



Framework Convention on Climate Change

Distr.: General
23 November 2010

Original: English

Subsidiary Body for Implementation

Thirty-third session

Cancun, 30 November to 4 December 2010

Item 7 (b) of the provisional agenda

Matters relating to Article 4, paragraphs 8 and 9, of the Convention

Matters relating to the least developed countries

Report on the regional training workshops on the implementation of national adaptation programmes of action in 2009–2010

Note by the secretariat*

Summary

This report provides a summary of the five regional training workshops on the implementation of national adaptation programmes of action (NAPAs) conducted by the Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG) in partnership with the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and its agencies in the period 2009–2010. The five workshops were held in: Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, from 19 to 23 October 2009; Bamako, Mali, from 8 to 12 February 2010; Vientiane, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, from 4 to 8 May 2010; Sao Tome, Sao Tome and Principe, from 4 to 8 September 2010; and Apia, Samoa, from 3 to 6 November 2010. They focused on providing participants with hands-on training in the design and preparation of proposals for the implementation of adaptation projects identified in NAPAs, and in the subsequent submission of these proposals to the GEF to receive support under the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF). In addition, the workshops addressed barriers and challenges faced by least developed country Parties in accessing funding under the LDCF. Countries were grouped for the workshops according to their language and regional similarities, in order to provide a platform for learning and sharing experience and to exploit synergies. This report includes a summary of the key topics presented at each of the training workshops, as well as a summary of the issues raised by participants that need to be addressed by the GEF, its agencies and the LEG in order to further facilitate access to funds under the LDCF for the successful implementation of NAPAs.

* This document was submitted after the due date as a result of the timing of the meeting of the Least Developed Countries Expert Group.

Contents

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction	1–8	3
A. Mandate.....	1–2	3
B. Scope of the note	3	3
C. Possible action by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation	4	3
D. Background.....	5–8	3
II. Proceedings.....	9–21	4
A. Details of each workshop	9–17	4
B. Organization of the training for each workshop	18–21	6
III. Analysis of the main issues addressed during the training.....	22–54	6
A. Preparing national adaptation programmes of action	22–23	6
B. Designing an implementation strategy	24–25	7
C. Preparing projects for financing under the Least Developed Countries Fund	26–35	7
D. Integrating national adaptation programmes of action into national development plans and medium- and long-term adaptation planning	36–37	9
E. Country-specific case studies	38	9
F. Practical field trips.....	39–50	10
G. Evaluation of the workshops by participants	51–54	12
IV. Summary of suggestions for future support.....	55–81	12
A. Improve access to relevant information about the implementation process for national adaptation programmes of action	56	12
B. Improve access to relevant information about the Global Environment Facility agencies	57–58	13
C. Enhance individual and institutional technical capacities	59–60	13
D. Develop training and outreach materials for use at the national level	61–62	14
E. Process Least Developed Countries Fund projects in multiple languages.....	63–65	14
F. Design generic templates for national adaptation programmes of action projects.....	66–68	14
G. Provide capacity-building, including for using a programmatic approach in implementing national adaptation programmes of action	69–71	15
H. Provide support for demonstrating adaptation-additionality and co-financing in projects	72–75	15
I. Enhance the provision and delivery of financial resources	76–77	16
J. Enhance support for the demonstration, promotion and application of technologies for adaptation.....	78	16
K. Organize more activities to share experiences and lessons learned	79–81	16

I. Introduction

A. Mandate

1. As part of its priority activities under its work programme for 2008–2010, as endorsed by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) at its twenty-ninth session,¹ the Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG) planned to organize training for least developed country (LDC) Parties in the design of strategies for the implementation of national adaptation programmes of action (NAPAs) and in the preparation of project proposals for submission to the Global Environment Facility (GEF) to receive support under the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF). This training was conducted in collaboration with the GEF and its agencies, through workshops that were categorized by region and the three languages used by LDC Parties, namely English, French and Portuguese.

2. At its thirty-second session, the SBI requested the secretariat to prepare a report on the regional training workshops referred to in paragraph 1 above, to be made available by its thirty-third session.²

B. Scope of the note

3. This document provides information on the workshops referred to in paragraph 1 above, drawing on the presentations and discussions that took place. It contains a description of the workshop proceedings (chapter II), analysis of the main issues addressed during the training (chapter III) and a summary of suggestions for further support (chapter IV).

C. Possible action by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation

4. The SBI may wish to take note of this report at its thirty-third session as part of its consideration of the outputs of the LEG, with a view to adopting further guidance on future support programmes during its consideration of the extension of the mandate of the LEG.

D. Background

5. The LEG was established by the Conference of the Parties (COP), at its seventh session, to advise on the preparation and implementation strategy for NAPAs.³ Since its constitution in 2001, the LEG has served four mandates, for the periods 2002–2003, 2004–2005, 2006–2007 and 2008–2010. The current mandate of the LEG is based on a decision adopted by the COP at its thirteenth session.⁴

6. In support of the preparation of NAPAs, the LEG organized one global workshop to launch the NAPA preparation process, in Dhaka, Bangladesh, in 2002, and four regional training workshops on the preparation of NAPAs in 2003. Of these four regional workshops, two were conducted for African LDCs, in English and French respectively, and one each for Asian and Pacific LDCs. The workshops were designed to equip NAPA teams

¹ FCCC/SBI/2008/14, annex I.

² FCCC/SBI/2010/10, paragraph 85.

³ Decision 29/CP.7.

⁴ Decision 8/CP.13.

with hands-on tools for preparing NAPAs using the LEG annotated guidelines⁵ and to facilitate the exchange of experiences.

7. After the completion of their NAPAs, a number of LDC Parties highlighted the challenges that they faced in accessing funds under the LDCF for implementing their NAPAs, and they expressed the need for the LEG to provide training on the development of NAPA implementation strategies, including on accessing funds under the LDCF.⁶ In response, the LEG put together a training module and undertook five regional training workshops aimed at supporting LDCs in the design and preparation of both project proposals that meet the funding requirements of the LDCF and strategies to enhance NAPA implementation. The training was based on the *Step-by-step guide for implementing national adaptation programmes of action*⁷ (hereinafter referred to as the Step-by-step guide) and the five regional workshops were organized based on regional needs and language considerations. They were conducted in close collaboration with the GEF, its agencies and regional and national centres of excellence in each of the target regions.

8. The SBI, at its thirty-first session,⁸ invited the GEF to support, when sufficient voluntary finding had not been provided from bilateral sources, the organization of the four training workshops in 2010. In addition to the support provided by the GEF, financial resources were provided by the Governments of Australia, Canada, Ireland, Spain and Switzerland. The Government of Brazil provided in-kind support by arranging the translation of the training materials into Portuguese for the lusophone workshop.

II. Proceedings

A. Details of each workshop

1. Workshop for anglophone African least developed countries

9. The workshop took place from 19 to 23 October 2010 in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, and was hosted by the Vice President's Office, Division of Environment, of the Government of Tanzania, supported by a regional centre of excellence, Environmental Protection and Management Services, based in Dar es Salaam. The contact person for logistical arrangements for this workshop was Mr. Richard Muyungi.

10. Thirteen African anglophone LDCs were represented, each, in most cases, by three participants. The group was diverse, with participants coming from ministries of finance, planning, agriculture, water and environment and also from some non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Resource persons included the Chair of the LEG, Mr. Fred Onduri Machulu (Uganda); a member of the LEG, Mr. Benjamin Karmoth (Liberia); representatives of the secretariat, the GEF Secretariat, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the United Nations Environment Programme; and a training consultant.

2. Workshop for francophone least developed countries

11. The workshop took place from 8 to 12 February 2010 in Bamako, Mali, and was hosted by the Government of Mali under the auspices of the Direction Nationale de la Météorologie. The contact person for logistical arrangements for this workshop was Mr. Birama Diarra. The workshop was attended by 60 participants, representing 15 francophone

⁵ <http://unfccc.int/files/cooperation_and_support/ldc/application/pdf/annguide.pdf>.

⁶ FCCC/SBI/2007/32, paragraphs 41–52, and “surveys to LDC Parties”.

⁷ <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/publications/ldc_napa2009.pdf>.

⁸ FCCC/SBI/2009/15, paragraph 57.

LDCs. The participants were a diverse mix of government officers and some representatives of NGOs, including many UNFCCC national focal points. Resource persons included the Vice-Chair of the LEG, Mr. Ibila Djibril (Benin); two members of the LEG, Mr. Erwin Künzi (Austria) and Mr. Pa Ousman Jarju (Gambia); representatives of the secretariat, the GEF Secretariat and UNDP; and a training consultant.

3. Workshop for Asian least developed countries

12. The workshop took place from 4 to 8 May 2010 in Vientiane, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, and was hosted by the Department of Environment under the Water Resources and Environment Administration. The contact person for logistical arrangements for this workshop was Mr. Syamphone Sengchandala.

13. The workshop was attended by participants from 10 Asian LDCs and one Caribbean LDC (Haiti). In total, 46 participants took part in the workshop, comprising officers from ministries or departments of agriculture, disaster management, environment, finance, planning and forestry, and from local government. There was a rich mix of participants, including a number of UNFCCC national focal points. Resource persons included the Chair of the LEG; two members of the LEG, Mr. Jan Verhagen (Netherlands) and Mr. Batu Uprety (Nepal); representatives of the secretariat, the GEF secretariat, UNDP and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO); and a training consultant.

4. Workshop for lusophone least developed countries

14. The workshop took place from 4 to 8 September 2010 in Sao Tome, Sao Tome and Principe, and was hosted by the Government of Sao Tome and Principe through the General Directorate of Environment. The contact person for logistical arrangements for this workshop was Mr. Aderito Manuel Fernandes Santana. The workshop was opened by the Minister of Public Works and Natural Resources, His Excellency Mr. Carlos Manuel Vila Nova.

15. Eighteen participants attended the workshop, representing five lusophone African LDCs. Participants were officers from ministries or departments of planning, environment and foreign affairs. Two were also UNFCCC national focal points. Resource persons included the Vice-Chair of the LEG; one member of the LEG, Mr. Adérito Santana (Sao Tome and Principe); representatives of the secretariat, the World Bank on behalf of the GEF secretariat, and UNDP; and training consultants.

5. Workshop for Pacific least developed countries

16. The workshop took place from 3 to 6 November 2010 in Apia, Samoa, and was hosted by the Government of Samoa under the auspices of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment. The contact person for logistical arrangements for this workshop was Ms. Anne Rasmussen. The workshop was opened by the Associate Minister of Natural Resources and Environment, Honourable Tapuai Sepulona Tapuai.

17. Twenty participants attended the workshop, representing five Pacific LDCs. The participants comprised officers from ministries or departments of agriculture, fisheries, health, tourism, planning, environment and foreign affairs, and a representative of NGOs in Samoa. Resource persons included the Chair of the LEG; a member of the LEG, Mr. Douglas Yee (Solomon Islands); the Chair of the LDCs, Mr. Bruno Tseliso Sekoli (Lesotho); representatives of the secretariat, the GEF secretariat, FAO and Australian Department of Climate Change and Energy Efficiency; and a training consultant.

B. Organization of the training for each workshop

18. The key resource material for the training was the step-by-step guide, developed by the LEG in close collaboration with the GEF and its agencies. A set of training materials,⁹ based on the step-by-step guide, was developed and used to guide the day-to-day proceedings of the workshops. Additional presentations on key thematic areas (agriculture and food security, coastal zones and marine ecosystems, and early warning and disaster management) were contributed by GEF agencies. Short extracts from NAPAs, poverty reduction strategy papers and the United Nations Development Assistance Framework were provided for selected countries at each workshop to inform case studies during practical sessions. In addition, participant countries at each workshop contributed presentations on their specific experiences in preparing and implementing their NAPAs.

19. Each workshop was for five days.¹⁰ Four of the days were structured to allow for exchanges between the participants, the LEG and resource persons on:

(a) Essential basics of the least developed countries work programme (LDC work programme), NAPAs, the LDCF, the GEF and designing a NAPA implementation strategy (day 1);

(b) Formulation of project proposals using GEF procedures and guidelines, reasoning for baseline activities, additional adaptation costs and co-financing (day 2);

(c) Transition to the development of full project proposals, and designing country-specific NAPA implementation strategies (day 3);

(d) A conclusive exercise focusing on broadening the scope of adaptation in LDCs (day 4).

20. Each of the days ended with practical sessions in small groups, focused on designing implementation strategies and developing NAPA projects in the context of the GEF project cycle.

21. The fifth day of each of the workshops was dedicated to a field trip, which allowed participants to interact with local communities on their experiences in dealing with climate change on the ground. At the end of the field trip, participants were given an opportunity to brainstorm on the type of adaptation solutions that could address climate change problems observed at visited sites.

III. Analysis of the main issues addressed during the training

A. Preparing national adaptation programmes of action

22. The workshops were designed taking into consideration the different stages of the NAPA cycle and recognizing that there are some LDCs that are still in the process of preparing their NAPAs; therefore, the workshop programme was adapted to address the needs of these countries, as applicable. This was the case for the francophone, Asian and lusophone workshops and the countries in this category were Angola, Equatorial Guinea, Myanmar, Nepal and Timor-Leste.

⁹ Training materials available at <http://unfccc.int/files/cooperation_support/least_developed_countries_portal/ldc_expert_group/application/pdf/training_workshop_on_implementing_napa_training_materials_eng.pdf>.

¹⁰ The field trip for the Pacific workshop was compressed and conducted in the afternoon of the fourth day.

23. Materials for the workshops were drawn from the technical paper prepared by the LEG entitled *NAPAs: Overview of preparation, design of implementation strategies and submission of revised project lists and profiles*.¹¹ The countries were provided with further information on where to locate resources for the preparation of their NAPAs, including the roles that the LEG, the GEF and its agencies and the secretariat can play in supporting the NAPA preparation process. In addition, the countries were given an interactive *NAPA Source Kit* CD-ROM, which contains comprehensive guidelines and resource materials for the preparation and implementation of NAPAs.¹² Furthermore, the LEG assigned its members to each of the countries that were yet to finalize their NAPAs in order to prepare case studies indicating the level of progress in the preparation of their NAPAs, barriers encountered, proposals for possible solutions and potential areas of intervention by the LEG and partners in the NAPA preparation process. This information was used to inform the discussions at the workshops.

B. Designing an implementation strategy

24. In the sessions on designing an implementation strategy, participants were introduced to two main options: (a) pursuing funding from the GEF for a single project by following the sequence of steps in the process for submitting a proposal; or (b) designing an integrated or so-called programmatic approach that would address parts or all of the priority needs identified in the NAPA, going through the planning and justification for implementation stages, then accessing funds under the LDCF for an initial phase of the implementation under the current ceiling of funding available to each LDC.

25. The training considered the advantages and disadvantages of each of these approaches, and the general recommendation was for countries to choose the approach that would best meet their immediate needs. It was noted that a programmatic approach may make more sense but would require significantly more funds than are currently available to each LDC under the LDCF alone and also more effort to develop a programme.

C. Preparing projects for financing under the Least Developed Countries Fund

1. Overview of the Least Developed Countries Fund project cycle

26. The training workshops covered the three stages of the process for accessing financial resources under the LDCF: the project identification form (PIF), the project preparation grant (PPG) and the endorsement by the Chief Executive Officer (CEO). Participants were made aware that the purpose of the PIF is to determine the general eligibility of the project for LDCF funding. The PIF was described as being a concept note that provides information on indicative activities as well as on budget and arrangements for implementation. The second stage, applying for a PPG, was described as a request for financial support for the development of a more comprehensive project proposal for endorsement by the CEO. Finally, the last stage, endorsement by the CEO, was described as being a demonstration of a fully developed project, ready for implementation. In addition, participants received information on the timeline for the submission and processing of projects.

27. Participants who had had no experience in preparing projects for financing under the LDCF were appreciative of these explanations, while the others saw an opportunity to

¹¹ <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/publications/lcd_tp2009.pdf>.

¹² Available from the UNFCCC secretariat.

refresh their knowledge and ask more detailed questions based on their country-specific experiences.

2. Preparing a concept for a project proposal

28. In this session, participants were taken through the essentials of the preparation of a sound project proposal, including the choice of a GEF implementing agency, the selection of NAPA priorities and the development of partnerships and coordination. In addition, to assist participants in developing an implementing strategy, an interactive presentation was given on the two types of approach possible: the single project approach and the programmatic approach. The presentation highlighted the advantages and disadvantages of each approach. It also addressed other issues to consider in defining an implementation strategy, such as the scale of the projects/programme, the identification of baseline activities, the cost of adaptation, and the need (or not) to update and revise the NAPA.

29. The session included guided practical work: participants worked in randomly assigned break-out groups on defining an implementing strategy for a given NAPA case study.

3. Completing the project identification form

30. A session on the preparation of a PIF was held. This session focused on the description of the main elements of the PIF, a review of the process for approval of the PIF, collaboration with agencies during preparation of the PIF, and the differences in the preparation of a PIF depending on the chosen implementation strategy.

31. The session included a guided practical session, in which participants, working in the same break-out groups as in the previous session and on the same case studies, were tasked to define project concept frameworks.

4. Applying for a project preparation grant and completing the full project documents

32. A description of the PPG phase was given, covering both the purpose and scope. This session highlighted key issues such as hiring and managing consultants, work planning, and common hurdles in PPG management. The session addressed what information is required for the development of full project documents for endorsement by the CEO, namely: a project results framework; a detailed project budget, with an indication of the source of funding and co-financing components; a project justification, including additional cost reasoning; description of the monitoring and evaluation process; and implementation plans.

33. In the last guided practical session, participants designed a results framework for their assigned case studies.

5. Co-financing in Least Developed Countries Fund projects

34. The concept of co-financing under the LDCF was reviewed and discussed at all five workshops. The presentation described the expectations of the GEF in terms of co-financing under the LDCF and provided a few examples of projects that have received co-financing.

35. At the end of the sessions on preparing projects for financing under the LDCF, participants left with a good understanding of the project development and approval processes under the LDCF. They acknowledged the efforts of the GEF in streamlining the process of approving projects. Based on the training sessions and their own experience, participants concluded that most of the delays observed in the implementation of NAPA projects resulted not only from the approval processes of the GEF but also from the

countries' limited understanding of certain requirements, such as co-financing. In addition, some participants mentioned poor relationships between the countries and the implementing agencies and the lack of strong country ownership of the projects as some of the problems that prevent timely project approval.

D. Integrating national adaptation programmes of action into national development plans and medium- and long-term adaptation planning

36. This session entailed discussions on ongoing efforts to scale up adaptation efforts, as well as on the means and mechanisms for linking NAPAs to national planning processes. It included an overview of potential synergies between adaptation activities and other multilateral environmental agreements, regional synergies and the potential for collaboration, as well as other elements of the LDC work programme. In addition, the GEF agencies that were present provided a broader overview of their activities in support of climate change adaptation, and possible links that could be created with NAPAs.

37. It emerged during the discussions that placing NAPAs and adaptation planning within the development context is instrumental in ensuring their integration into national plans and programmes. It was also generally agreed that such an approach guarantees support at the national level for NAPA implementation, and provides a foundation for overcoming barriers associated with co-financing for NAPA projects, an area that has proved most difficult and time-consuming in preparing projects.

E. Country-specific case studies

38. Individual countries were encouraged to prepare presentations on their national experiences in preparing and implementing NAPAs, as inputs to discussions during the training. Participants were encouraged to focus on their national criteria for prioritizing immediate and urgent adaptation actions, on their experiences in developing an implementation strategy for their NAPA, and on experiences gained during the preparation of their first NAPA project submitted for financing under the LDCF. Several countries provided their experiences and updates on projects that were under implementation. At the end of the training, country teams were given an opportunity to work together to develop and/or further improve their NAPA implementation strategy and determine their next steps. During their presentations, countries made the following key points:

(a) Despite limited awareness and capacity at the beginning of the process, with regard to climate change in general and adaptation in particular, NAPA preparation was relatively straightforward;

(b) The NAPA preparation process improved the level of awareness and capacity at the national and community levels, and this increased capacity has benefited other processes, including the preparation of national communications, and the awareness of the importance of climate change has been raised at the policymaking level;

(c) During the implementation of their NAPAs, countries met challenges in preparing their NAPA project documents, as they required detailed information that was not readily available: the section on justification, and also issues related to co-financing, proved difficult for the countries;

(d) There is a need both for enhanced efforts to build the capacity of LDCs to enable them to develop their own projects, and for the simplification of procedures in order to avoid the use of international consultants, reduce costs, and improve on the country-driven nature of the preparation process to enhance country ownership of projects.

F. Practical field trips

1. African anglophone workshop

39. Participants were taken on a practical field trip to Bagamoyo, an important cultural heritage site of Tanzania, 45 miles north of Dar es Salaam and one of Tanzania's NAPA projects, which was approved by the GEF Council in October 2009. The field trip demonstrated how the area is already experiencing the effects of climate change. The key impacts demonstrated were: the inundation of traditional water sources, leading to the salinization of shallow water wells, the only source of domestic water supply in the area; increased coastal erosion and its associated impacts on settlements; and the degradation of culturally important sites, such as historical buildings and cemeteries.

2. Francophone workshop

40. The field trip in Mali took participants to a community of 44 villages where farmers use agrometeorological information to plan their farming activities. Agriculture and livestock rearing are important activities to the Malian economy, accounting for 35–45 per cent of the country's gross domestic product and nearly 86 per cent of the country's total employment.¹³ However, Mali's climate is characterized by high inter-annual variability in its rainfall, with increased recurrence of dry years and prolonged droughts in recent history, which has severe negative effects on Malian communities' livelihoods.¹⁴

41. As part of a national strategy to reduce poverty, strengthen food security and protect the environment, rural communities are provided with agrometeorological information, as well as tools and instruments, to assist them in strategically planning their agropastoral activities and therefore better adapting to climate change and variability. Women form a large proportion of the beneficiaries of this programme.

42. Participants had the opportunity to engage in open discussions with farmers, including on their understanding of climate change and its influence on their farming systems, possible causes of climate change and the responsibility of communities, indigenous coping mechanisms and strategies, and the application of agrometeorological information and how it has assisted them in addressing the new challenges brought about by climate change. The farmers also provided information on the type of external assistance that could be provided to them in order to further enhance their livelihoods.

43. The farmers were very pleased to have spoken with regional and international experts on their experiences in dealing with climate change, and to have laid down their needs for further assistance. The workshop participants were highly motivated by this experience and admitted that Mali's two NAPA projects submitted to the GEF, which both address the challenges of climate change in the areas of agriculture and food security, were justified.

3. Asian workshop

44. Participants were taken to the Rice and Cash Crops Research Centre in Vientiane. The director of the centre introduced to them both the centre itself and its roles in breeding rice and cash crops. The director indicated that the major climatic threats to the Lao People's Democratic Republic's rice and cash crops are droughts and rising temperatures. The centre is therefore charged with breeding rice that can withstand, among other things, drought and is resistant to diseases emerging due to higher temperatures.

¹³ <<http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/napa/mli01f.pdf>>.

¹⁴ As footnote 13 above.

45. The centre has been able to stabilize and improve rice yields in the Lao People's Democratic Republic, thus contributing to the national agricultural goals to: ensure food security for all of the country's people; promote the production of commodities for export; stabilize the shifting cultivation and eradicate poppy cultivation; and diversify and modernize the agriculture sector. While appreciating the successes of the centre, the director also indicated the challenges in acquiring the latest technologies for research and the breeding of rice and other cash crops.

46. During the discussions, it was made clear that such centres are essential for building the resilience of communities, and hence countries, by exploring crop varieties more suitable to a changing climate. It was also noted that it takes at least 18 years to develop a rice cultivar and that similar time frames are applicable to other crop varieties. Participants greatly welcomed the visit to the centre and saw it as a perfect model for addressing challenges in crop production which should be promoted in all LDCs. Participants noted that the breeding of drought-resistant crop varieties is one of the most popular adaptation options proposed to address the adverse effects of climate change on crops, and they were happy to have experienced what such a centre looks like and what it does.

4. Lusophone workshop

47. The field trip in Sao Tome took participants to two communities which had been identified as highly vulnerable to climate change in the country's NAPA. The first community is experiencing major fire outbreaks, as it lies in an area where the savanna is increasingly taking over the forest. The three main issues faced by this community are difficulties in accessing water, low agricultural productivity and reduced forest productivity. These issues are being addressed in a NAPA project supported by funding from the LDCF. The project is awaiting endorsement by the CEO of the GEF and is planned to start in early 2011. The second community was a coastal fishing community. This community is threatened by severe storms and sea level rise, with the accompanying coastal erosion and loss of land. These issues are being addressed in an adaptation project receiving financing from the Japan-UNDP African Adaptation Programme (AAP). The project components are a geomorphological study, the establishment of early warning systems, and other adaptive initiatives. Implementation is planned for 2011.

48. In the two areas visited, participants had the opportunity to hold discussions with members of the local communities, who shared with them their understanding of climate change and its manifestation in their living environment, their concerns with regard to its impact on their livelihoods, and what they expect from the implementation of the above-mentioned NAPA and AAP projects.

5. Pacific workshop

49. The field trip in Samoa took participants along the eastern coast of the country's Upolu Island to see how coastal restoration project activities have been used to secure the coastal and port areas by construction of sea walls, as a way of reducing the effects of increased wave action. The main threat that prompted the need for the restoration of the coastal land was the gradual encroachment of the sea onto the mainland in recent years. This encroachment has resulted in the inundation of settled land, where building foundations were still visible but have now been completely covered by the sea. The project initiated the construction of sea walls using locally available rocks, and the filling of the land with soil where it had been eroded by the waves. It was demonstrated how the wall is being strengthened by the planting of coconut trees. Local communities provided locally available materials for the construction of the sea walls and assisted in planting the coconut trees to reinforce the wall.

50. During the discussions, participants recognized the potential value of sea walls in protecting coastal communities against the consequences of sea level rise.

G. Evaluation of the workshops by participants

51. At the end of each workshop, participants filled out an evaluation form. In their responses, the majority of participants expressed their satisfaction with the workshop, the training materials, and the documentation and content of the workshop.

52. The participants pointed out some logistical constraints in some of the venues, which were beyond the control of the organizers, such as disruptions due to power outages, or challenges in getting materials translated as the workshops progressed, including the need to work across two to three languages simultaneously to get some points across. Feedback on the content of the workshops, such as ideas on streamlining exercises, was incorporated into the subsequent workshops. The efforts made by the LEG to get materials translated into French and Portuguese were greatly appreciated and encouraged a lively discussion about other materials that were available in some countries from other initiatives. Participants pledged to share these materials with colleagues in other countries using existing regional networks.

53. All members of the LEG who supported the workshops noted the high motivation of the participants and the liveliness of their discussions. They also noted that each workshop had a unique character, with its own set of priority issues, reflecting the degree of involvement of the participants in the NAPA process, the level of regional cooperation, and the nature of the interaction between the countries' NAPA teams and the agencies operating in the respective region. The members of the LEG saw this diversity as very enriching. Furthermore, the regional nature of the workshops created a familiar environment in which participants felt comfortable to share their experiences and lessons learned in preparing and implementing their NAPAs. Many participants expressed the need to have more frequent regional interactions in order to share experiences and lessons learned and to explore synergies during the design and implementation of their NAPA projects.

54. Through the workshops, the less experienced teams built their capacity to engage more effectively with the implementing agencies, to oversee the preparation of NAPA project proposals and to contribute to the effective implementation of the projects on the ground. The more experienced teams enhanced their NAPA implementation strategies and their capacity by sharing lessons learned and best practices with their counterparts. Some of them took advantage of the platform offered by the workshop and the availability of the GEF agencies to finalize their NAPA project proposals and submit them to the GEF soon after the workshop.

IV. Summary of suggestions for future support

55. Many suggestions were made by participants at the different workshops. The main ones are summarized below in no particular order.

A. Improve access to relevant information about the implementation process for national adaptation programmes of action

56. Participants appreciated the elaboration of the different stages in the development of projects and their subsequent implementation, and all the steps evaluated by the GEF and its agencies. One source of frustration has been the perceived delays in processing, when in

fact projects were being processed, or other necessary steps were being arranged, such as the contracts for transferring funds between the GEF and the agency or between the agency and the country. While some officers may have access to real-time information on the status of projects, the majority of those involved in NAPA projects would not. It was thus proposed that information on the amount of funds available to a given country at a given point in time (which depends on the total amount of funds available in the LDCF), details on the status of project processing in the GEF system, and other details on arrangements for implementation be made accessible as much as possible. Given the need for this information to be widely disseminated at the national and subnational levels, including to community stakeholders, it was noted that making this information available via the Internet alone is not the most effective means of communicating it.

B. Improve access to relevant information about the Global Environment Facility agencies

57. As countries implement their NAPA projects, and in some cases more than one project, there is a growing need for information about the comparative advantages of the different GEF agencies. This is especially relevant when countries are seeking more specialist support for their adaptation projects, where agencies that have not traditionally worked in that country may in fact offer a lot of advantages. In some cases, it is easier to identify co-finance for LDCF projects if the GEF agency has an existing project in the applicable sector, although this is not a requirement. Information on the current and future country-assistance strategies of the various agencies would thus be useful for countries to help them identify potential agencies.

58. Other important information about an agency includes the specific procedures used to process a project proposal, which are additional to the requirements of the GEF/LDCF. Although these are unlikely to be prohibitive, prior knowledge of them would avoid frustrations about the time taken to process projects and the additional information that may be required. In some cases, agencies may have templates of what they consider to be essential elements of an adaptation project. Countries can thus use this information to better align their proposed project activities with what an agency is able to best assist them with. The workshops gave all GEF agencies the opportunity to present summaries of their adaptation approaches and portfolios, and there is potential for this information to be improved.

C. Enhance individual and institutional technical capacities

59. Participants strongly indicated that climate change adaptation requires coordinated interaction between communities and the structures providing support for the implementation of adaptation measures. They highlighted that communities alone cannot coordinate, implement and monitor adaptation activities without the existence of effective and accountable organizations and institutions. It was suggested that support for the establishment of strong national inter-institutional arrangements for adaptation planning and implementation needs to be put in place.

60. In order to achieve the desired goal of addressing the immediate and urgent needs for adaptation in the LDCs, noting that a significant amount of time has elapsed since the establishment of the NAPA process, countries indicated an urgent need for more technical support for implementing NAPAs, building on the work of the LEG thus far.

D. Develop training and outreach materials for use at the national level

61. Appreciating the value of the training and training materials provided during the workshops, many countries expressed the desire to have similar or customized materials that they could use to train a larger number of national stakeholders involved in NAPA projects. For example, one country indicated that it would like assistance from the LEG in order for it to produce a training package that it could use to raise the awareness about climate change of communities, community mayors and other leaders, and officers in different ministries. This would assist in developing the capacity of many more stakeholders to design and implement adaptation activities.

62. Further, it was pointed out that such a training package could be used in a ‘training of trainers’ format, with additional support provided to the new trainers to ensure that they conduct subsequent training at the national level in a satisfactory manner.

E. Process Least Developed Countries Fund projects in multiple languages

63. Participants at the francophone workshop indicated that operational officers at the government level work only in French and most do not possess a working knowledge of English. This constitutes a significant barrier in developing GEF projects, the guidelines and templates for which are only in English. Participants gave examples of cases in which the PIFs had to be developed in French at the national level and then translated into English for submission to the GEF.

64. The participants thus proposed that the GEF allow NAPA project documents to be submitted and processed in French. If this was not possible, the francophone LDCs proposed that GEF project templates and guidelines, including sample logframes and model project documents, be translated into French.

65. Similar issues were raised during the lusophone workshop. In addition, some non English speaking participants expressed the need for training in negotiation and project development in English, to enable them to better participate in global programmes where only English is used.

F. Design generic templates for national adaptation programmes of action projects

66. Participants have discovered that there is no harmonized way of developing projects from the priorities identified in their NAPAs, and that the main activities included in a project often follow the structure used by the GEF agency chosen to work with the country. Countries rely mostly on the guidance and structures proposed by the agencies in deciding on the elements of the projects. Examples were provided of agencies recommending that projects be designed in certain a way to ensure that they would fall within their technical capacity. Debates were held on whether such formulations driven by the agencies are in line with the original design of the NAPAs. It was highlighted that the advantages and disadvantages of this approach need to be evaluated in the light of the fact that projects need to deliver their intended outcomes and lead to reduced vulnerability, while ensuring that the best support is provided by the agencies.

67. To ensure a balance between the capacity-building and outreach components of projects and concrete adaptation actions that address specific vulnerabilities, participants indicated the need for generic project templates or outlines for particular adaptation goals, which could then be customized and adapted to meet country-specific needs. Another option would be to identify sample projects and/or exemplary logframes from funded

projects. For example, projects that address drought could follow a similar structure, with country-specific details incorporated as necessary. In fact, this would expand on what has already been done for some specific projects addressing drought under the LDCF/Special Climate Change Fund and for projects to address glacial lake outburst floods (GLOFs) in several countries in Asia. Such templates could be developed for the major thematic areas (agriculture, water resources, early warning, etc.). The LDC Parties could then easily adapt these templates to suit their individual country-specific cases and submit the projects to the GEF, thereby greatly reducing the length of time taken to develop proposals for approval, meaning that concrete adaptation actions could be implemented without delay.

68. In addition, participants noted that the development of templates for NAPA projects could be even more necessary where the implementation strategy of the project is based on a programmatic or sector-wide approach. The templates could provide a means to capture knowledge on the design of adaptation measures from a given country or from other regions, without having to reinvent project designs every time.

G. Provide capacity-building, including for using a programmatic approach in implementing national adaptation programmes of action

69. The following key capacity deficiencies were mentioned: the human and institutional capacity to implement adaptation at the national level and among implementing agencies; the capacity to access and/or make use of tools for vulnerability assessment; and the capacity to design adaptation projects.

70. At all of the workshops, participants indicated the need for further support from the LEG in order for them to fully implement their NAPAs, including for using a holistic implementation strategy that addresses the whole NAPA as a coordinated programme. This programme could then be implemented in phases depending on the funding available from the LDCF and other sources, and would improve the coordination of projects and avoid delays associated with the development of single projects from the PIF through the PPG to the full project documents for each project being funded under the LDCF.

71. Participants also suggested that the LEG examine approaches for disbursement of funds used in other funding programmes such as bilateral aid programmes, to assess whether there are better models for disbursing funding for NAPA projects and activities.

H. Provide support for demonstrating adaptation-additionality and co-financing in projects

72. The materials prepared for explaining co-financing proved very effective as participants quickly grasped what co-financing for LDCF projects entails. However, since most of the participants had been involved in preparing LDCF projects in their respective countries, they mentioned that the requirement for demonstrating co-financing had proved to be an area that creates misunderstanding and causes delays in developing LDCF projects at the national level. They indicated that even though the concept is regarded as simple for LDCF projects, it is not easy to explain to ministries and it takes considerable time for them to comprehend it and hence be able to compile activities and programmes including financing that may constitute co-financing for target projects. Participants mentioned that ministries, at times, abandoned the development of LDCF projects and concentrated on other funds which require much less justification and demonstration.

73. Participants noted that, despite the fact that the concept of co-financing is meant to be simple for LDCF projects, given the delays it causes, its effectiveness and intended

benefits need to be closely reviewed. Participants indicated that at least 50 per cent of the delays in developing projects are due to co-financing.

74. In addition, discussions touched on the distinction between purely additional adaptation projects and those that are considered to have components other than adaptation. An example was made of interventions to reduce the risk of Glacial Lake Outburst Floods (GLOFs), which may be seen as purely adaptation-related climate change activities. However, co-financing was still required for the GLOFs project in Bhutan. Participants debated that perceptions of pure adaptation versus adaptation with other 'business as usual' development components differ and are not always easy to comprehend. A case was mentioned in which co-financing had to be demonstrated even though a purely additional adaptation project was clearly justifiable from the perspective of the respective country. It also arose during the discussions that there is a need for more clarification of baselines and additionality in LDCF projects, through, inter alia, a clear set of examples from current NAPA projects.

75. The GEF announced that it is producing simplified guidance on demonstrating adaptation-additionality and co-financing in NAPA projects, to be released before the end of the year. Nevertheless, participants shared their experiences to date and, at most of the workshops, the issue of co-financing generated the most questions and discussion. After the workshop, participants expressed a much improved understanding of co-financing under the LDCF.

I. Enhance the provision and delivery of financial resources

76. Discussions on the financial resources needed to fully implement NAPAs dwelled on the fact that much more financing than is currently available under the LDCF will be required. Participants highlighted that the costs indicated in the NAPAs represent the lower limit of the finance required for the implementation of all priority activities identified, and that much more than this will be required to address the medium- and longer-term adaptation priorities.

77. There is a need to explore sources of funding other than the LDCF for implementing NAPAs. Participants suggested that the LEG could support countries by locating and providing necessary relevant information, including procedures and guidelines for accessing such funds. Where necessary, the LEG may incorporate elements addressing accessing these funds in its training workshops.

J. Enhance support for the demonstration, promotion and application of technologies for adaptation

78. Participants suggested that institutions that will take part in the implementation of NAPAs (e.g. government ministries or departments, local development councils or community organizations) would benefit from appropriate information and tools for the development, deployment and transfer of locally viable adaptation technologies. Support could include the provision of necessary machinery, equipment and structures, know-how, management techniques, education and training.

K. Organize more activities to share experiences and lessons learned

79. Given the evolving nature of adaptation, it was proposed that capacity-building through workshops should be maintained as a continuing effort. In particular, these

workshops should provide more opportunities for the sharing of experiences, lessons learned and best practices among countries in a particular region.

80. Participants at the francophone workshop mobilized themselves to form an adaptation network for francophone LDCs. A delegate from Benin was elected as the coordinator and tasked with following up with the LEG to ensure a successful launch of their network. They also asked the secretariat to assist them with setting up their group. The network subsequently set up a website and mailing list.

81. Participants also proposed that the LEG, with the support of the secretariat, set up an interactive platform for countries to show-case their NAPA projects, to promote exchange of experiences, best practices and lessons learned, as part of the LDC Portal.¹⁵

¹⁵ <www.unfccc.int/ldc>.