

# CLIMATE INVESTMENT FUNDS

Joint CTF-SCF TFC  
September 15, 2011

---

## **NOTE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CIF TRUST FUND COMMITTEE AND SUB-COMMITTEE MEETINGS AND THE ANNUAL PARTNERSHIP FORUM**

## **I. Introduction**

1) At the Joint CTF-SCF Trust Fund Committee Meeting in June 2011, the joint meeting reviewed document CTF-SCF/TFC.6/CRP1, *Note on the 2011 Partnership Forum and* expressed its appreciation to the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) for its offer to host the 2012 Partnership Forum. The joint meeting (i) requested the EBRD and the CIF Administrative Unit to work together to identify a location that is easily accessible and cost effective; (ii) requested the EBRD and the CIF Administrative Unit to explore the possibility of convening the meeting in Istanbul; (iii) requested the CIF Administrative Unit to take into consideration the possibility of holding the next Partnership Forum and the Trust Fund and Sub-Committee Meetings jointly in order to allow the most efficient use of participant's time and CIF resources; and (iv) requests that participants be notified early of the proposed dates for the Forum, in order to ensure strong and high level attendance.

2) This note is prepared in response to the joint meeting's requests and provides information on the steps that the CIF Administrative Unit and EBRD have taken to identify an easily accessible and cost effective location to hold the Partnership Forum, including exploring options in Istanbul. This note also provides information which will help the joint meeting to make a decision regarding the timing and location of the next Partnership Forum, taking into account the possibility of convening both the Trust Fund and Sub-Committee Meetings jointly with the Partnership Forum, and the need to allow for efficient use of CIF resources and participants' time.

## **II. Organization of the 2012 Partnership Forum**

### *Timing of Trust Fund Committee and Sub-Committee meetings*

In reviewing the organization of the CIF Committee meetings in 2012, it is clear that holding the meetings in June and November did not allow for maximum efficiency in the organization of the CIF work. The period between end of June and early November is only four months, and it is proving difficult for the Administrative Unit and the MDBs to prepare fully for the November meetings in the shortened time. Furthermore, the period between a meeting in early November 2011 and end June 2012 is almost eight months, and in order not to overly delay certain discussions and decisions, there may be a need to convene extra intersessional meetings, as has been proposed by the SREP Sub-Committee so as not to delay the review of countries' investment plans. The convening of meetings at the end of June is also problematic from an administrative perspective. The dates of the CIF meetings in late June 2011 coincided with the end of the fiscal year, and the Administrative Unit was unable to capture within the FY11 budgetary cycle all the costs related to the Committee meetings and Forum. This has resulted in significant costs being carried over into FY12, which will have an impact on the management of the FY12 budget that was approved by the Trust Fund Committees.

Given these concerns, and based on a review of the international calendar, it is proposed that the CIF Committee meetings in 2012 and thereafter, be held every six months, preferably in early May and early November. These dates are six months apart, and appear to avoid major climate change and other international meetings (in particular the meetings of the UNFCCC which are normally held in early June and early December and the Rio+20 meeting to be held June 4-6, 2012). The proposed dates for 2012 are:

April 30 – May 4, 2012

October 29 – November 2, 2012.

### **III. Timing of 2012 Partnership Forum**

As requested by the joint meeting, the CIF Administrative Unit has reviewed the option of holding the Partnership Forum jointly with the CIF Committee meetings. Currently the CIF Administrative Unit is responsible for convening on an annual basis three sets of meetings: the bi-annual Trust Fund Committee and Sub-Committee meetings and the annual Partnership Forum. Holding the Partnership Forum in conjunction with one set of committee meetings does appear to be cost effective since it would result in two sets of meeting (as opposed to three), placing fewer demands on the travel schedules of the participants.

In exploring the feasibility of organizing the Partnership Forum together with one set of CIF Committee meetings, we reviewed the calendar of meetings for May, June and November with a view to identifying a 10-12 day window in which to convene the combined meetings. Given the schedule of meetings in 2012, we were unable to identify a time slot that met these needs in May or June, but we were able to find a suitable opening in the calendar during the two week period October 30 - November 9.

Experience from past Partnership Forums is that the advanced planning needed for preparation of a large meeting such as the combined Partnership Forum and Committee meetings is at least 12 months. Given that the 2011 Partnership Forum was held at the end of June 2011, it does not appear feasible to organize the 2012 Forum before June or July. As we have yet to confirm a location for the next meeting (pending a decision on its location and timing), convening the Forum before that date may not even be possible in the agreed location (see discussion of location below). If the Forum is to be convened in conjunction with one set of Committee meetings, it is proposed, therefore, that the 2012 Partnership Forum be convened in conjunction with the Trust Fund Committee and Sub-Committee meetings in November 2012 (as opposed to May 2012). This would allow sufficient time for the preparation of the Forum and would allow for the cost savings associated with combining the Forum and the Committee meetings.

Furthermore, it is proposed that the Governance Frameworks for the CTF and the SCF be amended to provide that the Partnership Forum be convened at eighteen month intervals. Experience from the last two Forums shows that the organization of the Forum every 12 months requires tremendous effort and imposes a significant work load on the CIF Administrative Unit and the MDBs. Also, the costs of the Partnership Forum are significant (\$1.6 million in 2011<sup>1</sup>), and convening the forum at eighteen month intervals would serve to reduce such costs. Convening the Partnership Forum every 18 months would eliminate the cost of one Partnership Forum every three years, an approximate cost of US\$ 1.6 million (based on 2011 Forum), and it would place fewer demands on the travel schedules of the committee participants.

The additional six months between the Forum should not, however, be so significant as to diminish the value of the Partnership Forum as a vehicle for engaging a broad range of stakeholders, particularly since efforts are underway to further strengthen stakeholder engagement in the Committee meetings (through implementation of the recommendations presented to the June 2011 Committee meetings that emerged from the NGO and private sector consultations) and on-going engagement at the country level.

It should be recognized that if the proposal to convene the Partnership Forum every eighteen months is approved, the term for members serving on the CIF Committees would be affected, since the rules of

---

<sup>1</sup> US\$1.3 million to the administrative budget of the CIF; US\$ 311,000 to the budget of the African Development Bank.

procedure provide that “a year term shall run from the date immediately after the last day of a Partnership Forum meeting until the last day of the next Partnership Forum meeting”. It will be recalled that aligning the terms of the members of the Committees is useful since the Partnership Forum provides an opportunity to organize consultations for the purpose of agreeing on membership of the Committees.

If the Forum were convened every eighteen months, the current twelve month term for SCF Sub-Committee Members would become eighteen months (i.e., covering three meetings of the Sub-Committee instead of two) and the current twenty four month period for the Trust Fund Committees would become thirty six months (covering six meetings of the Trust Fund Committee) unless there was agreement to align the Trust Fund Committee member terms with those of the Sub-Committees so that membership on all CIF Committees would be for 18 months, with the possibility for renewal.

The above proposal would require an amendment to paragraphs 31 of the CTF Governance Framework and paragraph 32 of the SCF Governance Framework which require that “The Partnership Forum will be convened annually to provide a forum for dialogue on the strategic directions, results and impacts of the CIF”. If the Trust Fund Committees agree that the Forum should be convened every eighteen months, proposed language to amend the Governance Frameworks will be presented to the November 2011 joint meeting of the CTF and SCF Trust Fund Committees.

#### **IV. Location of the 2012 Partnership Forum**

EBRD has made preliminary inquiries to identify possible locations in London and Istanbul for the 2012 Partnership Forum and CIF Committee meetings. Initial analysis of the costs of holding the meetings in London, which were undertaken when it was assumed that the Forum would be held in June 2012, indicated that convening the meetings in London in the run-up to the 2012 Olympics, which are scheduled to take place in London from July 27 - August 10, 2012, would have been extremely difficult since costs during that period are very high and there is significantly reduced availability of suitable venues able to accommodate the anticipated 500+ participants. With this in mind, and with the needed twelve months to effectively organize and coordinate the Partnership Forum, London in June was deemed unsuitable

Research was then carried out to identify suitable venues in both London and Istanbul for November 2012. EBRD contacted several suitable sites in London with availability in November. Costing for London can be found in Annex 1: *Estimated Cost Comparison between London and Istanbul – 2012 Partnership Forum – November 2012*. Several sites were contacted in Istanbul and quotes received. These quotes indicate that costs are lower in Istanbul than in London, and several sites were available when initial inquiries were made. Annex 1 provides estimated costs for holding the Partnership Forum in both London and Istanbul in November 2012. However, it should be noted that these costs are estimates based on discussions with a sampling of suitable sites. As no particular site has been contracted for the Forum, estimates may change. As can be seen in Annex 1, the estimated cost difference between holding the 2012 Partnership Forum in London (US\$2.62 million) and Istanbul (US\$2.18 million) is approximately US\$ 440,000. It is therefore proposed that the Partnership Forum take place in Istanbul.

#### **V. Conclusions**

The recommendations and proposals described in this note will allow for greater costs savings, ensure sufficient time for planning and organization of the 2012 Forum and CIF Committee meetings, and allow for adequate notice to ensure high level participation in the Partnership Forum.

## Annex 1

## Estimated Cost Comparison between London and Istanbul – 2012 Partnership Forum – November 2012

	<u>LONDON</u>				Total Forum Costs	<u>ISTANBUL</u>				
	CIF AU Estimated Costs	EBRD Estimated Costs				CIF AU Estimated Costs	EBRD Estimated Costs			Total Forum Costs
		Cash	In-Kind	Total			Cash	In-Kind	Total	
Venue (facilities, interpretation booths, microphones, food services, etc.)	4,000	912,000		912,000	916,000	4,000	521,064	-	521,064	525,064
Personnel incl. temporary	110,000	83,728	24,000	107,728	217,728	110,000	83,728	72,000	155,728	265,728
Travel (Participants, CSO, Panelists)	774,880				774,880	637,120				637,120
Stakeholder Outreach	107,000				107,000	107,000				107,000
Communications	153,000					153,000				
Telecommunications	5,000	10,000		10,000	15,000	5,000	5,000		5,000	10,000
Translation (documents)	30,000				30,000	30,000				30,000
Interpretation (Fr/Eng/Spa)	96,000				96,000	220,000				220,000
General Operations Costs (equipment, registration, storage, freight, etc.)	20,000	53,000		53,000	73,000	20,000	15,400		15,400	35,400
	1,299,880	1,058,728	24,000	1,082,728	2,229,608	1,286,120	625,192	72,000	697,192	1,830,312
Contingency (10%)	129,988	105,873	2,400	108,273	238,261	128,612	62,519	7,200	69,719	198,331
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,429,868</b>	<b>1,164,601</b>	<b>26,400</b>	<b>1,191,001</b>	<b>2,620,869</b>	<b>1,414,732</b>	<b>687,711</b>	<b>79,200</b>	<b>766,911</b>	<b>2,181,643</b>