



Distr.: Limited
November 24, 2009

English only

UNCDF, UNDP and UNEP Asia Pacific Region

Local government's role in environment, natural resource management and climate change - lesson learning workshop

5-6 October 2009, Amari Watergate Hotel, Bangkok

Report of the Workshop

I. Background

A number of countries in the Asia-Pacific region are receiving UN support to strengthen the role and capacity of their local governments. An area of growing interest is the role of local governments in managing environment, natural resources and climate change, where there is also UN support through a range of environment and local governance programmes. However, work on identifying and exploring these operational links has been limited to date.

To address this gap, UNCDF, UNDP and UNEP are developing a short guidance note. The guidance note will use country case studies and examples where appropriate.

II. Workshop Rationale and Objectives

The workshop aimed to inform the development of the guidance note by generating discussions on the above-mentioned themes between local governments, UN and other development agencies.

The discussions and lessons learned would also be used to inform strategic change and the possible expansion of UNCDF, UNDP and UNEP local governance programmes.

III. Participants and Organisers

1. Participants from national, provincial and local governments involved in development planning, finance and environmental management in Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, Laos, Nepal, Timor-Leste, Thailand and Viet Nam attended the workshop.
2. Participating UN staff included representatives of various UNCDF and UNDP Country Offices, UNDP Regional Centre in Bangkok, UNEP Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, UNCDF Bangkok Regional Office, UNDP/UNEP Poverty Environment Facility in Nairobi, and UNDP headquarters in New York.
3. Altogether, 48 participants attended the workshop. The names and contact details of the participants are provided in Annex II.
4. The workshop was jointly organised by UNCDF, UNDP and UNEP Asia Pacific Region.

IV. Agenda

5. The workshop consisted of the following seven sessions:
 - *Session 1: Workshop objectives and overview*
 - *Session 2: Local government expenditure and the environment*
 - *Session 3: Local government revenues and the environment*
 - *Session 4: Local government planning, regulatory and management role*
 - *Session 5: Thematic break-out groups*
 - *Session 6: Country break-out groups*
 - *Session 7: Next steps and way forward*
6. Detailed workshop agenda is provided in Annex III.

V. Workshop Proceedings

Session 1: Workshop objectives and overview

7. Mr Martin Krause (UNDP) officially opened the workshop and welcomed the participants. He stated that the overall objective of the workshop was to find ways to promote and improve the role of the local government (LG) in natural resource management (NRM) and climate change response. The workshop also aimed to improve the knowledge of major sources of greenhouse gas emissions and major sources of climate change risk at the local level, hence contributing to the development of the plan on climate change adaptation and mitigation on local level under the UN Territorial Approach. He emphasised that, unlike the formal climate change negotiations, the nature of the workshop was informal, and encouraged all participants to get involved in the discussions. The workshop was highlighted as an example of various UN agencies (UNCDF, UNDP, UNEP) working together.
8. Mr David Jackson (UNCDF) elaborated that the workshop was essentially a brainstorming session, pulling together lessons of local governments in dealing with climate change challenges. This information would contribute to a guidance note for local governments, currently being developed by Michael Winter (consultant assigned to assist in drafting the guidance note). Draft note should be ready by the end of October 2009.
9. Mr Sanath Ranawana (UNEP) introduced the UNDP-UNEP Poverty Environment Initiative (PEI) programme, the goal of which was mainstreaming environmental considerations into national development planning. He stated that, from PEI experience, it was clear that local governments have a key role to play in management of environment, natural resources and climate change, due to their level of local knowledge and involvement.
10. Ms Suela Krifsa (UNCDF) apologised for the early departure of Mr Martin Krause, and facilitated the formal introduction of each participant.
11. Mr Paul Steele (UNDP) provided further information on the PEI programme by highlighting the interplay between environment and poverty. As a large proportion of the world's poor depend on natural resources (such as forests and fisheries) for livelihoods, unsustainable use of these resources has negative ramifications on poor people's livelihoods, health and vulnerability. The impacts of climate change on environment (precipitation, rising sea levels, soil evaporation, etc)

add another dimension to this relationship. Mr Steele stated that the involvement of local governments is crucial in dealing with poverty-environment linkages, but that unfortunately they are often ignored by national governments.

12. Mr Michael Winter (Consultant, UNCDF) provided further detail on his methodology in developing a guidance note for local governments. The note will include a matrix of various local government actions and the ways in which they impact on natural resource management, environment and climate change (NECC) issues¹. The government action was separated into three broad categories – local public expenditure management, local revenue collection and local regulation. Mr Winter highlighted certain comparative advantages of local governments in the dealing with NECC issues (local knowledge, better accessibility and responsiveness to problems, etc), and emphasised fact that the term “local government” covers a wide variety of institutional arrangements. Mr Winter encouraged workshop participants to engage in discussions; the information will be useful for developing the guidance note.
13. During the panel discussion, local government representatives called for greater political decentralisation, giving local governments greater control over natural resources in their local jurisdictions. The need for higher levels of funding for local governments was also expressed. In terms of responsibility, some speakers argued that local governments are best equipped to manage NECC issues, whilst others argued these issues should be addressed at local, national and supra-national levels. The importance of effective dissemination of information on climate change impacts on natural resources was highlighted, as was the importance of engaging all stakeholders (not just government). In regards to the matrix, the need to include governance issues and to differentiate between rural and urban government was expressed. It was also suggested that the matrix should not constrain the discussions.

Session 2: Local government expenditure and the environment

Presentation

14. Following an introduction by Mr Henrik Larsen (UNDP), Mr David Jackson (UNCDF) gave a presentation on local government expenditure and NECC. He argued that whilst the challenge of NECC is global, the immediate effects are local (e.g. just a few kilometres can separate arid and fertile areas, or a disaster prone area from a safe one). Consequently, in order to deliver a “local holistic response” to NECC-related problem, there is a need to take account of local specificity in national expenditure planning. Mr Jackson discussed the relevance of decentralisation arrangements (delegation vs. de-concentration vs. devolution) to resource allocation for NECC, and provided examples of unfunded mandates (with local governments not having resources to deal with their responsibilities). He described the importance of different local government expenditure classifications, and concluded by highlighting the importance of integrating NECC into expenditure planning.

Panel discussion

15. Local government representatives outlined the roles of local governments in NECC in their respective countries. Cambodia noted that the country’s decentralisation process has provided great benefits to the population, and is hence continuing (transferring functions, roles, as well as funds). Bhutan’s representatives lamented the lack of clear rules and responsibilities between different levels of government, and the lack of incentives for local governments to address climate change in Bhutan.

¹ The blank version of the matrix was distributed to participants prior to the commencement of the workshop, in order to stimulate and guide the discussions. The matrix is presented in Annex I.

General discussion

16. The following issues were raised during the general discussion:
- The need for NECC issues to be discussed at the national level and included in the budget planning processes.
 - The need for improved knowledge of NECC issues by governments and the public; greater awareness should result in their incorporation into national plans.
 - The difficulty associated with incorporating long-term impacts of climate change into national plans (with tangible results favoured instead, due to the ease of reporting).
 - The need for “quick win” NECC initiatives and projects in order to get local governments engaged, e.g. community-based forestry, pilot agriculture and water management projects.
 - The need for greater devolution and decentralisation, as local governments are in a better position to respond to NECC concerns.
 - The need for clear land tenure, and clearer definition of roles and responsibilities of different levels of government (national, provincial, district, etc).
 - The need for better funding of local environment ministries.
 - The need to develop local laws to deal with investment in natural resource sectors.

Concluding remarks

17. In considering steps forward, speaker from Bhutan noted that poverty-environment mainstreaming is happening; the next step is to “climate-proof” local government spending. Speaker from Cambodia suggested that improved governance would lead to better NRM, and proposed that the national tax on agricultural land in Cambodia be removed in order to decrease urban migration. Mr David Jackson noted that the local governments appear to have a comparative advantage in dealing with NECC issues, but not necessarily the political will.
18. In summing up the discussions, Mr Henrik Larsen stated that whilst the workshop had put forward three areas focusing quite narrowly on expenditures, revenues and regulation / management, the discussions had brought out a range of wider local governance issues:
- Decentralisation is not the panacea in dealing with NECC issues. The discussions highlighted areas where LGs have a comparative advantage but examples from a number of countries also illustrated areas where LGs are likely not prioritize action if fully devolved. This highlights both the need to further understand the complex task of improving policy-provision-production roles and how financing and other tools can be applied to support expenditure assignments related to CC
 - Discussions also highlighted the importance of the political aspects of local governance, including central-local relations, moving beyond the narrow issues of local public expenditure management and finance. This includes issues of accountability and integrity which several countries highlighted.
 - Also, many countries referred to issues of capacity development – many countries might not have the capacity to take on the roles and functions at present and the assessment of capacity gaps and needs as well as the processes for capacity development will be important.

Session 3: Local government revenues and the environment

Presentation

19. Following an introduction by Sameer Karki (UNDP), Ms Priya Shyamsundar (SANDEE) made a presentation on “Local revenues and expenditures from an environment perspective”. Using a 2006 study, Ms Shyamsundar showed that, in terms of a share of the country’s total public

expenditure and GDP, local government expenditure in developing countries lags behind the OECD average. There is also considerable variation in expenditure between developing countries, with local governments in China and Poland having the highest expenditure shares. Transfers from national government are the primary sources of LG revenue, which limited the accountability of LG to local users. A case study of community forestry in Nepal was presented as an example of how exploitation of local resources can be a significant source of local revenue, whilst also leading to pro-poor and pro-environment outcomes.

Panel discussion

20. The speaker from Nepal described the local government revenue arrangements in Nepal. Whilst over 90 percent of LG revenue is in form of transfers from the central government, arrangements differ between sectors (forestry, mining, tourism, and hydropower). Road construction is the priority; however, it has led to a significant negative environmental impact. International support (particularly in terms of technology) is therefore needed for construction of environmentally-friendly roads in the rural areas. More finances are needed for conducting environmental and social impact assessments; good governance is also an issue. Climate change impacts experienced by Nepal include reductions in the monsoon season, and the loss of snow in the Himalayas; the latter will have an impact on around 1.3 billion people in South Asia, who are dependent on snow as a water source.
21. The speaker from Laos described the political and environmental problems associated with agricultural plantations in the Savannakhet province. The speaker lamented the lack of finances and human resources in the environment department of the provincial government, inadequate inclusion of provincial government in decision-making, and lack of clarity in roles of different levels of government.

General discussion

22. The discussion time was used by representatives of Nepal, Laos, Bangladesh, Bhutan and Thailand to provide further detail on revenue and expenditure arrangements in their home countries. In addition, the following issues and ideas were raised:
 - The option of national government subsidising environmentally-friendly projects proposed by local governments.
 - The importance of involving non-government actors (such as NGOs) in community forestry projects and waste management.
 - The issue of local and international NGOs interfering with industries which are a major source of government revenue (such as hydropower) on environmental grounds.
 - The inherent conflict between economic growth and preservation of environment.
 - The need to address political struggles between different levels of government and between different government departments.

Conclusion

23. In summing up points raised, Sameer Karki (UNDP) noted that the central government still appears to be the primary collector of revenue; consequently, the issues of equity between different levels of government and the possibility of favouritism towards certain LGs need to be considered. While there are opportunities for local government and communities to generate revenue from NRM (e.g. community forestry in Nepal), the impacts of this approach need to be studied further.

Session 4: Local government planning, regulatory and management role

Presentation

24. Mr Ranawana delivered a presentation on the role of planning, management and regulatory functions of LG in NRM. He argued that while there are significant potential benefits to LG from effective NRM, these remain largely unrealised. LGs are directly or indirectly responsible for providing many services that depend on ecosystems (primary production, food and water, flood regulation, etc); sound NRM could enhance LGs' ability to fulfil their mandate more effectively. LGs are best placed to enforce sound environmental governance measures for sustainable and equitable use of local NR. However, LGs face a number of institutional, regulatory and financial constraints, including lack of coordination between different agencies responsible for NRM, legislative gaps and overlaps, and lack of resources. Improved local development planning and budgeting processes and more-participatory approaches in planning and managing NR assets were highlighted as some of the ways of enhancing LG management of natural resources.

Panel discussion

25. Participants from Thailand highlighted the importance of participatory spatial planning in identifying suitable land for development, and lamented the lack of such planning in Thailand's "top-down" development plans. It was also argued that NRM problems cannot be solved without solving the problem of poverty. The decentralisation process of forest management in Thailand's Nan province was highlighted as a success story, with local administration considered more effective than central government in managing the forest resource for the benefit of local population.

26. Participants from Timor-Leste stated that while LGs do not yet exist in their home country, the passing of the Local Government Act (currently in parliament) will trigger the establishment of municipalities. Timor-Leste's economy is highly dependent on oil extraction, which has negative environmental impact. Environment is not considered as an important issue by the public or the government; consequently, the environment department is poorly funded. Whilst not formally a part of the government, community leaders perform an important role of educating communities about preservation of natural resources.

General discussion

27. The following issues and ideas were highlighted during the general discussion:

- The need to address jurisdictional issues in countries with multi-level government, including the need for effective conflict resolution arrangements.
- In regards to the decentralisation process, there is a need for increased transfer of funds and capacity building to local governments to accompany the increases in responsibility.
- The possibility of establishing a good governance committee (to be appointed by the civil society) at the provincial level in Thailand.
- Because NECC is a broad area, LGs might have different roles in NRM compared to climate change-related disaster management.

Conclusion

28. In summing up the session, Ms Seon-Mi Choi (UNEP) noted the need to combine integrated spatial planning with economic planning to ensure effective and equitable management of natural resources. The need for improved financing and capacity building in environment agencies was also noted.

Session 5: Thematic break-out groups

29. Following an introduction by Michael Winter and Sanath Ranawana, participants broke up into three thematic groups which reflected the structure of the proposed matrix (“government expenditure”, “government revenue” and “government planning”). The aim of the exercise was for participants to share their views and experiences on the interface between LG and NECC (as viewed through these three “lenses”).
30. In reporting its findings, Group 1 (“government expenditure”) noted that, at this stage, there appears to be very little expenditure on NRM by LGs; this consists primarily of salaries to environment officials, maintenance of conservation areas, reduction of pollution and disaster response. Notably, there is even less expenditure on climate change issues, although this may change in the near future as new resources for climate change adaptation become available. Lack of technical capacity and resources, low level of priority given to environmental issues, lack of clarity in NRM responsibilities, and lack of clear land tenure were highlighted as challenges. The increased availability of donor funds, private investment as a source of revenue, and improved LG legislation were identified as opportunities. Comments from other groups included the need to address the lack of climate change data in order to attract interest from LGs.
31. Group 2 (“government revenue”) provided details of revenue collection arrangements in NR sectors in Nepal, Bhutan, Cambodia, Thailand and Timor-Leste (with the latter still in the development stage). Lack of revenue sharing by the central governments was highlighted as a major challenge, with the perception that NRM activities undertaken by LGs were largely unrecognised. Other challenges included the hesitance of LG to collect taxes because of their unpopularity, and waste collection fees not reflecting the cost of generated waste. Tax relaxation on climate change adaptation initiatives, new levies on activities that cause increased salinity of coastal areas, and carbon credits generated from REDD-related activities were some of the proposed solutions / opportunities. Comments from other groups included the need to distinguish between LG collecting revenue from its constituents and LG having access to funds through distribution by the central government.
32. Group 3 (“government planning”) highlighted the following issues (among others):
 - The need for vertical integration (between local and national governments) and horizontal integration (between different departments at the same government level) in government planning.
 - While LGs have a comparative advantage in terms of local knowledge, the possibility of “elite capture” in participatory planning needs to be addressed.
 - The need to differentiate rural and urban priorities.
 - The need to ensure that LG processes and institutional arrangements can accommodate long-term concerns such as sustainable NRM and climate change.
 - The need to address weak monitoring and assessment of LG plans.

The following comments were raised by other participants:

- In order to avoid “elite capture” in participatory planning, poor people need to be properly informed about the issue at stake.
- The possibility of separate planning systems for NRM and climate change should be looked at.
- The issue of urban migration needs to be addressed in LG plans.

Session 6: Country break-out groups

33. Country break-out groups were given a task to come up with 5 concrete recommendations on how the identified NECC issues could be applied at the country level. Each country gave a short presentation of its findings.
34. Cambodia identified itself as one of the countries most vulnerable to climate change. It is currently considering producing “climate change manuals” for national and sub-national governments, which will address both adaptation and mitigation.
35. Representative from Laos proposed the following interventions:
- Awareness raising and increased understanding of NECC for local communities and LG officials.
 - Capacity building on data collection, planning, budgeting, monitoring and enforcement for NECC implementation for LG technical officials.
 - Improve coordination and collaboration of roles, mandates and responsibilities on NECC activities among sector agencies (local, central and others).
 - Revision, adoption, dissemination and enforcement of the Environment Protection Law, including decrees and instructions at local level.
 - Development of a common land use map (using GIS data) to help address land titling and land use rights for local communities.
 - The need for the national government to allocate a separate national budget for NECC activities to local authorities (as part of the 7th National Socio-Economic Development Plan).
 - Implementation of the new PEI project (which covers two provinces).
36. Participants from Nepal suggested to following country-level reforms:
- Introduction of new levies by the local governments, including uncultivated land tax, deforestation tax on private land, ground water tax, solid waste tax and waste water discharge tax.
 - Increasing the percentage of NRM-related tax sharing with the LGs.
 - Introducing formal participatory village-level planning, with strong involvement from civil society and local communities.
 - Clarifying the roles and responsibilities of NGOs in village and district level planning process, and increasing their mobilisation.
 - Because industrialised countries have been the primary culprits in causing climate change, they have the responsibility to provide more funding for CC adaptation measures in developing countries. UN has the responsibility to draw attention to this issue.
37. Participants from Thailand proposed the following domestic interventions:
- Improving local taxes collection efficiency.
 - Introducing LG holistic participatory planning (incorporating spatial planning).
 - Strengthening NR and environment management through poverty reduction.
38. The delegation from Timor-Leste came up with following suggestions:
- Development of a national policy for managing natural resources in Timor-Leste.
 - Clear separation of roles and responsibility between the national and local governments.
 - Improved financing of local governments and stronger involvement of NGOs.
39. Representative from Bangladesh proposed the following interventions:

- Introduction of a regulatory framework for LGs to monitor and enforce compliance with pollution regulations.
- Delegation of authority to LGs to deal with NECC issues.
- Increased LG financing, capacity building and performance incentives in regards to NECC activities.
- Introduction of small pilot NECC-related initiatives (with LGs in the leading role).

40. Representative from Bhutan suggested the following interventions:

- Strengthening of the Local Development Planning Manual by incorporating preparation of holistic and integrated area-based development and land use plans for current & future annual and development plans.
- Undertaking economic analysis to demonstrate poverty-environment linkages.
- Promoting benefit-sharing policies and strategies for local communities through community tourism
- Promoting hydro-power for watershed management.
- Improving the management of human-wildlife conflict.
- Strengthening the capacity of LG to deal with environmental management, climate change adaptation, disaster risk reduction, planning and budgeting.
- Improving NECC-related LG regulations.
- Increasing the involvement of civil society organisations and semi-government agencies to bring about improved expenditure on NECC at local level.

Summary

41. In summing up the session, Ms Seon-Mi Choi (UNEP) recalled the persistent calls for higher levels of revenue and expenditure on NECC required by LG. The need for specific guidelines and manuals for LG, and the need for more holistic planning were also noted. Whilst the PEI initiative provides LGs with various technical skills and tools (spatial planning, etc), there is a need to analyse further what is specifically required at the country level.

Session 7: Next steps and way forward

42. Mr Mike Winter reiterated that the findings of the workshop will be incorporated into the guidance note for local governments. The initial draft note will be available by the end of October 2009, and will be sent to all participants for comment. The final draft note will be available by the end of November; it will be no more than 10 pages long, and will focus on practical measures which LGs can implement.

43. Mr David Jackson thanked the participants for their contributions. In terms of next steps, he advised the participants to bear in mind the multifaceted nature of NECC (some components of which are overlapping). He noted that, at this point, LGs might not necessarily be the best players to act on NECC issues: while they might have the comparative advantage in terms of local knowledge and accessibility, they appear to lack adequate incentives. Therefore, the option of delegation (rather than devolution) by central governments should be considered. The question of who is responsible for funding NECC issues (developing or developed countries) needs to be discussed further. Mr Jackson urged countries with UNCDF programmes to seek to incorporate the workshop's findings into existing projects. UNCDF stands prepared to contribute support to any enhanced role for LG in CC adaptation, particularly in those areas in which it has relevance and expertise (such as grants mechanism).

44. Mr. Henrik Larsen stated that the workshop has been instrumental in showing what LGs can and cannot do in regards to NECC issues, and hence will make a valuable contribution to the guidance note. He noted that the suggested matrix will be useful, but limited; for example, there is a need to

look at impacts of LG actions on different people and communities. He also noted that the relationship between LGs and climate change has not received enough attention in UNDP; this will need to be addressed.

45. Mr Paul Steele stated that the minutes of the workshop will be available for comment by the end of October. He asked the participants to fill in the workshop review form and collect the flash drive containing workshop's presentations. He thanked the UNDP and UNEP staff for organising the workshop.
46. Ms Priya Shyamsundar stated that the role of LGs in NECC issues should not be ignored. There is also a need to look at incentives created by LGs for people in regards to NECC, and it would be useful if the guidance note can address this. The role of LGs in designing and implementing mechanisms to value and conserve ecosystem services needs to be studied further. There is also a need for more case studies on LG role in NRM revenue collection and distribution (other than Nepal).
47. Dr Dechen Tsering (UNEP), in her concluding remarks, suggested that the workshop may serve as a catalyst for an ongoing forum. She noted the need for giving people dependent on NR a stronger voice, and the need for increasing government expenditure on environment (via, *inter alia*, more revenue collection). The lack of government capacity and the need to encourage environmentally-friendly investment also need to be addressed. Whilst the workshop has delivered general lessons that can be shared, the guidance note will provide more practical advice on how LG can address NECC issues.

Annex I: Matrix “mapping” the LG and NECC interface

LG action areas	NRM	Environment	Climate change (mitigation and adaptation)
Local public expenditure management	Specific activities (e.g. investments in soil/water conservation)	Specific activities (e.g. solid waste management, construction of environmentally friendly roads)	Specific activities (e.g. investing in flood control structures)
Local revenues	Specific activities (e.g. taxes on resource exploitation)	Specific activities (e.g. property tax breaks for housing improvements)	Specific activities (e.g. property tax breaks for housing improvements to minimise flood damage)
Local regulatory frameworks	Specific activities (e.g. by-laws enabling local level NRM)	Specific activities (e.g. enforcement of anti-pollution by-laws)	Specific activities (e.g. local building codes, local land use planning and zoning)

Annex II: List of Participants

ID	Full Name	Job Title	Agency / Organisation	Email address
BANGLADESH				
1	Mr. Azizur Rahman Siddique	LGSP-LIC Project Manager	UNCDF	lgsp-lic@hotmail.com
2	Ms. Teresa Benito	Programme Officer	UNCDF	teresa.benito@uncdf.org
3	Mr. Steven Goldfinch	Programme Officer	UNDP, Disaster Management Cluster	steven.goldfinch@undp.org
4	Mr. Prasanta Baushan Barua	Joint Secretary Local Government Division	Ministry of Local Government Rural Development and Cooperatives	prasanta-barua@hotmail.com
5	Mr. Sujay Chowdhury	Assistant Chief Planning	Ministry of Environment & Forests	sujay_110@yahoo.com
BHUTAN				
6	Mr. Tashi Dorji	PEI Officer	UNDP	tashi.dorji@undp.org
7	Mr. Karma Jamtsho		LDD/GNHC	kjamtsho@gnhc.gov.bt
8	Mr. Sangay Penjor	Senior Programme Coordinator	DCD/GNHC	spenjor@gnhc.gov.bt
CAMBODIA				
9	Mr. Nicola Crosta	Chief Technical Advisor	UNCDF	nicola.crosta@undp.org
10	Mr. Ny Kimsan	Deputy Director of Department of Local Administration	Department of Local Administration	kimsandoc@hotmail.com
11	Mr. Andrew Mears	Climate Change Advisor	UNDP	Andrew.Mears@undp.org
12	Mr. Lay Khim	Assistant Resident Representative and Team Leader of Environment & Energy Cluster	UNDP	Khim.Lay@undp.org
13	Mr. Phang Leng Huot	Deputy Director-General	Ministry of Interior	Lenghuot_phang@yahoo.fr
LAOS				
14	Mr. Thilaphong Oudomsine	Programme Officer	UNCDF	thilaphong.Oudomsine@undp.org
15	Mr. Phongphonh Xayachack	Official Staff	Prime Minister's Office	pongphonh@hotmail.com
16	Mr. Syvongxay Thavisack	Technical Officer	Ministry of Planning and Investment, Investment Promotion Department	tvxay@hotmail.com
17	Mr. Oukham Oupakone	Engineering on Water Resources	Water Resources and Environment	oukham2@hotmail.com
18	Mr. Anousone Phimmasane	Governor Staff	DPI Savannakhet	anousone_h@yahoo.com
NEPAL				
19	Mr. Gopi Krishna Khanal	Programme Manager LGCDP	Ministry of Local Development Nepal	lgcdp@wlink.com.np

ID	Full Name	Job Title	Agency / Organisation	Email address
20	Mr. Dhruva Bhandu Aryal	Under Secretary National Planning Commission	National Planning Commission	sivaaryal@yahoo.com
21	Ms. Dibya Gurung	Programme Officer	UNDP	dibya.gurung@undp.org
TIMOR-LESTE				
22	Ms. Joana Lima	Programme Officer	UNDP	joana.lima@undp.org
23	Mr. Mario Ximenes	National Director for International Environmental Affairs	SoS Environment	mario.ximenes@undp.org
24	Mr. Miguel Pereira	National Director	Ministry of State Administration	miguelcarvalho76@yahoo.com
THAILAND				
25	Ms. Araya Nuntapotidech	Director	Regional Environment Office 10	envioff@esarnny.com , nantapotidech@gmail.com
26	Mr. Virunpob Supab	Senior Environment Officer	Regional Environment Office 10	envioff@esarnny.com
27	Mr. Thanu Polbun	Advisor to the PAO Chief Executive	Nan Provincial Administrative Office	tanu_po@hotmail.com
28	Mr. Wachirapong Suwansophon	Plan and Policy Analyst	Nan Provincial Administrative Office	wachirapongcmu@hotmail.com
29	Dr. Suchada Wattana	Policy and Plan Analyst	Ministry of Interior	suchadawattana@hotmail.com
VIET NAM				
30	Dr. Michael Parsons	Senior Technical Advisor Poverty and Environment Project	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment	michael.g.parsons@gmail.com
UNCDF Bangkok Regional Office				
31	Mr. David Jackson	Head of Office, a.i. and Senior Technical Advisor	UNCDF	david.jackson@uncdf.org
32	Ms. Suela Krifsa	Regional Portfolio Specialist	UNCDF	suela.krifsa@uncdf.org
33	Ms. Npokrprawi Kridaratikorn	Regional Operations Analyst	UNCDF	npokrprawi.kridaratikorn@uncdf.org
34	Mr. Michael Winter	Consultant	UNCDF	mikewin68@gmail.com
UNDP RCB				
35	Mr. Paul Steele	Environment Advisor	UNDP	paul.steele@undp.org
36	Mr. Sameer Karki	Regional Technical Adviser Biodiversity	UNDP	sameer.karki@undp.org
37	Mr. Nikolai Beresnev	Environmental Economics Associate Officer	UNDP	nikolai.beresnev@undp.org
38	Ms. Panida Charotok	Programme Assistant	UNDP	panida.charotok@undp.org
39	Mr. Martin Krause	Team Leader, Environment & Energy	UNDP	martin.krause@undp.org
40	Mr. Henrik Larsen	BDP Advisor, Local Gov/Decentralisation	UNDP	henrik.larsen@undp.org

ID	Full Name	Job Title	Agency / Organisation	Email address
UNPEI				
41	Mr. John Horberry	Manager	UNDP-UNEP Poverty-Environment Facility	john.horberry@unpei.org
UNEP				
42	Dr. Dechen Tsering	Deputy Regional Director	UNEP	dechen.tsering@unep.org
43	Mr. Sanath Ranawana	Regional Advisor	UNEP	sanath.ranawana@unep.org
44	Ms. Seon-Mi Choi	Associate Programme Officer	UNEP	seon-mi.choi@unep.org
45	Mr. Manesh Lacoul	Consultant	UNEP	Manesh.lacoul@unep.org
46	Ms. Saranya Rojananuangnit	Team Assistant	UNEP	saranya.rojananuangnit@unep.org
UNDP				
47	Mr. Charles McNeil	Senior Policy Advisor	UNDP	charles.mcneil@undp.org
SANDEE				
48	Ms. Priya Shyamsundar	Programme Director	South Asian Network for Development and Environmental Economics	priya_sandee@yahoo.com

Annex III: Workshop Agenda

Monday 5 October 2009

8.30 Registration

9.00 **Workshop objectives and Overview**

Chair: UNDP (Martin Krause)

Workshop objectives: UNCDF (David Jackson) and UNEP (Sanath Ranawana)

Participant Introductions

9.15 **Overview of environment, natural resource management and climate**

Presentation: UNDP (Paul Steele)

Overview of local government system and institutions and environment and climate in Asia Pacific

Presentation: Mike Winter, UNCDF consultant

Panel discussion: Thailand (Ministry of Interior) and Bangladesh (Ministry of Local Government)

10.30 Group Photo

10.45 Tea/coffee

11.00 Local government expenditure and the environment

Local government expenditure patterns and infrastructure focus, environment al implications and climate “risks” of current spending, potential for more environment related spending, potential for environment “block grant”, how to climate “proof” local government spending

Chair: UNDP (Henrik Larsen)

Presentation: UNCDF (David Jackson)

Panel discussion: Cambodia (Department of Local Administration) and Bhutan (Local Development Division, GNHC)

12.30 Lunch

1.30 Local government revenues and the environment

Local government revenue sources, environment implications, fiscal powers and potential for incentivising environment positive behaviour

Chair: UNDP (Sameer Karki)

Presentation: Priya Shyamsundar, Director, South Asian Network for Development Economics and Environment (SANDEE)

Panel discussion: Nepal (Ministry of Local Development) and Lao PDR

3.00 Tea/coffee

3.30 Local government planning, regulatory and management role

Local government planning and natural resources, local government powers and functions and environment implications, links between natural resource based user groups and local government)

Presentation: UNEP (Sanath Ranawana)

Panel discussion: Thailand (Provincial representatives from Nan and Khon Kaen) and Timor-Leste (Ministry of State Administration)

5.00 Close

6.00 Reception, Ayudhdhaya Room, 8th Floor

Tuesday 6 October 2009

8.30 Summary of day 1

9.00 **Thematic Break out groups on:**

- Expenditure
- Revenue collection
- Management role of local government

10.00 Tea/coffee

10.30 Report back

11.30 **Country break-out groups on** strengthening country level programmes on local government to cover environment, natural resources and climate change

12.30 Lunch

1.30 Country presentations

3.00 Next steps and way forward
UNCDF, UNDP and UNEP

4.00 Close

Annex IV: List of Acronyms

GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GIS	Geographic Information System
LG	Local government
NECC	Natural resource management, environment and climate change
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
NRM	Natural resource management
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
PEI	Poverty-Environment Initiative
RCB	UNDP Regional Centre in Bangkok
SANDEE	South Asian Network for Development and Environmental Economics
UN	United Nations
UNCDF	United Nations Capital Development Fund
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNEP	United Nations Environment Program