

Local Project Approval Committee (PAC): “Assisting Least Developed Counties (LDCs) with country-driven processes to advance National Adaptation Plans (NAPs)”

14 June 2013

Participants:

Magdy Martinez-Soliman, Deputy Director, BDP, Chair

Adriana Dinu, Office-in-Charge, and Deputy Executive Coordinator, EEG/GEF, Co-Chair

Steve Gold, Principal Policy and Technical Advisor, EEG/GEF, Green LECRDS

Pradeep Kurukulasuriya, Sr. Technical Advisor- Adaptation, Green LECRDS, EEG/GEF (out-posted in Bangkok)

Dipa Bagai, Team Leader, BDP/Capacity 21/Capacity 2015, Bangkok

Denis Nkala, Regional Coordinator, RBAP

Oksana Leschenko, Programme Specialist, Environmental Focal Point, RBEC

Marianna Gindin, Programme Associate, EEG/GEF,, Green LECRDS

Discussion:

Magdy Martinez-Soliman

- After individual introductions around the table of participants, welcomed the initiative and opened the floor for discussion on the project

Steve Gold

- Thanked everyone for participating and comments and feedback sent in advance of the PAC
- RBA representative indicated that participation would not be possible, but comments would be provided by Wednesday, 19 June 2013
- Provided an overview of the project; its cooperation and institutional coordination in response to the Convention's request

Pradeep Kurukulasuriya

- Explained that this project involves a partnership with several UN Agencies such as UNEP, IFAD, UNITAR, WHO, FAO, etc., as well as other international partners to provide support to LDCs (GIZ, Global Water Partnership)
- UNDP and UNEP, as GEF- Implementing Agencies are taking a lead on providing support to LDCs on their National Adaptation Programmes. The project before the LPAC is one which will be overseen by UNDP-GEF. There is a complimentary project (also for \$1m) that is overseen by UNEP.
- Both initiatives are designed to make available support services to LDC support to get their respective NAP processes started. The UNDP-GEF project that is before the PAC, will enable assistance to be provided in the context of 2 of the 3 outcomes of the overall project design. In particular, the UNDP-GEF project focuses on (a) developing operational and flexible NAP papers

and providing training to LDCs to advance medium- to long-term adaptation planning processes in the context of their national development strategies and (b) developing partnerships (including with regional centres and other organizations) to support LDCs with their NAPs. Financing for the actual NAP preparatory activities within each country will be financed through individual country projects financed by the GEF/LDCF as well as bilaterals.

- Clarified issues raised by Regional Bureaux that pilot country selection will be done by the Board through a selection mechanism that will engage and consult with the Regional Bureaux; this will be a demand driven process that will be built up incrementally over time
- Clarified that the NAP process is one of, if not the most important issue for LDCs currently in the UNFCCC Negotiations, given its relevance to future GCF Funding. The UNFCCC Secretariat has also indicated that it will provide all the necessary support to ensure the programme is a success.

Dipa Bagai

- Welcomed the initiative from capacity building perspective, noting that it has a wide scope with practical solutions, there is demand and need for this kind of work with potential to grow
- This initiative is well positioned to help LDCs and will generate more effective collaboration at the country level
- Very much a demand-driven process

Oksana Leschenko

- Flagged that RBEC does not have any LDCs
- Noted that this initiative has similarities to RBEC's initiatives in Moldova, Kosovo and Turkmenistan
- Followed up on RBEC's written comment/question on source of additional funding to aid countries

Stephen Gold

- Responded to RBEC comments explaining that additional funding will be raised during the life of the project, especially from the GEF-LDCF and other sources as co-financing to the initial LDCF Grant
- Multi-Agency cooperation and collaboration is in place to ensure broad coverage of LDCs from multiple sources of international support

Adriana Dinu

- Added to the discussion that this is a three-tier quality assurance mechanism that is built into GEF signature programmes, whereby the same team assists all global communities of practice on Green Low-Emission Climate Resilient Development Strategies (GLECRDS), sharing technical information

Magdy Martinez-Soliman

- Thanked everyone for their inputs and collaboration
- Pronounced the project “PACed”

Note: RBA provided written comments after the LPAC, which were addressed in writing

Pradeep Kurukulasuriya

- The current discussions in the UNFCCC, especially on long-term financing, has made it clear that public funds alone will not be sufficient to address climate change. Private finance, as well as both international and domestic finance will be required to address the climate change challenge. In most part, available international finance available through current and planned vertical funds (e.g GEF, Green Fund) are designed to channel the additional finance (relative to ODA).
- Project document will clarify which phase of NAPs this Global Project will support (phase 1 or 2 or both)
- **Question:** *Malawi: Malawi intends to develop a NAP, this is already in the new national Climate Change Programme (follow-up on the AAP / old CCP). Malawi has allocated resources for that already, but could clearly need further support, in technical terms, but certainly in resources as well from this project. Malawi is member of the LEG and the Adaptation Committee of the UNFCCC, and is privy to the discussion in there, e.g. the guidelines that have been developed and approved and further guidance from the Malawi members of these committees. Also, we are currently developing a LDCF GEF project on: “Implementing urgent adaptation priorities through strengthened decentralized and national development plans”. This was labelled as the “first NAP” in the CoP-18 in Doha. Malawi could therefore clearly be used in the Project as “front-runner” and example.*
- **Answer:** Correct. Malawi was supported by the UNDP-GEF team to secure approx. \$4m for advancing climate resilient national and sub-national development plans. Malawi is a good example that illustrates the value of the GSP, which is designed to provide top up support to country activities that already have secured resources for in country activities.



Cleared by: Magdy Martinez-Soliman
Deputy Director and PAC Chair

Pradeep Kurukulasuriya

- Provided further information on most recent discussions within the Convention; non-LDCs have also begun a discussion with UNFCCC to develop their NAPs
- It is possible that next year the UNFCCC will also have NAPs for non-LDC countries, which will enable countries in RBEC countries to partake in the programme equally

Denis Nkala

- Pointed out that there is a clear need for these activities
- Project document clearly outlines needs and recipients it will target
- Pointed out the need for consultation with Regional Bureaux on country selection process
- Mentioned that it would perhaps be better to use regular staff rather than consultants to undertake some of the activities outlined in the document
- Rather than focusing on south-south cooperation only, it would be good to broaden it to a triangular-cooperation for full perspective, giving countries a choice of which centre will support its activities and provide advice
- Underlined that the project will have a major impact if delivered successfully

Stephen Gold

- Responded to RBAP comments, assuring that the Regional Bureaux will weigh in to the final decisions taken by the Steering Committee, and will have input in the selection process of the countries
- The project intends to limit the use of consultants and work more closely with institutional capacities across agencies
- Starting point is to use institutional resources before going to hiring consultants

Adriana Dinu

- Supported the country selection process
- Pointed out that LDCF-funded projects cannot use UNDP staff to undertake those activities, as per rules of the Fund (staff time is charged only to fees generated by the project, not activities)
- Noted that this is a flag-ship programme responding directly to LDC-LEG call for action
- This initiative has high profile at the Convention and will be used as global platform for global programming
- Communication will follow: responding to LDC concerns; holding side-events; newsletters, etc.
- Knowledge Management should be central and will attract additional funding and additional LDC to participate in the programme

Stephen Gold

- Pointed out that this Global Support to NAPs is somewhat similar to the NCSP and LECB programmes already under implementation in UNDP/GEF under GLECRDS
- Pointed out that the programme will be implemented under DIM at half the cost of that of doing it through UNOPS

ANNEX: Written Comments

RBA comments to the NAPs project

1. Total resources required: On page 1 the total resources required are provided as approx USD 10.4 million. It is not clear from the ProDoc what this unfunded component is supposed to achieve. Is it feasible that these resources will be mobilised during the two years of the project?

Yes, the plan is to mobilize these funds over the next 2 years. It is feasible given the high political importance the issue of NAPs within the UNFCCC and among donors.

2. Delivery: i) How many and which countries will be the focus of the UNDP support? ii) The budget provided on page 38 shows that the main budget item is consultants. Given that one of the 3 pillars of this LDC project is institutional support, it would be useful to consider how to make use of civil society, think-tanks and academia in the countries of focus, as an alternative to the hiring of consultants.

All LDCs will benefit from this project via a combination of regional consultations/awareness raising/training workshops and a select few that request support will benefit with the provision of more hands on/customized support. The exact number of those who receive customized support will depend on (a) demand and (b) coordination with other Agencies. Demand will be ascertained through a survey and written requests for assistance from the UNFCCC focal point to UNDP or UNEP. These will be shared with the relevant COs. Coordination with other agencies is also important as many are collaborating with UNDP and UNEP on this initiative (UNITAR, WHO, IFAD, FAO etc). These other agencies also have resources that can they can use to provide the necessary support. So the final number of countries that receive dedicated support from the resources overseen by UNDP is not expected to be more than 10, while the number of countries that receive support from the broader partnership that this GSP has created, will be much more.

3. It is uncertain what (LDC) countries could benefit from this Project. If the budget is approx. 2 million, and most of this going to "overhead" and consultants, then what would the intended 12 LD countries benefit? Even if all the funds would go to these countries then this would amount to only USD166,000. And in this case with the sizeable overhead and international consultants costs, there would be very, very little to implement and spend in-country. This ProDOc seems clearly to focus on UNDP and UNEP, but the benefits for the countries clearly need to be better articulated to get these countries interested and on board.

This project is designed to provide assistance to LDCs to get their NAP process started. So it is essentially about the readiness work that needs to be done before the NAP process commences. LDCs can also access finance from the GEF-managed LDCF to finance in-country activities related to the NAPs. So this particular UNDP managed project is designed to finance the chapeau level support to country specific activities. The UNDP managed project, in coordination with a parallel project

managed by UNEP, will enable technical experts to be mobilized to support countries with their preparatory work for getting the NAP process started. As mentioned earlier, country level activities will be financed through additional resources mobilized from the LDCF and various co-financing from bilateral sources.

4. Would it be possible to add a mention to the fact that even though climate change should be integrated into development plans, we need to make sure it is ADDITIONAL financing and registered as such and not counted as ODA?

The current discussions in the UNFCCC, especially on long-term financing, has made it clear that public funds alone will not be sufficient to address climate change. Private finance, as well as both international and domestic finance will be required to address the climate change challenge. In most part, available international finance available through current and planned vertical funds (e.g GEF, Green Fund) are designed to channel the additional finance (relative to ODA).

5. The document is not very clear on how far the project is going with regards to the development of NAPs. It seems that it is aiming at supporting phases 1 and 2 of the NAP processes but this needs to be clarified.

Thank you for the comment. We will clarify this with additional text.

6. Are the NAP papers supposed to be the plans on paper? Or is deliberately unclear to allow for interpretation and flexibility depending on the co-financing mobilised?

Correct. There is a significant political discussion on this topic. It has been deliberately worded like this to ensure flexibility of interpretation. This is important as the NAP process is interpreted differently in each LDC. The project is designed to be flexible to these different interpretations of the NAP process.

7. It doesn't seem that 2 million (in total) would be sufficient to develop 12 NAPs.

As mentioned above, the \$2m is not meant to finance and develop 12 NAPs. It is there to provide technical assistance to countries to get their NAP process started. In essence, it largely focuses on the public goods that can benefit all LDCs, with some customized support to a select number of LDCs that request assistance. The cost of advancing a NAP process in a specific LDC, will need to be estimated based on needs/gaps and relevant activities that are already ongoing and financed separately from the LDCF and other sources of finance.

8. The project board is supposed to meet in August. Will it be only then that the choice of countries will be known?

Correct. A survey of country specific needs is to take place in July and based on that the Board will select the first set of countries to benefit from 1-1 support. As mentioned above, all LDCs will benefit from the project in other ways including through regional workshops.

9. The ProDOc seems to have a focus on Asia? Many of the mentioned concurrent initiatives are in Asia. Please clarify this regional focus.

This is perhaps a manifestation that the co-financing UNDP has articulated in order to secure the financing is largely from initiatives in Asia. However, the project will benefit all LDCs in Africa, Asia, Pacific and Latin America (Haiti). We will make sure this is clarified further in the project document.

10. Malawi: Malawi intends to develop a NAP, this is already in the new national Climate Change Programme (follow-up on the AAP / old CCP). Malawi has allocated resources for that already, but could clearly need further support, in technical terms, but certainly in resources as well from this project. Malawi is member of the LEG and the Adaptation Committee of the UNFCCC, and is privy to the discussion in there, e.g. the guidelines that have been developed and approved and further guidance from the Malawi members of these committees. Also, we are currently developing a LDCF GEF project on: "Implementing urgent adaptation priorities through strengthened decentralized and national development plans". This was labelled as the "first NAP" in the CoP-18 in Doha. Malawi could therefore clearly be used in the Project as "front-runner" and example.

Correct. Malawi was supported by the UNDP-GEF team to secure approx. \$4m for advancing climate resilient national and sub-national development plans. Malawi is a good example that illustrates the value of the GSP, which is designed to provide top up support to country activities that already have secured resources for in country activities.

RBEC Comments:

From: Lene Jespersen

Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2013 3:36 PM

To: Stephen Gold; Marianna Gindin

Cc: Haoliang Xu; Rosemary Kalapurakal; Oksana Leshchenko; Martin Krause

Subject: RBEC comments: Project Appraisal Committee (PAC) meeting-"Assisting Least Developed Countries (LDCs) with country-driven processes to advance National Adaptation Plans (NAPS)", 14 June at 10:00 am to not later than 11:30 am at the BDP Rio Conference Ro

Dear Stephen and Marianna,

Thank you very much for the opportunity to comment on the project "Assisting Least Developed Countries (LDCs) with country-driven processes to advance National Adaptation Plans (NAPS)". Our dear colleagues in BRC have reviewed the project proposal and we have the following comments:

1. Assisting LDCs with their NAP process is a highly opportune and appreciated initiative which should be fully supported.
2. The RBEC region will not benefit directly from this project (as we do not have LDCs), but it would be useful if coordination could be established with initiatives in our region, in particular projects in Moldova, Kosovo and Turkmenistan.
3. What surprises a bit is that 81% of the planned budget is not yet mobilised. On the cover page it's over US10M, and activity-wise the project is also quite big - 12 countries are attempted to be covered. However, the budget allocated is just 19% of the required amount. According to our experience, resource mobilisation takes a lot of time and effort. Are there any specific plans in place to quickly raise USD 8.4m? Moreover, in the budget section of the ProDoc only USD 1.998M is broken down. The results framework matrix includes all 12 countries, which presumably requires USD 10M. So the question is what is the strategy of the project designers to address this issue?
4. There are 9 barriers identified in the document. It is not entirely clear how they all are addressed by the proposed activities which are clustered in 3 components/outcomes. We attach a concept here, which Yegor, from our Central Asia climate risk project that has been developed. May be a similar diagram for this project would help to visualize the project concept (please see attached).
5. Coordination between UNDP and UNEP is most welcomed but could be described a bit more. Comparative advantages are presented but how the synergies are going to be assured is not entirely clear from the document.
6. The project team – comprised of 3 individuals - will cost a significant portion of the entire budget. Very little money will remain for actual activities, unless the USD 8,4m can be mobilized quickly.

Please find also some additional comments in the attached and we also attach the diagram mentioned in point 4.

Hope this is helpful. Kindly also note that we envisaging to be participating in person on Friday.

With best regards,

Lene

RBAP Comments:

From: Denis Nkala

Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2013 1:12 PM

To: Stephen Gold

Cc: Marianna Gindin; Nicholas Rosellini; Gordon Johnson

Subject: Project Appraisal Committee (PAC) meeting-"Assisting Least Developed Countries (LDCs) with country-driven processes to advance National Adaptation Plans (NAPS)", 14 June at 10:00

Dear Stephen

I refer to Magdy's email. I am forwarding our comments for tomorrow's PAC (project specified as in the subject line above).

This is a comprehensively written project document. Given the complex partnership with UNEP and other UN Agencies it is probably worth the while to expound the project concept, strategy and implementation arrangements. This is well done.

As a project that targets the capacity gaps in LDCs, responding to intergovernmental processes to help LDCs fill in these gaps, the justification for the project is strong.

It is noteworthy as well that the project took into account some of the core development issues in UNDP including sharing knowledge, deriving and putting lessons learnt to use in project design, reflecting on sustainability (ownership) and analysing risk factors. We have noted that the project has taken stock of existing projects in Asia and Pacific in the project design. Furthermore, the project is in synch with the UNDP's intergrational strategy with strong links with poverty, national planning and disaster risk mitigation.

We also take note of the selection criteria which the Board will use to select participating countries and the assurance of a balanced selection. We think that the criteria to be used could be further explored even though the Board will likely review it.

The results to be achieved are very clear. Therefore it seems that the project document writers have given a fairly strong guidance for implementers to achieve success. The comments for improvement are mostly on the process. A substantial amount of resources are budgeted for consultancies. An option may be to look beyond knowledge exchanges only for the South-South Cooperation as envisaged in the prodoc and replace some of the consultancies by practicing staff from partner countries. Within these concepts, I note the repeated phraseology of South-South and North-South cooperation. Instead of North South-Cooperation, triangular cooperation would be more pertinent where the UN agencies may facilitate practicing staff to provide services rather than consultants. The countries would select from which country their advice should come from and the project can facilitate that.

Approval of the project document is recommended.

Denis Nkala

