



© Hoang Gia Hai Hoang/CARE.

Pro-Poor Governance of Global Adaptation Funds

A Discussion Paper

CARE, Germanwatch and Bread for the World



Pro-Poor Governance of Global Adaptation Funds

A Discussion Paper

CARE, Germanwatch and Bread for the World

November 2009

Acknowledgements

This discussion paper was prepared by Andrew Jones for CARE, Germanwatch and Bread for the World. It was reviewed and edited by Christina Chan, Sven Harmeling, Angie Dazé, Sönke Kreft, Thomas Hirsch, Poul Erik Lauridsen, Charles Ehrhart, and Christoph Bals.¹ The team would like to acknowledge the input of colleagues from the Climate Action Network, including Richard Weaver, Kit Vaughn, and Marcus Oxley, as well as participants from civil society and Party delegations who provided feedback at a panel discussion held during the UNFCCC meeting in Bangkok on September 28-October 9, 2009.

¹ This paper was prepared with financial support from the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ). The views expressed here are in the sole responsibility of the author and CARE, Germanwatch, and Bread for the World.

Content

- Executive Summary ii
- I. **Introduction** 1
- II. **Assessment of Selected International Funding Experiences to Date** 3
 - Aid & Development Effectiveness 3
 - Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB and Malaria 8
 - The Kyoto Protocol’s Adaptation Fund 12
- III. **Implications for a Global Climate Change Adaptation Funding Mechanism** 14
 - Prioritized Funding 14
 - Participation and Downward Accountability – Global Level 15
 - Participation and Downward Accountability – National Level 17
- IV. **Conclusion** 18

Executive Summary

People in extreme poverty are least responsible for, but most vulnerable to, climate change. It is imperative that the international agreement and framework for adaptation assistance to developing countries ensures that communities, populations and people most at risk and least equipped to manage the consequences receive the restitution they are due, either in the form of direct adaptation support or broader infrastructure, service and policy reforms that facilitate local adaptation efforts.

Even with aggressive mitigation commitments and action in the years ahead, the future prospects of especially vulnerable people hang on the mobilization of massive new and additional resources for adaptation and whether such resources (a) prioritizes their needs and challenges, (b) ensures their active and meaningful participation at all levels, and (c) is accountable to them. Scant attention has been paid to these three principles and how they can be operationalized within international adaptation funding mechanisms.

This paper – commissioned by CARE, Germanwatch and Bread for the World – looks to help fill the void.² Drawing on experiences to date with existing climate change adaptation and other international funding mechanisms, it sets forth concrete, workable suggestions for pro-poor governance of international adaptation funding. These are:

Prioritized Funding

- 1. Support for Human Vulnerability and Climate Risk Assessments.** Effective adaptation requires analysis of current exposure to climate shocks and stresses and model-based analysis of future climate impacts. It also demands an understanding of the existing vulnerability of individuals, households, and communities and the institutional, political, physical, and social environment, as well as ecosystems, in which they live. Eligible developing country governments seeking international adaptation funding should be assisted to carry out human vulnerability and climate risk assessments and show how priorities in their proposed adaptation plans and budgets derive from and respond to such assessments. Vulnerability assessments should be gender responsive and involve local stakeholders. Results need to be tracked, disseminated widely, and applied in conjunction with climate risk assessments.
- 2. Upfront Resources for Inclusive Planning.** Resources for inclusive and participatory assessment and planning processes must be provided up front. Essential to such processes is as clear, accessible, timely, accurate and complete information as possible, based on the latest expert assessments of climate change impacts relevant to a given region and any promising experiences and lessons for reducing vulnerability, building resiliency, and adapting in similar environments.
- 3. Prioritization of Most Vulnerable People in National Adaptation Action Plans and Strategies.** Ultimately, global adaptation funding of a larger amount should only go toward national adaptation plans and strategies that demonstrate an inclusive and participatory process of planning and the prioritization of actions and investments, which is based on human vulnerability and climate risk assessments.

² This paper can also be seen as a complement to the Adaptation Action Framework proposed by Climate Action Network International.

Participation and Downward Accountability – Global Level

- 1. Composition of Global Board.** Representatives from vulnerable communities, populations and people and from civil society should be on the Board of any future international adaptation funding regime. They should have full participation and voting rights. Delegates from civil society should come in particular from organizations with strong and direct links to vulnerable communities, populations and people.
- 2. Support for Representatives from Vulnerable Groups and Civil Society.** Any new international adaptation funding regime should provide support to vulnerable groups and civil society delegations on a global Board to meet basic standards and guidelines for delegate selection (or election), information sharing, constituency consultation and position development, and reporting. If direct representation proves politically unattainable in the near term, emerging standards for active civil society and affected population participation should be respected, at a minimum.
- 3. Composition of Adaptation Technical Panel.** There should be assurances of representation of most affected groups directly – or, at a minimum, through civil society representatives with clear, strong links to them – on an Adaptation Technical Panel, or any similar institutional arrangement to be agreed upon. The Adaptation Technical Panel would assist in the preparation of national (and potentially regional) strategies and recommend to a Board a “financial entitlement” for countries to implement, with periodic grant installments, their approved strategies.³
- 4. Independent Monitoring and Evaluation.** The global monitoring and evaluation system for any future adaptation funding regime must include an independent capacity that can provide external direction and support to annual monitoring processes and more occasional evaluations of the outcomes of developing country adaptation strategies and investments supported by global funding. Monitoring should include regular assessments of progress made in fulfilling basic civil and political as well as economic, social and cultural human rights through adaptation programs and policies.
- 5. Space for Civil Society Review and Comment.** As proposed strategies, implementation reports, and requests for grant installments are submitted by national governments, it will be crucial for space to be provided for civil society to review and comment on the contents – via posting on the web and allowing sufficient time for concerned groups to digest and feed back – and for such comments to be taken seriously in international-level decisions on further assistance.

Participation and Downward Accountability – National Level

- 1. Establishment of Country Coordinating Mechanisms.** In disbursing funding to developing countries, any future global adaptation finance regime should include the establishment of a coordinating mechanism within countries (or enhancement of comparable existing mechanisms) to represent all relevant stakeholders, build on and coordinate a range of adaptation institutions and resources in country, and spearhead national adaptation planning and monitoring and evaluation. This should not be regarded as a condition for adaptation funding, but as an instrument to facilitate the development of effective adaptation strategies, taking into account the human rights obligation of developing country governments to give special attention to their most vulnerable people.

³ The idea for this panel comes from proposals made by many developing countries in the negotiations. It potentially could build on the Least Developed Countries Expert Group, which has gathered a lot of experience around the NAPA process.

- 2. Composition of Country Coordinating Mechanisms.** Guidelines for composition and putting representatives in place should be made explicit and resourced as needed. Resources should be made available for this, specifically up-front finance for developing countries to invest in processes and institutions for sustaining planning, implementation and monitoring activities in a manner that enables and encourages the participation of all stakeholders, particularly vulnerable people.
- 3. Terms of Reference.** Any future international adaptation financing regime should expect developing country governments to put in place terms of reference for their country coordinating mechanisms and support them to live up to their agreed terms of reference. These should reflect good practice related to composition, roles and responsibilities of members, including of chairs and any other leadership positions; proactive and transparent communications and information sharing; meeting formats and rules; constituency accountability; and processes and procedures for national strategy development, implementation, monitoring and evaluation.
- 4. Sub-national Coordinating Committees.** Strong consideration should be given to mandating sub-national coordinating committees that can connect more easily with and represent up the local-level realities and perceptions of what can and should be done as part of an effective and appropriate adaptation strategy. For many developing countries, this would call for major and sustained institutional strengthening support.
- 5. Reporting.** In proposals for international funding, developing countries should document 1) significant most affected population representation in country coordinating mechanisms, 2) legitimate selection or election processes for such representatives, and 3) effective access to information for affected population constituencies and their meaningful participation in planning and monitoring and evaluation of plan and budget implementation.

I. Introduction

Climate change is a study in social injustice. People in extreme poverty are least responsible for the problem; yet climate change is increasing their vulnerability and undermining their efforts to build better lives for themselves and their children.

Most of the world's poorest people rely on climate-sensitive livelihoods, such as rain-fed farming. They live on the most precarious land, depend on marginal ecosystems, and are hit by flooding, drought and other hazards. The world's poorest people also have limited access to and control over natural, physical, financial and other resources. They are therefore already struggling to survive on the knife edge of crisis. This, in and of itself, is an unacceptable injustice.

People in extreme poverty are in no position to withstand the additional burden of climate change.

A wide range of climate change adaptation needs are already being felt in much of the world. These needs will only grow over time, with the rate of growth dependent on progress made on the mitigation front. The post-2012 agreement now being negotiated, therefore, will have to include greatly stepped-up commitments by the Parties to meet the developing world's adaptation challenges, a fact that is increasingly recognized and in the spotlight. To date, however, there has been little space for discussion of how to ensure that the people most negatively affected and least equipped to deal with climate change benefit from adaptation funding, and few concrete proposals to facilitate this outcome.

Recently, Climate Action Network International (CAN) brought this discussion forward with its proposal for an Adaptation Action Framework (AAF), which builds on many ideas and demands expressed in the current negotiations. The AAF proposes key principles, among others:

- Prioritizing the adaptation needs of and ensuring resources reach the most vulnerable;
- Recognizing climate change impacts vary and thus responses will have to be based on local assessment and relevant to local communities and people;
- Maximizing national, sub-national and community level ownership of adaptation planning and implementation processes;
- Planning and implementing adaptation actions in a transparent and well documented way ensuring inclusive representation at every stage of the process as well as compliance with human rights standards; and
- Gender equity in all planning and decision making.

Drawing on selected international funding experiences to date, this paper puts forth concrete suggestions for how the following three principles, already reflected in the AAF, can be operationalized in a way that respects country-driven adaptation and does not place an undue burden on developing countries:

Prioritization of funding support to especially vulnerable populations and people;

- Active and meaningful participation by vulnerable populations and people in decision-making on adaptation at all levels; and
- Downward accountability – i.e. accountability to the people most vulnerable to the negative consequences of climate change.⁴

It is not yet clear what shape the future adaptation funding regime will take. There are already existing Funds, and there is a call for a new Convention Adaptation Fund, or an Adaptation Window of a Multi-Window Fund, as proposed by the G77 and China. There are also good reasons for any future funding regime to build on the Kyoto Protocol's Adaptation Fund experience and progress to date.

This paper will not focus on the pros and cons of these different institutional options (nor bilateral and multilateral funding outside the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change), but it will examine – through the lens of the above principles of 1) prioritized funding, 2) participation, and 3) downward accountability – lessons to be learned from various international funding experiences to date, climate change and non-climate change related. These lessons should be broadly applicable, regardless of which funding mechanism(s) are ultimately preferred.

⁴ Such principles are intended to ensure that those most harmed by climate change have a voice and ultimately are made whole by those most predominantly responsible for climate change; the context is not one of charity but rather restitution, the benefits of which should flow all the way down to the most (negatively) affected individuals.

II. Assessment of Selected International Funding Experiences to Date

Precedents enabling participation by and ensuring resource flows and accountability to especially vulnerable people in other international environmental treaties are under-developed at best. On average, other international environmental funds are managed by government representatives within multilateral bodies such as the World Bank and the UN, leave it to governments to determine and pursue funding priorities, and allow for only limited inputs from and accountability to affected communities. While measures are increasingly being taken to expand and support increased civil society participation in some global funding mechanisms, they still too often leave affected communities on the margins of policy and decision making on their behalf.

Developments in the realm of development effectiveness, the experience of the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB, and Malaria, and elements of existing adaptation funds offer useful insights into how prioritized funding, participation, and downward accountability can be more vigorously upheld. This section addresses each of these in turn.

Aid & Development Effectiveness

While adaptation finance should be additional to resources provided to fulfill existing Official Development Assistance commitments, architects of any future international adaptation finance regime can look to lessons learned and best practices in aid and development effectiveness, particularly as it pertains to defining “country-driven” approaches to adaptation and identifying ways in which to minimize undue burden placed on developing countries.

Country Ownership

Within the world of development assistance, there is an increasingly strong push for a new kind of partnership between donor and recipient governments, characterized by mutual accountability for aid effectiveness and developing country ownership, led by responsible national governments, of their own development processes. This trend is consistent with and can help define what is meant by “country driven” adaptation. In both cases, developing country citizens have a central role to play.⁵

Developing country citizens have a central role to play.

Although the process officially began with the Monterrey Consensus in 2002, donor and developing country governments laid out the full vision and roadmap for aid reform in Paris in 2005, captured in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. In 2008, these same governments met in Accra to accelerate and deepen implementation of the Paris Declaration.

⁵ This is not to suggest that climate change adaptation funding should be lumped together with ODA. In fact, CARE, Germanwatch, Bread for the World and partners in the Climate Action Network insist that such funding must be additional, based on developed countries’ legally binding commitment under the UNFCCC to assist vulnerable developing countries in dealing with the adverse effects of climate change, a commitment that reflects the fact that industrialized countries’ historical emissions have greatly harmed poor countries and, for the latter to be made whole, there must be restitution. That separate and additional (to ODA) funding, however, should be invested at developing country level in a fashion that recognizes and ensures synergies with development and disaster risk reduction and preparedness plans and budgets.

The Accra Agenda for Action reflects the consensus that country ownership of the development process should not be equated with merely government ownership but rather should be inclusive of citizens and civil society. To illustrate, explicit references are made to how developing country

The importance of systems of downward accountability and informed participation in national government-led development processes is increasingly recognized.

governments must engage their citizens in open and inclusive dialogue and ultimately in preparing, implementing, and monitoring development policies and plans, as well as deepen engagement with civil society organizations (CSOs) as independent, complementary development actors and work with them to maximize their contributions.⁶

Since Accra, various multi-stakeholder groups, including governments and civil society, have been developing a shared understanding of key aid effectiveness principles such as country ownership and accountability, as well as indicators and targets to measure and track progress going forward.⁷ Within that space, the importance of systems of downward

accountability and informed participation in national government-led development processes is increasingly recognized.

Prioritizing Funds

The development effectiveness perspective is inherently human rights-based, designed to ensure that developing country citizens furthest away from realizing their civil, political, economic, social, and cultural rights are the central focus of all development actors and processes.

That said, there is no apparent focus in the Paris and Accra process on ensuring aid reaches the most vulnerable or poorest populations within developing countries. Generally, this is understood to be part of what poverty fighting and social justice CSOs are pushing for under the banner of development effectiveness, a broader concept that subsumes and reorients the aid effectiveness discourse.

The development effectiveness perspective is inherently human rights-based, designed to ensure that developing country citizens furthest away from realizing their civil, political, economic, social, and cultural rights are the central focus of all development actors and processes.⁸ The development effectiveness discourse, then, suggests that assessments of poverty and planning in response must explicitly identify, engage, and prioritize poverty reduction for people in the most extreme poverty. Reports exploring how best to mainstream climate change responses within overall development processes also have come to the conclusion that a special focus on the poorest and most vulnerable is a duty of all governments.⁹

Participation and Downward Accountability

With respect to operationalizing the principles of participation and downward accountability in development, evidence points to multi-stakeholder partnerships that are mutually accountable – within a context of local and democratic ownership of the development process more generally¹⁰ – as the way forward.

6 See Accra Agenda for Action, Paragraphs 8 and 20 (September 2008).

7 Interview with Liz Steele, former CARE International Advisor and NGO Representative to CONCORD, July 29, 2009.

8 See Tujan, T., *Development Effectiveness: Claiming Rights and Achieving Development* (2008); *Reality of Aid, Civil Society and Development Effectiveness: Another View* (2008).

9 See, e.g., Commission on Climate Change and Development, *Closing the Gaps: Disaster Risk Reduction and Adaptation to Climate Change in Developing Countries*, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Stockholm, Sweden (2009).

10 Advisory Group on Civil Society and Aid Effectiveness, *Synthesis of Findings and Recommendations*, p. 12 (August 2008) (defining “local and democratic ownership” as “ownership that is widespread and deep-rooted, including ownership by all who are involved in, and affected by, the planning, design, implementation, and monitoring of aid-supported development programs”).

Multi-Stakeholder Partnership and Mutual Accountability

The Overseas Development Institute, a UK-based think tank, identifies the following components of mutual accountability:

1. Agreeing on a shared agenda, including development strategies and results as well as how aid is to be delivered;
2. Monitoring mechanisms to track and review progress toward delivering agreed agendas, e.g. targets set in national development strategies and plans; and
3. Regular spaces for dialogue, debate and negotiation, which effectively enable broad stakeholder participation and underpin success in the first two components.¹¹

With respect to the third point, the Advisory Group on Civil Society and Aid Effectiveness explored the ingredients of success for effective multi-stakeholder spaces, ones that are conducive to fruitful policy dialogue. While acknowledging barriers to participation and the challenge of making the policy development process inclusive of a broad range of CSOs, from national and sub-national levels, they found progress in many developing countries. They concluded that such spaces should:

- Be regular and systematic, to allow all those engaged in the dialogue to have adequate advance notice of upcoming dialogue to sufficiently prepare their analysis and positions;
- Cover all stages of the policy process from issue identification to agenda setting, policy design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation;
- Be designed in a transparent, inclusive manner...so that all stakeholders are clear on the rationale for the dialogue process, including the process for selecting CSO participants;
- Begin with the establishment of shared principles, including recognition of the value of each stakeholder group's voice, mutual respect, inclusiveness, accessibility, clarity, transparency, responsibility and accountability;
- Be accessible to and inclusive of a broad range of CSOs;
- Have internal and external feedback mechanisms, to inform CSO participants and those inside the agencies responsible for policy-making whether and how CSOS' inputs influenced policy development; and
- Be adequately resourced for both policy makers and CSOs, with incentives for outcomes reflecting a multi-stakeholder position.

For CSOs to contribute effectively in such spaces calls, additionally, for serious capacity, e.g. to undertake analysis, generate sound evidence, and develop alternative proposals, and for legitimacy to speak for the people they claim to serve or represent.¹²

CSO Legitimacy

Building on the latter, legitimacy point, defining what is civil society and who speaks for concerned communities is no small, uncontested matter. In developing countries, one finds a range of so-called civil society organizations, from those with real constituencies and those that revolve around an individual leader and his or her agenda without any real roots in society.

In many cases, where political systems are weak and a lack of trust characterizes relations between competing factions, national governments see civil society organizations as either allies with whom they can work or political enemies they would rather marginalize if not suppress.

¹¹ ODI Background Note, *Mutual Accountability at Country Level: Emerging Good Practice*, by Liesbet Steer and Cecilie Wathne (April 2009).

¹² Advisory Group on Civil Society and Aid Effectiveness, *An Exploration of Experience and Good Practice*, by Jacqueline Wood and Real Lavergne, pages 15-18 (August 2008).

The result is that rather than focusing on including CSOs that are rooted in poor, marginalized communities in the development process, government officials too often look to elevate civil society representatives they know to be friendly and supportive of the national government agenda, whether they have real constituencies or not. It is important to guard against this risk and ensure that CS representation is legitimate, i.e. has “close and demonstrable links” and ultimately is accountable to key, often hard to reach and in some cases discriminated against constituencies.¹³

Long-Term Investments in Systems

Another key lesson from experiences with development assistance is that systems thinking and long-term systems strengthening are required. Rather than focusing on and investing in capacity building of civil society organizations in isolation, for example to strengthen their voice and ability to participate in governance, it is more effective to invest in systems and capacities to enable and bring together all stakeholders in clearly defined and agreed, mutually respectful processes at all levels, e.g. related to participatory budgeting and local development planning and monitoring. No doubt this requires long-term investments in the kinds of institutions through which competing viewpoints and proposals can be aired and negotiated leading to widely representative local, sub-national and national level plans and budgets, as well as ongoing review, evaluation, and accountability mechanisms.¹⁴

Access to Information

Access to information is the oxygen that allows participation and accountability systems to breathe.

Last but not least, access to information is the oxygen that allows participation and accountability systems to breathe. The International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) and Publish What You Fund are leading the way on developing standards related to information sharing on aid. Principles developed by the latter are useful in considering what is needed to enable poor people to participate in broader, national government-led planning processes and monitor and feed back on investments made on their behalf. Their four principles are as follows:

1. Information on aid should be published proactively;
2. Information on aid should be timely, accessible and comparable;
3. Everyone has the right to request and receive information about aid; and
4. The right of access to information about aid should be promoted.

Proposed standards for what constitutes compliance with these principles are appropriately ambitious given the fundamental importance of information to active and meaningful participation and downward accountability:

- With respect to **timeliness**, information should be “up-to-date, accurate and complete” and “made available in sufficient time to permit analysis and evaluation...and engagement in [relevant] processes, [i.e.] while planning as well as during and after the implementation of aid projects and programs.”
- With regard to **accessibility**, information should be “presented in plain and readily comprehensible language and formats appropriate for different stakeholders, while retaining the detail and disaggregation necessary for analysis, evaluation and participation” and “should be made available in the languages spoken by the affected communities.”

¹³ One helpful framework for thinking about the legitimacy issue is found in Blagescu, M. and J. Young, *Partnerships and Accountability: Current Thinking and Approaches Among Agencies Supporting Civil Society Organizations*, ODI Briefing Paper 255, page 6, London, England (August 2005).

¹⁴ One article that emphasizes these points is *Overseas Development Institute Briefing Paper, Citizens' Voice and Accountability: Understanding What Works and Doesn't Work in Donor Approaches*, London, England (February 2009).

- As for **the right to request and receive information**, “Public bodies engaged in funding and delivering aid should guarantee the right of access to information, both through proactive publication of information and by establishing [simple and free] mechanisms by which everyone can request and receive information.” A right to independent legal recourse in the event of barriers to access and refusals to provide information is also proposed.¹⁵

Case Study:

Participatory and Accountable Poverty Reduction

Practical examples that demonstrate multi-stakeholder partnership and an institutionalized commitment to the principles of informed participation by and downward accountability to poor people are emerging.

Mozambique boasts a well functioning framework for participatory poverty monitoring that includes a permanent forum for domestic stakeholders from national and donor governments and civil society. Known as the Development Observatory, this forum was established in 2003 to foster dialogue between stakeholders. The initiative helped level the playing field on access to relevant information and greatly enhanced the quality of communication between government and civil society. It also helped galvanize and legitimize a diverse range of CSOs (60 as of 2007) dedicated to bringing “the voice of poor people hidden behind government statistics to decision makers.”

In 2006, the Observatory evolved to include forums and civil society focal points at the provincial level, thereby enabling more robust participation in what are now annual poverty assessments and reports provided to all stakeholders. With leadership from the G20, poverty monitoring across the country has evolved to focus more on specific donor and national government commitments and performance targets and particularly research “to capture the perception of communities about the state of poverty, the impact of government services, the extent of their participation in poverty reduction activities and what could be improved and by whom.”¹⁶

Related to bottom-up processes assessing poverty reduction service delivery and outcomes, but with a particular focus on linking national budget allocations to actual expenditures and resulting improvements on the ground, **Uganda** pioneered a methodology called public expenditure tracking surveys (PETS).¹⁷ PETS is a diagnostic tool for stakeholders to audit the delivery and use of public funds at local service provider level, serving as an opportunity to assess irregularities in resource flows and whether public investments are ultimately yielding improvements in services.

Following the results of the initial PETS in 1996, which revealed a rather shocking “leakage” or “capture” rate of 78 percent in the education sector, the Government of Uganda “began publishing monthly intergovernmental transfers of public funds in the main newspapers, broadcasting information on them on radio and later on requiring primary schools to post information on inflows of funds for all to see.”¹⁸

PETS, complemented by a strong central government-led commitment to transparency, has proven hugely effective in reducing inefficiency and corruption¹⁹, in boosting the performance of local governments and service providers receiving national funding and, ultimately, in empowering poor citizens to hold them to account.

15 See <http://www.publishwhatyoufund.org/issues/principles>

16 Derived from multiple sources, including primarily African Forum and Network on Debt and Development, *The Second Generation Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers: The Case of Mozambique* (2007); and Handley, G., *Mutual Accountability at Country Level: Mozambique Case Study*, Overseas Development Institute (2008).

17 The Uganda/PETS example is based mainly on International Institute for Educational Planning, *Public Expenditure Tracking Surveys in Education* at www.unesco.org/iiep.

18 *Ibid*, page 76.

19 “Capture” was reduced from 78 percent to 18 percent in the education sector from 1995 to 2001. *Ibid*.

Transparency and access to information – on relevant conditions and trends, strategies and plans in response, budgets and actual expenditures, and ongoing assessments – must extend down to sub-national and local levels for people who are most vulnerable to participate actively and meaningfully and to hold their representatives in government and civil society and those contributing funds intended for their benefit to account.

Minimizing Undue Burden on Developing Countries

As the above examples reflecting emerging standards for country (or “local and democratic”) ownership of and mutual accountability for aid and development attest, pro-poor governance of global adaptation funds need not place undue burden on developing country governments. Generally speaking, adaptation funds would be channeled through national governments and the ministries leading various sector development plans. Management of adaptation funds, then, would be included in broader efforts, already underway, by governments and civil society to develop shared strategies and plans for sustainable development and poverty reduction and shared principles, indicators, and targets to measure and track progress on country ownership and accountability.²⁰

Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB and Malaria

For the most part, the design and evolution of the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB and Malaria (or Global Fund) reflect the dominant aid effectiveness themes of country ownership, mutual accountability, and multi-stakeholder partnership. Launched in 2001, by design the Global Fund is explicitly and deliberately a partnership – at all levels – between governments, civil society, the private sector, and affected communities.

Participation and Downward Accountability

Board Membership

The Global Fund partnership extends to full-fledged representation of affected communities and civil society on the global Board and their participation, with equal rights, in semi-annual Board and Board Committee meetings. The 20 voting members of the Board are divided into two, “donor” and “implementer”, blocks. For the former, there are 8 seats reserved for donor governments and 1 each for the private sector and private foundations. For the latter, 7 seats are for developing country governments and 3 for civil society, drawn from communities living with HIV and TB and affected by malaria (1), developing country non-governmental organizations (NGOs) (1), and developed country NGOs (1). Delegates for the NGO and community delegations are selected based on an open, competitive process with criteria of selection, selection committee members (drawn from people already actively engaged in the Global Fund’s work), and final selections all publicized to broader constituencies.²¹

What is striking about the Global Fund approach is the role that affected communities and civil society working directly on their behalf have in overall governance, including disbursement of funds to developing countries. Not only are there 3 out of 20 Board seats reserved for them but each Board delegation is authorized to bring 10 representatives to each Board meeting,

²⁰ The example of Bangladesh illustrates well how country-led adaptation, with support from a range of sources, can be effectively integrated in national aid and development processes. See IIED, Article... appearing in *Tiempo*, London, England (July 2009).

²¹ Interviews with Jaqueline Wittebrood, Communications Focal Point (CFP), Developed Country NGO Delegation to the Global Fund Board on August 6, 2009; Dr. Cheick Tidiane Tall, CFP, Developing Country NGO Delegation on September 8, 2009; and Rachel Ong on September 9, 2009, Communications Focal Points for the Global Fund’s Developed Country, Developing Country, and Affected Communities’ Board Delegations, respectively.

which means that 10 people living with HIV and/or TB or affected by malaria and 20 civil society representatives can attend and directly support their delegates. With strong analysis, consultation, and preparation, community and civil society perspectives and positions on policy and strategy issues are considered, heard, and taken on board. That said, there are challenges to effective participation, including a power imbalance in practice between the donor and implementer blocks, and the NGO and community delegations in particular, stemming at least in part from civil society's more limited capacities and means to engage.²²

Guidelines for Board Member Participation

Drawing from good practices of the delegations themselves, the Global Fund compiled guidelines for how delegates can effectively represent, engage, and be accountable to their constituencies.²³ According to the guidelines, Board members should commit to:

- Participating fully in all Board meetings;
- Reading all relevant documents beforehand to “ensure effective input”;
- Participating in all communications among the delegation, the wider NGO community s/he represents, and with other delegations;
- Voting on all Board decisions;
- Advocating for the participation of community representatives in policy and program design, implementation and evaluation at all levels;
- Maintaining a focus on issues of interest and importance to the communities/NGO movements they represent;
- Seeking input from their constituency on issues being considered by the Board in advance of the Board meetings; and
- Consulting with and reporting to a broader community of NGOs, CBOs, and communities living with or affected by the three diseases before and after Board meetings.

In relation to consultation and reporting, the NGO and community delegations rely on their Focal Points. Focal Points serve alongside the Board Member and Alternate Board Member as the third member of the Board Delegation. They use list serves to enable their constituencies to stay informed and contribute to developing delegation positions.²⁴

Country Coordination Mechanism

At the country level, the Global Fund seeks to replicate the same multi-stakeholder partnership in the form of a country coordinating mechanism (CCM), recognizing “that only through a country-driven, coordinated and multi-sector approach involving all relevant partners will additional resources have a significant impact.”²⁵ The CCMs are charged with developing and submitting grant proposals to the Global Fund “based on priority needs at the national level” and, once approved, overseeing grant implementation.

22 Interviews with NGO and Community Board Delegation Focal Points.

23 Global Fund, *Guidelines on Constituency Processes* (March 2008).

24 Ibid. For the Developed Country NGO Delegation, a constituency network called the Contact Group is managed by the Focal Point who according to the Guidelines is expected to develop an extensive network of contacts and ensure information related to the Global Fund is widely distributed, facilitate the sharing of views and development of constituency positions, and, with support from the Secretariat, tap into and make use of the communication infrastructure needed to get the job done. To assist with information dissemination and communications more generally before and after meetings, the Developing Country NGO Board Delegation has put in place four regional communications focal points, as well as an electronic bulletin offering translation into six languages. Ibid.

25 This section relies on the following publication: Global Fund, *Guidelines on the Purpose, Structure, Composition and Funding of Country Coordinating Mechanisms and Requirements for Grant Eligibility*.

The CCM's membership "should be broadly representative of a variety of stakeholders, each representing an active constituency with an interest in fighting one or more of the three diseases."

In practice, CCM representatives have been drawn from the full range of stakeholders, including civil society, and the CCM approach has enabled direct civil society and affected community engagement that otherwise would have been more limited. Unlike at the global level, however, there is no prescribed formula for CCM composition (although the guidelines suggest 40% representation from outside of the government)²⁶, nor are the terms of engagement sufficiently delineated so as to ensure, in practice, "equal rights to participation, expression and involvement in decision making." Instead, the detailed workings of the CCMs are to be determined at the country level, by the CCMs themselves. As such, the nature and degree of civil society participation varies from country to country and thus, ultimately, country ownership and accountability to those most affected varies.

Reviews and evaluations of the Global Fund and the CCMs in particular confirm this, although they also point to progress over time in addressing concerns.²⁷ One 2005 civil society review of the CCM experience in India, for example, identified the following challenges:

- Roles and operating methods not clearly defined and understood by CCM members;
- Domination by the government and under-representation of civil society;
- NGO members not chosen by the NGO sector and not truly representative;
- Limited involvement in decision making, i.e. decisions made in advance by the CCM chair and a few others;
- Information not shared within and outside CCM; and
- Poor monitoring and evaluation.

The review also brought out dissatisfaction with the lack of representation of marginalized groups, whose voices were not being heard in the CCM process.²⁸

Minimum Standards for Accessing Funding

Over time, the Global Fund has taken steps to address shortcomings through its CCM guidelines and minimum standards for accessing Global Fund funding. Minimum standards include, among others:

1. CCM members representing non-government sectors must be selected/elected by their own sector(s) based on a documented, transparent process developed within each sector;
2. All CCMs are required to show evidence of membership of people living with and/or affected by the diseases; and

²⁶ This guideline is now more widely respected than in earlier years although some countries still fall short and many find it difficult to secure and enable representation from people affected by the three diseases. Global Fund Implementer Series, CCM Governance and Civil Society Participation Brief (2008).

²⁷ Global Fund, Lessons Learned in the Field – Health Financing and Governance: A Report on the CCM Model (2008).

²⁸ According to the review, "few CCMs have instituted a formal process for selection and/or election of their members, with government officials often controlling the selection of NGO representatives." Moreover, "constituency consultations are hindered by a lack of time, limited resources, poor communication and work overload." India HIV/AIDS Alliance, National Civil Society Consultation on the Global Fund (2005).

3. CCMs are required to create a transparent, documented process which ensures that CCM and non-CCM members have the opportunity to contribute to proposal development and conducting grant oversight.²⁹

Most recently, the following was added to the CCM composition section of the guidelines: “In order to ensure vulnerable and marginalized groups are adequately represented, the Global Fund strongly encourages CCMs to consider how to improve [their] representation and participation...taking into account the scale of the national epidemic of the three diseases and the key affected populations in the national context.” Eligible costs also were expanded to include CCM meeting costs, including travel for non-governmental members and enhanced communications and information dissemination, and costs associated with facilitating constituency consultation and processes to promote and improve the quality of stakeholder participation, including from civil society.³⁰

Refinements to the guidelines over time appear to be bearing fruit. A comprehensive 2008 report based on 40 case studies across 20 countries found that the CCM partnership model succeeds in bringing together diverse stakeholders, mediating competing interests and empowering civil society, at least “in those countries where government has learned to embrace multisectoral collaboration”.³¹

On the flip side, the report concluded that “the voice of civil society in CCMs still needs strengthening, particularly where government dominates the public health arena and civil society is too weak to engage effectively.” Barriers to stronger civil society participation included lack of technical capacity, problems in accessing CCM-related information, and difficulties interacting with civil society constituencies, suggesting the need to invest in capacity strengthening of civil society networks/social movements and systems for more effective information sharing, inclusive dialogue, and decision making that is responsive to grassroots inputs.³² Finally, the report underscored the need to grow and diversify civil society representation in the CCMs, including expanding membership for those most affected.

Even as it continues to evolve in the face of shortcomings, the Global Fund experience over several years now is highly instructive for those designing the future climate change adaptation regime, especially as regards to how best to ensure community and civil society participation and downward accountability.

²⁹ See Global Fund, Clarifications on CCM Minimum Requirements, March 2008. Essentially the same three standards were emphasized by Tidiane from the Developing Country NGO Board Delegation as a means to ensuring genuine grassroots participation and accountability. Interview, September 8, 2009.

³⁰ Global Fund, Revised Guidelines on the Purpose, Structure, Composition and Funding of Country Coordinating Mechanisms and Requirements for Grant Eligibility.

³¹ Same as Note 24. The report also noted the importance of CCM leadership in creating a culture of inclusion and mutual respect between government and civil society by actively seeking civil society input and opinion and welcoming different points of view.

³² Both the Developing Country NGO and Community Board Delegations referred to a new Global Fund “community systems strengthening” policy – not yet finalized – intended to strengthen marginalized communities’ capacities to participate more effectively in the CCMs. Interviews with Tidiane and Rachel Ong, September 8, 2009. The Peru CCM experience has been cited as a model for more equal partnership with robust nongovernmental participation and institutionalization of sub-national CCMs to enhance participation by and responsiveness to grassroots civil society and affected communities. The Global Fund Implementer Series, Country Coordinating Mechanism Model: Partnerships and Leadership, Geneva (2008).

The Kyoto Protocol's Adaptation Fund

Agreed at the seventh session of the Conference of the Parties in 2001, the Adaptation Fund (AF) was established pursuant to Article 12.8 of the Kyoto Protocol “to assist developing country Parties that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change to meet the costs of adaptation.” Its governance structure, strategic framework and operational policies and guidelines have only recently been put in place but contain some innovative features.³³

Prioritizing Funding

Even at this nascent stage, one clear positive, even unprecedented characteristic of the AF is its explicit emphasis on funding the most vulnerable populations. The strategic priorities approved by the AF Board emphasize that adaptation projects and programs must be “country driven [and] based on the needs, views and priorities of eligible Parties” while prioritizing the most vulnerable communities within developing countries eligible for AF resources: “In developing projects and programs, special attention shall be given by eligible Parties to the particular needs of the most vulnerable communities.”

Such a focus is garnering increasing support at the level of the international community, both for moral, rights-based reasons and for practical reasons related to achievement of development goals. In order for it to be implemented effectively, national governments seeking Adaptation Fund money will need to systematically assess human vulnerabilities to climate change in their countries and build appropriate, locally-owned responses into proposed adaptation projects and programs. Assuming international adaptation funding expands in the future to support comprehensive national adaptation strategies, an important precedent has been set.

Since the AF is still in its nascent stage, however, it remains to be seen how seriously this strategic priority will be taken when it comes to the review and adoption of project proposals. While many developing countries already have undertaken vulnerability assessments, official documents such as the National Communications or the National Programs of Action (NAPAs) rarely equip governments with the knowledge to develop adaptation policies and plans targeting the most vulnerable people, as an assessment by Germanwatch and Bread for the World revealed.³⁴ Thus, further international support for human vulnerability and climate risk assessments will be essential. Although there are still uncertainties in many regions about specific changes in future climatic conditions and their local-level effects, Germanwatch and Bread for the World argue that “in many cases the knowledge about the general climate trends are [sic] sufficiently sound” and point to a scientific district level mapping of climate change vulnerability in India as a potential model.³⁵

Participation and Downward Accountability

Board Membership

With respect to participation, the AF is managed and supervised by a Board (AFB) made up of 16 members (and 16 Alternates with same composition) from national governments representing each of the five UN regional groups (2 per region), small island developing states, least developed countries, Annex I Parties (2 additional), and non-Annex I Parties (2 additional). There is majority representation of developing countries in a context of consensus-based decision making. Nevertheless, beyond governments there is no direct representation let alone voting rights for non-governmental stakeholders, particularly vulnerable communities.

³³ Reference to Strategic Priorities, Policies and Guidelines approved at Poznan in December 2008 and provisional Operational Policies and Guidelines more recently at Bonn I and II.

³⁴ Germanwatch and Bread for the World, *Making the Adaptation Fund Work for the Most Vulnerable People*, Bonn, Germany (November 2008).

³⁵ *Ibid.*

At the same time, nongovernmental participation is enabled via access to AFB meetings and delegations and a general commitment to transparency, e.g. documents are posted on the website and meetings are webcasted.

AF Disbursement and Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)

At its recent September meeting, the AFB strengthened stakeholder engagement and the strategic priority emphasizing needs of the most vulnerable communities, at least in principle.³⁶ The final project proposal templates and preparation instructions will request Parties to report on stakeholder engagement and how the aforementioned strategic priority is being addressed. In addition, in the direction of the approach taken by the Clean Development Mechanism³⁷ and NGO demands³⁸, the Board instructed the Secretariat to enable via the website public comments on project proposals before they are adopted, establishing a vehicle for CSOs to weigh in and be heard before funding decisions are taken. These are important steps in the right direction.

The AFB also will develop a “results framework” which, if well designed, can ensure that M&E systems, including preparation of “annual project status reports” and “terminal evaluation reports”, do not exclude the most vulnerable populations. Their views must be heard on whether and how adaptation funding are building their adaptive capacities and, ultimately, enabling them to adapt successfully.

Case Study:

From Observation to Active Participation in Global Environmental Funds

A recent International Union for the Conservation of Nature review of civil society participation in multilateral bodies and global funding programs, prepared for the World Bank’s Climate Investment Funds Secretariat, points to a number of measures that can and should be taken to enhance such participation.³⁹ These include:

1. Clarify from the onset which constituencies within civil society are meant to be represented in order to enhance the ability of constituencies to select or elect their representatives, of representatives to communicate with and speak on behalf of their constituencies, and of constituencies to hold their representatives to account;
2. Empower civil society representatives to shape meeting agendas and participate actively in meetings through the right to add agenda items to provisional agendas circulated well in advance of meeting dates, make written submissions in advance, and intervene orally during meetings not merely at the discretion of the chair; and
3. Commit and enable civil society representatives to consult with their constituencies (including through secretariat support services, e.g. for information dissemination and meeting facilities, and travel support for constituency members to attend preparatory meetings), represent their constituencies’ views and positions (not merely their own), and comply with agreed, predictable consultation guidelines or standards, including sharing information far enough in advance and in languages and forms that facilitate constituency analysis and feedback.

While falling short of direct representation on decision-making bodies, steps such as these hold promise for much more active and meaningful participation by civil society and affected populations in international environmental funds.

36 Harmeling, S. and A. Kaloga: Adaptation Fund: Critical Progress at the 7th meeting.

37 Procedures on public availability of the CDM PDD, paragraph 40 of the CDM Modalities and Procedures, EB 09 Report, Annex

38 CAN adaptation group letter to AFB from 29 May.

39 Climate Investments Funds: Review of Practices on NGO/CSO Participation and Proposal for the CIF Committees (Prepared by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature) (January 2009).

III. Implications for a Global Climate Change Adaptation Funding Mechanism

To ensure that the governance of adaptation funds is pro-poor and country-driven, architects of the future international adaptation finance regime can look to developments in aid effectiveness, the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB and Malaria, and the Kyoto Protocol's Adaptation Fund and as good models from which they can build and apply to the post-2012 agreement.

The Adaptation Action Framework (AAF) put forth by Climate Action Network International proposes an Adaptation Funding Window (as part of a comprehensive funding mechanism under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change) to be governed by an Adaptation Funding Executive Board (AFEB) "based on the governance and operational principles of the Kyoto Adaptation Fund Board (which could be expanded to take up the role of, and essentially become, the AFEB)." The CAN proposal already generally reflects the three principles of prioritized funding for the most vulnerable, participation, and downward accountability. However, drawing on the experiences described above, it can and should be strengthened as follows.

Prioritized Funding

The UN Framework Convention on Climate Change is silent on the crucial need – and obligation from a rights perspective – to identify and support the most vulnerable communities, populations and people. Ultimately, they will be the ones most harmed by industrialized countries' historic emissions, and their governments are essentially collecting payment on their behalf. It is thus imperative that the international agreement and framework for adaptation assistance to the developing world ensure that those most at risk and least equipped to manage the consequences are receiving the restitution they are due, either in the form of direct adaptation support or broader infrastructure, service and policy reforms that facilitate local adaptation efforts.

Notwithstanding this oversight in the original text, Parties to the Convention are increasingly speaking out on this issue and, in the context of the Kyoto Protocol's Adaptation Fund, access to funding is contingent on special attention being given by eligible Parties to the particular needs of the most vulnerable communities. This is a key step forward.

CAN proposes funding to developing countries through an Adaptation Readiness and Urgent Actions Pillar to generate information, including to guide funding allocation, on local impacts, vulnerabilities, and demographic analyses, by supporting existing scientific and institutional capacity where it exists and investing in it where it does not. It also proposes funding the development and implementation of National Adaptation Action Strategies with the active and sustained participation of all relevant stakeholders.⁴⁰

The principle of prioritized funding to the people who need it most can be further strengthened and operationalized as follows:

⁴⁰ The ICM proposal reflects the promising, albeit imperfect in practice, Global Fund CCM experience.

1. Support for Human Vulnerability and Climate Risk Assessments.

Effective adaptation requires analysis of current exposure to climate shocks and stresses, and model-based analysis of future climate impacts. It also demands an understanding of the existing vulnerability of individuals, households, and communities and the institutional, political, physical and social environment, as well as ecosystems, in which they live. Eligible developing country governments seeking international adaptation funding should be assisted to carry out human vulnerability and climate risk assessments and show how priorities in their proposed adaptation plans and budgets derive from and respond to such assessments. Vulnerability assessments should be gender sensitive and involve local stakeholders. Results need to be tracked, disseminated widely, and applied in conjunction with climate risk assessments.

2. Upfront Resources for Inclusive Planning. Resources for inclusive and participatory assessment and planning processes must be provided up front. Essential to such processes is as clear, accessible, timely, accurate and complete information as possible, based on the latest expert assessments of climate change impacts relevant to a given region and any promising experiences and lessons for reducing vulnerability, building resiliency, and adapting in similar environments.

3. Prioritization of Most Vulnerable People in National Adaptation Action Plans and Strategies. Ultimately, global adaptation funding of a larger amount should only go toward national adaptation plans and strategies that demonstrate an inclusive and participatory process of planning and the prioritization of actions and investments, which is based on human vulnerability and climate risk assessments.

Eligible developing country governments seeking international adaptation funding should be assisted to carry out human vulnerability and climate risk assessments and show how priorities in their proposed adaptation plans and budgets derive from and respond to such assessments.

Participation and Downward Accountability – Global Level

With respect to participation and downward accountability, first at the global level, the CAN vision of an Adaptation Funding Window governed by an Adaptation Funding Executive Board (AFEB) “based on the governance and operational principles of the Kyoto Adaptation Fund Board” needs further clarification. In terms of “equitable and balanced” representation of Parties “within a transparent system of governance” (in line with Art. 11.2 of the Convention), the Kyoto Protocol Adaptation Fund Board is commendable. Further improvements should be envisaged for the future adaptation funding regime, however, in line with the Global Fund experience and the value of placing non-governmental delegates representing intended beneficiaries on the board and enabling them to participate fully in all decision making.

The principles of participation and downward accountability, at the global level, can thus be further strengthened and operationalized as follows:

1. Composition of Global Board. Representatives from vulnerable communities, populations and people and from civil society should be on the Board of any future international adaptation funding regime. They should have full participation and voting rights. Delegates from civil society should come in particular from organizations

Representatives from vulnerable communities, populations and people and from civil society should be on the Board of any future international adaptation funding regime.

with strong and direct links to vulnerable communities, populations and people. For the existing Kyoto Protocol Adaptation Fund, this would be politically challenging because it would require changing existing rules under the Kyoto Protocol. Nevertheless, it should be envisaged for the future, and more immediately should current negotiations call for establishment of a new fund structure.

2. Support for Representatives from Vulnerable Groups and Civil Society. Any new international adaptation funding regime should provide support to vulnerable groups and civil society delegations on a global Board to meet basic standards and guidelines for delegate selection (or election, ideally⁴¹), information sharing, constituency consultation and position development, and reporting.⁴² If direct representation proves politically unattainable in the near term, emerging standards for active civil society and affected population participation should be respected, at a minimum. See the IUCN good practice study summarized in the text box in Section II. These become crucial in the absence of direct representation.⁴³

- 3. Composition of Adaptation Technical Panel.** There should be assurances of representation of most affected groups directly – or, at a minimum, through civil society representatives with clear, strong links to them – on an Adaptation Technical Panel, or any similar institutional arrangement to be agreed upon. The Adaptation Technical Panel would assist in the preparation of national (and potentially regional) strategies and recommend to a Board a “financial entitlement” for countries to implement, with periodic grant installments, their approved strategies.⁴⁴
- 4. Independent Monitoring and Evaluation.** The global monitoring and evaluation system for any future adaptation funding regime must include an independent capacity that can provide external direction and support to annual monitoring processes and more occasional evaluations of the outcomes of developing country adaptation strategies and investments supported by global funding. Monitoring should include regular assessments of progress made in fulfilling basic civil and political as well as economic, social and cultural human rights through adaptation programs and policies.
- 5. Space for Civil Society Review and Comment.** As proposed strategies, implementation reports, and requests for grant installments are submitted by national governments, it will be crucial for space to be provided for civil society to review and comment on the contents – via posting on the web and allowing sufficient time for concerned groups to digest and feed back – and for such comments to be taken seriously in international-level decisions on further assistance and other forms of assistance.⁴⁵

41 The committee structures and composition for the World Bank’s new Climate Investment Funds, including the Pilot Program for Climate Resiliency, illustrate how civil society representatives can be elected by relevant constituencies. See <http://www.resolv.org/cif/results/index.html>

42 See Note 20 with respect to Global Fund guidelines.

43 Perhaps most significantly, resources must be invested in enabling southern civil society and vulnerable community representatives to follow Board meetings either in person or via webcast, access information, and engage meaningfully in decision making. E-Mail from Sven Harmeling, Germanwatch, September 22, 2009.

44 The idea for this panel comes from proposals made by many developing countries in the negotiations. It potentially could build on the Least Developed Countries Expert Group, which has gathered a lot of experience around the NAPA process. E-Mail from Sven Harmeling, Germanwatch, September 22, 2009.

45 This is in line with German Watch and Bread for the World’s proposed “public comment step” for the Kyoto Adaptation Fund’s approval procedure. Making the Adaptation Fund Work for the Most Vulnerable People, page 13 (November 2008). See also Muller, Benito and Luis Gomez-Echeverri, The Reformed Financial Mechanism of the UNFCCC Part I: Architecture and Governance, page vi (2009) (arguing that country funding mechanisms must be governed transparently and to “ensure equitable, efficient and effective use of funding...[such that] everyone who is entitled to receive (restitution) payments will receive them”).

An important precedent was set in this regard with the Kyoto Protocol Adaptation Fund Board's recent decision to post project proposals on its website for public comment.⁴⁶

Participation and Downward Accountability – National Level

Concrete guidelines with respect to how relevant stakeholders should be represented on and participate within in-country coordinating mechanisms are needed. Such 'concretization' is essential in line with emerging standards for transparency, participation and accountability in aid and development processes at country level. With regard to community and civil society representation and participation in national multi-stakeholder coordinating bodies, the Global Fund experience again suggests that mandated representation is the way to go, but also cautions that how representatives are selected or elected, and exactly how the work of the in-country coordinating mechanisms is carried out by its members – i.e. what a multi-stakeholder partnership means in practice, matter a great deal.

The principles of participation and downward accountability can therefore be further strengthened and operationalized as follows:

- 1. Establishment of Country Coordinating Mechanisms.** In disbursing funding to developing countries, any future global adaptation finance regime should include the establishment of a coordinating mechanism (or enhancement of comparable existing mechanisms) within countries to represent all relevant stakeholders, build on and coordinate a range of adaptation institutions and resources in country, and spearhead national adaptation planning and monitoring and evaluation. This should not be regarded as a conditional for adaptation funding, but as an instrument to facilitate the development of effective adaptation strategies, taking account the human rights obligation of developing country governments to give special attention to their most vulnerable people.
- 2. Composition of Country Coordinating Mechanisms.** Guidelines for composition and putting representatives in place should be made explicit and resourced as needed. Resources should be made available for this, specifically up-front finance for developing countries to invest in processes and institutions needed for sustaining planning, implementation and monitoring activities in a manner that enables and encourages the participation of all stakeholders, particularly vulnerable communities.
- 3. Terms of Reference.** Any future international adaptation financing regime should expect developing country governments to put in place terms of reference for their Country Coordinating Mechanisms and support them – financially and otherwise – to live up to their agreed terms of reference. Drawing on lessons from the Global Fund as well as multi-stakeholder mechanisms for poverty reduction, these should reflect good practice related to composition; roles and responsibilities of members, including of chairs and any other leadership positions; proactive and transparent communications and information sharing in line with emerging IATI/Publish What You Fund standards; meeting formats and rules; constituency accountability; and processes and procedures for national strategy development, implementation, monitoring and evaluation.⁴⁷
- 4. Sub-national Coordinating Committees.** Strong consideration should be given to mandating sub-national coordinating committees that can connect more easily with and represent the local-level realities and perceptions of what can and should be done

⁴⁶ Harmeling, S. and A. Kaloga: Adaptation Fund: Critical Progress in the 7th meeting.

⁴⁷ See Global Fund materials referenced in Notes 26 and 27.

as part of an effective and appropriate adaptation strategy.⁴⁸ For many developing countries, this would call for major and sustained institutional strengthening support. Examples of useful sub-national structures and processes can be found in the African poverty reduction cases presented in the text box in Section II.⁴⁹

Monitoring actual expenditures and their impact on the ground is at the heart of downward accountability and, ultimately, key to ensuring that investments in adaptation are yielding lasting, desired benefits for the people most at risk.

5. Reporting. In proposals for international funding, developing countries should document 1) significant most affected population representation in Country Coordinating Mechanisms, 2) legitimate selection or election processes for such representatives, and 3) effective access to information for affected population constituencies and their meaningful participation in planning and monitoring and evaluation of plan and budget implementation. Monitoring actual expenditures and their impact on the ground is at the heart of downward accountability and, ultimately, key to ensuring that investments in adaptation are yielding lasting, desired benefits for the people most at risk. In country monitoring and evaluation must be characterized by full transparency and broad-based participation vis-à-vis the most affected communities.

IV. Conclusion

The people least responsible for climate change will suffer most from its impacts, and they are least able to adapt. This paper is not intended to be the final answer on how the principles of prioritized funding, active and meaningful participation, and downward accountability should be operationalized in a post-2012 Adaptation Framework. It does aspire to contribute practical ways forward of relevance to international deliberations running up to Copenhagen. The version of the negotiating text, as of November 2009, includes several paragraphs, which can be further strengthened in light of recommendations in this paper. By drawing on various other international funding experiences and the latest developments in the aid effectiveness arena, this paper has hopefully succeeded in putting forth concrete, workable ideas that can help shape the future adaptation funding regime now under negotiation.

The time for deliberation and negotiation is short for those whose very lives depend on major increases in global adaptation funding and effective, accountable governance of the use of such funds.

⁴⁸ Practical Action, in its National Institutions for Community-Based Adaptation Briefing Note (2009) argues for the vital importance of building local and 'meso' level capacities and institutions for climate change adaptation planning and oversight.

⁴⁹ Examples can also be found in experiences in disaster risk reduction. See "Views from the Frontline: A local perspective towards implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action," produced by the Global Network of Civil Society Organizations for Disaster Reduction. The 2009 report finds that the countries that made most progress in implementing the Hyogo Framework for Action and strengthening local resilience were those that adopted a partnership approach at the local level.

