



Document from the 7<sup>th</sup> Africa Water Week,  
held in Libreville, Gabon, 29 October – 2  
November 2018

*This material is shared as a learning  
resource to promote awareness and good  
practice in the provision, use and  
management of water resources for  
sustainable social and economic  
development and maintenance of African  
ecosystems.*

*Copyright for this material rests with the  
authors.*



A knowledge asset of the African Ministers'  
Council on Water





**PLENARY SESSION DAILY REPORT**  
**(RAPPORT JOURNALIER DE SESSION PLÉNIÈRE)**  
**'7TH AFRICA WATER WEEK'**  
**« 7IEME SEMAINE AFRICAINE DE L'EAU »**  
**29 OCT. – 02 NOV. 2018**

<b>No.</b>	<b>AWW7-2018SS /</b>	<b>Version No.</b>	V1			<b>Report Date:</b> (Date du rapport)	30-10-2018
<b>Date:</b>	30-10-2018	<b>Time:</b> (Heures)	2:20 PM	to	3:40 PM	<b>Language</b> (Langue)	French
<b>Theme:</b>	Toward Achieving Water Security and Safely Managed Sanitation for Africa						
French theme	'Vers la Sécurité de l'Eau et des Services d'Assainissement gérés en toute sécurité pour l'Afrique'						
<b>Sub-theme:</b> (Sous-thème)	Funding SDG 6 Ambitions in Africa: Beyond Political Declarations.						
<b>Session No.</b>	SS20	<b>Title:</b> (Titre)	Climate Change Funds and Water				
<b>Country:</b> (Pays)	GABON	<b>City:</b> (Ville)	Libreville	<b>Location:</b> (Lieu)	Stade de l'Amitié Sino-Gabonaise, Angondje		
<b>Rapporteurs</b> (Rapporteurs):	Louise Ntchorere				<b>Technical Partner:</b> (Partenaire technique)	SASI GABON	
<b>Further details:</b> (Informations complémentaires)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PowerPoint Presentation (YES): <b>Climate Funds and Water</b></li> <li>• Technical Documentation (NO)</li> </ul>						
<b>Abbreviations and acronyms:</b> (Sigles et abréviations)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AWF/FAE: African Water Facility/Facilité Africaine de l'eau</li> <li>• AfDB/BAD: African Development Bank</li> <li>• GCF: Green Climate Fund</li> <li>• GEF: Global Environment Facility</li> <li>• ACCF: Africa Climate Change Fund</li> <li>• GWP: Global Water Partnership</li> </ul>						

**IDENTIFICATION OF THE LEAD CONVENER AND CONTACT (IDENTIFICATION DES RESPONSABLES ET CONTACTS)**

<b>Lead Convener (Responsable):</b>	AfDB and GWP Africa
<b>Co-convener (Coresponsable):</b>	ACCF, CLIM-CRIDF and AfDB AWF
<b>Contact:</b>	

**SPEAKER IDENTIFICATION (IDENTIFICATION DES INTERVENANTS)**

<b>Moderator (Modérateur):</b>	Francis Daniel Bougaire of the AfDB
<b>Speakers (Intervenants):</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• David Hebart-Coleman Expert Consultant on Water and Climate Change at the AfDB</li> <li>• Charles Reeve</li> <li>• Amadou Maiga of GWP</li> <li>• Jembere Tirunen</li> <li>• Anton Earle of SIWI</li> </ul>

## **SESSION OBJECTIVES (OBJECTIFS DE LA SESSION)**

This session had two key objectives. The first was to briefly define the various climate change funds and opportunities available in the water sector. The second was to create a conversation between partners, donors and stakeholders on the differences between funding for the development of water infrastructure and funding for adaptation activities and their implications for climate-linked funding.

## **SESSION PLAN (PLAN DE SESSION)**

- Introduction by Mr Francis Daniel Bougaire
- Presentation by Mr David Hebart-Coleman
- Presentation by Mr Jembere Tirunen
- Panel and Question & Answer session

## **SESSION SUMMARY (RÉSUMÉ DE LA SESSION)**

- After a brief introduction on the aim of the session, which was to bring together donors, stakeholders and partners, the moderator gave the floor to the presenters, who took turns outlining the various types of funds available, the reasons why those types of funds were created and above all, why it was difficult to gain access to those types of funds.
- The financial organisations that provide this sort of funding have their own goals and expectations regarding project funding and their criteria must be met for funds to be accessed. Organisations such as the AfDB, the GCF, the ACCF, the GEF and the GWP have funds available for projects, but their criteria can be difficult to meet.
- Over the years, a dichotomy has developed to regulate the process of accessing funds in order to better define the projects to be funded. The dichotomy between development projects and development projects linked to climate change have reduced abuses by focusing solely on projects added onto existing infrastructure. However, it is important to be able to clearly prove the link between climate change and the need to improve the infrastructure for the funding request to be approved.

## **QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS (QUESTIONS ET RÉPONSES) THEME: IS IT ADAPTATION OR IS IT DEVELOPMENT?**

### **QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS (QUESTIONS ET RÉPONSES)**

Question No.	1	Author (Auteur):	Moderator
Wording (Libellé):	Does this dichotomy have beneficial effects and who does it benefit?		
<b>ANSWERS (RÉPONSES)</b>		<b>Speakers (Intervenants)</b>	
I think this question should be addressed to the AfDB and the managers of the monetary funds to determine whether projects are aimed at development or anti-development. If you recall, in the past, all projects had to meet certain climate-linked criteria to receive funding, and there has been no real change. In my opinion, these criteria should not become conditions that delay development projects. The need for capacity building just to access funds can be an obstacle, and where governments are concerned, these funds should be viewed as additional funds and not as an end in themselves. In addition, organisations working on the ground should not be passed over in favour of state organisations.		Amadou Maiga	
It is important to stress that survival depends on adaptation to the environment. Those who adapt, survive. This aspect should be highlighted in the development sphere. First of all, it does not seem to me that there is a dichotomy; we evolve over time and adapt according to our needs. A lot of people request financing for development projects by disguising them as climate change projects and it is important to separate the wheat from the chaff.		Anton Earle	

There are benefits, since the process provides access to funding. Without it, it is very difficult to determine where the money goes. The concept of taking a development project and adding on an element that will make it a good project for climate change has actually created some problems, since we need to rethink every project to include climate change.	Charles Reeve
--	---------------

### **QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS (QUESTIONS ET RÉPONSES)**

Question No.		<b>Author (Auteur):</b>	Participant
<b>Wording (Libellé):</b>			
<b>Contribution</b>			<b>Speakers (Intervenants)</b>
You say there is a need to differentiate between development projects and climate change projects, and we agree, but you need to make the process of accessing funds less complicated. We have a lot of problems due to all sorts of things and accessing funds should not be slowed down.			

### **QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS (QUESTIONS ET RÉPONSES)**

Question No.		<b>Author (Auteur):</b>	AWF Coordinator
<b>Wording (Libellé):</b>			
<b>Contribution</b>			<b>Speakers (Intervenants)</b>
We have made studies and prepared a project that is now funded by the AfDB; we have not sought to separate the two as per your request, since that is often difficult, especially for hydro-agricultural facilities. If we move in your direction, we would have to have two sources of funding for the project and Lord knows how hard it is to find even one! It can take 2 or 3 years and then we would have to organise funding for additional measures? In operational terms, it seems to me that would be really difficult. Why not just ask whether projects include both aspects and fund them?			

Question No.		<b>Author (Auteur):</b>	Participant
<b>Wording (Libellé):</b>			
<b>Contribution</b>			<b>Speakers (Intervenants)</b>
One has to wonder why the various projects including climate change and water management fail to benefit from these funds. First of all, they are simply unaware of the financing; here we are debating about knowing how to access it and they don't even know it exists.			

Question No.		<b>Author (Auteur):</b>	Participant
<b>Wording (Libellé):</b>			
<b>Contribution</b>			<b>Speakers (Intervenants)</b>
We also need to be honest and admit that the means of proving the impact of climate change are unclear and that the bureaucratic approach causes considerable wastage of time and resources for the various actors in need of funding.			

Question No.		<b>Author (Auteur):</b>	Participant
<b>Wording (Libellé):</b>			
<b>Contribution</b>			<b>Speakers (Intervenants)</b>
The process of accessing funds is always difficult to understand and the criteria are numerous and also complicated. We don't even know what kind of aid we can receive from these various organisations. Grants? Low interest loans? Even on your sites it's never clear.			

Question No.		<b>Author (Auteur):</b>	Moderator:
<b>Wording (Libellé):</b>	Are there disadvantages to the use of this dichotomy?		
<b>ANSWERS (RÉPONSES)</b>			<b>Speakers (Intervenants)</b>
I remind you that the dichotomy is contingent. In the 1970s, we could not fund any project that did not take account of climate change. We had projects that were supposed to have a reduced impact on the climate and today we consider that impact on the climate is the project. I think it is the same thing and when we try to separate them, it doesn't work. They need to be integrated.			Amadou Maiga
I think I've already answered this question, but I'll try to be a little clearer. First of all, I will clarify who benefits and by default we will understand who does not benefit. Mitigation is often easier to demonstrate: reducing greenhouse gases, clean energy, etc., so these areas have an advantage that can be seen in the number of projects that are funded. Where Adaptation is concerned, it is harder to prove what I call climate-linked services, such as information on the climate, water flow management and adapting infrastructure to climate change. The impact of climate change is most clearly felt in relation to water.			Charles Reeve
I think there are a lot of advantages to using the separation process, since there are a lot of projects that were initially created to help the people which ended up having very negative impacts.			Anton Earle

Question No.		<b>Author (Auteur):</b>	Moderator:
<b>Wording (Libellé):</b>	What are the major risks involved in differentiating between the two?		
<b>ANSWERS (RÉPONSES)</b>		<b>Speakers (Intervenants)</b>	
The biggest risk is poor adaptation, if the projects we fund turn out to have a negative impact on the environment 10 or 20 years down the road.		David Helbart-Coleman	
There is also a risk in the fact that organisations may create projects to gain access to funding rather than projects they really need.		Charles Reeve	

Question No.		<b>Author (Auteur):</b>	Moderator:
<b>Wording (Libellé):</b>	Are there activities you associate with one or the other?		
<b>ANSWERS (RÉPONSES)</b>		<b>Speakers (Intervenants)</b>	
People lack knowledge about the mechanisms, whereas at the GWP, we offer capacity building for actors on the ground and direct them toward appropriate funds or run the risk that the funds may never be used.		Amadou Maiga	
We have created an ecosystem around the issue of climate change. A lot of reflection and funding has been focused on it; why not add an aspect that would make it stand out? The issue of gender inequality. Perhaps adding this aspect to your project would increase its impact.		Anton Earle	
It is important to select the projects we will use for adaptation to climate change very carefully. There are several potential approaches to development. Great care must be taken to look 15 or 20 years ahead to ensure that our projects do not end up on the wrong side of development.		Charles Reeve	

Question No.		<b>Author (Auteur):</b>	Moderator:
<b>Wording (Libellé):</b>	What are the best ways of addressing this difficulty?		
<b>ANSWERS (RÉPONSES)</b>		<b>Speakers (Intervenants)</b>	
I am not necessarily a great fan of the existing processes, but a top-notch analysis and understanding of climate change are essential for good development.		Charles Reeve	
It is important to ensure that the investment is sustainable over the long term and accept several variables in addition to climate change, such as population growth, etc.		Anton Earle	
I think it should be pointed out that, where water is concerned, all development projects linked to water should be in partnership with grassroots organisations.		Amadou Maiga	

## **CONCLUSIONS OF THE SESSION (CONCLUSIONS DE LA SESSION)**

- Continued on Thursday