

## **Day 2 Session 4**

### **Breakout Group II**

#### **National Group**

##### **Process and Output Note:**

**Facilitator:** Refers to the last question as our key task in NWP as very important to feed the inputs to negotiators who are part of this group.

##### **Remarks by group members:**

- We must first identify obstacles....and then their redressal**
- Classify obstacles as per blocks such as policy.....institutional collaboration**
- Policy deficit analysis**
- Brazil has a climate fund where multiple institutions are involved and fund is invested in an integrated fashion**
- It is a global issue and need to be addressed upfront**

**Q I. How can we overcome obstacles to adaptation (e.g. gaps in science, data, governance, policy... etc) related to water resources?**

#### **Policy**

Policy deficit analysis where current policies/there aspects impede sustainable water management, and how to address long term impacts/issues

Multiple policies at national level (no umbrella where all comes together e.g. US) and related to water and these need to be analysed for coherence (however also how these unfold in lower levels of governance e.g. local community/sub-basin)

Collect evidence and present this to policymakers in simple understandable form (for policy influencing)

Adaptation related policies often overshadowed by the surge of mitigation related strategies/actions at national level (this leads to low priority of adaptation at policy level e.g. Brazil)

Potential economic analysis in terms of costs and benefits related to adaptation needs is must for convincing policymakers, however it is difficult as longer timelines are involved and our measures may even prove mal-adaptation

Awareness-building is still deficient as people/policymakers want evidence and for that pilot learning are must to show economic gains/losses/disasters. NWP should collect more such examples for convincing.

You need a formal legislation process and then it is easier to look in to governance issues.

Inter-ministerial coordination and cooperation is useful institutional arrangement at the national level but for policymaking and implementing we need also projects. Implementation of such projects is must to deliver learning linking policy and practice. Legislation otherwise is difficult. In US Federal Government has asked all ministeries to write an adaptation plan and that makes it more rigorous. However, data availability could be constraint for this.

Climate law can provide regulatory framework (Mexico) that binds subnational institutions to conceive and implement adaptation related projects.

Two-way communication networks between national institutions is must and often this is weak so that also local governments/basin councils also don't become accountable.

Funding in general of NAPA's is a central problem (e.g. concept of change management implementation is must but we can't do all this without budgets)

Most of the national documents (National communication in Argentina) barring NAPA's are silent about adaptation or vaguely consider it.

It may not always be technical/big funding questions, you may use ongoing funds to be invested

### **Science**

National Coverage of weather stations (not optimal)

Data collection on building evidence is must

Technology options need to be tried/piloted

### **Governance**

This is the crux as we need to capture good governance cases but there are not many

NAPA ownership goes across sectors, and ownership is diluted hence governance weak. We need an umbrella organisation which “takes the bull by horn” and country mainstreams NAPAs (Zambia example).

## **Q II. How can indigenous and traditional knowledge be most effectively leveraged for resilient water management?**

It can be fostered by national agencies through a design of an integrative and inclusive consultative process and their concerns and inputs included in building policy/strategies (e.g. in Brazil)

We have to build a design methodology (inter alia using EBA, CBA methodologies) to capture such a knowledge and practices and leverage from it.

Best practices are available (Bolivia example)

We need also national events that specifically must focus on indigenous issues (Canada)

### **III. How can gender perspectives be most effectively integrated in adaptation practice?**

Brazil: we are trying to integrate certain measures in sector plans under National Climate Plan especially starting with “Health sector”

Gender strategies need to be build in sectors and performance based national level gender indicators in development/adaptation programmes needs to be put in.

### **IV. How could the NWP contribute to enable effective adaptation across and between local/indigenous, national, and transboundary/regional levels, including promoting further actions under the SBSTA of the UNFCCC process?**

NWP should exchange good experiences (coming from all sources) which have upscalable potential

Perhaps first NWP may focus on one programme and then relate it to crosscutting

It may also need to have good interface with practitioners and good communication plan

NWP need to communicate vertically and horizontally, e.g. also through country disseminators (national focal point for adaptation)

It could enter the arena of M&E, how to mainstream it for adaptation?

NWP must match the need of countries and efforts should be made here

It needs to also interface with key universities working on adaptation and engage these for designing/improving local adaptation strategies