

Climate Finance Readiness Seminar for National Implementing Entities (NIEs) # 5

28-31 August 2018

**Ground Floor, J- Building Room 080, 701 18th Street N.W, Washington, DC,
USA**

Report



Table of Contents

1. Introduction	4
2. Day 1: Tuesday, 28 August	4
Session 1: High level panel – International and Local perspectives on addressing global resilience.....	4
Session 2: Adaptation Fund Medium Term Strategy	5
Session 3: Re-accreditation	6
Session 3.2: lessons from the Accreditation Panel on Initiating and completing the re-accreditation process	7
Session 3.3: NIE experiences with Reaccreditation Process	8
Session 4: Effective Media Outreach for resilience Building	9
Session 5: Project Development.....	9
5.1: Adaptation reasoning in project preparation and design	9
Session 5.2: Project Development.....	10
3. Day 2: Wednesday, 29 August	11
Session 7: Environmental and Social Policy & Gender Policy (ESGP)	11
Session 7.2- NIE Sharing Experience on ESGP at Project and programme Level.....	11
Session 8: Monitoring and Adaptation Activities.....	13
Session 8.1 Trends and Perspectives on secretariat review and consolidation of Implementing Entity reports.....	13
Session 8.2 Reporting Requirements.....	13
Session 9: Role of the Designated Authority (DA)	14
Session 8: Monitoring and Reporting Adaptation activities.....	15
Session 9: Role of the DA	16
Session 10- Readiness and Capacity building	17
Session 10.3- NIE sharing experience and lessons learnt building capacity for environmental, social and gender safeguards through readiness grants.....	18
4. Day 3: Thursday, 30 August.....	19
Session 11: Learning Grants	19
Session 12: AF and GCF complementarity	21
Session 13: Strengthening resilience through innovation, technology and private sector engagement.....	22
Session 13.2 Innovation and technologies for enhancing local resilience – Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN)	22
Session 13.3: Group discussion and NIE reflection on the upcoming innovation financing window.	23
Session 14: NIE community of practice	24
Closing of Seminar.....	25
Day 4: Friday 31 August.....	25
Site Visit.....	25
Annex 1: List of Participants	27

Acronyms and Abbreviations

Adaptation Fund AF
Accreditation Panel AP
Money Laundering ML
Climate Change CC
Climate Technology Centre and Network CTCN
Designated Authority DA
Environmental Impact Assessment EIA
Environmental and Social Management Plan ESMP
Environmental and Social Policy ESP
Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy ESGP
Gender Policy GP
Green Climate Fund GCF
Implementing Entity IE
Knowledge Management KM
Least Developed Country LDC
Multilateral Implementing Entity MIE
National Implementing Entity NIE
Project Formulation Grant PFG
Project Performance Report PPR
Project and Programme Review Committee PPRC
Regional Implementing Entity RIE
Results-Based Management RBM
Risk Assessment RA
Stakeholder Engagement SE
South to South S-S
Technical Assistance TA
Unidentified Sub Project USP
Vulnerability Assessment VA
Small Island Developing States SIDS.

Report

Climate Finance Readiness Seminar for NIEs #5

28-31 August 2018

Ground Floor, J- Building Room 080, 701 18th Street N.W, Washington, DC, USA

1. Introduction

The Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat (the secretariat) hosted the 5th Climate Finance Readiness Seminar for its National Implementing Entities (NIEs), from the 28th-31st August 2018, in Washington DC, USA. This 4 Day Seminar which was facilitated by Marc Neilson had a total of 58 participants which included representatives from 24 of the 28 accredited NIEs to the Adaptation Fund (AF), the secretariat, significant stakeholders and consultants. The objective of the seminar was to facilitate a forum where the NIEs could share experiences, learning among peers and engage in open dialogue with the secretariat to strengthen relationships, knowledge and enhance their confidence and capacity in accessing, delivering and reporting on climate finance through the Fund's Direct Access modality. The workshop followed a participatory and adult learning approach through which NIEs shared and exchanged lessons, knowledge and experiences in the programming of climate adaptation finance. It was expected that such engagement would boost confidence as well as encourage the programming of climate finance through Direct Access in developing countries, and particularly in Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and Small Island Developing States (SIDS). At the end of each day of the workshop, the secretariat staff held one on one clinic sessions with participants who had requested to discuss and address individual specific issues related to all aspects of the Fund portfolio processes and mandate.

2. Day 1: Tuesday, 28 August

The seminar began with welcome remarks and introduction by Mr. Mikko Ollikainen, Manager of the Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat who highlighted how the impact of Climate Change (CC) is on the rise creating the need for increased concerted efforts in addressing CC. He went on to mention that 24 NIEs were represented in the seminar which has become an annual event for the past 5 years. Mr. Ollikainen gave a brief narration of some of the programmes/ projects being supported by the Fund which as at the time of the seminar, was represented by 28 NIEs all over the world and the ways in which it is creating valuable models for response to CC. He pointed out that due to an increase in demand AF has accepted new projects, with the hope of expanding in the near future. He also took an opportunity to give a special welcome to the newly accredited NIEs from Tanzania (National Environment Management Council), Niger (Banque Agricole du Niger), and Bhutan (Bhutan Trust Fund for Environment Conservation). Following this he went on to welcome everyone to the seminar and encouraged full participation so that it becomes an interactive and learning experience for all.

Session 1: High level panel – International and Local perspectives on addressing global resilience

This session was moderated by the facilitator, Mr. Marc Neilson, who introduced each of the panelists and gave a short overview of adaptation under the UNFCCC referring to the adaptation goal in the Paris Agreement and status of global adaptation finance and financing needs.

Panelists

- Dave Harishkumar Rasiklal - Deputy Managing Director, National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development (NABARD), India
- Enrique O’Farrill - Chief of Bilateral and Multilateral Department, *Agencia de Cooperacion Internacional de Chile* (AGCI), Chile
- Fatina Mukarubibi - Permanent Secretary and National Designated Authority of the AF, Rwanda

Discussion

To ensure thematic balance between diverse climate finance needs panelists pointed out the need for right Policies and Strategies to be in place whilst at the same time building capacity of the NIEs. It is important to also know the needs of the country. An example was cited in Rwanda where the policy on low carbon emissions, was a powerful step in reducing the country’s carbon emissions.

To ensure that financing reaches the most vulnerable, the panelists highlighted the need to have the right institutions and good financing mechanisms in place which have a tracking and monitoring system in place that helps see how the financing is reaching the intended beneficiaries. They agreed that the key is a bottom up approach and coordination since there are many entities involved in adaptation. A panelist expressed that the AF was the best example for bottom-up approach where the direct beneficiaries are the owners of the project. That solid mechanism and relying on local knowledge facilitates a better knowledge of the communities in need.

Regarding the establishment of regional centers to support capacity building for climate finance and project development, a panelist recommended that banks should support and supervise the entire system. The same institutions should provide a large number of trainees from National and International Bankers for international trade and also for rural development. Another panelist pointed out that even though AF is supporting 6 projects in Chile, there is still need for mass mobilization of resources and players while acknowledging that CC is not country specific. A collective approach of learning and sharing was therefore suggested. Countries were encouraged to mobilize local resources and adapt to new innovations and strategies. Panelists also agreed that it was important to have more dialogue at national levels and to generate more information both International and local perceptions on resilience. Ms. Fatina Mukarubibi from Rwanda where their project is nearing completion mentioned that having communities as owners of the projects ensures sustainability.

Session 2: Adaptation Fund Medium Term Strategy

Mr. Mikko Ollikainen gave a presentation and provided an overview of the resource mobilization strategy and targets for the AF as well as an update on the status of the available financial resources in the Fund. The main points of his presentation were.

- The Adaptation Fund currently funds 77 concrete, localized adaptation and resilience projects in 62 vulnerable countries with 5.6 million direct beneficiaries. Its projects are effective, flexible and scalable, and can be replicated in other communities
- AF Medium Term Strategy (MTS) was approved in October 2017, and set for the next five years. It is detailed and went through consultative process which is aimed at supporting the most vulnerable
- Fund's purpose is aligned with goal of Paris Agreement, SDG 13¹ and it delivers concrete action, innovative approaches to climate finance and valuable learning.
- 3 main Pillars for the MTS are Action, Innovation, Learning and sharing.

¹ <http://17goals.org/paris-agreement-sdgs/>

- 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
- New funding modalities under the MTS include a funding window for “enhanced direct access”: US\$ 20 M per year (>10 grants) Scale-up microgrants: US\$ 200,000 per year (10 grants) as well as South-South learning microgrants.
- The Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) has established an evaluation function which will provide quality control. This function will be made operational very soon. It is a learning process and for NIEs to participate in also. This issue is an ongoing discussion by the Board and will be discussed further in their coming meetings.

Session 3: Re-accreditation

This session was presented by Ms. Sylvia Mancini, who is the Operations Officer, AFB Secretariat and she gave an overview of the re-accreditation process. The main points of her presentation were

- An outline on the re-accreditation process and the important timelines that NIEs should take note of on the process.²
- The secretariat will continue to send out notification letters to accredited entities **18 months prior to the expiration of the entity’s accreditation**. In addition, the online accreditation system generates an automatic notification to the implementing entities
- NIEs are to submit an application for re-accreditation 12 months prior to its accreditation date.
- The implementing entity is strongly recommended to achieve re-accreditation within **three years from its accreditation expiry date**. Failure to do so within three years from its accreditation expiry date, the Panel will make a recommendation to the Board to change the status of the entity to “Not-Accredited”
- Accreditation is valid for 5 years
- When an implementing entity submits its re-accreditation application before the accreditation expiry date, it acquires a status of “In Re-accreditation Process” at its accreditation expiry date, until it achieves re-accreditation within three years from the accreditation expiry date.
- If an implementing entity does not submit re-accreditation application by its accreditation expiry date, or the entity does not achieve re-accreditation within three years from the accreditation expiry date, it acquires the status of “Not-Accredited” following an AF Board decision.
- Implementing entities which have submitted a complete re-accreditation application before the date of the Board decision **B.31/1** on the updated re-accreditation policy **need to achieve re-accreditation within two years** from the date of the Board decision otherwise, it will acquire the status of “Not-Accredited”.
- Review of a ‘regular’ re-accreditation will focus on three aspects (i) continued compliance with the Fund’s fiduciary standards, (ii) compliance with the Fund’s environmental and social policy and the Gender Policy and (iii) the results of the assessment of the implementing entity’s performance regarding quality at entry and project/programme implementation
- Fast Track accreditation and re-accreditation has been put in place to facilitate a more efficient accreditation and re-accreditation process.

Discussion Question and Answer (Q&A) session

Question - Is it true that if an entity has been accredited by GCF, the entity automatically qualifies for Fast Track accreditation with the AF?

² <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/apply-funding/accreditation/>

Answer - These two funds operate separately and there is no guarantee from the AF for fast track in this instance. The AF has its own requirements for accreditation, whereas the GCF has different categories' depending on fund size. Of note is that during reaccreditation the panel will be surveying hard evidence for eligibility for fast track reaccreditation.

Question - If an entity has a project they are implementing can they submit another project proposal during the 5-year period in which they are implementing the project?

Answer - The board has considered proposals where there is an element of learning and scaling up. For single country projects/programmes, entities may submit proposals if they were within the country funding cap.

Session 3.2: lessons from the Accreditation Panel on Initiating and completing the re-accreditation process.

Mr. Graham Joscelyne who is an Accreditation Panel (AP) member presented this session and shared the APs experience with reviewing and assessing applications for accreditation. Some key issues from the presentation are as follows:

- Some of the NIEs are not aware that the panel considers so many things for an application to be successful e.g., the panel even reviews the website of applying entities in search of evidence.
- The process also has principles and integrity which it has to adhere to. It is not always the case that if you are already accredited you will be automatically reaccredited.
- AF requirements have been updated since 2010 and accreditation now includes the following components • Environmental and Social Safeguards strengthened • Gender Policy introduced • Anti-corruption measures enhanced (including Anti-Money Laundering (AML) and Counter Terrorist Financing (CTF)) • Reaccreditation deadlines have now been set – with consequences if they are missed • Accreditation 'conditionality' no longer is an option.
- AF requires evidence of NIE's ESS and Gender 3C's (Commitment, Capacity, and Complaints mechanism)-
- AP are very interested in seeing how you have used the AF funds and they are narrowing down some of the focus so that they help fast track the re-accreditation process

Discussion Question and Answer (Q&A) session

Question - what happens in the event of changes in governance in NIE?

Answer - the panel will ensure that they are accrediting the same entity, recognizing the changes in government and leadership.



Figure 1: Plenary session

Session 3.3: NIE experiences with Reaccreditation Process

This was a discussion with selected panelists from NIEs, where they shared their experiences with the reaccreditation process.

Panelists

- Meryem Andaloussi- Head of the Environment Service ADA, Morocco
- Milagros Castro Rios- Head of Environmental and Social Unit UCAR, Argentina- she did not make it was a bit unwell
- Nayari Diaz Perez- Executive Director PACT, Belize

Discussion

- With regards to when NIEs began their re-accreditation process and how supportive their senior management were, Ms. Meryem Andaloussi from ADA, Morocco reported that their re-accreditation process began early 2017 and they managed to get re-accredited in August this year. They were also well supported by senior management throughout the process.
- In the case of Belize, Mr. Nayari Diaz Perez reported that they are currently in the re-accreditation process and receiving good support from their senior management.
- Argentina experienced challenges due to lack of the country support which lead to demotivation. Of note was that the re-accreditation process was happening while institutional changes were taking place in the Argentina government making the process a lot more difficult.
- For Morocco the biggest challenge was providing all the information in a changing and developing organization and also providing evidence-based information due to limited documenting on some work they had been doing.
- Panelists advised that entities assess the organizational capacity and assign a person or team responsible for the re-accreditation process. Entities were also encouraged to prepare for the process ahead of time, and operationalize the process through developing an actual workplan and identifying the requirements.
- Another consideration is that the process needs human and financial resources and ensuring compliance with the process meaning that being meticulous is of importance

Plenary discussions Q&A.

Question – there are agencies that have reached the funding country cap, how did they proceed knowing there are no more funds to continue the process.

Answer - They managed to have a cyclical process through the GCF where they managed to continue and upscale some of the projects they are doing through the AF.

Question - How did the mid-term evaluation impact their implementation process?

Answer - Morocco and Argentina had their mid-term evaluation process and they reported that it was good, also that the documentation worked positively for them.

A member of the AP explained that the panelists use the Mid-term evaluation process to see how financial management for the specific programmes works in entities because that is what AF uses. This gives AF a view of entities capacity in handling the funds.

Entities commented that the AF were delaying in the consideration of the process, that they were delaying in answering to entities requests. To this NIEs proposed that the fund provides more accessibility to the AP to assist entities get direct information on the panel's expectations on the accreditation process.

Session 4: Effective Media Outreach for resilience Building

- This session was presented by Mark Sugg who is the professional Videographer and filmmaker for the AF. This was a discussion with NIEs on how to effectively use media to communicate projects results and projects impact. With the use of different picture examples, he shared some crucial tips for good story telling. He also demonstrated how pictures can tell a good story and what kind of pictures should be taken for greater impact.
- He explained that pictures that tell a story don't require additional context or information and that photos should capture universal themes and ideas that are at the center of themes being focused around AF. It is important to show the positive impact that the projects have on communities through pictures that are accessible and relatable.
- Mr. Mark Sugg also mentioned that during the course of the workshop he would be doing video interviews with each of the NIEs represented on the work they are doing and provided a set of questions to help them prepare for the interviews

Session 5: Project Development

5.1: Adaptation reasoning in project preparation and design

This session was presented by Ms. Saliha Dobardzic who is the Senior Climate Change Specialist, at the AFB Secretariat. It provided an explanation of the secretariat's expectations from the entities when they complete Part II Section I of the request for Project/Programme Funding template. Below are the key points from the presentation

- Demonstration that activities are **relevant** in addressing adaptation objectives and that the project intervention **will help achieve the objectives without other funding**.
- Key Determinants of climate risk which are Emissions and Land-use change, Climate, and Socio-economic processes.
- The process of Adaptation reasoning includes adaptation needs and responses and 2 case studies in identifying needs were given, that is, Pakistan and Georgia.
- Adaptation outputs are capacity building, management and planning, practice and behavior, policy, information, physical infrastructure, warning and observing system, green infrastructure, and technology and financing.
- Demonstrating Adaptation Reasoning - Demonstration that activities are **relevant** in addressing adaptation objectives and that the project intervention (with approved funds) **will help achieve the objectives without other funding**
- Project Formulation Grant (PFG) and Project Formulation Assistance (PFA) grant are available which NIEs can access to support project development. The PFA grant has not been accessed by NIEs and entities were encouraged to utilize this resource.

Plenary Discussion Q&A

Question - When you look at impact what exactly do you consider? Is it quantification on impact like number of people reached, or the rehabilitation of the land?

Answer - When we look at impact it is kind of both quantitative and qualitative but impact specific, whatever is more appropriate for the project. We would like to be able to build capacity that people use the most appropriate indicator whatever that can be.

Question - Have you considered accepting proposals in different languages eg. Spanish, French?

Answer - Receiving proposals in different languages has some challenges for AF in that there are two levels in the process at the moment it won't be possible to have them in other languages because it would be costly.

Session 5.2: Project Development

This was a parallel session moderated by Mr. Daouda Ndiaye with a selected panel sharing experiences on project development.

Panelists

- Meruzhan Galstyan – Director, EPIU Armenia
- Zerihun Mekuria – CRGE Facility Coordinator, MOFEC, Ethiopia
- Lavinia Tama – Development Coordination Division Manager, MFEM, Cook Islands
- In response to how NIEs came up with project ideas at country level, Mr. Meruzhan Galstyan from Armenia explained that their project was a replication of a project that had been previously adopted by AF where they applied some lessons learnt.
- In the case of Ethiopia which was accredited by AF in 2016, and at that time already had their own climate resilience strategy where stakeholders were giving input to the strategy. The Ministry of Finance in Ethiopia was mandated to submit their sectoral plans after receiving plans from various stakeholders which were then reviewed by a panel. Following this they took components of these projects and integrated these individual sectoral plans into one project that addressed the issues of climate change.
- Ms. Lavinia Tama of Cook Islands reported that they were accredited in 2015 and instructed ministries to present project ideas. Two of the project ideas were chosen to become the projects funded by AF.
- The outsourcing of expertise during project development was found to be common to countries represented in the panel. NIEs required special skills from both local and international consultants at different levels such as economic assessments, project implementation and monitoring.
- The biggest challenges faced in getting their project approved by AFB for Cook Islands, was working under strict deadlines with limited technical staff and assistance. For Armenia gathering of baseline data was a big challenge since they were developing a relatively new concept it was a struggle to find related baseline data. Ethiopia reported that they faced the challenge of coordination and managing consultants working in different time zones.
- Mr. Meruzhan Galstyan of Armenia's advice to fellow entities was that community ownership of the project was very important and that it was necessary to focus on a few outputs that make a huge impact. He also encouraged them to get as much information as possible from AF website, where they can draw lessons from the experiences of others. Ethiopian representative advised that it is important to understand the process and what it takes. Fellow NIEs were encouraged to have cross sectoral engagements during the process, while being responsive to reviews from AFB, and to adapt accordingly.
- In the collection of data, a recommendation was to engage institutions who work with data and that NIEs capacitate data collecting agencies to collect climate related data. An example given was the relationship between climate change and linking it to project development.

Plenary discussion Q&A

Question - In development what do they use for the measurement of indicator ?

Answer - The AF has its criteria they use and that can be a guide, its not easy to draw a line between development so they use the guidelines of the fund thus it is important to really understand how the fund

works. The framework of the AF has tried to be as wide as possible from policy level to capacity building. At project level it has its own circumstances and they develop specific indicators. It's been widely accepted to have only one matrix e.g., from policy level, resilience or landscape. Individual projects should articulate how the indicators will be shown.

3. Day 2: Wednesday, 29 August

Session 7: Environmental and Social Policy & Gender Policy (ESGP)

This session was presented by Mr. Dirk Lamberts who is an Environmental and Social Safeguards expert from Brussels, Belgium. The main points of his presentation were

- ESP was adopted in November 2013 and focuses on preventing unwanted negative environmental and social impacts from AF activities.
- GP was adopted in March 2016 focusing on promoting desired positive impacts from AF activities
- Main Characteristics of ESP is to avoid unnecessary environmental and social harms as a result of AF-funded projects/programmes
- The underlying principles for ESP are that it is Evidence-based, Risk-based, Comprehensive, Safeguarding efforts commensurate with the risks, Categorization (inconsequential), and Risks to be identified against the ESP 15 principles.
- ESP is also integrated in the direct access modality.
- The Gender Policy (GP) builds on the ESP, in particular its risk principles on, Access and Equity, Marginalized and vulnerable groups and Human rights
- The GP expands the ESP principle of Gender equity and women's empowerment' to promote gender equality: equal rights, equal responsibilities, equal opportunities, equal access of women and men, and equal consideration of their respective interests, needs
- There are ESP and GP considerations in preparing project/programme proposals: steps and roles and responsibilities.
- Pertaining Unidentified Sub -Projects (USPs) ESP requires that environmental and social risks associated with all the activities have been identified at the time of submission of the proposal.
- ESP says that all eventualities and activities need to be identified before project implementation so that risk identification is done.
- We have this policy to prevent unwanted negative outcomes and environmental and cultural harm.

Session 7.2- NIE Sharing Experience on ESGP at Project and programme Level

NIEs took time to share their experiences of the ESGP at programme level specifically covering data collection, assessment at project management, and monitoring and evaluation of ESG safeguards during implementation. 3 NIE representatives sat in the panel to share their experiences.

1. Maher Abdelrahim, Head of World Bank Division, MOPIC, Jordan
2. Mpfunzeni Tshindane, Project Officer, SANBI, South Africa
3. Milagros Rios, Head of Environmental and Social Unit, UCAR, Argentina

Discussion

According to SANBI, South Africa safeguarding Data Collection was key in establishing good baseline Data. For them constant screening of project activities ensures that the Implementing Agencies (IA) are following AF standards, and helps see which activities might be triggered. At the time SANBI submitted their application they were not aware of the presence of the Indigenous Khoisan group that were living in

the region and the ongoing project had to ensure there is no harm to the Khoisan community. To handle this situation, they requested for a grant in the small grants facilities. One area they felt they could have done differently from the start is speaking simple language that is easily understood by beneficiaries. Another example is that in one of their projects an expert realized there was a Donga/Gully and recommended to the community how to stop erosion and also doing terracing. After he left people in the community were challenged not understanding what erosion was and eventually SANBI had someone come through to explain to them in lay man's terms. Another recommendation coming from SANBI was that there is need for someone dedicated to ensure that the projects are compliant with the ESPG.

In Jordan, MOPIC had Focus group discussions with beneficiaries and stakeholders for data collection. They focused on proper coordination and the engagement of a specialist enabled them to address challenges and blockages in the process of data collection. Jordan has not experienced any USP since this is a fairly new term for them. In terms of the Monitoring and evaluation plan they gathered information at monthly and quarterly intervals. They put a plan and system in place before the project commenced and over the duration of the project itself. Their M&E system was low tech with a simple spread sheet. What they noted they could have done differently was that they could have benefited in requesting a capacity building toolkit at an early stage in their project cycle and capacitating the grant beneficiaries in their own languages at an early stage. Hence the need to involve stakeholders on the ground, and meetings should have been done in the field before the proposal.

UCAR, Argentina reported that in their case their project was approved before the ESGP policy was in place. They relied mainly on the local consultations in the field and those who would work with beneficiaries for data collection. They crosschecked details to verify and confirm that the data collected was correct and relevant. One major challenge for them is the weakness of early warning systems, and through the assessments they aim to strengthen the project. Another challenge they faced was providing support on the ground and train the recipients on the policies, yet they had to travel long distances. Through a community-based approach, they can get information on the risks while requesting for progress reports and having frequent field visits. All the technologies were community-driven and they were able to learn technologies and replicate them with others. For them having two assigned people for the programme was beneficial as well as having monitoring visits.

Plenary discussions on ESGP

- A participant commented that it was fulfilling to see the positive impact the Gender Policy had on the quality of women's life and also seeing how women were highly involved and taking leading roles.
- South Africa reported that it was simple for them to comply with the Gender policy because their project is designed in such a way that women were the greater beneficiaries. In both projects they were implementing women are the bread winners so the Gender policy made a positive impact on the beneficiaries.
- A participant noted a positive aspect that they partnered with private and public institutions and managed to build local capacity in providing local early learning systems. For Argentina it was however a different case during implementation they observed that more men were taking leading roles in projects.
- Another challenge noted from mainstreaming gender in projects was that even though women were very receptive to the perspectives in the policy and that mindset shifts were notable, women did not own land hence limiting their decision making on the land, even though they did all the work.

Session 8: Monitoring and Adaptation Activities

Session 8.1 Trends and Perspectives on secretariat review and consolidation of Implementing Entity reports

The focus of this session was on exploring the trends and perspectives on secretariat review and consolidation of implementing entity (IE) reports presented by Ms. Alyssa Gomes a Consultant with the AFB Secretariat. Below are the main points of her presentation.

- There are 3 levels of the AF Results Based Management (RBM) approach namely Institutional Level (Top-Bottom), Operational Level (Bottom-up) and Project and Program Objectives.³
- There are also 3 steps in the reporting requirements for AFB which are (i)Project Design Phase, (ii) Implementation Phase and lastly (iii) project/ programme completion phase.
- NIEs to take note of automated reporting reminders from AFB secretariat and endeavor to respond timeously
- The AF Strategic Results Framework takes into account the Expected Results and Indicators.
- NIE Projects/ programs must be in alignment with AF Results Framework which includes Project objectives, Project objective indicators, Fund Outcome, Fund outcome Indicators and the grant amount.
- In the event of delays in reporting NIEs are advised to inform the secretariat on the delay

Table 1: Reporting requirements During project Cycle

<i>Step 1 Project Design Phase</i>	<i>Step 2 Implementation Phase</i>	<i>Step 3 Project/ Programme Completion Phase</i>
Alignment of at least one outcome and output with AF Strategic Results Framework	Annual Project Performance Report that needs to be filled	Final PPR
Target figures are given for each of the five core indicators if they are relevant to the project	At Inception, baseline & target at completion	Project completion Report
	At Mid-Term: Target at mid-term	Final Evaluation Report
	At project/programme completion - target achieved at final evaluation	Final Audited Financial Statement
	Mid-Term Review (MTR)	

Session 8.2 Reporting Requirements

Ms. Martina Dorigo, Programme Analyst AFB Secretariat presented on reporting requirements focusing on what aspects to consider during the preparation of project performance reports, mid-term evaluation reports and terminal evaluation reports. The main points of her presentation were.

- IEs are required to submit a Project Performance Report (PPR) on an annual basis, one year after the start of project implementation (date of inception workshop)
- The last PPR should be submitted six months after project completion. This will be considered as the project completion report;
- PPRs shall be submitted no later than two months after the end of the reporting year;

³ https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Alyssa_Secretariat-review-and-consolidation-of-IE-reports.pdf

- Submission of the PPR is linked to the disbursement schedule. Once the PPR is submitted, the secretariat reviews the report and provides a recommendation to the Board as to whether additional funds should be transferred.
- PPR has 8 sections of content which are Basic Data, Financial Data, Procurement Data, project risk, Project Implementation rating, Project Indicators, Qualitative questions and lessons learnt and Results Tracker
- Projects/programmes with more than 4 years of implementation funded by the Adaptation Fund will be evaluated at their mid-point of implementation
- Mid-term Evaluations (MTEs) should be prepared by an independent evaluator, independent from project/programme management, but selected by the IE
- The MTEs should be prepared no later than 6 months after the mid-point of the project and sent to the AF Secretariat.
- Major changes to the objectives and expected outcomes of the project, coming from the MTE should be communicated by the IE to the AFB Secretariat.
- A new OPG Annex provides rules regarding changes in project budget/design.
- Final Evaluations shall be prepared and submitted to the Fund's Secretariat within nine (9) months after project completion.

Discussion

Emphasis was made that the external evaluation should be filled every year, and that NIEs are expected to submit PPR without fail. The ultimate responsibility lies with the implementing entities.

Session 9: Role of the Designated Authority (DA)

The Operations Analyst of AFB Secretariat Ms. Young Hee Lee presented on the responsibility of the Designated Authority (DA) as per AF Operational Policies and Guidelines at accreditation and project stage. The main points of her presentation were

- The DA is a government official who acts as a focal point for the AF representing the government of the country in its relation with the Adaptation Fund Board and its secretariat.⁴
- Importance of timely notification of a new DA appointment. An official letter of notification of a new DA appointment must be communicated to the AFB secretariat
- Be Mindful that 'DA of AF' and 'NDA of GCF' are NOT always the same.
- Main Responsibilities of DA at Accreditation is firstly for an NIE: To endorse accreditation applications as an NIE on behalf of a national government and for a Regional Implementing Entity (RIE): To endorse accreditation applications as an RIE on behalf of a national government.
- The DA has the authority to endorse an NIE applicant and withdraw the current application and nominate a New NIE applicant at (re) accreditation process
- Main Responsibility of DA at Project stage is to (i) Endorse project/program proposal (submission) by NIEs, RIE, or MIEs, on behalf of (ii) Confirm that the endorsed project/programme proposal is in accordance with the govt's national/ regional priorities in implementing adaptation activities (iii) Regional project/programme

⁴ https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/YL_DA-role-per-OPG_YL_29Aug2018.pdf

Discussion

- An issue that was raised was that at times there can arise conflict of interest when the DA representing GCF is also representing AF. The AF highlighted that when such a case arises the matter should be raised and the DA who feels there is a conflict of interest should declare it.
- NIEs also mentioned that at times a DA can be overwhelmed with responsibility and asked if it is possible to appoint a Deputy DA to ensure smooth running of the projects. The AF highlighted that selection of a DA is a country driven process and the AF only recommends qualities that can be used in selection of DA, for now the requirement allows one DA without a deputy. If there are challenges another DA can be selected to replace the one who might be overwhelmed with the duties. AF went on to clarify that for one to qualify to be selected as DA they should be nominated by a minister or Ambassador or someone at cabinet level who should be equivalent to minister.

Session 8: Monitoring and Reporting Adaptation activities

Moderated by Ms. Martina Dorigo and Ms. Alyssa Gomes, selected panelists that represented NIEs shared their experiences on Monitoring reporting on project activities.

Panelists were

- Marianella Feoli - Executive Director FUNDECCOPERACION, Costa Rica
- Fatina Mukarubibi - Designated Authority, Ministry of Environment, Rwanda
- Vilna Mondragon - Project Manager FUNDACION NATURA, Panama

Discussion

- To describe how their NIE is implementing its monitoring system Ms. Vilna Mondragon who is managing the FUNDACION NATURA project in Panama explained that since they began their project they had a Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) process already set up for their 3 Executing Agencies. Their project is now in the midterm stage and they have been monitoring from the beginning and reporting from their level as NIE from the EA level. The EAs have to provide a report of the work being carried out every 6 months. The NIE has periodic field visits to all project sites, and the stakeholders also have a role in the monitoring.
- According to Ms. Fatina Mukarubibi, Rwanda which is almost getting to the end of its project has from the initial phases of the projects put in place a monitoring system for its IE which reports directly to the ministry. They setup an M&E steering committee and have M&E officers who organize periodic field visits and ensure reports are available for specific projects. A Midterm review has been undertaken for every project.
- Ms. Marianella Feoli who is the Executive Director for FUNDECCOPERACION, Costa Rica also reported that they have had an M&E system in place from the beginning of their project. In their case they divided the process into 3 levels, first at NIE level, secondly at IE level and the 3rd level is where they get in touch with the beneficiaries by conducting interviews with them to get an understanding of how the project is being run and the levels of impact on the beneficiaries. They have both Top down and bottom up approach coordination at the field level. They aim to encourage issues of respect, commitment and ownership from the communities they are working with.
- In response to the question on how NIEs established baseline for monitoring and data availability the Ministry of Environment (MoE) of Rwanda. pointed out that they embarked on intensive consultations with all stake holders and collected as much data as they could so as to establish a good baseline and pool of data. Ms. Vilna Mondragon of Panama reported that for baseline data they liaised with IEs and

in addition hired a consultant for both working areas. Costa Rica also recruited a local consultant who assisted on consolidated data gathering.

- NIEs were also asked on the approach they used to undertake their mid-term evaluation and the roles of stakeholders during the process. In Panama they hired an international consultant who handled the process. They had a big sample to work with and they ensured that during execution process there was capacity building for the stakeholders and beneficiaries. For Rwanda the Mid-Term review (MTR) was delayed, as the requirement for the MTR by AF was recommended when they were already past mid-way of their project. This project is community based so they had consultations at community level and also with stakeholders. Ms. Marianella Feoli of Costa Rica reported that they have not yet had an MTR, but they plan on having the services of a consultant and having all stakeholders on board during this process.
- In response to how the evaluation has impacted the project implementation Panama reported that the evaluation brought out some lessons learnt on what areas to improve on the project, also ways through which they could support the process. It also came to their attention through the MTR that they were not recording the synergy results of their projects so they are now able to address that. Another aspect they learnt from the MTR was that they didn't have a map of the stakeholders. Rwanda reported that most targets had been reached but one thing that came out from the mid-term evaluation, is the need for sustainability in the projects they are doing.
- The discussion was taken further in a plenary session where people were interested in finding out on the NIEs' control system how they ensure the M&E process is synchronized with the executing entity (EE). For Panama what they have done is ensure that the process is included or shown in the implementation plan, a quarterly schedule of the monitoring plan. In Costa Rica they have a software system for monitoring, and a contract, legal binding agreement with the EEs to ensure the process is adhered to.
- All NIEs in the panel reported that they have faced challenges coming up with indicators for their projects. They had to engage specialists in the process and do consultations with stakeholders and communities involved.

Session 9: Role of the DA

In a session moderated by Ms. Silvia Mancini, three NIEs participated in a parallel session in which they shared their experience communicating and engaging with the DAs to the Adaptation Fund on reaccreditation and project issues.

Panelists

- David Luther – Executive Director, IDDI, Dominican Republic
- Shelia Macdonald-Miller Program Manager PIOJ
- Pema Choephyel- CEO/ Director, BTFEC, Bhutan

Discussion

- A panelist mentioned that the political environment affects the effectiveness of the DA. They gave an example in which their NIE experienced delays in project endorsement due to centralized decision making within government which also affected how proposals submitted by the NIE were prioritized. To overcome these issues, the NIE had to involve other ministries at the high level.
- Another NIE mentioned that they had experienced continuous change in the DA and had 3 different DAs since their accreditation due to changes in government. For them it was about keeping the DA informed, and they had managed to gain the confidence of the DA.

- A newly accredited NIE mentioned that the political situation did not influence the established bureaucracy in their government, and there had been no political influence in them being nominated for accreditation.
- Another NIE mentioned that they had been nominated through a competitive and technical process which was non-political, and that this had kept the politics out of their operations.
- One NIE mentioned that one of their previous DAs had actually attended the NIE's steering committees during their reaccreditation process as they wanted to be kept informed about developments within the NIE.
- Some panelists acknowledged that they had experienced differences in opinion with the DA during project development but that these had been solved by the NIE looking at the national development priorities, and actively engaging the DA by holding several meetings with the DA to align AF project priorities. In addition, an NIE mentioned that they had at times even invited the DA to provide input and comments on project implementation, and this had enabled them to avoid any disagreements or conflict with the DA.

The panelists concluded by offering the following advice to other NIEs

Keep the DA informed of activities within the NIE.

- I. Make sure that whatever the NIE does is routed in the communities where activities are going to be implemented, that is, engage in a bottom up approach for continued consistency on the ground level.
- II. Keep the flow of communication going between the NIE and the DA and keep national planning and development goals in mind when making project decisions.
- III. Keep the DA informed on what the NIE is doing, including even inviting visitors for the NIE to meet the DA. This could involve informal methods of engagement e.g. inviting the DA for a coffee etc. to strengthen the relationship with the DA and to gain better understanding of their perspectives.

Plenary Session Q&A

Question - How do you deal with the politics?

Answer - Stay as neutral as possible and be transparent.

Question - What recommendations would you have in a situation in which you need to engage the DA beyond just getting an endorsement letter

Answer - maintain good communications with the DA and make them have ownership of the project.

Session 10- Readiness and Capacity building

This session provided a status update on the readiness programme and the launch of the readiness grants for financial year 2019 (FY19). The session was presented by Mr. Farayi Madziwa, Programme Officer of the AFB Secretariat. The main points of his presentation were:

- The main goal of the readiness programme which was launched in May 2014 is to increase the number of accredited NIEs, and strengthen their overall capacity
- Specific Objectives are (i) To increase the preparedness of applicant NIEs seeking accreditation by the AF (ii) To increase the number of high quality project/programme proposals submitted to the Board within a reasonable time period after accreditation
- Activities of the readiness programme are implemented through 4 key components which are :
-

1. Support to accredited IEs (through TA grants, including Project Formulation Assistance (PFA) grants, seminars, webinars, workshops)
 2. Cooperation/Partnership with climate finance readiness providers (bilateral + multilateral organizations, NGOs, NIEs + other funds)
 3. Support to countries seeking accreditation (through grants, workshops, tools and guidance documents)
 4. Knowledge management (by contributing to the Fund's knowledge management strategy, climatefinance ready website, coordinating the community of practice, and undertaking a study on capacity building and readiness support for Direct Access to adaptation finance).
- 30 Readiness grants have been approved in 26 countries and 16 technical assistance grants in the form of ESP and GP have been approved
 - Component 3 of the readiness grant states that countries without an NIE may apply for a grant to receive support from an existing NIE, and South to South (S-S) cooperation grants (up to 50K) are available for this. Expected benefits of this arrangement are that, it can speed up the accreditation process, instill confidence in the applicant and helps in responding to common challenges
 - Technical Assistance (TA) Grants (ESGP), help strengthen the capacity of NIEs to put in place safeguards to address social and environmental risks as well as gender related issues in adaptation projects and programmes.
 - TA Grant for ESP and Gender (TA-ESGP) – 25k to all accredited NIE and give assistance and support in a number of activities.⁵
 - Project Formulation Assistance (PFA) Grants are available for undertaking of specialist technical assessments such as Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), Vulnerability Assessment (VA), Risk Assessment, Other Environmental and Social Assessments for adaptation projects, up to 20k Maximum and can only be accessed when the project concept is submitted for approval by the AFB.
 - The Readiness Support Package that was approved 29th March 2017, is currently in its pilot phase and tailored to support countries obtain accreditation with the fund.

Plenary Discussion Q &A

Question - Has the AFB already approved S-S grants?

Answer – Yes, the grants for this year were made available on 24 July.

Question - Can technical assistance fund be accessed during accreditation?

Answer - You can access it if you have not received it before and also if you are streamlining into Gender. If you have already accessed one grant you will be eligible to the other.

Session 10.3- NIE sharing experience and lessons learnt building capacity for environmental, social and gender safeguards through readiness grants.

In this session panelists shared their experience developing policies, procedures and manuals for screening and assessing environmental and social risks and addressing gender issues in adaptation projects through the TA-ESGP grant.

Panelists

- Aissatou Sall - Program Officers, CSE, Senegal

⁵ https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/FM_Readiness-support-and-launch-of-readiness-grants-2018_NIE-seminar-5.pdf

- Mpfunzeni Tshindane - Project Office, SANBI, South Africa
- Claudia Godfrey - Director of Development and Supervision, PROFONANPE, Peru
- Lisa Andon-Deputy Executive Director, MCT, Micronesia

Discussion

- All NIEs in the panel reported that the application process for the readiness grant was fairly easy and accompanied with a form that was easy to fill out with clear principles and guidelines. 3 of the NIEs benefited from hiring a consultant, some hired Local and the others went chose international consultants.
- In response to whether they produced a policy or manual to facilitate dissemination, Mr. Mpfunzeni of South Africa reported that they produced a step-by-step tool kit, which was then shared with project partners, who simplified it to a local context and language. CSE of Senegal already had a tool kit, so all they did was update the policy and manual. Ms. Claudia Godfrey in Peru reported they were able to update the document they already had and publish it in Spanish and English and thereafter disseminate it to their partners. Micronesia already had an inhouse M&E document so all they needed to do was to update their policy to incorporate elements from AFB.
- Advice coming from the panel was that when you elaborate the terms of reference for the consultant, there is need for one to be clear and precise as possible. They also highlighted the need for a focal point person or project coordinator dealing with the policies at the time of re-accreditation. It was also found to be beneficial to train the trainers, and also to be watchful of the documents as intellectual property during dissemination. In Micronesia they hired a consultant to do the Training of Trainers (ToT) so that they have capacity to train others. One panelist advised NIEs to incorporate the policy from the onset of the project and continue to have periodic audits on how the policies are being implemented. Panelists also encouraged NIEs to get all the information on these grants and apply as they were very easy to access and also apply for.
- One of the panelists reported that they faced challenges in accessing quantitative data. To counter this challenge, they sought for an avenue to propose concrete activities which would enable them to collect data. South Africa's response was to create a system that enabled data collection, firstly through a vulnerability study where they identified risks and collected the data. Over and above this they had already been using some tabular information from the ESP grant which they transferred into excel making data readily available for them.

4. Day 3: Thursday, 30 August

Session 11: Learning Grants

Supporting knowledge gathering and sharing through learning grants presented by Ms. Cristina Dengel a Knowledge Management Officer in the AFB secretariat.

Discussion:

- This session was a scoping exercise to brainstorm and discuss what approach and designs the learning grants under the knowledge management component of the AF medium-term strategy (MTS) should adopt.
- NIEs reported that they have knowledge Management Systems in their organizations, other NIEs also outsource expertise to develop these systems in ways they can effectively document and preserve information. They also engage the communities, to find out the knowledge they have and organize

seminars with the stakeholders to get and share knowledge, on climate change. Some NIEs have a centralized system that conducts research and produces related papers.

- Costa Rica reported that they were sharing information from 4 different projects and have launched their platform on their website. On this platform partners and other stakeholders can share good practice and knowledge to avoid reinventing the wheel. They also have fact sheets which is in different levels, and they produce documents where they document all the activities that are happening in different centers, sharing good practice and encouraging synergy partnerships. They have emphasized that it is everyone's responsibility to gather information and to share the work they are doing.
- Another NIE reported that their government assisted their organization to setup a reference office on Climate Change to gather information and management of knowledge. They are in the process of developing a platform and scientific notes which they will share through workshops, and National strategic documents. They have also partnered with the University on the production of climate change knowledge that emerges from research.
- In Argentina they have already held seminars on knowledge sharing and published booklets and brochures to help share the knowledge. They also have workshops with experts on project site with beneficiaries and have a rich exchange between the two. Developing good relationship with the banks and other stakeholders has boosted specific areas of training and support. Information is shared through workshops, videos and shared documents. Face to face and peer to peer interaction among organizations have been effective in knowledge sharing
- Mexico reported that for knowledge sharing they have a research and development Centre and they use social network to reach people through opening a YouTube channel where they hold seminars and they stream them live. The videos shared on this channel are for sharing information and the work being done in projects.
- Niger managed to develop a national policy for their onsite initiative. They conduct regular monthly consultations where they learn and share information and are working with universities to produce technical papers. Another initiative they had was to regroup this information to specific thematic areas for easier accessibility
- The CTCN reported that it has a platform to share information with over 70 Webinars and adaptation approaches and information can access and share information.

Breakaway session

NIEs were put into 4 Breakaway groups to further scope out the type of activities and gaps that could be addressed through the learning grants. Each group sat for 10 minutes and discussed the following questions:

1. What kind of challenges or gaps are you currently experiencing with sharing knowledge and lessons learnt.
2. What type of activities could you implement to share lessons learnt with other NIEs and with the wider climate finance adaptation community.

Feedback from groups

1. Need for dedicated resource, technical consultants, system and provide recommendations on how they can use the system network, also acknowledge that they are at different phases, so it is important to learn from other countries who are ahead through creating learning platforms.
2. Recommended exchange visits among NIE, partners, platforms, and knowledge exchange by topic or by sector. They also suggested a focus on tool kits and training challenges in different contexts, measures and technologies. Another challenge is difference in languages hence the need for translation support to enable information to be shared in native language.

3. Developing centers of documents, borrowing documents, also providing university students scholarships to support students doing research in the areas of climate change. Web platforms and data areas are necessary to coordinate and centralize platforms. The grant could allow data collection and the making of documentaries.
4. NIE exchange visits and also in country exchange visits to dispense knowledge from the ground up and develop a repository on knowledge sharing, training.

Cristina concluded the session by thanking participants and expressing that the AFB would take all the feedback into consideration for the development of a concept paper from the above recommendations.

Session 12: AF and GCF complementarity

Mr. Daouda Ndiaye - Senior Climate Change Specialist at the AFB Secretariat and Ms. Anupa Lamichhane Accredited Entities Specialist, at the Green Climate Fund (GCF) presented on the complementarity and coherency between the two funds. The main points of the presentation are.

- There was need for complementarity and coherence in the work being done by AF and GCF, and in a few weeks a meeting would be held to discuss the relationship between the two funds.
- GCF has its principles for programming which are that it should be country owned, coordination of the NDA is key, multi-sector stakeholder process, and that it must be gender inclusive.⁶
- GCF has mitigation strategic impacts, and Adaption strategic impacts
- Mitigation strategic impacts deal with reduction of emissions from transport, buildings, cities industry and appliances, forests and land use, and energy generation and access.
- AF mandated to pursue complementarity and coherence. CMP10 (Lima 2014) requested the AF Board to consider options for developing operational linkages between the AF and bodies under the Convention (such as the GCF)
- In 2015 the Board considered matters related to complementarity, including establishing an operational linkage between the AF and the GCF.
- The AF secretariat to discuss with the secretariat of the GCF concrete activities to initiate collaboration, including but not limited to the following areas: Readiness support, including by organizing joint activities such as workshop and reaccreditation process.
- The AFB decided to fast-track re-accreditation of implementing entities accredited with the GCF within a period of 4 years prior to the submission of the re-accreditation application to the AF and as at today, 3 implementing entities had been re-accredited through fast-track.
- At the 20th GCF board meeting the board asked the co-chairs to engage with AF to better understand options for collaboration and to report back to the board at its 21st meeting
- While there has been progress, overlaps and opportunities to maximizing impact remain, requiring attention at governance level of the funds.
- Such options should expedite programming and delivery of climate finance for adaptation finance in a simplified manner, and should be informed by country and entity needs

Discussion

- One area of concern to the NIEs was the US\$ 10 million cap for AF grantees, and it emerged as one reason for needing synergy and complementarity with the GCF which does not have the cap limit, hence can possibly assist in upscaling AF projects which have reached their cap and need more funding. AF

⁶ https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/AF-GCF-complementarity-session_5th-NIE-seminar.pdf

pointed out that this has been considered before, and has happened with other projects where the GCF proceeded to fund and scale up the successful AF projects. Another related suggestion was that GCF could start funding only programmes or projects above US\$ 10 million mark.

- A question was asked on whether there is an MoU already in place for complementarity between the AF and the GCF. The response was that there is currently no MoU between the two, but there are different options still being explored so as to operationalize the relationship between the funding Agencies. Sharing experience and knowledge is underway and has been discussed in certain forums. Many of these options have been discussed before now the major issues are operationalizing the synergy and the feasibility.
- Another emerging question was that since country programme is the main working document, can NIEs use the same strategic document for the GCF, since a lot of work is done in compiling information for the document. In response the AF and GCF mentioned that they plan to link this process to all other funding documents to enable its use with many other funding agencies.

Session 13: Strengthening resilience through innovation, technology and private sector engagement

This session was moderated by Ms. Saliha Dobardzic who is a Senior Climate Change Specialist with the AFB Secretariat.

Session 13.2 Innovation and technologies for enhancing local resilience – Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN)

Ms. Jaime Revenaz - Webbe who is Regional Manager - Asia Pacific at the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN) presented this session. The main points of the presentation are.

- CTCN Innovation and technology focuses on enhancing local resilience and it is a large network with over 500 partners, it is the largest private network.
- For an organization to benefit from CTCN they have to become a network member,
- CTCN provides technical support, not necessarily through money but through other partners already in the network with a specific niche on the technological expertise required by the requesting organization.
- CTCN is very agile and has made the application process very simple and easy to access the request. They strive to have a speedy process from the time of application to the deliverable where the shortest working period is 2 months to a maximum length of 18 months
- CTCN is an operational programme mandated to collaborate and work together with the AF. They can assist NIEs with processing winning proposals for the AF, and provide technical assistance
- The CTCN allows NIEs to test new technologies so that they can identify what is best suited for various projects.



Figure 2: Ms Jaime Revenaz- Webbe who is the Regional Manager- Asia Pacific

Discussion

- In response to whether CTCN funds are specific to technological support only, the response was that CTCN is not a project preparational facility, their role is to step in when there is a technological need during the proposal writing, so they can provide access to a network member who assists with technical support.
- CTCN is accredited for support of GCF readiness and their institutional capacity building is not general engagement but very specific.
- CTCN provides support for scaling up technology and also looks at the cost of implementation and strengthening resilience through innovation, technology and the private sector. They are not looking to develop new solutions, but also consider that existing technologies need to be adapted to context.
- One challenge raised in the plenary was that at times these agencies AF, GCF and CTCN are not always synchronized hence the need for better coordination of these organizations and distinct, clear linkages.

Session 13.3: Group discussion and NIE reflection on the upcoming innovation financing window.

Participants were split into groups to gather and report their reflections on the following questions

Questions for discussion

- 1) How to support innovation for adaptation
- 2) What should be the most important considerations from your perspective in funding innovation through small grants (up to 250,000)?
- 3) What kind of support for innovation, technology development and transfer, innovative practices, and other is needed by developing countries
- 4) What do NIEs need to access the available support of resources for innovation?

Discussion from breakout groups

Group 1: In their response said that it was critical to produce transfer of information across projects and provide learning grants. More replication of work and projects being done would lead to many more communities being reached. It was also useful to lower barriers since there is need to use funds to validate the project at hand. The learning grants would help cover the technology grant and the resources can be used for validation thus NIEs need clear rules for validation.

Group 2: To help support innovation for financing, when it is in the government sector, the government needs to scale up if funding is available. There is also need to improve the way things are done locally for transformational impact on beneficiaries of projects. The kind of support needed for innovation and technology development and transfer are financing, capacity building, and physical infrastructure

Group 3: There is need to identify the innovations that are already existing which have already worked and then endeavor to improve these innovations and also simplify them so that they are user friendly e.g., water management, recycling and green energy. Emphasis was made on simplifying the process, including simplified access to information.

Group 4: Innovations should be country specific to cater for the challenges that are being found in a particular country justifying the need for a bottom up approach, something that is innovative for that particular country. The US\$ 25,000 cap was sufficient for piloting but not enough for the whole process. One other important consideration was that innovation for adaptation should be impact based. There was

need for Integration of the process into national systems as well. Other considerations should be funding and availability of capacity building experts in the areas, to support development. It is important to build local and scientific awareness and pilot the process, with a simple application process that is easily accessible and less bureaucratic. It is important for communities to take ownership of the technology.

It was stated that innovation comes with a risk that some things might not work, making it critical to learn from these experiences and put into consideration the possibility of mistakes and errors in implementing technologies. Participants were asked if they would be willing and interested in a follow up survey on innovation financing and they all agreed.

Session 14: NIE community of practice

This was a discussion on how to advance the online platform for the community practice facilitated by an NIE representative, Ms. Carolina Reyes from FUNDECOOPERACION (Costa Rica). NIEs discussed on how they could proceed with the online platform.

Discussion

- There was a general consensus among the NIEs that the community of practice was a powerful platform for information sharing and learning from the work being done among the NIEs. There was need for maximum utilization so that it would benefit everyone.
- The biggest challenge raised was that since 2016 the platform was setup and a WhatsApp group was opened to ease the communication, yet there was very little participation in the group. The online platform has also been under-utilized by NIEs. There was a need to chart a way forward with the platform, and to define a clear roadmap so that the platform benefits NIEs and serves its purpose. NIEs were concerned that failure to come up with a concrete road map and solution could run the risk of discussing the same challenges in the next workshop a year from now.
- A suggestion was made to nominate a committee for the community of practice and to have 6-month activity plan with a proper break down of activities, encouraging everyone's participation. AFB secretariat offered to provide needed support to the committee and to the community of practice, although they emphasized that the platform needs to be NIE driven.
- NIEs explored whether there were more preferred ways of accessing platform such as Facebook which gives notifications when there is activity.
- The discussion culminated in the formation of a steering committee to champion the use of the community of practice online platform with regional representatives based on geographic language spoken. Nominated committee members were:

English- South Africa: Mr. Mpfuzeni Tshithande and Jamaica: Ms. Sheila McDonald Miller

French- Senegal: Ms. Aissatou Sall and Benin: Mr. Matthieu Biauou

Spanish- Costa Rica: Ms. Marianella Feoli and Peru: Ms. Claudia Godfrey

The committee later provided feedback on an agreed roadmap for the community of practice as follows:

- 1) The community of practice would continue to use the existing online platform hosted by World Resources Institute (WRI)
- 2) Established WhatsApp groups, such the regional group for Latin America would continue to be available, and other regions or sub-regions in Africa and Asia were welcome to start their own WhatsApp groups

- 3) A newsletter would be developed by the AF secretariat with input from NIEs. NIEs would supply all the content for the newsletter.
- 4) The existing document outlining the governance and principles of the community of practice that was developed jointly by CSE of Senegal together with other NIEs would need to be finalized. It could be validated through the community of practice committee alongside the COP24 meeting.

Closing of Seminar

The seminar facilitator gave a brief summary of the important and take-home messages from the seminar. He pointed out that the AF had proven to deliver effective and substantial results through the concrete actions it funds to help the most vulnerable communities in developing countries adapt and build resilience to climate change.

Mr. Daouda Ndiaye, Senior Climate Change Specialist at the AFB Secretariat, closed the workshop on behalf of the manager of the secretariat, thanking the participants. He highlighted that the seminar had provided a good learning experience as more time was allocated to discussions. He went on to express gratitude and satisfaction, for 3 intensive days of interaction and learning thanking the organizers and everyone who had participated and contributed to making it a fruitful and successful seminar. He said that he hoped this workshop would be useful for future interaction of the NIEs and the Fund, be it through increased submission of accreditation applications or project and programme proposals to the Fund, and also encouraged NIEs to make use of the project assistant grants. NIEs were encouraged to make use of the community of practice platform and NIEs that were up for re-accreditation were reminded to be aware of the deadlines.



Figure 3: Group Photo of Participants at End of Seminar

Day 4: Friday 31 August

Site Visit

Representatives from the DC government gave presentations on the process the District of Columbia was developing a resilience strategy for the district. Participants were taken on a field visit to some of the resilient project activities under implementation by the district. The sites visited were located East of the Anacostia River and included:

1. Nash Run – A stream restoration project which lowered the 100year floodplain to enable stream floodplain to handle flood water instead of flooding homes by creating 1.08 acres of floodplain wetland

along the stream corridor. The project addresses resilience for single family homes in Kenilworth neighborhood. Lowered flood plain of stream

2. Alger Park – This project addresses both low income development (LID) homes and public right of way as well as stream restoration in a highly incised stream valley. Private space LID work is on-going, the stream restoration project is complete, and the public space LID installation was still under construction at the time of the tour. The project worked on private space and public space to reduce peak volume run-off flows and also worked in the stream to manage high flows.



Figure 4: Seminar participants at Field Visit

Annex 1: List of Participants

No.	COUNTRY	NAME	TITLE
1	Argentina (UCAR)	Ms. Milagros Castro Rios	Head of Environmental and Social Unit
2	Armenia (EPIU)	Mr. Meruzhan Galstyan	Director
3	Belize (PACT)	Ms. Nayari Diaz-Perez	Executive Director
4	Belize (PACT)	Ms. Farrah Tingling	Accounting Manager
5	Belize (PACT)	Mr. Darrel Audinette	Conservation Investment Manager
6	Benin (FNEC)	Mr. Mathieu Biauou	Director of Mobilisation Financial Resources
7	Bhutan (BTFEC)	Mr. Pema Choephyel	CEO/ Director
8	Bhutan (BTFEC)	Mr. Singye Dorji	Chief Finance Officer
9	Chile (AGCI)	Mr. Enrique O'Farrill-Julien	Chief of Bilateral and Multilateral Department
10	Cook Islands (MFEM)	Ms. Kristina Tatuava	Development Programme Manager
11	Cook Islands (MFEM)	Ms. Lavinia Tama	Development Coordination Division Manager
12	Costa Rica (Fundecooperacion)	Ms. Marianella Feoli	Executive Director
13	Costa Rica (Fundecooperacion)	Ms. Carolina Reyes	Project Officer
14	Dominican Republic (IDDI)	Mr. David Luther	Executive Director
15	Ethiopia (MOFEC)	Mr. Zerihun Mekuria	CRGE Facility Coordinator
16	India (NABARD)	Mr. Dave Harishkumar Rasiklal	Deputy Managing Director
17	India (NABARD)	Mr. Kuldeep Singh	Deputy General Manager
18	Jamaica (PIOJ)	Ms. Shelia McDonald-Miller	Program Manager
19	Jordan (MOPIC)	Mr. Maher A. Abdelrahim	Head of World Bank Division
20	Mexico (IMTA)	Mr. Aram Rodriguez De Los Santos	Deputy Director of Climate Change Risks at the General Coordination of Adaptation to Climate Change
21	Mexico (IMTA)	Ms. Rita Vazquez del Mercado Arribas	Coordinadora de Desarrollo Profesional e Institucional
22	Micronesia (MCT)	Ms. Lisa Andon	Deputy Executive Director
23	Morocco (ADA)	Ms. Meyrem Andaloussi	Head of Environment Service
24	Namibia (DFRN)	Mr. Martin Schneider	Executive Director
25	Niger (BAGRI)	Mr. Abdoulaye Djadah	General Manager
26	Niger (BAGRI)	Mr. Abdoul Razak Saidou Baraze	Chef Service Agricole

No.	COUNTRY	NAME	TITLE
27	Panama (FUNDACION NATURA)	Ms. Vilna Cuellar Mondragon	Especial Proyect Manager
28	Panama (FUNDACION NATURA)	Ms. Ashby Rivera	Adm Tec. Assist.
29	Peru (PROFONANPE)	Ms. Claudia Godfrey	Director of Development and Supervision
30	Rwanda (MOE)	Ms. Fatina Mukarubibi	Permanent Secretary and National Designated Authority of the Adaptation Fund in Rwanda
31	Senegal (CSE)	Ms. Aissatou Sall	Program Officer
32	South Africa (SANBI)	Mr. Mpfunzeni Tshindane	Project Officer
33	Tanzania (NEMC)	Mr. Fredrick F. Mulinda	Sr. Environmental Management Officer
34	Tanzania (NEMC)	Ms. Amina S. Kibola	Sr. Environmental Management Officer
35	Corporación Andina de Fomento (CAF)	Ms. Carolina Cortes	Chief Executive - Environment and Climate Change Unit
36	Green Climate Fund (GCF) South Korea	Ms. Anupa Lamichhane	Entities Specialist coordinating Asia-Pacific
37	UN Environnement (CTCN) (Danemark)	Ms. Jaime Revenaz-Webbe	Regional Manager, Asia-Pacific
38	DC Government	Mr. Bush Kevin	Chief Resilience Officer
39	DC Government	Mr. Burch Josh	Manages Stream Restoration
40	DC Government	Ms. Kate Johnson	
41	Adaptation Fund	Mr. Mikko Ollikainen	Manager
42	Adaptation Fund	Mr. Daouda N'diaye	Sr. Climate Change Specialist
43	Adaptation Fund	Mr. Farayi Madziwa	Program Officer
44	Adaptation Fund	Ms. Saliha Dobardzic	Sr. Climate Change Specialist
45	Adaptation Fund	Ms. Cristina Dengel	Knowledge Management Officer
46	Adaptation Fund	Ms. Silvia Mancini	Operations Officer
47	Adaptation Fund	Ms. Martina Dorigo	Program Analyst
48	Adaptation Fund	Ms. Young Lee	Operations Analyst
49	Adaptation Fund	Mr. Matt Pueschel	Communications Officer

No.	COUNTRY	NAME	TITLE
50	Adaptation Fund	Ms. Aya Mimura	Financial Analyst
51	Adaptation Fund	Ms. Sophie Hans-Moevi	Sr. Program Assistant
52	Adaptation Fund	Mr. Mark Sugg	Consultant – Videographer
53	Adaptation Fund	Mr. Graham Joscelyne	Consultant - Accreditation Panel
54	Adaptation Fund	Mr. Dirk Lamberts	Consultant - Env. and Safeguards Specialist
55	Adaptation Fund	Ms. Alyssa Gomes	Consultant - Project monitoring
56	Adaptation Fund	Ms. Yusun Lee	Consultant - Communications Specialist
57	Adaptation Fund	Ms. Samukile Takavingofa	Consultant - Report writer
58	Adaptation Fund	Mr. Marc Neilson	Consutlant - Facilitator