

CLIMATE INVESTMENT FUNDS

May 26, 2009

Summary of the Co-Chairs
Meeting of the PPCR Sub-Committee
May 14-15, 2009

Co-Chairs
Robin Davies, Australia
Adonis Fakhri, Yemen

Opening of the Meeting

1. The meeting was opened by Robin Davies (Australia). Mr. Davies was reappointed as the Co-Chair from the contributor countries through a decision by mail. In opening the meeting, the Co-Chair welcomed Denmark as a new Sub-Committee member and expressed the appreciation of the Sub-Committee for new contributions to the PPCR that had been announced by Denmark and foreshadowed by the USA.

Election of Co-Chair from a Recipient Country

2. The meeting elected Adonis Fakhri (Yemen) as the Co-Chair from a recipient country. Mr. Fakhri is to serve as a Co-Chair for a six month period from May through October 2009.

Adoption of the Agenda

3. The meeting adopted the agenda set forth in document PPCR/SC.3/1/Rev.1.

Presentation of Additional Report by PPCR Expert Group

4. The Sub-Committee noted that at its meeting in January 2009, it requested the Expert Group to undertake further analysis of the countries in the Middle East and North Africa region with a view to adding a priority country from that region to the pilot program. Furthermore, with regard to the earlier recommendation of the Expert Group that regional programs be developed for the Caribbean and South Pacific regions, the Sub-Committee requested the expert group to undertake further analysis, in collaboration with the MDBs and relevant regional organizations, with a view to recommending which cluster of countries should be included in each regional program.

5. The Sub-Committee welcomed the additional work prepared by the Expert Group and expressed its appreciation for the presentation of the additional reports (document PPCR/SC.3/3 and PPCR/SC.3/3/Add.1).

6. The Sub-Committee recognized that it had requested the Expert Group to make fine distinctions among countries' vulnerabilities and that this is a difficult challenge given the need to downscale global data to the regional or national level. The Sub-Committee also noted that many of the criteria to be used in selecting countries (such as replicability, absorptive capacity and demonstration potential) fall outside the comparative advantage of the scientific and technical expertise of the group.

7. The Sub-Committee invited the Expert Group to finalize and consolidate its reports for publication and, as part of this process, to refine further and complete, under the guidance of an ad hoc working group of Sub-Committee members, the analytical work on vulnerability assessment criteria underpinning the Expert Group's recommendations on country selection. In the view of the Sub-Committee, this work will be a particularly valuable PPCR knowledge product and may help inform future work in other contexts on resource allocation frameworks for adaptation financing.

Guidelines for Joint Missions

8. The Sub-Committee approved the *Guidelines for Joint Missions to Design PPCR Pilot Programs* (document PPCR/SC.3/9), subject to the comments made by the Sub-Committee. The Administrative Unit was requested to revise the guidelines on the basis of the comments and to clear the final text with the Co-Chairs of the Sub-Committee before publishing the guidelines.
9. In preparing the final guidelines, the following considerations should be addressed:
 - (a) Country leadership of the missions and country ownership of the pilot programs should be emphasized, consistent with the *Programming Guidance for the PPCR*;
 - (b) The importance of pre-mission consultations at the country level should be recognized in the guidelines;
 - (c) The importance of collaborating with other partners during the design and implementation of country programs should be fully recognized. With the agreement of the relevant government, other development partners working in the country to address adaptation challenges should be able to participate in the mission, at their own expense, when those organizations so request.

Programming Guidance for the PPCR

10. The Sub-Committee reviewed document PPCR/SC.3/4, *PPCR Programming and Financing Modalities*, and approved the procedures and financing modalities described in the document, subject to comments of the Sub-Committee. The Administrative Unit was requested to revise the programming document on the basis of the comments and to clear the final text with the Co-Chairs of the Sub-Committee before publishing the final document.
11. The concept of the Global Support Program was widely supported, and it was agreed that a more detailed program of work, with an associated budget, should be presented at the next PPCR-SC meeting.
12. In revising the document, the following considerations should be taken into account:
 - (a) Country ownership should be emphasized and program preparation should build on existing country strategies and plans, including NAPAs;
 - (b) Development of a PPCR strategic program should be an inclusive process and may serve as a platform for strengthening collaboration with other development partners working in the country;
 - (c) Option 1 in document PPCR/SC.3/4, *PPCR Programming and Financing Modalities*, should be included as the modality for determining financing for pilot programs;
 - (d) Initial tasks to develop a results framework at the country level should link back to the PPCR results framework. The guiding questions from the results framework should be annexed to the programming paper;
 - (e) Gender aspects should be included; and

- (f) Civil society organizations and indigenous peoples should be more clearly integrated in the process.

13. The Sub-Committee agreed to keep the programming guidelines under review in order to allow for flexibility to respond to challenges that may arise during implementation of the PPCR. The CIF Administrative Unit and the MDBs were requested to report on experience in carrying out the program so that the Sub-Committee can review the programming procedures and financing modalities.

PPCR Framework for Results Measurement

14. The Sub-Committee reviewed document, PPCR/SC.3/6, *PPCR Results Framework*, and expressed its appreciation for the work of the working group, and in particular, for Canada's leadership of the process.

15. The Sub-Committee provisionally approved the results framework as a basis for moving forward and noted that existing monitoring and evaluation procedures and processes of the MDBs should be used to monitor results at the project and country level in order to strengthen existing systems and reduce transaction costs. The Sub-Committee also noted that the SCF Trust Fund Committee had agreed that a process is to be established for ensuring consistency among the results frameworks for the SCF targeted programs and for developing an overarching framework for the SCF. The Sub-Committee recognized that the PPCR results framework will be considered in that process, and requested that any proposed revisions to the framework be brought back to the Sub-Committee for its consideration.

16. The Sub-Committee recalled its earlier decision that the guiding questions of the results framework should be annexed to the PPCR programming guidelines.

17. The Administrative Unit was requested to keep the resource implications of the results framework, particularly for the countries, under review.

Selection of Pilot Programs

18. Having considered the recommendations of the Expert Group in relation to the selection of a pilot country in the MENA region, and having considered the additional information and insights provided to the Sub-Committee by the relevant MDBs for deliberation in the selection of a pilot country, the Sub-Committee decided to invite the participation of Yemen in the PPCR. It noted that among the countries recommended, Yemen is the only country that is both an LDC and has an active MDB country investment program. It further notes that the participation of Yemen will provide an opportunity to address climate risks associated with increased precipitation in arid zones.

19. The Sub-Committee also noted that the Expert Group assigned priority to Djibouti based on its vulnerability to sea-level rise. The Sub-Committee was informed that the MDBs are currently working with Djibouti to strengthen analysis of its vulnerabilities to climate impacts and measures for climate resilience. Recognizing the small population size of Djibouti and its

limited absorptive capacity, the Sub-Committee invited the MDBs to come back to it with a more in-depth review of the on-going work performed by the MDBs and other development partners in Djibouti and to provide a recommendation as to whether such work can usefully be supplemented by the PPCR.

20. The Sub-Committee took note of the recommendations of the Expert Group in relation to the selection of target countries within the Caribbean and the Pacific regions. The Sub-Committee agreed to adopt the Expert Group's recommended option of favoring an inclusive, integrated approach in each region and agreed on a set of broad principles for giving effect to that option. Specifically, it was agreed that the regional pilots should: (a) place emphasis on relatively poorer states, (b) concentrate the bulk of resources in a limited number of countries, (c) maximize synergies between activities in individual countries, including where appropriate through thematic approaches, and (d) work with, and strengthen, regional institutions, particularly with a view to promoting cross-learning. The Sub-Committee requested the MDBs concerned, working with the Administrative Unit and in consultation with interested regional organizations, to prepare in accordance with these principles and previously agreed guidance a proposal for regional pilots in the Caribbean and the Pacific to be circulated for approval by mail by late July.

21. With respect to the Caribbean, the Sub-Committee requested that priority consideration be given to how the PPCR can best supplement the work of the MDBs in Haiti.

22. Recognizing similarities among the vulnerabilities of small island states, the Sub-Committee requested that in the development of a work program for the Global Support Program consideration be given as to how best to promote interregional sharing of lessons among small island states.

Use of Experts in the PPCR

23. The Sub-Committee welcomed the proposals for the use of expert advisors in the PPCR (document PPCR/SC.3/5).

24. The Sub-Committee agreed that the work of the Expert Group should be concluded in the manner outlined in paragraph 7 above.

25. Moving forward, the Sub-Committee recognized that the options presented in the document are not mutually exclusive, and that the PPCR can draw upon the options to seek expert advice as needed. It was stressed that preference should be given to using the expertise in the MDBs, where possible, and that considerations of fitness for purpose, cost, and conflict of interest should be brought to bear when seeking expert advice.

Update on Self Selection of Observers

26. The Sub-Committee welcomed the progress that has been made in advancing the self selection process for representatives of civil society to observe CIF meetings. The Sub-Committee looks forward to the completion of the self selection processes that are underway and

requests the organizations carrying out the processes to inform the CIF meetings in October 2009 of the results of the process and lessons learned.

Other Business

27. The Sub-Committee noted the importance of sharing experiences among the pilot countries and requested the Administrative Unit to convene a meeting of the PPCR pilot countries as early as possible, possibly in conjunction with the next PPCR Sub-Committee meeting.

28. The Sub-Committee agreed that the Co-Chairs and the Administrative Unit should keep under review the resources available to the PPCR and to consider whether the Sub-Committee should consider at a future meeting the inclusion of additional pilot countries in the PPCR.

Closing of the Meeting

29. The meeting was closed on May 15, 2009.