposals, clearly indicating that comments from the scientific community are welcome, i.e. in GEF or UNFCCC websites, etc.
- Posting the call for comments of scientific community in targeted scientific networks and more specifically climate change networks, i.e. climate-L, IISD Climate Change Daily Feed, LinkedIn climate change adaptation-related groups, etc.

#### **Option 2A.**

### **3. Proposal from the AFB Chair<sup>6</sup> to establish an Adaptation Fund Board Advisory Panel (AFBAP)**

#### **3.1. Background**

38. At the 12th meeting of the AFB, during a discussion on Initial funding priorities and resource allocation for the Adaptation Fund, the 2010 Chair, Mr. Farrukh Iqbal Khan, circulated a proposal of his own prepared with the assistance of the secretariat, entitled “Draft Terms of Reference of the Adaptation Fund Board Advisory Panel,” which he hoped would help the Board move forward. It provided for a new body of experts to be established with a view to develop criteria for prioritizing funding decisions on project and programmes and any other tasks the Board might request it to undertake in future decisions.

39. As a scope of work, the draft TORs stipulate<sup>7</sup>:

*“The tasks undertaken by the AFBAP are to provide advice to the Board in prioritizing the allocation of available funds. This might include developing a uniform set of indicators to help select projects and/or measure project performance pertaining to adaptation. Such indicators should quantify the economics of adaptive effects of project/programme activities, and be based on existing body of knowledge on economics of climate change adaptation and geographical distribution of climate change risks. The indicator framework would also consider cost-effectiveness of various solutions to climate change adaptation in different regions and sectors, as well as approaches that mitigate the drivers of vulnerability, as opposed to managing the impacts of climate change in a reactive manner. In analyzing different approaches, exploring the potential of involving the private sector will be crucial including e.g. in risk management and transfer, and as a part in broader partnerships such as Payments for Ecosystem Services.*

*The AFBAP should also assist the Board in defining the universe of Parties eligible for funding from the Adaptation Fund, and outline regional priorities.*

*The AFBAP analyses and presents technical information and may recommend courses of action to the Board/PPRC. It does not evaluate policy issues.*

---

<sup>6</sup> This is the 2010 AFB Chair, Mr Farrukh Ikhbal Khan

<sup>7</sup> For more details, see the complete draft TORs in Annex2 of this document

*The AFBAP presents technical and economic information relevant to policy decisions by the Board.*

*Furthermore, the AFBAP does not judge the merit or success of national plans, strategies or regulations.”*

40. The expected outcome of the first assignment of the AFBAP would have been a report, to be presented to the Adaptation Fund Board at the latest by the [15th] [16th] meeting of the AFB, which would help the Board in prioritizing the allocation of available funds. Therefore, the main focus of the proposed AFBAP was to work at the strategic level, to help in funding option decisions, instead of working on reviewing proposals.

41. During the discussion in the Board meeting, some members welcomed the proposal, saying that guidance was needed from an external body and that it was worth a try. Others were of the view that the time was not right for creating yet another body. The Chair offered to appoint a small committee, composed of selected Board members, to study the draft terms of reference and submit its views to the thirteenth meeting of the Board.

42. Having considered the presentation by the Manager of the Adaptation Fund Board secretariat and the Chair’s proposal on the possibility of creating an Advisory Panel, the Board decided that it would defer further consideration of the item until the thirteenth meeting of the Board (Decision B.12/35).

### 3.2. Analysis of the option

43. The proposal from Mr Farrukh Khan was not discussed at the subsequent AFB meetings since one of the needs for having such a panel, i.e. prioritization among countries, was solved by instituting the uniform USD 10 million for allocations cap per country at the subsequent 13th meeting (Decision B.13/23). The Board may wish to reconsider the proposal, in light of the decision to define a strategy for engaging with the scientific community. However, the issue of funding or regional prioritization should not be the focus of discussion of this option, but rather how this advisory panel can be used to engage scientific and more broadly sociological and economical experts’ community. Options to be discussed could include:

- The establishment of the AFBAP, with a “strategic” scope extended to an advisory role in projects/programmes review; **Option 1B**
- The establishment of the AFBAP, but restricted to an advisory role in projects/programmes review. **Option 1C**

44. Finally, the financial implication of the establishment of such body will have to be assessed. It is proposed to explore the idea of establishing membership to the advisory body on a voluntary basis, in the same model as the Assessment Panels of the Ozone secretariat.

## 4. ***Informal exchanges at the GEF secretariat with STAP***

### 4.1. Background

45. The STAP has, through its secretariat, approached the AFB secretariat in order to present its work with a view to eventually assist the AF review process in the future.

#### 4.2. Analysis of the option

46. STAP support to the AFB would be of the same nature as the support it provides to the GEF. If the Board wishes so, the secretariat could explore the possibilities of collaborating with STAP, including financial implications, and report back to the Board at a subsequent meeting. However, the heavy workload of STAP members combined with the current AF project/programme review timeline may be a constraint to meet the deadlines set for AF project review. **Option 1D**

### 5. ***Offer of support from the Nairobi Work Programme implemented by the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) of the UNFCCC***

#### 5.1. Background

47. The SBSTA is one of two permanent subsidiary bodies to the Convention established by the COP/CMP<sup>8</sup>. It supports the work of the COP and the CMP through the provision of timely information and advice on scientific and technological matters as they relate to the Convention or its Kyoto Protocol.

48. “Key areas of work for the SBSTA are the impacts, vulnerability and adaptation to climate change; emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries; promoting the development and transfer of environmentally-friendly technologies; and conducting technical work to improve the guidelines for preparing and reviewing greenhouse gas emission inventories from Annex I Parties. The SBSTA carries out methodological work under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol, and promotes collaboration in the field of research and systematic observation of the climate system”<sup>9</sup>.

49. In addition, the SBSTA plays an important role as the link between the scientific information provided by expert sources such as the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) on the one hand, and the policy-oriented needs of the COP on the other. It works closely with the IPCC, sometimes requesting specific information or reports from it, and also collaborates with other relevant international organizations that share the common objective of sustainable development.

50. At the 5th meeting of the AFB, the Chair of the AFB invited Ms. Helen Plume, Chair of the SBSTA, to report on the lessons learned through the implementation of the Nairobi Work Programme on Impacts, Vulnerability and Adaptation to Climate Change (NWP).

51. In her presentation, Ms. Plume said that the SBSTA had been mandated by the Conference of the Parties to coordinate the implementation of the NWP which was being implemented by Parties, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, the private sector, communities and other stakeholders, and which engaged up to 140 different stakeholders. The objective of the programme was to assist all

---

<sup>8</sup> Since the UNFCCC entered into force in 1995, the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the UNFCCC have been meeting annually to assess progress in dealing with climate change. The COP serves as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol, which also adopts decisions and resolutions on the implementation of its provisions. This annual meeting is referred to as the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP).

<sup>9</sup> For additional information, see <http://unfccc.int/bodies/body/6399.php>

Parties, in particular developing countries, the least developed countries and the small island developing states, to improve their understanding of impacts, vulnerability and adaptation to climate change, and to make informed decisions on practical adaptation actions and measures to respond to climate change based on sound scientific, technical and socioeconomic grounds.

52. The programme included the following nine areas of work: (a) methods and tools, (b) data and observation, (c) climate modeling, scenarios and downscaling, (d) climate related risks and extreme events, (e) socio-economic information, (f) adaptation planning and practices, (g) research, (h) technologies for adaptation, and (i) economic diversification. The various modalities of the programme's work involved workshops and meetings, compendiums and web-based resources, reports and technical papers.

53. The Chair of the SBSTA also drew the attention of the Board to the relevant outputs from the implementation of the NWP that might be supportive to the work of the Board. These included the reports on mandated workshops and experts meetings, compilations of submissions by Parties and organizations, and associated synthesis reports, as well as calls for action, compendiums of methods and tools to evaluate impacts, vulnerability and adaptation to climate change, adaptation assessments, adaptation planning, and methods and tools developed and shared by NWP partners.

54. She said that the AFB might wish to draw upon the technical support of the NWP in its efforts to prioritize adaptation programmes. The AFB might also wish to seek the advice of NWP on gaps and needs identified by adaptation stakeholders, as well as information on organizations, institutions and experts actively engaged in adaptation activities. The Chair of the SBSTA encouraged the Board to explore ways in which the NWP could assist the Adaptation Fund in its operations.

55. Following a series of questions and comments by Board members about the importance of linking the websites of the Adaptation Fund and the NWP, as well as the status of the roster of experts and the role of the NWP in the implementation of concrete adaptation projects, the Chair of the SBSTA explained that the NWP did not implement adaptation projects, but served as an information base that provided advice and assistance to stakeholders involved in adaptation activities on the ground. She also said that the roster of experts was in the process of being developed. While it was important to link that activity to UNEP's roster of experts, it was also important not to duplicate what was happening elsewhere, as it was the intention of the NWP to build upon work that was already in place. However, one way of furthering cooperation between the Adaptation Fund and the NWP would be to consider making a link between the websites of the two organizations.

## 5.2. Analysis of the option

56. Since the 5th AFB meeting and this presentation from the Chair of the SBSTA, there has been no formal interaction, except for the link to the NWP that was put in the AF website. However, it should be noted that the AF Strategic Priorities, Policies and Guidelines and Operational Policies and Guidelines encourage countries to take into account the NWP guidance.

57. The Board may wish to request another meeting or presentation from SBSTA, in order to initiate collaboration that could include the following (**Option 1E**):

- An option to tap on the roster of experts of the NWP, if the need arises,

- To engage with the NWP partnership, as part of Action 4 “*Promote collaboration and knowledge sharing on adaptation issues, enhancing the engagement with Civil Society*” of the AF Knowledge Management Strategy,
- Request the advice of the NWP when dealing with strategic issues, such as funding regional programmes, funding prioritization, etc.

## **6. Collaboration with the Hyogo Framework of the UN International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (UNISDR)**

### **6.1. Background**

58. At its 11th meeting, the Board heard a presentation made by a representative of Ms. Margareta Wahlström, Special Representative of the Secretary General for Disaster Reduction, on the Hyogo Framework of Action and the linkages between the work of the UN International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (UNISDR) and that of the Adaptation Fund Board.

59. Some members said that there were significant differences between the approach taken by the ISDR and the Adaptation Fund and it was observed that the Hyogo Framework placed the costs of response to disaster onto the countries responding to the disaster themselves. There was concern expressed that attempts to link the work of the Adaptation Fund and the ISDR might lead to the developed world shifting the costs of the adaptation on to the developing world.

60. Others suggested such was not the intention of the presentation and it was further noted that the Hyogo Framework was non-binding. It was observed that there were significant synergies between the work of the two organizations and much could be accomplished if they were to work together. That represented a challenge on a number of levels as for most countries disaster relief was considered in terms of human rights while adaptation was dealt with in terms of climate change and the Ministries that dealt with human rights issues rarely communicated with those that dealt with climate change.

61. The Chair thanked the representative of the ISDR for the presentation and said that the data that had been presented would be considered by the PPRC.

### **6.2. Analysis of the option**

62. The presentation from the ISDR was not discussed at subsequent PPRC meetings. The Board may want to consider how to engage with the Hyogo Framework and share knowledge, especially in projects/programmes or strategies related to disaster risk reduction. **(Option 1F)**

## **V. Additional options for scientific community engagement**

63. Apart from the options mentioned above, the AFB could explore other opportunities to engage with the scientific community. A few possibilities are listed in the following sections. It should be noted that these options are complementary and not exclusive.

### **1. Participation in scientific symposia and seminars**

64. The secretariat may participate or invite project/programme teams to participate in targeted seminars, conferences and symposia organized by universities or scientific societies and related to climate change adaptation. Such participation could be of different ways (**Option 2B**):

- Participation as observers, taking the opportunity of such participation to engage with scientists and spread the information about the possibility to comment on project/programme proposals through the AF website,
- Poster or oral presentation on an innovative adaptation solution proposed by one or several AF projects/programmes in a specific region or sector,
- Rental of a booth to present the AF and spread the information about the possibility to comment on project/programme proposals through the AF website.

## **2. Development of an AF Science and Policy network**

65. In the same model as the AF NGO network<sup>10</sup>, an AF Science and Policy network could be encouraged, which would be managed and animated by its members outside the secretariat. Such network could be facilitated using social media such as Facebook, Twitter or LinkedIn, but also through other channels including periodic face-to-face meetings, webinars, etc.

66. This network would be an important platform to comment on proposals submitted to the AF, but also could support the AFB secretariat in the production of publications on targeted adaptation solutions or case studies based on AF-funded projects/programmes.

67. In the past, some institutions and networks such as the Climate and Development Knowledge Network (CDKN), the Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI), or the Social Science Research Network (SSRN), have published working papers related to the AF projects or policies. Such actions could be coordinated under the AF Science and Policy network. (**Option 2C**)

## **VI. Conclusions**

68. From the analysis of the different options to involve the scientific community in AFB activities, two sets of options can be defined:

- I. Direct inputs: through the establishment of an ad-hoc advisory body that would support the Board in technical, economic and social issues related to its activities; i.e. project reviews, portfolio monitoring, strategic papers and scientific publications: Options 1;
- II. Indirect inputs: through positioning the AF within a network of adaptation practitioners, including scientific experts, academia, NGOs, Institutions, private sector and local communities, through different virtual or face-to-face channels: Options 2.

---

<sup>10</sup> For more information, see: <http://germanwatch.org/klima/afn.htm>

69. Of the different options described under the first category, 1B and 1C seem to be more adequate for the purpose aimed at in this document. The development of a roster of consultants to support the project reviews (option 1A) is limited in its feasibility by the duration of the current review process (less than one week between the deadline for the submission of proposals and the starting of project review), which makes it difficult to go through a procurement process in such a limited timeframe. As for the use of STAP, as explained above, it may induce some delays under the current AF project cycle and may not be cost effective. Similarly, if the Board decided on the establishment of a “dedicated” advisory body for independence and efficiency purposes, the other options provided under the first category may not be adequate,

70. Regarding the options falling under the second category, i.e. options 2A, 2B and 2C, they are all relevant and non-exclusive and therefore, could be planned under a comprehensive strategy for engaging with scientific community.

## **VII. Recommendations**

71. The PPRC may wish to discuss the two categories of options submitted above, to select the options that it considers as most relevant.

72. Following the discussion, the PPRC may wish to recommend the Board to request the secretariat:

- a) To further investigate the establishment of a voluntary-based advisory body in the models described under option 1B and 1C, including an evaluation of their costs. This should be included in a comprehensive strategy for engaging with scientific community;
- b) To include the options 2A, 2B and 2C within a budgeted action plan, under the above-mentioned strategy;
- c) To submit such strategy document to the Board at its 20<sup>th</sup> meeting.



## **Annex 1: Revised STAP Terms of Reference**

### **Terms of Reference of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP)**

**March 2012**

#### **MANDATE**

1. The STAP is established as an advisory body to the GEF. STAP shall provide objective, strategic scientific and technical advice on GEF policies, operational strategies, programs and on projects and programmatic approaches; and, maintain a database of institutions, networks and individual scientists to provide the necessary expertise and advice for the GEF. STAP's activities shall be coordinated with the activities of the GEF Secretariat and the Implementing and Executing Agencies (GEF Agencies<sup>11</sup>) and be consistent with GEF processes and procedures approved by the Council.

2. The STAP shall interact in a complementary manner with other relevant scientific and technical bodies, particularly with the subsidiary bodies of the Convention on Biological Diversity, the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Convention to Combat Desertification and the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants. For focal areas in which the GEF is not operating as a convention's financial mechanism, the STAP shall advise on the development of scientific and technical criteria and provide scientific and technical advice on priorities for GEF funding. The STAP shall provide expert scientific advice to inter-agency task forces and bodies handling other GEF processes, when such advice is requested.

3. Pursuant to this mandate, STAP shall report to each regular meeting of the GEF Council and, if requested, to the GEF Assembly on the status of its activities.

4. UNEP shall provide STAP's Secretariat and operate as its liaison with the GEF.

#### **PERFORMANCE**

5. UNEP shall monitor the STAP's performance, which shall be measured against agreed deliverables, targets and indicators to be specified in the STAP's program work.

#### **COMPOSITION**

6. The Executive Director of UNEP, in consultation with UNDP, the World Bank, the Executing Agencies, and the GEF Secretariat, upon approval of the GEF Council shall appoint six members of STAP and shall also appoint a Chairperson. The members shall ordinarily be appointed for a term of two years renewable for a further two years. Members may be removed by the Executive Director of UNEP only for cause.

---

<sup>11</sup> The Implementing Agencies consist of UNEP, UNDP and the World Bank. Executing Agencies include the FAO, UNIDO, IDB, ADB, AfDB, EBRD, IFAD. Beginning in GEF-4, all agencies are allowed access to GEF resources

7. The STAP shall provide scientific and technical advice relevant to the GEF and the Trust Funds it manages, including GEF Trust Fund, the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF), the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF), and other trust funds as approved by the GEF Council. The composition of STAP shall reflect:

(a) Recognized leadership in specific relevant fields in the GEF focal areas of Biological Diversity, Climate Change Mitigation, Climate Change Adaptation, International Waters, Ozone Depletion, Persistent Organic Pollutants, and Land Degradation and with an ability to bridge scientific, technological, economic, social and policy issues;

(b) Geographical and gender balance;

(c) Experience in the management of science and with knowledge of issues in the implementation of complex international initiatives;

(d) An understanding of the organizational and operational setting of the Implementing and Executing Agencies, particularly the context of program and project development and implementation; and

(e) Knowledge about the scientific processes required for the implementation of relevant conventions in developing countries and familiarity with relevant international assessments.

8. To avoid any potential conflicts of interest, members who hold positions in Government, non-governmental organizations, or who are working in, or have any contractual arrangement, as consultants or otherwise, with an Implementing or Executing Agency or the GEF Secretariat, shall disclose this information to the Executive Director of UNEP. Potential conflicts of interest with agencies or individuals involved in individual projects should be disclosed to the Chairperson of STAP. At the discretion of the Chairperson, members may be excluded from attending Panel discussions in which he/she has a personal interest or has had significant involvement in any capacity.

9. Panel Members will work collaboratively on issues of relevance to multiple focal areas. Panel Members will help keep other Panel Members abreast of emerging science as it relates to their areas of engagement.

10. Concerning the Panel's work on issues of climate change adaptation, the Climate Change Adaptation Panel Member will provide operational and strategic advice on the GEF's adaptation project portfolio that is funded through the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) and Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF). Other STAP Panel Members will also provide advice on such projects as they relate to their focal areas and areas of expertise. In the context of climate change adaptation and resilience in projects and programs in focal areas funded by the GEF Trust Fund, the Climate Change Adaptation Panel Member will provide input to other STAP Panel Members and identify possible areas of synergies.

11. STAP may convene ad-hoc working groups to address particular issues or questions which arise and to obtain specialized technical opinions as needed. The ad-hoc working groups may also be designed as resource groups for the GEF Agencies on

specific technical aspects of project design and provide advice on technological options, cost-effectiveness and related social issues.

12. The Chairperson of STAP shall act as the spokesperson in various meetings, and may assign members to represent STAP at meetings. The Chairperson shall be provided adequate financial support in carrying out these responsibilities.

### **STRATEGIC ADVICE**

13. STAP shall advise the GEF Council regarding contemporary issues of the global environment and how to address them; provide a forum for integrating expertise on science and technology, including their social, economic and institutional aspects; function as an important conduit between the GEF and the natural and social science communities and relevant technologists, and, synthesize, promote and galvanize relevant and up to date contributions from them. In carrying out this role, STAP's advice will complement ongoing activities within the GEF-related conventions.

14. STAP's role in providing strategic advice to the GEF and the trust funds that it manages shall be as follows:

(a) Advise on the state of scientific, technical and technological knowledge related to each focal area, or area of engagement of the GEF, highlighting policy and operational implications for the GEF;

(b) Advise on the scientific and technical aspects of specific strategic matters such as cross-cutting issues; scientific coherence of GEF operational strategies and programs, and their consistency with GEF policies and objectives; and integration of national and global benefits in GEF interventions;

(c) Advise on research by identifying applied/targeted research which would improve the design and implementation of GEF programs and projects, and by reviewing the research work of the GEF Agencies and the GEF Secretariat.

15. As part of its strategic role, STAP shall provide a number of specific products on a regular basis, including:

(a) Thematic Briefing Documents that summarize the available scientific knowledge and technological know-how within selected specific themes, and translates this knowledge into actionable advice for the GEF. The Briefing Documents also identify controversies and knowledge gaps, and suggest needs for further research, technology development and capacity development.;

(b) Triennial reports to the GEF Assembly on the broad scientific and technical issues that emerged during the preceding phase of the GEF and on emerging issues and gaps as an outlook for the subsequent replenishment period of the GEF;

(c) Reviews of the scientific and technical aspects of GEF operational and focal area strategies and programs;

(d) Papers of a scientific and technical nature relevant to GEF strategies and programs; and

(e) A STAP Annual Work Program information paper for the GEF Council.

#### **OPERATIONAL ADVICE**

16. STAP will contribute to the identification, design, structure, and periodic review of programming strategies in all areas of engagement, in consultation with the GEF Secretariat and the GEF Agencies. STAP will commission reports on scientific needs and demands in the program being considered, including recommended indicators and targets. These reports will include sections on the scientific literature supporting the need for a Strategic Program, scientific assessments of geographic locations identified for assistance, advice on appropriate scientific approaches and methodologies, advice on analytical techniques including scientific aspects of M&E, and scientific dissemination and communication strategies.

17. STAP will contribute to ensuring the scientific soundness and technical quality of GEF projects through the provision of tools to the GEF Secretariat to apply in screening project concepts, enabling independent reviews and provision of objective scientific and technical advice, including responding to requests, from the GEF Secretariat and the GEF Agencies, to enhance the quality of projects at any stage during project development. STAP's activities shall be integrated into the processes and timing set out in the GEF Project Cycle, conducted in close cooperation with the GEF Agencies and the GEF Secretariat, and based on the standard documentation provided by the GEF Agencies during various phases of the GEF Project Cycle. Decisions regarding project clearance, approval or endorsement at various steps in the project shall be consistent with procedures approved by the Council.

18. STAP, after identifying and documenting a need, may propose to a GEF Agency in consultation with the GEF Secretariat, the development of a specific Programmatic Approach, to be entered into the Project Cycle as a concept for evaluation under the Programmatic Approach.

19. STAP shall convene a Research Committee to advise the GEF CEO on each Targeted Research proposal received.

20. STAP shall maintain a database of institutions and networks, to enable access to internationally-recognized specialists which will be quality assured by STAP Panel members in the scientific and technical areas relevant to the GEF operations, and STAP will assure independence of project reviews, through STAP selection of reviewers.

21. STAP shall standardize the types of information needed in the technical review process and establish generic guidelines for the terms of reference for external technical reviewers, in consultation with GEF Secretariat and the GEF Agencies. STAP shall continuously update its networks and shall advise the GEF Council on GEF technical review procedures.

22. STAP shall develop and keep under review criteria, which will be reviewed and approved by the Council, for the Panel to initiate additional reviews of projects on a selective basis. STAP shall have the discretion and initiative to selectively review, in accordance with the criteria approved by the Council, any project proposal, after notifying the Chief Executive Officer.

23. STAP shall inform the GEF Agencies of its requirements for minimum documentation to be made available to its members for all projects throughout the project cycle so that it has a complete perspective on GEF operations. These requirements shall be based on the GEF Agencies' standard documentation as it applies throughout the GEF Project Cycle

## **EVALUATION**

24. STAP will provide timely and relevant advice on scientific and technical matters related to monitoring and evaluation activities. The Chairperson of STAP takes part in relevant meetings and consultations on monitoring and evaluation in the GEF.

25. STAP will provide advice on the work program of the GEF Evaluation Office related to evaluations with components on science and technology, and suggestions on such subjects to evaluate. It may also provide opinions on the evaluability of scientific aspects and related methodologies for measuring global environmental impacts, in response to evaluation approach papers, Terms of Reference or reports. STAP members may also be called upon to support directly an evaluation, while respecting the independence of both STAP and the GEF Evaluation Office.

26. The Panel will also support, on request, monitoring of scientific and technical aspects of the GEF, through knowledge management and information sharing; for scientific and technical evaluation of the portfolio. STAP supports the GEF Secretariat in the development and use of scientific indicators to measure impact at national and portfolio levels.

## **SECRETARIAT**

27. STAP and its ad-hoc working groups shall be served by a Secretariat. This Secretariat shall be provided by UNEP. The Secretary of STAP shall be responsible for the Secretariat functions. Under the guidance of the Chairperson, these functions shall include:

(a) Making arrangements for sessions of STAP and its working groups and providing them with services as required;

(b) Preparing the budget and reporting on its status;

(c) Ensuring the necessary coordination, liaison and involvement with the GEF Secretariat, the GEF Evaluation Office, Implementing and Executing Agencies, Conventions, subsidiary bodies and other relevant bodies;

(d) Ensuring the necessary coordination, liaison and involvement with UNEP's Management Team, and UNEP's scientific and technical focal points.

(e) Entering, in accordance with the Rules and Regulations of UNEP, into such administrative and contractual arrangements as may be required by STAP for the effective discharge of its functions;

(f) Maintaining, keeping under review and constantly updating the database of institutions and independent experts;

(g) Drafting policy, strategy and operational papers for Panel Members and assisting in their timely transmission to the GEF Council and other bodies of the GEF;

(h) Preparation of documents, reviews and reports, including reports on the performance of STAP and its Secretariat; and

(i) Performing such other support functions as may be assigned by STAP.

28. Appropriate budgetary procedures shall be instituted to ensure the independence of the operations of STAP

### **COOPERATION WITH SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL BODIES OF THE CONVENTIONS AND OTHER SCIENTIFIC BODIES**

29. STAP's activities shall be considered complementary to and take into account the work done by the subsidiary bodies on scientific, technical and technological advice of the Conventions on Biological Diversity, Climate Change, Desertification and Persistent Organic Pollutants, and the Panels of Inter-governmental Assessments. STAP will contribute especially in cross-cutting issues, through its ability to review and synthesize scientific and technical information relevant to the objectives and strategies of the GEF. In carrying out its mandate, STAP shall interact with these bodies in a collaborative and cooperative manner reflecting their relative mandates and roles.

30. Cooperation and coordination between STAP and these bodies may be enhanced through a variety of arrangements, including reciprocal participation in meetings and other activities including in working groups. The Chairpersons of the subsidiary bodies and assessment panels may be invited to participate in meetings of STAP and/or its working groups.

31. STAP shall establish practical working arrangements for meeting and consulting with the subsidiary bodies of the Conventions, advisory and assessment panels as well as with relevant research bodies.

### **SPECIAL CONDITIONS**

32. The disclosure of information related to STAP's activities shall be conducted according to the Policy Procedures related to Public Availability of Documentary Information on GEF Operations of UNEP

### **AMENDMENTS**

33. The GEF Council may approve amendments to the present arrangements.

## Annex 2

### Draft Terms of Reference of the Adaptation Fund Board Advisory Panel (AFBAP)

#### 1. Scope of Work

The tasks undertaken by the AFBAP are to provide advice to the Board in prioritizing the allocation of available funds. This might include developing a uniform set of indicators to help select projects and/or measure project performance pertaining to adaptation. Such indicators should quantify the economics of adaptive effects of project/programme activities, and be based on existing body of knowledge on economics of climate change adaptation and geographical distribution of climate change risks. The indicator framework would also consider cost-effectiveness of various solutions to climate change adaptation in different regions and sectors, as well as approaches that mitigate the drivers of vulnerability, as opposed to managing the impacts of climate change in a reactive manner. In analyzing different approaches, exploring the potential of involving the private sector will be crucial including e.g. in risk management and transfer, and as a part in broader partnerships such as Payments for Ecosystem Services. . The AFBAP should also assist the Board in defining the universe of Parties eligible for funding from the Adaptation Fund, and outline regional priorities. The AFBAP analyses and presents technical information and may recommend courses of action to the Board/PPRC. It does not evaluate policy issues. The AFBAP presents technical and economic information relevant to policy decisions by the Board. Furthermore, the AFBAP does not judge the merit or success of national plans, strategies, or regulations.

In performing the tasks described above, the AFBAP will be guided by the strategic priorities policies and guidelines of the Adaptation Fund; the operational policies and guidelines to access resources from the Adaptation Fund; and any other relevant decisions by the CMP or the Board.

The AFBAP will also consider any existing criteria to determine vulnerability; including but not limited to the country capacity to respond to the adverse effects of climate change; its socio-economic situation. The question of uncertainty and lack of information in several areas will be highlighted in this review.

The expected outcome of this work will be a report, to be presented to the Adaptation Fund Board at the latest by the [15<sup>th</sup>] [16<sup>th</sup>] meeting of the Adaptation Fund Board.

#### 2. Organization of AFBAP

##### 2.1 Size and Balance

The membership size of the AFBAP should [be][not exceed]... members to allow it to function effectively. It should consist of senior experts from both public and

private sectors with recognized specific expertise in: [water resources; agriculture and food security; human health; terrestrial ecosystems and biodiversity; risk management and coastal zones [and any other discipline further identified as relevant to adaptation to climate change by IPCC]]. The positions of the senior experts must be filled to promote a broad expertise basis in the AFBAP and regional/vulnerable groups balance. [The overall goal is to achieve a representation of all the disciplines identified as relevant for adaptation to climate change and all the regional and vulnerable to climate change groups.]

The panel should include substantial representation of the private sector, including insurance, finance, and other relevant fields.

## 2.2 Nominations

The Board will identify a number of senior experts to integrate the AFBAP as members. In the future, nominations of senior experts may be made by individual Parties through their relevant government organization or other AFBAP members to the Secretariat.

## 2.3 AFBAP Co-Chairs

The AFBAP shall elect two Co-Chairs who shall represent the AFBAP and preside over its meetings.

## 2.4 Replacement

If an AFBAP member relinquishes or is unable to perform his/her duties, the procedure set out in paragraph 2.2 shall be followed.

## 2.5 Code of conduct

The code of conduct of the Adaptation Fund Board shall apply to the members of AFBAP to avoid conflict of interests in the performance of their duties.

# 3. **Functioning of AFBAP**

## 3.1 Language

The AFBAP meetings will be held and reports and other documents will be produced only in English.

## 3.2 Scheduling of Meetings

The AFBAP will conduct its work by meeting face to face, remote conference system and electronic mail communication, as appropriate. The place and time of the AFBAP meetings will be established by the Co-chairs.

## 3.3 Rules of Procedure



The rules of procedure of the Adaptation Fund Board will be followed in conducting the meetings of the AFBAP, unless otherwise stated in the terms of reference for AFBAP as approved by the Board.

#### 3.4 Observers

No observers will be permitted at the AFBAP meetings. However, anyone can present information to the AFBAP with prior notice.

#### 3.5 Functioning by Members

The AFBAP members function on a personal basis as experts, irrespective of the source of their nominations and accept no instruction from, nor function as representatives of Governments, industries, NGOs or others.

### 4. Report of AFBAP

#### 4.1 Procedures

The AFBAP report will be developed through a consensus process. The reports must reflect any minority views appropriately.

#### 4.2 Access

Access to materials and drafts considered by the AFBAP will be available only to AFBAP members or others designated by AFBAP. The secretariat shall establish a password-protected section on the Adaptation Fund website to facilitate the work of the AFBAP. Final report will be made available through the Adaptation Fund website.

#### 4.3 Comments by Public

Any member of the public can comment to the AFBAP Co-Chairs with regard to the report and they must respond as early as possible. The secretariat will make sure that this possibility to comment is secured through the Adaptation Fund website.

### 5. Support to the AFBAP

The secretariat will appoint an officer among the secretariat's staff to act as focal point for the AFBAP and assist them in all the tasks related to its conduct of business.