



Working paper No. 1 (2005)

**Discussion paper for the informal workshop on the SBSTA Programme of
Work on Impacts, Vulnerability and Adaptation**

CONTENTS

| | <i>Paragraphs</i> | <i>Page</i> |
|---|-------------------|-------------|
| I. PURPOSE AND SCOPE | 1–5 | 2 |
| II. BACKGROUND | 6–11 | 2 |
| III. OPTIONS FOR THE CONTENT AND POSSIBLE INITIAL ACTION AREAS OF THE PROGRAMME OF WORK..... | 12–18 | 3 |
| IV. OPTIONS FOR THE PROCESS OF IMPLEMENTATION AND MODALITIES | 19–27 | 6 |
| V. FINAL REMARKS..... | 28 | 7 |

Annexes

| | |
|--|----|
| I. Approaches to assessment and adaptation | 8 |
| II. Example of possible initial action areas | 10 |
| III. Terms of reference of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice | 11 |

I. Purpose and scope

1. The purpose of this discussion paper is to support and facilitate discussion at the informal workshop of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) programme of work on impacts, vulnerability and adaptation to climate change. The intention is to help develop common ground and common understanding of certain issues of a “technical” nature, which fall into two categories: a) the possible content and structure of the programme of work with its corresponding action areas; and b) the process for implementation of the programme of work and the modalities.
2. In section II the paper provides some background information on the development of work on impacts, vulnerability and adaptation to climate change within the SBSTA and the current mandate.
3. Section III provides a synthesis of the proposals put forward by Parties in their written submissions together with suggestions made during the in-session workshop at the twenty-second session of the SBSTA (SBSTA 22) in Bonn on 19 May 2005. On the basis of this information the paper addresses possible options for the structure and content of the programme of work. The concept of “initial action areas” is also proposed here to cover broad sets of initial actions that could be implemented in parallel, and that together would comprise a balanced programme of work. The programme of work could initially consist of a number of parallel action areas, which might be refined as work progresses and other actions are added as appropriate.
4. Section IV discusses a possible implementation process and modalities of work. Earlier discussions have considered the possibility of a staged approach to the implementation of the programme of work, as well as some suggestions on broadening the modalities. These possibilities are also covered in section IV. Some concluding remarks are presented in section V.
5. Annex I provides a summary of approaches to impacts and vulnerability assessments and adaptation, which can be used in the development of the initial action areas according to the needs of the Parties. Annex II provides some illustrative examples of initial action areas with the embedded approaches and possible counterparts. Annex III includes Article 9 of the Convention, as well as reference to relevant decisions on the role of the SBSTA in the UNFCCC process.

II. Background

6. Following the conclusion of the consideration of the Third Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) by the SBSTA in 2000–2003, the Conference of the Parties (COP), by its decision 10/CP.9,¹ requested the SBSTA to initiate its work on scientific, technical and socio-economic aspects of impacts of, and vulnerability and adaptation to, climate change, and to focus on exchanging information and sharing experiences and views among Parties on practical opportunities and solutions to facilitate the implementation of the Convention. To initiate its consideration of this matter, the SBSTA conducted one pre-session workshop at SBSTA 19 (December 2003) and two in-session workshops on different aspects of this matter, one each at SBSTA 20 and 21² (May and December 2004).
7. Subsequently, the COP, at its tenth session (December 2004), requested the SBSTA (decision 1/CP.10)³ to develop a structured five-year programme of work on the scientific, technical and socio-economic aspects, vulnerability and adaptation to climate change. This request specified four general issues (or thematic areas) that this programme of work should address, as follows: methodologies, data and modelling; vulnerability assessments; adaptation planning, measures and

¹ FCCC/CP/2003/6/Add.1.

² See <http://unfccc.int/adaptation/methodologies_for/vulnerability_and_adaptation/items/3468.php>.

³ FCCC/CP/2004/10/Add.1.

actions; and integration into sustainable development, in the context of the terms of reference of the SBSTA as referred to in Article 9 of the Convention.

8. The COP also invited Parties to submit their views on the work programme, and requested the secretariat to organize, under the guidance of the Chair of the SBSTA, an in-session workshop during SBSTA 22 to facilitate the development of this programme.

9. The submissions from Parties⁴ included a wide range of ideas and proposals on the content of the five-year programme of work and on its implementation.

10. Upon the request of the SBSTA Chair, presentations from Parties and discussion at the in-session workshop⁵ were focused on four main elements: objectives, scope of work, structure, and major milestones. The introductory presentation by Mr. Ian Burton,⁶ subsequent presentations from Parties and the ensuing discussion period allowed for an active and productive exchange of views among delegates. As a result of the discussions, the Chair prepared a summary⁷ to serve as a basis for the further development of the programme at SBSTA 22. A contact group considered the summary and continued discussion on the objective, scope of work, process, structure, activities, modalities and review of the programme of work. This work was not completed at SBSTA 22.

11. In its conclusions,⁸ the SBSTA agreed to further consider and elaborate, at its twenty-third session, the draft decision (and its annex) to FCCC/SBSTA/2005/4, containing possible elements of the programme of work, with a view to forwarding a draft decision for adoption by the COP at its eleventh session (November–December 2005). At SBSTA 22, it was also agreed that an informal workshop would be held before SBSTA 23, to be organized by the secretariat under the guidance of the Chair of the SBSTA to facilitate the development of the programme of work.

III. Options for the content and possible initial action areas of the programme of work

12. An analysis of the submissions by Parties and discussions at the in-session workshop, as well as at the contact group at SBSTA 22, suggest that the content and action areas of the programme of work should reflect the following broad requirements:

- (a) Responsiveness: including a sufficient range of topics of concern to as many Parties as possible.
- (b) Inclusiveness: taking into account a range of approaches to assessment and adaptation, including risk management, sectoral approaches, integrated approaches, livelihood approaches and others, and also taking full account of traditional and indigenous knowledge on adaptation. Annex I to this document presents summary definitions of the broad approaches as they relate to adaptation, and assessment of impacts and vulnerability. The work programme also should address a variety of other dimensions; such as the geographical scale the activities are addressing, e.g. local, national, regional and global as well as distinguish actions that are in the competence of the SBSTA, and actions that are more appropriate at a national level or an organization level.
- (c) Continuity: taking into consideration the discourse and action on vulnerability and adaptation both within and outside the Convention, both to avoid duplication of efforts

⁴ FCCC/SBSTA/2005/MISC.3.

⁵ <http://unfccc.int/meetings/sb22/in_session_workshops/items/3443.php>.

⁶ Professor Emeritus from the University of Toronto, Canada.

⁷ http://unfccc.int/files/meetings/sb22/in_session_workshops/application/pdf/chairs_summary_of_the_in-session_workshop_on_adaptation.pdf.

⁸ FCCC/SBSTA/2005/4, paras 12–14.

and exploit complementarities and synergy of activities, to involve appropriate stakeholders.

- (d) Practicality: having a maximum potential for application in future work on adaptation under the UNFCCC, while being practical and feasible to implement in 5 years.
- (e) Action oriented: taking into consideration whether practical benefits can emerge from the actions in the programme of work. (Questions that might help in defining the practical benefit of one or another proposed activity could include whether it is: Likely to identify ways to improve adaptive capacity? Likely to lead to the identification and selection of adaptation measures that can realistically be expected to reduce vulnerability? Likely to lead to adaptation measures that can be supported financially or that will attract financial support? Likely to produce economic benefits significantly greater than their costs? Likely to attract the interest and participation of stakeholders, professional and expert organizations, the private sector, vulnerable communities, national governments and international agencies?)
- (f) Consistency with the mandate of the SBSTA: taking into consideration that any actions in the programme of work should be compatible with the terms of reference of work of the SBSTA, which in accordance with Article 9 of the UNFCCC, includes providing the “COP and its subsidiary bodies with timely advice on scientific and technological matters relating to the Convention”.⁹

13. A possible simple structure accommodating these requirements may be based upon the four thematic areas specified in decision 1/CP.10, namely: a) methodologies, data and modelling; b) vulnerability assessments; c) adaptation planning, measures and actions; and d) integration into sustainable development, with thematic areas of areas A and B focusing mainly on impact and vulnerability and C and D – mainly on adaptation matters.

14. Parties suggested a broad range of work and topics under each of the issues (or thematic areas) in decision 1/CP.10 in their submissions, discussions at the in-session workshop and at a contact group session during SBSTA 22. These included thematic action areas as well as activities and general deliverables, such as improving (or improved) understanding and sharing of experiences and information, promoting improvement and application of methods, reviewing existing knowledge, taking stock of existing knowledge, and enhancing dialogue and cooperation with relevant outside (non-UNFCCC) actors.

15. A generalized synthesis of proposals for action areas and topics is provided in table 1. This synthesis based on the suggestions put forward by Parties, and sometimes represent actions (e.g. A1–3) and sometimes identifies topics (e.g. B1–5) for which actions by the SBSTA are to be defined (e.g. in the course of the development of the programme of work).

⁹ See also Annex III for more details.

Table 1. Possible action areas based on submissions by Parties and presentations at the in-session workshop on developing the work programme (SBSTA 22)

| | |
|---|---|
| A. Methodologies, data and modelling | |
| 1. | Promote further development and dissemination of methods and tools for impacts, vulnerability and adaptation assessments, including tools for practical approaches to adaptation in regional, national, local, sectoral and livelihoods contexts. |
| 2. | Promote further development and dissemination and better access to and application of global climate models, and regional climate and impact models. |
| 3. | Improve access to, and management of, climate data and products; and socio-economic information on vulnerable populations and economic sectors. |
| B. Vulnerability assessments | |
| 1. | Risks, key vulnerabilities, thresholds, and critical limits of climate change, in particular with regard to sea level, water, agriculture, health, ecosystems, and infrastructure. |
| 2. | Economic impacts of climate change, both at the national and sectoral levels. |
| 3. | Vulnerability indicators. |
| 4. | Vulnerability of small island developing States. |
| 5. | Lessons learned from National Adaptation Programmes of Action for least developed countries, including on participatory rapid integrated vulnerability assessments (PRIVA). |
| C. Adaptation planning, measures and actions | |
| 1. | Costs and benefits of adaptation, analytical tools for the development of adaptation options, and decision-making tools. Long-term targets for adaptation. |
| 2. | National adaptation strategies and institutional arrangements. |
| 3. | Actions to reduce vulnerability of economic sectors to the impacts of climate variability and change. |
| 4. | Adaptation strategies for agriculture, water resources, extreme weather events, sea-level rise, ecosystems and health. |
| 5. | Financial hedging, risk sharing and insurance (including micro-insurance). |
| 6. | Adaptation technologies and technology transfer, including research and development. |
| 7. | Adaptive capacity, monitoring and evaluation of the effectiveness and success of adaptation measures and projects. |
| D. Integration into sustainable development | |
| 1. | Tools and best practices for identifying synergy and for integration of adaptation with sustainable development objectives both at the national and sectoral level. |
| 2. | Integrating disaster reduction and adaptation planning. |
| 3. | Local adaptations and sustainable livelihoods. |
| 4. | Economic diversification aimed at reducing reliance on vulnerable economic sectors. |

16. The two dimensions of *adaptation approach* and *geographical scale* are embedded in the action areas listed in table 1. For example, actions to reduce the vulnerability of economic sectors could be addressed at all geographical scales: local, national, regional or global and imply application of different approaches to assessment and adaptation.

17. These approaches, as described in Annex 1, are not mutually exclusive or competing, rather they are complementary. For example, a vulnerability assessment can examine livelihoods at the community level and utilize risk assessment and integrated management techniques. Moreover, no single approach can be adequate for all thematic and action areas. The choice of approach, as well as of methods and tools, depends on priorities, timeframes, the questions to be addressed and available resources. Accordingly, Parties in their deliberations on the programme of work may choose to use approaches that they consider to be better suited to given circumstances.

18. The action areas presented in table 1 are likely to exceed what a five-year programme of work is likely to achieve. A selection of initial action areas in the context of each thematic area might be made with a view to creating a practical and balanced programme of work. This selection might be made keeping in mind the broad requirements identified by Parties (see paragraph 12). Examples of such a selection of initial action areas, together with information on corresponding adaptation approaches, geographical scales, and possible counterparts are presented in Annex II.

IV. Options for the process of implementation and modalities

Process

19. Parties in their submissions suggested a phased approach for implementation of the programme of work. This means that the programme of work would evolve under the guidance of the SBSTA on the basis of feedback received through progress reports, Party submissions, regional consultations and possible inputs from relevant organizations, such as the IPCC in its Fourth Assessment Report.

20. A practical process of developing and implementing the programme of work may include a “two-line approach” that could cover the activities described below.

21. Together with the approval of the programme of work, the SBSTA may wish to identify a number of initial action areas that could be launched immediately (“first line”). These action areas may include those on which work is already under way (e.g. work on improving of systematic observations and data, collection and dissemination of methods and tools, summarising lessons learned from national adaptation programmes of action (NAPAs), etc.).

22. In parallel, a stock-taking activity could be organized for other action areas that are relatively new and for which actions are yet to be defined (“second line”). As was suggested in a number of submissions and at the workshop, and discussed at a contact group during negotiations, a targeted stock-taking exercise could provide a summary of information and, on the basis of current knowledge could lead to the identification further action by the SBSTA. Each proposal would be backed by detailed studies highlighting its strengths and weaknesses. Such an exercise would not be prescriptive. It would leave it open to the SBSTA to accept or reject all or part of the suggestions that resulted from the stocktaking. It would leave possible choices and many details to be worked out by the Parties.

23. Both lines of activities would draw on relevant information, including submissions from Parties providing details of relevant activities, national communications, NAPAs, previous in-session workshops, IPCC assessment reports, and other inputs from the IPCC and relevant international, regional and other organizations, and other relevant sources.

24. In addition, the work on stocktaking, development and implementation of the programme of work could benefit from a series of meetings, possibly conducted back-to-back to the regional workshops requested by decision 1/CP.10 (paragraph 8). One additional workshop might be needed to consider adaptation in Annex I Parties.

Modalities

25. Parties have proposed a range of modalities for work, in their submissions, presentations at the in-session workshop and in the contact group at SBSTA 22. These can be categorized as either “conventional” (e.g. workshops, submissions and background papers) or innovative (e.g. involving scientists, experts from Parties and organizations on an ad hoc basis to take stock of a particular issue and put forward options for consideration by the SBSTA).

26. The list of proposed specific modalities for the programme of work that Parties have put forward included the following:

- (a) Preparing technical papers and syntheses of information;

- (b) Conducting different kinds of workshops and meetings – from large regional workshops to small technical expert meetings on a particular topic;
- (c) Establishing ad hoc working groups of experts (e.g. formed to address a particular task) that would report on their work on the programme of work to the SBSTA;
- (d) Involving individual experts and relevant organizations to prepare proposals on specific issues for action, and present them to the SBSTA for consideration;
- (e) Discussing issues and proposals for action via the Internet;
- (f) Inviting Parties to submit “targeted submissions” containing their views and relevant information on a particular topic/issue to be considered by the SBSTA for further action;
- (g) Improving and extending existing web-based resources for disseminating information on methods (e.g. the UNFCCC Compendium on methods and tools).

27. The proposals from Parties suggest that the five-year programme of work could use a combination of previously used modalities together with other modalities that have not been used before in adaptation work under the Convention. This might be enhanced through the establishment of an ad hoc group (or groups) of experts to assess existing knowledge on a particular action area and formulate a limited number of proposals for action in relation to the area in question for the Parties to consider.

V. Final remarks

28. This paper identifies a few main questions for consideration by Parties:

- (a) What should be the content of the programme of work? The structural principles suggested in this paper are based on the issues (thematic areas) listed in decision 1/CP.10, namely, methodologies, data and modelling; vulnerability assessments; adaptation planning, measures and actions; and integration into sustainable development. Generalized action areas might be identified under each issue taking into account the broad requirements for a balanced programme of work, i.e. responsiveness, inclusiveness, continuity, practicality, action oriented and consistency with the mandate of the SBSTA. Discussions on this matter during the workshop might provide input to the further development of the scope of work;
- (b) What process of implementation may be used? An initial selection of action areas would enable work to start immediately after the adoption of the work programme. In parallel, a stock-taking activity would start for other areas to identify further actions. The balance of the programme could be reviewed and strengthened through oversight by the SBSTA on the progress made; meetings of Parties in conjunction with regional workshops, and possibly one additional meeting for Annex I Parties, taking into account the IPCC Fourth Assessment Report. The discussion on this matter may provide input for consideration of the process and activities and review of the programme of work;
- (c) What modalities might be used? The interest seems to lean towards the continued use of some well-tried modalities together with some new possibilities, including the involvement of experts on a specific issue that would prepare basic proposals for actions and present them to the SBSTA for further consideration and decision (ad hoc and limited-term expert group on adaptation). The discussion on this matter may provide input for consideration of the process and activities of the programme of work.

Annex 1

Approaches to assessment and adaptation¹⁰

There is a wide array of approaches, frameworks, methods and tools to assess and prepare for adaptation, as well as many ways to categorize them. These fall into two **generic groups** of approaches: **scenario-driven/top-down approaches** and **vulnerability-driven/bottom-up approaches**. Frameworks and approaches such as the **risk management, livelihoods, sectoral and integrated** approaches, can be considered specific methods or tools under one or either of the above groups. Below are brief descriptions of the above-mentioned groups and a number other key specific approaches.

Scenario-driven/top-down approaches focus on future climate scenarios using general circulation models (GCMs), which are then applied to models of ecosystems and to a variety of sectoral impact models designed to quantify the magnitude of the potential physical impacts on ecosystems and economic sectors. Options for adaptation to future possible climate change are identified and, in some cases, prioritized. The approaches have been widely used to address questions about key long-term impacts of climate change and the extent to which the harmful effects of climate change can be reduced through adaptation.

Vulnerability-driven/bottom-up approaches focus on assessing current vulnerability to both climate and non-climate related factors and examining current practices in adaptation. They include evaluation of vulnerability to future climate related risks involving key stakeholders in the evaluation process, and eventually lead to formulation of adaptation policies that strengthen adaptive capacity. Bottom-up, vulnerability-driven approaches are more suited to developing adaptation strategies in shorter time frames that meet local needs. The approach also addresses longer-term vulnerability to climate change, hence contributing to sustainable development.

Risk assessment and management can be a part of either of the above-mentioned groups of approaches. It focuses on analysing current risk and adaptation to climate change vis-à-vis communities, relating these closely to sectoral and national sustainable development groups and agencies. This synthesis, operationalized as a programme of total risk management for a wide range of elements at risk, ranging from communities to ecosystems, at long and short time scales and across spatial scales (e.g. restoring ecosystems can reduce local vulnerability and risk and improve environmental conditions at the various levels). Applications of an integrated risk management framework in decision making should take into consideration the current situation and vulnerabilities, including the adaptation strategies currently being pursued at the local, regional and national levels; adjustment of risk management practices to account for changing climate and vulnerability conditions; and include elements of both anticipatory risk management and reactive risk management.

The United Kingdom Climate Impacts Programme (UKCIP) climate adaptation: Risk, uncertainty and decision making is an example of this approach applied for adaptation. It proposes a step-wise approach to vulnerability and adaptation assessment to help decision makers identify important risk factors and

¹⁰ The summary is based on: 1. FCCC/SBSTA/2004/INF.13 Application of Application of methods and tools for assessing impacts and vulnerability, and developing adaptation responses. Background paper. Note by the secretariat., 2. UNDP. *Adaptation policy framework for climate change. Developing strategies, policies and measures*. Nations Development Programme. 2005. Edited by Bo Lim. Co-authored by Ian Burton, Elizabeth Malone, Saleemul Huq. Cambridge University Press. 253 p. , 3. UNEP. 1998. *Handbook on methods for climate change impact assessment and adaptation strategies*. United Nations Environment Programme, Retrieved from http://130.37.129.100/english/o_o/instituten/IVM/research/climatechange/Handbook.htm, 4. UNFCCC “Compendium of methods and tools to evaluate impacts of, and vulnerability and adaptation to, climate change”. UNFCCC secretariat with service of Stratus Consulting. 2002. http://unfccc.int/adaptation/methodologies_for/vulnerability_and_adaptation/items/2674.php

judge the significance of the climate change risk compared to the other risks faced, so they can work out what adaptation measures are most appropriate.

The **sectoral approach** focuses on assessment of vulnerability and adaptation in particular economic sectors and areas sensitive to climate variability and change, such as water resources, agriculture, natural ecosystems, coastal zones, human health and infrastructure. To date, associated sectoral analysis has been done mostly using a sectoral bio-physical model with data on climate change scenarios as an input (scenario-driven/top-down approach). This approach was applied in vulnerability and adaptation assessments reported in more than 150 national communications from both Annex I and non-Annex I Parties in the period 1995–2002. The strength of this approach is that it gets closer to action and implementation. This is a strength because much adaptation policy and practice is driven by the needs of stakeholders in specific domains, such as agriculture, water and coasts. It may be seen as a more top-down approach that does not connect with the needs at the community level, but more recent work-studies have used the vulnerability-driven/bottom-up approach and/or associated tools to address sectoral adaptation at all levels.

The livelihoods approach is a way of thinking about the objectives, scope and priorities for development. The word “livelihood” can be used in many different ways. The following defines livelihoods as “A livelihood comprises the capabilities, assets (including both material and social resources) and activities required for a means of living. A livelihood is sustainable when it can cope with and recover from stresses and shocks and maintain or enhance its capabilities and assets both now and in the future, while not undermining the natural resource base.” Adapted from Chambers, R. and G. Conway (1992) *Sustainable rural livelihoods: Practical concepts for the 21st century*. IDS Discussion Paper 296. Brighton: IDS.

Sustainable livelihoods approaches prioritize people’s assets (tangible and intangible); their ability to withstand shocks (the vulnerability context); and policies and institutions that reflect poor people’s priorities, rather than those of the elite.

It is a relatively new approach in the context of adaptation to climate change. One of the few examples of application of this approach is a project undertaken within the UNEP/GEF programme: *Assessments of Impacts and Adaptations to Climate Change* (<<http://www.aiaccproject.org/>>). The project followed the sustainable livelihoods framework to assess the adaptive capacity of local communities to future climate change. The strength of this kind of approach is that it addresses adaptation needs at the community level, and allows the poorer and more vulnerable to decide or influence the priorities. It may be seen as remote from international decisions and policy and not easy to connect/integrate in some cases into national policies.

The **integrated approach** considers the interactions between the diversity of impacts of climate change and adaptations in related sectors and areas and their interactions in the context of other changes. An example of this approach undertaken for integrated impact assessment is the Advanced Terrestrial Ecosystem Analysis and Modelling (ATEAM) project, a Europe-based project involving more than 50 scientists from 10 countries to assess vulnerability to global climate change. It covered agriculture, forestry, carbon storage, energy, water, biodiversity and mountains. An important part of ATEAM was the development of a framework that allows for the integration of output from ecosystem and hydrological models with socio-economic data.

In a broader sense, an integrated approach to adaptation implies close collaboration across disciplines (e.g. natural, sectoral, disaster reduction and social), across geographical (local, national, regional, global) and temporal (from current impacts to short- and mid- term climate variability to long-term change) scales.

Annex II**Examples of possible initial action areas of the Programme of Work**

| Action area | Scale and approach | Examples of possible partners |
|---|---|---|
| A2. Promote further development, dissemination and better access to and application of, global climate models, and regional climate and impact models | Global, regional, national Scenario-based approach | Research community, experts, UNDP, UNEP, research community, System for Analysis, Research and Training (START) |
| A3. Improved access to, and management of, climate data and products; and socio-economic information on vulnerable populations and economic sectors | Global, regional, national, sectoral, local Scenario-based approach; vulnerability-based approach; including sectoral and integrated assessment tools | WMO, FAO, GCOS, GEOSS, FAO, Research Community, World Bank, WRI, IIHD, etc. |
| B 1. Risks, key vulnerabilities, thresholds, and critical limits of climate change in particular with regard to sea level, water, agriculture, health, ecosystems, and infrastructure | Global, sectoral, regional Scenario-based and vulnerability-based approaches; risk assessment/management; integrated approach and livelihoods approach | WMO, WHO, FAO, CBD secretariat, IUCN, etc. |
| B 4. Vulnerability of SIDS | Regional, national, sectoral Scenario-based and vulnerability-based approaches; risk assessment/management, livelihoods approach | Regional organizations, research community, development agencies, LEG, etc. |
| C 2. National adaptation strategies | National Scenario-based and vulnerability-based approaches; risk assessment/management | Development agencies, experts, CGE, LEG, etc. |
| C 4. Adaptation strategies for extreme weather events, sea-level rise, ecosystems and health | Local, national and global Risk assessment/management; integrated approach | WMO, WHO, FAO, CBD secretariat, IUCN, ISDR. UNDP, Provention Consortium, Red Cross and Red Crescent, .etc. |
| C 5. Financial hedging, risk sharing and insurance (including micro-insurance) | National, communities, global Risk assessment/management | World Bank, IFIs, reinsurance industry, experts |
| C 6. Adaptation technologies and technology transfer, including research and development | Integrated National and regional | Experts (EGTT), business community, etc. |
| D2. Integrating disaster reduction and adaptation planning | Local, national and global Risk assessment/management; integrated approach | WMO, IUCN, ISDR. UNDP, Provention Consortium. Red Cross and Red Crescent, etc. |
| D4. Economic diversification aimed at reducing reliance on vulnerable economic sectors | National, sectoral, regional; Risk assessment/management | World Bank, development agencies, experts, etc. |

Annex III

The terms of reference of the work of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice

Article 9 of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE

1. A subsidiary body for scientific and technological advice is hereby established to provide the Conference of the Parties and, as appropriate, its other subsidiary bodies with timely information and advice on scientific and technological matters relating to the Convention. This body shall be open to participation by all Parties and shall be multidisciplinary. It shall comprise government representatives competent in the relevant field of expertise. It shall report regularly to the Conference of the Parties on all aspects of its work.
2. Under the guidance of the Conference of the Parties, and drawing upon existing competent international bodies, this body shall:
 - (a) Provide assessments of the state of scientific knowledge relating to climate change and its effects;
 - (b) Prepare scientific assessments on the effects of measures taken in the implementation of the Convention;
 - (c) Identify innovative, efficient and state-of-the-art technologies and know-how and advise on the ways and means of promoting development and/or transferring such technologies;
 - (d) Provide advice on scientific programmes, international cooperation in research and development related to climate change, as well as on ways and means of supporting endogenous capacity-building in developing countries; and
 - (e) Respond to scientific, technological and methodological questions that the Conference of the Parties and its subsidiary bodies may put to the body.
3. The functions and terms of reference of this body may be further elaborated by the Conference of the Parties

Note: The functions of SBSTA and SBI have been elaborated in decisions 6/CP.1 and 13/CP.3.¹¹

¹¹ The decisions, *inter alia*, noted that “the roles of the subsidiary bodies can be broadly characterized as follows: (a) The SBSTA will be the link between the scientific, technical and technological assessments and the information provided by competent international bodies, and the policy-oriented needs of the Conference of the Parties, (b) The SBI will develop recommendations to assist the Conference of the Parties in its review and assessment of the implementation of the Convention and in the preparation and implementation of its decisions”