



Pilot Program for Climate Resilience Bulletin

Summary of the Seventh meeting of the Pilot Program for Climate Resilience (PPCR) Pilot Countries

Published by the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD)

ONLINE AT [HTTP://WWW.IISD.CA/CLIMATE/CIF/PPCR/PPCR7/](http://www.iisd.ca/CLIMATE/CIF/PPCR/PPCR7/)
VOLUME 172, NUMBER 13, MONDAY, 6 MAY 2013



MEETING OF THE PPCR PILOT COUNTRIES

The seventh meeting of the Pilot Program for Climate Resilience (PPCR) for pilot countries and participating regions convened on 1-3 May in Washington, DC, and was hosted by the World Bank through the Climate Investment Funds (CIF).

Over 70 participants attended the meeting, which provided countries and regional organizations with opportunities to share challenges and experiences in implementing their programmes to enhance climate resilient development. During practical discussions on Wednesday, participants were able to converse on issues related to the PPCR revised results framework, including work plans, core indicators, and national monitoring and reporting systems.

On Thursday, participants examined different models of country and regional coordination mechanisms, including managing interagency coordination, engagement with stakeholders, measuring and reporting results, and mainstreaming climate resilience.

On Friday, core indicator guidance sheets and score cards for monitoring and reporting received attention, with CIF staff providing information on the content and context of the work plans, and soliciting feedback in order to improve the core indicator guidance sheet and score card. Participants also focused on activities pursued by businesses and enterprises, with support from Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs), in middle-income countries outside of the PPCR, and engaging the private sector through a competitive set-aside under the PPCR.



Country representatives taking part in the "core indicator quiz".

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, 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\$7.6 billion to the CIF, administered through country-led programs and investments, by the African Development Bank, Asian Development Bank, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), Inter-American Development Bank, 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.

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 that should initiate transformation with potential for scaling up climate resilience. The three programs under the SCF are the Forest Investment Program

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 MDBs and other sources. With CIF support, 49 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 gap between now and the next international climate change

IN THIS ISSUE

A Brief History Of The Climate Investment Funds	1
Report of the Meeting of PPCR Pilot Countries	3
Upcoming Meetings	8
Glossary	9

The *Pilot Program for Climate Resilience Bulletin* is a publication of the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) <info@iisd.ca>, publishers of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* © <enb@iisd.org>. This issue was written and edited by Kate Louw and Suzi Malan. The Digital Editor is Manu Kabahizi. The Editor is Liz Willetts <liz@iisd.org>. The Director of IISD Reporting Services is Langston James "Kimo" Goree VI <kimo@iisd.org>. Funding for coverage of this meeting has been provided by the Climate Investment Funds (CIF). 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>, +1-646-536-7556 or 300 East 56th St., 11D, New York, New York 10022, USA.



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

(FIP), the PPCR and the Program for Scaling-Up Renewable Energy in Low Income Countries (SREP). Pledges for the three SCF programs total US\$2.44 billion.

The FIP supports developing country efforts to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, promote sustainable forest management and enhance forest carbon stocks. 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 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\$1.3 billion has been pledged.

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 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 Strategic Programs for Climate Resilience (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 countries in October 2009 and has met six 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 SPCR 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 SPCR, 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.

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



Participants watching a presentation on the core indicators.

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. One objective of the meeting was to share innovative approaches to 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 (REDD+) investment. A further objective was to work 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.

OCTOBER 2012 PILOT COUNTRY MEETING: The sixth meeting of pilot countries and regions participating in the PPCR convened in October in Istanbul, Turkey. 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 monitoring and evaluation showcases.

The fourth meeting of pilot countries participating in the SREP convened in October in Istanbul, Turkey. 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.

The fourth meeting of pilot countries participating in the FIP convened in October in Istanbul, Turkey. 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 monitoring and evaluation showcases. Consultations also took place on the revised FIP results framework between pilot and contributor countries.

During a meeting of CTF, convened during the same period in Istanbul, Turkey, pilot countries shared experiences, successes and challenges, and lessons learned from the CTF implementation process, and discussed and provided feedback and recommendations on CTF monitoring and evaluation showcases. Consultations also took place on the revised FIP results framework between CTF and contributor countries. In a master class on wind energy and biodiversity issues, CTF support at different stages of wind energy development was highlighted, including 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.

REPORT OF THE MEETING OF PPCR PILOT COUNTRIES

On Wednesday afternoon, Funke Oyewole, CIF Deputy Program Manager, welcoming participants to the seventh meeting of PPCR Pilot Countries, congratulated the endorsement of the Haiti SPCR as the final of 20 programmes, saying this marked a new phase in the implementation of the PPCR. She stressed the importance of speaking candidly about challenges and encouraged sharing suggestions for

improvement during discussion sessions. Oyewole noted the role of the PPCR as a demonstration model and commended the pilot countries' pioneering work on monitoring and evaluation.



Shaanti Kapila, Global Support Program Coordinator, CIF

Shaanti Kapila, Global Support Program Coordinator, CIF, outlining the proceedings for the meeting, stressed the need to balance information sharing with discussion and exchange of experiences, such as emerging trends.

Andrea Kutter, PPCR Senior Program Coordinator, CIF, updated participants on the status of the PPCR, and highlighted emerging strategic lessons, including: the importance of investing

in climate data and hydrometeorological services; and the need to address challenges in project preparation and meeting deadlines for monitoring and reporting. She noted the need to incentivize greater private sector investment as one of the main pillars of sustainable development, inviting participants to access the private sector website for programmes and projects that engage the private sector.

UPDATES FROM PILOT COUNTRIES AND REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

During the discussions on pilot country programme updates, many participants noted challenges in institutional arrangements, including encouraging coordination across ministries and a lack of understanding on climate issues by those at local levels. One participant noted the need to respect the mandate of different ministries, while another called for ensuring less cumbersome institutional arrangements that enable the potential for restrictive information flows. They also noted that cumbersome institutional frameworks may delay decision making. Participants highlighted the creation of legal frameworks to overcome these hurdles.

On limited stakeholder capacity, participants suggested capacity building to ensure effective participation, cooperation and communications. Others noted that due to the marginal nature of the most vulnerable populations, engaging those communities might be difficult but necessary. Some highlighted the role that persons seconded from other relevant organizations and institutions can play in capacity building.

On increasing stakeholder engagement, participants urged inclusion of church groups and the private sector. Participants also called for clearly defining private sector and engaging at



Participants conferring.

its sub-sectoral levels so that unique attributes are leveraged. Others noted the need for concise, targeted messages to engage local communities.

Some participants highlighted the role of universities in data collection, with one participant suggesting establishing a regional coordination body to engage universities in this regard. Others called for creating a central portal to access data.

On procurement and recruitment, participants stressed flexibility, urging countries to take heed of available capacity and work with relevant individuals to understand the procurement process.

Participants outlined numerous challenges in coordination, including obstacles in cross-ministry coordination, with some highlighting methods to overcome this, such as through establishing coordination bodies and climate change units. Others underscored that PPCR programmes should be tangential and contribute to, as well as complement other national or regional work undertaken in climate change programmes. They also highlighted the importance and role of continuous dialogue to enhance stakeholder coordination.

Responding to discussion on advances in on-the-ground activities, participants emphasized the role that communities and local non-governmental organizations can play in compliance and enforcement. They also stressed that incentivizing the private sector is necessary to encourage the sector's participation and ensuring the right leverage to co-finance activities. Others noted that private sector involvement can lead to cost reduction. Some queried ways of leveraging funds to create climate change awareness and building funds into national budgets to sustain climate change adaptation activities.

PPCR MONITORING AND REPORTING – PART 1

On Thursday morning, PPCR pilot countries and observer organizations reconvened for discussions on the role of monitoring and reporting in their programmes. Christine Roehrer, Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist, CIF, emphasized the need for interactive “learning-by-doing” and presented on the PPCR revised results framework, including work plans, core indicators, and national monitoring and reporting systems.

In an “icebreaker” exercise participants were tasked with finding cartoons, distributed around the room, that most correlates with their country's monitoring and evaluation experiences, and to report their impressions. One participant referred to the inability of governments to assimilate the large amount of research and analysis documentation. Another pointed to a cartoon on the overwhelming “overload” of information from assessments. Other participants singled out cartoons on: the tendency of governments to ask for advice



Christine Roehrer, CIF, and Allan Edgar Brown, CIF

without heeding it; the problem of small island states having too few people responsible for too many things; and the fact that plans and goals are seldom aligned.

Roehrer explained the need for pilot programmes to demonstrate best practices, which require learning through doing, emphasizing the role of accountability required by significant contributions and using appropriate instruments to provide the right information. Saying that PPCR is amongst the most advanced and straight-forward of programmes, she reminded participants that pilot countries are involved with cutting-edge adaptation measures and are pioneers in monitoring and reporting, and thus provide much-needed practical lessons to the world.

On progress from past experiences, Roehrer highlighted: improvements on core and optional indicators; submission of monitoring and reporting work plans; establishment of baselines and targets; annual reporting to commence in 2014; and future implementation of the revised results framework. On the complexity of adaptation and ways to measure resilience, and the operationalization of monitoring and evaluation, she advised looking at the practicalities of measuring progress towards resilience. On scoring, Roehrer differentiated between scales of indicators, and reminded that indicators provide a quantitative measure on qualitative issues. Emphasizing the need for a participatory approach, she suggested wider stakeholder participation to critically review scores in order to increase transparency and accountability.

In response to questions on transformative practices and avoided costs, she responded that countries are not confined to measuring core indicators, but are encouraged to develop country-specific indicators. Another participant commended including the enforcement of a participatory approach, suggested ensuring participation of key stakeholders, and requested additional guidance on best practices to ensure value addition. Participants further posed questions on: setting time frames for individual countries; developing qualitative indicators and setting targets for national plans according to national circumstances; achieving common understanding of targets; developing indicators for key sectors; and the danger of “rolling” target dates. One participant proposed introducing specific target dates, while another suggested specific definitions to reduce subjectivity.

Participants broke into discussion groups to assess eight country work plans for monitoring and reporting on core indicators, with many cautioning against drafting plans that only list indicators. They highlighted that although indicators may have been defined in the work plans, these should be elaborated on and developed to ensure coherence between project indicators and global indicators. Many lamented the dearth of detail on resource allocation for stipulated tasks, and urged detailing those responsible for carrying out the tasks.

Some noted the need to ensure a universal understanding of the language used in the work plans. Others lauded establishing timeframes for tasks, with one group noting that the deadlines set may not be feasible or in accordance with CIF deadlines.

On data collection, participants underlined the necessity of establishing a baseline, saying that adequate data collection should be carried out. They also called for addressing data reporting requirements. Many said that ensuring multi-stakeholder collaboration in this regard would be beneficial.

PRESENTATION BY THE GOVERNMENT OF BELIZE ON ITS CLIMATE RESILIENCE INVESTMENT PLAN

Marion Cayetano, Climate Resilience Investment Plan Focal Point, Belize, presented Belize's strategic climate programme, saying their vulnerability to hurricanes, storm surges and heavy rains has forced the government to find ways of building

resilience in its economy and communities. Underscoring that the vulnerability to potential impacts of climate change cuts across all development challenges in Belize, he emphasized the need to invest in developing a comprehensive strategic programme to build resilience against climatic disasters. On the planning context, he referred to their goals for poverty reduction, climate resilience development, and economic development to be optimized by 2030. Explaining the country's multi-criteria evaluation, Cayetano outlined the medium-term development strategy which is revised every three years, and a prioritized investment plan supported by the World Bank and national financial resources. He explained the country's proposed climate resilience decision support tool, which is driven by stakeholder participants and combines mapping of potential hazards and critical infrastructures, identifying preliminary criteria, *inter alia*: technical engineering parameters, economic parameters, and social, health, safety and local parameters. Cayetano described the participatory approach through workshops to develop evaluation criteria, and stressed objectives, including: a more resilient and sustained economy; better access to markets and services; improved employment opportunities and poverty reduction; and more resilient and healthy communities.

During the ensuing discussion, participants commented on: ensuring that all agency units are "on-board"; having a national climate resilience orientation; and assessing the impacts and quantifying these across sectors to determine priorities and critical areas. Emphasizing stakeholder engagement during the preparation stages, a participant reminded sharing information as a function of readiness, and incorporating policy makers. Other participants stressed the importance of stakeholder involvement and political will, and translating international policies into legitimate stakeholder consultations at the project level. One participant suggested that the private sector and other institutions in developing countries lack the capacity to effectively engage with government, and said sufficient consultation requires more than "a few meetings and workshops."

MAINTAINING THE PROGRAMMATIC APPROACH: COUNTRY COORDINATION

Andrea Kutter introduced Thursday afternoon's discussions on maintaining the programmatic approach for implementing SPCRs, outlining that the discussions aim to assess potential synergies and benefits given the multisectoral and multilevel nature of climate change. Nasser Brahim, CIF Administrative Unit, called on participants to elaborate on their lead government institutions and coordination bodies addressing climate change. He noted many countries have delegated the responsibility for climate change and the SPCR to their environment ministries, whereas others have delegated it to planning ministries. He urged mainstreaming climate change into all national plans.



Andrea Kutter, PPCR Senior Program Coordinator, CIF

Fisseha Abissa, Stakeholder Engagement Officer, CIF, provided an overview of the principles guiding stakeholder engagement. He said governments should, *inter alia*, acknowledge and monitor the concerns of stakeholders, and recognize the dual role of civil society organizations (CSOs), both as critics and partners. He summarized three overarching approaches to engage stakeholders: facilitation as a service to disseminate information; consultation to seek the views of stakeholders; and building partnerships to involve stakeholders as project implementers.

PART 1: COUNTRY AND REGIONAL

COORDINATION

MECHANISMS: Dan Bakoye Chaibou, Ministry of Planning, Niger, presented Niger's experiences on implementation mechanisms, and the challenges and lessons drawn from their experiences. He identified projects and strategic policies at the national level, explaining the different scales at which projects are deployed, and the ministries involved. Bakoye proposed re-examining strategies for which methodologies have



Dan Bakoye Chaibou, Niger

already been developed with regards to community action projects and described other aspects of the SPCRs, *inter alia*: financial flows; information flows from monitoring and evaluation experts, through the regional focal points, to "in-house" experts and community participants; and taking governmental environmental safeguard measures into account, including planning, execution, verification, and evaluation.

Ronette Jordon, Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, highlighted lessons learned from SPCR implementation, citing the importance of partner agencies' full participation, clearly defining the stakeholder roles and responsibilities, and harmonizing activities across agencies. In the ensuing discussion participants asked for clarification on methods to coordinate SPCR implementation across government institutions, and how to measure the "representativeness" of local communities in the national consultation process.

Mark Bynoe, Senior Resource Economist, Caribbean Community Climate Change Centre (CCCCC) described the implementation plan for the Caribbean countries' regional framework, and the institutions on which these are built. He outlined: consolidating and expanding the regional climate monitoring network and global platform linkages; downscaling and expanding climate projection models and high resolution maps; and implementing entities, including fisheries, and agricultural and epidemiological institutes. He described operational examples of interaction across a variety of sectors and institutions, including continuous dialogue with all countries within the region, hosting consultative sessions, and institutional assessment to allow for better articulation of common methodologies. On challenges, he noted the plan's complexity, the high number of agencies and countries directly involved, the significant capacity constraints, and dealing with countries at different levels of programme implementation. On

lessons learned, he highlighted the importance of maintaining continued dialogue with stakeholders; that all adaptation is local and urged thinking regionally while delivering nationally.

Participants posed questions on: signing the memorandums of understanding; the challenges of policy and country programme alignment; potential dialogue with other countries in the region such as Belize; and how to capture climate resilience experiences from other countries.

PART 2: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT: Litara Taulealo, Ministry of Finance, Samoa, emphasizing the importance of CSOs for capacity building, funding flows, and information dissemination, outlined steps undertaken to assess CSOs capacity to engage communities and build their climate resilience. She said there has been little direct capacity building of CSOs, noting it generally occurs as a goal of project implementation. She highlighted that the PPCR has provided an opportunity to broaden the programmatic approach in working with and providing support to CSOs.

Martin Nyambe Sishekanu, Ministry of Finance and Planning, Zambia, presented on his country's stakeholder engagement activities, providing an overview of the areas of engagement. He noted the establishment of governmental systems at district and provincial level for project implementation, which assessed capacity and financial needs. He said multi-sectoral teams, including traditional leaders, civil society and private sector partners, had conducted a number of site visits, underscoring the comprehensive nature of the visits, which inspected: institutional arrangements at district level; qualitative vulnerability at ward level; and information validation at community level. He mentioned challenges such as budget tracking being solely centered on government, calling for a broader view of expenditure governance. He also urged tracking budgetary allocations as opposed to actual expenditures.

PPCR MONITORING AND REPORTING – PART II

On Friday morning, participants resumed discussions on monitoring and reporting, with Christine Roehrer reflecting on the previous day's workshop with the monitoring and reporting specialists. Recalling the objectives of executing monitoring

and reporting, she emphasized the role of learning and accountability, which leads to evidence-based decision making. One workshop participant reflected on the limitations of the five core indicators, *inter alia*, definitions and methodology, and noted concerns of the large volume of work required to complete the process. Another recognized that, contrary to when funding is negotiated, human and financial resources for monitoring and reporting allocation may prove insufficient. Roehrer cautioned that although funding should cover the costs of monitoring and reporting, difficulties will be considered on a case-by-case basis over the coming month.

Roehrer presented on the five core indicators, including: the number of people supported by PPCR to cope with climate change (A1.3); the degree of integration of climate change in national plans including sector planning (A2.1); the extent to which vulnerable households, communities, businesses and public sector use improved PPCR supported tools (B1); the evidence of strengthened government capacity and coordination mechanisms to mainstream climate resilience (B2); and the quality and extent to which climate responsive instruments or investment models are developed and tested (B5).

Participants then took part in a "core indicator quiz," requiring them to identify core indicators and select indicators most suited to their country. Roehrer presented on the objective of having core indicators, including: to guide countries in determining whether the PPCR has enhanced the country's capacity to mitigate climate change impacts; to provide a snapshot of PPCR supportive country-based services; and to measure progress made by PPCR projects over time.

Roehrer then introduced the core indicator guidance sheets, containing: the rationale for indicator measuring; technical definitions; methodology; data sources and data collection; responsibilities for monitoring and reporting; and quality assurance. She cautioned against aggregating scores between countries or producing averages, stressing the importance of, for example, determining the amount of people living below the poverty line or gender imbalances. Roehrer went on to explain the PPCR reporting tool kit, and invited participants to divide into roundtable discussions according to PPCR country units,



Participants during the monitoring and reporting workshop for specialists.

and, in collaboration with their monitoring and evaluation specialists, complete their core indicator scorecards, so as to familiarize themselves with, and to review, the core indicators.

Participants posed a number of questions, including: what encompasses adequate financial resources; depicting annual progress if targets have been reached; and how to measure financial gaps, particularly as it pertains to donor contributions. She responded that although terminologies and understanding may be different between countries, they should be measured consistently within countries over time so that change can be measured and documented.

Roehrer introduced the “road test” of core indicator B1 on strengthened adaptive capacities. She outlined the procedure for utilizing this in the field, noting that project implementers would fill this out and forward it to the national focal point so that the data can be aggregated and analyzed at the country level.

In the ensuing discussion, one participant queried the evaluation of public awareness platforms, noting that information on knowledge bases can be captured under multiple core indicators. Roehrer noted that information addressed under indicator B1 is on the use of these instruments and B5 is on the quality of the instruments used. Others asked how data could be attained timeously to establish a baseline by August 2013. Roehrer responded that programme managers must be brought into the process to provide sufficient and relevant information. Allan Edgar Brown, CIF Administrative Unit, urged participants to build time for sufficient data collection into monitoring and reporting plans.

Roehrer introduced indicator B2 on the evidence of strengthened government capacities and coordination mechanisms to mainstream climate resilience. She noted that elements to consider include whether government capacities have been strengthened, and whether this information is available in the public domain. She said in order to have an understanding of the scores, participants should detail the achievements under this indicator. Brown noted that the subtleties of using the scorecard are often based on “how the questions are asked,” stressing that the two dimensions being measured are mainstreaming as well as capacity.

In the ensuing discussion, Roehrer invited general feedback on the indicators, and participants posed questions on: establishing institutional capacity and increased female participation; and the definition of climate change expertise. Responding to a suggestion on simplifying the score sheets by adding more “yes/no” responses, Roehrer cautioned that this strategy often does not capture progress made. Reminding participants to submit comments by the end of May 2013, she suggested tasking the monitoring and reporting specialists to discuss outstanding issues during the afternoon’s workshop.

PPCR LEARNING ACTIVITIES FOR THE FINANCIAL YEAR 2014

On Friday afternoon, Shaanti Kapila introduced the discussion on PPCR learning activities for 2014. She said that based on input from member countries, MDBs and programme sub-committees, key areas identified for learning activities include hydrometeorological and climate services, review of the first funding phase activities, and monitoring and reporting. Under hydrometeorological and climate services, she noted possible actions include e-learning modules, thematic workshops and facilitating PPCR member countries in other global discussions.

Kanta Rigaud, PPCR Senior Environmental Specialist, CIF, outlined the e-learning module, saying that it will be an open access platform to facilitate learning in order for countries to ascertain, *inter alia*, existing gaps and capacities when addressing climate services at the country level. Andrea Kutter, on the review of the first funding phase, said this exercise will produce knowledge products based on opportunities, experiences and lessons learned, and suggested this is a result of many member countries expressing the value of learning from the use of the funding during this phase.

On other possible activities, participants called for additional tool development, including: screening tools on climate risk management and additional e-learning modules; work on the private sector role in adaptation; and hosting a trade show showcasing climate resilient products and tools.

PRIVATE SECTOR ACTION ON CLIMATE-RESILIENT DEVELOPMENT

Vladimir Stenek, Senior Climate Change Specialist, IFC, presented on the roles of the private sector in middle-income countries towards adaptation, including towards entities needing solutions, and financial assistance to enable them. On the gaps and barriers to fulfilling these roles, he outlined: information; time horizons; internal resources; technological solutions; finance; and policy regulation. He noted these problems are not limited to small or middle-income countries, but also occur in developed countries. He further stressed the importance of identifying and addressing risks and opportunities. Using the example of a Colombian port, he



Craig Davies, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development

told of an IFC investigation on the potential impacts of sea level rise on business as a consequence of climate change, and identified key areas for adaptation investments, and key interventions.

Craig Davies, Senior Environmental Advisor, EBRD, using the water usage of a paper and pulp mill in Bosnia and Herzegovina as case study, related the large reduction in water loss from a relatively small investment. He further cited investing in improved irrigation in an Ukrainian agricultural plant through establishing drip irrigation, which raised the company’s resilience to climate change. Outlining financing modalities and links to climate finance, he identified: technical assistance and policy dialogue; loans through investing in improved technology and infrastructure; use of financial intermediaries, such as local banks; and concessional finance as opposed to loan finance at market rates, to support small businesses in low-income countries.

Participants discussed: the role of MDBs in overcoming private sector engagement; providing incentives to the private sector that reduce the risks of long timeframes and uncertainty of climate-resilience research and development; providing the right type of financial assistance together with technical support to ensure success; and offering CIF funding in local currencies.

Bhuban Karki, Undersecretary, Ministry of Finance, Nepal, outlined his government’s engagement with the private sector, saying that areas of engagement and possible challenges were

identified when implementing the PPCR. He noted that through using a public-private partnership model, complementarities could be leveraged, such as faster PPCR implementation, additional investments, and more efficient use of resources. He stressed the Government's role in enabling private sector participation through policy support, subsidies and beneficial taxation policies.

Anupa Aryal Pant, Operations Analyst, IFC, presented on the IFC's role in the Nepalese PPCR. She noted strengthening the value chain within efforts to promote climate resilient agribusiness and said the IFC provides technical and financial assistance, as well as assists in establishing access to markets, specifically irrigation technology. Noting that the IFC is working across all aspects of the supply chain, she outlined its provision of "risk sharing" and loan facilities, extension services, and access to technology.

In the ensuing discussion, some asked questions on the role of the Nepalese government in the IFC's implementation of the PPCR. Pant clarified that there are a number of steering committees in which government is involved and to which the IFC project component reports. On a query regarding determination of rental equipment rates, she said that this is the decision of the companies concerned, and emphasized that the IFC cannot be involved to such an extent that market distortions occur.

ENGAGING THE PRIVATE SECTOR THROUGH A COMPETITIVE SET ASIDE UNDER THE PPCR

Andrea Kutter explained the motivation behind the Competitive Resource Set Aside, which will contribute to transformative changes in the pilot countries. She said this funding of US\$70 million will be allocated to private sectors programmes and projects and aimed to remove private sector investment barriers. She explained that CIF recognized that the PPCR portfolio contained limited private sector activity, and acknowledged the private sector's crucial role in reaching national development goals. Kutter referred participants to the CIF website that provides the tools needed for submitting private sector concepts and ideas, including procedures, timelines, and formats to present concepts. Calling for innovative concepts, she outlined the process, including the proposal submission deadline, and the ranking and selection process, and noted these will be announced in November 2013.

REFLECTIONS AND WRAP UP

Mark Bynoe noted CCCCC's activities in developing training and web-based tools from which lessons learned could be disseminated. Kapila suggested exploring the possibility to scale-up these activities beyond the Caribbean region.



Anupa Aryal Pant, IFC

Kapila, in closing, thanked participants for their enthusiastic input over the course of the three days and encouraged them to provide feedback and input during the intersessional periods, including on possible intersessional activities. She closed the meeting at 4:26 pm.

UPCOMING MEETINGS

UNFCCC Subsidiary Bodies Session: The 38th sessions of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) 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 **www:** <http://www.unfccc.int>

Soil Carbon Sequestration: A Solution for Climate, Food Security and Ecosystem Services: This conference aims to highlight the growing importance of conserving and restoring soil organic carbon for multiple win-win benefits within various land-type and land-use settings. It will review the state of science and further knowledge needs involved and discuss, *inter alia*; land use and land restoration practices; verifying carbon sequestration and linkages with the UNFCCC and other global goals, agreements and negotiations; and increasing the flow of climate-linked funding for land and soil restoration. **dates:** 26-29 May 2013 **location:** Iceland **contact:** Organizing Committee **e-mail:** arna@land.is **www:** <http://www.fao.org/globalsoilpartnership/events/detail/en/c/154385/>

The Asian and Pacific Energy Forum (APEF 2013): The UN Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) is convening APEF 2013 to promote regional cooperation for enhanced energy security and the sustainable use of energy. APEF 2013 is the first ministerial conference of its kind to bring together 62 member states and associate members from the Asia-Pacific region on energy. It is expected that a Ministerial Declaration and Regional Plan of Action will be agreed, addressing energy issues from access, efficiency and renewable energy sources to connectivity and trade, within the overall context of sustainable development and in connection with the UN Secretary General's global initiative, Sustainable Energy for All. **dates:** 27-30 May 2013 **location:** Vladivostok (Primor'Ye), Russian Federation **contact:** APEF 2013 **e-mail:** apef@un.org **www:** <http://www.unescap.org/apef>

73rd Meeting of the CDM Executive Board: The Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) Executive Board (EB) will convene its 73rd meeting (EB73) to consider matters relating to the operation of the CDM.

dates: 27-31 May 2013 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **e-mail:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** <http://cdm.unfccc.int/calendar/index.html>

Vienna Energy Forum 2013: The third Vienna Energy Forum (VEF 2013) will focus on the energy dimension of the Rio+20 outcome document. This high level meeting will be an opportunity for leaders, policy makers and energy practitioners to engage in interactive dialogue on key sustainable energy issues, including policies, markets, finance and technologies. The Forum is also aimed at enhancing understanding of how sustainable energy fits into the broader post-2015 development framework. **dates:** 28-30 May 2013 **venue:** Hofburg Imperial Palace **location:** Vienna, Austria **contact:** UNIDO **e-mail:** vef2013@unido.org **www:** <http://www.unido.org/media-centre/upcoming-events/vienna-energy-forum-2013.html>

Fifth Scaling up Renewable Energy Program (SREP)

Pilot Country Meeting: The fifth meeting of pilot countries participating in the SREP will provide a platform for pilot and reserve countries to share updates on the status of their projects, last assessed in October 2012. Sessions will focus on the areas of monitoring and reporting on energy access results, project delivery, and private sector engagement. The countries participating in the SREP are: Ethiopia, Honduras, Kenya, Maldives, Mali, Liberia, Nepal and Tanzania. **dates:** 28-30 May 2013 **location:** Maldives **venue:** Bandos Island **phone:** +1-202-458-180 **e-mail:** cifadminunit@worldbank.org **www:** <https://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/content/srep-pilot-country-meetings>

44th GEF Council Meeting: The Global Environment Facility (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:** 17-20 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 **www:** 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 **www:** <http://www.adaptation-fund.org/page/calendar>

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 **www:** <https://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/content/fip-pilot-country-meetings>

GLOSSARY

CIF	Climate Investment Funds
CSO	Civil Society Organization
CTF	Climate Technology Fund
EBRD	European Bank for Reconstruction and Development
FIP	Forest Investment Program
GEF	Global Environment Facility
IFC	International Finance Corporation
MDB	Multilateral development banks
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
SCF	Strategic Climate Fund
SPCR	Strategic Program for Climate Resilience
SREP	Scaling Up Renewable Energy Program in Low Income Countries



The Globe at the World Bank Headquarters.