



Asia-Pacific Forum
for
Environment and Development

**ASIA-PACIFIC FORUM FOR
ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT
SECOND PHASE
(APFED II)**

**Proceedings of APFED II Showcase Workshop
and Third NetRes Meeting**

14-17 October 2008

Mount Lavinia / Colombo, Sri Lanka



APFED II Showcase Workshop and Third NetRes Meeting
Table of Contents

Foreward	... i
Preface	... ii
* * * * *	
Chair's Summary	... 1
Agenda and Programme of Work	... 30
List of Participants	... 35
[APFED Showcase Workshop]	... 37
Opening Session	
Keynote Speech <i>by Dr. P. Hassan</i>	... 38
Presentation: Sri Lanka's Policy Achievements and Future Challenges to Promote Environmental Management for Sustainable Development <i>by Ms. L. P. Batuwitige</i>	... 42
Overview of the APFED Showcase Workshop and Third NetRes Meeting <i>by Mr. H. Nishimiya</i>	... 47
Session 1: APFED and APFED Showcase Programme	... 49
Presentation: APFED Showcase Programme Planning and Implementation	... 53
Presentation: 2006-2008 APFED Showcase Programme: Introduction	... 58
Session 2 : Progress Reports of APFED Showcase Projects for Tackling Climate Change	... 62
i) Enhancing Productivity of Utilisation of Bio Energy in Sri Lanka <i>by Mr. N. Musaffer</i>	... 103
ii) Renewable Energy Promotion for Sericulture Project in Nepal <i>by Mr. D. R. Gautam</i>	... 107
iii) Corporate Sustainable-developmental Responsibility <i>by Dr. K. H. Wei</i>	... 118
iv) Community Based Educational and Partnership Actions - Carbon Neutral Initiative for Community Empowerment and Climate Change Mitigation in Indonesia <i>by Mr. T. Lesmana</i>	... 124
v) Special Report of Showcase Test Case: Thai Initiative for Green Procurement and Purchasing <i>by Dr. Q. Chotichanathawewong</i>	... 130
vi) Tentative results on developing alternative income generation and ecosystem rehabilitation in Gobi, Mongolia <i>by Ms. N. Mandakh</i>	... 135
vii) Sustainable Community Forestry and Poverty Reduction in Vietnam – Linking Natural Resource Accounting of Ecosystem Services to Carbon Financial <i>by Mr. N. V. Ky</i>	... 140
viii) Reforma–Cebu (Philippines): A Community-based Resource Management Initiative and Climate Change <i>by Mr. H. C. Zanoia</i>	... 148
Session 3: Effective Support, Monitoring and Evaluation of Pilot Projects	... 155
Presentation: Monitoring and Evaluation aspects of the GEF - SGP Sri Lanka Country Programme <i>by Ms. S. Samarasuriya</i>	... 156
Presentation: Monitoring and Evaluation Mechanism (GEF/SGP India) <i>by Mr. P. Sodhi</i>	... 159
Presentation: Monitoring and Evaluation Mechanism: A Case from IUCN <i>by Mr. R. Mahindapala</i>	... 167

Table of Contents

Session 4: Good Practice for Sustainable Development - Ryutaro Hashimoto APFED Award and APFED Good Practice Database	... 172
Session 5: APFED Showcase Programme Handbook	... 179
Presentation: APFED Showcase Programme Handbook	... 206
Session 6: Reporting and Lesson Sharing of the APFED Showcase Programme	... 210
Presentation: Reporting and Lesson Sharing of the APFED Showcase Programme	... 214
Session 7: Effective Reporting of Project Performance	... 218
Session 9: APFED Showcase Programme Information Management	... 220
Presentation: APFED Showcase Programme Information Management (APFED Web)	... 224
Presentation: APFED Showcase Programme Information Management (APFED Newsletter)	... 231
Presentation: Using video to communicate sustainable development	... 233
[Third NetRes Meeting]	... 243
Session 1: Overall Progress Report of APFED	... 244
Presentation: Overall Review of APFED II	... 251
Session 2: APFED Knowledge Initiative	... 254
Presentation: APFED Knowledge Initiative	... 267
Session 3: APFED Policy Dialogue: Progress and Future Plan	... 272
Presentation: APFED Policy Dialogue	... 280
Session 4: Joint Research and Activities for NetRes	... 284
Presentation: Joint Research and Activities	... 289
[Site Visit]	... 293
Waste Management and Environment Education for Lagoswatta Tsunami Resettlement Village	
Article Copy: Lagoswatta: The First Eco-Friendly Village Project in Sri Lanka	... 294
Enhancing Productivity of Utilisation of Bio Energy in Sri Lanka in Nikaweretiya	
Presentation: Community Governance Programme, Community Bio Fuel Processing Centre	... 299
Material1: Jatropha	... 310
Material2: Biodiesel Production	... 321
[Reference]	... 329
Reference 1. Message From APFED Policy Dialogue on Climate Change	... 330
Reference 2. APFED II Fourth Plenary Meeting Chair Summary	... 341
Reference 3. APFED Showcase Panel Meeting Chair Summary	... 348
NetRes3 Photos	... 355

Foreword

Asia continues to face the conundrum of finding ways to sustain economic growth and improve environmental performance at the same time. The Asia – Pacific Forum for Environment and Development (APFED), for which our institute acts as a secretariat, has been carrying out work instrumental in prompting policy transformation, field actions and partnership building for promoting effective environmental management and sustainable development in Asia and the Pacific.

The APFED Showcase Programme is one of the key programmes for the APFED Phase II (APFED II) in assisting stakeholders in the region to experiment with the implementation of policies, measures and actions recommended in the APFED Final Report of 2004. For the past 4 years, about 38 projects have been supported across Asia and the Pacific to catalyse experimental policies and actions at the policy and field levels. We have now come to the stage of reviewing the progress and drawing lessons from the Programme. The APFED Showcase Workshop was successful in consolidating the key findings on the progress and lessons learnt so far, and setting out a work plan to facilitate Showcase project implementation, synthesise achievements and share lessons.

NetRes, an Asia – Pacific regional network of policy institutes for environmental management and sustainable development, is an important institutional mechanism for supporting the implementation of APFED programmes. The Third NetRes meeting further articulated the work plan for undertaking activities to facilitate APFED activities and joint research work in pursuit of sustainable development in the region.

These proceedings are a useful compilation of knowledge and agreements accumulated during the four-day gathering of the aforementioned APFED Showcase Workshop and the Third NetRes Meeting. The meetings were supported by the Government of Japan, the Government of Sri Lanka, Sarvodaya Foundation, and the United Nations Environment Programme's Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (UNEP/ROAP). The success of the meetings can be attributed in particular to two co-chairs and APFED members, Dr. Vinya S. Ariyaratne, Director, Sarvodaya Headquarters "Damsak Mandira", and Dr. Parvez Hassan, Former Chairman of the International Union of the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) Law Commission. I would like to express our gratitude to the two co-chairs and co-organisers. I expect that the aspirations manifested by APFED stakeholders will be embodied in tangible outcomes and shared widely to facilitate policies and actions aimed at sustainable development in Asia and the Pacific.



Hironori Hamanaka
Chair, Board of Directors
Institute for Global Environmental Strategies


P r e f a c e

Recent oil and food price surges have placed human survival as a priority concern across the world, and dispersed away the once grown public attention to climate change and other environmental issues. It is vital to maintain long-term perspectives to maintain our livelihood as a part of our mother land and earth in symbiosis with enchanted nature. We need to continuously rethink of whether our lifestyles are indeed conducive to protecting our environment and pursuing sustainable development.

Experts who gathered for the APFED Showcase Programme Workshop and the Third NetRes Meeting held in Mt. Lavinia shared compassion for pursuing such goals. Together with Dr. Parvez Hassan, I had a privilege to host and co-chair the meetings where we reviewed the progress made in supporting community based actions for pursuing sustainable development, and their success factors and interface with macro-policy in the region. The support to the meetings and programmes reviewed therein was provided under the auspices of the Asia – Pacific Forum for Environment and Development (APFED), a regional group of eminent personalities on environmental management and sustainable development for Asia and the Pacific supported by the Government of Japan, particularly the Ministry of the Environment. The meetings were co-organised by the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES) and the United Nations Environment Programme’s Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (UNEP/ROAP) in collaboration with the Government of Sri Lanka.

I was pleased to share the progress and lessons achieved by the Sarvodaya Shramadana Movement. I and Dr. A. T. Ariyaratne, Founder-President of Sarvodaya were particularly gratified to receive the participants of the meetings at the Sarvodaya Headquarters and showed one of our proclaimed success projects, Damniyangama Eco-village, a resettlement housing project for the people affected by Tsunami in December 2004. Sarvodaya’s aspiration to promote community empowerment has a universal message with the belief that achievements can be made internally within the people’s mind and brings happiness to the people.

Sarvodaya will continue to work with our partners to promote sustainable development and empower people and communities to this end. I am certain that the outcome of these meetings will bring the APFED process and stakeholders forward to achieve our common objectives.



Dr. Vinya S. Ariyaratne,
APFED Member and Executive Director
Sarvodaya Shramadana Movement – Sri Lanka

**ASIA-PACIFIC FORUM FOR ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT
(Second Phase)
Showcase Workshop and the Third NetRes Meeting
14-17 October 2008
Colombo, Sri Lanka**

CHAIR'S SUMMARY

The APFED Showcase Programme Workshop and the Third NetRes Meeting were held in Mt. Lavinia, a suburb of Colombo, Sri Lanka. The meetings were hosted by the Sarvodaya Foundation and co-organised by the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES) and the United Nations Environment Programme's Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (UNEP/ROAP) with the sponsorship of the Government of Japan, specifically the Ministry of the Environment and with the support of the Government of Sri Lanka.

The meetings were attended by 30 participants including the representatives and staff members of the organisations that have been implementing APFED Showcase projects addressing climate change issues, NetRes member institutes, co-organising organisations and resource persons.

Dr. Vinya S. Ariyaratne, APFED Member and Executive Director, Sarvodaya Headquarters "Damsak Mandira", and Dr. Parvez Hassan, APFED Member, Former Chairman of the International Union of the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) Law Commission were elected as co-chairs of the Workshop and the Meeting. In accordance with the Agenda and the Programme of Work, the participants listened to the presentations and had intensive discussions with a view to exchanging information and promoting better common understanding on the APFED activities particularly the APFED Showcase Programme, and forging agreements upon future work plans.

This summary is intended to reflect the thrust of discussions and highlight key elements and agreements that have emerged throughout the meetings. The summary of presentations and discussions appear in Annex I. The Agenda and Programme of work and the List of Participants are also herewith attached as Annexes II and III.

1. Policy and programme issues

(1) Priority policy issues for sustainability

Asia is not an exception to the increasing risk and rampage of climate change. Persistent population growth pushes up the demand for energy, food and farmland thereby increasing green house gases emissions, ecosystem destruction and land use conversion. The environmental risk has been augmenting at an accelerated rate in Asia and the Pacific. To reverse a pervading trend of environmental degradation, and reinforce the trajectory of pursuing sustainability in the region, Policy priority setting and mainstreaming must be further instigated in this respect. Under these backdrops, priority has been given to climate change, renewable energy and energy efficiency improvement in the context of APFED II programmes.

(2) Project continuity

It is vital to integrate self-financing mechanisms into the project component to ensure that the project activities shall continue beyond the project implementation period. Without deliberate attempts to install such a self-financing mechanism, it is difficult to expect that the project will continue for a long term.

In this context, it is also vital to explore potential funding by bilateral or multi-lateral aid agencies to scale up the project to a full fledged project.

(3) Macro-policy review and project site baseline surveys

A succinct stock-taking and assessment of relevant macro-policy and its implementation in the sector or thematic areas related to the project must be undertaken to ensure the proper planning and effective implementation of Showcase projects. Mapping local resources is a useful step to undertake a baseline information analysis and involve a local community.

It is also essential to have a baseline assessment on socio-economic and environmental conditions of the project site and local municipality, and to have a technical assessment on the feasibility and expected impacts of projects in the planning process. It is encouraged to apply a PDCA cycle¹ approach to ensure effective implementation of the project during the project implementation period and in the long-run.

(4) Macro-policy analysis

One of the distinctive features for the APFED Showcase Programme is to address the linkage of project activities with national legislation, policy, institutional frameworks and market and financing mechanisms. Consideration must be paid to such an interface between field projects and macro-policy with a view to providing inputs for prompting appropriate policy evolution and transformation.

In analysing the interface between field actions and macro-policy, further consideration can be given to the linkages with relevant international policy framework and market mechanisms. The development of carbon trading market is one of the international mechanisms that deserve due attention. The Chicago Carbon Exchange and Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) are some of such international mechanisms that deserve further attention.

(5) Participatory approach and stakeholder empowerment

All the projects of the APFED Showcase Programme has been employing a participatory approach involving local people and stakeholders in project activities in one way or the other. The project activities have been facilitating capacity development that must be further promoted. At the same time, it is vital to employ methods to measure and demonstrate quantifiably the impacts of capacity development to the extent possible.

(6) Institutionalising stakeholders

It is vital to go beyond individual levels, and reach out to a group of stakeholders in implementing

¹ PDCA stands “plan, do, check and act”. It is used to promote regular monitoring of project implementation progress, and to facilitate necessary adjustments for effective project implementation.

Showcase projects. In this context, it is indispensable to organise and institutionalise stakeholder groups. Giving functional titles to key stakeholder members is one way to institutionalise stakeholders and to acknowledge their responsibility and contributions for the project. It is also useful to form focus groups and convene their meetings on a regular basis.

(7) Benchmarks and indicators

Short, mid and long-term targets need to be spelled out clearly in the planning process. In this context, it is useful to formulate a set of benchmarks and indicators along with the milestones and project implementation timeframes. Benchmarks and indicators can address social, economic and environmental aspects. They can also address people's perceptual and behavioural changes as well as improvement/changes in environmental performance. To promote effective application of benchmarks and indicators for sound monitoring, capacity development of stakeholders must be undertaken as a part of the project activities.

(8) Technology application

Simple and low cost technology application and dissemination is an essential success factor for APFED Showcase projects. Local people must be able to maintain and repair technology. Local/indigenous knowledge and practice must be made use of in this regard.

(9) Information measures

Labelling (e.g. Green Label for products, Green Leave for service sector in Thailand, and carbon labels) application will enhance the effectiveness of implementing projects.

Disclosure of project information also helps ensuring the effective project implementation. It can be undertaken in the form of website, newsletters, and newspapers in written form, or video, art, play and comics in other visual or cultural forms.

2. Monitoring, evaluation and reporting

(1) General approach

Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) must be undertaken in the regular intervals to check progress, impacts, and outcome in project implementation process on a regular basis. M&E must aim at facilitating effective project implementation and promoting learning and information sharing among stakeholders. It should be recognised that it is not primarily for policing project implementation.

The result of M&E is important in the process to demonstrate the effectiveness of project implementation, draw lessons, and provide recommendations for scaling up and replicating projects. Such a continuous process is essential to bring a pilot project to a full-fledged project.

M&E must delineate not only the positive progress, but also negative aspects to avoid errors and failure.

(2) Result-based approach

M&E must be a result-based approach. In this context, it is important to develop a matrix to be in developed and updated in the planning and implementation processes, and such a matrix must show shows inputs, activities, outputs, sub-result, results and impacts.

(3) Impacts on people and ecosystems

Impacts must be demonstrated in the form of social, economic and environmental indicators. Analysis on the impacts must be geared to demonstrate what impacts have been brought on people and ecosystems in the pre-project period, project implementation period and post-project period.

There are factors that are not necessarily *prima facie* measurable. In such a case, some anecdotal or descriptive observation is still useful in M&E processes.

(4) Co-financing

Matching co-financing including in-kind contributions must be measured. Public-private partnership can be also assessed in M&E.

(5) Regular field visits and interactions with local stakeholders

Field visits, financial monitoring and cross-checking with other institutes are essential steps to take for undertaking M&E. Other than face-to-face communication and mandatory report submission, it is useful to promote email interactions and exchange formatted updates and communication on a voluntary basis.

(6) Timely completion and reporting

As obliged in the terms of reference and letters of agreement, project implementing organisations (IOs) are obliged to complete project activities and submit reports in a timely manner through NetRes institutes to the APFED Showcase Secretariat and the APFED Secretariat. NetRes institutes are required to assist IO in further substantiating and refining their reports by adding their observation and evaluation to the reports.

(7) Mobilising staff members

In addition to regular staff members who must perform a primary responsibility for project monitoring, volunteers and interns are also mobilised to supplement regular monitoring activities.

3. Information management

(1) Documenting and publicising project implementation

Priority must be given to the work to document, share information and publicise project implementation including its process and impacts. Appropriate budget provision, financial support, and personnel deployment must be rendered for such a purpose.

(2) Make stories

It is vital to present project outcome as stories so as for other people to find interests and understand what the existing problems were, what changes intervening project activities have brought about, and how the stakeholders continue to carry out activities to pursue project objectives beyond the project implementation period.

(3) Information dissemination

A variety of measures must be taken to promote information dissemination to a wide range of stakeholders. Higher priority should be attached to this information dissemination component in the

project implementation and reporting processes.

(4) APFED Website and database

APFED Website provides a useful feature. GEF/UNDP Small Grant Programme maintains the global database that shows the profiles of projects including community participation, sustainability and gender issues, and their experiences can be taken into account in developing/substantiating the APFED Website. Photographs and videos are also included. Such a database is useful. Digital cameras are included in the budget for documenting purposes.

Newspapers, case studies and media documentaries are also compiled at the end of the projects for knowledge management.

4. Future plans

IOs and NetRes institutes have agreed to make contributions to the following activities. The APFED Secretariat (IGES) and the APFED Showcase Facility Secretariat (UNEP/ROAP) shall communicate to the IOs and NetRes institutes to seek their timely contributions to the following activities:

(1) APFED message on climate change

In devising the APFED message on climate change, the written contributions shall be made in a timely manner based on the progress made in implementing and writing reports on the climate change related APFED Showcase projects. Besides, other relevant elements such as those to be drawn from the APFED Award case studies shall be provided as written contributions.

(2) APFED II interim report

It is planned that the APFED II interim report shall be developed in March – May 2009. In this process for which written contributions based on the Showcase project implementation are required.

(3) APFED II Final report preparation process

It is scheduled that the draft APFED II final report shall be developed in June 2009, and it will be submitted for review at the APFED II Fifth Plenary Meeting planned to take place in July/August 2009.

(4) APFED Showcase website

The Showcase Facility Secretariat (UNEP/ROAP) and the APFED Secretariat (IGES) shall further collaborate to substantiate the APFED Showcase website that is hosted by UNEP/ROAP. In addition to the written contributions, photos, videos and newspaper/journal articles must be contributed to the website.

(5) APFED Newsletters

The APFED Secretariat in collaboration with the APFED Showcase Facility Secretariat shall develop and circulate APFED Newsletters that will feature the key elements and progress in APFED activities including the Showcase Programme.

(6) Workshops and drafting group meetings

To facilitate the above-mentioned activities particularly the work for synthesising Showcase project

findings, achievements and lessons and for drafting the APFED II Final Report, it is suggested to convene additional sessions of the workshop and thematic drafting groups where feasible. It was requested that the APFED Secretariat and the APFED Showcase Facility Secretariat will continue consultations with potential partners to explore such possibilities.

5. 3rd NetRes Meeting

Through the deliberation in pursuance with the agenda and programme of work for the 3rd NetRes meeting, the participants have exchanged views and explored agreements on future NetRes operations. It is worth highlighting particularly the following points for a record of the meeting as the agreements reached by the representatives of the IOs and NetRes institutes to make contributions to the following activities:

- (1) NetRes contributes to policy dialogues and IGES will facilitate preparation in collaboration with NetRes institutes,
- (2) To support the development of APFED Database by adding good practices that NetRes institutes promote,
- (3) IGES facilitates communication and formation of joint research proposals and resource mobilisation for undertaking such joint research. Topics can include co-benefit approach, ecosystem/environmental payment and access and benefit sharing of genetic and biological resources,
- (4) Joint publication should be explored on common interests, and the output should be used not just for publication purposes itself, but for making available as text books in training/higher education, and
- (5) Joint training/course on sustainability should be explored; and IGES should explore a possibility and modality for undertaking such a training/course on sustainability; ADB can be a potential partner to tab upon.

Annex I**SUMMARY OF PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSIONS****Opening Session**

At the opening session, Dr. Vinya S. Ariyaratne, APFED Member and Executive Director, Sarvodaya Headquarters "Damsak Mandira" made welcome remarks by briefly introducing APFED and Sarvodaya activities, and underlining his continuous aspiration for promoting sustainable development and collaboration in the region. Mr. I.H.K. Mahanama, Additional Secretary, President Office also made welcome remarks referring to the recent initiative of the Government of Sri Lanka for promoting sustainability policy including the application of happiness index following the similar attempt by Bhutan, Mr. Hendricus Verbeek, Administrative Officer, UNEP/ROAP made opening remarks by briefly reflecting the past achievement and on-going process for facilitating the implementation of the APFED Showcase Programme.

Dr. Parvez Hassan, APFED Member and Former Chairman of the International Union of the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) Law Commission, Pakistan delivered a keynote speech. He outlined the recent changes such as oil and food price increase that has been changing the paradigm of the region that are at stake for promoting sustainable development. He underlined the need to formulate and demonstrate concrete achievements of APFED II that are now in the 3rd – 4th year of the 5 year programme. The outcome and its evaluation is a key determinant for the Government of Japan and its partner to assess a need and merit for continuing APFED activities. Following the outcome of the APFED II Fourth Plenary Meeting held in Davao, Philippines in July 2008, he emphasised the important task that is entrusted at this meeting and its participants to review the achievements and agree upon future work plans. He made an offer to invite APFED group to have a meeting in Pakistan in 2009.

Ms. L. Padmini Batuwitige, Director, Ministry of the Environment, Sri Lanka made a presentation on the Sri Lanka's policy achievements and future challenges to promote environmental management and sustainable development. She underlined the Government's commitment to promoting regional and international collaboration for pursuing sustainable development. Sri Lanka implements a policy mix. Sulphur and air pollutant emissions have been declining over the past 5 years. The Climate Change Secretariat was established in 2001, and a national carbon fund was also established in 2008. Land management and waste management have been also promoted through various policy measures. E-waste inventory was developed, and a policy instrument is being developed through receiving public comments. The Ministry took a role in linking more closely human development index and sustainability in 2008. The National Council for Sustainable Development was established in 2008 and is chaired by the Prime Minister to stimulate a policy process for pursuing sustainability.

Mr. Hiroshi Nishimiya, Principal Researcher, IGES gave an overview of the APFED Showcase Workshop and Third NetRes Meeting highlighting key issues to be discussed at each session of the Workshop and the Meeting, and underlining the importance of having common understanding and agreement on future work plans to facilitate APFED activities and a process for formulating the APFED II final report.

Session 1: APFED and APFED Showcase Programme

Ms. Aretha Aprilia, Programme Specialist, UNEP/ROAP, introduced the overall process of the APFED Showcase Programme and highlighted the progress made in facilitating the implementation of the Showcase Programme. She elaborated about the background of APFED Showcase Programme, the outline of the Programme, administration and management of the Programme. It is noted that in total, the number of proposal submissions in 2006 – 2008 are 747 proposals, which were submitted from 47 countries. It is foreseen that by 2009, the Secretariat will receive more than 1,000 proposals in total under APFED II activity. It would be interesting to analyse and identify the focus areas, points of concerns raised by the region, which are reflected by the proposal, to be presented at the APFED 2nd phase report. The general trend of submission is that the majority of proposals addressed the issues of land management, agriculture and forest, following the issue of waste and chemical, and climate-related issues. She also touched upon the progress on the nearly-completed project in Korea and recommencement of project in Myanmar, both under 2006 Showcase. The new modalities of funds disbursement for 2008 Showcase were also elaborated in her presentation.

Ms. Ikuyo Kikusawa, Researcher, Programme Management Office (PMO), IGES, highlighted some of the key observations concerning the implementation of the APFED Showcase projects. She referred to the questionnaire survey that was commenced towards NetRes and IOs from July to September, 2008. Discussions mainly focused on the comments and suggestions from NetRes and IOs. Major concerns were delays in disbursement, complicated administrative modalities, and insufficient preparation including the surveys on local communities and the feasibility analysis. The APFED Secretariat has addressed these issues by providing suggested disbursement modalities and developing the Showcase Handbook, which gives guidance on the procedure, stakeholder responsibilities, funding modalities, etc. The development of monitoring and evaluation schemes was also suggested.

Session 2: Progress Reports of APFED Showcase Projects for Tackling Climate Change

“Promoting Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency”

In his presentation, Mr. Namiz Musafer, Project Coordinator, Practical Action, Sri Lanka, an implementer of the project called Enhancing Productivity of Utilisation of Bio Energy in Sri Lanka, justified the reason of selection of project on bioenergy in order to promote renewable energy to rise up to the challenge to overcome the issues of climate change. The project does not only address renewable energy aspects, but also addresses the issue of community development. Practical Action submitted their proposal to the APFED Showcase Programme to seek opportunities to assist the local community in tackling the current energy crisis. Mr. Musafer explained about the project that is located in Rasnayakapura and Gurugoda villages. He indicated the initial resistance from farmers due to their reluctance to change their way of farming, and due to their focus on food produce farming. Nevertheless after series of discussion sessions with the farmers, the project excels to be implemented. Mr. Musafer also presented on the implementation of activities to extract and process jatropha to biofuel and the future of project, that also includes village electrification, renewable energy centre establishment, and so forth.

Mr. Dhruva Raj Gautam, Team Leader, Renewable Energy Promotion for Sericulture Project,

Energy and Environment, Nepal, undertaking Supporting Farmers with Silk House and Solar for Sericulture Promotion, explained on the major achievements of the project. Under the APFED Showcase Programme funding, the implementing organisation has succeeded to install solar panel systems at household levels, constructed 50 silkworm rearing house for demonstration, established farmers' networks to promote sericulture, and plantation of mulberry plants by farmers. It is worth to note that the government started to realise the importance of silkworm rearing house as well as solar energy to promote alternative energy. The project had achieved the promotion of income-generating activities and generates local employment. At the same time, the project plays the role to improving health conditions and reducing carbon emission (with 52 biogases, 2100 kg of fuel wood are reduced annually). It was mentioned that knowledge and skills of farmers are deemed more important than establishment of infrastructure. Several challenges faced are including lack of sufficient market, lack of human resources, among others.

Dr. Kua Harn Wei, Assistant Professor, Department of Building, School of Design & Environment, National University of Singapore, responsible for the project namely Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) for Environment and Sustainable Development in Asia and the Pacific, commenced his presentation by mentioning the latest CSR research that were undertaken by NUS, SIIA, and other international groups. The term "CSdR" (Corporate Sustainable development Responsibility) was introduced by NUS and its partners, which framework comprises of literature review, focus group meetings, etc. The result was the identification of six categories of indicators. Dr. Kua also pinpointed the activities that promote sustainable work place and collaborate with several participating private companies to implement innovative approaches on 'green office'. The identification of areas of weakness enables NUS and its partners to address the challenges and propose approaches on how to conduct sustainable practices within the office. For this initiative to succeed, engagements from stakeholders as agent of change are sought, including involvement of schools in addition to private companies' engagements.

Mr. Teddy Lesmana, Researcher, Center for Economic Research, Indonesian Institute of Science, Indonesia, involved in the implementation of Community based educational and partnership actions - Carbon neutral initiative for community empowerment and climate change mitigation in Indonesia, provided the brief overview of Indonesia's state of energy, of which the primary source of energy is oil, followed by gas. Most of the energy consumption is by the industry sector, and due to the growing demand of electricity, renewable energy sectors are in high demand. The case study of micro hydro power in Cinta Mekar that was supported by the UN-ESCAP was presented. This project provides electricity to 220 households and the electricity produced is sold to the national electricity company, which resulted in the income generation for the community. In the case of the APFED Showcase project, it was foreseen that the sites would be in Lombok and Bogor. However following a series of site visits and further review, taking into account various considerations such as security situation, financial, etc, LIPI as implementing organisation together with IGES as the NetRes, plan to build the micro hydro power in Bogor. Bogor is located near Jakarta and the village population is dense, therefore the project will provide tangible impacts on the local community.

"Green Procurement in Thailand"

Dr. Qwanruedee Chotichanathawewong - Assistant President, Thailand Environment Institute (TEI), explained about the project on green procurement in Thailand, which was commenced by the

initiative of “green labels” around 10 years ago. The green procurement is implemented in three pilot companies. One of the success stories is that companies agreed to adopt green procurement. Government and private companies are also interested on the green products. The challenge was the difficulties in getting “green label” and “green leaf” certification for hotels. Therefore TEI and Thai Green house gas organisation promoted “Carbon Label”, which is easier to obtain than the Green Label.

“Adaptation and Ecosystem Management”

Ms. Nyamtseren Mandakh Researcher, Desertification Study Center, GeoEcology Institute of Mongolian Academy of Sciences, Mongolia, in charge of the project, Rehabilitating Desert Zone Ecosystems and Promoting Sustainable Alternative Livelihood in Gobi Protected Areas, Buffer Zones and Peripheral Communities in Mongolia, talked about the critical ecological situation and the desertification of the land in Mongolia. The Showcase project examines the climatic and socio-economic factors of desertification. The analysis on interviews and discussions conducted as part of the project activities has been undertaken. The remoteness of the project site makes the supervision difficult. It takes 24 hours to reach the project site, and it therefore makes the management difficult. Water management, hand craft marketing, and the establishment of an educational panel are some of the planned activities. Tree planting on the deserted areas was demonstrated with a number of photos. The project supports the community to sell the handcrafts. The gaps identified were poor information sharing, a lack of transparency between local and central governments, limited feedback from the stakeholders, inconsistency of the environmental policy and current field situation.

Mr. Nhu Van Ky, Department of Forestry, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, Viet Nam, involved in the implementation of Sustainable Community Forestry and Poverty reduction in Vietnam, introduced the Sericulture project in Nepal. The achievements having been made so far include training of personnel, establishment of advanced satellite remote sensing datasets, and internet-based carbon registry among local communities. He also addressed the benchmarks and indicators being used. For example, the number of participating households in registering lands is a means to measure the project progress although this has not yet been undertaken. Through the project, the baseline data are collected from 15 households and will be increased. The future activities include the development of CCX protocol to materialise the carbon trade activities.

Mr. Huberto Cadampog Zanoria, Director, Community Extension and Development Office, Southwestern University, Philippines, who has undertaken REPORMA-CEBU (Resource and Poverty Response, Mapping and Management - Cebu), began with the introduction of climatic situation in the Philippines, capturing the vulnerable condition of the region where the sea level rise strongly affects. To tackle water issues including water-borne diseases and shortage of drinking water, the scheme shifts from a punitive upland resource management approach to a multi-sectoral approach to protect the resource endowment. It addresses the issues of coastal resource management, urban renewal, climate change, etc., engaging multi-stakeholders by establishing the network called KNOW-Net and enhancing eco tourism and income augmentation activities. The project has achieved the strengthened involvement of youth, while there are still constraints such as inadequate system of record keeping and limited capability of new officials on development planning. Limited awareness on climate change and disaster mitigation should be addressed.

Discussions

The registration with CCX and its credit rate drew participants' attention although the activity has not yet commenced and no answer can be given. The project has supported the marketing and the capacity building.

Visits of NetRes representatives to the project site provide the community with external perspectives. The project implementation tends to focus on local interests, but the site observation by a third-party agency maintains the balance between international aspects and the local needs.

A question was raised as to how companies can be brought into CSRs, and what are incentives. Companies are attaining economic benefits and improving good publicity. With respect to how to expand CSR activities beyond Singapore, it was said that based on the experiences analysed in Singapore, lessons can be shared with other countries to upscale CSR at the regional level. Standardisation of CSR – through inductive approach, certain standardisation is emerging based on the actions undertaken by small companies.

Session 3: Effective Support, Monitoring and Evaluation of Pilot Projects

Ms. Shireen Samarasuriya, National Coordinator, SGP Sri Lanka, UNDP, introduced the SGP-funded projects. The maximum number of grant under SGP is up to USD 50,000, with the average funds for Sri Lanka of around USD 20,000. The projects are expected to reach the most marginalised community. The proposals that are selected are not necessarily well-written, but they should demonstrate the feasibility and applicability of the proposed projects. The submissions were not only in the form of written proposals, but also video clips and/or photographs submissions. The database is regularly updated for monitoring and evaluation purposes, to keep track of the progress, which are to be reported to the GEF Council. The photos taken before and after of the project implementation are presented to see the impacts of the project. Therefore a digital camera is considered as one of the items to be included in the budget. The partners are encouraged to publish newspaper articles to feature projects in their national and/or local papers, prepare project documentaries as means of information dissemination, etc. The modalities of four instalments of funds disbursement are used, and monitoring with regular field visits prior to the disbursements are carried out. The partners are invited to participate on the capacity building workshops. Partnerships are also established with the Ministry of Environment and universities. Local governments are engaged to play the roles in monitoring activities.

Mr. P.S. Sodhi, National Coordinator, GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP) India explained about the operation of GEF SGP in India, which is established under the Centre for Environment and Education (CEE) India. The programme commenced in 1995 with the overall budget of USD 5,8 million and had supported 257 projects. The involvement of UNDP in the projects covering over 100 countries varies from implementation to supervision. The co-financing is leveraged USD 7.1 million. CEE has 7 regional offices in the country and the standard operating procedures are referring to effective management. For undertaking field visit, local governments are engaged as partners. The question was raised that monitoring and evaluation can not be conducted within the limited time (e.g. jatropa can not be grown and monitored in the time period provided to one project) as well as the

ownership of the project. Projects have faced difficulties in receiving the fund from the government in the country. When a project is supported by multiple agencies, the degree of involvement is maintained to keep balance; for example, 6 representatives from one organisation and 6 from the other. To keep the uniformity, it usually takes a lot of time for negotiation and discussion. The aim is to make a logical contribution, which leads to the marketing of the products obtained through the project. Monitoring must be undertaken in the individual level, so that an implementer can be fairly evaluated. How to link with the government is the key to obtaining the financial resource.

Mr. Ranjith Mahindapala, Country Representative- Sri Lanka, International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN), commenced his presentation with the introduction of the IUCN organisation, which applies the Results-based approach. In regards to the Small Grant Programme administered by IUCN, a series of steps that are referred to are: inputs, activities, outputs, subresult, results, and impacts. The five major criteria include: 1) relevance; 2) effectiveness, to indicate whether the project is doable, within the timeframe, and whether the outputs can give desired impacts; 3) efficiency; 4) impacts (changes in people and environment); 5) sustainability (what is the ownership, continuity of work after project). The challenge is mainly the inability to deliver the project in timely manner despite very ambitious plans. Therefore it is imperative to monitor and keep track of the progress and milestones. Also, stakeholder participation, replication options, financial planning, and feasibility of activities must be taken into account. To monitor outputs, deliverables need to be recorded, comparison with the original targets have to be made, an inception planning meeting need to be organised, and indicators have to be developed. In addition, lessons providing negative and positive impacts and making stories are important to share experiences.

Discussions

It is difficult to assume that a project itself tells a right story about public partnership and indicators, for instance. The issue is how to link the success stories with actual actions. Specific outcomes (e.g. skill up) bring other organisations to work on the specific issues raised. A delivery of joint monitoring with other institutions needs to be addressed. Partnership with other supporting organisations and use of those institutes who actually carry out activities is important. When multiple donors provide co-financing, it is difficult to distinguish the components each donor finances. For the case of GEF, GEF funds are used only for the environment related components. At the community level, a marketing scheme is the key to success. However, marketing has not received a lot of interest, and this should be advocated and enhanced.

Mere procurement of equipment is not acceptable under the Showcase Programme. In the SGP, necessary equipment is 100 % covered by NGO not by SGP funds. However, in a special case, the situations have to be sanctioned. In a long-term project, exchange losses occur, and a project form is also different from country to country. A disbursement ratio is flexible in SGP Sri Lanka. When gains or losses occur, it will be placed on to a project. It should be asked that how the gain is to be used since 1 – 2 % of contingency expenditure is generally expected.

In the discussions, it was highlighted that it is essential to monitor and report on the project implementation on a regular basis, and it is obligatory in the case of GEF. With respect to the impacts of projects on the macro-level policy, the project activities are written in a way that will

correspond to thematic or the cluster of policy issues in order to assess the linkages of activities with macro-policy issues. With respect to replicability, universal models of replicability cannot be spelled out and such a limitation needs to be acknowledged while the articulation of tailored methods to promote replication under varying conditions is useful.

Non-written submission substituted by photos and vide as applications are accepted in GEF/SGP in Sri Lanka, and it is a useful procedure. Documentary films are costly to produce and time-consuming for evaluation.

Session 4: Good Practice for Sustainable Development – Ryutaro Hashimoto APFED Award and APFED Good Practice Database

Ms. Tomoko Noguchi, Researcher, Programme Management Office (PMO), IGES, delivered a presentation on the APFED Award and Good Practice Database, and introduced the cases awarded this year. She also explained the procedures of APFED Award case study. The roles of each stakeholder were addressed, and the reporting and collaborative activities on the case study were stressed.

Discussions

The number of applicants to the Award Programme is very small. It would be helpful if NetRes institutes can promote the submission of application in each country or to partner organisations. Also, providing incentives of conducting the case study would encourage the application. Stories about the project through publication could become the incentives for applicants. Value added to provide credibility in publishing the results should be considered.

Being part of the process enables us to know how to assess the successful projects implemented by local organisations with limited experiences in applying to such awards.

Regarding the Good Practice Database, if a non-awarded project is considered as reasonably successful, there would be a consideration to be added on the database.

Session 5: APFED Showcase Programme Handbook

Ms. Ikuyo Kikusawa, Researcher, Programme Management Office (PMO), IGES, introduced the Showcase Handbook, which guides all the stakeholders through the procedure of implementing and supervising the Showcase projects. The Handbook indicates the roles and timing of actions throughout the implementation. By following the procedure indicated, the mutual understanding among the Secretariats, NetRes and IOs can be established.

Discussions

The procedure was made clear and simple, and efficient implementation can be expected. It would be appreciated if the samples of required documents are made. The suggested disbursement of 60 - 30 - 10 % should be provided quarterly. Fixing the conversion rate is one option. If the procurement is justifiable and considered as necessary, special sanctions can be made on a case by case basis.

Session 6: Reporting and Lesson Sharing of the APFED Showcase Programme

Mr. Masanori Kobayashi of IGES stressed the importance of audio visual products developed through the APFED Programmes to sustain and promote the APFED activities. The submission of three major APFED reports, namely APFED II Interim Report, APFED Programme Report and APFED II Final Report, are scheduled to be published. The presentation addressed the Asian models that could be distilled by the Showcase projects. It also admits the gaps between the information obtained from the Showcase projects and the components that APFED Secretariats intend to address in the reports. To bridge the gap, the NetRes joint activities can contribute to the facilitation of macro policy and the results obtained through local activities.

Discussions

2008 and 2009 Showcase projects may not be integrated into the Final Report as the final results of the projects will come after the Report publication; however, the consolidated theme-specific analysis can be made.

It is important to highlight the achievements of several areas, in which the Showcase projects can be categorised. Commonality among the projects should be identified and featured. It is impossible to show all the results within 1, 2 years, but at least changes made during the limited period should be demonstrated. For example, even if the amount of waste generated shows little difference, the perception of community may be altered by the training provided through a project. Story telling is important and effective tools, and also a suitable modality to distribute the experiences should be explored.

Mr. Verbeek of UNEP/ROAP suggested that the Showcase Programme should not be too ambitious because the Programme is to showcase innovative activities. Therefore the Programme should stay focusing on the approaches and interim results rather than actual results. Dr. Hassan commented that a regional form of eminent persons in the A-P region should be established like the ones in EU and the US.

Session 7: Effective Reporting of Project Performance

Mr. Masanori Kobayashi, Coordinator, Programme Management Office (PMO), IGES, gave guidance on the three topics to be discussed in the working group discussion. The topics are 1) benchmarks and indicators and their application, 2) interface between policy and field actions, and 3) innovative and success factors. The participants were divided into three working groups, and were asked to rotate every 45 minute and discuss different topics. The discussions are expected to be developed each time the WG is rotated. The accumulation of information and knowledge would be discussed in the end of discussions.

Session 8: Reporting from the Working Groups

Working Group 1: Benchmarks and Indicators and Their Application

Facilitator: Ms. Aretha Aprilia, UNEP/ROAP

Rapporteur: Mr. Hendricus Verbeek, UNEP/ROAP

A number of issues regarding the setting of benchmarks and indicators were raised. Those include the difficulties in measuring the incremental effects of APFED contribution when a project is part of another bigger project, in motivating IOs to commit funds for indicators as they are output-oriented, in balancing results with costs incurred (i.e. energy consumption: economic balance of electricity bill – investment costs), and in finding the benchmark and its definition. In addition, an innovative approach does not always tally with a traditional way of performance monitoring (i.e. It is difficult to measure how a small project contributes to the livelihood, which is affected by a number of external factors.). Among those, major concerns can be categorised into two clusters: the issues under the Showcase Programme and the issues regarding the selection of indicators.

Problems under the Showcase project

- Short time frame
- Difficulties in measuring sustainability of the project (after completion)
- Limited institutional capacities
- Availability, accessibility and reliability of baseline data

Problems in selecting indicators

- Difficult to find right variables
- Indicators not project – specific
- Too many indicators
- Risk of isolating the effects of the project

To overcome the issues raised above, suggestions were made. A primary idea for problem solving is to adopt simple but flexible indicators. A participatory approach for data collection and/or self-appraisal is suggested. With the involvement of the community, the following indicators were suggested.

Suggested indicators

- Project-specific / APFED contribution-specific / community-specific indicators
- Proxy indicators for qualitative outputs
- Indicators integrating indigenous knowledge (people's science)
- Result-based indicators
- Simple and flexible indicators incorporated into project implementation
- Broad-based indicators, impacting livelihoods
- Use of existing data, rather than duplicating

Objects to be measured

- Community commitment
- Adoption of outcomes / outputs
- Proof of concepts – what is being done

Reflecting the above suggestions in the real situation, concrete methods were discussed in concluding the working group session. The outcomes help materialise the suggested indicator

settings.

Livelihood Indicators

- Project-specific household questionnaires
- Interviews and focus group discussions
- Satisfaction survey

Environmental Indicators

- Specific project outputs (i.e. number of trees planted or saved)
- Achieved carbon credits
- Looking at historic trends
- Try to look at the outcomes

Other indicators (Empowerment, Awareness)

- Measuring proxy indicators
- Measuring community participation
- Variety of stakeholders
- Documenting the performance of the project with visual means (i.e. “before and after”, “with or without” photographs)

Working Group 2: Interface between Policy and Field Actions

Facilitator: Ms. Ikuyo Kikusawa, IGES

Rapporteur: Dr. Suneel Pandey, TERI

The gaps between macro policy and field action were discussed. At first, the discussion was shifted towards how to deal with the gap rather than fill in the gap. A recommended action is to look for a government official who is interested in a local project and make him/her to be a focal point of the implementation from a governmental agency. Regarding the gap, it was stated that there is no policy that works as an incentive to local collaborators. A problem repeatedly brought up was the conflict between ministries, such as contradiction of laws, for example. Discussants have also seen the tensions between civil society and the government as well as the time lag of sending the local information to the upper level of government due to the consultation time at each level. The major concerns over the gaps were as follows.

Financial

- Limited (lack of) financial support
- Sources usually funded by outside the country (making it difficult to connect macro policy and the local actions)

Institutional

- Conflict of interests (whether policy maker’s interests benefit the local)
- Mismatch of local context and macro policy
- Lack of information disclosure
- Local activities begin before a policy is made (e.g. companies take a lead first and may influence the policy)

- Environmental policy making process occurs at the government level (hardly reach the local)
- Lack of inter-ministerial coordination (overlapping mismatches in the policy legislation)
- Multiple layers of policy awareness

In reflecting the gaps identified, the value-added engagement of policymakers was considered as effective to bridge the gap between macro policy and field contexts. This can be done by increasing the recognition of local action among policymakers and providing them with the credibility of the project success. Policy makers are thought to look at the results and high positive impacts of the project on the environment, society and market. The suggested solutions were rather focused on the approach towards government officials than local communities. Major points discussed in this session are as follows.

Approach towards policymakers

- Contacting government officials (right focal persons interested in the issue)
- Sensitising and involving congress people
- Sustaining the advocacy with policy makers
- Institutionalising the involvement of policy makers
- Taking local government into the project
- Bringing policy makers to the field

General suggestions

- Bring all the stakeholders (e.g. ministers, mayor, academia, international organisation, civil society, media) on the round table and reach a consensus
- Benefiting stakeholders rather than enforcing them
- Coordination among ministerial governments
- Settling a specific agreement (introducing community needs, local methods and activities to the government)
- Enhanced communication among civil society groups to make their voice bigger and to be heard

To put these suggestions into practice, the methods that can be adopted in the project implementation were explored. The importance of the gatherings such as policy dialogues among multi-stakeholders was emphasised. It is important to make opportunities, in which local collaborators can get further involved, to draw their collective voice. Moreover, establishing the strategic and systematic framework that illustrates the contributions and benefits of each stakeholder was considered critical. A further consideration must be placed on a longer-term support/project (of APFED) to materialise the suggestions since these methods will become effective over the long period.

Policymaker involvement

- Training and workshops to synthesise policymakers (capacity building)
- Policy forum discussions among project practitioners, academia, policymakers, etc.
- Contacting local officials (with an intention of delivering an interest from lower level to higher level)
- The committee formation for the strategic involvement of policy makers to formally create their continuous interest

Community involvement

- Awareness programme on the policy provision through mass media (choose the most used media in the region)
- Continuous lobbying and advocating (roles of civil society)
- Opinion surveys on the benefits of the existing policies to the local
- Amendment of existing policy

Others

- A road map to elucidate the roles of each stakeholder and project under the larger policy vision while reflecting a particular element of policy

Working Group 3: Innovative and Success Factors

Facilitator: Mr. Masanori Kobayashi, IGES

Rapporteur: Dr. Biman Prasad, USP

The Group reviewed a variety of success factors that were envisaged in the context of the APFED Showcase projects, and related undertakings as follows:

Stakeholder involvement

- Community participation and support; a wider range of stakeholder involvement including youth and women
- Ownership, motivation and willingness, mutual respect and trust, inclusiveness, recognition of their involvement and contributions to project activities
- Consensus on objectives, and sharing interests among stakeholders
- Leadership at local level, gender
- Frequent consultation; where a physical distance is a constraint, other forms of communication such as e-mail, telephones and Skype must be used. When there are constraints in using information and communication technology (ICT), other options should be considered such as using volunteers

Project planning and management

- Projects must aim at gradual and incremental changes, and must not target short-term drastic changes
- Clear delineation on the scope of work, frame for implementation, and timeframe
- Mechanisms that ensures the project sustainability/continuity are incorporated in the project
- Integration of local livelihood issues
- Appropriate risk management

Coordination

- Local government's coordination and proactive support
- Cooperation with other institutions, academia and NGOs

Information, technology and capacity development

- Information dissemination, transparency

- Appropriate technology, local maintenance
- Intellectual property right, copy right immunity or concessional licensing
- Capacity building and training
- Mediation, conflict resolution

To better understand the above-mentioned success factors, the Group also listed the failure factors in contrast:

Stakeholders

- Community resistance, limited interest at the side of the stakeholders

Policy and administrative aspects

- Government bureaucracy
- Lack of incentives (e.g., tax breaks, assistance/service)

Project planning and management

- Overambitious and unrealistic project goals
- Too short project implementation period

Other social issues

- Security problem such as theft of equipments

In order to secure success factors and avoid failure/error factors, the following measures and actions were suggested:

Planning and implementation

- Flexibility and realistic objective setting – deviation should be within the realm of main objectives
- Sound baseline and technical assessment
- BAU scenario and post intervention assessment
- Regular site visits and consultation particularly at the time of contract development, during implementation and post-implementation evaluation
- Establishing a steering committee with position titles
- Institutional mechanisms at the community, not at the individual levels built in the project implementation modalities for promoting monitoring and public information dissemination.
- Mapping resources made available for project implementation
- Use of micro-finance
- Mutual interests to be taken care in the project
- Prompt fund disbursement
- Securing autonomy of APFED components focusing on incrementality of environmental components

Stakeholder involvement

- Participation in planning and implementation
- Leadership development
- Facilitator, not dominant, but prompting social transformation with stakeholders

- Governance/accountability structure
- Maintaining frequent communication among stakeholders, if not through face-to-face meeting, then through emails, formatted communication, Skype and other low cost and less time consuming communication measures
- Making the project as common property
- Public recognition of achievements and contributions made by stakeholders
- Gender sensitivity
- Involving local governments
- Local and indigenous knowledge application, consolidating local knowledge through consultations
- Using local mechanism
- Local language, personal contact, with all, door to door
- Use of non-text communication methods such as visual materials, art, film, photos, comic, information centre, play, local newspapers, radio, website
- Using local culture for conciliation, mediation, arbitration and litigation

Monitoring and evaluation

- Frequent reporting, monthly update, bimonthly/quarterly on a voluntary basis

Macro policy issues

- Providing incentives for promoting sustainable development
- Tax exempt status for recipients and donors

APFED Showcase programme management

- Allowing 2nd application to seek continuous funding in the following consecutive year under the APFED Showcase Programme
- Attempting to seek additional funding for scaling up the Showcase project to be funded by aid agencies

Session 9: APFED Showcase Programme Information Management

Ms. Aretha Aprilia, Programme Specialist, UNEP/ROAP delivered the presentation that elaborated the activities in regards to information management and dissemination of the APFED Showcase Programme. The activities undertaken are 1) APFED Showcase websites development (www.apfedshowcase.net) administered by UNEP/ROAP and APFED Showcase webpage under APFED website (www.apfed.net/showcase) administered by IGES; 2) media outreach; 3) collaboration with UNEP subregional officers and communication officer to disseminate APFED Showcase activities; 4) Facebook, as virtual network of interested parties on APFED Showcase Programme and environmental projects implementation as a whole; 5) newsletter, with IGES taking the lead.

Ms. Tomoko Noguchi, Researcher, Programme Management Office (PMO), IGES, addressed information management of the Showcase Programme. The presentation began with the examples of information dissemination and exchange schemes that have been adopted by NetRes institutes. She demonstrated the image of the APFED Newsletter with the prospected contents. It was proposed that the Secretariats collaborate in channelling the latest information on APFED activities. The further

development of APFED websites and the action towards launching newsletter were also stated.

Mr. Nalaka Gunawardene, Director and CEO, Television for Education - Asia Pacific (TVE Asia Pacific), provided introduction of the company, which had been established and generally well-received in the region, with several engagements with international organisations, including UNESCAP, IGES, UNEP, etc. He pinpointed the importance to consider the strategies to develop video documentaries so that the benefits can be reaped optimally. There are several considerations for producing audiovisual items, mainly: 1) importance of defining the purpose early on in the process (what we are trying to accomplish); 2) defining audience (whom to be primarily reached); 3) selection of the formats (documentaries, drama, panel debates, interviews, Public Service Announcement, animation, etc). Good story telling with incorporation of entertainment aspect of information sharing is an essential component in reaching the audience. The simple test for mass appeal is: New, True, Interesting (NTI). It is not recommended to share the information on the detailed laws technicality, regulations, technology, or diplomacy. The challenge is to get the audience to stay engaged as we deliver the information to them.

Discussions

Video filming in a remote area always has challenges concerning power availability. There is no complete way for the issues by being caution and preparing. In some cases, 50 % of outreach programmes show the possibility of making good use of skilled person fully or in an optimal way. Cell phone companies succeed to involve teenagers by sending messages on the web that can be accessed by mobile phones.

A basic principle is the better preparation the better the final outputs. The first visit is to spend time, get impressions, and recognise issues, and filming with equipment should be done in the second visit. Featured people are not video friendly people in most of the cases, (e.g. hierarchy and ethical issues exist). The research should also address who could read a story and where the people to be featured are (from what time to what time they are committed to the work you would like to focus). Both broadcast and narrowcast have to get the consent signed by participants on what information can be disclosed.

In the media activities, it seems difficult to know how to measure the investment and what the return is. However, it is possible to measure the returns with numbers. Many societies have a rating system and most broadcastings rate the programmes. The data about audience, frequency of access, favoured topics, etc. are regularly collected. Although the information dissemination study has been commenced, there is a room to discuss on the return of the investment. For example, 49million dollars were earned from the lighting a billion lives campaign. The return is greater, but quantifying the return is difficult.

Session 10: Drafting of Workshop Discussion Summary

The draft chair summary was distributed to the participants and received suggestions and comments on the contents.

Third NetRes Meeting

Opening Remarks

by *Mr. Masanori Kobayashi, Coordinator, Programme Management Office (PMO), IGES*

Session 1: Overall progress report of APFED

Mr. Masanori Kobayashi, Coordinator, Programme Management Office (PMO), IGES, briefly explained the overall views of the APFED Programme including Showcase Programme, Policy Dialogue and Knowledge Initiatives in addition to the introduction of NetRes. The APFED II Final Report was again explored, and the importance of joint activities on the lesson dissemination was emphasised. The Report is planned to be published in the 2010 MCED meeting in Kazakhstan. The recommendations and impacts of the projects will be consolidated.

Session 2: APFED Knowledge Initiative

The presentation on the activities under Knowledge Initiative (KI) and the result of the 2008 APFED Awards was delivered by Ms. Ikuyo Kikusawa, Researcher, Programme Management Office (PMO), IGES. The allocation and timeline of case studies for the awarded projects were presented. The emphasis was on the enhancement of KI including value adding to the good practices, the enrichment of the database, and the dissemination of good practices. It was proposed to make the database more user-friendly and attractive by providing the tools for assisting users and the stories behind the project implementation.

Discussions

To reach specific targets like chamber and academia, effective information dissemination is necessary. It is important to identify academia sources, and NetRes can support to specify the target. Showcase projects have already interacted with corporations and other agencies. However, it could be more enhanced by using mailing list and e-mailing the project pictures to local lobbies and governments. Conversation with a group of academia like AGS can help to find interest people and also receive fresh ideas in return. There is limited chance to present the results within NetRes, and such opportunities need to be explored.

Session 3: APFED Policy Dialogue: Progress and Future Plan

Mr. Masanori Kobayashi, Coordinator, Programme Management Office (PMO), IGES, introduced Policy Dialogue meetings held in Bali and Tokyo in December 2007 and March 2008, respectively. Cross cutting issues such as a co-benefit approach and biodiversity are to be addressed. The APFED message on climate change set the principle messages including global participation in GHG emissions. The recommendations to develop the regional programme of education for sustainable development were delivered. The outputs of the Dialogue in Tokyo were further integrated into the other governmental meeting by Dr. Kim. The key elements such as the importance of CSR movement and incentive schemes of promoting 3R at the meeting were also explicated.

Discussions

If the rough schedule of the Policy Dialogue meeting is set, it would be easier for NetRes to attend. Such meetings should be regularly organised. A topic on the preferable policy changes in the future was suggested for the dialogue. A stronger emphasis on 3R and new technologies in waste energy recovery are being developed. A lack of expertise on the recycling and importing of waste is revealed, and such issues are rather internally treated. The importance of disseminating the project outcomes by preparing a short report (e.g. 10 pages) was raised.

Session 4: Joint Research and Activities for NetRes

Mr. Kobayashi addressed the possibilities of the joint research activities with a number of examples. Topics like co-benefit approach and CDM, on which cost efficiency is focused, are given a substantial emphasis. According to the data on climate change related investments, the investors show little interest in reforestation and afforestation while hydro power and energy efficiency received high interests. Thus, there is a gap between the local projects (e.g. CCX) supported by APFED and current priority issues discussed in CDM. To fill in the gap, we can draw the APFED Showcase projects and develop the basis that can be submitted to the sectors of natural resource management and forest management, for example.

Discussions

Another topic raised in the Davao meeting is a community-based self-reliant mechanism through eco service payment. Collaboration with other related international agencies such as ADB and USAD can be achieved through the case studies and Showcase projects. As future activities, elaborating proposals for joint research and preparing a joint application for external funds should be further explored.

There is no need to put APFED Showcase projects in the CDM framework. Suggested joint activities include publications producing the course materials to colleges by synthesising the knowledge and full fledged research-based or practice-based activities depending on target readers. Course materials can be used in the universities, to which APFED members belong. A linkage among climate change, sustainable development, co-benefit approach and poverty reduction has been sought in the macro level policy, but not in the field level. Showcase projects should seek for such a linkage in the community level.

Wrap up Session – Concluding Remarks

Mr. Verbeek from UNEP/ROAP emphasised the crucial functioning of NetRes collaboration and appreciated the contributions from all the participants. Mr. Nishimiya reminded the significance of joint activities that contributed to MCED and other macro policy level meetings, and introduced other financial resource opportunities in Japan.

Site Visits

Sarvodaya Headquarters and Lagoswatta Eco-village

In the afternoon on Day 2, the participants visited the Sarvodaya Headquarters and Lagoswatta Eco-village as one of the resettlement housing project for the people affected by Tsunami in December 2004. The participants were welcomed by Dr. Vinya S. Ariyaratne, Executive Director and Dr. A. T. Ariyaratne, Founder of Sarvodaya. Sarvodaya promotes a wide range of community empowerment activities across the country, and it has brought influence to other neighbouring countries such as *Chipko* movement (tree conservation) in India and *Aga Khan* movement (community empowerment philanthropy) in Pakistan. It reaches out to 30,000 villages of which 3,000 are self-managed. Micro-finance, society & environment, ecology & environment are some of the key features of the Sarvodaya's activities. In the 50 years of activities, Sarvodaya shows lessons of success and failures for community empowerment. Sarvodaya's promotes philosophy that achievements can be made internally within the people's mind and that brings happiness to the people. Such a philosophy enables people to solve problems, meet their needs, and harness their freedom.

Lagoswatta eco-village project was to rescue a part of victims affected by Tsunami in December 2004. 50,000 were said to have lost their lives, and the damage was estimated to be over US\$40millions. In May 2005, Global Eco-village Network has launched the project, and the resettlement housing project was completed on 22 March 2006 to accommodate 55 households of about 300 people. People were selected by the government-run lottery, and moved in the new house with the provision of paid labour work, but otherwise for free of charge. The APFED component was to support the establishment of the waste segregation in the community. Two stations of segregated waste collection were established, and wastes are collected every Friday. As community people are so conscious about material conservation, there are not so much volume of wastes generated and collected at the waste collection stations.

One of the families who reside in one of the house explained that they were happy to be at the settlement house. They have home gardens with fruit trees, a solar panel and composting. They pay RP85 – 100 for electricity from grid per month against the daily income of 500 – 600 per day from fish trading. Solar power is used to light 3 lamps in the house, and other electronic appliances are powered by grid electricity. They use firewood for cooking.

In the town meeting, a town council chief, a young man, said that many residents have increased their income to the level of RP12,000 – 24,000 per month with the increased business. Settlement brought positive effects to neighbouring communities such as the construction of new roads and the opening of bus service. It has a library, a park and a clinic that people living outside can also use.

The community is well organised. Residents pay life-time membership for RP240 or RP24 per year. There has been a suggestion to establish a community plantation. It is said that there can be a potential of developing livestock farming or poultry farming.

By and large, eco-village has brought both ecological and social benefits to the local community. Despite that the waste segregation activity has limited result in terms of recycling or reusing, it has brought social impacts such as increased awareness on environmental issues and maintaining community cohesion. These elements are, however, difficult to quantifiably demonstrate.

2006 APFED Showcase Project “Enhancing Productivity of Utilisation of Bio Energy in Sri Lanka”
in Nikaweretiya Divisional Secretariat division, Kurunegala district

On Day 4, the participants visited the project sites of the 2006 APFED Showcase project for promoting bio-energy in Sri Lanka accompanied by the staff of Practical Action that coordinate the implementation of the project. They first visited the Rural Center for Development in Nikaweretiya to have a briefing on the project. After that, they visited the Gurugoda biofuel center. The project progress was presented at the SAARC biofuel conference held in Colombo in September 2008.

In the project site, 13 families participate in the project by planting 7,800 jatropha plants as live fence to protect farmland from livestock. Jatropha requires 3 years to get matured to start producing oil generating seeds. To expel oil from seeds, a locally made machine was used and it was procured at RP26,000 plus RP15,000 for a motor.

Near the biofuel center, a woman who participates in the project explained that she has planted 350 jatropha plants knowing that 1kg of jatropha seeds can be sold at RP20 per kg. 3 year old jatropha produce 1kg jatropha seeds, 2kg by 5 year old jatropha and 4 kg by 10 year old jatropha. Her family owns 3 acres (1.2 ha), and produce rice in 2 acres producing 250kg crops per acre. Her household generates RP6 – 7,000 per month revenue and owns 1 tractor and 1 motorcycle. Jatropha oil seeds can supplement income and partially meet oil demand although their contributions to the household income and oil procurement will be minimal.

One of the advantages was that the community already had an experience of working for an international project funded by Christian Aid to operate wind turbines for wind power generation. 40 wind turbines operate in the area by 13 households with 2.5kw capacity. Instead of paying for an electricity company, households pay RP150 per month to the community fund for communal services and development. While solar panels have potentials particularly for a dry season from February to August, wind turbines still provide better power generation through 24 hours throughout the year.

Micro-hydro can have a potential. It is called pico-hydro. A turbine can cost RP35,000 per unit, and it can increase electricity supply by 50 per cent. It can generate 180 unit of power where 1 unit of electricity can cost RP18. Each family pay RP500 per month for electricity. Pico-hydro has a good economic potential.

At the same time, households use firewood for cooking. A single energy source cannot resolve energy crunch. Biofuel or renewable energy will not supply energy sufficiently under the current system. Yet, it has an impact on the people’s awareness, and influencing their cropping/natural resource use patterns. To meet various demands of households, it is proposed to promote multi-cropping where people cultivate jatropha, vegetable, fruit and plant trees. Biogas production can be also explored. Such a multi-cropping pastoral agroforestry can provide a potential model in Asia for sustainable natural resource use and sustainable livelihood. However, due to the limited interest of investors, so far such projects were not yet materialised.

Note on “Co-financing” – Case of the GEF Small Grant Programme

What constitutes Co-financing?

Co-financing, in the context of the SGP is the ‘additional funds’ that is leveraged in cash/kind from multiple sources. It can be in many forms such as finances, technology, manpower- skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled, knowledge, information, etc. This helps and enables to develop local ownership, empowerment and undertake activities under a project that might be imperative for the success of the project but are not permissible under GEF funding.

Co-financing can be mobilized at the programme level or at the project level.

- Programme level co-financing is mostly institutional tie-ups that provide cash co-financing to the programme for a particular component (such as capacity building, up-scaling, administrative cost etc.) or generally. Co-financing at the programme level can also be in kind in terms of institutional support in administration, monitoring or expertise.
- Project level co-financing are at the level of individual projects and may be in cash or in kind. Here the proponents are encouraged to facilitate both the communities and other donor sources.

In cash Co-financing in projects:

- The financial contributions from communities,
- Grants from local authorities and governments (Panchayats, Elected representative funds, District authorities, state government and central government schemes),
- Donations from individual to the project,
- Bank loans to Self Help Groups that is utilized in the project,
- Savings of the Self Help Groups that is utilized in the project

In kind Co-financing in projects:

- Community’s contribution in terms of labour,
- In kind material donations by community and other donors, such as building material, machinery etc.
- In kind intellectual services such as know-how, monitoring, impact assessments etc.,
- Space such as office space

Method for calculating co-financing in projects:

- Organizations account for co-financing contributions in the statement of accounts and in the utilization certificates,
- Letters of support stating the amount and nature of support from other donors/government have to be submitted by partners to the Regional offices and the National Secretariat,
- Implementing agencies are suggested to maintain records of labour and material contributions at the grass root level, like the Self Help Groups, Village Committees, Forest Committees, Water Committees Federations, Panchayats etc.,
- The labour contributions is calculated by multiplying the number of man days with minimum wage rates,
- Records have to be maintained by groups/grass root level institutions on savings, bank loans etc, in addition to the bank documents. These records are utilized for calculating co-financing.

Extending Solidarity, Savings and Self Help to Self Help Groups (SHGs) for Income Generation Activities

Introduction:

There is no easy credit available for all the different needs of people. But group members have been able to borrow from their groups when people need for all most all types of their needs and requirements. In the beginning members borrowed to repay money lenders; to release mortgaged lands, to buy rice to eat; to meet their productive and consumption needs. The lessons in various projects have detailed that this is one of the more important ways of addressing the sustainability issues (local ownerships). Under the Small Grants Programme, extension of working capital advances to SHGs is not encouraged as a part of the grant under the UNDP GEF SGP. Instead, it is imperative that the system should be built within the SHGs in such a manner, that, over a period of time, the communities raise the capital through group savings and bank loans leveraged on the basis of the group savings.

Key Issues while creating Solidarity through SHGs: Some of the key points, which need consideration during SHGs, are as follows.

- Group Meetings: Promoting democratic values, transparency in all members knowing what decisions are being taken and for whose benefit. Creating social and personal development, through skills, enterprise development and livelihood benefits.
- Autonomy: Creating group capacity of all members in managing the actions and the systems through book keeping, leadership and funds management.
- Social Justice: Ensure social justice through local empowerment by group decision making and ways to manage them. All group members participate directly and fully in all group functions.

What is an SHG: An SHG is a small, autonomous, non political group of people living near each other and sharing common concerns, who come together voluntarily to work jointly for their personal, social and economic development.

General Characteristics of SHGs: In the SGP the SHGs are encouraged in the projects within the following principles. This normally acts as guidelines for all types of groups in villages. These points are indicative and not exhaustive.

- Small Size
- Voluntary Membership
- Emphasis on Mutual help
- Homogeneity.
- Regular meetings, records and book keeping
- Autonomy
- Collective Leadership
- Non-Political Focus

Elements of the Concept:

The SHG concept contains several components or elements. These are key and needs to be adapted to make them successful.

- Savings and credit activities
- Avoid lending to non-members
- Memberships and Size of Groups
- Bookkeeping
- Meetings
- Rules and systems agreed commonly
- Raising Working Capital assistance through sources
- Group assets building
- Group Audits
- Facilitation, capacity building of self and members in group autonomy
- Creating and federating

The process of group formation and strengthening in the SGP is promoted with having five phases. The NGOs and the CBOs are fully aware and take the effective measures.

- Preparatory Phase: Introducing the concept to the communities.
- Group Initiative: Helping the group members to save and have meetings.
- Group Stabilization: Helping the groups to choose facilitators, norms setting, book keeping and records
- Group Consolidation: Linking to banks, lending, audits and penalties, working capital needs raised and linked
- Withdrawal Stage: Outsiders withdraw roles and communities manage and lead to further visions.

Why Organise SHGs:

To achieve the goal of empowering, the un-reached, most disadvantaged in a more sustainable manner. Rather as support to SHGs members in the SGP, we promote their capacity building in enterprise development and other allied activities. The focus needs to be on accounting-book keeping, planning, resource management, advocacy, savings and thrift activities and formal bank linkages. These supports are given in order to build long-term sustainable capacities within the community that is essential for livelihood interventions. The stakeholders should realize the benefits of this system to encourage and uplift the poor and underprivileged, especially women.

The SHGs/Federation should be encouraged to build a group fund based on savings and start the process of inter loaning; more for productive and less for consumption actions/activities. We should clearly encourage the groups to agree on the norms for operations and also make written agreements in the village meetings regarding the loans recovery terms, interest rates, penalties etc.

The next step is to create bank linkages for the groups, through opening of bank accounts. Usually within a year of savings, the banks are willing to provide enterprise development loans to the groups. Hence, at the initial stages the members use the loan from the group kitty and later bank loans as working capital for IGA. This model has been used successfully in various SGP projects like the

SFCID and KCC to start an eco-tourism enterprise, the briquette plant in RAC, Orissa, Oil expeller units in JAGRITI, Kulu, fish drying units in TIDE, Karnataka; Oil expellers; grain banks; seed banks; micro enterprises; organic farming groups; medicinal plants growers etc by Humanity, WOSCA, Sambandh; FEEDS; ATREE; Cendect; PEEKAY Foundation WSSS and many others like the IBTADA, VNHCS; Mahila Jagrut; Lok Panchyat; PHD CCI; PAGVS; KRAPAVIS, Shanti Maitri; ALERT, Sahyog; Nidaan; Nav Jagriti; and Saink Foundation.

With Best Regards,

Prabhjot Sodhi
National Coordinator,
GEF UNDP Small Grants Program
Centre for Environment Education (CEE)
www.sgpindia.org; www.ceeindia.org

**ASIA-PACIFIC FORUM FOR ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT (Second Phase)
Showcase Workshop and the Third NetRes Meeting
14-17 October 2008
Colombo, Sri Lanka**

Agenda and Programme of Work

Day0: Monday 13 October 2008

Arrival of participants

Day1: Tuesday 14 October 2008

Showcase Workshop

- 9:00 ***Opening Session***
Welcoming remarks
by Dr. Vinya S. Ariyaratne, Executive Director, Sarvodaya Headquarters "Damsak Mandira"
- Welcoming remarks
by Dr. I.H.K. Mahanama, Additional Secretary to the President, Sri Lanka
- Opening remarks
by Mr. Hendricus Verbeek, Senior Administrative Officer, UNEP/ROAP
- APFED's aspiration for promoting sustainable development in Asia and the Pacific
by Dr. Parvez Hassan, Former Chairman of the International Union of the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) Law Commission, Islamic Republic of Pakistan
- 9:25 Sri Lanka's policy achievements and future challenges to promote environmental management for sustainable development
by Ms. L. Padmini Batuwitige, Director/Environment, Ministry of Environment, Sri Lanka
- 9:40 Overview of the APFED Showcase Workshop and Third NetRes Meeting
by Mr. Hiroshi Nishimiya, Principal Researcher, IGES
- 9:50 ***Session 1: APFED and APFED Showcase Programme***
Introductory presentations
by Ms. Ikuyo Kikusawa, IGES and Ms. Aretha Aprilia, UNEP/ROAP
- 10:10 ***Session 2 "Progress Reports of APFED Showcase Projects for Tackling Climate Change"***
Introduction
by Mr. Masanori Kobayashi, Coordinator, Programme Management Office (PMO), IGES
- 10:15 Presentations by Project Implementing Organisations (15 mins)
"Promoting Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency"
i) *Mr. Namiz Musofer, Programme Coordinator, Practical Action, Sri Lanka*
Project: Enhancing Productivity of Utilization of Bio Energy in Sri Lanka
ii) *Mr. Dhruva Raj Gautam, Team Leader, Renewable Energy Promotion for Sericulture*
Project, Energy and Environment, Nepal

Project: Supporting Farmers with Silk House and Solar for Sericulture Promotion

iii) *Dr. Kua Harn Wei, Assistant Professor, Department of Building, School of Design & Environment, National University of Singapore*

Project: Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) for Environment and Sustainable Development in Asia and the Pacific

iv) *Mr. Teddy Lesmana, Researcher, Center for Economic Research, Indonesian Institute of Science, Indonesia*

Project: Community based educational and partnership actions - Carbon neutral initiative for community empowerment and climate change mitigation in Indonesia

11:15 Discussions

11:35 **Coffee Break**

11:50 Continuation of Session 2

“Special Report of Showcase Test Case”

Dr. Qwanruedee Chotichanathawewong Assistant President, Thailand Environment Institute

Project: Thai Initiative for Green Procurement and Purchasing

“Adaptation and Ecosystem Management”

v) *Ms. Nyamtseren Mandakh Researcher, Desertification Study Center, GeoEcology Institute of Mongolian Academy of Sciences, Mongolia*

Project: Rehabilitating Desert Zone Ecosystems and Promoting Sustainable Alternative Livelihood in Gobi Protected Areas, Buffer Zones and Peripheral Communities in Mongolia

vi) *Mr. Nhu Van Ky, Department of Forestry, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, Viet Nam*

Project: Sustainable Community Forestry and Poverty reduction in Vietnam- linking natural resource accounting of ecosystem services to carbon financial markets

vii) *Mr. Huberto Cadampog Zanoria, Director, Community Extension and Development Office, Southwestern University, Philippines*

Project: REPORMA-CEBU (Resource and Poverty Response, Mapping and Management - Cebu)

12:35 Discussions

13:00 **Lunch Break**

13:45 **Session 3: Effective Support, Monitoring and Evaluation of Pilot Projects**

Introductory Remarks

by Mr. Masanori Kobayashi, Coordinator, Programme Management Office (PMO), IGES

13:50 Presentation by Resource Persons (15 mins)

Ms. Shireen Samarasuriya, National Coordinator, SGP Sri Lanka, UNDP

Mr. Prabhjot Sodhi, National Coordinator, GEF Small Grants Programme India

Mr. Ranjith Mahindapala, Country Representative- Sri Lanka, International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN)

14:35 Discussions

15:15 **Coffee Break**

15:30 **Session 4: Good Practice for Sustainable Development – Ryutaro Hashimoto APFED Award and APFED Good Practice Database**

- 15:45 *by Ms. Tomoko Noguchi, Researcher, Programme Management Office (PMO), IGES*
Discussions
- 16:15 **Session 5: APFED Showcase Programme Handbook**
by Ms. Ikuyo Kikusawa, Researcher, Programme Management Office (PMO), IGES
- 16:30 Discussions
- 17:00 **Session 6: Reporting and Lesson Sharing of the APFED Showcase Programme**
by Mr. Masanori Kobayashi, Coordinator and Mr. Hiroshi Nishimiya, Principal Researcher, Programme Management Office (PMO), IGES
- 17:15 Discussions
- 18:00 **Reception at a Hotel Restaurant**

Day2: Wednesday 15 October

- 9:00 **Session 7: Effective Reporting of Project Performance**
Introductory presentation
by Mr. Masanori Kobayashi, Coordinator, Programme Management Office (PMO), IGES
- 9:15 **Working Group Session**
Working Group 1: Benchmarks and Indicators and Their Application
Working Group 2: Interface between Policy and Field Actions
Working Group 3: Innovative and Success Factors
- 11:45 **Session 8: Reporting from the Working Groups**
Presentations by Working Groups
- 12:45 **Lunch Break**
- 13:30 Site Visit to the APFED Showcase Project Test Case
“Waste Management and Environment Education for Lagosatte Tsunami Resettlement Village”
- APFED Project Test Case Site Visit Briefing at Sarvodaya Head Quarters
by Dr. Vinya S. Ariyaratne, Executive Director, Sarvodaya Headquarters "Damsak Mandira"
- 18:30 **Dinner at a Local Restaurant**

Day 3: Thursday 16 October

- 9:00 **Session 9: APFED Showcase Programme Information Management**
Presentation on APFED Showcase Website
by Ms. Aretha Aprilia, Programme Specialist, UNEP/ROAP
- 9:10 Presentation on APFED News Letter
by Ms. Tomoko Noguchi, Researcher, Programme Management Office (PMO), IGES
- 9:20 Presentation “Using video to communicate sustainable development”
by Mr. Nalaka Gunawardene, Director and CEO, Television for Education - Asia Pacific (TVE Asia Pacific)

- 9:40 Discussions
- 10:10 **Session 10: Drafting of Workshop Discussion Summary**
Facilitated by APFED Secretariat
- 12:00 **Concluding and Wrap-up Session**
Concluding remarks
by Co-Chairs and Organisers
- 12:15 **Lunch Break**

Third NetRes Meeting

- 13:15 Opening Remarks
by Mr. Masanori Kobayashi, Coordinator, Programme Management Office (PMO), IGES
- 13:30 **Session 1: Overall progress report of APFED**
Introductory presentation
by Mr. Masanori Kobayashi, Coordinator, Programme Management Office (PMO), IGES
- 14:00 **Session 2: “APFED Knowledge Initiative”**
Introductory presentation
by Ms. Ikuyo Kikusawa, Researcher, Programme Management Office (PMO), IGES
- 14:15 Discussions
- 14:30 **Session 3: APFED Policy Dialogue: Progress and Future Plan**
Introductory presentation including the Revised APFED Message on Climate Change and Future Plans
by Mr. Masanori Kobayashi, Coordinator, Programme Management Office (PMO), IGES
- 14:45 Discussions
- 15:15 **Coffee Break**
- 15:30 **Session 4: Joint Research and Activities for NetRes**
Introductory presentation
by Mr. Masanori Kobayashi, Coordinator, Programme Management Office (PMO), IGES
- 15:45 Discussions
- 16:30 Wrap up Session
Concluding remarks
by Co-Chairs and Organisers
- 18:00 **Dinner at a Hotel Restaurant**

Day4: Friday 17 October

6:00 – 22:30 Site Visits to the 2006 APFED Showcase Project
“Enhancing Productivity of Utilisation of Bio Energy in Sri Lanka” in Nikaweretiya Divisional Secretariat division, Kurunegala district

Day 5: Saturday 18 October

Departure of Participants
Provisional Agenda

ASIA-PACIFIC FORUM FOR ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT (Second Phase)
Showcase Workshop and the Third NetRes Meeting
14-17 October 2008
Colombo, Sri Lanka

List of Participants

APFED Member

- Parvez Hassan Former Chairman of the International Union of the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) Law Commission, Islamic Republic of Pakistan
- Vinya S. Ariyaratne Executive Director, Sarvodaya Headquarters "Damsak Mandira"

NetRes

- Lim May-Ann Executive, Environment and Public Education, Singapore Institute of International Affairs
- Qwanruedee Chotichanathawewong Assistant President, Thailand Environment Institute (TEI)
- Mahmood Ahmad Khwaja Research, teaching & training/Visiting Research Fellow, Sustainable Development Policy Institute, Pakistan (SDPI)
- Suneel Pandey Fellow and Area Convenor, Centre for Environmental Studies, The Energy and Resources Institute (TERI)
- Biman Chand Prasad Professor and Dean of Faculty of Business and Economics, University of the South Pacific (USP)

NetRes – IGES

- Hiroshi Nishimiya Principal Researcher, Programme Management Office (PMO)
- Masanori Kobayashi Coordinator, Programme Management Office (PMO)
- Ikuyo Kikusawa Researcher, PMO
- Tomoko Noguchi Researcher, PMO

Showcase Project Implementing Organisations

- Rohitha Ananda Project manager, Practical Action, Sri Lanka
- Dhruba Raj Gautam Team Leader, Renewable Energy Promotion for Sericulture Project, Energy and Environment, Nepal

Kua Harn Wei	Assistant Professor, Department of Building, School of Design & Environment, National University of Singapore
Nhu Van Ky	Department of Forestry, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, Viet Nam
Teddy Lesmana	Researcher, Economic Research Center, Indonesian Institute of Sciences (LIPI)
Nyamtseren Mandakh	Researcher, Desertification Study Center, GeoEcology Institute of Mongolian Academy of Sciences
Namiz Musafar	Programme Coordinator, Practical Action, Sri Lanka
Huberto Cadampog Zanoia	Director, Community Extension and Development Office, Southwestern University, Philippines

Resource Persons

Wipula Dahanayake	Programme Officer, Television for Education - Asia Pacific (TVE Asia Pacific), Sri Lanka
Shireen Samarasuriya	National Coordinator, GEF Small Grants Programme, UNDP, Sri Lanka
Prabhjot Sodhi	National Coordinator, GEF Small Grants Programme, UNDP, India
Ranjith Mahindapala	Country Representative, International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN), Sri Lanka
Nalaka Gunawardene	Director and CEO, Television for Education - Asia Pacific (TVE Asia Pacific), Sri Lanka

Regional and International Organisations and Bilateral Aid Agencies

L. Padmini Batuwitage	Director/Environment, Ministry of Environment, Sri Lanka
I.H.K. Mahanama	Additional Secretary to the President, Sri Lanka

United Nations Environment Programme Regional Office for Asia-Pacific (UNEP/ROAP)

Hendricus Verbeek	Administrative Officer
Aretha Aprilia	Programme Specialist