



**ADAPTATION FUND**  
Readiness Programme  
for Climate Finance

## **Regional Climate Finance Readiness Workshop: Promoting Direct Access to Adaptation Finance for Countries in Central Africa**

March 18-19, Accra International Convention Center, Accra, Ghana

### Report



## 1. Introduction

The Adaptation Fund (AF) hosted 17 representatives from 9 countries from Central Africa, including civil society representing the Adaptation Fund NGO network, for a regional workshop held on March 18-19 in Accra, Ghana to promote access to Adaptation Finance, through the Fund's Direct Access modality, and to develop effective adaptation projects. Discussions focused on familiarizing country focal points and candidate national implementing entity (NIE) representatives with the AF fiduciary requirements for accreditation, project proposal submission and review process, and familiarization with AF policies and procedures, including its Direct Access modality and its environmental and social policy (ESP) and gender policy (GP).

The workshop took place on the margins of the UN Africa Climate Week 2019 which is under the auspices of the Nairobi Framework Partnership that supports developing countries in preparing and implementing their plans to address climate change under the Paris Climate Change Agreement.

At the end of each day of the workshop, the Adaptation Fund Board (AFB) 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's accreditation process.

## 2. Day 1: March 18, 2019

Farayi Madziwa, Readiness Program Officer at the Adaptation Fund and facilitator of the workshop, provided opening remarks, welcoming all participants to Ghana and highlighting the unique opportunity to access climate finance from the AF. He expressed his hope that the workshop would be interactive and participatory, and that the AF would learn as much from the participants as they would from the Fund. He explained that Day 1 would focus on the accreditation process, while Day 2 would focus on projects and include case studies and interactive sessions.

Silvia Mancini, Operations Officer (Accreditation) delivered the welcome address on behalf of Mikko Ollikainen, the manager of the AFB secretariat. In her speech she highlighted that Ghana had an US\$ 8 million AF funded project to support rural communities in three northern regions of the country to build resilience against persistent drought conditions and improve access to water and the management of water resources. She pointed out that more than a third of the AF portfolio was in Africa, with 28 adaptation projects totaling US\$ 214 million and that all countries in Central Africa were eligible to seek accreditation as NIEs through the Fund's Direct Access modality. At the time of the workshop, only one country from Central Africa, Rwanda, had an accredited NIE that was implementing projects through the Fund's Direct Access modality, that is, the Ministry of Environment (MoE), "formerly Ministry of Natural Resources of Rwanda – MINIRENA". She concluded by highlighting the recent success of the AF at the UN climate conference in Poland in December 2018, where the Fund raised a record US\$ 129 million to serve countries that are vulnerable to climate change and was mandated to serve the Paris agreement starting on 1 January 2019.

Following the welcome address, participants were then invited to briefly introduce themselves and explain what they expected from the workshop. The main expectations are included in Annex I to the report.

## Presentations and dialogue

### **Introduction to the Adaptation Fund, Farayi Madziwa, Readiness Program Officer - Adaptation Fund**

The presentation provided an overview of the AF and highlighted the Fund's recent 10-year anniversary. Farayi presented the context in which the AF operates among other climate funds under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), such as the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and the Green Climate Fund (GCF). He pointed out some of the key features of the AF, which include:

- AF financing through a share of proceeds from the carbon market was one of the unique characteristics of the original setup of the Fund. However, since the crash of the carbon market the AF has had to rely on alternative sources of funding, such as voluntary contributions, mostly from national and sub-national governments from developed countries that are part of the UNFCCC;
- that the AF was the only climate fund with a majority of its board members originating from developing countries;
- that the AF was the first climate fund to operationalize Direct Access.
- that the AF currently has 29 accredited NIEs (the 29<sup>th</sup> being the Ministry of Water and Environment of Uganda that the AFB accredited at its thirty-third meeting in March 2019), 11 accredited multilateral implementing entities (MIEs), and 6 regional implementing entities (RIEs).
- that through Direct Access, NIEs have more control over the use of grant funds they receive and over which projects to fund. Although the process of obtaining accreditation can be challenging, the AF has experienced that it offers NIEs some benefits which include strengthening fiduciary management capacity, strengthening the NIE's transparency, building institutional knowledge and enabling some NIEs to access additional funds from other sources.

The presentation also provided information on other aspects of the AF including the following:

- The Fund's 2018-2022 Medium-Term Strategy (MTS) which is based on the 3 pillars of Action, Innovation and Learning, and is underpinned by cross-cutting issues that include capacity building and support, complementarity with other funds, engagement with vulnerable groups and gender issues. The MTS provides new opportunities for funding which do not affect the country cap, namely:
  - o The funding window to enhance Direct Access, with a budget of up to US\$ 100 million over 5 years.
  - o Project scale-up grants of up to US\$ 100,000 per project to design scaling up pathways for existing funded NIE projects.
  - o Innovation grants of up to US\$ 5 million per project.
  - o Learning grants of up to US\$ 150,000 per project.The above grants are only available to NIEs and can be accessed simultaneously.
- The AFB established an evaluation function for the Fund through the Technical Evaluation Reference Group (TERG). Evaluation of the AF is done independently and the TERG reports directly to the AFB. The AFB had recently appointed the chair of the TERG and the process to staff and operationalize the evaluation function is still ongoing.

- In Katowice at the UN Climate Conference, it was formally decided that the AF “shall” serve the Paris Agreement as of January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2019. As such, the AF is will serve both the Paris and Kyoto agreements.

Question: How long does it take to get accredited?

Response: The process to obtain accreditation is a country-driven process and the duration is usually dependent on how active and driven a country is. The process can take anywhere from 6 to 24 months, sometimes more. From the experience of the AFB secretariat, it has taken on average 1 year and a half for an entity to obtain accreditation.

Question: Can a country receive more than US\$ 10 million?

Response: The AFB has set a limit of US\$ 10 million per country for single country projects. The NIE can use up their country cap as they wish, that is, by implementing a single project up to the country cap or multiple smaller projects. There is also a funding window for regional projects which falls outside the country cap. NIEs are encouraged to work with MIEs on regional projects. The issue of the country cap is currently under discussion by the AFB at its meetings.

It should also be noted that there is readiness funding available to support NIE capacity building during accreditation and for institutional capacity building post-accreditation. However, the funding is available as a onetime grant for each type of grant available and the support received cannot duplicate support available through another grant. For example, if an NIE receives funding for a technical assistance grant for the Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy (TA-ESGP), the expectation is that the NIE builds institutional capacity to address environmental and social risks as well as gender issues simultaneously, and it cannot access the stand-alone technical assistance grant for the gender policy (TA-GP).

Question: The AF shall serve the Paris agreement, but if a country has not ratified Kyoto, which one is dominant?

Response: At COP 25 in Katowice, Poland, the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA) decided that the AF shall serve the Paris Agreement and be accountable to the CMA as of 1 January 2019. The CMA also recommended to the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP) that the AF serve the Paris Agreement exclusively when the share of proceeds from the mechanism, established under Article 6 of the Paris Agreement to contribute to the mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions and support sustainable development, becomes available. This could mean that until such time, countries under both the Kyoto Protocol and the Paris Agreement would be eligible to receive funding from the AF. However, there are a number of procedural and administrative issues that still need to be addressed by the AFB, CMA and CMP.

Question: A country has started the accreditation process, but wishes to change its intermediary, through a South-South (S-S) cooperation grant, to a MIE. Is that possible?

Response: Accreditation is a country-driven process and entities should carefully consider what kind of support they need, based on their capacity gaps and also who they want to receive support from if they request for a S-S cooperation grant. Yes, it is possible for the Designated Authority (DA)/ focal point to the AF to request a cancellation of the agreement for S-S cooperation. However, S-S cooperation grants can only be accessed through accredited NIEs and the country seeking accreditation can only receive

alternative support through the grant from another accredited NIE. Countries can also receive support from multiple sources other than an NIE, but this would be outside the scope of readiness and capacity building support from the AF and would be based on mutual arrangements made between the country seeking support and the provider of support independent of the AF.

Question: If a MIE does not support accreditation in a certain country, can it submit proposals on its behalf?

Response: All proposals submitted to the AF have to be endorsed by the DA of the country. If the DA endorses a project by a MIE, then that MIE may submit a single-country project or regional project for funding, but, it cannot submit a proposal through Direct Access. A MIE can discuss priorities with a country's DA and submit a proposal to the AF on condition that the MIE is accredited with the AF and the DA endorses the proposal.

### **AF readiness programme: pre-accreditation and project development support, Farayi Madziwa**

Farayi Madziwa gave a presentation on the AF Readiness Programme. The programme has 4 key components: provide support to countries seeking accreditation; support NIEs already accredited through seminars and webinars; cooperate with other climate finance providers; and knowledge management. 85 % of readiness grants have gone to the Africa region, and 13 countries in total have received these grants. The different types of grants and activities under the Readiness programme are:

- S-S cooperation grants set at US\$ 50 000.
- Readiness Package grants set at US\$ 100 000 USD.
- The ESP readiness grant set at US\$ 25 000.
- The GP grant set at US\$ 10 000 USD.
- The project formulation grant set at US\$ 30 000 USD. It does not fall under Readiness but provides support for project development.
- The project formulation assistance grant set at 20 000 USD.
- There are several other activities under Readiness this year, such as the country exchange program; training workshops for countries not accessing funds and for project development and submission, and an annual seminar for accredited NIEs.
- There is also a Community of Practice, that releases a bulletin written by NIEs on readiness support.

### **Accreditation process overview: Direct Access to AF resources, Silvia Mancini, Operations Officer (Accreditation) – Adaptation Fund**

Silvia Mancini gave a presentation about the AF accreditation process. The process has matured, it's been piloted by the AF for 10 years now. Direct Access allows for direct management of funds, the responsibility for the NIE is thus important. The accreditation process consists of 3 phases: nomination of DA; application; preselection/screening/reviewing and approval. The Secretariat and accreditation panel (AP) manage this process, but the final decision is taken by the Board. Farayi Madziwa added that the AP is independent and reports to the Board. For the DA, it is important to choose an organization/entity with a strong institutional capacity, both for accreditation and project design. As soon as the DA selects a potential organization, this potential NIE will be granted access to the accreditation system online, apply

(in English) and upload relevant documents. Accreditation is valid for 5 years. 18 months before the end of this 5-year period the NIE must restart the re-accreditation procedure. The key elements to consider for an NIE to undergo the accreditation process are: the selection by the DA; the examination of the institutional capacity; and the capacity and self-drive/motivation of the NIE to complete the process.

Question: Who organizes the training workshops for non-accredited countries?

Response: The AF has in the past organized regional workshops in Africa, Asia, and Latin America and the Caribbean to raise awareness of AF processes and procedures and to build developing country capacity for accreditation and the Fund's project life cycle. Some countries get accreditation without support or training workshops from the AF. The online application process is in itself a capacity building tool and provides guidance to all applicants. Potential NIEs are encouraged to contact Silvia Mancini and the rest of the accreditation team.

Farayi Madziwa added that the next UN Climate Week was in China in September, where the AF would target countries from that region for accreditation through a workshop that would be held as part of the Climate Week.

Comment from participant: The AF requirements for accreditation entail that several institutions will contribute to the process, such as the ministry of environment, of finance, the auditing chamber, the Central Bank, so this will be an examination of all the institutions of our government, as each institution is independent.

Silvia Mancini added that the focal point selected by the DA must abide by the accreditation standards, or the process may be delayed. The panel is looking for one entity, one NIE, that has the legal capacity and meets the AF fiduciary standards.

Comment from participant: We lack leaders in the field, there are external rules that delay the process.

Question: Is the accreditation process with the GCF the same as with the AF?

Response: If an Entity is accredited with one organization, it may be eligible for fast track reaccreditation with the other. GCF accredited Entities with the GCF can also be eligible for fast track re-accreditation with the AF

### **AF accreditation success stories: Ministry of Environment (MoE) AF funded project, Rwanda – Immaculee Uwimana**

Immaculee Uwimana, Environment & Climate Change Adaptation & Mitigation Specialist at the Ministry of Environment (MoE) of Rwanda (formally Ministry of Natural Resources of Rwanda (MINIRENA), presented Rwanda's experience with accreditation and reaccreditation to the AF. She then explained that accreditation started by invitation by the Fund in 2009, and that the process took a long time because of fiduciary standards, environmental standards and social safeguards. The first submission was in 2010, and accreditation was obtained in 2012, following auditor checks and procurement. She emphasized that the application requires time and human resources. The process necessitates political will to mainstream the environment and climate change in national development plans. She pointed out that re-accreditation was affected by the change in the name of the accredited entity (the Ministry of Natural Resources). All responsibilities were transferred to the Ministry of the Environment.

Question: Can Rwanda participate in S-S cooperation grants?

Response: Yes

Question: Did anything change aside the name of the NIE from MINIRENA to MoE?

Response: All responsibilities were transferred to the new ministry, although there were some minor changes in responsibilities. The ministry was upgraded to combat climate change.

### **Understanding accreditation gaps and challenges in Central Africa - experience sharing by countries (Group discussion)**

Participants were split into 3 groups and asked to discuss the following two questions:

- What are the challenges and gaps that you are facing in your region or country to access adaptation finance from the AF or other sources?
- What is the best way to support you to access climate finance from the AF and other sources?

Group 1 responses:

*Challenges:*

- Lack of a legal framework in countries.
- Lack of coordination, among different institutions.
- Duration of the process, money cannot improve livelihoods, impacts have already taken place.

*Solutions:*

- Capacity building and institutional strengthening.
- Simplify the process, accelerate it.

Group 2 responses:

*Challenges:*

- The choice of entity, access to information.
- Lack of access to accreditation information.
- Logistics, financial reports, operationality.

*Solutions:*

- Accompany countries further in the accreditation process.

Group 3 responses:

*Challenges:*

- Difficulty identifying potential NIEs that would fulfill all AF / AP conditions.
- Dependency of the institution on the government.
- The process is too time-consuming.

*Solutions:*

- AF should visit the country and help identify an NIE.
- It would be helpful to get around the government and give more authority and autonomy to the focal point to manage finances.
- The Fund must find a way to accelerate the process.

Farayi Madziwa concluded the session by thanking the groups for their inputs and emphasizing that accreditation, submission of proposals and solutions on the ground are all country driven. Countries must constantly engage in the process, take ownership of it, and communicate regularly with the Panel, he added.

### **Lessons from the AF on accreditation, Shey Tata, Accreditation Panel member - Adaptation Fund**

Shey Tata presented the following perspective from the AP:

- Fiduciary and legal standards are very rigorous, there are several steps and procedures.
- The applicant entity must be able to enter legally binding contracts with AF
- The applicant entity must ensure proper financial management, accountability and oversight, and adhere to international financial monitoring and auditing standards.
- The applicant entity must be able to handle and investigate complaints about the project.
- These are not bureaucratic impositions on the entity, but a way to make agencies more effective even after accreditation
- The Board has been looking at ways to improve the quality of accreditation, by making sure the standards are relevant and of the highest quality. It has strengthened its criteria against money laundering and the financing of terrorism, not by adding new requirements, but simply by strengthening a number of significant criteria: procurement, internal control framework and financial management. There is a thorough screening process.

### **Going through the accreditation process – Selecting an NIE and submitting an application for accreditation (case study)**

Silvia Mancini then moderated a case study exercise to familiarize participants with the accreditation application form. The following points were made:

- The AF does not finance startups.
- The Panel does not require confidential information from the applicant, but rather evidence of procurement, open market, capacity for project management and transparency.

Comment from participant: We are trying to prove to the AP, the Board, that we have the capacity to achieve this. We have an auditor, there are checks and balances, and several units within each ministry to minimize risks. In terms of money laundering, it depends on who we are dealing with. Outside contractors are vetted, examined, there is a vetting procedure. Transparency is very important.

Response by AP member: It's the responsibility of the entity or government to make sure that the all steps are respected. If not, it means that the entity does not have the capacity to become accredited.

The AP is looking at the decision-making process of the entity: systems, procedures and processes that the organization has codified. The documentation could exist in 1 comprehensive document. It is how the



entity does business; if someone retires, the system continues, and it must not be dependent on 1 person. It must be consistent with international practices.

### 3. Day 2: March 19, 2019

#### **What next after accreditation? Overview of the AF project/programme cycle - Review and approval process, Dirk Lamberts, Environmental & social Safeguards Expert, Adaptation Fund, on behalf of the Projects & Programs Review Committee (PPRC)**

Dirk Lamberts focused on the period that follows accreditation, detailing the project development phase. Projects are concrete activities, with no specific sector(s), and are country driven, with no co-financing requirements. There are discussions to increase the country cap (currently at 10 million USD). The NIE is responsible for oversight, while the DA is responsible for endorsing each project. Sometimes NIEs open a call of proposals, and best ideas are selected for developing a programme / project to be submitted to the AF. The AF looks at the nature of the activities. Are they concrete? Are they appropriate? The AF looks at the environmental and social aspects, national plans and strategies, cost-effectiveness, feedback from consultations, duplication with other sources of funding and complementarity. Typically, 9 weeks before the Board meets, the projects must be submitted. Within a tight frame, the AFB secretariat reviews the project, provides initial reviews followed by final reviews, with recommendations made. Very few full proposals have been outright rejected. There is also a 3-step process: pre-concept, concept and full proposal. The role of the NIE is to implement and manage funds, while the DA observes projects during implementation, produces project performance reports, can comment on projects, and ensures that the government continues to endorse the project during implementation. The DA can thus end the project if it no longer endorses it. There can be delays, the AF has a policy to deal with delays. The entity has 4 months to sign the legal agreement or risk cancellation. The project begins within 6 months. Requests for extensions are a maximum of 6 months before the official completion date.

Question: Shouldn't the NIE first provide a Project Identification Form (PIF), then prepare a full proposal? Full proposals are costly, shouldn't we start with a PIF?

Response: A concept is what you can start with. Concepts already show issues, adaptation efforts etc.

Question: What is the difference between an Executing Entity (EE) and an Implementing Entity (IE)?

Response: Executing Entities are organizations that execute adaptation projects and programmes supported by the Fund under the oversight of Implementing Entities. National Implementing Entities are the national institutions accredited by the Adaptation Fund Board to receive direct financial transfers from the Fund in order to carry out adaptation projects and programmes.

Question: The UNFCCC requires National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPA), but we are not accredited. Should NAPA priorities be adopted, as they are identified by the government?

Response: Consistency with national plans is key. During the project proposal review process the AF checks for alignment with relevant national plans, strategies and policies. The DA endorses the project and ensures consistency with national priorities such as NAPA.

## **Introduction to the AF Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy, Dirk Lamberts, Environmental & social Safeguards Expert - Adaptation Fund**

Dirk Lamberts introduced the Environmental and Social Policy (ESP), and Gender Policy (GP) of the Adaptation Fund. The ESP was adopted in 2013, the GP in 2016. Projects were given a grace period to comply with these policies. The ESP reflects a modern way of safeguarding risk, putting more emphasis on evidence-based risk finding. The AF's ESP is 9 pages long, while the World Bank's Environmental and Social framework is much longer. The AF's ESP is not prescriptive, it does not indicate how to apply principles, except that entities must identify risks of negative environmental and social impacts in all project components, and efforts to mitigate these impacts must be commensurate with the risks. All projects need to complete the project application template table to be eligible for funding. The GP is about promoting gender equality. It is very important to consider Gender from the beginning, or else it will be difficult to apply this principle once the project has started. Cost effectiveness, Knowledge Management, the full cost of adaptation reasoning, and the results framework, were all briefly mentioned as key components of any project.

Question: What if only 10 of the 15 principles have been identified?

Response: You can use your own system, but the risks must be identified according to the 15 fundamental principles of the AF ESP. If the entity identifies risks, then impact assessments are required. These impact assessments can be soft (e.g. cultural) and hard (e.g. human rights).

## **Linking accreditation to adaptation action: Ministry of Environment (MoE) AF funded project, Rwanda, Ministry of Environment, Rwanda**

Immaculee Uwimana presented Rwanda's experience linking accreditation to adaptation action through one specific project she detailed:

- The project was a regular one, identified through the needs of local communities suffering from mostly landslides and flood events. The NIE was the MoE with collaboration with the Rwanda Water and Forest Authority (RWFA), amounting to almost 10 million dollars.
- The project outcomes were: reduced flooding and better food security; and diversification of livelihoods and climate resilience.
- Project activities included trainings, relocation of households from high risk areas, the setup of rainwater harvesting tanks, and the supply of cow ruminant and biogas. Several pictures of the project were shared with the audience.
- The people owned the process, so it can be replicable by them in the future.
- There was an intersectoral team: agriculture, water, environment, government, people with knowledge of the local context.
- There was a robust Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system, complementarity with national priorities, understanding of the vulnerability of beneficiaries, and gender balance, throughout the project.

Question: What is the capacity of the community to be autonomous before and after the project, to manage the project without outside help?

Response: The MoE of Rwanda provided vocational training, several assets such as cows, biogas and ruminant, and established a fund to ensure autonomy.

Question: What is the average salary of a public servant in Rwanda, compared to the average revenue of the project beneficiaries?

Response: We don't have precise data, but we would focus more on the impact of the project, i.e. the transfer of technology and techniques and the newly acquired capacities.

Question: What was the role of the private sector?

Response: The private sector provided a selection process through procurement services, houses and buildings and the construction of agricultural terraces.

Question: I see the added value of involving populations in the project. How do you implement all activities on the ground? How do you manage the private sector's role and the Ministry's?

Response: Our activities were/are M&E; with support from local communities and villages, we designed the project; the rest was done with the help of the private sector.

Silvia Mancini added that she wished to applaud the re-accreditation of Rwanda and the success of the project.

Farayi Madziwa explained that the AF always involves civil society in projects. When proposals are submitted to the AF, they are posted on the website, and civil society can provide comments about these proposals. It is very wise to consult with stakeholders and local interested parties, or else they will feel left out.

### **Best practices of stakeholder engagement and consultations in AF related processes in project development, Emmanuel Seck - Enda *Énergie*, Senegal**

Emmanuel Seck, representing Enda *Énergie* and the AF NGO network presented Senegal's experience with the Adaptation Fund, highlighting the importance of M&E and good governance and explaining the following points:

- Senegal was one the first countries to be accredited, through CSE, a responsibility rather than a privilege. CSE wishes for other countries to learn from Senegal's experience.
- There can be instances of bad adaptation, so civil society needs to be consulted in advance. Certain groups and members of civil society may not have the capacity to fully understand project activities and adaptation strategies. In these cases, participation through proper communication is vital. Consultations must be held with direct and indirect stakeholders. All projects are accessible online.
- Emmanuel Seck described a CSE project involving dikes that had been accepted by civil society, because they protected the coast from erosion, improved subsistence and created employment.
- Emmanuel Seck also mentioned a women's community organization, whose main concerns were outlined and honored throughout the project: the rehabilitation of the dikes; awareness of local adaptation issues; capacity building for adaptation to climate change; mainstreaming of climate change issues; and transparency managing funds.

Question: In my country, indigenous people are the most vulnerable, they require special attention. How do you approach these vulnerabilities?

Response: We need to look at the process globally, we need a crucial mass of stakeholders, we shouldn't leave anyone behind. There are different contexts, in Senegal little is said about indigenous people. We complement and complete the State's work in order to be as inclusive as possible.

Farayi Madziwa added that the take home lesson was that it was important to consult women, vulnerable groups, indigenous groups, as they were all tied together.

Question: In certain cultures, there are particularities. For instance, men must be consulted before women. How does the AF respond to this?

Response: This is a valid point. ESP and GP are essentially principles that are very important for the Fund, anyone applying for our funds should adhere to them. The Fund does not impose upon the country, the process is country driven, but the project must adhere to AF policies, even though contexts are different. Gender must be taken into consideration. The entity shouldn't impose, but should try to be creative, for instance by organizing a meeting only with women, then a separate meeting with men. At the end of the day, all groups must be consulted, and ESP and GP must be referenced and respected. There is a compliance document for ESP and GP, it can help you understand policies and refers to cultural contexts.

Immaculee Uwimana (MoE, Rwanda) added that Climate Change affected women more than men, and there is no way to skip gender considerations, we need to know what the needs of women are, without interfering with culture.

### **Understanding adaptation planning and priorities in Central Africa - experience sharing by countries (Group discussion)**

The final session of the workshop involved case studies and an interactive exercise. Farayi Madziwa introduced the topic, explaining that the amount of adaptation finance is limited and finite, and that it was important to identify priorities and maximize current resources.

Participants were split into 3 groups and asked to identify 2 priorities for adaptation in the region/Central Africa:

#### Group 1 responses:

- Water management.
- Management of coastal areas.

#### Group 2 responses:

- Agriculture, for food security, and climate-smart agriculture especially.
- Early warning system, to allow countries to be ready in terms of weather forecasts, for agriculture.
- Management of water resources.

#### Group 3 responses:

- The foundation of climate-smart agriculture is forests, so deforestation and the need to reforest.

- Reducing coastal erosion.
- Access to water. Climate Change imposes the need for a better management of water resources.

Question: Forestry is a mitigation activity, not really an adaptation one?

Response: Yes, but there is adaptation in forestry. However, if an entity submits a project to the AF, it must clearly articulate the adaptation component.

Farayi Madziwa added that when entities prepare proposals, they sometimes subcontract consultants to write up the proposals. While this is acceptable, at times these consultants lack adequate knowledge and familiarity with the AF project life cycle and project guideline documents as they often do not participate in the AF readiness workshops, and so do not always have the information and knowledge the entity receives through such events. It would therefore be beneficial to NIEs to be a lot more involved in the proposal writing process.

### **Interactive exercise: AF project development and addressing requirements of the Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy in projects and programmes**

Dirk Lamberts then outlined the case study exercise, an interactive exercise looking at compliance with ESP and GP during the project development phase. He presented a fictitious case study, involving irrigated agriculture, a dam, a shrinking lake, overfishing and lack of livelihood alternatives, to assess how participants would theoretically comply with ESP. The 3 groups were asked to complete a risk assessment table that presented the 15 principles of the AF's ESP.



Farayi Madziwa concluded the case study by explaining that the 15 principles table was exactly what potential NIEs would see in the formal project application. He added that focal points don't need to be accredited to start proposals, they can start preparing projects in anticipation of being accredited.

## **4. Conclusion**

A participant wished to thank the group for the great workshop, explaining that his country was not waiting to be accredited, and wished to access the funds 'yesterday', highlighting the urgency of the situation.

Silvia Mancini gave closing remarks for the workshop by expressing her happiness/satisfaction with the way the workshop was conducted. She explained that the AF is trying to learn how to help countries adapt to climate change, and the Fund is accessible to all countries in need. The process starts with readiness, then accreditation, then the project phase, when impacts on the ground are really felt. She said the Fund

needed to travel this road together and urged focal points to communicate with the Fund regularly, before a final round of applause officially ended the workshop.

## **ANNEX I: Main expectations of participants**

Following the welcome address, participants were invited to briefly introduce themselves and explain what they expected from the workshop. The main expectations were:

- To understand the accreditation process.
- To obtain clear ideas to access finance from the AF, prepare projects and be accredited.
- To understand specific AF requirements for accreditation, and to get a sense of where they stand now in terms of accreditation.
- To understand obstacles to accreditation, eligibility of projects, complementarity with other donor institutions.
- To explore opportunities for connections between all Central African countries.
- To obtain clear steps to access adaptation finance, accreditation and direct access, stressing that the participant's country suffered every day from the effects of climate change, such as a lack of water in villages and extreme heat.
- To learn about Direct Access.
- To obtain Direct Access, given that certain donors spend a large part of the project funds on administrative expenses, explaining that Direct Access would allow for more funding to reach the countries and territories in need, and mentioning the IPCC's latest study warning that the planet only had 12 years left before extreme climate change impacts. The participant explained that the process of project implementation was too slow given the urgency of the IPCC's latest report.
- To increase knowledge of climate change adaptation in general.
- To accelerate accreditation, given that the participants' country is very shaken by climate change, with many deaths caused by floods, droughts and an overall lack of access to water.
- To understand who manages Direct Access finance once this modality is accessible.
- To learn from other countries' experiences, mentioning a successful plastic ban in the participant's country.
- A participant made a joke about not receiving his luggage, and having to adapt to such a situation, explaining that, thankfully, he was attending an adaptation workshop.

The AF staff mentioned:

- The impressive cleanup efforts of the Ghanaian people at the local beach.
- The recent board meeting of the AF and the successful reaccreditation of Rwanda's Ministry of Environment (MoE).
- The hope that all present countries would be accredited as NIEs next year.
- A summary of expectations regarding Direct Access, explaining the importance of networking and working together to achieve common goals, and encouraging participants to attend the UN climate week activities after the workshop.

## Annex II: List of participants

No.	COUNTRY	NAME	TITLE
1	Burundi	Pascal BARUTWANAYO	National Designated Authority of the Adaptation Fund
2	Burundi	Béatrice BANYANKANGENDA	Office for Environment Protection (OBPE)
3	Cameroon	Francis Dany MATIP NOUGA	Ministry of Environment, Protection of Nature and Sustainable Development - Head of National Designated Authority of the Adaptation Fund
4	Cameroon	François Oben NDIOM	Ministry of Environment, Protection of Nature and Sustainable Development - Assistant of the Head of National Designated Authority
6	CAR	David Melchisedeck YANGBONDO	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development - Director of Climate Finance Mobilization
7	Chad	Fatime OUSMANE DABA	Ministry of Environment, Water and Fisheries National Designated Authority of the Adaptation Fund
8	Chad	Ibrahim Kossi NOURADINE	Fonds Spécial en faveur de l'Environnement - Responsible for Studies, Training and Documentation
9	DRC	Patrick Sholongo OKITAYELA	Ministère de l'Énergie et des Ressources Hydrauliques (UCM) - Climate change specialist
10	DRC	Dieudonné-Athanase Eyul'anki MUSIBONO	Director - Okapi Fund for Nature Conservation in DRC
11	Equatorial Guinea	Pedro Malavo NSENE	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, Forest and Environment - UNFCCC Focal Point
12	Equatorial Guinea	Gabriel NGUA AYECABA	Ministerio de agricultura, Ganaderia, Bosques y Medio Ambiente - Director General de Conservacion de Medio Ambiente
14	Rwanda	Ms Immaculee UWIMANA	Ministry of Environment -Climate Change Adaptation & Mitigation Specialist
15	Sao Tome and Principe	Victor Manuel Do Sacramento BONFIM	Ministry of Infrastructure, Natural Resources and Environment - Director of Nature Conservation, Sanitation and Environment Quality
16	Sao Tome and Principe	Anselmo Xavier FERNANDES	Meteorologist - Instituto Nacional de Meteorologia
17	South Sudan	Manyok Payai JOHN	Ministry of Environment and Forestry - Deputy Director for Climate Change & UNFCCC National Focal Point
18	South Sudan	Joseph Africano BARTEL	Ministry of Environment and Forestry - Undersecretary of Environment
<b>Adaptation Fund</b>			
19	USA-Washington DC	Mr. Farayi Madziwa	Program Officer
20	USA-Washington DC	Ms. Silvia Mancini	Operations Officer
21	USA-Washington DC	Mr. Mourad Shalaby	Consultant - Readiness
22	USA-Washington DC	Ms. Sophie Hans-Moevi	Sr. Program Assistant
23	USA-Washington DC	Mr. Shey Tata	Accreditation Panel Expert
24	Belgium	Mr. Dirk Lamberts	Consultant - Env. and Safeguards Specialist