

**The 9th Focal Point Forum  
of the  
Nairobi work programme on impacts, vulnerability and  
adaptation to climate change (NWP)**

18:00–20:30, 30 November 2015  
Paris

**A Summary Note**

## **1. Introduction**

The ninth NWP Focal Point Forum was held in Paris during the forty-third session of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA 43). Focal point forums have, in the past, focused on taking stock of relevant activities being undertaken by NWP partner organizations, and identifying opportunities for mutual learning and collaboration. The forums have also helped to support outreach, and foster dialogue and the exchange of information relevant to the NWP among stakeholders involved in adaptation.<sup>1</sup>

## **2. Mandate**

The SBSTA, at its twenty-eighth session, requested the secretariat to regularly organize Focal Point Forums, with the participation of focal points from NWP partner organizations and representatives from interested Parties, with a view to taking stock of activities undertaken by organizations and institutions in support of the objective of the NWP and to promoting a periodic dialogue between Parties and engaged organizations and institutions.<sup>2</sup>

## **3. Background and preparatory tasks**

### **Context**

In accordance with decision 17/CP.19, SBSTA 40 agreed on a set of activities to be undertaken under the NWP, by SBSTA 45, in order to collect, analyse and disseminate information and knowledge to inform adaptation planning and actions at the regional, national and subnational levels, addressing ecosystems, human settlements, water resources and health.<sup>3</sup> These activities are to be undertaken under the guidance of the Chair of the SBSTA, in collaboration with the Adaptation Committee (AC), the Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG), and with contributions from relevant NWP partner organizations and regional centres and networks.<sup>4</sup>

The SBSTA requested the secretariat, under the guidance of the Chair of the SBSTA, in collaboration with the Adaptation Committee and the LEG and with contributions from relevant Nairobi work programme partner organizations, including regional centres and networks, to develop case studies, as appropriate, that highlight good practices and lessons learned addressing the following for consideration at SBSTA 43 (November–December 2015):<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Summaries of discussions from previous Forums are available at <<http://unfccc.int/4300>>.

<sup>2</sup> FCCC/SBSTA/2008/6, paragraph 29.

<sup>3</sup> FCCC/SBSTA/2014/2, paragraph 19.

<sup>4</sup> FCCC/SBSTA/2014/2, paragraph 24.

<sup>5</sup> <<http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2014/sbsta/eng/02.pdf>>, paragraph 24.

- (a) Available and implemented tools and methods for adaptation planning processes addressing the four issues of ecosystems, human settlements, water resources and health;
- (b) Good practices and lessons learned in relation to adaptation planning processes, including on monitoring and evaluation, addressing the four issues of ecosystems, settlements, water resources and health;
- (c) Good practices and lessons learned related to processes and structures for linking national and local adaptation planning.

Drawing on the discussions held during the informal brainstorming organized at the margin of the SBSTA 42, the ninth Focal Point Forum focused at achieving a common understanding of what is the most effective way of facilitating learning on adaptation that can be promoted through the NWP in its function as a knowledge hub on adaptation. The case studies to provide contextual inputs for the Forum were selected from the pool contributed by Parties and the NWP partners on good practices and lessons learned in relation to adaptation planning processes addressing the four issues of ecosystems, human settlements, water resources and health, and in relation to processes and structures for linking national and local adaptation planning).<sup>6</sup>

### **Preparatory work prior to the Forum**

A review group was set up to undertake the necessary preparatory work for the Forum. The Group included members from the AC, the LEG and thematic experts from NWP partner organizations (with relevant expertise addressing water resources, human health, settlements and ecosystems) (See annex 1 for the composition of the review group). The work of the review group focused on the following:

- (a) Review case studies against the criteria and select five case studies that fulfill most of the criteria as an individual exercise;<sup>7</sup>
- (b) Consider the shortlisted pool of case studies from the initial review and nominate up to two case studies that demonstrate strongest evidence for each individual criterion;
- (c) Propose any changes to the criteria based on the outcome of this exercise;
- (d) Provide inputs to the design of the 9<sup>th</sup> Focal Point Forum.

The secretariat, under the guidance of the Chair of the SBSTA and with inputs from the review group, and taking into account thematic and regional diversity (reflecting comments from the review group), selected the five case studies to inform discussion at the Forum (see annex 2 for the assessment of the selected case studies against the criteria).

### **Criteria for identifying and selecting case studies**

The following five criteria for best practices developed by the LEG were used as a basis for selecting case studies for sharing at the Forum:<sup>8</sup>

#### *(a) Effectiveness/impacts*

- Institutional arrangements. Characteristics of effective institutional arrangements (e.g. established following clear mandates, continuity of the arrangements, sufficient capacity, recognized authority, ease of addressing gaps and needs);
- Opportunities, obstacles and ways to overcome obstacles;
- Level of funding against project/ programme cost.

- (b) *Measurability*: Overall goal of the practice and how it has been achieved or is intended to be achieved
- (c) *Replicability*: Potential for replication in another setting (different scale, different region, etc.)

<sup>6</sup> Case studies are available at the Adaptation Knowledge Portal <<http://www4.unfccc.int/sites/NWP>>.

<sup>7</sup> Case studies were assigned to experts by their thematic expertise for the individual review exercise.

<sup>8</sup> Description for the efficiency criterion has been amended to fit within the scope of this work.

- (d) *Efficiency*: Ability to deliver desired results or intended benefits within the pre-defined timeframe
- (e) *Sustainability*:
  - Ability to continue to be implemented, deliver benefits and have lasting impact/effects over time, without requiring substantial additional resources;
  - Environmental, economic and social sustainability of the practice (meeting current needs, without compromising the ability to address future needs).

## 4. Focus of discussions

As indicated earlier, the ninth Focal Point Forum focused on achieving a common understanding of what is the most effective way of facilitating learning on adaptation that can be promoted through the NWP in its function as a knowledge hub on adaptation. Adaptation learning could constitute both good practices and lessons learned. Selected case studies as a result of the review group exercise were used to provide contextual inputs for the discussion.

The overall goal of the Forum was to identify ways to facilitate effective learning on adaptation under the NWP. This was addressed through the following three questions:

- (a) What constitutes good practice (i.e. the key characteristics or elements that need to be provided in information on adaptation planning and practices to be considered a good practice)?;
- (b) What are the key regional and thematic contexts?;
- (c) What are the most efficient ways of recording and sharing good practices and lessons learned that can be promoted through the NWP to support greater action towards adaptation?.

## 5. Proceedings

The Forum was chaired by the Chair of the SBSTA Ms. Lidia Wojtel and facilitated by Mr. Henry Bonsu. The Forum was attended by over 70 representatives from Parties and NWP partner organizations. Annex 3 to this summary note contains the agenda for the Forum.

The Chair of the SBSTA, in her opening remarks, highlighted the objectives of the Forum and provided a broader context of the evolving role of the NWP as a global adaptation knowledge hub in the new climate regime for removing knowledge barriers and meeting information and knowledge needs for scaling up adaptation action. She also thanked all review group members for their work in preparation for the Forum.

The Forum was divided into several segments. As a part of **setting the stage**, Mr. Henry Bonsu introduced the format and objectives of the Forum. Mr. Robert Munroe, a member of the review group, presented the scope of the preparatory work undertaken before the Forum. This was followed by a second segment **focusing on presentation and discussion of case studies** that are making an impact. The case studies were presented in interactive formats (video and photo slides).<sup>9</sup> Each case study presenter was “interrogated” by an expert witness on the specific criteria borne out by the case study.

The third segment was an **open forum to share good practices** in the plenary setting. The facilitator provided key points on how to document adaptation good practices to facilitate effective learning (based on the feedback provided by the review group) and used the framing questions to facilitate interactive exchange among participants on the following:

- (a) key characteristics or elements that need to be provided in information on adaptation planning and practices to be considered good practices and lessons learned;

---

<sup>9</sup> Presentations of the case studies are available at <<http://unfccc.int/9357.php>>.

- (b) key regional and thematic contexts;
- (c) most efficient ways of recording and sharing good practices and lessons learned that can be promoted through the NWP to support greater action towards adaptation.

A working group was set up at the end of the Forum with interested participants, with a view to following up on critical actions emerging from the discussion. Possible action points for the group could include but not limited to:

- (a) Based on discussions at the Forum, develop a guidance note on documenting adaptation practice to facilitate learning under the NWP;
- (b) Explore effective ways to facilitate learning under the NWP in 2016 and beyond, including based on the case studies contributed by Parties and partner organizations under the NWP in 2015 (this could include the development of user-friendly knowledge products, learning events to be hosted by partners/Parties etc.).

Representatives from the AC and the LEG provided concluding remarks, where they highlighted the Forum as an excellent example of collaboration with the AC, the LEG and partners under the NWP, and that the discussions provided a useful basis for further collaboration and developing effective ways to facilitate learning under the NWP, and more importantly in linking national and local adaptation planning processes.

Following the conclusion of the discussion segment, the Vice Chair of the SBSTA, Mr. Carlos Fuller, provided concluding remarks and closed the Forum on behalf of the Chair of the SBSTA. In his closing, Mr. Fuller noted the valuable information exchange among Parties and NWP partner organizations and requested the secretariat, under the guidance of the Chair of the SBSTA, to follow up on the outcomes of the Forum.

## 6. Summary of the plenary discussions

A summary of key messages from the plenary discussions associated with the framing questions is captured below.

The following characteristics or elements emerged as being key parameters to be included in information on adaptation planning and practices to be considered good practices and for lessons learned, which also includes regional and thematic context:

- (a) **Potential for replication** in another setting (at a different scale, in a different region, etc.) is an important element to consider;
- (b) **Cost-effectiveness** is an important element to ensure the sustainability of any project (i.e. successful implementation by local communities beyond the “temporary” project life);
- (c) A **learning process** (other than the M&E) needs to be built in so as to ensure that the adaptation planning process becomes an iterative exercise. This iterative process will help generate new/additional/updated information and provide space for innovation or amendments based on this information or from failures. Information on lessons learned in terms of **both successes and failures** are therefore equally important;
- (d) It is important that the lessons learned have been generated from projects or development activities that have been implemented for a period of time (for example, a period of 2-3 years) with an inherent understanding that adaptation funding is an investment in future;
- (e) Community consultation/community engagement is an important aspect to be considered as a component of the good practice. The **community level ownership** (e.g. determined by the level of engagement in testing what is appropriate locally; level of commitment to drive the process) is an important criterion. In addition, consideration of the vulnerable groups (e.g. needs/interests/engagement of women, children) in adaptation planning process is also an essential factor;
- (f) One of the elements should be **consideration of and positive impacts on vulnerable ecosystems** as a result of adaptation interventions;

- (g) Good practice also needs to have been demonstrated through a **strong evidence-base**;
- (h) Good practice needs to constitute focus on a **long-term resilience building** versus a short-term/quick gain;
- (i) One of the considerations for the good practices should be whether adaptation actions have demonstrated/resulted in **mitigation co-benefits**;
- (j) Lack of/limited finance often can be a barrier to effective implementation of adaptation actions. In this regard, it is important to include information on parameters such as **transparency of financial distribution/allocation and investment in human capital** when considering good practices;
- (k) Good practices and lessons learned that have been generated from projects implemented at a small scale (with modest funding) are also important to be considered. Often times development projects with large funds from bilateral or multilateral donors tend to get more visibility;
- (l) It is important to consider solutions and record good practices that are holistic, cross-sectoral and span multiple scales (e.g. transboundary adaptation solution in case of river basins shared by many countries).

Participants also provided useful insights into most efficient ways of recording and sharing good practices and lessons learned that can be promoted through the NWP to support greater action towards adaptation. These include:

- (a) Countries need to document their knowledge needs and the NWP could play a role in catalysing actions to respond to these knowledge needs (e.g. communicating these knowledge needs to scientific communities; collaborating with relevant partners to undertake concrete actions). Such demand-driven approach will help closely align the work under the NWP with actions needed in countries;
- (b) Sharing of good practices and lessons learned should involve scaling down and scaling up (i.e. taking lessons from regional to national to local context, and from local to national to regional context);
- (c) Given different types and levels of knowledge (e.g. scientific, local and traditional/indigenous knowledge; more knowledge of what has happened in the past as opposed to what will happen in future), effective sharing requires interfacing with different groups of knowledge holders (e.g. scientists, farmers, pastoralists, policy makers) and different knowledge systems (e.g. biological, social) and packaging/repackaging information/information in appropriate forms;
- (d) One of the effective ways of sharing lessons is by bringing local communities (who “experience” adaptation challenges first hand) in one forum and providing a space for them to share their lessons learned and challenges that they have faced, test their assumptions and identify methods and tools that could be most relevant for their specific context, which could be more effective than providing them with prescriptive information on what they need to do;
- (e) Face to face interactions among adaptation practitioners and communities (from multiple disciplines) are effective ways for sharing good practices and lessons learned;
- (f) It is important to document and share good practices at national (e.g. information on financial disbursement; integration of relevant sectors in adaptation planning) and regional levels (e.g. sharing of good practices and lessons learned specific to formulating and implementing NAPs in the regional context through organization of subregional/regional forums);
- (g) One of the effective ways of sharing is identifying and working with ground/local champions who have strong leverage in the communities;
- (h) Considering the importance of interacting with practitioners, experts, local champions with first-hand experience in designing/implementing adaptation actions, a database containing contact details of these experts would be helpful;
- (i) Information on lessons learned in terms of both successes and failures need to be recorded and shared.

## Annex 1: Composition of the review group

<i>Name of review group member</i>	<i>Affiliation</i>	<i>Thematic focus for the first review task</i>
Mr. Don Lemmen	Adaptation Committee (AC)	Linking national and local adaptation planning
Mr. Batu Uprety	Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG)	
Mr. Saleemul Huq	ICCCAD	Linking national and local adaptation planning
Mr. Ali Raza	IUCN	Ecosystems
Mr. Robert Munroe	UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre	Ecosystems
Ms. Anna Forsuland	SIWI/AGWA	Water resources
Ms. Marina Maiero	WHO/WHO regional offices	Health
Mr. Klaus Radunsky	AC	
Mr. Clifford Mahlung	AC	

**Annex 2: Assessment of selected case studies against the criteria (as a result of the review group exercise)**

<i>Effectiveness/impacts</i>	<i>Measurability</i>	<i>Replicability</i>	<i>Efficiency</i>	<i>Sustainability</i>	<i>Brief explanation/assessment</i>
<p><b><i>Title of the selected case study:</i></b> <i>Lami Town, Fiji: Ecosystem-based Adaptation Study, Main focus : Ecosystem, Small Island Developing States</i>  <b><i>Organization Name:</i></b> <i>United Nations Human Settlements Programme</i></p>					
<p>The benefits and costs of four different combinations were compared with taking no action.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scenario comparison cost-benefit analysis considering ecosystem-based adaptation, hybrid approaches and engineering options.</li> <li>• Further insight into cost-benefit analyses for adaptation approaches (especially ecosystem-based adaptation) is needed.</li> <li>• General approach applied to specific context (Small Island Developing State) could be applied elsewhere.</li> </ul>	<p>Timeframe for 20 years.</p>		<p>The benefits and costs of four different combinations were compared with taking no action.</p>

<i>Effectiveness/impacts</i>	<i>Measurability</i>	<i>Replicability</i>	<i>Efficiency</i>	<i>Sustainability</i>	<i>Brief explanation/assessment</i>
<p><b>Title of the selected case study:</b> Sustainable Resettlement &amp; Reconstruction in Flood-Prone-Peri-Urban Areas in Saint Louis (Senegal), <b>Main focus :</b> Human settlements, Africa  <b>Organization Name:</b> United Nations Human Settlements Programme</p>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “UN-Habitat carried out a preliminary mission to Senegal in January 2011 to identify a proper resettlement site to build low-cost houses for the relocation of the most at risk in Diaminar and Guet Ndar. In April 2011 the Municipality carried out an affordability study in the two affected neighbourhoods, disaggregated by gender, including an assessment of the willingness and capacity to pay for the new houses to be received, and a socio-economic analysis on the impact of the resettlement, including livelihood aspects.”</li> <li>• “A resettlement site was eventually identified, not too far from the areas of origin, which is an important aspect to be observed in any relocation project due to the dependency of the targeted population on location-specific economic activities.”</li> <li>• “The Prime Minister of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Social benefits that have and will accrue to beneficiaries include improved housing and secure tenure. Some 68 of the most vulnerable families were resettled. The project eventually will effect a transformational change by providing the beneficiaries with secure title to their property.”</li> <li>• “The project demonstrates the possibility of deploying a mechanism which combines, on the one hand, urban upgrading and implementation of disaster mitigation measures for certain households and, on the other hand, relocation of the most at-risk families with construction of adequate shelter at a safer location.”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “As a result of the successes from this project, MRAZI has benefited. It has received public funds to build more houses to relocate people living in flood-prone areas in several urban centres of Senegal in the 5 years to come. This Ministry has officially requested for UN-Habitat technical assistance to carry out such challenging task.”</li> <li>• “The technology used in this project, the prefab, was rather convincing to the Senegalese authorities, which would like to see it replicated for implementing the next projects related to relocation from flood-prone areas and construction in safe areas.”</li> <li>• Replicable, the thoroughness and the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “UN-Habitat carried out a study in September and December of 2010 with experts from Arcadis on the impact of climate change and the hydrological conditions affecting Saint Louis... This fine-grained assessment for the population’s vulnerability provided for a more closely calibrated and less disruptive adaptation plan. Instead of trying to relocate the entire neighbourhood of Guet Ndar, for example, a more graduated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “In April 2013, after visiting the Mayor of Saint Louis and the new Minister of Reorganization and Planning of Flood-Prone Areas (Ministère de la Restructuration et de l’Aménagement des Zones d’Inondation – MRAZI), UN-Habitat signed a MoU with the Mayor to transfer the responsibility for the management and administration of 68 completed houses to the Municipality of Saint Louis.”</li> <li>• “Master builders specialised in prefab technology were brought from Guatemala to Saint Louis for a few months to form local master builders and specialised workers. In this way the project developed local skills, which can enhance job opportunities for the local population in the future.”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This project identified the most vulnerable families in the Guet Ndar neighborhood of Saint Louis, while building the resilience capacity of the remaining families. It therefore shows how a single project can combine disaster mitigation measures for some households and relocation of others.</li> <li>• The administration in place at the time of the project seemed highly supportive of it and the responsible Ministry received public funds to build more houses to relocate the most vulnerable families in several additional urban centers in Senegal over the following 5 years.</li> <li>• Economic options and livelihoods were carefully considered for the families who were being relocated, so as to ensure minimal negative impact on their ability to earn money.</li> <li>• Impact: The direct impact on the 68 families that were relocated will be significant, as well as the indirect impact on the rest of the families for whom resilience to climate change was built for the long term. Economic options and livelihoods were carefully considered for</li> </ul>

<p>Senegal visited the site in 2012 and expressed his satisfaction with the project, signalling a strong political will by the national government to support the completion of the project.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “UN-Habitat carried out a study in September and December of 2010 with experts from Arcadis on the impact of climate change and the hydrological conditions affecting Saint Louis. . . This fine-grained assessment for the population’s vulnerability provided for a more closely calibrated and less disruptive adaptation plan. Instead of trying to relocate the entire neighbourhood of Guet Ndar, for example, a more graduated response was possible: only those most vulnerable families whose houses fronted directly on the ocean were relocated, while other households remained in situ while building their resilience.”</li> <li>• The thorough nature of this project and the attention to detail given to the lives of the most impacted, makes this case study an example.</li> <li>• Particularly impressed with the all the dimensions it has taken into account and the thoroughness of all aspects of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “The construction of the land fill allowed safeguarding the houses during the last rainy season (end of 2012) which was particularly intense, provoking floods in most of Saint Louis, and has shown to the neighbours what measures need to be undertaken to build and be safe from flooding.” Both qualitative and quantitative measurements are given. Case study outlines clear pathways to outcomes.</li> </ul>	<p>level of detail given indicates high replication as it covers aspects common to other cases of similar vulnerabilities.</p>	<p>response was possible: only those most vulnerable families whose houses fronted directly on the ocean were relocated, while other households remained in situ while building their resilience.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “UN-Habitat, through different supporting agencies, provided technical, advisory and financial support to the Municipality.” Efficient use of resources - most vulnerable targeted first, the rest benefitted with least amount of resource wastage.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “To help build the community’s resilience to external shocks the project partners sought to help diversify their economic opportunities. To this end partners established a small industrial facility at the project site and provided hands-on training to around 100 residents on producing prefabricated housing modules, which have been carefully adapted to the local context. Artisans who learned new skills now have an additional or supplemental source of income on which to fall back. The project thus went beyond merely reducing exposure to storm surge and sea level rise to tackle some of the more fundamental root causes of vulnerability.”</li> <li>• “The establishment of an environmental buffer zone on the coastline and improved environmental conditions in the new relocation site. Plans for tree planting both in the new buffer zone as well as elsewhere in the city could yield ecosystem benefits. Additionally, the connection of resettled residents to basic environmental services</li> </ul>	<p>the families who were being relocated, so as to ensure minimal negative impact on their ability to earn money.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Measurability: Especially once the relocated families secure titles for their property, the change in their resilience may be measurable. The comparison between the new homes constructed and their neighbours during the 2012 rainy season is especially telling.</li> <li>• Replicability: Public funds to relocate more houses of those living in flood-prone areas has already been allocated, and the prefab technology used will make this effort easier.</li> <li>• Efficiency: The project seems to have been completed within the allocated timeframe, and the project implementer worked with several agencies to support the Municipality.</li> <li>• Sustainability: The responsibility for the 68 completed houses was transferred to the Municipality, and for those families not relocated the project implementers established a small industrial facility at the project site and provided hands-on training to around 100 residents on producing prefabricated housing modules. This offers skill development and future job opportunities. In addition, a buffer zone was created along the coastline will protect the community from severe weather in the future, as well as provide ecosystem services.</li> </ul>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>impact of climate change. Level of detail does not overwhelm the scope of the project. It approached the issues steadily, one step at a time, the resettlement nearby indicates efficiency. The measures taken seem to be effective and appropriate.</p>				<p>will provide health benefits and reduce the potential for uncontrolled disposal of solid wastes and wastewater.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted location-specific economic activities when relocating.</li> <li>• Prime Minister engaged.</li> <li>• Detailed vulnerability assessment allowed a gradual relocation response.</li> <li>• MoU with Mayor to transfer responsibility.</li> <li>• Sought economic, social and environmental benefits</li> <li>• Focus on local stakeholder engagement (e.g. informal association of fisherfolk).</li> <li>• Sustainable - employment opportunities created indicate sustainability.</li> </ul>	
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

<i>Effectiveness/impacts</i>	<i>Measurability</i>	<i>Replicability</i>	<i>Efficiency</i>	<i>Sustainability</i>	<i>Brief explanation/assessment</i>
<p><b>Title of the selected case study:</b> <i>Water and climate change adaptation in the Danube River basin, central and eastern Europe, Focus: Water; Europe</i></p> <p><b>Organisation Name:</b> <i>World Wide Fund for Nature</i></p>					
<p>The project shows tangible results in improving adaptation and resilience in a complex transboundary context and at large scale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large volume of information provided that is relevant to a number of the criteria.</li> <li>• Clear mandate from heads of state secured.</li> <li>• Reflexive insight on obstacles, e.g. ‘slow government implementation’.</li> <li>• Logic of adaptation approach choice explained rather than adaptation approach just described.</li> <li>• Flood retention capacity calculated.</li> <li>• Despite scale of intervention, once quantified multiple benefits are taken into account it appears cost-effective.</li> <li>• Cost (including management costs) of restoration in comparison to hard infrastructural approaches is lower.</li> </ul>	<p>Targets included areas of flood plain restored (2236 km<sup>2</sup> ) and the increase flood retention capacity (lowered the Danube flood peaks with 40 cm).</p>	<p>The approach can be replicated in other transboundary basins.</p>	<p>Showed efficiency bridging between local scale community support and implementation to international scale with summit of heads of states.</p>	<p>The project demonstrated a sustainable path for the Danube, increasing the capacity to with stand floods while generating other co-benefits including reducing nutrient pollution and enhancing biodiversity.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project shows tangible results in improving adaptation and resilience in a complex context. The Danube River Basin is a highly populated area, home to 83 million people and falling within the territories of 19 European States. The initiative promoted and restored the Lower Danube Green Corridor to give room to flood safely while generating other co-benefits including reducing nutrient pollution and enhancing biodiversity.</li> <li>• In summary, the large-scale adaptation in the Danube shows the value of restoring the natural resilience of the environment to climatic variability and change by decommissioning under-performing water infrastructure, in this case by more safely retaining and releasing peak floods. It also highlights how replacing vulnerable monocultures with more diverse livelihoods based on natural ecosystems (in this case tourism, fishing, grazing and fibre production) can strengthen local economies. International agreements for better water and river management have been a powerful driver of change at the national scale in the Danube.</li> </ul>

<i>Effectiveness/impacts</i>	<i>Measurability</i>	<i>Replicability</i>	<i>Efficiency</i>	<i>Sustainability</i>	<i>Brief explanation/assessment</i>
<p><b><i>Title of the selected case study: Piloting Climate Change Adaptation to Protect Human Health in China , Focus: Health; Asia</i></b>  <b><i>Organization Name: World Health Organization; United Nations Development Programme</i></b></p>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This project in China was part of a global GEF-funded WHO/UNDP pilot to protect health in seven countries. At national level the project was implemented by the Ministry of Health of the P.R. of China.</li> <li>• By the end of the project effective early warning systems for heat stress were working in four cities in China. Based on the warnings received different health prevention activities were implemented targeting different population groups (e.g. children, already sick people, outsider workers and general population). The main outcome of the project is to strengthen the national capacity of China to respond to the increased health risks due to heat waves, with a special emphasis on cerebro-cardiovascular diseases in the four project cities.</li> </ul>	<p>The project designed a full monitoring and evaluation framework. In terms of health risks and impacts, the number of people accessing the proposed health prevention measures was monitored. Total number of cerebro-cardiovascular events was also measured. The number of heat stress events for which warnings were used was also tracked.</p>	<p>China effectively documented the process followed to design an early warning system for heat stress. The project will therefore be easily replicated by countries facing similar risks.</p>	<p>The project delivered good results, with the establishment of an early warning system for impeding heat waves, the design of a system for “early forecast, early prevention and early treatment”, the rise of public awareness through a coordinated media campaign including videocasts and the increase of bilateral and multilateral cooperation of decision-makers, government officers and researchers.</p>	<p>The EWS for heat has been adopted by the Ministry of Health and continues working after the end of the project.</p>	<p>The project focuses on reducing the impacts of climate change on cerebro-cardiovascular diseases, etc. in the four project cities through the implementation of health education and heat wave and health risk early warning system designed to protect human health. The project does this with a focus on the following areas of capacity development: data collection and sharing, early warning system, communication and cooperation, and public awareness.</p>

<i>Effectiveness/impacts</i>	<i>Measurability</i>	<i>Replicability</i>	<i>Efficiency</i>	<i>Sustainability</i>	<i>Brief explanation/assessment</i>
<p><b>Title of the selected case study:</b> <i>Nepal Climate Change Support Program (NCCSP), Focus: Linking national and local adaptation planning process, Asia.</i>  <b>Organization Name:</b> <i>Nepal</i></p>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establishment of LAPAs within the NCCSP shows clear institutionalization of local plans into national planning processes.</li> <li>• Mandate and principle of the LAPAs clear within the national planning process.</li> <li>• Coordination among District Environment Energy Climate Change Coordination Committee (DEECCCC) and Village Environment Energy Climate Coordination Committee (VEECCCC), MEECCCC indicated effective institutional arrangements that monitor, evaluate and implement the LAPAs.</li> <li>• Good capture of how the various institutions and government agencies are coordinating to deliver LAPAs.</li> <li>• High level of detail provided on LAPA Priority Actions but detail on how local people have benefitted in terms of reduced vulnerability is not apparent, despite significant detail provided on monitoring</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Goal of the project is to increase the adaptive capacity of these vulnerable rural communities to cope with such climatic challenges.</li> <li>• Expected results from the national plan and outcome of the LAPAs very well presented quantitatively. How the goal has been achieved is also very well articulated.</li> <li>• Overall consistency between the local level impacts and national level expectations from the plan. However, results from reduced.</li> <li>• Clear process Changes implemented Evidence of benefits at local level.</li> <li>• Localising climate change adaptation through the implementation of LAPAs in 14 districts, strong tracking system, engagement of local</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementation of LAPAs in 14 districts indicates and proof of interventions reducing vulnerability indicates replicability.</li> <li>• Strong tracking system.</li> <li>• Good prospects noted for full national roll-out Has been applied in other regions.</li> </ul>	<p>The project is in its second year of implementation and is making steady progress. The positive changes on the lives of poor and vulnerable people in just two years seems impressive. Other than this information, difficult to assess this criteria.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capacity building activities in the targeted communities under different themes may ensure sustainability of the project activities.</li> <li>• Involvement of DDCs, Line agencies, community user committees and service providers indicates buy-in and collaboration of all sectors and is an indicator of sustainability. However, would've liked more clarity on role of service providers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear link between national and local planning.</li> <li>• Easy to follow description of the project, concise and clearly written.</li> <li>• Specific objectives not mentioned; however mentions expected outcomes.</li> <li>• LAPAs have a wide and holistic range of activities, which incorporates food security, natural resource management, energy, infrastructure, capacity building and health making it a well-rounded, multisectoral approach to climate resilience planning.</li> <li>• Explicitly considered sustainability.</li> <li>• Good use of adaptation technology .</li> <li>• Meets criteria, and initiative led to adaptation implementation and follow-up.</li> </ul>

<p>process. → Could offer significant experience of measurability through a presentation but experience not given in detail in case study itself, if this is a criteria for selecting the case studies then W2 below is my suggestion.</p>	<p>people in identification, prioritization, implementation and monitoring &amp; evaluation of demand/need-based adaptation actions (proof of interventions to reduce vulnerability) and good prospects for replication to address local challenges.</p>				
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	--

## Annex 3: Agenda

### UNFCCC Nairobi work programme Ninth Focal Point Forum

18:00–20:30, 30 November 2015

#### Agenda

18:00–18:05 Opening (*Ms. Lidia Wojtal, Chair of the SBSTA*)

#### ***Setting the stage: Purpose and direction for the 9<sup>th</sup> Forum***

18:05–18:15 Introduction (*Mr. Henry Bonsu, facilitator*)

18:15–18:20 Scope of the preparatory work undertaken by the review group (*Mr. Robert Munroe*)<sup>10</sup>

#### ***From Efficiency to Effectiveness: 5 case studies that are making an impact***

- 18:20–19:00 Presentation of good practices from the case studies<sup>11</sup> and discussion
- Nepal Climate Change Support Program (NCCSP): *Mr. Naresh Sharma, Nepal*
  - Sustainable resettlement and reconstruction in flood-prone peri-urban areas in Saint Louis (Senegal): *Mr. Marcus Mayr, UN-Habitat*
  - Piloting climate change adaptation to protect human health in China: *Ms. Elena Villalobos Prats, WHO*
  - Lami Town, Fiji: Ecosystem-based adaptation study: *Mr. Marcus Mayr, UN-Habitat*

Refreshment break (19:00–19:10)

#### ***Spreading the wealth on adaptation: an open forum to share good practice***

19:10–19:15 Presentation of key points based on the preparatory work undertaken by the review group

- 19:15–20:05 Interactive discussion:
- What constitutes good practice (i.e. what are the key characteristics or elements that need to be provided in information on adaptation planning and practices to be considered a good practice) and lessons learned?
  - What are the key regional and thematic contexts?
  - What are the most efficient ways of recording and sharing good practices and lessons learned that can be promoted through the NWP to support greater action towards adaptation?

#### ***From words to action: a new working group to pick up the baton***

20:05–20:20 Next steps (Facilitated group discussion)

20:20–20:30 Closing (*Ms. Lidia Wojtal, Chair of the SBSTA*)

<sup>10</sup> A review group constituting members of the Adaptation Committee (AC), the Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG), and thematic experts from NWP partner organizations, undertook the preparatory exercise in reviewing and selecting the case studies for presentation at the Forum.

<sup>11</sup> Five case studies were selected for consideration out of 170 case studies contributed by the Parties and the NWP partner organizations, in response to the invitation by the secretariat, on good practices and lessons learned addressing the four issues of ecosystems, human settlements, water resources and health; and processes and structures for linking national and local adaptation planning. These five case studies with strong evidence of good practice were selected to provide contextual inputs for the discussion at the Forum. A review group constituting members of the Adaptation Committee (AC), the Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG), and thematic experts from NWP partner organizations, undertook the preparatory exercise in reviewing and selecting the case studies for presentation at the Forum.