



Global Climate Change Alliance

Global Learning Event “Innovative and effective approaches to climate change: Experiences from the Global Climate Change Alliance”

Summary Report

12-14 September 2012, Brussels, Belgium

The contents of this publication are the sole responsibility of MWH and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the European Union. This report is prepared solely for the use and benefit of the Contracting Authority. It is the result of an independent review, and neither MWH, nor the authors accept or assume any responsibility or duty of care to any third party.

Table of Contents

1. GLOBAL LEARNING EVENT: AIMS AND OBJECTIVES.....	1
2. PARTICIPATION.....	2
3. THE FINAL AGENDA	2
4. WORKING GROUP AND OPEN SPACE METHODOLOGIES	6
4.1. Working groups	6
4.2. Open Space	6
5. SESSION SUMMARIES	7
5.1. Setting the scene	7
5.2. Background papers and working groups	11
5.2.1. Mainstreaming climate change into national development planning.....	12
5.2.2. Addressing climate change through forest based mitigation and adaptation.....	13
5.2.3. Addressing climate change through disaster risk reduction and coastal zone management.....	13
5.2.4. Adapting to climate change: agriculture, land and water management	14
5.2.5. Aid delivery modalities and approaches	15
5.3. Open Space	16
5.4. Technical summary of key conclusions from the GLE.....	17
5.5. Panel Discussion	20
6. MULTI-MEDIA ASPECTS	22
6.1. Videos	22
6.2. GCCA website	22
6.3. Cap4Dev GCCA Community	22
7. PARTICIPANT EVALUATION.....	22
ANNEX I – PARTICIPANT EVALUATION.....	25
Process	25
Quantitative results	25
Comments received	30
Positive comments about the workshop.....	31
Suggestions for improvement.....	31

Suggestions for a possible follow-up.....	32
---	----

1. GLOBAL LEARNING EVENT: AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

By 2013, the GCCA will be funding over 45 climate programmes (national, regional and global) in more than 35 countries and across 4 regions. As the experience accumulates across the globe from these and other programmes, it is important that the GCCA ensures that lesson learning is an integral part of the process, and that the knowledge generated from its implementation is shared across countries and regions and with development partners.

To support this, a Global Learning Event (GLE) was organised in Brussels from the 12th to 14th September 2012. This meeting brought together partners directly involved in the implementation of GCCA-funded programmes across the world, for the purpose of promoting exchange of experience across projects and countries, identifying achievements and lessons learned so far, building knowledge about the best ways of implementing climate-related assistance, and promoting networking across GCCA partners, and informing the future development of the GCCA.



To support the delivery of these aims, an agenda was developed that focussed on five working groups addressing questions that were developed based on analysis of the GCCA funded interventions to date (both in identification / formulation, and implementation). This analysis was summarised in five themed background papers, that were prepared during the months preceding the GLE, focused on mainstreaming climate change, forest based adaptation and mitigation, disaster risk reduction and coastal zone management, adaptation in agriculture, land and water management

and aid delivery modalities and approaches¹. In addition to this, an “Open Space” session was included in the agenda, to allow the discussion of further topics, as proposed by the participants themselves. To support the remaining two aims of the GLE, both the GCCA website was “revitalised” in the months preceding the GLE, and officially launched at the event, while the *GCCA Community* on the Cap4Dev platform was also publicised and promoted at the GLE for participants to join during and immediately after the GLE. Finally, a panel discussion was included in the agenda, to allow a formal space for discussion and exchanges on the future of the GCCA initiative.

The event itself was held at the Albert Borschette Centre in Brussels. This document summarises the main activities and outcomes from the GLE, including the working group sessions, Open Space topics discussed, the technical summary of the key conclusions and the closing panel discussion.

2. PARTICIPATION

Participation in the GCCA Global Learning Event (GLE) approached close to 160 participants². This included representation from nearly all of the GCCA supported national and regional interventions, as well as from development partners, Directorate General’s Development and Cooperation, Climate Action and Agriculture and Rural Development, the ACP Secretariat, EU Delegations to GCCA partner countries and regions, Member States, EC related institutions, other EC supported regional climate change programmes, NGOs and other stakeholders.

The approximate numbers from each of these groups that attended part or all of the GLE were:

- GCCA supported interventions: 74
- Development partners: 15
- EC HQ: 30
- ACP Secretariat: 7
- EU Delegations: 11
- Member states: 8
- EC related institutions / EC climate change programmes: 6
- NGOs and others: 4

The highest level of participation occurred on Day 1, which then stabilised around the attendees from GCCA supported programmes and those most directly involved in these same programmes. Nevertheless, the level of attendance remained high throughout the three days, clearly in excess of 100 participants.

3. THE FINAL AGENDA

The final agenda as delivered at the GLE is presented below:

¹ Copies of these papers, in English and French, with their annexes (of which the French is partially translated for the those GCCA supported interventions in French speaking countries only), can be found at: <http://www.gcca.eu/policy-dialogue-and-experience-sharing/global-learning-event>

² The listing of registered participants can be found at: <http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/gcca-community/documents>

Day 1: 12th September: Setting the scene and Working Groups 1 and 2

09:15 to 09:25	Welcome and Opening	Chair for morning session: <i>Dr. Cristiana Pasca Palmer, Head of Unit C2 - Climate Change, Environment, Natural Resources, Water, Directorate-General for Development and Cooperation EuropeAid (DEVCO), European Commission</i>
09:25 to 09:45	Global Learning Event: objectives and agenda	<i>Dr. Mark Futter GCCA Global Support Facility (GSF)</i>
09:45 to 10:15	Key developments of the GCCA	<i>Mr. Paul Renier, Deputy Head of Unit C2 - Climate Change, Environment, Natural Resources, Water, Directorate-General for Development and Cooperation – EuropeAid (DEVCO), European Commission</i>
10:15 to 10:25	GCCA Programme video – Guyana	<i>Ms. Tamara Levine, GSF with Aditya Persaud (Guyana)</i>
10:25 to 10:55	Key note speech on EU Climate Policy at the International Level	<i>Mr. Jos Delbeke, Director General, Directorate-General Climate Action, European Commission</i>
10:55 to 11:30	Questions & Answers	<i>Facilitated by Dr Cristiana Pasca Palmer</i>
11:30 to 12:00	Coffee break	
12:00 to 12:05	Presentation of thematic experts	Chair for next session: <i>Mr. Timothy Clarke, European External Action Service and former Head of the EU Delegation to Tanzania, European Commission</i>
12:05 to 12:20	Overview of the background document: Mainstreaming climate change into national development planning: GCCA experience	<i>Dr. Thomas Downing, Global Climate Adaptation Partnership SEI Oxford. Visiting Professor, University of Oxford</i>
12:20 to 12:30	GCCA Programme video – Pacific	<i>Dr. Sarah Hemstock (University of the South Pacific) & Dr. Gillian Cambers (Secretariat of the Pacific Community)</i>
12:30 to 12:45	Overview of the background document: Addressing climate change through forest-based mitigation and adaptation: GCCA experience	<i>Ms. Catherine Paul, GCCA GSF</i>
12:45 to 13:00	Questions & Answers	<i>Facilitated by Mr. Timothy Clarke</i>
13:00 to 14:30	Lunch break	
14:30 to 17:30	Working Groups in FR and EN	
	1: MAINSTREAMING	2: FORESTS

Day 2: 13th September: Working Groups 3, 4 and 5

09:00 to 09:05	Presentation of thematic experts and planning for the day		Chair for morning session: <i>Mr. Edmund Jackson, Environment and Climate Change Programme Officer, ACP Secretariat</i>
09:05 to 09:20	Overview of the background document: Addressing climate change through disaster risk reduction and coastal zone management: GCCA experience		<i>Ms. Frances Reupena, Water & Sanitation Sector Coordinator, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, Samoa</i>
09:20 to 09:35	Overview of the background document: Adapting to climate change: agriculture, land and water management: GCCA experience		<i>Mr. Ian Noble, Global Adaptation Institute</i>
09:35 to 09:45	GCCA Programme video – Tanzania		<i>Dr. Francis Njau (Tanzania)</i>
09:45 to 10:00	Overview of the background document: Aid delivery modalities and approaches: GCCA experience		<i>Ms. Tamara Levine, GCCA GSF</i>
10:00 to 10:30	Questions & Answers		<i>Facilitated by Chair of morning session</i>
10:30 to 11:00	Coffee break		
11:00 to 13:30	Working Groups in FR and EN		
	3: DISASTER RISK REDUCTION	4:ADAPTATION	5: AID DELIVERY MODALITIES AND APPROACHES
13:30 to 15:00	Lunch break Facilitators		
15:00 to 16:00	Working Group reporting back and discussion in plenary session		<i>Chaired by Mr. Philippe Zoungrana (CILSS)</i>
16:00 to 16:40	Market Place for Open Space: “Pitching” of topics for discussion during Open Space during the morning of day 3. Conclusion and briefing on Open Space for next day		<i>Mr. Peter Brinn, GCCA GSF</i>
16:40 to 17:00	(1) Capacity 4 Development collaborative platform and GCCA Community and (2) the “refreshed” GCCA website		<i>Mr. Christoforos Korakas Quality Management Officer - capacity4dev.eu; Knowledge Management Systems, European Commission / Ms. Catherine Paul, GCCA GSF</i>
17:00 to 19:00	Drinks reception – In the Albert Borschette Conference Centre		

Day 3: 14th September: Open space, technical conclusions, discussion and close

09:00 to 9:10	Cap4Dev GCCA Community	Ms. Valerie Cuvelier, GCCA GSF
09:10 to 9:20	The Climate Support Facility	Mr. Manu Harchies, GCCA Climate Support Facility
09:20 to 09:30	Summary of GCCA supported programme in Jamaica	Mrs. Mary-Ann Gooden (Jamaica)
09:30 to 09:40	Open Space logistics	Mr. Peter Brinn, GCCA GSF
09:40 to 10:30	Breakout sessions for the Open Space	Concerned delegates (support from GSF – EN & FR)
10:30 to 11:00	Coffee break	
11:00 to 12:10	“Change over” and continuation of the Open Space	Concerned delegates (support from GSF – EN & FR)
12:10 to 13:40	Lunch break	
13:40 to 14:10	Technical Summary of Key Conclusions of Workshop	Ms. Catherine Paul, GCCA GSF
14:10 to 14:20	Introduction to Panel Discussion	Chair – Mr. Simon Maxwell, Executive Chair, Climate and Development Knowledge Network (CDKN).
14:20 to 16:00	Panel discussion “Response to key conclusions from the workshop and looking to the future of the GCCA” Moderated by the Chair, with Q&A opportunity. Panellists will be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government of Ireland, Mr. Noel Casserly, Climate Change Policy, Department of the Environment, Community & Local Government, Ireland • Ethiopia: Mr. Dessalegne Mesfin Fanta, Deputy Director General, Environmental Protection Authority, Ethiopia • European Commission: Mr. Kristian Schmidt, Acting Director, Directorate C Sustainable Growth and Development, Directorate-General for Development and Cooperation EuropeAid (DEVCO). • Nepal: Pr. Pokharel, Executive Director of Alternative Energy Promotion Centre, Ministry of Environment, Science and Technology, Nepal • Cambodia: Dr. Tin Ponlock, Deputy Director General, Department of Administration for Nature Conservation and Protection, Cambodia • EEAS: Mr. Gary Quince, Ambassador to the African Union, Head of EU Delegation to the African Union. 	
16:00 to 16:15	Closing remarks	Mr. Kristian Schmidt, Acting Director, Directorate C Sustainable Growth and Development, Directorate-General for Development and Cooperation EuropeAid (DEVCO), European Commission.

4. WORKING GROUP AND OPEN SPACE METHODOLOGIES

4.1. WORKING GROUPS

The purpose of the working groups within the GLE was to address a series of questions based on the analysis presented in each of the background papers on the five themes of mainstreaming climate change, forest based adaptation and mitigation, disaster risk reduction and coastal zone management, adaptation in agriculture, land and water management and aid delivery modalities and approaches. GLE participants self-selected which working group and language session to join. Facilitators and Rapporteurs were assigned to manage the working groups, document their findings, and prepare combined reporting back to the GLE plenary sessions and for input to GLE reporting and other GCCA publications.

Responses to the questions posed for each working group were developed based on the following framework:

<p>Situation/Challenge(s)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Describe the situation and what were the main challenges encountered?</i> 	<p>Process that helps to address the situation or challenge(s)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>For example the process you are going / went through, the success factors in addressing the situation and related challenges?</i>
<p>Results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>What are the outcomes / results / achievements?</i> • <i>Can you also specify if you have any examples / products (e.g. terms of reference, studies, policies, plans or budget-related documents) that you could share (possibly through the Capacity4Dev platform?)</i> 	<p>Lessons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>What are the lessons learned to date? (please also analyse solutions that did not work, but from which you have learned).</i>

The methodology adopted to share and develop responses to the questions within this framework was based on sub-dividing the working groups into smaller sub-groups, and for members of these sub-groups to select one of the questions of interest and to discuss that question within their group. Exchanges and discussion would then follow, with, at the conclusion, summary responses requested for each part of the framework on a single large note. The whole working group then returns together and these responses are shared, with the facilitator asking for further explanation to amplify the summary responses. Thus for each question and each participant, the aim was to provide a complete story in terms of the framework. From this, others in the working group would engage and solicit more detail and exchanges. The technical outcomes from the working groups, as reported to the GSF plenary, are presented in Section 5.

4.2. OPEN SPACE

The purpose of the Open Space within the GLE programme was to provide the opportunity for participants to propose topics which they themselves would lead discussion on, adopting their own methods and approaches. The concept of, and invitation to participate in, the Open Space session was communicated prior to arrival to participants and during the plenary sessions during day 1 and

the first half of day 2 during the programme. Peter Brinn [GCCA GSF] acted as the Open Space focal point during the GLE. Those topics proposed, which were encouraged to either build on some issues, challenges and lessons from the earlier working group sessions, providing time and space to develop further some ideas that may have emerged during the working group session, or to introduce some new topics that have overall relevance to the GCCA, were then presented to all participants in Plenary in the *Market Place* on the afternoon of day 2 of the GLE. Those topics with enough popularity from the floor, as registered by a (non-binding) show of hands, were then to be taken forward for inclusion in the Open Space on the morning of day 3. No formal reporting back was included in the GLE agenda, as use of media such as Cap4Dev was encouraged to capture and continue the Open Space topic discussions.



Based on interest and proposed topics from the participants, and in consultation with Peter Brinn, a total of 13 topics were presented from the floor during the Market Place. All of the topics displayed enough interest to be included within the Open Space session, the details of which are presented in Section 5.3.

5. SESSION SUMMARIES

5.1. SETTING THE SCENE

Following the welcome and opening of the Global Learning Event (GLE) by Dr. Pasca-Palmer, and an outline of the main highlights and activities within the GLE agenda by Dr. Mark Futter, Paul

Renier presented on “*Key developments of the GCCA*”. Mr Renier’s presentation³ provided background on the elaboration of the GCCA as an initiative to tackle the combined challenge of the fight against poverty and climate change⁴, before moving onto summarising the activities that had been undertaken to date to support delivery of the aims and objectives of the GCCA. He then moved onto to pose a number of key issues that are being discussed within EuropeAid and wider in the EC, on the future direction of the GCCA, and which the GLE offers the opportunity for some of the GCCA’s key stakeholders to respond to. These are presented below:

- **Target countries:** These have been LDC and SIDS to date that have benefitted from GCCA contributions between 2008 and 2013; the list is slowly being exhausted: What approach for post 2013: Does this include opening up to other “most vulnerable countries”? What criteria should be used? Do we need to consider absorption capacity?
- **Policy dialogue:** joint declarations, what next? How do we maximise their impact? Joint technical group at regional level to ensure follow-up? Or regional technical sessions between negotiators and development practitioners to align “field actions” with “negotiations”?
- How can the GCCA best contribute to national efforts at a **strategic, (cross)sector-wide level** (e.g. mainstreaming, integrated approaches, budget support)?
- What **modalities and/or approaches** used by the GCCA have proven most successful in supporting **alignment** with national strategies, systems and procedures? How so?
- To what extent are **pilot or demonstration projects** important to developing countries help address climate change? How do they complement work at a more strategic, (cross)sector-wide level?
- What about the importance of **applied research**, data collection and management?
- How to best support **long-term institutional strengthening** and capacity building in relation to climate change?
- What **future** for the GCCA?, which **direction(s)** should the GCCA take over the coming years, and What should be the **priorities** of the GCCA (e.g. thematic priorities, aid delivery modalities and approaches, target beneficiaries)?
- How can the GCCA best **complement** other initiatives?

Following Paul Renier’s presentation and the video of the GCCA supported intervention in Guyana (see Section 6.1), Jos Delbeke presented a wider overview and update on the status of EU climate policy at the international level. Mr. Delbeke’s presentation was centred on five topics: (i) what the EU has done and is doing to reduce GHG⁵ emissions, (ii) prospects and challenges associated with the upcoming UNFCCC Climate Change Conference at Doha, (iii) comments on the Adaptation Framework, (iv) comments on the Green Climate Fund and, (v) the role of the GCCA in the climate change landscape. His comments are summarised below:

i. What has been achieved by the EU

The EU has delivered on all of its original commitments under the Kyoto Protocol (KP), with respect to emission reductions and financial support. The EU is also pledged to continue this through the KP Second Commitment Period. On emissions reductions within the EU, the EU has launched a number of flagship initiatives that include the following:

- Emission Trading Scheme (ETS) focussed on the power, steel, and cement manufacturing sectors for example, continues to bring down emissions

³ Available at: <http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/gcca-community/documents>

⁴ Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament: Building a Global Climate Change Alliance between the European Union and poor developing countries most vulnerable to climate change: Brussels, 18.9.2007 COM(2007) 540 final <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2007:0540:FIN:EN:PDF>

⁵ GHG: Greenhouse gas

- Cars, with new energy efficiency standards that are the most stringent in the world, most ambitious emission standard of 95g/km
- Renewables: by 2020 with target of 20% of energy produced by renewables
- Energy efficiency: The Energy Efficiency Directive was approved by the European Parliament on the 11th September 2012.⁶

However, it is recognised that more needs to be done to strengthen the ETS, as the price of carbon remains too low due to a lack of demand.

ii. Preparing for the UNFCCC Doha conference

At the UNFCCC Durban conference, a step was taken by the EU and other committed parties to look beyond Kyoto and develop a regime that includes existing major GHG emitters as well as emerging economies such as China, India, Brazil and South Africa. Their inclusion reflects the changing economic landscape since the Kyoto Protocol in the late 1990s. At this time, the EU contributed 20% of global GHG emissions – this is now down to 11%, while China's per capita emissions now equal those of the EU.

It is therefore clear that Europe can only go forward to address climate change if major emitters also take on emission reduction commitments. At the Doha conference, the EU is looking for wider agreement on the 2nd Kyoto commitment period, and the taking forward of the Durban Platform, to be defined by 2015 and become effective in 2020.

The negotiations will not be easy, but the strong EU commitment to the process remains.

iii. The Adaptation Framework

The Adaptation Framework is a critical element for LDC and SIDS to address the challenges of climate change. In Doha, the ambition is to have an agreement on how to develop national adaptation plans (NAPs) with modalities and guidelines. These documents are important to move away from a piecemeal approach and develop programmatic long term approaches to adaptation, moving to integration into national policies and plans. The NAPs also aim to facilitate funding prioritization. Negotiations in Doha will need to come to an agreement on their structure and contents to achieve these aims.

iv. The Green Climate Fund

At the Copenhagen CoP, there was an important pledge that by 2020 there would be funds of US\$100 billion / year to provide financial support to adapt to, and mitigate climate change. New institutions are being created to operationalize this commitment, including the Green Climate Fund (GCF). Contributions will be sought from donor countries, the private sector and the carbon market. The GCF now needs to define detailed management arrangements and set up management structures to launch in 2020, and determine how it will make use of existing multi-national financial institutions to deliver these funds.

v. The role of the GCCA

The GCCA focus on LDC and SIDS as most vulnerable countries to climate change is important, as is its innovative approach to combining different sources of finance, supporting REDD+, CDM, as well as partner country planning capacity and capabilities, with associated reporting and monitoring. This latter issue is important, as there is a strong insistence on monitoring, reporting and verification (MRV) and delivery to make the case for donations on both adaptation and mitigation. DRR and forest management, which are also GCCA priorities, also have an absolute importance. There are

⁶ [European Parliament voted in favour of the Energy Efficiency Directive on 11 September 2012](#)

existing and developing linkages between the GCCA, fast start funding (FSF) and GCF, which are going to grow in importance.

At this time there is an on-going political debate between Member States, European institutions and the European Parliament on the next funding round of the EU's budget from 2014 to 2020. The EC has tabled that 20% of the future budget should be dedicated to "climate-relevant" interventions on both international and domestic issues, which is (directly and indirectly) quadruple from last budget. The EC needs to explore how best to use this money to "leverage" other financial resources from EU MSs and other global funds. The UNFCCC Doha meeting is important for this.

In the Q&A slot that followed, a number of themes emerged from the questions that were raised from the floor. These are summarised below:

- GCCA: (a) It was restated that the GCCA is an initiative with no time limit, but that funding is provided from the EU financial framework, as well as contributions from EU Member States. In this regard, the GCCA has not been as successful as originally foreseen in gaining financial support from a wider range of EU Member States. However, those that have contributed continue to support the initiative, and with more stories of successful implementation from the existing programme of intervention, it is up to GCCA managers to attract these funds. (b) There has been limited uptake of supported interventions related to the carbon market / CDM, which reflects the challenges LDC / SIDS face to enter this market, as well as the need for more active engagement with the private sector. (c) The GCCA also supports developing absorptive capacity in partner countries, which in the future could include a greater role for national universities as a means to deliver this. (d) In terms of disbursement of funds, the GCCA formulation process seeks to align with national priorities and harmonise with other donors. This takes time for approvals to be sought and given.
- The UNFCCC Climate Change Conference in Doha: Dealing with countries such as the USA, India and China on the UNFCCC negotiations is challenging. Each is active within their borders and in particular sectors associated with technological developments, but at the international level they adopt a tough stance. For Doha, the EU is looking for the G77 Group (which includes Brazil, China, India and South Africa as members) to take a more active approach. If there is failure at the Doha CoP, this could jeopardise the UN-based multilateral approach to which the EU is committed, as well as make any concerted approach to control climate change impossible. If this is an outcome, then EU policy will have to reflect this.
- The Adaptation Framework: Concerns were expressed from the participants from GCCA partner countries regarding the move from NAPAs to NAPs and what this could mean in terms of delaying implementation of priority activities as already identified in the NAPAs. It was restated that the aim of the NAPs is to develop a more programmatic approach to adaptation, and move away from the ad-hoc NAPAs, so that there are linkages and integration with national plans and strategies. In some cases, NAPAs already do this, but there are countries where this is not the case; sharing of good practice will assist in minimising any reworking that may be required. The GCCA already supports the implementation of projects identified in NAPAs, but also seeks to move to a more strategic approach and processes leading to climate change mainstreaming. NAPs are therefore part of this process. Nevertheless, there was a sense of frustration on the insufficient provision of funds to support climate change adaptation measures.
- The Carbon Market and CDM: As noted earlier, the uptake of CDM related activities within the GCCA has been limited. In addition to these comments, it is clear that at the moment, there is a global lack of demand for CDM generated carbon credits, and therefore the role of

CDM in the EU ETS during the Kyoto Second Commitment Period is expected to be small. Europe is too small a market to absorb all the certified emissions reductions (CER) being generated under CDM, particularly from China and India. Further opening up of the ETS to more CERs would result in even lower carbon prices – in this respect there is a need for others to enter the market, create demand and lift the prices. One route to provide more access to developing countries is to widen the scope for forest carbon credits to enter the market, which however is unlikely before 2020. Indeed, this requires credible methodologies and procedures for MRV.

- Monitoring, Reporting and Verification: As well as being an important issue to allow access to, and growth, of the carbon market, the need and requirement for credible MRV is a crucial issue for the future success of the GCF. Beneficiaries of funds must be able to demonstrate that adaptation is actually taking place and that mitigation measures are working. This will determine the amount of funds committed in the future.

5.2. BACKGROUND PAPERS AND WORKING GROUPS

As outlined in Section 1, five background papers were prepared during the months preceding the GLE, and circulated to the participants prior to the GLE. In addition, as a result of the analysis undertaken, a number of questions were developed for consideration by the participants during the thematic working groups, using the methodology as summarised in Section 4.1.



To support this process, a number of speakers were invited to review these papers and bring their own wider international experience and insights to the table to inform thematic working groups. These speakers also acted as facilitators for their working groups (either English or French), with

support from other members of the GSF team and DEVCO C2, and reported back the combined English and French working group findings to a plenary session on the afternoon of day 2. These summary findings are presented below for each explored theme in turn, noting that each opening presentation is available on the Cap4Dev platform at <http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/gcca-community/documents>, with more detailed text also available at the same location on Cap4Dev. It should be noted that the topics summarised here for each of the five themes reflect the views of the participants, as recorded and summarised by the session facilitators and rapporteurs.

5.2.1. Mainstreaming climate change into national development planning

For the mainstreaming theme, the following five topics emerged from the discussions and exchanges that took place within the working groups:

- Topic 1: A progression from projects to programmes and strategies is desirable, although each level presents its own challenges. This progression has implications for implementation, planning and finance.
- Topic 2: Mainstreaming requires practical procedures that work in different organisational contexts.
- Topic 3: Building capacity is a precondition for successful climate change responses. It underpins all scales of planning and implementation, and must not be confused with holding a workshop or training course.
- Topic 4: An adequate and shared knowledge base is a key precondition for success. Who knows what? What are critical knowledge gaps given the climate change objectives of the country in question? Do those who lack critical knowledge "know that they don't know"? If not, how can this be addressed? What is the decision context in which this knowledge will be used?
- Topic 5: Coordination between climate change actors is often mentioned as a key aspect of mainstreaming. It comprises international coordination among donors, regional coordination across countries with shared experiences and needs, and coordination between regions and localities within nations. Coordination requires more than engaging in dialogue and issuing joint declarations. For mainstreaming to be effective, it must instead underpin climate change response actions at diverse levels, including analysis, policy, strategy and operations.



5.2.2. Addressing climate change through forest based mitigation and adaptation

For the forest-related theme, the following seven topics emerged from the discussions and exchanges that took place within the working groups:

- Topic 1: Sustainability of forest-based interventions can be improved through measures that encourage the participation of local communities, engagement and working with local authorities and NGOs, and involvement of the private sector. Projects that deliver short and medium term benefits to these key stakeholders will have greater success
- Topic 2: Forest information systems are needed to monitor trends both negative and positive. These systems offer greatest benefits when operated transparently, are based on relatively simple designs, with long term technical assistance on operation, maintenance and enhancement.
- Topic 3: Capacity development needs in the forest sector are not unique. However, they are best addressed based on well-defined objectives and a good diagnosis of needs across all stakeholders. These needs require regular review as new drivers come to the fore. An immediate priority area is data collection and analysis. However, training is required on a recurrent basis, as well as the provision of other incentives to minimise staff turnover.
- Topic 4: Institutional and coordination arrangements are key for sustainable forest management. Clearly defined institutional responsibilities and boundaries are to be encouraged, with new interventions integrated into existing structures, thereby supporting development of institutional memory. The value of nesting arrangements under REDD+, in particular the role of regional programmes is an area for further discussion.
- Topic 5: Financing through forest carbon credits may be attractive at first sight, but is not always feasible or even desirable.
- Topic 6: Experience from aid delivery and implementation modalities adopted by the GCCA has highlighted the importance of alignment with national policy planning and institutions and structures. GCCA programmes have played an important role in “gap filling”, through which the pooling of resources can address capacity issues in partner countries. They have also offered flexibility to address needs as they have developed within a programme.

5.2.3. Addressing climate change through disaster risk reduction and coastal zone management

For the DRR- and CZM-related theme, the following five topics emerged from the discussions and exchanges that took place within the working groups.

- Topic 1: Institutional and coordination arrangements require significant investment in time and resources, and these should be provided. In developing GCCA supported programmes with a focus on CZM, it might be most appropriate for such an intervention to focus on enabling activities and outcomes.
- Topic 2: Data management is important for CZM and DRR, as they require large quantities of data and associated data management and analysis skills. Capacity constraints are also common, and need to be addressed through a range of measures.
- Topic 3: Stakeholder involvement and consultations should be more systematic, identifying issues that may hinder community participation and need to be addressed, and developing community confidence and buy-in.
- Topic 4: Project design and sustainability-related considerations should consider either infrastructure or ecosystem-based approaches, with an appropriate and sufficiently rigorous evidence base to consider all approaches. Where managed retreat is considered an option in high-risk areas, approaches to support gradual resettlement should be explored and encouraged.
- Topic 5: Aid delivery and implementation modalities continue to require attention, focussing on donor coordination and harmonisation. This should start during programme design and include activities in the field of CZM, DRR and climate change.



5.2.4. Adapting to climate change: agriculture, land and water management

For the climate change adaptation theme, the following seven topics emerged from the discussions and exchanges that took place within the working groups:

- Topic 1: NAPAs have played an important role in providing an initial framework for GCCA funded interventions. However it may be appropriate in moving forward to develop closer relationships between NAPAs and longer term development strategies.
- Topic 2: Stakeholder engagement should be included at all stages of project / programme design, starting early and continuing at appropriate intervals during a project / programme. This should include local government, CSO and NGO and importantly private sector representation, which is often missing. This wide and on-going consultation offers benefits in terms of sustainability and capturing traditional knowledge, and selection of implementation partners.
- Topic 3: National level coordination is needed to support donor alignment and harmonisation, but this also needs to reflect the international and regional as well as sub-national systems and structures. The jury was “out” on whether to a single climate change department or climate change embedded within multiple government departments with a high level co-ordinating body.
- Topic 4: Learning and capacity building is maximised through well designed pilots and demonstration projects. Such projects have good monitoring and reporting systems, with collected data and information available to interested parties in country. It is also important that the role and use of external experts is carefully managed so that knowledge is not lost when their input comes to an end.
- Topic 5: Other issues raised included the significance of adopting ecosystem based adaptation approaches and understanding linkages between climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction and the costs and benefits of preparedness.



5.2.5. Aid delivery modalities and approaches

For the aid delivery modalities theme, the following five topics emerged from the discussions and exchanges that took place within the working groups.

- Topic 1: On issues of alignment, it was noted that national and donor calendars can influence selected approaches for implementation modality, for example, where funds are available in a country where there is no time to allow budget support readiness, this is likely to limit implementation to project approach alone. However, where budget support can be adopted, then it is important that the climate dimension is not lost, and this can be supported in the selection of indicators.
- Topic 2: Harmonisation continues to present challenges. This ranges from the different administrative approaches and requirements of different donors, as well as the lack of capacity with partner countries to address each donor's administrative requirements. These challenges can be addressed through strong national coordination mechanisms and strategies already in place to coordinate and direct donor funding.
- Topic 3: The agreement on the selection of indicators was debated. In the case of general budget support, this is mainly associated with process indicators, while some countries are looking at the use of outcome indicators. Confidence in the database on which indicators are developed can be an issue, and here the GCCA can support both primary data collection / and setting up of monitoring systems, and discussions on the selection and setting of SMART⁷ indicators.
- Topic 4: Management issues both within partner governments and the EU Delegations can have both positive and negative impacts. For example, use of TA within a wider budget support programme can assist with, as noted above, the definition of indicators. Sometimes the lack of awareness of procedures within EU Delegations can hamper the selection of the most appropriate modality and missed opportunities, as can the tight calendar for GCCA funding approvals within the EC's programming deadlines.
- Topic 5: General issues raised included the benefits from the GCCA regional mainstreaming workshops and the Global Learning Event itself in offering networking opportunities for informal knowledge exchange on aid delivery modalities as well as wider issues.

⁷ Specific, measurable, available at a reasonable cost, relevant to the needs of decision makers, time-bound.

5.3. OPEN SPACE

For the Open Space session, 13 topics were proposed and led by GLE participants. There were 9 English and 4 French language participant led topics, and the session was arranged such that there were two French language topics in each of the two rounds of Open Space discussions. The two rounds consisted of the following topics:

Round 1

Topic Title	Proposer
Formulation of sustainable development goals (ENG)	Qazi AHMAD (Bangladesh)
Climate Change and National Heritage (ENG)	Mary Ann Gooden (Jamaica)
Training on mainstreaming (FR)	Isabelle MAMATY (CSF)
Great Green Wall (FR)	Mamadi GAOURANG (Chad)
Informing Research (ENG)	Frank RAES (JRC)
Climate Finance (ENG)	Frances REUPENA (Samoa) / Joy HECHT (CSF)
Locally managed climate change adaptation networks (ENG)	Sarah HEMSTOCK (USP)

Round 2

Topic Title	Proposer
Managing competing donor-driven climate change activities at a national and regional level (ENG)	Pasha CARRUTHERS (SPC)
GCCA project efficiency: leveraging the private sector (FR)	Quentin DUCENNE (REFORCO Director, DRC)
Responsive funding options for GCCA? (ENG)	Jules SIEDENBURG (GSF STE)
How to create a regional GCCA community / networks (ENG)	Gillian CAMBERS (SPC)
Maladaptation in the implementation of policies against the adverse effects of climate change (FR)	Wai NADJI TELLRO (Chad)
Property rights issues in the face of climate change (ENG)	Siran BENT (Jamaica)

There are noticeable “clusters” among around the participants who proposed and led the discussions on these topics. Four of the topics were proposed by participants from the Pacific, and two each from Chad and Jamaica. One came from Bangladesh, with the remainder from GCCA stakeholders and implementing partners.

There was no formal plenary reporting back from the Open Space sessions, as they were very much self-organised. Throughout the preparation of the session, it was repeatedly made clear that for

reporting and further discussion, use of the Cap4Dev platform GCCA Community was encouraged [<http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/gcca-community/blogs>].

5.4. TECHNICAL SUMMARY OF KEY CONCLUSIONS FROM THE GLE

The technical summary of the key conclusions from the GLE was prepared in consultation between the GSF and EuropeAid during the morning of day 3, based on analysis of the five themed working groups and other insights drawn from discussions during the first two days of the GLE.

The presentation of key technical conclusions started with a reminder of conference objectives and of the search for synergies between policy dialogue and technical/financial support, which is a hallmark of the GCCA initiative. It then moved on to the presentation of key conclusions, structured around a number of cross-cutting themes that emerged from working group sessions.

Theme 1: Pilot and demonstration projects

- Ensuring adequate ownership by local stakeholders is essential for the success of pilot and demonstration projects.
- A good monitoring system is needed to ensure lessons from implementation are learned, widely disseminated and used to support scaling-up.
- Developing a technical package is a common approach, but exploring up-scaling delivery modes is less frequently part of a pilot programme – and yet may significantly affect chances of replication.
- The ability to scale up pilot and demonstration projects also depends on the existence of effective sectoral and cross-sectoral programming mechanisms, which are often missing.
- The setting up of a climate change trust fund can help establish a faster pipeline for financing and/or replicating pilot actions.
- Synergies must be sought between field activities and other programme components (e.g. use project findings to inform policy-making and capacity building efforts; use institutional

strengthening, capacity building activities, research and data collection/management activities to create a favourable environment for field activities).

Theme 2: Applied research, monitoring, data collection and management

- Consolidating existing data and information should be the starting point, as this supports the definition of needs and clear objectives in relation to research, data collection and management.
- When developing data management systems, it is recommended to:
 - avoid excessive complexity (thus ensuring systems can be operated with national resources);
 - make adequate provisions for support and maintenance – throughout and beyond project duration.
- The knowledge base needs to be developed in particular with regard to:
 - how development activities ensure resilience to future climate change;
 - the costs and benefits of various adaptation options and strategies.
- Specific efforts must be made to ensure that collected data, the results of analytical work performed on available data and research findings remain in the country and are widely shared and available.

Theme 3: Supporting a transition from NAPAs to adaptation strategies to climate change mainstreaming

- NAPAs, which are based on a project approach, were developed to meet urgent needs. However, a strategic approach to the response to climate change is better at making links and ensuring synergies with development goals, so a progression from projects to programmes and full-fledged climate change strategies is desirable. There is evidence that this transition is happening, although not at the same pace, and with different approaches across countries.
- Building on NAPAs to develop a climate change strategy is a frequently cited goal, but in practice only a few NAPAs have migrated into effective programmatic planning.
- There is no consensus on whether climate change should be addressed as a “sector” (climate change strategies) or a “cross-cutting issue” (cross-sectoral mainstreaming approach). Developing countries use both approaches.
- There is little practical experience as to how effective climate change strategies are in shaping development planning. This consideration may support the case for mainstreaming.
- Mainstreaming requires practical procedures that work in different organisational contexts. Rules and procedures can support climate mainstreaming into decision-making processes – but if inadequate can also act as barriers.
- There is little experience so far on mainstreaming climate change into budgetary, monitoring and evaluation systems.

Theme 4: Long-term institutional and capacity strengthening

- A proper assessment of needs and constraints must underpin all institutional and capacity building efforts.
- This in turns helps set out clear objectives (institutional and capacity building for whom, to achieve what and when?).
- High-level political support for addressing climate change is essential. GCCA programmes can play a role in this regard, through sensitisation and advocacy activities.
- National authorities should be supported in setting up effective institutional and coordination arrangements. There is no blueprint for such arrangements: what works in one country may not work in another one, as institutional arrangements must be rooted in a specific context that takes account of existing structures and mechanisms. In particular, there are no conclusions on whether it is best to have a climate change department or agency, or to embed climate change management in multiple departments with a coordinating body at a senior level.
- Coordination is not limited to making declarations or holding meetings. If it is to underpin policy, strategy and operations, it must be a deeply-rooted process that produces concrete achievements.

- Coordination must take place at various levels (international, regional, national, sub-national), with links between systems and processes across levels.
- There are clear benefits to involving local governments, civil society and non-governmental organisations in coordination mechanisms.
- Institutional and capacity building efforts should be focused by priority on organisations expected to play a leadership or coordinating role. Nevertheless, ultimately all stakeholders should be included in capacity building efforts, based on identified needs and priorities.
- Where integrated approaches such as integrated coastal zone management require the setting up of new, complex institutional mechanisms, GCCA interventions may consider addressing specific issues that can contribute to wider institutional building processes (rather than trying to address all aspects simultaneously).
- Capacity strengthening activities should build on past training and capacity development efforts.
- Capacity building is not limited to holding a workshop or training course. It is a long-term process that makes use of a variety of approaches, and requires national commitment and leadership.
- Donors can support (not lead) capacity building efforts. For this support to be successful, a long-term commitment and long-term partnerships are required.
- Capacity mobilisation needs to occur within countries, and not rely excessively on technical assistance and external experts. Nevertheless, TA remains useful if it really supports national processes. Making external experts work with national ones is a good approach.

Theme 5: Aid effectiveness and aid delivery modalities

- Interventions need to be anchored in existing policy, institutional and monitoring frameworks (which is not incompatible with support for their improvement).
- Further donor harmonisation efforts are required.
- Strategic, sectoral approaches should be preferred to *ad hoc* projects. In some countries, the GCCA has been effective as a flexible mechanism to fill gaps between projects and programmes. This has value, but a more strategic approach is more likely to generate long-term impacts. Such a move may notably require an increase in the *effective* duration of programme identification and formulation work, as the short time over which such work is often conducted in practice makes “gap filling” and contributions to on-going initiatives the easiest option.
- The ‘scaling’ of climate finance from projects to sector and national budget support has not been widely achieved so far. Among other possible strategies, developing countries can support such scaling by defining clear strategies and the associated budget needs: even if the budget is not initially funded, quantifying needs in relation to objectives helps make the case for donor support.
- The GCCA should continue to pave the way for increased use of budget support – but make sure that the climate change dimension does not get lost, in particular in general budget support programmes.
- Further work is needed to develop good budget support indicators. The use of “smart” indicators must be reconciled with the requirement to use national indicators. There are issues to be addressed with regard to the reliability, credibility and availability of data.
- The mobilisation of climate finance through the private sector and civil society could be better addressed.
- EC staff and programme managers should make sure that administrative procedures, which are often perceived as heavy and inflexible, do not compromise ownership, alignment and effectiveness.

The (brief) presentation of these technical conclusions was concluded by an overview of possible follow-up actions (including continued networking via the Capacity4Dev platform, use of Climate Support Facility services and the preparation of a publication for the Qatar Conference of the Parties), and a review of key questions on the future of the GCCA to be addressed in the final panel discussion.

PowerPoint presentations of the main technical summary (in English and French) are available on the Cap4Dev platform at: <http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/gcca-community/documents>

5.5. PANEL DISCUSSION

As noted above, the key technical conclusions of the meeting highlighted the importance of:

- The **two pillars** of the GCCA (policy dialogue and experience sharing and technical and financial cooperation)
- Learning and scaling up **pilot or demonstration projects**
- **Applied research, data collection and management** at the national or regional level
- Contributing to **national efforts at a strategic, (cross) sector-wide level** (e.g. climate change mainstreaming into national development planning, budget support)
- **Aid effectiveness**
- Supporting **long-term institutional strengthening and capacity building** in relation to climate change
- Addressing the **future** of the GCCA

The Panel discussion reacted to the key conclusions from the workshop and looked at the future of the GCCA.

The Panel was chaired by Mr. Simon Maxwell, Executive Chair, Climate and Development Knowledge Network (CDKN).

The panel included the following persons:

- Government of Ireland, Mr. Noel Casserly, Climate Change Policy, Department of the Environment, Community & Local Government, Ireland
- Ethiopia: Mr. Dessalegne Mesfin Fanta, Deputy Director General, Environmental Protection Authority, Ethiopia
- European Commission: Mr. K. Schmidt, Acting Director of Directorate C – EuropeAid (DEVCO),
- Nepal: Pr. Pokharel, Executive Director of Alternative Energy Promotion Centre, Ministry of Environment, Science and Technology, Nepal
- Cambodia: Dr. Tin Ponlock, Deputy Director General, Department of Administration for Nature Conservation and Protection, Cambodia
- EEAS: Mr. Gary Quince, Ambassador to the African Union, Head of EU Delegation to the African Union.



Main outcomes included the following:

1. The climate change community must still **make the case** to address climate change, and to do it together with development. In doing so, the case must be relevant, logical (e.g. science based), engaging and positive.
2. Key features of good climate change support include promoting a **strategic approach and long-term institutional strengthening** (e.g. through mainstreaming in national development planning and budgeting) and applying the **aid effectiveness principles** (in particular coordination and alignment). The GCCA is moving in this direction, which is one of the reasons for EU donor support to the initiative (e.g. Ireland : "for a small MS committed to multi-lateral processes, the experience has been positive").
3. The evidence of climate change is becoming compelling and countries are **making progress** in mainstreaming climate change (e.g. Ethiopia) while others are still facing challenges (e.g. on the budgeting and financing sides).
4. Challenges at the country level include **competing priorities, governance (including donor coordination and absorptive capacities), finance (between 2013 and 2020) and implementation**.
5. The GCCA contributes to addressing these challenges, in particular long-term institutional strengthening (e.g. through mainstreaming in national development planning and budgeting) and applying the aid effectiveness principles. It also benefits from a great level of **ownership** and enthusiasm.
6. On this basis, most of the audience is **supporting the continuation of the GCCA building on the achievements and integrating lessons learned to date** (e.g. deeper mainstreaming and institutional strengthening to manage and attract climate finance). The focus on LDCs and SIDS should not be forgotten. Other areas that can also be explored include the role of the private sector, results based management and linking up with successful EU initiative like the ETS.
7. Whatever the future of the GCCA, **mainstreaming into EU development cooperation remains key**.
8. There is also demand for a **more ambitious GCCA** (more comparable to the Climate Investment Funds (CIF), while the GCF is being operationalized) and **a call to more EU member states to join the GCCA**.
9. The future of the GCCA will be assessed over the next months, in particular taking into account the **outcome of Doha**.

6. MULTI-MEDIA ASPECTS

6.1. VIDEOS

As noted in Section 3 (The Final Agenda), three videos were presented during the GLE. These were based on the GCCA supported interventions in Guyana, Tanzania and the Pacific. The videos for Guyana and the Pacific were produced based on filming and interviews undertaken during missions to Guyana and Fiji during May and June 2012 respectively. The Tanzania video was produced in a more collaborative way, based on film prepared by one of the implementing partners in country, with production support provided by the GSF.

In addition to this, video interviews were held with the following contributors: Jos Delbeke, Timothy Clarke, Simon Maxwell, Dr. Tin Ponlock as well as a number of other participants for example Adikarim Toure from Mali and Pasha Carruthers from the Pacific. These interviews were undertaken by journalists from Cap4Dev and will also be made available on the GCCA website and / or the Cap4Dev GCCA Community platform.

6.2. GCCA WEBSITE

In the months preceding the GLE, significant resources were allocated by the GSF to revitalise the GCCA website (<http://www.gcca.eu/>). To “officially” launch the revitalised English version of the website, a slot was included in the programme in the afternoon of day 2. Practical details regarding the GLE, the GLE flyer, as well as copies of the background papers and annex (in English and French), were all made available in the days leading up to the GLE on the revitalised website. It is planned that the French version of the website will be published in early 2013.

6.3. CAP4DEV GCCA COMMUNITY

As one of the main objectives of the GLE was to encourage further exchanges and lesson learning, the availability and use of the GCCA Community on EuropeAid’s Cap4Dev platform was encouraged throughout the three days of the GLE. Participants were encouraged to apply for membership while attending the GLE, presentations were posted to the GCCA Community as soon as possible after they were delivered, while blog strands were created for each of the Open Space topics, to provide a place for reporting back on each of the Open Space slots and future exchanges.

As noted above, the videos presented at the GLE were also published on the GCCA Community page, as was a “Welcome” video from Paul Renier to new members.

7. PARTICIPANT RESPONSE

Evaluation forms were distributed during the morning of day 3, with a request that those completed were returned before participants departed at the end of day 3. Both English and French language versions were available. The event was well received by the majority of participants, with an average score of 4.18 from 5.00 for the overall appreciation of the GLE. Details regarding the participant evaluation scores are presented in Annex I.



Global Climate Change Alliance (GCCA) Support Facility

Global Learning Event – Annexes

ANNEX I – PARTICIPANT EVALUATION

PROCESS

Evaluation forms were distributed during the morning of day 3, with a request that those completed were returned before participants departed at the end of day 3. Both English and French language versions were available. In total 52 forms were returned, 41 in English, 10 in French and 1 bilingual⁸. In terms of organisation type, 50 of the respondents provided this information. The detailed breakdown was 29 were national representatives involved in the implementation / management of a GCCA programme, 6 were regional representatives involved in the implementation / management of a GCCA programme, 3 were from a regional organisation not directly involved in the implementation / management of a GCCA programme, 4 were from an international organisation, 4 were EU staff, 1 from an EU Member State and 2 others. Two respondents, one a national representative involved in the implementation / management of a GCCA programme and one from a regional organisation not directly involved in the implementation / management of a GCCA programme also classified themselves as from an international organisation. There were more evaluations scores returned for round 1 of the Open Space session (47) than for round 2 (30), which may reflect the timing of the distribution of the evaluation forms.

QUANTITATIVE RESULTS

The following results, presented in Table A1, were obtained (scores correspond to the following: 5 = excellent, 4 = good, 3 = reasonable, 2 = poor, 1 = very poor) (*means ≥ 4 shown in green; 3.5-3.99 in blue*). Note that standard deviations of the scores received for the Open Space topics have not been calculated, given the small sample sizes.

Table A1: Summary of Evaluation Scores for the GCCA Global Learning Event

CRITERION / SCORES RECEIVED	5	4	3	2	1	MEAN	S.D. ⁹
Overall appreciation of Global Learning Event	12	28	4	0	0	4.18	0.58
How do you rate the following sessions and activities of the Global Learning Event							
Thematic presentation-mainstreaming	16	27	3	1	0	4.23	0.67
Thematic presentation-forests	11	26	6	0	0	4.12	0.63
Thematic presentation- DRR	12	25	9	0	0	4.07	0.68
Thematic presentation- adaptation	17	21	5	0	0	4.28	0.67
Thematic presentation- aid delivery	14	22	4	1	0	4.20	0.71
Working Group 1 - mainstreaming (EN /FR)	9	20	5	1	0	4.06	0.73

⁸This was an English language form, with responses to open questions completed in French. This form was therefore considered to be in the French group.

⁹Standard deviation.

CRITERION / SCORES RECEIVED	5	4	3	2	1	MEAN	S.D. ⁹
Working Group 2 - forests (EN /FR)	4	15	2	2	0	3.91	0.79
Working Group 3 - DRR (EN/ FR)	2	17	2	0	0	4.00	0.45
Working Group 4 - adaptation (EN/FR)	8	11	2	0	0	4.29	0.64
Working Group 5 - aid delivery (EN/FR)	6	18	4	0	0	4.07	0.60
Guyana video	21	24	4	0	0	4.35	0.63
Pacific video	15	22	3	0	0	4.30	0.61
Jamaica video ¹⁰	10	15	6	2	0	4.00	0.87
Tanzania video	19	24	6	0	0	4.27	0.67
Panel Discussion	11	23	4	0	0	4.18	0.61
Open Space							
Formulation of sustainable development goals (ENG)	3	5	0	0	0	4.38	n/c
Climate change and national heritage (ENG)	1	3	0	0	0	4.25	n/c
Training on mainstreaming (FR)	1	3	0	0	0	4.25	n/c
Great Green Wall (FR)	4	2	0	0	0	4.67	n/c
Informing Research (ENG)	2	2	0	0	0	4.50	n/c
Climate Finance (ENG)	1	5	1	1	0	3.75	n/c
Locally managed climate change adaptation networks (ENG)	6	5	0	0	0	4.55	n/c
Managing competing donor-driven climate change activities at a national and regional level (ENG)	2	2	0	0	0	4.50	n/c
GCCA project efficiency: leverage private sector (FR)	0	2	0	1	0	3.33	n/c
Responsive funding options for GCCA? (ENG)	1	1	0	0	0	4.50	n/c
How to create a regional GCCA community / networks(ENG)	3	3	1	0	0	4.29	n/c
Maladaptation in the implementation of policies against the adverse effects of climate change. (FR)	2	5	0	0	0	4.29	n/c
Property rights issues in the face of climate change (ENG)	2	2	1	0	0	4.20	n/c
Unattached scores	0	3	0	0	0	4.00	n/c
Pooled scores	27	43	5	2	0	4.23	0.69
Overall evaluation of the Global Learning Event							
Quality of presentations in plenary	19	27	5	0	0	4.27	0.63
Quality of discussions in plenary	10	28	12	0	0	3.96	0.67

¹⁰ Video replaced by Powerpoint based presentation on GCCA supported programme in Jamaica.

CRITERION / SCORES RECEIVED	5	4	3	2	1	MEAN	S.D. ⁹
Quality of working groups	11	30	8	1	0	4.02	0.68
Size of working groups	12	24	12	2	0	3.92	0.80
Quality of discussions in working groups	12	24	11	0	0	4.02	0.71
Balance between plenary and working groups	8	29	11	1	0	3.90	0.68
Appreciation of your own learning	18	23	8	0	0	4.20	0.71
Usefulness for your daily work	14	24	7	2	0	4.06	0.79
General organisation and logistics	19	26	5	0	0	4.28	0.64

Note: n/c = not calculated

As can be seen, most of the mean scores (35 of 41 scores) are above 4.00 (i.e. between “good” and “excellent”). Some of the highlights include the following:

Overall appreciation of the GLE: As the GLE progressed, the collaborative atmosphere and active engagement of participants was very evident. The pooled mean evaluation score for this is 4.18, with 4.24 for the English group respondents and 4.00 from the French. These are very encouraging results.

Thematic presentations: The pooled mean evaluation scores for these presentations are all above 4.00, even with the range of presenters and presentational styles.

Working Groups: The pooled mean evaluation scores for all of the working groups, except Forests, are all above 4.00, even with the range of presenters and presentational styles. There are exceptionally high scores above 4.50 for the French language Adaptation and Aid Delivery Working Groups.

Videos: The pooled mean evaluation scores for all of the videos, except Jamaica, which was replaced by a presentation, are all above 4.25. It is noticeable that the French language scores were lower than the English language scores. This reflects the lack of French language videos, and is something that clearly needs to be addressed, given their very positive response from GLE participants.

Panel Discussion: This was also well received, with a pooled mean evaluation score of 4.18.

Open Space: This was again well received, with a pooled mean evaluation score of 4.23.

Overall evaluation of the Global Learning Event: The highest score here was for “General organisation and logistics” at 4.28, which reflects the time and resources that was invested in the planning and preparation for the GLE by the GSF Backstopping Team. What is also very encouraging was that the next highest score was for the criterion “Appreciation of your own learning” at 4.23, which strongly aligns with the objectives of the GLE.

Session and activities as well as criteria with scores below 4.00 in Table A1 are commented on below:

Working Group 2 - forests (EN /FR)

The pooled mean evaluation score for this group was 3.91, but with a wide difference between the English and French language groups of 3.78 and 4.40 respectively. Both groups were relatively

small, as the Mainstreaming theme was more popular for the participants in this working group slot. The reasons for the difference in the scores may reflect the lack of GCCA project experience in the English language group compared to the French language group, and also the differences in the how the working groups were organised i.e. English group was sub-divided into 3 sub-groups while the smaller French group size worked as a single group for the discussions and participant exchanges. In doing so, the limited GCCA and other experiences for sharing in the working groups were not diluted and all of the experiences within the group were shared with all the participants. For small groups, this approach should be considered in future events.

Open Space: Climate Finance (ENG)

The mean evaluation score for this Open Space discussion was 3.75. However, as shown in Table A1, this score is based on 8 returns, with scores ranging from 2 (1 no.) to 5 (1 no.), with most returns providing a score of 4 (5 no.). Most of the returns were either 4 or 5, and the mean score of less than 4.00 reflects the 1 low evaluation score of 2 on the mean value. Thus, the vast majority of the attendees who provided evaluation scores found this Open Space discussion either “Excellent” or “Good”.

Open Space: GCCA project efficiency: leverage private sector (FR)

The mean evaluation score for this Open Space discussion was 3.33. This is based on one of the smallest sample sizes for the Open Space assessments of only 3 respondent scores, 2 no. of score 4, and 1 of score 2. Given the small sample size, it is difficult to draw any concrete conclusions regarding this Open Space discussion.

Overall evaluation of the Global Learning Event: Quality of discussions in plenary

The pooled mean evaluation score for this criterion is 3.96, and is very similar for both the English and French language groups, at 3.95 and 4.00 respectively. These scores may reflect feedback comments to the open questions that suggested the need for longer time for question and answer slots in the plenary sessions, as well as the need for the session chairs to keep to time and ensure speakers / questioners from the floor kept to the point with their interventions.

Overall evaluation of the Global Learning Event: Size of working groups

The pooled mean evaluation score for this criterion is 3.92, but in this case, different scores from the English and French language groups of 3.88 and 4.10 respectively. These different scores very likely reflect the large size of the English working groups compared to those for the French language sessions. This was an issue related to the availability of both working group rooms and possibly the availability of additional facilitator and rapporteurs. This was especially the case for the very large Mainstreaming English Working Group on day 1 that had to remain in the plenary conference room, and on day 2 when the Adaptation and Aid Modality Working Groups had to share the same plenary conference room on day 2. The difference in the two language groups is also seen in the criterion “*Quality of discussions in working groups*” which has mean scores of 3.92 and 4.44 for the English and French groups respectively, and can be considered to also reflect this issue. For future events, with a similar number of participants it would be prudent to book a larger number of larger capacity rooms, so that this issue can be addressed, as well as being prepared to call upon more facilitators and rapporteurs to run these working groups.

Overall evaluation of the Global Learning Event: Balance between plenary and working groups

The pooled mean evaluation score for this criterion is 3.90, with the same scores for both the English and French language groups. These scores may reflect feedback comments to the open questions that suggested spending more time in future GLEs on the working groups and less on plenary sessions.

Some differences were observed between the English and French language respondents. The evaluation scores for these two groups are presented in Table A2, as well as the overall evaluation scores for each of the criterion, noting that the Open Space scores are pooled for each language group. For the overall appreciation of the Global Learning Event, there was a 0.24 difference in the mean scores, with the English respondents' score of 4.24, compared to the French respondents' score of 4.00. For the session and activities, it is noticeable that all of the French respondents have higher mean scores for their working groups than the equivalent English working groups. The greatest differences in the scores between the two groups were associated with the Forests and Aid Delivery working groups. For the videos, it is also noticeable that the English respondents gave higher mean scores to these than the French respondents. For the panel discussion, the mean scores were close. For the scores associated with the overall evaluation of the Global Learning Event, these were similar except for those based around the working groups (size and quality of discussions) with higher scores for the French respondents. These differences are discussed later in Section 11.

Table A2: Comparison of Overall, English and French Global Learning Event Evaluation Scores

CRITERION / SCORES RECEIVED	ENG Group (n = 42)	FR Group (n = 11)	Overall (n = 53)
Overall appreciation of the Global Learning Event	4.24	4.00	4.18
How do you rate the following sessions and activities of the Global Learning Event			
Thematic presentation-mainstreaming	4.31	4.00	4.23
Thematic presentation-forests	4.09	4.20	4.12
Thematic presentation- DRR	4.11	3.90	4.07
Thematic presentation- adaptation	4.28	4.27	4.28
Thematic presentation- aid delivery	4.19	4.20	4.20
Working Group 1 - mainstreaming (EN /FR)	4.00	4.25	4.06
Working Group 2 - forests (EN /FR)	3.78	4.40	3.91
Working Group 3 - DRR (EN/ FR)	3.94	4.20	4.00
Working Group 4 - adaptation (EN/FR)	4.19	4.60	4.29
Working Group 5 - aid delivery (EN/FR)	4.00	4.67	4.07
Guyana video	4.49	3.80	4.35

CRITERION / SCORES RECEIVED	ENG Group (n = 42)	FR Group (n = 11)	Overall (n = 53)
Pacific video	4.45	3.78	4.30
Jamaica video ¹⁰	4.11	3.50	4.00
Tanzania video	4.34	4.00	4.27
Panel Discussion	4.17	4.25	4.18
Open Space			
Pooled Scores (ENG, FR, Overall (including unattached) Sessions)	4.30	4.10	4.23
Overall evaluation of the Global Learning Event			
Quality of presentations in plenary	4.28	4.27	4.27
Quality of discussions in plenary	3.95	4.00	3.96
Quality of working groups	4.00	4.10	4.02
Size of working groups	3.88	4.10	3.92
Quality of discussions in working groups	3.92	4.44	4.02
Balance between plenary and working groups	3.90	3.90	3.90
Appreciation of your own learning	4.15	4.40	4.20
Usefulness for your daily work	4.03	4.22	4.06
General organisation and logistics	4.33	4.10	4.28

As far as the duration of the GLE is concerned:

- 39 out of 48 respondents to this question found it 'about right';
- 1 found it too long;
- 8 found it too short.

COMMENTS RECEIVED

Comments were received in reply to three open questions on:

- positive comments about the Global Learning Event;
- suggestions for improvement;
- suggestions for a possible follow-up.

Below is a summary of the main themes emerging from the comments received, along with the number of respondents who raised each of these themes (*in brackets*).

Positive comments about the workshop

- Good platform for experience and knowledge sharing (33)
- Good opportunity for networking (14)
- Overall management and logistics (10)
- Usefulness of the Open Space (3)

Suggestions for improvement¹¹

- Revisit working group / open space methodologies and logistics (various including more time for discussions, stronger facilitation, provision of open space “experts”, specific success stories exercise) (17)
- Include technical / project implementation / specific thematic presentations from GCCA supported projects as a means of knowledge and experience sharing (16)
- Invite wider range of stakeholders e.g. CSO / beneficiary representation / private sector (3)
- Improved food options for lunch breaks (5)
- Include sight-seeing tour (5)

In responding to these proposals, with respect to the working groups, these suggestions are sensible, and during the GLE, the methodology adopted for the working groups was developed and adapted to reflect experiences and lessons learnt on day 1 to carry on into day 2. This included a debriefing that was held following the close of day 1 with the GSF GLE team. Thus, on day 2, only one cycle was included in the working groups to reflect the time constraints in the GLE agenda, and the provision of additional rapporteurs was made to record discussions and insights from the working group small group discussions that will contain detail of interest that is likely to be lost in the working group reporting back and reflection sessions. For the open space, all of the participants were requested to propose topics for the open space in advance. Of the two that did, one of these subsequently withdrew. Without knowing the topics in advance it was thus difficult to make available experts to support the discussion. However, for future events, making available additional persons will be considered. Given the full agenda on the three days of the GLE, reporting back on the open space topics would have required perhaps an extra half day in the programme, which will be considered for future events.

The second most popular group of suggestions relate to the inclusion of project specific presentations within the agenda. The approach adopted for the GLE was not to have a series of such presentations as this can result in fewer interactions in comparison to the active engagement that the working groups and open space sessions were seeking to, and did deliver. However, at future GLE, the inclusion of more sector specific or geographically based project discussions could be considered for the agenda, using approaches that encourage active participation from GLE attendees.

The final technically based suggestion (i.e. invite a wider range of stakeholders including CSOs and the private sector) is also an issue worthy of consideration for future events. Their attendance could initially take place at a future regionally based GLE.

¹¹ In a number of cases, suggestions for improvements were actually proposed in the box dedicated to suggestions for a possible follow-up. They are included in the ‘counts’ in this section.

The next two most popular suggestions related to wider food choices, mainly on vegetarian choices, and inclusion of a sight-seeing tour in Brussels. On the first issue, this can be easily addressed at future GLE in the specifications provided to the caterers. For the second event, this might be something to consider for the future through for example, an evening tour through Brussels followed by a dinner rather than the drinks reception that was included in the agenda.

Suggestions for a possible follow-up

- Follow-up Learning Event, with various suggestions for timing (6 months, annual to 2 years' time or when more projects have more to share), locations (in GCCA beneficiary country as alternative to Brussels), participants (wider range of invitees) and objectives (stock taking from this event, more detailed exchanges on regional basis, to inform future GCCA programming, ministerial level policy follow-up at regional and / or global level) (17)
- Promotion of networking and exchanges, through dissemination of GLE summary report, promotion of use of GCCA website and Cap4Dev (7)

In responding to these proposals, with respect to suggestions for follow-up, there was a clear request for future learning events, but with a range of objectives, locations, frequency and participants. One of the suggestions was for an event to inform priorities and programming for GCCA activities in the future. Others were focussed on holding either geographically based or sectoral / thematic based events to share experiences, lessons learned or success stories. For a global event, the suggested timing for the next event varied from 6 months to 2 years, or would be based on an assessment of when there were more lessons and experiences to share across the GCCA supported programme. In terms of balancing costs and resources expended, the adoption of a series of regionally based learning events could be considered in the future, given the success of this approach for the “mainstreaming” workshops, with the return of a global event at some point after the regional events have taken place. A cross-regional event for SIDS could also be considered. These options would need to be looked at in the light of the future implementation approaches adopted by the GCCA under the 2014 to 2020 programming and following the outcomes from the upcoming Qatar UNFCCC CoP at the end of November 2012.

Suggested follow-up actions also included the encouragement of further exchanges and lesson sharing through the use of the GCCA website, Cap4Dev and dissemination of a GLE Summary Report. These are all activities that have been agreed for action between EuropeAid and the GSF for implementation following the conclusion of the GLE.