

CLIMATE INVESTMENT FUNDS

JOINT CTF-SCF/TFC.15/4

October 26, 2015

Joint Meeting of the CTF and SCF Trust Fund Committees

Washington, D.C.

Monday, November 9, 2015

Agenda Item 4

PROPOSAL ON THE FUTURE OF THE PARTNERSHIP FORUM

PROPOSED DECISION

The joint meeting of the CTF and SCF Trust Fund Committees, having reviewed the document JOINT CTF-SCF/15/4 *Proposal on the Future of the Partnership Forum* endorses the following option:

[*Option I:* The Partnership Forum is retained as a large two-day conference targeting multiple stakeholders and covering all CIF themes, with modifications, including:

- (i) Content should be specific and focus on lessons, solutions, and results with a limited number of sessions to enable a deeper discussion of key questions. To the extent possible, the Partnership Forum should showcase questions and lessons from the emerging CIF work program on evidence-based learning.
- (ii) Participation should be guided by who has useful experience and knowledge to share and who has a strong business case or operational need to learn.
- (iii) The knowledge bazaar concept would be dropped with networking facilitated through structured and unstructured approaches.
- (iv) The Partnership Forum should be part of a process, including learning and sharing before and during the event and follow-up work and actions.
- (v) A political dimension could be explored through linking the Partnership Forum to a high-level international event such as a COP and including a ministerial session as part of the agenda.
- (vi) The co-hosting arrangement is discontinued with the CIF Administrative Unit now taking the lead in organizing future Partnership Forums working in close collaboration with all MDB partners and other relevant stakeholders.
- (vii) The timing of the Partnership Forum should be flexible and would be determined by the CIF Administrative Unit Program Manager in collaboration with the joint meeting and need not necessarily adhere to the 18 month cycle. If there is a strong business case for organizing the Partnership Forum apart from the semi-annual CIF trust fund committee meetings, then this should be pursued with the agreement of the joint meeting.

The next Partnership Forum will be convened in association with COP 22 in Marrakech, Morocco in November 2016.]

[*Option II:* As an alternative to the Partnership Forum, existing pilot country meetings would be both consolidated and strengthened into three sets of thematic meetings focusing on energy (CTF and SREP countries), resilience (PPCR countries), and forests (FIP countries) (with possibilities to explore synergies among topics where relevant). Several modifications proposed in the preceding option would apply, including:

- (i) Specific content focusing on lessons, solutions, and results with fewer overall sessions to enable a deeper discussion of key questions. To the extent possible, the pilot country meetings “plus” would showcase questions and lessons from the emerging CIF work program on evidence-based learning.
- (ii) Participation would be guided by who has useful experience and knowledge to share and who has a strong business case or operational need to learn.
- (iii) Networking would be facilitated through structured and unstructured approaches.
- (iv) The meetings would be part of a process, not a one-off event, and would include follow-up work and actions, including potential actions to be further explored through the evidence-based learning work stream.
- (v) A political dimension could be explored through linking the meetings to a high-level international event and including a ministerial session as part of the agenda.

If this option is endorsed, it is proposed that each thematic pilot country meeting “plus” be held once every 18 to 24 months and that the first pilot country meeting “plus”, a joint CTF-SREP energy meeting, be convened by June 2016.]

I. INTRODUCTION

1. In May 2015, the Joint Meeting of the CTF and SCF Trust Fund Committees agreed that given the volume of events leading up to the COP 21 in Paris, there would be no CIF Partnership Forum in 2015. The Joint Meeting requested the CIF Administrative Unit to present a proposal on the future of the Partnership Forum, taking into account the issues covered in the strategic paper and comments provided by the Trust Fund Committee members.
2. This paper responds to the request to present a proposal on the future of the Partnership Forum.

II. BACKGROUND

3. The Governance Documents of the CIF state that the Partnership Forum:
 - a) Is a broad-based meeting of stakeholders of the CIF;
 - b) Will be convened every eighteen months to provide a forum for dialogue on the strategic directions, results and impacts of the CIF;
 - c) Will provide an opportunity for independent scientific, technical and other advice on major issues of implementation in integrating climate change and development and for sharing cutting edge knowledge concerning climate change challenges; and
 - d) Will be a meeting for dialogue and consultation and will not lead to written outcomes, such as agreed texts or declarations.
4. Since 2008, the CIF has held five Partnership Forums co-hosted by one of the five partner multilateral development banks (MDBs):

2008: Washington, D.C. – The World Bank Group (WBG)
2010: Manila, Philippines – Asian Development Bank (ADB)
2011: Cape Town, South Africa – African Development Bank (AfDB)
2012: Istanbul, Turkey – European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD)
2014: Montego Bay, Jamaica – Inter-American Development Bank (IDB)
5. As the CIF portfolio has grown and advanced from investment plan preparation to project implementation and the number of stakeholders involved in the CIF has increased, so too has the Partnership Forum grown into a large, logistically complex, and resource intensive undertaking with more than 500 participants joining the 2014 Partnership Forum in Jamaica. The final budget tally for the 2014 Partnership Forum was approximately \$1,000,000 between the CIF Administrative Unit and the co-host IDB for just the event. This figure excludes preparatory missions by the CIF Administrative Unit

and the IDB and the substantial amount of staff time from the CIF Administrative Unit, IDB and all CIF MDB partners that went into the preparation and execution of the forum.

6. In light of the busy international calendar of events in 2015 leading up to COP 21 in Paris, the joint meeting of the CTF and SCF Trust Fund Committees agreed in May 2015 that there would be no CIF Partnership Forum in 2015. Instead, for a targeted and timely dissemination of the results achieved and lessons learned by the CIF and in order to improve the visibility of the CIF, the joint meeting requested the CIF Administrative Unit, on a pilot basis, to organize smaller and more targeted events, preferably alongside other regional or international events of the MDB and other partners, especially events hosted in recipient countries.
7. Responding to this request, the CIF Administrative Unit, in partnership with the MDBs, recipient countries, and other partners organized two events in 2015 in conjunction with relevant external events:
 - (i) A panel at the Barcelona Carbon Expo in May 2015 on the CIF experience in leveraging private sector finance for renewable energy projects. The panelists (including three from the private sector) shared evidence of the CIF impact in scaling up renewable energy in Mexico, Morocco, Thailand, and Turkey. The session targeted a predominantly private sector audience of technology providers and project developers.
 - (ii) A double panel session at the UN Climate Change Conference in Bonn in June 2015 sharing CIF results on the ground from Kazakhstan, Mozambique, and Zambia and complementarities and coherence that recipient countries can achieve through a strategic alignment of financing from different climate funds (CIF, Adaptation Fund, GCF, and GEF). This session targeted climate change negotiators from donor and recipient countries.
8. In addition, the CIF will be visible at COP 21 in Paris showcasing CIF results and communicating CIF learning in a number of side events organized by the CIF, MDBs, recipient countries, and other partners. Beyond these efforts aimed at informing targeted groups of decision-makers and thought leaders at venues where they will already be, the CIF also organized a number of events in 2015 for internal constituents, including three pilot country meetings (for SREP new countries, and FIP and PPCR new and existing countries) and two geothermal dialogues (the second of which included a knowledge exchange among CTF and SREP recipient countries). These events benefited from outside expertise. The PPCR pilot country meeting was organized in partnership with the European Space Agency – European Space Research Institute (ESA-ESRIN) and enabled PPCR country representatives to learn from ESA and other experts on practical applications of satellite earth observation technology for climate resilience. The PPCR meeting also included a one-day workshop on climate services that brought in experts from the UK Met Office, the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research, and

Columbia University's International research Institute for Climate and Society. The geothermal dialogues benefited from the participation of both public and private actors (including project developers, banks, insurance companies, and others) active in the geothermal sector. For the first time, CIF developing country Observers were sponsored to participate in the FIP and PPCR meetings.

9. The CIF Administrative Unit carried out a survey over the course of a three-week period in August-September 2015 to gather feedback on the usefulness of, and solicit inputs on ways to improve upon, the Partnership Forum and other CIF events. The survey was circulated to the entire CIF database of more than 1,000 contacts and received 125 responses from different stakeholder groups, with the largest number of responses coming from recipient countries (38 percent).¹ The options on the future of the Partnership Forum presented below have been developed taking into account the feedback provided through the survey, as well as the views expressed by different CIF stakeholders through informal consultations.
10. Survey respondents validate the usefulness of the Partnership Forum: 92% of those responding to the survey question, "Please rate the Partnership Forum in terms of usefulness for sharing CIF-related ideas and experiences and engaging in dialogue on the CIF's strategic directions, results and impacts," indicated the Partnership Forum was very useful (61%) or somewhat useful (31%). Respondents see value in bringing together different stakeholders but there was no clear consensus as to whether this could best be achieved through a large conference bringing together all stakeholder groups or several smaller, targeted events (in fact there was a nearly 50/50 split). Among survey respondents who provided specific feedback on how to better influence decision-makers through CIF events and how to improve the Partnership Forum, there was consensus that CIF events, including the Partnership Forum, should: (i) have a strong knowledge sharing focus grounded in concrete case studies and results; (ii) better target participants based on who has useful information to share and an operational need to learn; and (iii) be built around a less dense agenda with more time available for deeper discussion and engagement on a smaller number of topics. Informal consultations suggest that there is appetite among some CIF stakeholders that the Partnership Forum in particular should also include a political dimension.
11. While participation in external events is important to raise the visibility of the work supported by the CIF and its results among new audiences, there is a consensus among CIF partners that targeted external engagement is additional to, but not a substitute for, CIF-driven events. Five key objectives guide the organization of CIF events: (i) sharing lessons, knowledge, and results; (ii) fostering peer-to-peer learning; (iii) communicating/raising the visibility of CIF results and achievements; (iv) strengthening

¹ Respondents were asked to identify among the following CIF stakeholder groups: contributor countries, recipient countries, MDBs, private sector, civil society organization, Indigenous Peoples' group, academia/think tank/scientific expert, other development partner, other.

networks among different stakeholders; and (v) engaging in broader conversations on how to transition to low-carbon, climate resilient development. Table 1 summarizes the different ways in which the CIF engages with its stakeholders through events and the objectives that each type of event can potentially achieve. Only two types of events – the Partnership Forum and pilot country meetings – can potentially deliver on all of these objectives, with some modifications to the existing formats.

Table 1. CIF EVENTS AND INTENDED OBJECTIVES

		Share lessons, knowledge, results	Peer-to-peer learning	Communicate/raise visibility of CIF	Building networks	Engage in broader conversations
Event	Target Audience	Objectives				
Partnership Forum	Wide range of stakeholders (governments, MDBs, civil society, private sector, Indigenous Peoples, other climate funds) from within and outside the CIF	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Pilot country meetings	CIF recipient countries in a specific program	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Thematic workshops/dialogues (e.g., concentrated solar power, geothermal)	public and private actors (policy/decision-makers, project developers, financiers, MDBs) active in a specific sector	✓	✓		✓	
Sessions/side events at external fora (e.g., COP, Bonn Climate Change conference, WBG Annual Meetings, Carbon Expo, etc.)	varies by event: Ministers or high-level government officials, climate change negotiators, private sector, civil society	✓		✓		✓

III. OPTIONS OF THE FUTURE FORMAT OF THE PARTNERSHIP FORUM

12. Taking into account the four dimensions noted above of (i) having a strong knowledge sharing focus grounded in concrete case studies and results; (ii) better targeting participants; (iii) enabling deeper discussion on fewer topics; and (iv) including a political dimension, two options on the future format of the Partnership Forum are proposed:

Option 1: Retain the Partnership Forum, with modifications

13. Under this option the existing format of a large two-day conference targeting multiple stakeholders and covering all CIF themes would be retained, with the following modifications:
- (i) Content should be specific and focus on lessons, solutions, and results. The number of sessions should be limited to enable a deeper discussion of key questions. A common theme summed up by one survey respondent is that the CIF “offers real practical on the ground examples of stuff happening at scale, and being able to talk about that – how it worked, the challenges, the lessons learned, the results, what they'd do differently next time, is really useful.” To the extent possible, the Partnership Forum should showcase questions and lessons from the emerging CIF work program on evidence-based learning.
 - (ii) With fewer sessions covering more specific topics, participation would necessarily be reduced. Identification of participants, including sponsored participants from governments, civil society organizations, Indigenous Peoples groups, and the private sector, should be more selective and should be guided by who has useful experience and knowledge to share and who has a strong business case or operational need to learn.
 - (iii) The knowledge bazaar concept would be dropped, as there was a sense from the survey and consultations that it had taken on more of a communications rather than a lessons sharing function. Networking would be facilitated through structured and unstructured approaches. Structured networking could take place through “business matching” – e.g., between service providers and country officials or others looking to adopt a specific service or technology. Unstructured networking could take place through informal activities (e.g., thematic dinners where a venue and meeting place are suggested, but there is no formal organizer and participants self-select).
 - (iv) The Partnership Forum should be part of a process, not a one-off event. Learning and sharing should happen before and during the event – e.g., with fewer sessions and speakers, the organizing team would work closely with individual speakers to

develop effective presentations. During the event, real-time feedback could be used, such as polling devices or other digital tools, to ensure that content is relevant and useful for participants. There should also be follow-up work and actions – e.g., case studies presented could be consolidated and shared digitally through guidance notes, or questions identified by participants could be further explored through subsequent workshops or be taken up under the evidence-based learning work stream.

- (v) A political dimension could be explored through linking the Partnership Forum to a high-level international event such as a COP and including a ministerial session as part of the agenda.
- (vi) As all MDBs have now each co-hosted one CIF Partnership Forum, it is proposed that the co-hosting arrangement is discontinued with the CIF Administrative Unit now taking the lead in organizing future Partnership Forums working in close collaboration with all MDB partners and other relevant stakeholders.
- (vii) The timing of the Partnership Forum should be flexible to take advantage of strategic opportunities within the climate and development finance calendars and enable synergies with other events when feasible. It is proposed that the timing of the Partnership Forum be determined by the CIF Administrative Unit Program Manager in collaboration with the joint meeting and that the timing need not necessarily adhere to the 18 month cycle. Likewise, if there is a strong business case for organizing the Partnership Forum apart from the semi-annual CIF trust fund committee meetings, then this should be pursued with the agreement of the joint meeting.

14. If this option is selected, it is proposed that the next Partnership Forum be convened in association with COP 22 in Marrakech, Morocco in November 2016.

Option 2: Pilot country meetings “plus”

15. Under this option, there would be no Partnership Forum. Rather, existing pilot country meetings would be both consolidated and strengthened into three sets of thematic meetings focusing on energy (CTF and SREP countries), resilience (PPCR countries), and forests (FIP countries) (with possibilities to explore synergies among topics where relevant). The pilot country meetings are an innovation of the CIF, and recipient countries have shown strong appreciation for these meetings as a valuable platform for peer-to-peer learning. There is an opportunity to further improve the value proposition of these meetings for recipient countries and other CIF stakeholders through forging strategic partnerships with recognized centers of expertise (building on the experience

of the partnership with ESMAP in the organization of the first geothermal dialogue in 2014 or the partnership with ESA-ESRIN for the last PPCR pilot country meeting). Such partnerships would “crowd in” learning from outside of the CIF and forge connections with experts who could support the low carbon development and climate resilience agendas of recipient countries. This approach would also raise the visibility of the CIF by expanding CIF lessons sharing to a wider audience of practitioners engaged in low carbon and climate resilient development, including stakeholders of other climate funds. Notwithstanding important strategic changes, the pilot country meetings should continue to provide a platform for discussing CIF-specific topics, such as monitoring and reporting.

16. If the option of pilot country meetings “plus” were selected, the modifications proposed in the preceding option would apply, including:

- (i) Specific content focusing on lessons, solutions, and results with fewer overall sessions to enable a deeper discussion of key questions. To the extent possible, the pilot country meetings “plus” would showcase questions and lessons from the emerging CIF work program on evidence-based learning.
- (ii) Participation would be guided by who has useful experience and knowledge to share and who has a strong business case or operational need to learn.
- (iii) Networking would be facilitated through structured and unstructured approaches.
- (iv) The meetings would be part of a process, not a one-off event, and would include follow-up work and actions, including potential actions to be further explored through the evidence-based learning work stream.
- (v) A political dimension could be explored through linking the meetings to a high-level international event and including a ministerial session as part of the agenda.

17. If this option is endorsed, it is proposed that each thematic pilot country meeting “plus” be held once every 18 to 24 months and that the first pilot country meeting “plus”, a joint CTF-SREP energy meeting, be convened by June 2016 as there are existing provisions for both CTF and SREP pilot country meetings in the FY 16 CIF work program and budget.

Budget

18. Activities undertaken during FY 16 pertaining to either of the two options would be financed through the CIF FY 16 administrative budget. For FY 17, the budget implications of the selected option would be included in the CIF FY 17 work program and budget.