



Meeting Minutes of National Coordinating Body

Date	22 September 2016, Thursday
Time & Place	(Main Meeting Room, UNDP, Aage 5 th Floor, Malé)
Attendees (7 members)	Moosa Zameer Hassan, Ahmed Shifaz, Mizna Mohamed, Aishath Hudha Ahmed, Ali Rilwan, Ilham Altho Mohamed, Fathimath Shadiya, Abdullah Adam (MFF), Shaha Shakeeb (GEF SGP and MFF)
No.	48

Since the Chairman Naeem and Assisting Chairman Sinan was unable to attend the meeting, Zameer was appointed to be the Chair of this meeting.

1. Introduction and Welcoming the New NCB Members.

- 1. A new representative from MNU, Fathimath Shadiya joined the meeting. NCB expressed that it is very important to have an MNU representative in the NCB.
- 2. Mizna joined the NCB as a representative from ENDEVOR, NGO. She previously sat in the NCB as a representative from MNU.

2. Decision on Cycle 5, MFF Concepts.

 It was decided in the 46th NCB Meeting to evaluate the proposals and decide on the quality to be awarded based on the quality of the proposals received. Moreover, it was also decided to make a call for concept simultaneously. The call has already been announced and the concepts are due on 5th of October 2016.

2. Proposal One: HIDS

- 3. The proposal is on awareness and solid waste collection through distribution of dustbins and organizing collection
- 4. The grantee has also have proposed to use environmentally friendly vehicle for collection purposes.
- 5. However, NCB highlighted that contributing to conservation of mangroves and wetland areas in the island was mentioned as an objective of the proposal and the project can contribute to this as currently the wetlands are used as dumpsites. However, the project does not have any activities to clean up or conserve the wetland hence a suggestion was made to include wetland clean up as a project activity to be covered by in kind contributions.
- 6. It was also discussed that since about 76% of the project funds is budgeted to be utilized for equipment and hard components, to request the grantee to revise the proposal and budget = to fit with the SGF guidelines.
- 7. The budget summarized version is in MVR and the detailed one is in USD. The detail version needs to be in MVR as well.
- 8. Moreover, there are too many activities and too many focal areas. Good idea to focus on specific and bare minimum needed to establish a running mechanism in both the islands.
- 9. Overall the NCB saw this as a good proposal and decide to approve the proposal for funding conditionally and to request the grantee to revise the scope of the grant.





10. Proposal Two: KOLAMAA

- 11. The project focuses on building awareness of the community for establishing good waste management practices. While this is an essential element awareness alone cannot lead to a proper functioning waste management system
- 12. Without a focus on other elements of a proper waste management system such as bringing in about the governance mechanism and basic infrastructure and equipment the proposed activities might not lead to long lasting results
- 13. The proposal requires more research and to reflect on the successes and incorporate additional elements seen in other local communities with successful waste management models/practices
- 14. When designing a project of this nature existing awareness and resource material produced from other projects of this nature can be utilized in the project activities
- 15. The limited infrastructure in the target community might prove it increasingly challenging for the project to be sustainable in the long run
- 16. On a more general note, it was discussed in NCB that since so many proposals and concepts focus on awareness, to have standard materials for awareness, which can be utilized by future projects
- 17. It was suggested by NCB to put this to the grant committee in UNDP and collect samples of the various awareness materials produced over time in various projects.
- 18. And to have a standard pack to awareness and use this with certain modifications.

3. Comment on Questionnaire – National Progress on MFF Sustainability Planning, Support of the Development of a Sustainability Strategy for MFF.

- 1. What decisions have been made regarding transforming your NCB s into a permanent national coastal management body, or equivalent institutionalized governance body?
 - There are certain hesitations and issues if NCB was to function as a national or regional body. This was discussed at length in the 41st NCB meeting and documented in the meeting minutes
 - As discussed in the 41st NCB meeting the NCB might lose its uniqueness and autonomy if becomes a national body. Sustaining regional bodies has been very problematic based on past experiences hence the most appropriate option would for NCB to remain as is and seek opportunities within UNDP and government to function.
 - It was highlighted by the member representing UNDP in the board that UNDP is seeking a board to render services such as the NCB board for its small grant programmes. However, UNDP is looking for a single board that has members from the National Steering Committee which is the NCB equivalent for the GEF Small Grants Programme. NCB discussed that being a board for future Small Grants by UNDP might be one way for it to remain relevant and sustain its functions
 - It was also discussed that the board then do not have to be limited coastal management only. Although by definition all issues in Maldives would fit under coastal management, since coastal management given its unique geography and set up.





2. What process and milestones for institutionalizing the work of the NCB is being followed? The steps being taken should include concrete actions to align the NSAP more effectively with national policies and to seek its official endorsement.

MFF mechanism is already being utilized by the LECReD Small grant programmes. NCB provides technical assistance as well and is also evaluating proposals and making decisions for the LECReD Small Grants programme. The NCB plans to remain as is and to seek opportunities of this nature in the future

- 3. What will be the status and role of the transformed, permanent NCB or NCB-like structure?
 - What are its membership, Terms of Reference and operational procedures expected to be?

The Terms of Reference would only change to reflect the additional arrangements needed for available opportunities. Otherwise it would remain the same

- What sources of financing to support the work of the transformed NCB have been identified?
 Private Sector Grants of UNDP
- What will its reporting procedures be?
- 4. What concrete mechanisms for productive engagement by MFF with the Private Sector have been decided?

No concrete decisions have been taken but it was decided to explore opportunities such as mission disposal funds such as Canadian and EU funds

5. What practical linkages to other national and regional organizations and programmes/projects have been made, or are planned to be made?

The LECReD Project set up. Services to be rendered to any programme or organisation seeking services of the nature.

To explore opportunities within UNDP Maldives further

- 6. What steps have been taken, or will definitely be taken, to attract external funding to support future projects?
 - External funding, or at least co-financing of Small Grant Projects, based on the MFF Project Guidelines?
 - CSR and related avenues from the private sector.
 - External funding of larger national or bilateral projects that broadly support MFF's objectives?

Danish and japan funds. US aids.

• Research funding, and research-based knowledge, which could be applied to support MFF's sustainability objectives.





- 7. With reference to a Sustainability Strategy for MFF, what initiatives and mechanisms have been, or will be developed at national level, to support:
 - The Knowledge Management & Communication (KMC) Strategy of MFF; and

Local level platform to share knowledge and to utilise the materials developed through the grant projects thus far

- Adaptation of the MFF Regional ICM Course into national university and other in-country training programmes?
 Maldives National University has expressed interest in this. The Faculty of Science is willing to undertake this. The MFF NC now has to further pursue this with the university with the NCB representative of MNU
- 8. What other key attributes of the MFF programme have been, or will be integrated into national planning and policy development; and how will this be achieved? These include: resilience analysis, ecosystem-based management, climate change adaptation, co-management, gender mainstreaming and the rights-based approach.

The grants evaluated and contributed by NCB will continue to influence policy decisions for example an on ongoing small grant project of MFF has led to the revision of architectural drawings of waste management centres used by Ministry of Environment and Energy.

9. What contact and discussions have NCB members had with their national representatives for GEF and for national and regional Climate Change initiatives, including their National Designated Authority for the Green Climate Fund (GCF)?

The focal point for GEF and GCF sits within Ministry of Environment and Energy (MEE). NCB has a representative from MEE and NCB Chairman represents Environmental Protection Agency who closely works with MEE. Suffice to say that synergies had been created but no discussion regarding funding opportunities had been held.

10. What scope for active cooperation between MFF and the GEF, and between MFF and the GCF or other climate change initiatives, has been identified; and how will the opportunities identified be taken forward in support of MFF Sustainability?

No discussions had been held to yet but discussions can be contacted by the Chairman and well as the Ministry of Environment and Energy (MEE) representative in the NCB since all focal points are based in MEE





4. Discussion on the MFF Focal Area for the next cycle.

- 1. For the 2017, it seems that MFF would be getting funding for Cycle 6.
- 2. It was decided to see that geographical areas which have already been covered, to compile this list and share with the NCB and base this decision on elimination of existing projects by UNDP and government
- 3. It was discussed that in H. Dh and H. Alif Atoll, there are no ongoing projects and focus had being rather low.
- 5. Comment on Terms of Reference for a local consultant to undertake a study of the challenges faced by island communities / council implementing good waste management practices (Waste Study)
 - 1. A ToR for the waste study had been drafted to undertake the waste study activity in the MFF Work Plan
 - 2. The activity was proposed after the recent MLE mission compromised of Senior Operations Manager from MFF Secretariat and two NCB members
 - 3. It was discussed that the observations of the MLE mission highlighted that there are several challenges with the waste management model in local islands which are known for its good waste management practices. These models are being replicated other islands through Small Grants and through government funding without addressing the challenges. These challenges are however complex and need to be backed by evidence in order for it be taken up as recommendation
 - 4. Shifaz has already commented on the ToR which has being incorporated
 - 5. The funds for this activity is USD 2000. However, an additional USD 3000 had been sourced from UNDP Core funds
 - 6. Mizu suggested that a study can also be conducted on other small grant themes such auto pot farming, crab culture etc to see what has worked and what has not and the reasons
 - 7. Mizu also suggested that if there are no funding for such studies, the thematic areas required to make such studies can be shared with Faculty of Science at MNU, and get them to come up with research topics that would cover such studies

6. Discussion of MTR Report.

1. It was decided to re-share the MTR report with NCB and to obtain feedback at the next NCB meeting.