

Sarah Champion MP
Chair
International Development Committee
House of Commons
London SW1A 0AA

13 May 2020

Dear Chair

Thank you for your letter of 29 April. We welcome the Committee's inquiry into the Effectiveness of Aid and your interest in the cross government funds. I am glad the committee found my attendance at the evidence session on 28 April 2020 useful.

I have provided answers to your questions below:

How do climate-related activities administered by the joint funds co-ordinate with other areas of UK government ODA spending on climate, such as International Climate Finance (ICF)?

The cross government nature and governance structures of the Conflict Stability and Security Fund (CSSF) and the Prosperity Fund ensure that the UK has broad expertise and funding to respond to emerging conflict and prosperity priorities, and that interventions complement and are synchronised with other activities being delivered across government.

A number of the Prosperity Fund's programmes specifically seek to promote increased resilience to, or mitigation of climate change as part of their approach to support inclusive growth; and the CSSF is working with government departments together to find or trial creative solutions to address the intersection between conflict and climate change.

All PF and CSSF activity on climate action is coordinated at both a cross-government strategic level and at a programme-level. This ensures alignment with, and contribution to UK climate objectives and to UN Sustainable Development Goal 13 on Climate Action. Such coordination includes:

- The Director of the Joint Funds Unit (JFU) is a member of a senior cross-Government climate forum, ensuring that the strategy and policy of the Funds is informed by the latest developments on UK climate change policy.
- JFU Advisers hold regular working-level meetings with counterparts across HMG, including from BEIS and DFID, to understand and contribute to the development of policy and strategy on climate, including on aligning all UK aid spending with the objectives of the Paris Agreement.
- BEIS is represented on the Prosperity Fund Portfolio Board. This helps to ensure that climate expertise is factored in at the highest level of decision-making.

- Representatives from a range of government departments feature in the governance structures of individual CSSF and PF supported programmes, providing oversight and ensuring complementarity with related work streams. This includes ICF/BEIS representation on PF programme boards.
- The joint FCO-BEIS International Energy Unit, which provides policy support to PF low carbon energy related programmes, is embedded in the BEIS International Climate and Energy Directorate, which is also home to the BEIS ICF team.
- There is close collaboration with International Climate Finance teams at posts, with Policy leads for ICF and PF programmes often part of the same team or part of a cross government programme board, which greatly facilitates collaboration and synergies.

For example:

In Indonesia, the PF is central to the UK's climate change and COP26 engagement. The Indonesia Renewable Energy programme coordinates closely with other HMG work, for example with DFID's UK Climate Change Unit in supporting the Indonesian government's Low Carbon Development Initiative, and with BEIS on the design and delivery of International Climate Finance programmes. Other PF strands in Indonesia, including the Global Future Cities programme which supports urban mobility in Bandung, complement other HMG support such as the BEIS PACT (Partnering for Accelerated Climate Transitions) programme, which is also helping to scope new areas of cooperation in zero emission vehicles and other sectors.

The British Embassy in Bogota, Colombia, ensures funding and programming across the PF, CSSF, ICF and other departmental streams is coordinated in support of delivery of HMG objectives in the country. This includes support for the implementation of the peace deal, which has climate implications as there has been an increase in deforestation. Land-grabbing, clearing land for illicit crops, extensive cattle herding, and illegal gold mining have contributed to a significant rise in the destruction of tropical forest; the majority in conflict-affected areas. To address this, teams across the Embassy are using resources from both the CSSF and ICF to design an integrated programme, recognising that the drivers of insecurity and deforestation are the same. For example, the CSSF is testing higher risk interventions supporting Colombian security and justice agencies to tackle environmental crime. CSSF conflict experts helped BEIS to design a business case to promote sustainable development and formalise land management in conflict-regions, and thereby help implement specific parts of the peace deal. CSSF also funded a political economy analysis of deforestation to help inform ICF programming.

We note from the CSSF's Annual Report 2018/19 that the Fund has published 83 of 90 programme summaries and 63 of 90 annual reviews. Does the Fund intend to publish the remaining summaries and reviews? If so, what is the timescale for this?

There is a presumption to publish information on all CSSF programmes. Programmes are required to publish a programme summary and an annual review summary, with sensitive information redacted, rather than the whole summary being exempted. However, given the sensitivity of some of the CSSF's work it is not always possible to publish information on every single programme. The two key reasons for this are to protect UK national security and to protect the safety and security of beneficiaries, partners and partner governments. The JFU challenges teams where information is exempted to ensure compliance with the above criteria.

For 2018/19, the CSSF has published information on nearly all of its programmes. Out of 90 programmes, we have published 83 programme summaries (representing 92%) and 77

annual review summaries (some programmes had one annual review for multiple programmes). On 30 April, we published the 2018/19 Annual Review Synthesis. Please find attached a copy for your reference. This collates the lessons learnt from the 2018/19 reviews and summarises trends, findings and key learnings. These lessons have already been shared across the CSSF and have informed the 2020/21 budget allocations process. We will also be looking at how we can share these lessons effectively with partners. For 2019/20, 90 out of 95 CSSF programmes have published a programme summary, representing 95% of programmes.

I hope this addresses the committee's questions. Should you require anything further, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Joelle Jenny', with a stylized, flowing script.

Joelle Jenny
Director, Joint Funds Unit