

**COMMUNITY-BASED ADAPTATION PROJECT
MINUTES OF THE THIRD BOARD MEETING HELD VIA TELECONFERENCE FROM UNDP EEG NY-USA
18 MAY 2011, 10am to 1pm (NY time)**

Agenda Item	Areas of Presentation and Discussion	Issues Noted/Discussed/Presented	Follow up Actions Responsible Persons/Entities
Welcome Remarks	The chair started by thanking for the continued support from the board members, and stressed the significance of this particular board meeting as the project moves into an advanced stage of implementation.		
Overview	<p>The chair noted that the overall implementation of the CBA pilot project is on track, and producing successful results. The progress of the Project has already started to receive publicity. All partners (GEF Sec, UNV, UNDP, and SGP) were congratulated.</p> <p>Based on the recommendations from the Mid-Term Review (MTR) done by an external independent consultant, fine-tuning of the project needs to be reviewed and implemented for continued success in the future. In addition, since CBA is a pilot project, both technical and management experiences of the Project will be useful in designing future CBA projects. .</p> <p>The chair emphasized knowledge management as well as policy communications for replication and up-scaling as the key focus of the second phase of the project , hence the important areas of discussion during the meeting with regards to how best GEF Sec, UNDP, and UNV can collaborate in creating strategic outlets for knowledge materials.</p>	<p>-Collaboration with GEF Sec in seeking future CBA projects with the funding from GEF LDCF and SCCF, in principle was agreed to, and GEF Sec is open to new proposals. GEF Sec rep agreed to further discuss internally.</p> <p>-Discussion highlighted on possible strategies to position a pilot CBA project to tap on funds for community-based adaptation from diverse sources including GEF.</p> <p>- It was clarified by the Chair that GEF-SGP is largely funded by the GEF Trust Fund whose focus is to produce global environment benefits, while SGP can be utilized as a delivery mechanism of CBA projects by leveraging other sources of fund including GEF SCCF/ LDCF.</p>	Follow up through UNDP/GEF (the Communities Team in collaboration with Pradeep as the Relationship Manager of LDCF and SCCF).
Review of minutes from 2010 Board meeting – Matters arising from it for discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Re-allocation of funds to needy countries- Substantive discussion line under MTR - Efforts to document key lessons-Covered under the section on lessons below - Analysis of CBA portfolio of projects-picked in work plan and a start initiated through the technical report circulated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bangladesh and Guatemala are laggard countries in programming; cut-off dates will be given so new projects do not exceed the closing date of global project. Morocco was noted to have picked up and started rolling out projects in 2010 onwards. - The M&E publication discussed in last year’s board meeting is still pending. 	<p>-Follow up and give directions to CBA countries. <i>Action: PMU</i></p> <p>-Add to the 2011 Work Plan <i>Action: PMU</i></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Participation in the side events at the GEF Council meetings-November 2011 - Participation of CBA in IIED led platform for knowledge exchange - Lobbying GOJ to partner in the new CBA GEF proposal under preparations 		
Annual Progress Report (2010)	<p>Project Coordinator presented the progress as follows. The CBA project is on-track. There have been strong partnerships with UNDP Gender Team and a CBA/CCA. Gender guidebook (a guidebook for designing and implementing gender-sensitive community-based adaptation programmes and projects) has been developed and disseminated. Local partnerships have also been very strong as in the case of Morocco and Namibia for example.</p>	Focus on the phase 2 of the project is on Knowledge management on lessons learnt and policy influence.	
	Outcome 1: Enhance adaptive capacity to allow communities to reduce their vulnerability to adverse impacts of future climate hazards.		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -48 ongoing projects, Additional 6 project expected within the year to get a total projects to 54. -Partnerships forged with Peace Corps volunteers, ACCMA, GTZ, Fondation Credit Agricole, Zakora, AAP, National Governments. -In 3 countries, 11 CBOs/NGOs were brought on board. -Guidebook, case study, midterm technical report, project templates done. -Training on Volunteerism, VRA, capacity building of NGOs, PM+E. -Training conducted for Journalist, NGOs, CCA \$ project development. -UNV training on methodologies and CCA done. -Examples of success of CBA projects in Namibia, Samoa, Morocco. -Monitoring of up to 42 projects were done by UNVs, + PMU. -Briefing materials prepared for Kazakhstan, Namibia, and Niger. 	<p>-Reporting on community level activities must be improved and captured more in APR. Although the UNV cost shared agreement document (outputs/outcomes) are developed according to the CBA global project, details in UNV independent annual report coming out of the project detailing the outputs and outcomes they are supporting was not clearly noticeable in UNDP APR, especially with regard to community level successful outputs.</p>	<p>-Indicators must be reviewed to ensure better reporting on communities. <i>Action: PMU will follow up with UNDP Task Manager and SGP Global Manager.</i></p>

	<p>-CBA feeds into UNDP Climate adaptation meetings, EEG projects, and Quarterly Adaptation Newsletter.</p>		
	<p>Outcome 2: National policies and programmes promote replication of best practices derived from CBA projects</p>		
	<p>Promotion through missions (5 PMU, 45 by NCs and UNV's) -SGP NSC informed of CBA progress, links to governments. -Contribution to national level CC policies formulations (Namibia, Kazakhstan). -High level visits (presidents and prime ministers). -CBA works closely with regional councils, Municipalities, Local and Traditional Authorities, Farmers, Vocational Centre's and Inter. Institutions. -Round table meetings, in Kazakhstan and Central Asia regions. -Local Committees engaged (Tamalolo in Niger), NGO's engaged in Morocco -Featured in documentaries (French TV on Morocco projects). -CBA contributes to coastal management local policies (Samoa-the coastal infrastructure management plans) -Other lessons shared in the websites, conferences, and publications. -Data on CBA entered in SGP websites, includes IAS/VRA data sets.</p>	<p>-Reporting on community level activities needs to be captured at outputs level as spelled out in the APR, so it is clear on the contributions of partners. -There were issues with the availability of IAS/VRA's information in 2009 and 2010 in the SGP website. With the participative contribution of UNVs, the information is continually being made available. The focus on phase 2 of the CBA pilot project will be to get concrete results from IAS/VRA to better explain the contributions of the CBA pilot project. It was noted that the CBA pilot project is the most scientifically rigorous pilot project compared to other CBA projects. This makes it unequal among many other CBA projects and should be able to provide guidance notes for M&E and how to successfully conduct CBA project.</p>	<p>-This reporting detail at outputs levels can be better framed once the indicators are reviewed to ensure better reporting of communities is reflected. <i>Action: PMU will follow up with UNDP Task Manager and SGP Global Manager.</i> -Put efforts in getting more qualitative results and develop a report on the analysis. In addition, PMU will include indicators to measure qualitative progress, and guide UNVs to follow up. <i>Action: PMU</i></p>
	<p>Outcome 3: Cooperation among member countries promotes innovation in adaptation to climate change including variability.</p>		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Website host knowledge products, lessons from countries. -Conducted policy workshops (Namibia, Kazakhstan and Niger), engaged parliamentarians. -Utilized newsletters, electronic prints, participatory videos, briefs for GEF, UNFCCC and COPS 15 meetings. -Plans to develop a guidance note on how to successfully monitor CC projects for CBA in 2011 		
<p>Summary of technical report on the CBA projects across portfolios.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Biodiversity-22 projects have been prepared (Samoa-12, Bolivia-4, Jamaica-6, Kazakhstan, Namibia, Niger and Vietnam have 1 each (pages 1-14). -Sustainable Land Management - 25 projects (Bolivia-3, Jamiaca-3, Kazakhstan-8, Namibia-2, Niger-2, Samoa-5, Vietnam-2) (pages 15-23) -Water Resources Management-16 projects (Bolivia-3, Kazakhstan-5, Namibia-4, Niger-2, Samoa-1 and Vietnam-1) -Technology Transfer-44 (Niger-8, Samoa-8, Vietnam-8, Kazakhstan-7, Namibia-7, Bolivia-6) -Capacity building-48 (All countries-Kazakhstan, Namibia, Niger, Samoa, Vietnam, Jamaica, Bolivia) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The report should be beefed up in the second version to capture lessons and impacts. It should contain concrete events, results and impacts oriented messages coupled with punchy statements, statistics and displayed in many ways including graphs. -It was also noted that the report could look at how to adapt approaches in various ecosystems and archetypes to provide lessons on how to addresses these differences when conducting CBA projects. This was the essence of the piloting in this project. -Technical report should not be titled: MTR. Title is confusing as there was a project MTR alongside the package of information provided. The report did not also capture <i>actual lessons learnt</i>. It was explained and noted that it was more of a status of intervention report. -This material was considered for possibility of distribution at the COP 17 in Durban once it is properly titled and reflects the above mentioned recommendation to include analysis on how to adapt approaches in various ecosystems and archetypes to provide lessons. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The next report will be due after 2012, as part of the final project report and will be more detailed with lessons: <i>Action PMU</i>. -Title will be reviewed and will be changed, while analysis and lessons will be included in the next version, before dissemination. - <i>Action: PMU</i>

Mid Term Review recommendations and policy matters	<p><u>1. See Recommendations extracts from the MTR report</u></p> <p><u>2. Policy Issues on Midterm Review Report</u></p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A Partial re-allocation of resources for Bangladesh and Guatemala based on absorptive capacity because of the current slow project development - Project will be operationally closed by February 2013. Consideration of an extension to be initiated formally by 2012 to December 2013 to handle backlogs and late projects expected to be programmed by 2012. - Scaling up of CBA projects to non project countries-How should this be handled? <i>Current efforts by UNDP includes:</i> A draft PIF for a new project is being reviewed internally with PMU and SGP to seek funding from SCCF. SGP regional projects funded by non-GEF sources such as MAP CBA and SIDS CBA will further the practices and lessons of SPA CBA. National CBA projects (e.g. Guatemala, Niger) are under preparations. UNDP Africa Adaptation Programme, funded by the Government of Japan, is signing MOA's with the SGP countries in Africa, in some cases using the existing CBA project as entry points (Niger and Namibia). 	<p>-GEF Sec noted there was no problem with request for extension. The project needs to follow normal no-cost extension procedures.</p> <p>-GEF Sec will be keen to see the next proposal coming out of the experiences of the pilot project.</p>	<p>Preparation and submission of a new CBA project focusing on IP CCA to GEF with clearance of the Communities RTA, and in consultation with Pradeep as the relationship Manager. - <i>Action: PMU to consult with UNDP</i></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Documentation of lessons is a planned activity in 2011. How best to handle this (proposing consultancy-based approach for specific deliverables), see work plan - Revamping the CBA Website-Use of photo galleries, a UNV page exist and is being populated, CBA page on UNDP Teamwork's done. Needs to start thinking of its sustainability and how to take care of probable interests and concerns from partners (GEF Sec, UNV) <p>New management arrangements of CBA PC in 2011 at 78%/22% for SGP/CBA: This new arrangement addresses the issue of maintaining the institutional memory while enhancing the synergy between the Project and SGP Central Management, by avoiding further staff turnover in CBA.</p>	<p>-There was concern raised by UNV that not enough time and attention will be given to CBA by PC, and that more work will fall into the UN Volunteers. In the past, also at a country level, national UN Volunteers have performed many tasks outside their ToR, including SGP NC tasks. Clarification of Roles & Responsibilities matrix was already suggested by UNDP and they are currently being prepared to correct this situation to allow UNV to focus on technical roles they are expected to pursue by their mandates, instead of getting involved in management of projects.</p> <p>SGP mentioned that the situations in-country could be country specific, and should be validated to adopt solutions.</p> <p>SGP also explained that keeping the current PC on board has the advantage that institutional memory and knowledge can be contained as this was already a concern before resulting from high turnover. This will also ensure mainstreaming CBA tasks at the national level into SGP delivery responsibilities while attaining cost-efficiency through cost-sharing and synergizing with SGP strategy. Although the cost sharing is at 78/22, CBA work will nevertheless be done as need, even if it means giving more time to the PC to manage CBA rather than his requirements for CPMT roles. It was noted that these percentages are just but guidance for cost recovery and does not properly reflect on the amounts of tasks to be performed.</p>	<p>-Validate specific situations in each SGP countries- - <i>Action PMU and SGP to ensure workload does not fall into national UNV's.</i></p> <p>- Prepare and share the CBA Roles & Responsibilities matrix with UNV. - <i>Action: PMU and UNDP Task Manager</i></p>
--	---	---	---

2011 Workplan	Focus on the phase 2 of the project is on Knowledge management on lessons learnt and policy influence.		
	Grant Making in Countries Bangladesh, Guatemala, and Morocco	-As was discussed in 2010 CBA Review: Bangladesh, Morocco and Guatemala are laggard countries in programming; cut-off dates should be given so that new projects do not run past the closing date of global project.	-Follow up and give directions to CBA countries. – <i>Action: PMU</i>
	Knowledge Management Products <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) A case study of the best Practices from 4 pilot countries (Bolivia, Kazakhstan, Jamaica, Bangladesh: 4 case studies) 2.) Thematic-Based lessons and Practices (SLM, Biodiversity, technology transfer, etc) documentation 3.) A "policy brief" on how CBA results are influencing policy communications at country context 4.) Success and Challenges of CBA Project Delivery in a non SGP Situation: Case study of Bangladesh 5.) Evaluation of Volunteerism & CBA practices in the project 6.) Experiences of CBA for GEF Policy discussion before the November GEF Assembly-Compiled Report 7.) Compile a full Synthesis report on the Outcomes of VRA and IAS to evaluate projects contribution to GEBs 	<p>-GEF Sec welcomed very much the KM focus as it is in-line with GEF focus, and agreed to work with the Project to identify strategic outlet for disseminating knowledge materials (e.g. GEF Council, Workshop, etc) and advice on their needs at future GEF events well in advance. In particular, KM focusing on policy influence in mainstreaming CBA is of great interest to GEF Sec. It is very important to document all success stories, as GEF Sec consolidates CBA efforts to share with other stakeholders.</p> <p>- Feasibility of the Bangladesh case study should be assessed taking into consideration the start up discussion of SGP in the country.</p> <p>-UNV was pleased to extend the UNV co-financing commitment through 2012 and remains engaged. However, UNV noted that the 2011 work plan was ambitious plan given the time left in the year. In order to track the progress, it should be linked to the Results Framework of the Project Document. A possible modification in the future would be an output-based work plan. UNV was also pleased to see that evaluation of volunteerism and adaptation is one of the 2011 KM deliverables.</p>	<p>-Comprehensive documentation and reporting of all local activities in policy communications/ influence and lessons learnt. – <i>Action: PMU</i></p> <p>-GEF Sec will advise on knowledge dissemination opportunities for 2011 - <i>Action: GEF/PMU /UNDP</i></p> <p>- 2011 annual workplan to be re-organized to be linked to the outputs in the ProDoc, and financial</p>

		<p>-SGP mentioned that if resources are available, bringing grantee partners as part of the national delegations to global meetings. Negotiations could be an important way of ensuring that knowledge stays within the community. This will be an alternative to the preparations of print materials. Therefore there is need to ensure that allocation of funds is balanced, for such purposes also. SGP further suggested that the project should find innovative and cost-efficient methods of KM dissemination (USB sticks).</p> <p>-UNV informed that there are free on-line translations available from UNV.</p>	<p>resources to be allocated appropriately in each deliverable. <i>Action: PMU</i></p>
	<p>Sharing of Knowledge Products</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) International Conferences (CBA6, UNCCD-COP, GEF Council, RIO+20, etc) 2.) CBA Guidebook on gender and climate Change, generated lessons to be discussed with UNDP Regional Bureaus 3.) Article on up-scaling and funding architecture for the CBA5 book for the 5th IPCC 	<p>-GEF Secretariat events calendar will be shared with UNDP for possible contribution to mainstream and maximize stakeholder outreach.</p>	<p>-GEF Sec will inform UNDP on GEF event calendar: – <i>Action: GEF/ UNDP/PMU</i></p>
	<p>Monitoring & Evaluation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) Redesigning the VRA methodology with lessons from project (based on Samoa and Morocco lessons) 2.) Compile a final lessons learnt report for 34 projects (62% of portfolio) closing in 2011 3.) Report findings from meetings, conferences and workshops (CBA6, COP 17), other events, as well as local/national activities: National Round Table Meetings in Central Asia, Regional Round Tables in Kazakhstan, Namibia Workshop for national stakeholders 	<p>-Monitoring and tracking progress will be considered pertinent in the next two years. UNV pointed out that there is consideration to have an IUNV sit in Morocco to follow up on this aspect. The Board underscored the need and importance to lay clear guidance on this, especially ensuring that VRA/IAS were up to date. PC explained that M&E data was on track with inputting into the SGP database, with exceptions of a few countries whose capacity is yet to be developed. . A draft guidance note was also tested previously in the project.</p>	<p>-Clear guidance on M&E should be prepared and used to collate information and track progress while inputting into the SGP database.</p> <p><i>Action: PMU and SGP</i></p>
<p>Budgets Summary for 2011</p>	<p>Grant making (Guatemala, Morocco, Bangladesh)-\$720,000 -Committed Grants Releases/tranches and COBs-\$1,090,657 -Administrative costs (PC, PA, Rents etc)-\$264,637 -Monitoring and Evaluation activities-\$4,000</p>	<p>-The budget was noted to be very tight amidst many deliverables. The Board endorsed the budget and advised on the immediate implementation of the action items is to deliver on time.</p> <p>-In the interest of ensuring closer collaborative ties</p>	<p>-The budget is for the May 2011 through May 2012 when the next board will sit to approve the next budget.</p>
<p>Grand Totals=\$2,159,994</p>			

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Preparation of Knowledge management products-\$72,200 -Sharing of Knowledge products-\$8,500 -UNOPS F&A-\$175,160 	<p>and discussion on the progress of the project, it was suggested that the project could consider a Project Board Meeting twice a year. PC explained that the requirement is once a year only, while ensuring that urgent issues will be dealt with immediately and any policy and management issues will be brought to the attention of the relevant board member(s).</p>	<p>-The Board agreed that joint meetings will be held in the future and not necessarily as Board Meetings but consultative meetings to be able to handle urgent issues. Action: PMU</p>
Resource Mobilization Updates	<p>GEF: \$4,500,000 GoJ: \$400,000 GoS: \$ 178,000 UNV: \$ 1,266,000 AusAID: \$345,000</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -PGRFA/BSF-\$600,000 for Namibia CES grantee approved (pre-project stage) -AAP in Niger and Namibia-\$600,000 directly for CBA projects -In kind Co-Financing from various sources-\$800,000 realized. <p>-In total, the Project leveraged co-financing of \$4,189,000.</p>	<p>-Highlighted as provided in 2010 board meeting minutes for information purposes.</p>	
Key Lessons in 2010	<p>-In this global pilot project, good communication is vital to exchange experiences among country stakeholders and partners. Success requires close cooperation and coordination between all participating partners</p> <p>-The vulnerability reduction assessment (VRA) has proven a useful tool for enhancing capacity building, fostering local ownership, and capturing emerging lessons from project implementation. --The CBA project has created a good potential for learning by piloting the Vulnerability Reduction Assessment (VRA) tool. The tool has been highly effective in raising local awareness of climate change risks, identifying community needs and capturing local knowledge and ideas. However, its reliability and consistency in terms of generating quantitative measurements is weak</p>	<p>-Hard copies of the discussion points highlighted the lessons. This was not specifically discussed but was captured in various outcomes highlights during the APR presentation.</p>	

	<p>-Ensuring effective involvement of local and national authorities increases the chance of community based adaption activities to be scaled up and achieve their full potential.</p> <p>-Linkages to the national adaptation program are keys in order to have influence in policy at the national level. For long terms sustainability, community needs and vulnerability to climate change also need to be mainstreamed into municipal policies and planning. Building strong linkages with national and municipal authorities increase the chances of internalization of policy and sustainability.</p> <p>-Capacity building and awareness raising require continued effort when working at the community level</p> <p>-Local Ownership and in-kind contributions are key factors for the success of community level adaptation projects</p>		
<p>AOB</p>	<p>1) Governance and Management Arrangements</p>	<p>-The Board discussed the current PMU arrangements. The rationale and explanation was provided by the PC, UNDP Task Manager and SGP. The Board agreed that this was a frugal way of handling the issue corporately but informed that care should be taken so that PMU functions would always be adequately addressed. UNV further made it clear that they would like to confine themselves to typical UNV functions. It was noted that this project was an exception in which UNV provided management support, especially at PMU, an arrangement that was hitherto agreed to during the early phases of the project.</p> <p>In his closing remarks, the UNV representative stated that they would be very keen to be part of the second phase and expect to be involved in its formulation and discussions.</p> <p>- It was pointed out that in some cases and where the</p>	<p>-UNV will not be part of PMU and will concentrate on UNV technical functions. <i>Action: UNV, PMU, SGP</i></p> <p>This was agreed to. <i>Action</i></p>

	<p>2) Coordinate development of Knowledge products</p>	<p>knowledge products are pointed to a specific partner, it may be useful to coordinate the development of the same bilaterally. This was discussed in the context of developing materials for the GEF meeting and to align inputs to the GEF communications strategy</p>	<p><i>PMU/UNV</i></p> <p>This was agreed to be a good way to develop products in line with existing strategies, especially when considering GEF's use. <i>Action.</i></p> <p><i>PMU</i></p>
<p>There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 12 noon.</p>			

<p>Members Present</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) Roland Sundstrom- GEF Secretariat, Climate Change Group 2.) Ghulam Isaczai – UN Volunteers Headquarters, Chief, Development Division 3.) Takaaki Yamaguchi – UN Volunteers Headquarters 4.) Delfin Ganapin - SGP Global Manager 5.) Fumiko Fukuoka – UNDP Sr. Technical Advisor , Communities Team - (Chairperson) 6.) Charles Nyandiga – UNDP CBA Project Coordinator/SGP Technical Specialist (Ex-officio) 7.) Anna Lisa Jose – UNDP CBA, Programme Associate 	<p>Members Absent</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) Boni Biaginni, GEF Secretariat (represented by R. Sundstrom)
---	---

Signed by Chairperson :

Dated :