



ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/EFC.17/9

8 October 2015

ADAPTATION FUND BOARD

Ethics and Finance Committee

Seventeenth Meeting

Bonn, 6-7 October 2015

REPORT OF THE SEVENTEENTH MEETING OF THE ETHICS AND FINANCE COMMITTEE FOR BOARD REPORT

Agenda Item 1: Opening of the meeting

1. The Chair of the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC), Ms. Irina Helena Pineda Aguilar (Honduras, Group of Latin American and Caribbean Countries), opened the meeting and greeted the participants at 9.17 a.m. on 6 October 2015.

Agenda Item 2: Organizational matters

(a) Adoption of the agenda

2. The agenda below was based on documents AFB/EFC.17/ Rev.1 (Provisional agenda) and AFB/EFC.17/2/Rev.1 (Annotated provisional agenda).

3. At the invitation of the Chair, the Manager of the secretariat proposed the addition of two sub-items under Other Matters: one on investment income, to discuss guidance for implementing entities (IEs) on how investment income on project funds should be handled, and another on a mechanism to receive returns of funds, such as unspent project funds and investment income, into the trust fund.

4. Thus amended, the agenda was adopted.

1. Opening of the meeting
2. Organizational matters
 - (a) Adoption of the agenda
 - (b) Organization of work
3. Evaluation of the Fund
4. Effectiveness and efficiency of the accreditation process
5. Gender-related policies and procedures of the Fund
6. Annual report for the fiscal year 2015
7. Complaint handling mechanism
8. Implementation of the code of conduct
9. Financial issues
 - (a) Financial status of the trust fund and CER monetization
 - (b) Reconciliation of the Board and secretariat, and trustee budgets for the fiscal year 2015
 - (c) UNFCCC CER voluntary cancellation tool
10. Other matters
 - (a) Investment income
 - (b) Mechanism to receive returns of unspent project funds into the trust fund
11. Adoption of the recommendations and the report
12. Closure of the meeting

(b) *Organization of work*

5. The Committee adopted the organization of work proposed by the Chair.

6. In accordance with paragraph 29 of the rules of procedure, the Chair then called upon all EFC members to orally declare any conflict of interest that they might have with any item on the current meeting agenda.

Agenda Item 3: Evaluation of the Fund

7. The Chair drew the Committee's attention to the evaluation report contained in document AFB/EFC.17/3 (Evaluation of the Fund (stage I)) and invited Dr. Charles Ehrhart from the company TANGO International to present the main findings of the evaluation.

8. Dr. Ehrhart began his presentation by stressing that one of the evaluation's strongest conclusions and messages was that the Fund was a "learning organization". He went on to describe the Fund's key strengths, which he said were concentrated in its relevance, effectiveness and efficiency. Key weaknesses notably included the lack of adequate, predictable and reliable funding. Finally, he presented what he considered the most important recommendations arising from the evaluation, including a proposed way forward to address the challenge of financial sustainability.

9. Following his presentation, Dr. Ehrhart elaborated on some of the recommendations in response to questions and comments.

10. On the questions of financial sustainability, it was observed that while some donors appeared to think the Fund was doing a good job, others had a negative view of the Fund and showed strong resistance to the Fund being captured under a new agreement. Speculating on the possible reasons behind such resistance, Dr. Ehrhart pointed to a legacy of biases from the early days of the Fund, which left some key governments disillusioned and sceptical. While some had later been impressed by the improved functioning, not all had taken a second look. The Fund may not have fully communicated its unique value within the climate framework, and communication might therefore be considered an area for improvement.

11. The recommendation regarding the need to develop comprehensive policies and guidelines for the transparent selection of national implementing entities (NIEs) elicited a number of comments and questions. Addressing them, Dr. Ehrhart pointed out that having a single person acting as the designated authority to determine which entity would receive up to \$10 million in funding, and potentially much more through the Green Climate Fund, could increase risks and lead to selecting entities that may not be the most suitable. Opening up the NIE selection and project approval process by moving the selection responsibility from the individual to a group of stakeholders would ensure that projects were selected on the basis of facts rather than politics. Furthermore, while the Fund was well positioned to judge whether an NIE candidate was capable of performing the required tasks, the opinion of local stakeholders needed to be taken into account in NIE selection for the government to select the most suitable candidate.

12. With respect to policies and guidelines, Dr. Ehrhart pointed out that there was substantial research supporting the position that vulnerability to climate change could be defined in a way that was relevant and appropriate across countries, namely according to exposure, sensitivity and adaptive capacity, and it was currently possible to identify especially vulnerable social groups within a country. The requirement could be problematic if the need to prioritize the most vulnerable countries as a whole was overemphasised, but a way should be found to ensure that the Fund was reaching the most vulnerable social groups within a country regardless of which country it

was working in. On the topic of vulnerability, the Manager of the secretariat drew the Committee's attention to an analysis by the secretariat of climate change adaptation reasoning in project and programme proposals, which was on the agenda of the Projects and Programme Review Committee (PPRC) at their current meeting and could prove informative on the topic.

13. Dr. Ehrhart also elaborated on some of the other recommendations, explaining that approval of project and programme proposals should be delegated to the secretariat because the secretariat had clear approval guidelines and criteria; by the time proposals reached the committee, they had already met the Board's criteria, and there was no need for further discussion. In addition, the Board member seat on the Climate Investment Funds' Pilot Programme for Climate Resilience (PPCR) governing body should be designated to the secretariat to ensure that the Fund was represented on that body, and to possibly enhance synergy and cooperation between the Fund and the PPCR; on that point, the Manager of the secretariat clarified that the secretariat already attended the PPCR meetings as an observer, and there was ongoing cooperation between the two bodies, particularly on results-based management and readiness.

14. Following the evaluator's presentation, Dr. Eva Lithman spoke on behalf of the Independent Review Panel (IRP). She began by noting that the IRP was a pro bono service provided by three people: a civil society representative, a climate specialist and an evaluation expert. Their work, which had begun in May 2014, had consisted of providing comments on several drafts of the terms of reference, assessing tender proposals and commenting on the draft and final evaluation reports.

15. Dr. Lithman went on to discuss the IRP's assessment, saying that the evaluation conformed to basic evaluation standards, was in line with the terms of reference and answered most of the evaluation questions. In her view, evaluation of the Adaptation Fund (the Fund) was a particularly complex task due to the many stakeholders involved and the shifting environment, and the evaluation team had had some difficulty grasping the full complexity of the Fund's operation. She found the final report somewhat difficult to read, with the links between the findings and the recommendations not always entirely clear. Noting that a shortage of time had prevented the normal practice of circulating the evaluation to stakeholders for comments, she observed that it could still be done, or could wait until completion of the second stage of the evaluation.

16. With regard to things to take into consideration going forward, Dr. Lithman stressed that developing good terms of reference was crucial and required a lengthy process. Consequently, if the time required for the effective work of the evaluation team was six months, a total timeframe of one year should be considered. Where the IRP had provided quality assurance for the first stage of the evaluation, the Board might consider having the evaluation for the second stage carried out through the Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), or separating the quality assurance mechanism between people who looked at the evaluation from a professional evaluation perspective and people who were subject matter experts. She also suggested that a stakeholders' advisory group might be added to the quality assurance mechanism. In terms of budget, she advised considering whether the evaluators would be expected to perform country-level studies.

17. Following the presentations and discussion, the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC) recommended that the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) request:

- (a) The Chair of the Board supported by the secretariat to prepare a management response to the Evaluation of the Fund (stage I) for consideration by the Board during the intersessional period
- (b) The secretariat to prepare options for conducting stage II of the evaluation (portfolio evaluation) for consideration by the EFC at its 18th meeting.

(Recommendation EFC.17/1)

Agenda Item 4: Effectiveness and efficiency of the accreditation process

18. The representative of the secretariat presented document AFB/EFC.17/4 and responded to questions and comments from the Committee. She highlighted the fact that the Accreditation Panel recognized the need to establish rules of procedure in order to procedurally enhance the accreditation process. To achieve substantive enhancement of the accreditation process, the Panel is developing internal guidance of good practices notes which are expected to facilitate the assessment consistency and coherence and provide guidance to applicants. The representative of the secretariat stressed that the exponential growth in the number of documents submitted by the applicant entity, some of which were irrelevant to the accreditation requirements, exhibited the need to establish clear and simplified guidance on application. She also stressed that compared to the previous practice where all the Panel members simultaneously reviewed each application, the current practice whereby two Panel members conduct a sequential review would contribute to enhancing the objectiveness and timeliness of the review. In addition, she emphasized that the final review report and recommendation note prepared by the two Panel members must receive feedback and comments from the Panel as a whole. The Panel recommendation of accreditation is submitted to the Board only after the Panel reaches consensus on the final review report and recommendation of accreditation.

19. Following the discussion, the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC) recommended that the Adaptation Fund Board:

- (a) Note the status report on the Accreditation Panel and the secretariat's work to enhance effectiveness and efficiency of the accreditation process procedurally and substantively (Document AFB/EFC.17/4); and
- (b) Request the Accreditation Panel and the secretariat to consider the relevant findings of the Evaluation of the Fund (stage I) and finalize their work and present a draft for consideration by the EFC at its 18th meeting.

(Recommendation EFC.17/2)

Agenda Item 5: Gender-related policies and procedures of the Fund

20. The Manager of the secretariat began by explaining that the preparation of the document for this item (Document AFB/EFC.17/5) had been influenced by two important developments in the months leading up to the current meeting: the Evaluation of the Fund (stage I) (Document AFB/EFC.17/3) advised the Fund to develop and implement a comprehensive gender policy based on a review of other funds' gender policies (Document AFB/EFC.17/3); and the newly adopted Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) for 2030 explicitly included gender equality and women's empowerment as Goal 5. The secretariat had therefore deemed it important to provide the Board with a draft gender policy, which was annexed to the document.

21. The representative of the secretariat then presented the document and responded to questions. She noted in particular that resources to support IEs or candidates would be available through the Fund's readiness programme and project preparation grant support for IEs. The Committee also recognized that implementation was very important, and the action plan would therefore be key to the policy's success. Furthermore, gender issues were not only about women and girls but also about men and boys, and it would be desirable to include disaggregated data to show the involvement of both men and women in projects.

22. The Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC) recommended that the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board):

- a) Recognize the importance of streamlining and strengthening the integration of gender considerations in the policies and procedures of the Adaptation Fund;
- b) Welcome the draft Adaptation Fund gender policy as contained in Annex I of document AFB/EFC.17/5;
- c) Decide to:
 - (i) Launch a public call for comments on the aforementioned policy with a deadline of 31 December 2015; and
 - (ii) Request the secretariat to present, at the 27th meeting of the Board:
 - (1) A revised proposal for an Adaptation Fund gender policy incorporating the inputs received from Board members and interested stakeholders through the public call for comments;
 - (2) An action plan to operationalize an Adaptation Fund gender policy, including any necessary changes to the relevant Adaptation Fund policies and procedures;
 - (3) A compilation of the comments received through the public call for comments; and

- (4) An estimate of the costs related to operationalizing the policy.

(Recommendation EFC.17/3)

Agenda Item 6: Annual performance report for the fiscal year 2015

23. The representative of the secretariat presented the annual performance report covering the period from 1 July 2014 to 30 June 2015 as contained in document AFB/EFC.17/6/Rev.1. The report included cumulative information showing that the Fund's project portfolio was maturing, with 34 projects under implementation, implementing concrete adaptation activities across a variety of sectors. The members' attention was drawn to the fact that a project in Lebanon was showing a delay of 29 months, while another in Guatemala had been delayed by 20 months. It was also noted that of the 48 approved projects, 14 were being implemented by NIEs and 34 by multilateral implementing entities (MIEs), including 22 by UNDP accounting for 44% of the approved funding amounts. UNDP had also submitted 11 of the 12 project change requests received by the secretariat as at 30 June 2015, for issues such as allowing direct project support services to be provided by the IE, proposed material changes and proposed project extensions.

24. Responding to a question, he further explained that the health, infrastructure and urban management sectors were not programmed simply because projects were allocated to sectors based on their main sector of activity, and those sectors had not been the focus of any of the projects received to date; a footnote had therefore been added to indicate that the categories used did not capture the entire scope of activities.

25. Several concerns were expressed in relation to project delays and the underlying causes, including lack of capacity, particularly in smaller countries, and the possibility that some IEs might have a history of delays. It was noted that any such history of delays in projects funded by the Fund would be captured in the annual performance reports.

26. Lastly, reacting to an observation that part-time involvement of government employees on projects would allow for greater continuity, the secretariat representative pointed out that the Board had considered a document in that regard in 2011 but had only approved a template annexed to the document, not a formal policy; IEs would therefore have to consider any requests from governments by applying their own policies and procedures as assessed during the accreditation process.

27. Subsequently, the EFC accepted to listen to a representative of UNDP, who made a statement by telephone regarding the basis for the project change requests submitted by UNDP, and then responded to a number of questions. UNDP explained that requests for direct project/programme services represented procurement and direct payment services requested by governments subsequent to project approval. Such services were usually identified prior to project approval and the costs were included in project management costs, but exceptionally, the national executing entities that were to provide those services found they were unable to do so for reasons such as lack of capacity. Such services had therefore to be charged retroactively, over and above the fees for project cycle management. The charges were from a universal price list developed

by the UNDP Bureau of Management based on costs in developing countries. In addition, in such situations UNDP always made sure to engage the country counterpart in the process in order to build their capacity.

28. Having considered document AFB/EFC.17/6/Rev.1 and taking into account the additional information provided by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC) recommended that the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board):

- a) Approve the Adaptation Fund's Annual Performance Report for the fiscal year 2015 contained in document AFB/EFC.17/6/Rev.1;
- b) Take note of the report of the secretariat on the number of requests for direct project services (RDPS) requested by UNDP up to the end of fiscal year 2015;
- c) Request the secretariat to inform implementing entities (IEs) that the Board expects execution services provided by IEs to be submitted for consideration by the Board at the time of project approval, and such submissions to comply with the Board Decisions B.17/17 and B.18/30 on such services;
- d) Request IEs to clarify with partner executing entities the services that may be requested of the IEs before submission of fully-developed project/programme documents to the Board;
- e) Request that RDPS be submitted to the secretariat before an agreement is signed between the IE and the government or executing entity for the provision of those services;
- f) In cases where a request for direct project/programme services (RDPS) is submitted to the secretariat for a project/programme that has been already been approved by the Board, request that IEs submit all the relevant justification for the RDPS explaining how the costs were established, along with a letter from the Designated Authority of the Adaptation Fund for the country(ies) of the project/programme endorsing the RDPS;
- g) Request the Chair of the Board to discuss the matter with UNDP at the appropriate level; and
- h) Approve, on an exceptional basis, the provision by UNDP of Direct Project Services up to the amount of US\$ 100,000 for the project in Guatemala.

(Recommendation EFC.17/4)

Agenda Item 7: Complaint handling mechanism

Complaint 001

29. The Chair opened the consideration of Complaint 001 by welcoming Mr. Bert Keuppens, a member of the Accreditation Panel, who had joined the meeting by telephone for the

consideration of this item. The Manager of the secretariat then introduced the item at the invitation of the Chair. Based on a complaint regarding the ability of an implementing entity (IE) to meet the fiduciary standard on transparency, anti-corruption measures and self-investigative powers, the Board had decided to request the Accreditation Panel to review the performance of the IE. Following their review, the Panel had recommended the suspension of the IE's accreditation. The Board in turn decided to note the Panel's recommendation and provide the IE with the opportunity to take the necessary corrective action as well as a fair chance and opportunity to present its views to the EFC pursuant to paragraph 39 of the Operational Policies and Guidelines (decision B.24/25). Accordingly, a letter had been sent to the IE requesting that the relevant documents be submitted by 31 August 2015. Documents had been received, albeit just a few days prior to the current meeting, and IE officials had requested to the opportunity to address the Committee.

30. IE representatives briefed the EFC and answered questions from the members. The Chair thanked the IE representatives, who then left the room. The Committee then heard from an Accreditation Panel member, Mr. Keuppens, regarding his assessment of the information provided. The Panel member informed the meeting of the background documentation in regards to this case as well as the discussions with the IE. The Panel confirmed that they received some of the additional documents only few days prior to this EFC meeting. Since the new information arrived just recently, the Panel suggested that more time was needed to review the documentation before it could make any conclusion as to whether the fiduciary standards, particularly in the area of transparency, anti-corruption measures and self-investigative powers, are being met and what, if any, additional measures should be put into place.

31. Following the discussion, the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC) recommended that the Adaptation Fund Board allow the Accreditation Panel more time to review the documentation submitted in relation to Complaint 001 and present its findings to the EFC at its 18th meeting.

(Recommendation EFC.17/5)

Agenda Item 8: Implementation of the code of conduct

32. The Chair drew the attention of the Committee to the code of conduct and zero tolerance policy for corruption posted on the Fund website, noting that the latest version was revised on 4 April 2013. No matters were raised under the item.

Agenda Item 9: Financial issues

(a) Financial status of the Trust Fund and CER monetization

33. At the invitation of the Chair, the representative of the trustee reported on activities of the trustee since the last meeting, including issuance of the Single Audit Report and preparation of the Adaptation Fund Trust Fund Financial Statements for financial year 2015, and provided an update on the financial status of the Trust Fund. At the end of August 2015, total revenue to the Fund amounted to US\$ 483.4 million, including US\$ 194.4 million from certified emission reduction (CER) sales and US\$ 284.9 million from donations (and US\$ 4.1 million in investment

income). Funds available for new project and programme approvals amounted to US\$ 130.0 million. The trustee reported that opportunistic sales of CERs continued at a modest pace, notwithstanding continued oversupply in the markets and very weak demand from buyers. Since January 1, 2015, the trustee had sold 1.9 million tons and generated US\$ 3.6 million of sales proceeds, of which € 2.6 million represented a pure premium over market prices. The average price achieved to date in 2015 was € 1.65, significantly above the market price for CERs from both the first and second commitment periods. Pledges were still outstanding from Belgium and Wallonia Region. The trustee presented the plan for monetization of CERs through the balance of financial year 2016, focusing on taking advantage of opportunities to sell CERs at premium prices through bespoke direct and over-the-counter sales.

34. Following the discussion, the Ethics and Finance Committee took note of the Adaptation Fund Trust Fund financial report and CER monetization plan prepared by the trustee (Document AFB/EFC.17/7).

(b) Reconciliation of the Board and secretariat, and trustee budgets for the fiscal year 2015

35. The representative of the secretariat presented the reconciliation of the approved budgets and actual costs for fiscal year 2015 and the approved budgets for fiscal year 2016, for the Board and secretariat and the trustee. Along with the Manager of the secretariat, she then fielded questions on the figures presented, notably in relation to the recommendations arising from the Fund evaluation.

36. In the area of communications, two short-term communications consultants had been hired, one as a speech writer and another to produce communications materials such as videos, keep the website up to date, and manage social media and other such campaigns. Due to a change in the bank's policy on hiring consultants, it was no longer possible to hire extended-term consultants; while the secretariat was somewhat constrained by this, a communications plan was in place in preparation for the Paris meeting, including the production of a longer video on the Fund's project and programme portfolio and a series of short videos of NIE interviews already available on the Fund's YouTube channel.

37. Following a reassignment of responsibilities within the secretariat, one senior climate change specialist was responsible for knowledge management in the portfolio and a newly-hired readiness program coordinator would support knowledge management as it related to readiness. The secretariat was also planning to update its knowledge management strategy to take into account the evolution of the Fund in recent years.

38. An increase in travel costs budgeted for 2016 was attributable to the addition of two secretarial staff members; no additional meetings were planned.

39. During the discussion, the representative of the trustee raised the matter of the preparation of independently audited financial statements. The trustee noted that it already provided the board with a Single Audit at no cost, and that the EFC might wish to consider the continued utility of the financial statements, which cost approximately \$60,000 per year. Deleting this requirement would

require an amendment to the trustee Terms and Conditions, by decision of the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP).

40. The Ethic and Finance Committee took note of the reconciled budgets of the Adaptation Fund Board and secretariat and the trustee for the fiscal year 2015 (Document AFB/EFC.17/8).

(c) *UNFCCC CER voluntary cancellation tool*

41. The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) secretariat made a presentation on the launch of its on-line Voluntary Cancellation Tool (VCT) allowing individuals and other entities to buy and cancel certified emission reductions (CERs) and make payment by credit card or PayPal. The trustee provided an assessment of the tool's potential use for the monetization of the Fund's CERs, consistent with information already provided by the trustee to the Committee intersessionally. The Committee expressed a desire to participate in the VCT, but acknowledged the trustee's assessment that the retail-based nature and small transaction size expected on the VCT would not be cost effective for the Fund. Following a discussion on the costs, potential benefits and impediments to use (size, legal, tax and regulatory implications, etc.), the Committee decided to request the UNFCCC secretariat to consider adding a feature to the VCT directing potential larger volume CER purchasers directly to the trustee for follow-up.

42. Having considered the proposal of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) secretariat and the opinion by the trustee, the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC) recommended that the Board request:

- a) The secretariat and the trustee to explore options for using the UNFCCC certified emission reduction (CER) Voluntary Cancellation Tool (VCT), including through advertising, and to report back to the EFC intersessionally;
- b) The secretariat to work with the UNFCCC secretariat in reaching out to additional potential large volume private buyers of CERs from Commitment Period 1 (CP1 CERs) and CERs from Commitment Period 2 (CP2 CERs) in the Adaptation Fund inventory, and once the secretariat identifies buyers, to put them in contact with the trustee; and
- c) The trustee to sell the CERs to buyers identified by the secretariat, subject to its Terms and Conditions and the Monetization Guidelines approved by the Board.

(Recommendation EFC.17/6)

Agenda Item 10: Other matters

a) *Investment income*

43. The representative of the secretariat provided a short explanation on the item, recalling that at its 25th meeting in April 2015, the Board had requested the secretariat to send a letter to all accredited IEs with projects and programmes under implementation asking for information on

investment income generated by fund grants. Responses had been received by the end of June 2015, and the Project Performance Reporting (PPR) template had since been amended to allow IEs to report investment income annually. She cautioned that the information had been collected under a wide range of different conditions and was solely intended to inform the discussion on how the Board wished to deal with such income in future. Furthermore, countries had not provided many details, with responses often consisting of a one-line email. The representative of the trustee added that most of the IEs the trustee worked with would not be able to determine what investment income came from which project, as funds were pooled.

44. The Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC) recommended that the Adaptation Fund Board request the secretariat to present a document on investment income for consideration by the Ethics and Finance Committee at its 18th meeting, containing:

- a) A compilation of the practice/operational rules followed by other funds regarding investment income; and
- b) A proposal of guidelines on investment income accrued by implementing entities for the Adaptation Fund.

(Recommendation EFC.17/7)

b) Mechanism to receive returns of unspent project funds into the trust fund

45. The Manager of the secretariat explained that the issue had arisen during discussions regarding investment income, when the trustee had pointed out that there was no mechanism allowing IEs to transfer money back into the Fund. The representative of the trustee added that as the trustee had no legal arrangement with the IEs, there was no legal framework under which to accept money back into the trust fund. Consequently, a Board decision was needed authorizing the trustee to accept funds from the IEs into the Fund.

46. The Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC) recommended that, for the purpose of facilitating the return of funds to the Adaptation Fund Trust Fund, the Adaptation Fund Board authorize the trustee to receive funds from implementing entities for deposit to the Adaptation Fund Trust Fund in accordance with the trustee's Terms and Conditions and procedures agreed between the trustee and secretariat.

(Recommendation EFC.17/8)

Agenda Item 11: Adoption of the recommendations and the report

47. The present report was adopted based on the draft report of the Committee contained in document AFB/EFC.17/L.1, as orally amended.

Agenda Item 12: Closure of the meeting

48. The meeting closed at 9:53 a.m. on 8 October 2015.

ANNEX I

Ethics and Finance Committee Seventeenth Meeting Bonn, Germany, 6-7 October 2015

EFC members present in the meeting

Ms. Irina Helena Pineda AGUILAR (Chair) (Honduras, Latin America and the Caribbean)

Ms. Tove ZETTERSTRÖM-GOLDMANN (Vice-Chair) (Sweden, Annex I Parties)

Mr. Zaheer FAKIR (South Africa, Africa)

Mr. Petrus MUTEYAULI (Namibia, Africa)

Mr. Nauman Bashir BHATTI (Pakistan, Asia-Pacific)

Mr. W. L. SUMATHIPALA (Sri Lanka, Asia)

Ms. Umayra TAGHIYEVA (Azerbaijan, Eastern Europe)

Mr. Aram TER-ZAKARYAN (Armenia, Eastern Europe)

Mr. Philip WEECH (Bahamas, Latin America and the Caribbean)

Mr. Hans Olav IBREKK (Norway, Western Europe and others)

Mr. Naresh SHARMA (Nepal, Least Developed Countries)

Mr. Samuela Vakaloloma LAGATAKI (Fiji, Small Island Developing States)

Ms. Patience DAMPTEY (Ghana, Non-Annex I Parties)