

---

**Compilation of relevant documents for Action Area 5, activity (a) of the Excom workplan**

<p><b>Action Area 5:</b> Enhance the understanding of the capacity and coordination needs with regard to preparing for, responding to and building resilience against loss and damage associated with extreme and slow onset events, including through recovery and rehabilitation</p>
--

<p><b>Activity (a):</b> Invite relevant national disaster risk management and international humanitarian organizations and their partners, taking into account extreme and slow onset events and with a view toward comprehensive climate risk management:</p>
--

- |  |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. To develop and conduct country-specific analyses of climate risk and associated loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change in different sectors;</li> <li>ii. To identify institutional requirements to prevent, minimize or otherwise manage loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change.</li> </ul> |
|--|

<p><b>Expected results:</b> Information provided by relevant national disaster risk management and international humanitarian organizations and their partners is documented and disseminated</p>
---

This note compiles the following relevant documents in relation to Action Area 5, activity (a):

1. Draft guideline for initial action as at the conclusion of Excom 1..... *Page 2*
2. Co-chairs' proposal for a finalized guideline for initial action as shared with the members on 18 December 2015..... *Page 4*
3. Co-chairs' proposal for a draft letter of invitation and a summary of further discussion points, taking into account the proposed finalized guideline and feedback received from members ..... *Page 6*

**1. Draft guideline for initial action as at the conclusion of Excom 1**

AA 5a	
A	B
<p><b>Preliminary list of organization</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• World Food Programme</li> <li>• IOM</li> <li>• OCHA</li> <li>• UNHCR</li> <li>• ICRC/IFRC</li> <li>• Interagency standing committee (The Interagency Standing Committee (ISC))</li> <li>• CCRIF</li> <li>• ARC</li> <li>• PCRAFI</li> <li>• Other regional or national risk transfer / sharing initiatives (e.g. Mexico's FONDEN)</li> </ul> <p><b>National disaster risk management organizations:</b></p> <p>We suggest a joint letter from Special Representative of the SG for DRR and Co-Chairs of WIM inviting governments through the Sendai/DRR and UNFCCC focal points to express interest in collaborating with the WIM to pursue activities under 5a. The ExCom could then follow-up and invite interested Parties to develop country specific analysis and identify institutional requirements.</p> <p>This letter should also invite relevant regional disaster risk management organizations (e.g. SADC, CDEMA, ECOWAS, etc) to contribute.</p>	<p><b>International humanitarian organizations:</b></p> <p>We recommend directly requesting engagement in this activity through the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC). The Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) is the primary mechanism for inter-agency coordination of humanitarian assistance. It is a unique forum involving the key UN and non-UN humanitarian partners. The IASC was established in June 1992 in response to United Nations General Assembly Resolution 46/182 on the strengthening of humanitarian assistance.</p> <p>The members of the IASC are the heads or their designated representatives of the UN operational agencies (UNDP, UNICEF, UNHCR, WFP, FAO, WHO, UN-HABITAT, OCHA). In addition, there is a standing invitation to IOM, ICRC, IFRC, OHCHR, UNFPA, the Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of IDPs and the World Bank. The NGO consortia ICVA, InterAction and SCHR are also invited on a permanent basis to attend. The IASC is chaired by the United Nations Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC), the head of OCHA.</p> <p><b>World Bank/GFDRR – key actor esp. on recovery and reconstruction side – is part of IASC, so this could also help enhance the links and collaboration between</b></p>

	<p>actors</p> <p>The IASC could be requested to provide a consolidated response on behalf of the humanitarian system.</p> <p><b>National disaster risk management organizations:</b></p> <p>We suggest a joint letter from Special Representative of the SG for DRR and Co-Chairs of WIM inviting governments through the Sendai/DRR and UNFCCC focal points to express interest in collaborating with the WIM to pursue activities under 5a. The ExCom could then follow-up and invite interested Parties to develop country specific analysis and identify institutional requirements.</p> <p>This letter should also invite relevant regional disaster risk management organizations (e.g. SADC, CDEMA, ECOWAS, etc) to contribute.</p>
<p><b>Proposed letter of invitation</b></p>	
<p>To,</p> <p>The Executive Committee (ExCom) of the Warsaw International Mechanism (WIM) was established by Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in Warsaw in December 2013. The aim of the ExCom is to guide the implementation of the functions of the WIM as set out in paragraph 5 of UNFCCC decision 2/CP.19.</p> <p>In Lima last year, the Parties to the Convention adopted a two-year work plan of the ExCom. As part of its work plan... One of the action areas of this two-year work plan calls for enhancing the understanding of capacity and coordination needs with regard to preparing for, responding to and building resilience against loss and damage associated with extreme and slow onset events, including through recovery and</p>	

<p>rehabilitation.</p> <p><b>I. Developing and conducting country-specific analyses of climate change risk</b></p> <p>To assist it in implementing action in this area, the <a href="#">ExCom</a> is inviting relevant <a href="#">organisations</a> and their partners, taking into account both extreme and slow onset events and with a view toward comprehensive climate change risk management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To develop and conduct country-specific analyses of risk and associated loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change in different sectors; and</li> <li>• To identify institutional requirements to prevent, minimize or otherwise manage loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change.</li> </ul> <p>In carrying out this work, your <a href="#">organisation</a> should bear in mind that there is a difference between natural and anthropogenic climate changes. While attributing impacts between the two (natural and anthropogenic changes) is a challenge, the Convention process <a href="#">recognises</a> differentiated responsibilities when addressing the adverse effects of climate change.</p> <p>From a climate change perspective, vulnerability is measured on the basis of: (1) exposure; (2) sensitivity; and (3) adaptive capacity. Exposure, in turn, is of two types: (1) exposure to current climate variability; and (2) exposure to climate change. Vulnerability is defined, therefore, as the propensity or predisposition to be adversely affected.</p> <p>In the context of anthropogenic climate change, risk is the probability of an event and its consequences occurring over a particular timeframe, with those consequences made more severe under higher exposure and vulnerability. The risk of loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change is exacerbated by increased probabilities of a climate change-related event, as well as increased exposure or vulnerability to that event. Analyses of risks associated with loss and damage associated with climate change should therefore be assessed for (i) the present as well as the (ii) near and (iii) further future (2030 and 2050) under (a) low and (b) high emission scenarios.</p> <p>On behalf of the <a href="#">ExCom</a>, we would like to invite you to share this information with us by the end of March 2016.</p> <p><b>Assessing the capacity of humanitarian and disaster risk management systems</b></p> <p>Further to the invitation above, we invite you to collaborate with the <a href="#">ExCom</a> for in assessing the</p>	
---	--

<p>capacity of humanitarian and disaster risk management systems in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emergency preparedness for climate change-related events</li> <li>• Taking anticipatory action to reduce the risk of loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change</li> <li>• Increasing resilience during post climate change-related disaster recovery, rebuilding and rehabilitation.</li> </ul> <p>In collaborating on this assessment process, your <a href="#">organisation</a> should bear in mind that the UNFCCC recognizes the transboundary nature of climate change; and that the extent to which developing country Parties can effectively implement their commitments to address the adverse effects of climate change will depend on the effective implementation by developed country Parties of their commitments related to financial resources and transfer of technology.</p>	
--	--

## 2. Co-chairs' proposal for a finalized guideline for initial action as shared with the members on 18 December 2015

**Consolidated guidance for undertaking Action Area 5, activity (a)** Invite relevant national disaster risk management and international humanitarian organizations and their partners, taking into account extreme and slow onset events and with a view toward comprehensive climate risk management:

- i. To develop and conduct country-specific analyses of climate risk and associated loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change in different sectors;
- ii. To identify institutional requirements to prevent, minimize or otherwise manage loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change

### I. Preliminary list of humanitarian and disaster risk management organizations

#### Humanitarian organizations:

- Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC)<sup>1</sup>, could be requested to provide a consolidated response on behalf of the humanitarian system (members of the IASC are the heads or their designated representatives of the UN operational agencies: UNDP, UNICEF, UNHCR, WFP, FAO, WHO, UN-HABITAT, OCHA. In addition, there is a standing invitation to IOM, ICRC, IFRC, OHCHR, UNFPA, the Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of IDPs and the World Bank);
- World Bank/GFDRR<sup>2</sup>; • ICRC/IFRC; • CCRIF; • ARC; • PCRAFI;
- Other regional disaster risk management and national risk transfer / sharing initiatives (e.g. Mexico's FONDEN).

### II. Proposed letter of invitation

To,

The Executive Committee (Excom) of the Warsaw International Mechanism (WIM) was established by Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in Warsaw in December 2013. The aim of the Excom is to guide the implementation of the functions of the WIM as set out in paragraph 5 of UNFCCC decision 2/CP.19.

In Lima last year, the Parties to the Convention adopted a two-year work plan of the Excom. As part of its work plan. One of the action areas of this two-year work plan calls for enhancing the understanding of capacity and coordination needs with regard to preparing for, responding to and building resilience against loss and damage associated with extreme and slow onset events, including through recovery and rehabilitation.

#### I. Developing and conducting country-specific analyses of climate change risk

To assist it in implementing action in this area, the Excom is inviting relevant organizations and their partners, taking into account both extreme and slow onset events and with a view toward comprehensive climate change risk management:

<sup>1</sup> IASC is the primary mechanism for inter-agency coordination of humanitarian assistance. It is a unique forum involving the key UN and non-UN humanitarian partners. The IASC was established in June 1992 in response to United Nations General Assembly Resolution 46/182 on the strengthening of humanitarian assistance. The IASC is chaired by the United Nations Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC), the head of OCHA. The NGO consortia ICVA, InterAction and SCHR are also invited on a permanent basis to attend.

<sup>2</sup> Part of IASC, so this could also help enhance the links and collaboration between actors.

- To develop and conduct country-specific analyses of risk and associated loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change in different sectors; and
- To identify institutional requirements to prevent, minimize or otherwise manage loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change.

On behalf of the Excom, we would like to invite you to respond to this letter and share any initial thoughts in response to the aforementioned topics by the end of [March 2016] or as soon as you are able.

**Assessing the capacity of humanitarian and disaster risk management systems**

Further to the invitation above, we invite you to collaborate with the Excom in assessing the capacity of humanitarian and disaster risk management systems in the following areas:

- Emergency preparedness for climate-related events;
- Taking anticipatory action to reduce the risk of loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change;
- Increasing resilience during post climate change-related disaster recovery, rebuilding and rehabilitation.

The Excom will reach out in the coming months with additional details on how we might collaborate with your institution.

### ***3. Co-chairs' proposal for a draft letter of invitation and a summary of further discussion points***

*(Excom letter head)*

Dear xxx,

On behalf of the Executive Committee of the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage associated with Climate Change Impacts (hereinafter referred to as the Executive Committee) of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and in our capacity as its Co-Chairs, we are pleased to present you an opportunity to enhance synergy between your work and that of the Executive Committee in the areas related to preparing for, responding to and building resilience against loss and damage associated with climate change impacts.

The Conference of the Parties (COP), at its nineteenth session, established the Warsaw International Mechanism to address loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change through its three main functions: enhancing knowledge and understanding of comprehensive risk management approaches; strengthening dialogue, coordination, coherence and synergies among relevant stakeholders; and enhancing action and support, including finance, technology and capacity building. The Executive Committee is mandated to guide the implementation of these functions. The COP, at its twentieth session, approved an initial two-year workplan of the Executive Committee (Workplan).

Action Area 5 of the Workplan focuses on enhancing the understanding of the capacity and coordination needs with regard to preparing for, responding to and building resilience against loss and damage associated with extreme and slow onset events, including through recovery and rehabilitation.

In this context, the Executive Committee invites relevant national disaster risk management and international humanitarian organizations and their partners, to develop and conduct country-specific analyses of climate risk and associated loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change in different sectors, taking into account extreme and slow onset events and with a view toward comprehensive climate risk management.

An expected result of this activity is, as envisioned by the COP, documentation and dissemination of the information provided by these national disaster risk management and international humanitarian organizations and their partners.

Accordingly, on behalf of the Executive Committee, we would like to invite you to undertake the activities mentioned above, and update us, in writing, with the relevant information arising from your work, by X date.

Information provided will also serve as an input into the subsequent work of the Executive Committee, in particular, with relation to inviting relevant organizations at all levels to collaborate with the Executive Committee to assess, including through the use of existing relevant data and knowledge, the capacity of humanitarian and disaster risk management systems for:

- i. Emergency preparedness and response;
- ii. Taking anticipatory action to reduce risks;
- iii. Explicitly increasing resilience during post climate-related disaster recovery, rebuilding and rehabilitation.

An expected result of this activity, as envisioned by the COP, is documentation of assessment of the capacity of humanitarian and disaster risk management systems.

The Annex to this letter contains additional information that you may find useful in considering the above invitations by the Executive Committee.

We are happy to answer any questions you may have as you consider this invitation.

Signed by: xxx

Annex: Additional information (*pending further consideration by the Excom*)

Useful links:

- <Information on the Executive Committee>.
- <Two-year workplan of the Executive Committee>.

*Possible elements which the Excom may need to further consider (without prejudging its inclusion or final placement – i.e. annex or cover letter):*

1. Regional balance of country-specific analyses (see comments #1–2 below provided by members);
2. Differentiation of natural and anthropogenic climate changes (see comment #3 below);
3. Consideration of present and different future climate change scenarios (see comment #4 below);
4. Consideration of 5(a)(ii) together with 5(a)(i) or in conjunction with AA 5(b); Linkage between invitations for AA5(a) and AA5(b) (see comments #5–6 below);
5. Consideration of the national aspect (see comments #7–9 below);
6. Clarifying language on financial and technical support for invited entities to respond to the invitation (see comment #10 below);
7. Consideration for template/ToR, and a review process (see comments #11–12 below).

**Comment #1**

In conducting the country-specific analyses, effort must be made to include all major regions (regional balance), particularly those vulnerable to loss and damage from the adverse effects of climate change. Thought should also be given to making country assessments comparable, where possible.

The choice of countries to assess is tough and potentially political. Would it be possible to ask the institutions being addressed to suggest / recommend appropriate countries for analysis? While we may not want to give these institutions too much leeway, the fact remains that these very institutions will have better knowledge of which countries have been assessed and what information is available in their region. Provided there is comprehensive regional coverage in the institutions being approached, then what they come back with should be representative.

**Comment #2**

This request should be clear that all major regions need to be considered; These analyses may not reflect the encompassing risks faced; these analyses should, at the very least, be conducted on a regional basis.

**Comment # 3** (textual proposal):

Further, in carrying out this work, your organisation should bear in mind that there is a difference between natural and anthropogenic climate changes. While attributing impacts between the two (natural and anthropogenic changes) is a challenge, the Convention process recognises differentiated responsibilities when addressing the adverse effects of climate change.

From a climate change perspective, vulnerability is measured on the basis of: (1) exposure; (2) sensitivity; and (3) adaptive capacity. Exposure, in turn, is of two types: (1) exposure to current climate variability; and (2) exposure to climate change. Vulnerability is defined, therefore, as the propensity or predisposition to be adversely affected.

In the context of anthropogenic climate change, risk is the probability of an event and its consequences occurring over a particular timeframe, with those consequences made more severe under higher exposure and vulnerability. The risk of loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change is exacerbated by increased probabilities of a climate change-related event, as well as increased exposure or vulnerability to that event. Analyses of risks associated with loss and damage associated with climate change should therefore be assessed for (i) the present as well as the (ii) near and (ii) further future (2030 and 2050) under (a) low and (b) high emission scenarios.

**Comment # 4**

Some of the presentations made to members at Excom 1 indicated that there were limitations to the reach and effectiveness of humanitarian and DRM systems, in terms of, for example, future climate change, which needs to be captured: (textual proposal) “In guiding this work, it may be useful to consider climate change related losses at present and under future climate change scenarios (1.5°, 2°C and high emissions)”

**Comment #5**

There might be a close interlink between 5a and 5b, that would be make it better to address both altogether and not separately; 5(a) ii (Identify institutional requirements to..) deeply depends on or links with the results of 5(b) i, ii and iii, when assessing ... capacities of humanitarian and DRM systems; the same institutions and/or organizations that will be involved in carrying out both activities; it might be advisable to think a little bit more of how are we going to convey this message to involve governmental institutions and international organizations in this task.

Even when It is clear that one of the objectives is to enhance the understanding of ‘coordination needs’, neither 5(a) ii nor 5(b) I, ii and iii, specifically address the issue. On the other hand, they clearly address the issue of capacity. In the case of 5(a) ii, it just request “to identify institutional requirements to...”, while perhaps it might be needed a question on “institutional arrangements”.

**Comment #6**

Need for explicit reference to/understanding of the existing institutional arrangement that exists; It may be that this synopsis will inform the target outlined or do we think the target, as is, will allow for an implicit consideration?

**Comment #7**

More precise to refer to national institutions rather than national organizations, when inviting the “relevant disaster risk management ..organizations” because, at least in the case of my country, it is the estate or governmental institutions the ones responsible by law to address this issue. It does not mean that NGOs cannot be relevant or also undertake important tasks, but it is imperative to bear in mind that difference; No need for differentiation as to the international humanitarian organizations since their its status is very clear.

**Comment #8**

In many developing countries the mandate lies with a government body. However, we do note that in some instances there are regional bodies charged with this responsibility. As such, the governance structure may need to be evaluated to understand how these links can be effective.

**Comment #9**

Need to address national Disaster Risk Management entities rather than national organization. It is because at least in my country, the disaster risk management is being addressed by a governmental entity or governmental entities, such and national disaster risk management directorate and national climate change directorate. In addition, since this activity might include academic institutions at national level in order to analyze country specific climate risks and associated loss and damage arising from the impacts of climate change.

**Comment #10**

When inviting such institutions and organizations to carry out such activities, the issue of financial or technical support might arise in some cases. The way the proposed draft letter is structured leaves open space to national institutions and organizations to respond to the general terms of the activities, so some of them may come back asking for clarification on the issue of resources.

**Comment #11**

Important to clarify the level or depth of the country-specific analysis of climate risk we are talking about in 5(a)i; need to first discuss if it would be advisable to provide some general template or basic non-mandatory ToRs on what we expect from this analysis, to help guide clearer responses from them; the purpose of these activities is to “Enhance the understanding of the capacity and coordination needs with regard to preparing for, responding to...”, not beyond that point, at least at this stage of our work.

**Comment #12**

In light of the foregoing and in consideration of the Paris outcome at COP 21, specifically Article 8 and paragraphs 48-52 of the associated Decision on loss and damage, the Excom will reach out in the coming months with additional details on how we might collaborate with your institution.

This may delay the work while they wait for us to revert. We may wish to offer to clarify and provide **additional guidance** where required.

Notwithstanding, in terms of additional details and guidance provided by the Excom, which we may consolidate and include in the letter in an appropriate manner (or submit separately), please note the following:

As we know, there are different perspectives on risks leading to disasters, vulnerability, financing etc., I see merit in achieving the delicate balance between DRM and L&D in conducting these risk assessments by having other **organizations (such as those that are already engaged more specifically in CC analyses) to comment on the reports**....Climate Analytics comes to mind, but there are others, though important to be cognisant of the required time frame. Nevertheless, what might be possible is to encourage those institutions and organisations addressed in the invitation letter to consult widely, including with institutions outside the DRR community that are engaged more specifically in CC analyses, in developing their responses to the Excom.