



# CIF Pilot Country Meetings

## Summary Report

**iisd | Reporting Services**

Published by the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD)

ONLINE AT [HTTP://WWW.IISD.CA/CLIMATE/CIF/PF2012/](http://www.iisd.ca/climate/cif/pf2012/)  
FINAL ISSUE, VOLUME 172, NUMBER 8, SUNDAY, 4 NOVEMBER 2012



### CIF 2012 PILOT COUNTRY MEETINGS, 30 OCTOBER – 1 NOVEMBER 2012

The Pilot Country Meetings for the Climate Investment Funds (CIF) met from 30 October-1 November 2012 in Istanbul, Turkey, in association with the CIF 2012 Partnership Forum, which meets on 6-7 November 2012. The Pilot Program on Climate Resilience (PPCR) and the Scaling-Up Renewable Energy Program (SREP) Pilot Country Meetings convened on 30 October. The Forest Investment Fund (FIP) Pilot Country Meeting took place on 31 October, and the Meeting of Climate Technology Fund (CTF) Countries met on 1 November. A Master Class on Wind Energy and Biodiversity Issues convened on 1 November in the afternoon.

Over 140 participants attended the meetings, including representatives from pilot and contributor countries, multilateral development banks (MDBs), UN agencies, civil society, including indigenous peoples' organizations, and the private sector.

During the PPCR meeting, pilot countries provided updates on progress with the programming and implementation process for the Strategic Programs for Climate Resilience (SPCR). Participants discussed and provided feedback on the: PPCR learning product; and PPCR monitoring and evaluation (M&E) showcases. Consultations between pilot and contributor countries were also convened on the revised PPCR results framework.

During the SREP meeting, pilot and reserve countries provided updates on their progress with the SREP programming and implementation process. Participants also learned about various emerging financing instruments, discussed business and delivery models, and shared ideas for the next SREP Pilot Country Meeting.

During the FIP meeting, pilot countries provided updates on the status of their investment plans. Participants also discussed and provided feedback on the: FIP learning product; and FIP M&E showcases. Pilot and contributor countries also consulted on the revised FIP results framework.

During the CTF meeting, countries shared experiences, successes and challenges, and lessons learned from the CTF implementation process. Countries also discussed and provided feedback and recommendations on the revised CTF results framework.

Presentations made during the Pilot Country Meetings are available on the CIF website (<https://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/>). Briefings were also provided at each meeting on: consultations on Trust Fund Committee and Sub-Committee seats; the comprehensive CIF evaluation planned for 2013; and communications.



View of the Bosphorus strait, which forms the boundary of Europe and Asia within Turkey.

### A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE CLIMATE INVESTMENT FUNDS

The CIF is a set of financing instruments that provide developing countries with a jump-start toward achieving climate-smart development. Through two distinct funds, the Climate Technology Fund (CTF) and the Strategic Climate Fund (SCF), the CIF support developing countries' efforts to mitigate and manage the challenges of climate change by providing grants, concessional loans and risk mitigation instruments, and through leveraging significant financing from the private sector, the multilateral development banks (MDBs) and other sources. With CIF support, 48 developing countries are piloting low-emissions and climate-resilient development, transformations in clean technology, sustainable forest management, and increased energy access through renewable energy.

The CIF, formally approved by the World Bank's Board of Directors on July 1, 2008, is a collaborative effort among the MDBs and countries to bridge the financing and knowledge

#### IN THIS ISSUE

A Brief History of the Climate Investment Funds . . . . .	1
Report of the CIF Pilot Country Meetings . . . . .	3
Meeting of PPCR Pilot Countries . . . . .	3
Meeting of the SREP Pilot Countries . . . . .	4
Meeting Of FIP Pilot Countries . . . . .	6
Meeting Of CTF Pilot Countries . . . . .	9
Other Issues Raised In The Meetings. . . . .	11
Special Event: Master Class on Wind Energy and Biodiversity Issues . . . . .	11
Upcoming Meetings . . . . .	12
Glossary . . . . .	13

The *CIF Pilot Country Meetings* is a publication of the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) <[info@iisd.ca](mailto:info@iisd.ca)>, publishers of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* © <[enb@iisd.org](mailto:enb@iisd.org)>. This issue was written and edited by Leila Mead, Delia Paul and Yulia Yamineva, Ph.D. The Digital Editor is Francis Dejon. The Editor is Robynne Boyd <[robynne@iisd.org](mailto:robynne@iisd.org)>. The Director of IISD Reporting Services is Langston James "Kimo" Goree VI <[kimo@iisd.org](mailto:kimo@iisd.org)>. Funding for coverage of this meeting has been provided by the World Bank. IISD can be contacted at 161 Portage Avenue East, 6th Floor, Winnipeg, Manitoba R3B 0Y4, Canada; tel: +1-204-958-7700; fax: +1-204-958-7710. The opinions expressed in the *Bulletin* are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of IISD. Excerpts from the *Bulletin* may be used in other publications with appropriate academic citation. Electronic versions of the *Bulletin* are sent to e-mail distribution lists (in HTML and PDF format) and can be found on the Linkages WWW-server at <<http://www.iisd.ca/>>. For information on the *Bulletin*, including requests to provide reporting services, contact the Director of IISD Reporting Services at <[kimo@iisd.org](mailto:kimo@iisd.org)>, +1-646-536-7556 or 300 East 56th St., 11D, New York, New York 10022, USA. The IISD Team at the CIF 2012 Partnership Forum and Associated Events can be contacted by e-mail at <[leila@iisd.org](mailto:leila@iisd.org)>.



<http://enb.iisd.mobi/>

gap between now and the next international climate change agreement. The CIF were designed through consultations with various stakeholders and are governed by donor and recipient countries, with active observers from the UN, the Global Environment Facility (GEF), civil society, indigenous peoples' organizations and the private sector.

The CTF and the SCF each have a specific scope and objective, and their own governance structure. Thus far, donor countries have pledged approximately US\$7.2 billion to the CIF, administered through country-led programs and investments, by the African Development Bank (AfDB), Asian Development Bank (ADB), European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (ERBD), Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), International Finance Corporation (IFC) and World Bank.

The CTF provides developing and middle-income countries with incentives to scale up the demonstration, deployment and transfer of technologies with a high potential for long-term greenhouse gas emission reductions. It focuses on large-scale, country-initiated renewable energy, energy efficiency and transport projects. Each CTF investment plan is tailored by the country to be integrated into national development objectives. The first 13 CTF investment plans were endorsed by the Trust Fund Committee between January 2009 and March 2010. Approximately US\$5 billion has been pledged to the fund. To date, although half of CTF funding has been approved, progress on implementation has been uneven. Many countries are now revising their investment plans to reflect changing circumstances on the ground.

The SCF supports developing country efforts to achieve climate-resilient, low-carbon development. It operates through three targeted programs with dedicated funding to pilot new approaches to climate action to initiate transformation with potential for scaling up climate resilience. The three programs under the SCF are the FIP, PPCR and SREP. Pledges for the three SCF programs total US\$2.2 billion.

The FIP supports developing country efforts to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, promote sustainable forest management and enhance forest carbon stocks. It finances large-scale investments and leverages additional resources, including from the private sector. The FIP is active in eight pilot countries and over US\$630 million has been pledged for it.

The PPCR helps developing countries mainstream climate resilience into development planning and offers additional funding to support public and private sector investments. It provides incentives for scaled-up action and initiates a shift from "business as usual" to broad-based strategies for achieving climate resilience at both the national and regional levels. Thus far, there are nine pilot countries and two pilot regions, and US\$1.2 billion has been pledged.

The SREP aims to: scale up the deployment of renewable energy solutions and expand renewable markets in the world's poorest countries; and pilot and demonstrate the economic, social, and environmental viability of low-carbon development pathways in the energy sectors of low-income countries. The program finances solar, wind, bio-energy, geothermal and small hydro technologies. To date, seven countries have joined the SREP as pilot countries. The SREP Sub-Committee has endorsed investment plans from five countries, another country submitted its plan for endorsement at the November 2012 Sub-Committee meeting, and the seventh country has yet to submit its plan. The preparation of projects identified in the investment plans is also underway. In addition to the

seven pilot countries, another four countries and one regional program (with a focus on two countries) have been identified, and funding has been made available for them to prepare their investment plans. Over US\$360 million has been pledged to the SREP.

### **CIF PILOT COUNTRY MEETINGS**

The CIF Pilot Country Meetings provide the opportunity for those working on CIF-financed operations in countries around the world to regularly meet and discuss progress and experiences in an open and collaborative manner. Representatives of CIF pilot country governments are joined by their counterparts from the MDBs, donor countries and other stakeholders to share knowledge, learn from experiences in CIF implementation, and foster mutual trust and accountability.

CTF countries meet annually, SCF pilot countries meet semi-annually, and all CIF countries meet as needed to discuss emerging CIF-wide issues. A total of 18 Pilot Country Meetings have been organized between October 2009 and November 2012. Through discussing common issues, pilot country representatives have identified areas of common understanding, and have communicated their views to the CIF governing bodies on how to improve the CIF.

Pilot Country Meetings also provide a space for cross-fertilization among CIF programs. For example, in early 2011, SREP countries that were in the initial stages of CIF programming had the opportunity to learn from PPCR experiences in preparing their SPCRs for endorsement. PPCR experiences highlighted the need for: multi-stakeholder engagement and ongoing inter-ministerial collaboration and coordination; a clear understanding of the state of knowledge, awareness and policies to address climate change; and political will to bridge capacity gaps.

The PPCR, the CIF program that is farthest along in implementation, convened its first meeting of pilot in October 2009 and has met five times since. CTF pilot countries first met in March 2010 and have met twice since; and SREP and FIP pilot countries first met in November 2010 and have each met three times since then.

**JUNE 2011 PILOT COUNTRY MEETINGS:** These meetings convened in Cape Town, South Africa, prior to the 2011 CIF Partnership Forum.

Six SPCRs had already been endorsed by the PPCR Sub-Committee when this meeting convened. Thus the meeting's objective was to bring countries together to discuss common issues related to preparing and implementing the SPCRs, including the results framework, and gender and stakeholder involvement, as well as to look at lessons learned on the basis of the PPCR learning brief.



Patricia Bliss-Guest, Program Manager, CIF Administrative Unit, Funke Oyewole, Deputy Program Manager, CIF Administrative Unit, and Andreas Biermann, Senior Policy Manager, EBRD, at the PPCR

The objective of the SREP Pilot Country Meeting was to provide technical input to countries to support the preparation of investment plans. Experts from MDBs and UN agencies reported on options for renewable energy policies, subsidies and finance. Participants also discussed challenges and opportunities associated with the SREP results framework, climate-risk assessment for energy investments, and gender mainstreaming.

The meeting of FIP pilot countries provided input to countries to support the preparation of their investment plans and targeted discussions on stakeholder involvement, cooperation with partners and donors, synergy with national processes and results framework.

The meeting of CTF countries offered an opportunity for country representatives to discuss experiences with CTF implementation, focusing on renewable energy and energy efficiency. Participants also discussed the results framework with a view to moving forward with implementing systems for monitoring and evaluating results.

**MARCH/APRIL 2012 PILOT COUNTRY MEETINGS:** PPCR pilot countries met in March 2012 in Livingstone, Zambia. The meeting objectives were to provide a space for countries to discuss and prepare for the challenges and opportunities of maintaining a programmatic approach in implementing PPCR Strategic Programs; and to exchange views on the design and implementation of systems to monitor results and manage knowledge. A segment on climate information systems and hydro-meteorological services was also organized in recognition of the fact that a large proportion of PPCR pilot countries plan to make investments in this area.

SREP pilot countries met in March in Nairobi, Kenya. Countries discussed experiences, lessons learned and best practices regarding technologies, financing instruments and private sector engagement, as well as exchanged views on designing and implementing systems to monitor results. In addition, one full day was focused on structured, case study-based learning using Kenya's experience in developing their SREP Investment Plan.

In April 2012, FIP pilot countries convened in Brasilia, Brazil. The objectives of the meeting were to share innovative approaches to REDD+ investments and working with the private sector, indigenous peoples and local communities, and

to exchange views on the design and implementation of systems to monitor results from REDD+ investments.

## REPORT OF THE CIF PILOT COUNTRY MEETINGS

### *MEETING OF PPCR PILOT COUNTRIES*

The sixth meeting of pilot countries and regions participating in the PPCR convened on Tuesday, 30 October. During this meeting, pilot countries provided updates on their progress with the programming and implementation process for the SPCRs. Participants discussed and provided feedback on the PPCR learning product; and PPCR M&E showcases.

**OPENING SESSION:** On Tuesday morning, Andrea Kutter, PPCR Coordinator, CIF Administrative Unit, provided an overview of the program portfolio, noting it currently totals 20 investment plans, of which 18 have been endorsed by the Sub-Committee. She highlighted the sectors prioritized by countries as: agriculture and food security; water management, including irrigation; and infrastructure. She drew attention to private sector involvement in adaptation efforts, particularly in agriculture and food production, and stressed ongoing discussions on how to incentivize further private sector investment.

**UPDATES FROM PILOT COUNTRIES AND DISCUSSION:** During this session, participants broke into three groups to discuss pilot country updates on the status of implementation of SPCRs. Groups noted important challenges facing countries, including: improving coordination among government agencies and other stakeholders; establishing buy-in from implementing agencies and partners; building capacity; engaging the private sector and NGOs; promoting knowledge management, data sharing, and education and awareness; linking SPCRs to broader national processes; and the need to study gender-differentiated impacts of programs.

One group highlighted, as a "climate justice" issue, the fact that some countries did not have a loan component in their portfolio. Others emphasized: the value of approaches that take into account national needs, circumstances and realities; challenges of coordinating among multiple partners, including on procurement issues; and the importance of regional cooperation, for example on water issues involving neighboring countries.



A group discussion on country experiences with the CTF.



Ana Paulo S.G. Chichava, Deputy Minister, Ministry for the Coordination of Environmental Affairs, Mozambique

#### PRESENTATION OF PPCR LEARNING PRODUCT

**AND DISCUSSION:** On Tuesday afternoon, Anna Hidalgo, CIF Administrative Unit, presented on the PPCR's recent use of online tools, highlighting challenges of Internet connectivity, and the need to encourage sharing among countries and delve deeper into more technical topics.

Participants broke into small groups to consider priority themes, which to date include: coastal zone management; disaster risk management; hydro-meteorological and climate information services; water and watershed management; natural resources management and tourism; agriculture and food security; climate-resilient infrastructure; gender; and private sector involvement.

Reporting back to plenary, the groups proposed also focusing on: mountain ecosystem management; climate-induced migration; restoring livelihoods of vulnerable groups affected by climate change; impacts of climate change on health, especially related to water scarcity; impacts of climate change on biodiversity; and youth employment. They further recommended addressing management issues, such as: capacity building in knowledge management, including in tracking success stories; creating appropriate investment plans for and engaging the private sector; collecting baseline information to enable M&E; and formalizing roles to enable civil society organizations to contribute to projects.

During the ensuing discussion, the World Meteorological Organization highlighted current efforts to develop a global framework for climate services, while the International Finance Corporation (IFC) emphasized the need to quantify the opportunities for private sector investors.

#### BRIEFING ON CONSULTATIONS FOR SUB-

**COMMITTEE SEATS:** Patricia Bliss-Guest, Program Manager, CIF Administrative Unit, briefed participants on the upcoming consultations for selecting Trust Fund Committee and Sub-Committee seats, which will be held on Monday evening, 5 November 2012. She said membership terms are 18 months to coincide with the Partnership Forum cycle, and stressed the importance of continuity of individual members during this period. Bliss-Guest emphasized that: Trust Fund Committees have eight seats each for eligible recipient and contributor countries, while each Sub-Committee has six seats for each group; for the PPCR, the six eligible recipient country seats are reserved for pilot countries; and for the SREP and FIP, four seats have been occupied by pilot countries and

two by non-pilot countries. She emphasized the self-selection process for choosing members within respective constituencies, which is undertaken during the Partnership Forum.

**PPCR M&E SHOWCASES:** On Tuesday afternoon, Cambodia reported SPCR resources of around US\$411 million from donors and the private sector, and described efforts to build on national and sectoral M&E systems in Cambodia to monitor implementation of the National Strategic Development Plan.

Mozambique presented a phased approach to building on existing M&E, including, for example, reporting under the Hyogo Framework for Action on global disaster risk reduction and current preparation of a national climate change strategy. She described three phases: design and initiation based on a low-carbon development strategy from 2013 to 2014; refining indicators, improving baselines, and testing the framework from 2015 to 2020; and further development up to 2025.

Guido Geissler, CIF Administrative Unit, commended the: use of the PPCR process as a catalyst; involvement of other donors; linkages between the national and sectoral levels; and emphasis on baselines and targets.

**SHARING EXPERIENCES FROM OUTSIDE THE PPCR: MEASURING RESULTS IN IFAD'S ASAP:** Elwyn Grainger-Jones, Director, International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), presented IFAD's results framework in its Adaptation for Smallholder Agriculture Programme (ASAP), which provides about US\$1 billion annually to farming communities. He emphasized that climate financing can potentially benefit adaptation, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions and poverty.

**WRAP-UP AND CLOSING:** Tajikistan announced that his country will host the next PPCR Pilot Country Meeting in the summer of 2013. Andrea Kutter bade farewell to Meena Khanal of the Ministry of Environment, Nepal, upon her imminent retirement, expressing gratitude for her contributions to the PPCR and the Sub-Committee.

#### MEETING OF THE SREP PILOT COUNTRIES

The fourth meeting of pilot countries participating in the SREP convened on Tuesday, 30 October. During this meeting, pilot and reserve countries provided updates on their progress with the SREP programming and implementation process. Participants also learned about various emerging financing instruments and shared their preliminary experiences.

**OPENING AND INTRODUCTION:** On Tuesday morning, Zhihong Zhang, SREP Coordinator, CIF Administrative Unit, noted total pledges and contributions of US\$392 million, and said the SREP Sub-Committee



Zhihong Zhang, SREP and CTF, Coordinator, CIF Administrative Unit

has endorsed investment plans from five of the seven pilot countries. He noted 18 countries, mostly from Africa, have expressed interest in joining the SREP. Among recent Sub-Committee decisions, he stressed, *inter alia*, approval of a results framework, and the decision on distribution of grants versus loans depending on a country's risk rating. He said the upcoming Sub-Committee meeting on 31 October would address, *inter alia*, a semi-annual operational report and an investment plan for the Maldives.

**UPDATES FROM SREP PILOT COUNTRIES:** This session was moderated by Zhang. Ethiopia said projects already endorsed include the development of a geothermal field and sector study, a wind power project, and a capacity building and investment facility for small and medium enterprises (SMEs) on clean energy. He underscored challenges of schedule delays, a longer than expected process to establish a project implementation unit, and the temporary local currency liquidity challenge at private banks in the country.

Honduras elaborated on three components of its investment plan: strengthening the renewable energy policy and regulatory framework; grid-connected renewable energy development support; and sustainable rural energy. She also stressed as challenges: maintaining coordination between domestic institutions and (MDBs); ensuring continuity during the upcoming government transition; completing terms of reference for key studies; and consolidating stakeholder input as a result of consultations.

Kenya highlighted three projects: geothermal development of 400 MW; hybrid mini-grid systems, with the aim of achieving 30% solar and 70% thermal; and solar water heating. She underscored challenges, including harmonization among, and funds disbursement from, multiple MDBs. She said SREP impacts included leveraging of private sector support, and development of innovative business models to finance high-risk projects.

Noting his country is the only small island developing state (SIDS) in the SREP, the Maldives underscored the special challenges facing SIDS in data collection and analysis, and efforts to strengthen human resources, institutional frameworks and policies. He highlighted plans to remove or reduce dependence on imported fossil fuels, and for an investor conference to bring in private funding, using SREP funds as a catalyst.

Mali described its investment plan components, including solar energy, rural electrification, micro-hydro and strategic coordination, noting that political turmoil in the country had interrupted international technical cooperation. He highlighted the new coalition government now in place, observing that stability is a strong element in implementing programs.

Nepal said activities under its investment plan include small hydropower development, and mini- and micro-initiatives related to off-grid electricity (solar and micro-hydro) and biogas. He highlighted: the lengthy process of preparing an investment plan; difficulties in aligning MDB requirements with national government systems and policies; balancing the aims of leveraging finance with reaching the poor and vulnerable; and the need for capacity building and human resource development.

**UPDATES FROM SREP RESERVE COUNTRIES:** This session included presentations from four reserve countries – Armenia, Liberia, Mongolia and Yemen – on progress in preparing their investment plans, and one pilot country, Tanzania, which has to submit its investment plan.

Armenia underscored lack of fossil fuel resources, but nearly unlimited solar energy potential and significant small hydro and wind energy potential in her country. She noted the existing legal and institutional frameworks and its progress towards realizing hydro energy potential, and elaborated on challenges in scaling up renewable energy and opportunities for SREP investments.

Liberia noted abundant renewable energy resources, including biomass and solar, and an already-formulated national energy policy. She pointed to lack of a regulatory and policy framework to attract private investment, limited human capacity and absence of financing.

Noting that most of its electricity is derived from coal, Mongolia underscored the potential for developing renewable energy. He noted an ongoing 100,000 solar house national program for nomadic people, a national renewable energy program, and a renewable energy law.

Yemen highlighted plans for two wind farms, a geothermal well, photovoltaic systems and biogas digesters. He also underlined several opportunities for SREP investments, including installment of on-grid renewable energy projects and development of a commercial wind energy policy.

Tanzania noted problems of poor energy access and said renewables contribute less than 1% to its current energy mix. He highlighted renewable energy potential and, as areas for potential SREP investment, suggested developing geothermal energy, mini-grid systems to connect rural areas, and energy efficiency measures.

**EMERGING FINANCING INSTRUMENTS, AND BUSINESS AND DELIVERY MODELS:** This session was moderated by Shaanti Kapila, CIF Administrative Unit, on Tuesday afternoon. Ethiopia presented on a results-based partnership with Norway to provide NOK 500 million over a five-year period for increasing access to sustainable energy, and avoiding and reducing greenhouse gas emissions in rural areas through the use of renewable energy and increasing energy efficiency. In the following discussion, participants discussed, *inter alia*, the potential of carbon finance, and the importance of involving the private sector in pre-financing implementation activities.

Armenia shared a success story based on a hydropower development project where it received a US\$5 million credit from the World Bank and was able to leverage an additional



Tamara Babayan, Armenia

US\$28 million without sovereign guarantees, leading to the installation of 26 small hydro stations. She also noted that renewable energy generation increased from 0.5 to 7% as a result of financing and policy reforms, such as a feed-in tariff system and guaranteed purchase of electricity.

Honduras presented on an infrastructure project funded on concessional terms by the World Bank with Global Environment Facility (GEF) and the European Union (EU) support to strengthen communities and develop photovoltaic energy. He noted the project employs subsidies for installation and microfinance. A civil society observer noted that Honduras paid special attention to incorporating the social development component into investment plans and said that both the private and public sectors had sought advice from the International Labour Organization, on properly consulting local communities.

**SREP M&E SHOWCASE:** Guido Geissler, CIF Administrative Unit, said M&E systems: act as a communication tool to convey how countries are progressing in investment plan implementation, including successes and challenges faced; and facilitate evidence-based decision making through information and data generation. He also stressed their role in accountability both to donors and within their own countries.

Presenting on his country's SREP M&E system, Nepal discussed transformative impacts of SREP in his country, including gender and social inclusiveness, scaling up investments and energy access, and innovation. He discussed a recently convened national M&E workshop, which emphasized, *inter alia*, the need to strengthen M&E systems, and coordination among programs and ministries. He stressed aligning SREP M&E systems with national M&E systems, the comparative advantage of the SREP in integrating climate change concerns at the national level, and capacity building for key stakeholders.

**IDEAS FOR THE NEXT MEETING OF SREP PILOT COUNTRIES:** The session was moderated by Anna Hidalgo on Tuesday afternoon. During this session, participants stressed the SREP's positive outcomes, such as development of renewable energy plans in countries and bringing stakeholders together to work on renewable energy. In breakout groups, participants discussed existing actions, knowledge needs and experiences to share on: renewable energy financing; renewable energy technologies; renewable energy policies, regulations and enabling environments; SREP policies, processes and procedures; case studies and lessons learned; and measuring results. This information will be synthesized by the CIF Administrative Unit.

**WRAP-UP AND CLOSING:** In closing, participants were advised the next meeting would convene in September 2013, in a location to be determined.

### MEETING OF FIP PILOT COUNTRIES

The fourth meeting of pilot countries participating in the FIP convened on Wednesday, 31 October. During this meeting, pilot countries provided updates on their progress with the FIP programming and implementation process. Participants also discussed and provided feedback on the FIP learning product; and FIP M&E showcases. Consultations also took place on the revised FIP results framework between pilot and contributor countries.

**OPENING AND INTRODUCTION:** On Wednesday morning, pilot countries presented updates on the status of their investment plans, with particular focus on progress made in setting FIP targets and baselines for results monitoring as they prepare to move into the implementation stage.

Andrea Kutter, FIP Coordinator, CIF Administrative Unit, announced that Indonesia, Ghana and Burkina Faso would present their investment plans to the Sub-Committee meeting on 5 November for endorsement. She reported that 13 projects were in the FIP pipeline,



Andrea Kutter, FIP and PPCR Coordinator, CIF Administrative Unit

two of which have been approved, with one, in Mexico, already receiving funds. She described the Dedicated Grant Mechanism (DGM) for indigenous peoples and local communities, and stressed it is intended to work closely with investment plans. Highlighting the DGM's unique nature, Kutter said its first meeting will convene on Friday, 2 November, and be led by indigenous peoples' representatives, with governments attending as observers.

**UPDATES FROM PILOT COUNTRIES AND DISCUSSION:** This session convened on Wednesday morning and was moderated by Shaanti Kapila, CIF Administrative Unit. Brazil reported that the FIP has improved integration of several federal government initiatives on mitigation and reducing deforestation in the Cerrado region. He highlighted a "biome" approach to information sharing among the three FIP projects and with relevant government ministries, including finance. Responding to a question about administrative structure, he highlighted the creation of a permanent coordination mechanism linking implementing agencies in the Cerrado states with national and inter-ministerial discussions, and relating these to national-level initiatives, such as Brazil's low-carbon agriculture plan.

Burkina Faso noted the designation of representatives for various committees to support the REDD+ process, and validation of Readiness Preparation Proposals (RPP). Referring



Participants from Burkina Faso with Traore Modibo, African Development Bank (standing), and Hocine Chalal, World Bank (right)



Rick Jacobsen, Global Witness, intervened during the discussions

to advances made to date, he stressed stakeholder involvement, and an ongoing inter-ministerial national program on rural development. He also stressed that although institutions have been established, fiduciary arrangements still require strengthening.

Responding to an inquiry from Mexico on the rural development program and budget allocation, Burkina Faso said the program: engages three ministries with the same development objectives; is part of the national growth strategy; and is based on bilateral financing. Participants also praised the increased dialogue with stakeholders during the RPP process.

The Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) noted the investment plan's advances, including on setting up focal points in eleven provinces and consultations with stakeholders. As challenges, he noted: access to bank loans; lack of flexibility in managing financial resources for the preparation process; and technical aspects, such as M&E and environmental impact studies. He identified lessons learned, including the need for: combining internal and external expertise; a permanent communication channel with civil society; and supporting local structures and NGOs with related on-the-ground experience. He said the FIP plays an important role in piloting possible elements of the future REDD+ mechanism, which is still being negotiated, such as benefit-sharing, payments for environmental services and measurement, reporting and verification (MRV). Global Witness enquired about the status of the presidential community forestry decree, with the DRC replying that it will be signed shortly. On different reporting formats, the DRC said that work on MRV under the Congo Basin Forest Fund will assist relevant work under the FIP.

Ghana noted Sub-Committee comments and peer reviews had helped focus the investment plan, stating it emphasizes areas that achieve the greatest greenhouse gas emission reductions and co-benefits. He noted challenges include: improving coordination among MDBs and bringing in other Ghanaian sectors; delays in releasing funds; and sustaining private sector interest. He discussed lessons learned, including the need to: engage stakeholders at all levels and balance their interests; and build synergies among agencies. He identified as successes a multi-stakeholder platform and a bottom-up approach. Referring to the example of the DRC, a World Bank representative asked about linkages between the REDD+ and FIP investment plan processes and if mutual synergies existed. Ghana said there is considerable integration, and that some feel the FIP should be an expansion of the REDD+ program.

Indonesia said the country's size, cultural diversity and geographic dispersal presented challenges for consultations and achieving consensus among stakeholders. He observed the FIP can help transform governance practices through promoting broad coordination and dialogue. He urged partners to hasten the project and financing approval process in order to begin implementation in early 2014, before the general election and

cabinet appointments. Responding to a question from Brazil, he clarified that the government handles grant activities while facilitating MDB engagement with the private sector, adding that the FIP may reduce Indonesian banks' perceptions of forestry as a high-risk investment.

The Lao People's Democratic Republic (PDR) reported on civil society consultations organized at national and subnational levels, stating that civil society diversity is a challenge, and noting lack of organization as a single forum with agreed representatives who may come forward to access FIP grant funding. He noted the government's schedule to complete national forest management plans by 2015 based on different protection levels for forests.

As advances, Mexico noted: establishment of institutional arrangements for projects; significant progress in project development, reinforced by the new Climate Change Law; and M&E. He highlighted challenges, including the need for: a broad platform for monitoring policy interventions; regional leadership development; better balance of loans, grants and private funding; and technical capacity building. He likened implementing FIP projects to "lifting a piano" where everyone contributes to a common task, but it is difficult to assess each individual contribution.

In the ensuing discussion, participants addressed whether the CIF should work on enhancing technical capacity in countries. They also discussed how to manage FIP resources, which despite concessional terms can be quite expensive for recipient countries due to exchange rates induced by the financial crisis. On aligning a national MRV system for forestry with project-level M&E, Mexico said they are developing a national MRV system as mandated by the Climate Change Law, with financial assistance from Norway.

Peru described advances in preparing its investment plan, including: establishment of a technical working group to assemble information and draft a consolidated document; work towards incorporating concerns of all stakeholders, including indigenous peoples' organizations; and updated information related to, *inter alia*, deforestation drivers. As lessons, he stressed: the investment plan must be flexible; participatory processes demand political commitment; and the FIP must complement other innovative funding initiatives. Referring to FIP impacts, he noted: consolidation of inter-institutional cooperation; enhanced attention to indigenous peoples' needs; improved coordination between national and regional government entities; and integration of forestry policy and current initiatives.



Agus Sartiso, Indonesia, discussed experiences with ministerial collaborations within the government.



Fiu Mataese Elisara, O Le Siosiomaga Society, Samoa, welcomed the integration of indigenous peoples' concerns in country projects.

In a general statement, a Samoan representative of indigenous peoples' organizations welcomed the "powerful" remarks in country presentations on the DGM and integration of indigenous peoples' concerns. However, he lamented lack of discussion on the future of REDD+, referring to its current status in the climate change negotiations and the "poor" state of carbon markets. On how the CIF would relate to the Green Climate Fund (GCF), and recalling the sunset clause, he expressed concern that the CIF will be taken over by the GCF, which, he said, currently has no financial contributions.

Mexico highlighted a related debate regarding how to bring together negotiating a REDD+ mechanism under the UNFCCC with taking concrete actions to reduce emissions under the CIF.

#### PRESENTATION OF FIP LEARNING PRODUCT

**DRAFT AND DISCUSSION:** On Wednesday afternoon, Andrea Kutter introduced the CIF-commissioned report on REDD+ Stakeholder Collaboration at the Country Level. She explained it draws on interviews with REDD+ stakeholders and field visits to four pilot countries, who then shared their experiences.

Peru discussed issues regarding indigenous peoples and land tenure status, highlighting that forests, oil and mineral resources are owned by the state, and that perverse incentives exist for deforestation to acquire land tenure. He highlighted the FIP's usefulness in taking forward current work to improve the land tenure system, and that the government is discussing how FIP funds can benefit indigenous peoples.

Indonesia described intra- and inter-ministerial collaboration, and noted that while many issues require national-level coordination, the country's Forestry Management Units operate at the local level, and concern local government.

The DRC said that, apart from the FIP, other agencies support the development of national REDD+ policies, including UN-REDD, FAO and UNDP. He mentioned related MDB-supported activities, such as the World Bank's Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF); the African Development Bank's Congo Basin Forest Fund; and the GEF's conservation of carbon stocks.

Burkina Faso said his country's decentralization program enables enhanced local participation and highlighted community-run forests. He noted the government's work in improving land management, and that, as part of the FIP, it cooperates with NGOs working on rural, agriculture and forestry issues. He stressed the important role of women in implementing forest policies and combating poverty.

Pilot countries that did not participate in the field visits then reflected on lessons related to stakeholder collaboration at a country level. Brazil reiterated that the FIP helped improve

inter-ministerial collaboration and link various forestry initiatives. He noted an existing national strategy and said the FIP is a tool to foster national collaboration and goals. For local-level collaboration, Ghana stressed the role of communication and referred to a stakeholder platform that identifies local groups and conducts consultations to develop REDD+ activities.

Lao PDR noted that national-level collaboration occurs within a national environment committee and in sectoral working groups that include various stakeholder groups. Mexico highlighted: collaboration, building on past experiences; the need for a flexible approach; capacity building to enhance stakeholder engagement and collaboration; and that greater specificity leads to increased complexity.

In the ensuing discussion regarding additional themes going forward, participants stressed: a transformational approach requires creating trust and confidence at the grassroots level; the need for concrete activities to foster collaboration; improving community welfare through the FIP; emphasizing capacity building in future FIP activities; tackling multisectoral collaboration as the FIP addresses more than just forests; and distinguishing between different private sector actors.

**FIP M&E SHOWCASES:** Guido Geissler, CIF Administrative Unit, encouraged sharing practical experiences and using FIP M&E to make evidence-based decisions and contribute to accountability, not only to donors, but also within recipient countries.

Lao PDR presented on current draft M&E guidelines at national, sectoral and project levels, highlighting a national target to increase existing forest cover by 70% by 2020, and presenting 32 intended indicators in nine categories. He noted difficulty in comparing data from different sources. Responding to questions on the absence of quantification of values within the indicators, he noted that the Lao forest strategy does include targets, drawn from a 2009 draft prepared with the assistance of Japan.

On governance indicators, including on cross-border trade in timber, he mentioned increasing staff capacity and education levels. Brazil queried the cost of monitoring 32 indicators, with Lao PDR responding that satellite images can be purchased for monitoring some of the indicators, but that poverty-related indicators will be difficult to measure. As an example, the Asian Development Bank (ADB) offered Cambodia's estimate of US\$1 million a year to monitor its national development plan.

Mentioning his country's experience of introducing a biodiversity component into forestry program monitoring, Mexico noted the challenge of choosing indicators that will bring specific issues to the forefront, cautioning against adopting those that are either too complex or too simplistic.



José Carlos Fernández, Mexico

### BRIEFING ON CONSULTATIONS FOR SUB-

**COMMITTEE SEATS:** On Wednesday afternoon, Funke Oyewole, Deputy Program Manager, CIF Administrative Unit, briefed participants on consultations for selecting members of the Trust Fund Committees and Sub-Committees. Stressing the principle of equitable governance and a self-selection process, she urged countries to participate in the consultations to ensure active, engaged committee membership. She said no hard rules exist for FIP Sub-Committee representation, but stressed regional representation and noted that, in the past, four recipient country seats were taken by pilot countries and two by non-pilot countries.

Brazil stressed the importance of discussing any new rules related to FIP governance in the FIP Sub-Committee meeting, noting some decisions regarding FIP governance had been taken by the SCF Trust Fund Committee, and asked why the PPCR has a different rule regarding the number of pilot country seats. Oyewole replied that the three programs were negotiated at different times as part of the CIF design, and a process exists to change the governance rules if needed.

**WRAP-UP AND CLOSING:** In closing the session, Shaanti Kapila said that Indonesia offered to host the next FIP Pilot Country meeting in conjunction with the UN-REDD and FCPF meeting in June-July 2013.

### MEETING OF CTF PILOT COUNTRIES

During this meeting, pilot countries shared experiences, successes and challenges, and lessons learned from the CTF implementation process, and discussed and provided feedback and recommendations on CTF M&E showcases. Consultations also took place on the revised FIP results framework between CTF and contributor countries.

**OPENING AND INTRODUCTION:** This session convened on Thursday morning. Zhihong Zhang, CTF Coordinator, CIF Administrative Unit, updated participants on progress in the CTF, noting that nine countries have pledged US\$4.8 billion to date. He noted that overall, half of the funding has been approved for 38 projects, which is expected to leverage about US\$18.2 billion of additional finance. Regarding projects in the pipeline, he said some are on track and others are experiencing difficulties. He identified the following key items for the upcoming Trust Fund Committee meeting on 3 November 2012: semi-annual operational report; updates on investment plans from Egypt and Turkey; the use of the released CTF funds due to project modifications or cancellations; a revised CTF results framework; and the document on interaction between CIF financing and carbon markets. He described the “traffic light system” to track project delivery and noted that the Trust Fund Committee requested that countries provide updates on their investment plans 24 months after they are endorsed.

South Africa asked about pledges versus actual contributions as well as disbursements, and Zhang noted that there is money available for fiscal year 2013 and that availability of finance in the future depends on when contributor countries schedule fulfillment of their pledges. He said the trustee can provide more information on this.

### CTF IMPLEMENTATION EXPERIENCES AND

**LESSONS LEARNED:** This session aimed to draw on experiences and lessons learned from the CTF countries and focused on several key questions related to: the top three lessons from each country’s participation in the CTF; the experience of in-country coordination and country ownership toward a programmatic approach for transformation; main

challenges and barriers and what can be done to address them; and how circumstances in countries have changed since investment plans were endorsed. Countries were also invited to share experiences on implementing projects financed by the CTF.

This session was moderated by Shaanti Kapila, CIF Administrative Unit, who explained the plenary would split into breakout groups to enable a more in-depth discussion.

### Experiences with the programmatic approach:

Participants convened in breakout groups to address the following issues: top three lessons from each country’s participation in the CTF; experience of in-country coordination and country ownership toward a programmatic approach for low-carbon development; challenges and barriers and what can be done to overcome them; and how circumstances have changed in countries since investment plans were endorsed. A summary of the discussions is provided below.

Turkey discussed: the transformational impact of the CTF; coordination as central in preparing the investment plan; and the need to strengthen M&E and CTF focal points. With Vietnam, she stressed the importance of enhancing implementing agency capacity for the success of projects, and the need for coordination with implementing agencies, which she identified as a challenge. Thailand mentioned good support from the World Bank and the ADB in preparing the document.

South Africa said coordination is not a problem in his country as decisions are made in clusters at the ministerial level. He highlighted competing agency mandates, such as between the environment, energy and finance ministries. He said CTF funds are perceived as concessions, but transaction costs are high, noting this is why commercial banks do not want to get involved in the CTF. He also noted burdensome reporting requirements, over-bureaucratization of M&E, and that a multiplicity of objectives can shift the focus from the main objective of moving toward low-carbon development.

The Philippines noted the CTF triggered awareness on climate change in the country, and brings credibility to programs due to its strict requirements, and mentioned the absence of a clearly defined process for the revision of CTF investment plans. Regarding the Philippine investment plan, the ADB emphasized the context changes fast, in reference to transformations in the energy market, such as solar energy prices, and in administration. He also said that the CTF helped initiate large-scale projects.

Indonesia asked if companies implementing projects can access CTF finance directly, as opposed to through the government. An ADB consultant said that what matters is whether the government guarantees a loan, and if it does not, then terms and conditions would be the same as for private sector transactions.

Ukraine said its investment plan focuses mainly on the energy sector with the CTF contribution being less than 10%. He noted that introducing green tariffs led to an explosion of investment in renewable energy, with solar energy production increasing in 2011 by 60 times that of 2010. He said that although “the cheapest money doesn’t have the shortest and simplest procedure” to access it, without the international financial institutions, they would not have been able to move forward.

Chile said its investment plan was being used to implement the national energy strategy, thus receiving high-level political support. She said working closely with government agencies and MDBs would be essential to success. On challenges, she

said that the technology in their solar project was new for them, and that Chile had requested that some of the funds support local university courses and internships. She highlighted that the CTF has created greater awareness regarding new technology potential, and local banks are expressing an interest in investing in renewables.

Morocco underscored great interest and commitment to renewables. She described the establishment of the national energy development fund of US\$1 billion, which is scaling up solar energy development. On challenges, she noted that although CTF funds were expected to leverage further resources for energy development, the national fund had not been structured as a lending body. She said this barrier was removed by creating a high-level steering committee that could present projects for CTF funding.

The ADB added that industrial integration is an important funding objective, highlighting that domestic SMEs should take part in and benefit from project activity. He noted that in the case of Morocco, project partners had agreed that 35% of the investment should be spent through domestic SMEs.

Egypt said that investment plans must be more dynamic in adapting to new political situations, highlighting the need for job creation and capacity building. She affirmed that the investment plan's objectives remain relevant, but that more detailed implementation arrangements should be spelled out.

**Experiences with project implementation:** Participants then convened in groups to discuss: projects being implemented or prepared, and their status; how the project supports low-emissions development goals; challenges; and lessons.

Turkey discussed an energy project, noting that solar licenses would be issued and given to private firms so they can begin to secure financing. She said US\$172 of US\$250 million had been disbursed and underscored challenges in: promoting wind and small hydro; and getting loans from banks.

Chile presented on the concentrated solar power (CSP) project, noting they are close to opening a tender process and that the project has co-financing from KfW, IFC and possibly the EU. Regarding challenges, she highlighted that this is a market creation project and misperceptions exist among players due to the lack of experience with CSP technology in the country.

Vietnam highlighted the need for capacity building and enhancing national focal points, and identified complex

procedures of MDBs and implementing agencies as a challenge.

South Africa stressed that insufficient feedback from MDBs and access to information pose challenges. On problems with aligning country ownership and MDB projects, he gave an example of the IFC selecting a South African bank with only fifteen branches in the country, despite the existence of larger banks with more experience with green finance.

Thailand said more frequent feedback from the MDBs would help countries. The Philippines highlighted a project converting 100,000 tricycles from gasoline to electric power and noted the need for more interaction with end beneficiaries during the project preparation stage.

Egypt shared information about a wind energy project, for which CTF funds of US\$50 million were used to leverage total financing of US\$300 million, noting that some of the challenges faced were inconsistent data about bird flyways as important migration locations, and migration altitudes that may change seasonally and from year to year.

Morocco briefed participants on its CSP project, the largest in the developing world. She highlighted the current energy authority's commitment that total energy produced will be sold to the government at the same price as fossil fuel-generated power, noting her government's commitment to a diversified energy mix. She reported that while wind energy is competitive with traditional sources, they have had to combine hydro with wind in order to promote stability. She also highlighted a project for rural electrification to increase consumer demand and reduce poverty.

Responding to a question from Jordan on why funding was tied to solar energy projects, the ADB responded that solar has traditionally been seen as "dispatchable power." He explained that the original idea was to use CTF funds to buy a large amount of new CSP capacity in order to achieve economies of scale and drive down the unit cost, asking participants if this intended transformation is occurring. The CIF Administrative Unit suggested that part of the "story" is to create local jobs and other co-benefits, in addition to power generation. Jordan replied that scale would have been better achieved by developing projects on a regional basis, rather than in separate countries.

Thailand said its government had decided that CTF funding should flow directly through the private sector. The ADB



Tatiana Molina, Chile, presented on a concentrated solar power project.



Saleh Al-Kharabsheh, Jordan

explained that since the investment plan was conceived, the government has been able to raise funds in private capital markets and that multilateral funding appears less attractive. Thailand added that the national government had proposed a number of government agencies to work with CTF funds to support national low-carbon development plans, but that domestic agencies showed a “lack of readiness” to do so. She expressed a need for technical assistance from the CTF for capacity building.

**BRIEFING ON CONSULTATIONS FOR SUB-COMMITTEE SEATS:** Funke Oyewole, CIF Administrative Unit, presented this briefing, emphasizing that the Trust Fund has eight seats each reserved for recipient and contributor countries. She also stressed that only countries should be put forward, not specific names, as the CIF Administrative Unit will then contact the countries in order for them to put forward the names of specific individuals

#### **OTHER ISSUES RAISED IN THE MEETINGS**

Jeff Brez, Senior Communications Officer, CIF Administrative Unit, highlighted recent improvements to the CIF website, and invited participants to write and blog about their CIF experiences. The World Bank’s Independent Evaluation Group noted that the comprehensive CIF evaluation would be conducted by an external firm next year under the oversight of a committee specially formed by the MDBs.

#### **SPECIAL EVENT: MASTER CLASS ON WIND ENERGY AND BIODIVERSITY ISSUES**

**WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION:** This session convened on Thursday afternoon. Jeff Brez, CIF Administrative Unit, moderated this session. Zhihang Zhang, CIF Administrative Unit, highlighted that the CTF is supporting countries at different stages of wind energy development, for example, introducing wind farms in South Africa, and working with Egypt, where large-scale wind energy has already been developed, but is still facing many challenges.

**COUNTRY CASE STUDIES: Egypt:** Noting difficulties with estimating bird collision risks for wind farms, Maryam Sayed Khalil, Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation, presented the results of a 2010 environment and social impact assessment in the Gulf of Suez. She said they identified possible mitigation measures, including: avoiding building small turbines too close to each other;



Maryam Sayed Khalil, Egypt

building turbines 125m in height; avoiding lattice towers; and painting turbine blades. She also noted two possible mitigation scenarios: shutting down all turbines in spring for one hour after sunrise and before sunset; and shutting down on demand when large flocks of birds approach.

During the discussion, on using nets around turbines, Sayed Khalil replied this is not feasible due to the height of turbines. Responding to a query by a civil society observer with the CTF about the original height of turbines, she said the 200-meter height leads to higher energy production, but is also more dangerous for birds. Ethiopia asked about energy loss in the two identified scenarios, with Sayed Khalil replying that the loss would be 10% in the first scenario and only 2% in the second one. A representative from Eskom, South Africa, asked about the length of the monitoring period, with Sayed Khalil replying that the 2010 study included about 100 hours of observations.

**South Africa:** Via videolink, Megan Diamond, Endangered Wildlife Trust (EWT), South Africa, noted the long-standing partnership with the utility company Eskom in conducting activities such as: the implementation of a national wildlife mortality incident register; research and monitoring; input into the design of new power lines considering environmental impact assessments and strategic environmental assessments; and training programs.

Via videolink, Rudi Kruger, Eskom, South Africa, discussed management systems to avoid or mitigate biodiversity impacts of wind energy projects. During the planning phase, he underscored: avoiding building new infrastructure within Important Bird Areas or critically endangered areas without prior engagement with relevant stakeholders; and designing wildlife-friendly power lines. During the operating phase, he highlighted that, *inter alia*, existing infrastructure must be monitored for potential biodiversity impacts. He said key deliverables of the Eskom/EWT partnership include: a system to report and identify localities of negative bird interactions with power lines; and a database to facilitate retrofitting, and future design and placing of electricity networks and structures. He highlighted: an extensive body of knowledge developed through the Eskom/EWT partnership; biodiversity considerations integrated into all phases of the Eskom project lifecycle; and networking and access to biodiversity specialists due to the partnership.

During the discussion, one participant called attention to the EWT website (<http://www.ewt.org.za/>), noting it has information on sensitivity maps and micro-siting. On using noise frequency made by turbines to discourage collisions, it was noted that acoustic deterrence has not been developed, and that the focus has been on siting and avoiding high migratory areas.

**Turkey:** Erdinç Çetin, Zorlu Energy, presented on private sector perspectives and actions, and the company’s wind farm, the largest in Turkey. He described measures taken to protect local and migratory wildlife, mentioning: pre-construction ornithological surveys; daily checking of turbines and reporting of bird deaths; social actions to benefit communities around the wind farm site; and installing a radar system capable of shutting down turbines when wildlife approach, including training staff in its operation. He highlighted the company is the first to use this system in Turkey, and noted the most difficult challenge was gaining acceptance within the company for this expense, which was seen as non-profitable.



Alemayehu Tafesse Mengesha, Ethiopia, and Richard Grimm, BirdLife International

In response to questions, he said the cost of radar equipment was around US\$100,000. He highlighted that the radar system is proactive and anticipates the route of approaching birds, adding that turbines have shut down 10 times so far, and no bird deaths have been observed.

**KNOWLEDGE MAPPING EXERCISE:** Richard Grimmett, BirdLife International, observed that clean energy is not necessarily free of environmental impacts, including: risk of collisions and impacts on bird feeding and migration strategies; and barotrauma to bats caused by changes in air pressure. He advised: siting of wind farms away from wildlife areas and routes; modifying sites and turbines; and avoiding measures that attract wildlife. He supported the exclusion of highly sensitive areas as the best and cheapest approach, and Turkey's post-construction monitoring and use of radar.

Alemayehu Tafesse Mengesha, Ministry of Water and Energy, Ethiopia, noted that policy "must come first" in order to have a legal framework for handling issues, and emphasized the need for practical measures, supported by research.

Addressing the group via video, David Cottingham, US Fish and Wildlife Service, noted the importance of dynamic partnerships between utilities, governments and local communities. He offered information sources on conducting pre- and post-construction surveys, and recommended studying the impacts of offshore wind farms.

George Ledec, World Bank, stressed that the negative impacts of wind farms are greater on bats than on birds because they: are attracted to spinning turbines; can be killed without actually touching the blades because of decompression; and reproduce slowly. He suggested the following measures to protect bats: careful site selection; changing the cut-in speed of wind turbines; and post-construction monitoring.

**WRAP-UP AND CLOSING:** In conclusion, moderator Brez summarized the discussions noting the six areas of interest for the international "community of practice," including the need for: a better understanding of bird and bat behavior; environmental impact assessments and standards at the design stage; post-construction monitoring and mitigation of negative impacts; legal and regulatory frameworks; national capacities for expertise and data; and private sector and utility engagement.

Panelists also added a number of concluding remarks related to, *inter alia*: funding issues associated with the costs of some technologies, such as the radar technologies demonstrated in Turkey's presentation; the need for collected knowledge on best practices; and the importance of strategic environmental assessment and publicly sharing pre- and post-construction monitoring data; and the need for experience sharing on site selection for wind farms.

## UPCOMING MEETINGS

**12th RRI Dialogue on Forests, Governance and Climate Change:** The 12th Rights and Resources Initiative (RRI) Dialogue on Forests, Governance and Climate Change will consider the theme of "Scaling-Up Strategies to Reduce Emissions and Deliver Development in Forest Areas." Participants will: identify the major emerging threats to forests and take stock of proven strategies to reduce emissions; assess the potential for expanding; and consider promising new initiatives to address the current and future drivers of deforestation and degradation, and the long-standing constraints of under-development and weak governance. **date:** 5 November 2012 **venue:** Newseum **location:** Washington (District of Columbia), US **contact:** RRI Secretariat **phone:** +1 202 470 3900 **fax:** +1 202 944 3315 **e-mail:** info@rightsandresources.org **www:** <http://www.rightsandresources.org/events.php?id=686>

**CIF Partnership Forum:** CIF and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) are co-hosting the CIF 2012 Partnership Forum and associated meetings, including pilot country meetings, a Civil Society Organizations Forum, and a Private Sector Forum. **dates:** 6 - 7 November 2012 **location:** Istanbul, Turkey **contact:** CIF Administrative Unit **phone:** +1 202 458 1801 **email:** cifevents@worldbank.org **www:** [http://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/partnership\\_forum\\_2012\\_home](http://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/partnership_forum_2012_home)

**World Energy Outlook 2012 Launch:** The International Energy Agency (IEA) will launch its flagship publication, the World Energy Outlook (WEO) 2012, on 12 November at IEA Headquarters in Paris, France. The WEO-2012 will include analysis and insights into global energy market trends and their meaning for energy security, environmental protection and economic development. It will also contain updated forecasts to 2035 of energy production and demand, investment, trade, and emissions, broken down by country, fuel and sector. **date:** 12 November 2012 **location:** Paris (Ile-De-France), France **contact:** Paweł Olejarnik **phone:** +33 1 40 57 67 57 **e-mail:** pawel.olejarnik@iea.org **www:** <http://www.worldenergyoutlook.org>

**43rd GEF Council Meeting:** The GEF Council meets twice a year to approve new projects with global environmental benefits in the GEF's focal areas, and provide guidance to the GEF Secretariat and agencies.

**dates:** 12-16 November 2012 **location:** Washington (District of Columbia), US **contact:** GEF Secretariat **phone:** +1 202 473 0508 **fax:** +1 202 522 3240 **email:** secretariat@thegef.org **www:** [http://www.thegef.org/gef/council\\_meetings](http://www.thegef.org/gef/council_meetings)

**UNFCCC COP 18:** The 18th session of the Conference of the Parties (COP 18) to the UNFCCC and the eighth session of the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP 8), among other associated meetings, are scheduled to take place in Doha, Qatar. **dates:** 26 November to 7 December 2012 **location:** Doha, Qatar **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49 228 815 1000 **fax:** +49 228 815 1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** [http://unfccc.int/meetings/doha\\_nov\\_2012/meeting/6815.php](http://unfccc.int/meetings/doha_nov_2012/meeting/6815.php)

**Doha Global Business Day 2012:** Doha Global Business Day 2012 is jointly organized by the World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD) and the International Chamber of Commerce, and will take place on 3 December 2012, at the Diplomatic Club in Doha, Qatar. The event will

be held in parallel to COP 18, and will explore the business perspective of diversifying the energy mix by 2050 within a framework of global green growth. The afternoon will have a special focus on the opportunities for green growth in the Middle East. **date:** 3 December 2012 **location:** Doha (Ad Dawhah), Qatar **contact:** Barbara Black, Manager, WBCSD **phone:** +41 (0)22 839 31 05 **fax:** +41 (0)22 839 31 31 **e-mail:** [black@wbcsd.org](mailto:black@wbcsd.org) **www:** <http://www.wbcsd.org/dohabusinessday.aspx>

**19th Meeting of the Adaptation Fund Board:** The Adaptation Fund Board supervises and manages the Adaptation Fund under the authority and guidance of the countries that are parties to the Kyoto Protocol. **dates:** 11-14 December 2012 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** Jeannette Jin Yu Lee **phone:** +1 202 473 7499 **fax:** +1 202 522 2720 **email:** [jlee21@thegef.org](mailto:jlee21@thegef.org) **www:** <http://www.adaptation-fund.org/page/calendar>

**3rd Meeting of the Board of the Green Climate Fund (GCF):** This meeting is expected to discuss, *inter alia*, the decisions on the Fund taken by COP 18. **dates:** 12-15 March 2013 **location:** Berlin, Germany **contact:** GCF Interim Secretariat **phone:** +49 228 815 1371 **email:** [isecretariat@gcfund.net](mailto:isecretariat@gcfund.net) **www:** <http://gcfund.net/meetings.html>

**CIF Trust Fund Committee and Sub-Committee meetings:** These meetings will take place in May 2013. **dates:** May 2013 **location:** Washington DC, US **contact:** CIF Administrative Unit **phone:** +1 202 458 1801 **email:** [cifevents@worldbank.org](mailto:cifevents@worldbank.org) **www:** [http://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/partnership\\_forum\\_2012\\_home](http://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/partnership_forum_2012_home)

**UNFCCC Subsidiary Bodies Session:** The 38<sup>th</sup> sessions of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) and Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) will take place in Bonn. **dates:** 3-14 June 2013 **location:** Bonn (Nordrhein-Westfalen), Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** 49 228 815 1000 **fax:** 49 228 815 1999 **e-mail:** [secretariat@unfccc.int](mailto:secretariat@unfccc.int) **www:** <http://www.unfccc.int>

**44th GEF Council Meeting:** The GEF Council meets twice per year to approve new projects with global environmental benefits in the GEF's focal areas, and provide guidance to the GEF Secretariat and agencies. **dates:** 17-21 June 2013 **venue:** World Bank Headquarters **location:** Washington DC, US **contact:** GEF Secretariat **phone:** 1 202 473 0508 **fax:** 1 202 522 3240 **e-mail:** [secretariat@thegef.org](mailto:secretariat@thegef.org) **www:** [http://www.thegef.org/gef/council\\_meetings](http://www.thegef.org/gef/council_meetings)

**20th Meeting of the Adaptation Fund Board:** The Adaptation Fund Board supervises and manages the Adaptation Fund under the authority and guidance of the countries that are parties to the Kyoto Protocol. **dates:** June 2013 (TBD) **location:** Bonn, Germany (TBD) **contact:** Jeannette Jin Yu Lee **phone:** +1 202 473 7499 **fax:** +1 202 522 2720 **email:** [jlee21@thegef.org](mailto:jlee21@thegef.org) **www:** <http://www.adaptation-fund.org/page/calendar>

**Pilot Program for Climate Resilience (PPCR) Pilot County Meeting:** This meeting is expected to convene in Tajikistan in the summer of 2013. The PPCR is a program under the Strategic Climate Fund (SCF), one of two funds under the CIF. **contact:** CIF Administrative Unit **phone:** +1 202 458 1801 **email:** [cifevents@worldbank.org](mailto:cifevents@worldbank.org) **www:** [http://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/partnership\\_forum\\_2012\\_home](http://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/partnership_forum_2012_home)

**Scaling Up Renewable Energy Program (SREP) Pilot County Meeting:** This meeting is expected to convene in September, 2013. The SREP is a program under the Strategic Climate Fund (SCF), one of two funds under the

CIF. **contact:** CIF Administrative Unit **phone:** +1 202 458 1801 **email:** [cifevents@worldbank.org](mailto:cifevents@worldbank.org) **www:** [http://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/partnership\\_forum\\_2012\\_home](http://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/partnership_forum_2012_home)

**Forest Investment Program (FIP) Pilot Country Meeting:** This meeting is expected to convene in Indonesia in September, 2013. The FIP is a program under the Strategic Climate Fund (SCF), one of two funds under the CIF. **contact:** CIF Administrative Unit **phone:** +1 202 458 1801 **email:** [cifevents@worldbank.org](mailto:cifevents@worldbank.org) **www:** [http://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/partnership\\_forum\\_2012\\_home](http://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/partnership_forum_2012_home)

**20th Meeting of the Adaptation Fund Board:** The Adaptation Fund Board supervises and manages the Adaptation Fund under the authority and guidance of the countries that are parties to the Kyoto Protocol. **dates:** June 2013 (TBD) **location:** Bonn, Germany (TBD) **contact:** Jeannette Jin Yu Lee **phone:** +1 202 473 7499 **fax:** +1 202 522 2720 **email:** [jlee21@thegef.org](mailto:jlee21@thegef.org) **www:** <http://www.adaptation-fund.org/page/calendar>

## GLOSSARY

ADB	Asian Development Bank
AfDB	African Development Bank
CIF	Climate Investment Funds
CSP	concentrated solar power
CTF	Clean Technology Fund
DGM	Dedicated Grant Mechanism
EBRD	European Bank for Reconstruction and Development
EWT	Endangered Wildlife Trust
FAO	UN Food and Agriculture Organization
FCPF	Forest Carbon Partnership Facility
FIP	Forest Investment Program
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GCF	Green Climate Fund
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IFC	International Finance Corporation
M&E	monitoring and evaluation
MDB	Multilateral development banks
MRV	measurement, reporting and verification
PPCR	Pilot Program for Climate Resilience
REDD+	reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries; and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks
RPP	Readiness Preparation Proposal
SCF	Strategic Climate Fund
SME	small and medium enterprise
SPCR	Strategic Program for Climate Resilience
SREP	Scaling Up Renewable Energy Program in Low Income Countries
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change