UNFCCC Reporting and Climate Finance Mapping 2016-2017

Noel Casserly:

Final Report –October 2017

Contents

1) Context and Summary 3

2) Irish Aid Climate and Environment Expenditure under the Bilateral Aid Programme 4

3) Civil Society, Multilateral and other Climate Relevant Expenditure in 2016 11

4) Climate Action Country Reports 13

5) Developments in OECD DAC ENVIRONET 13

6) Methodology 14

7) Conclusions and Recommendations 16

Annex 2: Climate Finance Projections for 2017 & 2018 18

Annex 3: Civil Society Organisations Climate and Relevant Expenditure by Country 22

Annex 4: Progress in INDC/ NDC and NAP Process in Key Partner Countries 25

Annex 5: Note of Conference Call on Review of Rio Marker for Biodiversity 27

1. Context and Summary

In March 2017, Irish Aid procured a consultancy for external professional services on climate finance, including research, analysis and expert technical support for the mapping of all Irish Aid Climate Financing for 2016 in key partner countries.

The objectives of the assignment were to:

- Track Irish Aid's Rio Marker expenditure for 2016 and indicative plans for 2017, including the timely submission of a detailed dataset to the Climate Change Policy Adviser. This dataset will inform DFAT's reporting to the Department of Communications, Climate Action and Environment, the EU, the UNFCCC and the DAC-CRS. The dataset will include the Environment purpose code, 4 Rio markers – Biodiversity, Desertification, Climate Change Adaptation and Climate Change Mitigation and additional markers for disaster risk reduction; climate resilient agriculture, capacity building and technology transfer. This rigorous mapping of Irish Aid Climate Financing will be conducted for Key Partner Countries and across HQ business unit expenditures for Civil Society, Humanitarian, Multilateral and Policy Units.
- To contribute to increased transparency produce a country Climate Action Report for each key partner country (Uganda, Ethiopia, Tanzania, Malawi, Mozambique, Zambia, Sierra Leone and Vietnam) that maps all Irish Aid Climate Financing to each country and provides detailed descriptions of the programmes and projects supported in 2016;
- Provide technical support to engage with OECD-DAC ENVIRONET to formulate and advocate for Ireland's positions for international donor reporting on climate finance;
- Produce a final report that presents the work completed, a summary of data collected and collated, and makes recommendations for continued data collection on climate finance in the Irish Aid Management Information System. The full data set, country reports and a report on ENVIRONET engagement will be annexes to the final report.

This report presents the results of that mapping exercise and outlines some conclusions and lessons learnt from the process. A summary of the overall results of the climate finance mapping exercise is set out in Table 1 below.

The mapping exercise identified €35,201,946 million in climate finance disbursements from bilateral programmes in ten countries in 2016 which is over 8% increase over similar expenditure in 2015. The results are summarised in Annex 1, with details of projects and programmes in the accompanying spreadsheet. Much of this expenditure was on activities that had climate adaptation benefits in the agriculture sector and building resilience in regional rural economies as well as supporting nutrition and food security. The funding, in many instances, also contributed to multiple objectives, in the areas of Biodiversity and Desertification as well as Disaster Risk Reduction, Capacity Building, Technology Transfer, and Forestry.

An examination of the funding provided to Civil Society programme partners in 2016 identified approximately €19,618,479 million in expenditure on climate and environment related activities. Irish Aid contributions to multi-lateral climate change funds and specialised UN bodies in 2016 amounted to €2,169,000. Relevant contributions to other international bodies (multi-country: IIED, WRI & MRFCJ) amounted to €1,850,000. These results are set out in Section 3 of the report.

Table 1: Overall Summary of Climate Finance in 2016

	2015 €	2016 €	% Change
Bilateral – key partner countries[1]	32,464,110	35,201,946	+8.4%
Multi-country[2]	1,850,000	1,850,000	0
Multi-lateral climate change funds[3]	1,200,000	1,500,000	+25%
Specialized bodies UN bodies[4]	489,000	669,000	+36.8%
Total Climate Specific Finance[5]	36,003,110	39,220,946	+9.5%
Civil Society[6]	17,194,070	19,618,479	N/A[7]

Section 4 of the Report addresses the preparation of the eight country Climate Action Reports. Section 5 addresses the outcome of a recent OECD DAC ENVIRONET Conference call on the review of the Rio Marker for Biodiversity. Section 6 sets out the methodology of the OECD DAC markers as well as an overview of the mapping methodology used in undertaking the assignment. Finally, Section 7 presents conclusions and recommendations.

2. Irish Aid Climate and Environment Expenditure under the Bilateral Aid Programme in 2016

The mapping exercise identified a total of €35,201,946 in bilateral climate finance disbursements in 2016, an increase of 8.43% on the 2015 total of €32,464,410. Just two countries, Ethiopia and Malawi, accounted for almost 66% of total climate finance disbursements under the bilateral aid programme in 2016. Annex 1 outlines a summary of the results of the mapping exercise in key partner countries.

Many of the Irish climate relevant disbursements have multiple co-benefits and therefore are scored under more than one Rio Marker and in particular may be marked for both mitigation and adaptation. Disbursements have been marked as cross-cutting where adaptation and mitigation are of equal significance. Support for climate adaptation forms the greatest share of the total amount.

[1] Ethiopia, Malawi, Mozambique, Tanzania, Vietnam, Myanmar, Uganda, Zambia, South Africa, Zimbabwe
[2] IIED, WRI, Climate Justice Advocacy
[3] Least Developed Countries Fund, UNFCC Trust Fund for Supplementary Activities - LEG
[4] UNEP, UNISDR
[5] Bilateral, multilateral, multi-country/ regional bodies, specialized UN bodies but excluding IA Civil Society Programme Funding
[6] Climate relevant expenditure provided by Irish Aid to civil society organizations in 2016 was Rio marked and accounted for systematically for the first time, in cooperation with the project partners themselves. Figures for 2015 were estimated from expenditure data held in the IA financial management system
[7] Caution about making a direct comparison in the light of the different methodologies used in assessing climate relevant finance for CSOs in 2015 and 2016.

Projects and programmes focusing on climate adaptation accounted for 76% of the total spend in 2016 and projects and programmes focusing on climate mitigation accounted for just under 4% of the total expenditure; the balance of the expenditure, just over 20%, was expended on projects of a cross-cutting nature addressing both climate adaptation and mitigation.

The vast majority of activities are based in rural areas, rural communities or villages. Activity is largely focussed on climate smart agriculture, food and nutrition security, social safety nets, rural development, water and sanitation, and capacity building. Energy access forms a large part of the mitigation total through deployment of solar photovoltaics and fuel-efficient cook-stoves. Sustainable biomass is also supported.

As was the case in reports for previous years, the mapped climate finance in this report includes financial support both for activities marked as 'principal', e.g. where adaptation or mitigation is a primary objective of the activity, and for activities marked as 'significant', e.g. where adaptation or mitigation is a secondary objective or intended co-benefit of the activity. In aggregating finance for principal and significant activities, 'principal' activities are weighted with a coefficient of 100% and 'significant' activities are weighted with a coefficient of 50%. This applies for climate, biodiversity and desertification finance. It is also applied here to the disaster risk reduction category although a marker has not been agreed and finalised under the OECD DAC system. A fuller explanation on the methodology is set out in Section 6 of the Report and the activities underpinning the figures are further described below.

Climate finance projections for 2017 and 2018 are presented for selected key partner countries in Annex 2. Overall, a similar level in climate finance is projected for 2017, although it is notable that a lower level of climate finance expenditure is forecast for Mozambique, Tanzania, and South Africa in 2017 where a number of programmes are coming to an end, but higher levels of expenditure projected for Mozambique and Vietnam in 2018.

Where new programmes are in preparation or existing ones are under review, there is an opportunity for Irish Aid to enhance the climate resilience of these programmes in cooperation with Partner Countries. Embassy Climate Focal Points can play an important role here. The recent completion of vulnerability assessments for partner countries by Irish Aid will help in this process. All projects in relevant sectors, in development or under review, should systematically consider the impacts of climate change and take steps to manage and reduce these, drawing on the tools and guidance in the Climate and Development Learning Platform.

Adaptation

The mapping exercise identified €26,771,296 in bilateral climate finance for adaptation activities in 2016 representing over 18% increase over adaptation expenditure in 2015 (the increase in adaptation expenditure in 2016 is partly offset by reductions in mitigation and cross-cutting expenditure).

For the purpose of the OECD DAC Rio Markers, climate change adaptation is defined as activities that aim to reduce the vulnerability of human or natural systems to the impacts of climate change and climate-related risks, by maintaining or increasing adaptive capacity and resilience. This encompasses a range of activities from information and knowledge generation, to capacity development, planning and the implementation of climate change adaptation actions.

Irish Aid activities in adaptation are generally directed towards adaptation in agriculture, water resource management, social safety nets, early warning systems, and disaster risk management. The incorporation of adaptation in Irish Aid country programmes reflects the recognition that climate change is already impacting development with implications for the achievement of development goals.

In Ethiopia, an example of a programme delivering significant climate adaptation benefits is the Productive Safety Net Programme, which aims to support the rural poor, who face chronic food insecurity, to resist shocks, create assets and become food self-sufficient,. In 2016, it is notable that a number of humanitarian assistance projects, with climate adaptation benefits, were funded such as the Emergency Cash Transfer Programme in the districts of Lilongwe and Nsanje, and the provision of food, shelter, site planning/ preparation, water and sanitation for South Sudanese refugee settlements in Uganda.

Mitigation

The mapping exercise identified €1,254,725 in bilateral support for mitigation activities in 2016 (36% reduction on 2015 expenditure on mitigation[8]). For the purpose of the OECD DAC Rio Markers, mitigation is defined as activities that contribute to the objective of stabilisation of greenhouse gas (GHG) concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system by promoting efforts to reduce or limit GHG emissions or to enhance GHG sequestration.

Irish Aid mitigation activities were mostly focussed on energy and in particular renewable energy such as solar, efficient cook-stoves, biofuels and sustainable biomass and sustainable agriculture techniques such as agroforestry and conservation agriculture. Examples of mitigation projects include:

- the dissemination of improved cookstoves in Tigray and SNNPR, Ethiopia, and
- enhancing integrated watershed management with climate smart agriculture[9] in Gergera Watershed, Ethiopia.

Cross-cutting

The mapping exercise identified €7,175,925 in bilateral support for activities with equal focus on adaptation and mitigation benefits in 2016 (a reduction of about 10% on 2015 expenditure). The cross-cutting category is used in the reporting of climate finance to the EU and the UNFCCC. See section 7 on the methodology for more details. Examples of cross-cutting projects in 2016 include:

- building a competitive horticulture cluster & revitalising the coconut sector in Mozambique where climate change is recognised within the project with an objective to increase capacity for mitigation and adaptation at the local level.
- the local development programme aimed at improving the livelihoods, health status, food and nutrition security of poor households in Northern Province, Zambia. Appropriate farming practices, such as conservation agriculture, will result in sustainable land-use and

[8] The drop in mitigation expenditure can be accounted for due to two programmes in Malawi, with significant mitigation benefits finishing in 2015 – Agro-forestry Food Security Programme (AFSP II) and the Conservation Agriculture Techniques Programme with the National Association of Small-holder Farmers

[9] The project is an enhanced model for integrated watershed management based on the inclusion of agroforestry practices which have significant mitigation potential.

increased productivity while maintaining eco-system services resulting in adaptation as well as mitigation benefits.

Agriculture

The mapping identified €19,570,490 in bilateral support for agricultural projects in 2016 (an increase of almost 33% on 2015 agriculture expenditure). A significant portion of Irish Aid's support for the response to climate change is focussed on the agriculture sector as a means of raising the incomes of the poor to help reduce poverty and hunger. Agriculture is a key economic sector for Irish Aid's partner countries, representing the main livelihood in rural areas, and will be significantly impacted by climate change. Climate change impacts agriculture through increased drought, increased extreme rainfall events, higher temperatures with greater evapotranspiration, and shortened or changed growing seasons. These in turn can lead to *inter alia*, reduced harvest or crop failures, reduced fodder for livestock due to poor vegetation growth, and soil erosion.

Activities in agriculture include changing crops for increased diversity, improved nutrition or drought resilient varieties, watershed management, and soil conservation and management. Irish Aid supports research on crop varieties and options that support nutrition and withstand climate change impacts. Conservation agriculture is supported by Irish Aid in agricultural activities across programme countries. In conserving soil and water, conservation agriculture contributes to adaptation to climate change. Investment and training in improved irrigation infrastructure and management is another activity that acts to boost agricultural production while increasing resilience to climate change. Examples of agriculture projects include:

- Improve nutrition of rural households in Niassa Province with drought tolerant sweet potatoes in Mozambique
- More Milk Project: Improving milk production and marketing through Dairy Market Hubs in Tanzania.

Disaster Risk Management

The mapping exercise identified €25,997,819 in disaster risk management (DRM) bilateral finance in 2016 (51% increase on 2015 level of expenditure – with notable increases in Ethiopia, Malawi and Uganda). There is no internationally agreed methodology for tracking financial support for DRM in developing countries although the OECD DAC is close to developing an agreed methodology for this. The approach taken in the climate finance mapping exercise in 2016 to identify funding for DRM relevant activities is the same as that used in 2014 and 2015 - where project descriptions and project documents that included and specified disaster risk management or disaster risk reduction objectives or plans, were marked for DRM.

Examples of relevant projects funded include:

- Productive Safety Nets Programme in Ethiopia
- Humanitarian Assistance - Emergency Cash Transfer Programme in Malawi.

Capacity Building and Climate Change

The mapping exercise identified €23,984,754 in bilateral support for activities that included capacity building for climate change in 2016 (an increase of 5% over the 2015 level of expenditure).

The UNFCCC describes capacity building as “enhancing the ability of individuals, organisations and institutions in developing countries...to identify, plan and implement ways to mitigate and adapt to climate change”. Although the UNFCCC asks countries to report on capacity building support, there is no agreed methodology. The OECD DAC is considering it as an area for future development.

Examples of relevant projects funded include:

- Partnership for Ethnic Minorities’ Equitable and Inclusive Development (P4EM) in Vietnam which has a strong focus on capacity building by strengthening government-civil society partnerships for addressing poverty and marginalization of ethnic minority population groups.
- MVIWATA - which aims to strengthen lobbying and farmer groups and networks at all levels in Tanzania including through capacity building, economic empowerment and advocacy.

Technology Transfer

The mapping exercise identified €15,520,616 in bilateral support for climate technology in 2016 (33% increase on 2015 level of expenditure). Technology in the UNFCCC context is usually understood to include physical technologies, knowledge and techniques. For the purposes of this report, activities that have a significant research component as well as activities that support new technologies are counted. The UNFCCC states that “promoting the effective development and transfer of environmentally sound technologies is critical in enabling developing countries to pursue their objectives for sustainable development in a climate-friendly manner”. Although the UNFCCC asks Parties to report on technology transfer support, there is no agreed methodology for doing so.

Examples of relevant projects funded include:

- Sustainable community based seed production system in Tigray, Ethiopia which aims to improve seed yield crops that are high-producing and resistant to pests and disease, thereby increasing crop production; the project is therefore helping to build resilience amongst farmers and help them adapt to climate change.
- Conservation Agriculture Techniques run by National Association of Smallholder Farmers in Malawi (NASFAM) which is aimed at improving sustainable crop production, productivity and marketing through adoption of Climate-Smart Agriculture principles and practices under smallholder farmer conditions in the context of climate change.

Agroforestry, Afforestation and REDD

In 2015, Irish Aid disbursed €10,906,425 in bilateral support for Agroforestry, Afforestation and REDD in 2016 (a drop of 8% on the 2015 level of expenditure). The supported activities include planting trees, and protecting and increasing forest areas. These are driven by a number of objectives: preventing and reducing soil erosion, improving soil moisture retention, planting nitrogen fixing species to improve soil quality, inter-cropping to diversify and increase agricultural output from a given area, and providing alternative income and food sources such as honey, fruit and nuts. Each of these can contribute to adaptation to climate change in areas where soil degradation and erosion pressures are expected to increase with climate change and where farmers need to diversify crops and income sources to reduce risk. It also has a strong mitigation component where planting and protecting trees not only stores carbon in wood but also enhances the sink of carbon in soils due to reduced disturbance. Planting trees and protecting and expanding forests normally have positive impacts on biodiversity except where non-native trees are planted in mono-culture forestry.

An example of relevant projects funded is

- Cocoa value chain: developing a high quality cocoa value chain improving production and market access in Tanzania through introduction of technologies and practices to reduce environmental impact and adapt to climate change.

Biodiversity

The mapping exercise identified €10,952,795 in biodiversity bilateral finance for 2016 (6% increase on 2015 level of expenditure). The OECD Rio Marker definition for biodiversity finance requires that it promotes at least one of the three objectives of the Convention for Biological Diversity - the conservation of bio-diversity, sustainable use of its components (ecosystems, species or genetic resources), or fair and equitable sharing of the benefits of the utilisation of genetic resources. Typical activities would include water resources protection and rehabilitation; integrated watershed, catchment and river basin protection and management; sustainable agricultural and farming practices; integrated pest management strategies; soil conservation; combating deforestation and land degradation while maintaining or enhancing biodiversity in the affected areas.

These criteria are all very relevant to Irish Aid's activities in key partner countries. Examples of current projects having a positive impact on biological diversity include:

- Enhancing integrated Watershed Management with Climate Smart Agriculture in Gergera Watershed in Ethiopia
- Local Development Programme in Northern Province Zambia
- Seed Industry Development Programme Phase II in Malawi

Desertification

The mapping exercise identified €10,434,965 desertification bilateral finance in 2016 (2% increase on 2015 level of expenditure).

The OECD Rio Marker definition for desertification finance requires that it aims at combatting desertification or mitigating the effects of drought in arid, semi-arid and dry sub-humid areas through prevention and/or reduction of land degradation, rehabilitation of partly degraded land or reclamation of desertified land.

Typical activities include the rehabilitation of land, vegetation cover, forests and water resources, conservation and sustainable management of land and water resources; sustainable irrigation for both crops and livestock to reduce pressure on threatened land; and development and transfer of environmentally sound traditional and local technologies, knowledge, know-how and practices to combat desertification. These criteria are relevant in many of the projects funded by Irish Aid in partner countries. Examples of projects which contribute to combatting desertification include:

- Fostering Gender Equitable Land Governance for Inclusive Agricultural Development Including Pastoralism in Tanzania.
- Provide food, shelter, site planning/preparation, water and sanitation in new refugee settlements in Uganda.

Table 2: Climate & Environment Finance Mapping of Bilateral Programme 2016 (€)

	UNFCCC										
	Climate Finance	Adaptation	Mitigation	Cross-cutting	UNCBD Biodiversity	UNCCD Desertification	Agriculture	Disaster Risk Management	Capacity Building	Technology	Forestry & REDD Incl. Agro-forestry
	€	€	€	€	€	€	€	€	€	€	€
Ethiopia	14,178,725	13,244,000	934,725	0	6,097,370	5,200,000	3,312,370	10,700,000	7,199,700	2,920,000	5,300,000
Malawi	8,990,511	4,503,819	320,000	4,166,692	1,816,692	916,692	7,541,211	8,415,731	7,601,211	7,801,211	2,666,692
Mozambique	3,480,866	3,261,366	0	219,500	339,000	1,860,273	2,769,909	245,224	1,905,485	1,671,905	100,000
Myanmar	190,000	190,000	0	0	0	0	250,000	130,00	130,000	0	125,000
South Africa	250,000	250,000	0	0	0	0	150,000	0	175,000	125,000	0
Tanzania	2,875,000	1,875,000	0	1,000,000	450,000	1,350,000	4,325,000	1,400,000	2,200,000	1,250,000	1,200,000
Uganda	1,137,983	458,250	0	679,733	579,733	1,032,000	0	1,557,000	575,000	675,000	4,733
Vietnam	2,868,861	2,868,861	0	0	0	76,000	152,000	2,654,864	3,068,358	67,500	500,000
Zambia	1,110,000	0	0	1,110,000	1,670,000	0	1,010,000	835,000	1,010,000	1,010,000	1,110,000
Zimbabwe	120,000	120,000	0	0	0	0	60,000	60,000	120,000	0	0
Totals	**35,201,946**	**26,771,296**	**1,254,725**	**7,175,925**	**10,952,795**	**10,434,965**	**19,570,490**	**25,997,819**	**23,984,754**	**15,520,616**	**10,906,425**

3. Civil Society, Multi-lateral and other Climate Relevant Expenditure in 2016

Irish Aid Headquarters provides multi-annual programme funding to a number of Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) to support their activities in developing countries. Climate relevant expenditure provided by Irish Aid to civil society organizations in 2016 was Rio marked and accounted for systematically for the first time, in cooperation with the project partners themselves.

The climate finance mapping exercise identified €19,618,479 million in funding provided to thirteen civil society programme partners for climate and environment related activities in 2016. Approximately 62% of this expenditure was accounted for by two of the CSOs, Concern and Trocaire. Table 2 below sets out the relevant expenditure for each of the thirteen relevant CSOs.

Civil society projects and programmes focusing on climate adaptation accounted for over 80% of the total spend in 2016 and projects and programmes focusing on climate mitigation accounted for less than 1% of the total expenditure; the balance of the expenditure, almost 19%, was expended on projects of a cross-cutting nature addressing both climate adaptation and mitigation.

Over 50% of this expenditure was programmed in eight countries – Ethiopia, Kenya, Malawi, Sudan, Uganda and Zambia. Annex 2 shows the expenditure for each of CSOs by country. The full results of the mapping exercise are set out in the accompanying spreadsheet.

Table 3: Civil Society Organisations Climate and Environment Relevant Expenditure in 2016

CSO	**Adaptation**	**Mitigation**	**Cross-cutting**	**Biodiversity**	**Desertification**	**Climate relevant**
Concern	8,010,085	0	113,000	5,267,097	3,970,979	8,123,085
Trocaire	1,932,900	143,060	1,992,801	3,245,735	1,473,890	4,068,761
Goal	1,866,240	19,899	1,016,801	731,033	812,705	2,902,940
Self Help Africa	1,443,143	0	55,768	777,335	1,499,881	1,498,911
Oxfam International	219,298	0	0	0	60,000	219,298
Action Aid	0	0	362,701	362,701	362,701	362,701
World Vision	53,523	0	0	109,219	53,523	53,523
Misean Cara	1,793,951	0	81,736	1,076,042	631,682	1,875,687
Vita	132,000	2,750	8,250	0	0	143,000
Aidlink	158,046	0	20,925	43,425	64,536	178,971
Serve	79,306	0	0	25,003	0	79,306
Childfund	0	0	63,825	63,825	63,785	63,825
Help Age Afford	48,471	0	0	0	0	48,471
Total	**15,736,963**	**165,709**	**3,715,807**	**11,701,415**	**8,993,682**	**19,618,479**

Almost €8.3 million in funding was provided to civil society programme partners for climate and environment related activities in key partner countries 2016. Over 36% of this expenditure was disbursed through Concern Worldwide. The climate relevant expenditure by CSOs in key partner countries is set out in Table 3 below.

Table 4: Civil Society Organisations Climate and Relevant Expenditure in key partner countries 2016

Code	Country	Total €	Concern Worldwide	Trócaire	GOAL	SHA	Misean Cara	Other[10]
ETH	Ethiopia	1,886,254	731,249	166,017	395,791	264,127	250,570	78,500
MOZ	Mozambique	639,244	550,000					89,244
MWI	Malawi	2,300,710	635,040	377,805	739,550	320,428	131,337	96,550
SLE	Sierra Leone	299,876	280,000		11,400			8,476
TZA	Tanzania	263,982						263,982
UGA	Uganda	1,563,447			851,592	332,322	249,887	129,646
VNM	Vietnam	84,801						84,801
ZMB	Zambia	1,249,200	833,224			325,473	90,503	0
Totals		8,287,514	3,029,513	543,822	1,998,333	1,242,350	722,297	751,199

Multi-lateral Expenditure and Specialized UN bodies

In 2016, as in previous years, Irish Aid provided financial support for climate relevant activities through multi-lateral channels. Support is provided through multi-lateral climate change funds such as the Least Developed Countries Fund and the UNFCCC Trust Fund for Supplementary Activities (Least Developed Countries Expert Group- LEG) and specialized UN bodies such as UNEP and UNISDR. In addition, funding is provided to a number of other bodies – the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), World Resources Institute (WRI) and the Mary Robinson Foundation for Climate Justice. The support provided in 2016 is summarised in table 4 below.

[10] Oxfam, World Vision, Vita, Action Aid, Aidlink, Child Fund, Serve, Help Age

Table 5: Multi-lateral, Specialized UN Bodies and other Climate Relevant Expenditure

	Amount €	Funding Source	Financial Instrument	Type of Support	Sector
Least Developed Countries Fund	1,000,000	ODA	Grant	Adaptation	Environment
UNFCCC Trust Fund for Supplementary Activities - LEG	500,000	ODA	Grant	Adaptation	Environment
United Nations Environment Programme	169,000	ODA	Grant	Adaptation	Water
United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction	500,000	ODA	Grant	Adaptation	DRR
Other (multi-country) • IIED • WRI • MRFCJ	 1,100,000 600,000 150,000	ODA	Grant	Cross-cutting	Environment

4. Climate Action Country Reports

Climate Action Reports were prepared for eight Key Partner Countries (Ethiopia, Malawi, Mozambique, Tanzania, Zambia, Uganda, Sierra Leone, and Vietnam). These reports are designed to be a useful tool to Embassies, both for internal use and also as a tool for external communication of Irish Aid climate and environmental work.

The reports build on the earlier climate country reports published by Irish Aid in 2014 and 2015 and present the results of the climate finance mapping exercise for 2016 as well as providing an overview of the climate change policy landscape in each country. The reports also draw from the Climate Risk Assessment Reports on selected key partner countries prepared in 2017 by Irish Aid. The table in Annex 2 summarises the climate focus and principal partners in key partner countries

The progress on the Nationally Determined Contribution process and National Adaptation Planning process in each partner country is summarised in Annex 4.

5. Developments in OECD DAC ENVIRONET

At the suggestion of Irish Aid I did not attend the OECD DAC ENVIRONET meeting which took place in Paris in October 2017. I did, however, participate in a conference call with OECD DAC ENVIRONET members on the review of the Rio Marker for Biodiversity. A summary of the discussions is presented in Annex 3.

6. Methodology

OECD DAC Rio Markers

Since 1998 the OECD DAC has monitored development finance targeting the objectives of the Rio Conventions. Data are reported by members of the OECD DAC, collected through the Creditor Reporting System (CRS) and identified using "Rio markers", where providers are requested to indicate for each development finance activity whether or not it targets environmental objectives. There are four Rio markers, covering: biodiversity, desertification, climate change mitigation, and climate change adaptation. The Rio markers are descriptive rather than strictly quantitative. They allow for an approximate quantification of financial flows targeting the objectives of the Rio Conventions – climate change adaptation and mitigation (UNFCCC), biodiversity (UNCBD), and desertification (UNCCD).

In the mapping exercise, the OECD DAC Rio Marker methodology was employed to identify and score disbursements with climate, biodiversity and desertification relevance as well as other activities: disaster risk management, agriculture, capacity building, technology transfer, and agro-forestry and REDD. The markers work on a three-score system with relevance or eligibility of projects to the definitions marked in three ways:

- Principal marker: 2
- Significant marker: 1
- Not targeted: 0

The choice of principal, significant or not-targeted relates to hierarchy of objectives in the programme or project design. A principal marker is applied if the marker issue in question is one of the principal objectives of the activity and has a profound impact on the design of the activity. A significant marker is applied if the marker policy is a secondary objective, or a planned co-benefit, in the programme or project design. The zero marker is applied to show that the marker policy was not targeted in the programme or project design. If the programme or project has not been examined for its relevance to the Rio Markers, the marker is left blank.

Climate related multi-lateral flows have been addressed in guidance[11] from the OECD DAC ENVIRONET:

a) contributions from donors channelled through multilateral organisations and earmarked for climate purposes are included in bilateral figures, where they are Rio-marked;

b) contributions to multilateral climate funds[12] are counted in their totality as multilateral contributions for climate purposes

[11] Treatment of Climate-related Multilateral Flows in DAC Statistics & Status of Reporting – Technical Note prepared for the Joint ENVIRONET and WP-STAT Task Team on OECD Rio markers, environment and development finance statistics - as of November 2015.

[12] Multilateral climate funds (i.e. entirely dedicated to climate) - on the List of ODA-eligible international organisations (Annex 2 of the DAC Statistical Reporting Directives) and whose contributions are counted in their totality as multilateral contributions for climate purposes - include: CIFs (Clean Technology Fund and Strategic Climate Fund), GEF's LDCF and SCCF, Adaptation Fund

c) core contributions to agencies partly active in the climate field are included in multilateral ODA but not Rio-marked, since this would raise comparability issues with different donors scoring contributions to the same multilateral institution differently, and could lead to over-estimation. Instead, “inputed multilateral contributions” are calculated to estimate the climate-related share of these contributions which can be attributed back to donor.

Mapping Methodology: Bilateral

The two track approach in mapping and tracking of bilateral expenditure used in earlier years was again used in 2016 (reporting of climate and environment expenditure on the bilateral aid programme by embassy staff; and analysis of relevant financial accounts held by Irish Aid HQ to screen embassy programme disbursements).

The reporting template, previously used, was circulated in April 2017 to embassy staff for completion and updating as appropriate. The table is designed to be simple to use, only requiring entry of the project title, description, and the disbursement amount, and choosing from a drop down list for scoring against the OECD DAC Rio Markers and other environmental markers. The template itself then calculates the climate finance accounting weight and the consequent climate finance amount for each activity and the resulting total climate finance amount. This automatic calculation, coupled with drop down lists for marking reduces the number of decision points for the user and thus simplifies the task.

In May 2017, while correspondence was ongoing with the embassies, a parallel process was begun to map potential climate and environment finance in the 2016 financial returns to Irish Aid HQ from Partner Country embassies. The returns included information on disbursement amount, brief description, sector, policy code and recipient/implementing entity. An initial step taken was to screen out non-programme disbursements e.g. administrative costs. With just programme disbursements remaining, an assessment was made as to sectors with no relevance to climate change. After this initial screening, the shortened list of programme expenditures was compared with the mapped climate and environment finance of 2015. Disbursements that represented a continuation of 2015 climate and environment relevant programmes were identified.

When the templates were received back from the embassies, the information was compared against the screened financial data from embassies. Three subsequent steps were undertaken;

- Check whether any environment or climate relevant activities had been missed by embassy reports
- Enhance project/programme descriptions where necessary
- Check the consistency of embassy reporting with OECD DAC criteria

In some instances, there were disbursements listed in the financial returns recorded in the HQ data that had not been identified by the embassies as climate or environment finance. Queries were returned to the embassies seeking information on the disbursements in question and whether they could be relevant to climate or environment and supporting documentation was requested where appropriate. This exchange and consultation of project/programme documentation lead to a small number of additional disbursements as climate and environment relevant which were then confirmed with embassies.

Mapping Methodology: Civil Society Expenditure

Civil society climate relevant expenditure funded by Irish Aid in 2016 was Rio marked and accounted for systematically for the first time, in cooperation with the project partners themselves. Returns for year 5 (2016) of multi-annual budget allocations for each of the CSOs were provided and examined to identify and collate the relevant expenditure. The process was more time consuming than originally anticipated because returns from 12 of the 13 CSOs did not contain project and programme descriptions and these had to be drawn from the programme objectives and outcomes to align with the relevant reporting templates.

Irish Aid organised a workshop on climate and development for Civil Society Organisations in Limerick on 29 and 30 March and this provided an opportunity to present on the plans for using the Rio markers to track climate adaptation and mitigation, biodiversity and desertification. I participated in these discussions.

Multi-lateral expenditure

Climate relevant disbursements to multi-lateral climate change funds, specialized UN Funds, and other climate relevant expenditure were identified from the record of payments from the IA financial management system. The payments were then compared to the data from the 2015 outturn.

Climate Action Reports

During August and September 2017, the drafting and updating of the eight climate action reports for key partner countries was undertaken. The initial drafts were circulated to Irish Aid for comment in early August and the third revision of the reports, taking on board the comments and suggestions were circulated on 19th September.

As well as updating the relevant data for support under the bilateral aid and civil society programmes, significant developments in the policy landscape in each country were noted. Earlier embassy focal points were invited to enhance project and programme descriptions in a number of instances where new programmes and projects were put in place and this information was included where provided. Irish Aid provided the text for new and updated case studies for inclusion in the Reports. Information on climate impacts, vulnerability, as well as policy updates was also drawn from Irish Aid Risk Assessment Reports of six countries (Ethiopia, Malawi, Mozambique, Tanzania, Uganda and Zambia) as well as relevant developments from the country sections of the Climate and Development and Learning Platform.

7. Conclusions and Recommendations

Number and apportionment of contract days

- Irish Aid may wish to consider the overall allocation of days and their apportionment in any similar contract for the future. The total number of days (46) allocated for this year's project underestimated the amount required in taking on the new arrangements for mapping civil society climate finance as well as the substantial rewrites of the Climate Action Reports. On the other hand it should be possible to reallocate some days from the mapping of bilateral expenditure where the system is now up and running quite well.

- As Irish Aid tendered for the climate finance contract early in 2016 this allowed for the initial call to embassy focal points to take place in April allowing for a more manageable time frame than earlier years to meet reporting deadlines.

Climate Finance Disbursements under the Bilateral Aid Programme

- Climate finance disbursements under the bilateral aid programme show a significant increase at over 8%. Projections for climate relevant expenditure in 2017 and 2018 are similar.
- Improving capacities and capabilities in the mainstreaming and integration of climate in development programmes in partner countries will help shape new projects and further increase total bilateral climate finance in the years ahead.
- Where new programmes are in preparation or existing ones are under review, Irish Aid should continue to enhance the climate resilience of these programmes in cooperation with Partner Countries. All projects in relevant sectors, in development or under review, should systematically consider the impacts of climate change and take steps to manage and reduce these drawing on the tools and guidance in the Climate and Development Learning Platform. The recent Risk Assessment Reports will also provide useful reference and guidance.
- The two track process again worked well and helped to identify a number of additional projects not identified by the embassy focal points in their returns as well as a small number of projects that should not have been included. However, overall the embassy returns this year did not require as many adjustments as in earlier years indicating that the system is now up and running quite well.
- Irish Aid has already indicated that ongoing improvements will continue to be made to the Financial Management System to enhance OECD DAC Reporting. As previously recommended, the process would be greatly improved if the financial management system could capture greater detail on project and programme descriptions which would help to verify codings (the expenditure returns from the embassies should include this information).
- Embassy focal points should be encouraged to put basic information on climate relevant programmes and projects (description, climate relevance, implementing partners and level of funding) on the relevant country pages on the Climate and Development Learning Platform.

Mapping and Tracking of Civil Society Expenditure

- As outlined earlier, the process of mapping and collating CSO expenditure was more time consuming than originally anticipated because returns from the CSOs did not contain project and programme descriptions. These had to be drawn from the programme objectives and outcomes in the returns to align with the relevant reporting templates required for the CRS (and EU & UNFCCCC). Irish Aid should consider adjusting the reporting format for the CSOs to better to align with reporting templates for the CRS, EU and UNFCCC.

Climate Action Reports

- From beginning of August the preparation of revision of the draft reports took place (third iteration of all eight reports were circulated in mid-September). Eight days were allocated for this element of the contract and in hindsight additional days could have been allowed (some days could be reallocated from the bilateral mapping in any future contract).

Annex 1: Climate Finance Projections 2017 & 2018

	Climate Focus and key partners	2017	2017 Elaboration	2018	2018 Elaboration
Ethiopia	Projects funded directly by Irish Aid under the bilateral aid programme include the Productive Safety Nets Programme, improving livelihoods and resilience through climate smart agriculture, support for rural livelihoods through dissemination of energy efficient cookstoves, and the promotion of sustainable community based seed production systems. Civil Society partners Concern, Trocaire, GOAL, Self Help Africa, Misean Cara, and Vita are also helping to build resilience to climate change through a wide range of projects.	Similar	The same partners will receive approximately the same amount of budget for implementation of climate related projects	Similar	The same partners will receive approximately the same amount of budget for implementation of climate related projects.
Malawi	Projects funded directly by Irish Aid under the bilateral aid programme include improving the effectiveness of investments in food security and sustainable agriculture, strengthening community resilience through social cash transfer programmes, accelerating the uptake of low emission energy efficient cook stoves, and strengthening community disaster resilience. Civil Society partners Concern, Trócaire, GOAL, Self Help Africa, Misean Cara, and Action Aid are also helping to build resilience to climate change through a wide range of projects.	Similar	Support to WFP has finished, but support to Trinity College Dublin has replaced this and support to Total Land Care, UNICEF in 2016 continues with similar budget as 2015.	Similar	No major changes expected in programme partners. Any changes to budget allocations between different existing partners would not significantly impact on the statistics being reported.

Mozambique	Projects funded directly by Irish Aid under the bilateral aid programme include Prosan- programme for food security and nutrition; preparedness and disaster risk reduction; building a competitive horticulture cluster and revitalizing the coconut sector; and, responding to nutrition emergency in drought affected provinces. Civil Society partners Concern, Child Fund, Serve and Help age are also helping to build resilience to climate change through a wide range of projects.	Lower	The majority of programmes reported since 2013 will come to an end in 2017 without new disbursements (PROSAN, ARENA, CIP, Gorongosa NP) as the current CSP period ends. New programmes to be developed and funded as from 2018.	Higher	2017 will be a design year for the new CSP and new programmes will be in place in 2018. The new mission strategy will give more attention to climate change related matters in our programmatic approach.
Tanzania	Projects and programmes funded by Irish Aid have a strong agricultural focus. Projects funded directly by Irish Aid under the bilateral aid programme include improving cocoa and oil seed value chains, improving milk production and marketing, strengthening farmers networks, and fostering more equitable land governance. Civil Society partners Oxfam, World Vision, and Help Age are also helping to build resilience to climate change on a range of projects.	Lower	The current CSP ends in 2016 and programmes are ending. The new CSP for Tanzania provides an opportunity for better mainstreaming of climate change and a higher level of funding.		The new CSP for Tanzania provides an opportunity for better mainstreaming of climate change and a higher level of funding.
Uganda	Projects funded directly by Irish Aid under the bilateral aid programme include the provision of water, sanitation and hygiene services to South Sudanese refugees, as well as the provision food, shelter and site planning for refugees, and a skills development programme in the Karamoja region in response to market	Similar	Completed design and started implementation of new CSP 2016 - 2020; with partners largely identified and will be the same throughout the CSP.	Similar	Same partners to be supported throughout the CSP.

	needs. Civil Society partners GOAL, Self Help Africa, Misean Cara, Aidlink, Childfund and Help Age are helping to build resilience to climate change through a wide range of projects.				
Vietnam	Projects funded directly by Irish Aid under the bilateral aid programme include the The National Targeted Programme on Sustainable Poverty Reduction Program (Programme 135), the Partnership for Ethnic Minorities' Equitable and Inclusive Development (P4EM), and from university to community: preparing a generation of professionals in sustainable development. Civil Society partners Action Aid are helping to build resilience in supporting women in target areas so they can break the cycle of poverty and violence, and build economic alternatives.	Similar	Some initiatives might be replaced.	Higher	Climate change better mainstreamed across the projects, notably around projects that support ethnic minorities
Zambia	Projects and programmes funded by Irish Aid have a strong agricultural focus. Projects to improve livelihoods, address food insecurity and build resilience of small scale farmers continue to be undertaken in Northern Province. Civil Society partners Concern, Self Help Africa and Misean Cara are helping to build resilience to climate change by increasing smallholder skills and knowledge and engaging farmers in value chains and networks,	Similar	The same programmes are continuing up to 2017	Uncertain	Currently developing a new CSP for 2018-2022, and likely to have a complete new set of programmes. At present uncertain about the climate finance elements

South Africa/ Zimbabwe	Projects funded directly by Irish Aid in South Africa under the bilateral aid programme focus on improving emerging farmers livelihoods through climate smart agriculture as well as support for the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA) for Southern Africa. In Zimbabwe, support is provided to support the livelihoods of rural youth in partnership with Technoserve Zimbabwe.	Lower	Closure of existing programmes with Technoserve in South Africa and Zimbabwe.	Lower	Maintaining support to UN OCHA at 2017 level

Annex 2: Civil Society Organisations Climate and Relevant Expenditure by Country in 2016 (full table)

Code	Country	Total €	Concern Worldwide	Trócaire	GOAL	SHA	Misean Cara	Oxfam	World Vision	Vita	Action Aid	Aidlink	Child Fund	Serve	Help Age
AFG	Afghanistan	**350,000**	350,000												
BDG	Bangladesh	**321,677**	321,677												
Bol	Bolivia	**26,316**					26,316								
Bra	Brazil	**5,449**					5,449								
BDI	Burundi	**80,000**	80,000												
DRC		**375,000**	375,000												
ERI	Eritrea	**173,482**					108,982			64,500					
ETH	Ethiopia	**1,886,254**	731,249	166,017	395,791	264,127	250,570			78,500					
GTM	Guatemala	**211,826**		211,826											
HND	Honduras	**497,375**		497,375											
HTI	Haiti	**403,596**	349,106				54,490								
IND	India	**76,972**			11,263		65,709								
KEN	Kenya	**1,814,557**		588,481	46,437	200,793	782,851		5,074		96,550	94,371			
	LARO Regional Prog	**739,826**		***739,826***											
LBR	Liberia	**213,750**	213,750												
	Madagascar	**54,490**					54,490								

MOZ	Mozambique	**639,244**	550,000										39,650	48,523	1,071
MRT	Mauritania	**8,411**							8,411						
MWI	Malawi	**2,300,710**	*635,040*	***377,805***	*739,550*	320,428	131,337				96,550				
	Nepal	**84,800**									84,800				
NER	Niger	**487,594**	487,594												
NGA	Nigeria	**8,225**					8,225								
NIC	Nicaragua	**150,121**		150,121											
PAK	Pakistan	**417,549**		417,549											
PHL	Philippines	**15,229**					15,229								
PRK	North Korea	**342,000**	342,000												
RWA	Rwanda	**895,027**	510,000	385,027											
SDN	Sudan	**1,125,098**	945,298		179,800										
SDS	South Sudan	**305,628**			296,912		8,716								
SLE	Sierra Leone	**299,876**	280,000		11,400				8,476						
SOM	Somalia	**250,000**	250,000												
TCD	Chad	**705,147**	705,147												
TZA	Tanzania	**263,982**						219,298	8,647						36,037
UGA	Uganda	**1,563,447**			851,592	332,322	249,887		13,369			84,600	24,175		7,502
	Vietnam	**84,801**									84,801				
ZMB	Zambia	**1,249,200**	833,224			325,473	90,503								
ZWE	Zimbabwe	**928,918**		**534,734**	340,468		22,933							30,783	

PIL		**3,861**													3,861
	Dev. Ed	**259,041**	164,000		29,727	55,768			9,546						
Totals		**19,618,479**	**8,123,085**	**4,068,761**	**2,902,940**	**1,498,911**	**1,875,687**	**219,298**	**53,523**	**143,000**	**362,701**	**178,971**	**63,825**	**79,306**	**48,471**

Annex 3: Progress in INDC/ NDC and NAP Process in Key Partner Countries

Country	INDC/ NDC Process	NAP Process
Ethiopia	Ethiopia was one of the first countries to submit its INDC in June 2015. The INDC includes a 64% decrease in the 2030 carbon emissions target covering key agriculture, forestry, transport, electric power, industry and construction sectors. The outlined financial needs of US$ 150 billion to implement the proposed activities might be revised following dedicated ongoing studies.	Ethiopia has finalised a draft NAP document with priorities drawn from the Climate Resilient Green Economy Strategy as the guiding document. Sectoral NAP strategies have also been developed for some of the sectors.
Malawi	The Malawi NDC process has not yet commenced, but Malawi's INDC was prepared in 2015 and identifies priority sectors and thematic areas for climate change adaptation activities, based on national development priorities: agriculture (crops, livestock, fisheries), water resources, health, infrastructure, land-use planning, transport, population and human settlements, disaster risk management, forestry (wildlife), energy and gender. The main sectors contributing to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in Malawi are energy, agriculture, forestry and other land use, and waste.	Malawi commenced the NAP process in September 2014 through the establishment of the Core Team and the official launch. This was followed by initial sector training and commissioning of the preparation of Malawi's NAP Roadmap, including a target timeline for the 17 different steps involved in the NAP process (per the UNFCCC guidelines). UNDP has supported the Environmental Affairs Department (EAD) with the launch of the NAP Stocktaking and a report has been shared.
Mozambique	The Mozambique Government is expected to ratify the Paris Agreement by end 2017. The process of reviewing the INDC has started and the Government of Mozambique is working with Word Bank and is also being supported by the NDC Partnership and UNEP to define the specific actions for all different goals proposed in the INDC.	Mozambique has submitted the road map for the NAP to the UNFCCC and UNDP is supporting the process. The NAP will be launched by end in 2017. The World Bank is supporting development of some sectoral NAPs.
Sierra Leone	Sierra Leone's INDC was published in October and submitted to the UNFCCC. The largest GHG emitting sectors are Agriculture and Waste and between them, they are projected to emit between 95 to 98% of the projected national emissions from 2015 to 2030.	Sierra Leone has yet to develop its NAP but has taken some steps to strengthen the institutional and policy framework to enhance the coordination and implementation of climate change adaptation and mitigation including the planned introduction a National Climate

		Change Act and the high-level National Climate Change Council.
Tanzania	Tanzania has not yet signed or ratified the Paris Agreement, but they submitted their INDC to the UNFCCC in 2015. Ratification of the Paris Agreement is expected to be completed by end of 2017. Under its INDC, Tanzania will reduce greenhouse gas emissions economy wide between 10-20% by 2030 relative to the BAU scenario of 138 - 153 Million tons of carbon dioxide equivalent ($MtCO_2e$) gross emissions, depending on the baseline efficiency improvements, consistent with its sustainable development agenda.	The Government of Tanzania is being supported by GIZ to undertaking a comprehensive stocktaking at all local councils in mainland and Zanzibar as well as with ministries and government agencies. NAP stock taking workshops have been taking place and the NAP stocktaking report will be ready by end of 2017. Tanzania has also applied for GCF NAP readiness funds with support from UNDP, but the application has not yet been approved.
Uganda	Uganda's INDC was submitted to UNFCCC in October 2015 and Uganda ratified the Paris Agreement in September 2016. The INDC presents a 22% decrease in carbon emissions target by 2030 covering key energy, forestry and wetlands sectors. It outlines funding needs of USD 2.4 billion for adaptation priority sectors, but is not certain about its mitigation requirements.	The Uganda NAP has not been developed though the road map for the development of the NAP was submitted to the Secretariat of the UNFCCC in 2015. Plans are under way to launch the NAP process with support from UNDP under the DRR programme and an application for accessing funds for the NAP process is in advanced stages through UNEP on behalf of government.
Vietnam	Viet Nam submitted its INDC to UNFCCC in September 2015, signed the Paris agreement in April 2016 and ratified it in November 2016.	Vietnam plans to complete its NAP by 2019
Zambia	Zambia's first NDC includes both adaptation and mitigation actions with a goal of achieving its contribution by 2030. A total emission reduction of 47% against a 2010 base year is targeted. Like many other countries, Zambia is now faced with the challenge of implementing the NDC. Consultants CDKN and its partners – Ricardo and Africa Development and Investment (ADI) – are providing technical support to enable the country to move towards implementation.	The Government of Zambia has not yet developed the NAP, though an initial stakeholder engagement to introduce the NAP has been conducted. The government has approached the Global Water Partnership and UNDP to collaborate on its bid for preparatory and readiness funding under the Green Climate Fund. The Ministries of Health and Agriculture are working on their sectoral NAPs, with support from UNDP. There is also a plan to initiate NAPS for water and energy, which will all inform the National NAP when the funds are available to start on the national process

Annex 4

OECD DAV ENVIRONET Conference Call on the Review of the

Rio Marker for Biodiversity - Thursday, 26 October

Note of Discussions

- I participated in this meeting on behalf of Irish Aid. Other participants included representatives from Switzerland, Germany, France, Italy, Japan, European Commission (ENV & DEVCO), USAID, UNCBD, UNCDD, OECD DAC Secretariat.
- The aim of the meeting was to have a discussion and take feedback on draft text adjustments to the eligibility criteria of the biodiversity marker which had been circulated in advance by the Secretariat (I did not have sight of this).
    - Para (a) focusing on mainstreaming integration aspects, protection and enhancement – Switzerland and EC provided feedback. Proposed adjustment acceptable – measures to improve and additional investment for "existing" are important aspects.
    - Para (b) – Proposed text adjustments are acceptable. EC referred to importance of stakeholder engagement and inclusion of sectoral policies. Switzerland drew attention to the difference between research and knowledge management.
    - Para (c) – addressing "sustainable use" of ecosystem services and positive incentives as well as the need to make unsustainable practices more sustainable – phasing out of harmful incentives. Some discussion on whether criteria needs a narrower focus – reference to conservation may be misplaced – more appropriate to para (a). Agreed some further redrafting would help.
    - Para (d) – discussion on ecosystem services and benefit sharing. Japan questioned whether genetic diversity would be better addressed in para (a). EC acknowledging there may be some overlap but is fine with draft text "fair and equitable sharing" is ok (no mention of access). Switz ok with adding word "access" but EC mentioned that access to genetic resources is a wider issue. France advised they will come back with written comments.
    - Para (e) – minimal changes. Text is fine
- Next Steps: Secretariat will prepare a revised text taking on board suggestions. Any additional comments or suggestions welcome in writing by 30 November. Also, there will be a call for suggestions on the revision of the Desertification criteria by the end of the year.

Noel Casserly

27th October 2017