

**PPCR Pilot Countries Meeting  
Manila May 21-24, 2018**

**Summary of Knowledge Fairs**

At the PPCR Pilot Countries Meeting (PCM) held in Manila (Philippines) on May 21-24 2018, attendees were invited to participate in a series of knowledge fairs (KF) designed and facilitated by the Learning Partner team to provide participants with an opportunity for cross-learning and knowledge sharing in a dynamic environment. At each of the four KF, participants were able to explore various “stalls” hosted by specific PPCR countries, regions, or MDB representatives and the Learning Partner team. Each KF followed the theme of the preceding session on the agenda and enabled a deeper discussion into the experiences of members of the PPCR community of practice. Each of the KF is briefly summarised below.

**Knowledge Fair 1 - Linking Climate Science to Climate Policy and Practice**

In this KF, participants were invited to engage in lively discussions on achievements, challenges and best practice on strengthening the science-policy interface, framed by experiences from Zambia, the Caribbean region, as well as a team from the World Bank who presented a recently developed online tool to grow the capacity of members of the resilience community to implement climate policy and practice. In addition, the plenary speakers from the morning session on day one of the event were positioned at one of the stalls to allow participants an opportunity to explore any thoughts or questions stemming from their presentations. Through the KF participants were encouraged to work collaboratively and think creatively about how to address real-life problems, and scale-up potential solutions.

**Stall 1:**

The Caribbean Regional Track presented their recently developed systems for scaling climate information from global and regional levels down to local scales. The hosts of Stall 1 presented ways in which downscaled data is able to inform tools designed specifically to be accessible to vulnerable persons such as fishing communities and farmers, and then utilised to modify behaviors and practices in order to build resilience to forecasted weather patterns, and increase awareness of extreme weather events. The questions asked by participants revealed how much of the project successes can be attributed to a strong networking component amongst national and regional institutions.

**Stall 2:**

Zambia took on the role of stall host, focussing on the use of science to inform project design. They provided participants with updates on their project and explained how data and research were key to determine the areas which are more vulnerable and thus need more urgent interventions. Questions from the participants related to the timeframe set by the project (target by 2044) and perspectives on how to scale up. Participants found this to be useful for thinking around implementation in their countries.

**Stall 3:**

The plenary speakers for the climate science-policy theme hosted this stall, discussing the key challenges surrounding the science-policy interface. Issues raised included challenges on the ground for accessing accurate seasonal forecasts. Jamaica suggested a solution implemented

in schools that is used to connect farmers to the field and which is yielding monetary benefits. In Uganda, seasonal forecasts are underutilised by farmers and communities. As a solution, the government is using hybrid forecasts, with biophysical indicators. A report is available for this from the Ugandan PPCR Government team. The issue of attribution was also discussed. In Bangladesh and Ethiopia, the GCF is split over whether proposed investments revolve around problems that are climate change or mismanagement related. Solutions proposed included acknowledging the problem in the proposal and using problems to connect PPCR countries to each other in the quest for solutions. A further key issue is that of balancing and addressing cultural practices, which often impede climate resilience building progress. It was suggested that this is more difficult at the national than the local level. Key to the solution is talking to and engaging with the right development actors, such as religious leaders. Overall, there are issues around the deep uncertainty of the science. Solutions may lie in articulating the benefits of adaptation and monetising these benefits. Low regret options should be differentiated from high regret investments. The Zambian PPCR Risk Assessments are a useful approach to identifying these (reports available from the Zambian PPCR Programme Management Unit). It was also pointed out that new hydromet data does not automatically translate into new knowledge with the result that science does not inform policy. A solution may lie in being able to link land management to ecosystem services and adaptation.

#### **Stall 4:**

A team from the World Bank presented a recently completed online course for developing the capacity of state and non-state actors in the resilience community to bring climate science and policy into practice. The team presented an overview of the features and functionality of the course. Participants gained awareness of the course which was for the most part not known amongst attendees, as well as an insight into the applicability of the course for different stakeholders. Participants articulated an appreciation for the course and the tools that it provides as well as opinions on how to further enhance the programme. The two primary suggestions for further development were (1) to make the course available in languages other than English, and (2) to develop the course into an app that can be utilised off-line when access to the internet is not guaranteed.

#### **Knowledge Fair 2 - Building Climate Resilience with People and Communities**

The second KF invited participants to experience the challenging and rewarding journeys toward people-first resilience of fellow PPCR countries. Structured around a series of questions, participants were encouraged to discuss with colleagues that have extensive experiences and learn the 'know how' of resilience building not to be found in text books, in an open exchange of opinions to guide the further development of community resilience processes. The stall hosts for this fair included Papua New Guinea, Bolivia and Uganda.

#### **Stall 1**

Bolivia, speaking to the topic of participatory design and management of natural resources shared with the participants their model of resource management which involved a multiple set of stakeholders, starting from local communities (directly or via their elected representatives) and up different levels including regional and national representatives. The hosts described how such projects are initiated through a participatory diagnostic phase that leads to co-management of projects. Participants engaged in the conversation by asking

questions concerning the details of the design and application of the participatory mechanisms used in the project.

## **Stall 2**

At this stall, participants were given the opportunity to engage with the panelists from the earlier session on Ecosystems based Adaptation (EbA) which included Charles Rodgers, Senior Advisor at the Asian Development Bank and Shaun Martin, Senior Director, Climate Change Adaptation and Resilience, WWF. An important issue explored in this stall was the identification of entry points for EbA projects. Many other questions, mostly clarifying what constitutes EbA, were asked by participants. These questions led to responses in the form of case study examples that provided the foundation for the key message being that in determining whether a particular project or approach would be considered EbA, it is important to start by considering whether the proposed intervention address “the vulnerabilities of people, not elephants”. EbA is focused on addressing the vulnerabilities of people and communities, and not ecosystems themselves, or plant or animal species that are reliant thereupon. Participants discovered the importance of positioning EbA as part of an overall strategy or plan for resilience building.

## **Stall 3**

Papua New Guinea hosted the stall with a view to understanding good practice in sustainable programming. The question was: What are the problems for sustainability when projects are scaled up? PNG has 30m USD in PPCR funding and is struggling with mainstreaming, particularly in terms of realising their objectives of water and food security. A key challenge for them is engaging sub national government and working across sectors. Mozambique recommended that implementing district level budgeting is a key enabler, allowing scale. Engaging Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) is also important. In terms of mainstreaming, domestic budget allocations are critical and budget tracking, as experienced in Zambia is integral to the solution. Capacity building, at all levels and from the outset, is a critical success factor. Climate change offices/secretariats are best located in planning ministries in order to achieve mainstreaming objectives. A legal framework, such as a Climate Change Act, is also a key enabler. Nepal suggested that documenting key lessons and streamlining these through different sectoral departments is key to sustainable programming. Community empowerment is central to sustainability, premised by microfinance solutions for vulnerable households and local level ownership of projects.

## **Stall 4**

This stall was hosted by Uganda where the question of how to integrate new technology and indigenous knowledge in seeking out local climate change responses was explored. In so doing, a number of countries shared experiences on mapping out the holders of traditional knowledge, strategies for integrating such stakeholders into initial project development phases, documenting practices, and providing platforms for engaging throughout the roll-out of projects.

## **Knowledge Fair 3 - Financing Climate Resilience**

During this KF, participants were given the opportunity to move from one level of climate finance readiness to another through the experiences of Mozambique, Tajikistan and

Jamaica. Participants were able to interrogate the experiences of these countries to grow their own understanding of how to increase access to reliable finance for resilience.

### **Stall 1**

Mozambique presented their experiences and challenges in getting commercial banks to support climate finance projects. They quickly identified a key constraint in that not all districts in Mozambique have banks. Often times, it is in these rural districts where the most vulnerable communities are found and where access to climate finance is most needed. Thus, one key objective they formed was to achieve a situation in which each district will be served by at least one bank. To further this aim, partnerships have been established with four local banks. However, conditions attached to accessing financial support are difficult to meet for many individuals or households (e.g. people need to be officially employed to qualify as borrower, and interest rates are high). . Through the sharing of experiences, participants were able to brainstorm about the constraints that banks face and offered possible solutions which include microfinance activities (getting family / communities to vouch for vulnerable individuals), and public or donor funds to support climate change financing, thus reducing risks for the banks. The experiences of Jamaica and Tajikistan with regards to microfinance were seen to be most instructive.

### **Stall 2**

Tajikistan presented participants with an overview of its innovative intermediated microfinance for resilience project CLIMADAPT which has achieved great success in creating access to finance for resilience throughout the country. Responding to questions from participants, the hosts were able to unpack the various key success factors. Participants were particularly interested in understanding the structures employed to enable the finance flows between the MDB, government agencies, private sector financial institutions, and the community organisations and individuals that took on the loans. This information was seen as being extremely valuable by all the participants who may then explore similar projects in their countries with an understanding of how to establish the necessary structures and institutional arrangements.

### **Stall 3**

The IADB and Jamaica jointly hosted stall 3 focusing on Jamaica's experience with extending a line of credit to small enterprises and households through a Mutual Bank. Participants were particularly interested in issues on how to make this financing solution sustainable and maintaining low rates of interest. Key to the IADB/Jamaica strategy is to spread risk and to limit non-manageable risks.

### **Stall 4**

Participants were able to engage with a representative of the Green Climate Fund (GCF) and gather information valuable to them for future GCF funding proposals. Of particular interest to PPCR countries was the process for translating their unfunded SPCRs into projects that could be funded through the GCF. Countries were further provided with valuable information into the utilisation of the GCF Readiness Programme for proposal writing and further programme development support.

#### **Knowledge Fair 4 – Knowledge and Networking Strategy**

During this KF, participants were invited to give their feedback on the PPCR learning and networking initiatives conducted thus far in support of the development of the Knowledge and Learning Network, as well as their thoughts as to how each of the elements that form part of the Network can be best structured in order to maximize benefits for the PPCR Community of Practice. The gathered information and opinions will shape future PPCR learning and networking activities, ensuring they are truly demand-led.

##### **Stall 1**

Participants discussed knowledge products and the process of co-creating such products. Useful suggestions were made as to different types of products, such as photo stories and videos/documentaries. There was a strong interest in products that would address the community level audience, while the donors at the KF were particularly interested in knowledge products that document good practice and replicable learnings.

##### **Stall 2**

Participants were asked to share their thoughts on the best way to use the online environment to facilitate learning and knowledge sharing, networking and communication amongst the PPCR Community of Practice. Their opinions are informed by their experiences using the PPCR Learning Platform demonstrated on Facebook, as well as their experiences outside of the PPCR. Participants agreed that there is a need for the PPCR/CIF to play an active role in facilitating knowledge sharing and networking on an ongoing basis and through a variety of channels. The chosen channels should link to one another wherever possible in order to spread awareness and increase accessibility. The CIF website should play a leading role in linking the various platforms that make up the learning platform together. Whilst some platforms are to an extent organic and self-sustaining, facilitating activities across platforms is seen to be an important function that requires dedicated CIF resources and efforts to maintain. It was further indicated that the knowledge and learning network should be established in such a way that it can continue to function beyond the lifespan of the PPCR as “climate change is here to stay”. For this reason, it is viewed as important that each of the channels chosen to form part of the learning platform allows for participation of other members of the resilience community.

##### **Stall 3**

Participants were invited to share their thoughts on the effectiveness and usefulness of face to face learning, knowledge sharing and networking events, informed by their past experiences with PPCR events and other similar gatherings. Participants provided much detailed and useful feedback including thoughts on being given an opportunity to shape the agenda, the optimum length of presentations, means of showcasing country achievements, and ways to boost personal exchange and networking.

##### **Stall 4**

Participants were encouraged to share their opinions on how best to establish and maintain networks amongst the PPCR community of practice. One of the key outcomes of the

discussion was a united sentiment that it is important to connect the PPCR community to the wider resilience community, and to lay the foundations for ongoing networking beyond the lifespan of the PPCR. A number of other resilience networks were identified and opportunities for engagement and networking were explored. Creating a map of such networks and strategy for cross connecting between these networks was seen to be important steps in progressing resilience networking in general.