ADAPTATION FUND
Readiness Programme
for Climate Finance

CTCN
CLIMATE TECHNOLOGY CENTRE & NETWORK

Meeting for Providers of Readiness Support for Adaptation

Saturday 13 May 2017,
Marriott World Conference Hotel, Bonn, Germany

1. Introduction

The meeting aimed to agree on ways to ensure better coordination between the different actors working on adaptation readiness. It was attended by 11 organizations, including a representative from the UNFCCC secretariat. An attendance register is attached as Annex I to this document. Based on responses to a survey that participants had completed ahead of the meeting, organizations that were providing readiness support for adaptation expected the following from the meeting:

- ⇨ Improved coordination between readiness providers
- ⇨ Network of support providers to share best practices and cases
- ⇨ Strengthened partnerships
- ⇨ An inventory of what organizations are actually supporting finance readiness
- ⇨ Inspiring examples of successful direct access for projects with measured impact
- ⇨ Better understanding amongst the international readiness providers and Funds of the needs, gaps, available resources, and linking local actions to global processes

2. Opening keynote address

Mr. Mikko Ollikainen, Manager of the Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat and Mr. Jukka Uosukainen, Director at the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN), welcomed participants to the meeting. They reconfirmed the importance of direct access to build resilience at the local level and highlighted the need to enhance coordination and build on respective strengths and complementarities. They reiterated that capacity building and climate finance readiness support for adaptation was an increasingly important item within the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change. In addition, the CTCN has a mandate from the COP to collaborate with the Financial Mechanisms under the Convention to accelerate the transfer of climate technologies and enhance access to adaptation finance as well as strengthen project development in developing countries. This meeting represented an important avenue to address this mandate and ensure that developing countries are better served.

3. Readiness as a means to facilitate Direct Access to adaptation finance

The CTCN shared an overview of the institution and the readiness support it provides, highlighting its experience and steps taken to build partnerships with both the Adaptation Fund and the Green Climate Fund (GCF). These partnerships are mutually beneficial to the mandates of the funds and institutions involved. In the discussion that followed, participants agreed that:

- ⇨ There are different models of readiness support which include support through grants, South-South cooperation, technical assistance, and facilitating peer-peer engagement to support accreditation and project development. Whichever model is followed, consideration of the following questions could help improve delivery and effectiveness of support: (i) who the ideal partner is for the readiness support, and (ii) what are the type and quantity of resources necessary for effective delivery of the readiness support.
- ⇨ Collaboration and coherence of readiness support at the country level is critical. The challenge for developing countries is not only a lack of capacities, but also a lack of information sharing. Providers of readiness support should therefore share information and communicate more among themselves on their respective country support, as well as promote collaboration between in-country actors.
- ⇨ Using and applying local resources such as local agencies and experts in readiness related work generally ensures stronger ownership and sustainability (long term vision). Providers of readiness support should therefore communicate with recipients of the readiness support, to identify relevant local resource persons or institutions that should be engaged in the activities.
- ⇨ Applying a competitive process and bidding for local institutions to serve as on the ground delivery support structures can be an effective way to optimize resource use.

4. Understanding Direct Access

The Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat (AFB Secretariat) gave a presentation on their direct access modality which allows national implementing entities (NIEs) to access funds from the Adaptation Fund without going through an intermediary. The modality enables NIEs to manage all aspects of the project including financial management, and the full cycle of project management from design and implementation to monitoring and evaluation.

Direct access is proving that national entities can successfully implement projects and offers the following benefits:

- ⇨ Funds and projects directly managed by countries
- ⇨ Elevates issues relating to climate change and adaptation to the national level
- ⇨ Improves intragovernmental collaboration and amplifies stakeholder voices

In addition, at the institutional level, accredited NIEs are benefiting from being able to:

- ⇨ Identify areas to bolster financial management and accountability
- ⇨ Shift from following others' rules to having greater control of operational processes, rules and procedures e.g. in procurement
- ⇨ Improve risk management by instituting policies against fraud and corruption
- ⇨ Sustain institutional knowledge and enhance institutional governance

5. What do we mean by readiness ?

With the understanding that climate finance readiness is the ability of countries to effectively plan, receive and manage climate finance, including the monitoring and reporting of such finance, participants discussed what readiness for direct access to adaptation finance entails. Participants agreed that readiness support should:

- ⇨ Be a guiding process
- ⇨ Be sustained to ensure long term capability strengthening
- ⇨ Consider what can be done in the short term and what can be done in the longer term
- ⇨ Be tied to showing impacts as a result of implementing projects
- ⇨ Provide support to national focal points and support them in identifying the institution best suited to access and manage climate funds directly

To avoid duplication of efforts between providers of readiness support active in the same country, participants underlined the importance of (i) checking with recipients of readiness support on other readiness activities ongoing or planned in the country, and (ii) enhancing communication between readiness support providers to make it more effective and regular. Participants agreed that coordination between readiness support providers is critical to ensure efficiency while respecting the country-driven nature of support.

6. Presentation and discussion of results from the pre-event survey

The AFB Secretariat gave an overview of the responses received on the pre-event survey. Most of the organizations which responded to the survey indicated providing support under the following five main categories:

1. Policy and regulatory design

2. Project development, which included project preparation, pre-feasibility/feasibility assessment, and project design
3. Institutional set up and capacity building for accreditation, project pipeline building
4. Development of regional networks e.g for LDCs
5. Support to local civil society organizations to engage with national governments and local climate finance beneficiaries

The AFB Secretariat presented a map showing a snapshot of the countries where the organizations participating in the meeting had readiness support activities for adaptation. The map showed that many organizations were working in similar geographic locations and some were working in the same countries. Participants agreed that:

- ⇨ The map was a very useful tool to provide a snapshot of where readiness providers are active and to identify possible opportunities for partnerships and collaboration
- ⇨ The map should be regularly updated (if possible) and shared within the network of adaptation readiness providers
- ⇨ It would be useful for adaptation readiness support providers to also consult other relevant platforms that provide a snapshot of who is doing what and where (e.g. http://www.gcfreadinessprogramme.org/partner-countries)
- ⇨ It could be useful to get an overview with further details such as outcomes from support, information on National Adaptation Plans (NAPs), Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs), contact information etc.

7. Challenges in providing readiness support and lessons learnt

A panel consisting of representatives from the German Society for International Cooperation (GIZ), United Nations Environment Programme (UN Environment), World Resources Institute (WRI) and Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS) discussed the challenges faced by readiness support providers in delivering adaptation support to developing countries.

The panelists highlighted the following challenges:

(i) Accreditation support

- ⇨ The technical decision and political decision for nominating the most suitable NIE do not always align
- ⇨ Lack of understanding of the scope and depth of detail necessary to meet fiduciary requirements (e.g. having a certain policy in place vs demonstrating application/implementation of the policy)

- ⇨ Staff turnover during the provision of readiness support: a possible solution identified for this was for entities going through the accreditation process to have a small team in charge of accreditation instead of an individual
- ⇨ Supporting for project development in an uncertain environment of accreditation is challenging (e.g. providing proposal support against pending accreditation)

(ii) Project or programme design support

- ⇨ Readiness recipients at times only focus on the immediate need to access finance and neglect the programming aspect and project development
- ⇨ The engagement of private sector actors in adaptation projects/programmes remains low and uncertain, and requires using terminology and language that the business sector can relate to. It could be beneficial to bring private sector on board at the early stages of project design/development
- ⇨ While civil society organizations (CSOs) have good networks and experience within communities, and are active on the ground, governments have been slow in engaging them in project design/development
- ⇨ Support provided by CSOs (even when funded by development partners) is not accounted for since it does not filter through to national budget processes and treasury

The panelists highlighted the following lessons learnt:

- ⇨ It is critical to engage both the national climate change focal point and the designated authority/focal point of the Fund that will be providing adaptation finance in the planned readiness activities
- ⇨ It is important to manage expectations, and therefore clear communication and transparency are critical.
- ⇨ CSO engagement in readiness support should be targeted and should be outcome based.

The panelists highlighted the following good practices:

- ⇨ Multi-stakeholder assessments and consultations
- ⇨ Documentation of capacity needs and gaps, which has the added benefit of attracting partners to implement
- ⇨ Development of a flexible roster of experts to provide technical support e.g. regional technical support mechanism under PIFS

The panelists highlighted the following gaps in readiness support:

- ⇨ Ownership of processes by readiness support recipients should be strengthened
- ⇨ South-South collaboration in providing readiness should be strengthened in several regions
- ⇨ Readiness agents/focal points should be engaged in national planning processes to ensure that capacity building is included in national and sub-national plans and budgets
- ⇨ Accreditation processes still vary greatly between Funds, standardizing the accreditation process could make providing readiness support easier.

8. Advancing collaboration, synergies and complementarity in adaptation readiness support

Collaboration in providing readiness support for adaptation could be enhanced through:

- ⇨ Identifying country needs and possible complementarities of action (e.g. for technology related issues the CTCN could be a good partner to engage with)
- ⇨ Identifying focal points in each organization for regular coordination
- ⇨ Developing joint (or complementary) projects or activities for country readiness support (e.g. joint meetings or capacity building workshops) and creating joint avenues for readiness access
- ⇨ Learning from each other and sharing information

Participants agreed that:

- ⇨ There is need for multi-country programmes/actions on readiness support
- ⇨ It would be useful to explore synergies with the Green Climate Fund (GCF) readiness coordination mechanism and envisage the possibility of combining readiness coordination on adaptation for both the GCF and Adaptation Fund
- ⇨ There is need to enhance understanding of the gaps in readiness support among readiness support providers
- ⇨ There is need for improved communication between organizations to enable readiness support providers to refer recipients to other providers who have specific expertise
- ⇨ It would be useful to develop a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) on adaptation readiness and a training package to enhance readiness support capitalizing on existing training modules and databases (e.g existing roster of experts)

To continue coordination and communication between adaptation readiness support providers beyond the meeting, participants agreed that:

- ⇨ The group should be maintained and should keep the focus on adaptation readiness (sharing information on activities, experience, lessons, networks, experts…)
- ⇨ Communications should continue but should be kept simple, targeted and concise. In addition to a group email, suggestions also included the use of social media for information sharing (e.g. Facebook)
- ⇨ Face to face meetings are valuable and planning for a meeting once a year should be considered (next meeting could have a thematic focus and include beneficiaries)
- ⇨ The map showing a snapshot of where each of the organizations providing readiness support for adaptation is working should be shared, regularly updated and if possible linked with other relevant platforms (e.g. the toolbox navigator for NDCs). The map can be accessed available via the following link: https://drive.google.com/open?id=1G2Eb6UnsG2Dtbi5lrEX0DJ_wCK0&usp=sharing
- ⇨ A database providing information on who to contact for specific readiness support needs should be developed as a tool for readiness support beneficiaries

9. Way forward

Participants agreed that it was important to enhance communication and information sharing with a view to avoid duplication and cultivate collaboration and partnerships based on complementarities. However, it was agreed to avoid over loading organizations with additional work. Participants agreed on the following follow-up actions:

1. To prepare a short report from the meeting and to share with all participants for comments/inputs
2. To establish a group email and for the Adaptation Fund to take the lead on group communications
3. To share the current map showing a snapshot of the providers of readiness support for adaptation with the network, and for the adaptation Fund to provide regular updates to the map, which would be shared with the network.

ANNEX I : ATTENDANCE REGISTER

ATTENDACE REGISTER: MEETING FOR PROVIDERS OF READINESS SUPPORT FOR ADAPTATION
BONN, GERMANY, SATURDAY, 13 MAY 2017

Organization	Location	Contact Name	Title	Email	Sign
Adaptation Fund	Washington, DC, USA	Farayi madziwa	Program Officer	fmadziwa@adaptation-fund.org	
CTCN	Denmark	Jonathan Duwyn	Programme Officer	Jonathan.Duwyn@unep.org;	
UN Environment Regional Office for Asia and Pacific (UNEP ROAP)	Bangkok, Thailand	Mozaharul Alam	Regional Coordinator	mozaharul.alam@unep.org	
UN Environment	Nairobi, Kenya	Barney Dickson	Head, Climate Change Adaptation Unit	Barney.Dickson@unep.org	
UNDP	Thailand	Gelila Terrefe	Senior Country Support Specialist	gelila.terrefe@undp.org	
WRI	Washington DC, USA	Gaia Larsen	Deputy Director	glarsen@wri.org	
GIZ	~~Bonn~~, Germany	~~Denise Engel~~ Ursula Frossmann-Lucas	Advisor	~~denise.engel@giz.de~~ ursula.frossmann-lucas@giz.de	
GIZ	~~Bonn~~, Germany	~~Susann Mende~~		~~susann.mende@giz.de~~	
Asian Institute of Technology (AIT)	Klong Luang, Thailand	Victor R. Shinde	Senior Specialist, Water Engineering and Management	victorshinde@ait.asia	
CDKN	London, UK	Mairi Dupar	Global Public Affairs Coordinator	mdupar@odi.org.uk	
SouthSouth North	Cape Town, RSA	Webster Whande	Director	webster@southsouthnorth.org	
Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat	Fiji	Exsley Taloiburi	Climate Change Finance Adviser	ExsleyT@forumsec.org	
Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat	Fiji	Scott Hook		scotth@forumsec.org	
Germanwatch	Bonn, Germany	Julia Grimm	Coordinator AN NEO Network	grimm@germanwatch.org	
Commonwealth Secretariat	London, UK	Nyambe Harsen	Economic Adviser, Climate Finance	h.nyambe@commonwealth.int	
International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED)	London, UK	Janna Tenzing		Janna.Tenzing@iied.org	
Green Climate Fund (GCF)	Songdo, Korea	Clifford Polycarp	Manager, Country Operations Dialogues	cpolycarp@gcfund.org	
AECOM "USAID Adapt Asia-Pacific"	Bangkok, Thailand	Bikram Ghosh	Chief of Party	bghosh@adapt-asia.org	
Enda Energie	Dakar, Senegal	Emmanuel Seck		emmanuel.seck@endaenergie.org	
IMC Worldwide	London, UK	Loyd Mawena		Loyd.mawena@imcworldwide.com	
UNFCCC	Bonn, Germany	Sadya Ndoko	Programme Officer	sndoko@unfccc.int	
Adaptation Fund	Washington DC	Silvia Tenen	Accreditation Officer	smaneiro@adaptation-fund.org	