

**Least Developed Countries Expert Group's 29th Meeting  
17 to 19 March 2016, Dili, Timor Leste**

*The LEG meeting began on March 15 and opened up to observer organizations on March 17. This report reflects on the portion of the LEG meeting observer organizations were invited to attend.*

## Observations Report

### Key Outcomes:

- NGN agreement to participate in Advisory Group for the NAP Expo. Decision to be communicated to the LEG.
- Decisions to be made regarding the NGN other involvement in the NAP Expo.
- Consider if there should be greater involvement of the NGN in NAP Central, including the common calendar of NAP events.

### Participants

An actual participants list was not shared so this list has been cobbled together from observations and different pieces of information.

LEG Members		Observers	
Abias Moma (Chair)	Angola	Rohini Kohli	UNDP: NAP-GSP
Erwin Kunzi	Austria	Prakesh Bista	UNDP: NAP-GSP
Sonam Lhaden (Vice-Chair)	Bhutan	Barney Dickson	UNEP
Thinley Namgyel*	Bhutan	Aaron Becker	FAO (Bangkok office)
Beth Lavender	Canada	Fred Kossam	Adaptation Committee
Benon Yassin	Malawi	Rawleston Moore	GEF
Jan Verhagen	Netherlands	Jo-Ellen Parry	NAP Global Network
Tomasz Chruszczow	Poland	<b>UNFCCC</b>	
Abiziou Tchinguilou	Togo	Paul Desanker	
Adrian Fitzgerald	Ireland	Motsomi Maletjane	
		Julie Amoroso	

*Note: \* Thinley was on the LEG for the prior two years but is not an official member at present. He is doing a year as an observer to support the transition of knowledge from past LEG work.*

### Day 1 (Thursday, March 17)

The day was spent on presentations that were first delivered by the LEG and then by the different observer organizations. The objective was to identify areas of collaboration and avoid duplication of effort. Some observations from the presentations given:

#### 1. LEG: Key elements of the LEG Work Programme for 2016 – 2018

*This presentation has been shared with the NGN group so this will just provide some comments on the content.*

- Have set a goal of having NAPs established in all LDCs by 2018. Recognized in subsequent discussions that this is a normative goal that is unlikely to be achieved in practice as countries move at their own pace.
- They are interested in collaborating on their training sessions for LDCs. Could be opportunity for exploring connection to the NGN.
- Want to improve NAP Central and are looking for support in this area. NGN might be able to support by providing access to information / reports from different countries.

## **2. LEG: Update on Key Developments of NAPs**

*This presentation also was shared with the NGN Team.*

- There is reference in the presentation to the PEG M&E Tool, which is to support the M&E of NAP processes (not outcomes). Apparently it has not yet been completed. They have a conceptual design, but it is still in the planning stages.
- Looking for better coordination of training on NAPs. While this seems to be directed more toward the multilaterals, could also be important for the NGN if are doing more work in-country in LDCs.
- Related to the above, they are looking for a common calendar of training opportunities on NAPs, likely through NAP Central's NAP Global Calendar: <http://www4.unfccc.int/nap/Pages/NAP-Calendar.aspx>
- Are looking for a means of tracking adaptation progress, to support the SBI and the Paris commitments. As already discussed, there is interest in building on the past work IISD has done on the AP Review and for CARRIAA in this regard.

## **3. Adaptation Committee: Highlights of their Work Plan and the 9<sup>th</sup> Meeting**

*Presentation by Fred shared by email.*

- The content of the presentation reviewed the outcomes of the AC meeting; nothing was particularly new.
- There was no discussion following the presentation regarding how the AC and LEG will collaborate on implementation of the Paris commitments, namely:
  - Development of joint methodologies for recognizing adaptation efforts
  - Development of methodologies for the facilitation of support
  - Development of methodologies on reviewing the adequacy and effectiveness of adaptation and support
  - Participation in the A-TEP
- Joint meeting of the AC and LEG seems likely to occur on May 27 regarding formation of joint task force. LEG wanted clarification regarding what would be the focus of the background paper that the Secretariat will be requested to prepare.
- LEG invited to nominate someone to be part of the NAP Task Force. I do not know if the LEG agreed to accept this invitation or if someone was nominated to take on this role.
- LEG invited to develop joint information paper with the AC on experiences of countries in accessing the readiness programme of the GCF. No formal decision was taken in the open meeting, but seemed like this will be going ahead.

#### **4. Green Climate Fund: Update on Support of NAPs by the GCF**

*The GCF team could not come to Timor Leste in person but participated by Skype with video. It was clear that there is a lack of clarity regarding what the GCF is doing and what funding is available and how it can be accessed. The main issues that came up were around the following:*

- There is currently a cap of \$1-million that countries can access for readiness activities. This means that there is insufficient funds for the development of full NAPs. The way that the GCF supports NAPs therefore is:
  - Development of, for example, vulnerability assessments that will contribute to development of the NAP. Example of Vanuatu provided.
  - Funding projects that have been identified in existing NAPs.
  - Knowledge exchange activities.
- The Board of the GCF has been asked to come up with more clarity regarding how the GCF will support NAPs, particularly as they are more than individual projects. Option is to remove the cap so that support can be provided for development of full NAPs. Decision to be made at its next board meeting in June. Then once this decision is made will need to come up with the modalities.
- GCF is open to holding a one-day session for LDCs on accessing funds from the GCF during the NAP Expo. Also could be interested in developing a training module on this topic. LEG would be interested in making this a repeat event so that questions can be clarified over time.
- It was noted that the GCF does not have the capacity at this time to create knowledge products as it is understaffed. Are available to review products developed by the LEG. For example, Fred suggested the development of case studies on how countries have accessed funds.
- Fred also suggested that there be meetings of NDAs to share experiences. GCF noted that it has workshops underway with NDAs focused on readiness and pipeline development, for example.
- GCF noted that it has a report on readiness and a presentation on experiences to date that it could share with the LEG members.

#### **5. UNEP: Experience on supporting efforts to build readiness in the LDCs**

Barney spoke about the work that UNEP is doing in areas such as supporting efforts to get accreditation to the Adaptation Fund, readiness activities for the GCF (e.g. strengthening NDAs), and participation in NAP-GSP.

- Noted challenge of UNEP and other multilaterals with respect to getting accredited to the GCF. Only one agency has so far signed their master agreement for accreditation with the GCF.
- Provided guidance to LEG members such as: get engaged in the GCF sooner rather than later as the queue is growing; work on accreditation in parallel with proposals; will need a large team to support engagement work.
- Noted that there are efforts to try and coordinate available funding for NAP support from GCF, GIZ, UNEP etc. but it has not been going well so far. Requires more time and dedicated effort.

#### **6. GEF Secretariat: Technical Review of the programme priorities of the LDCF**

Rawleston mostly used the time to note that he was hoping to get some input from the LEG on the technical review of program priorities of the LDCF that is underway and is to be completed by COP22. There was more discussion in this on Friday so see below. It was also noted that the GEF is looking to

increase the cap on its support to LDCs from its current level of \$30M as a number of countries are reaching this threshold and it is impeding their ability to move forward on adaptation priorities.

### **7. FAO: Experiences on supporting countries on agriculture and NAPs**

Aaron spoke mostly about the work that the FAO is doing in the area of climate smart agriculture, and not so much about how the FAO is supporting NAPs. They have some work in this area (mainstreaming of agriculture into NAPs) but it was not highlighted in the presentation. (Seems to have been a miscommunication with FAO).

### **8. UNDP: Upcoming plans for the NAP GSP**

Rohini and Prakesh noted that the NAP GSP will be starting its second phase in July/August and that they have been providing support in three areas: regional training, including with the LEG; one-on-one training; and sensitization of countries. In next phase:

- Are planning to do 10 regional workshops, both general and thematic.
- Want to expand their virtual community of practice
- Plan to continue their support for work on NAP Central
- Invited LEG members to be on their technical committee

### **9. NAP Global Network: Experience in documenting national adaptation actions and update on upcoming events**

I only was asked questions related to the work of the NGN (not the work done on the AP or CARIIAA reviews). Things that they wanted to know:

- How is the NGN using the LEG's NAP Guidelines, to ensure coherence of messaging/approach?
- Where are there opportunities for collaborating with the LEG?
- What my views on the outcomes of the NAP process?
- What knowledge products do we have that could be shared with LDC members?
- What other donors are involved in the NGN in addition to the US and Germany?
- Are we collaborating with the Poverty and Environment program?

## **Day 2 (Friday, March 18)**

### **1. Discussion on concrete proposals for collaborative activities under the new LEG Work Programme**

The main topics below were discussed, with some notes on things of relevance to the NGN.

#### **A. NAP Expo**

- Expect will be similar to last year's structure. Would like to see more connectivity between the sessions held at the beginning of the week by different organizations and the content of the NAP Expo; need to ensure that there is no duplication of content.
- Suggested overarching theme = "Advancing NAPs in the post-Paris era" or "Accelerating NAPs in the post-Paris era" or something in this vein.
- Sub-theme ideas were to look at the links between NAPs and the SDGs (how to coordinate); financing (particularly with respect to accessing the GCF); role of non-state actors (with discussion largely focusing on the private sector, but also including others).

- They will also want to showcase areas of progress and learning at the different stages of the NAP process.
- There is an expectation (naturally) that the NAP GSP will play a large role in the Expo. The NAP-GSP indicated that they will want to focus on finances, potentially with a focus on the private sector; and on the sharing of country experiences.
  - This suggests that there is good potential for overlap with what they want to do, and what the NGN might want to see as the focus of its mini-TTF.
- It seems likely that the GCF will hold a one-day sessions with the LDCs on readiness activities, accessing the fund; results could be fed into the two-day NAP Expo.
- In addition to the GCF, NAP GSP and NGN expressing interest in organizing a meeting or workshop in conjunction with the NAP Expo, requests have also been made by the Geneva Association (focused on insurance) and the AC NAP Task Force.
- There is discussion about the formation of an advisory group to support shaping of the NAP Expo. I am not sure if this group was in play previously, but my notes suggest that this is a new idea.
- Having space for the sharing of lessons came up in discussion on multiple occasions
- UNEP – may look at the outcomes of the next Adaptation Gap report focused on financing. Might also contribute through the GAN but it has not yet been agreed upon.
- UNDP-FAO – session could look at sectoral integration focused on agriculture, and possibly on SME engagement.

#### B. Regional NAP Expos

- Expect will look at how to build on existing initiatives, such as the APAN meetings. There was a clear idea of what these events would be in Asia, but less so for LAC and Africa.
- Suggested that could also look for opportunities to do regional expos in conjunction with LEG regional training events.

#### C. Technical support

Only one group looked this issue. Some of the things that they saw as priorities were:

- Data management and tools development.
- Understanding the linkages between NAPs and NAPAs.
- Creation of authoritative training materials by the LEG that can be used by others; and mapping of existing resources.
- Ensure that the GCF invites LDCs to regional meetings.
- Need more capacity / guidance on how to bring together lessons learned by different groups work on NAPs.

## 2. **Feedback on the LDCF**

Rawlestone circulated a list of questions for the LEG members to consider. The outcomes were perhaps less interesting than the discussion that took place around them. Essentially the GEF is looking to see what the role of the LDCF should have going forward, particularly in relation to the emergence of NAPs and the role that the GCF has in supporting NAPs. There is a tension between whether the LDCF should focus on capacity building activities or on the implementation of adaptation actions.

- There was general agreement that all of the current activities that the LDCF funds are important, namely implementation of NAPAs, the LDC work program (with its support for things like institutional strengthening), and support for NAPs. It was noted that all of these activities are mandated by the COP so unless there is a change, this should work continue to go forward.
- There is continuing need to provide LDCs with long-term capacity building support.
- The LDCF has the advantage over the GCF of being understood by LDCs (they know how to access it); it provides equitable access (via the cap); it is the only fund focused on LDCs (which gives LDCs a sense of comfort); and its work remains relevant to LDCs.
- It was suggested that the LDCs be given an opportunity to have direct access to the LDCF. Rawlestone questioned the logic of this given that few of the entities with direct access to the Adaptation Fund have developed and submitted funding proposals.

### 3. Interaction with the Government of Timor Leste

An overview of the country's efforts to prepare for climate change impacts was made. They are one of the countries that has nearly reached their \$30M ceiling, which means that they need to prioritize their funding request to the LDCF. They have a number of things underway, on the mitigation and adaptation side. Part of their funding request to the LDCF would be to establish the framework for their NAP.

#### Day 3 (Saturday, March 19)

There was a meeting for about an hour that involved the LEG members and the observer organizations. The main focus of it was to look for commitments related to support for:

- **NAP Expo**, which is the LEG's priority; want to finalize commitments as much as possible, including indication of financial support. Discussion outcomes integrated into notes from day 2. The LEG will be sending out letters asking people to be part of the Advisory Committee.
- **Training on NAPs**. Want to form Advisory Group to support the coordination of training; could be the same group as the one for the NAP Expo. Expect that the NGN will be asked to share information about our training sessions. Concept note to be circulated by the Secretariat.
- **NAP Central**. Requested to establish profile and focal point if have not already done so.
- **Data collection**. Need to be able to assess the progress, gaps and needs of particular countries.

It was suggested that the LEG send a letter to different groups to ask them to prioritize support for LDCs. LEG agreed to send the letter out as soon as possible.

The LEG will circulate sections of the report from the meeting of relevance to each observer organization to them in the next two weeks, for review and feedback before the final report is submitted for SBI-44.