On the sidelines of COP19, TI will host a special session of the Climate Finance Integrity Talks series, to present key findings from TI research on challenges and opportunities for the governance of climate finance, both globally and nationally.

TI, in collaboration with the Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI), has conducted governance assessments of nine multilateral climate funds, to analyse both their internal accountability frameworks and the degree to which their policies and practices embody and uphold principles of transparency, accountability and integrity. These investigations pointed to concerning informational gaps regarding the funds’ ability to determine accountability, follow-up, liability and sanctions in cases of suspected corruption. TI is calling for better clarity regarding what anti-corruption safeguards exist and how they can be adequately enacted and enforced.

Meanwhile, TI has completed climate finance accountability assessments in Bangladesh, Dominican Republic, Kenya, Maldives, Mexico and Peru, and REDD+ corruption risk assessments in Indonesia, Papua New Guinea and Vietnam. In a similar vein, these studies unanimously conclude that enhanced transparency is vital to ensuring robust public accountability in countries. While corruption risks remain serious in many climate finance recipient countries, climate finance delivery systems have yet to effectively demonstrate anti-corruption and accountability.

Bringing global and national knowledge and experiences together, TI’s COP19 workshop aims to produce a clear set of policy and practical recommendations aimed at ensuring that climate finance is better guarded against corrupt abuse. This is a forum for open discussions across all relevant stakeholder groups on realistic yet innovative outputs.

Participation is free but with limited spaces, secured through online registration. Interested persons should have sufficient knowledge of or interest in issues of climate governance and a keenness to actively contribute to discussions.
AGENDA

11:00 – 12:00
WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

PRESENTATION

TRANSPARENCY INTERNATIONAL FINDINGS ON THE GOVERNANCE OF CLIMATE FINANCE FROM GLOBAL TO LOCAL LEVELS

Lisa Elges, Team Leader, Climate Finance Integrity Programme, Transparency International
Bruno Brandão, Consultant, Brazil Programme, Transparency International

PUBLISH WHAT YOU FUND ON TRANSPARENCY IN CLIMATE FINANCE

Dr David Hall-Matthews, Managing Director, Publish What You Fund

12:00 – 13:30
PANEL DISCUSSION 1

OPENNESS IN ANTI-CORRUPTION SAFEGUARDS: HOW TO ENSURE THAT ANTI-CORRUPTION IS AT THE CORNERSTONE OF CLIMATE FINANCE POLICY

TI’s recommendation: Greater transparency is needed for multilateral climate funds to demonstrate the existence and effectiveness of accountability mechanisms. Relevant and appropriate information should be made publicly available regarding funds’ internal anti corruption policies, as well as the fiduciary and accountability requirements of its implementing entities and any other downstream actors.

INVITED PANELLISTS

Christiaan Poortman, Senior Advisor, Transparency International
Mirey Atallah, Senior Officer, National Programs at UN-REDD Programme Secretariat
David Banisar, Senior Legal Counsel, Article 19
Richard Calland, Associate Professor in the Public Law Department, the University of Cape Town

QUESTIONS TO THE PANEL

What is the current justification for the policy of many Funds not to disclose information on the accountability and anti-corruption policies, procedures or other mechanisms which are required as fiduciary safeguards and employed by their implementing partners? How is the balanced against the wider public interest and the public right to know what these safeguards are and how they work?

Would it be feasible for funds to adopt a more open information approach to the accountability mechanisms required of accredited implementing entities – such as policies on information disclosure, complaints mechanisms, whistle-blower protection, issuing and enforcing sanctions, financial reporting and procurement?

In that context, what policy measure would be feasible to allow for public information on sanctions - such as black listed actors - with clear reference to the source of finance and projects affected by the sanctioned corrupt activity?

How can this information best be disclosed so that it is clear, comprehensive and meaningful enough for citizens to engage in climate finance decision-making processes, and to demand accountability when things go wrong?

Q&A FROM THE AUDIENCE
**QUESTIONS TO THE PANEL**

What policies should be adopted to enable access to climate fund executive meetings at global and national levels? What is the justification for closed-door sessions and how does this weigh with the public interest?

What policy measures are possible to enable more comprehensive information disclosure on decisions made at the national level on which projects and programmes are financed?

What fund-level policy determinations would be feasible to increase space for civil society and climate finance and project stakeholders more broadly?

Notwithstanding pre-appraisal project consultations, what policy measures would be feasible to promote the engagement of citizens throughout the project cycle - in particular implementation, monitoring and evaluation?

**Q&A FROM THE AUDIENCE**

**13:30 – 15:00**

**NETWORKING LUNCH**

**15:00 – 16:30**

**PANEL DISCUSSION 2**

**OPENNESS IN DECISION-MAKING AND MONITORING PROCESSES:**
**HOW TO ENSURE MEANINGFUL TRANSPARENCY FOR AND ENGAGEMENT WITH CITIZENS AT ALL STAGES OF THE PROJECT CYCLE**

**TI’s recommendation:** Increased, proactive engagement of citizens and civil society is required in national and global decision-making processes. This includes but is not limited to more access to climate fund executive meetings at global and national levels, proactive disclosure of information related to project approval/rejection, established forums and mechanisms for public monitoring – from policy formulation, to project design and throughout project implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

**INVITED PANELLISTS**

Liane Schalatek, Associate Director, Heinrich Böll Foundation North America

Alpha Kaloga, Policy Officer, Germanwatch

Smita Nakhooda, Team Lead, Climate Finance, Overseas Development Institute

Tanya Peterson, Director of Marketing and Communications, Gold Standard Foundation

Alexander Froede, Project Head, GCF Readiness Programme, GIZ

Gloria Visconti, Lead Climate Change Specialist, Inter-American Development Bank

Pieter Terpstra, Senior Associate, World Resources Institute

**16:30 – 17:00**

**COFFEE BREAK**
17:00 – 18:30
PANEL DISCUSSION 3

STRENGTHENING ACCOUNTABILITY: ENFORCING ZERO TOLERANCE FOR CORRUPTION POLICIES AT ALL LEVELS OF FUND ACTIVITIES AND THROUGHOUT PROJECT CYCLES

**TI’s recommendation:** Climate funds need to demonstrate zero tolerance for corruption and fraud, through both preventative and remedial measures. Clear and comprehensive integrity policies should be in place at all levels of fund activity, backed up by robust enforcement mechanisms. This means well-monitored codes of conduct and conflict of interest policies, compliance and investigatory functions, and systems for issuing and enforcing penalties or sanctions. This also means ensuring that accountability mechanisms are coordinated across projects and programmes to prevent disparate practices and to reduce “implementing entity shopping” or leakage tendencies.

---

**INVITED PANELLISTS**

Judy Ndichu, Climate Finance Integrity Programme Coordinator, Transparency International Kenya

Christiaan Poortman, Senior Advisor, Transparency International

Marcia Levaggi, Manager of the Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat

Dethie Soumare NDIAYE, Coordinator of Adaption Fund related activities at Centre de Suivi Ecologique (CSE)

Bram Schim van der Loeff, Senior Programme Officer Communication & Outreach at European Investment Bank

Karin Kemper, Director, Climate Policy and Finance, The World Bank

---

**QUESTIONS TO THE PANEL**

What policy measures are feasible to require that the aforementioned accountability mechanisms are applicable to organisations contracted or subcontracted to carry out fund projects or programmes?

What policy measures are needed to strengthen local level accountability issues including the protection of informants who witness and report corruption and fraud? What confidentiality and protection should be prescriptive at the fund level to ensure that cases of corruption and fraud can be reported and investigated in a fair way, without endangering either the accuser or the accused?

What can funds do to ensure better-coordinated information sharing and sanctioning practices such as cross-debarment agreements so that the climate finance system is not undermined by repeat offenders?

---

**Q&A FROM THE AUDIENCE**

18:30 – 21:00
CLOSING REMARKS
REFRESHMENTS