



**UNITED
NATIONS**



**Framework Convention
on Climate Change**

Distr.
GENERAL

FCCC/SBI/2008/14
10 November 2008

Original: ENGLISH

SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR IMPLEMENTATION

Twenty-ninth session

Poznan, 1–10 December 2008

Item 6 (b) of the provisional agenda

Implementation of Article 4, paragraphs 8 and 9, of the Convention

Matters relating to the least developed countries

**Report on the fourteenth meeting of the
Least Developed Countries Expert Group**

Note by the secretariat*

Summary

This document reports on the fourteenth meeting of the Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG), held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, from 29 September to 1 October 2008. It provides a response to the request made by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation, at its twenty-eighth session, for the LEG to report on its progress and show how it has prioritized its work. The report includes a summary of the status of preparation and implementation of national adaptation programmes of action (NAPAs), as provided by the secretariat of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) during the meeting. Discussions held between the LEG, the GEF and two of its agencies on the project approval process and activities of the agencies in NAPA preparation and implementation, are also reported in this document. Results of a survey conducted among least developed country Parties are summarized. Issues discussed at a session between Ethiopia's NAPA team and the LEG to share experiences in the preparation and implementation of that country's NAPA are presented.

* This document was submitted after the due date as a result of the timing of the meeting of the Least Developed Countries Expert Group.

CONTENTS

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. MANDATE	1–2	3
II. SUMMARY OF THE FOURTEENTH MEETING OF THE LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES EXPERT GROUP	3–34	3
A. Proceedings.....	3–5	3
B. Status of preparation and implementation of national adaptation programmes of action	6–10	3
C. Consideration of efforts to facilitate implementation of national adaptation programmes of action	11–32	4
D. Interaction between the Least Developed Countries Expert Group and Ethiopia’s national adaptation programme of action team.....	33–34	10
III. PRIORITY ACTIVITIES FOR IMPLEMENTATION.....	35–36	11

Annexes

I. Priority activities of the work programme of the Least Developed Countries Expert Group, 2008–2010.....	12
II. Members of the Least Developed Countries Expert Group as at 29 September 2008	13

I. Mandate

1. The Conference of the Parties (COP), by its decision 29/CP.7, established the Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG) to advise on the preparation and implementation strategy for national adaptation programmes of action (NAPAs), and adopted the terms of reference of the LEG. According to these terms of reference, the LEG is to convene twice each year, and report on its work to the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI).

2. In response to decision 8/CP.13, the LEG developed, at its thirteenth meeting, a work programme for 2008–2010,¹ which was considered by the SBI at its twenty-eighth session. The SBI invited the LEG to report on its progress at the twenty-ninth session of the SBI, and to include in this report information showing how the LEG has prioritized its work and the timelines for activities.²

II. Summary of the fourteenth meeting of the Least Developed Countries Expert Group

A. Proceedings

3. The fourteenth meeting of the LEG was hosted by the Government of Ethiopia and held in Addis Ababa from 29 September to 1 October 2008. The LEG elected Mr. Fred Machulu Onduri (Uganda) to the position of Chair of the group, to replace Mr. Bubu Jallow (Gambia), who resigned from the LEG in September 2008.

4. By its decision 8/CP.13, the COP decided that the LEG may invite the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and its agencies to its meetings. Furthermore, the SBI, at its twenty-eighth session,³ encouraged the LEG to seek to ensure the complementarity of its work programme activities with related efforts by the GEF, its agencies and other relevant entities. To this end, representatives of the GEF and two of its agencies – the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) – participated in the fourteenth meeting.

5. During the meeting, the LEG focused its work on the following: reviewing the status of NAPA preparation and implementation (see chapter II B below); considering efforts to support least developed countries (LDCs) in preparing and implementing NAPAs (chapter II C); developing further steps in the implementation of its work programme (chapter III); and prioritizing its work (annex I). It also held an interactive session with Ethiopia's NAPA team (chapter I D).

B. Status of preparation and implementation of national adaptation programmes of action

6. On the status of preparation of NAPAs, the GEF representative reported that as at 29 September 2008, 48 LDCs had received funding to prepare NAPAs. Of these, 38 have completed and submitted their NAPAs to the UNFCCC secretariat. Of the remaining countries, many are expected to submit their NAPAs within the next 12 months. A few countries are still in the early stages of NAPA preparation, including countries that have recently emerged from conflict or that face particular difficulties because of language constraints. The LEG noted the need for greater efforts to assist the 10 remaining LDC Parties in completing their NAPAs, building on lessons learned from other Parties that have submitted their NAPAs. The LEG agreed to work with the GEF and its agencies to further examine causes of delays in the NAPA process for some LDCs, and find solutions as appropriate.

¹ FCCC/SBI/2008/6, annex I.

² FCCC/SBI/2008/8, paragraph 50.

³ FCCC/SBI/2008/8, paragraph 47.

7. On the status of implementation of NAPAs, the GEF reported on NAPA projects under consideration by the GEF.⁴ As at 29 September 2008, one project, in Bhutan, had received endorsement of the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the GEF, while 15 project identification forms (PIFs) had been approved by the CEO and the GEF Council (from Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Djibouti, Eritrea, Gambia, Haiti, Malawi, Mauritania, Niger, Samoa, Sudan, Tuvalu and Zambia). Three PIFs had been cleared by the CEO and posted on the GEF website for Council approval (for Benin, Democratic Republic of Congo and Sierra Leone). Four PIFs had been submitted but not yet cleared by the CEO (from Burundi, Guinea, Mali and Vanuatu). Two PIFs (from Yemen) are expected to be processed once the country's NAPA has been finalized and submitted.

8. Of the countries that are eligible for funding (i.e. those that have submitted NAPAs), 15 had yet to submit their first PIF (Central African Republic, Comoros, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Kiribati, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Maldives, Mozambique, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Uganda and United Republic of Tanzania).

9. To date five of the 10 GEF agencies are supporting LDCs in implementing NAPAs, as follows: UNDP (involved in the implementation of 16 PIFs), UNEP (3), the African Development Bank (AfDB) (1), the International Fund for Agricultural Development (1), the World Bank (1) and AfDB and UNDP jointly (1).

10. In terms of distribution of funds committed under the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF), the GEF reported that 60 per cent of those funds are being used to support projects in Africa, 32 per cent in Asia and 8 per cent in the Pacific. By sector, 46 per cent of the funding is for projects in agriculture and food security, 33 per cent in water management, 13 per cent in disaster management and 8 per cent in coastal management.

C. Consideration of efforts to facilitate implementation of national adaptation programmes of action

1. Results of a survey conducted during the twenty-eighth session of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation

11. During the twenty-eighth session of the SBI, the LEG distributed a questionnaire among LDC Parties on the status of preparation and implementation of NAPAs, in accordance with its work programme. Although only 13 responses were received, they provide useful input to the work of the LEG in its consideration of how to facilitate implementation. The results were discussed on the first day of the meeting, and are summarized below:

Specific challenges faced:

- (a) A lack of human capacity at the national level for project development and implementation, which presents a key obstacle to effective implementation of NAPA projects (and adaptation projects in general);
- (b) The low capacity of national institutions in some Parties to support NAPA preparation and implementation, and the need for more coordination between ministries;
- (c) Extreme difficulties and delays faced by some LDCs in starting their NAPA preparation, and in implementation;

⁴ See paragraphs 13–18 of this document for a detailed explanation of the project approval and funding cycle under the GEF.

- (d) Some Parties observed that, in the case of GEF funds, there is a long delay between the concept stage of projects and accessing the funds for implementation on the ground. Given the urgency and immediacy of NAPAs there is a need to address this delay;
- (e) Long delays, mentioned by many respondents, in delivery of funds for project implementation after formal GEF approval at the various stages (PIF and project preparation grant (PPG)) has been received;
- (f) For LDC Parties that had already completed their NAPAs, the introduction of the PIF to replace the PDF-A proposal form in the GEF project cycle extended the project preparation cycle owing to the need to re-formulate project proposals (including for previously approved projects);
- (g) Guidance for the preparation of NAPAs reflecting the new information requirements involved in completing a PIF would have been helpful to LDCs;
- (h) Other issues raised by the LDC Parties on the GEF project cycle for the LDCF that still need to be addressed include:
 - (i) The degree of efficiency in the processing of projects under the LDCF compared with those under other GEF funds;
 - (ii) Practicalities of choosing or changing implementing agency;
 - (iii) The number of projects a Party can submit to the LDCF for funding;
 - (iv) The relevance of sources of co-financing, including from non-project sources such as national budget support in a specific sector;
 - (v) The nature and scope of additional assessment work required before NAPA projects can be implemented;
 - (vi) Clarification on access to GEF funds to support adaptation and NAPA implementation;
 - (vii) How GEF agencies can best involve national sectoral institutions in the implementation of projects;
 - (viii) Coordination of budgeting and implementation of projects funded by the LDCF with those funded by other GEF funds;
 - (ix) How a Party's access to the LDCF for NAPA implementation will be affected if it is no longer classified as an LDC.

The following needs were expressed:

- (i) To be better informed about implementation of NAPAs in other LDCs;
- (j) Advice on finalizing NAPAs, especially on presenting information that would facilitate the development of project proposals for funding, and on designing effective implementation strategies that draw on financing beyond the resources available through the LDCF;
- (k) Advice on how to revise priorities over time as vulnerabilities change and priority needs are addressed;

- (l) Assistance from the LEG in developing outreach materials that can be used at the national level to promote awareness of climate change and to support implementation of NAPAs;

The following proposals to respond to Parties' needs were made:

- (m) More technical support, including training by the LEG and others in a position to do so, on project proposal development (e.g. development of templates for projects);
- (n) Regional workshops for countries to share lessons and experiences on how to implement projects with similar objectives at the sub-regional and regional levels;
- (o) Updating priorities in NAPAs and officially communicating these to the secretariat in order for the information in submitted NAPAs to be updated;

The following lessons were identified:

- (p) LDC Parties should be encouraged to budget for the development of project proposals and preparation of an implementation strategy for the NAPAs;
- (q) LDC Parties sometimes develop project proposals for funding that address multiple priorities in a NAPA. However, this appears to complicate the GEF project approval process if the projects are not explicitly linked to the stated list of priorities in the NAPA;
- (r) Co-financing does not appear to be an obstacle to the implementation of NAPAs for some LDC Parties;
- (s) Establishing a good working relationship with the GEF agency at the national level is very important for effective project development and implementation;
- (t) LDC Parties may be able to use the information collected during the preparation of their NAPAs when conducting the vulnerability and adaptation assessment required as part of their second national communications;
- (u) The NAPA process is an important foundation for LDCs to develop national climate change adaptation strategies for the medium to long term.

12. The LEG, in an attempt to expand the number of responses to the survey, decided to encourage those LDCs that had not completed the questionnaire, to do so. To this end, the LEG requested the secretariat to follow up with national climate change focal points and NAPA teams to solicit more feedback.

2. Discussion with the Global Environment Facility and its agencies

The Global Environment Facility project cycle

13. Representatives from the GEF and its agencies took part in the first day of the LEG meeting. In response to requests by LDC Parties to clarify the LDCF project cycle, the representative from the GEF outlined the four stages involved:

- (a) Pre-PIF activities: The Party selects a project idea based on priorities identified in its NAPA, identifies an implementing partner from among the 10 GEF agencies, then develops a project concept into a PIF or a combined PIF/PPG submission;

- (b) PIF: A PIF, a brief description of the project concept including indicative activities, a budget and implementation arrangement, is prepared and submitted to the GEF for review via the chosen agency with the sole purpose of determining whether the project will be eligible for LDCF funding;
- (c) PPG: On approval of the PIF by the GEF, a request for financial support in the form of a PPG for development of a more comprehensive project proposal is submitted for endorsement by the CEO;
- (d) CEO endorsement: A comprehensive project description, including detailed project argumentation, description of activities, budget and, implementation arrangements with the purpose of demonstrating a fully developed project ready for implementation, is submitted.

14. The representative from the GEF explained that four elements of a proposed project are taken into account in the review of a PIF: (1) the basic project idea or the additional cost argument; (2) implementation set-up; (3) the indicative budget and co-financing; and (4) how closely the project matches NAPA priorities.

15. The following timelines are followed for the processing of PIFs under the LDCF:

- (a) PIFs are reviewed by the GEF secretariat on a rolling basis, within a maximum of 10 working days;
- (b) If a PIF is cleared, it is included in the GEF work programme and posted on the Web for four weeks for consideration by the GEF Council. If the elements mentioned in paragraph 14 above are not sufficiently detailed in the PIF, the PIF is returned to the GEF agency for revision and resubmission;
- (c) Once the PIF has been approved by the Council, funds are reserved for the project, pending submission of a fully developed project document (PPG) within 18 months, after an endorsement by the CEO;
- (d) Resubmitted PIFs are usually processed within a maximum of 10 days, following the steps above.

16. The PPG proposal submission stage works as follows:

- (a) Upon clearance of the PIF by the CEO, the project is now eligible for funding;
- (b) A PPG proposal must be prepared, clearly describing the process for developing the full project proposal that will be presented for CEO endorsement, and including a budget and a schedule of activities to be implemented;
- (c) The PPG is approved by the CEO (without the proposal being posted on the Web).
- (d) A PIF and PPG proposal can be submitted together to speed up processing;

17. The final stage is CEO endorsement. LDCF projects are endorsed directly by the CEO, and only posted for four weeks on the Web as information for the Council. Once endorsed, funds are released to the implementing agency to start implementation. The CEO endorsement is contingent on the following:

- (a) A detailed description of the four elements listed issues in paragraph 14 above;

- (b) Description of a monitoring and evaluation framework that includes impact indicators to measure the environmental impact of the project;
- (c) Letters of endorsement for co-financing.

18. In the discussion that followed, it was observed that given the tight timelines between a project proposal and its implementation, a solid justification of the project in the PIF and the PPG proposal, accompanied by an accurate assessment of the baseline investment and additional investments needed to address climate change concerns, is key to a project's success.

Activities of the Global Environment Facility agencies and lessons learned

19. The representative from UNEP described efforts in NAPA preparation and implementation for which UNEP is providing financial and technical support. She explained that Angola and Myanmar have just started preparing their NAPAs. Three LDCs have successfully submitted PIFs, which have been approved (Djibouti, Gambia and Mauritania), while the PIFs of another three are in final review (Lesotho, Comoros and Rwanda). Two LDCs are in the design phase of their PIFs and expect to submit them to the GEF in the coming months (Cambodia and United Republic of Tanzania).

20. The representative from UNDP also shared information with the LEG on efforts to support implementation of NAPAs. UNDP has supported the preparation of 31 NAPAs and the implementation of 23, 16 of which are either in the PPG phase (project design) or waiting for clearance by the GEF before proceeding to project design. For 12 of these 16, UNDP submitted the PIFs within a year as the Parties' chosen implementing agency, which means the projects are on track to meet the GEF allotted time frame of 22 months between the end of NAPA preparation and project implementation.

21. UNDP is seeking to build partnerships with other United Nations agencies in order to draw on their respective strengths. For example, it hopes to work with UNEP in the Comoros and Rwanda, and with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations in Lesotho and Zambia. It was mentioned that UNDP's strengths lie in disaster risk reduction, national planning to achieve Millennium Development Goals and coordination of United Nations agencies at the national level.

22. The representative also described a tool kit that UNDP uses to support NAPA implementation, which includes: project development guidelines, the Adaptation Policy Framework⁵ (a monitoring and evaluation framework for adaptation), a web-based programming site and publications on best practices and lessons learned.

23. In promoting a country-driven approach, UNDP is supporting efforts by several LDC Parties to coordinate adaptation planning at the national level. For example, UNDP is supporting Malawi and Nepal in creating platforms for coordinating adaptation activities.

24. Based on the discussions between the LEG and the GEF agencies at the meeting, major challenges in the development of NAPA projects for implementation were highlighted:

- (a) Putting forward a strong argument for the additionality of proposed project activities;
- (b) Identification of the required co-financing in some cases;
- (c) Complementarity between the NAPAs which take a project approach and national development efforts that are sources of co-financing and which also take a programme approach;

⁵ <<http://www.undp.org/gef/adaptation/climate-change/APF.htm>>.

- (d) Limited capacity in agencies, regional and country offices, as well as at the national levels, to manage the new NAPA projects;
- (e) Concluding contracts and fulfilling reporting obligations for NAPA preparation projects before implementation can start.

25. The LEG and the representatives of the GEF and its agencies also discussed the issues that arose from the questionnaire referred to in paragraph 11 above. The following action points were agreed:

- (a) The GEF and its agencies will explore the possibility of publishing a “Quick Guide” to accessing the LDCF, to be disseminated to all LDCs in the near future;
- (b) The LEG will work with the GEF and its agencies to further explore causes of delays and to identify solutions as appropriate;
- (c) The GEF and its agencies will contribute to LEG projects such as the step-by-step guide for NAPA implementation;
- (d) The LEG, through the secretariat, will contact the other GEF agencies that are involved in NAPA implementation but did not attend its fourteenth meeting, and request an update on their work in NAPA implementation as well as materials that could be used in developing the two guides.

26. It was observed that there is a need to improve the flow of information, especially on problems encountered by specific countries. To facilitate more effective responses to problems, it was agreed that information on responses to surveys showing specific difficulties on a country-by-country basis should be compiled by the LEG and shared with the GEF and its agencies regularly. This information would enable the provision of targeted technical support to LDC Parties.

27. The LEG offered to provide information to LDC Parties on issues that are relevant to project preparation and development such as on: adaptation projects in the NAPAs and their links to national development policy; costs and benefits of different adaptation options; synergy and trade-offs among adaptation activities; and synthesis of key findings from ongoing research on adaptation in the context of the UNFCCC, to guide planning and implementation.

28. Lastly, the LEG agreed that constraints on the preparation of NAPAs would also impact on implementation unless adequate capacity were built at the national level to address the constraints. The LEG concluded that the interaction with the GEF and its agencies during its fourteenth meeting had been fruitful, and it looks forward to more interaction at its future meetings.

3. Additional guidance for the design and preparation of strategies to implement national adaptation programmes of action

29. The LEG noted the difficulties that many LDC Parties are having in designing effective implementation strategies for their NAPAs. The LEG also considered the questions and concerns that countries raised in completing their NAPAs. To this end, the LEG as part of its work programme is developing a technical paper to offer additional guidance to LDCs for the NAPA preparation and design of implementation strategies.

4. Development of a step-by-step guide to implementing national adaptation programmes of action

30. To address the need of LDC Parties for more support and information when accessing funds from the LDCF and implementing NAPAs, the LEG has agreed on terms of reference for the preparation

of a step-by-step guide to NAPA implementation that the group is developing. The guide will address many of the questions raised by LDCs on how to implement NAPAs effectively, and will build on the information contained in the technical paper mentioned in paragraph 29 above.

5. Efforts to promote synergy

31. The LEG considered efforts to promote synergy among projects presented in NAPAs for implementation. It was discussed that, when implementing NAPA projects in the forestry sector that address land degradation and promote sustainable land management (SLM) to enhance the resilience of vulnerable systems and communities, LDCs should take steps to coordinate this work with their implementation of national action plans (NAPs) under the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification. The LEG decided to include a discussion of options for promoting and coordinating implementation of NAPA projects alongside NAP projects in the step-by-step guide.

32. The LEG also decided to identify synergy among projects from different NAPAs within a region or sector, as part of its work in synthesizing and analysing NAPAs.⁶ Furthermore, the LEG discussed actions that it could undertake to promote synergy, including:

- (a) To facilitate the sharing of information among Parties on activities being implemented to help guide others in their project development;
- (b) To produce outreach materials that identify a common set of activities and tasks for the main types of project within the sectors that are most frequently addressed in NAPAs (agriculture, water and forestry);
- (c) To conduct regional workshops to promote the exchange of experiences and lessons learned in preparing and implementing NAPAs;
- (d) To include information on sources of funding and funding priorities by major donors by region in the step-by-step guide to NAPA implementation;

D. Interaction between the Least Developed Countries Expert Group and Ethiopia's national adaptation programme of action team

33. In keeping with its practice of interacting with the national NAPA teams where the LEG meeting is hosted, the LEG conducted an interactive session with representatives of Ethiopia's NAPA team. Ethiopia's NAPA team presented an overview of the NAPA process, its institutional arrangements and stakeholder consultations, and plans for implementation. The presentation focused on the main outcomes and priorities presented in the NAPA. The team mentioned the value of the NAPA preparation process in raising the profile of climate change issues in Ethiopia, as well as the profile of the institutions handling climate change matters at the national level.

34. The team described plans of the Ethiopian Government to convene a meeting with donors to solicit funding for its priority NAPA activities. To this end, the team requested assistance from the LEG and the secretariat in the preparations for this meeting, which is tentatively planned to take place in December 2008.

⁶ See the work programme in document FCCC/SBI/2008/6, annex I, page 7.

III. Priority activities for implementation

35. The work programme of the LEG for 2008–2010 as contained in document FCCC/SBI/2008/6, annex I, was considered during the meeting, and the following activities were identified as priority for implementation:
- (a) Efforts to support countries emerging from conflict or experiencing particular difficulties in finalizing their NAPA owing to language constraints;
 - (b) Updating and improving guidance for the preparation and design of NAPA implementation strategies, taking into account issues that have been raised by Parties and GEF agencies;
 - (c) Efforts to build the capacity of LDC Parties to implement NAPAs through the provision of guides, and other technical support designed to improve, among other things, Parties' access to the LDCF;
 - (d) Efforts to provide technical support and training in areas identified by Parties during the stocktaking meeting on NAPAs held in September 2007 as well as through other channels;
 - (e) Improvements to NAPA-related knowledge management and outreach, aimed at sharing good practices and lessons learned from piloting adaptation projects with other developing countries;
 - (f) Support for LDC Parties in integrating adaptation into national planning.
36. In response to the request of the SBI, the LEG considered which of its work programme activities should take priority in 2008–2010. A list of priority activities, with timelines, is presented in annex I.

Annex I

Priority activities of the work programme of the Least Developed Countries Expert Group, 2008–2010

Activity ^a	Main deliverable and target dates
Enhance efforts to support least developed countries (LDCs) with special needs in preparation and implementation of national adaptation programmes of action (NAPAs)	Ongoing
Further support NAPA preparation and implementation through preparation of a technical paper for NAPA preparation and development of implementation strategies	Distribute technical paper by December 2008
Prepare and disseminate a step-by-step guide on NAPA implementation	Finalize guide by the fifteenth meeting of the Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG) (March 2009) and distribute soon afterwards
Organize training in the design of NAPA implementation strategies and preparation of projects based on the step-by-step guide	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborate with relevant agencies to provide ongoing training • Conduct regional training based on the guide from April 2009 onwards
Conduct a survey of LDC Parties, United Nations agencies and other relevant actors to collect information on the status of implementation of NAPAs	Ongoing follow-up with LDC Parties, conduct next complete survey at the thirtieth session of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI)
Conduct capacity-building and outreach activities as requested by Parties at the 2007 stocktaking meeting and through surveys	Training activities, workshops and other forms of technical support, ongoing
Summarize key aspects of NAPAs with a view to identifying key vulnerabilities, adaptation options by sector and opportunities for regional synergy, and to show evidence of alignment with, and integration of NAPA activities into, national development priorities and plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribute a brochure on NAPAs by the fourteenth session of the Conference of the Parties (COP) • Analyse results at LEG 15 and include results in LEG report to SBI 30 • Produce outreach materials as appropriate
Conduct activities to promote synergy during implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to explore synergy in implementation of projects addressing multiple objectives, ongoing • Regional initiatives including workshops to exchange experiences, to be scheduled
Catalyse action by United Nations organizations and bilateral and multilateral agencies in support of NAPA implementation and implementation of the LEG work programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the Global Environment Facility and its agencies in producing a “Quick Guide” to accessing the Least Developed Countries Fund • Participate in joint training activities and knowledge exchange initiatives
Awareness raising of the NAPA process with a view to advancing adaptation and encouraging effective implementation of NAPAs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expand the LDC website to include a portal with NAPA projects • Produce a publication on the NAPA approach by LEG 16 • Hold as side event at COP 14 for launch of NAPAs • Produce outreach materials for NAPA teams • Participate in collaborative efforts and initiatives by partner organizations
Develop an approach paper on the collection of information for assessing the effectiveness of the NAPA programme and NAPA projects at the national and global level	Finalize working paper at LEG 16

^a Summarized from document FCCC/SBI/2008/6, annex I.

Annex II**Members of the Least Developed Countries Expert Group
as at 29 September 2008**

Mr. Mirza Shawkat Ali	Bangladesh
Mr. Ibila Djibril	Benin
Mr. Adérito Manuel Fernandes Santana	Sao Tome and Principe
Mr. Benjamin Karmorh	Liberia
Mr. Erwin Künzi	Austria
Ms. Beth Lavender	Canada
Mr. Fred Machulu Onduri	Uganda
Mr. Russell Nari	Vanuatu
Mr. Mohamed Shareef	Maldives
Mr. Batu Krishna Uprety	Nepal
Mr. Adrianus Jan Verhagen	The Netherlands
Vacant ¹	—

¹ This position should be filled by an expert from a Party not included in Annex I of the Convention.