



AF NGO Network activities in Doha

1.1 *NGO Network side event at the COP*

The AF NGO Network also convened its own side event, in which all case studies of the related countries were presented in depth. The event titled "Mapping and Evaluating the AF's Funded Projects" was also well attended.



The case study compilation describes in a concise manner the state of project implementation, based on in-country consultations by making use of qualitative research techniques considering project documents and processes. From the recommendations that have been drawn from the study one can retain among others that there is a need to involve local stakeholders and vulnerable groups from the outset of each project in order to ensure the best benefits out of the interventions. In addition, inter-institutional and multi-stakeholder coordination are seen as means for the projects to promote transparency and that direct access is no impediment to having a direct link to local communities. In addition, it also came out that ownership is higher when the project has some infrastructure components or tangible deliveries.

1.2 *CSO Dialogue in Bonn*

The AF pursued its interaction with CSOs through the so-called "CSO Dialogue". The meeting took place on Monday, December 10th, one day before the meeting of AF's committees with a group of civil society organizations mainly representing the AF NGO Network.

The AF NGO Network is an independent network from the AFB, which has been initiated in 2010 by Germanwatch and other NGOs to track projects and NIE process in developing countries. At this meeting three new partner organisations: Practical Action Kenya; The NGO Forum on Cambodia; Forum Climate Change (ForumCC Tanzania). Another partner of the network, Indigo South Africa, was cut in via Skype.

The meeting started with an introduction of the AFB chair, Luis Santos from Uruguay, followed by a welcome and thank-you statement from Sven Harmeling (Germanwatch), who presented the partners

and key milestones achieved by the network since the last Board meeting such as the recent release of a case study conducted in six countries.

Country and Implementing Entity	Project context	project approval date	Partner in compiling the case study, contact person
1. Honduras UNDP)	Addressing Climate Change Risks on Water Resources in Honduras	March 2011	Fundaciòn Vida, Isaac Ferrera
2. Pakistan (UNDP)	Glacier-lake outburst floods	December 2010	LEAD Pakistan, Kashmala Shahab Kakakhel
3. Senegal	Adaptation to coastal erosion in vulnerable areas	September 2011	Enda TM, Emanuel Seck
4. Nicaragua (UNDP)	Reduction of Risks and Vulnerability Based on Flooding and Droughts in the Estero Real River Watershed	December 2010	Centro Humbolt, Mónica López Baltodano
5. Jamaica	Enhancing the Resilience of the Agriculture Sector and Coastal Areas to Protect Livelihoods and Improve Food Security	June 2012	Panos Caribbean, Indi McLymont-Lafayette
6. Benin	Adaptation of Cotonou Lagoon ecosystems and human communities to sea level rise and extreme weather events impacts	?	OFEDI, Krystel Dossou
7. South Africa	Establishing and NIE and developing a project proposal for the AF	?	INDIGO development & change, Bettina Koelle

Afterwards, Alpha Kaloga (Germanwatch) presented the case studies of the AF NGO Network, by explaining the rationale, used methodologies, limitation of the findings as well as the key recommendations that could be drawn out of the studies. In his view, all projects are much appreciated by the beneficiaries and the governments and come timely in the targeted areas, as climate change is manifesting itself harshly and often. However, the projects address only some parts of the overall adaptation needs within each respective country. Therefore, there is a clear call for scaling up the resources allocated to address other adaptation activities not covered by the projects. He also emphasised that the findings are not applicable to all countries, because of the different scope of the studies and the bound time constraints that did not allow a full and in-depth assessment of each case for general recommendation applicable to all AF funded projects. The case studies report stimulated discussion and interest by the Board members, who on the one side posed specific questions to some case countries' studies. One member of the Board asked how far the methodologies used in the case studies comply with the guidelines and requirements of the AF. Kaloga explained that, although the budget and the time spent for the case studies did not allow tracking whether all guidelines of the AF were met, however, the case studies strived to pursue certain requirements of the Board such as the level of involvement and the level of consultation of the targeted vulnerable communities. Finally, the chair encouraged to further continue initiating new papers regarding the implementation of projects and requested to try linking them with the AF guidelines.

Afterwards each of the partners from developing countries briefly provided the state of debate and development regarding the AF and its funded projects in their respective countries. This was followed by a question and response session. Interesting was a statement of one Board member, who very much appreciated the input, particularly the perception and expectations of the targeted people. He said that

it is important for the Board members not only to discuss on paper about the project, but also to have some clear pictures on what is actually going on in the project regions and that the interventions of the partners have met his expectations.

In the second part, the AF Network presented its talking points on key items to be discussed at the upcoming meeting as well as some reflections on how the AF could take advantage of the discussions in the GCF. This presentation was followed by a strategic interaction between the AFB members present at the Board meeting and the CSO on the strategic direction of the AF with respect to the GCF. Sven Harmeling presented potential scenarios regarding the future relationship between the AF and the GCF and analysed the implications of the decisions in Doha for the future of the AF.¹

As usual, the CSO dialogue was an interesting exercise for both CSO and AFB members, which enabled a frank interaction among both stakeholders working or following the AFB. The report of this dialogue was also subject of discussion at the AFB meeting, where the chair once again expressed his gratitude for the constructive work being done by the CSO with regard to the AF.

¹ see e.g. a recent article which also addresses this issue under: <http://www.dandc.eu/articles/220645/index.en.shtml>