



ADAPTATION FUND
Readiness Programme
for Climate Finance



Climate Finance Readiness Seminar for National Implementing Entities (NIEs) #4 Report

26th-28th of July 2017

Hotel Club Punta Leona, Puntarenas Province, Costa Rica





Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Day 1.....	4
2.1. Update from the Adaptation Fund.....	4
2.2. Adaptation Fund Medium Term Strategy.....	4
2.3. Is NIE re-accreditation: Process overview.....	5
2.5. Launch of readiness grants for 2017	8
2.6. Project development: Understanding the project template	9
2.7. NIE project development experience	10
3. Day 2.....	11
3.1. Case study: Complying with the Fund’s Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy	11
3.2. NIE feedback on implementation of grants for technical assistance	11
3.3. Overview of the AF Project Performance Report.....	12
3.4. Monitoring and reporting on project performance.....	13
3.5. Adaptation Fund project perspectives from an Executing Entity: The Centro de Investigaciones en Desarrollo Sostenible (CIEDES).....	14
3.6. Learning and sharing from international experience on tools and best practice in monitoring and evaluation (M&E).....	15
3.7. NIE experience in Knowledge Management.....	17
3.8. Providing peer support through South-South cooperation grants.....	19
3.9. NIE community of practice.....	19
4. Day 3: Field visit.....	21
Annex 1: List of participants	23



ADAPTATION FUND
Readiness Programme
for Climate Finance



1. Introduction

The fourth Climate Finance Readiness Seminar for National Implementing Entities (NIEs) took place from the 26th to the 28th of July 2017 at Hotel Club Punta Leona, Puntarenas Province, Costa Rica and was facilitated by M. Federico Vargas. The seminar was hosted by *Fundecooperacion Para el Desarrollo Sostenible* (Fundecooperacion), an accredited NIE of the Adaptation Fund (the Fund), in partnership with the Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat (the Secretariat).

This was the first annual NIE seminar taking place outside Washington DC. The seminar began with participants being welcomed by Ms. Marianella Feoli, executive director of Fundecooperacion, who highlighted the importance of knowledge sharing between the different entities as they might confront the same issues and could learn solutions from each other. Then, Mr. Mikko Ollikainen, manager of the Secretariat, addressed his welcoming remarks that Costa Rica, due to its flourishing environment and ecosystems, as well as its replicable and innovative multi-sector projects targeting vulnerable agriculture communities, was an ideal place to host the seminar, which simultaneously was being held in the year that the Fund was celebrating its 10th anniversary. While providing a brief summary on the Adaptation Fund in the Paris Agreement, he emphasized that the Fund is already contributing to achieving the adaptation objectives of the Paris Agreement. Finally, Honorable Luis Felipe Arauz, the Minister for Agriculture and Livestock in Costa Rica, acknowledged the serious vulnerability of the agriculture sector due to Climate Change (CC), and, in this context, the necessity for adaptation to go further. He stated that adaptation to CC is an ethical commitment to the planet and that mitigation and adaptation must be implemented in parallel. Today, it is technically possible to link mitigation and adaptation, and increase productivity in agriculture implementing the adequate tools. This seminar occurred to develop these strategic relationships, building up South-South cooperation.



Figure 1 Mr. Arauz, Minister for Agriculture and Livestock in Costa Rica



2. Day 1

2.1. Update from the Adaptation Fund

The first presentation by Mr. Daouda Ndiaye, Senior Climate Change Specialist, AFB secretariat explained the recent developments of the Fund. The main points of his presentation were:

- The Adaptation Fund is one of several international funds in the multilateral climate finance landscape that has mobilized over US\$ 637 million in cumulative funding since becoming operational in 2007. These resources came from Certified Emission Reductions (CER) proceeds and from developed countries' contributions. However, whilst the Fund was meant to be financed largely from proceeds of the clean development mechanism (CDM), the recent collapse of the carbon market means that new resources are needed, and the new main contributor to the Fund are voluntary contributions.
- Projects funded by the Fund are implemented in the Global South and 39 are implemented by Multilateral Implementing Entities (MIEs), 4 are implemented by Regional Implementing Entities (RIEs), and 23 are implemented by NIEs. However, the number of direct access entities is increasing, and there are 25 today.
- As lessons learned, it was established that support for direct access and readiness support was needed. Hence, several strategies were developed such as the Readiness Programme, launched in 2014
- Three new policies have been developed: The Accreditation of Small Entities that may not be able to access up to USD 10 million, the Environmental and Social Policy (ESP) (November 2013), and the Gender Policy (GP) (March 2016).
- The financing of regional activities (launched in 2015) is a window for opportunities, and has been successful in terms of demand¹.
- The conclusion of the first evaluation of the Adaptation Fund was that the Fund is relevant and complementary to the UNFCCC and contributes to the Paris Agreement in terms of coherence, effectiveness of the main processes, efficiency and sustainability.

2.2. Adaptation Fund Medium Term Strategy

Mr. Mikko Ollikainen presented the Adaptation Fund Medium Term Strategy and implications for the Fund and NIEs. The key points of his presentation were:

- A comprehensive strategy on how the Fund would best fulfill its mandate and the future of the Fund, such as the lifting the countries cap, are being considered and a draft will be delivered in October 2017.

¹ It is open to RIEs and MIEs partnering with NIEs and other national agency if addressing food security, DRR & EWS, Transboundary water management, Innovation in adaptation finance.



ADAPTATION FUND
Readiness Programme
for Climate Finance



- The Fund's purpose is aligned with the goal of the Paris Agreement, Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 13, and it delivers concrete action, innovative approaches to climate finance and valuable learning.
- The Fund is proposed to be based on three pillars: (1) Actions for quality projects; (2) Innovation, which is different for each country, moving away from traditional approaches, showing that the Funds is taking more risks; (3) Learning, which has for objective to generate knowledge & communicate practical lessons from operational processes.
- Some crosscutting themes are recurrent such as gender equality and women's empowerment; reaching the most vulnerable communities and social groups and building long-term institutional and technical capacity for effective adaptation
- First draft for public consultation about the strategic plan of the Fund will be ready in August 2017 and if approved by the board in October 2017, will be put into practice.

In response to a question about the role of Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) in receiving funding directly from the Fund, Mr. Ollikainen mentioned that the financing of the CSOs could be done through accredited NIEs.

2.3. Is NIE re-accreditation: Process overview

Ms. Young Hee Lee presented the Fund's re-accreditation process including timing and procedure as well as the experience of the Fund with the process. The key points of her presentation were:

- As of July 2017, 43 implementing entities were accredited including 12 MIEs, 6 RIEs and 25 NIEs. Also, 12 IEs were reaccredited including 9 MIEs, 1 RIE and 2 NIEs, and 8 NIEs were in the process of being reaccredited.
- Accreditation is valid for 5 years (in line with other international processes) because within this timeframe, institutional, legal, and financial aspects might change. Reaccreditation is to ensure that the entity continues to comply with accreditation standards despite any changes (changes of which must be stated in the application for reaccreditation).
- The process of reaccreditation includes: a notification letter to accredited implementing entities (IEs) and a letter of an expression of interest indicating the entity's interest in reaccreditation and intention to submit the application. The Secretariat would then provide the IE with credentials to enable access to its re-accreditation application online and the IE would prepare and submit the re-accreditation application online. Finally, the Accreditation Panel reviews and submits a recommendation on accreditation and the Board takes a decision on re-accreditation.
- The main focuses of re-accreditation review are (1) Continued compliance with the Fund's fiduciary standards; (2) Ability to comply with the Fund's environmental and social policy and



gender policy; 3) The results of the assessment of IE's performance regarding quality at entry and project/programme implementation.

- The documentation which needs to be provided must be the most recent and where no changes have occurred in certain criteria, these must also be explicitly stated in the application. The documentation must also reflect the capacity and commitment for complaints handling and oversight reporting to assess and manage environmental and social risks and gender related issues.
- The 'Fast-Track' re-accreditation process is available for entities accredited to the Green Climate Fund (GCF). The reaccreditation process, application form, guidance for the gender policy, accreditation standards and information on fast track reaccreditation are also available online².

During the open dialogue that took place following the presentation, Ms. Lee explained that IEs should not delay to apply for reaccreditation because it could result in a delay in providing funds for project implementation. She also pointed out that going through the reaccreditation process could bring supplementary capacity to the IEs and help to provide support to the IEs' peers. In addition, she explained that the reaccreditation is more rapid because the IE would already be familiar with the process and a large part of the work would have been carried out during the accreditation process. A summary of supporting documentation in languages other than English can be submitted to the Secretariat, and the entity would be asked to translate some part of the documents which are requested by the Accreditation Panel. This would help the IE reduce the burden of translating documents into English.

2.4. Re-accreditation experience sharing by NIEs

Through a panel discussion, the NIEs shared their experience on the re-accreditation process, including the challenges and opportunities presented by going through the process. The NIE panelists were:

- Mr. Michael Jennings, South African National Biodiversity Institute (SANBI)
- Ms. Le-Anne Roper, Planning Institute of Jamaica (PIOJ)
- Mr. Jorge Almonacid, Unit for Rural Change (UCAR), Argentina

² <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/re-accreditation-process>
<https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/opg-annex-6-accreditation-application/>
<https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/Guidance-on-Accreditation-Standards.pdf>
https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/AFB-EFC19-7-Rev.1_Effectiveness-and-efficiency_Gap-Analysis-GCF.pdf



ADAPTATION FUND
Readiness Programme
for Climate Finance



The Planning Institute of Jamaica (PIOJ) started the reaccreditation process as soon as the first Adaptation Fund notification letter was received. A committee led by a coordinator was setup to provide the documentations to the Secretariat and responsibilities were allocated. Deadlines were set up and information was provided on time. Internal meetings were organized and people's commitments facilitated the process. Overall, the process was also eased by the electronic submission and the strong support of the Secretariat through emails and skype meetings.

The process of reaccreditation of the South African National Biodiversity Institute (SANBI) started in August 2015. Due to the lack of human capacity and the difficulty of collecting the necessary and adequate documents, their reaccreditation process lasted over a year. Moreover, contextualizing ESP in the project and the reinterpretation of the fast track process somehow added some difficulties. However, the comprehensive efforts of the Secretariat and the electronic process provided support for the reaccreditation.

Finally, the Unit for Rural Change (UCAR) started 9 months ago, is still undergoing the reaccreditation process, and aims to be finished in the second half of 2017. Their main challenges are to provide more information and documentation about the ESP, in addressing the new criteria such as transparency, and in the evaluation of new risks. Although their accreditation by the GCF helped, the lack of commitment, communication and the bureaucratic processes hampered their progress.

Overall, the panelists advised other NIEs to go through the reaccreditation process as it helps to identify the strengths and weaknesses of their own organizations. They stated that even though it puts the NIEs in challenging situations and could require some commitment of human resources and time, maintaining an active accreditation status helps to have an international acknowledgement and facilitates partnerships with other international and national entities, and also avoids losing opportunity to access additional financial resources of the Fund.



Figure 2 Mr. Michael Jennings, Ms. Le-Anne Roper, and Mr. Jorge Almonacid discussing the re-accreditation process experience

2.5. Launch of readiness grants for 2017

Mr. Farayi Madziwa presented the framework for the Adaptation Fund Readiness Programme for Climate Finance and officially announced that the call for readiness grants for 2017 was now open. The key points of his presentation were:

- The Readiness Programme has been integrated into the Fund's work plan and budget, its transition into a long-term and more permanent feature of the Fund is enabled.
- The proposed changes in the Legal Agreements for the Readiness grants include updating the sections on material change (addressing total budget change at output-level), performance reporting, and branding (acknowledging the Fund for products and materials produced through project grants provided by the Fund).
- The Readiness grants are available for South-South cooperation as a component number three of the Readiness Programme for peer support to countries without an NIE.
- The Technical Assistance Grants (TAGs) are available to help strengthen the institutional capacity of NIEs to assess and manage environmental and social risks and to address gender related issues in projects and programmes.
- The Grants for Project Formulation Assistance (PFA) are available to build capacity in project preparation and design and undertaking specialist technical assessments.
- Activities planned under the Readiness Programme for the remainder of 2017 include a Study on Capacity Building and Readiness Support for Direct Access to Adaptation Finance, the



fifth webinar on October the 19th and the Climate Finance Readiness Workshop for the Caribbean Region, Barbados, 24-25 October.



Mr. Farayi Madziwa explains the framework of the Adaptation Fund Readiness Programme

2.6. Project development: Understanding the project template

Mr. Daouda Ndiaye presented the overview and perspective/lessons from the Secretariat on the issues faced by IEs when completing the Fund's project template. The key points of his presentation were:

- Project cycle steps: (1) Submission of the project or programme to the Adaptation Fund Board, (2) Screening for consistency and technical review by the Secretariat, (3) Review by the Project and Programme Review Committee, (4) Decision-making by the Adaptation Fund Board, (5) Contracting by the Adaptation Fund Board, (6) Project implementation and monitoring by the Implementing Entity.
- There are two optional processes of proposal approval: submission and approval of a concept first, followed by submission and approval of the full proposal (two-step project approval process), or the submission and approval of a full proposal in one step (one-step project approval process). The funding application is available online³, along with key documents⁴.
- Country(ies) eligibility is upon one requirement: Country(ies) should be developing country(ies) party to the Kyoto Protocol that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects

³ <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/content/request-projectprogramme-funding-adaptation-fund-amended-november-2013>

⁴ [https://www.adaptation-fund.org/sites/default/files/OPG%20ANNEX%204-2%20Instructions%20\(Nov2013\).pdf](https://www.adaptation-fund.org/sites/default/files/OPG%20ANNEX%204-2%20Instructions%20(Nov2013).pdf)



of climate change. Each proposal submission should be endorsed by the government through its Designated Authority (DA).

- Proposals must demonstrate adaptation actions which are concrete, justified, visible and consistent with national sustainable development strategies. Moreover, the project/programme must provide (1) economic, social and environmental benefits to the most vulnerable communities, including gender considerations; (2) a logical explanation why the proposed scope and approach were selected to the particular adaptation challenge; (3) the lack of duplication/overlap with other activities; (4) lessons learned from earlier projects and coordination arrangements; (5) a learning and knowledge management component; (6) a consultative process; (6) a justification for the funding requested based on the full cost of adaptation; (7) the adaptation benefits achieved should be sustained after the end of project/programme; (8) enable replication and scaling up; (9) economic, social, environmental, institutional, and financial sustainability; (10) a clear description of the roles and responsibilities of the implementing entity as well as any executing entity or organizations/stakeholders that are involved in the project; (11) all major risks, consider their significance, and include a plan of monitoring and mitigating them; (12) should include results frameworks; (13) alignment with Fund's Results Framework; (14) include a detailed budget; (15) disbursement schedule with time-bound milestones.

2.7. NIE project development experience

The NIEs shared their experience with project proposal development and submission through group leads. Each group leader led the discussions on a specific section of the proposal template and rotated to the next table.

- Mr. Michael Jennings, South African National Biodiversity Institute (SANBI) presented the dashboard designed to assess project activities against AF policies.
- Ms. Aissata Boubou Sall, *Centre de Suivi Ecologique* (CSE), Senegal presented arguments for the principles of the AF requirements.
- Ms. Vilna Cuellar, *Fundación Natura*, Panama presented the table and diagram created to present the roles of each actor.

At the end of the group discussions, key take home messages were:

- The process can be eased by the hiring of consultants
- It is advised to mainstream the policies and the requirements during project design/process than during the project implementation
- Administrative cost and time laps between the participative consultation and project approval should be taken into consideration.



3. Day 2

3.1. Case study: Complying with the Fund's Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy

Mr. Dirk Lamberts, Environmental and Social Safeguards expert presented the Environmental and Social Policy (ESP) adopted in November 2013 and the Gender Policy (GP) adopted in March 2016.

- The Operational Policies and Guidelines (OPG) determine the modalities for financing by the Fund.
- The ESP and GP main differences are: the ESP focuses on preventing unwanted negative environmental and social impacts from Fund activities while the GP focuses on promoting desired positive impacts from Fund activities.
- The ESP's goal is to avoid unnecessary environmental and social harms as a result of Adaptation Fund-funded projects/programmes, and the risks should be identified against the policy's 15 principles. The ESP is integrated in the Direct Access modality and is linked with the Environmental and Social Management System (ESMS) of the IE.
- The Gender Policy (GP) builds on the risk principles of the ESP regarding the human rights of marginalized and vulnerable groups. The GP expands the ESP principle of gender equity and women's empowerment' to promote gender equality.
- Although environmental and social (E&S) risks need to be identified prior to submission of the funding request and an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) included in the proposal, unidentified sub projects (USPs) can be used when (i) the project is a category B project, AND (ii) the USP is a minor part of the project, AND (iii) assessment or ESMP cannot be completed in time, or mitigation measures run into project implementation.

3.2. NIE feedback on implementation of grants for technical assistance

Through a panel discussion, NIEs shared and reflected on their experience implementing grants for technical assistance for both the ESP and GP, and the links to project implementation. The NIE panelists were:

- Lisa Ranahan Andon, Micronesia Conservation Trust (MCT)
- Mr. Martin Schneider, Desert Research Foundation of Namibia (DRFN)
- Ms. Aïssata Boubou Sall, *Centre de Suivi Ecologique* (CSE), Senegal

The TAG process of the Micronesia Conservation Trust (MCT) was straight forward. This process included the hiring of a consultant familiar with the GCF and AF processes, who ensured that the proposal complied with the requirements. The consultant also provided training activities to the NIE



ADAPTATION FUND
Readiness Programme
for Climate Finance



and partner institutions about the ESP and GP. The materials developed during this process provided internal tools to be used during the design of project proposals and, later, in their monitoring. Hence, the policies would be internalized and disclosed.

The *Centre de Suivi Ecologique* (CSE)'s TAG access was straight forward because the project concept was well prepared to support the AF. The only difficulty was in the language required for submission. Terms of reference were included in the process, which may have reinforced the analysis of the institutional environment allowing identification of weakness. Once this step was completed, involving the whole team was key to ensure buy in from all actors. The importance of identifying a focus, and developing procedures and manuals for each institutional level was also highlighted. Workshops about policies were organized to allow for institutional capacity building, and an update on international standards and best practice led to a better integration of the institution at the international level. Time management and the effective involvement of colleagues was key in this success.

The Desert Research Foundation of Namibia (DRFN) had already implemented an ESMP and had developed strong partnerships with other entities. They shared the risk assessment manual based on the Namibian context on their webpage and listed projects granted for the other countries including these components. The panelist from DRFN mentioned that NIEs need to be trained on the newest policies, and also the executing entities needed training through the development of manuals. Training should include the 15 ESP principles, grievance mechanisms and analysis of national policies. Making contact with the AF Secretary and institutional organization before starting to integrate the policies was key to DRFN's success.

In the ensuing discussion, panelists agreed that during the processes of providing TAG application documents, and during assistance, issues surrounding the ESP and GP at the institutional level could be identified. Challenges could be overcome through the involvement of the DA; analysis of practices in other countries; and the hiring of both local and/or international consultants.

3.3. Overview of the AF Project Performance Report

Mr. Daouda Ndiaye presented the structure and expected content of the Fund's project performance report (PPR). The key points of his presentation were:

- IEs are required to submit a Project Performance Report (PPR) on an annual basis, one each year after the start of project implementation, and the last PPR should be submitted six months after project completion. The submission of the PPR is linked to the disbursement schedule.
- The PPR is composed of 8 sections (1) Basic Data, (2) Financial Data, (3) Procurement Data, (4) Project risk, (5) Project implementation rating, (6) Project indicators, (7) Qualitative



Questions and Lessons Learned (8) Results Tracker: tracks indicators that aligns both (i) the Adaptation Fund Strategic Results Framework, and the (ii) Fund's five core indicators.

- The Results Based Management approach operates at three main levels (1) Guidance from CMP (2) Portfolio (fund-level) (3) Projects/programme-level
- Project/programme-level monitoring must be carried out by the IEs and Fund-level monitoring is carried out by the Secretariat under the direction of the Board
- The Fund's goal and expected impact are:
 - Goal: Assist developing country Parties to the Kyoto Protocol that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change in meeting the costs of concrete adaptation projects and programmes, in order to implement climate resilient measures.
 - Impact: Increased resilience at the community, national, and regional levels to climate variability and change.
 - The Fund-level framework includes seven key outcomes and associated outputs to facilitate aggregation and present Fund level results that contribute to the overall goal and objectives of the Fund, which are available online.
- The Fund's results based management (RBM) tools are: (1) Strategic results framework⁵, (2) the 5 core indicators⁶, (3) Project Performance Report (PPR).
- The Fund results framework⁷ includes long-term goals, outcomes, outputs and a small set of indicators for the Fund, and works toward the achievement of the overall goal and outcomes.
- Project-level indicators and their measurement methodologies are not always comparable across projects. Thus, even if two projects are targeting similar outcomes, it becomes difficult to aggregate indicators across projects. Hence, the five indicators were adjusted to fall under each of the seven Fund-level outcomes to better aggregate indicators across. They allow the Fund to aggregate quantitative indicators for a portfolio that is diverse, increasing transparency and demonstrating value for money. However, they might be challenging to measure (detailed 2-page methodologies are available on the Fund's website for each core indicator).

In the ensuing discussion, it was mentioned that there is no need to wait for Adaptation Fund financing when the PPR is submitted, however, it is strongly advised to submit reports early and to insert some "buffer" in the project timetable bearing in mind this is mandatory. An additional PPR is not mandatory during the project implementation.

3.4. Monitoring and reporting on project performance

⁵ https://www.adaptation-und.org/sites/default/files/AFB.EFC_13.4%20Results%20Tracking.pdf

⁶ https://www.adaptation-fund.org/sites/default/files/AFB.EFC_14.6%20Core%20Indicator%20Methodologies.pdf

⁷ <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/sites/default/files/Results%20Framework%20and%20Baseline%20Guidance%20final%20compressed.pdf>
https://www.adaptation-fund.org/sites/default/files/AFB.EFC_13.4%20Results%20Tracking.pdf

The NIEs discussed their experiences with Adaptation Fund reporting requirements in a panel session and in particular, talked about the Project Performance Report for annual reporting, mid-term review, and project evaluation. This also included discussion on overall monitoring and project oversight function by NIEs. The NIE panelists were:

- Ms. Shelia Miller, Planning Institute of Jamaica (PIOJ)
- Mr. Emile Habimana, Ministry of Natural Resources (MINIRENA), Rwanda
- Ms. Carolina Reyes, *Fundecooperacion Para el Desarrollo Sostenible* (FUNDECOOPERACION), Costa Rica

For the Ministry of Natural Resources (MINIRENA) of Rwanda, a core challenge was to provide enough quality information that could be compared to the baseline. To overcome this, project design was modified, impacting on the planned budget. Time lags between these changes and AF approval led to more issues, as similar projects were developed by other entities. In response to this, a platform was developed to monitor projects; and field visits and meetings with the executing entity (EE) every three months to ensure that the EE can comply with the requirements were carried out. Identifying particular activities to prioritize was key to successfully implementing projects.

Fundecooperación, Costa Rica's accredited NIE faced difficulty in answering the four required sections, in particular the financial details, as it had more than 40 EEs with different starting dates. To overcome these issues, adjustments within the NIE were carried out. A system was created to reduce risks and to increase opportunities with close monitoring and exchange between the different EEs. Moreover, the NIE decided to include for its internal purposes, a report which includes financial information and which is prepared every six months. Constant communication with EEs and an adaptation of the information required by the Fund to a new internal reporting process within the NIE was key to their success.

The Planning Institute of Jamaica (PIOJ) had a similar experience to Costa Rica. To overcome the issues encountered, executing entities had to sign a program operation manual which listed the necessary requirements before signing the formal contract. Procurement training workshops were also offered. Then, they engaged their EE to report their activities, risks and progress on templates which they provided every month. Reporting was at face to face meetings to discuss any challenges. This proved an effective strategy.

3.5. Adaptation Fund project perspectives from an Executing Entity: The Centro de Investigaciones en Desarrollo Sostenible (CIEDES)



ADAPTATION FUND
Readiness Programme
for Climate Finance



Mr. Rafael Oreamuro from the executing entity “Centro de Investigaciones en Desarrollo Sostenible” (CIEDES) of the University of Costa Rica presented their project titled “Integrated Water Management in the Abangares river watershed”. The project objective is to implement a program for the integrated management of water resources in the Abangares River basin for sustainable use, with an emphasis on creating a water supply fit for human consumption. Through the installation of four meteorological stations, the project investigated hydrology, and water quality. The potential integrated management of water resources for economic and social development of the area was assessed.



Figure 3 M. Rafael Oreamuro, CIEDES

3.6. Learning and sharing from international experience on tools and best practice in monitoring and evaluation (M&E)

Ms. Loreta Rufo from the Pilot Programme on Climate Resilience, Climate Investments Funds (CIF) and Mr. Dennis Bours from the Global Environment Facility (GEF) presented their experiences and lessons learned in the application of tools and approaches to monitoring and evaluation for adaptation projects.

After a group exercise where participants were asked to classify provided words/phrases between “evaluation” and “monitoring” on two different boards, the key points from Mr. Bours’ presentation were:

- It is important to make the distinction between monitoring and evaluation in terms of timing, scope, main participants, process and written outputs to be able to assess the positive and negative impacts and products and services of the completion of the activities and the long-term effect of the project.
- The M&E is carried out during ongoing reporting, reflection and learning. This occurs during and after the initial assessment, the planning and implementation, monitoring and evaluation at the start of the project, project middle and project end. M&E allows the planned work and the intended results for various project phases to be assessed, which can be controlled (inputs,



activities, outputs), under direct influence (outputs, outcomes) and under indirect influence of the projects (outcomes and impacts)⁸

- An appropriate M&E allows efficiency, effectiveness and cost effectiveness results to be evaluated.



Figure 4 Exercise Board

Then, Ms Loreta Rufo presented the Pilot Program for Climate Resilience (PPCR) Results Monitoring and Reporting Experience and Lessons. The key points from her presentation were:

- To improve climate resilience of countries, the PPCR uses a two-phase, programmatic approach, based on a learn-by-doing model which requires sharing lessons learned and stakeholder engagement:
 - Phase 1: assist national governments in integrating climate resilience into development planning
 - Phase 2: provide additional funding to put the plan into action and pilot innovative public and private sector adaptation solutions.
- The Key Principles of the PPCR are: (1) Country Ownership, (2) Use of Participatory Approach, (3) the use of Mixed-Methods and (4) Learning-by-Doing.
- The PPCR Core Indicators are: at national level: (1) the degree of integration of climate change in national and sectoral planning, (2) evidence of strengthened government capacity and coordination mechanism to mainstream climate resilience; and at project level (1) the quality and extent to which climate responsive instruments/investment models are developed and tested (2) extent to which vulnerable households, communities, businesses, and public sector services use improved PPCR supported tools, instruments, strategies, and activities to respond to climate variability or climate change (3) number of people supported by the PPCR to cope with the effects of climate change.

⁸These effects can be economic, socio-cultural, institutional, environmental, technological or of other types.



- The PPCR monitoring and reporting (M&R) process includes the following steps: (1) compose the in-country stakeholders’ groups, (2), convene a stakeholder scoring workshop, (3) establish scoring criteria for indicator 1 and 2 (national level) (4) aggregate project level data for the other indicators (5) quality assurance (6) submit report to the administrative unit.
- In 2017 a stocktaking exercise was established for the PPCR M&R to assess the relevance, effectiveness, and sustainability of the PPCR monitoring and reporting system after three years of implementation.
- The next steps include: (1) a complementary reporting to generate project- or output-level indicators, (2) an updated the toolkit; provide examples (3) to develop and implement the PPCR M&R Capacity-Building and Training Initiative; CIF/MDBs to optimize their role as brokers of knowledge-sharing activities (4) CIF/MDBs to accelerate efforts to invest in participatory, regional-level monitoring and reporting systems for PPCR and (5) to provide technical assistance to countries on systemic challenges

The last part of the presentation was carried out by Mr. Bours who presented the challenges factors for the M&E in climate change adaptation (CCA) interventions. These are listed in the table below:

1. Complexity of determinants and attribution	7. Variable time horizons
2. Maladaptation	8. General uncertainty
3. Counterfactuals	9. Lack of conceptual agreement on definitions including what constitute successful adaptation
4. Shifting baselines	10. Differing M&E focal areas
5. Adaptation as a moving target	11. Differing adaptation actions
6. Variable time horizons	

Table 1: challenges factors for the M&E in climate change adaptation (CCA) interventions as presented by Mr. Dennis Bours

Participants were asked to identify which parameters had been most problematic. Those chosen included: (1) Complexity of determinants and attribution; (4) Shifting baselines; (5) Adaptation as a moving target; (6) Variable time horizons; (8) General uncertainty; and (10) Differing M&E focal areas

3.7. NIE experience in Knowledge Management

Through a panel session, NIEs discussed the tools they used for data collection, processing and dissemination of information and link these to knowledge generation and knowledge management. This included the tools for internal and external communication of relevant knowledge. The NIE panelists were:

- Mr. Jorge Almonacid, Unit for Rural Change (UCAR), Argentina



ADAPTATION FUND
Readiness Programme
for Climate Finance



- Ms. Dewi Rizki, Partnership for Governance Reform in Indonesia (Kemitraan)
- Ms. Cynthia Cespedes, Peruvian Trust Fund for National Parks and Protected Areas (PROFONANPE)

The Peruvian Trust Fund for National Parks and Protected Areas (PROFONANPE) set up a specific arrangement for knowledge at the project level which includes the specific components of the Fund to disseminate the information at all levels. This new setup showed the needs for capacity building of the stakeholders (including the internal team, the members of the EE, and the administrative council) and an adjustment of the other projects. In this context, the M&E assessment was carried out based on the document generated by the projects and the collected activities data stated in projects reports. The tools used to disseminate knowledge are: workshops, forum, seminars at national level, and social media; and a digital platform has also been set up. Special care is taken to disseminate in the appropriate language (English or Spanish) depending on who the information is handed over to.

In the Partnership for Governance Reform in Indonesia, a tracking system was created, which allows the partner projects to establish a constant communication between the stakeholders and disseminate their knowledge. Workshops and special questionnaires also allow the NIE to monitor engagement community engagement, project implementation, and quality of knowledge created. Tools used to disseminate the knowledge are questionnaires, the internal library system and the information center, including books, workshops and infographics, the involvement of public in activities, and the use of technology such as: newsletter, emails.

The Unit for Rural Change (UCAR) faced a similar situation to PROFONANPE. An integrated management system was implemented, which generates information also used for mitigation. There are three main themes: contents, mitigation and capacity building. Their best ally is the management control department which provides key reports. This latest team manages quantitative knowledge about finance, the types of beneficiaries, and the stage at which is the project, through a centralized data base. In future, this knowledge platform will also include the monthly reports, the different technologies used, and weather predictions. The tools used to disseminate the information are workshops, territorial planning, field visits, convocations, experience exchanges and the systematization of experience.

In the ensuing plenary discussion, it was agreed that working with different financing entities can be quite challenging, added to the bureaucracy of certain institutions. In this context, establishing adequate institutional tools for integrated knowledge can be quite challenging, and requires more collaboration.



ADAPTATION FUND
Readiness Programme
for Climate Finance



3.8. Providing peer support through South-South cooperation grants

NIEs that have been providing peer support to candidate NIEs for accreditation through South-South cooperation grants under the Readiness Programme discussed their experience in a panel session, and shared challenges and possible solutions. The NIE panelists were:

- Ms. Aissata Boubou Sall, Centre de Suivi Ecologique (CSE), Senegal
- Ms. Wangare Kirumba, National Environment Management Authority (NEMA), Kenya

For the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA), the South-South cooperation grants allowed them to engage with two other potential NIEs. Their actual work is still in progress in both countries as the DA authorities must still sign the confirmation letters of designated implementing entities. In this context, NEMA shared that this type of partnership must be carried out prior to their application to accreditation and project proposal, and a common understanding of mentoring must be established. A common mistake is that the mentored entity believes that the mentoring entity will directly lead them to accreditation. Hence, the main challenges are: managing national processes, expectations and keeping motivated. This process could be improved by having a peer to peer support encouraging NIEs to work together, to mitigate their respective weaknesses.

For the *Centre de Suivi Ecologique* (CSE), the South-South cooperation grants also supported the preliminary work of guiding a potential entity to its accreditation. A connection was made with the authorities of the country to develop the South-South cooperation grant proposal. Similar to NEMA, a common understanding of “mentoring” was established, and responsibilities were clearly stated. The CSE pointed out that this type of work must be carried out at a country level when the IE is designated, the technical team identified, and institutional agreements signed, because difficulties are faced when the designed institutions do not follow the accreditation evaluation criteria of the Fund. Once this step is ensured, work consists of explaining the Fund templates and the documents to provide, along with the elaboration of a roadmap, awareness and information. The main challenges are the changes in task force composition within the recipient of peer support, which at times results in having to restart the whole process. A potential improvement would be to increase the grant amount and call for offers per areas.

3.9. NIE community of practice

Ms. Indira Masullo from the World Resources Institute (WRI) presented an online platform “Climate Finance Community of Practice for National Entities”. This was followed by a plenary discussion by the implementing entities and the secretariat, on the draft charter that had been developed by the Fund’s NIEs for the NIE community of practice and the possible online platform through which the community could engage.



ADAPTATION FUND
Readiness Programme
for Climate Finance



The key points of Ms. Indira Masullo were:

- The Climate Finance Community of Practice (CoP) for National Entities is a network of national institutions seeking funding from the international climate funds
- The CoP aims to strengthen the capacity of its members to secure and deploy funding from the international climate funds by facilitating knowledge exchange between its members. It also seeks to elevate the voice of its members and help them create positive change in the dynamics of the climate finance landscape
- Membership is open to a wide range of institutions working at the national and sub-national level and two resources are available to support the objectives of the CoP: (1) A website and (2) Chat rooms
- The website is not WRI branded and includes (1) General information about the CoP, (2) Blog, (2) Library, (3) News, (4) Calendar
- Driven by national entities, the website helps disseminate practical knowledge and is expected to be in different languages
- The website features include: (1) Management of privacy, (2) Library with documents and links organized by chat rooms and/or importance, (2) Private messaging (3) Conference calls (4) Personalized dashboard, (5) Chat rooms in different languages
- Governance of the CoP Co-Chairs will be designated from members in a revolving basis.

The plenary dialogue focused on the following:

The previous need of an exchange platform was first mentioned to the Fund by NIEs in 2015 to enable continuous interaction between the different entities and this was restated during the COP in Marrakech. Hence, the NIE champions driving the process to establish the CoP proposed a possible mechanism and led the process to develop a charter for the CoP. Some parameters still need to be determined such as who is going to interact and who qualifies to be part of the CoP and platform. Moreover, questions were raised such as, what will the future of the platform be once project implementation is finished? Hence, the main and lasting objective of this tool needs to be identified. Another question was asked “how do we bring life to it?”

To address these questions participants were then asked: What is Winning? Where will we play? How will we win? The answers were:

- An active community
- A committed community
- Registered/accredited community
- An organized community
- An aware community



ADAPTATION FUND
Readiness Programme
for Climate Finance



- A useful tool
- Defined benefits for the community



Figure 5 Plenary session

4. Day 3: Field visit



Figure 7: Mrs Meza (DA for Costa Rica), Mrs Feolii (Executive Director – Fundecooperacion) and Mr Ollikainen (Manager of the Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat with an Adaptation Fund project beneficiary



ADAPTATION FUND
Readiness Programme
for Climate Finance



The last activity of the seminar was the visit of the AF funded project “Reducing Vulnerability by Focusing on Critical Sectors (Agriculture, Water resources, and Coastlines) in order to Reduce the Negative Impacts of Climate Change and Improve the Resilience of These Sectors”.





Annex 1: List of participants

COUNTRY	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME
Argentina (UCAR)	Arias Almonacid	Jorge
Armenia (EPIU)	Lokyan	Anush
Belize (PACT)	Diaz	Nayari
Belize (PACT)	Guerrero	Raineldo
Benin (FNEC)	Gnanvi	Appolinaire
Chile (AGCI)	Schilling	Nadine
Cook Islands (MFEM)	Tatuava	Kristina
Costa Rica (Fundecooperacion)	Feoli	Marianella
Costa Rica (Fundecooperacion)	Reyes	Carolina
Costa Rica (Fundecooperacion)	Barrantes	Gerardo
Costa Rica (Fundecooperacion)	Campos	Johnny
Costa Rica (Minister for Agriculture and Livestock, Costa Rica)	Arauz	Felipe
Costa Rica (Fundecooperacion)	Courquin	George
Costa Rica (Designated Authority)	Meza	Andrea
Dominican Republic (IDDI)	Perez Sarraff	Evaydee
India (NABARD)	Das	Loken
Indonesia (Kemitraan)	Rizki	Dewi
Jamaica (PIOJ)	Roper	Le-Anne
Jamaica (PIOJ)	Miller	Shelia
Jordan (MOPIC)	Abdelrahim	Maher
Kenya (NEMA)	Kirumba	Mary Wangare
Mexico (IMTA)	Santos del Prado Gasca	Karina
Micronesia (MCT)	Andon	Lisa
Morocco (ADA)	Andaloussi	Meyriem
Namibia (DFRN)	Schneider	Martin
Panama (FUNDACION NATURA)	Cuellar Mondragon	Vilna
Panama (FUNDACION NATURA)	Morales de Fadul	Leonor
Panama (FUNDACION NATURA)	Alzamora Gonzalez	Alvin
Peru (PROFONANPE)	Cespedes Madalengoitia	Cynthia
Rwanda (MINIRENA)	Habimana	Emile
Senegal (CSE)	Sall	Aissatou
South Africa (SANBI)	Jennings	Michael
USA (Adaptation Fund)	Ollikainen	Mikko
USA (Adaptation Fund)	N'diaye	Daouda
USA (Adaptation Fund)	Madziwa	Farayi
USA (Adaptation Fund)	Dorigo	Martina
USA (Adaptation Fund)	Young	Lee
USA (Adaptation Fund)	Hans-Moevi	Sophie
USA (Adaptation Fund)	Sugg	Mark
Belgium (Adaptation Fund)	Lamberts	Dirk
Costa Rica (Adaptation Fund)	Roccard	Jessica
Costa Rica (Adaptation Fund)	Vargas Uzaga	Federico
Republic of Korea (Green Climate Fund)	Hoffmaister	Juan
USA (GEF)	Bours	Dennis
USA (WORLD BANK)	Rufo	Loreta