

## NAP Global Network Steering Committee Meeting

### Agenda

February 10, 2018 | Nadi, Fiji

## Participation

---

### Steering Committee Members

- **Ichiro Sato** – Director, Office for Climate Change, Global Environment Department, Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)
- **Juan Pablo Vallejo** – National Adaptation Plan Coordinator, National Planning Department, Colombia
- **UnaMay Gordon** – Principal Director, Climate Change Division, Ministry of Economic Growth and Job Creation, Jamaica
- **Christoph von Stechow** – Senior Policy Officer, Climate Policy Division, Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ), Germany
- **Fred Kossam** – Head of Climate Change and Research Services, Ministry of Natural Resources, Energy and Mining, Malawi
- **Kimberley Chretien** – Senior Policy Analyst, Environment Canada, Canada
- **Alexis Lapiz** – Strategic Partnership Chief of Climate Change Commission, The Philippines, on behalf of Atty. Romell Antonio O. Cuenca, Assistant Secretary, Climate Change Commission

### Management Team and Bilateral Development Partner Advisors

- **Andrea Kuhlmann** – Climate Policy Support Programme, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH
- **Timo Leiter** – Advisor for Climate Adaptation and Climate Finance, GIZ

### NAP Global Network Secretariat – International Institute for Sustainable Development

- **Anne Hammill** – Director, NAP Global Network Secretariat, IISD
- **Christian Ledwell** – Program Manager, NAP Global Network, IISD
- **Patrick Guerdat** – Developing Country Engagement Officer, IISD
- **Blane Harvey** – Associate, IISD and Targeted Topics Forum Facilitator

## Objectives

---

The objectives of the Steering Committee (SC) meeting are to:

1. Review progress and achievements from Year 2-3, identifying key challenges and lessons
2. Review and approve the work plan for Year 4
3. Identify lessons and best-practices from the Targeted Topics Forum series

## Materials (available via Steering Committee's [online space](#))

---

- DocA: Draft Network Strategy
- DocB: Update on Planned 2018 Activities
- DocC: List of Knowledge Products
- DocD: Theory of Change

## Summary of Decisions Taken and Next Steps

---

- Steering Committee to continue in its current form, meeting annually to provide guidance on strategic questions (e.g., how the Network engages with NDC-NAP process linkages). Meetings to be scheduled to coincide with NAP Global Network events (e.g., peer learning summits).
- Network Secretariat to continue seeking opportunities to collaborate with the NDC Partnership, with goal of highlighting the opportunity for countries to use the NAP process when adaptation considerations arise in NDCs.
- Network Secretariat will seek to identify bilateral donor champions to broker relationships with bilateral actors who are not yet engaged in the Network, and will seek to engage existing bilateral donor staff engaged in the Network through more systematic communications.
- Network Secretariat will seek to engage country focal points to disseminate the Network's knowledge products and NAP process guidance to their colleagues, as well as to clarify the support available through the Country Support Hub.
- For peer learning events, Network Secretariat will provide electronic copies of workbooks, will seek to translate technical presentations in advance where possible (or post-event where not possible in advance), and continue the inclusion of a field trip.
- Network Secretariat will also seek to formalize facilitation methods used at Targeted Topics Forums to share with participants, as well as look to include a session on event facilitation methods at the 2019 communications-focused TTF.

## Review of NAP Global Network Year 2-3 Activities

---

Following the previous NAP Global Network Steering Committee meeting was held in Kingston, Jamaica, in 2016, the purpose of this Steering Committee meeting convened in Nadi, Fiji, was to provide an update on global activities undertaken by the Network, gather inputs on the Network's strategy for next steps, and receive feedback on how to improve our work going forward.

Anne Hammill, Director of the NAP Global Network Secretariat, provided an overview presentation on the NAP Global Network's activities in the intervening years since the last Steering Committee meeting, including analysis of the problem context that the Network was created in response to; the Network's role in providing NAP process support in relation to other existing NAP support entities; the Network's objectives and Theory of Change; and the Network's strategy for 2018. She noted some common challenges that many countries engaged in the NAP process are facing, including: private sector engagement, integration of adaptation in 'orphan' sectors (e.g., waste), and bridging planning to implementation.

This overview presentation was followed by discussion by Steering Committee members. Inputs are summarized below.

### **Alignment with other sustainable development agendas**

- Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) remain the more high profile agenda in most countries, and alignment between NAP processes and NDCs should continue to be an area of focus for the Network.

- There is also a need to find alignment between the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and NAP processes.
- In Philippines, the Sendai Framework is also an influential agenda in addition to Paris Agreement that the NAP process should align with.

### **Role of the Network**

- Network could support country's national institutions with the accreditation process to the Green Climate Fund (GCF).
- The Network looking at orphan sectors (e.g., waste management) and developing frameworks for doing so could help gain additional traction in countries
- There is a lack of clear metrics for measuring adaptation (as opposed to the clear metric of greenhouse gas emissions for mitigation efforts) that has caused delays on achieving NAP process implementation and NDC adaptation components. Network may be able to contribute on clarifying and emphasizing how adaptation can deliver co-benefits for mitigation.
- Because the NDC has its home in the Energy sector—progress on NDC mitigation goals is owned by Energy sector—the NAP process is often driven by many sectors (e.g., forestry, water, agriculture, etc.). The Network may be able to play a role in anchoring the NAP process in a sector (e.g., through supporting institutional arrangements to drive the NAP process).

### **Bilateral coordination**

- It was noted that “enhancing bilateral donor coordination” was the Network activity area where the least amount of progress has been achieved, and that there are still many cases of donors working in silos.
- The Network should think about supporting countries—through their national implementing entities—to access GCF readiness / NAP support. This is a key priority for most countries. Bilateral contributions to the Network could be used for this activity.
- One challenge is that donor participation also has to be self-funded

## **Year 4 Activities**

---

The following summarizes overview discussions of the NAP Global Network's planned activities in 2018-19.

### **Peer Learning and Exchange**

- **Targeted Topics Forums:** The NAP Global Network's workplan includes one final Targeted Topics Forum (TTF) to be held with the second cohort in early 2019. This will be the final TTF, but will be followed by 'peer learning summits,' the scope of which is still being defined. By design, TTFs were closed to allow for a safe space to share what was *not* working in NAP processes, but peer learning summits may be designed to be more open. Three peer learning summits are anticipated: one per year through to 2020. The first – tentatively planned for mid-2018 – would be on NDC-NAP links.

- **Peer Exchange Program:** These have to date been opportunistic, and have had some good stories emerge. Going forward, the Network will look to include more multi-day exchanges where participants work with peers in-office on technical topics.

### National Level Action

- **Country Support Hub:** Through the Country Support Hub, the Network supported five countries (Morocco, Albania, Jamaica, Botswana and Cambodia) with short-term technical support to fill targeted gaps related to their NAP process. We are looking to scale this up, and have a number of requests in development. Through feedback received at the Fiji TTF, the Network will also emphasize in its messaging that light touch responses (e.g., conducting a lit review of vulnerability assessments, or reviewing a funding proposal) are available, and not all need to involve engaging a consultancy.
- **In-Country Support Program:** The Network Secretariat currently has 17 country programs, expanding into the Pacific region, and want to focus on quality rather than quantity. The Secretariat could consider taking on a handful of additional countries but they would have to be compelling opportunities, as the Secretariat isn't looking to becoming an implementing agency.

### Enhancing Bilateral Support

- In order to advance activities to help coordinate bilateral donor support: need to identify donor champions. Currently driving engagement through donor newsletters, through informal knowledge-gathering
- Donor coordination is taking place to some extent in countries where the Network has in-country programs
- Communications will also focus on supporting this activity area, using existing channels to produce knowledge products on key themes in the NAP process. Will be emphasizing storytelling and impact-tracking.

The following is a summary of Steering Committee response to the above proposed activities.

- How will peer learning summits avoid duplicating the regional NAP trainings that the LEG is doing? Who will participate (existing cohorts or new participants)?
  - We want to be responsive. There is a risk that if we're not organizing workshops, Network will lose relevance. There may be opportunity to focus on overlooked themes (e.g., NDC-NAP linkages). Will look to take forward interactive peer learning approach.
- On NDC-NAP linkages: noted that parties are still developing the Paris Agreement rulebook, and what counts as adaptation communications. Should be conscious of risk of creating confusion ahead of decisions made at COP24.
- How do you maintain knowledge and capacity following on 'sustained peer learning approach'—for instance, plan to track cohorts was mentioned?
  - Peer Exchange Program one option for sustained engagement in the Network for those who have taken part in the TTF cohorts.

- Communicating Country Support Hub to country participants will be important next step to fulfilling its role as a key function of the Network.
- Has Network had measurable impact on international discussion (e.g., COP side events)?
  - Response: We work with the Secretariat actors like the LEG, present ourselves as a resource. Often try to provide a high-level overview. But there are challenges about becoming too engaged in the process because of politics, and as many Network participants are engaged in the negotiations.
- It is an advantage that the Network can act as a neutral knowledge broker rather than an actor in the negotiations themselves. Recommendation to maintain this approach.

### **Strategic Partnerships**

- For BMZ, important for initiatives like the NAP Global Network and NDC Partnership to work together where possible. Can collaboration go forward more informally, or is there a desire to formalize the relationship? Is there anything BMZ can do?
  - NAP Global Network can't become an associate member of the NDC Partnership because it isn't a legally established entity, and so it would need to be IISD
  - At the moment, there is nothing to exclude Network from participating in in-country discussions about how to implement the NDC Partnership's in-country work program.
  - If IISD becomes associate member, will be important that NDC Partnership and Network develop joint high-level messaging on NDC-NAP linkages.
- From BMZ's perspective, it would be useful if all members of the NDC Partnership to see the value of the NAP process. One of the NDC Partnership's goals is to build on existing initiatives.
  - Last year, the Network noticed that there wasn't high level of awareness about NAP processes among NDC-focused actors.
- A goal worth considering would be for NDC Partnership staff to look to NAP processes when adaptation considerations arise.
  - There were initial discussions on linking the NDC Support Desk and having adaptation-related requests link to the NAP GN's Country Support Hub.
- Does the NAP Global Network have strategic targets about advancing NAP activities, especially with GCF Readiness Program?
  - Worked with the GCF advising on application process, have discussed an MOU between the Network and the GCF on knowledge management.
  - Not captured in an MOU, but Network is working with Jason Spensley from GCF—participated in COP23 side event, wrote a recent [blog](#).

### **Bilateral coordination**

- A bilateral-focused meeting could benefit many in-country bilateral actors. 30 agencies recently met in Jamaica, and outcomes of the meeting still to be determined
- Short meeting on the sidelines of SBs or COP proposed as best approach
- What is meant by identifying donor champions?

- When five new donors came on board at COP 22, it was the result of a push by the US and Germany to bring bilaterals on board. Effort by bilateral champion wouldn't need to be sustained, but instead the role would involve occasionally acting as a bilateral ambassador advocating for Network
- At NDC-NAP Exchange Forum, if Network could sponsor participants who were not yet engaged, it could be an opportunity for this type of advocacy.

## Knowledge Management

- Jamaica has used webinars are used to convene Jamaica's focal point network, to keep them engaged. Network webinars should continue
- [Country NAP process posters](#) were a useful outreach tool
- Current formats working well, but more outreach is needed. Disseminating materials through existing communities of practice or community of knowledge may be worth pursuing, and it may be worth asking country focal points would be willing to support outreach.
- Internet connectivity noted as a potential barrier to accessing Network knowledge products, especially in LDCs. Distributing flash drives containing knowledge products at meetings as was done at the TTF should be continued to promote methods and tools.
- Contacting a journalist pools about new knowledge products should be considered
- For bilateral donors, important to highlight countries' successes in moving NAP processes forward through posters, sNAPshot briefs, etc.—doesn't necessarily have to be a NAP document launch, just important to show where progress is happening.

## Role of the Steering Committee

- **Context from Anne:** Steering Committee is needed for accountability and guidance. We haven't engaged Steering Committee as much as hoped, and so wanted to look at next steps for the Steering Committee. There is a strong desire from the Network Secretariat to continue receiving high-level oversight being provided by Steering Committee, but the question is what type of governance structure that members prefer?
- The Network Secretariat also meet with a Management Team (composed of representatives from the US, Germany and Canada) for an hour every two weeks to provide a detailed update on activities and discuss operational issues.
- When initially established, the priority for the Steering Committee was approval of the Network's work plan. We had promised it would be fairly light touch. As time has progressed, it became a way to check-in that the Network is on the right track with key decisions (e.g., phase-out of TTF, emphasizing Country Support) and to seek guidance on issues like approaching the NDC-NAP linkages.

### **Next steps proposed by Steering Committee members:**

- It is important to specify means for convening, which can be challenging given time zones. Given logistical challenges, an advisory committee that meets biannually to provide strategic directions may be better approach
- COP, NAP Expo proposed as platforms to convene, though it's noted that government representatives' schedules can be very tight during these meeting.

- Scheduling Steering Committee meetings to coincide with Network events (such as TTFs) proposed as a preferred approach.
- Country oversight for Network's legitimacy, and it is important to find quorum
- Providing several months' advance notice for the date and time is helpful to secure SC members' participation
- SC members could be champions for the Network in-country.
- Steering Committee membership being a champion for the Network could be main role, as well as providing advice and guidance as needed but not drive the Network's workplan. Lighter touch approach works.
- Peer learning summit could be the new event around which Steering Committee members can meet.

### **Reflections on Targeted Topics Forums**

- For M&E, for it an enriching process. Country case studies and technical presentations on M&E methodologies were useful. Peer learning workshops should be continued – there is a sacrifice in committing the time and travel, but it is worthwhile.
- Structure of TTFs is very interactive and energetic. Avoids information overload. This TTF had a good range of topics covered (e.g., financing, communications). Information presented is useful for those not experts on areas.
- At future workshops in Philippines, they hope to use facilitation methods used at TTF. There could be a value in Network formalizing the methodologies to help countries replicate them.
- Gender day was useful for those who are not gender specialists but who are leading NAP processes. Communication is a timely topic, though it depends in part on countries having funds for dissemination. On logistics, lunch could have been improved. Opportunity to meet others working on NAP processes valuable.
- In group of 80 on gender day, very energetic and dedicated. Clear appetite for this work
- Good balance between technical presentations and country group exercises. For future events, important to get participation from those who can move the process ahead. Given the range of where countries are in the NAP process, could be useful to try to work through a situational example (e.g., present a 'Country X' example outlining the stage in the NAP process where they are, and walk through their next steps)
- Hearing other countries share their experiences, there is validation of NAP experience. Save-the-Date in November was useful for scheduling. Agrees with Alexis' point that it would be useful to systematize the facilitation methods so that they can be replicated. On Gender Day, for future, it may be worth restructuring the day, as the survey at the end of the day was intensive work. Participants may be more engaged if it was moved to the morning session.
  - Bringing the two cohorts together was the high point of the week.
  - Field trip was well-chosen, field trips should be continued as a feature of the peer learning
  - Good to hear that specialist presentations and country group work. Facilitation methods are only half of the job – engaged participants are equally important, and the groups that met in Nadi were very engaged.

- Cohort model fostered good relationships between participants, which may help with risk-taking. NAPA process was very much a box-ticking exercise, whereas NAP processes are more dynamic
- A section focused on facilitation methods could be part of the next TTF if communications is the thematic focus.
- One challenge we could focus on more is language in the room, and how to create an experience that is as enriching for those who aren't.

***Should the Network off simultaneous translation at peer learning events?***

- English still tends to be default language for many international climate discussions
- In agenda, there is a need to be conscious of time; simultaneous translation can add length.
- Simultaneous translation involves significant costs. In nomination process, it may be worth asking countries send staff who have some level of English if it is the working language
- Feedback from some francophone participants was 'this is what we face every time we go to an international meeting'. Secretariat translated some workshop materials, but could translate more
- May be worth considering translation of the resources post-event
- Participatory exercises went well, especially with multiple groups, but technical presentations presented a greater challenge
- Participants have consistently welcomed the opportunity to interact with countries beyond region their region, as there are already a number of regional exchange opportunities. Having a global, cross-region workshop necessarily involves some challenges with multi-linguistic communication

***Would the peer learning summits work if they wasn't a cohort?***

- Participant selection is more important than cohort approach. If materials for discussions were shared more in advance, it might help ensure there is a more common baseline, help delve into the complexities.
- the Malawi TTF was a rich experience, was a positive experience I to have met others in the cohort and reconvened.

***Anne: There was a lot of evaluation at this TTF – was it too much? And were workbooks helpful or a heavy workload?***

- The workbook was helpful – will bring it to Colombia to work with colleagues from home to prompt discussions with colleagues at home.
- Workbook will also help prompt discussions in Philippines
- Offering electronic versions of workbooks in addition to printed version would be useful