



## ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/EFC.29/8  
7 April 2022

---

### **ADAPTATION FUND BOARD**

Ethics and Finance Committee

Twenty-ninth meeting

Bonn, Germany, and online, 5–6 April 2022

### **REPORT OF THE TWENTY-NINTH MEETING OF THE ETHICS AND FINANCE COMMITTEE**

#### **Agenda Item 1: Opening of the meeting**

1. The incoming Chair of the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC), Mr. Mattias Broman (Sweden, Western Europe and Others Group), opened the meeting and greeted the participants at 1:15 p.m. (Central European Time (UTC+1)) on 5 April 2022.

#### **Agenda Item 2: Transition of the Chair and Vice-Chair**

2. Mr. Broman took over as the Chair of the EFC. There was no Vice-Chair for the meeting as a new Vice-Chair of the EFC had not yet been elected by the Adaptation Fund Board.

#### **Agenda Item 3: Organizational matters**

##### *a) Adoption of the agenda*

3. The EFC adopted the following agenda for its twenty-ninth meeting on the basis of the provisional agenda (AFB/EFC.29/1/Rev.2):

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Transition of the Chair and Vice-Chair.
3. Organizational matters:
  - a) Adoption of the agenda;
  - b) Organization of work.
4. Financial issues:

- a) Financial status of the Trust Fund and CER monetization;
  - b) Work plan of the Board and Secretariat for the fiscal year 2023;
  - c) Administrative budget of the Board and Secretariat, and Trustee for fiscal year 2023, and the Adaptation Fund Technical Evaluation Reference Group and its secretariat for fiscal years 2023–2024;
  - d) Fiscal years 2023–2024 update to the work programme of the Adaptation Fund Technical Evaluation Reference Group.
5. Report of the Chair of the Adaptation Fund Technical Evaluation Reference Group:
    - a) Draft evaluation policy of the Adaptation Fund;
    - b) Information update on phase I of the thematic evaluation of innovation;
    - c) Progress update on ex-post evaluations and emerging lessons from phase 2 (ongoing).
  6. Other matters.
  7. Adoption of the recommendations and report.
  8. Closure of the meeting.
4. The EFC agreed to add, under other matters, a presentation on the European Union contribution to the Fund, to be made by a representative of the European Commission.

*b) Organization of work*

5. The Chair welcomed the following newly elected members, congratulated them, noting that they would be required to sign the written oath of service as mandated by the rules of procedure of the AFB:

- Mr. Washington Zhakata (Zimbabwe, Africa)
- Mr. Ali Mohammed (Somalia, Africa)
- Ms. Sohee Gwag (Republic of Korea, Asia-Pacific)
- Ms. Joanna Milwicz vel Delach (Poland, Eastern Europe)
- Mr. Wenceslao Carrera Doral (Cuba, Latin America and the Caribbean)
- Mr. Antonio Navarra (Italy, Western Europe and Others Group)
- Mr. Kevin Adams (United States of America, Annex I Parties)
- Mr. Michai Robertson (Antigua and Barbuda, Small Island Developing States)

6. The EFC adopted the organization of work proposed by the Chair based on the provisional timetable set out in the annotated provisional agenda (AFB/EFC.29/2/Rev.1).

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

agenda of the current meeting. He also drew attention to the Board's code of conduct and zero tolerance policy, which were available on the website of the Fund. No conflicts of interest were declared.

#### **Agenda Item 4: Financial issues**

##### *a) Financial status of the Trust Fund and CER monetization*

8. A representative of the trustee presented the Adaptation Fund Trust Fund financial report prepared by the trustee as at 31 December 2021 (AFB/EFC.29/3). At 31 December 2021, funds available for new decisions had amounted to US\$ 271.5 million, net of the operational reserve, with an additional US\$ 48.3 million in donations receivable and US\$ 243 million in the form of pledges, for a total of US\$ 562.8 million in potential funding availability. The trustee's latest report, along with its previous reports for the Fund, was available on the trustee's website.<sup>1</sup>

9. A second representative of the trustee provided an update on the CER market and CER monetization. As at 4 April 2022, the trustee had generated revenues of US\$ 211.6 million through the sale of 32.9 million tons of CERs since the start of the monetization programme in 2009, at an average price of US\$ 6.4 per ton. Since the beginning of fiscal year 2022, 1.9 million tons of CERs had been sold at an average price of US\$ 1.70 per ton, for proceeds of US\$ 3.1 million. In the coming months, the trustee would continue to focus on over-the-counter transactions as the most viable and cost-effective way to sell CERs for the Fund, and specifically on low-carbon compliance schemes, such as the carbon tax, and the climate neutrality drive in both public and private entities. The trustee would also be paying attention to developments under the Paris Agreement in terms of a potential carbon trading mechanism and the implications for the Fund.

10. Subsequently, responding to questions from EFC members, he specified that CER demand from the carbon neutral drive was much broader than the demand from low-carbon compliance schemes, and tended to result in year-end sales, resulting in a degree of seasonality. He also acknowledged a request to show the inflows of CERs into the Fund in future reports, and clarified that the trustee did not have a target CER balance, rather aiming to sell all the CERs it could. Only the more recent CERs could be monetized through current demand, however; the mechanism for monetizing the older CERs, which represented the bulk of the Fund's CER holdings, no longer existed. In terms of expectations for carbon assets under the Paris Agreement, they were expected to be very different from CERs; each country would develop their own means of achieving their climate target and thus their own carbon assets, and it remained to be seen how those might be converted into international assets.

11. The manager of the secretariat addressed questions regarding the relatively high level of funding availability for Board allocations, acknowledging the substantially higher level of contributions and pledges arising from the Glasgow climate change conference but noting that the recent lifting of the Adaptation Fund country cap to US\$ 20 million and the steady increase in

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://fiftrustee.worldbank.org/en/about/unit/dfi/fiftrustee/fund-detail/adapt>.

the number of implementing entities could be expected to lead to a substantial increase in programming.

12. The Ethics and Finance Committee took note of the trustee's report (AFB/EFC.29/3).

*b) Work plan of the Board and secretariat for the fiscal year 2023*

13. Introducing the item, the Manager of the secretariat drew attention to document AFB/EFC.29/4 and proceeded to describe the actions taken to implement the work plan for fiscal year 2022. He highlighted the fact that the 2022 work plan had been prepared at a time when cases of coronavirus disease (COVID-19) were receding and vaccines were becoming available, leading to an expectation that normal modes of operation would resume. Although that had not turned out to be the case, notably due to the emergence of a new variant of the disease late in the year, the situation had since improved and the 2023 work plan had been developed based on the assumption that the secretariat would return to a normal mode of operation in fiscal year 2023. He then presented the proposed work plan for fiscal year 2023, as set out in annex I to the document.

14. Following his presentation, he responded to questions and comments from EFC members. Regarding how the Fund's projects were being scaled up by other funds, he noted that relevant communication materials were currently being developed and would be presented to the Board when ready but specified that the Green Climate Fund (GCF) in particular was scaling up projects from the Fund's portfolio. The secretariat's knowledge management team was also conducting a study on the scalability of Fund projects, expected to be completed by late June 2022. He further noted that the Board had a standing agenda item on coordination with GCF but allowed that it would be a good idea to report on coherence and complementarity with other funds annually in the future, in particular given that it was a crosscutting element of the current medium-term strategy, as was gender.

15. Asked why the secretariat had only undertaken two virtual project monitoring missions in 2021, he specified that "virtual" should really be understood to be "hybrid", as the national implementing entity organized many on-site activities in the context of a mission. Even when in hybrid format, missions involved considerable work and took time to organize and conduct, and there was a limit to how many could be performed.

16. The Manager also spoke about the readiness programme, being the Fund's main mechanism for addressing barriers faced by developing countries in accessing the Fund's resources. In normal times, the secretariat had organized events regionally and sometimes sub-regionally to raise implementing entities' awareness of what to expect from the Fund and to provide training. During the pandemic, online training courses on how to access resources had been made available in English, French and Spanish and had been very well received, leading to the production of similar training modules on accessing innovation funding. Online training was also available on the accreditation process, which was recognized as an important challenge for entities wishing to access the Fund's resources.

17. Finally, the Manager confirmed that gender training for Board members had been delayed by the pandemic but was still planned for the near future.

18. The Ethics and Finance Committee recommended that the Adaptation Fund Board approve the secretariat's proposed work plan for fiscal year 2023, as set out in annex I to document AFB/EFC.29/4.

**(Recommendation EFC.29/1)**

*c) Administrative budgets of the Board and secretariat and the trustee for fiscal year 2023 and the Adaptation Fund Technical Evaluation Reference Group and its secretariat for fiscal years 2023–2024*

19. Presenting the administrative budget of the Board and secretariat for fiscal 2023 (AFB/EFC.29/5, pages 3–15), a representative of the secretariat began by outlining the current spending estimates for fiscal year 2022 in comparison to the 2022 approved budget. The Manager of the secretariat then described the impact of COVID-19 and the implications of the World Bank trust fund reforms for the 2023 budget, as well as the continuing changes in staffing needs, before returning the floor to the representative of the secretariat for a presentation of the 2023 budget itself.

20. Next, a representative of the AF-TERG secretariat presented the administrative budget for the AF-TERG and its secretariat for fiscal years 2023 and 2024 (AFB/EFC.29/5, pages 16–20) and a representative of the trustee presented the trustee's estimated actual figures for fiscal year 2022 and the budget for fiscal year 2023 (AFB/EFC.29/5, pages 21–22).

21. During the ensuing discussion, several members highlighted the importance of the readiness programme and questioned the adequacy of the allocated budget. The Manager of the secretariat pointed out that the proposed budget reflected the readiness work programme, which was quite labour intensive; in some previous years the secretariat had been overly optimistic about what it was able to achieve. The budget also reflected the number of staff working on the programme, as well as the secretariat's understanding of how the Board wished to allocate resources, although the budget could be increased if the Board so wished. He also noted, however, that the Fund benefited from readiness work done by other funds, in particular GCF.

22. Questions were also raised regarding the World Bank trust fund reforms and the potential impact on the Fund's expenses. The Manager confirmed that the budget proposal did not take the reforms into account; the impact of the reforms was currently unclear due to ongoing negotiations. The representative of the secretariat added that the current practice was to pay for specific services used, but the World Bank had determined that the costs for other, more general services were not being recovered. The secretariat, together with the Global Environment Facility secretariat, was currently reviewing the services used in the context of the ongoing negotiations with the World Bank and would have a better idea of the cost implications later in the year.

23. Members voiced general support for the proposed increases in staffing, noting that the Fund still compared well with other funds in terms of number of staff relative to fund size. The Manager pointed out that salaries of individual staff members could not be disclosed, as they were considered confidential under the World Bank's policy on access to information, but assured the EFC that they were in line with the bank's salary structure.

24. Several suggestions were made regarding new senior staff members. The Manager of the secretariat welcomed suggestions regarding the hiring of an innovation specialist with a clear mandate while also noting that the secretariat already worked with outside organizations specializing in innovation. He also confirmed that the current secretariat staff had existing capacities in the areas of environmental and social safeguards, gender and indigenous peoples. He informed the EFC that of the 14 full time secretariat staff members funded by the Fund, 7 were from developed countries and 7 from developing countries, and confirmed that while staff were primarily recruited based on their skills, diversity was an important factor. The exception was the Junior Professional Officer appointment, which fell under the World Bank's donor-funded staffing programme, where positions generally needed to be filled by a national of the sponsoring country.

25. Having considered the proposed budgets set out in document AFB/EFC.28/5, the Ethics and Finance Committee recommended that the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board):

(a) Approve, from the resources available in the Adaptation Fund Trust Fund:

(Board and secretariat)

(i) The proposed budget of US\$ 7,932,406 to cover the costs of the operations of the Board and secretariat for the period from 1 July 2022 to 30 June 2023, comprising US\$ 6,616,656 for Board and secretariat administrative services (the main secretariat budget), US\$ 567,050 for accreditation services and US\$ 748,700 for the readiness programme;

(Technical Evaluation Reference Group of the Adaptation Fund and secretariat)

(ii) The proposed revised budget of US\$ 1,329,965 to cover the costs of the operations of the Technical Evaluation Reference Group of the Adaptation Fund (AF-TERG) and its secretariat for fiscal year 2023, covering the period from 1 July 2022 to 30 June 2023, comprising US\$ 691,496 for the management component and US\$ 638,469 for the evaluation component (the resulting increase of US\$ 36,916 over the originally approved AF-TERG budget for fiscal year 2023 consisted of a carry-over of US\$ 60,000 from fiscal year 2022 and a net decrease of US\$ 23,084 for fiscal year 2023 that required an additional transfer from the trust fund);

(iii) The proposed budget of US\$ 1,336,413 to cover the costs of the operations of the AF-TERG and its secretariat for fiscal year 2024, covering the period from 1 July 2023 to 30 June 2024, comprising US\$ 705,684 for the management component and US\$ 630,729 for the evaluation component;

(Trustee)

(iv) The proposed increase of US\$ 6,000 in the trustee budget for fiscal year 2022;

(v) The proposed budget of US\$ 878,500 for the trustee services to be provided to the Adaptation Fund during fiscal year 2023;

(b) Authorize the trustee to transfer the amounts in subparagraphs (a) (i), (ii) and (iii) to the respective secretariats, and the amounts in subparagraphs (a) (iv) and (v) to the trustee.

**(Recommendation EFC.29/2)**

*d) Fiscal years 2023–2024 update to the work programme of the Adaptation Fund  
Technical Evaluation Reference Group*

26. Introducing the sub-item, the Chair of the AF-TERG recalled that group was currently completing the second year of its approved three-year work programme spanning the period 1 July 2020 to 30 June 2023, and said that it was clear that certain elements of the programme would extend beyond the end of the work programme period, in part due to delays in ongoing evaluation activities attributable to COVID-19. In addition, the draft evaluation policy to be presented at the current meeting, if approved, would have implications for the group's forward work programme. Furthermore, the group had identified thematic evaluation work that would feed into the overall performance evaluation of the Fund, originally planned for fiscal 2023 but now shifted to fiscal 2024 to allow sufficient evidence to be gathered and align with the development of the Fund's next medium-term strategy. Noting that an update to the work programme for the 2022 fiscal year was provided in information document AFB/EFC.29/Inf.2, she presented an update of the current AF-TERG work programme for fiscal 2023 and the adjusted timelines for elements of the work that would extend into fiscal 2024 (AFB/EFC.29/7).

27. Following her presentation, she provided additional information in response to questions and comments from EFC members. Regarding the possibility of aggregating the results of the various types of evaluation, she explained that evaluations at various levels were deliberately aimed at drawing lessons from the different levels, with ex-post evaluations providing information on sustainability of results at the project level, for instance, and thematic evaluations indicating how the Fund responded to certain issues compared to other funds. To date, the topics for thematic evaluations had been selected through consultation with internal and external stakeholders, including the secretariat and Board members, but she allowed that, in developing its next work programme, the AF-TERG could seek the Board's guidance more expansively on what the thematic priorities should be. She also confirmed that work elements feeding into the overall performance evaluation would be timed to provide input for the next medium-term strategy.

28. The Manager of the secretariat added that cooperation between the secretariat and the AF-TERG worked very well, with the two entities benefiting from a co-creation mentality.

29. The Ethics and Finance Committee recommended that the Adaptation Fund Board approve the updated work programme of the Adaptation Fund Technical Evaluation Reference Group for fiscal years 2023–2024 as set out in document AFB/EFC.29/7.

**(Recommendation EFC.29/3)**

**Agenda Item 5: Report of the Chair of the Adaptation Fund Technical Evaluation Reference Group**

*a) Draft evaluation policy of the Adaptation Fund*

30. Introducing the sub-item, the Chair of the AF-TERG recalled that the findings of a review of the Fund's existing evaluation framework had been presented to the EFC in March 2021. On the basis of those findings, the Board had requested the AF-TERG to prepare a draft evaluation policy for the Adaptation Fund to replace the existing evaluation framework. Together with another member of the AF-TERG, she then presented the draft evaluation policy for the Adaptation Fund as developed by the AF-TERG (AFB/EFC.29/6, annex I), including the next steps proposed by the AF-TERG.

31. Following the AF-TERG presentation, a member of the EFC, Ms. Naima Oumoussa (Morocco, Non-Annex I Parties), who had served on the advisory group for the evaluation policy during the intersessional period, spoke about the work undertaken to develop the policy. In particular, the Advisory Group (EPAG) which she was part of as a Board member, ensured that the process was highly inclusive and made sure views and ideas from all perspectives were taken into consideration. The EPAG also made sure that the policy would contribute to efforts to keep track of the progress made to achieve the Global Goal on Adaptation (GGA) established under the Paris Agreement. That progress should feed into the global stocktake set under the Paris Agreement to take place in a cyclic manner each five years starting from 2023. So, taking this into account the policy will enable the Adaptation Fund to make a significant tangible contribution to international efforts. The advisory group had also discussed the challenges and potential implications, especially budget implications, of the policy implementation, but had not wanted those challenges to limit the policy's ambition. In the group's view, the capacity that to be built in preparing the ground for the policy implementation, is focusing on real-time learnings and on the harmonization of existing monitoring and evaluation systems, would create synergies that would help rationalize the resources in the future.

32. Members welcomed the proposed policy and engaged in a robust discussion on the policy and its implications. Aspects highlighted during the discussion as being of particular importance included: communications, including clear articulation of who was responsible for communicating evaluation findings and lessons; a strong focus on and support for capacity-building; the importance of all the criteria presented and a desire to avoid presenting them as merely optional; the Board's responsibility for how the evaluation findings were utilized and its engagement with the secretariat's management response and a subsequent action plan; the implications of the policy for implementing entities; the budget implications of the policy at all levels; and inclusion of

conflict-sensitivity among the evaluation criteria. A number of amendments to the draft policy were proposed to address some of the issues raised.

33. Responding to comments and questions, members of the AF-TERG emphasized that the intention was not to compare implementing entity performance but rather to enable learning and strengthen performance. The implementing entities would perform the evaluations themselves and would be required to justify setting aside any of the criteria listed in the policy. The AF-TERG would cover the specifics of policy implementation in the guidance documents to be prepared as part of the proposed next steps, and would take the comments made at the current meeting into account when developing the guidance.

34. The Manager of the secretariat also responded to members' comments and question, noting that the draft policy appeared to reflect the Board's intentions when it established the AF-TERG. That said, the AF-TERG had evolved since it was established, and as a procedural matter it might be useful to verify at some stage whether its work remained in line with how the Board viewed the Fund's evaluation function. With regard to evaluating the governance of the Fund, he noted that the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol also reviewed the Fund's governance.

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

- (a) Approve the draft evaluation policy of the Adaptation Fund (the Fund) set out in annex 1 to document AFB/EFC.29/6/Rev.1, as amended by the Board, as the Adaptation Fund's evaluation policy, which shall not prejudice the Board's future consideration of the budget implications of the implementation of the evaluation policy;
- (b) Request the Adaptation Fund Technical Evaluation Reference Group (AF-TERG) to work in consultation with the secretariat to introduce the Adaptation Fund's evaluation policy to the Fund's stakeholders;
- (c) Request the AF-TERG to develop, in consultation with the secretariat, evaluation guidance documents for the implementation of the Adaptation Fund's evaluation policy, including budget implications, and to submit them to the EFC for consideration at its thirty-first meeting.

**(Recommendation EFC.29/4)**

*b) Information update on phase I of the thematic evaluation of innovation*

36. Introducing the sub-item, the chair of the AF-TERG recalled that the thematic evaluation on innovation had a strong focus on learning, aiming to bring lessons into the Fund from other institutions that were supporting innovation for development, as well as from inside the Fund's strategy and operations. The evaluation work was organized in three phases: the findings for

phase one, which had just ended, were set out in an information document (AFB/EFC.29/ Inf.3, annex I), which she proceeded to present.

37. Members welcomed the update and underscored the relevance of the evaluation. In their comments, they highlighted aspects of particular interest that included non-financial support for innovation; differentiation between concrete and systemic innovation; and risk appetite in terms of funding riskier new projects that could have a higher impact. One member also noted that the focus in terms of the role of the government appeared to be limited to de-risking and creating an enabling environment for innovation, while the role of government extended beyond that, to such things as investments in basic research and development.

38. Responding to questions, the Chair of the AF-TERG said that the evaluation report was due in June 2022 and would therefore feed into the development of the medium-term strategy. In terms of the questions to be asked in phase two of the evaluation, she said that the evaluation team had noticed that results and measurement frameworks lacked indicators for innovation and would look further at that aspect, in terms of implications for the Fund and for broader evidence of how innovation was changing pathways for the future. That evidence would also feed into the overall performance evaluation of the Fund.

39. The Ethics and Finance Committee took note of the AF-TERG report on phase I of the evaluation of innovation, as set out in annex I to document AFB/EFC.29/ Inf.3.

*c) Progress update on ex-post evaluations and emerging lessons from phase 2 (ongoing)*

40. The Chair of the AF-TERG presented an update on phase 2 of the work by the AF-TERG on ex-post evaluations (AFB/EFC.29/Inf.4), which was still ongoing.

41. Subsequently, she acknowledged comments by EFC members regarding digitization of project data, ensuring the AF-TERG's independence with respect to communication of findings and taking the evolving nature of climate risks into consideration when conducting ex-post evaluations.

42. Responding to a query on whether training would be made available, the Chair of the AF-TERG said that while the evaluation method was currently being piloted, local people would eventually be trained to do the evaluations. In addition, phase 3 of the work would include looking at training that could be applied more widely, including on generic topics.

43. The Ethics and Finance Committee took note of the update on phase 2 of the ex-post evaluation work being done by the AF-TERG, as set out in document AFB/EFC.29/Inf.4.

## **Agenda Item 6: Other matters**

### *Presentation on the European Union contribution to the Fund*

44. Representatives of the European Commission made a brief presentation on the status of preparations for the disbursement of the € 100 million contribution pledged by the European Union at the Glasgow climate change conference in late 2021, for the information of EFC members.

45. During their presentation, and subsequently in response to EFC members' comments and questions, they stressed that their presentation was being made in the interest of transparency and not as a result of any concerns regarding the Fund or its mode of operation. The legal aspects of the € 100 million contribution were regulated by the European Union's financial regulations, which currently lacked specific financial tools for contributing to a global initiative. In order to align with the financial regulations, it was necessary to first understand, among other things, how the funds were spent, how information on suspected fraud was handled and what happened to unused project funds recovered by the Adaptation Fund; European Commission legal department staff had been engaging in fruitful discussion with the secretariat on such matters.

46. During the discussion, it was noted that the European Union had previously pledged € 10 million to the Fund but had faced the same constraints to operationalizing its contribution; due to timing issues, it had instead channelled the funds through the United Nations Development Programme, which had then applied them to programmes and projects it was implementing on behalf of the Adaptation Fund.

47. One member suggested that the way the Fund managed its contributors be discussed at a future meeting, and asked whether legal agreements with contributors are posted on the Fund's website.

48. The Ethics and Finance Committee took note of the information provided by the representatives of the European Commission.

## **Agenda Item 7: Adoption of the recommendations and report**

49. The EFC adopted the recommendations in the present report at its twenty-ninth meeting and agreed to entrust the preparation of the report to the secretariat for later adoption. The present report was subsequently adopted by the EFC intersessionally.

## **Agenda Item 8: Closure of the meeting**

50. The meeting closed at 5.45 p.m. (Central European Time (UTC+1)) on 6 April 2022.

## **ANNEX**

### **Ethics and Finance Committee Twenty-ninth meeting Bonn, Germany, and online, 5 and 6 April 2022**

#### **EFC members present in the meeting**

Mr. Washington ZHAKATA (Zimbabwe, Africa)

Mr. Ali MOHAMMED (Somalia, Africa)

Ms. Sohee GWAG (Republic of Korea, Asia-Pacific)

Ms. Sheyda Nematollahi SARVESTANI (Islamic Republic of Iran, Asia-Pacific)

Ms. Joanna MILWICZ VEL DELACH (Poland, Eastern Europe)

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

Ms. Mariana KASPRZYK (Uruguay, Latin America and the Caribbean)

Mr. Michai ROBERTSON (Antigua and Barbuda, Small Island Developing States)

Mr. Idy NIANG (Senegal, Least Developed Countries)

Mr. Antonio NAVARRA (Italy, Western Europe and Others Group)

Mr. Matthias BACHMANN (Switzerland, Annex I Parties)

Mr. Mattias BROMAN (Sweden, Western Europe and Others Group)

Mr. Kevin ADAMS (United States of America, Annex I Parties)

Mr. Ali Waqas MALIK (Pakistan, Non-Annex I Parties)

Ms. Naima OUMOUSA (Morocco, Non-Annex I Parties)